

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

SPEAKER INDEX

<u>PRESENTATION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
DR. FINE	3
MS. VANDERSPEK	21
DR. GHOSH	27

<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
NOEL MUYCO	35
ELIZABETH HAWLEY	36
KELSEY BREWER	37
BRANDON MATSON	39

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BUENA PARK, CALIFORNIA; TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2016

2 9:00 A.M.

3

4 DR. FINE: GOOD MORNING. THIS IS THE FIRST OF
5 FOUR REGIONAL HEARINGS WE'RE HAVING ON THE PLAN. BEFORE
6 WE GET STARTED, JUST A LITTLE BIT OF HOUSEKEEPING. MAKE
7 SURE YOU PUT YOUR CELL PHONES ON SILENT AND VIBRATE SO
8 THERE'S NO INTERRUPTIONS. RESTROOMS ARE LOCATED JUST
9 BEHIND THIS WALL IN THE HALLWAY THERE. AND THEN IN THE
10 EVENT OF EMERGENCY, WE MAY ASK FOR EVACUATION OR SHELTER
11 IN PLACE IN CASE OF AN EARTHQUAKE.

12 AGAIN, WELCOME TO THE MEETING. MY NAME IS
13 PHILIP FINE. I'M DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER WITH SOUTH
14 COAST AQMD IN THE RULES DIVISION. AND LET'S GO AHEAD AND
15 DO INTRODUCTIONS.

16 MS. VANDERSPEK: I'M SYLVIA VANDERSPEK, AND I'M
17 CHIEF OF THE AIR QUALITY PLANNING BRANCH FOR THE STATE OF
18 CALIFORNIA.

19 MR. HUGO: GOOD MORNING. I'M HENRY HUGO. I'M
20 ASSISTANT DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER IN THE MOBILE SOURCE
21 DIVISION.

22 DR. GHOSH: GOOD MORNING. MY NAME IS JO KAY
23 GHOSH. I'M HEALTH OFFICER FOR AQMD.

24 DR. FINE: SO AS I MENTIONED, THIS IS A REGIONAL
25 HEARING, AND IT'S SIMILAR TO WHAT WE HAVE IN TERMS OF

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BOARD MEETINGS. WE'RE ACTUALLY TAKING A TRANSCRIPT, AND
2 THE TRANSCRIPT OF THIS MEETING WILL BE SHARED WITH OUR
3 BOARD MEMBERS AS REQUIRED FOR STATE LAW. WE DID A
4 PREVIOUS ROUND OF REGIONAL WORKSHOPS. THIS IS A LITTLE
5 MORE FORMAL. WE ARE TAKING COMMENT. IF YOU DO WANT TO
6 MAKE A COMMENT, WE HAVE BLUE CARDS OUT IN THE LOBBY.
7 PLEASE FILL ONE OUT. AND WHEN WE ARE DONE WITH THE
8 PRESENTATION, WE WILL BE ASKING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.

9 THERE'S THREE PARTS TO TODAY'S PRESENTATION AND
10 HEARING. THE FIRST IS THE PRESENTATION ON THE 2016 AQMP
11 AND SECOND YOU'LL HEAR FROM OUR CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES
12 BOARD ON THE STATEWIDE STATE LIMITATION PLAN FOR
13 PRIMARILY MOBILE SOURCES AND THEN ALSO AS REQUIRED BY
14 STATE LAW THE AQMP INCLUDES A CHAPTER ON THE HEALTH
15 EFFECTS. SO THESE REGIONAL HEARINGS SERVE AS HEARINGS
16 FOR THAT STATE-MANDATED ANALYSIS THAT IS PART OF APPENDIX
17 1 OF THE AQMP. SO WE'LL HAVE A BRIEF PRESENTATION ON
18 THAT. AM I MISSING ANYTHING?

19 SO WE'LL GO AHEAD AND GET STARTED WITH THE AQMP
20 ITSELF. AS MANY OF YOU KNOW, WE RELEASED A DRAFT PLAN
21 BACK IN JUNE AND WE REVISED THAT PLAN BASED ON COMMENTS
22 RECEIVED ON AT LEAST THE REVISED DRAFT EARLY IN OCTOBER.
23 SO WE'RE GOING TO TALK ABOUT TODAY THE CONTENTS OF THE
24 REVISED DRAFT AND THEN TOWARDS THE END I'LL TALK ABOUT
25 THE SCHEDULE GOING FORWARD.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MANY OF YOU ARE FAMILIAR WITH THIS, BUT JUST THE
2 CONTEXT WE ALL KNOW THAT AIR QUALITY IN SOUTHERN
3 CALIFORNIA HAS SEEN DRAMATIC IMPROVEMENTS OVER THE PAST
4 SEVEN DECADES BOTH IN TERMS OF OZONE POLLUTION AND
5 PARTICULATE MATTER, PM2.5. HOWEVER, WE STILL EXPERIENCE
6 SOME OF THE WORST AIR QUALITY IN THE NATION BETWEEN SOUTH
7 COAST AIR BASIN AND THE SAN JOAQUIN AND CENTRAL VALLEY
8 WHERE WE DO HAVE THE WORST AIR QUALITY IN THE COUNTRY.
9 SO WE REMAIN IN NONATTAINMENT FOR OZONE AND PM2.5. SO
10 THIS PLAN PRIMARILY ADDRESSES THOSE TWO POLLUTANTS AND A
11 PATHWAY GOING FORWARD FOR ATTAINING THOSE STANDARDS.

12 JUST BY WAY OF BACKGROUND, THE WAY THAT THE
13 PLANS FIT INTO THE CLEAN AIR ACT AND U.S. EPA IS THAT THE
14 EPA SETS THESE NATIONAL AMBIEN AIR QUALITY STANDARDS FOR
15 WHAT THEY CALL CRITERIA POLLUTANTS, AND THESE INCLUDE
16 OZONE AND PM2.5. AND BASED ON THE DATA THAT IS COLLECTED
17 AND MONITORED IN AREAS AROUND THE COUNTRY, AREAS ARE
18 DESIGNATED AS ATTAINMENT OR NON-ATTAINMENT. IF YOU'RE IN
19 NON-ATTAINMENT, A SERIES OF PLANNING REQUIREMENTS KICK IN
20 INCLUDING STATE LIMITATION PLAN, AND THAT STATE
21 LIMITATION, AS I MENTIONED, IS A BLUEPRINT FOR HOW A
22 CERTAIN AREA IS GOING TO REDUCE EMISSIONS IN ORDER TO
23 ATTAIN STANDARDS BY SPECIFIC CLEAN AIR ACT DEADLINES.

24 SO IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA IN THE SOUTH COAST
25 BASIN WE CALL THAT THE AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN WHICH

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FEEDS INTO THE STATE LIMITATION PLAN FOR CALIFORNIA.
2 WE'VE -- STATE LAW ALSO REQUIRES THE AIR QUALITY
3 MANAGEMENT PLAN TO ADDRESS NOT ONLY FEDERAL STANDARDS BUT
4 ALSO STATE AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS. WE ALSO COVER
5 THE SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN FOR THE COACHELLA VALLEY OUT BY
6 PALM SPRINGS AND INDIO.

7 AND THIS WILL BE THE AQMD'S 11TH PLAN DATING
8 BACK TO THE LATE '70S. SO THEN AS I MENTIONED, THE TWO
9 NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS WHICH WE STILL DO
10 ATTAIN ARE PARTICULATE MATTER AND OZONE. AND THE CLEAN
11 AIR ACT REQUIRES ACHIEVE THOSE AS EXPEDITIOUSLY AS
12 PRACTICABLE, WHICH MEANS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. AND SO
13 WHAT WE TRY TO DO IS WE HAVE AN INTEGRATED PLAN. WE HAVE
14 POLLUTANTS THAT CONTRIBUTE BOTH TO PM2.5 AND OZONE. SO
15 WE WANT TO HAVE ONE PLAN THAT WILL ALLOW US TO MEET ALL
16 THE STANDARDS AND NOT HAVE A PIECEMEAL EFFORT WHERE WE DO
17 A CERTAIN SET OF ACTIONS TO MEET ONE STANDARD AND A
18 SEPARATE SET OF ACTIONS THAT MEET THE OTHER STANDARDS.
19 THAT WILL BE VERY INEFFICIENT. SO WE TRY TO IN EACH AQMP
20 TO ADDRESS ALL THE STANDARDS FOR WHICH IT IS DESIGNED TO
21 ACHIEVE.

22 SO YOU CAN SEE HERE ARE THERE DIFFERENT OZONE
23 STANDARDS FOR WHICH WE DO NOT YET ATTAIN, AND YOU CAN SEE
24 THE DIFFERENT LEVELS AND THE ATTAINMENT YEARS OF THE ACT
25 AS WELL AS SUBMITTAL DUE DATE. AND THEN THERE'S TWO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PM2.5 STANDARDS FOR WHICH WE DO NOT YET ATTAIN. AND I
2 WON'T GO INTO DETAIL ON ALL THESE BECAUSE WHAT IS REALLY
3 DRIVING THIS PLAN IS THE OZONE STANDARDS ESPECIALLY THAT
4 2023 DEADLINE FOR THE EXTREME AREA. AND I'LL TALK ABOUT
5 THAT IN A MOMENT. I WILL MENTION THAT THE SIP SUBMITTAL
6 DUE DATES, A COUPLE HAVE PASSED, BUT WE ARE WORKING
7 CLOSELY WITH EPA, CARB, IN TERMS OF GETTING THE PLAN
8 SUBMITTED IN A TIMELY FASHION. WE DON'T FEEL LIKE
9 THERE'S ANY CONSEQUENCES AT THIS POINT IN BEING A LITTLE
10 BIT LATE, AND WE DID WANT TO TAKE THE TIME TO DO IT RIGHT
11 RATHER THAN FAST AND HAVE PLENTY OF OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE
12 PUBLIC INPUT AND COMMENT. SO THAT IS WHY WE'RE DOING
13 THAT. AND I'LL GET INTO THE SCHEDULE TOWARDS THE END.

14 SO THE CHALLENGE IN THE BASIN KIND OF CAN BE
15 NARROWED DOWN IN THIS ONE SLIDE. WHAT I'M SHOWING HERE
16 ARE NOX EMISSIONS AND TONS PER DAY FROM 2012 PROJECTED
17 INTO THE FUTURE. AND NOX EMISSIONS COMBINED WITH
18 COMPOUND EMISSIONS ARE WHAT FORM OZONE IN THE ATMOSPHERE.
19 NOX EMISSIONS ALSO REACT TO FORM A LARGE FRACTION OF THE
20 PARTICULATE MATTER THAT'S IN OUR AIR. AS PART OF THE
21 INTEGRATED PLAN WE KNOW THAT WE NEED NOX REDUCTIONS NOT
22 ONLY TO ATTAIN THE OZONE STANDARDS BUT ALSO TO OBTAIN THE
23 PM2.5 STANDARDS.

