

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

APPROVED MINUTES

Advisory Council Regular Meeting
9:00 a.m., Wednesday, March 11, 2009

CALL TO ORDER

Opening Comment: Chairperson Brazil called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m.

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

Absent: Secretary Ken Blonski, Rosanna Lerma, Kendal Oku

PUBLIC COMMENT There were no public comments.

ACTION

1. Proposed Change in Advisory Council Meetings Schedule

Staff Recommendation:

Recommend Advisory Council approve the proposed change in the Advisory Council meetings schedule to provide for two (2) meetings to discuss the February 11, 2009 Meeting on Air Quality and Public Health with Air District Staff, and develop recommendations for the Report to the Air District Board of Directors. The first discussion meeting would be on March 11, 2009, as originally scheduled, and the second discussion meeting would be on April 8, 2009.

Staff Overview:

Director of Technical Services Gary Kendall:

- Productive February meeting;
- Program and policy implications for the Air District;
- More time needed for a thorough discussion to ensure recommendations developed are meaningful;
- Recognized new Advisory Council members.

Executive Officer/APCO Jack Broadbent:

- Recommended Advisory Council discuss and finalize findings and recommendations to the Board of Directors.

Introductory Comments:

- Dr. Bornstein: Supported recommendation; suggested Advisory Council consider holding 3 symposia or hold 9 meetings plus January, and keep open a possibility for the third meeting in each cycle to agendaize additional items from Advisory Council Members.
- Broadbent/Roggenkamp: Administrative Code would need to be amended if schedule changes.
- Dr. Holtzclaw: Supported recommendation and confirmed transportation meeting will be delayed for one month.

MOTION: Dr. Holtzclaw made a motion to approve the staff recommendation; Mr. Kurucz seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

- Bard: Proposed not changing format or elimination of topics; make adjustments as needed.
- Bolles: Supported staff recommendation and multi-tasking.
- Bornstein: Presentations require an entire meeting unless there is one speaker; however, the idea is to have several speakers. Staff and members must compile, review and discuss reports which would be presented to the Board of Directors.
- Bolles: Questioned use of ad hoc committees.
- Brazil: Suggested not multi-tasking for the current topic; Concept is to obtain input from the full Advisory Council as opposed to limiting work to ad hoc committees.
- Broadbent/Roggenkamp: Discussed speaker and presentation logistics. Staff supports continuing approach; good recommendations have come out of work done to date and two meetings are recommended.
- Vura-Weis: Reminded Members of the varying meeting times; 9-11AM and 9-12 noon.
- Bornstein: Believed it was better to conduct three symposia very well. Next year, the Council will understand the process better and perhaps a fourth one could be held.
- Members: Recognized staff's recommendation and agreed that further adjustments could be made in future, as needed.

Council Action: Dr. Holtzclaw made a motion to recommend that the Advisory Council approve the proposed change in the Advisory Council meetings schedule to provide for two (2) meetings to discuss the February 11, 2009 Meeting on Air Quality and Public Health with Air District Staff, and develop recommendations for the Report to the Air District Board of Directors. The first discussion meeting would be on March 11, 2009, as originally scheduled, and the second discussion meeting would be on April 8, 2009; seconded by Mr. Kurucz; motion carried unanimously without objection.

Public Comment:

Ken Kloc, Environmental Law and Justice Clinic, Golden Gate University, commended Air District staff for innovative work with CARE program and proposed amendments to help close a few gaps in some of the recommendations:

1. Recommendation 1: “Consider establishing a PM 2.5 action level and a PM 10 action level”. He said PM 10 air quality standards are still enforced; that it incorporates PM 2.5 and is toxic.
 2. In the CARE program, the Air District has identified 6 impacted communities; however, there could be a large group of small neighborhoods and any one block could be heavily impacted by cumulative sources. He asked to incorporate into cumulative impact concepts some protections or measures to identify whether the issue is great. He suggested the gap for stationary sources be addressed in the recommendations for sources emitting PM 2.5 and PM 10 at levels below the major source category of emissions.
 3. He supported the Air District’s work with rules for indirect sources and suggested engaging in an indirect source inventory.
- Bard: Requested an explanation of a stationary source below major source categories. Kloc: It is one that has the potential to emit more than 100 tons per year of any criteria air pollutant; a facility that emits 70-90 tons of PM will not undergo an air modeling process and it also does not get covered by the Toxics Hot Spot Rule because PM is not on the list of air toxic contaminants. Sources that are old also represent the data gap and some have been grandfathered into the rules so they do not have to go through the same stringent permitting process as newer sources do.
 - Huang: Requested examples: Kloc: 1) Glass factory in East Oakland that has three glass furnaces; 2 are new and were permitted under more stringent processes and abatement devices. One is old and emits more than 50 tons a year of PM; 2) Steel company in Bay Area that is a synthetic minor source. It does not have to go through the major source permitting requirements and it emits more than 10 tons a year.
 - Broadbent: Major source definition is 100 tons or more, which is often subject to Title V permitting program. The Air District has a new source review program that is as, or more stringent than, the federal program that applies to much lower levels.
 - Bateman: Regarding impacted smaller communities, the District is developing a regulatory program for establishing more stringent permitting requirements but has not defined the boundaries of what those communities could be. They could be based on individual grid cells as having impacts above a certain level.
 - Regarding PM gap, the threshold for doing a modeling analysis for new and modified sources is a facility that has 100 tons per year of a criteria pollutant. Facilities over that level that have projects that increase emissions by smaller thresholds also triggers modeling. But the first step is that one must be a major source for a criteria pollutant. PM is not on the toxics list because it is a criteria air pollutant; however, the Cal EPA Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment is actually looking at a methodology whereby impacts of overall PM could be considered in health risk assessments along with other toxic air contaminants. The Air District has identified PM as a second phase in terms of more stringent permitting requirements and by that time, Cal EPA will have done more in establishing its methodology

for addressing PM along with other toxic air contaminants in terms of health risk assessment methodology.

- Kurucz: Questioned if there is an environmental process for air pollution to be considered when building highways. Roggenkamp: Caltrans would be the project lead for state highway systems and would conduct an environmental review process under CEQA. If an EIR is prepared, air quality would be reviewed and the Air District often comments on such documents. City or county agencies would be responsible for their own local roads and they would review air quality impacts, as well.
- Kurucz: Believed Mr. Kloc's third comment relates specifically to Recommendations 6 and 9. His second comment on indirect sources that could lead to small impacted areas and traffic has to do with stationary sources which would not seem to be the reason a hot spot exists. Mr. Kloc said from a cumulative impacts approach, you want to look at the combined impact of whatever stationary sources are present--freeways, indirect sources, and truck traffic. Once that cumulative review is done and everything is added up, you would want to ensure you are under all standards.
- Dr. Bedsworth: Confirmed the major source is 100 tons per year of any single criteria air pollutant. Kloc: Under the California Clean Air Act, we have very stringent requirements that trigger best available control technology at much lower levels of emissions at 10 pounds a day. Previously, he was referring to the requirement for air quality impact analysis for modeling analysis.
- Broadbent: Agreed the glass company example dates back prior to the time many permitting requirements were put into place. He clarified with Mr. Kloc that his third recommendation related to the need for an inventory of trips, and suggested recommendations be considered by the Advisory Council.

