

Federal Advisory Committee Act

Clean Air Act Advisory Committee: Teleconference Meeting Summary

December 1, 2016
The DuPont Circle Hotel
Washington, D.C.

Welcome

Mr. Jim DeMocker called the meeting to order at 8:30 am on December 1, 2016. Mr. DeMocker welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked the committee members in the room and on the phone to introduce themselves, followed by introductions of other attendees in the audience. The list of meeting attendees is provided in an appendix to this summary. Mr. DeMocker introduced Tamara Saltman, indicating that Ms. Saltman is the CAAAC Designed Federal Officer (DFO), and briefly described her duties as DFO and the work she is involved in at the EPA.

Mr. DeMocker mentioned that the CAAAC is entering a new cycle, noting that the terms for quite a few members are ending, and thus there will be several open slots on the committee for new members to fill. Mr. DeMocker reviewed the process for soliciting new members to the CAAAC and reappointing those whose terms are ending but are eligible for re-appointment. Mr. DeMocker asked that any questions related to the membership process be directed to Ms. Saltman.

Air Program Update and Discussion

Ms. Janet McCabe thanked the committee for their attendance and noted that this will be her last CAAAC meeting, due to the change in administration. Ms. McCabe expressed that the EPA cannot do the good work that it does without stakeholder involvement from industry, academia, state/local agencies, the community, and other stakeholders, and noted that one of the hallmarks of this administration has been placing a high value on stakeholder input. The CAAAC has been exemplary in providing advice to the EPA in how to reduce emissions through programs and regulations that are clear, easy to comply with, and cost effective.

Ms. McCabe indicated that this administration has had 7 years of accomplishments, highlighting tremendous progress with programs to reduce ozone, fine particle, and sulfur dioxide pollution, mercury emissions, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and more. Ms. McCabe referred to the list of topics on the agenda stating that it speaks to the breadth of the work that has been done and is ongoing at the EPA, as these are issues that are affecting our communities every day.

Ms. McCabe provided the committee with an update of the EPA air program's ongoing work. She noted that the EPA has finalized the Cross-State Air Pollution Transport (CSAPR) Update

rule, noting that this is an important rule that will reduce emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and ozone when it takes effect next year. The EPA also finalized the Exceptional Events Rule and Guidance to state/local agencies this year. This guidance assists air agencies with interpreting and implementing the rule to prevent and regulate ozone associated with wildfires. Ms. McCabe also pointed out that the EPA finalized the Information Collection Request (ICR) for the oil and natural gas industry, and the industry is currently working on responses to this request. In addition, the EPA issued the final Control Techniques Guidelines for existing oil and gas equipment in ozone non-attainment areas. Ms. McCabe mentioned the 2017 Renewable Fuels Standards (RFS) and that the ozone implementation rule have been proposed. There has been tremendous progress over the last 7 years and Ms. McCabe noted that the EPA is doing a better job on providing timely guidance materials. Other progress highlighted by Ms. McCabe included rules for refrigerants, the Significant New Alternatives Policy or SNAP program, which is very effective and included huge involvement by industry. Ms. McCabe noted that the EPA put out the next increment for the EPA's Environmental Justice strategy - EJ 2020. Related to the light-duty GHG standards, the EPA issued a proposed determination that the existing standards do not need to be changed. Ms. McCabe indicated that the EPA is waiting for the DC Circuit Court opinion on the legal challenge to the Clean Power Plan (CPP). Ms. McCabe thanked the Ports Group for their work, which is very important and affects many people. In late September, the National Port Strategy Assessment report was published, and the EPA is also working on a pilot program with Port Everglades to provide an example of air emission reduction strategies that could be implemented by other ports.

Ms. McCabe concluded the air program update by indicating that the EPA is currently in a transition period, and it is going smoothly. Ms. McCabe closed by thanking the CAAAC committee members who are leaving the committee and asked if there were any questions.

