BEFORE THE

SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

IN RE THE MATTER OF:	)
	)
PUBLIC HEARING:	)
	)
SCAQMD 2016 AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN	)
	)
	)
	)

DATE AND TIME:	THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2016 2:00 P.M.
PLACE:	HYATT PLACE RIVERSIDE DOWNTOWN 3500 MARKET STREET RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92501
REPORTER:	KRISTIN RIVERA, CSR CERTIFICATE NO. 11858
BRS FILE NO.:	99073

SPEAKER INDEX

160 S. OLD SPRINGS ROAD, SUITE 270, ANAHEIM, CA 92808
PHONE: 714.444.4100 FAX: 714.444.4411 EMAIL: DEPO@DEPO1.COM

RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA; THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2016

2:00 P.M.

MR. NASTRI: GOOD AFTERNOON, EVERYONE. WE'RE GOING TO GO AHEAD AND GET STARTED RIGHT ON TIME. THANK YOU ALL FOR COMING HERE TODAY. LET'S BEGIN THIS PUBLIC HEARING ON OUR REVISED 2016 AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN. WE HAVE A VERY DISTINGUISHED PANEL HERE TODAY FROM THE SOUTH COAST AQMD AS WELL AS THE CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD.

SO MY NAME IS WAYNE NASTRI, AND I'M THE ACTING EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROM THE SOUTH COAST AQMD. IT'S MY PLEASURE TO WELCOME YOU, AND I'M GOING TO TURN THIS MEETING OVER TO DR. FINE, WHO IS OUR DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOR PLANNING AND RULES.

DR. FINE: WELCOME. THANKS FOR COMING. BEFORE WE GET STARTED, I WANT TO INTRODUCE EVERYONE HERE AT THE FRONT. YOU'VE GOT OUR NAMES.

BILL, YOU WANT TO START.

MR. WONG: SURE. MY NAME IS WILLIAM WONG. I'M PRINCIPAL DEPUTY DISTRICT COUNSEL WITH THE AQMD.

MS. SUTKUS: AND THEN I'M CAROL SUTKUS. I'M WITH THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD.

DR. GHOSH: MY NAME IS JO KAY GHOSH. I'M THE

HEALTH EFFECTS OFFICER AT THE SOUTH COAST AQMD.

DR. FINE: CAN EVERYONE HEAR US OKAY? WE DON'T HAVE MICS. I KNOW IT'S A SMALL ROOM. WE WILL HAVE TO SPEAK UP.

JUST A COUPLE OF HOUSEKEEPING THINGS. OBVIOUSLY YOU SEE THE EXITS TO MY RIGHT AND THE REAR LEFT. PLEASE SILENCE YOUR CELL PHONES OR PUT THEM ON VIBRATE SO WE DON'T INTERRUPT THE PRESENTATION OR THE PUBLIC COMMENTS. IF WE NEED TO ASK TO EVACUATE OR SHELTER IN PLACE IN CASE OF EMERGENCY, WE WILL DO SO.

THE OTHER THING I DID WANT TO MENTION IS THIS AN OFFICIAL PUBLIC HEARING AS REQUIRED BY STATE LAW. SO WE ARE TAKING TRANSCRIPTS. THESE TRANSCRIPTS WILL BE PROVIDED TO ALL OUR GOVERNING BOARD MEMBERS AS PART OF THE RECORD WHEN THEY MAKE THEIR DECISION, HOPEFULLY, IN FEBRUARY ON ADOPTION OF THE AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN.

I HOPE YOU ALL GOT A HANDOUT OF THE AGENDA. FIRST OF ALL, WE'LL START OUT WITH THE PRESENTATION. I'LL GIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE REVISED DRAFT AQMP AS IT STANDS TODAY. WE'LL TALK ABOUT THE SCHEDULE, CONTENT, AND SOME OF THE CHANGES WE'VE MADE THUS FAR IN RESPONSE TO COMMENTS. THEN WE WILL HEAR FROM OUR COLLEAGUES AT THE CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD ABOUT THE STATE SIP STRATEGY BECAUSE THAT IS A PART OF OUR REGIONAL PLAN. AND THEN, FINALLY, WE'LL HEAR FROM DR. GHOSH, WHO IS OUR

HEALTH EFFECTS OFFICER, WHO WILL TALK ABOUT APPENDIX 1 OF THE AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN WHICH DEALS WITH THE HEALTH IMPACTS IN THE AIR BASIN ON OUR RESIDENTS. THAT IS ANOTHER THING THAT IS REQUIRED BY STATE LAW TO HAVE HEARINGS ON THAT PART OF THE REPORT. HOPEFULLY THE PRESENTATION WON'T FEEL TOO LONG. IT WILL PROBABLY TAKE US ABOUT 45 MINUTES. AND THEN WE'LL GET INTO PUBLIC COMMENT.

I HAVE FOUR CARDS ALREADY FILLED OUT. IF ANYONE ELSE WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A PUBLIC COMMENT, GET ONE OF THE BLUE CARDS. THERE'S SOME OUTSIDE OR SOMEONE WILL COME OVER TO YOU AND YOU'LL HAVE A CHANCE AT THE END.

OKAY. WITH THAT I'LL GET STARTED. IT'S VERY HARD FOR ME TO SEE, SO I'LL STAND UP ON THE SIDE, AND WE'LL GO OVER THE AQMP.

AGAIN, THIS -- SO AS MANY OF YOU KNOW ESPECIALLY OF THOSE WHO HAVE LIVED IN THE INLAND EMPIRE FOR MANY YEARS AIR QUALITY HAS IMPROVED DRAMATICALLY OVER THE LAST SEVERAL DECADES, AND THIS HAS BEEN DUE TO ACTIONS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL, AT THE STATE LEVEL, AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL TO REDUCE EMISSION REDUCTIONS. SO WE'VE MADE TREMENDOUS PROGRESS. WE USED TO HAVE MANY STAGE 1 SMOG ALERTS WHERE WE WOULD TELL KIDS IN SCHOOL SKIP RECESS, DON'T ENGAGE IN SPORTS. WE DON'T HAVE LEVELS LIKE THERE USED TO BE. YOU CAN SEE THE MOUNTAINS MORE OFTEN THAN YOU USED TO.

HOWEVER, WE STILL HAVE A LONG WAY TO GO. WE STILL HAVE SOME OF THE WORST AIR QUALITY IN THE NATION. WE STILL NEED SIGNIFICANT EMISSION REDUCTIONS IN ORDER TO ATTAIN HEALTH-BASED STANDARDS. SO THAT IS WHAT OUR PLAN IS ABOUT HOW WE'RE GOING TO DO THAT IN THE FUTURE.

SO THE WAY THIS WORKS UNDER THE FEDERAL CLEAN AIR ACT IS THE U.S. EPA WILL SET A NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARD TO PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH. AND THEN THEY'LL LOOK AT THE DATA THAT'S COLLECTED AT THE MONITORING STATIONS IN THE AREA. WE HAVE ABOUT 36 MONITORING STATIONS THROUGHOUT THE BASIN. AND THEY'LL COMPARE WHAT THE MEASUREMENTS ARE THROUGHOUT THE NATION. AND IF YOU'RE NOT MEETING THE STANDARD OR THE LEVELS ARE ABOVE THE STANDARD, THEN YOU'D BE DESIGNATED AS NONATTAINMENT OF THAT STANDARD. ONCE YOU GET THAT DESIGNATION BY THE U.S. EPA, A LOT OF REQUIREMENTS KICK IN. AND AMONG THOSE ARE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS. AND ONE OF THOSE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS IS A STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. THAT IS REALLY THE BLUEPRINT FOR HOW A PARTICULAR NONATTAINMENT REGION IS GOING TO ATTAIN THE STANDARDS VIA CERTAIN CLEAN AIR ACT DEADLINES.

THE AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN, THE AQMP, IS OUR PORTION OF THE STATE SIP OR STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR CALIFORNIA. THE STATE LAW, CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE, ALSO REQUIRES US TO UPDATE OUR AIR QUALITY

MANAGEMENT PLAN EVERY SO OFTEN. SO THIS SERVES TO SATISFY THAT REQUIREMENT AS WELL. AS I MENTIONED BEFORE, IT REALLY IS A BLUEPRINT ABOUT WHAT MEASURES ARE WE GOING TO TAKE TO REDUCE EMISSIONS THAT WILL RESULT IN MEETING THE AIR QUALITY STANDARDS.

THIS WILL BE THE 11TH PLAN THAT THE AQMD HAS BEEN INVOLVED WITH BACK SINCE THE LATE '70S. SO THE TWO POLLUTANTS WE FOCUS ON ARE THE TWO POLLUTANTS FOR THIS AREA IS STILL IN NONATTAINMENT, AND THAT IS TWO POLLUTANTS; GROUND LEVEL OZONE AND PARTICULATE MATTER OR PM2.5. AND YOU'LL HEAR IN A MOMENT ABOUT THE HEALTH EFFECTS OF THOSE POLLUTANTS. SO WE FOCUS ON THOSE BECAUSE THOSE ARE THE ONES IN WHICH WE HAVE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS BECAUSE WE ARE IN NONATTAINMENT.

YOU CAN SEE HERE THERE ARE FIVE DIFFERENT FEDERAL STANDARDS FOR WHICH WE STILL DO NOT ATTAIN THOSE STANDARDS. THERE'S TWO FOR PM2.5, AN ANNUAL STANDARD AND A DAILY STANDARD; AND THEN THREE DIFFERENT OZONE STANDARDS. AND WHEN WE DO THIS PLANNING PROCESS, WHAT WE DO IS WE WANT TO HAVE ONE SET OF ACTIONS, ONE SET OF INTEGRATED ACTIONS, ONE STRATEGY, ONE SET OF MEASURES TO ATTAIN ALL THE STANDARDS. WE DON'T WANT TO HAVE SEPARATE PLANS FOR EACH BECAUSE THEY MAY CONFLICT. IT DOESN'T GIVE US THE MOST EFFICIENT PATH TO ATTAINMENT. SO THAT'S WHY WE DO THIS ALTOGETHER WHEREVER WE CAN.

YOU'LL SEE FOR EACH STANDARD THERE'S A CERTAIN LEVEL, WE GET A CLASSIFICATION, AND THEN THERE'S LATEST ATTAINMENT YEARS WITHIN THE CLEAN AIR ACT. AND THEN YOU'LL ALSO SEE WE HAVE A DUE DATE FOR THESE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS, AND YOU CAN SEE WE'RE A LITTLE BIT LATE ON A COUPLE OF THEM. BUT THE CONSEQUENCES OF BEING A FEW MONTHS LATE IS NOT TERRIBLY SIGNIFICANT AT THIS POINT. WE'VE BEEN WORKING WITH EPA, WORKING WITH CARB, TO MAKE SURE WE GET THIS PLAN RIGHT, HAVE PLENTY OF TIME FOR PUBLIC INPUT RATHER THAN JUST RUSH IT THROUGH JUST TO MEET THESE DEADLINES. AS LONG AS WE GET IT IN BY THE TIME FRAME THAT WE'RE ON, WE'LL AVOID ANY OF THE POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES THAT COME WITH BEING A BIT LATE ON THE SUBMITTAL DATE.