24 SO WHAT WE SEE HERE ON THE BLUE BARS IS WHAT WE
25 CALL A BASELINE OR WHAT THE EMISSIONS WILL BE IN THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BASIN GOING FORWARD. IF WE DO NOT IMPLEMENT THIS PLAN,
2 THERE ARE NO ADDITIONAL RULES AND REGULATIONS DEVELOPING.
3 SO YOU CAN SEE BY THE BLUE BARS THAT WE DO GET 50- TO
4 60-PERCENT REDUCTION GOING FORWARD IN NOX EMISSIONS. AND
5 THIS IS ALREADY DUE TO RULES AND REGULATIONS ON MOBILE
6 SOURCES AT THE STATE AND FEDERAL LEVEL. SO WE DO GET
7 EMISSION REDUCTIONS AND WE DO EXPECT TO SEE AIR QUALITY
8 IMPROVEMENT. BUT THE CHALLENGE IS THAT'S NOT ENOUGH. WE
9 NEED TO GET DOWN TO THOSE RED BARS BY 2022, 2023, AND
10 2031 IN ORDER TO ATTAIN THE STANDARDS. SO THAT'S AN
11 ADDITIONAL 43-PERCENT REDUCTION OF NOX EMISSIONS WITH THE
12 NEW RULES AND REGULATIONS BY 2023 AND 55 PERCENT BY 2031.
13 AND THOSE ARE THE TWO OZONE STANDARDS. IF WE'RE ON THAT
14 TRAJECTORY, NOT ONLY WILL WE MEET THE ONE-HOUR STANDARD
15 IN 2022 SHOWN HERE, BUT WE SHOULD ALSO EASILY MEET THE
16 PM2.5 STANDARDS BY OUR DEADLINES IN 2025 AND 2019.

17 SO THE OTHER PIECE OF THIS CHALLENGE IS WHILE
18 NOX EMISSIONS AS IMPORTANT FOR ATTAINING THE STANDARDS
19 FOR THE LOCAL AIR QUALITY AGENCY IN CALIFORNIA, OUR
20 PRIMARY AUTHORITY IS OVER STATIONARY SOURCES NOT MOBILE
21 SOURCES. SO WHEN WE LOOK BACK TO 2012, 88 PERCENT OF NOX
22 EMISSIONS CAME FROM MOBILE SOURCES WHICH ARE THE PRIMARY
23 AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD,
24 WHICH YOU'LL HEAR ABOUT THAT IN A MOMENT, AS WELL AS THE
25 FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. SO THE CHALLENGE IS WE HAVE THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RESPONSIBILITY ON ATTAINING AIR STANDARDS, BUT WE DO HAVE
2 LIMITED AUTHORITY OVER THE MAJORITY OF THE SOURCES
3 CONTRIBUTING TO THE NON-ATTAINMENT PROBLEM.

4 SO WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE CONTENTS OF THE PLAN --
5 AND I ENCOURAGE EVERYBODY TO GO ONLINE AND REVIEW THE
6 PLAN. AND WE HAVE LOTS OF SUMMARIES AND PRESENTATIONS.
7 I'M NOT GOING TO GO INTO ALL THE DETAILS TODAY. WHEN WE
8 LOOK AT THE PLAN, WE LOOK AT THE NOX EMISSIONS NEEDED FOR
9 ATTAINMENT GOING FORWARD. SO THIS IS WHAT WE NEED TO
10 REDUCE; ABOUT BETWEEN 350 AND 400 TONS PER DAY IN 2023
11 AND EVEN MORE IN 2031. YOU CAN SEE THAT THE MAJORITY,
12 ALMOST 70 PERCENT, OF THE EMISSION REDUCTIONS WE NEED FOR
13 ATTAINMENT ARE DUE TO RULES AND REGULATIONS, JUST
14 IMPLEMENTING EXISTING RULES AND REGULATIONS. AND THEN
15 YOU SEE WHAT WE'VE ADDED ON TOP OF THAT ARE WHAT THE NEW
16 REGULATIONS PROPOSED AT THE LOCAL LEVEL AND AT THE STATE
17 LEVEL WITHIN THE PLAN ITSELF, AND IT'S A SMALL SLIVER,
18 BUT WE UPDATE THESE PLANS EVERY THREE TO FOUR YEARS. SO
19 WE INCLUDE WHAT TECHNOLOGY ALLOWS US TO DO IN TERMS OF
20 REGULATORY ACTIONS TO ACHIEVE REDUCTIONS. SO YOU CAN SEE
21 IT'S A SMALL SLIVER, BUT IT'S ACTUALLY A VERY SIMILAR
22 MAGNITUDE TO ALL THE PREVIOUS PLANS WE'VE ADOPTED OVER
23 THE PAST 5 TO 15 TO 20 YEARS.

24 BEYOND THE NEW RULES AND REGULATIONS, WE NEED
25 REDUCTIONS FROM FEDERAL SOURCES. THESE ARE PRIMARILY THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TRAINS AND SHIPS AND THE AIRCRAFT. AND THE STATE
2 STRATEGY INCLUDES REDUCTIONS THAT NECESSARILY HAVE TO
3 COME FROM FEDERAL SOURCES. BUT EVEN AFTER THAT WE STILL
4 HAVE A GAP. AND THIS GAP IS SHOWN IN THE GREEN BAR.
5 THESE ARE REDUCTIONS THAT WOULD NOT FEASIBLY BE ACHIEVED
6 THROUGH REGULATORY ACTIONS, BUT CAN BE ACHIEVED IN
7 COMBINATION WITH LONGER TERM REGULATORY ACTIONS BY
8 PROVIDING INCENTIVES TO CHANGE OUT EQUIPMENT IN A CHANGE
9 OUT OF THE EXISTING FLEETS WHETHER IT'S ON-ROAD OR
10 OFF-ROAD FLEETS. SO REGULATIONS CAN WORK TOWARDS
11 REDUCING TAIL PIPE EMISSIONS AND REDUCING EMISSIONS ON
12 ALL THESE EQUIPMENTS, BUT IT TAKES A LONG TIME FOR THOSE
13 STANDARDS TO KICK IN. BUT WHAT INCENTIVES CAN DO IS
14 ACCELERATE THOSE EMISSION REDUCTIONS BY INCENTIVIZING A
15 MORE RAPID FLEET TURNOVER. SO THIS PLAN DOES HAVE A
16 SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF REDUCTIONS THAT NEED TO COME
17 NECESSARILY THROUGH THOSE TYPES OF ACTIONS.

18 AND, AGAIN, AS I MENTIONED BEFORE, WE AS A
19 LOCAL AGENCY, 88 PERCENT OF THE NOX IN 2012 DID COME FROM
20 MOBILE SOURCES. WE HAVE LIMITED AUTHORITY. WE HAVE SOME
21 AUTHORITY, WHICH I'LL TALK ABOUT IN A MOMENT, BUT
22 NECESSARILY A PLAN SUCH AS THIS THAT REQUIRES SO MANY
23 EMISSION REDUCTIONS FROM ALL THE SOURCES NEEDS TO
24 INTEGRATE NOT JUST LOCAL ACTIONS BUT STATE ACTIONS AS
25 WELL AS FEDERAL ACTIONS.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SO JUST BACK TO STATIONARY SOURCES FOR A
2 MOMENT, AS WE DO IN EVERY PLAN, IT'S BEEN A VERY LONG
3 PROCESS DATING BACK OVER THREE YEARS NOW WHERE WE
4 THOROUGHLY EVALUATE ALL THOSE STATIONARY SOURCE
5 CATEGORIES THAT ARE UNDER OUR PRIMARY AUTHORITY. WE LOOK
6 AT THE EMISSION INVENTORY, WE LOOK AT WHERE THE
7 OPPORTUNITIES ARE FOR ADDITIONAL REDUCTIONS, WE LOOK AT
8 OTHER ACTIONS THAT HAVE BEEN TAKEN WITHIN THE STATE AND
9 OUTSIDE THE STATE OF STATIONARY SOURCES IN TERMS OF
10 STRATEGIES AND REGULATIONS. WE HELD MULTIPLE WORKING
11 GROUPS, WE HAD SEVERAL WHITE PAPERS, WE HELD MEETINGS OF
12 OUR ADVISORY GROUP, WE HELD A CONTROL TECHNOLOGY
13 SYMPOSIUM TO SOLICIT IDEAS. AND AFTER WE LOOKED AT ALL
14 THOSE OPTIONS, WE DID COME UP WITH A ROBUST SET OF
15 ADDITIONAL STATIONARY SOURCE CONTROLS. AND THAT LISTS
16 THE MAJOR CATEGORIES HERE. WE'RE LOOKING AT NOX
17 REDUCTIONS FROM NON-REFINERY FLARING, LOOKING AT NOX
18 CONTROLS FOR PRIMARILY COMMERCIAL COOKING APPLIANCES. WE
19 FOUND SOME OPPORTUNITIES THERE. WE'RE LOOKING AT A
20 RECLAIM PROGRAM WHICH IS OUR CAP AND TRADE PROGRAM FOR
21 NOX EMISSIONS FROM 270 LARGEST INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES.
22 AND WE'RE LOOKING FOR FURTHER REDUCTIONS FROM RECLAIM
23 INCLUDING A POTENTIAL COMMAND CONTROL OPTION FOR RECLAIM
24 GOING FORWARD. WE ARE ALSO LOOKING AT COMMERCIAL AND
25 RESIDENTIAL EQUIPMENT ANYWHERE FROM HOT WATER HEATERS TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SPACE HEATERS TO OTHER TYPES OF EQUIPMENT YOU FIND IN A
2 COMMERCIAL BUILDING OR RESIDENTIAL BUILDING. AND WE'RE
3 ALSO LOOKING TO SEE WHETHER WE CAN REDUCE NOX EMISSIONS
4 FROM DIESEL PUMP GENERATORS WITH SOME ALTERNATIVES THAT
5 HAVE EMERGED FOR BACKUP POWER.

6 BUT ONE THING I WANT TO MENTION IS EVEN IF WE
7 TOOK ALL OUR STATIONARY SOURCES AND ZEROED OUT THEIR
8 EMISSIONS TOMORROW, WHICH OBVIOUSLY IS NOT POSSIBLE, BUT
9 EVEN IF WE DID THAT, WE'RE STILL A LONG WAY FROM
10 ATTAINMENT. SO THAT IS WHY MOBILE SOURCES ARE THE
11 PRIMARY FOCUS OF THESE PLANS.

