

VENTURA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
February 28, 2006
MINUTES

Chairman Kuhn convened the meeting at approximately 7:45 p.m.

I. Director's Report

Christine White, manager of the APCD Engineering Division, reminded the committee to complete their Statements of Economic Interest before April 4, 2006.

Mike Villegas reported that many California local districts had been meeting with ARB to discuss a coordinated plan to attain the new 8 hour ozone standard. The District's new non-attainment status is moderate, but there is a good chance it will be bumped up to serious. Many districts are not expecting much reduction in stationary source emissions. ARB will be working on emission reductions from locomotives, offroad vehicles, onroad trucks and large marine vessels.

II. Call to Order

Chairman Kuhn called the meeting to order at approximately 7:50 p.m.

III. Roll Call

Present

Sara Head
Duane Vander Pluym
John Procter
Hugh McTernan
Stephen Garfield

Clint Matkovich
Michael Kuhn
Ron de la Pena
Michael Moore

Absent

Stan Greene (excused)
Manuel Ceja (excused)
Ron Dawson (excused)
Ryan Kinsella (excused)

Hector Irigoyen (excused)
Aaron Hanson (excused)
Scott Blough

Staff

Christine White
Mike Villegas

Don Price

Public

Keith Moore
David Corrente, Elliot's Custom Furniture

IV. Minutes

The minutes of the September 27, 2005, meeting were approved as drafted.

V. Chairman's Report

There was no Chairman's report.

VI. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

VII. Old Business

There was no old business.

VIII. New Business

The annual election of officers took place. Committee members Kuhn and Head were reelected chair and vice chair, respectively. A second vice chair nomination failed for lack of a second. After a single vote for both chair and vice chair, the committee decided that, in the future, votes for chair and vice chair shall be done separately to facilitate multiple nominations.

Proposed Revisions to the Permit Fee Rule (Rule 42)

Mike Villegas presented information on the proposed revision to Rule 42. Approximately one third of the emission inventory in Ventura County is stationary sources, which have permits. The District funds its programs in part from permit fees based on emissions. Revenue has been reduced as permitted emissions go down. District programs that require funding include permits, inspections and compliance, planning, ambient air monitoring, rule development, and overhead.

The Board has revised the fund balance policy by increasing the target from 3 to 4 months reserve to 4 to 6 months reserve. A series of 10 percent fee increases will not ultimately attain this goal; a series of 15 percent fee increases may attain the 4 to 6 month fund balance goal. Although the increase is expected to net about \$170,000 next year, additional program cuts are expected. Problems began with a recent sharp increase in pension contributions and other obligations. A discussion took place on the meaning and ramifications of the increased fund balance goal and the nature of the DMV fees.

Christine White discussed two proposed text changes for Rule 42. The first was a revision to Subsection B.1.b to eliminate the need for an application withdrawal in writing. A discussion occurred on the meaning of Subsection B.1 and how applicants are notified of their fee obligations. The second was a revision to Subsection B.2.d to include public participation costs (postage, printing, newspaper publication) in the permit fee.

Mike Villegas discussed recent staff cutbacks and past permit fee increases. A previous 15 percent fee increase was significantly opposed by industry. Mike Villegas stated that the proposed fee increase will go to the Board on April 11 and become effective July 1, 2006.

A discussion of District funding sources occurred, with an emphasis on new alternatives. Committee member Moore and audience member Keith Moore expressed frustration about the dysfunctional business model being employed by the District. Committee member Vander Pluym stated that DMV fees could be increased and their use expanded but are under the control of the state legislature. Per-capita fees, indirect source review fees and other alternate revenue streams were discussed. Keith Moore stated that the value of the District to the community should be emphasized, and this cannot be done by reducing staff. Although no motion was made, the committee agreed that these issues require further discussion.

After this discussion, the Committee member Garfield moved the recommended action. Committee member McTernan seconded the motion. Committee members de la Pena and Moore expressed reservations about proposal and it's predicted failure to prevent funding problems for the District. The Committee voted 9 Yes and 2 No to approve the motion.

Committee member Garfield stated that Rule 42, Section I (page 7 of the rule) is not consistent with common practice. In the section, late fee payments are given a 10 day grace period after notification that the permit will be voided. It was suggested that the section be deleted. Christine White agreed to prepare an explanation and recommendation on the issue.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:30 p.m.

Prepared by:
Don Price, APCD Staff