BAY AREA
AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT
DISTRICT

ADVISORY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING

WEDNESDAY
SEPTEMBER 9, 2009
9:00 A.M.

7TH FLOOR BOARD ROOM
939 ELLIS STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109

AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER

Opening Comments — Harold Brazil, Chairperson
Roll Call — Clerk

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items, Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.3. *The public has the opportunity to speak on any agenda item. All agendas for Advisory Council meetings are posted at the District, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, at least 72 hours before a meeting. At the beginning of the meeting, an opportunity is also provided for the public to speak on any subject within the Council's purview. Speakers are limited to five minutes each.*

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of Minutes of the July 8, 2009 Advisory Council Meeting

DISCUSSION

2. Discussion of revised draft report on the Advisory Council's May 13, 2009 Meeting on California's 2050 GHG emission reduction target of 80% below 1990 levels - transportation sector

   The Advisory Council will discuss the revised draft report on the May 13, 2009 Meeting with Air District staff and finalize the recommendations.

ACTION

3. Change Date for the November, 2009 meeting of the Advisory Council

   Advisory Council meetings are typically scheduled on the 2nd Wednesday of each month, except for June, August and December. In 2009, the 2nd Wednesday of November is the 11th, which is Veterans Day, a holiday observed by the Air District. The Council will discuss with Air District staff and select an alternate meeting date for November.

OTHER BUSINESS

4. Council Member Comments/Other Business

   Council or staff members on their own initiative, or in response to questions posed by the public, may: ask a question for clarification, make a brief announcement or report on their own activities, provide a reference to staff about factual information, request staff to report back at a subsequent meeting concerning any matter or take action to direct staff to place a matter of business on a future agenda.

5. Time and Place of Next Meeting

   9:00 a.m., Wednesday, October 14, 2009, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109.

6. Adjournment

CONTACT EXECUTIVE OFFICE - 939 ELLIS STREET SF, CA 94109

(415) 749-5130
FAX: (415) 928-8560
BAAQMD homepage:
www.baaqmd.gov

- To submit written comments on an agenda item in advance of the meeting.
- To request, in advance of the meeting, to be placed on the list to testify on an agenda item.
- To request special accommodations for those persons with disabilities notification to the Clerk's Office should be given in a timely manner, so that arrangements can be made accordingly.
- Any writing relating to an open session item on this Agenda that is distributed to all, or a majority of all, members of the body to which this Agenda relates shall be made available at the District's offices at 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109, at the time such writing is made available to all, or a majority of all, members of that body. Such writing(s) may also be posted on the District's website (www.baaqmd.gov) at that time.

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

939 ELLIS STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94109

(415) 771-6000

EXECUTIVE OFFICE: MONTHLY CALENDAR OF DISTRICT MEETINGS

SEPTEMBER 2009

TYPE OF MEETING	DAY	DATE	TIME	ROOM
Board of Directors Regular Meeting *(Meets 1st & 3rd Wednesday of each Month)* - CANCELLED	Wednesday	2	9:45 a.m.	Board Room
Advisory Council Regular Meeting	Wednesday	9	9:00 a.m.	Board Room
Board of Directors Climate Protection Committee *(Meets 2nd Thursday each Month)*	Thursday	10	9:30 a.m.	4th Floor Conf. Room
Board of Directors Budget & Finance Committee *(At the Call of the Chair)*	Monday	14	2:00 p.m.	4th Floor Conf. Room
Board of Directors Regular Meeting *(Meets 1st & 3rd Wednesday of each Month)*	Wednesday	16	9:45 a.m.	Board Room
Joint Policy Committee	Friday	18	10:00 a.m.	MTC Auditorium 101 8th Street Oakland, CA 94607
Board of Directors Executive Committee Meeting *(At the Call of the Chair)*	Thursday	24	9:30 a.m.	4th Floor Conf. Room
Board of Directors Mobile Source Committee – *(Meets 4th Thursday of each Month)* - CANCELLED AND RESCHEDULED TO 10/5//09	Thursday	24	9:30 a.m.	4th Floor Conf. Room

OCTOBER 2009

TYPE OF MEETING	DAY	DATE	TIME	ROOM
Board of Directors Mobile Source Committee – *(Meets 4th Thursday of each Month)*	Monday	5	9:30 a.m.	4th Floor Conf. Room
Board of Directors Regular Meeting *(Meets 1st & 3rd Wednesday of each Month)*	Wednesday	7	9:45 a.m.	Board Room
Board of Directors Legislative Committee *(Meets 2nd Thursday each Month)*	Thursday	8	9:30 a.m.	4th Floor Conf. Room

October 2009 Calendar Continued on Next Page

OCTOBER 2009

TYPE OF MEETING	DAY	DATE	TIME	ROOM
Board of Directors Climate Protection Committee *(Meets 2nd Thursday each Month)*	Thursday	8	Following Board Legislative Cme. Meeting	4th Floor Conf. Room
Advisory Council Regular Meeting	Wednesday	14	9:00 a.m.	Board Room
Board of Directors Stationary Source Committee *(Meets 3rd Monday Quarterly)*	Monday	19	9:30 a.m.	Board Room
Board of Directors Regular Meeting *(Meets 1st & 3rd Wednesday of each Month)*	Wednesday	21	9:45 a.m.	Board Room
Board of Directors Mobile Source Committee – *(Meets 4th Thursday of each Month)*	Thursday	22	9:30 a.m.	4th Floor Conf. Room
Board of Directors Ad Hoc Cme. on Port Emissions	Monday	26	9:30 a.m.	4th Floor Conf. Room

NOVEMBER 2009

TYPE OF MEETING	DAY	DATE	TIME	ROOM
Board of Directors Regular Meeting *(Meets 1st & 3rd Wednesday of each Month)*	Wednesday	4	9:45 a.m.	Board Room
Advisory Council Regular Meeting	Thursday	12	9:00 a.m.	Board Room
Board of Directors Climate Protection Committee *(Meets 2nd Thursday each Month)*	Thursday	12	9:30 a.m.	4th Floor Conf. Room
Joint Policy Committee	Friday	13	10:00 a.m.	MTC Auditorium 101 8th Street Oakland, CA 94607
Board of Directors Regular Meeting *(Meets 1st & 3rd Wednesday of each Month)*	Wednesday	18	9:45 a.m.	Board Room
Board of Directors Budget & Finance Committee *(At the Call of the Chair)* - CANCELLED	Monday	25	1:30 p.m.	4th Floor Conf. Room

HL – 9/3/09 (8:38 a.m.)
P/Library/Forms/Calendar/Calendar/Moncal

AGENDA: 1

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
Memorandum

To: Chairperson Brazil and
Members of the Advisory Council

From: Jack P. Broadbent
Executive Officer/APCO

Date: September 3, 2009

Re: Advisory Council's Draft Meeting Minutes of July 8, 2009

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve attached draft minutes of the Advisory Council's meeting of July 8, 2009.

