

APPENDIX I

SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED AT THE CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD'S PUBLIC FORUMS ON THE U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY'S PROPOSED NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS AND WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED

Since the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) did not conduct any hearings on the proposals in California, the California Air Resources Board held two public forums to give California stakeholders an opportunity to be heard. These forums occurred on January 16, 1997, in El Monte and on January 17, 1997, in Sacramento. This appendix provides a summary of the issues raised at these forums or in writing. Written comments provided to the California Air Resources Board in response to the forums are being transmitted under separate cover.

STANDARDS-SETTING PROCESS

- The level and form of the revised standards should be protective of public health and based on the best scientific information available; economics should not be considered until developing policies on how to implement the standards. (Gladys Meade, citizen; Gayle Feuer, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC); Andy Igrejas, California Public Interest Research Group (CalPIRG); Julia May, Communities for a Better Environment (CBE); Bob Reynolds, Lake County AQMD; Heidi McLean, citizen; Gil Humpherys, citizen; Barry Wallerstein, South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD))
- Consideration of cost and implementation issues need to be addressed when the standards are set. (Dr. Kenneth Green, Reason Foundation; Robert Wyman, Regulatory Flexibility Group; Rod Hill, Northern Sierra AQMD; Mike Wang, Western States Petroleum Association (WSPA))
- Standards should be set with local involvement, not with a “top down” approach. (Dr. Kenneth Green, Reason Foundation)
- Standards should be in a form that is easily understood by the public. (Barry Wallerstein, SCAQMD; Bob Reynolds, Lake County AQMD)
- Standards should be set to protect the most sensitive populations. (Susana Tapia, CBE; Hans Hermann, Bonnie Holmes-Gen, Sierra Club; Paul Knepprath, American Lung Association (ALA); Andy Igrejas, CalPIRG; Kathryn Johnson, citizen; Joan Lee, citizen)

- U.S. EPA should adopt tighter standards to protect wilderness areas and ecosystems in addition to public health. (Vicky Hoover, Sierra Club)
- Standards should be set at levels that are achievable by a majority of areas by the next standard review cycle. A “step by step” process should be used to lower the level of standards. (Rod Hill, Northern Sierra AQMD)
- The costs associated with meeting the new standards should be considered only with respect to timelines and other implementation issues related to meeting the standards. (Barry Wallerstein, SCAQMD)
- There is a lack of reliable scientific information that supports a finding that compliance with the revised standards could be accomplished in California. Southern California cannot achieve current standards, and certainly cannot achieve the proposed standards. Air quality regulations need to be seen in the context of what is possible to achieve at a cost that is within reason. Cost-benefit studies are needed to determine whether the benefits of implementing the new standards would be worth the associated costs. Regulatory agencies and environmental activists have exploited the public’s exaggerated fear of the consequences of breathing air that is somewhat less than perfect. Air quality standards must make allowances for the natural imperfections in the atmosphere. (Lloyd Davis, citizen)
- The comment period should be extended to allow for extensive review of the proposed standards. (Cindy Tuck, California Council of Environmental and Economic Balance (CCEEB); Brian White, California Chamber of Commerce)
- More public outreach and education are needed to get support for standards. (Rod Hill, Northern Sierra AQMD)

PARTICULATE MATTER STANDARDS

- The move to revise particulate matter standards is premature; there is an insufficient health basis for revised standards at this time due to lack of scientific data. U.S. EPA should maintain its current particulate matter standards. (Bill Jones, General Motors/American Automobile Manufacturers Association (GM/AAMA); Mark Saperstein, ARCO; Cindy Tuck, CCEEB; Glenn Keller, Engine Manufacturers Association; Brian White, California Chamber of Commerce)
- U.S. EPA should implement a targeted research program on particulate matter and a PM_{2.5} monitoring network to provide the information necessary to revise particulate matter standards. (Bill Jones, GM/AAMA; Cindy Tuck, CCEEB)