SO OUR BIGGEST CHALLENGE IS REDUCING EMISSIONS. AND IT'S REALLY COMES DOWN TO REDUCING NOX EMISSIONS OR NITROGEN OXIDE EMISSIONS. NITROGEN OXIDES ARE EMITTED FROM ANY COMBUSTION PROCESS ANY TIME YOU BURN ANY TYPE OF FUEL WHETHER IT'S NATURAL GAS, DIESEL GASOLINE, JET FUEL, WOOD. WHATEVER IT IS YOU FORM NITROGEN OXIDES TO SOME EXTENT. AND WE KNOW THAT WE NEED THESE REDUCTIONS IN NITROGEN OXIDES TO MEET NOT ONLY THE OZONE STANDARDS BECAUSE NITROGEN OXIDES LEAD TO OZONE FORMATION BUT ALSO THE PM2.5 STANDARDS BECAUSE NITROGEN OXIDES ALSO LEAD TO PM2.5 FORMATION, WHICH IS WHY THIS PLAN IS HEAVILY

FOCUSED ON NOX EMISSION REDUCTIONS.

YOU CAN SEE HERE THE BLUE BARS SHOW THE TOTAL NOX EMISSIONS IN THE SOUTH COAST BASIN IN 2012 AND THEN MOVING FORWARD, THE PROJECTIONS FOR NOX EMISSIONS GOING ALL THE WAY THROUGH 2031. AND THE FIRST THING TO NOTICE IS THE BLUE BARS GET SMALLER JUST BASED ON EXISTING RULES AND REGULATIONS AND CONTINUED IMPLEMENTATION OF THOSE RULES AND REGULATIONS WE'RE GOING TO SEE ABOUT A 50- TO 60-PERCENT REDUCTION IN NOX EMISSIONS GOING FORWARD, AND THAT SHOULD LEAD -- WILL LEAD TO AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS.

THE CHALLENGE IS THAT IS NOT ENOUGH TO MEET THE FEDERAL STANDARDS. WE NEED TO TAKE -- THESE BLUE BARS NEED TO SHRINK DOWN TO WHERE THE RED BARS ARE IN ORDER TO MEET THE STANDARDS BY THOSE DEADLINES. SO NEED ABOUT A 43-PERCENT ADDITIONAL REDUCTION IN 2023 AND ABOUT A 55-PERCENT ADDITIONAL REDUCTION IN 2031. SO THIS IS THE REAL CHALLENGE ESPECIALLY THE 2023 STANDARD BECAUSE THAT'S ONLY SIX OR SEVEN YEARS AWAY. ESSENTIALLY WE NEED TO TAKE ALL THE NOX EMISSION REDUCTIONS THAT WOULD OTHERWISE OCCUR AND CUT THAT IN HALF IN THE NEXT SIX OR SEVEN YEARS. NOW, YOU CAN ALSO SEE HERE THAT IF WE'RE ON THIS TRAJECTORY TO MEET THIS 2023 STANDARD, NOT ONLY WILL WE MORE OR LESS MEET THE 2022 RED BAR STANDARD HERE, WE'LL ALSO BE MUCH CLOSER TO MEETING THE 2031 STANDARD.

SO THIS RIGHT HERE IS REALLY DRIVING THE PLAN. THE OTHER THING TO NOTICE IS IF WE HIT THESE RED BARS, WE WILL MEET THE PM2.5 STANDARDS IN 2019 AND 2025 WITH ROOM TO SPARE. SO THAT IS WHY WE DO THIS INTEGRATED PLANNING BECAUSE WE KNOW IF WE FOCUS ON NOX WE CAN MEET ALL THE STANDARDS BY THE DEADLINES ASSUMING, OF COURSE, WE CAN GET THESE REDUCTIONS.

SO THAT'S -- ONE CHALLENGE IS REDUCING NOX. THE OTHER CHALLENGE IS A LOCAL AIR QUALITY AGENCY WE HAVE LIMITED AUTHORITY FOR MOBILE SOURCES. ABOUT 12 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL EMISSIONS OF THOSE NOX EMISSIONS I JUST SHOWED COME FROM STATIONARY SOURCES, AND THAT'S WHAT WE HAVE PRIMARY JURISDICTION AS A LOCAL DISTRICT IN CALIFORNIA. AND ABOUT 88 PERCENT IN 2012 CAME FROM MOBILE SOURCES. THESE NUMBERS CHANGE A LITTLE BIT WITH TIME. BUT IN GENERAL EVEN GOING FORWARD ABOUT 20 PERCENT AT MOST COME FROM STATIONARY SOURCES. AND, AGAIN, WE HAVE LIMITED AUTHORITY. SO IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE THE STANDARDS, WE'RE GOING TO NEED REDUCTIONS FROM MOBILE SOURCES.

SO I'M NOT GOING TO GO INTO TOO MANY DETAILS ABOUT THE PLAN. IT'S ALL AVAILABLE ONLINE. AND THERE'S MANY MEASURES IN THE PLAN, APPENDICES. IT'S WELL OVER A THOUSAND PAGES IF YOU ADD EVERYTHING UP. BUT JUST TO SUMMARIZE THE APPROACH WE'RE TAKING, SO WHAT I'M SHOWING

HERE IS THE NOX EMISSION REDUCTIONS NEEDED FOR ATTAINMENT IN BOTH THESE YEARS. SO YOU CAN SEE THAT FROM 2012 LEVELS WE NEED ABOUT 400 TONS PER DAY REDUCTIONS BY 2023 AND ABOUT CLOSER TO 450 IN 2031.

WHERE ARE THOSE EMISSION REDUCTIONS COMING FROM? WELL, THE BLUE BARS SHOW THE REDUCTIONS THAT WILL OCCUR THROUGH CONTINUED IMPLEMENTATION OF EXISTING REGULATIONS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL FOR STATIONARY SOURCES AND AT THE FEDERAL AND STATE LEVEL FOR MOBILE SOURCES. ABOUT 70 PERCENT OF THE REDUCTIONS NEEDED ARE COMING FROM CONTINUED IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATIONS. SO THERE'S STILL ABOUT 30 PERCENT WE NEED. SO THIS PLAN ACCOUNTS FOR THIS EXTRA PIECE.

SOME OF WHAT WE'RE PROPOSING IN THE PLAN ARE NEW STATE AND LOCAL REGULATIONS TO ACHIEVE EMISSION REDUCTIONS, AND THAT'S THIS PURPLE BAR RIGHT HERE, WHICH SEEMS QUITE SLIM. BUT WHEN YOU CONSIDER WE REVISIT THIS PLAN EVERY THREE OR FOUR YEARS AND THAT EVERY THREE OR FOUR YEARS WE ARE LEGALLY REQUIRED TO INCLUDE ALL FEASIBLE MEASURES, ALL FEASIBLE REGULATORY ACTIONS. SO MOST OF THE REGULATIONS ARE ALSO ENCOMPASSED IN THE BLUE BAR. WE CAN BUILD UP THAT WITH WHAT NEW TECHNOLOGY ALLOWS US TO DO, AND THAT'S WHERE WE ADD ONTO THAT BASED ON WHAT WE'VE LEARNED OVER THE LAST THREE OR FOUR YEARS. AND, OF COURSE, GIVEN MORE TIME THOSE REGULATIONS HAVE

MORE TIME TO TAKE EFFECT AND GET MORE REDUCTIONS FURTHER DOWN THE LINE.

WE ALSO NEED REDUCTIONS FROM FEDERAL SOURCES. THE STATE DOESN'T CONTROL OF EMISSIONS FROM AIRCRAFTS, FROM SHIPS, FROM TRAINS, AND FROM INTERSTATE TRUCKING. SO THE PLAN THAT YOU'LL HEAR ABOUT THE STATE LEVEL, THE STATE SIP STRATEGY, INCLUDES REDUCTIONS FROM FEDERAL SOURCES BECAUSE WE CANNOT GET TO ATTAINMENT WITHOUT THOSE REDUCTIONS AS WELL. AND EVEN WITH THAT WE ARE STILL LEFT WITH -- WE ARE STILL LEFT WITH A GAP. SO THIS REMAINING GAP IS WHAT WE ARE LOOKING AT AS ADVANCED DEPLOYMENT OF THESE CLEANER TECHNOLOGIES.

SO REGULATIONS CAN DEFINITELY HELP HAVE MANUFACTURERS PRODUCE THE TECHNOLOGY AND MAKE THEM COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE, GAIN PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE, BUT THEN IT TAKES A LONG TIME FOR REGULATIONS TO TAKE EFFECT. YOU HAVE TO WAIT FOR THE FLEET TO TURNOVER, WHETHER IT'S A TRUCK, WHETHER IT'S A TRAIN, IN ORDER TO GET FULL -- TAKE FULL ADVANTAGE OF THOSE REGULATIONS. SO WHAT INCENTIVES DO IS HELP ACCELERATE THAT DEPLOYMENT.

SO ONE WAY TO DO THAT IS FINANCIAL INCENTIVES. THERE'S OTHER WAYS TO DO IT. ONE WAY TO DO IT IS IF TECHNOLOGY ADVANCES EVEN FURTHER WE CAN DO ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS AND HELP FILL THAT GAP. BUT FOR NOW WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT IS A LARGE AMOUNT OF INCENTIVES TO HELP

ACCELERATE THAT FLEET TURNOVER AND GET THE CLEANEST EQUIPMENT OUT IN USE AND REPLACE THE OLDER, DIRTIER EQUIPMENT.

SO AS I MENTIONED BEFORE, IF WE ONLY DID THIS PLAN LOCALLY, WE WOULD NOT GET TO ATTAINMENT. SO WE HAVE TO INTEGRATE OTHER STRATEGIES AT THE STATE AND FEDERAL LEVEL. SO THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT THIS PLAN DOES. YOU'LL HEAR ABOUT CARB'S SIP STRATEGY, AND THAT SIP STRATEGY ALSO INCLUDES REDUCTIONS FROM FEDERAL SOURCES. BUT WE HAVE OUR OWN STATIONARY AND LOCAL MOBILE SOURCE STRATEGY THAT WILL ASSIST ATTAINMENT TAKEN AS A WHOLE.

