Minutes: NAP Stakeholders Meeting

Tuesday, January 30, 2001
9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
South Coast AQMD, 21865 E. Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, California
North Building, Conference Room GB

Attended by:

1. Anderson, Craig (IEA)
2. Barham, Bob (ARB)
3. Carmichael, Tim (CCA)
4. Chico, Tom (SCAQMD)
5. Coleman, Curt (CMTA)
6. Cook, Jeff (ARB)
7. Fazeli, Bahram (CBE)
8. Fletcher, Bob (ARB)
9. Forbis, Paula (EHC)
10. Garvey, Ellen (BAAQMD; teleconference)
11. Hess, Peter (BAAQMD; teleconference)
12. Holmes-Gen, Bonnie (ALA; teleconference)
13. Lake, Judy (SDAPCD)
14. Lee, Barbara (CAPCOA; teleconference)
15. Marty, Melanie (OEHHA)
16. McCutchan, Melanie (EHC)
17. McNerny, Don (ARB)
18. Murchison, Linda (ARB)
19. Pasek, Randy (ARB)
20. Prasad, Shankar (ARB)
21. Ranzieri, Andy (ARB)
22. Salaver, Luna (BAAQMD; teleconference)
23. Schaufelberger, Chris (BAAQMD; teleconference)
24. Servin, Tony (ARB)
25. Smith, Linda (ARB)
26. Swanton, John (ARB)
27. Takemoto, Brent (ARB)
28. Terry, Lynn (ARB)
29. Tschogl, Kathleen (ARB)
30. Tuck, Cindy (CCEEB)
31. Venturini, Peter (ARB)
32. Wallerstein, Barry (SCAQMD)
33. Walsh, Kathleen (ARB)
34. Wang, Mike (WSPA)
35. Wong, Todd (ARB)

Introductions

The meeting convened at 9:40 a.m. After thanking Barry Wallerstein (SCAQMD) for hosting the meeting, Shankar Prasad informed the group that Cal/EPA had released the draft model EJ mission statement (copies of the January 25, 2001 memo were available at the meeting). The draft program elements adopted by Cal/EPA are the same as those developed for the NAP. Lynn Terry added that Cal/EPA's mission statement serves as an overarching framework for all agencies within Cal/EPA, and ARB plans to move ahead with its own EJ program. At the Board hearing on January 25th, concerns over ARB's EJ-related activities were voiced, and focused the Board's attention on the issue. Ms. Terry noted that from hereon, ARB has a lot of work to do in EJ communities, and the Board is expecting staff to take some immediate actions.

NAP Guidelines -- Scope & Time Frame

Bob Fletcher followed with an update on the NAP (handout provided at the meeting). Currently, the conceptual outline for the NAP guidelines include the following:

(1) Technical Assessment (e.g., develop the mapping capabilities);

(2) Risk Reduction Strategies (e.g., review ATCMs, identify pilot projects); and

(3) Guidance on CEQA and Land Use (e.g., incorporate cumulative risk in the permit process).

With the release of the draft Ca/EPA EJ mission statement, EJ issues are at the forefront for all BDOs. Thus, there is a need to take action, and the NAP guidelines will be presented to the Board in December 2001, rather than in 2002. The decision to accelerate the schedule is in part due to the availability of models that can be refined to assess cumulative risk at the neighborhood-scale. In this case, a model is not being developed, but rather, available models that are known to be reliable are being augmented. It is expected that improvements to the model will be made over time, and a modeling work group and a separate peer-review group will be formed. Tentative plans call for holding workshops on the conceptual plan in March 2001, and holding workshops on the draft guidelines in June 2001. The schedule could change depending on the timetables for other Board items.

Arguments in favor and against accelerating the guidelines were raised. Some participants made the point that the health risk from ambient air toxics is high, and it isn't necessary to study every community in California to realize that air pollution problems exist and need to be addressed right now. More than likely, micro-scale problems will differ from community-to-community, but that should not be a deterrent to taking action where it is needed. Resources need to be mobilized to address not only "big ticket" items, but also to prevent people's quality-of-life from getting worse. Knowing that problems exist should be reason enough to work as hard as we can to make things better in all communities. As such, ARB should try to develop the guidelines sooner that December 2001. Others suggested that ARB must not rush into taking actions that were not based on sound science, and to make use of the data collected at Barrio Logan.

There was also a discussion about what, if any, role the pilot study at Barrio Logan played in the decision to accelerate the development of the NAP guidelines. Several stakeholders asked when the contractor's report would be released, and what actions were deemed necessary based on what was learned at Barrio Logan. In terms of the report and associated data, the contractor's report should be available at the end of March 2001, but the air monitoring data may be available sooner. The micro-scale and regional models for Barrio Logan are in development, and some preliminary testing is underway. As a first cut, the Aspen model is being used to estimate exposure at the county level. Currently, there are problems with extrapolating county-level mobile source data to other scales. Next, OEHHA data would be used to develop estimates of health risk. The long-term plan is to develop census tract level estimates for cancer risk, chronic effects, and acute effects. To address effects other than cancer, criteria

pollutant exposure must also be considered. Ultimately, through the use of other models, other locations could also be examined.

The role and value of monitoring was discussed. The state's toxics monitoring network is designed to quantify regional levels, and to date, data to support the presence of major hotspots is not substantial. While the ARB toxics monitoring program is good (cf. the new ARB air quality almanac), some comparisons to the data collected in MATES II are needed. It is likely that air quality in urban areas will be similar, but at smaller scales, some high-risk sites could be identified. Moreover, the major risk drivers may differ from one community to the next. Recognizing that micro-scale problems may exist, should ARB expand its efforts in terms of monitoring at the community-scale? What about extensive use of mobile monitoring systems? Clearly, targeted monitoring in some neighborhoods could provide direct evidence of how severe a problem is, and could justify taking quick action in certain cases. In some cases, monitoring/modeling can help (e.g., Auto Nation project in the SoCAB), and more data are needed to verify existing estimates (i.e., power plant emissions).

