

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, April 13, 2011

CALL TO ORDER

Opening Comment: Chairperson Blonski called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chairperson Ken Blonski, M.S., Vice Chairperson Stan Hayes, Secretary Robert Bornstein, Ph.D., and Council Members Sam Altshuler, Jennifer Bard, Louise Bedsworth, Ph.D., Benjamin Bolles, M.S., Harold Brazil, Peter Chamberlin, Jonathan Cherry, AIA, Alexandra Desautels, John Holtzclaw, Ph.D., Kraig Kurucz, Gary Lucks, JD, CPEA, REA I, Liza Lutzker, Kendall Oku, and Dorothy Vura-Weis, M.D., M.P.H.

Absent: Council Members Jeffrey Bramlett, Jane Martin, Ph.D., and Jonathan Ruel

Also in attendance: Mr. Gary Kendall, Advisory Council Liaison

Staff: Brian Bunger, Air District Counsel
Eric Stevenson, Director of Technical Services
Henry Hilken, Director of Planning, Rules & Research

Public Comment Period: There were no public comments.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of Minutes of the March 9, 2011 Advisory Council Meeting:

The following amendments to the minutes of March 9, 2011 were proposed:

Page 2: spell out the meaning of the abbreviation CPCs “Condensation Particle Counters”

Page 3: replace “science distribution” with “size distribution”

Page 4: replace “is not a simple whatsoever” with “is not simple”

Page 6: Change “organic compounds in metals” to “organic compounds and metals”

Page 13: Delete remaining paragraph after: “the District must look into chemical composition”

Page 14: replace “envitro” with “in-vitro”

Page 14: Add “or cells” after “identify a set of indicator species”

Page 14: Change “regulate something” to “regulate UFP or chemical species”

Page 14: Nrf2 is the correct term

Page 14: Correct spelling of Dr. Vura-Weis’ name

Council Action: Member Holtzclaw made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 9, 2011 Advisory Council Meeting, as amended; Member Kurucz seconded the motion; carried unanimously without objection.

DISCUSSION

2. Discussion of Draft Report on the Advisory Council’s March 9, 2011 Meeting on Ultrafine Particulate: Health Effects, Measurement and Analysis.

Mr. Altshuler presented a power point slide show (attached to these minutes), titled “Ultrafine Particulate Matter (UFP): Cause for Concern” to the Advisory Council. Dr. Vura-Weis and Ms. Lutzker also assisted with the presentation. The slide show and the report are the basis for the future presentation and report to the Board of Directors.

The following comments were made about the slide show and report:

- Ensure that the report backs up the power point.
- Power point is a good introduction to discuss the draft report.
- Very positive.
- Good review of the issues.
- Regarding the recommendation - whether and to what extent should the Air District regulate PM or UFP in terms of permitting? Where does this lead in terms of policy?
- Are we ready to make a presentation to the Board and make a recommendation? Perhaps we should give them an update.
- Certain conclusions in the presentation are less controversial, fairly certain, tell the Board about that.
- CEQA runs parallel with permitting, and UFP would be a significant impact.
- The big point is that we need to follow the science. Don’t know where it may take us. The science is not mature, but promising. We can see the cell changes now, rather than waiting for the epidemiology. We need to follow the testing and see where it goes.
- Look more at the PM numbers near freeways. Look into data about filters and ultra-tight windows.
- It’s premature to set a CEQA threshold.
- Historically we’ve been given 10 minutes to present before the Board of Directors, maybe they’ll give us more time. Can this be broken down into 5 minutes summary of the science, 5 minutes of emerging issues? A science introduction is needed. Don’t count on more time. What’s the most important 5 minutes?

- May need to pick the ten best slides.
- Indoor air quality information and the historical background helped paint the whole picture.
- Reorganize the slides. The report is clear and condensed. Liked the order/logic of the recommendations. Monitoring is intended to answer the questions “What is in the air and where does it come from?” Add that to the report. Combine recommendations 2 and 4 which are both related to health impacts, link them together.
- For Recommendation #3, broaden or expand that to control measures. How might this affect the design of our PM 2.5 control program; need to understand the implications of the PM 2.5 control measures have on UFP. Need to understand how they correlate with our other control measures. We haven’t established the measurements or metrics. Emerging issue is that particles numbers are going up, while mass is going down. We have reduced PM 2.5; is that increasing the UFP?
- We’ve just begun to touch on this issue, and need to go deeper. What is the implication of what we’ve heard? Let’s agree on some things to talk to the Board about and tell them to stay tuned, and that we have more coming.
- Tell the Board up front that this is our first look at this. The first recommendation, regarding monitors in environmental justice areas; prefer that monitoring occur in high impact areas, wherever they are. A variety of monitors and locations is not a bad idea.
- Look into the correlation between the UFP and the PM 2.5. The part we are leaving behind may be what we couldn’t even measure before. Smaller particles may not be of the same nature, and there are different issues.
- Don’t just focus on the UFP. Would like an explanation of particle mass decreasing, but with particle numbers increasing. How can this be? If we have these controls, how can there be more particles?
- We need an explanatory on vapors. Where are we are looking, and how are we monitoring? Needs clarification.
- Regarding the detail in the presentation: cubic centimeter note was helpful.
- UFP monitoring should measure particle numbers and composition.
- Indoor exposure occurs when people use common cleaning products. Sealed windows will keep the outdoor air from entering, but they don’t allow the indoor air to exit. How do feel about indoor air quality?
- The maximum exposure you get is on the freeway, or if you live in the zone around the freeway. Someone needs to come in and talk about exposure.
- Regarding Recommendation #1 - where does the money come from? What would you recommend as location, how many and where is the money coming from? They will be put in high traffic, high diesel, and high population areas to measure exposure. We are developing a strategy to place these near road ways.
- Try to not be too detailed and specific. They are looking into it and thinking about it. Should be worded “as appropriate” instead of listing specific steps.