12 SO ALTHOUGH AQMD DOES NOT HAVE PRIMARY
13 REGULATORY AUTHORITY OVER MOBILE SOURCES, WE DO HAVE SOME
14 AUTHORITY UNDER STATE AND FEDERAL LAW, AND THIS IS
15 GENERALLY REFERRED TO AS INDIRECT SOURCE AUTHORITY AND WE
16 DO HAVE SOME FLEET AUTHORITY. AND THE APPROACH WE'RE
17 TAKING TOWARDS THIS IS TO WORK WITH THE DIFFERENT TYPES
18 OF FACILITIES THAT WOULD COME UNDER THIS AUTHORITY.

19 SO WHAT INDIRECT SOURCE MEANS IS THAT A SOURCE
20 OF A PARTICULAR FACILITY THAT ATTRACTS MOBILE SOURCES
21 SUCH AS THE AIRPORT, A RAIL YARD, A WAREHOUSE
22 DISTRIBUTION CENTER, PORTS, OR EVEN A NEW DEVELOPMENT OR
23 REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS THAT ATTRACT OFF-ROAD AND ON-ROAD
24 SOURCES WE DO HAVE SOME AUTHORITY OVER THEM. IT'S
25 LIMITED AUTHORITY. IT'S AUTHORITY THAT GETS CHALLENGED

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IN THE COURTS ALL THE TIME. SO THE APPROACH WE WANT TO
2 TAKE IS WORK WITH THOSE PARTICULAR INDUSTRIES AND SEE IF
3 WE CAN SET TARGETS AND WORK COLLABORATIVELY TO ACHIEVE
4 NOT ONLY NOX EMISSION REDUCTIONS, BUT NOX EMISSION
5 REDUCTIONS THAT CAN BE CREDITED TO OUR STATE LIMITATION
6 PLAN AND OUR AQMP THROUGH THE COURSE OF THE PLAN.

7 SO WE WANT TO TAKE ABOUT A YEAR APPROACH TO
8 MEET WITH WORKING GROUPS IN THESE DIFFERENT INDUSTRIES
9 AND IDENTIFY THE BEST PRACTICES AND WHAT CAN BE DONE AND
10 SEE IF WE CAN DEVELOP MECHANISMS TO MAKE THEM CREDITABLE.
11 BUT IF THAT DOESN'T YIELD RESULTS IN THAT TIME FRAME,
12 THEN WE MAY NEED TO PIVOT TO REGULATIONS IF NEEDED.

13 SO WE HAVE SEVERAL MEASURES IN THE PLAN THAT
14 LOOK AT THIS, BUT I DO WANT TO MENTION THAT THE EMISSION
15 REDUCTIONS THAT THESE TYPES OF MEASURES WOULD ACHIEVE ARE
16 EMISSION REDUCTIONS THAT ARE ALREADY COMMITTED TO BY THE
17 STATE. AND WHAT THESE MEASURES ATTEMPT TO DO IS HELP
18 FACILITATE THOSE EMISSION REDUCTIONS THROUGH HELPING THE
19 STATE IMPLEMENT STRATEGIES TO ACHIEVE THOSE EMISSION
20 REDUCTIONS.

21 SO AS I MENTIONED BEFORE, WE RELEASED A DRAFT
22 PLAN IN JUNE AND RECEIVED 69 COMMENT LETTERS. AND BASED
23 ON THOSE COMMENTS AND AS WELL AS MEETINGS AND ADVISORY
24 GROUP MEETINGS, WORKING GROUP MEETINGS, WE DID MAKE SOME
25 SIGNIFICANT REVISIONS TO THE PLAN. WE DID ADD ADDITIONAL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PRIORITY ON USING ZERO EMISSION TECHNOLOGY WHERE COST
2 EFFECTIVE AND FEASIBLE BUT IN AREAS WHERE IT'S NOT YET
3 COST EFFECTIVE AND FEASIBLE, NEAR-ZERO EMISSION
4 TECHNOLOGY. AND WE RECOGNIZE THAT DEFINITION OF ZERO AND
5 NEAR ZERO MEANS TO LOOK AT TOTAL LIFE CYCLE EMISSIONS
6 ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF ENERGY OPTIONS AND
7 EMISSIONS OPTION. SO YOU'LL FIND THAT THROUGHOUT THE
8 PLAN IN SEVERAL MEASURES. WE DID ADD ADDITIONAL
9 REGULATORY MEASURES IN TERMS OF INTERNAL COMBUSTION
10 PRIMARILY DIESEL GENERATORS, AS I MENTIONED, AND THEN
11 LONGER TERM REGULATORY ACTIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL AND
12 COMMERCIAL APPLIANCES.

13 WE DO KNOW THAT INCENTIVES ARE NEEDED TO MEET
14 THE ADVANCEMENT OF THESE TECHNOLOGIES SO WE HAVE A LITTLE
15 BIT OF CLARITY ON WHAT WE MEAN BY THAT. AND THEN AS I
16 MENTIONED BEFORE, WE ARE COMMITTING TO A SIGNIFICANT
17 REDUCTION IN NOX FROM OUR LARGEST STATIONARY SOURCES UP
18 TO 5 TONS PER DAY AND WE INTEND TO VERY SOON ENGAGE IN AN
19 ANALYSIS WHICH WILL HELP US DECIDE WHETHER TO GO FORWARD
20 WITH RECLAIM AND SERIOUSLY CONSIDER WHETHER REPLACING IT
21 WITH A MORE COMMAND AND CONTROL REGULATORY STRUCTURE IS
22 THE MOST EFFICIENT WAY TO ACHIEVE THOSE EMISSION
23 REDUCTIONS.

24 WE DEFINITELY ADDED CLARITY AND CERTAINTY AND
25 TIME LINES TO THE FACILITY-BASED MEASURES BASED ON

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COMMENTS RECEIVED, ADDITIONAL CLARITY ON THE FLEET RULE
2 AUTHORITY THAT WE HAVE AS WELL AS UPDATED DATA, EMISSION
3 INVENTORY MODELING AND ALL THE TECHNICAL DETAILS THAT GO
4 INTO THE PLAN.

5 SO WHEN WE TALK ABOUT THE INCENTIVES THAT ARE
6 GOING TO BE NEEDED TO ACCELERATE EARLY DEPLOYMENT OF
7 THESE TECHNOLOGIES, THE TECHNOLOGIES THAT HAVE BEEN
8 DEVELOPED RECENTLY ALLOW US TO NOT ONLY SPECIFY SOME
9 SPECIFIC PATHWAYS TO GET THE EMISSION REDUCTIONS THAT WE
10 NEED, IT ALSO ALLOWS US TO MODIFY IT. SO IN PAST PLANS
11 WE'VE USED BLACK BOX. THE CLEAN AIR ACT ALLOWS US NOT TO
12 BE SPECIFIC ABOUT A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF EMISSION REDUCTIONS
13 THAT ARE NEEDED FOR ATTAINMENT. BUT SINCE WE'RE ONLY SIX
14 OR SEVEN YEARS AWAY FROM ATTAINMENT DEADLINES FOR THIS
15 PLAN, WE'RE TRYING TO BE AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE ABOUT
16 THE TECHNOLOGY THAT WE NEED, TECHNOLOGIES THAT EXIST, AND
17 WHAT IT'S GOING TO TAKE TO GET THOSE TECHNOLOGIES OUT
18 THERE.

19 SO THIS IS ONE OF THE INNOVATIVE PARTS OF THIS
20 PLAN THAT WE'RE NO LONGER PUTTING EVERYTHING IN THE BLACK
21 BOX. WE ARE SPECIFYING EXACTLY WHAT IT'S GOING TO TAKE
22 TO GET TO ATTAINMENT. BUT WHAT IT'S GOING TO TAKE IS A
23 SIGNIFICANT EXPANSION OF THE INCENTIVE PROGRAM TO GET
24 THAT FLEET TURNOVER, AND WE CALCULATE THAT TO BE ROUGHLY
25 ABOUT \$14 BILLION OVER THE NEXT 7 TO 15 YEARS. AND

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THAT'S ROUGHLY ABOUT A BILLION A YEAR. MOST OF THAT WE
2 KNOW IS GOING TO BE MOST COST EFFECTIVE IN THE MOBILE
3 SOURCE SECTOR. ALTHOUGH WE DO FEEL LIKE THERE WILL BE
4 SOME COST-EFFECTIVE OPPORTUNITIES ON THE STATIONARY
5 SOURCE SECTOR ESPECIALLY RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL, AND
6 SMALL BUSINESSES. AND WE LOOK FORWARD TO THE CAPITAL
7 INVESTMENT TO BE ABLE TO CHANGE OUT TO CLEANER
8 TECHNOLOGY.

9 IN THE AQMP THERE ARE SOME RELATED DOCUMENTS AS
10 A PROJECT WE DO CREATE A DRAFT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL
11 IMPACT REPORT UNDER CEQA. WE RELEASED THAT ON SEPTEMBER
12 16TH FOR A 60-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT REVIEW PERIOD, WHICH I
13 THINK ENDS TODAY. THAT HAS BEEN OUT, AND WE TALKED ABOUT
14 THAT AT SOME OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS. WE ALSO DO A
15 SOCIOECONOMIC PLAN WHICH LOOKS AT THE COST OF THE PLAN AS
16 WELL AS THE BENEFITS OF THE PLAN. SO WE HAVE BEEN
17 WORKING HARD ON THAT, AND WE HAVE BEEN RELEASING CHAPTERS
18 AS WE HAVE BEEN COMPLETING THEM. WE RELEASED THE COST
19 AND BENEFITS ANALYSIS ON AUGUST 31ST. WE RELEASED THE
20 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE IMPACT SECTION IN SEPTEMBER AND
21 THEN WE PUT IT IN A REGIONAL ECONOMIC MODELING OF THE JOB
22 IMPACTS, SUBREGIONAL JOB IMPACTS, AND ALSO IMPACTS FROM
23 CEQA. WE RELEASED THAT AT THE BEGINNING OF THIS MONTH.
24 SO WE'RE UPDATING SOME OF THOSE CHAPTERS AND WILL BE
25 COMPLETING THAT AND HAVE EVERYTHING OUT UPDATED SOMETIME

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THIS MONTH.

