

Federal Advisory Committee Act

Clean Air Act Advisory Committee

Hybrid (In-Person & Virtual) Meeting
June 27-28, 2023

Welcome & Opening Remarks, Day 1

This Clean Air Act (CAA) Advisory Committee (CAAAC) meeting followed a hybrid format that accommodated both in-person and virtual attendees through Microsoft Teams. Ms. Lorraine Reddick, the Designated Federal Official, opened the first day of the meeting and reviewed the agenda, which is displayed below. A list of attendees is provided in Attachment 1. Previous meeting minutes as well as materials associated with this meeting will be available online at EPA’s CAAAC website (<https://www.epa.gov/caaac>).

Day 1 Meeting Agenda

Time	Item	Presenters/Facilitators
1:00 – 1:05 pm	Opening Remarks	John Shoaff and Lorraine Reddick <i>EPA Office of Air Policy and Program Support</i>
1:05 – 2:00 pm	OAR Highlights	Joe Goffman, Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator <i>EPA Office of Air and Radiation</i>
2:00 – 2:45 pm	EJ in Air Permitting Principles	John Mooney, Director <i>Region 5 Air and Radiation Division</i>
2:45 – 3:00 pm	Break	
3:00 – 3:25 pm	IAQ Research Priorities WG Final Report for CAAAC Deliberation & Approval	Dan Greenbaum, <i>President Emeritus Health Effects Institute</i>
3:25 – 3:50 pm	Program Update – 50 th Anniversary	John Shoaff and EPA OAR Program Representatives
3:50 – 3:55 pm	Public Comment	John Shoaff and Lorraine Reddick <i>EPA Office of Air Policy and Program Support</i>
3:55 – 4:00 pm	Close Meeting	Lorraine Reddick <i>EPA Office of Air Policy and Program Support</i>

Office of Air and Radiation (OAR) Highlights

Mr. Joe Goffman, Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator of the EPA Office of Air and Radiation, began by reviewing several rulemakings that OAR launched this spring. He mentioned that revised National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter (PM NAAQS) were proposed at the end of last year, and the EPA is hoping to finalize that rulemaking this fall. In addition, within the last 2-3 weeks, the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee

(CASAC) received information from the EPA for review of the EPA's Policy Assessment for the Reconsideration of the Ozone NAAQS.

Mr. Goffman mentioned that, in April, the Administrator returned to the Gulf region to address air toxics from the chemical manufacturing industry. He stated that the EPA Administrator recently announced a proposal to address chemical manufacturing, which is concentrated in Louisiana and Texas, to address and reduce risk to communities from six major chemicals. The administration created a proposal to address the manufacturing of ethylene oxide, a commercial sterilizer. This proposal was crafted in such a way as to ensure that medical equipment is still readily available. The EPA is working with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to ensure an adequate supply of medical equipment is maintained.

Mr. Goffman also described a proposal to address greenhouse gases (GHGs) and other pollutants from both light-duty and medium-duty vehicles. The EPA's Office of Air and Radiation (OAR) proposed emissions standards for model years 2027+ leveraging manufacturers' incorporation of clean technology in the new vehicles they are building. Several vehicle manufacturers have announced ambitious goals to market new truck/car fleets starting later in the decade and into 2030 which will rely heavily on electric vehicles.

In May, the Administrator announced a proposal to address GHG emissions from the power sector for existing coal-fired power plants. The proposal reflected sustained engagement with utilities, co-ops, and grid operators and involved a new system for addressing CO₂ emissions in which states manage the electricity sector within their jurisdictions.

Mr. Goffman stated that the supplemental New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) emissions guidelines for the oil and gas sector, which was proposed last November, should be finalized by the end of this year.

Discussion

Bob Wyman expressed appreciation to the EPA for its stewardship of CAA amendments, and that he is confident that the stated proposals will help achieve the decarbonization of the electric grid and support the electric vehicle transition. He also stated that he believes the proposals will be able to sustain any potential legal challenges that may come up.

