

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

APPROVED MINUTES

Air Quality Planning Committee  
9:30 a.m., Wednesday, June 13, 2007

- 1. Call to Order:** Acting Chairperson Emily Drennen called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m.  
  
**Roll Call:** Emily Drennen, Acting Chairperson, Harold Brazil, Irvin Dawid, John Holtzclaw, Ph.D.; and Robert Huang, Ph.D.  
  
**Absent:** William Hanna, Kraig Kurucz, Ed Proctor, Ken Blonski.  
  
**Also Present:** Chairperson, Fred Glueck
- 2. Public Comment Period.** There were no public comments.
- 3. Approval of Minutes of April 11, 2007:** Ms. Drennen provided revisions to the minutes that will be incorporated into the final version. Chairperson Glueck moved approval of the minutes; seconded by Dr. Holtzclaw. Upon conclusion of the revisions of the minutes Acting Chairperson, Drennen called for approval, minutes were approved unanimously.
- 4. 2007-2008 Wintertime Outreach:** *Mr. Richard Lew, Community Outreach Manager, Outreach and Incentives presented information to the Committee on Wintertime outreach.*

Mr. Lew provided the Committee a brief presentation on the following:

Spare the Air Tonight:

- Health advisories issued on nights when PM concentrations are forecast to be unhealthy for “sensitive groups”
- Voluntary program to encourage clean air choices
- Elements:
  1. Advertising
  2. Media and Employer Relations
  3. Website/AirAlerts

Mr. Lew provided the following update on Particulate Matter (PM).

- Particles 2.5 microns in size (1/20th size of a human hair)
- Can remain airborne for hours, days or weeks
- Potential to travel deep into the lungs
- Health effects may include:
  1. Coughing
  2. Eye irritation
  3. Asthma trigger

There are a number of sources where PM derives, some of which include:

- Wood-Burning Stoves
- Power Plants
- Heavy Duty Diesel Engines
- Cars and Trucks
- Industrial Sources

The Outreach Strategy for 2007-2008 will consist of the following:

- Media relations (press advisories which will include the Spare the Air Kickoff; press releases announcing major events and stories)
- Employer and community events (over 90-100 employer/community events per year; some of which include festivals, state fairs with bi-lingual speakers present)
- Asthma clinics (worked with over 70 clinics to spread the word about spare the air)
- Radio and television advertising (commercials with Executive Officer)
- Wintertime surveys (will conduct phone surveys about the public's attitude and behavior)
- Expansion of the Woodstove change out program (currently in place in Santa Clara, with a proposal to expand it throughout the nine counties)
- Wintertime [sparetheair.org](http://sparetheair.org) web site
- Collateral materials include:
  - Video commercials
  - Bookmark about particulate matter
  - Tip card about wood burning
  - Handbook about wood burning and particulate matter

In conclusion, Mr. Lew provided an overview of the Air District's Wood Smoke Strategy for the upcoming season. This information included:

- **Regulatory:**
  - Rule development public workshop July 2007
    - Mandatory wood burning curtailment (on Spare the Air Tonight)
    - Visible emission limitation

- **Outreach:**
  - Inform public of new requirements and clean air choices they can make
  - Improve awareness of PM/wood smoke health impacts
- **Incentives:**
  - Expected to kickoff in mid January 2008, plans are in place to go district-wide with a wood stove/fireplace change out program; which will subsidize purchases of new cleaner EPA certified wood stoves.

Ms. Drennen thanked Mr. Lew for his presentation and asked the Committee if they had any questions.

Chairperson Glueck suggested that fliers be distributed at stores such as Osh Hardware, Home Depot, Safeway, etc. in locations that sell bulk wood with permission from the vendors advising of the Spare the Air Program.

Mr. Dawid commented on the Spare the Air Tonight advisory notifications that were issued last season, referring to the frequency of the advisories.

Ms. Drennen expressed her excitement with regard to the wood stove change out program, extending to the 9 counties. Ms. Drennen wanted to know the cost of the subsidy that each family would receive, as well as the total budget for the subsidies. Mr. Lew indicated that the projected budget is between \$100-\$600 depending if the individual decides to use natural gas change out, EPA certified, wood stove with the total budget still being worked on at this time.

