

BOARD MEETING DATE: March 6, 2015

AGENDA NO. 22

REPORT: Mobile Source Committee

SYNOPSIS: The Mobile Source Committee met on Friday, February 20, 2015. Following is a summary of that meeting. The next Mobile Source Committee meeting is scheduled for Friday, March 20, 2015 at 9:00 a.m.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Receive and file.

Dr. Clark E. Parker, Sr., Chair
Mobile Source Committee

EC:fmt

Attendance

Committee Chair Dr. Clark E. Parker, Sr., and Committee Members Ben Benoit and Shawn Nelson attended via videoconference; Committee Members Dr. Joseph Lyou and Judith Mitchell attended the meeting at the SCAQMD Diamond Bar headquarters.

The following items were presented:

ACTION ITEM:

1) Staff Proposed Comments on U.S. EPA's Proposed Ozone Standard

Dr. Philip Fine, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer /Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources, discussed the draft comment letter prepared by SCAQMD staff regarding the proposed revision to the 8-hour ozone standard. As a way of background, the Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the U.S. EPA to review National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) every five years considering scientific health and air quality information, at-risk groups affected, uncertainties in the data, and advice from the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC), an independent committee charged with providing guidance to U.S. EPA. The review evaluates whether the current standard is "requisite to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety."

Dr. Fine outlined the ozone standard development timeline and milestone months starting with June 2007 when U.S. EPA first proposed an 8-hour ozone NAAQS in a range of 70-75 ppb, then finalized at 75 ppb in March 2008. The standard was proposed for revision to a range of 60-70 ppb in January 2010 subsequently it was decided to not finalize the proposal and instead maintain the 8-hour ozone NAAQS at 75 ppb; in addition, it was noted that the next review of the standard to determine if it is health protective had already begun. After an April 2014 court ruling decreeing that U.S. EPA propose a rule based on the latest ozone review, U.S. EPA complied by proposing in November 2014 to lower the ozone NAAQS in the range of 65-70 ppb.

Dr. Fine reminded the Committee that ozone non-attainment areas are classified (i.e., extreme, severe, serious, moderate, marginal) based how much the area exceeds the standard, thus affecting the required attainment date. Final designations for the proposed ozone NAAQS are anticipated by October 2017, thus a State Implementation Plan (SIP) would be due October 2020. If the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) is classified as “extreme” nonattainment, the area would be given 20 years from the effective date to attain the standard, thus 2037.

A chart of NO_x emissions from all sources (e.g., heavy-duty diesel trucks, off-road equipment, ships, locomotives, etc.) in our region was displayed along with the levels of emissions the SCAB needs to reduce to meet the existing and new ozone standards. Preliminary data estimates the need for 80-85 percent NO_x reductions from the 2023 baseline to meet the proposed range of 65-70 ppb.

Dr. Fine highlighted the original Board-approved comments the SCAQMD staff submitted during the 2010 proposed revisions to the ozone NAAQS that are proposed to be re-submitted to U.S. EPA. Those comments included the support of standards based on the health effects science and that the implementation rules should be designed to ensure workable attainment dates and address fair-share reductions from federal sources, deployment of zero-emitting technologies, and an integrated SIP for all pollutants.

SCAQMD staff is currently proposing to submit additional comments (to simplify and streamline submittals for exceptional events, provide clear guidance on international transport, and support flexible monitoring requirements) that have been included in a comment letter to U.S. EPA, for which staff is seeking the Board’s approval.