Outreach to communities will play an important role in the success of the NAP, and ARB will need to make sure that communities get the information they want. The Board is expecting staff to increase the outreach efforts, and with several important items going to the Board later in the year, and coordination will be critical. For the NAP, ARB needs to educate communities on how pollutants from individual sources could accumulate and pose health risks, so that they can make informed decisions about what happens in their communities. In this regard, communities want to know what the real risk drivers are, and would not take action for the wrong reasons. Take for example the power plant project in Southgate -- when communities organize, they can prevent projects from being built where they live.

With regard to CEQA and land use, Title 17 allows the ARB to prepare staff reports rather than EIRs to justify new regulations. In response to the January 25th Board hearing, ARB is looking into including an EJ section in future staff reports. As for the districts, ARB has issued guidelines on local permitting and CEQA compliance, but these guidelines are dated, and will now need to include an EJ component as well. The ARB must think carefully about what the most important issues are and what can be done by the end of the year. As such, permitting is not likely to be fully addressed in this time frame. Overall, ARB will work with the districts to address obvious problems and to get information out to communities that need help. In developing tools for decision-makers, cumulative risk must become a fundamental consideration to land-use planners and decision-makers at the neighborhood-scale.

Neighborhood Modeling Approaches

Andy Ranzieri followed with a presentation on the conceptual modeling protocol for the NAP (handouts of the slides and a description of modeling approach were available at the meeting). Questions about how to determine if the model was working properly, and reconciling regional and micro-scale results were raised. For both items, there are selected metrics and other criteria that must be met, at a minimum, to provide assurance that the model results are reasonably accurate. With respect to health effects, there was interest in knowing what factors would be used to estimate pollutant impacts. For some compounds, 10-20 percent differences in pollutant concentrations can in some cases translate into very large differences in health effects. In closing, Mr. Ranzieri noted that any estimates for the NAP would probably be limited by data quality. For purposes of the guidelines, ARB should be able to recommend which models are likely to work best, provide suggestions on how they should be used, and be open to suggestions.

Risk Reduction Strategies

Peter Venturini briefly reviewed the purpose of the concept paper on risk reduction strategies that he presented on November 28, 2000. He reiterated that ARB staff are still interested in receiving comments on the concept paper, and had received comments from CCEEB, IEA, and SDAPCD (Note: Comments from WSPA were sent on January 29th, but were not available at the meeting). Currently, ARB staff is looking through the comments and developing responses, but wanted to hear from more stakeholders on what the risk reduction component of the guidelines should contain (Note: Near the end of the meeting, Tim Carmichael offered to prepare a collective set of comments from the environmental groups). Eventually, ARB staff will be identifying the key action items. For example, the ATCMs for hexavalent chromium from chrome-platers and perchloroethylene from dry cleaners will be revisited, but there are questions as to how to conduct the outreach for these efforts. Outreach and educational programs are needed (e.g., DTSC's work on auto shops has been effective), but should ARB target small businesses and try to establish a business-mentoring program? The ARB will also be looking into where negative declarations should/should not be issued, so that communities may have information they can use to evaluate land-use issues. Feedback from the stakeholders would be helpful, as ARB needs to get the word out to EJ communities. It was mentioned that the neighborhoods around LAX were visited to find out what residents were concerned about relative to the proposed airport expansion. Similar efforts could be conducted for the NAP.

For this part of the NAP, especially, the air districts need to be a major player and partner. District involvement is critical because community-specific priorities need to be identified, and may likely be different from state-level risk

drivers. While state-level actions reduce pollutant exposures in neighborhoods, they need to be coupled with short-term projects that provide benefits specific to the community. Based on the comments from SDAPCD, there are resource issues for the districts, namely where is the money for NAP going to come from and how much will be needed. Every effort must be made to locate sources of funding for the NAP (e.g., Carl Moyer Program) and to get the most out of whatever resources are obtained. There's a lot of work to do at the community-level, but it is also important to acknowledge the amount of reductions that have already been achieved through state and local programs (i.e., MATES II indicates that a 50 percent reduction in toxic risk has occurred over the last 10-years).

The definition of "risk" was briefly discussed. There is no consensus within the group as to what is "high risk" or "acceptable risk," and at some point these terms may need to be defined. While "risk" will be a subject of much further debate, it is important to also keep in the mind the following:

- Big vs. little sources – in terms of the number of people exposed and the severity of the exposure, which is the greater risk?
- Should we also determine the number of people exposed to various levels of risk within the area of interest along with risk numbers?
- What provisions do we have for highly mutagenic compounds that are formed in secondary transformation processes (e.g., nitro-PAHs)?
- If new information is discovered in SB 25, is there flexibility to include other measures in the suite of risk reduction strategies for NAP?

Next Meeting

The next stakeholders meeting is planned for early April, but the date could change depending on the efforts for SB 25 and the Clean Air Plan. From now until the end of February, most of ARB's attention will be directed toward preparations for the Clean Air Plan and the February Board Hearings, so a detailed work plan will not be ready by the next meeting. It was suggested that should ARB decide to hold a public workshop on the NAP in March, that a stakeholders meeting be held about 10-days prior to the workshop to get some feedback on things that must be said and things to avoid saying to community groups. Before ending the meeting, a request was made to have meeting materials sent out earlier so that there would be time to review the material before the meeting, and the notice for the Board hearing on February 22nd (in Richmond) was handed out.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.