DISCUSSION

Attached for your review and approval are the draft minutes of the July 8, 2009 meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack P. Broadbent FOR
Executive Officer/APCO

AGENDA: 1

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

DRAFT MINUTES

Advisory Council Regular Meeting
9:00 a.m., Wednesday, July 8, 2009

CALL TO ORDER

Opening Comment: Chairperson Brazil called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m.

Roll Call: Chairperson Harold Brazil; Vice Chairperson Jeffrey Bramlett; Secretary Ken Blonski; Council Members, Jennifer Bard, Louise Wells Bedsworth, Ph.D., Benjamin Bolles, Emily Drennen, MPA, Stan Hayes, John Holtzclaw, Ph.D., Robert Huang, Ph.D., Kraig Kurucz, M.S., Sara Martin-Anderson, M.P.P., Kendal Oku, Neal Osborne, Jonathan Ruel, Dorothy Vura-Weis, M.D., M.P.H.

Absent: Robert Bornstein, Ph.D., Rosanna Lerma, Karen Licavoli-Farnkopf, Jane Martin, Dr.P.H.

Deputy APCO Jean Roggenkamp introduced the Air District's new Manager of Executive Operations, Jennifer Chicconi. Advisory Council member Jennifer Bard introduced Sharlene Kraner, an Oakland High School Junior currently interning with the Lung Association.

Public Comment Period: There were no public comments.

Consent Calendar:

1. Approval of Minutes of the May 13, 2009 Advisory Council Meeting

Ms. Bard requested minor amendments to the minutes, as follows:

- Page 2, under Highlights of Presentation, delete the words, "…in 2002".
- Page 2, third bullet, replace "AB 375" with "SB375".

Council Action: Member Holtzclaw made a motion to approve the minutes of May 13, 2009, as amended; Member Drennen seconded the motion; unanimously carried without objection.

2. Discussion of Draft Report on the Advisory Council's May 13, 2009 Meeting on California's 2050 GHG emission reduction target of 80% below 1990 levels – transportation sector.

Chairperson Brazil thanked the subcommittee of Advisory Council members who prepared the draft report; Stan Hayes, John Holtzclaw and Emily Drennen.

Mr. Hayes distributed a handout on "Emerging Issues" for the draft report, and Ms. Drennen distributed a document entitled, "Other transportation-related recommendations."

Advisory Council members recognized the work of the Subcommittee and provided the following comments and suggestions regarding the Draft Report:

Council Member Discussion/Comments:

Key Point: #1:
Dr. Vura-Weis questioned areas in the report where numbers of percentage reductions and different years they relate to is referenced, which she believed was confusing. She suggested adding to the end of the sentence: "This means a 9% reduction from 2004 levels by 2020 and an 82% reduction by 2050."

Mr. Ruel supported the "business-as-usual" comment in Key Point #1, and he and Dr. Bedsworth both suggested a table be used for different years, tons and percentages for 1990, 2004, 2050, what it would measure, what business-as-usual would be, and target. Members agreed with adding a graph and interpretive language to reference the graph under Key Point #1. Dr. Bedsworth agreed to provide an Excel chart for the Final Report showing business-as-usual, reductions and percentages relative to certain points in time, which shows a dramatic need to reduce.

Key Points #2 - #6:
Mr. Hayes discussed Key Points #2 and #3, stating that in order to achieve the 80% reduction envisioned in AB32 and there must be a major transformation of the transportation sector, transforming fuels, vehicles, and dramatic changes in technology and mobility. While there have been vehicle fuel efficiencies, there has been no corresponding reduction in miles per gallon performance of vehicles.

Mr. Hayes reviewed Key Points # 4 and #5, stating he was struck at how daunting the GHG gap was between currently identified measures in the 2050 target.

Regarding Key Point #6, Mr. Hayes thinks it is the mobility as the "stool leg" that is most amenable to local control, and local governments can affect this process. He then provided a brief explanation regarding Key Point #6 a, b, c, and d.

Vice Chairperson Bramlett referred to Key Points #1 through #6, stating there are a lot of tools and things we can do already, but they are insufficient in our everyday approach and suggested adding stronger language. In comparing Key Point #1 to #2, he asked that percentages be checked. Members agreed to do so once the Excel chart is added.

Mr. Ruel referred to the gap between current measures and the 2050 target and suggested taking Key Point #5 and move it up to be Key Points # 1 or #2.

Key Point #7:

Mr. Hayes said Key Point #7 talks about the local transportation planning's effect on GHG reductions from the transportation sector, which was difficult to write. He questioned whether or not to initially include Steve Heminger's slide on the affect of various local policy options on GHG reductions by 2035. Sobering was the amount of GHG emission reduction from the transportation sector in the Bay Area which is virtually all due to measures adopted by the ARB. He believed that the amount of affect that variations have in local policy is limited, which is also an important message which should be conveyed to the Board of Directors. The Advisory Council heard about what MTC's T2035 plan envisions and there are a number of reasons why there is such a large funding gap between what we would like to do and what we are able to do which are outlined as Key Points #7 a, b, and c.

Mr. Hayes noted that Mr. Heminger indicated it is also more maintenance and repair of the existing transportation systems than it is about construction of new freeways that represent the largest expenditure of funds.