2 IN ADDITION, WHAT'S NEW FOR THIS PLAN WE'RE
3 ALSO WORKING ON AN ACTION PLAN FOR SECURING THE NEEDED
4 INCENTIVE FUNDING. AND SO JUST TO TALK A LITTLE ABOUT
5 RELATED DOCUMENTS, I WON'T GO INTO CEQA IN DETAIL. BUT
6 WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE COST AND BENEFITS OF THE PLAN, YOU
7 COULD SEE THAT THE TOTAL INCREMENTAL COST OF THE PLAN IS
8 ABOUT \$15 BILLION OVER THAT 15-YEAR PERIOD IN 2031, AND
9 THAT COMES OUT TO BE \$1.4 BILLION PER YEAR.

10 AS YOU CAN SEE, A LARGE PORTION OF THAT IS
11 INCENTIVE FUNDING THAT IS ASSUMED TO COME FROM PUBLIC
12 SOURCES, BUT THERE IS SOME OTHER COST THAT WILL NOT BORN
13 BY PUBLIC INCENTIVE FUNDINGS AS YOU CAN SEE HERE. YOU
14 CAN ALSO SEE SOME OF THE MEASURES THAT ARE BEING PROPOSED
15 WHICH ARE ACTUALLY A COST SAVINGS DUE TO FUEL SAVINGS OF
16 GOING FORWARD.

17 SO OUR SOCIOECONOMIC PLAN WE CAN GO INTO MORE
18 DETAILS IF THERE'S ANY QUESTIONS. WE HAVE STAFF HERE
19 THAT CAN ANSWER IN MORE DETAIL. BUT WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE
20 HEALTH BENEFITS OF THE PLAN, THEY DO OUTWEIGH THE COSTS
21 LARGELY DUE TO THE AVOIDED PREMATURE DEATHS FROM
22 REDUCTION IN PARTICULATE MATTER. BUT THE OVERALL PUBLIC
23 HEALTH BENEFIT IN THAT TIME PERIOD IN THE FOUR-COUNTY
24 REGION IS ABOUT IS 256 BILLION. OBVIOUSLY A LOT LARGER
25 THAN THE 15 BILLION IN COSTS. IT COMES OUT TO ABOUT 24

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BILLION A YEAR IN PUBLIC HEALTH BENEFITS. AS I
2 MENTIONED, IT'S LARGELY ASSOCIATED TO THE LOWERING OF
3 PREMATURE DEATHS DUE TO THE REDUCTION IN PM2.5. BUT IT
4 ALSO INCLUDES MORBIDITY EFFECTS, LESS HOSPITAL VISITS,
5 LESS OFF-WORK DAYS, AND OTHER IMPACTS SUCH AS THAT.

6 FINALLY, WE ALSO, YOU KNOW, ARE GETTING A LOT OF
7 COMMENTS THAT THIS PLAN, OBVIOUSLY, ATTAINMENT RELIES ON
8 SECURING A LARGE AMOUNT OF INCENTIVE FUNDINGS. SO PEOPLE
9 WANT TO KNOW HOW ARE YOU GOING TO SECURE THAT FUNDING, IS
10 IT REALISTIC? SO WHAT WE'RE DOING IS DEVELOPING AN
11 ACTION PLAN THAT WILL BE COME TO OUR BOARD IN PARALLEL
12 WITH THE AQMP, AND WE'RE IDENTIFYING A PROCESS TO SECURE
13 THAT INCENTIVE FUNDINGS. THAT PROCESS IS ALREADY BEING
14 DONE IN MANY CASES. SO THAT PLAN WILL INCLUDE SOME
15 BACKGROUND, TALK ABOUT EXISTING FUNDING PROGRAMS,
16 POTENTIAL NEW FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES, AND THEN HOW
17 DISTRICT STAFF WILL MOVE FORWARD TRYING TO PURSUE THAT
18 FUNDING AND THEN ALSO SCHEDULE AND REPORTING BACK TO OUR
19 GOVERNING BOARD.

20 SO WE DO HAVE IN CHAPTER 4 A DISCUSSION OF THE
21 LEVEL OF FUNDING NEEDED. AND I MENTIONED \$14 BILLION PER
22 YEAR ALREADY. BUT IT'S NOT ALL GOING TO COME FROM ONE
23 SOURCE. IT'S GOING TO NECESSARILY COME FROM MULTIPLE
24 SOURCES. AND WE HOPE THAT WILL INCLUDE ACTION AT THE
25 LOCAL AND REGIONAL LEVEL AS WELL AS STATE AND NATIONAL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LEVEL .

2 AND SOME EXAMPLES WE'VE BEEN TALKING ABOUT --
3 AND, AGAIN, NOTHING IS SET IN STONE. THESE ARE JUST
4 IDEAS. THESE ARE ALL OPTIONS HERE ON THE TABLE. ALL OF
5 THESE OPTIONS ARE BEING EVALUATED, AND THEY INCLUDE THIS
6 LIST OF EXPANDING EXISTING INCENTIVE FUNDING ALL OF WHICH
7 ARE LISTED HERE AND THEN NEW POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES AS
8 LISTED BELOW. WE DON'T NEED TO GO INTO DETAIL NOW. BUT
9 IF ANYONE HAS ANY QUESTIONS, WE CAN GO INTO DETAILS.

10 AND THEN IN TERMS OF ACTIVITIES, WE NEED TO
11 ANALYZE OUR AUTHORITY AND AUTHORITIES AT THE STATE IN
12 TERMS OF SECURING FUNDING THROUGH FEES AND OTHER REVENUE
13 AUTHORITIES. WE WANT TO FORM A STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP
14 TO BUILD A COALITION OF SUPPORT FOR SECURING FUNDING.
15 WE'VE ALREADY STARTED THAT AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL IN TERMS
16 OF A NATIONAL COLLABORATIVE WORKING WITH NATIONAL
17 ASSOCIATION OF CLEAN AIR AGENCIES. THERE'S GOING TO BE A
18 LOT OF OTHER AREAS WITH THE NEW OZONE STANDARD THAT ARE
19 GOING TO BE NONATTAINMENT. WE'RE TRYING TO GET PRIVATE
20 SECTOR SUPPORT AS WELL AS OTHER NON-GOVERNMENTAL
21 ORGANIZATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS AS WELL. AND ALSO
22 AT THE STATE LEVEL WORKING WITH CALIFORNIA AIR POLLUTION
23 CONTROL OFFICE ASSOCIATION AND OTHER PRIVATE
24 PARTNERSHIPS.

25 JUST AN UPDATE OF WHERE WE ARE IN TERMS OF

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MAKING DEVELOPMENT. AS I MENTIONED, WE RELEASED THE
2 DRAFT IN JUNE AND REVISED DRAFT IN OCTOBER. AND THE
3 TECHNICAL APPENDICES HAVE ALL BEEN POSTED ONLINE. AT
4 THIS POINT THERE ARE SOME MINOR TECHNICAL UPDATES THAT
5 WE'RE MAKING AS FAR AS INVENTORY MODELING. AND AS WE DO
6 MAJOR REVISIONS, WE POST THE SUMMARY OF THOSE MAJOR
7 REVISIONS. WE HAVE A DRAFT CHANGES VERSION ONLINE
8 BETWEEN THE REVISED DRAFT AND FINAL DRAFT. SO FAR WE'VE
9 RECEIVED 69 LETTERS ON THE REVISED DRAFT, BUT I THINK
10 THAT'S GONE UP TO -- WE HAD 30 AT THIS POINT. WE DID
11 HAVE A NUMBER OF POSTDATE FOR THOSE COMMENTS. SO WE'RE
12 LOOKING AT THOSE 30 LETTERS AS WE SPEAK. AND OUR PLAN IN
13 EARLY DECEMBER IS TO RELEASE A DRAFT FINAL THAT TAKES
14 INTO ACCOUNT THOSE STATUS COMMENTS THAT WE RECEIVED.
15 WE HAVE ONGOING ADVISORY MEETINGS, REGIONAL STAKEHOLDER
16 MEETINGS. WE'VE HAD OVER 163 ADVISORY STAKEHOLDER
17 MEETINGS THROUGH THIS WHOLE PLANNING PROCESS OVER THE
18 PAST TWO OR THREE YEARS.

19 JUST TO LOOK AT THE SCHEDULE IN DRAFT FORM, YOU
20 CAN SEE THAT WE'RE SCHEDULING -- WE'RE HOPING TO GET TO
21 OUR BOARD IN FEBRUARY FOR BOARD CONSIDERATION AND WE'RE
22 HOPING TO RELEASE THIS DRAFT FINAL IN THE BEGINNING OF
23 DECEMBER FOR A FINAL 60-DAY REVIEW PERIOD BEFORE OUR
24 BOARD CONSIDERATION.

25 AND HERE'S OUR PUBLIC WORKSHOP SCHEDULE. THESE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ARE ACTUALLY PUBLIC HEARINGS NOT WORKSHOPS. AS I
2 MENTIONED BEFORE, TRANSCRIPTS ARE ACTUALLY BEING TAKEN.
3 AND THIS IS THE FIRST. AND WE'LL BE GOING TO CARSON THIS
4 AFTERNOON AND THEN ON THURSDAY TWO LOCATIONS IN THE
5 INLAND EMPIRE.

6 SO IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, FEEL FREE TO
7 CONTACT ME, PHILIP FINE. OUR PLANNING MANAGER IN CHARGE
8 OF THE PLAN IS MICHAEL KRAUSE, WHO IS ALSO HERE.

9 AND THAT WRAPS UP THE PRESENTATION. I THINK --
10 I'D LIKE TO GO TO THE OTHER PRESENTATION BEFORE WE TAKE
11 COMMENT. SO WITH THAT I'LL HAND IT OVER TO SYLVIA
12 VANDERSPEK FROM THE CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD.

13 MS. VANDERSPEK: OKAY. THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING.
14 SO QUICKLY MY NAME IS SYLVIA VANDERSPEK, AND I'M WITH THE
15 AIR RESOURCES BOARD. SO TODAY I'M HERE TO UPDATE YOU ON
16 THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD STATE SIP STRATEGY AND HOW IT
17 FITS WITHIN THE AQMP ALONG WITH THE NEXT STEPS THAT WE'RE
18 GOING THROUGH AT THE SAME TIME.

19 SO WHAT IS THE STATE SIP STRATEGY? BASICALLY
20 WHAT IT IS IS THE AIR RESOURCE BOARD'S REDUCTIONS FROM
21 MOBILE SOURCES AND CONSUMER PRODUCTS TO MEET AIR QUALITY
22 STANDARDS THROUGHOUT THE STATE AND PROVIDE HEALTHFUL AIR.
23 AS PHIL DISCUSSED EARLIER, MOBILE SOURCES ARE A
24 SIGNIFICANT PART OF THE AIR QUALITY PROBLEM HERE IN THE
25 SOUTH COAST. SO WE NEED TO MAKE SURE WE ADDRESS THIS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SOURCE.

