

Minutes: NAP Stakeholders Meeting
 Tuesday, November 28, 2000
 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
 Lower Level Hearing Room, 2020 L Street, Sacramento, California

Attended by:

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| 1. Allard, Doug (SBAPCD) | 15. Marsee, Sheila (ARB) |
| 2. Barham, Bob (ARB) | 16. Martin, Jerry (ARB) |
| 3. Bode, Richard (ARB) | 17. Murchison, Linda (ARB) |
| 4. Carmichael, Tim (CCA) | 18. Prasad, Shankar (ARB) |
| 5. Cook, Jeff (ARB) | 19. Salmon, Andy (OEHHA) |
| 6. Fazeli, Bahram (CBE; teleconference) | 20. Suer, Carolyn (ARB) |
| 7. Fletcher, Bob (ARB) | 21. Takemoto, Brent (ARB) |
| 8. Forbis, Paula (EHC; teleconference) | 22. Terry, Lynn (ARB) |
| 9. Garvey, Ellen (BAAQMD) | 23. Tuck, Cindy (CCEEB) |
| 10. Holmes-Gen, Bonnie (ALA) | 24. Venturini, Peter (ARB) |
| 11. Krebs, Patti (IEA) | 25. Wallerstein, Barry (SCAQMD) |
| 12. Kyle, Amy (UCB) | 26. Walsh, Kathleen (ARB) |
| 13. Lee, Barbara (CAPCOA) | 27. Witherspoon, Catherine (ARB) |
| 14. Lloyd, Alan (ARB) | |

The meeting was convened at 9:40 a.m. During introductions, it was noted that President-elect Barbara Lee would be replacing Larry Greene for CAPCOA. Bahram Fazeli and Paula Forbis participated by teleconference.

Barrio Logan – Status (9:50 to 10:40 a.m.)

After introductions, Linda Murchison and Richard Bode gave an update on Barrio Logan effort. The following items were discussed:

1. Data Analysis by Sonoma Technology, Inc. (STI)

It was reported that STI is doing some additional analyses, and the final report would be completed around the end of December 2000. Data are accessible via AIRS, but no elemental carbon data is available. There is still a need for data on mobile sources, shipping and railroad activity.

2. Neighborhood-scale Emission Inventory

The discussion began with questions about how the micro-scale emission inventory was developed and how it compares (i.e., strengths and weaknesses) to the regional-scale inventory. At Barrio Logan, source data on auto repair facilities, construction equipment, portable equipment, and miscellaneous shipyard sources are lacking. With respect to ship emissions, the ARB emissions inventory is being updated for marine vessels, with ongoing work in El

Monte. Area sources were also of concern (e.g., loading docks and distribution centers). Some feedback was requested as to which area sources would be specified in this effort, and absent source-specific data, could surrogate data or streamlining factors be developed. For mobile sources, assessment protocols need to consider local patterns and tendencies in vehicle traffic (a transportation survey is planned for Barrio Logan). It was suggested that DMV and/or Smog Check data could give some insight on the mix of vehicles used in Barrio Logan, but studies by the BAAQMD found that differences of 25% or more can occur between what is registered and what is driven in a given community.

3. Modeling Protocols & Outputs

At ARB, efforts continue to quality assure the emissions data. PTSD is getting a new staff person with experience in EPA models with another to follow. Initial discussions focused on which models were best suited for micro-scale analyses and how to decide which model is best suited for efforts of this kind. ARB staff explained that existing models (e.g., Aspen, ISC, line models, and Cal Puff) are not designed to estimate cumulative impacts. Because models have different strengths and weaknesses, they are constantly being updated and improved. Hence, ARB will take a broad look at neighborhood-scale air quality problems and decide which would address issues best and continue efforts to modify and validate the chosen one. Closing questions called for clarification of how meteorology would be considered and whether we would be able to track emissions back to larger, upwind sources like in MATES II. Given the complexity of modeling issues, a separate modeling presentation would be scheduled for the next stakeholders meeting.