Dr. Vura-Weis referred to Key Point #7 b and mention of an expectation of tripling of freight volumes by 2035, and she asked for an explanation to be provided. Mr. Hayes noted this was from the MTC presentation, but it could be removed. Kraig Kurucz said the comment seemed to be tied in the local population growth section, and Mr. Hayes agreed to follow-up on the reference.

Dr. Vura-Weis said Key Point #9 is important and covers two different opportunities for the Air District: 1) public education and helping to change public attitudes; and 2) providing guidance to cities on how they make plans. She questioned whether there would be a way to separate those as two separate points. Mr. Hayes said the Recommendations section spells out what those mean and it dovetails the Recommendations back to this section. He noted that the guidance portion is contained in Recommendation #2.

Dr. Vura-Weis suggested changing the title of the Key Point #9 to, "Major needs and opportunities for the Air District exist in public education and assistance to cities" so it is clear what is contained in the section. Mr. Hayes said he did not want to limit it and noted that those opportunities would be identified and addressed in the Recommendations section.

Ms. Drennen suggested splitting the paragraph into two to make those points stick out more. Mr. Hayes suggested completing Key Point #9's paragraph at: "While posing major challenges, this also presents major opportunities for the District. Then, make the next point out as "a", start "b" with "There is a need for continued District assistance and guidance,".

Key Point #8:

Mr. Hayes said further improvements in mobility (and resulting reductions in VMT) are possible, and he discussed examples of good urban planning, more walkable communities, compact development, TOD and parking reforms.

Mr. Bramlett said Key Point #8's title suggests that improvements in mobility will result in reductions in VMT but someone with another set of values may not agree with this. He suggested saying we are looking for reductions in VMT from that change in mobility and not what we expect the result to be, because it may not. Similarly, in the last sentence, Mr. Bramlett asked to list the actual concepts or programs rather than the locality, i.e., (such as those in San Francisco).

Key Point #9:

Mr. Hayes said there appears to be major needs and opportunities for the Air District and the subcommittee tried to summarize what they heard from the speakers about the things that the District can do. Primarily, they involve the District's role in climate protection, co-benefits between GHG reduction and air quality improvement, need for assistance and guidance of technical areas in support of climate protection efforts, like GHG inventories and integration and guidance of SB375 implementation.

Dr. Bedsworth said AB32 does not contain the 2050 goal but rather the 2020 goal. She said the 2050 goal is in the Executive Order and there are several areas that refer to AB32's 2050 goal which should be changed because it is not codified into law. She believed the freight volumes question relates to goods movement, the Port of Oakland and population growth, and this is the reason for the increase.

Dr. Bedsworth also referred to Key Point #7; MTC plan showing "limited effect from the transportation sector" and she cautioned the Council about being too pessimistic about it in presenting it. There needs to be fundamental and planning paradigm changes, and she suggested talking about current constraints, but would hesitate in being too pessimistic about the role that transportation planning can play.

Mr. Hayes agreed and said he did not want to discourage action by saying the target is impossible; there was some sensitivity analysis that looked at different levels of policy changes which were pretty aggressive, but it did not seem to move the graph line in the chart presented too much. He felt the Board of Directors should understand there is a lot to be done, but additional local land use policies are not the "silver bullet" and will not change the fundamental slope of the graph line.

Chairperson Brazil believed significant movement in the graph line and a pricing scenario policy was needed, which should be the type of message that should go to the Board of Directors.

Dr. Bedsworth said there are no "silver bullets" that are going to address transportation; all three pieces are needed and she asked not to downplay the results (or graph lines) of the T2035 objective.

Dr. Huang referred to page 5 of the PowerPoint slide from Mr. Heminger's presentation regarding telecommuting, which was not reflected in the Draft Report. It indicates telecommuting needs to go from 3% to 10% market share, as well as other parking strategies like parking cash-out. He suggested including this in the summary or in the recommendations. He shared sentiments about not doing enough and questioned if anyone read Thomas Friedman's book, "Hot, Flat and Crowded: Why We Need a Green Revolution--and How It Can Renew America." The author discusses examples of why Europe was able to reduce gas consumption through increasing the gasoline tax and utilizing funds into other areas. He questioned whether MTC or the Air District could do something like this and wanted to express this as a possibility.

Ms. Drennen said she recently heard Enrique Peñalosa Londoño speak, who is a Columbian politician and former Mayor of Bogota. In three years he was able to tax gasoline and prioritize infrastructure investment for people over cars. She believed there is a possibility to make fundamental changes and it takes a lot of political will.

Mr. Blonski referred to Key Point #7 b and the statement of a population of 2 million or more people, 1.8 million new jobs, and the need for 700,000 new homes. He thinks the District should encourage

carrying capacity and the amount of growth as a direct effect on infrastructure and how much infrastructure is needed. He said it seems this is an important variable in all materials being looked at. Statistically, it would be interesting to see what would need to take place at varying population increases and the cost of those increases.

Mr. Blonski also asked to clarify in comments that transportation is reflected in the context with the whole number. Because of the references to so many numbers, he found it difficult to look at transportation just in context of all other sources of GHGs. Regarding land use planning, as long as local jurisdictions are able to receive income from land use and unless some policies are looked at, it will be difficult to change lifestyles and bring about change.

Chairperson Brazil referred to Key Point #7 b and noted that MTC has access to updated socio-economic data from ABAG. The numbers presented are already outdated; Projections was based on pre-recession information and they are now seeing numbers much lower.

Mr. Hayes thinks there is always a balance in the Key Points section to state what the speaker said and not to imply that the subcommittee has necessarily evaluated information themselves. He suggested replacing wording in Key Point #7 b to indicate that "MTC projects that the Bay Area will have …"

Dr. Vura Weis suggested including a comment that, even though growth does not continue at these predicted rates, we still need to address the issues with the same energy and creativity as if they were to continue at predicted rates.

Dr. Holtzclaw referred to Mayor Peñalosa's talk, noting that he was the Mayor of a third world city. He faced opposition about changing the auto and road use, as the land is divided up into private spaces and streets, which are controlled by those who have cars, and biking is fairly dangerous. The public spaces are sidewalks and parks. Cars used to park in public spaces all the time. The Mayor incrementally took streets, widened sidewalks, increased gas taxes on cars, took away parking, and Dr. Holtzclaw believed that this is the kind of planning transformation needed. While it will be hard to inspire, this is the task—for elected officials and the public to see there is another way of doing it.