Ms. Drennen thanked Mr. Lew again for such a great presentation.

**5. Committee Discussion on the Study “Still Toxic After All These Years – Air Quality and Environmental Justice in the San Francisco Bay Area” from a Planning Perspective:** *The Committee discussed the study co-authored by Dr. Manuel Pastor of the University of California Santa Cruz.*

Ms. Drennen provided the Committee with a brief background of “Still Toxic After All These Years” noting that both she and Chairperson, Ken Blonski thought it would be a great idea to have the Committee digest the presentation. Staff was requested to prepare a brief summary regarding any particular thoughts and ways that the Air District could respond with regard to changes to programs and policies as a result of this presentation.

Henry Hilken, Director of Planning, Rules and Research noted that the Air District appreciates Dr. Pastor for coming to the Air District on numerous occasions, and presenting the study he co-authored. Mr. Hilken noted that there are some overlaps and similarities between that study and the things that are being done under the C.A.R.E. Program. Mr. Hilken noted that Mr. Phil Martien, Project Manager of the C.A.R.E. Program would make a couple of remarks regarding the extent that the Air District was involved in the study, which was limited, as well as the thought of the Air District moving forward.

Mr. Martien, provided background information to the Committee on the Air District’s involvement in the report as well as a summary about the findings. Mr. Martien noted that

Dr. Pastor had several community meetings to discuss the issue, which various Air District staff members attended and were in communication with the group when developing the document.

In summary, Dr. Pastor looked at the correlation between race, ethnicity and toxic air contaminants in the Bay Area. The type of work that has been done in the South Coast region uses two different kinds of data sets, the toxic release inventory data set and the national air toxics assessment data set to conduct their study. Both data sets have been released by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, which are considered national data sets. The study noted the correlation and tried to test the assumption that land use and income was not the only driving factor, but that race and ethnicity was also an important consideration.

Mr. Martien noted that suggestions were made based on looking at cumulative impacts when doing health risk assessment type work, looking at social vulnerability, as some people are less able to see a doctor and have less access to healthcare, so individuals should be aware that population moving forward in trying to reduce toxic air contaminants and that we should encourage meaningful community participation and meaningful actions, as these are the 4 principles that were laid out at the end of their report.

The Air District is willing to work with Dr. Pastor, so that local emissions data and repeat their analysis can be used. Due to complications with the national data sets that were used, as there has not been as much attention put specifically on the bay area, therefore, the Air District was interested in having Dr. Pastor redo his work using CARE emissions data as the Air District is currently working with Dr. Pastor now.

Mr. Martien noted that the studies preliminary findings are similar to that of the CARE program. The principles that were laid out are principles that the CARE program can move on, as it was not real specific as to what needs to be done, but noted that the Air District does want to endorse and embrace those principles, as the Air District moves forward.

One thing to point out is that when the CARE program talks about cumulative impacts, were are not just looking at cumulative impacts for toxic air contaminants, but the CARE program does look at all 189 contaminants that the Air Resources Board had defined in doing their analysis. The CARE program does not look at PM in general, so there are health impacts from PM in general beyond just the toxic components of PM or the things that have been recognized as toxics such as diesel PM.

Ms. Drennen thanked Mr. Martien for the presentation to the Committee.

Ms. Drennen referenced the discussion guide that she prepared with regard to Dr. Pastor's study, "Still Toxic After All These Years." Ms. Drennen noted that the discussion would be based on the Guiding Principles, and the questions in relation to each one. The purpose of doing this is to see if the Committee agrees, disagrees or have further questions to pass along to the full Advisory Council and the Board.

Chairperson Glueck suggested the Committee be careful when interrupting the study by Dr. Pastor and to keep strong emphasis on a big factor that he identified, which was the language barriers and the one that Dr. Pastor did not mention was education. Chairperson Glueck

stated that the economic constraints that put people in certain situations versus their educational constraints should be weighed carefully in terms of how the Committee addresses recommendations as well as the findings as they were presented.

