

Bay Area Air Quality Management District
939 Ellis Street
San Francisco, CA 94109
(415) 749-5000

APPROVED MINUTES

Advisory Council Regular Meeting
9:00 a.m., Wednesday, January 13, 2010

CALL TO ORDER

Opening Comment: Chairperson Bramlett called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

Roll Call: Chairperson Jeffrey Bramlett, Vice Chairperson Ken Blonski; Secretary Stan Hayes; Council Members Jennifer Bard, Louise Bedsworth, Ph.D., Benjamin Bolles, Robert Bornstein, Ph.D., Harold Brazil, John Holtzclaw, Ph.D., Robert Huang, Ph.D., Kraig Kurucz, Rosanna Lerma, Jane Martin, Dr.Ph.H., Debbie Mytels, Kendal Oku, Jonathan Ruel, Dorothy Vura-Weis, M.D., M.P.H.

Absent: Gary Lucks, Sarah Martin-Anderson and Neal Osborne

Chairperson Bramlett opened the meeting with the following report:

- He thanked report writers for their efforts in 2009;
- He announced that Gary Kendall, Director of Technical Services, had retired as of December 30, 2009;
- Neal Osborne resigned due to work commitments. He suggested Advisory Council Members refer potential candidates qualified under the Community Planning category to the District.

Introduction of New Advisory Council Members

Chairperson Bramlett provided an introductory background of new Council Member, Gary Lucks, who is excused from the January and February meetings. He then introduced Debbie Mytels and provided a brief description of her background and experience.

Oath of Office

The Oath of Office was given to Council Member Debbie Mytels.

Public Comment Period: There were no public comments.

Consent Calendar:

1. Approval of Minutes of the November 10, 2009 Advisory Council Meeting

Advisory Council Action: Member Holtzclaw made a motion to approve the minutes of November 10, 2009; Member Blonski seconded the motion; unanimously carried without objection (Hayes abstained).

DISCUSSION

2. Discussion of New Meeting Format Implemented in 2009

Chairperson Bramlett reaffirmed the Air District's vision and mission, asked Advisory Members to keep the focus throughout the year on public health, described the purpose of the Advisory Council, and noted last year's discussion, evaluation and focus on public health, cumulative effects, communities, land use planning, mobile sources, transportation, energy and efficiency; buildings, carbon capture and sequestration, standards and cost engineering.

Director of Technical Services, Gary Kendall, welcomed new and returning members and gave a presentation of the new meeting format implemented in 2009, stating that a total of nine meetings were held. The January Retreat's focus was to identify topic areas; three symposiums were held and discussion meetings for the first two meetings followed for each specific topic; and the Advisory Council prepared a report for each of the symposiums.

Overall, the three topic meetings with excellent speakers were very successful and three reports were prepared and presented to the Board of Directors. He described the formulation of the work groups, selection of speakers for topic meetings, the meeting report preparation process, and said the Advisory Council Chairperson and lead author presented the reports to the Board of Directors.

The Administrative Code specified a total of nine meetings; one retreat, four symposium or topic meetings, each followed by a single discussion meeting, which staff believes was too ambitious. The first two topic meetings required two discussion meetings each to complete the report. Also observed was that often, because of the number of speakers and length of presentations, there was limited time for the Council to interact with speakers during the panel process. Staff wants to ensure there is enough time for Council members to discuss the presentations and materials received and prepare the final report, and he noted that editing of the final reports was very time-consuming.

Mr. Kendall presented changes for 2010. Staff proposes scheduling two discussion meetings after topic meetings and to use the technique proposed for the third meeting where Council members email their suggestions and recommendations for the report to the work group no later than one week after the meeting date. Staff also suggests limiting the number of speakers to three and limiting presentations to no more than 30 minutes.

Mr. Kendall said another question is whether there should be more flexibility in scheduling meetings. If the Council is able to hold discussion and complete their report in one discussion meeting, the second discussion meeting could be canceled. Secondly, he questioned whether the Council wanted to change the timeframes for discussion meetings from 9:00 to 11:00 a.m. to 9:00 to noon. Thirdly, he asked whether it is possible to allow more autonomy to the work group

drafting the report and focus the full Council's editing on the recommendations and not so much on key points and emerging issues.

Member Vura-Weis questioned and confirmed with Mr. Kendall that the Administrative Code specifies that the meeting schedule is up to ten meetings per year.