Discussion

Ms. Nancy Kruger stated that it has been an honor to serve on the CAAAC committee under Ms. McCabe's leadership. Ms. Kruger said that grants given to state and local agencies under section 103 of the Clean Air Act need to be increased, and she indicated that the National Association of Clean Air Agencies (NACAA) has provided funding recommendations to the EPA. Ms. Kruger emphasized that it is important for Federal grants to provide consistent funding, and she expressed concern that these funds could potentially decrease under the new administration. Ms. McCabe thanked Ms. Kruger for her remarks and responded that it is important for states and NACAA to voice their concerns to the new administration, noting that she would help channel these comments in any way that she could in the future.

Ms. Pamela Faggert commented that the EPA's door has always been open under Ms. McCabe's leadership, and she thanked Ms. McCabe for that. Dr. Lee Kindberg echoed Ms. Faggert's sentiments and also thanked everyone for their input on the Ports work.

Ms. Kindberg asked if there were any updates on the Volkswagen settlement. Ms. McCabe indicated that there is a partial settlement for 2-liter engines, and work is progressing on the settlement for 3-liter engines. She also noted that Volkswagen has submitted their zero emission vehicle investment plans for review.

Mr. Howard Feldman also thanked Ms. McCabe and the EPA and commented that he thought there had been fair discussions between the agency and industry. Mr. Feldman asked which issues may be subject to rulemaking in the next two months (i.e., before the new administration takes office). Ms. McCabe said that there are a few rules currently being reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), including revisions to the regional haze rule. Other rules, such as some of the residual risk and technology (RTR) rules will likely be proposed, and Ms. McCabe was hopeful that the Appendix W modeling guidance would be finalized in that timeframe.

Ms. Joy Wiecks also thanked Ms. McCabe and the EPA. She commented that there are many differences for tribal groups that the EPA should be mindful of when developing programs and regulations. Ms. McCabe acknowledged the comment, noting the care tribes take for their communities.

Members of the committee who joined the meeting via the phone also thanked Ms. McCabe and the EPA for the open-door policy and one CAAAC member asked about the status of the SNAP rule. Ms. McCabe replied that the rule was being published today (12/1/16).

Ms. Ann Weeks thanked Ms. McCabe and the EPA, especially for the Agency's support of air traffic pollution reduction, which is the largest source of air toxics.

Ms. Jalonnie White-Newsome asked if there would be any type of communication during the transition period with the CAAAC with respect to how the EPA is moving forward. Mr. DeMocker said he would convey the value of this committee to the incoming administration.

Mr. Andrew Hoekzema expressed gratitude to Ms. McCabe for her work as well. Mr. Hoekzema noted his disappointment that the EPA did not solicit comments on the ozone implementation approach and asked why the EPA took, in his opinion, a very conservative approach. Ms. McCabe said that she would characterize the approach differently, that it provides value, and that many states appreciate the stability in expectations this approach provides. In the area of ozone, Ms. McCabe explained that the EPA has tried different approaches to reduce ozone-forming pollutants, but has been squarely told by the courts that those approaches were inconsistent with the Clean Air Act (CAA). Ms. McCabe added that this current approach is realistic based on what the courts have told the EPA. Ms. McCabe noted that the EPA asked for input specifically on consistency with the CAA and legal precedent.

A number of other committee members continued to thank Ms. McCabe for her service. Ms. Myra Reece asked Ms. McCabe if she thought there would be big challenges or opportunities

ahead for states. Ms. McCabe said that relationships between the EPA and the state, local, and tribal agencies are key, and she hoped these agencies would continue to see the EPA as a colleague, co-regulator and a resource. Climate issues are and will be a huge concern, and she hopes state agencies will continue to work with the EPA on this issue.

Mr. Donald Neal expressed gratitude to Ms. McCabe for the EPA's openness over the years. He also noted there has been a revolution in transportation, charging stations, battery storage facilities, etc., in the past few years and invited Ms. McCabe to tour his company's battery storage facility.