Dr. Clark E. Parker, Sr. asked why the U.S. EPA believes the science will provide the ability to meet these new ozone standards when the current ozone standards are already a challenge to attain. Dr. Barry Wallerstein, Executive Officer, responded that, as noted in the presentation, U.S. EPA reviews scores of health studies and sets

standards based solely on public health and not on the ability to meet the standards. However, the U.S. EPA also issues an implementation rule that does provide guidance to air agencies as to methods to assist in demonstrating attainment, such as the consideration of emissions entering the Basin from outside the U.S. known as international transport. Dr. Wallerstein expressed concern that the CAA is long overdue for updates but political gridlock has hampered the ability to “open” the CAA and revise, although it may happen in the near future if regions are unable to achieve the standards. Dr. Wallerstein highlighted his own personal experience during decades working in air pollution control and the seeing evolution of technology, such as particulate matter filters on diesel trucks and engines, concluding that dramatic change can happen but it takes time. He advised the Committee to allow staff to conduct the necessary analysis of the technology advancements and forecast the needs to meet the new ozone standard. The analysis will take place during the development of the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) to determine our ability to meet the 2008 8-hour ozone NAAQS.

Dr. Parker asked if the proposed new ozone standard is not unrealistic. Dr. Wallerstein noted that this particular ozone standard faced litigation in the courts forcing U.S. EPA to revisit the health studies multiple times to confirm the conclusions. Ultimately, the conclusion was the 2008 ozone standard is not health protective with an adequate margin of safety. The next step is to determine what U.S. EPA will allow in their implementation rule for the proposed ozone standard to assist areas in meeting the standard. However, he felt confident that with Southern California, including five percent of the national population, and having significant economic influence, there is optimism that the attainment issues in the Basin will be considered at the federal level.

Dr. Joseph Lyou suggested the comment letter be strengthened to further emphasize the importance of the health studies that reflect and support the need to change the current ozone standard. He believed some words in the comment letter such as “flexibility” and “workable” should be more clearly defined. Dr. Wallerstein responded that such terms were intentionally broad at this point, and that more clearly defining such words requires extensive conversations between Board members and stakeholders to determine how much flexibility would be necessary to meet the standards or what would be considered workable attainment dates. In order to make such determinations, the technical work and analysis should take place first. If at that time consensus finds that the standard cannot be reached in a timely manner, then what needs to be done can be discussed.

Dr. Lyou expressed his concern that the new technologies to assist in meeting the standards already exists so the question is a matter of commitment. He recognized that there are “artificial barriers” such as who is responsible for reductions and who pays for such reductions. But he also reminded the Committee that the cost is not just

money for reductions but those who pay with their health if standard is not met. Dr. Parker agreed with Dr. Lyou that there are barriers as reflected in the chart showing the NO_x sources that need to reduce emissions. Most of the sources are not regulated by the SCAQMD but rather are under federal or CARB authority. He noted that this will be a challenge nationwide and not just in Southern California.

Councilmember Judith Mitchell suggested that the comment letter provide additional emphasis on the federal government providing a fair share of emission reductions in the region and to assist in funding support of the deployment of zero emission technologies.

Mayor Ben Benoit agreed with his fellow Committee members that it is challenging for the SCAQMD to achieve the ozone standards when a majority of the emission sources are under state and federal authority, and he also stated that this message needs to be carried to Congressional representatives.

The Committee approved the comment letter with the suggested modifications to be sent to the full Board for their approval at the next meeting. No comments were made by the public.

Moved by Mitchell; seconded by Lyou; unanimously approved with suggested changes.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

2) Report on U.S. EPA's 2008 Ozone Implementation Rule

Dr. Elaine Chang, Deputy Executive Officer in Planning and Rules, provided a detailed update of U.S. EPA's final Implementation Rule for the 2008 8-hour Ozone NAAQS. She reminded the Committee that a draft rule was proposed in June 2013 and a pre-Federal Register publication of the final rule was released on February 13, 2015. The purpose of the rule is to provide guidance to air agencies on SIP planning requirements. Such guidance will affect the development of the 2016 AQMP, specifically the 2008 8-hour ozone standard (75 ppb), the 1979 1-hour ozone standard (120 ppb) and the 1997 8-hour ozone standard (80 ppb). As a reminder, the SIP to demonstrate attainment of the 2008 8-hour ozone standard is due July 20, 2016. In the implementation rule, U.S. EPA is revoking the 1997 ozone NAAQS (80 ppb) but is retaining 17 requirements to ensure the region does not backslide from the progress already achieved and previous SIP commitments. Such requirements included continued implementation of Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT)/ Reasonably Available Control Measures (RACTM), Reasonable Further Progress (RFP), transportation control measures, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) offset demonstration, attainment demonstration, contingency measures and CAA Section