2 SO WHAT DOES THE STATE SIP STRATEGY HAVE? WELL,
3 IT HAS A LIST OF MEASURES AS WELL AS AN AGGREGATE
4 COMMITMENT AT THE END. SO THAT IS OUR COMMITMENT NOT
5 ONLY TO THE SOUTH COAST, BUT OTHER AREAS THROUGHOUT THE
6 STATE ALSO. SO WHAT WE DO IS WE HAVE AN AGGREGATE
7 EMISSION REDUCTION COMMITMENT THAT SPECIFIES THE NUMBER
8 THAT WE HAVE TO MEET BY A DATE CERTAIN. FOR SOUTH COAST
9 WE ARE COMMITTING TO 97 TONS OF NOX AND 60 TONS OF ROG
10 FOR THE 2031 COMMITMENT. AND THEN THE SECOND PIECE OF
11 THAT COMMITMENT IS THAT WE ARE GOING TO PURSUE A LIST OF
12 MEASURES.

13 SO THE SECOND PART OF THE COMMITMENT IS ACTUALLY
14 ACTIONS BY A CERTAIN DATE THAT WE ARE COMMITTING TO
15 FOLLOW THROUGH WITH EPA. AND THE REASON THAT WE DO IT
16 THIS WAY IS THAT MANY TIMES AS YOU'RE GOING THROUGH THE
17 REGULATORY PROCESS AND EACH OF THESE MEASURES IN THIS
18 LIST WILL GO THROUGH ITS OWN REGULATORY PROCESS. THINGS
19 CHANGE SO YOU COULD GET MORE OR LESS EMISSION REDUCTIONS
20 THAN IS ORIGINALLY THOUGHT. SO WE'VE GOTTEN THIS PROOF
21 THROUGH EPA, AND IT HAS STOOD THE TEST OF TIME. SO ONCE
22 IT GOES TO EPA AS PART OF THIS AQMP, THEN IT BECOMES
23 FEDERALLY ENFORCEABLE. SO EACH OF THOSE ACTION DATES
24 THAT WE SPECIFY IS TECHNICALLY AN ENFORCEABLE COMMITMENT.

25 SO WHAT ARE WE DOING HERE? WELL, ARB HAS A LONG

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HISTORY OF REDUCING EMISSIONS FROM MOBILE SOURCES, AND WE
2 HAVE A WELL-ESTABLISHED BLUEPRINT IN PLACE. FIRST OF
3 ALL, WE ESTABLISHED CLEANER ENGINE STANDARDS. SO ONE OF
4 THE THINGS BEFORE -- I WANT TO STEP BACK JUST ONE SECOND.
5 SO THIS STATE STRATEGY ACTUALLY LOOKS AT ALL OUR
6 SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS AND THE BLUEPRINT FROM THE PAST, AND
7 WE ARE TARGETING ALL OF THE SOURCE AND MAKING SURE THAT
8 WE'RE ADDRESSING ALL OF THESE ELEMENTS THAT WE'RE GOING
9 TO BE TALKING ABOUT.

10 SO, AGAIN, YOU KNOW, CLEANER ENGINE STANDARDS,
11 WE'VE GOT LOW NOX STANDARDS FOR TRUCKS, AND WE'RE ALSO
12 PROPOSING SOME STANDARDS FOR THE FEDERAL SOURCES. THE
13 NEXT THING IS THAT WE'RE TRYING TO INCREASE THE
14 PENETRATION OF ZERO EMISSION TECHNOLOGY WHERE IT'S
15 FEASIBLE. AS YOU KNOW RIGHT NOW, ZERO EMISSION
16 TECHNOLOGY IS HERE. IT'S JUST A MATTER OF GETTING OUT
17 THE FLEET AND GETTING USED IN PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS.
18 ONCE THESE ENGINES THAT ARE OUT THERE WHAT'S REALLY
19 IMPORTANT IS TO ENSURE THAT THEY'RE DURABLE. SO WE HAVE
20 MANY MEASURES IN HERE THAT ENSURE THAT EMISSIONS REMAIN
21 DURABLE THROUGHOUT THE LIFE OF AN ENGINE OR A VEHICLE.

22 WE'RE PLANNING ON EXPANDING THE USE OF CLEANER
23 FUELS. THERE'S A LOW DIESEL MEASURE IN THIS PLAN. THIS
24 PLAN TARGETS SOME OF THE OLDER TYPE EQUIPMENT THAT --
25 LIKE FOR FEDERAL SOURCES AND OLDER TRUCKS, AND THAT'S

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WHAT IT'S REALLY FOCUSING ON.

2 AND THEN PART OF WHAT WE HAVE DONE FOR MANY
3 YEARS IS PILOT STUDIES. PILOT STUDIES HELP US GAUGE
4 WHETHER A TECHNOLOGY IS FEASIBLE IN AN APPLICATION. AND
5 IT'S VERY IMPORTANT. SO IT'S KEY TO DO WHAT WE'RE DOING
6 HERE. AND THEN FINALLY INCENTIVIZING THE DEPLOYMENT OF
7 THE CLEANEST TECHNOLOGY. WE'RE WORKING THE SOUTH COAST
8 TO DEVELOP A FUNDING PLAN. AND THEN AS ALSO PART OF IT
9 OUR MOBILE SOURCE ACTIONS. THE STATE SIP STRATEGY
10 INCLUDES FOR FURTHER DEPLOYMENT. AND THEY'RE REALLY JUST
11 FOR THE SOUTH COAST. AS PHIL SAID EARLIER, WHAT WE DON'T
12 HAVE THE -- WE'RE ALLOWED THIS UNDER THE CLEAN AIR ACT.
13 WE DON'T ACTUALLY HAVE THE FUNDING OR THE REGULATIONS IN
14 PLACE, BUT WHAT IT IS THERE'S EMISSION REDUCTIONS THAT WE
15 CAN GO AFTER IF THE TECHNOLOGY BECOMES FEASIBLE WE CAN
16 DEVELOP REGULATIONS FOR IT, WE CAN INCENTIVIZE FOR OTHER
17 TECHNOLOGIES.

18 SO WHAT ARE THE EMISSION REDUCTIONS FOR THE SOUTH
19 COAST IN THIS PLAN? AS I SAID EARLIER, WE'RE PROVIDING
20 97 TONS OF NOX EMISSIONS AND 60 TONS OF ROGS EMISSIONS.
21 ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE DO WANT TO SHOW IS THAT ARB IS
22 CURRENTLY IMPLEMENTING MANY PROGRAMS, AND THE
23 IMPLEMENTATION OF THOSE PROGRAMS ARE PROVIDING
24 SIGNIFICANT EMISSION REDUCTIONS. SO, IN FACT, WHEN YOU
25 LOOK AT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CURRENT PROGRAM AND THE NEW

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REGULATIONS THAT WE'RE PROPOSING HERE, IT'S 80 PERCENT.
2 SO 80 PERCENT OF THE EMISSION REDUCTIONS FROM TODAY TO
3 2031 ARE COMING FROM REGULATIONS.

4 SO WE JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE WE HIGHLIGHT IT IS
5 THE CORE OF STRATEGY AND WHAT INCENTIVES ARE FOR IS FOR
6 THAT LAST INCREMENT TO GET THE EARLY TURNOVER OF
7 TECHNOLOGY. SO WHEN YOU LOOK AT THIS CHART, IT SHOWS
8 FROM THE LIGHT DUTY VEHICLES THAT 93 PERCENT ARE COMING
9 FROM REGULATIONS. FOR HEAVY DUTY VEHICLES 88 PERCENT.
10 YOU KNOW, UNFORTUNATELY WHEN YOU LOOK FEDERAL SOURCES,
11 THAT'S 46 PERCENT. WE DON'T HAVE CONTROL OVER THE
12 FEDERAL SOURCES, BUT WE DEFINITELY THINK THAT INCENTIVES
13 ARE A VERY ECONOMICAL WAY TO TURN THAT EQUIPMENT OVER.
14 AND THEN OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT WE HAVE A LITTLE MORE
15 AUTHORITY, SO 71 PERCENT OF THE REDUCTIONS COME FROM
16 THAT.

17 SO WHAT ARE WE DOING MOVING FORWARD HERE? WELL,
18 BASICALLY WE WILL BE RELEASING A DOCUMENT ALSO IN
19 DECEMBER, AND ACTUALLY WE WILL BE RELEASING TWO
20 DOCUMENTS. ONE IS OUR STATE SIP STRATEGY. AND THEN
21 ALONG WITH THE SOUTH COAST SIP, THERE WILL BE A STATE SIP
22 ELEMENT WITH OUR COMMITMENT FOR THEIR REGION IN THEIR
23 PLAN.

24 SO THE CHANGES THAT WE'RE CURRENTLY MAKING ARE
25 SOME INVENTORY UPDATES WHERE WE FOUND OUT SOME NEW

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 INFORMATION REGARDING LOCOMOTIVES AND AIRCRAFT. AND
2 WE'VE ALSO GONE THROUGH AN EXTENSIVE PUBLIC PROCESS.
3 WE'VE HAD TWO BOARD MEETINGS, WE'VE HAD A LOT OF
4 STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS. SO WE ARE MAKING SOME CHANGES
5 BASED ON THAT STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT. ONE OF OUR
6 MEASURES, ADVANCED CLEAN AIR TRANSIT, WE'RE GOING TO MAKE
7 SURE THAT TRANSIT INFRASTRUCTURE ISSUES ARE ADDRESSED
8 ESPECIALLY IN DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES.

9 FOR OUR LAST MILE DELIVERY MEASURE, WE PLAN ON
10 ADDRESSING FLEET PURCHASING REQUIREMENTS AND MAKING SURE
11 THAT THESE ELECTRIC VEHICLES FOR THIS SECTOR ARE OUT
12 THERE. FOR THE SMALL OFF-ROAD ENGINES LIKE THINGS LIKE
13 LAWN AND GARDEN EQUIPMENT, WE'RE GOING TO FOCUS ON "ZEBS"
14 ENCOURAGING "ZEBS" TO BE OUT THERE. FOR CONSUMER
15 PRODUCTS WE'RE PROVIDING MORE FLEXIBILITY TO THE CONSUMER
16 PRODUCTS INDUSTRY. AND THEN ALSO WE'RE ADDRESSING SOME
17 ISSUES FOR THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY. WE'RE GOING TO BE
18 QUANTIFYING MORE REDUCTIONS IN THE FUTURE FOR THE AIR
19 POLLUTION PROBLEM.