Chairperson Bramlett reviewed proposed changes for consideration:

1. Hold up to four topic meetings per year and a total of up to ten meetings per year;
2. Schedule two discussion meetings after each topic meeting in order to allow more time for discussion of presentations and time to complete a final report;
3. Council members email input on report to work group within one week after topic meeting;
4. Limit speakers to three (3) and presentation length to thirty (30) minutes maximum;
5. Add flexibility to the scheduling of meetings--always schedule a second discussion meeting. If not needed, cancel it;
6. Discussion meetings will be held from 9:00-12:00 noon instead of 9:00-11:00;
7. Focus the Advisory Council editing and discussion of the draft report on the recommendations section of the report. (Focus does not mean exclusion of other items.)

Ms. Lerma questioned and confirmed that the Board of Directors were very impressed with all three reports and discussed how recommendations could be incorporated into the District's programs.

Secretary Hayes confirmed that the presentation meetings are proposed to run from 9:00 a.m. to noon, stating that originally, discussion meetings were proposed for 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon and this was changed to 9:00 to 11:00 a.m. Mr. Kendall said last year, the two most complicated topic meetings had required two full discussion meetings. Secretary Hayes believed the opportunity to interact with people immediately afterwards was very valuable. He supported the reduction to three presentations, and said he would be willing to invest more time for the initial meeting.

Dr. Bedsworth noted the instance of a couple of speakers leaving prior to the panel's conclusion, and Mr. Kendall discussed the District's work to confirm the allotted time for speakers and believed this could be partially mitigated by starting on time, limiting the presentations to 30 minutes, and having the panel formed between 10:30-11:00 a.m. Staff can also emphasize the need for speakers to stay until noon or, perhaps, take a longer Q&A session after the speaker's session.

Chairperson Bramlett confirmed with members there was unanimous support for scheduling two discussion meetings after each topic.

Vice Chairperson Blonski questioned the four topic meetings would be prioritized. Mr. Kendall noted that an informational meeting is built in for discussion of agency initiatives related to climate protection. Based on that, only three topic meetings can be held, and he agreed it would

be valuable information for Council members to have. He also confirmed with Vice Chairperson Blonski that the schedule of meetings would be established ahead of time.

Dr. Holtzclaw suggested scheduling a site visit if a second discussion meeting is not needed, which he felt would be valuable.

Ms. Bard said it would be helpful to know what topics are scheduled and she asked to schedule time for Air District report and updates that relate to initiatives discussed, as well as other emerging initiatives that the Council may wish to address. Mr. Kendall noted that the Executive Officer's Report provides informational updates. Mr. Broadbent concurred and asked the Chairperson to consider allowing him to move his report up on the agenda to better help inform and assist in the discussion regarding future topics under Agenda Item 3.

Dr. Bornstein said that it would be rare that a meeting would be canceled and thinks a topic could be determined and set for the second meeting.

Mr. Bolles questioned if a focus group could meet off-line to provide editing and asked if a quorum was needed to hold a second discussion meeting. District Counsel Brian Bunger said a focus group could meet as an ad hoc committee and edit work during the course of the year, but he recommended members be identified and formed as work groups for each topic.

Chairperson Bramlett agreed and said editing can be done by the work groups and forwarded via email to him. He can work to address minor editing, and major questions can be returned to the group for more discussion and/or further amendment. Mr. Kendall noted that there is a fair amount of work off-line and he advocated for having separate work groups for each topic meeting. Chairperson Bramlett concurred.

Chairperson Bramlett reviewed the proposal, as follows:

1. Hold up to 4 topic meetings per year for a total of up to 10 meetings;
2. Schedule 2 discussion meetings. If a second meeting is not needed it can either be canceled or something else can be discussed and the meeting held;
3. Members will email comments to work group members within one week after the topic meeting;
4. Limit number of speakers to 3 and presentation length to 30 minutes;
5. Discussion meetings will be held from 9:00-12:00 noon instead of 9:00-11:00 a.m.;
6. Focus editing and discussion of the draft report to the recommendations section of the report.

Vice Chairperson Blonski said he also liked the suggestion by Dr. Holtzclaw for a local site visit, if appropriate.

Dr. Bornstein suggested asking speakers to have one panel topic that summarizes their points as what they see as emerging issues and what they see as possible recommendations in order to provide a summation to the work group.

