

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

APPROVED MINUTES

Advisory Council  
Air Quality Planning Committee Meeting  
1:30 p.m., Tuesday, August 3, 2004

1. **Call to Order – Roll Call.** 1:41 p.m. Quorum Present: Harold Brazil, Chairperson, Irvin Dawid, Emily Drennen, Fred Glueck, John Holtzclaw, Ph.D., Kraig Kurucz. Absent: Kevin Shanahan.
2. **Public Comment Period.** There were none.
3. **Approval of Minutes of June 15, 2004.** Dr. Holtzclaw moved approval of the minutes; seconded by Mr. Kurucz; carried unanimously.
4. **District's Ozone Control Strategy.** Chairperson Brazil called for discussion on the District's Ozone Control Strategy. The following points were made in discussion of the Further Study Measure (FSM) on biodiesel:
  - a) some transit agencies consider biodiesel impractical as it entails a loss of warranty protection on vehicle engines. An AC Transit biodiesel demonstration project on buses revealed many engine breakdowns. Biodiesel does not major particulate matter (PM) reductions, but the extent of reductions in emission of NOx is less impressive. (Brazil)
  - b) biodiesel is being demonstrated in a refuse truck fleet in Berkeley and may be more applicable to this type of fleet rather than to an urban transit fleet. (Dawid)
  - c) the feasibility of this FSM will include evaluation of potential feed stock sources and several bench tests on various types of equipment to ascertain emission benefits. The District will evaluate emulsified fuel as well. (Henry Hilken, Environmental Planning Manager)
  - d) keeping fuel emulsified for a stand-by field generator can be costly and impractical. (Kurucz)
  - e) the purpose of alternative fuels is to reduce this country's dependence on petroleum. (Dawid)

The following points were made in discussion of indirect source mitigation:

- (a) the San Joaquin Valley air district is considering a rule that would require a permit on land-use developments with certain types of air quality impacts and thereby provide an incentive for sound development. The District will closely track the rule given the potential for litigation from the building industry. State law requires that a nexus exist between a fee and the associated pollution mitigation. The District will continue to advocate Smart Growth. (Hilken)
- (b) four years ago, this Committee reviewed the District's indirect source mitigation authority in parking cash-out and urban heat island programs. (Glueck)
- (c) the Bay Area is much more Smart Growth and transit oriented than it was two decades ago. A number of years ago the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) analyzed an alternative transit scenario that included denser development, and parking cash-out, etc. The

results from that alternative when compared with the preferred regional transportation plan scenario Regional Transportation Plan showed greater reductions in driving by 8%, in congestion by 15%, and in emission reductions by 7-8%. Since then, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) has conducted more compact projections. A repeat of the 1994 projections by MTC showed fewer land-use savings because of demographic changes and more compact projections. (Holtzclaw)

- (d) despite such projections from MTC and ABAG, land-use remains fragmented in the Bay Area with its 101 cities and nine counties. Despite transportation control measures (TCMs) and smart growth strategies, decision-making nevertheless remains with local entities. (Dawid)
- (e) congestion acts as an educator and motivator toward Smart Growth; and planning grants are an effective way of providing communities with input. (Holtzclaw)
- (f) The District should use its financial influence in grant allocation as a motivator to get cities to reduce trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and also to encourage Smart Growth. (Glueck)

Chairperson Brazil stated the Committee has so far identified two issues in its discussion. The first concerns the FSM on alternative fuels, and the second advocates getting regional planning assistance for local planners and to promote Smart Growth. Mr. Glueck suggested that the District be more aggressive in communicating with and educating local planners. Mr. Dawid stated that the District should also comment on controversial projects from a regional perspective.

Mr. Hilken replied that the District's comments in environmental review primarily concern major projects. However, having input at the general plan or specific plan level is better because it occurs earlier in the process. He added that the District has a project endorsement process in which criteria on density and access would be discussed in comment letters. The Committee could comment on and prioritize the items set forth in TCM No. 15. Also, the Transportation Fund for Clean Air provides extra points for the implementation of TCMs. Mr. Kurucz opined that influence on traffic locally and regionally is also achieved through setting forth appropriate categories of review in proposals that come to local decision-makers.

Mr. Hess observed that the Committee's comments emphasize the implementation of TCM No. 15. The Council's assistance in communicating information to local planners and governments in the nine Bay Area counties would also be very useful. A couple of years ago, District staff and Councilmember Hayes made presentations to the planning departments of local entities on urban heat island mitigation. Mr. Hess suggested that the Committee consider ways of implementing TCM No. 15 after the Ozone Control Strategy is adopted. It would get local entities involved in applying regional principles locally.

Chairperson Brazil suggested the Committee include in its formal recommendations that Council members attend meetings with local planners. Mr. Hess stated these meetings would combine staff and the Council, and emphasize woodsmoke abatement, urban heat islands, Smart Growth and the Spare the Air program. Mr. Glueck suggested the Committee keep in mind that such efforts do not have to be limited to redevelopment and planning departments but could also include major developers and their planning staff. If the latter make the appropriate proposal to the local decision makers then the ideal planning categories would already be incorporated in project development.

After further discussion, Mr. Kurucz moved that the Committee adopt the following

recommendations; seconded by Dr. Holtzclaw; carried unanimously:

*The Advisory Council agrees that the District staff has selected appropriate measures:*

- 1. for review and adoption as control measures or further study measures.*
- 2. as transportation control measures.*
- 3. from other Districts for review and adoption as control measures or further study measures.*

*The Council also has the following line items that it further wishes to comment on in the Plan:*

- 1. The District include a FSM for alternative fuels, specifically including but not limited to emulsified, ethanol, biodiesel and other fuel types. The District should take into account their applicability under existing and future technologies.*
- 2. The District and Council work in concert to explore the local and regional implementation of items identified in TCM No. 15.*

The Committee agreed that the implementation of TCM No. 15 should be one of the primary tasks of its work plan for next year.

- 5. Committee Member Comments/Other Business.** There was brief discussion on pending legislation proposing the elimination of exemption for vehicles 30-years and older in the state's Smog Check program.
- 6. Time and Place of Next Meeting.** 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, October 12, 2004, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109.
- 7. Adjournment.** 3:25 p.m.

James N. Corazza  
Deputy Clerk of the Boards