Shannon Broome expressed concern that court-ordered deadlines for CAA Section 112 standards are driving things in such a way that it is compromising the quality of the EPA's ability to develop suitable regulations. She gave an example of a rule being proposed with errors in calculations due to the Agency's time constraints in publishing the proposed and final standards. Mr. Goffman responded that OAR appreciates the points made and encourages commenters to continue providing detailed feedback.

Mary Peveto brought up the vulnerability of the Title V permitting program and stated that Oregon and multiple other states are facing inadequate funding. She stated that Title V fees are inadequate to fund the state permitting programs due to the way the fees are calculated. She asks what EPA plans to do to transition states into a different fee structure that is fair, reasonable, and

protective. Mr. Goffman encouraged the CAAAC members to bring forward potential solutions to this problem.

Sara Hayes mentioned the proposed NSPS for power plants and noted that she had been hearing concerns that state regulators will not be comfortable using the allowed flexibility for state plan development, and asked whether EPA intends to provide any more guidance. Mr. Goffman stated that the EPA had not been formally asked for a model rule, and they are counting on receiving information through the proposed rule about what states/utilities would like to have the option to do.

Dan Greenbaum stated that there is evidence of health effects from lower and lower pollutant levels as research advances. He asked about the timeline for the PM and ozone NAAQS rules. Mr. Goffman responded that they are keen to get the PM final rule out before the end of the year and that they are waiting on further guidance from CASAC before releasing the ozone proposal.

Bob Meyers expressed that several proposals have regulatory text that is detached from the proposed rule, and asked why this is. Mr. Goffman asked Mr. Shoaff to follow up about this after the meeting.

Environmental Justice in Air Permitting Principles

John Mooney, the Director of the Region 5 Air and Radiation Division gave a presentation describing how the EPA Office of Air and Radiation is working to integrate environmental justice (EJ) principles into air permitting. Region 5 chaired a national workgroup in July 2021 in response to the numerous questions about how EJ impacts CAA permits. This group has worked to develop an interim operating framework that provides practical recommendations for analyzing and addressing EJ in air permitting actions. It was transmitted to all EPA regions by the Office of Air and Radiation to assist in their work to support state, local, and Tribal agencies issuing permits, who issue the majority of permits under the federal Clean Air Act.

In late 2022, the workgroup created eight guiding principles for addressing EJ concerns in air permitting. Mr. Mooney stated that these principles were created to support EPA regions in taking immediate action, representing sequential steps for permit reviewers to give insights into EJ concerns. The principles memo from the Office of Air and Radiation encourages EPA regions to work collaboratively with tribal, state, and local entities to apply these principles to air permitting. He stated that there is a relationship between the principles and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

The eight Principles for Addressing EJ Concerns in Air Permitting are: (1) identify communities with potential EJ stressors, (2) engage early in the permitting process to promote meaningful participation and fair treatment, (3) enhance public involvement through the permitting process, (4) conduct a “fit for purpose” EJ analysis, (5) minimize and mitigate disproportionately high and adverse effects associated with the permit action to promote fair treatment, (6) provide federal support through the air permitting process, (7) enhance transparency through the air permitting process, and (8) build capacity to enhance the consideration of EJ in the air permitting process.

Mr. Mooney provided related documents: “EPA Legal Tools to Advance Environmental Justice” from May 2022, “Interim Environmental Justice and Civil Rights in Permitting Frequently Asked Questions” from August 2022, “EJ in Air Permitting: Principles for Addressing Environmental Justice Concerns in Air Permitting” from December 2022, and “EPA Legal Tools to Advance Environmental Justice: Cumulative Impacts Addendum” from January 2023.

Mr. Mooney proceeded to go through documentation of each of the principles, describing the purpose of the task, logistics, timing, and recommended tools to complete each task.

Discussion

Rosemary Ahtuanguak expressed that she is hopeful for future generations in her community because of the work that the EPA is doing. She expressed the importance of targeting environmental exposures at the source. She also described a human health risk assessment, conducted in her community, that was cut short by the EPA. She urged the EPA to continue to invest in research for communities like hers.