SO OUR PRIMARY AUTHORITY IS OVER STATIONARY SOURCES. I WANT TO TALK ABOUT THAT FOR A MOMENT. JUST LIKE EVERY PLAN, ALL 11 PLANS WE'VE DONE IN THE PAST, THE FIRST STEP IS WE LOOK AT ALL THE STATIONARY SOURCE CATEGORIES, LOOK AT THE EMISSIONS INVENTORY, WHERE THE NOX EMISSIONS ARE COMING FROM, AND THEN LOOK AT THE CONTROL OPTIONS THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO REDUCE THOSE EMISSIONS. AND WE LOOK AT THAT INTERNALLY, WE LOOK AT THAT -- WHAT HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED ELSEWHERE IN THE STATE, WHAT HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED ELSEWHERE IN THE COUNTRY TO SEE WHETHER THERE'S ANYTHING OUT THERE THAT IS MORE STRINGENT THAN WE HAVE ALREADY DONE. TYPICALLY WE HAVE THE MOST STRINGENT REGULATIONS ACROSS THE STATE OR ACROSS THE COUNTRY, SO TYPICALLY WE DON'T FIND A LOT OUT THERE THAT

WE ARE NOT ALREADY DOING. ALTHOUGH, SOMETIMES WE FIND A FEW MEASURES, A FEW REGULATIONS, OUT THERE THAT ARE SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT THAN OURS, AND WE NEED TO ADDRESS THAT BY LAW.

BUT WE ALSO TRY TO PUSH THE ENVELOPE, AND WE HAD A CONTROL TECHNOLOGY SYMPOSIUM BRINGING EXPERTS AND INDUSTRY AND PEOPLE TO SEE IF WE -- IF THERE ARE ANY NEW TECHNOLOGIES THAT WE SHOULD BE CONSIDERING. WE'VE HAD WORKING GROUPS, WE'VE HAD WHITE PAPERS OVER THE PAST THREE OR FOUR YEARS LOOKING FOR NEW EMISSION REDUCTIONS. AND THE AQMP ITSELF HAS AN ADVISORY GROUP THAT'S MET 14 TIMES OVER THE LAST COUPLE YEARS TO PROVIDE INPUT ON THE PLAN AS WELL AS IDEAS FOR ADDITIONAL MEASURES.

AT THE END OF THAT VERY LONG PROCESS, WE HAVE INCLUDED MANY REGULATORY MEASURES IN THE PLAN. IT IS LIMITED, LIMITED AMOUNT OF EMISSION REDUCTIONS. I SHOWED YOU THE SMALL SLIVER THERE. BUT THESE ARE THINGS THAT WE THINK WE CAN MOVE FORWARD WITH. SOME AREAS ARE LOOKING AT NON-REFINERY FLARING AND REDUCING EMISSIONS THERE, LOOKING AT COOKING APPLIANCES ESPECIALLY COMMERCIAL COOKING APPLIANCES BECAUSE THAT IS AN AREA THAT HAS NOT ACTUALLY BEEN REGULATED BEFORE. THERE ARE NO NOX EMISSION LIMITS ON COOKING APPLIANCES. WE'RE LOOKING AT RECLAIM. RECLAIM IS OUR CAP AND TRADE PROGRAM FOR NOX EMISSION SOURCES. ESSENTIALLY OUR 270 LARGEST INDUSTRIAL

FACILITIES ARE WITHIN THIS PROGRAM. AND WE'RE PROPOSING ANOTHER 35-PERCENT REDUCTION BY 2031 ON TOP OF THE 45 PERCENT-REDUCTION THAT OUR BOARD ADOPTED LAST YEAR. WE'RE LOOKING AT COMMERCIAL AND RESIDENTIAL EQUIPMENT. ANYTHING FROM YOUR HOT WATER HEATER, TO YOUR SPACE HEATER, UP TO SOME OF THE BOILERS THAT MIGHT BE IN COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS. WE THINK THERE'S SOME OPPORTUNITIES FOR EITHER VERY LOW NOX EMITTING EQUIPMENT OR ZERO-EMISSION EQUIPMENT IN GOING FORWARD AND THEN LOOKING AT DIESEL BACK-UP GENERATORS. IN SOME APPLICATIONS WE THINK THERE ARE SOME NEWER ALTERNATIVES THAT DON'T INVOLVE THE NOX EMISSIONS THAT COME WITH TESTING DIESEL BACK-UP GENERATORS, YOU KNOW, 20, 30, 40 HOURS A YEAR.

BUT WE DO WAN TO HIGHLIGHT IF WE TOOK ALL THE STATIONARY SOURCES IN THE ENTIRE BASIN DOWN TO ZERO, WE WOULD STILL NOT MEET OUR GOALS. WE STILL NEED MOBILE SOURCE REDUCTIONS. TO THAT END, WE HAVE THE STATE SIP STRATEGY THAT IS LOOKING AT MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL OPTIONS AND DOES PROPOSE REGULATORY MEASURES FOR MOBILE SOURCES. BUT AS I MENTIONED BEFORE, WE ARE LEFT WITH THIS GAP THAT LOOKS AT ADVANCING THE DEPLOYMENT OF THE CLEAN TECHNOLOGIES IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE REGULATIONS.

SO THE STATE HAS A LOT OF DIFFERENT WAYS THEY'RE LOOKING AT DOING THIS. INCENTIVES IS ONE WAY. ANOTHER

WAY IS REGULATIONS AS TECHNOLOGY ALLOWS AND SEVERAL OTHER MEASURES THAT WE CAN TAKE. LOCALLY WE DO HAVE SOME LIMITED MOBILE SOURCE AUTHORITY, AND IT COMES UNDER FEDERAL AND STATE LAW, AND IT IS KNOWN AS INDIRECT SOURCE RULE AUTHORITY. AND THIS LOOKS AT DIFFERENT TYPES OF FACILITIES -- AND THEY'RE LISTED HERE. -- THAT ATTRACT MOBILE SOURCES EITHER ON THE ROAD OR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT COMING IN. SO WE DO HAVE SOME AUTHORITY OVER THOSE TYPES OF FACILITIES. IT IS CONTROVERSIAL AUTHORITY, AND IT OFTEN GETS CHALLENGED IN COURT.

SO WE'RE TAKING AN APPROACH WHERE WE WOULD LIKE TO GET THE PROCESS STARTED AND MEET WITH THE FACILITIES, START THOSE WORKING GROUPS, START WHAT WOULD OTHERWISE BE A RULE-MAKING PROCESS AND SEE IF WE CAN FIND A PATH FORWARD TO ACHIEVE EMISSION REDUCTIONS AT THESE FACILITIES IN A WAY THAT'S VERY SIMILAR TO WHAT HAPPENED IN THE PORTS. THE PORT OF LONG BEACH AND PORT OF L.A. HAD THE CLEAN AIR ACT ABOUT TEN YEARS AGO AND WERE ABLE TO ACHIEVE EMISSION REDUCTIONS ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS THAT WERE VERY SUCCESSFUL IN COLLABORATION WITH THE REGULATORY AGENCIES. SO WE WANT TO SEE IF WE CAN REPEAT THAT, THAT MODEL, IN SOME OF THESE OTHER TYPES OF FACILITIES. AND THE GOAL IS TO FIND A WAY WHERE WE CAN GET ENFORCEABLE EMISSION REDUCTIONS -- IT DOESN'T NECESSARILY HAVE TO BE THROUGH REGULATION. -- THAT WE CAN PUT INTO OUR PLAN AND

GET CREDIT FOR THESE REDUCTIONS WITHIN OUR SIP, WHICH MEANS WE WOULDN'T HAVE TO GO ELSEWHERE TO FIND THOSE EMISSION REDUCTIONS. SO WE WILL SEE WHAT WE CAN DO AND SEE IF WE CAN FIND THAT ENFORCEABLE MECHANISM. AND IF WE CAN'T FIND A WAY OTHER THAN REGULATION, THEN WE MAY HAVE TO MOVE TO REGULATION AS WE GO FORWARD.

SO I WANTED TO TALK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE REVISIONS. WE RELEASED OUR FIRST DRAFT PLAN IN JUNE. WE ACTUALLY RELEASED THE CONTROL MEASURES FOR THAT PLAN TOWARDS THE BEGINNING OF THE YEAR IN SEVERAL STEPS WITH OUR WORKING GROUP. BUT WE DID RELEASE THE MAIN BODY OF THE PLAN IN JUNE. WE TOOK COMMENT. WE GOT ABOUT 69 COMMENTS. AND BASED ON THOSE COMMENTS, BASED ON STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS, WE DID MAKE SOME SIGNIFICANT CHANGES, AND THEY'RE KIND OF LISTED HERE.

WE DID PRIORITIZE ZERO-EMISSION TECHNOLOGIES, BUT QUALIFYING THAT BY SAYING WHEREVER IT'S COST EFFECTIVE AND FEASIBLE, AND THEN THAT NEAR ZERO OR ULTRA LOW NOX EMITTING TECHNOLOGY EVERYWHERE ELSE. WE DO RECOGNIZE THAT WHEN WE'RE TALKING ABOUT COST EFFECTIVE AND FEASIBLE, WE DO NEED TO CONSIDER ALL THE EMISSIONS ASSOCIATED WITH DIFFERENT TYPES OF TECHNOLOGIES AND THE ENERGY SUPPLY THAT GOES INTO THAT. SO WE PLAN ON STARTING AN ANALYSIS VERY SOON THAT LOOKS AT ALL THE DIFFERENT TECHNOLOGIES AND COMBINATION OF TECHNOLOGIES,

LOOKING AT THEIR LIFE CYCLE IN BASIN NOX EMISSIONS TO BE ABLE TO PROPERLY COMPARE THEIR COSTS AND BENEFITS.

WE GOT A LOT OF COMMENTS THAT WE SHOULD BE LOOKING MORE SERIOUSLY AT SOME REGULATORY ACTIONS RATHER THAN JUST INCENTIVES. SO WE DID FIND SOME AREAS WHERE WE THINK THERE ARE REGULATORY OPPORTUNITIES IN THE 2030 TIME FRAME, LOOKING AT INTERNAL COMBUSTION ENGINES AND DIESEL BACK-UP GENERATORS AND THEN RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL APPLIANCES. I'VE ALREADY TALKED ABOUT THESE MEASURES, BUT THOSE WERE IN RESPONSE TO COMMENTS WE HAD RECEIVED. BUT EVEN WITH THESE NEW REGULATORY MEASURES, IT DOES NOT GET US WHERE WE NEED TO GO FAST ENOUGH SO INCENTIVES ARE STILL A MAJOR PART OF THE PLAN IN ORDER TO ADVANCE DEPLOYMENT AND GET THAT EQUIPMENT OUT.