Mr. Kurucz referred to Key Point #3 and said in the "three-legged stool" comment about transforming fuels, vehicles and VMT, it seems like the efficiency of present vehicles is short-term but probably overwhelmed in the long-term by the change to entirely new fuels. He questioned how speakers inter-related their comments about vehicles versus fuels in the long term and thinks people might be willing to change VMT if they have a cleaner car.

Mr. Hayes said they all inter-react, particularly the vehicle and their fuel systems. He liked the "three-legged stool" analogy because it was easy to remember, it made sense to pass this along to the Board, but questioned the characterizations of "easiest", hard and hardest, as he was not sure if this gave the wrong impression to the reader.

Dr. Bedsworth referred to Key Point #7 and suggested an amendment to the first sentence: "The current ability of local transportation planning to effect additional GHG reductions…" She suggested adding a colon after the word "factors" at the end of the paragraph; "This is due to a variety of factors: (and list out a, b, and c as stated)." Mr. Hayes questioned if this would imply that it is the current ability of planners to deal with the issue, or are there constraints they are stuck with. Dr.

Bedsworth believed that a, b and c are the constraints and not the ability or willingness of people. She thinks that the fact that 81% of our money must go to maintaining or operating the current system seems like a hard constraint to vastly improve the efficiency of public transit.

Ms. Drennen believed some percent of MTC 2035 funding is open for negotiation, but noted there is a large portion that was voter-approved and can only be used for specific purposes. She suggested adding this statement as point "d".

Ms. Bard suggested rewording the beginning of Key Point #7 to a positive rather than a negative in order to present the case for what needs to be done on scales, speed and scope to reach very aggressive GHG targets, and suggested starting the point: "MTC should develop a strong sustainable communities strategy containing all necessary policies on the scale, speed and scope required to reach our GHG goals." She said this will capture more of the urgency and need to do far more of what we are doing, as well as recognize constraints that follow afterwards.

Mr. Ruel suggested the second sentence indicate: "The *current* ability of local transportation planning to effect additional GHG reductions from the transportation sector beyond those resulting from ARB-adopted measures will require a strong sustainable strategy containing all of these necessary policies beyond what is required in SB375."

Ms. Bard referred to Key Point #9 and asked to see recognition of the Air District's role in advocating and working with local governments to set a strong regional GHG reduction target to help drive local policies. She noted that AB32 has a 5 million metric ton reduction for transportation, which was based on one study. However, Growing Cooler indicates reductions of up to 11-14 million metric tons as being possible. Therefore, she asked for the Air District's role to support a much stronger target for reducing GHGs through the JPC and in working with local governments and asked to add "c". The subcommittee supported adding item c, and to wordsmith final language:

> **"c. There is research to support much higher GHG reduction targets and reductions are possible (11-14 million metric tons). The Air District supports the strongest regional GHG targets to support local policies to be successful in reaching our GHG goals."**

Ms. Roggenkamp agreed there are dramatic things that will need to happen in order to make a difference in GHG reductions. The JPC is working jointly to help agencies who have the primary responsibility for implementing SB375. However, no one knows what SB375 will take to implement in terms of setting targets and getting regional agencies to work together. So, saying things like "we should go beyond what is or will require" is pushing too far what is not known yet. She said the District will participate in the SB375 process and will be working with partners, cities and counties.

Mr. Hayes said the ARB is supposed to set the regional targets and he was not sure what the District's role is. Ms. Bard said regional stakeholders will have input into those target in a year-long process through the Regional Target Advisory Committee to identify methodologies to establish what the targets will be. The Air District, through the JPC, local governments and the public, can request the strongest possible reduction targets to be successful, which she also thought would help drive policy, as well.

Ms. Roggenkamp added that SB375 even includes within it a possibility for regions to suggest targets for ARB, which may be stronger than what ARB may arrive at.

Mr. Hayes then discussed the outlined provided to Council members and staff on Emerging Issues, and asked for feedback.

Ms. Martin suggested moving up the third bullet regarding "multi-pollutant planning" to be the first bullet. Dr. Holtzclaw suggested amending the last bullet point, changing "educating" with "informing". Mr. Kurucz questioned if the technology gap in development and adoption of the new technologies in vehicles would qualify as an emerging issue, and Ms. Drennen pointed out that this was included in the second bullet point.

Ms. Bard suggested there be a bullet which recognizes the need for regional planning. The Council briefly discussed the funding gap and the planning process, and members agreed to add the following bullet:

"Need for a regional planning and funding revolution, recognizing a large technology and funding gap"

Ms. Drennen asked to add a bullet regarding parking and the transportation pricing schemes as emerging issues, as follows:

"Exploration on the role of pricing policies to reduce GHG emissions"

Chairperson Brazil suggested there be recognition that a funding revolution is needed, as there are shortfalls in transportation.

Mr. Bolles suggested adding the following bullet:

"Prioritize investment in people over cars"

Mr. Blonski referred to Emerging Issues and requested replacing the previous suggestion made by Dr. Holtzclaw (6th bullet) of "informing" the public about air quality and climate protection, stating the next three bullets are different strategies about changing behavior. He believed it was one thing to inform the public but something else to get them to change their behavior. He suggested increasing the public's knowledge, believing the District would want to weigh in on strategies to consider changing those behaviors.

Dr. Vura-Weis suggested not only increasing public knowledge/awareness but also motivation, and she asked to change the 6th bullet under Emerging Issues to:

"District's role in and best techniques for increasing public awareness and concern about air quality and climate protection"

Dr. Holtzclaw and Ms. Drennen suggested that a "d" be added under #3 in Key Points to convey the idea that what seems impossible can become a reality in moving forward, recognizing the discussion regarding Mayor Peñalosa.

Mr. Bramlett suggested moving onto a discussion regarding Recommendations. While he likes the message he heard, he was somewhat uncomfortable including things only a few members have worked on when there is a process that establishes a record.