20 SO ONCE WE PUT THIS DRAFT DOWN THE STREET, WE
21 ALSO PLAN ON TAKING THIS TO OUR BOARD. SINCE THE SOUTH
22 COAST BOARD IN THEIR CURRENT SCHEDULE IS GOING IN
23 FEBRUARY, THEN WE WILL BE TAKING THE STATE SIP STRATEGY
24 ALONG WITH OUR COMMIT FOR THEM AT THE MARCH HEARING.

25 SO THAT'S CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION. IF YOU

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WOULD LIKE TO CONTACT ANY OF US, THE STAFF PERSON IN
2 CHARGE IS KIRSTEN CAYABYAB AND THEN CAROL SUTKUS IS THE
3 MANAGER. THIS DOCUMENT CAN BE REACHED ON OUR WEB PAGE.
4 AND, AGAIN, WE WILL BE UPDATING IT AT THE FIRST PART OF
5 DECEMBER.

6 DR. FINE: SO, FINALLY, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A
7 BRIEF PRESENTATION ON OUR APPENDIX 1 OF OUR AQMP WHICH
8 DEALS WITH HEALTH EFFECTS OF POLLUTION IN THE BASIN.

9 DR. GHOSH: GOOD MORNING. SO THIS IS THE
10 PRESENTATION ON APPENDIX 1 HEALTH EFFECTS. SO SIMILAR TO
11 PREVIOUS YEARS, THIS APPENDIX INVOLVES SOME HEALTH
12 EFFECTS ORGANIZED BY CRITERIA POLLUTANTS. SO THERE'S A
13 BRIEF SECTION ON OZONE, ON PM, AND SO ON. THERE'S ALSO A
14 BRIEF SECTION ON TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS. AND THE MAIN
15 PURPOSE OF THIS HEALTH EFFECTS APPENDIX IS TO PRESENT
16 THIS VERY BRIEF SUMMARY. WE'RE NOT GENERATING NEW
17 SCIENCE HERE. WE'RE REALLY JUST SUMMARIZING REVIEWS
18 CONDUCTED BY OTHERS.

19 WE PRIMARILY DRAW FROM REVIEWS FROM US EPA AND
20 OTHER SCIENTIFIC AGENCIES. BUT IN ADDITION TO THAT,
21 BECAUSE OBVIOUSLY THESE LARGE REVIEWS DON'T OCCUR EVERY
22 YEAR, WE ALSO CONDUCTED A SUPPLEMENTARY LITERATURE REVIEW
23 TO LOOK SPECIFICALLY FOR ARTICLES THAT WERE PUBLISHED
24 SINCE THE LATEST U.S. EPA REVIEW. FOR EXAMPLE, THE
25 LATEST SCIENCE ASSESSMENT FOR PARTICULATE MATTER DONE BY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE EPA WAS THIS LAST 2009. ALSO, THERE'S A LOT OF
2 SCIENCE THAT'S COME OUT SINCE THEN. THESE SUPPLEMENTAL
3 LITERATURE REVIEWS TRY TO ADDRESS SOME OF THIS MORE
4 RECENT LITERATURE.

5 SO THIS SLIDE DISCUSSES SOME OF THE STATUTORY
6 REQUIREMENTS. FIRST THIS APPENDIX WAS PREPARED IN
7 CONJUNCTION WITH THE PUBLIC HEALTH AGENCY, WHICH IS
8 REQUIRED BY THE HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE. THE PUBLIC
9 HEALTH AGENCY THAT THIS WAS PREPARED WITH WAS OEHHA.
10 THAT'S THE CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT.
11 AND OF COURSE WE ALSO PREPARED THIS IN CONSULTATION WITH
12 THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD AS WELL.

13 FOR THIS APPENDIX AN ADVISORY COUNCIL IS ALSO
14 REQUIRED BY HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE. IT WAS FORMED WITH
15 MEMBERS SELECTED BY THE GOVERNING BOARD AND AQMD
16 ADVISORY GROUPS. THIS ADVISORY COUNCIL CONVENE -- I
17 APOLOGIZE. IT SHOULD BE THE ADVISORY COUNCIL CONVENE ON
18 AUGUST OF 2016. WE HAVE TO GET THAT CORRECTED. AND AT
19 THIS MEETING THE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS REVIEWED AND
20 DISCUSSED APPENDIX 1. THERE WERE MINUTES TAKEN FROM THIS
21 MEETING. OF COURSE WE CERTAINLY USED THOSE MINUTES AND
22 INCORPORATED COMMENTS THAT WERE MADE AT THAT TIME. WE
23 ALSO RECEIVED PUBLIC COMMENTS DURING THAT MEETING AS
24 WELL.

25 SO THE PIECE THAT IS REQUIRED BY HEALTH AND

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SAFETY CODE REALLY JUST IS THE PIECE ON PARTICULATE
2 MATTER IN THE SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN. BUT IN ADDITION TO
3 THAT, WE ALSO INCLUDE SUMMARY OF HEALTH EFFECTS OF THE
4 OTHER MAJOR POLLUTANTS AS WELL.

5 SO I WANTED TO GO THROUGH A COUPLE OF THE MAIN
6 CHANGES THAT WERE MADE IN THIS APPENDIX SINCE THE
7 PREVIOUS VERSION OF THE AQMP. AND ONE OF THE MAIN PIECES
8 WAS REALLY JUST CLARIFYING THE PURPOSE OF THE DOCUMENT
9 AND ALSO THE METHODS THAT WE USED TO PUT THIS DOCUMENT
10 TOGETHER. SO THIS IS CLARIFYING THE INTRODUCTORY, THE
11 INTRODUCTION SECTION OF THE APPENDIX.

12 SO, AGAIN, BRIEFLY THE PURPOSE IS TO PROVIDE A
13 BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE EFFECTS OBSERVED AND ATTRIBUTED TO
14 THE VARIOUS AIR POLLUTANTS AND THE DESCRIBED HEALTH
15 IMPACTS OF PARTICULATE. AND WE DO HAVE A GREATER FOCUS
16 ON OZONE AND PARTICULATE MATTER SO THE SECTIONS ON OZONE
17 AND PARTICULATE MATTER ARE FAR MORE DETAILED. WE DISCUSS
18 SPECIFIC STUDIES IN MUCH GREATER DETAIL IN TERMS OF THE
19 POTENTIAL HEALTH EFFECTS OF THESE POLLUTANTS. AND THE
20 REASON BEING, OF COURSE, WE ARE NONATTAINMENT FOR THESE
21 POLLUTANTS AND, OF COURSE, THERE MAY BE GREATER CONCERN
22 FOR THE POTENTIAL HEALTH IMPACTS OF THOSE POLLUTANTS IN
23 OUR REGION.

24 THE EPA REVIEWS A LARGE BODY OF SCIENTIFIC
25 EVIDENCE, AND THIS INCLUDES DIFFERENT KINDS OF STUDIES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SO THERE'S TOXICOLOGICAL STUDIES, EPIDEMIOLOGICAL
2 STUDIES, AND ALSO HUMAN EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES AS WELL.
3 AND SO IN THEIR INTEGRATED SCIENCE ASSESSMENT THEY LOOK
4 AT ALL THESE DIFFERENT LINES OF EVIDENCE AND ASSESS IT
5 BASED ON THE WEIGHT OF EVIDENCE APPROACH.

6 ANOTHER IMPORTANT FOCUS OF THE U.S. EPA REVIEWS
7 WHICH HAS BEEN ADDED TO APPENDIX 1 IS A DISCUSSION ABOUT
8 CENSUS POPULATION. SO, OF COURSE, PEOPLE ARE CONCERNED
9 WITH THE IMPACTS TO PEOPLE WHO MAY BE MORE SENSITIVE TO
10 THESE EFFECTS. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, OFTEN TIMES THEY'RE
11 BASED ON AGE, GENERALLY THE VERY YOUNG OR VERY OLD;
12 GENETIC FACTORS, CERTAIN PEOPLE WITH CERTAIN PRE-EXISTING
13 HEALTH CONDITIONS; FOR EXAMPLE, CERTAIN RESPIRATORY
14 CONDITIONS OR CARDIOVASCULAR CONDITIONS AND ALSO PERHAPS
15 A DEGREE IS BASED ON SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS.

16 ANOTHER ONE OF THE MAIN IMPROVEMENTS IS WE TRIED
17 TO STANDARDIZE OUR APPROACH IN TERMS OF THE WAY THE
18 SUMMARIES ARE PRESENTED FOR EACH POLLUTANT. SO IN EACH
19 SECTION WE DO PRESENT A TABLE SIMILAR TO THIS. IT MAY
20 NOT BE EXACTLY LIKE THIS, BUT IT PRESENTS THE SAME
21 INFORMATION AGAIN BASED ON THE -- WHATEVER IS THE MOST
22 RECENT U.S. EPA REVIEW OR FACTS FOR CRITERIA POLLUTANTS.

23 SO HERE THIS IS PM2.5, AND IT'S SPLIT BY
24 SHORT-TERM EXPOSURE EFFECTS AND LONG-TERM EXPOSURE
25 EFFECTS. AND, OF COURSE, ARE THE DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HEALTH OUTCOMES. SO, AGAIN, U.S. EPA USES A WEIGHT OF
2 EVIDENCE APPROACH WHICH MEANS IF YOU LOOK AT DIFFERENT
3 KINDS OF EVIDENCE AND ASSESS IT FOR CONSISTENCY AND
4 REPRODUCIBILITY THEY ALSO LOOK AT THE DIFFERENT LINES OF
5 EVIDENCE AND ASSESS WHETHER THESE DIFFERENT LINES OF
6 EVIDENCE TELL A COHERENT STORY IN TERMS OF WHAT IMPACTS
7 THESE POLLUTANTS MAY BE HAVING ON THE POPULATION'S
8 HEALTH.

9 SO HERE FOR PM2.5 BASED ON THE 2009 ISA YOU CAN
10 SEE, FOR EXAMPLE, CARDIOVASCULAR EFFECTS THERE'S CAUSAL
11 RELATIONSHIP FOR BOTH SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM EXPOSURE.
12 SIMILARLY FOR MORTALITY. AGAIN, THESE HEALTH CATEGORIES
13 ARE NOT NECESSARILY MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE. FOR EXAMPLE, OF
14 COURSE, MUCH OF THE MORTALITY RELATIONSHIP IS BASED ON
15 MORTALITY FROM CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASES.