2. Discussion of Draft Report Relative to the Advisory Council's February 11, 2009 Meeting on Air Quality and Public Health

- Drennen: Supported recommendation for the Air District to conduct outreach through Public Health Departments.
- Bornstein: Believed that the Summary included most of the technical content from the February minutes.
- Holtzclaw: Questioned if the Air District has plans to look at grandfathered sources. Bunger: The District has a large number of sources that have been around for decades. Periodically they are revisited, standards are continually being addressed, rule development is driven by changes in technology, and some are the subject of enforcement. As PM is reviewed, this will be something identified in planning processes.
- Holtzclaw: Suggested going back and looking at older sources to control PM, looking at restricting those sources of heavy diesel, making equipment diesel-free, taking mobile sources outside of the heavily impacted area from the Port, and start making recommendations and including this in the Clean Ports Initiative.
- Hilken: Over 85% cancer risk is from diesel PM and this is the District's major focus. Air District does not have regulatory authority over tailpipe emissions. The ARB has a robust program for addressing a range of diesel sources and has adopted stricter regulations for on-

road trucks. Significant reductions are expected as fleets turn over. There are many District grant and incentive programs, expanded enforcement programs, increased focus on mobile sources, enforcement of idling limits at the Port for trucks and also for locomotives. Compliance and Enforcement Division is looking at ways of expanding efforts to work with ARB to ensure rules are being complied with. Regarding railroads, the inventory shows locomotives are a small part of overall emissions, and diesel trucks and ships are by far a large source.

- Brazil: Questioned if there will ever be a diesel-free port. Hilken: spoke of cleaner, ultra low sulfur diesel. Mr. Bunger noted that as EPA has examined engine classes and set new regulatory on-road limits. In the future, diesel trucks will have similar emission controls as gasoline engine vehicles have and, therefore, be much cleaner.
- Hayes: Acknowledged the Air District's role in protecting and improving health. He was struck by Dr. Iton's information on poverty versus life expectancy as well as the confluence of heavy vehicle traffic, emissions from freeways, and asked to hear what the Air District could do to regulate traffic on roadways, given legal limitations.
- Roggenkamp: Focusing on land uses or land uses in conjunction with roadways would help to address the issue. SB 375 focuses on GHG's, looking at the land use transportation connection and reducing VMT. The Air District will be pursuing an indirect source rule focusing on land uses but not necessarily regulating roadways.
- Kurucz: Supported recommendations and the in-depth review, clarified that Recommendation #4's use of the word "that" means it has a double standard and suggested the use of ", which" so that it has the extra, added benefit but not an original goal. The way it is stated should be so they accomplish both.
- Kendall: Suggested the subgroup of the Advisory Council address questions. He noted that Dr. Bhatia's discussed a new ordinance in San Francisco that deals with siting new housing adjacent to a high volume roadway. It requires an analysis of emissions and a determination through modeling what the annual average impact is from the emissions from the roadway. If above .2 micrograms per cubic meter, items such as an HVAC system is required which takes out 80% of fine particles. This raises the question of whether the Air District should recommend other cities and counties consider such an approach or ordinance.
- Martin-Anderson: Regarding the poverty connection which is the take-away from the presentations, there is a definite link to political power, political agency, there are reasons freeways are there and that BART is above ground. She felt HVAC and land use answers was a bit late for impacted communities, noted there is not a lot of new housing, and she hoped that the agency focuses on helping people who are there now who do not have the political, agency or power to speak to decision-makers. Regarding considering roadway stationary sources, docked boats or docked rails, she questioned learning more about any legal precedents. Ms. Roggenkamp said the District would never classify a roadway as a stationary source; it could be a source, but not one where the District has regulatory control over at this time. Exposure to individuals on the roadways is because they are on the roadways. Those next to the roadway is because the land uses were placed next to the roadway, which are two different types of exposure.
- Martin-Anderson: Dr. Bhatia interestingly suggested considering roadways as stationary sources and something that the District could regulate more generally.

