

VENTURA COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
February 24, 2009  
MINUTES

Chairman Vander Pluym convened the meeting at approximately 7:35 p.m.

I. Director's Report

Mike Villegas, APCO, stated that a public workshop for draft new Rules 55.1, Paved Roads and Public Unpaved Roads, and 55.2, Street Sweeping was held on February 5, 2009. The workshop went well and some changes are being made to the draft rules based on comments received at the workshop.

District staff will be meeting with California Air Resources Board staff and representatives of the Port of Hueneme to discuss the use of shorepower at the port. This would mean that vessels would use electricity from the grid to power the vessels cranes and other operations while docked in port. Therefore, the auxiliary engines would not be operated while the vessel is connected to grid power.

The District's draft fiscal year 2009-10 budget looks to be balanced.

II. Call to Order

Chairman Vander Pluym called the meeting to order at approximately 7:40 p.m.

III. Roll Call

Present

Scott Blough	Keith Moore
Stephen Garfield	Greg Patterson
Sara Head	Ron Peterson
Hugh McTernan	Duane Vander Pluym
Marilyn Miravete-Smith	

Absent

Stan Greene (excused)	Michael Moore
Steven Kane (excused)	Aaron Hanson
Michael Kuhn (excused)	

<u>Staff</u>	
Mike Villegas	Don Price
<u>Public</u>	
Mark Jacobsen	Cal Lutheran University
Jim Tovias	Self

IV. Minutes

The minutes of the September 23, 2008, meeting were approved as drafted.

V. Committee Comment

There was no Committee Comment.

VI. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

VII. New Business

Proposed Amendments to Rule 42, Permit Fees

Don Price, of APCD staff, gave an overview of the proposed amendments. The main points where as follows:

- An increase of 3.5 percent for permit renewal fees, effective July 1, 2009. This proposal would increase the minimum renewal fee by \$16.00. Of the 1,366 facilities on permit, 869 are subject to the minimum fee. This proposal would increase District revenue by approximately \$70,000 in fiscal year 2009-10.
- Staff is proposing to change the transfer of ownership fee to include any administrative activity that requires a permit to be reissued outside of the annual renewal cycle. The fee will not be charged if the administrative changes are made during renewal.
- Staff is proposing to assess hourly processing fees for Part 70 permits. This proposal would increase District revenue by approximately \$15,000.

Committee member Keith Moore asked for more background on the District's budget.

Mike Villegas gave an overview of the District's budget situation.

- The District is expected to experience a net savings for the current fiscal year (FY 2008-09).
- The draft budget for FY 2009-10 shows the District is expected to have a balanced budget.

- In FY 2010-11 and the following few years the costs to fund the current retirement system is expected to increase by 20 percent annually. This will create a significant increase in District expenditures via increased labor costs. Further, labor costs account for 79 percent of District expenditures.
- The District does not have the ability to increase revenue significantly in any one year. This is because permit fees account for only 30 percent of District revenue and increases are capped at 15 percent.
- Based on these facts staff is proposing a modest increase in permit fees at this time to avoid the need for large fee increases in the future.

Jim Tovias stated he thought this seemed like a fee increase to offset future costs.

Mark Jacobsen, representing California Lutheran University, expressed his frustration with the proposed fee increase.

Chair Vander Pluym expressed his concern with a permit renewal fee increase at this time. However, he was supportive of the proposed change to assess permit processing fees on Part 70 (Title V) permits. He stated it may be advisable to revisit the permit renewal fee increase next year based on the current economic situation.

Committee member Keith Moore stated he was not supportive of a permit renewal fee increase, but was ok with permit processing fees on Part 70 permits.

Committee member Patterson stated he felt staff was being careful with the District budget, and was sending an appropriate message with a modest fee increase. He noted that permit fees were the one source of revenue where the District had discretion with the use of the funds.

It was moved (McTernan), and seconded (Miravete-Smith), to recommend to the Board, adoption of the proposed revisions to Rule 42 as proposed by staff. The motion failed on a vote of 4 yes, 4 no, and 1 abstention.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:45 p.m.

Prepared by:

Mike Villegas  
Air Pollution Control District Staff