185 emission fees. Sanctions could still be imposed if there is a failure to implement or submit a SIP. Dr. Chang noted that while there is a revocation of the 1997 ozone NAAQS, the backsliding requirements maintain compliance with the standard so that there is no change in our SIP commitment or implementation schedule.

Dr. Chang highlighted important elements in the final implementation rule. The base year for the 2016 AQMP should be 2011 as default with an option to use 2012. The emission inventory was submitted to U.S. EPA in July 2014. The emission inventories are updated every three years, examining all emission sources for a typical ozone season day and disclosing the inventory in a public process. If the emission inventory is changed after the SIP submittal, then there is a need to re-evaluate to ensure that there was no impact on the attainment demonstration or control strategy.

The RACT/RACM analysis will be based on technological and economic feasibility and should consider information submitted as part of the public comment period. The RFP analysis will ensure reasonable progress prior to the attainment deadline, specifically 15 percent reduction in volatile organic compounds (VOCs) for the first six years and three percent per year VOC reductions with an option for substituting NOx reductions. Reductions from sources outside the non-attainment areas are not allowed in the RFP analysis. This particular requirement poses a potential problem for the 2016 AQMP in the Coachella Valley since there are limited local sources and in the past, RFP in the Coachella region has been combined with that in the SCAB region to demonstrate compliance.

Emission reductions to demonstrate attainment are required to be implemented in the calendar year prior to the attainment date. Since the attainment date is July 20, 2032, the control strategies would need to be in place by the beginning of 2031. Attainment is demonstrated by photochemical grid modeling and an attainment finding is based on the most recent three complete years of ambient data prior to the attainment date; thus, for the 2008 8-hour ozone standard, the years would be 2021, 2022 and 2023.

Contingency measures require one year's worth of emission reductions for each RFP milestone year and attainment year. Contingency measures are not needed for extreme non-attainment areas with enforceable commitments to develop and adopt contingency measures that meet the CAA Section 182(e)(5) ("black box") requirements. Those requirements include submitting measures three years prior to the attainment date in regulatory form. As discussed in the last agenda item, U.S. EPA is considering the effect from emissions contributed from outside the U.S. known as international transport. The determination will be on a case-by-case basis, but the attainment demonstrations would still need to meet all other CAA requirements.

Finally, Dr. Chang noted that U.S. EPA is encouraging states to adopt policies and programs such as energy efficiency, renewable energy, land use planning and travel efficiency that provide co-benefits to assist in meeting the standards.

Dr. Wallerstein was supportive of the U.S. EPA in considering influential factors such as international transport but noted that attainment cannot be achieved without further reductions from federal sources. Councilmember Judith Mitchell asked whether international emissions could be quantified. Dr. Philip Fine stated that he believes the quantification of the international emissions might require the use of global models, but U.S. EPA should provide guidance on how to treat natural vs. anthropogenic emissions.

Dr. Parker inquired as to why the region would still be subject to sanctions if the U.S. EPA is revoking the 1997 ozone standard of 80 ppb. Dr. Chang reminded those present that the final implementation rule includes 17 anti-backsliding requirements that still need to be implemented and non-implementation would trigger the sanctions. Dr. Wallerstein acknowledged that there are multiple standards and various deadlines to attain healthy ozone levels, and the aim is to not undermine previous commitments while sharing U.S. EPA's goal of progressing to cleaner air.

Dr. Lyou questioned the concern for Coachella Valley not being able to demonstrate RFP and Dr. Chang explained that the Coachella Valley is not expected to attain the ozone standard by 2018 so RFP would still be required and necessary related emission reductions in the SCAB would not be occurring fast enough.

