



BAY AREA
AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT
DISTRICT

ADVISORY COUNCIL AIR QUALITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

- REVISED AGENDA -

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

HAROLD BRAZIL, CHAIRPERSON
IRVIN DAWID
FRED GLUECK
KRAIG KURUCZ

PAMELA CHANG
EMILY DRENNEN
JOHN HOLTZCLAW, PH.D.
KEVIN SHANAHAN

TUESDAY
FEBRUARY 3, 2004

BOARD ROOM
9:00 A.M.

1. **Call to Order – Roll Call**
2. **Public Comment Period**

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items, Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.3. The public has the opportunity to speak on any agenda item. All agendas for Committee meetings are posted at the District, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, at least 72 hours before a meeting. At the beginning of the meeting, an opportunity is also provided for the public to speak on any subject within the Committee's purview. Speakers are limited to five minutes each.

3. **Approval of Minutes of July 22 and September 30, 2003**
4. **Control Measure Review**

The Committee will review the air pollution control measures for volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxide and particulate matter contained in the recently adopted attainment plans of the South Coast Air Quality Management District and San Joaquin Unified Air Pollution Control District for possible application to the Bay Area AQMD attainment planning process.

5. **Committee Member Comments/Other Business**

Committee members, or staff, on their own initiative, or in response to questions posed by the public, may ask a question for clarification, make a brief announcement or report on his or her own activities, provide a reference to staff regarding factual information, request staff to report back at a subsequent meeting on any matter or take action to direct staff to place a matter of business on a future agenda.

6. Time and Place of Next Meeting

9:30 a.m., Tuesday, April 6, 2004, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109.

7. Adjournment

CONTACT CLERK OF THE BOARDS - 939 ELLIS STREET SF, CA 94109

(415) 749-4965
FAX: (415) 928-8560
BAAQMD homepage:
www.baaqmd.gov

- To submit written comments on an agenda item in advance of the meeting.
- To request, in advance of the meeting, to be placed on the list to testify on an agenda item.
- To request special accommodations for those persons with disabilities notification to the Clerk's Office should be given in a timely manner, so that arrangements can be made accordingly.

HB:jc

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
939 ELLIS STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94109
(415) 771-6000

CLERK OF THE BOARDS OFFICE:
MONTHLY CALENDAR OF DISTRICT MEETINGS
JANUARY 2004

<u>TYPE OF MEETING</u>	<u>DAY</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>ROOM</u>
Board of Directors Regular Meeting; including a Community Tour of three locations in San Francisco	Wednesday	7	9:45 a.m.	Board Room
Board of Directors Mobile Source Committee	Thursday	8	9:30 a.m.	4 th Floor Conf. Room
Board of Directors Public Outreach Committee - CANCELLED -	Monday	12	9:45 a.m.	4 th Floor Conf. Room
Advisory Council Retreat / Regular Meeting	Wednesday	14	10:00 a.m.	Port of San Francisco Bayside Conference Room, Pier 1 San Francisco, CA 94111
Board of Directors Legislative Committee	Wednesday	14	9:30 a.m.	4 th Floor Conf. Room
Board of Directors Regular Meeting	Wednesday	21	9:45 a.m.	Board Room
Regional Agency Coordinating Committee (RACC)	Friday	23	1:30 p.m.	MTC 101 Eighth Street Oakland, CA 94607
Board of Directors Stationary Source Committee	Monday	26	9:30 a.m.	Board Room
Board of Directors Budget & Finance Committee - CANCELLED -	Wednesday	28	9:45 a.m.	4 th Floor Conf. Room

MR:mr
1/15/04 (11:50 a.m.)
P/Library/Calendar/Moncal

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
939 ELLIS STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94109
(415) 771-6000