Council members discussed and agreed to the following amendments to emerging issues:

EMERGING ISSUES:

- Multi-pollutant planning that integrates criteria pollutants, air toxics, and GHGs in development and implementation of air quality plans.
- Large "gap" between currently available measures and what will be needed to meet AB32's 80% reduction target by 2050.
- Major transformation of transportation sector, including technology innovations to reduce carbon footprint.
- Interactions between air quality and climate protection measures, both synergistic and antagonistic.
- District's role in implementation of SB375 regional GHG targets.
- District's role in and best techniques for increasing public awareness and concern about air quality and climate protection.
- Need for a regional planning and funding revolution, recognizing a large technology and funding gap.
- Exploration on the role of pricing policies to reduce GHG emissions.
- Prioritize investment in people over cars.

Regarding recommendations, Mr. Hayes said he thinks the compiled list is specific as to what the District can legally do within its authority in the near-term, and there are some recommendations that are longer term. He then briefly restated the draft Recommendations into the record.

Ms. Drennen noted that the recommendations were mostly formed from the work of the Council's Air Quality Planning Committee. She and Dr. Holtzclaw believe that creating a HOT network will increase VMT and not decrease VMT, HOT lanes are a huge part of MTC's 2035 plan, and a significant percent of money is going into this network.

Chairperson Brazil noted that MTC's vision analysis was the precursor to the full RTP which was done, and it was done to develop scenarios to inform the MTC Commission to put the plan together. HOT lanes was one separate scenario, as well as land use policy changes, land use and pricing, but these could not be used as an actual project RTP, but they could with the investment strategies.

Mr. Hayes said he was not sure if Key Point #7 was within the District's purview and Advisory Council Members recommended rewording #7 to make it more general, or leave it as is. Ms. Roggenkamp discussed previous Advisory Council recommendations such as the smog check program, noting that the Board has a Legislative Committee that weighs in on legislative matters. In this case; however, the Air District works all the time with MTC. The JPC is also the regional coordinating agency, and coordinating functions of land use, transportation and air quality issues are discussed. She noted the District is updating its Clean Air Plan, and the Advisory Council could suggest that the District consider how things might be incorporated into transportation-related measures in the Clean Air Plan.

Mr. Kendall asked that Key Point #7 be reworded and Mr. Hayes agreed the recommendation be made more general after the first sentence of #7, stating the basic question is how to reduce regional VMT which needs more study. He also did not believe the Council could complete the Report at this meeting and suggested a second meeting be held.

Ms. Bard questioned if there could be a recommendation that MTC go back and relook at the allocation of funding and where projects can be reallocated. Ms. Roggenkamp noted this will not occur until another RTP is done four years from now, and Council Members acknowledged this process was now starting.

Ms. Bard then described her work with Sonoma County in reallocating certain projects for more pedestrian and bicycle projects. She asked that consideration for reallocation of projects be considered, if appropriate, in the RTP process.

Ms. Martin referred to Recommendation #3 and suggested adding accountability standards in terms of SB375. Council Members supported the suggestion, and Mr. Hayes asked to check and ensure it was not identical or included within Recommendation #8:

"d. Creating evaluation or accountability standards once GHG targets are adopted."

Ms. Roggenkamp suggested concluding the regular meeting so the subcommittee could meet. Council members all agreed that another meeting was needed to finalize the Report.

ACTION
Potential Change in Advisory Council Meetings Schedule

Advisory Council Action: Mr. Hayes made a motion to schedule an Advisory Council discussion meeting on September 9, 2009; Dr. Vura-Weis seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Council members discussed the subcommittee's efforts and follow-up to the Final Report. Mr. Kendall suggested the subcommittee meet after the regular Advisory Council meeting to discuss the draft Report. Mr. Bunger clarified that per Brown Act requirements, up to 10 members would be able to meet as a subgroup.

Mr. Kendall recognized the complexity of topics and follow-up discussions. He said the Advisory Council will probably have 3 topic meetings this year, and the Air District may need to amend its Administrative Code slightly to limit the topic meetings to no more than 4 per year.

AIR DISTRICT OVERVIEW
Report of the Executive Officer/APCO

On behalf of Mr. Broadbent, Ms. Roggenkamp discussed the PowerPoint presentation which staff provided to the Board of Directors' Executive Committee meeting in May regarding the role and process of the Advisory Council. Discussed were types of recommendations that the Advisory Council had made based upon the first topic meeting, and staff are currently working on those recommendations and moving them into work programs.

She reported on the Summertime Spare the Air season, stating there have been 7 Spare the Air Alerts to date, 5 days each of exceedances of the federal and state 8-hour standard, and 4 days of exceedances of the state 1-hour standard. Spare the Air Everday's particular focus is on carpooling, with the tagline of "Any Ride is Worth Sharing."

Ms. Roggenkamp reported on the District's new website design, said the Board of Directors adopted its budget in June and it may need amendment depending upon the State's budget adoption. The District also hopes to have a Health Officer on board in another month or two.

OTHER BUSINESS
Council Member Comments/Other Business

Chairperson Brazil questioned and confirmed with Ms. Roggenkamp there has been no specific direction from the U.S. EPA on lowering the federal standard. The Air District assumes it will be a non-attainment area for the PM2.5 standard; however, the designations have not yet been officially finalized by U.S. EPA.

Mr. Hayes thanked Gary Kendall and Jean Roggenkamp for their work with keeping him and the subcommittee on track.

Ms. Bard reported that the EPA is revising the NO_x standard, they are looking at near roadway levels, and she questioned what effect this would have. Mr. Kendall said staff is aware of this; there are a certain number of monitors required based on population, and the District will need to review those areas which are close to high traffic roadways.

Chairperson Brazil, Ms. Bard and Mr. Osborne reported on their attendance to the A&WMA Conference in Detroit, Michigan June 16-19, 2009.