[Supervisor Shawn Nelson arrived at the Hall of Administration videoconference location at 9:35 a.m.]

3) Report on 2016 AQMP Passenger Transportation and Goods Movement White Paper Development

Mr. Henry Hogo, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer/Science & Technology Advancement, provided an update on the development of two of the ten white papers for the 2016 AQMP. Staff provided background information on the development of the 2016 AQMP and preparation of "white papers" to facilitate input regarding the plan's development. In addition, the white papers will provide factual background information and discuss major policy issues. There are a total of ten white papers; of which, three are directly related to mobile sources: passenger transportation, goods movement, and off-road equipment sectors. Another two white papers (energy and business case) are indirectly related. The Energy and Business Case White Papers will use some of the information provided in the Passenger Transportation and Goods Movement White Papers to look at various energy needs associated with the different mobile source technologies analyzed (e.g., electricity demand, hydrogen fueling infrastructure) and "business cases" for deployment of cleaner technologies.

In developing the white papers, working groups comprising members from the 2016 AQMP Advisory Group and other interested parties were formed to provide input and comments on the papers' development. To date, there have been four meetings of the two working groups. As part of the development of the white papers, staff will be coordinating with CARB and CEC on the state level and SCAG, local county transportation commissions, and subregional councils of governments on transportation and land use issues.

Relative to the Passenger Transportation White Paper, the white paper will build upon SCAG's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategies (RTP/SCS) development. At this time, staff is building on SCAG's 2012 RTP/SCS. In addition, CARB has conducted several technology assessments of light-duty and medium-duty vehicles as part of the adoption of the Low-Emission Vehicle (LEV) III regulation known as the "Advanced Clean Cars" Program, and the white paper will identify successes and challenges in reducing emissions from the passenger transportation sector. The white paper will also examine various emissions reduction scenarios to illuminate areas where further emission reductions may be realized and those areas where further emission reductions may be potentially more challenging.

The passenger transportation sector comprises seven categories: light-duty vehicles (passenger cars, light-duty trucks, sports utility vehicles, and minivans); medium-duty trucks and vans (heavier pick-up trucks, passenger and cargo vans); transit buses and shuttle buses; school buses; commuter rail; air transportation; and passenger ferries. Relative to emissions, the passenger transportation sector contributes around 27 percent of the total NOx emissions between 2014 and 2032, and 23 percent of the total VOC emissions in 2014, with a decrease to 15 percent in 2032.

Relative to the Goods Movement White Paper, the white paper will build upon information from the technology assessments currently in development by CARB (SCAQMD staff has been involved in the assessments and is the lead on the development of the harbor craft technology assessment). In addition, the white paper will build upon CARB's Sustainable Freight Strategy development and the Caltrans Freight Mobility Plan. Similar to the Passenger Transportation White Paper, the Goods Movement White Paper will discuss successes and challenges in reducing emissions from the goods movement sector. The white paper will also examine various emissions reduction scenarios to illuminate areas where further emission reductions may be realized and those areas where further emission reductions may be potentially more challenging.

The goods movement sector comprises six emissions source categories: heavy-duty trucks; locomotives; marine vessels; harbor craft; cargo handling equipment, and air

cargo. The goods movement sector's emissions contribution to total NOx emissions is around 46 percent in 2014 and decreases to 38 percent in 2032.

A proposed outline for both white papers has been presented to the working groups for input and comments. The outline includes: purpose and background (including emissions from the various sources in each sector), overview of potential technologies that can be commercialized and deployed and potential operational efficiencies; overview of policy considerations in developing the 2016 AQMP; examples of potential emission reduction scenarios and discussion of the scenarios; and recommendations and proposed actions.