Ms. Patricia Strabbing echoed the prior sentiments, adding that the EPA has had a fair, balanced and stakeholder-inclusive approach. She also asked whether the EPA would issue a final determination on the light-duty vehicle GHG standards mid-term review before the next administration comes in. Ms. McCabe responded that the EPA's determination of the appropriateness of the standards, based on the mid-term evaluation has been proposed and is in the public comment period. After the comment period closes, the EPA Administrator, Gina McCarthy, will determine whether there is enough information to finalize the proposed determination.

Mr. Jason Walker commented that there have been some major steps taken with respect to tribal issues. He said that the tribes are trying to get their programs up to a level equal to the state agencies, but this has been difficult. He noted that he hopes tribal representation on the CAAAC will continue, as the terms for the three tribal representatives on the committee are expiring.

Dr. Nickey Sheats commented that Environment Justice (EJ) needs a big victory as the main topic of a policy on EJ, and EJ needs to not be relegated to a side topic of another policy or regulation. He asked whether EJ will be a priority for the next administration. Ms. McCabe agreed that EJ needs to be addressed. She noted that progress is difficult though, and there is still a lot of work to do in this area.

Mr. John Busterud was appreciative for the openness and transparency of the EPA with respect to the Clean Power Plan. He noted that regardless of what happens with that regulation, it makes sense for companies to keep moving forward.

Ms. Gillian Mittelstaedt requested that Ms. McCabe communicate to the new administration the importance of the indoor environment and that there is not enough leverage in the CAA to properly address indoor air quality.

Presentation: EPA Response to CAAAC Air Toxics Report

(Note: All presentations and meeting materials are available online at: <https://www.epa.gov/caaac>.)

Mr. Mike Koerber with the EPA's Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards provided a presentation on the EPA's response to the recommendations included in the CAAAC Air Toxics Report. He indicated that the EPA has reviewed and developed responses for all of the recommendations and has work underway for most recommendations. Other recommendations are highly complex, resource intensive or involve decision makers outside the EPA. Mr. Koerber gave an overview of the recommendations for which EPA has work under or is planning to do, those still under review, and those needing involvement by other parties. He noted that the EPA plans to keep the CAAAC informed about recommendation outcomes. Mr. Koerber referred to a chart of living recommendations with current draft responses where the EPA has tried to be as specific as possible. He invited everyone review the chart.

Discussion

Mr. Hoekzema suggested that tools for air toxics assessments could be more useful if the EPA also included future projections. Mr. Koerber responded that this is a good idea. He noted that the EPA is trying to be more timely with its assessments but would like to be more forward-looking if they can still complete the assessments in a timely manner.

With respect to Recommendation #9 on the chart, which is about reviewing, revising and updating the list of hazardous air pollutants (HAP) under section 112(b)(1) of the CAA, Ms. Kruger asked about the status of petitions to add HAP and also to add industrial source categories to the source category list. Mr. Koerber replied that the EPA was petitioned to add n-propyl bromide and other HAP to the HAP list. He noted that for n-propyl bromide, the EPA has made a technical finding of completeness and would next be making a finding about whether or not to list the chemical through the notice and comment process. He also noted that there had been some work done to investigate adding methyl bromide sources to the list of source categories, but he was unsure of the status of the process for that chemical.

With respect to Recommendation #7 on the chart, concerning a cumulative impacts policy, Dr. Sheats urged the EPA to move past tools and resources and to implement a policy to get pollution reductions. He noted that state agencies often will not go beyond the actions of the EPA due to state mandates, so it is important for the EPA to take action. Dr. Sheats further stated that EJ communities must be officially identified before any real action can occur for them. Mr. Koerber said that communities and sub-communities must be engaged and agreed that characterization is important before policy for EJ can be developed. Mr. Sheats suggested that the EPA develop a timeline for completing this characterization.

