

Transcript Permitting Rules Workshop 2

08/24/2021

* * * * *

Transcription is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

* * * * *

[silence]

[00:01:08] **ANEESH:** Welcome. Good evening, everyone. We'll go [00:01:20] ahead and get started in just a minute, right at six o'clock.

[00:02:00] **ANEESH:** Okay, it's six o'clock. We'll go ahead and get started. Welcome, good evening, everyone. Thank you for joining us this [00:02:10] evening to learn about and discuss draft amendments to the Air District's permitting rules. Tonight's workshop is being recorded and will be available on the Air District's Regulation 2 amendments [00:02:20] webpage. My name is Aneesh Rana, I work in the Air District's community engagement office, and I'll be facilitating tonight's virtual workshop. I'm sure many of you joining us this evening are well-accustomed [00:02:30] by now to using Zoom. For those who aren't or those that could benefit from a refresher, I'll go ahead and go over some of the Zoom and other technical features for the meeting. [00:02:40]

[00:02:41] For those of you joining via web browser on your computer, smartphone, or tablet, you'll see these icons along the bottom of your screen. By clicking the two icons in your bottom left corner, [00:02:50] you can mute and unmute your microphone and turn your camera on your device on and off. If you move down the bar more to your right, you'll find the participant icon. By [00:03:00] clicking this icon, you can see the other participants and rename yourself. We ask that you do this now, so we can better identify you if you wish to speak during the workshop. This is also [00:03:10] where you can raise your hand to indicate that you wish to speak.

[00:03:13] The reaction icon all the way to the right provides you another option for raising your hand, as well as the ability to share other reactions [00:03:20] to what you're hearing. If you're dialing into the meeting with your phone, you can press *9 to raise your hand and then *9 to lower your hand.

[00:03:29] Moving further down the bar, [00:03:30] you'll find the chat icon. You can use this feature to submit questions and comments privately to workshop hosts and our tech support if you're experiencing technical difficulties. You will also [00:03:40] be able to use the chat function to submit questions and provide feedback during certain portions of the meeting, which we'll clearly identify for you and explain. Please [00:03:50] note that all questions and comments in the chat will be recorded this evening. Next slide.

[00:03:57] If you need technical assistance at any point [00:04:00] during the workshop, we have representatives that can assist you. You can either contact us through chat or via phone, text, or email, and we'll drop this info in the chat for you to [00:04:10] refer back to in case you encounter any difficulties throughout the workshop. Next slide.

[00:04:19] Since [00:04:20] we are in a virtual space; I want to go over our virtual participation principles that we share before each of our workshops. We want to respect the speaker and make sure everyone can hear the information [00:04:30] being shared tonight clearly, so, please, one speaker at a time.

[00:04:34] You can help us avoid distracting or disruptive background noises by keeping your microphones muted when [00:04:40] you're not speaking. Be respectful of one another. Even though we are not together, physically, if you feel comfortable, please share your video when speaking so we can stay connected visually.

[00:04:50] Again, [00:04:50] in this virtual space complications do occur. We thank you in advance for your patience and flexibility. If you experience any technical difficulties, please [00:05:00] let us know and we'll do our best to assist you as quickly as possible. Next slide.

[00:05:08] Tonight's workshop will include a short poll [00:05:10] of participants and then we'll move into staff presentations. There'll be several opportunities for you to provide your immediate reactions and feedback to what is presented. Then, [00:05:20] following staff presentations, we'll take a short three-minute break before opening things up for questions and comments. We'll then close the workshop with Next Steps in [00:05:30] the rule development process.

[00:05:34] Now, for all of us to take a couple of quick polls [00:05:40] to help us understand who is in the room. Before we bring up the first poll, I just want to give a quick reminder to my colleagues at the Air District that you do not need to participate in the polls. Please, [00:05:50] do not close the polls as you have been given co-host capabilities, which means closing the poll on your screen will close it for everyone. The facilitation team will handle this. [00:06:00] If we could bring up the first poll.

[00:06:06] You should see this on your screen now. Please [00:06:10] take a moment and let us know where you are joining us from this evening. The chat is open. If you mark other, if you feel comfortable [00:06:20] sharing, please feel free to write in where you're joining us from. I [00:06:30] see responses are still coming in. I'll just wait a few more moments, especially for those that marked other and are writing in a response. It [00:06:40] looks like the [00:06:50] responses aren't changing. Let's go ahead and lock this in. We'll close the poll and share the results. I see [00:07:00] we have quite a bit of you joining us from Alameda and Contra Costa, then from Santa Clara [00:07:10] County, and a few of you from San Francisco, San Mateo, and Marin. Thanks. [00:07:20]

[00:07:23] You can go ahead and close this one. Now, let's bring up the second poll. That [00:07:30] should be on your screen now. If you could take few seconds [00:07:40] and let us know what perspective best represents you tonight, if you're joining us in the capacity of representing industry, as an individual, representing a community group, [00:07:50] government agency. Again, if none of these apply, select other. The chat is open. Feel free to go ahead and [00:08:00] write in a response and specify there in the chat.

[00:08:03] [pause]

[00:08:21] **ANEESH:** I think we could go ahead and lock those in and share the results out. Looks [00:08:30] like we have heavy representation from industry, some individuals, [00:08:40] and some representing government agencies. I'm just checking the chat here and I don't see that anyone has indicated [00:08:50] anything else if they chose other. We can go ahead and close those. I [00:09:00] just want to say thank you for participating in those polls and sharing with us a little bit [00:09:10] about yourselves. I'm going to hand it over to our Senior Deputy Executive Officer of Policy and Equity, Ms. Veronica Eady, who's going to provide [00:09:20] some opening remarks.

[00:09:22] **VERONICA:** Thank you, Aneesh. I just want to welcome everybody and thank you all for attending tonight's workshop. I know [00:09:30] that we have other things that we could be doing. I appreciate the time that you're taking out of your day to come here and be with us. We appreciate your commitment and engagement [00:09:40] to protecting Bay Area air quality.

[00:09:44] As you may know, this is the second public workshop we've had this year on the permitting rules amendments. We [00:09:50] really appreciate the feedback that we've gotten so far throughout the process and from the initial call with community advocates for the Air District to thoroughly evaluate [00:10:00] its permitting processes, to the insights provided by many stakeholders and members of the public in response to the proposed concepts to increase [00:10:10] health protection, that we presented to you back in May.

[00:10:14] Tonight we hope to receive your further feedback on the draft amendment [00:10:20] that are intended to prioritize community health. We look forward to hearing from you and seeing your advice that you have for us as the rule [00:10:30] amendment process continues. The draft amendments we'll be discussing with you tonight are just some of the changes we'll be making to the permitting process. We intend [00:10:40] to continue to evaluate ways to reduce undifferentiated fine particulate matter emissions as well.

[00:10:47] Many of you have been with us since the beginning [00:10:50] and have helped shape where we are tonight. We deeply appreciate it. I hope that you'll continue to remain engaged in this effort, offering your comments and asking questions as [00:11:00] we work together to protect the air quality for all people living here in the Bay Area. With that, I will hand it over to my [00:11:10] colleague, Jacob Finkel.

[00:11:11] **JACOB:** Great. Thank you so much, Veronica. Thanks, [00:11:20] everyone, for joining us this evening. Hopefully, everyone can hear me okay. My name is Jacob Finkle. I am a senior air quality specialist in the rules division at the Air District. Tonight [00:11:30] we plan to share with you the draft changes to two of the Air District's permitting rules. We hope to be able to receive your feedback and answer questions on the draft changes during the time we have [00:11:40] this evening.

[00:11:41] The permitting rule amendment effort is grounded in the Air District's commitment to reducing emissions and public exposure to air pollution with a particular emphasis on local [00:11:50] variability in air pollution, as well as community health vulnerability. Our goal is to make the air we breathe safer and healthier for everyone. We've drafted these changes based on the feedback [00:12:00] we've heard up to this point about the existing permitting process. Your feedback on the draft changes will continue to inform us in this rule amendment process.

[00:12:09] After [00:12:10] this workshop, we plan to update the Air District's stationary source and climate impacts committee on the draft amendments. We'll then look to prepare the changes for the full board of directors consideration [00:12:20] for adoption.

[00:12:21] It looks like we have a number of you have joined us tonight. Thank you so much for participating in the workshop. I want to emphasize that if you're not able to speak tonight, please [00:12:30] submit written comments to us. The deadline to submit those comments is Wednesday, September 1st.

[00:12:36] This slide shows the order of tonight's presentation. We're going to provide a very brief [00:12:40] background on this rule amendment effort, and then we will discuss the draft rule amendments. This slide indicates the draft changes focus on two rules within the permitting regulation, Rule [00:12:50] 2-1, the general requirements permitting rule, and Rule 2-5, the air toxics new source review rule. We'll discuss these rules in more detail on the following slides.

[00:12:59] I want to highlight that we'll [00:13:00] take two breaks during the presentation to receive feedback from workshop participants, one break after the presentation on draft changes to Rule 2-1, and one break after the presentation on draft [00:13:10] changes to Rule 2-5. After that, we'll move into the workshop question and answer period. Next slide, please.

[00:13:17] The current effort to evaluate the Air District's permitting [00:13:20] regulation is rooted in community members urging the Air District to address air quality impacts from permitting activities in Overburdened Communities. The [00:13:30] goal of the amendments is to make the rule more health-protective and improve transparency in the permitting process. The draft changes take into account variability and pollution burden and [00:13:40] population characteristics, depending on the location within the Bay Area.

