

VENTURA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
April 22, 2011
MINUTES

Chairman Vander Pluym convened the meeting at approximately 7:30 p.m.

I. Director's Report

Mike Villegas, APCO, reported that the District Board had adopted the Tailoring Rule (GHG permitting requirements) and amended Rule 42, Permit Fees. The Board also approved a support position for the California Air Resources Board's proposed amendment to the Ocean Going Vessel Fuel Regulations. These amended regulations will protect air quality and address the issue of vessels transiting the Navy's sea test range.

II. Call to Order

Chairman Vander Pluym called the meeting to order at approximately 7:35 p.m.

III. Roll Call

Present

Robert Cole

Rick Cook

Raymond Garcia

Todd Gernheuser

Michael Kuhn

Tom Lucas

Brandon Millan

Keith Moore

David Morse

Richard Nick

Ron Peterson

Duane Vander Pluym

Steven Wolfson

Absent

Sara Head (excused)

Kim Lim (excused)

Hugh McTernan (excused)

Marleen Luckman (excused)

Staff

Mike Villegas

Kerby Zozula

Don Price

Public

None

IV. Minutes

The minutes of the March 22, 2011, meeting were approved as drafted.

V. Committee Comment

Committee member Moore asked how the APCD staff reviewed development projects such as the South Shore project in Oxnard.

Mike Villegas stated that these projects were reviewed under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). APCD staff is tasked with reviewing the air quality portion of the Environmental Impact Report to determine if the emission calculations are reasonable and if the proposed mitigation measures are adequate. Mitigation is required to reduce project emissions below significance thresholds unless a finding of overriding consideration is made by the approving body (generally a planning commission or City Council).

Committee member Moore asked if this type of development project goes before the Air Pollution Control Board. Mike Villegas stated this type of project would not go before the Air Pollution Control Board.

Chairman Vander Pluym added that any interested party can review an Environmental Impact Report and submit comments on the document.

Committee member Moore asked if the county's nonattainment status was a factor considered in the review of these development projects. Mike Villegas stated that the APCD has set CEQA significance thresholds that take into account the county's nonattainment status, and the thresholds are quite low.

Committee member Moore asked how the APCD handles air emissions from Navy operations such as aircraft. Mike Villegas replied that the District obtains aircraft operation data from the Navy, and these emissions are included in the emission inventory as part of the Air Quality Management Plan.

VI. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

VII. New Business

- A. Proposed New Rule 26.13 New Source Review – Prevention of Significant Deterioration, and the Repeal of Rule 26.10, New Source Review – Prevention of Significant Deterioration

Mike Villegas, stated that Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) was a federal preconstruction permit program, which is currently implemented by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in Ventura County. PSD is a companion program to federal New Source Review (NSR). While NSR regulates nonattainment

pollutants, PSD regulates attainment pollutants. PSD is similar to NSR in that it requires best available control technology, but PSD does not require emission offsets. Instead of offsets, PSD requires an analysis of air quality impacts.

Don Price, of District staff, gave an overview of the main points of the proposed amendments:

- The PSD program applies to major new sources and major modifications.
- Currently, no facility in Ventura County has a PSD permit.
- The attainment pollutants have specified thresholds.
- A major new source of greenhouse gases (GHG) is defined as a source with a
- A major modification for GHGs is defined as a modification at a major source with an increase on 75,000 tons per year of CO_{2e}.
- CO_{2e} (carbon dioxide equivalent) is an expression of the global warming potential of a group of six GHGs. It is based on the global warming potential of the compounds compared to carbon dioxide, which is given a global warming potential of one.
- The PSD program includes an analysis of the air quality impacts of permit actions. This includes an air quality increment analysis, and an analysis of impacts on soils, vegetation, and Class 1 areas.
- The proposed rule is based on a model rule developed by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association and the U.S. EPA.
- If the District implements the PSD program instead of EPA, the District will charge permit processing fees, while EPA does not. However, the District would be able to process the permit in a more timely manner.

Committee member Moore asked what sulfur hexafluoride and hydrofluorocarbons were used for. Don Price replied that sulfur hexafluoride was used in electric switch gear and hydrofluorocarbons were used as refrigerants.

Committee member Moore asked if the District had adequate staffing to take on this new program. Kerby Zozula, of District staff replied that he felt that the District had adequate staff and in the worst case could hire a contractor for a major project.

The Committee and staff discussed the likelihood of a project requiring a PSD permit and the cost issues. Kerby Zozula stated that while it was unlikely that we would see a PSD permit application, it was possible one of the power plants could repower to turbines in the future. Mr. Zozula added that most of the cost in the PSD permit process would relate to the modeling and air quality analysis. Chairman Vander Pluym stated the applicant would likely hire a consultant to perform the modeling.

Committee member Morse asked about the maximum time required for the processing of a PSD permit. Staff replied that EPA permits had taken several years. Mike Villegas added that the District has a much more timely permit appeals process than EPA.

Committee member Gernheuser asked if the LNG terminal projects that were proposed in the past would be subject to PSD. Kerby Zozula replied yes.

It was moved (Millan) and seconded (Peterson) to recommend adoption of new Rule 26.13 and deletion of Rule 26.10, as proposed by staff. The motion passed unanimously.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:40 p.m.

Prepared by:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mike Villegas".

Mike Villegas
Air Pollution Control District Staff