Natalene Cummings asked for clarification about whether the EJ considerations are regulations or just guidelines. Mr. Mooney responded that the EJ considerations are guidelines only. She also inquired about the “early engagement” portion of the guidelines and described a situation in Wisconsin in which EPA issued a construction permit at the same time as the operating permit, shortening the allotted time for engagement. Mr. Mooney responded by describing early engagement in more detail. He said that the early action approach depends on the type of permit. Early engagement is recommended so that the community is engaged before projects progress too far to be changed.

Dan Greenbaum noted that from workshops he has been involved in, the feedback they have gotten from communities is that it is difficult for them to find the time to study the data, regulations, and permits to be able to provide input into the process.

Mary Peveto said that gathering more information about a problem does not necessarily help the community, because permitting authorities cannot help with many of the important issues that influence EJ, like land use, zoning, cumulative risk, and the built environment. She questions how helpful these guidelines will be. She agrees that it will successfully deliver information about the problem but says that it is difficult to imagine any impact without actionable authorities.

Jason Howanitz expanded upon Ms. Peveto’s comments, saying that giving people more information about EJ disparities also causes more grief for the communities. He also made the point that Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and EJ are notably different and should not be compared. Mr. Howanitz further expressed that the EPA continues to make promises that it cannot deliver because there are no EJ regulations, and it is relying on states to make decisions when those decisions can only be made at the federal level. He stated that the EPA is making recommendations when it should be more explicit about how processes work.

Shannon Broome expressed that there is no mention of statutory deadlines for conducting the processes outlined in these EJ permitting principles. She stated that the guidance documents have

good information, but that there needs to be more expectation setting so that state officials can create permits that incorporate these ideas by the permit deadlines.

Adrienne Hollis commented that she agreed that there is a need to engage the public before the public comment period and asked when there would be a time for responses from the public for principle #3. She also asked what “fit for purpose” means and whose purpose this refers to in principle #4. She further questioned the definitions of EJ disparities, asking how governments can determine what “disproportionately high risk” means. She expressed that there is a large focus on minimizing and mitigating adverse effects but argues that we should be primarily focused on eliminating them. She commented that the process presented is an informative process only, which does not provide an opportunity for the public to have an impact on the outcome of the permitting action.

Dan Nickey remarked that the small business environmental assistance programs established under CAA 507 could help small businesses with the permitting outreach process.

Mary Peveto said that there needs to be better documentation from the federal government about the makeup of existing EJ communities and that the EPA needs to propagate hard lines about where existing burdens are.

William Spratlin commented that these concepts need to reach the boardrooms of the companies siting these facilities, so they are adequately considered before the preliminary processes begin, such as land acquisition for facility placement or expansion.

Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) Research Principles Work Group

Dan Greenbaum, President of the Health Effects Institute presented on the Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) Research Principles Work Group report “Why Indoor Chemistry Matters.” This report provides recommendations on prioritizing research needs identified by the National Academy of Science Engineering and Medicine (NASEM) report. This NASEM report makes recommendations in four overall categories: human behavior, health disparities and EJ, air cleaners, and overarching recommendations.

Mr. Greenbaum stated that exposure and health effects resulting from indoor air chemistry are directly related to human behavior. He stated that research to address exposures and health effects will need to deepen understanding of human behavior, improve models through understanding human behavior, and expand to chemistry associated with human occupancy and human activities that influence indoor air pollution.

He stated that health disparities and EJ are relevant in the quality of housing, ventilation, and construction materials, and are often overlooked when considering indoor air quality and EJ.

The third category, air cleaners, has become more prominent in research, given the recently heightened public interest in indoor air quality. He stated that device manufacturers, researchers, and public health professionals need to communicate to consumers about the efficacy of indoor air cleaners and the chemical exposure consequences.

Mr. Greenbaum described additional issues in indoor air quality, including two emerging contaminants of concern: reactive oxygen species (ROS) and aldehydes. He encourages public-sector institutions to conduct surveys to determine which new chemicals are appearing in indoor environments.