- Kurucz: Given commute and goods movement patterns, scientists could model this and see the impact around it. However, if a permit was issued to the Golden Gate Bridge, they could not do anything about it. And, if something could be done to meter the cars like neighborhoods do, cars will find another route. Therefore, treating a roadway as a source does not provide the solution.
- Bolles: Suggested taxing heavy diesel at rush hour.
- Bunger: Felt Dr. Bhatia was talking on a conceptual modeling issue and looking at how people are being exposed in communities relative to sources and how land is being used.
- Vura-Weis: The Advisory Council supports implementation of port container fees. She questioned additional recommendations such as incentive programs, additional advocacy work, and specifically whether roadways are defined as stationary sources. She questioned reasonable methods of mitigation, such as walls or chemical compounds that would disperse or break down emissions.
- Roggenkamp: ARB will set targets under Recommendation #4; the Air District can participate in the process. She agreed that additional resources could be recommended for added enforcement. She agreed the Air District can accomplish Recommendation 6 and can work to do it better.
- Bedsworth: Two of the biggest initiatives are focused on preventing future harm in new development and sources, but more important is to emphasize the need for actions that will protect and reduce risks for existing burdens and to make this distinction.
- Kendall: The ARB has a very aggressive program that will require by 2023, all heavy duty diesel vehicles must meet the 2010 standard; otherwise called the Accelerated Replacement Rule. The 2010 standard is the equivalent of putting on catalytic converters on light duty gas vehicles resulting in low emissions with the use of ultra low sulfur diesel fuel required by State and Federal regulations. Regarding an indirect source rule, the Air District focuses its grant and incentive funding on impacted communities identified through the CARE program. However, if there is an indirect source rule in place and mitigation could not be achieved, fees would be paid and could be dedicated to where they would do the most good and provide the greatest health benefits. To get to this point, new vehicle standards and accelerated fleet turnover programs are needed. Other things can then be done such as the indirect source rule. He also referred to sound impacts and insulation at the airport, and similarly, HVAC systems could be funded for heavily impacted areas.
- Martin-Anderson discussed the subgroup having some process issues with the emerging issues portion of the report. She saw it as not quite ready to be final recommendations, but rather something interesting that came out of the work.
- Ms. Roggenkamp agreed the work can evolve over time. In terms of key points, she questioned whether the key points were those heard from presenters or key points that the group drew from and concluded from the presentations.
- Martin-Anderson: There were 10 running themes that the group prioritized. Ms. Roggenkamp suggested that the Advisory Council bring some key themes or interpretation/evaluation as those most important.
- Licavoli-Farnkopf: Referred to roadways and stationary sources, which may be addressed in Recommendation #6. They are stationary in the sense that the data is consistent in those

particular areas. Where this becomes important is for cumulative impacts; it is a roadway and cannot be ignored. Ms. Roggenkamp noted the roadway emissions are incorporated in the CARE Program, but it is an area the Air District has not regulated to date.

- Drennen: Suggested that roadways as stationary sources could be a central question for the transportation session to be focused in two meetings—how much can the Air District regulate roadways, what ways is it being done, ways to do it further, discussion of indirect source review and ideas for reducing VMT.
- Kurucz: In securing speakers, he asked to show what emission projections look like after the implementation of some of the future effective rules so the Advisory Council understands how it plays out--whether there are identified gaps in the near term or whether there is need to focus somewhere else.
- Brazil: Asked for specific comments on the draft and suggested starting with “Key Points”, and taking one section at a time. He confirmed with Ms. Martin-Anderson that the same subgroup would be incorporating changes to the draft. At the next meeting, the document should be fine-tuned such that it can be ready to be forwarded to the Board of Directors. Advisory Council Members suggested first beginning with a discussion of the Recommendations.

