

Monday, April 27 – Redwood City

9:30am-12:00pm

Redwood City Public Library

Wednesday, April 29 – Oakland

9:30am-12:00pm

Oakland City Hall

Thursday, April 30 - Petaluma

10:00am-12:30pm

Petaluma Public Library

Overview of Workshops

In April 2009, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) held public workshops in three Bay Area locations to discuss progress in developing the Bay Area 2009 Clean Air Plan (CAP). Staff presented an update on the implementation status of the 2005 Ozone Strategy, the framework for the CAP, preliminary outcomes of the all-feasible-control-measures review, and a preliminary list of control measures under consideration for the CAP.

Excluding District staff, approximately 56 people attended the workshops, representing a variety of public agencies, environmental and public health organizations, Bay Area businesses and industry, and community members. 22 people attended the Redwood City meeting; 23 people attended the Oakland workshop; 11 people attended the Petaluma workshop. Below is a summary of workshop proceedings and public comments recorded at the workshop. District responses to questions posed are provided in *italics*.

April 27, 2009 Redwood City

- In the summary of preliminary control measure evaluations several measures were rejected on the basis of cost effectiveness. Please share the basis of cost-effectiveness?

Cost-effectiveness is calculated by comparing the implementation costs to the estimated emission reductions for a control measure and expressed on a \$/ton basis. For an ozone control measure, the emission reductions represent the sum of ozone precursors (ROG & NOx). However, other pollutants can be included in calculating cost-effectiveness as well. For the 2009 CAP, we are interested in particulate matter, air toxics, and greenhouse gases, as well as ozone.

- Has the BAAQMD considered implementing a tax/fee scheme for noncompliance, such as the one implemented by the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District?

This question may refer to a requirement that air districts which are classified as severe or extreme ozone non-attainment areas must impose an annual fee on stationary sources within their jurisdiction. (See, for example, Measure # MCS-08 in 2007 South

Coast AQMP.) Based on our ozone status, this requirement does not apply to the Bay Area. Therefore, we are not considering the idea of imposing any such fee at this time.

- What is the connection of the Clean Air Plan to SB 375 which provides regional targets for reduction of greenhouse gases from land use development? Will SB375 targets be incorporated into the CAP?

SB 375 requires the Air Resources Board to establish regional greenhouse gas reduction targets by September 30, 2010; these targets will not be established until after the CAP is adopted. SB 375 implementation will be addressed primarily via the next update of the Regional Transportation Plan scheduled for adoption in year 2013. However, the District and its regional agency partners will attempt to lay the groundwork for a successful SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy via the CAP, the District's soon-to-be-developed Indirect Source Review Rule, updated CEQA Guidelines, and other planning efforts to promote focused growth that occur prior to the next RTP cycle.

- How will the multi-pollutant evaluation methodology be applied? How will it be used?

The multi-pollutant evaluation methodology will be used to quantify public health and climate protection benefits for proposed control measures in the CAP, to help analyze and prioritize the control measures, and to help evaluate any trade-offs among pollutants. Please refer to Multi-Pollutant Evaluation Method Technical Document posted on Plan website for more information.

<http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/Plans/Clean-Air-Plans.aspx>

- The EIR for the Luminaire project on Mountain View Road in Sunnyvale pointed to significant unavoidable air quality impacts associated with the Project. When a significant unavoidable impact is overridden by the lead agency, what are air quality implications for existing residents?

CEQA requires that impacts associated with implementation of a project are disclosed to the public through the environmental review process. The role of the Air District is to provide guidelines for reviewing air quality impacts. However, the lead agency (in this case, presumably the City of Sunnyvale) is responsible for evaluating a project on its overall merits and has discretion to override significant unavoidable impacts and to approve a project even if there are significant air quality impacts that cannot be fully mitigated. In such a case, the air quality implications for residents would depend upon a number of factors, including baseline ambient concentrations, types and amounts of pollutants emitted, and the location of the project relative to sensitive receptors.

- What is the planning horizon for the 2009 Clean Air Plan?

The Clean Air Plan is a triennial update to the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy. The CAP will focus on the 2010-2012 period. However, the Air District will attempt to look beyond this period to anticipate future issues and challenges as we develop the CAP.

- Will photochemical modeling of land use and transportation be conducted for the Plan to estimate transport to downwind air basins?