CLERK OF THE BOARDS OFFICE:
MONTHLY CALENDAR OF DISTRICT MEETINGS
F E B R U A R Y 2 0 0 4

<u>TYPE OF MEETING</u>	<u>DAY</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>ROOM</u>
Advisory Council Air Quality Planning Committee	Tuesday	3	9:00 a.m.	Board Room
Board of Directors Regular Meeting	Wednesday	4	9:45 a.m.	Board Room
- CANCELLED -				
Board of Directors Public Outreach Committee	Monday	9	9:45 a.m.	4 th Floor Conf. Room
Advisory Council Technical Committee	Friday	13	9:30 a.m.	Board Room
Board of Directors Regular Meeting	Wednesday	18	9:45 a.m.	Board Room
Advisory Council Public Health Committee	Monday	23	1:30 p.m.	Room 716
Board of Directors Budget & Finance Committee	Wednesday	25	9:45 a.m.	4 th Floor Conf. Room
Board of Directors Mobile Source Committee	Thursday	26	9:30 a.m.	4 th Floor Conf. Room

MR:hl
(1/26/04) 11:17 a.m.

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

DRAFT MINUTES

Advisory Council
Air Quality Planning Committee Meeting
9:30 a.m., Tuesday, July 22, 2003

1. **Call to Order – Roll Call.** 9:40 a.m. Quorum Present: Kraig Kurucz, Chairperson, Harold M. Brazil, Pamela Chang, Patrick Congdon, Irvin Dawid, John Holtzclaw. Absent: Fred Glueck, Kevin Shanahan.
2. **Public Comment Period.** There were none.
3. **Approval of Minutes of May 27, 2003.** Dr. Holtzclaw moved approval of the minutes; seconded by Mr. Congdon; carried unanimously.
4. **Legislative Update.** Peter Hess, Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer, noted that the State budget dominates the discussions at the Legislature. The District conceptually supports SB 288 (Sher), the New Source Review Restoration (NSR) Act of 2003 and is seeking amendments. Some reform to the NSR program is necessary. The California Association of Air Pollution Control Officers (CAPCOA) and the National Association of State and Local Air Pollution Control Agencies advocate that the NSR program consider the net air quality benefit of a retrofit or plant modification as surpassing the associated emission impacts of a single pollutant. The District and CAPCOA are working with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to develop principles of acceptability that will meet the federal NSR program requirements but not weaken the existing NSR program. The EPA has agreed to several tenets of NSR in California, which declare that NSR should:
 - a) minimize emissions from new sources and modifications of existing sources
 - b) protect public health
 - c) encourage the installation of the cleanest technology and pollution prevention
 - d) affirm that the most practical and cost effective time to control a source of air pollution is the time of initial construction and modification
 - e) ensure enforceability of provisions through permitting, record keeping and reporting
 - f) not provide disincentives to pollution reduction or act as a barrier to environmentally beneficial projects
 - g) recognize investments made by companies in state-of-the-art air pollution control
 - h) allow sources to respond rapidly to changing markets and plan for future investments in air pollution control and prevention activities

Air districts in the State advocate these NSR program improvements. EPA Region IX has been informed that there is no conflict between the federal reforms and the foregoing NSR tenets, and that it has the authority to reach an agreement with the State Air Districts regarding them. The EPA will also allow California NSR programs to be more stringent than the federal NSR program—an allowance that is not granted to any other state in the country.

Mr. Dawid requested that at the next Committee meeting staff address (a) SCA 11 (Alarcon) and ACA 14 (Steinberg), which would lower the threshold for transportation sales taxes and thus impact state air quality programs, and (b) the vehicle license fee bills AB 204 (Nation) and AB 1546 (Simitian), which affects only specific counties in the Bay Area. Also, future staff legislative reports should list the sponsors of a bill, as this would provide further insight into its intent.

Chairperson Kurucz inquired as to the status of SB 656 (Sher) on particulate matter (PM) regulation. Mr. Hess replied that it is not presently funded and is moving forward slowly. He added that in the Bay Area nitrates are a major source of PM, along with woodsmoke and diesel fuel. The District is uniquely prohibited by State legislation from using TFCA funds for preparing air quality plans as required by the California Clean Air Act. Therefore, the District is asking Senator Sher to expand the funding mechanism in SB 656 to include planning for ozone and PM.