Time and Place of Next Meeting: 9:00 a.m. Wednesday, September 9, 2009, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

Lisa Harper
Clerk of the Boards

AGENDA: 2

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
Memorandum

To: Chairperson Harold Brazil and Members of the Advisory Council

From: Jack P. Broadbent
Executive Officer/APCO

Date: September 2, 2009

Re: Continued Discussion of Draft Report for the Advisory Council's May 13, 2009 Meeting on California's 2050 GHG Emission Reduction Target of 80% Below 1990 Levels – Transportation Sector

The attached *revised* draft Report on the May 13, 2009 meeting on California's 2050 GHG Emission Reduction Target of 80% below 1990 levels – Transportation Sector was prepared by Advisory Council members Stan Hayes, John Holtzclaw, Emily Drennen and Kraig Kurucz.

The Advisory Council will discuss the *revised* draft Report with Air District staff and finalize the recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack P. Broadbent FOR
Executive Officer/APCO

Prepared by: Gary Kendall
Reviewed by: Jean Roggenkamp

Attachment

ATTACHMENT

REVISED DRAFT REPORT ON THE MAY 13, 2009 ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING ON CALIFORNIA'S 2050 GHG EMISSION REDUCTION TARGET – TRANSPORTATION SECTOR FOR DISCUSSION BY THE ADVISORY COUNCIL AT THE SEPTEMBER 9, 2009 MEETING

SUMMARY

The following presentations were made at the May 13, 2009 Advisory Council Meeting on California's 2050 GHG emission reduction target of 80% below 1990 levels - transportation sector:

1. ***Regional Transportation Plan 2035: Change in Motion*** by Steve Heminger, Executive Director, Metropolitan Transportation Commission. Mr. Heminger received his bachelor's degree from Georgetown University and his master's degree from the University of Chicago. He has been appointed by House Speaker Nancy Pelosi to serve on the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission, which will help chart the future course for the federal transportation program. In addition, Mr. Heminger is a member of the Board of Trustees for the Mineta Transportation Institute and the Board of Directors for the International Bridge, Tunnel and Turnkpike Association.

2. ***Vehicle Technology & Travel Reduction*** by Dan Sperling, Professor of Civil Engineering and Environmental Science and Policy, ITS- Davis. Dr. Sperling was honored as a lifetime National Associate of the National Academies, is author or editor of 200 technical articles and 11 books, including *Two Billion Cars* (Oxford University Press, 2009). He has led ITS-Davis to international prominence by building strong partnerships with industry, government, and the environmental community, integrating interdisciplinary research and education programs, and connecting research with public outreach and education. Dr. Sperling is also the Automotive Related Member of the California Air Resources Board.

3. ***Land Use, Public Transit & Trip Reduction*** by Tom Radulovich, Vice Chairperson of BART's Planning, Public Affairs, Access and Legislation Committee. He serves as Vice Chairperson of the Regional Rail Committee and alternate for the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Liaison Committee. He is a member of the Joint Development Liaison and San Francisco Transportation Authority Liaison Committees. Mr. Radulovich is also the Executive Director of Livable City, a non-profit organization whose mission is to create a balanced transportation system and promote complementary land use that supports a safer, healthier and more accessible San Francisco.

Goods Movement by John Boesel, the chief executive for CALSTART. After graduating from the University of California, Davis, in 1982, Mr. Boesel received his MBA from UC Berkeley in 1989. Immediately prior to joining CALSTART in 1993, he worked as an Environmental Business consultant providing services to natural resource-based businesses and non-profit groups. Mr. Boesel began work as the Vice President of Programs for CALSTART and was promoted to President and the organization's chief executive position in the fall of 2001.

DISCUSSION MEETING

KEY POINTS

Based upon speakers, members of the public and Advisory Council discussion, below is a summary of the key points made by the four speakers.

1. Widespread and major GHG reductions will be required in California. Under AB32 (California's *Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006*) and the Governor's Executive Order S-3-05 (establishing greenhouse gas reduction targets for California), widespread and major reductions in statewide emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) will be required. As shown in the table below, in 2004, California's GHG emissions totaled 469 million metric tons (MMT), but unless steps are taken, by 2020, that total will rise by 27% to 595 MMT. AB32 requires that California's GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels (425 MMT) by 2020. The Governor's Executive Order S-3-05 set a further target of 80% below 1990 levels (85 MMT) by 2050. As shown in the table, to achieve those goals, GHG emissions in 2020 will have to be reduced by 170 MMT below 2020 business-as-usual (BAU) levels and by another 340 MMT by 2050. Put another way, achieving AB32's 2050 goal will require net reductions in statewide emissions (510 MMT) over 2020 BAU that are more than all of the GHG emitted by California in 2004 (469 MMT). This means a 9% reduction from 2004 levels by 2020 and an 82% reduction by 2050.

Year	GHG Emissions (MMT)	GHG Reduction from 2020 BAU (MMT)	% Reduction from 2004
1990	425		
2004	469		
2020 – BAU	595		
2020 - AB32	425	170	-9%
2050 - 80% Below 1990	85	510	-82%

2. Transportation is the largest and fastest growing contributor to GHG emissions in California. The transportation sector is the largest contributor to GHG emissions in California, accounting for 38% of the states' GHG emissions in 2004. It is the fastest growing sector, with GHG emissions from transportation rising more rapidly than any other sector – up 120% between 1970 and 2004. At current rates, GHG emissions from transportation will increase by another 26% by 2020.

3. A large GHG "gap" exists between currently identified measures and California's 2050 target. While hypothetical scenarios have been developed to examine what will be required to achieve California's target of an 80% GHG reduction below 1990 levels by 2050, currently identified measures are not sufficient to achieve that target. A number of significant, new measures are needed to close the gap. These may include such measures as travel demand management (e.g., pricing incentives, zoning changes, expanded transit, HOV/HOT lanes), vehicle efficiency improvements, and major shifts from oil to lower-carbon fuels (e.g., biofuels, electricity, and hydrogen).