Dr. Huang questioned staff about the priority of this issue with regard to the Air District's Board of Directors. Mr. Hilken's response to Dr. Huang noting that this is a very high priority and that the CARE program was created 3 years ago and the Board of Directors have been very strong supporters of the program, allotting resources in the budget. The idea behind the CARE program is to have a very robust regulatory program for criteria pollutants, a number of programs to reduce toxic emissions, but felt that there is more to do to try and identify the communities that are most affected by toxic air contaminants, those communities where the most vulnerable members of society live and really target mitigation strategies in those areas. This was the purpose of creating the CARE program, receiving strong support from both the Executive Officer and the Board of Directors.

The Committee discussed the following:

*Guiding Principle #1: Cumulative Impacts – Does BAAQMD accept the bottom-line conclusions that “environmental inequity is alive and well in the Bay Area” and that there is a “separate and independent effect of race on estimated pollution burdens”?*

The Committee agreed with the conclusion.

*Guiding Principle #2: Social Vulnerability – How Does BAAQMD already take into account factors of social vulnerability? How could we do better?*

Mr. Hilken noted the Air District has resource teams that work in the various communities which include East Palo Alto and Richmond that meet bi-monthly to talk about issues as well as a facilitator that works with the communities. Mr. Hilken also noted the risk assessments as part of the permitting process, and there are very conservative assumptions about exposures that conform to state guidelines.

Past information reported earlier is that with some of the CARE findings, is that the Air District has targeted the Carl Moyer Grants in communities that are most impacted by all toxic emissions, particularly diesel. In the past rounds of the Moyer process, the Air District has targeted 50% of the funds in communities most impacted by toxic air contaminants using the CARE data.

Members questions one which included the concerns of communities that do not have monitors in place at this time. Mr. Lew responded that there are a series of monitors and quality assurances currently in place. Mr. Lew also noted that monitors are specifically located at the request of the community members. Mr. Hilken interjected, noting that there are mobile monitors that can be moved but are limited in quantity.

Dr. Holtzclaw asked what type of speciation is conducted to determine the location/source of the pollutants. Mr. Martien responded that there are 20 plus stations throughout the Bay Area where samples are placed for toxic air contaminants. The ARB has 2 or 3 where they sample for a fuller sweep of contaminants. Some of the information obtained can be used to determine the source, but air contaminants have multiple sources and look very similar.

Mr. Dawid questioned staff about the areas that have the worst air quality in the Bay Area and that he does not feel that it is associated with race or ethnicity including Livermore and San Martien, asking staff explain the aspect of air quality and environmental justice.

Mr. Hilken's response was that it is a matter of the pollutant. As ozone levels tend to be highest in the hot inland valleys and Livermore, Santa Clara Valley and eastern Contra Costa are where the highest ozone levels are noted. This past winter, the most exceedances were in Vallejo and San Jose. Mr. Hilken noted that air toxics from some of the CARE maps that were shown indicate the highest concentrations included northeast San Francisco, western Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, and some in the Santa Clara Valley, as it depends on the pollutant.

Ms. Drennen asked if the Air District has a plan in place for having more air quality monitoring and actually determining the proactive prevention of pollution. Mr. Hilken responded to Ms. Drennen, informing her that this is the intent of the CARE Program. Mr. Martien also informed Ms. Drennen that the Air District has compiled an emission inventory in the first phase of the CARE program to look at where the toxic air contaminants are high and it has identified that West Oakland and part of San Francisco as being high. The focus at this time is West Oakland for numerous reasons, partly because there is a health risk assessment going on associated with the port and also because of the CARE program having identified that as a region that should be looked at carefully for additional monitoring in the Air District's budget, apart from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) grant.

Mr. Martien also informed Ms. Drennen that the idea is to use the data, to screen and find where the Air District should be focusing its efforts and then to really dig in to understand what is happening within that neighborhood. Lastly, Mr. Martien noted that the CARE program should also come up with mitigation strategies for example, the Green Ports Initiative that the Air District is currently working on.