- 5. Status of State and Federal Efforts to Reduce Diesel Emissions.** Michael Murphy, Environmental Planner, stated diesel emissions in the Bay Area derive primarily from trucks, buses, ships, trains, construction, agricultural and other off-road equipment, and small gasoline engines. On-road and off-highway mobile source emissions contribute the majority of nitric oxide (NO_x) and reactive organics (ROG) emissions, and a sizeable fraction of PM₁₀. Off-road engines emit significant sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emissions because they do not use ultra low sulfur diesel (ULSD). Forthcoming requirements to use ULSD should greatly reduce emissions from off-road sources.

Bus transit fleets are the traditional experimental ground for federal and state regulation of heavy-duty engines. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has adopted a separate rule for transit buses that includes options for compliance paths that use either alternative fuel or diesel. NO_x is a large contributor to diesel PM. Most Bay Area transit properties have chosen the diesel path, but they have yet to attain the rule's fleet-wide NO_x average. In adopting fleet-specific regulations for other fleets, CARB may choose to consider different types of fleet-wide NO_x averages.

Zero emission (fuel cell) bus demonstration projects will be conducted by AC Transit in partnership with Golden Gate Transit and San Mateo County Transit in partnership with Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority. Through the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA), the District has contributed \$1 million to each of these two demonstration projects.

The 1998 CARB standard for urban transit bus NO_x of four grams per brake-horsepower hour will be lowered nearly to zero in 2007. Presently, PM traps are already reducing PM emissions below this level, and natural gas engines will likely meet these limits by 2007. The CARB retrofit strategy for transit bus diesel PM is based on diesel emissions as a toxic air contaminant. It fixes January 1, 2002 as the baseline and requires that in each succeeding year a higher percentage of the fleet must be retrofitted. CARB is also considering retrofit strategies for other on-road fleets.

Out of a total of 4.6 million vehicles registered in the Bay Area, approximately 90,000 are heavy-duty trucks. These trucks represent 5-6% of the daily vehicle miles traveled. CARB has regulated heavy-duty truck engines since 1987. Since October of 2002, as a result of litigation filed by CARB and EPA, the engine manufacturers have largely complied with CARB standards for 2004. The 2007 standards will further reduce emissions and are similar to the 2007 transit bus emission standards. CARB is also proposing that, when an engine is rebuilt, its on-board computer controls be reprogrammed to remove off-cycle emissions. The reprogramming is not technically difficult, but the task is labor-intensive. CARB believes that the engine manufacturers rather than the truck owners should bear the cost of the reprogramming. The issue is likely to prove controversial.

CARB has a proposal for 2007 that would require installation of devices that limit vehicle idling. It is also considering a requirement for PM₁₀ retrofit requirements for heavy-duty engines similar to what it requires for transit fleets. In September 2003, CARB will consider a PM trap retrofit rule for garbage trucks. This will be the first application of such a rule to private fleets. The requirement to use ULSD will also follow, thereby reducing SO₂ and further enable PM retrofit technologies. On July 31, 2003, CARB will hold a public hearing to adopt fuel specifications for ULSD, which will be similar to EPA's efforts to establish a nation-wide ULSD specification that will become effective in 2006. In California, this would apply to on and off-road components.

EPA and CARB have cooperated to adopt similar off-road diesel engine standards for construction equipment, ground support equipment and portable equipment, which would apply nationwide. EPA recently defined agricultural engines as off-road engines, thereby subjecting them to its off-road standards. There is controversy over whether state or federal rules govern the emissions from this equipment as well as whether it must use CARB diesel fuel, which has lower sulfur content than diesel fuel in the federal program. Federal regulations for this equipment contain three tiers, which become effective with each successive year. While CARB does not employ the terms of federal emission standard designations for this equipment, its emission standards are the same.