16 FOR RESPIRATORY EFFECTS IT IS A SLIGHTLY LOWER
17 CAUSAL DETERMINATION. IT'S LIKELY TO BE A CAUSAL
18 RELATIONSHIP. AND THESE CATEGORIES ARE VERY CLEARLY
19 DEFINED IN THE EPA REVIEW DOCUMENTS AS WELL. AND YOU CAN
20 SEE THEY LOOK AT SOME OTHER CATEGORIES; REPRODUCTIVE AND
21 DEVELOPMENTAL EFFECTS, CARCINOGENICITY. AND FOR PM2.5
22 THIS IS THE CATEGORY THAT IS ONE CATEGORY LOWER, VERY
23 LIKELY, WHICH IS SUGGESTIVE OF CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP.

24 SO SIMILARLY FOR OZONE EFFECTS, OZONE WAS
25 REVIEWED BY U.S. EPA IN 2013. AGAIN, YOU CAN LOOK AT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SHORT-TERM VERSUS LONG-TERM EFFECTS. AND HERE YOU CAN
2 SEE VERY CLEARLY THAT FOR OZONE THE STRONGEST CAUSAL
3 RELATIONSHIP IS FOR SHORT-TERM OZONE EXPOSURE AND
4 RESPIRATORY EFFECTS.

5 SO WE HAVE RECEIVED 25 COMMENT LETTERS ON THE
6 APPENDIX 1. MANY OF THE LETTERS WERE LETTERS FROM
7 MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL AS WELL AS COMMENTS
8 RECEIVED FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. I'M CERTAINLY NOT
9 PRESENTING THE SUMMARY OF EVERY COMMENT RECEIVED HERE,
10 BUT JUST SOME OF THE MAJOR COMMENTS OR MAIN COMMENTS, AND
11 I TRIED TO DIVIDE IT BY THE SECTIONS OF THE DOCUMENT OF
12 THE COMMENTS THAT CAME THROUGH.

13 SO AS I MENTIONED BEFORE, ONE OF THE MAIN
14 CHANGES BASED ON SOME OF THE COMMENTS WE RECEIVED WAS TO
15 PROVIDE A BETTER CLARITY ABOUT THE PURPOSE OF THIS
16 DOCUMENT AND ALSO THE ROLE OF THE DIFFERENT AGENCIES, FOR
17 EXAMPLE, THE ROLE OF THE AQMD VERSUS THE U.S. EPA IN
18 ASSESSING SCIENCE AND ASSESSING CAUSALITY. IN THE
19 SECTION FOR AIR TOXICS, IT WAS SUGGESTED THAT WE ADD A
20 BRIEF DISCUSSION OF THE HEALTH EFFECTS OF VOC.
21 PARTICULARLY BECAUSE VOC'S ALSO CONTRIBUTE TO THE
22 FORMATION OF OZONE. AND WE HAD A COMMENT THAT ASKED US
23 TO ADDRESS THE ACES STUDY. THAT'S THE ADVANCED
24 COLLABORATE EMISSION STUD ON PM.

25 IN THE OZONE SECTION, THIS SECTION WAS ACTUALLY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REORGANIZED QUITE A BIT AND REALLY FOCUSED ON THE HEALTH
2 EFFECTS THAT WERE DETERMINED TO HAVE A CAUSAL OR LIKELY
3 CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP. IN OTHER WORDS, THOSE HEALTH POINTS
4 THAT WERE HIGH ON THE CAUSAL DETERMINATION SCALE. AND,
5 OF COURSE, WE ALSO EXPANDED THE DISCUSSION OF THE
6 SENSITIVE POPULATION DESCRIBING WHICH POPULATIONS MAY BE
7 MORE SENSITIVE TO THE EFFECTS OF OZONE.

8 SIMILARLY, THERE'S ALSO A SECTION FOR
9 PARTICULATE MATTER. AGAIN, SIMILARLY, IT WAS
10 REORGANIZED AND WE FOCUSED ON THE HEALTH ENDPOINTS THAT
11 WERE EITHER CAUSAL OR LIKELY CAUSAL. AND ALSO, YOU KNOW,
12 AGAIN, BECAUSE AIR RESOURCES ASSESSMENT FOR PARTICULATE
13 MATTER WAS CONDUCTED IN 2009 WE ALSO FELT THAT IT WAS
14 IMPORTANT ADDRESS TO SOME OF THE HEALTH ENDPOINTS THAT
15 WERE PERHAPS A LITTLE BIT LOWER IN A SUGGESTIVE CATEGORY.
16 AND WE DISCUSSED THIS IN THE SECTION THAT'S MORE LIKE
17 EMERGING AREAS OF INTEREST. THERE'S SEVERAL COMMENTS
18 ABOUT THE ULTRA FINE PARTICLES. WE MOVED THAT WITHIN THE
19 PARTICULATE MATTER SECTION AND ALSO EXPANDED THAT
20 DISCUSSION.

21 IN ADDITION, WE REWORKED THE SUMMARY IN THIS
22 SECTION AND ALSO CREATED A SEPARATE SECTION FOR THE
23 ESTIMATES OF HEALTH BURDEN OF PARTICULATE MATTER IN SOUTH
24 COAST AIR BASIN. IN ADDITION, THERE'S SOME ADDITIONAL
25 COMMENTS ON APPENDIX 1. THERE WERE SOME COMMENTS RELATED

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 TO THE HEALTH RISK ABOUT PM IN CALIFORNIA ASKING ABOUT
2 WHETHER THERE IS AN ASSOCIATION. AND JUST TO, AGAIN,
3 CLARIFY, THE PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT REALLY IS TO
4 SUMMARIZE THE REVIEWS CONDUCTED BY OTHERS AND GET THE
5 OPINION OF U.S. EPA AND SOME OTHER SCIENTIFIC AGENCIES
6 THAT PARTICULATE MATTER IS ASSOCIATED WITH MANY HEALTH
7 EFFECTS, INCLUDING MORTALITY.

8 THERE WAS A COMMENT ALSO ABOUT POTENTIAL
9 CONFOUNDING BY SMOKING. AGAIN, THIS GENERALLY PERTAINS
10 TO EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES BECAUSE, OF COURSE, IN
11 EPIDEMIOLOGY YOU REALLY PRIMARILY RELYING ON
12 OBSERVATIONAL STUDIES. SO POTENTIAL FOR CONFOUNDING IS
13 CERTAINLY THERE. AND WE CERTAINLY ADDED QUITE A LOT OF
14 CLARIFICATION TO THE TEXT IN TERMS OF WHICH STUDIES
15 ADDRESSED CONFOUNDING FOR HOW THEY LOOKED AT INDIVIDUAL
16 STUDIES.

17 WE ALSO HAD A COMMENT ABOUT ADDRESSING THE
18 HEALTH EFFECTS OF ODORS. SO THIS IS WOULD ACTUALLY BE A
19 BRAND-NEW SECTION WITHIN THE APPENDIX, AND THIS WOULD BE
20 SOMETHING THAT REQUIRES NEW WORK AND WORK THAT IS QUITE
21 DIFFERENT FROM THE SUMMARIES OF THE CRITERIA POLLUTANTS.
22 THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WE'RE STILL WORKING TO ADDRESS,
23 BUT WE WILL BE ADDING A SECTION ON HEALTH EFFECTS OF
24 ODORS.

25 DR. FINE: THANKS, JO KAY. SO THAT CONCLUDES

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE PRESENTATION. WE'RE GOING TO OPEN IT UP FOR PUBLIC
2 COMMENTS. I DO HAVE SOME BLUE CARDS. IF SOMEONE WISHES
3 TO SPEAK, YOU CAN GRAB ONE NOW.

4 SO WE'LL GO AHEAD AND GET STARTED WITH PUBLIC
5 COMMENT. FIRST IS NOEL MUYCO. OKAY. NOEL LOST HIS
6 CHANCE.

7 NOEL, YOU'RE UP.

8 MR. MUYCO: I'M UP. THANK YOU. I'M NOEL MUYCO
9 WITH SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY. I WANT TO MAKE A
10 FEW STATEMENTS WITH REGARD TO THE AQMP. THE SOUTH COAST
11 AQMD HAS A LONG-STANDING FUEL POLICY. CONTINUATION OF
12 THIS PRACTICE IS ESSENTIAL IN ORDER TO MAXIMIZE EMISSION
13 REDUCTIONS NEEDED TO DEMONSTRATE ATTAINMENT. I ALSO WANT
14 TO ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPMENT OF A WORKING GROUP AND A
15 PUBLIC PROCESS OVERSEEING COST EFFECTIVENESS AND
16 FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENTS OF COMPETING TECHNOLOGY.

17 AND WHILE MOBILE SOURCES ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR
18 THE LARGE MAJORITY OF SMOG FORMING EMISSIONS, MORE THAN
19 80 PERCENT, SOUTH COAST AQMD SHOULD FOCUS ON ACHIEVING
20 ALL POSSIBLE EMISSION REDUCTIONS FROM THIS SECTOR AND
21 AVOID THIS PORTION IMPACTING SMALL STATIONARY SOURCES OF
22 EMISSIONS. AND WE ENCOURAGE INCENTIVES AS THE MOST
23 COST-EFFECTIVE PLAN TO ACHIEVING EMISSION REDUCTIONS IN
24 THE RESIDENTIAL AND SMALL COMMERCIAL SECTORS. AND SO CAL
25 GAS ALSO ENCOURAGES COLLABORATION AMONG STAKEHOLDERS AND

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 BROAD PARTICIPANTS TO LEVERAGE THE INCENTIVES TO SECURE
2 FUNDING.

3 LASTLY, I WANT TO THANK THE SOUTH COAST AQMD FOR
4 THEIR EFFORTS OF THIS PROCESS AND YOUR TRANSPARENCY
5 WORKING WITH THE STAKEHOLDER AND PROTECTING THE PUBLIC
6 HEALTH OF THE COMMUNITIES WE SERVE. THANK YOU.

7 DR. FINE: EXCELLENT. BEFORE WE GET TO THE NEXT
8 SPEAKER, I JUST WANT RECOGNIZE THE ACTING EXECUTIVE
9 OFFICER OF THE AQMD, WAYNE NASTRI. AND I ALSO WANT TO
10 RECOGNIZE ELIZABETH SWIFT, WHO IS THE MAYOR PRO TEM OF
11 THE CITY OF BUENA PARK WHO HAS JOINED US IN THE AUDIENCE.

