Clean Air Act Advisory Committee
September 20, 2012

Welcome/Opening Comments

Pat Childers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) began the meeting and gave an overview of logistics. He thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

Janet McCabe, Deputy Assistant Administrator Office of Air and Radiation (OAR) USEPA, thanked all Clean Air Act Advisory Committee (CAAAC) members and observers for attending the meeting. She introduced Assistant Administrator Gina McCarthy (USEPA) to open the meeting and to provide an update on the agency's Office of Air and Radiation (OAR) program.

Air Program Priorities and Updates

Ms. McCarthy welcomed all members to the meeting and thanked them for their hard work. Ms. McCarthy outlined her presentation, including thanking the "graduating" CAAAC members, providing an update on air issues and next steps.

Ms. McCarthy noted that USEPA understands how valuable CAAAC is to OAR decision making, and that CAAAC has led to more reasonable and practical decisions at USEPA. Ms. McCarthy recommended the charter for the CAAAC be renewed. She was confident that USEPA would have a lot of work to do over the next few years with CAAAC. She noted that USEPA is currently working on identifying the new members for CAAAC and that OAR has been working with the Administrator's office to make decisions before next January to ensure that there would be a complete slate the next time CAAAC meets.

Ms. McCarthy thanked the members who has served their six years and would not be returning to CAAAC, and noted that USEPA appreciates the hard work of these members. Carolyn Green, managing partner of Energy Capital Management, had served for 12 years. Lisa Gomez, Sempra Energy, was on the Committee for 10 years. Gary Jones, Director of Environmental Health and Safety Printing Industry, served seven years. Janice Noland, Assistant Vice President of the American Lung Association, served for almost seven years. John Campbell, General Manager of Caterpillar, served for seven years. Eddie Terrell, Oklahoma DEQ, was the final member leaving the committee.

Ms. McCarthy then provided an update on air issues. On August 21, USEPA got a U.S. Court of Appeals decision that vacated the Cross State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR). Ms. McCarthy noted that the agency is working through the ramifications of the decision, including the implications for a variety of decisions that are happening at the state, local, and tribal levels. The Administrator stated USEPA is looking at its legal opportunities and is working with the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) to do this. USEPA is also working with the regions on a weekly basis to talk about the decisions in the pipeline.

Ms. McCarthy also discussed the circuit court decision on greenhouse gases (GHG), which supported the Administrator's endangerment finding; kept in place the foundation for the Light Duty GHG Rule; and kept USEPA working diligently on the Tailoring Rule.

Ms. McCarthy noted that USEPA was able to move forward with a Plantwide Applicability Limit (PAL) on GHG and will be working with states on that issue. USEPA managed to work with the Senate to address concerns related to the Congressional Review Act of the Mercury and Air Toxics Standard (MATS). USEPA has been working hard to implement the MATS rule. Ms. McCarthy stated they have a team working to understand fully the energy world, connect with those that are making energy decisions on the planning side, and engage openly on the challenges. USEPA has been reaching out to the states and regions on the process of making the fourth year decisions. USEPA is reaching out to all the Independent

System Operators (ISOs) and planning entities with regular calls regarding plans to ensure they get reductions in a timely way consistent with the rule. Ms. McCarthy stated that USEPA is aware of the need to ensure reliability.

Ms. McCarthy also noted that USEPA proposed to update emission limits for new power plants under MATS. The updates would only apply to future power plants; would not change the types of state-of-the-art pollution controls that they are expected to install; and would not significantly change costs or public health benefits of the rule. They are moving forward and already made a commitment that any change to those standards will be completed in March.

Ms. McCarthy moved to the Light Duty Vehicle (LDV) Standards. USEPA is setting standards that will double fuel economy between 2010 and 2025. Approximately 12 billion barrels of oil will not be consumed as a result of more efficient vehicles.

Ms. McCarthy informed CAAAC participants that Margo Oge, USEPA, is retiring at the end of the month. Ms. McCarthy made a number of comments acknowledging her work and accomplishments, and invited attendees to share remarks about Ms. Oge.

Ms. McCarthy talked about USEPA's work on Risk and Technology Reviews (RTRs) and regional haze decisions. Also, on August 1, USEPA started the lower sulfur in marine bunker fuel, which was a big victory. This was a Ms. Oge initiative and was a heavy lift for the United States internationally. Many players participated in this. CAAAC celebrated some of the companies that provided leadership on this at the award ceremony.

Ms. McCarthy mentioned that the Energy Star program turned 20 and the Montreal Protocol turned 25. While they are still young, they have been hugely successful. There is over 70 percent recognition rate for the Energy Star label. USEPA is focused on addressing hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) and are trying to reach an international agreement there.

Ms. McCarthy moved to what is coming up next. Ms. McCarthy mentioned the new source reconsideration for MATS along with other petitions that need to be resolved with MATS. There are several significant decisions coming up starting with the 5-year review of the particulate matter (PM) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). USEPA will be finalizing that on December 14. The cement final rule is a reconsideration that USEPA has targeted for December. The refinery RTR is in interagency review. Ms. McCarthy explained USEPA is moving forward on the NO_2 monitoring rule. SO_2 designations and implementation need to be worked through. She thanked everyone at the meeting, the states, and the regulated community for helping USEPA work through some of those challenges. USEPA is in the process of drafting the second Urban Air Toxics Report to Congress, which is currently in review by the agency.

Ms. McCarthy explained USEPA will continue the dialogue with stakeholders on GHG and how to keep streamlining opportunities to address the permitting requirements under the Clean Air Act (CAA). USEPA is looking at biogenic CO_2 emissions. They have several Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) decisions coming up. The Administrator has been asked to wave the RFS and consider how the drought conditions across the nation impact the ability to achieve those standards without severe economic consequences. USEPA is looking at addressing RIN fraud issues. Ms. McCarthy explained USEPA has volume requirements for 2013. One exciting part of RFS is USEPA is finally seeing cellulosic fuels coming into the market. Ms. McCarthy added USEPA needs to finish California's waiver request, which goes along with establishing a national program on light duty vehicles. There was a hearing yesterday on that topic. USEPA looks forward to reviewing the comments received before making an appropriate decision.

Ms. McCarthy concluded that the team at USEPA is very dedicated and will be great in delivering the products moving forward.

Ms. McCabe thanked Ms. McCarthy for her recap of the upcoming agenda at USEPA. Before opening the floor to questions, Ms. McCabe noted the inspiring comments about Ms. Oge reflect the great legacy she is leaving. In addition, the last CAAAC meeting was chaired by Laurie Schmidt, USEPA. Ms. Schmidt has moved to another position within the Agency. Ms. McCabe thanked Ms. Schmidt for her time at OAR. Jim DeMocker, USEPA, is sitting in Ms. Schmidt's place and will be taking over as Chair of the CAAAC meeting. Ms. McCabe commenced the introductions around the room and opened the discussion for questions.

Rob Kaufmann, Koch Companies Public Sector, stated he had talked at the last two CAAAC meetings about NAAQS implementation issues. He was curious about modeling compliance under Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) of the NAAQS. Mr. Kaufmann met with USEPA and was presented with a schedule of things that were going to happen that would make it easier to model compliance with more realistic assumptions. Mr. Kaufmann requested an update from USEPA on this issue.

Steve Page, USEPA, stated USEPA has been evaluating ways to improve models. Mr. Page explained USEPA is preparing to brief senior USEPA managers on these issues. He confirmed there are several ideas, but is waiting for further discussions.

Ms. McCarthy added her department had several meeting on this topic recently. The decision on what to do with the modeling and monitoring has a larger context of timing and the process for the SO_2 designations. Ms. McCarthy assured Mr. Kaufmann that USEPA is working hard to move this process further. Ms. McCabe clarified that USEPA is moving forward with developing the tasks for the PSD modeling that were shared with Mr. Kaufmann.

Nicky Sheats, Thomas Edison State College, asked for clarified on the Urban Air Toxics Report. Ms. McCarthy responded that the CAA instructs USEPA to complete the second of two reports on progress and remaining challenges on air toxics. This report should have been completed several years ago, but was delayed. Ms. McCarthy explained the report looks at what steps the Agency has taken, how effective the Agency has been at reducing air toxics, and what states and local communities have done to address issues. The report highlights the overall success of reducing air toxics and areas where more work needs to be done. Ms. McCarthy encouraged participants to review the report when it is completed.

John Paul, Regional Air Pollution Control Agency, requested clarification on the newspaper article that claims there is an USEPA regulation on a minimum purchase requirement of four gallons of gasoline. Ms. McCarthy clarified that the issue relates to blender pumps or single hose pumps that dispense E15 as well as other blends. Ms. McCarthy explained that when the hose pumps fuel, about 1/3 of a gallon of fuel is left in the pump once the purchase is completed. USEPA wanted to ensure there was guidance in the misfueling rule about how to address this situation. If the next person is a motorcycle with a one gallon tank they will receive a much higher blend. Ms. McCarthy concluded the appropriate label is now required to inform people buying four gallons or more will be ok with any size engine.

Stacey Davis, Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP), inquired about the combined heat and power announcement from the Administration. She asked for more information on USEPA's role in implementing this rule. Ms. McCarthy responded the President signed an Executive Order (EO) on industrial energy efficiency. USEPA and U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) assisted with the EO. There was a recognition that there needs to be additional emphasis among the Agencies in spreading the word about combined heat and power. Ms. McCarthy explained USEPA's Office of Atmospheric Programs has worked with the states, regions, local communities, and facilities to look at opportunities for combined

heat and power. There are permitting challenges and challenges with utilities and the purchase of power. Ms. McCarthy noted this is a challenge for the agencies to develop a more cohesive program.

