

VENTURA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
May 24, 2005  
MINUTES

Chairman Kuhn convened the meeting at approximately 7:40 p.m.

I. Director's Report

Christine White, recently hired as the new manager of the APCD Engineering Division, introduced herself, and said APCO Mike Villegas was out of town on District business. Ms. White introduced new Committee member Scott Blough representing the City of Simi Valley.

II. Call to Order

Chairman Kuhn called the meeting to order at approximately 7:45 p.m.

III. Roll Call

Present

Sara Head	Manuel Ceja
Duane Vander Pluym	Michael Kuhn
John Procter	Ron de la Pena
Hugh McTernan	Michael Moore
Scott Blough	Ron Dawson
Michael Gollub	Hector Irigoyen

Absent

Clint Matkovich (excused)	Aaron Hanson
Stan Greene	

Staff

Christine White	Don Price
Kerby Zozula	Chris Frank

Public

Mark Griffin – AERA Energy  
Scott Cohen – West Coast Environmental  
Steve Blois – AGC California  
Rod Elliot – R + R Pipeline  
Tony Morelli – AGC California

IV. Minutes

The minutes of the February 22, 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 BusinessA. Proposed Schedule to Adopt New Rules to Control Airborne Particulate Matter Emissions.

APCD staff member Chris Frank distributed copies of a revised draft rule development schedule. He also distributed copies of comment letters from West Coast Environmental and AGC California, and staff's response letters.

Chris Frank presented staff's proposal. The presentation included the following elements: 1) Background information on coarse and fine particulate matter (PM) sizes (i.e.; TSP, PM10, PM2.5); 2) Identity of sources of various sizes of PM; 3) APCD's PM monitoring program; 4) Health effects and other damage caused by airborne PM; 5) Information on how often Ventura County's air violates state air quality standards for PM; 6) A summary of existing federal, state, and local PM control regulations; 7) A summary of the requirements of Senate Bill 656 (SB656); 8) The public process APCD staff will follow to develop new local rules to comply with SB656; 8) The identity of the source categories targeted for local regulation; 9) Control techniques that could be used to comply with the new rules; 10) A proposed timeline for development of new rules, and 11) Information on the issues raised at staff's May 17, 2005, public workshop.

Committee Member Procter asked what percentage of PM pollution is due to natural weather conditions as compared to human activity. Chris Frank (CF) responded staff believes most airborne PM in Ventura County results from human activities. Exceptions

are wild fires and silt build-up in river bottoms. Staff believes most windblown dust is initiated by the disturbance of soil by human activity.

Committee Member Procter asked how the differing toxicities of airborne PM chemicals would be considered in rule development. CF responded that SB656 is aimed at attainment of the three state ambient PM standards without regard to individual toxicities.

Committee Member Procter asked how different weather conditions like humidity affect ambient PM concentrations. CF responded moisture keeps dust on the ground and prevents it from entering the air. He referred to charts in the staff report showing that PM concentrations drop immediately after the first rain each year. He said only two of the nine exceedances measured in Simi Valley occurred during Santa Ana winds.

Committee Member Head said PM emission reduction credits (ERCs) are in short supply, and asked at what point in time voluntary emission reductions would become ineligible for banking as ERCs. Ms. Head also asked if the new rules would be included in the SIP. CF said since Ventura County is attainment for the federal PM standards, the future rules might not need to be included in the SIP.

CF referred to a letter from Associated General Contractors of California (AGC) listing concerns with specific control measures included in staff's proposal. CF said the concerns would be addressed individually when the rules are developed. The revised draft rule development schedule clearly states that during rule development, some of the control measures may be determined to be technically or economically infeasible for implementation in Ventura County.

Scott Cohen of West Coast Environmental, representing the Southern California Rock Products Association, referred to his comment letter. He suggested the order of rule development should be re-prioritized to address paved roads, the largest source of emissions, first. He suggested the first rule developed should be a general rule aimed at all sources of track-out, not aimed at specific industries. This would get at the biggest source – paved road dust.

Committee member Moore asked if track-out is the main source of paved road dust, as compared to road-shoulder dust. Scott Cohen responded road shoulders become stable and are probably not a large source of paved road dust. He said continuous traffic grinds large track-out particles into PM10.

Steve Blois, representing AGC California said the construction industry already does a good job policing itself. He questioned the PM inventory pie chart in the staff report that shows agriculture emissions to be 7% of the total while construction and demolition dust is 18%. He said the use of rumble strips to control track out from construction sites is much more prevalent now than it was in 2001 when the inventory data was collected. He

questioned the prioritization of rule development and the proposal to single out individual industries for regulation rather than regulating track out across all industries, including agriculture. He said all of the dust control measures aimed at construction sites are already mandated at the city and county level and he is concerned that APCD is proposing to establish duplicative requirements. Mr. Blois said controlling dust is a common interest and the construction industry looks forward working with the District staff to establish reasonable requirements.