[00:13:44] Air District staff has heard from and met with community advocates and community members who have vocalized concerns [00:13:50] about the permitting process. In May of this year, we introduced proposed concepts for public consideration based on the concerns and recommendations that advocates and community members had presented. [00:14:00]

[00:14:00] We presented the draft concepts in a public workshop on May 12th and received feedback from the public on the concepts. We then updated the two Air District committees on the proposed [00:14:10] concepts were presented to the Stationary Source and Climate Impacts Committee in May and then we went on to the Community Equity, Health and Justice Committee in July.

[00:14:18] We consider the feedback and drafted [00:14:20] the rule amendments that will be discussed tonight. On September 27th, we'll update the Stationary Source and Climate Impacts Committee on the draft rule amendment language and the public feedback we received [00:14:30] on it, with the intention of bringing the draft amendments to the full board of directors' consideration by the end of the year. Next slide, please.

[00:14:40] This [00:14:40] slide provides some context on the trends and variability of cancer risk in the Bay Area. Cancer risk in the Bay Area varies by location. Although background cancer risk [00:14:50] from exposure to the most common carcinogenic air pollutants has decreased over time, as the chart on the left shows, there are still disparities in cancer risk from exposure to poor air quality is the map of cancer [00:15:00] risk on the right shows. The color-coded cancer risk map on the right shows that the variability in cancer risk with orange and red areas such as those near West Oakland is having higher [00:15:10] modeled cancer risk from air toxics than other parts of the Bay Area. Next slide, please.

[00:15:17] This slide shows a breakdown of the types of air pollution sources [00:15:20] of cancer risk in the Bay Area and the types of pollutants that make up carcinogenic emissions in the region. The pie chart on the left shows cancer-risk weighted to toxic air contaminants, which are referred to as [00:15:30] TACs by the category of emissions. Toxic air contaminants or air pollutants that have been identified by the state of California as pollutants that may cause or can contribute [00:15:40] to an increase in the loss of life, serious illness, such as cancer, or are potential hazard to human health.

[00:15:46] The pie chart on the left shows that when emitting equipment is weighted based [00:15:50] upon cancer risks, things like ships, cars and trucks where Sierra District does not permit, although it oversees multiple programs that transition to cleaner technologies, account for the biggest cancer [00:16:00] risk contributions. This is reflected in the pie chart on the right, which shows the breakdown of toxic air contaminants that make up the majority of cancer risk from air pollution, which shows that a [00:16:10] large majority of emissions are diesel particulate matter, which is a byproduct of burning diesel fuel.

[00:16:16] Diesel fuel is often used to power things like truck, ships and construction equipment, although [00:16:20] the Air District permits many prime and backup engines, which are often powered by diesel fuel as well. Next slide, please.

[00:16:28] Staff received feedback during the [00:16:30] May Concepts Workshop and written common period that covered many topics. This slide shows the range of topics that workshop participants and

written commenters covered in their comments during the workshop [00:16:40] and in the written comments they submitted to the Air District. Staff worked to incorporate feedback from commenters to the extent possible.

[00:16:49] A number of comment [00:16:50] topics are also addressed through programs outside the permitting process and others that may be addressed through regulatory development or amendments such as fine particulate matter emissions, are currently [00:17:00] under review for technical feasibility. The permitting rule amendment processes isn't over and the draft amendments we're discussing tonight are just some of the changes that we're proposing to make to the permitting regulation. [00:17:10] We intend to continue evaluating it to further increase its health protectiveness.

[00:17:14] I'd also like to make note that the Air District staff is an initiating stakeholder outreach on the CEQA Thresholds [00:17:20] updates in the coming months. Next slide, please.

[00:17:25] The draft amendments address two parts of the Air District's permitting process, the general permitting [00:17:30] requirements, and the requirements for projects that would emit toxic air contaminants. The general permitting requirements are addressed through the Air Districts Rule 2-1, which establishes [00:17:40] is the general requirements that govern all of the permitting provisions in the permitting regulation.

[00:17:46] Rule 2-1 provides the framework for the Air District's permitting regulation, while other rules within the regulations [00:17:50] such as Rule 2-5, focus on specific elements of the permitting process. Rule 2-5 regulates projects that will have sources emitting toxic air contaminants by [00:18:00] evaluating the potential public exposure and health risks, mitigating potentially significant health risks resulting from these exposures, and providing net health risk benefits [00:18:10] by improving the level of control when existing sources are modified or replaced.

[00:18:15] Each year, the Air District conducts about 300 health risk screening analyses for projects subject to Rule [00:18:20] 2-5. Next slide, please.

[00:18:24] There are three draft updates to Rule 2-1. The overarching purpose of the updates is to provide more [00:18:30] information to the public on permit applications that face environmental and health burdens. The draft updates and tend to accomplish the objective of increased transparency by providing new [00:18:40] application noticing requirements and by clarifying what constitutes an Overburdened Community. The draft changes base the definition of Overburdened Community on areas

that score highly [00:18:50] on the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool or CalEnviroScreen, which developed by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.

[00:18:59] CalEnviroScreen [00:19:00] is a science-based method to assess cumulative impacts based in large part on a framework developed with input from a statewide environmental justice working group, and it evaluates pollution [00:19:10] burden and population characteristics at the census tract level. Next slide, please.

[00:19:17] The draft changes to Rule 2-1 are located in the [00:19:20] definitions and administrative requirements section of the rule. New section 2-1-243 defines Overburdened Community to meet an area located within a census [00:19:30] tract that scores at or above the 70th percentile in CalEnviroScreen version 4, or within 1,000 feet of any such census tract. Existing [00:19:40] section 2-1-408 in the administrative requirements part of the rule includes a draft change in processing time. The current standard permit application review period [00:19:50] is 35 working days after Air District staff deems the application complete. Draft amended section 2-1-408 extends that timeline required for the Air District to notify the permit [00:20:00] applicant of the approval, approval with conditions or denial of the permit application by 10 working days, so from 35 working days to 45 working days.

[00:20:10] These [00:20:10] changes to account for the anticipated increased time staff needs to process applications, notify the public, and review and respond to comments. Additionally, staff is considering [00:20:20] ways in which the extended review period could be limited to the most complex applications to prioritize timeliness in application processing.

[00:20:28] Draft amendments to existing Section [00:20:30] 2-1-412 would add a new notification requirement for projects that are proposed to be located in communities that are in the high-scoring CalEnviroScreen census tracts. The [00:20:40] draft language would require the same type of notification that is currently required for projects that will result in an increase in toxic air contaminant emissions that are proposed to be [00:20:50] located near K through 12 schools, but the applicability would extend to all projects within high scoring areas in CalEnviroScreen for which a health risk assessment is prepared.

[00:21:00] Applicants [00:21:00] that propose projects that will require a health risk assessment would have to distribute the notice to surrounding addresses located within 1,000 feet of the proposed source of air pollution if [00:21:10] the equipment or operation will be located within an Overburdened Community as defined in Section 2-1-243. Next few slides will show the geographic locations [00:21:20] of Overburdened Communities as they're defined in draft Section 2-1-243. Next slide, please.

[00:21:27] The image on the left of this slide shows San Francisco, [00:21:30] Marin, the Peninsula and a portion of the East Bay. In San Francisco, high-scoring CalEnviroScreen communities are located in the Tenderloin, Treasure Island and Bayview-Hunters Point. [00:21:40] In Marin, portions of eastern San Rafael score highly. Across the bay, portions of many communities score highly from North Richmond south to Hayward. Along [00:21:50] the Peninsula, high scoring areas are located in South San Francisco, San Bruno and Redwood City.

[00:21:55] The image on the right shows extreme Southeastern San Mateo County and most of Santa [00:22:00] Clara County. High scoring areas are located in portions of East Palo Alto, eastern San Jose, Morgan Hill and Gilroy. Next slide, please.

[00:22:10] The [00:22:10] image on the left of this slide shows the Carquinez and Suisun Bay regions. In Contra Costa County, high-scoring areas are located in multiple communities from Rodeo east to [00:22:20] Oakley. In Solano County, high scoring areas are located in Vallejo, Fairfield and Suisun City. The image on the right shows Sonoma County where there are high-scoring areas in Santa [00:22:30] Rosa, Sebastopol and Rohnert Park. Next slide, please.

[00:22:35] This slide shows the Bay Area Air District with highlighted high-scoring [00:22:40] CalEnviroScreen census tracts. Staff found that out of 1,552 total census tracts within the Air District's jurisdiction, 166 tracts or [00:22:50] about 11% of the total scored at or above the 70th percentile in draft CalEnviroScreen 4.0. Next slide, please.

[00:22:59] Since [00:23:00] 2009, the Air District has carried out an average of 72 public notifications for projects that triggered a school's notification requirement in Section 2-1-412. The draft [00:23:10] changed the Section 2-1-412 that would require enhanced notification of nearby addresses if the proposed project is located in an Overburdened Community and would require [00:23:20] a health risk assessment, would likely require a district staff to oversee nearly twice as many notifications and responses to comments per year for a total of nearly 140 notifications [00:23:30] annually. Next slide, please.

[00:23:35] What are the potential impacts of the draft changes to Rule 2-1 discussed in the previous [00:23:40] slides? Enhanced notification requirement for the subset of projects in Overburdened Communities that require health risk assessments could mean greater transparency and a better sense of awareness of projects [00:23:50] in the communities where the project might be located. The change

would require the Air District's Air Pollution Control Officer to respond in writing to comments received on the permit application [00:24:00] prior to taking final action on the application.

[00:24:03] However, there would be no change in the Air District's permitting authority which means that there would be at most a limited impact on permit issuance. [00:24:10] Although, greater community awareness of proposed projects could lead to constructive conversations between nearby residents and the permit applicant. There would be an increased expense [00:24:20] borne by permit applicants to cover the cost of the notification process. Public noticing requirement would also result in an increased permit processing [00:24:30] time, which would be necessary for the comment period and subsequent review and response to public comments. Next slide, please.