Kathryn Watson, Improving Kids' Environment, requested Mr. Childers circulate the Urban Air Toxcs Report to Congress as soon as possible. She asked if there was an opportunity to discuss the report with the CAAAC, and stated that her organization is interested in this topic given their highly industrialized state. Ms. Watson suggested discussing USEPA's next steps on addressing hotspots. She supported additional partnership opportunities with USEPA, noting Improving Kids' Environment's positive experience with the CARE program. She asked about the connection between the report and the National Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) and whether would be updated on a regular schedule. Ms. McCarthy agreed with Ms. Watson on the importance of partnerships. Funding has typically been cut on programs that are not mandated. Ms. McCarthy explained voluntary partnerships are still essential programs, and she stressed the importance of keeping them funded when possible. She explained that some of the information in the report is based on NATA data. USEPA has struggled to find the funding to continue with NATA. There are several issues and challenges with collecting the data for NATA.

Howard Feldman, American Petroleum Institute, noted ozone was not mentioned on the list of USEPA upcoming tasks. CAAAC is considering moving the streamlining report forward. Mr. Feldman requested more information from USEPA on where they stand on the streamlining report issue. Ms. McCarthy responded that ozone is in the process of being reviewed by Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC). USEPA is working through issues with the goal of having a proposal by the end of 2013. Ms. McCarthy explained she mentioned streamlining because the Committee has worked hard to develop a report. USEPA is anxious to see the report and be able to fully consider it. USEPA is not on the cusp of taking any streamlining effort at this point in time. The report is not anticipated to result in immediate regulatory action from USEPA.

Julie Simpson, Nez Perce Tribe, noted in the summer of 2011 a round of grant proposals were submitted for community air toxics funding. She asked the status of the awards of the funding. Ms. Simpson commented that the community air toxics project funding was helpful in conducting initial research. Mr. Page confirmed he will contact the correct office and provide the answer to Ms. Simpson on the status of the grant funding money.

Ms. McCarthy thanked everyone for their questions. Ms. McCarthy and Ms. McCabe turned the meeting over to Mr. DeMocker.

Permitting Workgroup Report Out and Vote to Forward Report

Juan Santiago, USEPA, summarized the work of the Permits and New Source Review Subcommittee. The workgroup's work resulted in a report that the CAAAC members would vote on at the end of the presentation.

The subcommittee was charged with developing streamlining options for EPA in the context of the GHG permitting rules, such as the Tailoring Rule and the Step 3 Rule. The group looked at existing streamlining methods and came up with new ideas on how to ensure effective streamlining by "thinking outside the box." The workgroup worked with state, local, tribal, industrial, and environmental groups, as well as EPA. The workgroup began work in April of 2012 and will conclude in October of 2012.

The first slide showed a detailed listing of the membership. The Clean Air Task Force (CATF), one tribe, and state and local agencies were involved, including direct participation from the National Association of Clean Air Agencies (NACAA).

The workgroup was charged with confirming, expanding, or narrowing current streamlining methods that EPA should explore further, and the source categories that may be well-suited either individually or collectively for each streamlining approach. The next task was to identify the regulatory and policy barriers associated with further development of permit streamlining methods for each of the source categories, and to recommend approaches to address those barriers. Finally, the workgroup wrote a report on how to prioritize the source categories and streamlining methods for further development. The report also discussed mechanisms for implementation.

The New Source Review and Title V GHG permitting rules both have their own set of challenges. The workgroup decided to divide into four separate groups. The first sub-workgroup discussed Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit streamlining for GHG-only sources, which refers to sources that exceed the thresholds for the Tailoring Rule but are not major sources for other pollutants. The second sub-workgroup discussed PSD permit streamlining for GHG sources that trigger permitting for other pollutants, and again, once the threshold is triggered for one pollutant, the source is a considered a major source of other pollutants too. This is under the "Major for One, Major for All" policy. The third sub-workgroup discussed Title V permitting, separate from PSD, and looked at streamlining opportunities for "empty permits" and "hollow permits". These have very few, if any, GHG requirements. The last sub-workgroup discussed streamlining the process of obtaining a Plant-Wide Applicability Limits (PAL).

The draft written report was completed on September 14, 2012, and was posted on the CAAAC website. The report provides a summary of GHG permit streamlining information received either through EPA's Tailoring rule process or the workgroup's efforts to collect additional information from industry and tribe participants. It does not offer specific recommendations or streamlining techniques due to resource and time constraints. The report also recommends that EPA solicit stakeholder feedback on streamlining options, through public notice and comment rulemaking. The workgroup did not discuss timing, but felt, in general, EPA has enough information to make a decision and proceed to a rulemaking.

Possible streamlining techniques were discussed within the workgroup. Options given included Potential to Emit (PTE) restrictions, the use of general permits and permits-by-rule, use of presumptive Best Available Control Technology (BACT) in the context of major and minor New Source Review (NSR), enhanced environmental performance standards with annual compliance certifications, unit or source category specific exemptions, and permits for equipment suppliers rather than for equipment owners/operators (certified equipment, such as Energy Star).

There was discussion as to whether EPA should choose to pursue any of these streamlining options, and that the agency should first further investigate costs and benefits.

CATF felt that it is unnecessary to finalize these techniques at current applicability levels. The report suggests the next step should be a rulemaking.

State and local representatives were generally supportive of streamlining techniques, especially in regards to minor sources that would become major for GHGs. New techniques should not preempt programs that are currently functioning well. Also, EPA should solicit stakeholder feedback on the options through public notice and comment rulemaking.

Mr. Santiago continued that tribal representatives were concerned that streamlining techniques would weaken Environmental Justice (EJ) and Endangered Species Act (ESA) requirements that are currently applicable.

Industry representatives were generally supportive of streamlining techniques, and felt it is prudent to streamline the current permitting process.

The first sub-workgroup discussed PSD Permit Streamlining for GHG Major Sources that trigger permitting for other pollutants under the Major for One, Major for All policy. John Paul was the Chair for this group, which included several tribes, permitting agencies, and industry representatives. This sub-workgroup worked together with sub-workgroup 2 (i.e., permit streamlining for GHG-only sources) because the two are very closely related. The goal was to seek input from various stakeholders.

The sub-workgroups developed a set of five questions to ask stakeholders in order to find out what actions and industries would trigger permitting for GHGs. In addition, the sub-workgroups looked through the dockets for the EPA Tailoring Rule and the Step 3 Rulemaking, and used information from there to recommend streamlining approaches.

Next, Mr. Santiago stated he would go through specific information they received from the 1st sub-workgroup.

Georgia Environmental Protection Division (GEPD) presented four different areas to the sub-workgroup. The first area was allowing the use of surrogate BACT emission limits to demonstrate GHG BACT compliance. The second area was establishing de minimis values for PSD applicability for GHGs. The third area was establishing de minimis exemptions to statutory requirements where the application of the statutory requirements would be of trivial or no environmental value. The fourth area was establishing presumptive BACT for certain types of emission units, understanding that a case-by-case technology requirement would be met by using top-down BACT approach for selecting the BACT limit.

American Petroleum Institute (API) provided information next. The first set of recommendations dealt with improvements to the current permitting process, such as enhanced minor source permitting, a moratorium on carbon capture and storage (CCS) for all sources except the largest CO2 sources because often the technology is not available to smaller sources, establishing a PTE transition policy, redefining the term “construction activities”, expediting State Implementation Plan (SIP) approvals, and expediting permit reviews. API supports streamlining techniques for the use of general permits and presumptive BACT, especially for natural gas combustion sources. They also support issuing guidance for streamlining ESA, EJ, and cultural resource reviews.

The National Environmental Development Association’s Clean Air Project (NEDA/CAP) also gave their input. NEDA/CAP supports improvements to the current permitting process, including eliminating or streamlining the analysis of CCS in BACT reviews, and developing a strategy to reward sources that have taken or will take synthetic minor limits prior to becoming GHG-only sources to avoid PSD permitting for other pollutants. NEDA/CAP supports streamlining techniques, such as developing a strategy to minimize or eliminate permitting for pollution control projects that trigger increases in GHGs and that cause increases in “other” pollutants, revising existing guidance and regulations so that PSD review would be confined to GHGs, and exempting GHG-only sources from the Major for One, Major for All policy. When a source triggers limits for GHG, all other conventional pollutants must be looked at to see if any should be moved to the major category.

There was one tribal representative who gathered information about streamlining from several other tribal members through conference calls and individual calls. There was no consensus as to streamlining options within the tribes. Tribes that are engaged in issuing permits themselves are more likely to agree with streamlining approaches. Concerns were expressed about suggestions to streamline the EJ and ESA review process.

The second sub-workgroup looked at PSD permit streamlining for GHG-only sources that do not trigger for other sources. Mohsen Nazemi from South Coast Air Quality Management District was the chair. There were also tribal, industry, and permitting representatives.

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is supportive of streamlining options such as limiting PTE through prohibitory rules (i.e., limit GHG emissions below 50% of the major source thresholds); addressing GHG-only sources under the Minor NSR Program only (as opposed to through Major NSR); and delaying PSD permit elements for new climate-warming pollutants (e.g., black carbon and ozone). SCAQMD felt improving the certainty of BACT analysis could be done through developing software to better assess localized impacts, minimizing corollary pollutant analyses, providing standardized calculation sheets, and limiting environmental and economic analyses to only two scenarios. SCAQMD supported additional streamlining options, such as expanding synthetic minor program to states with delegated programs, encouraging the use of flexible air permits for GHG sources, allowing the use of presumptive BACT for smaller and less-complex sources, using general permits for PSD for source categories where sources have very similar operational requirements, and establishing that cap-and-trade program allowances and offsets should not trigger PSD permitting in and of themselves.

The Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) supports streamlining options, such as streamlining PTE calculations for sources like landfills; allowing programmatic equivalency determinations; not applying the Major for One, Major for All policy to GHG PSD permitting; clarifying that under no circumstances will GHG be regulated beyond BACT; and permanently excluding biogenic CO2 emissions from permitting. LACSD also feels presumptive BACT should be used; however, it should not be a "one size fits all approach" and NSPS compliance should be considered as BACT for some source categories.

The third sub-workgroup dealt with Title V permit streamlining for "Empty Permits" and "Hollow Permits," which are permits that don't have GHG requirements, but may require monitoring. Conceivably a source could have not triggered Title V before, but is a minor source with a series of requirements that becomes a major source for GHGs under Title V but not trigger PSD.

Title V "empty" permits could be streamlined by using simplified permit conditions that list GHGs as a pollutant with no GHG monitoring, record-keeping, or reporting requirements. Use of general permits and permits-by-rule, synthetic minor permits, and exemptions by rule for seasonal sources, specific equipment, or naturally low emissions sources would also help to streamline.

In the case of "hollow" permits, the sub-workgroup recommended deferring permitting under a predetermined schedule to aid permitting authorities with the additional permitting workload.

Sub-Workgroup 4 focused on streamlining the general process of issuing a PAL. Joan Holmes was the chair of this group, and Mary Turner was a member.

The sub-workgroup identified five problems associated with the issuance of GHG PALs, which are establishing the PAL baseline for GHGs with data limitations, establishing the PAL baseline for landfill GHGs, GHG monitoring provisions for a GHG PAL, resetting the PAL upon renewal, and establishing a GHG PAL for a Greenfield facility.

The sub-workgroup then came up with potential recommendations to address these five issues. To establish the PAL baseline for GHGs, guidance should be developed to address the best ways to evaluate historical and future emissions of GHGs until sources have ten years of data. The guidance should address methods in the GHG reporting rule to evaluate historical GHG emissions under PSD, when to either estimate data or rely on other methods if the necessary historical data do not exist, other methods that might be used, what methods should be considered, to the extent the reporting rule does

not address certain GHGs, and whether PAL tracking should use the same methods as were used to set the PAL.

To establish the PAL baseline for landfill GHGs, the sub-workgroup recommended issuing a PAL that increases over time, consistent with the trajectory of emissions of the landfill over time. Landfills should be looked at differently than other sources because of the nature of the emissions over time.

The sub-workgroup recommended issuing guidance that could apply both to setting and tracking compliance with PALs, including indicating whether compliance with the methods in the reporting rule is presumptively adequate for these purposes, identifying the issues that permit writers need to address beyond the reporting rule, indicating what specific methods are preferred when filling in the gaps that exist in the reporting rule, and indicating if and when it is appropriate to deviate from this guidance to provide consistency comparisons of historical and future emissions when other methods were used to establish a baseline.

The next area the sub-workgroup looked at was resetting of the PAL upon renewal. Rule language on setting the PAL at the time of renewal should be clarified, and the resetting conditions should be specified in the initial PAL permit if the permitting agency and the permittee are willing to do so and if conditions are consistent with the PAL and public noticing requirements. Guidance would be very helpful in these areas.

Last, the sub-workgroup discussed establishing a GHG PAL for a greenfield facility. It is recommended that, for purposes of a PAL at a greenfield facility, the baseline actual emissions of all the units, which are all "new," is equal to their potential to emit. The PAL could be later reduced if the PTE of the greenfield facility is later reduced.

The next steps involve USEPA looking at the report and reviewing possible streamlining approaches as identified in the Tailoring Rule and further analyzing the comments received for these and other streamlining approaches. EPA should also determine viable streamlining options and take action on further development.

Mr. Santiago then opened the floor for questions.

Joy Wiecks, Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, commented that the tribal concerns and about EJ and ESA are not universal, and she does not want that to be misrepresented.

Ann Weeks, Clean Air Task Force, wanted to inform everyone at the table that CATF was glad to be a part of this process. CATF believes EPA has a robust set of stakeholder's views and can move forward with a rulemaking when it is justified. It is clear that the report does not make a formal recommendation of when EPA should go forward with a rulemaking.

Kelley Green, Texas Cotton Ginner's Association, stated that as a person who represents small sources, he is reading the document from a different perspective. There a large number of companies who have minor source permits who may have tier 4, 5, or 12 permits. If the threshold continues to drop, these sources will become major. If people have an idea of acceptable streamlining methods, they can begin to prepare for the threshold to drop. As the thresholds drop more, more sources get pulled into the system, so streamlining should be worked out early.

Nicky Sheats, Thomas Edison State College, said that from an EJ perspective, he is alarmed and fearful. The report limits the scope of EJ review, and there is potential to harm environmental protection. Mr. Sheats is afraid that when these ideas go out for rulemaking the EJ community will be overwhelmed and

will have little capacity to comment. As a result, streamlining rules may be adopted that could hurt EJ communities and environmental protection.

Pat Childers, USEPA, stated that the CAAAC and subcommittee recognize that a good amount of time was spent putting this report together. Yesterday, the subcommittee also spent hours discussing these issues. The question being raised is whether this report should be forwarded to EPA. As the DFO, Mr. Childers then asked if there were any CAAAC members who think the report should not be forwarded.

Howard Feldman, American Petroleum Institute, asked for clarification on which version of the report the CAAAC was approving because some minor changes have been made.

Mr. Childers clarified that there were minor changes made after the subcommittee meeting, and asked Mr. Santiago to go through the changes.

Mr. Santiago began by stating that the workgroup had an interim report that was completed in August and was posted on the CAAAC website and made available for comment. The comments received were very minor and mostly editorial. Beyond that, the subcommittee discussed the recommendation for a potential rulemaking. One change to the report was added to say that the workgroup did not discuss timing, to make clear that there is no suggestion to start a rulemaking at a specific time. This information will be added in three locations throughout the report. Finally, the last edit clarifies that the CATF is the only environmental group being referred to throughout the report. The CAAAC is voting on the final version of the report that includes these edits.

Mr. Childers clarified that for future reference, when the CAAAC discusses environmental, tribal, or industry groups, they are only talking about the views of participants and not the entire sector.

Carolyn Green, Radnor Financial Center, stated that she does not have a problem with sending the report forward, but she wants to ensure Mr. Sheats' concerns about EJ issues are addressed in the transmittal letter.

Mr. Childers replied that those issues will be addressed in the transmittal memo. The concerns are also addressed in the meeting minutes. This report is recommending potential streamlining methods, but it does not make recommendations for specific ones.

Mr. Sheats replied that he is raising concerns about the ability of the EJ community to participate meaningfully because of capacity issues, which applies to all rules across the board. Mr. Sheats continued that he supports those concerns being added to the transmittal letter and thanked Ms. Green for suggesting it. Mr. Sheats feels it is not fair to comment in the twelfth hour because he could not participate in the workgroup.

Mr. Childers asked the CAAAC if there were any objections to that inclusion in the letter.

Mr. Feldman replied that, depending on how the addition to the transmittal letter is worded, he does have an objection. When certain recommendations are singled out as more or less favorable, it opens a box that should not be opened. Mr. Feldman feels there are certain recommendations that would be more favorable for him, too.

Mr. Childers said Mr. Sheats' comment is general and does not apply only to this particular issue. EJ communities are overwhelmed with rulemakings in general. Mr. Childers then asked Mr. Sheats if this has to be in the report, and if not, can the report be moved forward. Mr. Sheats replied that yes, the report can move forward. Ms. Green said that she was not comfortable with that, but would yield to Mr. Sheats.

Ms. Weeks commented that no particular method for streamlining was embraced as an option for rulemaking; this report was an opportunity to put different views on the table in a public forum. USEPA is already committed to a rulemaking when thresholds go down. The views presented in the report are not recommendations, but rather a collection of wish lists. The message the Agency took away from this report was that when the thresholds are lowered, a notice and public rulemaking should be done and this document should be used as a public statement on stakeholders' opinions. She understood the concerns about the ability to participate. She feels EPA has resource constraints as well, and is supportive of a general statement about people's ability to participate.

Mr. Sheats stated that he is slightly uncomfortable about the report going forward because this could be particularly harmful to EJ communities. He feels it is not fair to hold up the report at this stage. Hopefully if the rulemaking happens, USEPA will ensure environmental and EJ communities participate.

Vicki Patton, Environmental Defense Fund, had a technical comment on the contents of page 15 of the report. There is a statement that says under pre-GHG PSD rules, sources can only be subject to PSD if the potential to emit one or more criteria pollutants exceeded major source thresholds. This issue was litigated and resolved based on the Agency's longstanding position that PSD applies differently to all regulated pollutants under the act. That section of the report needs to be corrected. There is a re-hearing pending in the D.C. Court Circuit that continues to advocate the narrower view of the law.

Next, Ms. Patton provided an observation of the process. It began over 5 years ago when the Supreme Court held that EPA had the authority to address GHGs under the Clean Air Act (CAA). EPA developed an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking to provide different options, convened a workgroup process to look at the way BACT would be administered for GHGs, and a number of people devoted an enormous amount of effort to discussing this.

The court affirmed the agency's interpretation, holding that clearly BACT applied to GHGs and dismissed petitions trying to dismiss the Agency's effort to inoculate small sources. Just recently the Agency finalized step 3. They decided to leave thresholds exactly where they have been, and as a result every environmental group in the country challenged the decision. It is a challenge to the Agency to administer this program in a way that would inoculate small sources.

Everyone should consider that people have worked very hard to make these programs work, and there was two and a half years of litigation in the DC circuit, which resulted in an affirmation of EPA's interpretation. Disruptions often come from members of the regulated community that continue to litigate after the issues have already been debated and discussed.