4. Transportation will have to be transformed. There is no clear, simple and obvious path to achieve California's 80% GHG reduction target by 2050. Rather, a major transformation of the entire transportation sector is necessary. Such transformation may be viewed as a "three-legged stool," in which we must transform vehicles ("easiest"), transform fuels (hard), and transform mobility (hardest).

    a. Transforming fuels will require that we shift from near-total (96%) dependence on oil today to a broad mix of lower-carbon fuels in the future, including biofuels, hydrogen, and electricity. What the best mix of fuels will be is still unclear. All fuels have drawbacks, with some even worse than gasoline. Rather than attempting to pick "winners" in advance, a durable, performance- and market-based policy, such as a Low Carbon Fuel Standard, is needed.

    b. Transforming vehicles will require that cars of the future be far more efficient and be powered mostly by electric drive. Key policies for such transformation include Pavley (AB1493) GHG standards for vehicles and ARB's Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) requirements. Plug-in Electric Vehicles (PHEV) are a promising technology and may succeed, but battery cost must drop sharply and durability increase. Vehicle efficiency (ton-mpg) has increased each year since the late-1980s, but fuel economy (mpg) has remained nearly the same, with fuel efficiency gains used to increase vehicle performance rather than to improve mileage. In the future, fuel efficiency increases must be converted into fuel economy gains.

    c. Transforming mobility (and thus reducing VMT) will require us to address current land use policies and urban sprawl. Conventional transit currently serves only 2-1/2% of the VMT in the U.S. (although a higher percentage of trips). Expanded traveler choice is critical, with more walkable neighborhoods, expanded conventional transit, and new mobility options that include dynamic ridesharing, smart paratransit, carsharing, and NEVs. Passage of SB375 is a step in the right direction.

5. California's transportation GHG policy addresses all three of the above "stool legs." Vehicles are being addressed through light-duty vehicle GHG standards (Pavley I and II); the ARB's ZEV mandate + ZEV incentives ["ZEV" includes battery electric vehicles (BEV), plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (PHEV), and fuel cell vehicles (FCV)]; "feebates" (mixture of fees and rebates to shift costs and incentivize behavior changes); and truck technology (aerodynamic design of cabs and trailer skirts, hybridization of urban and short-haul trucks). Fuels are being addressed through the Low Carbon Fuel Standard. Mobility (VMT and goods movement) is being addressed by VMT reduction via land use, transit and pricing (SB375) and such measures as low-emission requirements at ports, eco-driving, and tire inflation.

6. Mobility (VMT reduction) is the "stool leg" that is most amenable to local control. Important means available to local governments to reduce VMT include:

    a. Land use planning, including general plans and zoning requirements (e.g., where appropriate, consideration of allowing and encouraging the siting of markets and restaurants in residential areas, expansion of sidewalks, expanded use of traffic calming measures, reduction in local planning code parking requirements for new developments, modification of setback requirements, and relaxation of in-law unit prohibitions).

    b. Implementation of SB375, which requires that ARB set regional targets for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions from automobiles and light-duty trucks by 2020 and 2035 and requires that regional transportation plans adopt a sustainable communities strategy designed to achieve regional GHG reduction targets.

    c. Incentive pricing, including a carbon tax (viewed by speakers as preferable to a cap-and-trade program because of its greater economic efficiency), parking fees, unbundling of parking, high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes, and bridge tolls (e.g., time-of-day pricing).

    d. Grants, including merging of statewide funding pools (e.g., for air quality and GHG reduction) and revising agency grant scoring criteria to combine GHG reduction with other criteria (e.g., air district grant award scoring that combines air quality and GHG criteria).

7. Because the current ability of local transportation planning to effect significant additional reductions is limited, further GHG reductions from the transportation sector sufficient to reach California's 2050 GHG reduction target will require strong new and innovative policy tools, breakthrough technological advances, major changes in public attitudes and behavior, and large increases in funding. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transportation 2035 (T2035) Plan includes a number of measures to improve traffic, expand rail, bus, and ferry service, establish new transit hubs, reduce roadway congestion, increase freeway

performance through traffic operations systems and ramp metering, improve the efficiency of transit systems, establish a regional high-occupancy toll (HOT) network, and will invest in a Lifeline Transportation Program, a Regional Bicycle Network, and a Transportation for Livable Communities Program.

As shown in the table below, with respect to GHG emissions, MTC projects that ARB actions and implementation of the T2035 Plan will reduce CO_2 emissions from the transportation sector in the Bay Area by 35% over business-as-usual 2035 levels, compared with a 2035 objective of 57%. Almost all of these reductions (34%) are projected to result from measures adopted by ARB.

Year	Transportation CO_2 (1,000 TPD)	Relative to 2005	Relative to 2035 BAU	Reduction from 2035 ARB
2005	90			
2035 BAU	116	29%		
2035 ARB	77	-14%	-34%	
2035 ARB + T2035	75	-17%	-35%	-3%
2035 ARB + T2035 + Land Use + Pricing	67	-26%	-42%	-13%
2035 Objective	50	-44%	-57%	-35%

Limited additional GHG reductions are projected to result from additional, locally-adopted measures, over a wide range of locally-based infrastructure, land use, and pricing policy options. This is due to a variety of factors that include the following:

a. The Bay Area's transportation infrastructure is aging and reaching limits to roadway infrastructure expansion. The T2035 Plan projects expenditures of $218 billion by 2035. Of this, 81% will be required for maintenance and operations, with just 3% for roadway expansion, 14% for transit expansion, and 2% for bicycle, pedestrian, and other purposes.

b. MTC projects that, by 2035, the Bay Area will have nearly 2 million more people, 1.8 million new jobs, a need for over 700,000 new homes, and a tripling of freight volumes. Commute distances and traffic congestion are expected by MTC to increase accordingly.

c. Major shortfalls of as much as $40 billion exist between highway, transit and local road repair needs and available funding. Moreover, significant transit operating deficits exist and are increasing, with routes and services overlapping among two dozen different transit operators.

MTC calculates that measures in the T2035 Plan will achieve a small additional reduction of about 1% in GHG emissions beyond ARB-adopted measures by 2035. Even with the most aggressive combination of additional local land use and

pricing policies considered, MTC calculates that an additional reduction of only 10% would be achieved, still short of its 2035 objective.

There are no "silver bullets" available to address this shortfall. Because the current ability of local transportation planning to effect significant additional reductions is limited, further GHG reductions from the transportation sector sufficient to reach California's 2050 GHG reduction target will require strong new and innovative policy tools, breakthrough technological advances, major changes in public attitudes and behavior, and large increases in funding.