[00:24:39] We'd like to pause [00:24:40] to hear your feedback about the draft changes to Rule 2-1. Specifically, we would like to receive your feedback on the following three questions. First, what comments or suggestions do you [00:24:50] have on the designation of Overburdened Communities? Second, what comments or suggestions do you have on the draft enhanced notification requirements for Overburdened Communities? Third, [00:25:00] what comments or suggestions do you have on the draft extended application review timeline? In particular, what comments or suggestions do you have if the Air District further refined [00:25:10] the application review timeline to be based upon the relative project complexity rather than an across-the-board extension?

[00:25:18] Feedback is for the Air District staff's [00:25:20] consideration and will be reviewed in greater detail after the workshop as we prepare to move forward in the rule amendment process. The Air District Staff won't be responding to questions or comments [00:25:30] during this initial feedback session but will have a comments, questions and answers session later this evening. This is just a time for us to get some initial feedback from you on what we've covered so [00:25:40] far.

[00:25:41] Also, you can submit written comments to us anytime through September 1st. Please visit the link provided to review all the information on the draft [00:25:50] changes presented this evening. The Zoom chat feature where you can provide answers to the questions will open in a bit. If you could please indicate the feedback prompt number to which you're responding because [00:26:00] it would be helpful for us as we sort through the responses. I'll now hand it over to Anish to call on speakers for those who might want to speak on this. Thanks.

[00:26:08] **ANEESH:** [00:26:10] Thanks, Jacob. Before we get started, I just want to explain we are going to use a virtual whiteboarding tool called Miro board which you see [00:26:20] on your screen now. We use this to capture your feedback live on-screen. We have notetakers tonight who will do their best to

capture the essence of your comments live on [00:26:30] virtual sticky notes, so please excuse any typos or any brevity.

[00:26:36] We recognize that 15 minutes may not be enough time to allow everyone [00:26:40] to speak, so we're also going to open up chat now so you can submit comments in writing. If you wish to speak, please go ahead now and raise your hand. I will call on you in [00:26:50] the order that you raise your hand. If you're dialing in on your phone, you can dial *9 to raise your hand.

[00:26:56] [pause]

[00:27:28] **ANEESH:** Christine Wolfe, [00:27:30] please feel free to unmute yourself.

[00:27:35] **CHRISTINE:** Hi. I'm Christine Wolf. Can you hear me?

[00:27:39] **ANEESH:** Yes. [00:27:40]

[00:27:41] **CHRISTINE:** I'm with CCEEB, the California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance. Thanks for the opportunity to participate. We'd like to better understand why you're not [00:27:50] using the CARE Framework to identify Overburdened Communities? Since it provides a consistent region-wide set of data that accounts for community vulnerability as well as [00:28:00] exposures, and that can show direct correlations between air pollution and health impacts.

[00:28:05] This is in contrast to CalEnviroScreen, which you're proposing to use, where [00:28:10] a clear line can't be drawn between one environmental indicator like air pollution and health impacts. We lose that understanding of the relative contribution to risk and benefits to [00:28:20] health from Air District policies and programs. Just trying to understand what data CalEnviroScreen provides that the CARE Program doesn't.

[00:28:28] Then on item [00:28:30] three, I think, related to the permit processing time, trying to understand what the impacts to the overall permit backlog are going to be with [00:28:40] increasing demands on staff conducting HRAs and maybe just an understanding of whether or not the most complicated or complex projects, which you just referenced, are the [00:28:50] same as the projects that would have the greatest increase in modeled risk. Thanks.

[00:28:58] **ANEESH:** Okay. Thank you for your comment. We'll [00:29:00] move on to Aron Potash.

[00:29:04] **ARON:** Hey. Good evening. [00:29:10] This is Aron Potash from Latham & Watkins. Thank you very much for this workshop and for providing the opportunity to comment. I note that [00:29:20] the draft amendments have expanded the CalEPA definition of Overburdened Communities from the top 25% to [00:29:30] the top 30%, and there's no real explanation for the basis for that change. I also see that the draft amendments [00:29:40] would include a 1,000-foot buffer in this definition of Overburdened Communities, also without any robust explanation or basis. [00:29:50] These proposed changes to the CalEPA definition of Overburdened Communities would serve to [00:30:00] make it more difficult to permit diesel backup generation.

[00:30:06] The governor's issued a number of emergency orders to address [00:30:10] our current energy crisis. I'm hoping that the district can both take into account and that crisis and describe [00:30:20] what it's done to ensure that the draft amendments are consistent with the governor's emergency orders, which are really intended to maximize diesel backup generation to take stress [00:30:30] off the grid.

[00:30:32] As a related matter, I'm hoping the district can explain if it's taken into account that heatwaves coupled [00:30:40] with power outages are lethal events. We've tragically seen many people in our country die this year from heatwaves coupled [00:30:50] with power outages and that heat risks are, in fact, most pronounced in the lowest income communities.

[00:30:57] **ANEESH:** Thank [00:31:00] you for the comment.

[00:31:04] [pause]

[00:31:05] **ANEESH:** Are [00:31:10] there any other raised [00:31:20] hands? Yes, we have a Brian Hubinger.

[00:31:28] **BRIAN:** Good [00:31:30] evening. Can you hear me?

[00:31:32] **ANEESH:** Yes.

[00:31:34] **BRIAN:** Thank you. Two comments, one for number one around [00:31:40] the Overburdened Communities, talking about CalEnviroScreen and the assessment. It's not understood how often these [00:31:50] communities will be reassessed if there's improvements in air quality or other factors. Over time, how will we know and [00:32:00] how will these communities potentially shift from year to year?

[00:32:05] Then my second question or comment is around the notification requirements number [00:32:10] two. Not only is there a notification requirement, but there's also a commenting period associated with that [00:32:20] in the staff report. I'm curious what the scope of that comment period is if it's limited to technical corrections, or is [00:32:30] the Air District proposing conditional permitting associated with this? Thank you.

[00:32:37] **ANEESH:** Thank you, Brian, [00:32:40] for your comment.

[00:32:44] [pause]

[00:32:53] **[00:32:50] ANEESH:** Any other [00:33:00] request to speak at this time?

[00:33:34] [pause [00:33:30]]

[00:33:34] **ANEESH:** I'm not seeing any other raised hands or any comments coming in through the chat.

[00:34:00] [pause [00:34:00]]

[00:34:00] **ANEESH:** I think what we'll do since I'm not getting any raised hands or any comments coming into the chat, I think we'll just go ahead and move [00:34:10] on to the next portion of the presentation. I'll hand it back over to Jacob.

[00:34:20] [silence] [00:34:20]

[00:34:20] **JACOB:** All right, thanks, Aneesh. Just to remind everyone, thank you for your comments and also the questions that you stated. We intend to start going [00:34:30] over those during the Q&A. There were some questions in there that I think we can definitely provide some clarity on.

[00:34:38] Jumping into this slide, [00:34:40] there are multiple draft updates to Rule 2-5. The overarching purpose of the updates is to reduce exposure to toxic air contaminant emissions by [00:34:50] increasing the rule stringency for new or modified equipment. Rule 2-5 currently set standards on a regional scale. The standards apply regardless [00:35:00] of the project location within the Air District. The draft changes would include a more stringent standard in areas that score highly in CalEnviroScreen, so the areas that Rule 2-1 defines as Overburdened [00:35:10] Communities.

[00:35:11] There are also several changes to the exemption section in Rule 2-5. Updates to the Air District's Health Risk Assessment Guidelines and updates to the [00:35:20] toxic air contaminant trigger levels as well as the removal of obsolete rule language. The next several slides will walk through the draft updates to Rule 2-5 and the toxic air contaminant [00:35:30] new source review process. Next slide, please.

[00:35:34] Existing Section 2-5-111 exempts all toxic air contaminant emissions that occur from emergency [00:35:40] use of emergency standby engines. The draft amendments to Rule 2-5 modify this exemption by proposing to include some number of hours per year of emergency operating time per [00:35:50] engine in the health risk assessment, and staff seeks feedback on what this number should be.

[00:35:56] The Air District has received many comments requesting that it [00:36:00] do more to reduce diesel engine emissions. This proposed change would result in both toxic air contaminant and particulate matter emission reductions because many more standby engines will be considered [00:36:10] for their emergency use operations.

[00:36:13] Section 2-5-113 exempts small engines from health risk assessment and general permitting requirements. The draft [00:36:20] amendments would require a health risk assessment for a project if the combined capacity for these small engines is greater than 50 brake horsepower. This change will help ensure that projects [00:36:30] don't use multiple smaller pieces of equipment to avoid the requirements of the rule.

[00:36:35] Section 2-5-116 would exempt boilers from the requirement [00:36:40] to undergo a health risk assessment to verify that they will continue to meet all permit exemption criteria at these certain smaller boilers.

[00:36:50] Although [00:36:50] toxic air contaminants from these sources may exceed health risk assessment triggers, staff does not expect these sources to present any significant health risks based on [00:37:00] modeling experience with these sources. This exemption will enable the Air District to focus staff resources on projects that are more likely to have significant health risks. Next slide, please.

[00:37:12] In [00:37:10] the definition section of Rule 2-5, the draft amendments modify the definition of project in Section 2-5-216 to include [00:37:20] those new or modified sources of toxic air contaminants at a facility that have been permitted within the five-year period, immediately preceding

the date a complete application is received, and [00:37:30] any project at a facility that is under authority to construct.