Discussion: Original Draft Recommendations:

1. Incorporate Fine PM into the CARE Program and require “hot spot” analysis of regional projects. Also, incorporate this hot spot analysis into updated CEQA guidelines. Consider establishing a PM 2.5 action level. Consider additional localized saturation monitoring studies along freeway corridors and in impacted areas, like the CARE Program West Oakland Measurement Study.
2. Collect data at the neighborhood level, through monitoring or modeling, and through *community based participatory methods*, like the CARE Program West Oakland On-road Diesel Truck Survey, to better assess localized impact. Data should be understandable enough that community residents can use it to push for change. Conduct monitoring to confirm modeling results (ambient concentrations) of PM emissions from major roadways.
3. Add a Health Officer (HO) position to the BAAQMD staff, similar to the position at the South Coast AQMD. The HO could provide guidance on decision making, help educate the public on health impacts of air pollution, and assist local governments with land use planning strategies that reduce air pollution and greenhouse gasses.
4. Set strong regional GHG reduction targets that will have co-benefits of reducing air pollution in impacted communities
5. Increase technical assistance to local jurisdictions for land use planning, such as establishing General Plan best practices and commenting on EIR’s.
6. Identify roadways as sources for TACs and criteria air pollutants. BAAQMD can provide technical assistance by preparing a methodology for measuring this source in Environmental Review processes and providing mitigation strategies.
7. Be more aggressive in requiring pollution reduction plans from major polluters, such as ports, and in monitoring implementation of those plans.
8. Support implementation of Container Fees at Ports to pay for air pollution mitigation and public health programs (rather than for congestion relief, which means an increase

in PM and GHG), and support the anticipated state level resurrected Lowenthal bill. Investigate other strategies to fund emissions reduction and transit, such as gas taxes and increased vehicle license fees.

9. Implement Indirect Source Rules (ISR) and ensure protection for overburdened communities

10. Incorporate appropriate recommendations from the health officer presentations into the public hearing process for the CEQA Guidelines update and the Clean Air Plan 2008. Present this full report to the Board of Directors.

- Licavoli-Farnkopf suggested including PM 10.
- Hayes: The trigger level for significance for PM 2.5 is a very small fraction of the standard and almost always guarantees that it is significant. To the extent it is not in CEQA, it should be included. Mr. Hilken agreed and said they anticipate having recommended thresholds of significance for both PM 2.5 and PM 10 in the revised CEQA guidelines.
- Kurucz: Confirmed that the existing PM 10 threshold was not a fraction of the standard, but was based on regulations--80 pounds per day as the threshold.
- Kurucz: Was not inclined to add PM 10 because the PM 2.5 has the greater health effect and anything that generates particles in the PM 2.5 range would also generate in the PM 10 range.
- Hayes: There is a coarse fraction standard from 2.5 to 10 and sub 2.5 is predominantly driven by combustion products, autos, trucks, and construction equipment. But, this does not mean particles that are larger than 2.5 microns are not also an issue.
- Brazil: Questioned and confirmed that CEQA did not necessarily require a hot spot analysis already. The questionnaire has questions regarding air quality, project consistency with clean air plans and local impacts, and this is what the local air district guidance documents are intended to do—to provide that further detailed recommendations for lead agencies.
- Hayes: Believed one could worry about emissions generated by a new project and trigger their significance by comparison to some action level, but one should also worry about the construction for new residential units and impacts of existing sources.
- Brazil: Confirmed that it was possible to incorporate fine PM 2.5 analysis as part of the CARE program. Mr. Hilken said the Board and Executive Officer/APCO established the CARE Program because we have a well-established regulatory and planning program for the criteria pollutants. The CARE Program could augment that and could focus more resources on toxic air contaminants, but the issue of fine PM has come up a lot and he agreed with Mr. Hayes' comments—to look at Air District programs and address fine PM. The land use issues are serious; discussions with ABAG and MTC promote SMART growth and infill development, and we identify existing areas already impacted, especially with fine PM. The District has done some modeling, local scale monitoring at some of the priority development areas and looking at what those PM 2.5 levels might be similar to what San Francisco has done. It is an extremely important issue to balance infill/SMART growth objectives with the impacted communities' question.
- Hilken: Suggested and Advisory Council agreed, that a generally-worded recommendation about considering PM 2.5 in CEQA guidelines, land use guidance, CARE Program and other programs to get to the local land use impacts would provide good direction for staff. He noted that Recommendations #1 and #6 address many of these issues.