8. Further GHG reductions could be achieved through transit and public planning measures that further reduce VMT. Additional VMT reductions might be accomplished in a number of ways, including further expanded access to transit, further expansion and improvements in transit systems, further implementation of sustainable urban planning measures (e.g., livable/walkable/mixed-use communities), and closer proximity between residences and jobs. Such improvements might be accomplished through such measures as more transit-oriented development (TOD), more compact development (with its reduced infrastructure costs and savings on embedded energy/GHG costs), and parking reforms.

9. Major needs and opportunities for the Air District exist. Although significant, breakthrough technological advancements are needed, major changes in public attitude and behavior related to mobility and transit are also needed to achieve California's 2050 GHG target. While posing major challenges, this also presents major opportunities for the District:

    a. There is an ongoing and important role for the District to continue its leadership in educating the public and other agencies about climate change and the co-benefits that exist between GHG reduction and air quality improvement, including the air quality benefits of livable communities, walking, biking and increased use of public transit, thus helping the public better understand the relationship between personal actions and air quality and climate protection, and proactive steps that can be taken to reduce our carbon footprints.

    b. There is a need for continued District assistance and guidance, particularly in such areas as the development of GHG inventories for cities and others, recognizing and addressing the interactions between air quality and SB375 implementation, identification of GHG mitigation strategies and measures for cities, and integration of GHG and air quality considerations in CEQA guidance.

    c. The District has an important role to play in working with the ARB in setting Bay Area regional GHG reduction targets under SB375 and in other aspects of its implementation.

EMERGING ISSUES

- Multi-pollutant planning that further integrates consideration of criteria pollutants, air toxics, and GHGs in the development and implementation of air quality plans.

- Large "gap" between currently available measures and what will be needed to meet California's GHG reduction target of 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.

- Need for, and the development of, measures to accomplish a major transformation of the transportation sector, including breakthrough technology advances and policy innovations to reduce the sector's carbon footprint.

- Interactions between air quality and climate protection measures, both synergistic and antagonistic.

- Setting of SB375 regional GHG targets for the Bay Area and the District's role in SB375 implementation.

- District's role in, and best techniques for, increasing public awareness and concern about air quality and climate protection.

- Need for, and possible mechanisms to achieve, significant and long-term increases in transportation funding, recognizing the large technology and funding gap that currently exists.

- Exploration of the role of innovative incentive policies (e.g., pricing) to reduce GHG emissions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Advisory Council recommendations are based on the presentations by the four speakers on May 13th and subsequent discussion among the Advisory Council members.

1. The District has taken an important and widely recognized leadership role in climate protection. We strongly endorse and support those efforts, and we encourage the District to continue them.

2. The District is commended for, and should continue, its efforts to provide assistance and guidance in the following areas:

    a. Development of GHG emission inventories for the Bay Area and for communities requesting such assistance

    b. Development and implementation of climate protection provisions in CEQA guidance

c. Development and distribution of a model climate protection element for community general plans

d. Development and distribution of model provisions for community climate action plans

e. Development and distribution of educational materials regarding such topics as climate protection, the benefits of livable and sustainable communities, and the relationship between personal actions and GHG reduction

f. Possible establishment of a climate-related Spare-the-Air-Everyday outreach program.

3. The District should implement an integrated multi-pollutant planning strategy that includes and considers criteria pollutants, air toxics, and GHGs in the development of all non-attainment plans (NAPs).

4. The District should play a major role in the implementation of SB375, including the following:

   a. Working closely with ARB in the setting of Bay Area GHG reduction targets.

   b. Identification and description of key interactions among measures taken to improve air quality and climate protection, particularly the relationship of regional GHG reduction targets to the District's clean air plans.

   c. Technical support in the apportionment of regional GHG reduction targets among cities and other entities.

   d. Identification and relative comparison of alternative GHG mitigation strategies and measures for attaining SB375 targets.

   e. Creation of evaluation or accountability standards once GHG targets are adopted.

5. The District should continue its efforts to integrate air quality and climate protection into its evaluation and funding of grant applications. If needed, the District should also support the statewide merging of funding pools for air quality and climate protection grant programs.

6. The District should continue to work closely and actively with other agencies such as MTC and ABAG in the joint development and implementation of climate protection programs, including the T2035 Plan's sustainable communities provisions.

7. For the Bay Area to reach California's 2050 GHG reduction target, the District, MTC, and other responsible agencies will need to significantly expand multi-agency efforts to accomplish reductions in regional VMT. Reaching California's 2050 GHG reduction target will require additional strong and innovative policy tools, significantly expanded funding, major changes in public attitudes and behavior, and. as appropriate, use of a broad range of expanded policy measures (e.g., significant expansion of high-occupancy networks, innovative pricing and toll incentives, and major expansion in and increase in diversity of public transit and related options).

8. The District should consider annual or biennial evaluation and ranking of Bay Area cities and counties on the basis of such metrics as:

    a. Residential per capita GHG emissions,

    b. Commercial/industrial per employee GHG emissions, and

    c. Enactment and implementation of planning policies and measures to reduce GHG emissions.

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
Memorandum

To: Chairperson Harold Brazil and Members of the Advisory Council

From: Jack P. Broadbent
Executive Officer/APCO

Date: September 2, 2009

Re: Change Date for the November, 2009 Advisory Council Meeting

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Select an alternate date for the November, 2009 meeting of the Advisory Council.

BACKGROUND

Advisory Council meetings are normally scheduled for the 2nd Wednesday of each month, except for the months of June, August and December. In 2009 the 2nd Wednesday of November is the 11th, Veterans Day, a holiday celebrated by the Air District. Therefore the November, 2009 Advisory Council meeting must be scheduled on an alternate date.

DISCUSSION

The Council will discuss and select an alternate date for the November, 2009 Advisory Council Meeting. Possible alternate dates include Tuesday, November 10, 2009 and Thursday, November 12, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack P. Broadbent FOR
Executive Officer/APCO

Prepared by: Gary Kendall
Approved by: Jean Roggenkamp