[00:37:34] This revision is intended to ensure that all potentially related projects are included in the health risk assessment [00:37:40] to further prevent circumvention of this rule's requirements. This revision will also ensure that the combined impacts from multiple projects at a facility are fully considered in the health risk assessment. [00:37:50]

[00:37:51] Regarding Section 2-5-227, the draft changes proposed to delete the term priority community which would be obsolete with the addition of draft Section 2-1-243, which [00:38:00] defines Overburdened Community.

[00:38:03] The draft rule add Section 2-5-230, which defines the term essential public service. The essential public [00:38:10] service definition is based upon public feedback received during the concepts workshop, and in subsequent written feedback on the concept paper, along with reference to other rules at this [00:38:20] Air District and other large Air Districts that exempt some operations from specific standards based upon their categorization as essential public services. Next slide, please.

[00:38:31] The [00:38:30] draft rule also adds Section 2-5-231, which defines Acute Receptor. This term was added to clarify the applicability of the [00:38:40] acute hazard index limit and it will be useful for gas stations that would be subject to acute limits for the first time. The draft amendments to rule 2-5 modify the [00:38:50] project risk requirement in Section 2-5-302 to clarify that there would be two project risk limits, one in areas that score highly on CalEnviroScreen, and one in areas outside of [00:39:00] high scoring CalEnviroScreen areas.

[00:39:02] In Overburdened Communities, as defined in draft Section 2-2-243, the cancer risk limit would be 6 in 1 million, which represents [00:39:10] about 1% of the Bay Area average background cancer risk from toxic air contaminant emissions. In areas that are not located within Overburdened Communities, the health [00:39:20] risk limits would remain unchanged.

[00:39:22] Section 2-5-303, the net project health risk requirement would likewise be updated to reflect the more stringent limit in Overburdened Communities. [00:39:30] Next slide, please.

[00:39:32] The draft changes proposed to delete Sections 2-5-404 and 2-5-405 because the sections are no longer [00:39:40] necessary, given the definition of Overburdened Community in Section 2-1-243, which utilizes CalEnviroScreen to identify communities that experience relatively [00:39:50] high levels

of cumulative impacts. Furthermore, the requirements of Section 2-5-405 have been incorporated into the Air Districts AB 617 community emissions reductions programs. [00:40:00] Next slide, please.

[00:40:05] The proposed changes to Section 2-5-602 clarify the procedures for calculating [00:40:10] baseline throughput when a sources throughput rate is limited by a bottleneck at a related source. The draft changes to ensure consistency with the Section 2-5-214.3 definition [00:40:20] of a modified source of toxic air contaminants for a source that does not have conditions limiting daily or annual toxic emissions.

[00:40:29] The draft changes [00:40:30] also include updates to Table 2-5-1, which states the toxic air contaminant trigger levels. The table would be updated to include any new toxic air contaminants and any new health [00:40:40] effects values that have been identified by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. Staff is also proposing to revise the procedures that are used to determine [00:40:50] acute trigger levels to be consistent with the significant source thresholds in the Air District's Rule 11-18, which regulates toxic air contaminant emissions from existing facilities. [00:41:00] This change would impact all compounds and Table 2-5-1 that have an acute reference exposure level. Next slide, please.

[00:41:09] Staff is recommending [00:41:10] updates to the Air District's health risk assessment guidelines, which would revise the health risk assessment procedure for gas stations so that it is consistent with the procedures for all other source types [00:41:20] that are subject to Air Toxics, New Source Review.

[00:41:23] Fully incorporating the most recent risk calculation procedure guidelines from OEHHA would result in cancer [00:41:30] risk estimates for residents that are about 40% higher than the current procedures, and without a new limit on acute impacts. These changes wouldn't prevent gas stations from renewing existing [00:41:40] permits, but they could result in some existing gas stations from being able to increase capacity, or they could reduce the amount of gasoline that might be allowed at a new station. [00:41:50] Next slide, please.

[00:41:54] Staff reviewed projects for which the Air District completed health risk assessments between February 2017 and [00:42:00] February 2021, to provide a glimpse of the potentially affected application types if the cancer risk limit and Rule 2-5 was changed to 6 in 1 million in Overburden [00:42:10] Communities. As this slide shows, over 80% of projects in Overburdened Communities with the cancer risk between 6 and 10 in 1 million were engine or gas station [00:42:20] projects.

[00:42:21] Staff estimates that from the look-back analysis, that about 10 projects per year would have needed to modify operations, install additional abatement equipment, or consider [00:42:30] other options such as changing the location of the proposed equipment or operation to comply with the more stringent risk limit in Overburdened Communities. Next slide, please.

[00:42:41] The [00:42:40] draft updates that would change the cancer risk limit to 6 in 1 million in Overburdened Communities and incorporate the most recent procedures for calculating health risks from gas station [00:42:50] projects, would have probably meant that in Overburdened Communities, about 5 engine projects and 3 gas station projects per year would have been impacted by a stringent cancer risk [00:43:00] limit and updated health risk assessment from the updated health risk assessment procedure from gas stations.

[00:43:07] We looked at engine and gas station project [00:43:10] specifically because those are the most consistently common project types outside of Overburdened Communities. An additional seven gas station projects per year would likely have needed to undergo further [00:43:20] analysis or incorporate ways to reduce health risk from the proposed project. Next slide, please.

[00:43:28] Changes to Rule 2-5 based [00:43:30] on staff's look back analysis would primarily impact engine and gas station projects. Projects would be required to be cleaner, which could benefit public health in areas immediately surrounding [00:43:40] proposed projects compared to no change in the permitting rule, although these draft amendments are not likely to result in large changes to overall background health risk.

[00:43:49] There would [00:43:50] however likely be an increased expense that would be borne by permit applicants and a more stringent risk limit could mean an increase in permit processing time. These impacts could in turn [00:44:00] result in a potentially disproportionate impact on business and services, especially in Overburdened Communities where the cancer risk limit would be more stringent. Although this impact would be mitigated by the fact that [00:44:10] more stringent cancer risk limit does not apply to projects at a central public services. Next slide, please. Before we jump into the [00:44:20] feedback session, I'd like to quickly go through the next steps in the rule amendment process. First, please send written feedback on the draft amendments to me by Wednesday, September [00:44:30] 1st. On Monday, September 27th, we'll provide an update to the Air District's Stationary Source and Climate Impacts Committee on the draft amendments we presented this evening [00:44:40] and the feedback we've received. Just to clarify, this will be an informational item for the committee members. We won't be asking the board members to adopt any changes at that meeting. Next slide, please.

[00:44:52] We [00:44:50] would like to pause to hear your feedback on the draft rule changes this time regarding Rule 2-5. Specifically, we'd like to receive your feedback on the [00:45:00] following two questions. First, what comments or suggestions do you have on the more stringent risk limit in Overburdened Communities? Second, what comments or suggestions do you have on [00:45:10] the revision to the hours exemption for emergency engine use? Feedback is for the Air District staff's consideration and will be reviewed in greater detail after the workshop as [00:45:20] we prepare to move forward in the rule amendment process.

[00:45:23] Air District staff won't be responding to questions or comments during this initial feedback session, but we'll have comments, [00:45:30] questions and answer session later this evening immediately following this period and a short break. This is just the time for us to get some initial feedback from you on what we've [00:45:40] covered so far. Also, you can submit written feedbacks to us anytime through September 1st.

[00:45:46] Please, again, visit the link provided to review all the information [00:45:50] on the draft changes presented this evening, the Zoom chat feature, where you can provide answers to the questions we'll open in a bit. If you could please indicate the feedback prompt number to which you're responding, [00:46:00] it would be helpful for us as we sort through the responses. I'll again, hand it over to Aneesh to call on speakers for those who might want to speak on this topic. Thanks.

[00:46:09] **ANEESH:** [00:46:10] Thanks, Jacob. Like we did for the first feedback session, we have 10 minutes allocated for this [00:46:20] portion. We're going to bring the Miro board back up and invite you to raise your hand. If you wish to speak, the chat is also open to submit your comments in writing as well. With [00:46:30] that, do we have any--?

[00:46:36] [pause]

[00:46:36] **ANEESH:** Yes, [00:46:50] we've Aron Potash.

[00:46:55] **ARON:** Hey, all. This is Aron Potash [00:47:00] again, and thank you very much. I'd like to explore this question, which is on item two, Emission from Emergency Engine Use, further during [00:47:10] the discussion later on, but I'd just like to comment for now that there's no reasonable basis to include any emergency hours in health [00:47:20] risk assessments for backup generators. This is because emergency generator operation is not routine and it's not predictable. This is something that the district has found [00:47:30] itself in its 2019 guidance on emergency generators. It's something that US EPA has found. It's also something that the [00:47:40] California Energy Commission has found.

[00:47:42] I look forward to exploring that topic further with you during that discussion later in this session.

[00:47:46] **ANEESH:** Thank [00:47:50] you, Aron.

[00:47:51] [pause]

[00:48:24] We [00:48:20] have Shawn Lee. Please unmute yourself.

[00:48:28] **SHAWN:** [00:48:30] Hello, this is Shawn Lee. Thank you for letting us join this evening. I also want to comment on the emergency use [00:48:40] for engines as well. The previous commenter had mentioned about emergency generators. I [00:48:50] also would like to consider emergency fire water pumps, engine-driven emergency equipment, and those [00:49:00] things also are only used during emergencies. Would like to include beyond the emergency generators. [00:49:10] This is just emergency-driven equipment. Thanks.

[00:49:15] **ANEESH:** Thank you, Shawn.

[00:49:18] [pause] [00:49:20]

[00:49:29] **[00:49:30] ANEESH:** We have Brian Hubinger. Go ahead [00:49:40] and unmute yourself.