EPA regulates emissions from ships and boats, and recently adopted rules will become effective in 2004. It has divided commercial vessels into three categories. The standards are based on a pending international treaty with which manufacturers are trying to comply, possibly because it contains backdated compliance requirements. While EPA has applied these standards to smaller vessels, its application to large ocean-going vessels is still under consideration. CARB and EPA have parallel regulations for in-board and out-board recreational engines. The District is participating with CARB in this regulatory effort. There are two tiers of emission standards for commercial marine engines. These have not yet been applied to large ocean-going vessels. With regard to gasoline powered marine engines, large reductions in NO_x and hydrocarbon (HC) have occurred since 1998, and CARB required further major emission reductions in 2001.

EPA adopted three tiers of regulations for railroad locomotive emissions in 1997. Tier 0 requires emission reductions upon engine remanufacture. Tier 1 addresses already manufactured engines, and Tier 2 will apply to new engines in 2005. The standards will be applied differently to various locomotive types and applications ranging from freight and passenger hauls to yard switching.

CARB also regulates emissions of gasoline engines less than 25 horsepower (hp). A single 25 hp engine powering a two-stroke chain saw emits the equivalent of 10 cars driven 250 miles.

Other available control technologies include electronic fuel injection, which improves fuel economy and combustion. New diesel engines use common rail fuel injection: a single fuel line that equalizes the pressure across the cylinders. On-board diagnostics are becoming more common, and may set the stage for smog check programs for heavy-duty diesel engines. Dual fuel or pilot ignition engines employ ignition by compression. This increases fuel economy and engine power. The successful development of fuel cell technology remains on the horizon.

Major after-combustion devices include oxidation catalysts, PM filters, lean NO_x catalysts, NO_x absorbers, and selective catalytic reduction for NO_x from engines to meet the 2007 standards.

Engine idling control devices/systems are coming into vogue, and truck stops are now beginning to offer electronic power for parked trucks to reduce engine idling.

Fuel modifications include Fischer Troppe Diesel (natural gas converted into a stable liquid and blended into diesel fuel), biodiesel, emulsified diesel, ethanol diesel, and hydrogen for fuel cells. CARB and the California Energy Commission will hold a fuel symposium next month.

Apart from regulations, there are government incentive programs to reduce emissions, such as the Carl Moyer and TFCA programs. Some tax credits are available for alternative fuels, along with emission reduction credit programs for mobile sources. The latter is not prevalent in the Bay Area. Local land-use development agreements can include mitigation measures. Government purchase orders could stipulate that equipment to be shipped should be transported by low-emitting trucks.

In reply to questions and comments from Committee members, Mr. Murphy noted:

- It would be ideal if funding for the Carl Moyer program were increased and its funding mechanism corrected so that the District is no longer under-funded. Financial incentive programs should go beyond NOx and ozone and directly include PM₁₀. Air Districts should be allowed to prioritize for PM₁₀ reductions. The turnover of older vehicles nets the greatest emission reduction, followed by the accelerated deployment of cleaner engines.
- Most transit districts receive bus transit replacement dollars from the federal government. Both the Santa Clara Valley VTA and San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI) have delayed purchase of new buses by previously extending the definition of the useful life of the bus.
- Concern over the lack of lubricity in ULSD has been addressed by adding a small amount of lubricating agent to the fuel. CARB has adopted a lubricity specification for its new fuel. The federal specification for diesel fuel has a higher sulfur content than the CARB specification.
- Biodiesel improves combustion and reduces PM emissions, but it burns hotter and increases NOx. The advantage of reducing the waste stream must be factored into the evaluation.
- The re-circulation of exhaust gases in heavy-duty engines requires a larger cooling system. A costly, customized modification of existing trucks and construction equipment is, therefore, required. Financial incentive programs assist in this work.
- Emissions from two-stroke scooters are comparable to chainsaw engines.
- Bay Area hybrid buses use a diesel engine. CARB recently adopted a certification procedure for hybrid design. On-board engines would have to meet the same requirements that apply to non-hybrid applications. Hybrid buses that use CNG power to generate electricity for the on-board batteries, along with regenerative braking, were proposed for use at the San Francisco International Airport, but the high cost proved prohibitive. MUNI operates two diesel-electric hybrids, and the hybrid design in the South Bay uses a micro-turbine to generate electricity for the battery. The Bay Area company “CalStart” has a long-term contract with the United States Defense Department to evaluate hybrid designs, and could provide further insight into hybrids.
- Construction and other off-road equipment are scheduled for rule-making with regard to PM₁₀ retrofit strategies. The possible application of the three tiers of federal standards to the manufacturers of off-road equipment is not presently being considered by either ARB or EPA.
- The prohibition on importing liquid natural gas (LNG) into California, based on concerns over volatility, applies to marine shipping. LNG transport is allowed either by railcar or truck.
- In the Bay Area there is a lack of funding for alternative fuel programs, and the Air District has been the main source of funding for them. Funding from other entities would be desirable.