The Air District will use available air quality modeling information to help inform development of the CAP. However, State air quality planning requirements do not call for modeling of transport to downwind air basins as part of the plan.

- Will the greenhouse gas component of the CAP act as a regional climate action plan?

No. Although the Air District will seek to quantify and achieve potential greenhouse gas reductions as we develop the CAP control strategy, the CAP is not intended to serve as a comprehensive regional climate action plan.

- In preliminary control measures, was the movement of goods in and around the Ports considered? Will the idea of increasing rail freight to reduce trucks on highways be considered?

We anticipate that the CAP will address goods movement via a combination of mobile source measures, transportation control measures, and land use measures. Shifting the mode for freight delivery is one idea that will be considered.

- Will closed landfills be regulated as part of the CAP?

Closed landfills are tightly controlled already through AB 32 actions and the District's existing Regulation 8 Rule 34. Therefore, we do not anticipate adding any new controls on closed landfills in the CAP.

- Is pollen considered a form of particulate matter (PM) pollutant?

Pollen is a biogenic type of PM, produced from natural sources. Although pollen does contribute to overall PM levels, we focus on reducing emissions from anthropogenic (man-made) sources in our air quality planning and rule-making activities.

- Electrical vehicles and diesel engines have been mentioned, but why was natural gas, liquefied natural gas, etc. not mentioned? Electrical vehicles may be more polluting than natural gas due to emissions associated with production of electricity needed to power the vehicles.

The Air District has a long history of providing funding for both natural gas and electric vehicles and infrastructure. We agree that it is important to consider the upstream emissions related to power generation in analyzing the impact of electric vehicles. However, in the Bay Area the mix of power sources is relatively clean (natural

gas plants, hydroelectric, nuclear) from the air quality standpoint, so electric vehicles are the cleanest option.

- Not all transportation pricing strategies result in decreased emissions. How can the Plan implement pricing that reduces emissions?

We anticipate that the CAP will include control measures to promote transportation pricing to help reduce emissions. Although a variety of pricing policy mechanisms have been under discussion for years, most pricing measures would require approval of legislation and/or a vote of the people. The challenge is to build a coalition that can achieve the necessary public and political buy-in to gain approval of effective pricing measures.

- There are land use and transportation decisions made by local governments that negatively impact air quality. For example, the City of Berkeley implemented 4-way stop intersection compared to 2-way stops which results in more emissions. Will local government practices and decisions that impact air quality be addressed by the CAP?

The CAP will encourage local governments to implement policies and programs that benefit air quality. While the Air District encourages local governments to pursue policies to benefit air quality, we recognize that they must consider a variety of factors in their decisions related to land use, transportation, etc. We expect to include resources in the CAP for local planners who make decisions with air quality implications.

- Where can more information be found about the regional HOT lane network?

Please refer to MTC's HOT lane website: <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/hov/>

- What does the CAP propose for a more aggressive strategy in reducing cars and trucks and improving public transportation?

The California Air Resources Board has primary responsibility and authority to regulate emissions from mobile (transportation) sources in California. The CAP will propose a comprehensive strategy to complement ARB regulations with measures to reduce motor vehicle travel and emissions. In order to achieve our air quality and climate protection goals, we need to reduce motor vehicle use, as well as develop and deploy clean, more fuel-efficient vehicles. This will require partnerships with a wide range of agencies and entities, as well as significant behavior change from Bay Area residents.

- Motor vehicles and other mobile sources emit the majority of air pollutants and greenhouse gases. How can the District be more aggressive in addressing the issue of cars and trucks without authority to regulate mobile sources?

Although the Air District does not have direct authority to regulate emissions from mobile sources, we will pursue a multi-faceted approach to reduce vehicle emissions

via a combination of partnerships, public education, grants and incentives, a new indirect source regulation, enforcement of ARB regulations, etc. These efforts provide support for alternative modes of transportation, land use changes, pricing mechanisms, accelerated retirement of older, dirtier vehicles, promotion of new technologies and fuels, and other measures that collectively will help to reduce motor vehicle emissions and vehicle travel.

- Do the TCMs assign an emissions reduction target to cities and counties that is attached to potential funding?

No, to date one approach has been to give bonus points in grant programs application evaluation processes to local agencies that take actions to help implement the control measures in the District's air quality plans. We do not have any plans to assign specific emission reduction targets to local governments at this point in time.