- Evidence from health research overwhelmingly supports the need for tighter particulate matter standards. (Gladys Meade, citizen; Tim Carmichael, Coalition for Clean Air (CCA); Gayle Feuer, Janet Hathaway, NRDC; Hans Hermann, Bonnie Holmes-Gen, Sierra Club)
- U.S. EPA's proposal is a step in the right direction, but the particulate matter standards should be tightened even further. Both American Lung Association (ALA) and Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) presented specific recommendations for levels for PM2.5 and PM10 standards. (Gladys Meade, citizen; Dr. Bob Zweig, Paul Knepprath, ALA; Shipra Bansal, Susana Tapia, Julia May, CBE; Janet Hathaway, Gayle Feuer, NRDC; Bill Walker, Environmental Working Group; Vicky Hoover, Bonnie Holmes-Gen, Sierra Club; Andy Igrejas, CalPIRG; Heidi McLean, citizen; Gil Humpherys, citizen; Mildred Humpherys, citizen; Richard Wiles, et al, Environmental Working Group/Sierra Club; Marc Chytilo, Environmental Defense Center (EDC); Joan Lee, citizen)
- U.S. EPA should abandon its proposal to spatially average concentrations for the annual PM2.5 standard. Among the concerns expressed include the potential for spatial averaging to allow local "hot spots" and environmental justice concerns. (Barry Wallerstein, SCAQMD; Shipra Bansal, Julia May, CBE; Tim Carmichael, CCA; Janet Hathaway, Gayle Feuer, NRDC; Bill Walker, Environmental Working Group; Bonnie Holmes-Gen, Sierra Club; Paul Knepprath, ALA; Andy Igrejas, CalPIRG; Richard Wiles, et al, Environmental Working Group/Sierra Club)
- The 98th percentile form for the 24-hour PM2.5 and PM10 standards is not suitably protective. U.S. EPA should retain the current "one exceedance" form. (Tim Carmichael, CCA; Gil Humpherys, citizen)
- Based on research that suggests nitrates do not contribute to the health effects to the degree that other constituents do, nitrates should be excluded from the particulate matter standards. (Ted Holcombe, Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E))
- If U.S. EPA moves forward with PM2.5 standards, levels should be set at the upper end of the range under consideration in light of the uncertainties in the scientific data. (Cindy Tuck, CCEEB)
- U.S. EPA should not delay or dilute particulate matter standards that should have been in place years ago. (Gil Humpherys, citizen)
- PM2.5 standard will be impossible to attain. (John Sigler, Association of California Car Clubs)

- Epidemiological studies show a causal relationship between lung cancer and air pollution. (Joel Swartz, CBE)
- Average PM2.5 data for one year, not three, should be the basis of compliance determinations. (Janet Hathaway, NRDC)
- The PM10 standards need to be retained and/or tightened. (Janet Hathaway, NRDC; Gil Humpherys, citizen; Heidi McLean, citizen; Marc Chytilo, EDC)
- U.S. EPA should set the PM standards as proposed, with the exception of the proposed annual PM2.5 standard, which may be economically unreasonable given the marginal health benefits. (Mike Waugh, Tuolumne County Air Pollution Control District (APCD))
- Strongly supports move from PM10 to PM2.5. New PM2.5 standards should be used to regulate, and ultimately discontinue, use of residential wood stoves and wood-burning fireplaces in populated areas of California. (George Amaroli, citizen)

OZONE STANDARDS

- U.S. EPA's ozone standards proposal is a step in the right direction, but the ozone standards need to have a more health-protective level and/or form. NRDC, ALA, and Mildred Humpherys, citizen, have suggested tighter levels or an alternate form. (Janet Hathaway, Gail Feuer, NRDC; Mildred Humpherys, citizen; Dr. Robert Zweig, Paul Knepprath, ALA; Susana Tapia, CBE; Dr. Russell Sherwin, USC School of Medicine; Bonnie Holmes-Gen, Sierra Club; Tim Carmichael, CCA; Marc Chytilo, EDC; Arthur Unger, citizen)
- Proposed form of new ozone standard is good since it negates meteorological fluctuations. (Rod Hill, Northern Sierra AQMD)
- U.S. EPA should reaffirm the current ozone standard. (Bill Jones, GM/AAMA; Glenn Keller, EMA)
- Support the move from a 1-hour to an 8-hour standard, but 8-hour standard should be equivalent to 0.12 ppm 1-hour standard. (Cindy Tuck, CCEEB)
- In addition to the 8-hour standard, U.S. EPA should retain the existing 1-hour ozone standard to protect against adverse short-term impacts. (Janet Hathaway, Gail Feuer, NRDC; Julia May, CBE; Marc Chytilo, EDC)