- Bard: In coming up with recommendations, it was difficult to distill down what was presented. A lot of information is added in Recommendation #1 and there is some overlap with #6. The hot spot analysis referred to not only high impact communities, but also brings in the analysis of roadway exposures. It gets back to what authority the Air District has and what ways can we address them under such authority. She asked to include PM 10 as an extra measure for protections from the courser particles on the roadways, as well.
- Vura-Weis: Suggested that the order of recommendations might be modified; 1) items needing more data; and 2) steps to take with that data.
- Brazil: Clarified roadway exposure related to new roadway construction.
- Holtzclaw: Regarding #1 and #6, San Francisco's laws deal with trying to modify and reduce pollution in residences. He questioned if analysis had been done of an elevation aspect and whether above a certain elevation, filtering the air could be exempted.
- Kendall: For course particles, Dr. Holtzclaw is right. For ozone, when you get above the surfaces where ozone can expend itself by reacting with rubber and plants, levels can be even higher. Fine PM 2.5 and PM 1 behaves like a gas; he could not estimate the height to which you would have similar concentrations to what is measured at the surface other than to say fine PM is more like a gas than a particle.
- Holtzclaw: For an annual average, it might not be a problem because wind may push it to downwind breathers. Mr. Kendall said the annual average is generally lower because anytime there is a longer averaging time you incorporate different meteorological situations that result in lower ambient concentrations. Therefore, he did not know if it would affect the vertical structure.
- Bard: Felt Recommendation #1 was most important. She asked for more discussion of setting the PM 2.5 action level and discuss recommendations of the Advisory Council with respect to direction to staff.

MOTION: Ms. Bard made a motion to add PM 10 to Recommendation #1; Dr. Holtzclaw seconded the motion.

- Brazil: Agreed there was consensus for adding PM 10 and suggested bulleting #1 out and adding more of an outline form to break it down to separate recommendations. Dr. Bedsworth supported breaking it out in bullets, as there are many steps being recommended. She questioned whether they all contributed to a single goal for the Air District to achieve, suggested outlining the recommended goal or objective and then actions under the goal, and agreed this could be delegated to the subgroup.
- Hayes: Suggested incorporating PM 2.5 and PM 10 more fully into District programs, including CARE, CEQA and possible hot spot analyses of regional projects, and then fold in Recommendation #6 into it. He suggested deleting the first sentence; "Identify roadways as sources for TACs and criteria air pollutants." The new sentence would read, "BAAQMD is encouraged to provide additional technical assistance by preparing methodologies for evaluating roadway sources in Environmental Review processes and providing mitigation strategies."
- He suggested putting the last item in #1 into #2 because it relates more to data gathering and amending it to read: "Consider additional air pollution-related public health studies including

localized saturation monitoring studies along freeway corridors and in impacted areas, like the CARE Program West Oakland Measurement Study.”