- 6. Committee Member Comments/Other Business.** Mr. Dawid stated that a meeting of the South Bay Clean Cities Coalition would be held on August 6, 2003. He added that recently the Palo Alto City Council announced that TFCA funding was approved for signal retiming. He observed that TFCA funds would be better spent on programs that remove vehicles from the road than on ones that increase the speed at which they travel on them. The Committee should review this matter.

Ms. Chang summarized the proceedings of a conference on sustainable mobility at which it was noted that vehicle emissions are responsible for over 50% of total emissions. She added that in April of 2002 she attended an environmental design conference in Seattle, at which statistical data were presented that indicates 1.5% of gasoline moves passengers and the remaining 98.5% moves the vehicle; and less than 4% of the American public take transportation. A proposal to address this problem was offered, in which neighborhood sub cars would be used as transportation feeders to mobility centers for transfer to public transit. The Committee may wish to consider this matter in the future.

- 7. Time and Place of Next Meeting.** At the call of the Chair.

- 8. Adjournment.** 11:54 a.m.

James N. Corazza
Deputy Clerk of the Boards

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

DRAFT MINUTES

Advisory Council
Air Quality Planning Committee Meeting
1:00 p.m., Tuesday, September 30, 2003

- 1. Call to Order – Roll Call.** 1:19 p.m. Quorum Not Present: Harold M. Brazil, Patrick Congdon, Irvin Dawid, Fred Glueck. Absent: Kraig Kurucz, Chairperson, Pamela Chang, John Holtzclaw, Ph.D., Kevin Shanahan.
- 2. Public Comment Period.** There were none.
- 3. Approval of Minutes of July 22, 2003.** There being no quorum present, approval of the minutes was deferred to the next meeting.
- 4. Update on Networkcar Remote Emissions Demonstration Project.** Peter Hess, Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer, stated that this issue was of interest to this Committee and the Advisory Council about nine months to a year ago. Mr. Hess noted that the Air District moved forward to have discussions with Networkcar and has asked Ryan Glancy of Networkcar to present a report on the progress of Networkcar in the Bay Area.

Ryan Glancy, Solutions Manager, Networkcar provided the Committee with an overview of the Networkcar remote emissions project and highlighted the following:

- Networkcar's wireless device is installed in a car and is equipped with a performance monitoring system. It takes 15 to 20 minutes to install the CAReader.
- The device sends information to Networkcar's Data Center over a wireless network. About every 40 minutes the device is taking a reading from the car. This information is relayed to Networkcar's data center where the information is disseminated.
- The CAReader is commercially available and is sold as an aftermarket accessory by automobile dealers.
- The system enables vehicle owners to monitor the following: mileage, emissions systems components and associated Diagnostic Trouble Codes (DTC), and driving parameters.
- In 2001, Networkcar was awarded a contract for high mileage fleet vehicles for five years. The system allows the owners to be notified if their vehicles are out of compliance.
- The purpose of the Remote Emissions Monitoring Program is to dynamically monitor high mileage (over 75,000 miles per year).
- More devices were installed in 2000 model-year vehicles than any other model-year. The least number of devices were installed on 1994 vehicles.
- The number of vehicles participating in the study by vehicle manufacturers was reviewed, with Ford having the largest number and Chevrolet a close second. About

one-third of the vehicles had DTCs. Although Ford has the highest number of DTCs, the manufacturer with the highest percentage of vehicles with DTCs is Dodge.