Dr. Vura-Weis questioned whether or not it is possible for the draft report to be received a week prior to the scheduled Advisory Council meeting. Mr. Kendall referred to the 72-hour noticing requirement for the agenda's posting and said timing depends on the work group's ability to compile the draft report. Mr. Bunger stated that the draft report can be forwarded; however, he cautioned the Council holding conversation on it outside of the meeting.

Mr. Hayes supported emailing input within a week and believed it is timely and helpful to the work group. He suggested ground rules be set for input to indicate that the work group would have the final say on the draft report, with the understanding that changes would be heard by the entire Council. He supported focusing on recommendations but would not exclude other aspects of emerging issues or key points.

Chairperson Bramlett summarized consensus of items 3 and 6 above, as:

3. Work group members will bring conflicting comments to the work group for discussion, but ultimately the work group retains control for finalizing the report and meeting the deadline; and
6. Focus the Advisory Council editing and discussion of the draft report on the recommendations section of the report, but do not limit discussion of emerging issues or key points, as needed.

Dr. Bedsworth questioned the extent of which edits could be made without the need to meet as a full Council. Mr. Bunger replied that the Council should address substantive issues in its debate as a group, but minor wordsmithing could be accomplished afterwards.

Mr. Bolles suggested the Council consider formation of an editing group. Mr. Bunger stated that the Council should discuss and agree on the recommendations section, which moves forward to the Board of Directors, and this section should be the focus.

Council Action: Dr. Holtzclaw made a motion to approve the new Advisory Council meeting format as outlined below; seconded by Vice Chairperson Blonski; carried unanimously without objection.

1. Hold up to 4 topic meetings per year for a total of up to 10 meetings;
2. Schedule 2 discussion meetings. If a second meeting is not needed it can either be canceled or something else can be discussed and the meeting held;
3. Work group members will bring conflicting comments to the work group for discussion, but ultimately the work group retains control for finalizing the report and meeting the deadline;
4. Limit number of speakers to 3 and presentation length to 30 minutes;
5. Discussion meetings will be held from 9:00-12:0 noon instead of 9:00-11:00 a.m.;
6. Focus the Advisory Council editing and discussion of the draft report on the recommendations section of the report, but do not limit discussion of emerging issues or key points, as needed.

AIR DISTRICT OVERVIEW

4. Report of the Executive Officer/APCO

Mr. Broadbent said the Advisory Council's work has been highly successful in tackling difficult topics and in providing solid recommendations for the Board to consider, and the Board has directed staff to explicitly define how recommendations are being implemented at the District.

He provided an update on pending and planned Air District activities, policies and initiatives, described the District's administration and budget, the need to move the clean air agenda forward while balancing resources, and described the following District activities:

- Air monitoring;
- Regulation of stationary sources;
- Implementation of the Wood Smoke program;
- Initiation of a Bay Area Clean Air Communities Initiative that would direct additional resources and outreach calling for no new net increases, which is still being reviewed by the CARE Task Force;
- Review and update of CEQA guidelines that would 1) assess risks by having significance thresholds when siting a new source or receptor; 2) lower the significance threshold for criteria contaminants; and 3) include thresholds for GHG's, which will be considered by the Board of Directors in April;
- Conduct education and outreach on CEQA guidelines and toxic air contaminants with city and county staff;
- Continued development of a multi-pollutant plan to be considered by the Board of Directors in the second quarter. Mr. Hilken added that the Multi-Pollutant Plan is an update to the State Clean Air Plan, which the District is required to update to achieve State ozone standards. The plan identifies control measures, mobile and other sources, and it encourages more efficient vehicles. He said staff is also looking at additional pollutants to reduce fine particulate matter, reduce air toxics in impacted communities, reduce GHG's, and identify where there may be trade-offs. The District has worked closely with MTC, ABAG and BCDC staff and the plan will hopefully be out next month; and
- Development on an Indirect Source Rule (ISR) which addresses mitigation of future land use development, which will not be completed until the end of 2010,

Mr. Broadbent reported on the need for Advisory Council assistance in identifying where the District should direct itself, its regulatory authority and its resources in climate protection. He stated that a lot of work needs to be done with both the environmental community and industry through the CARE Task Force, and EPA proposed Title V Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule that would have the District include GHG's in Title V permits. Also, AB 32 is moving forward at the State level. CARB should be releasing their cap and trade regulations soon and California will also have a new Governor. Stationary sources will change as well, and the District is currently distributing settlement monies from the ConocoPhillips project and looking at energy-efficiency projects in the Pinole, Richmond, Crockett and Rodeo communities, which represents some examples of climate change activities for the District.