- Hayes: Suggested amendment of #2 as follows:
 11. Collect data at the neighborhood level, through monitoring or modeling, and through *community based participatory methods*, like the CARE Program West Oakland On-road Diesel Truck Survey, to better assess localized impact. Data should be understandable enough that community residents can use it to push for change. ~~Conduct monitoring to confirm modeling results (ambient concentrations) of PM emissions from major roadways.~~
- Kendall: Referred to the comment about PM 2.5 action levels and he suggested using general recommendations versus specific recommendations, as there are multiple places where they could be; in permitting, CEQA analysis, part of CARE, take the form of pounds of emissions or incremental concentrations. He suggested having staff determine which make sense in which particular context.
- Ruel: Reframing #1 to focus on incorporating fine PM into Air District programs makes sense. He did not want to lose the emphasis on hot spot analysis.
- Ruel: It might make sense to a mention of the add hot spots to #5 to; “Increase technical assistance to local jurisdictions for land use planning, such as establishing General Plan best practices and commenting on EIR’s, and encouraging other Bay Area governments to adopt a program similar to San Francisco’s and the role of the District in supporting that.”
- Kurucz: Referred to #9 and asked for amendment: “Implement Indirect Source Rules (ISR) and to ensure protection for overburdened communities”.
- Hayes: Suggested changing #9’s use of the word, “overburdened”. He said he would want circumstances to be addressed wherever they exist without regard to whether a cumulative effect from other things might be on the community. He questioned if the intent was to limit it to overburdened communities or to apply it to all communities that are impacted.
- Martin: Will adjust wording.
- Bard: Potentially, a developer would mitigate to the extent they can or pay into a fund, so the idea is that any project is not allowed to pollute and impact these communities more severely, and she felt this was the intention for #9.
- Hayes: In thinking about San Francisco and Dr. Bhatia’s comments, in a corridor-based approach, if you were within a corridor the width of which was dependent upon the traffic volume and the locations of which corresponded to the major roadways, anybody inside that building had to deal with the impacts, and it is this broad approach he would want to see. He did not want to see someone transfer the benefits to someplace else such they would continue to impact and overburden a portion of the community by putting the money somewhere else where the benefits do not accrue to the same people impacted.
- Brazil: Requested that an updated draft be included in the agenda packet, and Mr. Kendall agreed this could be done and the subcommittee of volunteers would work to ensure this occurs.
- Kendall: Commented on key points: One of the take away messages he got from Dr. Bhatia’s presentation is that for every one microgram per cubic meter you reduce fine PM, you get a

1% reduction in health effects. This is another key point that emphasizes why it is important to focus on fine PM.

- Holtzclaw: Still bothered by the idea that we will just filter the air in apartments rather than cleaning up the air. Possibly as a temporary measure, we could require filtering in new places, but ultimately, the overall goal is to clean up the ambient air.
- Vura-Weis: Believed there is a social responsibility to recognize that some areas are more impacted and deserve more resources for mitigations and perhaps a different level of regulation.
- Hayes: Suggested also indicating that the Advisory Council supports staff's efforts to funnel discretionary resources into impacted communities.
- Drennen: The hot spot analyses should be context-specific and take sensitive receptors in mind. She questioned whether members were interested in conducting an objective review of the effectiveness of the District's existing in-house communication efforts with communities. If found more effectiveness is needed, partnerships with the local health agencies could be instituted to conduct additional outreach.
- Huang: Confirmed that some of the recommendations were prioritized and he suggested using bullet points rather than numbers, suggested focusing on recommendations which the Advisory Council wants the Board to focus on, and suggested identify which are short-term and long-range.
- Bard: Suggested rephrasing Recommendation #4; the key word is "strong". She noted that the ARB will set regional targets and will do it with stakeholder input, so the idea is that, "The Air District would take leadership in advocating for setting...very strong targets that will have co-benefits of reducing air pollution in impacted communities." This will overlap with transportation, which also will assist reaching reduction targets.
- Martin: Referred to Recommendation #10 and suggested addressing redundancy to reduce the total number of recommendations.
- Hayes: We want strong GHG reduction targets regionally but also, we have a role as a District in helping to facilitate the development of implementation strategies because these will be pushed out to various jurisdictions in the Bay Area to try to implement. If one were to do this, one would want the results to be something that would maximize the air quality benefits of those reductions, and the District would play a key role in helping to identify the nexus between GHG reductions and traditional air programs.
- Brazil: Thanked all Advisory Council members, staff and presenters for their comments.
- Kendall: supported reducing and arranging recommendations in priority order and making them concise.
- Bolles: Confirmed with Ms. Roggeknamp that a Transportation GHGs Meeting would not be held on April 8, 2009, which was voted upon by the Advisory Council; the next meeting would finish up the report on Air Quality and Public Health. Mr. Kendall agreed two meetings are needed to finalize the report to the Board of Directors, and the schedule can be discussed at the next meeting. Staff has a list of desired speakers which will be confirmed for future meetings, and he noted that the November meeting falls on Veterans Day, which will need to be discussed and rescheduled.

