

---

# SOUTH CENTRAL COAST BASINWIDE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL COUNCIL

Santa Barbara APCD 260 N. San Antonio Rd. Suite A Santa Barbara CA 93110 805-961-8800

---

## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Michael Villegas**, APCO  
Ventura County APCD

**Dave Van Mullem**, APCO  
Santa Barbara County APCD

**Larry R. Allen**, APCO  
San Luis Obispo County APCD

## COUNCIL MEMBERS

**Mike Morgan**  
Council Member, City of Camarillo  
Ventura County

**Janet Wolf, Chair**  
2<sup>nd</sup> District Supervisor  
Santa Barbara County

**Debbie Arnold, Vice-Chair**  
5<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor  
San Luis Obispo County

---

## MEETING MINUTES August 9, 2013

### Present

Council Members: Mike Morgan, Ventura County  
Janet Wolf, Santa Barbara County  
Debbie Arnold, San Luis Obispo County

Staff: Mike Villegas, Ventura County  
Dave Van Mullem, Santa Barbara County  
Larry Allen, San Luis Obispo County

### 1. **Approval of Minutes of May 31, 2013**

Received and filed.

### 2. **Public Comment Period**

There were no public comments.

### 3. **CARB Truck Rule** (Dave Van Mullem)

CAPCOA has recently learned that the California On-Road Heavy Duty Diesel Vehicle Regulation (CARB Truck Rule) is the number one priority for the Air Resources Board (ARB). The purpose of the rule is to reduce emissions of diesel PM pollutants. According to the regulation, a heavy duty diesel vehicle is a truck or bus that weighs more than 14,000 pounds. There are 8 classes of

trucks in the United States. Classes 1-3 are less than 14,000 pounds and Classes 4-8 are greater than 14,000 pounds.

As a background, when ARB adopted their diesel regulations and Air Toxic Control Measures, studies had shown 70% of all the health risk came from diesel particulate. This was the driving force in adopting numerous diesel regulations throughout a 10-year time period. Regulations have already affected larger diesel vehicles and effective January 1, 2014, single-use operators with vehicles greater than 14,000 pounds will be required to comply with the regulations by installing diesel particulate matter (PM) traps.

ARB has been sending out notices of the regulation for at least 3 years to affected parties that they are able to find. They have information on vehicles through fleet registrations, but no direct information on single-use operators. Guestimates are that there are over 50,000 single-use operators.

PM traps can cost in the thousands of dollars. Prop 1B money cannot be used for these single-use operators because the regulation does not include single-use operators, and there are no other State grant funds to assist them in coming into compliance. This is going to affect a lot of small businesses. ARB is worried there will be rampant non-compliance, which is why it's become their highest priority. Looking forward, by January 1, 2023, nearly all trucks and buses will need to have 2010 model year engines or equivalent to ensure compliance.

#### 4. **CalEnviroScreen Overview** (Mike Villegas)

The California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) and the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) developed a science based tool for evaluating multiple pollutants and stressors in communities. This tool, California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen), creates a score based on census zip codes using various indicators.

CalEPA is looking at a cumulative impact, which they define as exposures, public health or environmental effects from the combined emissions in the geographic area, including environmental pollution from all sources. Also taken into consideration are sensitive populations and socioeconomic factors.

When you look at population characteristics, there's 2 main things they look at under the model; sensitive populations and socioeconomic factors. The model uses a suite of statewide indicators to characterize both the pollution burden and population characteristics. It assigns a score to each zip code then derives the CalEnviroScreen score for each zip code relative to all the other zip codes throughout the state. The cumulative scores are in percentiles, with high scores having higher health impacts. This means if you receive a zero score, there are no zip codes in the state with lower impacts than you; if you receive a 90, then 90% of the zip codes in the state have a lower impact. Using this methodology, there will always be a "worst" zip code even if they are in attainment.

In creating the CalEnviroScreen score, existing research on pollutants and health risks identify socioeconomic and sensitivity factors as effective modifiers. For example, studies on PM have found that low socioeconomic status was related to a 3-fold increase risk in mortality at the same pollution level as a better off area. A study of asthmatics found their sensitivity to air pollution was 7-fold greater than non-asthmatics, and the young can be 10 times more sensitive to environmental carcinogens than adults.