[00:49:41] **BRIAN:** Thank you. Similar comment to number one on the cancer risk limit, there are exemptions in the current [00:49:50] proposal not related to think public good is what it's called. It's pretty limited, but last we found in COVID [00:50:00] and PSPS, the world's power safety shut-off rules, there's a lot more critical facilities to our [00:50:10] economy and the Air District should explore broadening that definition to include critical infrastructure that [00:50:20] is similar to those in those two programs. Thank you.

[00:50:29] **ANEESH:** Thank [00:50:30] you. Next up, we have Allison Lany?

[00:50:35] **KARL:** [00:50:40] Hi. It's actually Karl Lany with Montrose Environmental. Can you hear me okay?

[00:50:46] **ANEESH:** Yes.

[00:50:48] **KARL:** I would just like to [00:50:50] remind the Bay Area AQMD of recent regulatory developments in South Coast relative to the definition of essential public services. While [00:51:00] historically, telecom facilities have not been considered essential public services in rural development in South Coast relative [00:51:10] to emergency engines and emergency generation, South Coast has recently recognized the importance of telecom to maintain [00:51:20] the communication network for first responders. As the Bay Area looks at what they consider to be essential [00:51:30] for the sake of this rule, I would like for consideration of telecom.

[00:51:36] **ANEESH:** Thank [00:51:40] you, Karl. Next up is Nilesh [inaudible].

[00:51:49] **NILESH:** [00:51:50] [inaudible] [crosstalk]

[00:51:55] **ANEESH:** [inaudible] if I mispronounced that.

[00:51:57] **NILESH:** No problem. Thank you. My [00:52:00] questions are two questions. The first one is, has the Bay Area community assessed that the impacts associated for the air [00:52:10] quality impacts in these communities are necessarily from stationary sources within those communities, or could potentially those impacts be caused [00:52:20] by sources that are away from those communities? I guess I'm trying to understand the rationale of trying to further control [00:52:30] gasoline stations within these communities which may not be necessarily impacting the air quality at a [00:52:40] significant level. If you could provide some clarification on which exact sources had the most significant impacts. [00:52:50]

[00:52:56] **ANEESH:** Next [00:53:00] up, we have Laurie Mincer.

[00:53:09] **LAURIE:** [00:53:10] Hi. This rule wouldn't allow replacement of backup diesel generators for essential infrastructure in populated residential areas. Has [00:53:20] BAAQMD informed local governments that this rule may cause much essential infrastructure to close during a power outage which may be caused by an earthquake or high heat event? [00:53:30]

[00:53:34] Also, has the BAAQMD considered how the rule would incentivize ongoing use of older, higher-emitting backup generators [00:53:40] and equipment in Overburdened Communities? Since the rule wouldn't allow replacements of many backup diesel generators [00:53:50] and other old equipment in Overburdened Communities, many owners of the generators will be incentivized to complete

expensive repairs. Without [00:54:00] the rule or with the difference in the rule though, the equipment could be replaced with lower-emitting technology. That's [00:54:10] all.

[00:54:15] **ANEESH:** Thank you.

[00:54:17] [pause] [00:54:20]

[00:54:25] **ANEESH:** [00:54:30] Nilesh, [00:54:40] would you like to unmute yourself again? I see your hand is raised.

[00:54:47] **NILESH:** Yes. The second follow-up question [00:54:50] I had was, has the Bay Area community assessed the impacts of these changes on the air quality within these communities, and [00:55:00] are there any slides or information to share on what those impacts are likely to be?

[00:55:07] [silence]

[00:55:09] **ANEESH:** [00:55:20] Thank you. I just want to remind folks; we are collecting these questions. We [00:55:30] will respond to them during the Q&A portion. Are there any [00:55:40] other hands?

[00:55:40] [pause]

[00:55:40] **ANEESH:** Okay, [00:56:10] I [00:56:20] think we're running a little bit ahead of schedule, but I think this is a good place to pause and take a five-minute [00:56:30] break. During this time, feel free to turn off your cameras and mute [00:56:40] yourselves. Hopefully, this will be enough time for you to run to the bathroom, get a quick stretch, or possibly [00:56:50] a quick snack. Our team is going to be identifying and pulling out those questions that we received during the feedback session so that we can respond to them during the Q&A.

[00:56:59] When [00:57:00] we return at, let's say, seven o'clock we'll open up the Q&A and we'll start with those questions from the feedback sessions. Then we [00:57:10] have a number of Air District staff on hand from the engineering and rural development and other departments that can answer your questions.

[00:57:20] I'd [00:57:20] also like to just mention that we do have a workshop evaluation survey that we'd really appreciate you filling out. I'll drop the link in the chat in case you have [00:57:30] time to fill

it out, but we'd really appreciate your feedback. It really helps us improve our workshops. Other than that, we'll [00:57:40] see you back at seven o'clock. Thank you.

[00:59:44] [music]

[01:02:10] **ANEESH:** Welcome back folks. Welcome [01:02:20] back. I know it was a short break, but I hope it was helpful for you to get a quick stretch, run to the restroom, or maybe grab a quick snack.

[01:02:30] This time, we're going to open things up for Q&A. We have a number of air district staff from our engineering, rule development and other departments available to answer [01:02:40] your questions.

[01:02:41] During the break, our staff was collecting and organizing the questions we received during the two feedback sessions. To start, we're going to allow staff to respond [01:02:50] to those firsts and then we'll invite speakers to raise hands and provide comment or ask questions. We're also bringing the [inaudible] back up so we can continue capturing your feedback. [01:03:00] The chat is also open, so you can continue sharing feedback or send in questions to us in writing.

[01:03:09] I'll start [01:03:10] with-- first question from Christine Wolfe was, "Why aren't you using the CARE framework program work? What [01:03:20] permits to overall backlog will be? What data does CalEnviroScreen provide that the CARE frame does not?" [01:03:30]

[01:03:35] **JACOB:** I can start by answering [01:03:40] a bit of that and then I'll also just hand this over to any of the experts within the air district who might want to comment more upon it. Really, in terms of the differences [01:03:50] between CARE and CalEnviroScreen, the CARE program was last updated in 2013. CalEnviroScreen [01:04:00] was updated this year in the draft version 4.0.

[01:04:06] CARE is looking at impacts from air quality and health [01:04:10] outcomes that have been leading to pollution, whereas CalEnviroScreen is looking at environmental burdens in addition to air pollution and population characteristics [01:04:20] as well. In terms of the analysis scope, CARE is looking specifically at zip [01:04:30] codes, CalEnviroScreen is looking at census tracts.

[01:04:32] I think that there is a large overlap between [01:04:40] the CalEnviroScreen and previously recognized CARE areas. We had been looking at CalEnviroScreen really as-- it's [01:04:50] the statewide framework that's been used to evaluate cumulative impacts. I think that that's where we had started in terms of looking [01:05:00] at evaluating cumulative impacts in our permitting regulation.

[01:05:10] In [01:05:10] terms of the impacts to the overall permitting backlog, I think that one of the reasons why we had discussed having this extension [01:05:20] is really because this is going to further increase the amount of work administrative requirements of our staff to process these [01:05:30] permits that would be subject to more stringent limits, and then what also have additional pieces such as notification requirements. That's what [01:05:40] we're hoping to address through that. I think that it's really with keeping that backlog in mind.

[01:05:48] Maybe what I can do is pass [01:05:50] it off to anyone, either in our assessment inventory and modeling division or in our engineering division to follow up with any particular [01:06:00] points that they'd like to add on this question. If [01:06:10] not, we can move on to the next question Aneesh.

[01:06:17] **ANEESH:** I don't have anything to add, Jacob. I think you [01:06:20] covered what I would say.

[01:06:21] **JACOB:** Thanks, Bill.

[01:06:27] **ANEESH:** The next question [01:06:30] was from Aaron Potash. I'm hoping the district can pay attention to many factors related to the air crisis such as the heat waves with power outages. [01:06:40]

[01:06:41] **JACOB:** I think on that piece-- Thanks for the questionnaire. We're acknowledging the fact [01:06:50] that with increased heat events and public safety power shutoffs, there is likely [01:07:00] to be more use of emergency engine and that is going to result in likely [01:07:10] more diesel emissions, which is going to increase cancer risk. What we wanted to do is just make sure that that is something [01:07:20] that's taken into account when we look at the potential health impacts from emergency backup generators.

[01:07:25] Again, as they're used to power multiple [01:07:30] different types of facilities, that's something that we want to be taking into consideration when we're looking at those health risk assessments, [01:07:40] and then make sure that there are abatement controls or exposure reductions that are placed upon those engines to reduce exposure or [01:07:50] reduce emissions from those while they're used.

[01:07:55] **ANEESH:** [01:08:00] Next question is, how often will [01:08:10] these communities be reassessed if there have been improvements in these communities? What is the scope of the comment [01:08:20] period? Is the air district permitting things in the section?

[01:08:27] **JACOB:** That was two different [01:08:30] questions. The first one was specifically regarding CalEnviroScreen and what-- If the air district does move forward and utilizing [01:08:40] CalEnviroScreen to identify overburdened communities, how often would those overburdened community designations be updated? Right now, we're specifically [01:08:50] looking at CalEnviroScreen version 4.

[01:08:53] CalEnviroScreen is updated every couple of years. It's the thing where if [01:09:00] we adopt the CalEnviroScreen version 4, then that's something that we would be looking [01:09:10] at and then we would address further refinements on that in the future. In terms of the comment period question, what [01:09:20] we're looking at here is really trying to make it so that community members [01:09:30] and surrounding workers and residents are aware of a project for which a health risk assessment is required to be prepared.