Staff provided an overview of the historic regulatory programs and strategies that have led to emission reductions in the passenger transportation and goods movement sectors. Relative to the passenger transportation sector, funding incentives programs such as the current Clean Vehicle Rebate Project (CVRP) for zero-emission and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles and the CEC AB 118 projects for electric vehicle charging and alternative fuel infrastructure have helped to accelerate deployment of zero-emission and alternative fuel vehicles. CARB's LEV-III Program calls for tighter tailpipe emissions standards beginning with model years 2015 through 2025; and the recent U.S. EPA greenhouse gas standards for light- and medium-duty vehicles will have co-benefits in reducing criteria pollutant emissions. In addition, there are federal emissions standards for locomotives, marine vessels, and aircraft that will result in cleaner engines. Relative to strategies for reducing vehicle miles travelled and congestion, the implementation of SB 375, promotion of active transportation programs, and choosing mobility alternatives such as transit and car-sharing, will provide co-benefits in reducing criteria pollutant emissions.

Relative to the goods movement sector, existing regulations such as the State Truck and Bus Regulation and U.S. EPA greenhouse gas standards for heavy-duty vehicles will further reduce emissions from heavy-duty trucks. CARB has adopted several regulations reducing emissions from ocean-going vessels while at berth, cargo handling equipment, harbor craft, transportation refrigeration units, and ground support equipment at airports. Funding incentives programs such as the Carl Moyer Program and Proposition 1B have been successful in accelerating emission reductions in the goods movement sector.

Operational efficiencies identified in the goods movement sector that result in fuel cost savings have potential co-benefits in reducing criteria pollutant emissions. Some examples include "smart" delivery routing through greater use of "connected vehicle" concepts and intelligent transportation systems; larger ocean-going container vessels resulting in fewer vessels calling at the marine ports; larger trains resulting in fewer train trips; and vessel sharing and locomotive sharing may have additional co-benefits.

Staff discussed some of the initial emission reduction scenarios analyzed to-date. The initial set of emissions scenarios was developed to initiate discussions with the working group participants. The scenarios are for illustrative and discussion purposes only and do not represent control strategies to achieve the emission levels in each of the scenarios. The scenarios provide information on areas to focus future technology development and commercialization and the timing for deployment of advanced control technologies. Additional scenarios may be developed based on discussions with the working groups.

To date, staff has developed six scenarios based on the 2023 and 2032 baseline emissions inventories for NO_x. The six scenarios include: “equal share” or “across-the-board” emission reductions (for 2023, a 65 percent reduction in NO_x is needed from all sectors to achieve the 8-hour ozone air quality standard and 75 percent reduction in NO_x from the 2023 baseline is needed by 2032); all sources within each sector are at the greatest level of control based on existing emission standards; assumption that certain emission source categories can achieve an additional 90 percent NO_x emissions reduction; and varying penetration of zero-emission technologies (25, 50, and 75 percent).

The first three of the six scenarios were discussed. To illustrate, the emission levels from the various sources, staff presented the emission reductions from the major source categories in the passenger transportation and goods movement source categories in graphical form. Bar charts were presented showing the “equal share” level of NO_x emissions for 2023. The horizontal line on the bar chart represents the overall 65 percent NO_x emissions reduction. Assuming that all sources are at the most controlled emissions levels based on existing standards, the overall 65 percent reduction level cannot be achieved among the various emissions sources. However, the analysis indicates that there are several emissions source categories (heavy-duty trucks and ocean-going vessels) which have higher remaining emissions compared to the other source categories. Assuming that some of these source categories can realize additional emission reductions through advanced control technologies or greater penetration of zero-emission technologies (in addition to the remaining source emissions being at the most controlled level), the 65 percent overall reduction can be achieved. Similar bar charts were presented for the 2032 scenarios.