With regards to Mr. Sheat's concerns, it seems like the Agency could reach out to the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC) and explain the implications. There has been a lot of concern over the years about how the BACT Clearinghouse has not been thoroughly populated and utilized.

Mr. Santiago replied that Ms. Patton's comments were correct and they have been captured in the report.

Mr. Feldman wanted to clarify that he was not objecting to Mr. Sheats' dissent, because Mr. Sheats has the right to object. API was not invited to be a part of the report, and Mr. Feldman wanted that to be known. The group can discuss the cover memo and changes to the report and go from there.

Jalonne White Newsome, We Act for Environmental Justice, stated that she wanted to second Mr. Sheats and Ms. Patton's comments on the fact that her community does not have the capacity to

comment on a lot of rules. Ms. Newsome has discussed engaging EJ communities in rulemakings with USEPA. Offering education about the rules, not waiting until the last minute, and making special efforts to reach out to the community and make sure people understand the implications of each rule is very helpful. For example, some communities had to rush to comment on the NAAAQ standard because they were not aware they could comment.

Ms. Wiecks stated that she fully supports giving EJ communities more time to comment because tribes can sympathize with not being able to comment on rules.

Mr. Childers replied he and Mr. Sheats have chatted in the past about improving consultations, but that subject extends to more than just this report. In the future, the CAAAC could possibly discuss this subject. At this point, the committee should decide if this report will be formally sent to EPA.

The CAAAC took a vote, and no members objected to sending the report to EPA. As a result, the report was formally forwarded to EPA. The concerns about how the workgroup was formed were taken to heart, and a more robust search will be done in the future.

Mr. Feldman stated that he approved the report, but he wanted to ensure it would only have a non-controversial cover letter. Mr. Childers answered that the full committee would write a cover letter stating, “Here is the workgroup report we approved.”

Mr. DeMocker conveyed thanks to everyone who worked hard on developing the report. The Agency looks forward to looking at the report.

Subcommittee Report Out

Mr. Paul transitioned to the subcommittee report out by commenting the electronic docket is a valuable tool. When looking at the streamlining techniques, the workgroup reviewed the comments submitted to the docket on the Tailoring Rule. USEPA solicited comments on streamlining and the workgroup was able to review the comments of various industry groups, environmental groups, and state and local governments. Mr. Paul suggested the Agency categorize the comments based on their originating source: state and local governments, environmental groups, and industry groups.

Mr. Santiago provided a report out from the Permits, New Source Reviews and Toxics Subcommittee meeting. The meeting began with an overview of NAAQS from Anna Marie Wood, USEPA. She reviewed the schedules, rulemakings and litigation issues for the different NAAQS. Ms. Wood’s slide will be made available on the CAAAC website.

Mr. Santiago continued the report out by moving to the GHG permitting. Mr. Santiago presented the phasing approach that the Agency is taking on GHG permitting. He addressed the Tailoring Rule and the different Steps that have been established thus far -- Steps 1, 2, and 3. Mr. Santiago reviewed the other rulemakings the Agency has undertaken to ensure there are sufficient existing permitting authorities for PSD across the nation.

The next main topic of the report of was the Title V program. Mr. Santiago addressed how GHG sources as of July 2011 are subjected to Title V requirements for the first time. The Agency is undertaking efforts to understand the number of permitting actions related to Title V. The discussion involved the discrepancies in the number of permitting activity compared to the numbers USEPA estimated under the Tailoring Rule and how the Agency plans to reconcile these differences moving forward.

Mr. Santiago reviewed the brief discussion on the biomass work the Agency is doing with the Science Advisory Board (SAB) related to GHG. The SAB is expected to release their recommendations in the fall. USEPA will then determine next steps on biomass depending on the results from the SAB.

The subcommittee talked about the 5-year study to evaluate whether it is administratively feasible for PSD and Title V permitting authorities to adequately administer their programs at lower GHG thresholds. Mr. Santiago noted the report is due in April 2015 and is already underway.

The last main topic of the subcommittee was Step 4 or the future phase rulemaking that is due in April 2016. There was discussion about data gathering needs for the Agency in order to better inform the next step, in light of the differences in permitting activity from what the original estimates were.

Mr. Santiago noted there was a lengthy discussion about the report that was reviewed. The main point of the discussion was on the topic of timing for the general recommendation to follow through on the notice and rulemaking process. The report has been reviewed in great detail and has been moved forward by CAAAC to USEPA.

Mr. Paul stated that the subcommittee is open to suggestions for next steps. The subcommittee mentioned the possibility of adding the 5-year study as a topic of discussion for the next meeting. An update from Ms. Wood has become routine for every subcommittee meeting, along with an update of GHG permits that have been issued.

Ozone Advance – What Is It and How Is It Working

Laura Bunte, USEPA's Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS), presented the new Ozone Advance program. The program started in April of 2012 and has been met with enthusiasm so far. Ms. Bunte provided an overview of the program, why attainment areas should work to reduce ozone, who is participating in the program, what participation entails, how areas might benefit from participating, and where the program is going next.

Ozone Advance is a collaborative effort by USEPA, states, tribes, and local governments to encourage emission reductions in ozone attainment areas, and to help them continue to meet the NAAQS. The program helps to meet current standards and future standards that may be issued down the road. The goals are to protect public health, to protect areas from non-attainment, and to better direct resources towards addressing issues efficiently. The Ozone Advance program does not add or remove requirements for areas. It is very flexible, but does not provide regulatory flexibility. Also, the program does not guarantee attainment. It is designed to help areas on the cusp of non-attainment reduce emissions.

Ozone Advance was modeled after the Ozone Flex program from 2006, and as a result the two programs are very similar. The Ozone Flex program had five participants, all of which were in the Texas and Oklahoma area. The areas currently participating in Ozone Advance are in 17 states and 7 EPA regions, though the majority are in the central Midwest corridor. The Midwest has problems with wintertime ozone, while the rest of the country has issues during summertime. There are states, counties, cities, and tribal lands participating.

Ms. Bunte anticipates more areas will join the program in the coming weeks and months because there is no deadline to sign up. Currently, three participants are non-attainment areas, including Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Desoto County, Mississippi, and the Upper Green River Basin in Wyoming. These areas can participate because they signed up while still in attainment and then were designated as marginal.

These areas do not have planning requirements yet, but if they get bumped up to a higher classification they would have to leave the program.

Participating areas are supposed to use their best efforts to quickly implement steps to reduce ozone. The participating area is the lead on all implementation, with help from an USEPA point of contact in a regional office. Within a year, the participating area is supposed to develop a path forward, which is a list of measures and programs that will be implemented to reduce ozone. Ozone Advance also encourages participants to develop an action plan, which provides additional information added like trend data and analytical information. For areas that want to go even farther, USEPA suggests an air quality management plan (AQMP). Most participants will not go that far initially, but the program could evolve into focusing on multi-pollutant AQMPs in the future.

The PM program will be starting in January after the NAAQs is finalized in December. For areas that participate in both the PM and Ozone programs, a multi-pollutant path forward will be developed.

There are many benefits to joining this program, such as cushioning against non-attainment. The program offers EPA assistance, including diverse things such as tools, resources, and data. Federal grants will be consolidated and participants can apply for them. USEPA will also provide technical advice for emissions inventory refinement or modeling efforts, which will help if an area does not have a lot of resources.

The program may provide recognition to some participants with awards, and in addition, all participants are highlighted on EPA's website. In the past competition, a grant preference opportunity was offered under the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act (DERA) program. Ms. Bunte is hopeful that some participants will receive grants, but the results have not yet been announced. Ozone Advance can also highlight existing programs to make them better known. The best way to get more information on the program is to go the website. New ideas from program and participants will be posted.

Julie Simpson, Nez Perce Tribe, asked for clarification on what an AQMP is. Ms. Bunte explained that an AQMP is an Air Quality Management Plan, which is a plan that encompasses SIP requirements, along with other issues that affect air quality, like EJ, land use, transportation, and climate. It is a very robust plan.

John Walke, Natural Resources Defense Council, began by saying that he heard the program was non-regulatory and not creditable for a SIP. Ms. Bunte replied that some measures the areas take could be credited in a SIP.

Mr. Walke asked for some concrete examples from the program. South Carolina, Mr. Walke's home state, is a participant. What motivates stakeholders to join? What has been done? Are there successes? Ms. Bunte replied that some areas signed up very recently so the programs are not yet up and running. Other areas have had several stakeholder meetings, have formed working groups, and are moving quickly towards developing a path forward. These areas will probably finish their paths forward in less than a year. EPA will need to talk to participants more closely to find out what motivated them to join. Some are interested in acting proactively to stay in attainment and avoid non-attainment. South Carolina is equipped to quickly move forward because it already has established stakeholders. Ms. Bunte stated that some areas that participated in the Ozone Flex program have plans posted on the website. Some areas are thinking of enacting ordinances and robust measures, while areas safely in attainment are interested in awareness programs and voluntary measures.

John Crouch stated that he is interested in the possibility of PM advance. If a community may be designated, can they join the program before designation? Ms. Bunte replied that areas can join before designation. Also, there will be an opportunity for public review of the guidance.

Mr. Jones asked if the program will result in mandatory or voluntary approaches. Ms. Bunte replied that most participants will pursue voluntary and awareness measures, while areas on the cusp of non-attainment will probably pursue mandatory measures. This information will be on the website.

Mr. Feldman stated that USEPA is scheduled to change the ozone standards this year or the year after. The changes could potentially make almost the entire country non-attainment. Mr. Feldman asked how Ms. Bunte thinks this program will mesh with the new ozone standards. Ms. Bunte replied that the program creators are dealing with that issue and believe the program would continue because designations would still be far down the road.