Ms. Wiecks asked for clarification with respect to Recommendation #24 on the chart, which is a recommendation to create an independent, standing committee. Dr. Jalonnie White-Newsome added that the intent of this recommendation was to ensure that the recommendations of the report were addressed by the EPA. Bill Harnett indicated that the EPA will continue to report to the CAAAC on the progress in responding to and implementing the recommendations.

Mr. Bob Morehouse asked if the EPA had received petitions to add any other HAP to the HAP list. He also noted that he would like probability levels reported when risks, particularly public health risks, are presented, such as in the context of Residual Risk and Technology Review (RTR). Mr. Koerber replied that the EPA received a petition to add hydrogen sulfide to the HAP list. He also mentioned that a Science Advisory Board review of EPA's risk methods is coming up, which may be a good forum to address the presentation of risk information.

Ms. Julie Simpson asked about the status of Recommendation #'s 6, 7 and 17 on the chart as they relate to tribes. Mr. Koerber responded that the efforts are ongoing and that the EPA welcomes participation by tribes in working to complete the actions described in the responses to the recommendations.

Mr. Hoekzema echoed Dr. Sheats' comment that the EPA should be the leader on technical issues. Mr. Hoekzema stated that state and local agencies will never have the resources to tackle these issues independently.

Ms. Gillian Mittelstaedt commented that analysis is needed to show what programs are reducing risk and a process is needed to continue to identify high risks.

Presentation: International Update (Embassy Monitoring and AirNOW Department of State; Montreal Protocol HFC Amendment)

Mr. Bill Harnett with the EPA's Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards provided an overview of AirNow, an air quality monitoring program developed by the EPA that provides real-time ozone and particulate matter (PM) data for 50 states, 24 national parks and 6 Canadian provinces. In addition, the State Department and the EPA developed an agreement to monitor air quality in countries that either do not measure or do not post air quality data and send that data to AirNow. These international monitors are generally at US embassies in these countries and are there to ensure U.S. citizens in those countries have data to make informed health decisions and also to provide an opportunity for the U.S. to create air quality partnerships with other countries. Currently there are 20 AirNow monitors located at international embassies and consulates, with 30 more planned. Mr. Harnett mentioned NowCast, which is a new realtime data computation method used in AirNow to show real-time Air Quality Index values. This new method improves the former approach that was biased low for PM, is more reactive, and does not require ongoing data analysis.

Ms. Cindy Newberg, with the EPA's Office of Atmospheric Programs continued with a presentation on the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol. The Montreal Protocol is a treaty between 197 countries established in 1987 to protect the ozone layer by phasing out ozone-depleting substances. There are two types of parties involved; Article 5 Parties and non-Article 5 Parties, where Article 5 Parties are typically under-developed countries that are generally given longer phase-out times. Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and halons were phased out globally in 2010 and the phase out for hydrochlorofluorocarbons (HCFCs) is underway.

Recently, amendments were made to the Montreal Protocol, referred to as the Kigali Amendments. The Kigali Agreement consisted of intensive negotiation to arrive at a global agreement to phase down hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) through step-wise reductions. Ms. Newberg explained that HFCs were developed to replace ozone-depleting substances, but these substances are potent GHGs that have a much higher global warming potential than CO₂. Ms. Newberg indicated that a smooth phase-down is expected and that the Kigali Amendment is a meaningful step toward reducing global warming.

Discussion/Comments

Daniel Greenbaum commented that there are now other countries using air monitors and selling pollution control technologies, and there is a business opportunity for U.S. companies selling emissions control equipment.

Ms. Simpson commended the EPA on the AirNow program. She also noted that while the presentation highlighted high air quality index values in India and other countries and low values in the U.S., there have been high values seen in the U.S. in AirNow related to fires.

Howard Feldman encouraged the EPA to use “interference-free” ozone monitors for the AirNow program.