Discussion

Mary Peveto stated that people living in low-income housing are often unable to control their environments. She asked how indoor air chemistry concerns interface with the quality and functionality of HVAC systems. Mr. Greenbaum responded that there is current research regarding HVAC and that he intends to share findings from this research after looking into it.

Bob Hodanbosi thanked the workgroup for developing this “very readable” report.

Jason Howanitz remarked that older housing is sometimes better for indoor air quality than newer housing due to the increased energy efficiency measures that have reduced the flow of air out of the housing envelope. He also noted that for people in low-income housing that are negatively impacted by the quality of their homes, his agency recommends that people file suits with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

John Shoaff noted that for the next steps regarding this report, the EPA would like to have a follow-up meeting in a few weeks to formally adopt the report. This would give the committee time to review and provide any comments they have before being asked to vote on its adoption.

50th Anniversary Program Update

John Shoaff introduced speakers from the EPA’s Office of Air and Radiation to discuss the Clean Air Act anniversary report.

Richard Haeuber from the Office of Atmospheric Protection began by commenting on the rigorous monitoring, reporting, compliance, and transparency of all CAA programs administered. He mentioned programs like EJScreen that incorporate EJ into the rulemaking process. He also mentioned the utilization of peer-reviewed screening methodology that can be used to identify the potential for power plants to contribute to air pollution in areas with EJ concerns. He said that, for the last 20 years, the EPA has produced progress reports that describe program implementation. The last report features a new section that examines the results of EPA power sector programs on disadvantaged communities. Additionally, Mr. Haeuber stated that the EPA is continuing to maintain and improve its air quality monitoring network, with ambient air monitoring stations, ammonia monitoring stations, wet deposition sites, and the measurement of Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) compounds.

Cindy Newberg, Director of the Stratospheric Ozone Protection Division of EPA, recapped the recommendations from the September 2021 report, such as the allocation of allowances under the implementation of Title VI of the CAA. She also mentioned the continued work of the SNAP program, expanding the list of alternatives to replace hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), and updating industry standards.

David Rowson, Director of the Indoor Environments Division, discussed the prioritization of indoor air issues and the record engagement with indoor air quality (IEQ) content on EPA's website. He stated that the indoor environments division has been working to improve school air quality and GHG emissions, particularly in schools serving low-income and disadvantaged communities. Mr. Rowson also mentioned the wildfire preparedness grants, which include \$11 million in new funding. He discussed the White House's Clean Air and Buildings challenge, which intends to promote ventilation, air cleaning, and filtration actions. He discussed support for tribal communities in indoor air pollution, state and tribal radon grants, and new Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) ventilation guidance.

Robin Dunkins, Senior Advisor to the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, continued the discussion. She stated that she has heard concerns about interstate pollution, emission factors, and air pollution monitoring related to EJ concerns. She stated that current emissions data is being assessed and will be available for review shortly. She also mentioned that EJ Screen Version 2.2 is being released with new updates, and that practical and implementable actions for EJ concerns will be addressed within 1-2 years. She stated that the Agency is working to engage with communities to ensure that the public understands air quality and its health implications.

Julie Henning, Associate Director for EPA's Transportation and Climate Division, announced that the EPA's Office of Transportation and Air Quality (OTAQ) has finalized several new rules setting new and more ambitious federal emissions standards for vehicle model years 2027 and later. These rules have been formulated with technology neutrality in mind. Additionally, OTAQ has increased funding for incentive programs, such as the Clean School Bus program and the Clean Ports program.

Discussion

Bob Meyers inquired about other areas of the 50th-anniversary report that were not addressed in the session, and whether the CAAAC should expect a further response about areas not addressed. Mr. Shoaff stated that there would be follow-up about the areas not addressed.

Mary Peveto asked whether there was any update on the use of data from low-cost sensors. Mr. Shoaff indicated that there would be further follow-up on this issue.

