

**Air Resources Board
Stationary Source Division
Workshop Summary**

Workshop: Proposed Amendments to the Cleaner-Burning Gasoline Regulations

Date: June 5, 1998

Location: 722 Capitol Mall, Sacramento

Purpose: To receive comments on proposals for adding compliance flexibility to CaRFG Regulations.

| | | |
|-------------------|--|-------------------|
| Attendees: | Stillwater Associates | CEC |
| | Kern Oil & Refining | Unocal |
| | Tosco | Sierra Club |
| | Chevron | Toyota |
| | Exxon | Parallel Products |
| | General Motors | Sierra Research |
| | Systems Applications International | ARCO |
| | Oxygenated Fuels Association | Mobil Oil |
| | Natural Resources Defense Council | AIAM |
| | Santa Fe Pacific Pipeline Partners | |
| | American Automobile Manufacturers Assoc. | |
| | Western States Petroleum Association | |
| | Farm Bureau | |

Key Points: Several speakers urged the ARB to take care that amendments do not prompt changes to gasoline that would diminish actual emission reductions, regardless of compliance with the CaRFG Regulations.

The representative for Parallel Products (ethanol producer) opposed any amendments if the amendments do not include the following:

- a credit in the Predictive Models for renewable fuel
- a reactivity credit for reduced CO emissions due to oxygen in gasoline
- new exhaust modeling incorporating high-emitters as a separate vehicle group
- lower reactivity assigned to evaporative emissions

The American Automobile Manufacturers Association (AAMA) requested a sulfur cap at 50 ppm, a DI limit at 1200, and a five-year sunset on amendments. AAMA agrees with the staff's proposed changes for the other caps.

The Sierra Club urged emission tests of gasoline whose properties are at the proposed higher cap limits.

The NRDC and Sierra Club opposed raising the RVP cap.

The Oxygenated Fuels Association opposed amending the regulations because of a lack of need, the possibility of greater emissions from non-catalyst engines (whose emissions are not counted in the Predictive Models), and more combustion-chamber deposits from higher aromatic contents.

Systems Applications International showed its modeling work involving the “Tech 4” database blocked into two vehicle groups according to hydrocarbon emission level