Mr. John Walke asked whether data from AirNow was being used in the review of the PM_{2.5} standards. Mr. Harnett replied that in the U.S., there are not a lot of people in the rural areas experiencing impacts from wildfires where high monitoring values may occur, so it is difficult to make a connection between health effects and air data there. There is more information in China and India in this respect because there is a higher population of people in the areas where there is bad air quality.

Mr. Daniel Nickey asked if any more embassy monitors were planned and also what the incentives are for embassies and consulates to install them. Mr. Harnett answered that the interest in having the air monitors comes from the embassies themselves due to the nature of the air quality in that location. The interest is also dependent on how the information will be used. In some cases, countries adopt standards to address the air pollution once a problem is noted and quantified through the monitors.

Mr. Hoekzema asked if there is a process for adding monitors to AirNow, noting that there could be existing monitors in other countries to add to the system. He also asked whether the EPA compares other countries’ data to the U.S. National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Mr. Harnett replied that monitors can be added to AirNow, but for monitors in the U.S., the monitor information would be used in determining NAAQS attainment, which may limit the number of areas wanting to voluntarily add monitors to the network. Mr. Harnett responded that generally, the process for monitor placement is to look for a confluence between the potential for bad air quality and a potentially exposed population.

Presentation: Protective Action Guides (PAGs) for Radiation

Ms. Sara DeCair with the EPA's Office of Radiation and Indoor Air provided a summary of Protective Action Guides (PAGs) for radiation. Ms. DeCair explained that PAGs are non-regulatory guidance for action in the event of nuclear emergencies. The EPA proposed revisions to the PAG manual and received about 5,000 comments. As a result of comments, changes were to the manual and the final PAG will be published soon.

Discussion/Comments

Ms. Simpson emphasized that this guidance is important for specific groups and requested outreach to tribes.

Mr. Adrian Shelley asked whether natural radiation in groundwater was accounted for in the drinking water PAG. He also asked whether the EPA had investigated de-centralized storage vs. centralized storage for low-level radioactive waste. Ms. DeCair indicated that low-level waste storage was outside the purview of the PAGs. She also responded that for drinking water, naturally-occurring materials are not a factor in relation to a nuclear incident, but is more a Safe Drinking Water Act issue.

Ms. Wiecks urged for continued follow-up on this issue, considering turn-over that occurs within groups that would need to implement the protective actions.

Presentation: E-Enterprise State and EPA Collaborative Leadership Model

Mr. Chet Wayland with the EPA's Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards gave a presentation on E-Enterprise for the Environment, a model to improve environmental protection through collaborative leadership between federal, state, and tribal environmental co-regulators. Mr. Wayland listed three key goals of the model, which are: 1) improving environmental protection through better program performance, 2) enhancing/streamlining services for stakeholders and agency partners, and 3) operating a partnership as a transformative model for Joint Governance. The keys to success are leveraged resources, collaboration, business process improvement, early engagement, and transparency. Mr. Wayland explained that E-Enterprise includes team membership with various teams co-chaired between state agencies and the EPA. There are many E-Enterprise projects underway, Mr. Wayland added, including LDAR, modernizing SIP submission and review, fuels reporting, and pesticide label matching. Mr. Wayland indicated that he foresees E-Enterprise living on and progressing under the new administration.

Discussion/Comments

Mr. Greenbaum asked if there is an evaluation piece to determine what was accomplished with E-Enterprise. Mr. Wayland did not think that had been considered, but that he would raise that issue to the leadership council.

Mr. Sheats asked if there would be more funding for this in the future. Mr. Wayland replied that he hoped that would be the case, but that the project is a stand-alone activity that has not had a dedicated stream of funding.

Mr. Hoekzema asked if any thought had been given to using E-Enterprise for the rulemaking process. Mr. Wayland indicated that it has been talked about, however one obstacle is to figure out legal considerations. Mr. Wayland stated that more information than usual was shared ahead of the rulemaking for the Clean Power Plan, and this could be used as a model for future rulemakings.