4. Model Validation

The group began with a discussion of what plans had been made concerning model validation. As model validation is critical, developing a validation plan should be a priority. Of principal concern was what plans had been made for reconciliation of the model output. Questions were raised as to how model outputs would be compared to ambient data, and how dense a monitoring network is needed to collect the data for validating the model results. It was noted that the monitoring station at Memorial Academy is still in place, but may be moved in the near future as there is still a need to use modeling to identify where maximum pollution levels occur. Analyses to compare the outputs from different models would be initiated to identify what, if any, biases or systematic errors are inherent to a particular model. Depending on the progress made, some preliminary modeling data would be presented at the next stakeholders meeting.

5. Air Toxic Risk Numbers

The group next discussed the plans to communicate risk results. As a first step, reaching an understanding of the modeling approach and protocols must

occur before moving on. Differences in risk numbers (e.g., 1,3-butadiene – OEHHA has calculated a higher risk value than USEPA) need to be reconciled as well as the extent of additional monitoring needed to validate the risk estimates. Risk from diesel was also discussed, along with the lack of a benchmark method for measuring diesel PM (it is estimated from measurements of total C). New instruments and methods need to be looked into -- ARB is looking to develop in-house capabilities for measuring ambient diesel PM).

6. Goals for Barrio Logan

Before moving on to the next item on the agenda, several items were raised as issues that the group needed to reach a consensus on: (1) What are the total emission levels at Barrio Logan? (2) How should the data be handled and made available? (3) What modeling protocol should be used? It was mentioned that we need to keep in mind that Barrio Logan is a pilot study, and other sites may have to be studied differently depending on what is learned. Moreover, it was clear that one needs to accept that one can't have all the data one wants, but this shouldn't be a limitation to take care of obvious problems.

Senate Bill 25 Press Release (10:40 to 11:00 a.m.)

Linda Murchison informed the group that a press release identifying the six communities where SB 25 monitoring would be disseminated later that morning. The stakeholder group members would receive an e-mail of the press release after the meeting. Phone calls were being made to community leaders in Barrio Logan, Boyle Heights, Wilmington, Fresno, Fruitvale, and Crockett. It was emphasized that these are not the six-most polluted areas in the state, but are representative of the range of air pollution problems that occur in the state. Some community representatives said that it was good to see ARB making a presence in their area. Subsequent discussion involved the following items:

1. Site Selection

There was considerable interest in the site-selection process. ARB staff received numerous inquiries and considerable input from communities (PTSD has a list). Primarily due to resource limitations, many requests were turned down (e.g., Sacramento). However, under the framework of the Board's Community Health Program, other sites could be added in the future. It was noted that Barrio Logan, Oakland-Fruitvale, and Wilmington were the NAP sites, but separate mention of that distinction would not be made in the press release. One member asked if the stakeholders group should lobby the legislature for more funding since there was a large budget surplus that might not be available in future years.

2. SB 25 Monitoring

For this program, a primary monitoring station would be established at the selected school, and depending on the need, satellite stations would be added. Questions were raised about pesticides – if it is done for SB 25, monitoring would focus on ambient monitoring at schools where pesticides are applied on a regular basis. Data have been collected for DPR, primarily at schools, and is currently being reviewed by ARB staff. The group was asked if they were aware of other monitoring efforts that might consider sharing resources. The BAAQMD's dioxin monitoring program, the FACES program in Fresno, and a PM10 monitoring station in Oakland operated by the USEPA were mentioned.

Community Risk Reduction Strategies (11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.)

Peter Venturini (SSD) presented the risk reduction plan developed for the NAP (the draft document was e-mailed prior to the meeting). The Risk Reduction Strategy will be part of the NAP, and efforts will be made to prioritize action-items.