WE ARE ALSO LOOKING AT OUR RECLAIM PROGRAM. AS I MENTIONED, WE HAVE A 5-TON PER DAY OR 35-PERCENT REDUCTION PROJECTED THERE. BUT ONE OF THE WAYS WE ARE LOOKING AT PERHAPS ACHIEVING THAT IS ACTUALLY LOOKING AT SUNSETTING THE PROGRAM AND RETURNING TO MORE OF COMMAND AND CONTROL APPROACH THAN THE CAP AND TRADE APPROACH THAT'S CURRENTLY BEING USED FOR THOSE FACILITIES.

WE ALSO ADDED SOME DISCUSSION ON FACILITY-BASED MEASURES AND FLEET RULES AND THEN A LOT OF TECHNICAL UPDATES ON MODELING AND EMISSION INVENTORY AND AIR QUALITY DATA THAT WE'RE CONSTANTLY TRYING TO GET THE

LATEST DATA AND INFORMATION IN. AND CHANGES ARE USUALLY QUITE SMALL AT THIS POINT, BUT WE DO NEED ALL THE NUMBERS TO ADD UP AT THE END OF THE DAY.

SO WE TALKED ABOUT INCENTIVE FUNDING. SO IN PAST PLANS WHAT WE HAVE DONE IS LOOKED AT ALL THE REGULATORY OPTIONS AND INCLUDED THEM IN THE PLAN. AND THERE'S ALWAYS BEEN THIS GAP IN FRONT OF US THAT WE COULD NOT FILL. WE USED TO PUT THAT INTO WHAT WE CALL THE BLACK BOX. UNDER THE CLEAN AIR ACT WE WERE ALLOWED TO DO THAT AND HAVE AN APPROVABLE PLAN EVEN THOUGH WE DIDN'T HAVE SPECIFICS ABOUT WHAT TECHNOLOGIES AND HOW MANY PIECES OF EQUIPMENT NEEDED TO BE CHANGED OUT OVER A CERTAIN TIME PERIOD. YOU WERE ALLOWED TO RELY ON ADVANCEMENT OF TECHNOLOGY TO GET YOU THERE.

BUT A COUPLE -- FIRST OF ALL, WE'RE ONLY SIX OR SEVEN YEARS WAY FROM THE ATTAINMENT DATE, SO IT'S VERY HARD TO RELY ON A TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT TO HAPPEN SOON TO MAKE A BIG DIFFERENCE. NUMBER 2, WE DON'T HAVE TO RELY ON TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT BECAUSE OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS OR SO WE HAVE HAD THOSE ADVANCEMENTS. WE CAN ACTUALLY LAY OUT A PATHWAY TO ATTAINMENT NOW. WE KNOW HOW MANY TRUCKS, HOW MANY OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT, HOW MANY TRAINS NEED TO BE REPLACED OR TURNED OVER TO A CERTAIN EMISSION STANDARD THAT WILL ACTUALLY GET US TO ATTAINMENT. THAT'S NEW WITH THIS PLAN. NOW THAT WE HAVE

THIS, WE DON'T HAVE TO PUT EVERYTHING IN THE BLACK BOX ANYMORE AND HOPE FOR A NEW TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT.

THE OTHER THING THAT IT ALLOWS US TO DO NOW THAT WE KNOW THE TYPES OF VEHICLES AND THE NUMBER OF VEHICLES WE CAN ACTUALLY CALCULATE THE COST OF DOING THAT. AND THE COST -- THE AMOUNT OF INCENTIVES IT WOULD ACTUALLY TAKE TO INCENTIVIZE THE REPLACEMENT OF THAT EQUIPMENT. SO WHEN WE ADD ALL THAT UP, IT IS GOING TO BE A SIGNIFICANT EXPANSION OF OUR CURRENT INCENTIVE PROGRAMS, AND IT COMES OUT TO ABOUT $14 BILLION OVER THIS 15-YEAR PERIOD, WHICH IS ROUGHLY ABOUT A BILLION DOLLARS A YEAR. MOST OF THAT IS ON THE MOBILE SOURCE SIDE, BUT WE DO SEE SOME OPPORTUNITIES ON THE STATIONARY SOURCES SIDE THAT WOULD BE COST EFFECTIVE AS WELL.

SO IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE AQMP ITSELF, THERE ARE RELATED DOCUMENTS. ONE IS THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT UNDER THE CALIFORNIA QUALITY ACT. THIS IS A PROJECT UNDER CEQA. SO WE DO HAVE TO LOOK AT THE OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PLAN. AND THAT'S UNDERGOING A PARALLEL PROCESS. WE JUST CLOSED OUR 60-DAY COMMENT PERIOD AND WILL BE RESPONDING. I THINK GOT EIGHT COMMENTS OR SO. WE'LL BE RESPONDING TO THAT AND REVISING THAT DOCUMENT GOING FORWARD.

IN ADDITION TO THAT, WE ALSO DO A FULL SOCIOECONOMIC ASSESSMENT OF THE PLAN, WHICH LOOKS AT THE

COST OF THE PLAN, LOOKS AT THE BENEFITS OF THE PLAN IN TERMS OF HEALTH, LOOKS AT ENVIRONMENT JUSTICE IMPACTS OF THE PLAN, AND THEN PUTS ALL THAT DATA INTO A REGIONAL ECONOMIC MODEL AND LOOKS AT THE JOB IMPACTS OF THE PLAN, THE IMPACTS TO OTHER ECONOMIC FACTORS, LOOKS AT IT ON A SUBREGIONAL BASIS, AND IT ALSO LOOKS AT SOME OF THE CEQA ALTERNATIVES. SO THAT HAS ALL BEEN RELEASED AND AVAILABLE ON OUR WEBSITE AND BEEN DISCUSSED WITH OUR ADVISORY GROUPS AND SUBCOMMITTEE. AND WE ARE WORKING ON AN UPDATED ASSESSMENT BASED ON COMMENTS WE RECEIVED AND WILL BE RELEASING THAT IN THE COMING DAYS OR WEEKS.

AND, LASTLY -- AND THIS IS NEW IN THIS PLAN -- BECAUSE WE HAVE SUCH A LARGE INCENTIVE NEED, WE ARE PUTTING TOGETHER A DOCUMENT THAT'S ESSENTIALLY AN INCENTIVE FUNDING ACTION PLAN, WHICH IS GOING TO LET OUR GOVERNING BOARD KNOW AND GET FEEDBACK FROM OUR GOVERNING BOARD TO STAFF OF HOW WE'RE GOING TO MOVE FORWARD IN SECURING THE FUNDING THAT WE NEED EITHER AT THE LOCAL LEVEL, AT THE STATE LEVEL, AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL. AND A LOT OF THE NEEDS ARE GOING TO BE LEGISLATIVE IN NATURE. SO WE NEED TO LOOK AT WHAT OUR OPTIONS ARE, LOOK AT WHERE WE WILL HAVE THE BEST CHANCE FOR SUCCESS, GET FEEDBACK, AND HELP BUILD A COALITION TO GET BEHIND RAISING THIS MONEY TO ACHIEVE CLEAN AIR IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

SO I'LL GO INTO A LITTLE DETAIL IN SOME OF

THESE. AND I WILL CAVEAT THIS BY SAYING THIS IS BEING UPDATED AS WE SPEAK. IN THE NEXT RELEASE SOME OF THESE NUMBERS MAY CHANGE TO SOME DEGREE, BUT THIS IS WHAT IS IN THE CURRENT VERSION, THE DISCUSSION VERSION, THAT'S OUT THERE NOW. SO THE TOTAL COST OF THE PLAN CAN BE SEEN RIGHT HERE. SO OVER THIS 15-YEAR PERIOD, IT'S ABOUT $15 BILLION AS THE INCREMENTAL COST OF THE PLAN. THAT'S THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NOT DOING ANYTHING AND THE TOTAL COST TO THE REGION IF THE PLAN IS FULLY IMPLEMENTED, WHICH COMES OUT TO ABOUT $1 AND A HALF BILLION A YEAR.

AND I NOTE THESE NUMBERS -- SOME OF THE LATEST NUMBERS I GOT TODAY. THESE ARE GOING TO CHANGE TO SOME EXTENT. I BELIEVE THIS MAY DROP A BIT, THIS MAY DROP A LITTLE BIT RIGHT HERE. THIS MAY STAY PRETTY SIMILAR. IN ANY CASE, YOU CAN SEE THE COST TO THE STATIONARY SOURCE SECTOR IS ABOUT $4 BILLION OVER THAT TIME PERIOD WITH SOME INCENTIVE FUNDING, AND THAT'S ABOUT 5.7 OVERALL.

ON THE MOBILE SOURCE SIDE, YOU SEE THE INCENTIVE FUNDING HERE, BUT YOU ALSO SEE SOME COST SAVINGS. AND THAT COST SAVINGS IS -- EVEN THOUGH THERE'S SOME COST OF CHANGING OUT EQUIPMENT, THERE'S COST SAVINGS DUE TO FUEL SAVINGS AND THE LOWER COST OF FUEL. SO THAT ALL GETS INCORPORATED INTO THIS ANALYSIS. AND YOU CAN SEE FOR THE TOTAL IT'S ABOUT $15 AND A HALF BILLION.

WE ALSO LOOK AT THE BENEFITS OF THE PLAN, AND

THESE ARE LARGELY THE HEALTH BENEFITS OF THE PLAN. SO LARGELY BASED ON LOWERING THE MORTALITY RATE, WE KNOW THAT PM2.5 AND OZONE TO SOME EXTENT LEADS TO PREMATURE DEATH. IT ALSO LEADS TO MORBIDITY, HOSPITAL VISITS, LOST WORK DAYS, LOST SCHOOL DAYS, AND A WIDE VARIETY OF OTHER IMPACTS. AND SO BY IMPROVING AIR QUALITY, WE GAIN HEALTH BENEFITS. WE CAN QUANTIFY THAT AND MONETIZE THAT. SO IF WE DO THAT, WE GET AN OVERALL BENEFIT OF OVER 256 BILLION IN OUR FOUR-COUNTY REGION WHICH COMES OUT TO ABOUT 24 BILLION A YEAR, WHICH IS MUCH MORE THAN THE BILLION AND A HALF DOLLARS IN THE COST. SO IT FAR OUTWEIGHS THAT.