Mr. Gary Jones commented that his industry struggles with annual emissions reporting, which has different requirements in different states, and he asked whether E-Enterprise might improve this process. Mr. Wayland said that the EPA is working on improving the Source Classification Code (SCC) database, which may help with these reporting issues. Mr. Wayland suggested that Mr. Jones contact the EPA group working to revise the SCC database for more information and promised to help make that happen.

Mr. Morehouse asked how the regulated community might be affected by E-Enterprise. Mr. Wayland indicated that the EPA needs to perform more outreach to better understand the regulated community's perspective in relation to E-Enterprise, but envisions that the regulated community would be a beneficiary of streamlined reporting and other efficiencies being developed under E-Enterprise.

Presentation: HEI Studies on Diesel PM and Subsequent Activities

Mr. Greenbaum with the Health Effects Institute (HEI), an independent research institute, gave a presentation on diesel PM. Mr. Greenbaum talked about PM emissions from old diesel engines, which is the primary area of health concern. Mr. Greenbaum highlighted the 2012 International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) review of diesel emissions, which classified diesel as a known human carcinogen. Mr. Greenbaum summarized HEI's Advanced Collaborative Emissions Study (ACES), which looked to characterize emissions from newer diesel engines (model year 2007 and 2010) and determine the health effects from those engines' emissions. Results from the study show no evidence of lung cancer from exposure to these engines, which is in contrast to previous studies with older diesel engines. Mr. Greenbaum concluded that the rules are working, and diesel emissions from new technology clean diesel engines are substantially lower. However, more work is needed to accelerate the replacement and retrofit of older diesel engines and to refine/strengthen vehicle controls in real-world conditions.

Discussion/Comments

Susan Collet indicated that Toyota is a sponsor of HEI and supported the ACES study. She noted that in Japan, there is another study being conducted to look at the cardiovascular effects of diesel emissions exposure, with results expected in late 2017. Ms. Collet indicated that the technology is available for cleaner diesel engines. She emphasized that a wide portfolio of technologies needs to be available and added that the 15 parts per million fuel standard has helped reduce health effects from diesel emissions. Lastly, Ms. Collet indicated that Toyota has conducted an attributions study, which shows that a large percentage of PM emissions originate from area and point sources.

Jay Duffy urged the EPA to focus on existing sources and to require particulate filters on older trucks when the engines are rebuilt. He also urged the EPA to develop a cancer risk factor for diesel emissions.

Mr. Nickey emphasized that it is important to assist small businesses in reducing diesel emissions. He noted that while several states have small business assistance programs to help businesses understand and comply with rules, such as the standards for reciprocating internal combustion engines, this avenue could also be used to help businesses understand the effects of diesel emissions from their mobile sources. Diesel emissions calculators would be helpful, as well as more guidance and compliance tools for small businesses.

Ms. Kruger also indicated that there is a need to continue to reduce diesel emissions. She noted that in a recent petition to the EPA, 11 state and local agencies urged stricter heavy-duty truck NO_x limits. She noted that NACAA is trying to help states develop mitigation project plans to use the Volkswagen settlement funds, and she indicated this is also an opportunity to reduce NO_x emissions. Ms. Kruger added that the 5-year grant under the Diesel Emission Reduction Act (DERA) is ending, and she is hopeful that DERA will be re-authorized.

Ms. Kindberg commented that the information presented in Mr. Greenbaum's presentation vindicates the long-term approach to diesel emissions reductions, noting that the work the EPA and others have done over the years have had a great impact. Ms. Kindberg asked whether any non-cancer endpoints were examined in the studies presented. Mr. Greenbaum clarified that many different health endpoints have been studied, not just cancer. He noted that mild inflammation was seen, but no other real effects were observed in the study.