Rob Kaufmann, Koch Companies, asked if participating areas that go into non-attainment get a SIP credit. Ms. Bunte replied that it would depend on where the baseline is set. She is hoping the programs will be aligned so that they are credited to SIPs.

Bill Becker, National Association of Clean Air Agencies, stated that USEPA is offering some important handholding, and this program is offering help areas to jump start programs and understand what tools are available, such as technical and stakeholder assistance.

Steve Page, USEPA, added that one of the big benefits is also when local entities are given contact information to other entities that have experience.

John Paul, Regional Air Pollution Control Agency (RAPCA), continued the presentation. He began by saying that when his area joined the Ozone Advance program, there was a lot of press attention and all of the stakeholders attended a public meeting. His presentation included background of RAPCA, CAA responsibilities, NAAQS, a history of ozone and PM standards and where these are headed, the consequences of nonattainment, sources of emissions, RAPCA area air quality and inventory, and different control options.

RAPCA is a six-county local agency, under the city of Dayton, Ohio. RAPCA is in the health department, and has helped solve issues with indoor air and other issues. RAPCA is one of 9 local agencies in Ohio, and there is a history of non-attainment for ozone and PM in the area. They are currently borderline non-attainment for both. At one time, this area had several major point sources. None of those point sources still exist today. There has been a transition away from manufacturing that has led to decreases in emissions.

USEPA is responsible for setting standards that protect public health. Section 107 specifies the states' responsibility for assuring air quality standards are achieved and maintained. Section 110(a)(2)(D) specifies interstate transport responsibilities, which is important for RAPCA. Air pollution prevention is the primary responsibility of state and local governments. USEPA has promulgated NAAQS for ozone, PM, SO2, NO2, CO, and lead. NAAQS are reviewed every five years and revised as appropriate and takes into consideration improved monitoring techniques and health studies. The CASAC is very important, because it reviews data and makes recommendations to the Administrator. There is a new PM standard coming this December, and an ozone one following that.

Next Mr. Paul showed maps of non-attainment areas at a standard of 70, 65, and 60 ppb ozone. When Mr. Paul showed the map of non-attainment areas at 70 ppb to Minnesota they became interested in the Ozone Advance program. The maps show both the extent of the problem and the correlation and similarities between PM 2.5 and ozone non-attainment areas. These maps show that in the future there is a large chance that most areas will become non-attainment, even if currently in attainment. National controls will contribute to the improved health of the country's citizens.

Next Mr. Paul showed a map of the monitors in Region 5 and the Dayton area. The monitors measure ozone as it comes into the Dayton area, in major populated areas, and then measure it again as it leaves the area. Even with the progress that has been made, there are still problems with attainment.

Mr. Becker asked if the air quality leaving Dayton is based entirely on the air quality coming in to the area. Are the counties exacerbating the exit pollution at all? Mr. Paul replied that Dayton contributes to the problem. Dayton needs to reduce ozone in order to reduce levels for Columbus.

The "Requirements for Ozone Areas" slide showed the consequences of non-attainment, including new source review and emissions offsets. If an area does not attain in the time frame given, it gets bumped up to moderate.

The next slide showed the correlation between ozone and PM and the different types of sources. During the 1970s it was easy to identify the point sources, but that is not the case today. Urban sources of pollution include mobile sources, such as on road, off road, and small engines; area sources; small commercial/institutional sources; and large stationary sources.

It is important to identify and focus on specific area and mobile sources that can be influenced. Non-road and on-road mobile sources are important. One thing to point out is that Ozone Advance areas have preferential scoring for future grants, so RAPCA is pursuing grant money to control emissions from major construction equipment.

Emissions inventories are not perfect when the data go back to 1977, but they give a good ballpark number. For volatile organic compounds (VOC) emissions, area sources are about the same, mobile sources have gone way down, and point sources are down to only 1,700, which is a huge drop. The goal now is to increase mobile source controls and to look at national controls.The NOX inventory shows a similar trend. Once again, the point source emissions have been greatly reduced from 18,000 to 5,000. The overall message is that emphasis must be placed on mobile and area sources.

Mr. Becker stated that the slide tells him that if an area still has point sources, there would still be significant air quality problems. Mr. Paul's area is hovering over the standard and is focusing on mobile and area sources, though the solution may be different for areas with manufacturing. Mr. Paul replied that one of the common solutions is national control. During the last round of SIPs, Dayton had an inspection maintenance measure that almost no one supported. Even the industry people testified against it. Mr. Paul was the only person in the entire state of Ohio who testified for keeping the program.

RAPCA's goal in participating in the Ozone Advance program was to identify ozone precursor emissions and split them up by emissions category (point, area, mobile). Also, RAPCA wanted to analyze potential emissions reductions and make recommendations for appropriate implementation.

To do this, four subcommittees were formed to begin the identification of emission reduction possibilities. They addressed national measures, point sources, area sources, and mobile sources. The goal was to get the community and the stakeholders involved, to look at and verify the emissions inventory, to identify potential measures, and to realize the potential of those measures. The subcommittees plan on meeting again in December and reporting the results to the community.

The National Measures subcommittee is looking at electrical generating units (EGUs), and are hoping that the mercury and air toxic standard holds up. They are also looking at 110 (a)(2)(D) SIPs, the Tier 3 Vehicle Rule, and the Low-sulfur Gasoline rule. The point sources subcommittee is looking at cut off points for source sizes and the possibility of Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) being statewide. The area sources subcommittee is looking at consumer products , architectural and industrial

maintenance coatings, a gas can replacement program, auto body refinishing, graphic arts, an open burning awareness campaign, residential insulation, and residential energy efficient appliance exchanges. The on-road mobile sources subcommittee is looking at Cash for Clunkers, clean diesel grants, alternative fuel conversions, lawnmower exchange programs, and national measures.

Next steps include increasing public awareness, holding a public meeting in December to discuss options and feedback, and sitting down with the NPO and other stakeholders to work on the plan.

Dan Johnson, WESTAR Council, stated that USEPA could support science to help the states understand how much international and stratospheric intrusion is occurring. In the west, background or boundary conditions are 50 or more percent of the problem. While areas will identify sources in their own jurisdiction, there is a legitimate need to look outside of those boundaries. A small county in Wyoming does not have the staff or a state of the art modeling manager to understand these issues. Mr. Johnson asks EPA to consider helping to establish a robust national inventory model assessment that would help to give each state a jumpstart. This would ensure each area knows what their main sources are and which measures would be best for them.

Mr. Feldman asked whether, when measures are identified, they run through the model to see the incremental ozone benefits? Mr. Paul replied that RAPCA must coordinate with the state, but the intent is to run the measures through the model, especially when a recommendation is to extend the RACT rules statewide.

Mr. Kaufmann said that he did not see any non-vehicle mobile source options, such as improving traffic flow, bike lanes, and ride sharing. Mr. Paul replied that those options are on the table. That is where the NPO's input will come in. Mr. Paul only listed the measures RAPCA would have an influence on.

Pam Giblin, Baker Botts, followed up on Mr. Johnson's point, stating that everything needs to be understood before trying to solve the problem. For example, in the Houston area there were some great discoveries about highly reactive VOCs and how ozone is formed. There is a compendium of knowledge available and it should be looked at. EPA should drill down into the technical (highly reactive VOCs) techniques available, and form a better understanding of ozone formation. Programs like Ozone Advance can provide information and help states with little or no resources.

Mr. Becker stated that Mr. Paul made a stronger case for supporting national measures than he did for supporting the Ozone Advance program. Solutions like biking will probably not have a significant impact. There should be strong federal measures, such as Tier 3, which is making sulfur-free gasoline. Mr. Becker stated he would love to debate this issue at another meeting. This will improve vehicles and reduce NOX levels overnight by 240,000 tons. It will reduce levels every year. Strong federal policies are needed that will give a large reduction and will cost less than a penny a gallon. The Ozone Advance is a good program, but it probably will not have a large impact.

Lee Kindberg, Maersk Incorporated, asked for permission to use Mr. Paul's slides from these presentations. The numbers clearly showed that point sources are down, so mobile sources must be reduced next. It is important to persuade mobile and area sources to reduce emissions and providing educational materials to communities can help. Ms. Bunte replied that some regional offices have been reaching out to communities that are on the cusp of non-attainment with different materials about the problems and requirements. Ms. Bunte said she will look into providing information more broadly.

Robert O'Keefe, The Health Effects Institute (HEI), stated that as emissions levels are reduced, trans-boundary air pollution becomes a real problem. There have been focused attacks on EPA for getting involved with China or India, which have limited EPA's ability to help these governments.

Mr. Sheats asked Mr. Paul to give an idea of how closely ozone is correlated with PM. Mr. Paul replied that both are transport problems, both are most likely tied to national measures (mobile source and EGUs), and both have NOX as a precursor. Dayton is borderline for ozone attainment. Mr. Paul feels people should be looking at the same sources to provide relief from both ozone and PM pollutants.

Mr. Feldman responded to Mr. Becker by saying that they have publicly disputed about the cost estimates given to move to Tier 3 fuel. API has asked the Agency to provide an analysis of the benefits, but they have not received anything. API has done modeling to show that the ozone reduction from Tier 3 would be a fraction of one part per billion, not several parts per billion.

Mr. Paul replied that he always pushes cleaner gasoline even though cost is a losing issue in the Dayton area. Gas prices can increase 25 cents in one day, so increasing the cost of gas by 1-5 cents does not resonate.

Diesel Exhaust and Health

Mr. DeMocker introduced Bob O'Keefe, HEI, to begin the presentation on diesel and health.