NOW, MOST OF THAT IS DUE TO PREMATURE DEATHS FROM PM2.5. BUT, YOU KNOW, THE LATEST NUMBERS -- AND, AGAIN, THESE ARE GOING CHANGE TO SOME EXTENT. -- SUGGEST THAT EVEN WITHOUT THIS, EVEN WITHOUT THIS 99 PERCENT FROM -- IT'S ACTUALLY OVER 95 PERCENT FROM JUST PM2.5. EVEN WITH JUST THE BENEFITS FROM NOT MISSING WORK, NOT MISSING SCHOOL, NOT GOING TO THE HOSPITAL, THOSE HEALTHCARE COSTS THAT IT WILL STILL OUTWEIGH THE APPROXIMATE BILLION DOLLARS A YEAR IN COSTS.

JUST LITTLE BIT MORE ON THE FUNDING ACTION PLAN. WE ARE DEVELOPING THIS AND BRINGING THIS TO OUR BOARD IN PARALLEL WITH THE AQMP. ONE ESSENTIAL FEATURE OF THAT IS A SCHEDULE ON REPORTING BACK TO OUR GOVERNING BOARD ON PROGRESS TOWARDS SECURING THE FUNDING AND TALKING ABOUT

WHAT WE WOULD DO NEXT IF WE WEREN'T MAKING PROGRESS. SO WE ARE LOOKING AT ALL SOURCES. EVERYTHING IS ON THE TABLE IN TERMS OF FINDING FUNDING.

THESE ARE OUR EXISTING PROGRAMS. WE CURRENTLY SPEND BETWEEN 100 AND 150 MILLION A YEAR ON THESE INCENTIVE PROGRAMS THROUGH THESE MECHANISMS. WE ARE LOOKING AT A SERIOUS EXPANSION OF SOME OF THESE. BUT WE'RE ALSO LOOKING AT NEW POTENTIAL SOURCES OF FUNDING. AND JUST SOME IDEAS ARE LISTED HERE. IT DOESN'T MEAN EVERYTHING IS LISTED HERE, AND IT DOESN'T MEAN WE HAVE DECIDED ON ALL OR ANY ONE SPECIFIC ONE. THESE ARE UNDER CONSIDERATION. THERE'S A LOT OF WORK THAT NEEDS TO BE DONE TO FIGURE OUT WHERE WE HAVE THE BEST CHANCE OF SUCCESS.

WE WILL BE FORMING A STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP TO HELP BUILD A COALITION TO HELP US SECURE THIS FUNDING AT THE NATIONAL AND STATE LEVEL. WE'VE ALREADY STARTED THE NATIONAL LEVEL WITH LOOKING AT THE OTHER STATE AND LOCAL AIR QUALITY AGENCIES ESPECIALLY THOSE STATES THAT ARE GOING TO BE OUT OF ATTAINMENT FOR OZONE STANDARDS. WE'RE WORKING WITH THE ENGINE MANUFACTURERS AND OTHER PRIVATE SECTORS, AND THEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS AND NGO'S. AND AT THE STATE LEVEL WORKING WITH OTHER DISTRICTS WITHIN THE STATE AND OTHER PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.

JUST A LITTLE BIT ON WHERE WE STAND TODAY. AS I

MENTIONED BEFORE, WE RELEASED THE DRAFT IN JUNE, THE REVISED DRAFT BEGINNING OF OCTOBER. WE HAD 69 COMMENTS ON THE JUNE DRAFT. WE NOW HAVE 30 COMMENTS ON THE OCTOBER DRAFT. AND WE'RE WORKING ON THOSE NOW FOR THE DRAFT FINAL WHICH WILL BE RELEASED IN EARLY DECEMBER. AND WE'LL HAVE ONGOING ADVISORY GROUPS AND ONGOING STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS. WE'VE HAD ABOUT 163 OF THESE SO FAR OVER THE PAST SEVERAL MONTHS TO A YEAR.

THIS IS A SCHEDULE, AGAIN, JUST IN GRAPHICAL FORM, BUT I DO WANT TO HIGHLIGHT THAT WE ARE TARGETING FEBRUARY ARE FEBRUARY GOVERNING BOARD MEETING FOR FULL BOARD CONSIDERATION LEAVING A FULL 60-DAY COMMENT PERIOD AFTER WE RELEASE THE DRAFT FINAL IN EARLY DECEMBER.

THIS IS OUR PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULE. THIS IS OUR FINAL ONE. WE'VE DONE TWO ON TUESDAY AND THEN THIS IS OUR LAST ONE TODAY FOR REGIONAL PUBLIC HEARINGS. AND THEN IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, YOU CAN FEEL TO CONTACT ME OR MICHAEL KRAUSE, WHOSE HERE TODAY. HE'S OUR MANAGER IN CHARGE OF THE EFFORT. AND I ENCOURAGE EVERYONE TO GET INVOLVED AND STAY INVOLVED AND LOOK FOR OUR REVISIONS TO COME OUT.

SO WITH THAT, WE HAVE TWO MORE PRESENTATIONS. SO, FIRST, WE'LL HEAR FROM CAROL SUTKUS AT CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD, WHO WILL TALK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE STATE STRATEGY WHICH IS INTEGRATED WITHIN OUR AQMP.

MS. SUTKUS: IF I START MUMBLING, YELL IF YOU CAN'T HEAR ME IN THE BACK. CAN YOU HEAR ME IN THE BACK?

SO I'LL GIVE YOU A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF OUR UPDATE ON OUR STATE SIP STRATEGY THAT WAS ALREADY MENTIONED. WE RELEASED OUR FIRST VERSION OF IT BACK IN MAY, AND WE'RE ABOUT DUE TO RELEASE AN UPDATE BY THE END OF THE MONTH. SO I JUST WANTED TO GIVE YOU A REAL QUICK OVERVIEW OF IT AND THEN AN IDEA OF SOME OF THE CHANGES COMING.

SO WHAT IS THE STATE SIP STRATEGY? IT'S ESSENTIALLY, JUST LIKE YOU HEARD BEFORE, A BLUEPRINT. THIS IS THE BLUEPRINT TO GET REDUCTIONS FROM THE VERSION -- THE AMOUNT OF REDUCTIONS FROM MOBILE SOURCES THAT ARE NEEDED, AND MOBILE SOURCES, AS YOU SAW IN THAT BIG PIE CHART, ARE A VERY SIGNIFICANT SOURCE OF THE EMISSIONS HEAR IN THE SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN. SO THE FAIR SHARE OF EMISSION REDUCTIONS THAT COME FROM MOBILE SOURCES ARE IN THE STATE STRATEGY. IT'S A DOCUMENT WITH A LIST OF MEASURES, REGULATORY INCENTIVE MEASURES, OTHER KIND OF TECHNOLOGY-ORIENTED MEASURES. AND IT ALSO CONTAINS THE COMMITMENT FOR THE STATE FOR ACHIEVING ATTAINMENT IN THE SOUTH COAST, AND THAT COMMITMENT COMES IN TWO FORMS.

FIRST OF ALL, I SAID THERE IS A LIST OF MEASURES WITH AN IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE OF WHEN WE WOULD DEVELOP THOSE MEASURES, THOSE PROGRAMS, WHATEVER THEY ARE, BY A

CERTAIN SCHEDULE, AND BRING THEM TO OUR BOARD FOR APPROVAL. AND THE SECOND PART OF IT IS AN AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF EMISSION REDUCTIONS THAT WE WOULD ACHIEVE BY A CERTAIN DATE FROM ALL OF THOSE MEASURES. WE HAVE IN THE DOCUMENT KIND OF EXPECTED EMISSION REDUCTIONS FROM EACH OF THOSE MEASURES. SOME OF THEM WILL GET MORE. SOME OF GET LESS ONCE THEY'RE FULLY FLUSHED OUT IN THE IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS. BUT WE STILL HAVE TO COMMIT TO THAT BOTTOM AMOUNT OF EMISSION REDUCTIONS. AND THEN THE DOCUMENT, WHEN IT IS PULLED ALTOGETHER INTO AN ATTAINMENT STRATEGY OR ATTAINMENT DEMONSTRATION FOR THE AREA GETS SENT TO EPA AND UPON EPA'S APPROVAL IT BECOMES ENFORCEABLE FEDERALLY.

SO I DON'T WANT TO GO THROUGH ALL OF THE MEASURES AND BORE YOU ALL. BUT THE BASIC STRUCTURE IS WE LOOK AT ALL THE MOBILE SOURCE CATEGORIES. AND WE'RE TALKING ABOUT ON-ROAD PASSENGER VEHICLES, ON-ROAD HEAVY DUTY TRUCKS, OFF-ROAD HEAVY DUTY ENGINES, CONSTRUCTION-TYPE EQUIPMENT, AND SMALL OFF-ROAD ENGINES SUCH AS YOUR LAWN AND GARDEN EQUIPMENT, FORKLIFTS, AND SUCH. SO FOR EACH OF THESE CATEGORIES WE BASICALLY LOOK AT GETTING THE CLEANEST ENGINE STANDARDS OUT THERE AND THEN ENSURING THAT THOSE ENGINES WHEN THEY'RE OUT IN USE ARE GETTING -- ARE OPERATING AS CLEAN AS THEY'RE SUPPOSED TO BE OPERATING, AND REMAIN -- THE EMISSION CONTROLS

REMAIN OPERATING THE WAY THEY'RE SUPPOSED TO BE. WE'RE ALSO LOOKING AT WHERE FEASIBLE INCREASING THE PENETRATION OF ZERO-EMISSION TECHNOLOGIES SOME PLACE. WE'LL BE LOOKING FOR NEAR-ZERO TECHNOLOGIES WHERE THAT'S FEASIBLE. THE IDEA IS GETTING THE CLEANEST ENGINES OUT THERE.

WHEN WE FOCUS ON CLEANING UP THE ENGINES AND VEHICLES, WE ALSO WANT TO MAKE SURE THEY'RE OPERATING ON THE CLEANEST FUELS, SO WE HAVE A MEASURE LOOKING AT THE CLEANER DIESEL ENGINE FUEL. AND FOR SOME OF THE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES THAT ARE STILL AT THE VERY BEGINNING STAGES, WE ALSO HAVE SOME MEASURES FOR PILOT STUDIES TO GET THEM TO DEMONSTRATE NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND GET THEM INTO THE MARKET. AND, LASTLY, JUST TO DEPLOY THE CLEANEST TECHNOLOGIES, GET THEM OUT THERE A LITTLE EARLIER THAN THEY HAVE WOULD HAVE BEEN, WE HAVE SOME INCENTIVE PROGRAMS AS WELL. SO THAT'S THE ESSENTIAL STRUCTURE FOR ALL OF THOSE CATEGORIES.