Exposure indicators include such factors as smog (or ozone) and PM2.5, which are estimated using the existing air monitoring network. A 4x4km grid was used to weigh all diesel PM emissions. The use of pesticides was estimated on a township (roughly 1 square mile) basis..

They also utilized EPA's toxic release inventory, which is self-reported and not as reliable as the California Air Toxics Hot Spots data.

Environmental indicators include clean-up sites for ground water, hazardous facilities, pollutants in water, municipal landfills, population characteristics (under age 10 and over age 65), and low birth weight rates. They also looked at populations over age 25 without a high school education, saying this leads to fewer occupational opportunities, economic hardship, and less access to medical care.

Socioeconomic indicators include educational attainment, linguistic isolation, race, ethnicity, and poverty. Health studies provide evidence that race and ethnicity can modify the adverse responses to pollutant exposures.

Looking at some of the scores in Oxnard as an example, ratings came in at all levels ranging from a zero for ozone (best in the state), up to 100 for pesticides (worst in the state). Even though they have relatively good air quality, their CalEnviroScreen cumulative score designated them as the worst 5% in the state due mainly to other environmental and socioeconomic factors.

The CalEnviroScreen tool can be used to help CalEPA and its boards, departments and offices define areas that need assistance in reducing health risks. CAPCOA commented it would not be appropriate to use this model for CEQA analysis. Air Pollution Control Districts have been reviewing the tool and submitting comments and feel it needs some work and fact checking.

#### **5. Ongoing Implementation of SLOAPCD Dust Rule (Larry Allen)**

State Parks is in the middle of a large monitoring project on the dunes to find out where any hot spots may be, and determine the best locations to install permanent monitors. As part of the project, they are required to monitor the air upwind and downwind of the riding areas. The project should be done by the end of September and data should be available in November. They have applied for a permit through the district, and the permit should be issued sometime next week. They also have a permit requirement with the Coastal Commission and Fish and Wildlife for anything that needs to be done in the area for control measures, such as re-vegetation or installing wind fences. Both of those agencies have requested more specificity and an EIR needs to be completed. No controls have been installed at this point.

A petition to repeal the district rule was circulated online about a month ago, but it provided a lot of misinformation about the basis of the rule and how it was implemented. Earlier in the year State Parks and Friends of the Dunes appealed the Superior Court decision on the rule. One brief has been received from Friends of the Dunes, State Parks brief is due to be filed by the end of the month, and then SLO APCD will have a month to file their brief. This appeal is being watched very closely throughout the state because it is contesting SLO APCD's authority to adopt a rule and require a permit of a facility like this. An unfavorable ruling would affect every districts' ability to regulate fugitive dust sources.

#### **6. OEHA Risk Assessment Guidance (Dave Van Mullem)**

Item was tabled to the next meeting due to time constraints.

**Reauthorization Update (All)**

The state provides grant funding to each of the districts in the form of a Carl Moyer grant, also in the \$2 and \$4 DMV fees. AB923 and the Moyer Program provide for approximately \$800,000 a year to each of our districts in grant funding to help local businesses comply with rules and regulations.

AB923 will sunset next year and we are trying to reauthorize it in order to extend the sunset date to 2024. We missed it last year by 2 votes and this year we have started from the beginning of the legislative session and are watching it closely. CAPCOA is leading a diverse coalition of environmental and industry members supporting the reauthorization. Two basically identical bills, AB8 and SB11, have been given the urgency designation and are currently under review. On August 12, we will enter the most pivotal point of the decision making process when both houses reconvene and one of the bills must achieve a final pass vote by end of session.

**7. Brown Act Issues (All)**

SLO APCD had someone suggest Brown Act violations may have occurred in regards to emails from the APCO to the full Board; the concern was that such correspondence could represent a serial meeting. These emails were outgoing and informational only, so legal Counsel determined no violation occurred; however the concern is the perception of a violation. SLOAPCD asked how the other districts handle similar issues. One suggestion was to post informational items on the website rather than emailing them directly to Board members. Another idea was to include the information as part of the Board agenda package.

**8. Other Business**

None.

**9. Confirm Next Meeting Date**

Next Meeting Date – October 16, 2013, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

**10. Adjourn**

Meeting was adjourned at 12:06 p.m.