- U.S. EPA should set a 1-hour ozone standard equivalent to California's standard of 0.09 ppm, or tighter. (Paul Knepprath, ALA; Bonnie Holmes-Gen, Sierra Club; Dr. Russell Sherwin, USC School of Medicine)
- U.S. EPA should register violations as soon as the standard is exceeded. (Janet Hathaway, Gail Feuer, NRDC; Andy Igrejas, CalPIRG)
- Form should not include three-year averaging. (Gladys Meade, citizen; Julia May, CBE)
- U.S. EPA has not adequately reviewed scientific literature on the impact that the discharge of ozone out of the atmosphere and its subsequent subsidence to the surface of the earth has on our ozone air quality. (Lloyd Davis, citizen)
- U.S. EPA's proposed 8-hour ozone standard is too close to background levels and should instead be set at 0.09 ppm. (Rod Hill, Northern Sierra AQMD)
- U.S. EPA should set the ozone standard to three significant figures and should not allow two hours of missing data per 8-hour averaging period. (Antoinette Weil Stein, citizen)
- Current rounding convention for ozone should be retained. (Barry Wallerstein, SCAQMD)
- U.S. EPA's proposals for ozone are based on inadequate science. (Bill Jones, GM/AAMA; Glenn Keller, EMA)

INTERIM IMPLEMENTATION POLICY (IIP) PRINCIPLES

- Equivalent progress toward attainment must be sustained. (Janet Hathaway, NRDC)
- New sources of fine particle pollution must be tightly controlled. (Janet Hathaway, NRDC)
- Interim Implementation Policies should assure that future efforts by U.S. EPA and California Air Resources Board provide their fair share of emission reductions from sources under their jurisdiction. (Barry Wallerstein, SCAQMD)
- IIP would require an early modeling assessment of the new ozone standard within 90 days of promulgation of the standards. Public participation for this submittal could not be accomplished within such a short time period. (Barry Wallerstein, SCAQMD)
- U.S. EPA should provide resource assistance to local agencies to meet the new requirements. (Barry Wallerstein, SCAQMD)

PM2.5 MONITORING METHOD AND STRATEGY

- New PM2.5 monitoring methods should be accurate and properly account for all species including nitrates. (Barry Wallerstein, SCAQMD; Tim Carmichael, CCA; Gayle Feuer, NRDC)
- U.S. EPA should not reduce the number of PM10 monitors and the frequency of PM10 monitoring. (Shipra Bansal, CBE)
- U.S. EPA should require daily monitoring of particulate monitoring. (Andy Igrejas, CalPIRG; Janet Hathaway, Gail Feuer, NRDC)
- States, including California, need both multi-filter monitors and chemical speciation for particles. (Janet Hathaway, Gail Feuer, NRDC)
- Monitors must be sited in most polluted areas, and violations at these monitors must trigger nonattainment designations. (Janet Hathaway, Gail Feuer, NRDC)
- Health standards must be backed by scientifically valid system of airborne particulate monitoring. More monitoring sites may be required. (Richard Wiles et al, Environmental Working Group/Sierra Club)
- Need accurate way to monitor PM at local levels. (Dean Hickman, Acousa)
- All major particulate polluters should be required to contribute to a fund administered by local air quality officials that is dedicated to statistically valid particulate monitoring in all metropolitan statistical areas in the U.S. (Richard Wiles et al, Environmental Working Group/Sierra Club)
- Compliance with the new health standard should not be achieved by moving existing monitors to cleaner locations, adding monitors only at clean locations, and dispersing the pollution source. (Richard Wiles et al, Environmental Working Group/Sierra Club)
- Until a representative monitoring system is in place, U.S. EPA should maintain the current rules for monitoring where exceeding the standard in one location triggers a violation. (Richard Wiles et al, Environmental Working Group/Sierra Club)

OTHER PARTICULATE-RELATED COMMENTS

- U.S. EPA should maintain an up-to-date database of particulate pollution levels nationwide and these data should be available to the public in a manner consistent with data already widely available in the Toxic Release Inventory. (Richard Wiles et al, Environmental Working Group/Sierra Club)
- Citizens in polluted communities should be given the right to petition for and receive the monitoring equipment needed to detect particulate and other air pollution, and receive timely notification of monitoring results. (Richard Wiles et al, Environmental Working Group/Sierra Club)

ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

- Costs and benefits of proposed standards are unsubstantiated. (Bill Jones, GM/AAMA)
- Standards should be set to save lives no matter what the cost. (Gail Feuer, NRDC; Robert Lavine, citizen; Kathryn Johnson, citizen; Heidi McLean, citizen)
- \$1 spent on air pollution saves \$45 in health care [statement attributed to U.S. EPA]. (Gail Feuer, NRDC) In a related comment, \$1 spent on air pollution saves \$20 in health care [again attributed to U.S. EPA] (Hans Hermann, Sierra Club)
- Consider industry voice on costs, but set tougher standards. (Gail Feuer, NRDC)
- Economy is a health issue--economy affects people's health. (Dr. Kenneth Green, Reason Foundation)
- Do not ignore or defer discussion of cost implication of NAAQS. (Robert Wyman, Regulatory Flexibility Group; Rod Hill, Northern Sierra AQMD)
- Conduct more cost-conscious implementation; perform cost-effective reductions first and defer other reductions. (Robert Wyman, Regulatory Flexibility Group)
- Provide incentives to develop clean technologies. (Robert Wyman, Regulatory Flexibility Group)
- Give states flexibility in designing new standards, allowing consideration of local costs. (Robert Wyman, Regulatory Flexibility Group)
- Damage to economically important Ponderosa and Jeffrey pines could be prevented by tougher standards. (Vicky Hoover, Sierra Club)

- Industry estimates of extreme cost are overstated. (Bonnie Holmes-Gen, Sierra Club)
- Uniform national controls should be implemented to prevent present situation of non-competitive business climate in some areas due to lower controls in neighboring areas. (Mark Nelson, Cleaner Air Partnership)
- Provide federal funding to avoid creating an unfunded mandate. (Rod Hill, Northern Sierra AQMD)
- The economic impacts to business have not been fully considered. (Brian White, California Chamber of Commerce)
- Control costs should be incorporated into the price of production and manufacturing. (Marc Chytilo, EDC)
- Standards that are comparable to California's standards will place California businesses on a level playing field with those in other states. (Marc Chytilo, EDC)
- Economic costs are a valid part of the debate during the implementation process. (Bill Walker, Environmental Working Group)

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES (COMMENTS ON ADVANCE NOTICE)

- U.S. EPA should provide adequate time and assistance to meet the revised standards and required SIP submittals, consistent with expeditious progress, future available technology, and economic viability. (Barry Wallerstein, SCAQMD)
- U.S. EPA should require SIPs by 2000 for areas with PM2.5 monitoring already in place. (Tim Carmichael, CCA)
- U.S. EPA needs to delay the implementation of the standards to allow more people to become involved in the process. (Dr. Kenneth Green, Reason Foundation)
- California Air Resources Board staff should not imply that, if new ozone standards are approved, the districts will not have to do more than they are currently doing. (Cindy Tuck, CCEEB)
- Don't defer discussion of implementation; need to have an integrated dialogue on the standards and how to go about achieving them. (Robert Wyman, Regulatory Flexibility Group)

- U.S. EPA needs to provide meaningful incentives to lead to monitoring, speciation, toxicology, and better science. (Robert Wyman, Regulatory Flexibility Group)
- States need flexibility to design implementation approaches that make sense. (Robert Wyman, Regulatory Flexibility Group)
- U.S. EPA should get input from the states on attainment dates and rate-of-progress requirements. (Robert Wyman, Regulatory Flexibility Group)
- Expedite progress on implementation issues that can be done now and are most cost-effective (i.e., Phase I implementation issues) and defer Phase II implementation issues. (Robert Wyman, Regulatory Flexibility Group)
- U.S. EPA needs to recognize intrastate transport (using California's method as a model) and give regulatory relief to downwind areas affected by upwind sources. (Rod Hill, Northern Sierra AQMD; Mike Waugh, Tuolumne County APCD)
- The existing nonattainment area classification system under the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) is unworkable; instead, the Area of Influence (AOI)/ Area of Violation (AOV) concept proposed by U.S. EPA should be supported. (Noel Bonderson, Amador County APCD; Rod Hill, Northern Sierra AQMD)
- U.S. EPA should address intrastate transport with a different classification system concept than contained in the 1990 CAAA; the new concept would hold downwind districts harmless for emissions from upwind areas outside their jurisdictional control. (Noel Bonderson, Amador County APCD)

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

- U.S. EPA's Natural Events Policy needs to include prescribed forest burning. (Rod Hill, Northern Sierra AQMD)
- U.S. EPA will need to get people to change their lifestyle. (John Sigler, Association of California Car Clubs)