[01:09:40] At [01:09:40] this point in time, we're looking at specifically the same requirements that are required now for the K through 12 notification, [01:09:50] the school's notification requirement. Not additional requirements that would-- as I think the commenter wondering [01:10:00] about. It wouldn't be adding additional requirements beyond what is currently required under section 21412. It's just [01:10:10] expanding essentially the scope of that.

[01:10:11] **ANEESH:** Okay. Next question. Just a few more. [01:10:20] Historically telecom facilities are not essential services. South coast has recently recognized this to maintain communication with emergency responders, [01:10:30] please consider telecom.

[01:10:33] **JACOB:** Yes. Thank you for that comment. That's definitely something that we can look into. We looked at [01:10:40] the essential services definition in south coast rule language. That's something that we can definitely take back. Thanks.

[01:10:49] **ANEESH:** [01:10:50] Next question, has BAAQMD assessed impacts in communities are from stationary sources within communities or away from communities? Which [01:11:00] exact sources had most significant impacts? Is there any information on the impact maybe fiscal of these policies?

[01:11:09] **JACOB:** [01:11:10] Yes. On this one, this is something that we had talked about in the earlier slides. There are a variety of factors that lead to air [01:11:20] pollution, regional air pollution, local air pollution. In the Bay Area, mobile sources are very much one of the [01:11:30] major driving sources of air pollution. What we're trying to do with this is really to-- in [01:11:40] areas where we identify that there are elevated cancer risk, elevated air pollution, elevated environmental effects, population

[01:11:50] characteristics that may result in residents of particular areas as being particularly susceptible to air pollution. [01:12:00]

[01:12:01] When it comes to the air district in terms of evaluating permit applications, that we're not further adding to that pollution [01:12:10] burden or that health burden. I think that one of the things that we'll be looking at as we continue in this process [01:12:20] is the socioeconomic impacts analysis. That's something that we will be preparing as we continue in this rule amendment effort. That's [01:12:30] I think to the point about the fiscal impacts of this. That's something that we would be looking at addressing.

[01:12:36] **ANEESH:** We [01:12:40] just have two more here that I'd like that we'd like to respond to before we go to the speakers. This one's from Lori Mincer [01:12:50] has it, has the air district considered how this rule wouldn't allow replacements of generators in overburdened communities which are very expensive? They should be replaced [01:13:00] with lower-emitting technology?

[01:13:04] **JACOB:** On this one, it's not that the changes would be preventing the permitting [01:13:10] of new or replacement engines, but really, they would be incentivizing the use of cleaner you know, backup power technologies or technologies [01:13:20] that are cleaner aside from backup engines, but yes, it wouldn't be preventing those new sources of potential air pollution. It's [01:13:30] really just looking at cleaner sources.

[01:13:38] **ANEESH:** One more here from [01:13:40] Oscar Garcia. A cancer risk change in overburdened communities will make it difficult to permit an engine, leaving overburdened communities at risk of not getting new [01:13:50] engines essential for public safety. How will BAAQMD address this public safety risk created by a lack of engine permits?

[01:13:59] **JACOB:** On this one, this is a little bit of a mix on the previous question just about that-- We're not, we [01:14:10] would not be preventing those engines. It really is making it so that new projects or modifications of existing [01:14:20] engines would be resulting in less exposure in the community. Then we have the essential services definition [01:14:30] where we're looking at those identified types of operations that would not be subject to the more stringent risk limit. That's [01:14:40] where we're trying to go with the essential services.

[01:14:47] **ANEESH:** Okay. [01:14:50] I'd like to invite our first speaker in. Aaron Potash, feel free to unmute yourself.

[01:14:59] **AARON:** [01:15:00] Hey, good evening all again. This is Aaron Potash. Jacob in responding to my first question [01:15:10] with respect to the health benefits of emergency engine usage. You [01:15:20] mentioned that there's health risks from generator usage, but have you taken into account the lives that are saved by backup engines? The [01:15:30] governor notes and his order extreme parallel to this state right now. The state is actually paying people to use backup generation [01:15:40] to preserve the integrity of the grid. When the power goes out, there's a significant health threat from heat exhaustion, from heat stroke and hundreds of people have died [01:15:50] this year alone.

[01:15:51] How have you balanced the health benefit of generator usage in preventing heat exhaustion and heatstroke against [01:16:00] the health risk that would be posed by engine emissions? As a corollary to that, have you taken into account the fact that the [01:16:10] governor directed the Air Resources Board to mitigate any health risks posed by engine operation during emergency [01:16:20] events, and that the Air Resources Board has jurisdiction over mobile sources, which the district acknowledges are a lot more significant driver [01:16:30] of health risk in the Bay Area.

[01:16:32] **JACOB:** Thanks Aaron. Again this is something that we want to get more [01:16:40] feedback on this. It's something that we acknowledge is there is additional emergency use as there may be more engines. We want to be [01:16:50] accurately reflecting the emissions from those engines. I think that what you bring up is definitely the information that's helpful for us as we go out [01:17:00] and look at what to do with this potential change to that section in the rule.

[01:17:09] **ANEESH:** [01:17:10] Next question will be from Christine Wolfe. Please unmute yourself.

[01:17:19] **CHRISTINE:** [01:17:20] Thanks. Just wanted to follow off of some of the previous comments. I think we really need to have a full picture of [01:17:30] the impacts to public health and emissions reductions that would be achieved by the proposed amendments given the pretty tangible impact to providing goods and services, [01:17:40] especially in overburdened communities that folks have been describing, particularly for facilities that rely on backup power. A lot of these facilities aren't [01:17:50] industrial facilities.

[01:17:51] Some of these are grocery stores, care centers, pharmacies, services that people across the bay area and in overburdened communities [01:18:00] in particular rely on. Setting these differential standards means that local businesses and services in affluent communities will be able to still be [01:18:10] open during things like PSP events or natural disasters. It seems like in the absence of an update to the basin-wide emissions inventory, we [01:18:20] have little against which to compare the impacts of the proposed amendments.

[01:18:25] The last basin-wide emissions inventory is 2011 data. I believe your slides referenced [01:18:30] projections for 2015 emissions using 2005 baseline data. Just interested to see if there's up to date data on the proportional contribution of specific facilities [01:18:40] or types of equipment that would be effected by the changes to [inaudible].

[01:18:47] To use the available data from the 2011 inventory, [01:18:50] as well as more recent results from west Oakland is a local example, the data shows that the majority of PM 2.5 emissions, as well as cancerous generally [01:19:00] is due to mobile sources which is outside of the district's regulatory authority. We know that CARB will be adopting a suite of rules targeted at significantly reducing emissions [01:19:10] in the near term from these sectors over the next few years.

[01:19:13] We'd like to understand what that means for the district's inventory and what the anticipated trend lines in cancer risk [01:19:20] and PM 2.5 exposures are in the district accounting for carbs work over the next several years. Updated inventory would also help us better understand when and why [01:19:30] the exceedances of the federal PM 2.5 standard occur and whether those are tied to the sources that will be effected by the proposed amendments.

[01:19:40] Lastly, just building off of something some other folk said, given that very few services that could be considered essential are included in the definition of the central public services, there [01:19:50] could be impacts to the area wide on providing critical services. We'd certainly welcome further analysis and the socioeconomic impact analysis and see what document on the impact on the regulation [01:20:00] on all essential public services, both within overburdened communities specifically and then also Bay Area wide. Thanks.

[01:20:07] **JACOB:** [01:20:10] Thank you very much, Christine. In terms of the emissions inventory-- Obviously, if any air district staff want to chime in here on that, I think [01:20:20] that the information we have in the report and that we used in this presentation is the current publicly available information. [01:20:30] I think in terms of looking at the next steps in this process-- When [01:20:40] we're looking at the socioeconomic impacts analysis for example, that is taking into account, what we anticipate, the number of potentially affected facilities and the [01:20:50] cost potentially incurred by that.

[01:20:55] Again I think on the specific inventory questions, again, if [01:21:00] there's anything to add on that from the air district that'd be great. Otherwise, I think that it's something that we're looking at and we're using [01:21:10] the information that we have right now.

[01:21:11] **PHIL:** [01:21:20] Hi. This is Phil Martien. I'll just add to the comments. Specifically really glad to hear that folks [01:21:30] are interested because my team has been working away on updating our regional baseline emission inventory, so that's great. [01:21:40] In this case, though I think because we're talking about localized impacts from nearby stationary sources, that comparisons [01:21:50] to the regional total inventory are less relevant than just the risk impacts from a nearby source.

[01:22:01] Even [01:22:00] though the stationary sources may be small in comparison to emissions totals for the region, the [01:22:10] impacts, the exposures can be in some cases high if you're living right adjacent to a source. I think that's [01:22:20] just a point that I'd want to add to that discussion.

[01:22:46] **JACOB:** I see that-- it looks like Nilesh. I think I see [01:22:50] your hand raised.

[01:22:53] **NILESH:** Thank you again [01:23:00] for letting me comment. I guess one other question I had was, for gasoline stations, I think the department now is that the [01:23:10] health risk assessments are going to be done by grouping gas stations that are adjacent to each other, if they are on two sides of a roadway [01:23:20] even if they are not owned or operated by the same entity. I guess what's the rationale in aggregating impacts from two different facilities of [01:23:30] the same kind?

[01:23:32] **JACOB:** On that question, I'm actually going to have to turn that over to staff [01:23:40] in our engineering division. I'm not aware of that Nilesh. If someone from engineering could follow up on Nilesh's [01:23:50] question. Just about [crosstalk]

[01:23:59] **CAROL:** [01:24:00] Hi this is Carol Allen from the engineering division, sorry. The air district is not proposing [01:24:10] to include cumulative impacts in the gas station analysis at this time. [01:24:20] That was something that was included as a potential analysis in the AB 2588 updates [01:24:30] and in the gas station guideline updates that CARB was working on as something [01:24:40] possible that the districts could consider. We're not including that as a proposal at this time. We will be continuing [01:24:50] to look at gas station impacts on a facility basis there.