Staff provided a summary of its initial assessment based on the emission reduction scenarios. The scenarios indicate that the “equal share” target of either 65 percent for 2023 or 75 percent for 2032 can be achieved assuming every source meets the most stringent levels of emissions based on existing standards. Some emission sources may not be able to reach the “equal share” level; as such, there is a need for other sources to further reduce their emissions. However, there is a potential for other sources to reach “equal share” levels or beyond with greater penetration of zero- and

near-zero emission technologies. Therefore, there is a need to accelerate commercialization and deployment of zero- and near-zero emission technologies. In addition to greater advanced-technology deployment, operational strategies that are being implemented (for fuel savings and moving goods more effectively) have the potential to provide additional emission reductions.

Staff indicated that based on the scenarios analyzed, there are several large emission sources where significant emission reductions can potentially be achieved. One policy question is the need to place higher priority on these sources to reduce emissions beyond the “equal share” targets and less emphasis on smaller sources that have a greater number of vehicles or equipment. Regardless, all sources will need to reduce emissions to the greatest extent possible to attain air quality standards.

Staff concluded with next steps in the white paper development process. Staff indicated there may be additional scenarios suggestions from the working group participants that staff will analyze. Staff will discuss with the working group its initial assessment of the scenarios and solicit additional input and comments. Staff is drafting the early chapters of the documents and will release to the working group for their comments. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 4, 2015. However, the meeting may be postponed to a slightly later date depending when draft chapters will be ready for the working group’s review. (This request came from the working group participants.)

Dr. Joe Lyou asked as to what the respective bases is for the development of the emissions reduction scenarios. Staff indicated that the baseline emissions for 2023 and 2032 were developed based on the reported emissions from the 2012 AQMP with existing regulations.

Dr. Parker asked a general question regarding the stalled labor negotiations at the ports and whether emissions from ships that are waiting outside of the ports have an effect on the 8-hour ozone readings. Staff indicated that additional air monitoring equipment has recently been deployed in the port area to see what the air quality levels are during this period of time. It is not clear if the situation will have an impact since the ships are further offshore. Staff indicated that there is a possibility that fewer trucks may be entering the ports during this time; however, Dr. Lyou indicated that trucks have been arriving at the ports, but leave empty since the containers either cannot be accessed due to the backlog or have not arrived, and this may increase emissions on the landside. Staff will be evaluating the measurements to see if there are any air quality impacts.

Dr. Lyou made a general statement that the process of developing the white papers will be helpful in many ways; however, he was not sure as to how informative the white papers will be to inform the Board on next steps. The white papers will lay out

the issues; however the papers will not provide to the Board as decision makers, “here are the alternatives, here are your authorities; and possible control measures”. The Board will need to think about the next steps as the white papers go to the Board. There are pluses and minuses. Overall, it is a novel approach and will be helpful. However, the Board will need to think about how to take this information to make decisions about what was learned and decide on the regulatory process.

On the transportation side and perhaps both transportation and goods movement, Dr. Lyou commented on how much creative thought and different thinking may help. Dr. Lyou mentioned car-sharing programs such Uber-pool and what difference will these innovative programs have on air quality. Are we thinking about transportation control measures that go beyond what SCAG is discussing as part of its development of the RTP. Is it time for the SCAQMD to go to SCAG to say that the region’s air quality needs go beyond what the RTP has provided? The SCAQMD may have to develop transportation control measures that go beyond the RTP.

On the goods movement side, when Dr. Lyou discussed with goods movement representatives, they talked about a need to reduce imports and movement of goods and have more local manufacturing. There may be ways to incentivize bringing back local manufacturing. There may be other more creative approaches. When it comes to regulatory authority, Dr. Lyou indicated that we need to be aggressive and use all authority available to the SCAQMD. Dr. Lyou’s preference is to have the white papers take a look at the SCAQMD authority.