Mr. O'Keefe gave an overview of his presentation which includes the health effects of diesel exhaust, the regulatory process that has occurred over the last 15 year, and the technological advances that have been driven by the regulatory process. The presentation also addressed what has been accomplished through the HEI Advanced Collaborative Emissions Study (ACES) study, the new International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) review on diesel and cancer study, and the lingering challenge of oil diesel in the developing world.

HEI is an independent research institution jointly and equally funded by government and industry. HEI does international research as well. Mr. O'Keefe explained HEI attempts to be as transparent as possible and they do not take policy positions.

Diesel has had a long and productive life for several reasons. Diesel engines typically have higher fuel efficiencies, lower CO and CO_2 emissions, have a heavy duty hauling capacity, and are more durable. In addition, diesel engines have existing fuel and maintenance infrastructure and in some countries (e.g., Germany, India) offer tax subsidies.

Mr. O'Keefe explained that in India, the government promotes diesel through tax subsidies that began with farmers and truckers. The subsidies expanded to the general population. There is approximately a 40 percent price difference between diesel and gasoline. The subsidy drives the increased use of diesel vehicles nationwide in India.

Mr. O'Keefe confirmed the health effects of diesel have been understood for a while. The primary concern is exposure to diesel PM and NOx from older diesel engines. USEPA estimates 20,000 fewer premature deaths from retrofitting existing heavy duty (HD) fleet in the United States. There is evidence of respiratory effects of diesel including reduced lung function, respiratory irritation, and asthma exacerbation. Several studies have found diesel to be a "probable" human carcinogen. That is a step below a "known" human carcinogen. The evidence has been limited because it is hard to do retrospective exposure assessments. The new IARC review of diesel carcinogenicity was published in June 2012. Mr. O'Keefe noted the problem is greatest in developing countries due to high levels of traffic and high levels of urbanization.

The study funded by HEI and carried out by Jim Zhang, University of Southern California, provides an example of the effects of traffic exposure on asthmatics. The study consisted of measuring the lung function of 60 asthmatic adults. Baseline measurements of lung function ensured that all participants

started at the same place. Participants walked in Hyde Park in London where they were exposed to urban air pollution. Participants also walked on Oxford Street in London where they were exposed to traffic-related air pollution. The study found that, after walking on Oxford Street verses walking in Hyde Park, the lung function in the population of asthmatics declined after exposure to the traffic-related air pollutants.

Mr. O'Keefe addressed the HEI Traffic Review study. The zone of contribution to traffic-related air pollution was about 300-500 feet from a major roadway. In Los Angeles, 44 percent of the population lives in the maximum zone of impact of major roads. Mr. O'Keefe noted not every person is exposed, but a high percentage of the population is. In Delhi, India, approximately 55 percent of the population lives within 500 meters of a freeway and within 50 meters of a major road.

Diesel technology and diesel exhaust has progressed over the years. Mr. O'Keefe broke the progression down into two early categories. Traditional diesel exhaust from pre-1988 diesel engines, which were in use prior to the U.S. USEPA diesel PM standards, can have high emissions. During the time period between 1988 and 2006, diesel engines began to show improvement through engine design. Mr. O'Keefe noted that diesel longevity means many of these engines are still on the road, especially in developing countries.

Mr. O'Keefe presented a graph showing the progress of transitional diesel. The HEI Tunnel Study in Pennsylvania evaluated onroad diesel reductions between 1975 and 2000. Mr. O'Keefe pointed out a steady decline of emissions between the years. The significant change came with the 2007 and 2010 rules where new diesel technology was created. In 2007, USEPA moved to require 15 ppm, PM control (filter and catalyst), and some NOx control (primarily exhaust gas recirculation). The 2010 USEPA requirements involved above plus and advanced NOx control (sensitive catalytic reduction). Mr. O'Keefe noted the changes were similar between light duty and offroad vehicles. The new technologies operate in a more sophisticated way.

Mr. O'Keefe explained the key need for ultra low sulfur diesel. Clean fuel is essential to enhanced control technology. Excess sulfur can block particle filters and coat NOx control causing reduced effectiveness. Mr. O'Keefe noted the de facto world standard is moving to 15 ppm or lower. He identified the need for exhaust treatment systems and explained how emissions can change with a diesel filter.

The ACES study is a cooperative multi-party effort to characterize emissions and possible health effects of new advanced heavy duty engine and control systems and fuels in the market between 2007 and 2010. The new 2007 and 2010 engine/control systems and fuels were designed to result in substantially reduced emissions. Mr. O'Keefe explained the importance of looking at any unintended consequences of adverse impacts to public health and welfare. ACES is moving forward to answer important questions in three phases. The first phase is 2007 engine emissions characterization, which has been completed. The second phase is 2010 engine emissions characterization, which is underway with testing and will be reported in 2013. The third phase is the 2007 and 2010 engine emissions health effects testing. The short-term health biological screening is completed and showed few to no health effects. A final report is expected in 2013.

Mr. O'Keefe presented a graphic showing the characteristics of new verses old diesel PM. The HEI ACES results compared to earlier testing show dramatic reductions; 98 percent reduction in mass, 90-99 percent reduction in ultrafine particles, and substantial reduction in carbon particles. New technology diesel is a remarkable achievement.

Mr. O'Keefe discussed polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) which have been of major concern in diesel exhaust. There has been a greater than 90 percent reduction in PAHs (including known

carcinogens). Many PAHs are now below detection limits. Some of the most toxic are so low they can no longer be measured.

Mr. O'Keefe moved to address the question of diesel and lung cancer. This issue has been studied by several agencies including IARC, USEPA, World Health Organization (WHO), and NIEHS. Most have called diesel a "probable" human carcinogen because it is difficult to quantify precise risk. California has found diesel to be a "known" carcinogen. Mr. O'Keefe mentioned there is a new IARC review of diesel carcinogenicity that was published in June 2012.

IARC, an agency of WHO, convened expert working groups for eight days to review toxicology and epidemiology evidence of whether a substance or source "causes" cancer. Mr. O'Keefe clarified IARC conducted a hazard assessment, not a risk assessment. They reviewed whether a substance can cause cancer (at any level of exposure) and they did not estimate what risks are for exposure on the street.

Historically a number of occupational studies have been relied upon. These studies all showed a small, but steady, increase of increased lung cancer risk. The new diesel exhaust in miners study was a major new occupational study in deep "non-metal" mines. There are approximately 12,315 blue-collar workers since 1940 working in the mine. Mr. O'Keefe noted detailed health records were available. There was a relatively enclosed environment for the study. The study found a risk of lung cancer increased three-fold to seven-fold in exposed workers. Mr. O'Keefe explained that translates to a 300 to 700 percent increase for cancer.

IARC convened June 5-12 and noted substantial (greater than 98 percent) improvements in new technology diesel in the United States. The IARC review focused on the older diesel technologies. The study concluded classified diesel exhaust is a "known" human carcinogen.

Mr. O'Keefe highlighted the next steps. The primary public health impact from diesel exhaust remains PM. However, finding that diesel exhaust from older engines is a known human carcinogen raises public health concern especially in developing countries, some occupational settings and possibly areas with substantial old technology diesel engines. In the United States, new technology diesel is required for new engines. HEI is reviewing the new science to determine if cancer impacts can be reliably quantified. A report is expected to be issued in 18-24 months. In the developing world, pressure will build to lower fuel sulfur, tighten diesel standards, and retrofit old engines.

Ms. Watson asked if reopening the human health assessment would be a step toward USEPA making a determination of diesel being a "known" human carcinogen. Mr. O'Keefe replied that USEPA has not labeled diesel as a "known" carcinogen. Particulates are the primary concern with diesel. Mr. O'Keefe noted the question is for USEPA to answer.

Mr. Sheats commented the issues in developing countries are also found in urban places in New Jersey. He asked if the composition of the particles from the new diesel engines after 2007 is mostly sulfate as opposed to the carbon core. Mr. O'Keefe confirmed that the nature of the composition of the particle has changed from primarily elemental carbon to primarily a sulfate particle. HEI has not looked at toxicity with a microscope yet, so the question remains open. Generally speaking, elemental carbon has been identified in older engines. Sulfate is less of a cancer concern.

Mr. Sheats asked if USEPA is going to study whether the risk of diesel would be from exhaust or PM. Mr. O'Keefe replied the question is open. He recommended the study should be of diesel exhaust.

Ms. Watson asked USEPA what the next steps include. Mr. Page answered that the Office of Research and Development (ORD) is already tracking the study. USEPA has risk information for many of the hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) that make up diesel. USEPA will be comparing the results of the study to

the bigger picture of the diesel exhaust. He noted there is a process at the Agency to take in new studies and make policy recommendations from them. The studies are long term.

Mr. O'Keefe added there was a discussion with the Administrator on how USEPA should respond to the IARC finding. HEI convened a panel from the 1999 studies to determine if they were reliable enough to do a quantifiable measurement. HEI will reopen the assessment.

Vince Helwig, Michigan DEQ, asked if USEPA or US Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is looking at boarder control concerns. Mr. DeMocker noted that USEPA will look into that.

Kelley Green, Texas Cotton Ginners' Association, commented that the large reductions are impressive. He asked about the magnitude of reductions for countries with both types of diesel engines. Mr. O'Keefe answered that the emissions are very high and engines are often poorly maintained. There is nonexistent enforcement. Mr. O'Keefe noted it is hard to know what the fuel quality is going to be. Transportation is not the only problem in the developing countries. He stated every 10-12 years the WHO does a global study of what kills people around the world. Air pollution is expected to rise on the list of mortality.

Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EE/RE) Road Map and Associated Tools

Mr. DeMocker introduced Chris Stoneman, USEPA, who presented on the energy efficiency and renewable energy (EE/RE) road map and the associated tools. Mr. Stoneman introduced the topic of promoting EE/RE policies and programs into State Implementation Plan (SIPs). In July 2012, Ms. McCarthy issued the road map manual to help with this task.