Mr. Huang expressed concerns about the Air District having enough data to have measures in place instead of continuous monitoring. Mr. Hilken replied that the CARE program's technical analysis and the mitigation strategies go parallel and that the Air District not wait for years before anything is done. The use of Moyer funds have been targeted in communities impacted the most, and each year it has been revised and the past call for projects where the CARE data was used to target those Moyer funds in those impacted communities. The Green Ports Initiative is intended to reduce emissions from the Bay Area Ports, the Port of Oakland being the largest because there are serious air pollution impacts from port activities.

Mr. Martien noted that the purpose of the additional studies as we know that diesel PM is bad and it is bad in West Oakland, but for example there is high diesel PM from ships and there is also high diesel PM from trucks.

Dr. Holtzclaw questioned if the Moyer funds could be used for putting in facilities for cold-ironing? Mr. Hilken's response was that it could potentially be used for that, but the Moyer requirements from ARB have very specific cost effectiveness thresholds that have to be met. Therefore, typically the cold-ironing may be more costly.

*Guiding Principle #3: Meaningful Community Participation – How effective are our current outreach strategies for reaching communities of color and other communities affected by environmental injustice? How can we do better?*

Ms. Drennen noted that it was mentioned earlier that the Air District has a responsibility to reach the entire region, and wanted to know how effective is the Air District reaching these particular populations and how do we know that we are effective?

Mr. Lew indicated that the Air District has translation services at all public meetings and works with community groups to identify and send out multiple notices in the various languages.

Mr. Dawid suggested if the Air District is going to target specific areas, not necessarily targeting areas that are associated with traditional environmental justice, there is a preference of targeting areas that are associated with some kind of pollution geographic, which would encompass the affluent pollution areas, which include areas that are associated with criteria pollutants, for instance areas with woodsmoke.

Mr. Lew informed Mr. Dawid that there is currently 6 other resource teams that meet every other month and the group takes on several issues with the communities in San Francisco, Tri-Valley and Napa. The group is aggressive in outreach, not only to the impacted “environmental justice” communities, but to all 9 counties.

Dr. Holtzclaw suggested that the Air District fund or provide grants to help communities in low income, low English language and neighborhoods, without any reporting requirements, etc. Mr. Lew responded by informing Dr. Holtzclaw that the Air District has provided many innovative grants, in particular the communities have asked for training on how to better participate in the environmental process, and how to better participate in community meetings with regulatory agencies.

Mr. Huang recommended the Air District seek out champions. The champions would consist of individuals who have an interest and has dedication to the community, but does not have the means to advocate.

Mr. Hilken also noted that as part of the CARE program, there is a CARE Task Force that advises staff and provides input and draft materials as part of the CARE program, which is comprised of community members, environmentalists, business, government, academics, health professionals and a variety of representatives and several community representatives that are on the task force that are very active in their communities and that participate regularly in the CARE Task Force.

Ms. Drennen commented that one of the proposals noted by Dr. Pastor was that the CARE program should be revised to provide more detail for neighborhood level analysis, and thought there was not enough detail according to the author.

Mr. Martien responded that the Air District is attempting to do additional monitoring, because in other communities where they have done health risk assessments, and Mr. Martien noted that the reporting can be difficult as there are many communities and to really make fine scale measurements. For a finer level of detail, one would need to go out to the

neighborhoods and make measurements, and the EPA grant that the Air District proposed would address that.

*“Develop real community-based participatory research projects.”*

Ms. Drennen acknowledged that this was touched upon earlier, with regard to the innovative grants that have been distributed and was wondering if there was a permanent structure of how to fund some of these projects. Also, if there was a particular grant program that was specifically for doing that type of work, that might spark community interest in doing some of these projects that the Air District might not otherwise get if it was just an open project.

Mr. Martien’s comment to Ms. Drennen’s statement noted that one of the things that the Air District is planning to do in West Oakland is a traffic survey of trucks and part of that is planning to work with the community to help the Air District do surveying of traffic in the area, stating that this is something that the community people has done in the past and the Air District is hoping to get community participation along with the survey.