SO THE EMISSION REDUCTIONS THAT WOULD BE ACHIEVED THROUGH THIS PROGRAM ARE OUTLINED HERE. AND I JUST WANT TO SAY FROM NOW TO 2031 THE EMISSION REDUCTIONS FROM OUR CURRENT PROGRAMS -- AND WE HAVE A LOT OF CURRENT REGULATION CURRENT PROGRAMS GOING FORWARD. -- AND THE NEW MEASURES AND THE STATE SIP ACHIEVE WHAT'S IN THE PERCENTAGES IN THOSE BOXES. SO LIGHT DUTY, 93 PERCENT; AND HEAVY DUTY, 88 PERCENT BETWEEN NOW AND 2031. IN THE

BARS FOR EACH CATEGORY, THE DARK BLUE IS FOR REGULATORY ACTIONS, AND THEY'RE AT THE CORE OF THE STRATEGY. AND THAT GIVES YOU THE PERCENTAGE OF REGULATORY ACTIONS GOING FORWARD. AND THEN THE LIGHT BLUE IS FOR THAT LAST INCREMENT GETTING THE INCENTIVE PROGRAMS OUT THERE. THE PERCENTAGES ARE FOR THE FULL AMOUNT OF REDUCTIONS WE WOULD GET BOTH FROM EXISTING PROGRAM AND THE NEW MEASURES GOING FORWARD.

ONE THING I WANTED TO MENTION ABOUT THESE MEASURES IS THAT EACH OF THESE MEASURES WILL ALSO GO THROUGH THEIR OWN PUBLIC PLANNING STRUCTURES. THEY'LL ALL HAVE WORKSHOPS AND THE PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT OF THOSE MEASURES, WHETHER THE REGULATIONS OR IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMS OR INCENTIVE PROGRAMS, WHATEVER THEY WILL BE GOING THROUGH, WILL BE THEIR OWN PROCESS AS WELL.

AND THEN MOVING FORWARD, SO I MENTIONED THAT WE HAD PUT OUT A PLAN IN MAY. WE'RE GOING TO PUT OUT A REVISED STRATEGY BY DECEMBER VERY, VERY SOON HERE. IT WILL INCLUDE SOME INVENTORY UPDATES AND SOME MODELING UPDATES, SOME UPDATES TO THAT IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE WHEN WE WOULD ADOPT AND PUT IN PLACE ALL THE MEASURES. AND LET'S SEE. I HAD SPECIFIED SOME EMISSION REDUCTIONS FOR THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY IN ADDITION TO THE SOUTH COAST AND THEN REFLECT THE FUNDING PLAN THAT WAS MENTIONED EARLIER. AND THEN IN RESPONSE TO SOME OF OUR PUBLIC

COMMENTS AND INPUT THAT WE RECEIVED ON OUR MEASURES THROUGH WORKSHOPS, THROUGH BOARD HEARINGS, AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD, WE'LL BE WORKING ON SOME OF THE MEASURES. THERE WILL BE SOME CHANGES TO MEASURES AS WELL.

AND I WANTED TO MENTION -- I MENTIONED MOBILE SOURCE FUELS. I ALSO WANTED TO MENTION THERE IS CONSUMER PRODUCTS RESPONSIBLE FOR REDUCTIONS, AND THERE IS A CONSUMER PRODUCTS MEASURES FROM THAT PLAN. AND THEN ONCE WE PUT OUT THIS DRAFT, WE'LL BE HEARING IT. WE'LL BRING IT AGAIN TO OUR BOARD, THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD, ALONG WITH THE AQMP. AND WHEN WE CONSIDER BOTH OF THEM TOGETHER, THEY GO TOGETHER IN A PACKAGE THAT'S THE ATTAINMENT DEMONSTRATION FOR THE AREA AND SEND IT ONTO EPA UPON APPROVAL BY THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD.

AND THEN JUST SOME CONTACT INFORMATION. I'M THE PERSON IN THE MIDDLE. YOU CAN CONTACT ANY OF US FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ON THE STATE STRATEGY OR ARB'S PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS FOR THE SOUTH COAST.

DR. FINE: THANK YOU, CAROL.

SO IN OUR FINAL PRESENTATION DR. GHOSH WILL TALK ABOUT OUR APPENDIX 1, THE HEALTH IMPACTS FOR AIR QUALITY.

DR. GHOSH: SO GOOD AFTERNOON. LET ME GO AHEAD AND GET STARTED HERE. SO APPENDIX 1 AS PHIL MENTIONED IS THE HEALTH AND SAFETY APPENDIX. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT IS PREPARED WITH EACH AQMP. IT IS ORGANIZED -- AS IN

PREVIOUS AQMP APPENDIX 1 DOCUMENTS, IT'S ORGANIZED FIRST BY CRITERIA POLLUTANTS, SO OZONE, PARTICULATE MATTER, AND SO ON. AND WE ALSO HAVE A SECTION ON TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS. SO FOR EACH OF THESE POLLUTANTS OR GROUP OF POLLUTANTS, WE PRESENT A SUMMARY OF THOSE HEALTH EFFECTS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH OF THESE POLLUTANTS.

NOW, ONE OF THE THINGS I DID WANT TO MENTION, YOU KNOW, IS HERE WE ARE NOT DOING A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OR ANALYSIS. THIS IS REALLY A VERY BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE HEALTH EFFECTS PRIMARILY DRAWING ON SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENTS AND REVIEWS CONDUCTED BY U.S. EPA AND OTHER SCIENTIFIC AGENCIES.

NOW, RECOGNIZING THAT THE EPA REVIEWS DON'T COME OUT EVERY YEAR FOR EVERY POLLUTANT, SO, FOR EXAMPLE, OZONE WAS LAST REVIEWED IN 2013, PM WAS LAST REVIEWED IN 2009, WE RECOGNIZE THERE'S A LOT OF SCIENCE THAT HAS HAPPENED SINCE THE LATEST REVIEW DOCUMENT. SO WE CONDUCTED A SUPPLEMENTAL LITERATURE REVIEW TO LOOK FOR THE MORE RECENTLY PUBLISHED STUDIES.

I DID WANT TO TAKE A MOMENT TO MENTION SOME OF THE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS. SO WE -- BY CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE WE ARE REQUIRED TO HAVE A REPORT -- TO PRODUCE A REPORT ABOUT THE HEALTH IMPACTS OF PARTICULATE MATTER IN THE SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN. THE REQUIREMENT IS SPECIFIC TO PARTICULATE MATTER, BUT ALTHOUGH IN THE

APPENDIX 1 WE DO ALSO INCLUDE THE HEALTH EFFECTS OF OTHER POLLUTANTS AS WELL. THERE IS A LEGAL REQUIREMENT THAT WE PREPARE THIS REPORT IN CONJUNCTION WITH A PUBLIC HEALTH AGENCY, AND IN THIS INSTANCE WE PREPARED IT WITH THE CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT OR OEHHA. AND, OF COURSE, WE ALSO PREPARED THIS REPORT IN CONSULTATION WITH THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD.

ANOTHER ONE OF THE REQUIREMENTS FROM THE HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE IS THAT AN ADVISORY COUNCIL REVIEW AND PROVIDE INPUT AND DISCUSSION ON THE PM REPORT. BUT, AGAIN, SIMILARLY, WE DON'T JUST GIVE THEM THE PM REPORT. WE GIVE THEM THE APPENDIX 1. MEMBERSHIP IN THE ADVISORY COUNCIL IS CHOSEN BY OUR GOVERNING BOARD AND BY OUR ADVISORY GROUPS. IT WAS CONVENED IN AUGUST OF 2016. AND I APOLOGIZE. IN THE PRINT VERSION OF THESE HANDOUTS THERE'S A TYPO. IT SHOULD SAY AUGUST 2016 NOT 2015. BUT THESE SLIDES ARE AVAILABLE ON OUR WEBSITE. SO AT THE TIME THE MEMBERS REVIEWED AND WE DISCUSSED, WE TOOK MINUTES OF THAT MEETING AS WELL, AND WE ARE USING THOSE MINUTES IN THE REVISION TO APPENDIX 1. AND, AGAIN, THE PM SECTION WITHIN APPENDIX 1 IS WHAT SATISFIES THIS CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE REQUIREMENT.

THE DRAFT APPENDIX 1 WAS RELEASED IN JULY OF 2016 BECAUSE TO THE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS AS WELL AS TO THE PUBLIC. IT IS AVAILABLE ON OUR WEBSITE. AND WE

ARE CURRENTLY WORKING ON OUR REVISION, WHICH I'LL TALK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT IN OUR SUBSEQUENT SLIDES.

JUST A REAL QUICK OVERVIEW OF APPENDIX 1. AGAIN, THE PURPOSE IN ADDITION TO SATISFYING LEGAL REQUIREMENTS REALLY THE PURPOSE IS TO PROVIDE A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF THE DIFFERENT AIR POLLUTANTS AND ALSO TO DESCRIBE HEALTH IMPACTS OF PARTICULATE MATTER IN THE REGION. WE DO PLACE A GREATER EMPHASIS ON THE SECTIONS FOR OZONE AND PARTICULATE MATTER. AGAIN, BECAUSE THESE ARE THE POLLUTANTS WHERE WE ARE IN NONATTAINMENT. THE OTHER POLLUTANTS ARE DISCUSSED IN LESS DETAIL. AND FOR THE OZONE AND PM SECTIONS WE DO GET INTO A LITTLE MORE DETAIL ABOUT SOME SPECIFIC STUDIES THAT MAY BE OF INTEREST TO THE READERS.

THERE IS A VERY LARGE BODY OF SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE THAT SHOWS THE ADVERSE IMPACTS OF AIR POLLUTION INTO HUMAN HEALTH. THERE ARE DIFFERENT KINDS OF STUDIES THAT ARE INCLUDED IN THIS U.S. EPA REVIEW. AND THESE ARE OFTEN TOXICOLOGICAL STUDIES, OFTEN ANIMAL CELL STUDIES, EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES, SO STUDIES OF HUMAN POPULATIONS, AND ALSO HUMAN EXPERIMENTATION STUDIES, SO LABORATORY STUDIES ON HUMAN SUBJECTS.

RECENTLY THERE'S BEEN INTEREST IN WHETHER THERE'S CERTAIN POPULATIONS THAT MAY BE MORE SENSITIVE TO THE IMPACT OF AIR POLLUTANTS COMPARED TO OTHER PEOPLE.

AND THIS MAYBE INCLUDES OFTEN TIMES YOUNG CHILDREN OR THE ELDERLY. THERE ARE CERTAIN GENETIC FACTORS AS WELL THAT MAYBE COULD MAKE A PERSON MORE SENSITIVE TO THE EFFECTS. CERTAIN HEALTH CONDITIONS, FOR EXAMPLE, PEOPLE WHO HAVE ASTHMA OR OTHER RESPIRATORY CONDITIONS OR HEART DISEASE. AND THERE'S CERTAINLY A LARGE BODY OF LITERATURE WHETHER SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS MAY ALSO INFLUENCE A PERSON'S SENSITIVITY TO THE AIR POLLUTION.