In the short-term, there are some obvious problems requiring immediate attention. Among the environmental groups, there is a consensus that some communities have clear problems that shouldn't require waiting for a science-based action plan to be developed. On the other hand, it was noted that the business community may not endorse moving ahead without a science-based plan in place. For the long-term, it was mentioned that ARB would need some time to do the model analysis for the guidelines, which would be one of several parts of the guidelines to be presented to the Board. To the extent possible, ARB staff would identify target dates for the items in the Risk Reduction Strategy.

1. Site Assessment Teams

There was general agreement that Site Assessment Teams were a good concept, but needed to be fleshed out further. There is a clear need to educate communities about the sources in their area, but businesses may not be receptive to the idea of allowing the general public to be part of the assessment teams (e.g., how to handle non-compliant situations, safety and access issues). Subsequent discussion focused on identifying what small businesses would be assessed and the logistics of conducting the assessments. There was concern that for small air districts, this would add significantly to their workloads and resources were not presently available to implement the concept. It was requested that CAPCOA try to develop an estimate how much it would cost to implement the teams as this would be a resource-intensive effort far beyond what is done for existing compliance assistance programs. Costs are also likely to vary as each district will need to figure out its priority concerns and implement its program accordingly.

Closing comments were made on the need to promote pollution prevention and reducing emissions, especially by small businesses. The outreach program being conducted by DTSC on toxics issues was mentioned as an effective on-going effort. Based on past experience, one member mentioned that access to information is not enough – one needs to have people deliver the message directly. As a first cut, ARB has some printed material on compliance assistance and would look into whether there is any material on pollution prevention.

2. Identify a Top Ten Toxics List

Discussion of this task was mixed. Some felt that it could be useful in terms of public education, but a range of parameters needed to be clarified. For example, different top ten lists could be made on statewide, regional, and local scales. While a statewide list would not be difficult to develop, local lists are likely to vary and may cause confusion when compared to lists for other geographic areas or scales. Questions were also raised about how stresses would be ranked (Is a modest wide-scale stress more important than a severe localized one? Should we look at exposures from high-risk categories or the cumulative risk of several/many small sources?), whether health effects should portray estimated cancer and/or non-cancer risks, whether information on emissions should be provided, and the multi-media nature of air pollution exposure (air issues ranked high in the Comparative Risk Project).

3. Community Inspection Reports

The issue of confidentiality was raised -- what would be done to maintain confidentiality with respect to business practices. It was suggested that ARB could serve as an information clearinghouse, possibly providing access to reports via the Internet.

4. Exchanging Information with Communities

Some participants felt that this task needed to be further clarified. For the program to advance, we need to learn what information communities are looking for and how best to open the lines of communication. For many communities, providing web access may not be useful. Town hall meetings were suggested as an option to consider. Programs to educate and empower communities are needed to promote pollution prevention and for reducing pollution production. More information is needed on pollutants released from household products, enforcement of air pollution rules and regulations, and the range of pollution-generating activities performed on a routine-basis by residents of a community.

5. Needs Assessment Reports

This task would require businesses to develop toxic pollution prevention plans; as such, new legislation would need to be enacted since it will impose additional costs on businesses. The prospect of requiring small businesses to

develop pollution prevention plans as part of settlements for violations was discussed.

6. Air Toxic Control Measures (ATCMs)

Two topics were briefly discussed: (1) the prospects for expediting the development of statewide ATCMs and (2) whether the current ATCM for hexavalent chromium should be reexamined.

7. Update CEQA Guidelines

As land-use plays an important role in extant environmental justice concerns, the discussion focused on what could be done relative to land-use planning in the future. In terms of ARB, OPR would need to be contacted to explore prospects for making revisions to CEQA. Also ARB would need to be proactive in working with land-use planning agencies to make them aware of air quality issues early in the planning process. Subsequently, the discussion shifted to whether the NSR process could be the mechanism for preventing high-risk situations in the future. It was noted that under existing law, permits must be issued if a source meets current siting requirements (i.e., a permit cannot be denied because of a poor land-use decision).

Other Business

The group asked if a 1-pager on SB 25 could be added to the minutes (Yes) and if the date of the Tuesday, March 27, 2001 could be changed.

Meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.