- The highest percentage of vehicles with DTCs by model-year participating in the study is for 1997 vehicles and the lowest is for 2003 vehicles.
- There are a variety of problems with the vehicles in the study and they include: problems with a catalytic converter, the transmission control system, mixture control, and the O2 heater circuit.
- As a vehicle accumulates more miles, there is a significantly higher occurrence of problems. The annual smog check would not detect problems in these vehicles, but this program does.
- Vehicles with over 200,000 miles had at least twice the percentage of events.

Mr. Glancy reported that during this quarter, Networkcar would install up to 200 devices into Port of Oakland taxis. In addition, about 120 devices will be installed in taxis operating at the Oakland airport and the taxis will be required to have a Networkcar device to operate at the airport. Mr. Glancy noted that Networkcar is working on a program with the City of Oakland and the police department to monitor the emissions to enforce the repair of any cabs that are out of compliance. The cabs that run through the airport would be required to have the device and they would have to be in compliance.

Some companies that have violated the Health and Safety Code and part of the enforcement regulation have been allowed to come into this program instead of paying penalties. Networkcar is looking for the Port of Oakland to allow Networkcar to make sure the cars get back into compliance and then Networkcar could see how the program is working.

In response to questions from the Committee members, Mr. Glancy provided additional information

- There was not an even distribution of devices across year, make and model of cars.
- Most of the problems identified were with pollution control equipment on the vehicle.
- Other benefits of the continuous monitoring program include detecting fraud and detecting a bad part in a vehicle. Mr. Glancy noted there was a recall because of this type of information being available.
- CARB feels the data is more than adequate and the number of ways the data can be analyzed.
- There was discussion on an incentive for high fleet operators to participate in this program and, with CARB's buy-in, the operators would not have to participate in a program like Smog Check II. Mandatory repairs would still have to be made.
- The data is there to see if the vehicle is in compliance on a day-to-day basis.
- The San Jose airport recently had a ribbon cutting for the new CNG facility for their own fleet of buses, but they are unable to do anything to have the cab companies refuel at the CNG facility. Could there be a mandate, as there will be at the Port of Oakland, that if the cabs want to serve the airport, they have to subscribe to the Networkcar program?
- This is something that can expand to other areas. Southern California does exempt some of the participants from the \$1500 fine levied by ARB if they operate with an active MIL.
- There are other programs whereby Networkcar sells a product through a new or used auto dealer and provides a number of functions that allows monitoring of performance, safety

and security of the vehicle, and location. Diagnostics are linked to the auto repair shops so if they detect a problem, the shop can notify the owner that there is a problem.

- Through the Bureau of Automotive Repair (BAR) there is a program called the Continuous Pilot Testing Program (CPT) which allows end consumers to come out of the regular Smog Check program and come into the CPT program.
- The contracts are with a variety of taxi and para transit companies. Networkcar did do some things with ATC, but there were issues of who actually owned the cars and other systems that were in the vehicles. It was more of a contractual issue on who owned the vehicles. The remainder of the companies are located in Southern California. The Port of Oakland fleet will be the first in Northern California.
- The use of Networkcar tells the driver that there is a problem at a high mileage (175,000+ miles) sooner than the Smog Check. It is more effective for the high mileage vehicles than Smog Check.
- The unit price to install the system is approximately \$1,500.

5. Review of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission Long Range Transportation Plan.

Ellen Griffin, Senior Analyst, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Legislation and Public Affairs, presented the report and stated that MTC is beginning a long public involvement process on the update of the Long Range Transportation Plan for the Bay Area (Transportation 2030). Ms. Griffin noted that this is a 25-year long-range plan for the Bay Area and it guides transportation policies and investments in the nine Bay Area counties. The Plan will be updated every three years and projects must be in the Plan to receive state or federal funds.