- Is it particle numbers or composition we want to monitor? You won't use the same monitor. What do we want to track? We will watch the science as it emerges. Let's not do the recommendations now. Prepare a report after we have more information and hear more speakers.
- During a normal smog test, there is no attempt to measure burning oil. If we look at gross polluters, we may end up going in that direction. Expand it to gross polluters.
- Timing on this. Are we doing it sooner or later? 4 recommendations – set up, track, look and compare. Tell the Board what we want to do with the information. Is this a one, four or five year process?
- I am very concerned about the health effects. What are other regulatory agencies doing for this now?
- Show that PM 0.1 is UFP.
- Reference the power point in the report. Put the science in report and highlight it on the power point.
- Emerging issues – how the technology for UFP is changing. Make a recommendation of what we should be monitoring, number or size or composition. Where is this going? Making policy that is flexible as our knowledge deepens, not to put on blinders as we get more information.

Secretary Hayes recommended that Advisory Council members send emails to the team if they had further comments or additions. Please send comments to Mr. Altshuler within a week. The team will make the changes they feel are necessary. There will be final action on this report at the next meeting.

Chair Blonski thanked Ms. Lutzker, Dr. Vura-Weis and Mr. Altshuler for their hard work on the report and presentation.

3. Discussion of Advisory Council Members attending the Annual Air & Waste Management Association (A&WMA) Meeting in June.

Chair Blonski noted that five members had expressed interest in attending.

Mr. Brazil, Dr. Bornstein, Mr. Holtzclaw and Mr. Altshuler will be representing the Advisory Council at the A&WMA conference. Chair Blonski requested that the representatives report back to the Advisory Council after their trip. Mr. Hayes is also attending the conference, but his trip is not being funded by the District.

OTHER BUSINESS

4. Council Member Comments / Other Business

Mr. Kendall spoke about scheduling speakers for the upcoming topic meetings. A team is needed to do a report on the information received. Mr. Kendall is arranging for a speaker at the June meeting who will talk about UFP from mobile sources; and another speaker is being considered who will talk about what happens between the tailpipe of a vehicle and 300 meters away; a discussion of the chemistry and physics of what occurs in the atmosphere with those particles as they are transported away from the source.

Mr. Altshuler, Dr. Bornstein and Mr. Bolles volunteered to join the next work team. Mr. Kendall asked if anyone else wants to help, let us know at the next meeting. (Mr. Brazil was added to the work team after meeting adjourned)

Mr. Lucks passed out an article that summarizes all the environmental legislation that passed last year.

Mr. Kendall announced that Mr. Lucks has volunteered to do a presentation to the Advisory Council about the legislative process, tentatively scheduled at 11:00 a.m., immediately after the May Advisory Council meeting.

Mr. Kurucz attended a meeting at UC Berkeley regarding green chemistry. The science is very interesting and ties in well with what we are talking about.

Ms. Bard stated that the Lung Association is working with the Air District in San Jose, on the development of a Community Risk Reduction Plan (CRRP). They have made an initial set of recommendations that look at healthy indoor air and reduction of emissions in communities located near freeways. There is a lot of community involvement and Ms. Bard had a handout for the Advisory Council.

Ms. Bard also reported that the American Lung Association's "State of the Air" report will be released on April 27, which is a national air quality report. They look at levels of ozone and PM 2.5 in counties through the country that have monitoring. The counties are graded on the number of days they exceed air quality standards. Ms. Bard also asked staff about the progress of a bill that the Air District and MTC are co-sponsoring. Mr. Hilken replied that the bill is in the pipeline and that an update would be given at a Legislative Committee meeting.

Mr. Hayes let the Advisory Council know that A&WMA is sponsoring an international conference "Greenhouse Gases in a Changing Climate" on November 16 - 17, 2011 in San Francisco. The deadline for abstracts is May 2, 2011. He is grateful that the Air District supports these events.

Mr. Altshuler alerted the Advisory Council to interesting articles about UC Berkeley professor, Richard Muller. Muller was a skeptic about global warming, and was hired by a group to perform a study to debunk previous global warming studies. Instead his results supported climate change science and he presented those results to the GOP.

5. **Next meeting:** The next meeting of the Advisory Council will be held on Wednesday, May 11, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at 939 Ellis Streets, San Francisco, CA 94109
6. **Adjournment:** Chair Blonski adjourned the meeting at 10:58 a.m.

IS/ Kris Perez Krow

Kris Perez Krow
Clerk of the Boards