USEPA worked with several participants to create the guidance issued in 2004; however the guidance was not well received because the amount of benefit that a state would get from an air quality plan was not worth the effort they would have to put in to get the credit. Ms. McCarthy directed the Agency to relook at the issue and determine what could be done to promote energy efficiency and improved air quality. There has been significant growth in state investments in EE programs to over $5 billion in 2011, and 29 states and DC have adopted Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS). RPS are requirements states put upon energy providers to ensure a certain amount of energy is generated from renewable sources. RPS generally increase over time to reach a target level in a future year. States also need to find greater emission reductions to meet revised NAAQS.

USEPA looked at what could be done to help states with these issues and decided to develop a comprehensive manual that helps the states walk through the guidance to figure out what is required in order to bring an EE/RE policy into their SIP. In early July, USEPA issued a first version of the manual that serves as a roadmap to existing EE/RE guidance. Associated with the road map is a set of tools, which are backed by a considerable amount of data and research. Mr. Stoneman added USEPA is providing energy savings information as well as online and onsite training on the electric energy sector. This particular issue will require more outreach and assistance in order to happen.

Mr. Stoneman addressed three aspects of the EE/RE road map manual. The document is divided into the main body and 11 different appendices covering a range of topics. The road map is intended to be an accessible document written in straightforward terms with explanatory charts and figures. USEPA did not create a "one size fits all" document. Mr. Stoneman explained the road map provides options including four different pathways for incorporating EE/RE policies and programs into the SIPs. In addition, the road map provides four approaches for quantifying EE/RE emissions impacts.

The baseline emissions projection pathway states when doing emissions forecast for EGUs in your area, believed impacts of the EGUs as a result of the introduction into the electric system can be accounted

for. The second pathway is the control strategy pathway, which states strategies must be quantifiable and surplus. The third pathway of emerging and voluntary measures is meant to be more locally measured to encourage reducing energy. The last pathway is the weight of evidence pathway. If modeling in an attainment designation shows just shy of the standard, the guidance allows any number of factors to help make the area in attainment by the attainment date. This can be used if something could not be modeled due to lack of timing or poor resources.

Mr. Stoneman addressed three elements for successful EE/RE integration in SIPs and TIPs. More aggressive state-wide policies produce greater potential emission benefits. There needs to be a robust dialogue between air and energy agencies. The last element is quantification of whether and to what extent the EE/RE initiative is affecting a particular nonattainment area.

Mr. Stoneman described three areas that states that may want to consider EE/RE in SIPs and TIPs going forward. The first is Ozone Advance areas. Mr. Stoneman noted there may be cases where an Ozone Advance area wants to look at an existing EE/RE effort or an additional EE/RE effort to get emission reductions. There will be a webinar catered to the issues for the Ozone Advance areas. Mr. Stoneman explained the second is the 2008 ozone NAAQS. The vast majority of areas are classified as marginal, but some may end up in the moderate category eventually. USEPA believes areas designated nonattainment can quantify EE/RE emissions benefits. The last category is other areas that may want to plan for possible, tighter NAAQS in the future.

Mr. Stoneman addressed the plan for implementing the manual. USEPA is attempting to establish a network of interested USEPA regions and states. Outreach to states is underway. EPA is emphasizing quantification and trying to finding states that are interested in working with the Agency side by side. The states of Maryland, Massachusetts, and New York have signed up to work with USEPA to apply the manual to SIP pathways. Mr. Stoneman noted USEPA is providing tools, outreach, technical assistance, and training as a way to implement the manual. He explained Ms. DeYoung will elaborate on those aspects.

Ms. DeYoung explained the reasons why state and local governments adopt EE/RE policies. States adopt these policies to create jobs in a state or locality, for energy security reasons, to help reduce the electricity bill of their residents, and to improve air quality. USEPA is developing tools and resources to make sure that the air quality improvements that are already underway from the existing policies and programs can be accounted for in SIPs and TIPs. It has been difficult to quantify the emission benefits of EE/RE policies and programs. In the 1997 8-hour ozone SIP, the states that did incorporate EE/RE in the SIPs either hired a contractor or worked hand-in-hand with USEPA on a methodology. Ms. DeYoung explained USEPA wants to listen to the concerns and develop tools so that states can implement the EE/RE policies with free tools that are easy to use.

USEPA has existing EE policy impacts projected through 2020, which can be downloaded off the USEPA website. The EE impacts of MWhr savings can be plugged into the new draft power plant emissions calculator. This calculator measures the emissions reductions from EE policies using E-GRID and capacity factors. USEPA released this tool with the road map manual and is currently being peer-reviewed. Ms. DeYoung noted the tool will be revised based on the peer-review and will be re-issued by the end of 2012. Once energy savings are entered into the draft calculator, states can see emissions impacts for virtually every power plant in the United States. These emissions impacts can be plugged into the co-benefits risk assessment tool called COBRA, which is also available on the USEPA website. Various benefits and impacts can be reviewed once the information is entered online.

The second scenario takes the same EE impacts and plugs them into the hourly marginal emissions tools, which looks at hourly impacts at the emission unit level. Knowing the MWh savings from the program, the emission impacts during high electric demand days can be calculated. Ms. DeYoung explained this

tool is under development and will be peer-reviewed later this year. She hopes the tool will be ready for the public by early 2013. USEPA is working to ensure the outputs from the tool at the unit level can be compatible to adjust the model-ready EGU emissions inventory. This allows the user to adjust the emissions from the hourly emissions tool and conduct air quality modeling related analysis. There was a webinar on August 27 to discuss the road map and existing tools.

Ms. DeYoung addressed how USEPA is sharing this information. USEPA has a strategic plan through outreach and training where they are combining online webinars, doing in person workshops, and offering one-on-one technical assistance. For example, in Region 6 in February USEPA worked to get the state air regulators, state energy offices, Public Utility Commissions (PUCs), and others to talk about opportunities to reduce emissions in a cost-effective way and maintain reliability on the grid. The next steps from the February meeting involved follow up calls to determine a path forward for specific states.

USEPA worked with Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management (NESCAUM) states who are very interested in getting into the details of energy savings from EE policies and programs. These states were interested in the measurement process and how the policies can be consistently compared across states. Ms. DeYoung explained Virginia DEQ hosted in-person training in May and invited the state Energy Office and PUCs. They wanted to do training for the air quality regulators so all knew what the priorities were and possible places to collaborate. A final decision was made to have regular meetings. Ms. DeYoung noted training in North Carolina is planned at the end of October. The State Energy Office and the PUC was invited. Using the case study example they want to figure out the data needs to incorporate some of the EE programs into different SIP pathways. The online training Mr. Stoneman mentioned can be downloaded off the road map website. Ms. DeYoung addressed the hands-on technical assistance with Maryland, Massachusetts, and New York. USEPA will be looking at pathways to determine what must happen to incorporate the specific EE/RE policies and programs in the SIPs. The case studies will be posted to ensure easy replication moving forward. Ms. DeYoung noted a goal of USEPA is to make the program mainstream.

As USEPA moves to implementing the 2008 Ozone NAAQS, air toxics, and other air quality standards, the states are going to need to take credit for the emission reduction strategies. Ms. DeYoung is hoping to do that through fostering the relationships between the air and energy regulators. Ms. DeYoung encourages everyone to talk with regional planning organizations within the states to find out what EE/RE programs are available now. Ms. DeYoung assured USEPA is here to help provide technical assistance to states. Her contact information is available on the USEPA website.

Ms. Green thanked Mr. Stoneman and Ms. DeYoung for the presentation. She asked, given the RPS and the efficiency programs in states today, whether USEPA is going beyond the existing. If an entity is a regulated source and implements additional EE measures at the facility, the facility does not get credit for that from an air quality standpoint. She asked for clarification on how USEPA makes the distinctions between what is existing today and what goes beyond current practices and how it accounts as an emission standpoint.

Ms. DeYoung replied that many air regulators are unaware of what is in their baseline projections. The existing EE policies addressed today generally are not included in the baseline forecast that states are using to look out into the future. She noted this is a missed opportunity. Not everything is specifically included in the annual energy outlook. If the energy outlook is being used as the baseline then the emission benefits from those policies are not included. If new programs come online Ms. DeYoung believes they should be captured as well. Once USEPA gets the resources and tools ready to go then they can reach out to do more.

Ms. Green stated she understands the parts about existing programs are not accounted for. She wanted to clarify USEPA wants to get them into the future year baseline. If a state PUC or a city utility

organization adopts a requirement in the future, does that become part of the new baseline or does it become an emission control measure for which they get credit? Ms. DeYoung responded if a policy is in place and has been adopted before the SIP is submitted and the energy savings can be projected out in a future year, then that can be included in the SIP. Mr. Stoneman elaborated that in the guidance USEPA recommends that existing mandatory policies and programs be incorporated in the baseline.

Ms. Davis stated she strongly supports efforts to quantify emission reductions from EE/RE and looking at the methodology is really important for other air quality programs in the future. Market based programs with financial incentives will be reliant on these current efforts. She asked if the tools account for the interactions. For example, if a power plant subject to CAIR and does EE programs that are new that will help meet that regulation, how is that accounted for?

Ms. DeYoung clarified the situation has an emissions budget program like CAIR and has EE happening and could reduce emissions somewhere, but the allowances could be sold because of the cap. The power plant emissions calculator uses E-GRID emissions factors and capacity factors. The tool is able to be manipulated to look into the future, but does not have the ability to do the dispatch or analysis being referred to. The hourly marginal emissions tool is a statistical displaced emissions model. It uses statistical assumptions from how power plants have reacted in the past to determine which power plants would be displaced. Ms. DeYoung reiterated the tool is not a dispatch model. A more sophisticated tool would be needed to make the "what-if assumptions."