Ms. Griffin reviewed Phase I, which focused on three major topics:

- 1) Goals and objectives of the Plan.
- 2) Prior commitments and what funds are available for new investments.
- 3) Transportation and land use. Regional agencies in the Bay Area completed a Smart Growth process last year and have adopted Smart Growth principles.

Phase II will focus on 1) local investment priorities; 2) technical analysis of proposed investment packages; and 3) congestion management agencies workshops and meetings. Phase II is the draft Plan that will come out in December 2004 and the target adoption date for the Plan is January 2005. Ms. Griffin added that in addition to the workshops, MTC is doing public opinion polls, telephone polls, there will be an interactive web component, and there will be focus groups.

Chris Brittle, Planning Manager, MTC, stated that one of the distinguishing features of the new Plan is that there will be more funds available to draw from. In the past, the federal planning process required the transportation revenue to be looked at over 25 years and only those projects and programs that met those revenues would be in the Plan.

Mr. Brittle noted that MTC feels there are probable revenue sources that will come into play as the Plan is being prepared. A number of counties are preparing sales tax plans, Senator Perata is talking about a bridge toll bill to raise the toll to \$3, and there will be a high-speed rail bond in November 2004. These revenue sources have to be anticipated and the public will need to understand what the implications of these revenue sources are on the Plan.

Mr. Brittle stated that the planning process started out by defining the goals and objectives that drive the programs and projects that are put into the Plan. The previous goals were: 1) mobility – improving the ease and convenience of using the transportation system, 2) safety – improving the safety of the transportation system for users, 3) equity – fairness in the planning, funding and operation of the region’s transportation system, 4) environment – plan and develop transportation facilities and services to protect and enhance the environment, 5) economic vitality – support transportation investments that are essential to the economic well-being of the Bay Area, and 6) community vitality – community-based efforts to improve quality of life by providing access to transportation funding. During the workshops in June, the public felt that these were too large and nebulous and did not have measurable standards and objectives.

Mr. Brittle reviewed the revised proposed goals that are being discussed with the public as follows:

1. Fix-It first – 80% of the funds in the transportation plan have to go to maintain the current system.
2. Making Connections – making transit systems work and having seamless connections, good service and good physical connections between systems.
3. Reliable Travel Choices – provide transit, carpool, biking and walking alternatives that would be attractive enough to be used by the public.
4. Smart Growth – this is a goal to recognize the consensus that has developed around the region on a Smart Growth strategy around transit centers and corridors.
5. Clean Air – is being singled out as the main environmental goal in the Plan.
6. Lifeline Mobility – transportation system improvements that benefit the elderly, low income, school children, and those that have less mobility options.
7. A Safe System – it has been suggested to make this safe and secure because of the current focus on terrorism.

Each goal will have a set of objectives and a set of ways to measure progress towards achieving the goal.

There was discussion on the following:

- The BART to SFO connection is not doing as well as projected because of the recession and the problems that the airlines are having. The CalTrain/Millbrae connection is not being well used at this time, but part of the issue is getting people used to the connection in addition to waiting for the economy to return and people start traveling again.
- One of the missing goals is pricing; i.e. driving and parking might be cheaper than using an alternative. Mr. Brittle indicated this is covered in providing a reliable service that the customer wants to pay for. Pricing is a strategy more than a goal, but it could be worked into a goal.
- The Clean Air goal (#5) is an off-shoot for the accomplishment of goals one through four.
- MTC will have to prioritize the goals.
- A potential goal or objective of cost-effectiveness needs to be kept in mind as the BART to San Jose/Santa Clara is proceeding. Mr. Brittle indicated there is a separate set of performance measures that are being used for this regional transportation Plan that is a result of Senator Perata’s legislation (SB 1492) that states any new project coming into the regional Plan should be evaluated.