A COUPLE OF KEY CHANGES THAT WE TRIED TO MAKE IN THIS YEAR'S VERSION OF APPENDIX 1 IS REALLY CLARIFYING THE PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT BASICALLY AS STATED HERE AND ALSO CLARIFYING THE METHODS THAT WE USE AND PUT THIS DOCUMENT TOGETHER, WHERE THE INFORMATION COMES FROM, AND SO ON. WE ALSO TRIED TO MOVE TO A MORE STANDARDIZED WAY OF PRESENTING EACH SECTION. I THINK IT WAS NOTED FROM SOME REVIEWERS THAT THE DOCUMENT WOULD BE -- IT WOULD JUST BE EASIER TO READ IF IT WAS PRESENTED CONSISTENTLY IN EACH SECTION FOR EACH POLLUTANT. SO WE REALLY TRIED TO STANDARDIZE THE PRESENTATION THAT WAY.

WITHIN THE STANDARDIZATION ONE OF THE THINGS WE TRIED TO DO IS PRESENT A TABLE SUCH AS THIS FOR EACH OF THE POLLUTANTS, FOR EACH OF THE CRITERIA POLLUTANTS. SO THIS TABLE IS BASED ON THE INTEGRATED SCIENCE ASSESSMENT FROM U.S. EPA. THIS TABLE IS FOR PM2.5. AND, AGAIN, THE MOST RECENT ISA WAS DONE IN 2009. AND HERE WE PRESENT

SHORT-TERM EXPOSURE EFFECTS AND LONG-TERM EXPOSURE EFFECTS AND DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF HEALTH OUTCOMES. AND, FOR EXAMPLE, THE HEALTH OUTCOME CATEGORIES INCLUDE CARDIOVASCULAR EFFECTS, RESPIRATORY EFFECTS, MORTALITY, REPRODUCTIVE EFFECTS, AND CARCINOGENIC EFFECTS. AND I DO WANT TO NOTE THAT THESE CATEGORIES ARE NOT MEANT TO BE MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE. FOR EXAMPLE, A LOT OF THE STUDIES ON MORTALITY LOOK AT CAUSE SPECIFIC MORTALITY, FOR EXAMPLE, MORTALITY FROM CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE, MORTALITY FROM RESPIRATORY DISEASES, AND SO ON.

THE U.S. EPA USES A WEIGHT OF EVIDENCE APPROACH. IN OTHER WORDS, THEY LOOK AT THE DIFFERENT KINDS OF STUDIES, TOXICOLOGICAL, EPIDEMIOLOGICAL, AND SO ON, AND LOOK FOR CONSISTENCY, LOOK FOR WHETHER THE EFFECTS THAT WERE SEEN FROM ONE STUDY WERE ALSO REPRODUCIBLE IN ANOTHER STUDY, PERHAPS CONDUCTED IN A DIFFERENT AREA, DIFFERENT POPULATION. THEY ALSO ASSESS DIFFERENT LINES OF EVIDENCE AND LOOK FOR COHERENCE ACROSS THE DIFFERENT SCIENCES EVALUATING THE SAME EXPOSURE AND OUTCOME.

SO THEY COME UP WITH CAUSAL DETERMINATIONS. SO THE HIGHEST CATEGORY OF CAUSAL DETERMINATION IS CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP. IN OTHER WORDS EXPOSURE CAUSES THIS EFFECT. THE NEXT CATEGORY DOWN IS CALLED LIKELY TO BE A CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP. SO THESE ARE BOTH PRETTY HIGH ON THE CAUSAL DETERMINATION SCALE. AND THEN FURTHER DOWN ON

THE SCALE IS CALLED SUGGESTIVE OF A CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP. AND IT GOES DOWN FURTHER DOWN, INADEQUATE AND THEN NOT CAUSAL. SO HERE FOR PM2.5 YOU CAN SEE THE STRONGEST RELATIONSHIPS ARE FOR CARDIOVASCULAR EFFECTS AND MORTALITY WITH ALSO A LIKELY CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP WITH RESPIRATORY EFFECTS.

THIS IS THE SAME TABLE BUT FOR OZONE. AGAIN, OZONE WAS REVIEWED IN 2013. AND ALSO LOOKING AT SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM EFFECTS HERE AND, AGAIN, FOR OZONE THE STRONGEST EFFECTS WERE RESPIRATORY EFFECTS, BUT THE CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP WITH SHORT-TERM EXPOSURE AND A LIKELY CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP WITH LONG-TERM EXPOSURE. SOME OF THESE OTHER CATEGORIES ARE ALSO LIKELY CAUSAL RIGHT HERE FOR SHORT-TERM EXPOSURES.

WE DID RECEIVE 25 COMMENT LETTERS ON APPENDIX 1 INCLUDING COMMENT LETTERS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL AS WELL AS MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. WE ARE CURRENTLY WORKING ON ADDRESSING ALL THOSE COMMENTS IN THE REVISED DRAFT DOCUMENT. AND I'M JUST TRYING TO SUMMARIZE SOME OF THE MAIN POINTS THAT WERE BROUGHT TO OUR ATTENTION IN THESE COMMENT LETTERS RECEIVED.

I ALSO TRIED TO GROUP THEM BY CATEGORY. SO STARTING WITH THE INTRODUCTION-TYPE SECTION, THERE WAS SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PURPOSES OF THE DOCUMENT AND WHAT WAS THE ROLE OF AQMD, ARE WE ASSESSING THE SCIENCE

OR ARE WE SUMMARIZING THE SCIENCE AS ASSESSED BY OTHERS. IN THE TOXIC SECTION THERE WAS A REQUEST TO HAVE A BIT MORE OF A DISCUSSION ON VOC'S, VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS, SO WE DID ADD A SECTION WITHIN TOXICS, LIKE A SUBSECTION WITHIN TOXICS TO TALK ABOUT THE HEALTH IMPACTS OF VOC'S. WITHIN TOXICS WE ALSO TALK A LOT ABOUT HEALTH IMPACTS ABOUT DIESEL PARTICULATE MATTER. AND WE ADDED A BIT OF DISCUSSION ON THE ADVANCED COLLABORATIVE EMISSION STUDY, ACES STUDY, REGARDING THE IMPACTS OF DIESEL PARTICULATE MATTER AS WELL.

IN THE OZONE AND THE PM SECTION, WE DID SOME REORGANIZATION TO REALLY FOCUS THE DISCUSSION ON THE HEALTH OUTCOMES THAT WERE HIGH ON THE CAUSAL DETERMINATION SCALE. SO THESE ARE CAUSAL OR LIKELY CAUSAL. AND WE ALSO EXPANDED THE DISCUSSION OF THE SENSITIVE POPULATION AND, AGAIN, TRIED TO STANDARDIZE THAT. SO THEY WERE PRETTY CONSISTENT ACROSS THOSE TWO SECTIONS.

FOR THE PM SECTION, ADDITIONALLY, WE -- IN THE PREVIOUS VERSION WE ALREADY HAD A DISCUSSION ON ULTRA FINE PARTICLES. BUT THERE'S CERTAINLY BEEN A LOT OF SCIENCE RECENTLY ON HEALTH IMPACTS OF ULTRA FINE PARTICLES. THIS WAS MOVED TO BE WITHIN THE PM SECTION WHICH MAKES A LITTLE BIT MORE SENSE. AND WE ALSO CLARIFIED THE SUMMARY SECTION AND CREATED A SECTION

CALLED "ESTIMATES OF THE HEALTH BURDENS OF PARTICULATE MATTER IN THE SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN. SO IN THAT PARTICULAR SECTION WE PRESENT ESTIMATES OF MORTALITY AND MORBIDITY NUMBERS. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, WE USE THE ANALYSIS DONE BY THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD LOOKING AT PM2.5 AND CARDIOPULMONARY DEATHS. THEY DID THE ANALYSIS FOR THE ENTIRE STATE AND ALSO SPLIT IT UP BY AIR BASIN. FOR THE SOUTH COAST THE ESTIMATE WAS ABOUT 4,000 CARDIOPULMONARY DEATHS PER YEAR IN THE SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN ATTRIBUTABLE TO PM2.5 LEVELS ABOVE BACKGROUND LEVELS WITH AN ESTIMATE OF BACKGROUND IN THAT ANALYSIS OF 5.8 MICROGRAMS PER CUBIC METER. NOW, IT IS IMPORTANT TO KNOW THAT 5.8 MICROGRAMS PER CUBIC METER IS NOT WHAT WE'RE AIMING FOR IN THIS PLAN OR TO ATTAIN THE FEDERAL AND STATE STANDARDS HERE. SO THE ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACTS OF THE PLAN ARE ACTUALLY PRESENTED IN THE SOCIOECONOMIC REPORT. SO YOU'LL SEE BECAUSE OF THE ANALYSIS IS DIFFERENT AND THE PURPOSE OF THAT ANALYSIS IS DIFFERENT THE NUMBERS ARE GOING TO BE A BIT DIFFERENT AS WELL.

IN ADDITION, SOME OF THE OTHER COMMENTS THAT WE RECEIVED ON APPENDIX 1 WAS SOME CONCERN THAT SOME PEOPLE THINK THERE IS NO HEALTH RISK ASSOCIATED WITH PARTICULATE MATTER IN CALIFORNIA. AND, AGAIN, YOU KNOW, JUST TO REEMPHASIZE, WE ARE JUST SUMMARIZING THE CAUSAL DETERMINATIONS FROM EPA AND ALSO PRESENTING SOME

SUMMARIES OF SOME KEY STUDIES, PARTICULARLY THOSE THAT ARE CONDUCTED IN CALIFORNIA OR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.

WE RECEIVED A COMMENT ABOUT WHETHER THE STUDIES OF PM ADDRESSED THE POTENTIAL CONFOUNDED BY SMOKING, WHETHER IT WAS SMOKING OR AIR POLLUTION CAUSING THESE EFFECTS. SO WE CERTAINLY ADDED A LOT OF CLARIFICATION ABOUT WHETHER THESE STUDIES ADDRESSED CONFOUNDING BY SMOKING AND HOW THAT WAS ADDRESSED IN EACH OF THOSE STUDIES. WE ALSO HAD A COMMENT -- RECEIVED A COMMENT ABOUT DISCUSSING THE HEALTH EFFECTS OF ODORS. AND THIS WAS SOMETHING THAT WAS NOT PREVIOUSLY INCLUDED IN THIS APPENDIX, BUT WE ARE WORKING TO WRITE UP A BRIEF DISCUSSION ABOUT HEALTH EFFECTS OF ODORS AS WELL.