12 THANK YOU FOR COMING.

13 OKAY. THE NEXT SPEAKER IS ELIZABETH HAWLEY.

14 MS. HAWLEY: GOOD MORNING. I'M ELIZABETH HAWLEY
15 REPRESENTING THE SAN FERNANDO BUSINESS COMMUNITY. WE
16 WELCOME THE OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT ON THE REVISED DRAFT
17 2016 AQMP. WE SUPPORT AN APPROACH THAT FOCUSES ON
18 INCENTIVE BASED MODELS AND WORKING WITH INDUSTRIES TO
19 ACHIEVE ATTAINMENT WHILE SUPPORTING ECONOMIC GROWTH IN
20 LOS ANGELES.

21 WE HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT AN OVERLY REGULATORY
22 PRESCRIPTIVE APPROACH THAT WILL SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE
23 COST ESPECIALLY FOR STATIONARY SOURCES WITHOUT BEING A
24 FEASIBLE WAY TO ATTAINMENT. THE BIGGEST CONCERN IS
25 INCREASED REGULATION ON SMALL BUSINESSES, LOCAL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RESIDENCES BY DRIVING UP COSTS MAKING IT LESS ATTRACTIVE
2 TO NEW BUSINESS IN THIS REGION.

3 WE SUPPORT CONTINUING PROGRESS ON EMISSION
4 REDUCTIONS DURING THE INCENTIVE-BASED FRAME WORKS FOR
5 COST EFFECTIVENESS AND DIFFERENT OPTIONS FOR BUSINESSES.
6 APPROPRIATE INCENTIVES WILL HELP OFFSET THE CAPITAL AND
7 OPERATIONAL COSTS USING TECHNOLOGY. VIKA WOULD URGE THE
8 AQMD TO CONTINUE WITH THE RECLAIM PROGRAM WHICH AS
9 SUCCESSFULLY RESULTED IN SIGNIFICANT AIR QUALITY
10 IMPROVEMENTS.

11 AND, FINALLY, VIKA SUPPORTS THE FUEL NEUTRAL
12 MOBILE SOURCE PLAN WHICH ALLOWS CONSUMERS CHOICES. THIS
13 FLEXIBLE APPROACH WILL CONTINUE TO ENCOURAGE INNOVATION.
14 WE LOOK FORWARD TO CONTINUING OUR WORK WITH THE AQMD
15 DEVELOPING A PLAN WHICH WILL HELP GROW OUR ECONOMY.
16 THANK YOU FOR ALL OF YOUR HARD WORK AND PRESENTATION
17 TODAY

18 DR. FINE: THANK YOU. NEXT SPEAKER IS KELSEY
19 BREWER.

20 MS. BREWER: GOOD MORNING. MY NAME IS KELSEY
21 BREWER. I WORK FOR THE ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA CITIES,
22 ORANGE COUNTY, ACCOC. WE HAVE JUST A FEW COMMENTS ABOUT
23 THE NEW PLAN. THE FIRST ONE DEALS WITH THE POTENTIAL
24 RULES OF PLACING A FEE ON HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT OF
25 RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL AREAS. THERE'S ALREADY A VERY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WELL-DOCUMENTED HOUSING AFFORDABILITY CRISIS IN ORANGE
2 COUNTY. AND THE ADDITION OF NEW FEES WILL HAMPER THE
3 CITY TO BUILD NEW FACILITIES TO MEET THIS DEMAND. SO
4 ACCOC IS REQUESTING THAT THIS ORGANIZATION TABLE THE
5 EXPIRATION OF NEW FEES.

6 ADDITIONALLY, ROUGHLY HALF OF ORANGE COUNTY
7 CITIES OWN DISCHARGE PERMITS WITH THE U.S. EPA AND
8 REGIONAL WATER BOARDS AND THESE ARE EXTREMELY TOUGH
9 PERMITS TO OBTAIN AND RETAIN. AND THE AQMP PROPOSES A
10 MEASURE THAT WOULD ALLOW THE AQMD TO REVIEW AND EVALUATE
11 THE STRENGTHS OF THESE PERMITS, AND WE WOULD ASK THAT THE
12 PROCESSES THAT ARE ALREADY IN PLACE JUST REMAIN.

13 THE REVISED AQMP INCLUDES LANGUAGE THAT PUTS
14 PRIORITY ON MAXIMIZING EMISSION REDUCTIONS UTILIZING ZERO
15 EMISSION TECHNOLOGY, WHICH IS NEVER COST EFFECTIVE AND
16 FEASIBLE. WHAT WE WOULD ASK IS THAT YOU ALLOW DIFFERENT
17 TECHNOLOGIES TO COMPETE HEAD TO HEAD. AND THE ACCOC
18 STRONGLY ENCOURAGES DEVELOPMENT OF A WORKING GROUP AND A
19 PUBLIC PROCESS THAT WILL REVIEW THE COST EFFECTIVENESS
20 AND FEASIBILITY OF ASSESSMENTS OF COMPETING TECHNOLOGIES.

21 FOURTH, THE PREVIOUS DRAFT AQMP FOCUSED ON AN
22 INCENTIVE-BASED APPROACH. THE REVISED DRAFT PLACES MORE
23 EMPHASIS ON MORE REGULATORY MEASURES. AND THE ACCOC
24 BELIEVES WE SHOULD FOCUS ON ACHIEVING ALL POSSIBLE
25 EMISSION REDUCTIONS FROM THIS SECTOR TO AVOID

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESSES AND
2 STATIONARY SOURCES OF EMISSIONS. INCENTIVES ARE THE MOST
3 EFFECTIVE TO ACHIEVING EMISSION REDUCTIONS IN THE
4 RESIDENTIAL AND SMALL COMMERCIAL BUSINESS.

5 AND, FINALLY AND PROBABLY THE MOST IMPORTANT,
6 THE ACCOC BELIEVES THAT THE DEVELOPMENT OF AND EXECUTION
7 OF THE INCENTIVE FUNDING PLAN IS KEY TO SUCCESSFUL
8 ORIENTATION OF THE AQMP. AND THE REVISED AQMP STILL
9 ESTIMATES THAT APPROXIMATELY \$1 BILLION PER YEAR IN
10 INCENTIVES WILL BE NEEDED. AND THE ACCOC URGES
11 COLLABORATION AND BROAD PARTICIPATION TO LEVERAGE ALL
12 POSSIBLE AVENUES TO SECURE FUNDING FOR THE REGION. AND
13 WE ARE WILLING TO HELP PARTNER WITH ALL OF YOU ON THAT.
14 THANK YOU.

15 DR. FINE: THANK YOU, KELSEY.

16 ONE MORE CARD. BRANDON.

17 MR. MATSON: BRANDON MATSON HERE ON BEHALF OF
18 THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY BUSINESS FEDERATION, BIZFED. WE
19 ARE A GRASSROOTS ALLIANCE WITHIN MORE THAN 160 TOP
20 BUSINESS GROUPS REPRESENTING OVER 25,000 EMPLOYERS
21 THROUGHOUT LOS ANGELES COUNTY. WE APPRECIATE THE
22 OPPORTUNITY THE DISTRICT HAS GIVEN OUR MEMBERS TO
23 PARTICIPATE ON VARIOUS WORKING GROUPS AND COMMITTEES TO
24 PROVIDE INPUT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DRAFT OF THE
25 2016 AQMP.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND TODAY WE HAVE SUBMITTED WRITTEN COMMENTS ON
2 BOTH THE DRAFT AND REVISED PLAN. SO MY COMMENTS TODAY
3 WILL HIGHLIGHT SOME OF OUR LARGE POINTS. FIRST, THIS
4 PLAN MUST BALANCE THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC NEEDS OF
5 THE RESIDENTS OF THE SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN. SO WITH THAT
6 IN MIND, WE SUPPORT A BALANCED APPROACH TO ACHIEVING AIR
7 QUALITY THAT ALLOWS FOR FURTHER ECONOMIC GROWTH. WE ARE
8 SUPPORTIVE OF AN AQMP THAT CREATES THE FRAMEWORK THAT
9 PRIORITIZES NON-REGULATORY INNOVATIVE APPROACHES FOR
10 EMISSION REDUCTIONS THAT ARE COST EFFECTIVE AND MINIMIZE
11 OPERATION DISRUPTION. PROGRAMS FOR CONTROL MEASURES
12 SHOULD INCENTIVIZE VOLUNTARY APPROACHES TO ACHIEVING AIR
13 QUALITY GROWTH AND NOT PUT LOCAL BUSINESSES AT
14 COMPETITIVE DISADVANTAGES WITH OTHER REGIONS.

15 WITH RESPECT TO THE REVISED AQMP, THERE ARE TWO
16 ADDITIONAL POINTS I'D LIKE TO MAKE. FIRST, WE SUPPORT
17 THE DISTRICT'S POLICY OF FUEL AND TECHNOLOGY. THERE IS
18 SOME LANGUAGE IN THE REVISED PLAN THAT WE ARE CONCERNED
19 ABOUT WITH THIS MATTER AND IT HAS BEEN HIGHLIGHTED
20 SPECIFICALLY IN ONE OF OUR RECENTLY SUBMITTED COMMENT
21 LETTERS. IN ADDITION, WE SUPPORT MAINTAINING THE RECLAIM
22 PROGRAM. WE BELIEVE IT WOULD BE A CONTINUED SUCCESSFUL
23 PROGRAM UNTIL AN ALTERNATIVE INCENTIVE OR MARKET-BASED
24 PROGRAM IS DEVELOPED FOR BUSINESSES TO ALLOW FLEXIBILITY
25 FOR EMISSION REDUCTIONS TO BE ACHIEVED IN THE MOST COST

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EFFECTIVE WAY. RECLAIM SHOULD BE CONTINUED TO BE
2 SUPPORTED BY THE DISTRICT.

3 SO IN CLOSING, WE APPRECIATE THE DISTRICT'S
4 CONTINUED ENGAGEMENT WITH THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY DURING
5 THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 2016 AQMP AND WE REMAIN COMMITTED
6 TO WORKING WITH THE DISTRICT TO ENSURE THAT THE PLAN
7 FULFILLS THE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS WHILE ALSO PROTECTING
8 CREATION AND ECONOMIC SUCCESS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

9 DR. FINE: THANK YOU. I DON'T HAVE ANY MORE
10 CARDS. DOES ANYONE ELSE WISH TO SPEAK TODAY? OKAY. IF
11 THERE'S NO OTHER COMMENTS, WE CAN CALL THE HEARING TO A
12 CLOSE. BUT WE'LL BE HERE A LITTLE BIT AFTERWARDS IF YOU
13 HAVE ANY QUESTIONS FOR US.

14
15 (END OF PUBLIC HEARING.)

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25