He reiterated that the Advisory Council’s input and direction has been phenomenal this year and staff looks forward to working with the Council in terms of moving the Clean Air agenda forward.

Chairperson Bramlett reiterated the need for Members to pay close attention to presentations and to keep track of recommendations. He cited changes in terminology and growing new technologies that the Council will need to continue to keep apprised of.

Dr. Holtzclaw commended the District and said he is pleased to see that issues have been raised that the public and press are starting to take seriously and report. One issue he hopes the District will continue to let the Council know about is the CEQA guidelines, noting that staff has taken a balanced position on the need for infill while addressing mitigations of development and cited his work with BAEHC, who are beginning to see staff as being responsive to their concerns.

Secretary Hayes echoed comments and was happy to see the District on so many fronts. He believed all programs work hand in hand to address the same issues. CEQA guidelines deal with new development and expansion, but toxins in CARE communities are from existing sources, and the multi-pollutant plan will assist in reducing toxins in those communities through reduction of existing sources.

3. Discussion of the 2010 Advisory Council Meetings

Mr. Kendall reviewed the basic format of Advisory Council meetings, topics, meeting dates and times, preparation of a report for each topic, the scheduling of two discussion meetings following each topic meeting from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon., staff’s provision for providing a report template, Council’s preparation of the final report to the Board, and the Council’s Chairperson and principal author’s presentation of the report to the Board.

Mr. Kendall said 2010’s focus will continue to be on California’s 2050 GHG emission reduction target which is very ambitious with major implications for California and the Bay Area. He noted the District has been designated as non-attainment for the PM 2.5 standard and expects to be designated as non-attainment for the national ozone standard after EPA completes its revision process.

Staff also believes it would be helpful to have background information on all climate protection initiatives and the first meeting is proposed as an informational meeting which goes into detail about all of the climate protection initiatives of the agency. He reviewed the proposed meeting format and provided a description of topics and dates, as follows:

| | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| Regular Meeting and Retreat | | 9AM – 11 AM – January 13, 2010 |
| Meeting 1 | Air District Climate Protection Initiatives | 9AM – 12 Noon – February 10, 2010 |
| Continue focus on California’s 2050 GHG Reduction Target of 80% below 1990 levels: | | |
| Meeting 2 | Industrial Sector | 9 AM – 11 AM – March 10, 2010 |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Discussion 2 (1 st mtg) | Industrial Sector | 9 AM – 11 AM – April 14, 2010 |
| Discussion 2 (2 nd mtg) | Industrial Sector | 9 AM – 11 AM – May 12, 2010 |
| Meeting 3 | Carbon Capture & Sequestration | 9 AM – 12 Noon – June 9, 2010 |
| Discussion 3 (1 st mtg) | Carbon Capture & Sequestration | 9 AM – 11 AM – July 14, 2010 |
| Discussion 3 (2 nd mtg) | Carbon Capture & Sequestration | 9 AM – 11 AM – September 8, 2010 |
| Meeting 4 | TBD | 9 AM – 12 Noon – October 13, 2010 |
| Discussion 4 (1 st mtg) | TBD | 9 AM – 12 Noon – November 10, 2010 |

Mr. Kendall noted that staff was considering a presentation and discussion on zero emission power plants for the October meeting, which is a new technology in which the fuel is burned with pure oxygen as opposed to air, eliminating the nitrogen. Criteria pollutant levels are very low and exhaust gases are CO2 and water.

He said that another potential presentation would be a presentation from TransForm; Windfall for All. TransForm is an advocacy organization for improved public transit, smart growth, livable communities, and others. They looked at the benefit of providing public transit service in every neighborhood that is equivalent to the top 20% available in the region. If done in the Bay Area, it would reduce vehicle CO2 emissions by 42%, which is another solution. He also stated that ARB's cap and trade regulation is a preliminary draft, but this is an essential element in the strategy for implementing AB 32 which specifies that GHG emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020.

Dr. Holtzclaw suggested Meeting 3 focus on land use changes on the sequestration issue. In looking at forests in Brazil as being the membrane technology that absorbs carbon and locks it up in plants, also needed was whether it does it if you are producing methanol as a source of fuel here, taking land that would be used for corn crops for people and using them somewhere else. He said CARB has taken a position on this. He asked to include this and to suggest EPA to do the same. Mr. Kendall suggested, and Dr. Holtzclaw agreed, to be a volunteer on the work group for the June meeting.