THIS IS MY CONTACT INFORMATION. CERTAINLY FEEL FREE TO CONTACT ME IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS.

DR. FINE: THANK YOU, JO KAY. I THINK WE'RE READY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT. I HAVE FOUR CARDS. IF ANYONE ELSE WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT, WE HAVE CARDS UP FRONT. PLEASE COME AND GET ONE. I WILL NOTE ONE MORE TIME THAT WE ARE TAKING A TRANSCRIPT, AND WE'LL BE TRANSCRIBING THAT AND IT WILL BE PROVIDED TO OUR BOARD MEMBERS. SO ANYTHING YOU SAY HERE WILL BE ON THE ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD FOR THE ADOPTION OF THE AQMP. SO IF ANYONE WAS AT PREVIOUS MEETINGS, WHAT YOU HAD SAID IS ALREADY ON THAT ALREADY ON THAT TRANSCRIPT.

ALL RIGHT. SO WE'LL START WITH LEA PETERSON.

MS. PETERSON: GOOD AFTERNOON. YOU ALREADY HEARD ME EARLIER THIS MORNING, SO I'M GOING TO KEEP MY REMARKS BRIEF. SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY APPRECIATES THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE COMMENTS ON THE SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICTS REVISED DRAFT OF THEIR AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN. SO CAL GAS STRONGLY SUPPORTS SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT'S EFFORT TO ATTAIN FEDERAL CLEAN AIR ACT STANDARDS. THE ATTAINMENT OF OZONE AND FINE PARTICULATE MATTER STANDARDS ARE VITALLY IMPORTANT TO OUR COMPANY IN THOSE COMMUNITIES WHERE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS OPERATES AND PROVIDES SERVICES.

FOR THOSE IN THE AUDIENCE WHO ARE NOT FAMILIAR WITH SO CAL GAS, WE HAVE 22 MILLION CUSTOMERS AND WE OPERATE IN OVER 500 COMMUNITIES. SO WE CONTINUE TO OFFER SUPPORT, EXPERTISE, AND PARTNERSHIP WITH THE SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT TO CREATE A TECHNICALLY SOUND FUEL TECHNOLOGY NEUTRAL AQMP THAT WILL PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH BY DEMONSTRATING TIMELY ATTAINMENT OF THE FEDERAL CLEAN AIR ACT STANDARDS WHILE ALSO SUSTAINING VITALITY OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ECONOMY. FOLLOWING ADOPTION OF THE PLAN, WE LOOK FORWARD TO CONTINUING TO COLLABORATE WITH SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONTROL MEASURES, EFFORTS TO

SECURE INCENTIVE FUNDING, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF INCENTIVE PROGRAMS.

SO WE RESPECTFULLY SUBMIT THESE COMMENTS AND THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THE TIME TO SPEAK TO YOU.

DR. FINE: THANK YOU, LEA.

NEXT IS ANDREW TORRES.

MS. TORRES: IT'S ALISON TORRES.

DR. FINE: I ALSO HAVE AN ANDREW TORRES.

NO RELATION I TAKE IT.

MR. TORRES: I'M A CONCERNED CITIZEN, AND I'M WORRIED ABOUT THE IMPACT TO BUSINESSES HERE AND HOW THESE REGULATIONS MIGHT PREVENT GOOD-PAYING JOBS IN THE INLAND EMPIRE. THE GENTLEMAN WHO PRESENTED IN THE BEGINNING SAID YOU LIKE TO PUSH THE ENVELOPE. YEAH, WE ALREADY HAVE SOME OF THE MOST STRINGENT LAWS AND PROGRAMS ON AIR POLLUTION IN THE NATIONS. ALL WE HAVE PUSHED IS BUSINESSES AND JOBS AWAY. CALIFORNIA NOW RANKS 50TH IN ALL STATES -- THAT'S LAST. -- FOR PLACES TO OPEN A BUSINESS.

PLEASE CONSIDER THIS BEFORE CREATING NEW REGULATIONS. THANK YOU.

DR. FINE: NEXT IS JOSHUA.

MR. NASTRI: I THINK HE TESTIFIED EARLIER TODAY.

DR. FINE: I THINK WE GOT HIS COMMENTS EARLIER AND HE LEFT.

ALISON.

MS. TORRES: THANK YOU. SORRY ABOUT THAT. GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS ALISON TORRES. I'M FROM THE EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT. I JUST WANT TO SAY FIRST WE APPRECIATE THE AQMD'S EFFORT IN THE AQMP AND RECOGNIZE THE CHALLENGES FACED TO MEET THE OZONE STANDARDS.

SOME CONCERNS THAT WE HAVE AS MENTIONED IN THE PRESENTATION STATIONARY SOURCES ALONE DO NOT ATTAIN THOSE STANDARDS AND MOBILE SOURCES IS A HUGE PORTION OF THAT. AS SUCH STATIONARY SOURCES, THEY'RE ALREADY HIGHLY REGULATED. AND THAT SMALL SLIVER THERE FROM NEW REGULATIONS CAN CAUSE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS TO OUR SERVICES. PARTICULARLY EMW IS CONCERNED WITH THE ENGINE REPLACEMENT IN VIEW ONE WITH REGARD TO DIESEL BACK-UP GENERATORS AND OUR ESSENTIAL SERVICES. THEIR RELIABILITY AND FUEL DEPENDENCE OF THE ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGIES DISCUSSED IN THOSE MEASURES THAT COULD POTENTIALLY REPLACE THESE ENGINES WILL GREATLY JEOPARDIZE ARE ABILITY TO PROVIDE PUBLIC SERVICES DURING EXTREME EMERGENCIES.

AS A PUBLIC AGENCY, IT'S CRITICAL THAT WE'RE PREPARED FOR WHEN A SIGNIFICANT EMERGENCY OCCURS AND THAT PUBLIC HEALTH IS NOT COMPROMISED DURING AN EXTREME EMERGENCY. IT'S WHEN THAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN, NOT IF IT'S GOING TO HAPPEN. SO WE ASK THAT IN THE AQMP AND FUTURE

RULE MAKING THAT THE IMPORTANCE FOR EXEMPTIONS FOR ESSENTIAL PUBLIC SERVICES WITH REGARD TO THESE REPLACEMENTS AND RETROFITS OF STAND-BY GENERATORS ARE RECOGNIZED.

IN ADDITION, WITH REGARD TO BIOGAS DISCUSSIONS IN THE MEASURES, WE APPRECIATE THE ADDED DISCUSSION RELATED TO INCENTIVE FUNDING FOR BIOGAS PROJECTS. AND OUR AGENCY WILL PARTICIPATE IN ANY FUTURE WORKING GROUPS. HOWEVER, WE DO NOT BELIEVE THAT BIOGAS TECHNOLOGIES ARE TRULY COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE, RELIABLE, OR COST EFFECTIVE YET. AND WITH THAT BEING SAID, WE REQUEST THAT REDUCTIONS FROM THESE PROJECTS ARE NOT SPECIFICALLY INCLUDED IN THE AQMP. WE GENERATE BIOGAS AT OUR FACILITIES, AND WE DO STRIVE TO UTILIZE THIS RESOURCE AND CONTINUE RESEARCHING AND TESTING COST-EFFECTIVE SOLUTIONS. HOWEVER, THROUGH EXPERIENCE, TECHNOLOGY SOMETIMES OFTEN LOOKS PROMISING, BUT THEY DON'T ALWAYS PERFORM AS EXPECTED.

LASTLY, ALONG THE LINES OF BIOGAS IN PARTICULAR WITH FLARES, THERE'S A MEASURE RELATED TO FLARES. AND AT OUR AGENCY WE UTILIZE THESE FLARES FOR EMERGENCY BACK-UP. SO WE'RE CONCERNED THAT THE INVENTORY FROM THE WASTE WATER SECTOR IS NOT ACCURATELY PORTRAYED IN CMB03 SINCE IT'S LUMPED WITH OTHER CATEGORIES. SO CONSIDERING THAT WASTE WATER FLARES ARE NOT A SOURCE OF NOX, WE WOULD REQUEST THAT THE WASTE WATER SECTOR BE EXCLUDED.

WE THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION. AND WE ALSO DID SUBMIT A COMMENT LETTER.

DR. FINE: THANK YOU. AND JUST TO RESPOND TO ONE OF YOUR POINTS IN TERMS OF THE DIESEL BACK-UP GENERATORS. WE FULLY UNDERSTAND THAT THERE'S MANY APPLICATIONS, ESSENTIAL PUBLIC SERVICES OR EMERGENCY APPLICATIONS, WHERE IT IS ESSENTIALLY THAT OPERATIONS CAN CONTINUE OVER VERY LONG TIME PERIOD OF POWER DISRUPTION OR EVEN FULL SUPPLY DISRUPTION. BUT THERE ARE OTHER APPLICATIONS THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT, SAY, JUST A LARGE COMMERCIAL BUILDING THAT ALSO HAS A DIESEL BACK-UP GENERATOR THAT MAYBE IS ONLY TRY TO GET THROUGH A FEW MINUTES OF A POWER DISRUPTION OR DOESN'T HAVE A NEED TO RUN FOR THREE OR FOUR DAYS IF THERE IS ACTUALLY A REGIONAL EMERGENCY. WE'RE PUTTING OUR EFFORTS INTO THAT, AND FULLY RECOGNIZE WHEN WE GET INTO RULE MAKING THE TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENTS THAT THERE WILL BE SECTORS THAT WILL NEED SPECIAL CONSIDERATION TO BE ABLE TO OPERATE DURING A REAL EMERGENCY.

MS. TORRES: WE APPRECIATE THAT. THANK YOU.

DR. FINE: I THINK THAT'S IT IN TERMS OF COMMENTS. ANYONE ELSE LIKE TO MAKE A COMMENT?

OKAY. WELL, STAFF WILL BE HERE FOR A FEW MINUTES AFTER IF YOU WANT TO COME UP AND HAVE A PRIVATE DISCUSSION OR HAVE ANY MORE QUESTIONS. BUT, AGAIN, I

THANK YOU FOR COMING. STAY INVOLVED IN THE PROCESS. WE'LL BE RELEASING NEW DRAFTS OVER THE COMING WEEKS AND LOOK FORWARD TO ALL YOUR COMMENTS ON THOSE AS WELL. THANK YOU.

(END OF PUBLIC HEARING.)

160 S. OLD SPRINGS ROAD, SUITE 270, ANAHEIM, CA 92808
PHONE: 714.444.4100 FAX: 714.444.4411 EMAIL: DEPO@DEPO1.COM