Ms. Mittelstaedt emphasized the importance of understanding that the causes of observable health effects are complex and involve many factors, including nutrition, existing health and the environment. For instance, she noted that in one study, there was a larger health effect observed in rats exposed to roadside air when lipids were present in the bloodstream. She also asked if immune suppression had been studied. Mr. Greenbaum agreed that many factors can contribute to health effects and noted there have been other studies that examined other factors related to

mobile sources, such as noise. He also responded that the link between diesel exhaust and immune suppression was studied a few years ago.

Mr. Nickey asked whether there was a drop in horsepower in retrofitted engines. Mr. Greenbaum replied that the HEI study only included new engines, but no issue with horsepower was noted.

Mr. Hoekzema commented that a lot of state implementation plan (SIP) measures are predicated on the expected durability of engines and controls and asked whether it would make sense to have diesel testing programs for on- and off-road vehicles. Mr. Greenbaum emphasized that to get further diesel emission reduction, the focus should be on older vehicles in urban centers. He also noted that the EPA does extensive in-use testing for heavy-duty vehicles and historically has done less testing for light-duty diesel vehicles because there are fewer of them in the U.S. However, due to recent experiences with emission control defeat devices, more testing of light-duty vehicles is being done.

Mr. Hoekzema said that there are still many nonroad engines in use from the 1940's, 1950's and 1960's, and he is curious as to whether the age data the EPA has for non-road vehicles includes these engines.

Ms. Strabbing commented that due to the Volkswagen scandal, the EPA has been forced to perform more on-road testing. She noted that this is causing problems with getting vehicles certified and hopes the EPA can get make to more definite testing schemes in the future.

Presentation: Ozone and PM Advance Program Review and Accomplishments

Ms. Laura Bunte with EPA's Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards gave a presentation on the Advance program, which is a collaborative effort to reduce emissions in attainment areas and to assist these areas in continuing to meet the NAAQS for ozone and PM_{2.5}. Ms. Bunte described the goals of the program as the following: 1) help attainment areas to ensure continued health protection, 2) better position these areas to remain in attainment, and 3) efficiently direct available resources towards action to address ozone and PM_{2.5} problems quickly. Ms. Bunte stated that each Advance area has unique issues to address to remain in attainment, such as wood smoke in the Northwest, and Ms. Bunte showed a map illustrating the Advance Areas. Ms. Bunte talked about the achievements so far under this program, noting that an important achievement has been the development of air quality programs. Ms. Bunte listed new trends in Advance Programs, which include mobile source programs, energy efficiency/renewable energy, green infrastructure, wood smoke reduction, education, and stationary source efforts. Information on the Advance Program is available at <http://www.epa.gov/advance>.

Discussion/Comments

Mr. Jason Walker noted that he was pleased to learn about this program and would like to get involved.

Ms. Wiecks asked about wastewater and how it relates to the Advance Program. Ms. Bunte replied that there are significant energy savings possible through process tweaks, and these could possibly translate to air pollution benefits as well.

Mr. Shelley commented that in Houston, the Advance Program was only used to identify things that had already been done to improve air quality, noting that no new program emerged. Ms. Bunte responded that some areas are just cataloging their past initiatives, but she stated that this activity also provided some benefits.

Ms. Mittelstaedt asked how the EPA balances the competing forces of the use of woodstoves vs. woody biomass boilers. She noted that incorrect storage of the biomass can lead to high moisture content and higher emissions when it is burned. Ms. Bunte indicated that there may be more discussion with the Forest Service and others that are promoting commercial-scale woodburning.

Mr. Hoekzema emphasized the importance of the EPA sending consistent signals about voluntary actions and how those actions are treated for determining attainment. He noted that it is possible that sources taking voluntary action might be penalized with lower standards in the future by rulemaking. Mr. Hoekzema urged the EPA to not discourage voluntary emission reduction actions. Mr. DeMocker replied that he would take this point regarding the clarity and coordination of voluntary and regulatory programs back to the EPA leadership.