Ms. Mytels noted another issue that may come up under the carbon capture and sequestration topic is the question of bio-char, which is a method that turns green waste into charcoal and then returns it to the soil, increasing soil fertility. She believed it might fit into the carbon sequestration topic in June or in October, and she volunteered to identify local resources and to be on the work group.

Secretary Hayes supported the meeting proposal but said he was struggling with the carbon capture and sequestration issue. He questioned how it wraps back to recommendations that the Board, in real time, can use in a meaningful way. Mr. Kendall replied that staff and the Board are looking for more forward-thinking ideas and recommendations. It may figure into cap and trade and achieve the GHG emission reduction target. The agency also has regulatory authority over stationary sources, so the Council could think of pitfalls, problems, what looks promising, what

is safe, and what will and will not work. He said nationally, it will have to apply to the utility industry, as well, and believes it will be useful to the Board and staff.

Dr. Martin suggested speakers include in their presentations the potential health impacts and health benefits associated with various proposals. Mr. Kendall agreed this would be important and suggested prioritizing whatever is being considered in terms of cost-effectiveness, priority and immediate health benefits.

Ms. Bard said in terms of what policies will achieve the most GHG goals and knowing transportation is still the biggest problem, she asked to move the TransForm topic up and relate it back to the transportation policies the Council had recommended due to the fact that it is one of the largest contributors in the Bay Area.

Ms. Bard also asked for the Advisory Council to have a greater understanding of all control measures that have been adopted, those being drafted this year, and to have them put altogether to identify gaps. She said the diesel truck routes and land use planning in the Bay Area seem to be a missing piece, and she suggested incorporating truck route planning to reduce emissions in CARE communities and help local decision makers plan for this. She also questioned the rationale for speakers chosen, and Mr. Kendall said WSPA represents all of the California refineries and oil production. The presentation would be California-wide, and the speaker has worked internationally, nationally and locally with ARB on climate protection and GHG emissions reduction.

Mr. Ruel referred to the carbon capture and sequestration meeting and thinks something working right now is landscaping, agriculture and forest resources. He cited the magnitude of carbon capture that exists and whether there were opportunities for speakers to address this. He felt that recommendations could be made on management of forest resources, grange land and agricultural practices, as well as landscaping for the combined impact on greater carbon sequestration. He also volunteered to be on the work group.

Mr. Bolles confirmed with Mr. Kendall that the cement industry includes a quarrying component, but not necessarily an asphalt batch plant. He described cement manufacturing noting that for every unit CO₂ emitted by the combustion of fuel, an additional unit of CO₂ is emitted by the process. It is an important source category and internationally, cement and power plants together are very significant.

Dr. Holtzclaw said diesel toxins and freeway and truck routes are one of the most important CARE issues in impacted communities and in CO₂ production. He supported studying this and expanding it past truck routes to what can be done with freeways in general.

Mr. Kurucz asked to look at zero emission power plants and conduct analyses that would be an energy balance over the production cycle, similar to discussions about hydrogen highway, delivery of fuel to cars, and analyzing how much benefit they produce. Mr. Kendall referred to the link in the presentation; <http://fossil.energy.gov/programs/projectdatabase/stateprofiles/2004/California.html> which shows how oxygen is produced, typically using electrical energy, which reduces the efficiency of the power plant.

Vice Chairperson Blonski asked to serve on the carbon capture and sequestration work group, and reported that the East Bay Regional Park District is spending millions of dollars worth of vegetation removal annually to reduce fire hazards. He said voters have taxed themselves for vegetation abatement, and interesting would be the question of how much of a role the vegetation has in carbon sequestration versus the fact that fire contributes annually to large losses. Fire plays a significant role in the habitat of many animals and is very important for a lot of the species they are trying to preserve, and he questioned whether this fits into the top four subjects or not.

Vice Chairperson Blonski also voiced interest in the role of oil and gas industries, given the fact that oil and gas production contributes to 59% of emissions. Many people fly, and through pipelines, Chevron provides 70% of jet fuel for SFO, 70% for San Jose, 100% for Oakland, and 70% for Sacramento. He believes there are impacts other than health and suggested the District take an international perspective about the role of these industries, as well as negative impacts and how to balance it.