- For the proposed coating and solvent measure included in the stationary source segment of the preliminary control measures, will this apply to production of coatings and solvents or the application of coatings and solvents? Does BAAQMD have authority to apply restrictions on these levels or are they under State control?

The District does have authority and has adopted rules (see BAAQMD Regulation 8) to regulate both the production and application of solvents and coatings. Some products are regulated by the Air Resources Board under its consumer productions program; the question as to whether ARB or BAAQMD has jurisdiction over a particular product generally depends upon the size of the container sold.

- What kind of comments have you received from industry sectors regarding the stationary source section?

To date, Air District staff has not received any formal comments on the potential stationary source measures described in the materials that were distributed for the April CAP workshops.

- Please say more about the direction the District is headed in terms of climate change with regards to energy efficiency?

As we develop the CAP control strategy, Air District staff is evaluating options as to the best way to address energy efficiency in the CAP within our legal authority. There are many agencies and players involved with this issue, and many initiatives already under way. We are consulting with other stakeholders to see if and how the Air District can fill gaps and/or add value to existing efforts, standards, and requirements.

- How will the impact of urban heat island measures on high temperatures, energy savings, and ozone and ozone precursors be calculated and communicated?

We know conceptually that decreasing urban heat island effects should be beneficial in terms of reducing ozone and other pollutants; however, it is difficult to document and quantify the potential benefits. Air District staff is investigating the research that has

been conducted in this area. We expect to draw on research performed by Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, a leader in this area, as one key resource.

April 29, 2009 Oakland

- David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF. With reference to the 2005 Ozone Strategy Control Measures Implementation Status, please be more clear as to which items that BAAQMD is responsible for implementing.

Comment noted.

- Will the District respond to public comments in a written form?

Yes, this document serves that function.

- Waafah Arborashed, Healthy 880 Communities. Please explain the use of the word “voluntary” with regards to multi-pollutant plan. Would like to see a strong plan with regulatory teeth.

State law merely requires the District to prepare a triennial update to its ozone plan. Air District staff used the term “voluntary” in its presentation to emphasize that the District is not required to develop a multi-pollutant plan, and that the District has decided to embark upon this path because we think that it makes sense to plan on multi-pollutant basis. Any rules and regulations that the District adopts pursuant to the CAP will be mandatory upon regulated entities.

- Karen Pierce, SFDPH. Are the criteria for evaluation on page two of the Summary of Preliminary Control Measure Evaluations listed in order of priority or weight so that the first criteria is cost effectiveness?

No. State law requires that air districts consider the evaluation criteria defined in Section 40922 of the California Health and Safety code in developing their air quality plans. However, the order in which the criteria are listed does not imply any priority or weighting among the various criteria.

- Andy Katz, Breathe California. The list of measures rejected and reasons why should be made available to community groups to review and verify, and so that the public can refine and add to measures reviewed for feasibility. This process should enter the public discussion.

As noted in the (yellow) workshop hand-out entitled “Summary of Preliminary Control Measure Evaluations,” the outcome of all measures reviewed or considered for the CAP will be posted on the District website and available for public review and discussion with Air District staff.

- David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF

- The District’s modeling advisory committee concluded that drastic reductions in ozone precursors would be required in order to make a difference in ozone. Questions the usefulness of small or moderate reductions in ozone precursors.

Incremental emission reductions from different control measures eventually amount to major emission reductions over time. In addition, it is important to note that ROG and NOx, the key ozone precursors, also act as precursors to formation of secondary (indirect) particulate matter. PM is perhaps the most harmful pollutant from the standpoint of its public health impacts.

- He praises the multi-pollutant approach. He has some concerns about the summary of preliminary control measure evaluations. First, he asserts that the District lists only air quality attainment plans reviewed for feasible control measures rather than highlighting measures from other sources such as public suggestions. He notes that he has submitted recommendations for control measures in the past. Second he would like to see a handout on measures rejected in the interests of transparency. Third, the criteria of “public acceptability” should be interrogated and challenged. The District should push public acceptability in the interests of cleaner air.

See response to comment from Andy Katz above.