Committee member Kuhn noted there is currently a regional mall under construction in Simi Valley, and that Simi Valley's dust control measures in effect at that project are very effective. He said the APCD has a history of developing rules that can be implemented as painlessly as possible and mesh well with other agency requirements.

Committee Member Procter said it is important that any new rules do not have unintended consequences. He noted possible problems with dust suppressants that could create a slurry with track-out and storm water contamination problems. Committee member Kuhn noted that requiring dust control plans might help to avoid such problems.

Steve Blois, representing AGC California, asked what the penalty would be if the District does not meet the July 31, deadline for adopting a rule development schedule. CF responded that there is no penalty listed in the law. Christine White noted that the APCD's program is audited by the California Air Resource Board.

Rod Elliot, representing R + R Pipeline, shared his experience with similar rules already in effect in Los Angeles County. He said rumble strips and PM10-efficient street sweepers are already required in Los Angeles. He said most of the requirements listed in staff's proposal are already enforced through SWPPP and additional regulations would be duplicative. Christine White responded staff would coordinate with the Regional Water Quality Board to make sure we are not doing something different.

Rod Elliot said detailed logs are required in Los Angeles of how often dust control is performed, including daily records of water truck use. On windy days, construction sites shut down rather than risking a fine. Builders budget about \$3,000 per house built for SWPPP compliance. Sand along Route 126 that has escaped from gravel trucks damages windshields and creates dust.

Tony Morelli, representing AGC California, said contractors are reluctant to apply too much water to a worksite for dust control because they are concerned about violating SWPPP requirements.

Participants discussed possible advantages of an industry-wide rule focused exclusively on track out (prompt implementation, simplicity, attacking the largest source first - paved roads), and disadvantages (rule development is more difficult when multiple industries

are involved in a single rule, less opportunity to finely tailor rules to unique industry circumstances).

Committee member Vander Pluym addressed many of the technical issues related to the proposed PM control techniques and said track-out controls, regardless of industry, should be the highest priority.

Committee member Moore suggested a hybrid approach to rule development that would make industry-wide track-out controls a high priority.

Committee members and staff discussed related issues including: 1) The fact that EPA removed speed variables from emission factors, 2) Local long term PM concentration trends; 3) Responsibility for dust control on highway construction projects; 4) Questions of APCD authority to enforce dust controls on Cal Trans and their contractors, and 5) The level of APCD staff resources needed to develop rules

Committee member de la Pena expressed concern about targeting track out based on available data. He asked if track out could be chemically analyzed and compared to airborne PM10 samples to make sure track out is a significant contributor.

Committee member Moore suggested revisions to the schedule to move agricultural track out operations to a higher priority. He suggested the list be re-titled as "order of business" rather than prioritization.

Committee member Ceja asked how staff's prioritization compares to other air districts' schedules, and if staff had quantified expected emission reductions from each measure. CF responded the lists proposed by other districts vary widely and emission reductions had not been quantified.

Mark Griffin of AERA Energy asked if track out from unpaved well locations onto private paved roads would be regulated. CF responded the rule would probably have a threshold based on the amount of traffic on the paved road.

Mark Griffin of AERA Energy asked if plan review fees would be rolled into the company's Title V permit. CF responded that if the dust control measures were included in the permit as conditions, permit-processing fees might be charged to cover the cost of developing the conditions.

Committee member Moore made a motion to revise the schedule by moving agriculture track-out emissions to high priority. Committee member Vander Pluym seconded the motion.

The Committee discussed staff resources needed to complete three high priority rules (including the addition of agriculture track-out) in the allotted time. Christine White expressed concern about staff resources.

The motion was approved by a vote of 9 yes and 3 no.

B. Proposed Revisions to New Source Review Rules (Rules 26, 26.1, 26.2, 26.3, 26.4, 26.5, 26.6, 11, 29 and 112).

This agenda item was postponed to a later date to be determined due to the late hour.

C. Proposed Revisions to Rule 72, New Source Performance Standards, and Rule 73, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants.

Staff member Chris Frank explained the revisions to Rule 72 and 73 will update the incorporations by reference of federal regulations. He said the rule revisions would not require any sources in Ventura County to take any actions. Staff is required to periodically update the rules as part of its federal funding agreement with EPA.

Committee member Procter made a motion to recommend Board approval of the proposal. Committee member de la Pen seconded the motion and the Committee voted unanimously to approve the motion.

IX. Adjournment

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

Prepared by:  
Chris Frank, APCD Staff