[01:25:13] [silence]

[01:25:14] **CAROL:** Hopefully, everyone heard that.

[01:25:16] **CHRISTY:** Hi [01:25:20] everyone. My name is Christy and I'm gonna just step [01:25:30] in for a moment for my colleague Aneesh until he gets back. I think he may have been dropped. I'm also with the community engagement office. Great to be here [01:25:40] with you all tonight. We see a hand

raised from Aaron Potash. Would you like to unmute yourself and ask a question or provide your comment for us.

[01:25:49] **AARON:** Hi Christy and thanks so much again for the opportunity to comment on this rule. I just want to follow up and deepen my comments for staff with [01:26:00] respect to rule 2.5. The districts workshop report states that the district is going to include a set number [01:26:10] of hours in HRAs for backup generators. The report further suggests that the number might be 100 hours. I [01:26:20] just want to reiterate that there's no reasonable basis to include any emergency hours in HRAs for backup generators.

[01:26:29] This is because emergency operation is neither routine nor predictable. For this proposition, I'd cite first the district's [01:26:40] own 2019 guidance on calculating potential for emergency backup generators which is cited in the district's workshop report. [01:26:50] That 2019 guidance states that emergency operations "will only occur infrequently when emergency conditions [01:27:00] arise."

[01:27:01] Another quote from that 2019 guidance is, "By its very nature, such emergency operation is unplanned and infrequent. When [01:27:10] it does occur, it's impossible to predict how long it will last." The California Energy Commission and [01:27:20] data center permitting has recently concluded the exact same thing. They've concluded that emergency generator usage at data [01:27:30] centers, in particular, is "infrequent, irregular and unlikely" and "cannot be modeled in any informative or meaningful [01:27:40] way." That's from the recent Great Oaks proceedings.

[01:27:45] Finally, I just want to point out that the district's own data on emergency [01:27:50] generator usage shows that it's either routine or predictable. The CEC as part of this Great Oaks proceeding reviewed 13 months of data from emergency [01:28:00] generators in the Bay Area and found that 25 of the 45 facilities reporting had had zero hours of emergency runtime.

[01:28:09] Emergency [01:28:10] generator usage at data centers is definitely not routine or predictable. Just because emergencies have become more frequent, it doesn't mean that [01:28:20] they're routine and predictable, and if backup generator use were routine and predictable, the district would know what the usage is. It would not have to be asking about it.

[01:28:30] I want to conclude by saying that this issue of assuming emergency usage for HRA purposes has real consequences in our full comments [01:28:40] that we'll be providing to the district before September 1st on the draft amendments. Our consulting shows that this would essentially amount to a de facto [01:28:50] ban on data centers if the district were to proceed with these draft amendments.

[01:29:00] **JACOB:** Thank you Aaron. I appreciate the comments, and this is definitely something that we [01:29:10] are, again, wanting to get feedback. The feedback that you're bringing us tonight is helpful.

[01:29:17] **AARON:** Thank you.

[01:29:19] [silence]

[01:29:30] **ANEESH:** Christine Wolfe.

[01:29:39] **CHRISTINE:** I'll go again while people are gathering their thoughts. I just [01:29:50] wanted to ask a question for the clarification of what the differences between the new definition of [01:30:00] an acute receptor versus the existing definition for the maximally exposed individual. I was also wondering if the figure on slide [01:30:10] 29, which is on the permits applications affected by the 2-5 changes, also includes applications that would be impacted by the changes to the [01:30:20] acute hazard methodology.

[01:30:22] [silence]

[01:30:27] **JACOB:** I can start on this one, Christine. Thanks for the question. [01:30:30] In terms of the information on slide 29, that's specifically looking at the projects with the cancer risk [01:30:40] of 6 to 10 in a million in overburdened communities. In terms of the acute receptor definition versus the maximally [01:30:50] exposed receptor, I think on that one, I would appreciate some help from our engineering division just in [01:31:00] terms of the rationale for that one. I think that in terms of what we have-- One of the reasons why we made [01:31:10] that change was to clarify what an acute receptor is, but it may be helpful if there's some additional context there for [01:31:20] Christine's question.

[01:31:21] **CAROL:** We have a [01:31:30] definition of acute receptor. This is Carol Allen again, by the way. We have a dash definition of acute receptor that we've been using in our health [01:31:40] risk assessment modeling guidelines, and all we are doing is including that definition in the role. It's [01:31:50] not a change from our current practices, it's just codifying it into the role. [silence] [01:32:20] I guess I'm not clear if people are hearing me or not. Is anyone hearing me now?

[01:32:29] **JACOB:** I can hear you. [01:32:30] Thanks, Carol.

[01:32:30] **CAROL:** All right. Thank you. [chuckles]

[01:32:31] **JACOB:** Thank you. [silence]

[01:32:32] **ANEESH:** Is there [01:32:40] any-- We have one more. Oh, we have another hand. This is from [01:32:50] Ewin. Ewin.

[01:32:52] **EMILY:** Hi, this is Emily. I have a question about rule 25113 that proposed inclusion [01:33:00] of emergency generators that are rated less than 50 brake horsepower if they're going to be more than one at a facility, but I was wondering in terms of the feasibility of actually modeling [01:33:10] those since the Bay Area doesn't permit those and really wouldn't know when a facility brings on more than one to its facility and then would have a cumulative horsepower [01:33:20] of over 50 horsepower. I was just wondering to hear from the district, how they plan to enforce that.

[01:33:27] [silence]

[01:33:27] **JACOB:** Yes. [01:33:30] Thank you for that question. [01:33:40] I think in terms of the enforcement piece on that one, again, we do have [01:33:50] compliance and enforcement staff that does go out and make sure that the rules that we have in [01:34:00] place are being adhered to. This is the sort of situation where when [01:34:10] there are permit applications that come in, staff does evaluate what the project would be, and then there are maybe follow-up [01:34:20] investigations by our compliance and enforcement staff. Again, if there's anyone at the air district who might want to further [01:34:30] elaborate to answer that question, that would be great. [silence] Otherwise [01:34:40] we can move on to the next question.

[01:34:45] **ANEESH:** Okay. Well we [01:34:50] have Lori Mincer.

[01:34:54] **LORI:** How will BAAQMD handle a permit application that would replace an existing [01:35:00] [inaudible] tank with a new [inaudible] that has [inaudible] health risk of 6.1 in a million. Although the project would reduce health risk and admissions, [01:35:10] it seems the project would not be allowed in an overburdened community but would be allowed in an affluent [01:35:20] area.

[01:35:21] **JACOB:** I don't want to speculate on particular project type. This would be a situation in which the draft [01:35:30] rule language does have two different cancer risk limits, one in overburdened communities and one [01:35:40] outside of overburdened communities. If the project is proposed to be

located in an overburdened community, it would be subject [01:35:50] to that more stringent cancer risk limit.

[01:35:53] [silence]

[01:36:20] **ANEESH:** Are there any other hands? [silence] [01:36:40] Sean Lee.

[01:36:50] **SEAN:** Hi again. I have a perplexing question. How is the air district going to evaluate the socioeconomic impacts [01:37:00] with this rule such that you don't have unintended consequences? Where if business are driven out of the [01:37:10] overburdened communities, it may drive the burden onto that community even more so. I just wanted to throw that out there [01:37:20] and see how that socioeconomic analysis could be done. Thanks.

[01:37:32] **JACOB:** Thanks Sean. In terms of the socioeconomic impacts analysis, in [01:37:40] this situation, we always conduct the socioeconomic impacts analysis where we're looking at the potentially impacted [01:37:50] sources as a result of the more stringent risk limit as a result of the other potential changes in the rule, and then, I think [01:38:00] that this is something where we would, again, be looking at potentially affected facilities, and then determining what the [01:38:10] impacts of that would be on those facilities.

[01:38:15] [silence]

[01:38:16] **ANEESH:** [01:38:40] I believe it was Emily Wen?

[01:38:49] [silence]

[01:38:57] **EMILY:** Hi, this is Emily again. I think [01:39:00] in the beginning it was mentioned that the CEQA guidelines were also going to be updated over the next couple of months, and in particular with that proposed amendment [01:39:10] for 25111 in terms of including potential emergency hours for emergency generators, I was wondering if there was a potential that if a certain [01:39:20] set of hours were to be published and incorporated in rule 2-5, would that also translate into the CEQA guidelines in terms of the sequence significance thresholds [01:39:30] for health risk assessments.

[01:39:33] **JACOB:** Thanks for the question. I think in terms of the CEQA, thresholds [01:39:40] and CEQA guidelines, it would be great if someone on the air district could jump in on that as well. We [01:39:50]

are looking at those updates and I think that it would be great if there is someone from the air district who might be able to speak [01:40:00] to that question.

[01:40:02] **HENRY:** Sure, I can jump in, Jacob. Hi, everybody. This is Henry Hilken and I'm the planning director of the air district. We are looking [01:40:10] at our CEQA guidelines right now and looking at some updates. At this current moment, we're focusing on the greenhouse gas thresholds. That's what we're working on currently. [01:40:20] The commenter makes a good point that this is something we do want to incorporate ultimately into our CEQA guidance.

[01:40:30] We do have plans to look further into the local exposure thresholds in our CEQA guidelines in the future, but we're in [01:40:40] part too aligned with what we're doing through this rulemaking process. We are aware of it; we're tracking this very closely. We plan on aligning the CEQA guidelines, but [01:40:50] probably following this process.