#### *Guiding Principle #4: Meaningful Action*

Ms. Drennen mentioned that a lot of the issues that were brought up relate to data sets and the effectiveness of the data sets and access to the data sets. Ms. Drennen asked if there are data sets that the Air District is not sharing with individuals and Mr. Hilken replied no, unless it is trade secret, as everything is available. Mr. Martien noted that the CARE emissions data are available as well.

Ms. Drennen asked about the proposal of collaborating more with stakeholders to expand inventories of unregulated resources and requested a response from staff. Mr. Martien replied informing Ms. Drennen that the Air District does have sources that are unregulated and that the Air District does make estimates for in the CARE inventory and that if there are things that the Air District is not aware of then, obviously there is no inventory.

Dr. Huang noted that in terms of collaboration, if the Air District is collaborating with the other 2 regional agencies, MTC and ABAG in some of the issues that the Air District is dealing with and if so, to what extent. Mr. Hilken noted that the Air District has worked with ABAG and MTC for many years, and more recently the Joint Policy Committee (JPC) was created a few years ago by state legislation and its 7 representatives from the Air District Board, the MTC Commission, ABAG Board, and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). They meet regularly, specifically to promote better coordination between the agencies. A lot of the work that they have looked at recently, has been on some of the Smart Growth visioning process which is going on around the bay area. They have also looked at climate change. They have also discussed issues related to exposure to air pollutants and that last year they had individuals from ARB and spoke about the Land Use Guidance Handbook that was published last year. There have been discussions on a number of occasions about the tension between all of our interests in promoting smart growth, infill, and compact development.

Ms. Drennen noted that the thing she found most interesting in the report was the idea of a cumulative impact approach versus the more generalized site specific approach regulatory wise. She asked how does this approach sit with the Air District and if it is different than



what is currently in place. Mr. Hilken responded by saying that Mr. Martien noted that this is the purpose of the CARE program. It is not done as a part of the permitting when a risk assessment or risk screens for a permit, it is just for the impacts from that facility and that is based on state guidelines Office of Environmental Health, Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), but as part of the CARE program that is the intent of it to get a more comprehensive cumulative view.

Ms. Drennen asked if the Committee members had any particular proposals or ideas after reading the report and hearing the presentation about how the Air District could respond to some of these ideas.

Mr. Dawid asked if the air quality will be better in 10 to 15 years than it is today. Mr. Hilken said that it is hard to say, because one has to factor in traffic volumes increasing, but it is certainly true that the vehicle fleet is much cleaner than it use to be and we are all aware, every year the ozone precursor emissions go down, although vehicle miles traveled increase, just because the fleet turns over, there are more newer clean vehicles on the road. The same is true for diesel vehicles, but they are further behind the curve. In the future, yes, there is more stringent State and Federal regulations for diesel vehicles and that fleet will turn over also but there is also more activity. How will this balance out; the Port of Oakland is projecting to double the amount of cargo that they handle, so the fleet will get cleaner, they are going to be moving more boxes the cumulative affect is complicated.

In reference to ARB's Land Use Guidance, Mr. Brazil asked Mr. Hilken if he sensed that other communities are actually using this. Mr. Hilken stated that San Francisco is using the guidelines. The Department of Public Health has been following this closely. The Air District has worked with them in 2005 the year the handbook was published, and the Air District co-sponsored a workshop at U.C. Berkeley on ARB's handbook. Rajiv Bhatia, M.D, the official at S.F. Department of Public Health has been very proactive and Mr. Hilken suggested that the Committee consider inviting him to a future meeting.

Mr. Brazil also asked about the guidance component of the CARE program, would there be anything from the ARB guidance included the CARE program? Mr. Hilken noted that one of the mitigation efforts the Air District plans to undertake as part of the CARE program is exactly the Land Use Guidance.

Ms. Drennen thanked staff for being responsive to this issue.

- 6. Committee Member Comments/Other Business.** There was none.
- 7. Time and Place of Next Meeting.** 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, August 8, 2007 – 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109.
- 8. Adjournment.** 11:24 a.m.

*/s/ Vanessa Johnson*  
Vanessa Johnson  
Executive Secretary