Supervisor Nelson commented that after spending time at SCAG, he has pushed SCAG to take another look at public transportation to not only lower emissions, but also reduce congestion. However, he believes SCAG’s model misses “important academic issues.” Supervisor Nelson indicated that models such as those back east where commuters living in the suburbs can take transit into a central city core and upon arriving, are able to walk to their office, are examples that could be encouraged in the SCAQMD region. If there are ways to incentivize businesses to locate near train stations to provide convenience to the commuter, there will be a significant increase in ridership. Supervisor Nelson indicated that SCAG is not working with the Riverside transportation agency to develop rail transportation from Riverside County to San Bernardino County that can connect with the east-west rail lines and the Ontario Airport. There are no real options as a resident in those areas except the freeways and the freeways are generally congested. Transit is no better given the congestion. We can get involved in bigger discussions that make sense and little things can make a difference.

Supervisor Nelson indicated that on the goods movement side, the SCAQMD should not be regulating how manufacturers operate and produce their goods. Dr. Lyou clarified that we should consider actions within our authority and “not take over

things”. Dr. Lyou indicated that Supervisor Nelson’s comments on the approaches to transit are common sense and should be supported.

Mayor Benoit indicated that he will bring the message to SCAG regarding a north-south corridor in the Inland Empire. Supervisor Nelson indicated that Metrolink has an opportunity with the SCAQMD to think a little bigger and make an effort to initiate discussion on things that can make a difference.

Dr. Parker indicated that these are types of conversations in which the Board will be involved in the upcoming AQMP. At the end of the day, the Board has to concentrate on things the SCAQMD can do and what authority we have and make sure that we do not spend too much energy in other areas and “drop the ball” on those areas where we need to focus. At the same time, we need to make sure that we do not let businesses leave our region. Otherwise, we will not have meaningful jobs to support the infrastructure needed to achieve air quality goals. Dr. Parker indicated that he is looking forward to the next two years of AQMP development and the discussions afterwards on how the plan will be implemented.

WRITTEN REPORTS:

4) Rule 2202 Activity Report

The report was received as submitted.

5) Monthly Report on Environmental Justice Initiatives – CEQA Document Commenting Update

The report was received as submitted.

OTHER BUSINESS:

None

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

The meeting was adjourned at 10:46 a.m.

Attachment

Attendance Roster

**SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
MOBILE SOURCE COMMITTEE MEETING
Attendance Roster- February 20, 2015**

NAME	AFFILIATION
Dr. Clark E. Parker, Sr.	SCAQMD Governing Board (<i>via videoconference</i>)
Dr. Joseph Lyou	SCAQMD Governing Board
Mayor Ben Benoit	SCAQMD Governing Board (<i>via videoconference</i>)
Councilmember Judith Mitchell	SCAQMD Governing Board
Supervisor Shawn Nelson	SCAQMD Governing Board (<i>via videoconference</i>)
Board Asst/Consultant Mark Abramowitz/	SCAQMD Governing Board (Lyou)
Board Asst/Consultant Chung Liu	SCAQMD Governing Board (Mitchell)
Tara Tisopulos	Orange County Transportation Authority
Erin Sheehy	Environmental Compliance Solutions
Curtis Coleman	Southern California Air Quality Alliance
David Rothbart	Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
Noel Muyco	Southern California Gas/San Diego Gas & Electric
Susan Stark	Tesoro
Adam Wood	Curt Pringle & Associates
Elaine Chang	SCAQMD Staff
Philip Fine	SCAQMD Staff
Barbara Baird	SCAQMD Staff
Kurt Wiese	SCAQMD Staff
Matt Miyasato	SCAQMD Staff
Henry Hogo	SCAQMD Staff
Dean Saito	SCAQMD Staff
Randall Pasek	SCAQMD Staff
Peter Greenwald	SCAQMD Staff
Joe Cassmassi	SCAQMD Staff
Jean Ospital	SCAQMD Staff
Chris Marlia	SCAQMD Staff
Carol Gomez	SCAQMD Staff
Sam Atwood	SCAQMD Staff
Michael Krause	SCAQMD Staff

**SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
MOBILE SOURCE COMMITTEE MEETING
Attendance Roster- February 20, 2015**

Patti Whiting	SCAQMD Staff
Kevin Durkee	SCAQMD Staff
Kim White	SCAQMD Staff