- He offers positive feedback on draft CAP framework and states that the notion of special topics (as shown in CAP schematic hand-out) has merit. The “land use and local impacts” category could be called “local sources.” The “energy and climate” category could be called simply “energy.” The proposed “Toolbox” should also include California Health and Safety Code 40233. This refers to District’s authority to establish an emission reduction target for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to achieve attainment via the transportation control measure component of the plan.
- It has not been demonstrated that there is a need for charging infrastructure for electric vehicles, yet these are included in the TCMs. In general it is important for the Plan to establish that there is a need before proceeding in a given direction.
- The District should seek authority to require mandatory employer TDM plans once again. [Note: this comment refers to authority which was revoked by the state legislature via SB 437 (Lewis) in 1995.]
- MTC’s recently-adopted T2035 regional transportation plan will increase vehicle miles of travel (VMT). The District should not be lending its support to expansion of the regional high-occupancy toll (HOT) lane network, as this network will have a negative effect rather than a positive effect on VMT and emissions. The evidence is unequivocal. Reducing congestion is different from reducing climate impacts.

- A proposal was submitted to MTC’s advisory council to hire an economist to evaluate and implement pricing with one of the regional agencies. The District should seek authority to implement pricing programs in addition to developing pricing programs.
- Kathleen Livermore, City of San Leandro
 - She would like to see more substantial measures in the climate and energy portion of the preliminary control measures. Can the District work with jurisdictions to enact minimum LEED standards requirements such as those enacted by Santa Clara County? While the building industry may fight this, they also complain about a lack of certainty; regional minimum building standards could help to provide certainty in this area. It is low hanging fruit.

Air District staff is researching and evaluating whether and how to address building standards in the CAP. Among other means, energy efficiency in new buildings can be potentially be addressed via the Indirect Source Regulation (ISR) that the District will be developing in the coming months.

- To supplement ISR, recommends that trip reduction plans be put in place for existing businesses close to transit.
- Mark Bain. In preliminary Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), what does the term “encourage sustainable travel behavior” mean?

This TCM category will implement strategies to encourage mode shifts away from single occupancy vehicle to transit, ridesharing, biking and walking, as well as other behaviors and choices to reduce motor vehicle emission by means of voluntary individual actions.

- Karen Pierce, SFDPH. She recommends that the District solicit more public engagement and input while completing control measures. She requests more opportunities for public involvement before the draft is completed to promote public buy-in. A model for public involvement in a planning process is the SFPUC’s Sustainability Plan. She would like to see collaboration with the public in developing the Plan.

The Air District is committed to working with the public and all interested stakeholders as we develop the CAP. We welcome constructive suggestions for how to improve our public involvement process.

- Jamie McLeod, Santa Clara Valley Water District
 - Many Bay Area jurisdictions are updating their General Plans including the City of San Jose, the City of Sunnyvale, and Santa Clara County. There is a critical interval before 2010 that would benefit from Air District guidance in the form of policies and goals for General Plans.

- The public idea of what is “acceptable” is changing. This is an important opportunity that should not be lost, to foster a negotiation and push the envelope of what is acceptable for policy.
- Recommends the District conduct public outreach after the adoption of the plan to build political will for its implementation.
- Recommends that the District promote at least LEED Silver for building standards for jurisdictions.
- The District should use its existing, highly effective, *Spare the Air* public service announcement apparatus to encourage greener behavior.
- Suggests the Land Use and Local Impacts category of measures be renamed to “built environment” measures.
- The District should encourage employers to implement transportation demand management (TDM) programs at their work sites.

- Andy Katz, Breathe California
 - This Plan should reference the outcomes of the Air District’s cumulative impacts working group process in developing new regulations and reviewing existing regulations for new and existing sources.
 - With regards to mobile sources, the District should take a more aggressive approach particularly on clean fleets, feebates for low-emission vehicles and parking spaces for plug-in hybrid vehicles through a feebate program or regulation on new development. The District should find additional funding sources to enable better implementation of TCMs in the plan.
 - Its important that the District take a stand on MTC’s high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes plan. He asserts that HOT lanes will increase greenhouse gas emissions; therefore he cautions District against promoting this pricing strategy.
 - Pricing or tolling to fund transit revenue should be developed and promoted as a feasible option. The District should take a creative look at its fee authority to see how it can implement a gasoline fee and VMT fee to raise revenue for transit. Integrated tolling has the potential to improve air quality. The Plan must find more effective ways to move transportation pricing forward.
 - The District’s advisory council issued recommendations related to public health. Those recommendations should be considered in the Plan.
 - He is concerned that the fall 2009 adoption timeline does not allow enough time for public review. This timeline may need to be extended to allow for adequate public review.