Opportunity for Public Comment

Mr. DeMocker asked if the public had any comments or questions. There were no comments from the public in attendance at the meeting.

Miscellaneous Business and Close

Mr. DeMocker indicated that the next CAAAC meeting will be scheduled for the spring of 2017. He asked the committee members to communicate with Ms. Saltman about any topics they would like to discuss at the next meeting.

Mr. Hoekzema expressed that he feels the discussion that occurs at these meetings is the most beneficial, indicating that the presentations he can read at home. With more discussion, Mr. Hoekzema believes the meetings can be more useful and that as an advisory committee, more advice from the committee members can be communicated to the EPA in this manner. Mr. DeMocker replied that the EPA is open to all ideas.

Mr. Nickey said that he would be interested in more information on the Volkswagen settlement and on what states are planning to do with the settlement funds.

Ms. Strabbing urged the EPA to keep a cadence with the CAAAC meetings and to continue to have at least two meetings per year. She felt that with any fewer meetings than they currently have, the group would lose momentum. Mr. DeMocker acknowledged the comment and said that this is something the committee can keep revisiting.

Mr. DeMocker adjourned the meeting.

Attachment A

CAAAC Meeting Attendance List

Committee Members	
Name	Affiliation
John Busterud	Pacific Gas and Electric Co.
Susan Collet	Toyota Motor Engineering & Manufacturing North America Inc.
Pamela Faggert	Dominion Resources Services Inc.
Howard Feldman	American Petroleum Institute
Daniel Greenbaum	Health Effects Institute
Robert Hilton	Robert Hilton Energy
Andrew Hoekzema	Capital Area Council of Governments
Gary Jones	Printing Industries of America (sub for Mark Bohan)
Robert Kaufmann	Koch Companies Public Sector, LLC
Lee Kindberg	MAERSK, Inc.
Nancy Kruger	National Association of Clean Air Agencies
Gillian Mittelstaedt	Tribal Healthy Homes Network
Robert Morehouse	Air Permitting Forum
Donald Neal	Southern California Edison
Daniel Nickey	Iowa Waste Reduction Center
Myra Reece	SC DHEC
Nickey Sheats	Thomas Edison State College
Adrian Shelley	Air Alliance Houston
Julie Simpson	Nez Perce Tribe
Geraldine Smith	Public Service Enterprise Group Inc.
Patricia Strabbing	Chrysler Group, LLC
Mary Uhl	Western States Air Resources Council
John Walke	Natural Resources Defense Council
Jason Walker	Northwestern Band of the Shoshone Nation
Ann Weeks (on phone)	Clean Air Task Force
Jay Duffy	Clean Air Task Force (sub for Ann Weeks)
Dr. Jalonne White-Newsome (on phone)	The Kresge Foundation
Peter Pagano (on phone)	Boeing
Joy Wiecks	Fond du Lac Band
Michael Buser	Oklahoma State University
EPA Attendees/Presenters	

Janet McCabe	Presenter
Jim DeMocker	Presenter
Tamara Saltman	Designated Federal Official (DFO)
Mike Koerber	Presenter
Chet Wayland	Presenter
Laura Bunte	Presenter
Cindy Newberg	Presenter
Bill Harnett	Presenter
Sara DeCair	Presenter
Catrice Jefferson	
Shanika Whitehurst	
Erica Roberts	
Wendy McQuilkin	
Other Attendees	
Patrick Ambrosio	Bloomberg BNA
Dan Charter	Consultant
Rachel Feinstein	HPBA
John Kinsman	Edison Electric Institute
Fran Marshall	SC DHEC
Sean Reilly	E&E News
Leslie Ritts	National Environmental Development Association's Clean Air Project
Ted Steicher	American Petroleum Institute
Contractor Support	
Lesley Stobert	EC/R Incorporated (a wholly owned subsidiary of SC&A)
Tanya Parise	EC/R Incorporated (a wholly owned subsidiary of SC&A)