[01:40:52] **ANEESH:** Next hand is from Lori [01:41:00] Mincer.

[01:41:00] **LORI:** Well, currently, tier 4 is best available control [01:41:10] technology for an engine. It will be prohibited in some locations in overburdened communities if the rule change is finalized. Has BAAQMD considered that [01:41:20] alternative technology may not be available that can operate reliably following an earthquake? Also, I would [01:41:30] like to ask, how is BAAQMD going to update the overburdened community designations following the health risk reductions [01:41:40] after rule 1118 implementation?

[01:41:42] **JACOB:** Lori, thanks for your questions. [01:41:50] On the second piece, we're looking at the overburdened community definition as being tied to what is identified as the highest [01:42:00] percentiles in CalEnviroScreen. It's independent of the rule 1118 process. That's [01:42:10] I think, the first piece. The second question-- unfortunately, I missed the first part of the question. In [01:42:20] fact, actually, if you would be able to restate it because I had a little bit of a connectivity issue.

[01:42:38] [silence] [01:42:30]

[01:42:39] **LORI:** Yes. [01:42:40] Tier 4 is the best available control technology for an engine and would be prohibited in some locations in overburdened communities if this rule change is finalized. Has BAAQMD [01:42:50] considered that alternative technology may not be available that can operate reliably following an earthquake?

[01:42:59] **JACOB:** Okay, thanks. On that question, I'm really not sure. I think that if there is anyone in our engineering [01:43:10] division who might be able to help with that, that would be great. Essentially, [01:43:20] it's just that there's going to be some requirement that is beyond what is available in tier 4, if I'm understanding correctly, Lori.

[01:43:28] **CAROL:** [01:43:30] I'll jump out a little bit with that. At the tier [01:43:40] 4 standards that we've been seeing, we have not seen projects that are approaching anywhere [01:43:50] near six and a million health risks for engines that are meeting the tier 4 diesel PM standards. The engines that are at [01:44:00] that six and a million above have all been tier 3 or tier 2 engines. We don't [01:44:10] expect there to be an issue if you are reaching those tier 4 standards.

[01:44:18] [silence]

[01:44:18] **JACOB:** Christy [01:44:40] Wolfe.

[01:44:43] **CHRISTINE:** I just wanted to follow up a little bit on [01:44:50] the point on 1118 implementation and something that another commenter brought up earlier about the [01:45:00] fact that CalEnviroScreen will be changing and that there will always be this top, 20%, [01:45:10] 25%, 30% because it's all relative and not based through the absolute impacts.

[01:45:18] Just interested [01:45:20] in your thoughts on how this will be addressed moving forward if there's this moving target for the permitting program [01:45:30] based on continuous changes to which communities are the most impacted, or if there actually are significant reductions in risk because of 1118 [01:45:40] or other programs. How that's going to be accounted for in the permitting process.

[01:45:48] **JACOB:** Thanks, Christine. In terms of the designation being tied to CalEnviroScreen-- CalEnviroScreen is what [01:46:00] we're proposing to base the definition of overburdened communities upon. Right now we're looking at CalEnviroScreen version 4. [01:46:10] That would be the basis for which we use to draw the boundaries of [01:46:20] those areas that are defined to be overburdened communities. In that sense, that is where the locations are. [01:46:30] There may be updates to CalEnviroScreen.

[01:46:36] In the most recent version of CalEnviroScreen [01:46:40] compared to CalEnviroScreen 3, there were changes in some of the census tracts in terms of where they fell [01:46:50] on the percentiles. That's something that we could potentially update, but at this point in time, we're looking [01:47:00] at specifically, that version of CalEnviroScreen.

[01:47:06] **PHIL:** This is Phil Martien, again, with the assessment [01:47:10] inventory and modeling team. Just to respond also to those remarks, it is true that risk has been [01:47:20] coming down throughout the Bay Area. What we've seen is that risk is coming down more slowly in some of these more impacted [01:47:30] communities. We don't foresee that in the very near future, that those impacted communities are just going to disappear. I think in the [01:47:40] future, there'll be a process for revisiting what the boundaries are.

[01:47:48] I think, in the near [01:47:50] future, it hasn't changed. Those areas haven't changed so much looking at the CARE areas versus looking at the CalEnviroScreen areas that we [01:48:00] see today.

[01:48:00] **ANEESH:** Next, we have Niles. [01:48:10] I just want to highlight for everyone, we have about nine minutes left for Q&A.

[01:48:18] **NILESH:** Thank [01:48:20] you. I have one more question related to gas stations. One of the things you've indicated is that to address the toxic [01:48:30] air contaminant emissions from gas stations, controls like limiting the throughput rate or operating time, how modified or proposed new gas stations [01:48:40] could potentially allow them to be under the new cancerous threshold. Are you talking about the slower dispensing rates [01:48:50] for throughput or is that a daily limit after which the gasoline station cannot operate?

[01:48:56] Then in terms of operating time, could you clarify more? Do you have [01:49:00] any modeling studies that show how much operating time a gas station would be allowed to operate for to remain under this 6 in 10 million cancerous [01:49:10] threshold? Thank you.

[01:49:13] **JACOB:** Thanks for your question. [01:49:20] If you're looking at changes or potential limits on throughput, or limits on a number of [01:49:30] dispensers or the locations of the dispensers, those are some of the potential risk reduction measures. In terms of the second [01:49:40] question just upon studies, in terms of what that would look like, that is something that we're continuing to look at as we evaluate the potential [01:49:50] impacts of this rule and what would be necessary for potentially effective facilities to comply with [01:50:00] the updated procedure in the health risk assessment guidelines.

[01:50:07] That is something that we're currently looking at [01:50:10] and will be continuing to assess as we proceed in the rule development effort. I think if anyone in engineering would [01:50:20] like to

add to those remarks, that would be helpful just in terms of the specific questions about gas station HRA modeling.

[01:50:32] **CAROL:** This is Carol Allen again. The changes that [01:50:40] will be happening with the incorporation of the 2015 [inaudible] guidelines-- One of the major changes to gas stations [01:50:50] is that we will be looking at acute health risk for the first time. Acute health risk is-- it [01:51:00] applies to a maximum one hour emission rate for the gas stations. Where that will come into play [01:51:10] is really in the size of the station. How many dispensers are at that station? If you're are proposing a new station and it's failing [01:51:20] on acute health risk, it might have to be a smaller station. You might not get as many dispensers as you would like. I think that's [01:51:30] one potential impact.

[01:51:36] As far as on [01:51:40] an annual basis throughput increase, if you're asking for a throughput increase at a gas station, you might not get as much as you want. I think those are some [01:51:50] of the impacts that we were anticipating.

[01:51:56] **ANEESH:** We got one question in [01:52:00] through the chat from Nilesh. Can the modeling studies be shared with us?

[01:52:11] **PHIL:** This is Phil Martien again with the assessment inventory and modeling team. Could you be a bit more [01:52:20] specific about which modeling studies you're looking for?

[01:52:24] **ANEESH:** Nilesh, if you're able to go ahead [01:52:30] and unmute yourself.

[01:52:31] **NILESH:** The modeling studies that indicate reducing the throughput rate or the operating time are the number of dispensers [01:52:40] at a gasoline station results in lowering of cancer risk and beating the acute cancer risk as well as the [01:52:50] average cancer risk thresholds. We just want to see what kind of throughputs would be allowed under [01:53:00] this new cancerous threshold. If they are even feasible for us to manage. If the operating time reduces [01:53:10] down to 12 hours per day, that may not be economically viable for a gas station to operate in that location then. [01:53:20]

[01:53:20] **PHIL:** I understand what you're looking for now. I have to defer to maybe our engineering team on that. [01:53:30] Any studies that we've looked at we're certainly happy to share.

[01:53:34] [silence]

[01:53:35] **ANEESH:** We [01:53:40] have about four minutes left. Probably time to take one more question.

[01:53:58] [pause

[01:54:20] **ANEESH:** I don't see any hands raised and I don't see any questions coming in through the chat. We [01:54:30] can go ahead and close the Q&A session before I hand it over to Jacob [01:54:40] to go over next steps in the timeline of the rule development process. I'd just like to take this opportunity to thank everyone for attending [01:54:50] and participating this evening, providing these comments, and asking these questions. I'd also like to thank my colleagues, [01:55:00] Jacob and Christine for stepping in and covering for me while I was experiencing and trying to resolve my internet [01:55:10] connection issues. Thank you. With that, I'll turn it over to Jacob.

[01:55:16] **JACOB:** Thanks very much Aneesh [01:55:20] and thanks everyone who attended tonight's workshop. I want to just clarify before we head out tonight. The [01:55:30] draft rule changes are on the website. If you just enter the address that's shown on this slide, they'll take you to the [01:55:40] webpage that has that information, the workshop report, the draft rule changes.

[01:55:44] Please submit your comments, your written comments to me. My email address is jfinkle@baaqmd.gov by [01:55:50] September 1st. We'll post the comments received and a copy of this workshop recording to the website. Staff is also [01:56:00] available to meet to discuss the draft amendments and answer other questions you might have. Just contact us. You can email me. Next slide, please.

[01:56:14] Thank you. Two more things. First, please fill out the workshop evaluation form. It's really helpful for [01:56:20] us. Next, the air district's board of directors is forming the agency's first community advisory council. This group of individuals will meet regularly to help develop key [01:56:30] air district initiatives, including future 8617 program planning. The application is live now and we'll close on September 7th at 5:00 PM. For [01:56:40] more information, just please go to the link that's on this slide. Otherwise, that's all. Thank you so much. [01:56:50] Really appreciate your time tonight and the feedback we received from you.

[01:56:54] [END OF AUDIO]