- Winston Rhodes, City of Pinole Planning Manager
 - BAAQMD and MTC should demonstrate to stakeholders that they are working together to counteract the perception that they are working at cross purposes. In order to make progress on GHG emission reduction, mobile sources need to be addressed which means that the District saying it has no authority over mobile sources is not useful.
 - There needs to be more precise and quantitative ways of measuring progress for clean air plans.
 - District should provide financial incentives for jurisdictions that are stepping up and being proactive in implementing land use practices with positive air quality

outcomes in order to help create political will, particularly now that budgets are so tight. One example is the State of California Housing and Community Development workforce housing program.

- Wafaa Arborashed, Healthy 880 Communities. How does the District work with local governments to lower emissions in impacted communities?

The Air District works to reduce emissions and population exposure in impacted communities via its Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) program. See <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/Planning-Programs-and-Initiatives/CARE-Program.aspx>

- Jennifer Ahlskog, Conoco Phillips. Is there a model for the District's multi-pollutant evaluation method? Has it been done before?

The multi-pollutant evaluation method is new, but it draws upon established studies such as those used by ARB to quantify the health impacts of its diesel air toxics control measures. Air District staff plans to host a public workshop to present the proposed multi-pollutant evaluation methodology on June 11.

- Brian Matthews, Stopwaste.org
 - How flexible will the District be in using or receiving data that has been speciated particularly in the area of organics. Will this plan be able to take in that kind of new information?

The District is currently investigating the idea of incorporating the reactivity of individual organic compounds into our regulatory efforts. This approach holds the most promise for source categories that involve a choice of constituents, such as operations involving coating and solvent use. It would be difficult to apply this to the composting of organics. However, information regarding the reactivity of compounds emitted from different feed stocks may prove useful in developing regulations governing composting operations. We would welcome any information you can submit that provides speciation of the organic compounds emitted from composting operations.

- How much flexibility is there in looking at BACT for GHG as GHG is integrated into permitting operations? For landfills the default is flaring; there hasn't been a lot of flexibility in changing the control. How much flexibility in looking at this as the technology evolves?

Flaring is the default method of control for solid waste disposal sites because it is the cheapest, most efficient control method. This choice on the part of the facility operators is not dictated by New Source Review standards. Operators may choose to control their emissions by flare, I.C.Engine, turbine, or even in some cases carbon adsorption. There are separate BACT determinations for each of these control methods. It is easier to offset emissions from energy recovery methods (engine or turbine) versus flaring as these are available from a growth allowance bank (a subset of the Small Facilities Bank), and not subject

to the 35 ton emissions level cut off as applied for the SFB. As greenhouse gas control is integrated into permitting, BACT determinations will continue to be broken down by control method as is the current practice for VOC emissions reductions.

- Plan needs to take into consideration emissions tradeoffs related to composting in developing a composting control measure. Can the CAP recognize the trade-offs and balancing act that needs to take place to achieve these emission goals? In terms of composting, how can the plan look at the trade-offs when BAAQMD isn't controlling for emission limits?

When assessing the environmental effects resulting from any rule-making efforts for composting operations, we will investigate the possibility that organic wastes may go into landfills or be transported out of the District should regulated controls prove to costly for composting operations. The trend in controlling emissions from composting operations has been toward the development of best management practices, and in some cases biofiltration, rather than costly control equipment. The efficacy of these practices is currently being investigated in a field study sponsored by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. The results of this study should be available in the 4th quarter of this year. In addition, the California Integrated Waste Management Board has contracted a Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) of Organic Diversion Alternatives and Economic Analysis of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Options which should be completed later this year. We will utilize the results from these studies as well as others in our rule-making efforts and consult with the regulated community and other stakeholders to fully evaluate the consequences of those rule-making efforts.

- When are written comments due? Will specific control measures be discussed today or at some other time?

Written comments will be considered at any time. However, we ask that comments be submitted by May 11, 2009 in order to be included in the formal summary of workshop comment that District staff will prepare (i.e. this document).

- Unidentified woman – Please consider providing incentives for schools to assist in shifting parents' behavior to be more sustainable.