Mr. Brazil questioned whether the Council should also include a presentation on addressing criteria pollutants, as well. Mr. Kendall said staff believes that continuing to look at GHG emission reductions relative to the 2050 target is the proper area of focus. He reiterated that everything that can be done to reduce GHG's in the transportation sector helps in terms of PM and ozone precursors and toxics, so there is a linkage. He believed the Council could get more into toxics and health impacts for the 2011 calendar year and added that the February presentation on the Multi-Pollutant Clean Air Plan should also address Mr. Brazil's questions.

Dr. Bornstein echoed points made by Mr. Hayes and Mr. Brazil, thinks meetings should be geared to reasonable recommendations that can be taken and applied to the Bay Area. He stated that the Council began with criteria ozone pollutants and went to large-scale climate change and smaller scale community risk assessment. He believed it is too much to have all subjects on GHG emissions reductions and none on small scale and did not believe a full lecture was needed on geology and ocean for carbon capture and sequestration because it is far from what the District can do. He suggested combining Meeting 3 and 4 into 1 meeting and freeing up the 4th presentation on community scale risk reduction.

He referred to a discussion he had with staff about proposing a meeting with three speakers; 1) on measurement, 2) on modeling; and 3) on planning and design. He highlighted recent technology with pollution monitors put on street lights. They are very small, make similar measurement to monitoring devices and he felt this could get down to the community scale distribution of pollutants. He added that new modeling techniques combine existing models with a new generation of smaller scale models, and a discussion of this might be useful.

Dr. Huang questioned if a possible topic for Meeting 4 could be nuclear energy. Mr. Kendall said it could be, and noted that many people believe nuclear energy will be the solution for achieving huge emission reductions.

Dr. Vura-Weis supported Dr. Bornstein's suggestion about focusing the last meeting on more community level issues and intervention. She suggested including mitigation strategies, as well. She also noted there is a GHG Committee of the Board itself and suggested sharing information on what the Committee and the Advisory Council are doing. Mr. Kendall said the presentation on climate protection initiatives at Meeting 1 in February should serve to incorporate some of this.

Chairperson Bramlett believed that all of the presentations should be in the context of improving health, and noted that carbon capture and sequestration is the largest reach.

Ms. Bard requested keeping an hour open for discussion at the next 3-hour meeting. Mr. Kendall explained that the presentation is informational. He suggested one-half hour be allotted for discussion, as an hour would restrict the amount of detail staff could provide on all of the various topics.

Dr. Bornstein asked that staff provide feedback about combining Meetings 3 and 4 and consider the subject of toxics as Meeting 4. Mr. Kendall agreed to discuss this with staff and report back at the next meeting.

Chairperson Bramlett summarized the schedule as follows:

Meeting 1: Climate Protection Initiatives – Informational Session and Discussion. Much of the year will be spent on GHG emission reductions.

Meeting 2: Industrial Sector – Work Group consists of Members Brazil, Bolles, Hayes and Kurucz.

Meeting 3: Combination of Carbon Capture and Sequestration; most interest has to do with planning and vehicles with TransForm presentation – Work Group consists of Members Holtzclaw, Ruel, Blonski and Mytels.

Meeting 4: Some formulation of health issues and perhaps a set of presentations that looks at how GHG's directly affect public health agendas, with discussion on development of the CARE program.

Mr. Kurucz requested staff provide a summary of activities occurring in the CARE communities, and Mr. Kendall replied that this would be presented at the February meeting.

Dr. Vura-Weis suggested issues around land use planning as deserving focus for Meeting 4 in October. Chairperson Bramlett believed that Meeting 3's presentation from TransForm could be carried across into Meeting 4.

Ms. Bard felt that combining TransForm and carbon capture and sequestration was too ambitious for one meeting. Mr. Kendall agreed and suggested including zero emission power plants with Meeting 3 because it is a technology that facilitates capture of carbon. Alternatively, he suggested including the cap and trade rule. He is hearing competing interests for looking at

health effects and community risk reduction and the other has to do with land use planning, which builds on the TransForm report. The theme will remain with GHG's and ideas that move toward the goal of reductions by 2050, and he recommended holding the community risk reduction at the first meeting in 2011. He asked that Meeting 4 be flushed out. If TransForm and land use planning is scheduled, more should be added to it, and further described the correlation between TransForm which ties back to the transportation sector. He indicated a possibility could be to have the first topic meeting in 2011 on community risk reduction.