- Commuters in the Bay Area are looking at what is the most convenient manner to get from point A to point B. How much of the goals and objectives may be directed toward some sort of social investigation, rather than just physical investigations for roads or buses, or more rail and get some sort of idea of where the convenience items are that the residents of the Bay Area are looking for as a means of partaking in other modes of transportation or coming up with viable goals that solve some of the local issues.
- MTC is doing a Regional Transit Connectivity Study that looks at specific connection issues around the system. The hope is that MTC will find some low-cost improvements and that those projects will make it into the Plan.
- What is it that the consumer in the Bay Area identifies as a convenience, i.e. making connections, time, money, smart growth, community planning. That would allow MTC to determine where the funding would be best spent.
- MTC attempts to capture all the variables in a sophisticated travel model, which predicts where the growth patterns are, who takes transit, who is using the carpool lane, etc. Based on the usage, MTC can look at the viability of the investments it is making.
- There was discussion on the Bayshore Freeway corridor, its peak periods, and that all options are being used in that area.
- If the bridge tolls go to \$3, those motorists who drive over the bridges will be contributing to public transit needs. The same scenario should be applied to other places by the use of "HOT" lanes and the money would be used to support public transit in that corridor. San Diego did this in 1988 through the use of Transportation Control Measures. MTC has looked at some corridors and the issue of "HOT" lanes will be discussed during the development of the Plan.

The Committee discussed what they see as the two main goals and determined Smart Growth was its first priority and Fixit-It First and Making Connections were second. Mr. Glueck stated that it would be beneficial to have this same presentation made to the full Council in November and a decision could be made as to what the full Council sees as its two main goals.

- 6. Committee Member Comments/Other Business.** Mr. Glueck stated it would be helpful to get some feedback from the Bureau of Automotive Repair (BAR) on Smog Check II with respect to how it is working. Mr. Glueck requested staff make a presentation at the next meeting on Smog Check II and how it is working, including any of the Advisory Council's recommendations that the Board of Directors may have taken action on.

Mr. Glueck stated that it would be interesting to see how the smog check stations are reacting to the extra cost and the extra training, what sort of negative or positive feedback, will they pass the cost through, etc.

In response to a question from Mr. Dawid on legislation that might enhance the role of the Air District, Mr. Hess stated that there would be a legislative update at the next meeting.

Mr. Dawid requested updates on the East Palo Alto and San Jose Mayfair meetings on the 2004 Ozone Attainment Strategy and 2003 Clean Air Plan.

- 7. Time and Place of Next Meeting.** 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, November 25, 2003, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109.

8. Adjournment. 2:26 p.m.

Mary Romaidis
Clerk of the Boards

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

January 22, 2004

To: Advisory Council Air Quality Planning Committee

From: James N. Corazza, Deputy Clerk of the Boards

Re: Links to Attainment Plans with Control Measures for Advisory Council Review

At the Advisory Council Retreat of January 14, 2004, staff was directed to provide website links to the attainment plans of the South Coast AQMD, along with related links which it considered topical, for purposes of facilitating Council review of control measures. These are:

This is the link to the South Coast's 2003 Clean Air Plan:

<http://www.aqmd.gov/aqmp/AQMD03AQMP.htm>

This link is specifically to the stationary and mobile source control measures:

http://www.aqmd.gov/aqmp/docs/2003AQMP_AppIVa.pdf

The state and federal components of the South Coast's (and San Joaquin's) plan are found here:

<http://www.arb.ca.gov/planning/sip/stfed03/stfed03.htm>

The San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD has control measures that have been analyzed as well. Here is a link to their plan:

http://www.valleyair.org/Air_Quality_Plans/AQ_plans_Ozone.htm#Draft%201-Hour%20ADP%20103

This link is specifically to their recommended control measures:

<http://www.valleyair.org/Workshops/postings/1-23-03/Appendix%20C.pdf>

This link is the gateway to all the documents produced for the Ozone Working Group:

<http://www.baaqmd.gov/pln/Plans/ozone/2003/workgroup/ozoneworkgrp.asp>

This link references the compilation of the preliminary findings on 370 control measure suggestions considered by staff:

http://www.baaqmd.gov/pln/Plans/ozone/2003/workgroup/CM_evals2.pdf

PH:GK:jc