The Air District has developed a climate protection curriculum for elementary schools and is in the process of expanding this curriculum to additional schools.

- Christine Cordero, CEH. The District should provide assistance to jurisdictions in addressing existing impacting sources in their General Plan Updates. When will the draft “advocacy platform” component of the CAP be available?

We expect to make the draft advocacy platform available as part of the draft control strategy (currently slated for release in July 2009).

April 30, 2009 Petaluma

- Ken Wells, Guiding Sustainability. How will the Plan coordinate with ARB regulations, AB 32, SB375, RTP 2035, and ABAG population and land use projections?

We are in a very dynamic period in terms of new legislation, plans and priorities. One of the challenges we face in crafting the CAP is how to integrate all these efforts. District staff will monitor these other plans and regulations, coordinate with ARB, and collaborate with our regional agency partners via the Joint Policy Committee as we develop the CAP.

- Does the all-feasible-measures review refer to air quality attainment plans from other parts of California or does it refer to plans internal to the region, such as the Marin County General Plan or jurisdiction climate action plans?

The all-feasible-measures review refers primarily to the need to review control measures in air quality plans prepared in other parts of the state. However, District staff is looking for good ideas for the CAP from all corners, including local climate action plans.

- Gillian Hayes, City of Santa Rosa. A concerted countywide parking pricing strategy for Sonoma County is needed so that parking pricing can thrive. She volunteers Sonoma County to be a test area or pilot project. Viable alternative modes must be operating, i.e. transit, in order to make parking pricing viable. The parking toolkit developed by MTC was utilized in Santa Rosa as a model and it proved to be very helpful. Perhaps the District could encourage cities to implement parking pricing policies like those already implemented by the City of Berkeley.

- Ken Wells, Guiding Sustainability
 - Politics aside, does the District have authority to implement parking pricing? Does District have authority to implement ISR?

The California Health & Safety Code does not specifically define the authority of local air district re: parking pricing, with the exception of H&S Code Section 40717.6 which states that air districts shall not require the imposition of parking charges or the elimination of existing parking at retail facilities. Local air district do have authority to regulate emissions from indirect sources and area-wide sources under H&S Code Section 40716.

- How is this plan going to address renewable energy production in the District that might offset energy generation outside the District?

District staff is currently evaluating options as to how best to address energy issues in the CAP.

- How will the plan affect renewable energy? Land fill gas plants are not as clean but are better from the perspective of GHG. What about bio-mass energy generation? How to evaluate and balance these issues in terms of air quality benefits? Does BAAQMD have a rule on charbroilers?

Re: energy, see response to preceding question above. Re: charbroilers, yes, the District adopted a rule to reduce emissions of NOx and PM from charbroilers in December 2007.

- Steve Birdlebough, Sierra Club

- How do you evaluate the implementation of transportation control measures (TCMs)? How do you track benchmarks? There should be a report card. Is there a report card being done on how well the TCMs have performed against stated goals? Evaluation needs to be performed in a methodical way. One example would be developing a report on the success of a measure facilitating intermodal connectivity by examining schedules and intermodal connections.

The Air District and MTC work together to prepare an annual progress report to ARB re: implementation of the TCMs in our air quality plan. Performance is typically reported in terms of progress in implementing key action items. Quantitative information is provided whenever possible; for example, the amount of funding and/or grants provided to help implement the different control measures at the regional and local level. In developing TCMs for the 2009 CAP, staff will try to identify performance metrics in the control measure description to help evaluate progress in implementing each measure after the CAP is adopted.

- The next step beyond implementation, what is the process for bringing the measures contained in the 2005 Ozone Strategy forward into the 2009 Plan as far as identifying what worked and what did not.

In developing the TCMs for the 2009 CAP, Air District staff and MTC staff will collaborate to evaluate outcomes and lessons learned in implementing the 2005 Ozone Strategy. Any input provided by interested parties will be considered as part of this effort.

- He is concerned about the cost of monitoring carpools in high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes. How would the system be able to identify carpools that would be allowed to use the lanes for free? How would this be implemented?

Operational issues such as this will be addressed by MTC and the Bay Area Toll Authority as development of the HOT lane proposal moves forward.

- Use public outreach to promote individual carbon footprints on a broad scale through a climate protection program.

- Air quality benefits associated with energy measures will outdistance other control measures.