John Walke, NRDC, commended both Mr. Stoneman and Ms. DeYoung for their work on the road map and tools. NRDC raised concern in a letter providing comments on an earlier draft of the manual. The concern is about the Agency's decision to authorize the Agency's decision on the weight of evidence test as one of four permissible approaches for receiving SIP credit. The Agency will be familiar with the public health communities concerns with the weight of evidence approach. Those concerns have increased in meeting the surplus and the test in this arena. Mr. Walke detected in the guidance a signal the Agency itself prefers the weight of evidence test least of the four options and yet the Agency still authorizes its use. He asked for explanation on the decision. Mr. Walke requested response on the extent to which the weight of evidence test will be taken advantage of in the future SIP approvals.

Mr. Stoneman responded USEPA took NRDC's comments into account. The pathway is contemplated as one that would be used after the process of developing the control strategy and attainment demonstration was completed. If attainment is still not reached, then that pathway will be used to get across the line. He explained weight of evidence is not intended to be used by itself in developing a control strategy.

Ms. Simpson inquired if the state and local energy program includes tribes. She asked to what extent tribes were involved in the outreach process for the technical assistance tools. Ms. Simpson requested "Tribal" be added to the program title.

Ms. DeYoung responded the state and local energy program does have a tribal component. USEPA included examples from tribes in the appendix in the road map. There are examples of how tribes can look at EE and include emission impacts from EE/RE programs. Mr. Stoneman noted USEPA inserted a small write up in the tribal newsletter. He noted they are in early stages of reaching out to tribes. Mr. Stoneman mentioned he was interested in working with Ms. Simpson on ways to reach out to tribes across the nation. Mr. Stoneman mentioned there was tribal participation in the webinar last month.

Mr. Kaufmann noted the discussion on the Presidential EO encouraging combined heat and power (CHP) among other things. He asked how CHP as implemented on the industrial side fits into this program. If an industrial user builds a new CHP plant it may increase emission on site. Mr. Kaufmann asked for comment on how this is addressed.

Ms. DeYoung responded the draft road map manual last year received comments on CHP. USEPA responded by including CHP in the first draft of the road map. She explained USEPA has CHP policies in programs and Appendix D discusses EE/RE and CHP policies. USEPA included emission quantification in Appendix I on CHP and how that differs from EE/RE. She explained USEPA had a call to determine what emissions quantification example could be elaborated on. USEPA is working on identifying an example as a case study describing how CHP can fit into the different pathways.

Ms. Patton thanked both presenters. She commented on an addition to outreach to tribes, states, and local government. Ms. Patton suggested thinking about how to implement this program under the CAA. During Mr. Paul's presentation he described emission offsets as being unavailable in Dayton, Ohio. She discussed emissions reductions being the basis of a case study pilot program in Dayton to demonstrate emissions offsets to ensure the reductions occur in the nonattainment area. Ms. Patton noted there is important work to be done beyond the air quality regulators. Is there an important role to think about for groups like tribal leaders, pulling together dialogues with other to work together to develop ideas in a broad way? Finally as these examples take hold, how does USEPA share those case studies and examples so that people can learn from them and they can be deployed on a wider basis?

Public Comments

Mr. DeMocker invited the public to give comments. None were given.

CAAAC Operation/Next Meeting/Close

Mr. DeMocker stated that Gina McCarthy made clear that she values this group and looks to them for ideas and guidance on improving EPA programs. Ms. McCarthy left a long list of priorities for the coming months, including CSAPR, MATS implementation, PM and ozone NAAQs, Tier 3, light-duty vehicle GHG rules, RTRs, the Cement Rule, the boiler and NO2 monitoring rule, SO2 designations, the Urban Air Toxics report, GHG streamlining, biogenic CO2, RFS decisions, and regional haze.

Mr. DeMocker then asked the committee to state what topics they are most interested in learning about and discussing in January. He also asked for opinions on the Clean Air Excellence Awards. Mr. DeMocker stated that Mr. Paul suggested a tag system to find materials in the docket more easily.

Mr. Johnson began by saying that Ms. McCarthy's list is daunting and everything on it is a priority. Mr. Johnson and his directors feel his organization needs to push back against requirements that do not result in air quality benefits. Tangible results of air quality improvements are needed, and requirements that do not provide this should be pushed aside. Mr. Johnson does not have specifics or priorities, but he wants to know how to prioritize the important issues.

Mr. Johnson gave two concrete suggestions. First, the CAAAC approved a report today, but rarely does the group find out what happens after that. The agenda should include a timeslot to discuss the actions EPA has chosen to take or not take based on earlier CAAAC recommendations. Mr. Johnson is also interested in the integration of SIP implementation and what EPA has done in developing the science to back those implementations. Mr. Johnson wondered if others would be interested in having a joint meeting.

Mr. Kaufmann thanked Mr. DeMocker for asking. NAAQs implementation is a huge issue for the manufacturing sector and probably for states, too. Mr. Kaufmann asked Ms. McCarthy earlier in the day about progress on modeling requirements for PSD in SIP approvals because it is a very important issue. Some things were discussed yesterday, such as the new 2008 ozone and PM2.5 rules. CAAAC should

provide input to EPA on how to make permitting more efficient and less burdensome without detrimental effects to human health or the environment.

Ms. Simpson supports continuing the awards. She would like updates on EPA's fire policy and the status of EPA's air toxics program.

Mr. Sheats seconded what Mr. Johnson said. CAAAC mostly examines how to streamline and lessen work without harming environmental quality, instead of focusing on protecting public health. Mr. Sheats would like to discuss urban air toxics and EJ topics. One thing EJ communities struggle with is how to protect residents from multiple sources of pollution. Mr. Sheats was just appointed to NEJAC, and could ask the group for high priority EJ topics.

Mr. DeMocker replied that Ms. McCabe is heavily involved with EPA's EJ agenda.

Mary Turner, Waste Management, stated that she is very interested in hearing about the science of biogenics.

Ms. Wiecks stated that she agrees the awards should continue. She asked if there are tribal representatives on the Title V workgroup. She is most interested in CSAPR, MATS, the SO2 designation process, and the GHG discrepancies that were discussed by the subcommittee. There are big differences between emissions projections and actual data.

Ms. Kindberg asked about EPA's progress on reducing health risks. She would like to see a report about progress, perhaps about how programs are working and pollutant concentration levels in the atmosphere are lessening. Ms. Kindberg would also like to hear about the science behind VOCs and diesel PM, and whether there is a lot of unknown information regarding these subjects.

Ms. Patton asked Mr. DeMocker how EPA will lay out the Urban Air Toxics Assessment. Is there a benchmark of progress made? Will there be information on sources that continue to contribute to toxic pollutants in communities? Mr. DeMocker replied that the Urban Air Toxics Assessment is still undergoing review. It will focus on the progress made and will look at state, local, and community programs and progress. It will look at next steps, successes, and areas where more work is needed. The program will also encourage research, but resource constraints are always a challenge.

Ms. Patton said the CAAAC should see detailed analyses and have a thorough discussion on how information shapes policies and forms innovative ideas that direct air pollution mitigation. The CAAAC should help to secure vital protection in communities that still suffer from a high toxic burden.

Ms. Simpson would want a general update on the rural air toxics program, if it existed. Instead, she would like to hear an update on the air toxics program.

Ms. Weeks stated that one item missing from the priority list is an update on EPA's progress on GHG performance standards for various industrial categories.

Mr. Sheats clarified that he is not suggesting an additional streamlining project, but he feels the CAAAC should focus on projects about health instead of just using it as a control factor.

Mr. Childers informed the group that decisions on membership will be made in November. There is a new charter in October and another meeting in January. The next meeting will most likely be during the week of January 8-10th, or January 15-17th. The following meeting will be in April or May.

Mr. DeMocker thanked everyone for their time, engagement, and commitment, and ended the meeting.

Clean Air Act Advisory Committee
September 20, 2012
List of Participants

Bill Becker	National Association of Clean Air Agencies (NACAA)
Laura Bunte	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS)
John Campbell	Caterpillar Inc.
Pat Childers	USEPA Office of Air and Radiation (OAR)
John Crouch	Hearth, Patio, & Barbeque Association
Stacey Davis	Center for Clean Air Policy (CCAP)
Jim DeMocker	USEPA Office of Policy Analysis and Review
Robyn DeYoung	USEPA
Howard Feldman	American Petroleum Institute (API)
Pam Giblin	Baker Botts
Lisa Gomez	Sempra Energy
Carolyn Green	EnerGreen Capital Management
Kelley Green	Texas Cotton Ginner's Association
Vince Helwig	Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Dan Johnson	WESTAR Council
Gary Jones	Graphics Arts
Rob Kaufmann	Koch Companies Public Sector
Lee Kindberg	Maersk Incorporated
Janet McCabe	USEPA OAR
Gina McCarthy	USEPA
Jalonne White Newsome	We Act for Environmental Justice
Janice Noland	American Lung Association
Bob O'Keefe	Health Effects Institute (HEI)
Steve Page	USEPA
Vicki Patton	Environmental Defense Fund
John Paul	Regional Air Pollution Control Agency (RAPCA)
Juan Santiago	USEPA
Nicky Sheats	Thomas Edison State College
Julie Simpson	Nez Perce Tribe
Chris Stoneman	USEPA
Eddie Terrill	Oklahoma DEQ
Mary Turner	Waste Management
John Walke	Natural Resources Defense Council
Kathryn Watson	Improving Kids' Environment
Ann Weeks	Clean Air Task Force
Joy Wiecks	Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa
Anna Marie Wood	USEPA