# SOUTH CENTRAL COAST BASINWIDE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL COUNCIL

**Technical Advisory Committee** 

Larry R. Allen, APCO

San Luis Obispo County APCD

David Van Mullem, APCO

Santa Barbara County APCD

Michael Villegas, APCO

Ventura County APCD

**Council Members** 

Karen Bright, Chair

Council Member, City of Grover Beach

San Luis Obispo County

Roger Aceves, Vice Chair

Council Member, City of Goleta

Santa Barbara County

**Brian Brennan** 

Council Member, City of Ventura

Ventura County

MEETING MINUTES
October 19, 2011

Present

Council Members:

Brian Brennan, Ventura County

Roger Aceves, Santa Barbara County Karen Bright, San Luis Obispo County

Staff:

Mike Villegas, Ventura County

David Van Mullem, Santa Barbara County

Larry Allen, San Luis Obispo County

### 1. Approval of Minutes of June 22, 2011

Bright/Brennan Minutes Approved

#### 2. Public Comment Period

None

# 3. EPA Implementation of the 0.075 ppm 8-hour Ozone Standard - Villegas

The implementation of the 0.075 ppm 8-hour Ozone Standard has become a bit contentious because the Clean Air Science Advisory Committee recommended a lower standard ranging from .060 to .070 ppm, and after review EPA came out with 0.075, a bit higher than was recommended. This standard became final in 2008. The Obama Administration stated they would reconsider this standard with the intent to lower it back into the .060 to .070 range. However, just a month ago, the Obama Administration advised that they would defer reconsideration of the standard until 2013, with finalization occurring in 2014.

EPA is in the process of implementing the 2008 standard, however, they are already behind schedule, leaving them open for potential litigation.

Classifications range from marginal to extreme, with moderate, serious, and severe in between. With a marginal classification, a District would have the shortest amount of time to comply with the standard. An extreme classification would have the most time to comply

with the standard. However, an extreme classification would subject many sources to federal air quality requirements and Title V permits.

To set the classifications, EPA has based it on a percentage of the district's design value, which consists of the average of 3 years of a district's 4<sup>th</sup> highest ozone reading. EPA initially was to use 2008-2010 data and is now considering using 2009-2011 data. For SLO County, utilizing newer data would considerably decrease the design value and its respective classification. EPA is considering locking in your current "bump up" in classification to allow districts a bit more time to attain the standard.

Another issue for many areas will be the reasonable further progress requirement requiring districts to reduce emissions of ozone precursors by 3% per year until attainment is reached; the South Coast and San Joaquin APCDs are unable to show this level of emission reductions. CAPCOA has prepared a letter to EPA outlining legal reasons to allow out of area reductions; EPA wants to discount transported emissions. The draft regulation is currently under review.

#### 4. EPA Revisions to Allocation of Clean Air Grants to Air Districts - Allen

Section 105 of the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) provides a mechanism for funding air quality control programs in nonattainment & maintenance areas. Historically, these grants were provided to air agencies in ozone nonattainment areas to help them develop plans and implement measures to reach attainment. As the ozone standards have been tightened over the years, however, the number of nonattainment areas has increased with no corresponding increase in the number of agencies receiving grant funding.

Last year, EPA began working to revise how the funds were disbursed to provide funding to more agencies. They developed a formula based on four weighting factors:

- o Nonattainment status and population-weighted severity of AQ problem
- o Air monitoring network and geographical size of district
- Population-weighted average risk for toxic air contaminants (e.g. diesel PM)
- Size and complexity of compliance programs (#permitted sources, delegation of fed air toxics programs).

Based on the criteria, significant changes in 105 funding allocations nationwide would occur, resulting in some areas losing funding and others gaining funding. To avoid significant financial impacts to agencies, EPA adopted a policy that no existing funded entity would lose more than 5% in any year, allowing them to plan for the loss of funds. In California, the formula would increase funding for South Coast and the Bay Area and reduce funding for all other currently funded districts; Ventura County and Santa Barbara County would both see an approximate 50% reduction over time. The formula will begin to be applied in 2012/2013.

In the 2011/2012 funding year, EPA Region 9 had an extra \$600,000 that was allocated to 8 additional districts that ranked highest based on the formula and were not already receiving funds. SLO APCD ranked #8 and will receive \$62,000 as a one-time award. There isn't any promise of additional funds.

# 5. GHG Offsets from Biomass; Placer County's Public/Private Partnership – Van Mullem

Placer County has a Public/Private Partnership to reduce the amount of open burning days and to convert waste into energy. The question posed is: Can this basic arrangement be used by the South Central Coast?

Placer County developed a protocol to transport waste to biomass power plants and turn the wood biomass into energy. They came to meet with Santa Barbara County APCD regarding their protocol and how it might be a suitable GHG mitigation for the Santa Maria Pacific project (oil project with an estimated 70k tons of GHG emissions per year).

There are currently 33 processing plants west of the Sierras, although Soledad shut down due a lack of demand. It would replace open burning of wood waste with burning in a controlled environment, generate reductions in GHG and criteria pollutants, increase production of renewable energy and provide other local benefits for forest areas.

Moving forward, Santa Maria Pacific would have to determine if the project would be practical with regard to upfront costs, timing and magnitude of GHG reductions. A buy-in would be necessary from P&D, APCD and other local stakeholders. Contracts would be necessary between SMP and Placer County for timely delivery of GHG credits. This project could be a useful model for Santa Barbara County initiatives.

## 6. Update on ARB's Portable Equipment Registration Program - Villegas

Ventura County APCD and the CAPCOA Engineering Managers are currently forming the basis of a guidance document for determining "portable" versus "permitted" equipment. ARB's rule definitions can be open to interpretation; therefore, the guidance document will be helpful.

## 7. SLOAPCD Draft Fugitive Dust Rule for the Oceano Dunes - Allen

SLOAPCD developed concepts for a draft rule in August 2011, held a public workshop in early September and presented the concepts to the Board in late September. The Board agreed with the primary concepts with minor modifications. The three primary concepts:

- a comprehensive Particulate Matter Reduction Plan (PMRP) requiring APCD approval
- a performance standard for measuring effectiveness and ensuring accountability
- a compliance schedule with phased milestones of progress

A PRMP would be required to identify all emission reduction strategies that would be implemented to ensure emissions from the Oceano Dunes State Vehicular Recreation Area (SVRA) don't exceed the natural background. PM monitoring downwind of the riding areas and comparable non-riding areas will be implemented to measure the effectiveness of the reduction strategies compared to the natural background.

SCCBAPCC Minutes October 19, 2011 Page 4 of 4

The performance standard requirements are based on close compliance with the State 24-hour average  $PM_{10}$  standard of 50 ug/m3, but allows for a small margin of error. The compliance milestones are based on the date of rule adoption. The draft rule is posted on our website and the staff report will be up soon.

## 8. Other Business/Next Meeting Date

Next meeting date – February 8, 2012 (Mr. Brennan to confirm date)

H:\APCO\BCC\Minutes\BCC Min 2011-10-19.doc