Chairperson Bramlett confirmed support for Meeting 3 to include carbon capture and sequestration and zero emission power plants and/or cap and trade. He noted support for Meeting 4 to include planning and vehicles and TransForm presentation, which puts the first discussion on health as the first meeting in 2011. There is also some support to look at public health issues while going through meetings. He suggested asking the presenters to identify, in their presentations, the direct links associated to public health.

Mr. Kendall said TransForm's analyses shows that if public transit service were provided in all Bay Area communities and neighborhoods equal to the top 20% that exists in the Bay Area, a 42% reduction in mobile source emission reductions could be achieved. To him, there is a very clear link to public health—it's just that the focus is on GHG's, but there are other co-benefits.

Dr. Bornstein suggested Meeting 4 be a report back from the Advisory Council to staff and to the Board about what they learned through the year and relate back to Meeting 1. The topic could be a synthesis topic with the outcome of not just a specific summary but an overview of what they learned during the year and are proposing to the Board and staff. Mr. Kendall noted there is always an opportunity for discussion and interaction with the Executive Officer/APCO and staff and felt that the discussion meeting following Meeting 4 might work well for this.

Dr. Bedsworth said she thinks it would be very relevant to discuss carbon capture as long as it ties it to what would be deployed in the Bay Area or how it relates to industry, agriculture and land use and forestry. She suggested another topic for Meeting 4 that looks at issues relating to adaptation to climate change, noting there is a regional effort going on that asks people to think about what changes in climate will mean for the Bay Area. She said a lot of this is tied into issues of land use and management of resources. And, while it could be moved to 2011, she believed that by the fall there may be interesting information developed.

Ms. Bard suggested another topic as health impact assessments which are becoming a tool for assessing impacts of development and impacts on air quality and GHG's. She noted CARB also recognizes the importance of them and suggested looking at it from the health risk assessment side with the cap and trade presentation.

Regarding the order of items, Ms. Bard said that due to strict timelines under SB 375, she asked for consideration to hold the TransForm presentation in June to alert the Council to issues around GHG reduction targets as they relate to transportation.

Dr. Holtzclaw supported a topic on bio char, discussed how it was discovered in the Brazilian Amazon and its effect on soils and fertility, which could be used as a replacement to chemicals the agriculture industry puts on soils.

Mr. Kendall noted that to date, staff has not invited speakers for the June meeting. He confirmed work group members for Meeting 4 and asked that those members in the work group provide suggestions to staff on subjects for presentation and speakers. He noted that the District is responsible for stationary sources, and carbon capture and sequestration are likely to come into play because the 2050 emission target cannot be achieved unless this is used and it will have to occur in the Bay Area unless requirements are relaxed.

Advisory Council Members then discussed the priority of presentations for Meetings 3 and 4.

Chairperson Bramlett summarized the revised Meeting proposal and noted that all presentations and discussion meetings would be held from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon, as follows:

Meeting 1: *Climate Protection Initiatives – Informational Session and Discussion*

Meeting 2: *California’s 2050 GHG Emission Reduction Target - Industrial Sector –*
Work Group: Members Brazil, Bolles, Hayes and Kurucz

Meeting 3: *Carbon Capture and Sequestration –*
Work Group: Members Bard, Huang, Holtzclaw and Bedsworth

AND

Cap and trade -
Work group: Members Ruel, Bornstein and Hayes

Meeting 4: *Motor Vehicles and Planning and TransForm presentation -*
Work Group: Members Bard, Holtzclaw, Ruel, Blonski and Mytels

Mr. Kendall asked that work group members for Meeting 4 work to identify speakers and subtopics for Meeting 4’s October 13, 2010 presentation.

OTHER BUSINESS

5. Council Member Comments/Other Business

Ms. Bard reported that the EPA is reconsidering the threshold for ozone. A public hearing would be held in Sacramento on February 4, 2010 and the ALA is recommending 60 ppb which is lower end of the range that the EPA is proposing between 60-70 ppb, and she asked for as much support from public health organizations as possible. She agreed to email the announcement to members.

6. Time and Place of Next Meeting - 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon, Wednesday, February 10, 2010, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109.

7. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 11:46 p.m.

/s/ Lisa Harper

Lisa Harper
Clerk of the Boards