- Kurucz: Requested for the next meeting there be an ability for an interactive, on-screen, administrative process in order to finalize recommendations.
- Kendall: Suggested that Advisory Council members forward any and all comments to Sarah Martin-Anderson and Mr. Kendall.

Revised (Incorporated) Recommendations for Subgroup Review:

(SUGGESTION TO USE BULLET POINTS AND OUTLINE FORM INSTEAD OF NUMBERING; IDENTIFY WHICH ARE SHORT-TERM AND LONG-RANGE ITEMS; OUTLINE GOAL AND THEN LIST ACTIONS UNDER GOALS)

1. Incorporate Fine PM into the CARE Program and require “hot spot” analysis of regional projects. Also, incorporate this hot spot analysis into updated CEQA guidelines. Consider establishing a PM 2.5 action level and a PM 10 action level. *(MOVE INTO #2)--Consider additional localized saturation monitoring studies along freeway corridors and in impacted areas, like the CARE Program West Oakland Measurement Study.*
2. Collect data at the neighborhood level, through monitoring or modeling, and through *community based participatory methods*, like the CARE Program West Oakland On-road Diesel Truck Survey, to better assess localized impact. Data should be understandable enough that community residents can use it to push for change. ~~Conduct monitoring to confirm modeling results (ambient concentrations) of PM emissions from major roadways.~~ *(MOVED FROM #1)--Consider additional air pollution-related public health studies including localized saturation monitoring studies along freeway corridors and in impacted areas, like the CARE Program West Oakland Measurement Study.*
3. Add a Health Officer (HO) position to the BAAQMD staff, similar to the position at the South Coast AQMD. The HO could provide guidance on decision making, help educate the public on health impacts of air pollution, and assist local governments with land use planning strategies that reduce air pollution and greenhouse gasses.
4. The Air District will take leadership in advocating for setting ~~Set~~ strong regional GHG reduction targets which that will have co-benefits of reducing air pollution in impacted communities.
5. Increase technical assistance to local jurisdictions for land use planning, such as establishing General Plan best practices and commenting on EIR’s, and encouraging other Bay Area governments to adopt a program similar to San Francisco’s and the role of the District in supporting that.
6. ~~Identify roadways as sources for TACs and criteria air pollutants. BAAQMD is encouraged to~~ provide technical assistance by preparing a methodologies for evaluating roadway sources measuring this source in Environmental Review processes and providing mitigation strategies.

7. Be more aggressive in requiring pollution reduction plans from major polluters, such as ports, and in monitoring implementation of those plans.
8. Support implementation of Container Fees at Ports to pay for air pollution mitigation and public health programs (rather than for congestion relief, which means an increase in PM and GHG), and support the anticipated state level resurrected Lowenthal bill. Investigate other strategies to fund emissions reduction and transit, such as gas taxes and increased vehicle license fees.
9. Implement Indirect Source Rules (ISR) ~~and~~ to ensure protection for overburdened communities. (SUGGESTION TO CHANGE WORD, “overburdened”)
10. (SUGGESTION TO INCORPORATE ITEM INTO ANOTHER RECOMMENDATION TO REDUCE TOTAL NUMBER OF BULLETS) Incorporate appropriate recommendations from the health officer presentations into the public hearing process for the CEQA Guidelines update and the Clean Air Plan 2008. Present this full report to the Board of Directors.

OTHER BUSINESS:

3. **Council Member Comments/Other Business** - None
4. **Time and Place of Next Meeting:** 9:00 a.m. Wednesday, April 8, 2009, 939 Ellis Street, San Francisco, CA 94109
5. **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 11:19 a.m.

Lisa Harper
Clerk of the Boards