Public Comment and Closing Remarks

There were no members of the public who wished to speak, and Ms. Reddick adjourned Day 1 of the meeting.

Welcome & Opening Remarks, Day 2

Ms. Reddick opened the second day of the meeting by reviewing the logistics, then Mr. Shoaff summarized yesterday's discussions.

Day 2 Meeting Agenda

Time	Item	Presenters/Facilitators
9:00 – 9:05 am	Opening Remarks	Joan Shoaff and Lorraine Reddick <i>EPA Office of Air Policy and Program Support</i>
9:05 – 9:35 am	IRA Update	Jennifer Macedonia <i>Associate Deputy Assistant Administrator EPA Office of Air and Radiation</i>
9:35 – 10:00 am	Thriving Community Technical Assistance Centers and OEJECR Update	Jacob Burney, <i>Division Director, Environmental Justice Grants EPA Office of Environmental Justice and External Civil Rights</i>
10:00 – 10:45 am	IRA Break Out Discussion 1	Patricia Koman, Senior EJ Coordinator & Scientist, U.S. EPA/OAPPS with CAAAC Panelists
10:45 – 11:00 am	Break	
11:00 – 11:45 am	IRA Break Out Discussion 2	Patricia Koman, Senior EJ Coordinator & Scientist, U.S. EPA/OAPPS with CAAAC Panelists
11:45 am – 12:00 pm	Public Comment, Summary/Next Steps, Close Meeting	John Shoaff and Lorraine Reddick <i>EPA Office of Air Policy and Program Support</i>

Update on Inflation Reduction Act (IRA)

Mr. Shoaff introduced Jennifer Macedonia, Associate Deputy Assistant Administrator for OAR to discuss updates on the Inflation Reduction Act. She mentioned that 46 of the 50 states have opted into Climate Pollution Reduction Grants (CPRG), which help states receive planning grant funding. She also mentioned Priority Climate Action Plans (PCAP). Phase 1 of the PCAPs is due in March 2024 for states and April 2024 for tribes and territories. The actual application is due one month after the Phase 1 due date. This application is a prerequisite for eligible entities to compete for an implementation grant, where OAR is prioritizing GHG reductions and the benefits of reduction to disadvantaged communities.

Ms. Macedonia also announced OAR’s Virtual Funding Fair, which was created to give access to other funding resources from various federal agencies. The funding fair is intended to demystify the federal funding landscape for CPRG stakeholders and continue interagency collaboration. There will be sector-based sections, including Transportation, Power, Buildings, Industrial, and Agriculture. She requested that CAAAC provide ideas to make this funding both fair and useful.

She went on to discuss the Methane Emissions Reduction Program, which contributes \$1.5 billion to reduce methane emissions for the oil and gas sector, providing both financial and technical assistance.

To recap, Ms. Macedonia mentioned that OAR has several other IRA programs, including Clean Air Act grants, CPRG Planning Grants, CPRG Implementation grants, funding to address air pollution at schools, grants to reduce air pollution at ports, funding for clean heavy-duty vehicles, funding to address air pollution, funding for diesel emissions reductions, funding for section 211(o), mobile source grants, and implementation of the AIM act. She described the dollar amount allocated to each program, as well as the opening and closing dates for each program.

Discussion

Mary Peveto expressed that it is difficult for community-based organizations to go out of their way to get the necessary resources and urges EPA to better understand the complications of putting out such large sums of money. She asked whether it would be possible to slow down the influx of money to let community-based groups catch up and be able to handle it.

Bob Hodanbosi inquired about the March 2024 deadline for states, asking if there is any advantage to applying early. Ms. Macedonia responded that applying early will not provide preference but will be helpful for the EPA in managing the applications.

Dan Greenbaum inquired about the heavy-duty vehicles program, asking if there is a targeted effort to help provide private sector companies money to use these vehicles. He stated that small businesses have no incentive to replace old vehicles without some sort of incentive program. Ms. Macedonia stated that the team is aware of this issue and is actively looking at opportunities to address it, especially with regard to getting these vehicles in low-income and disadvantaged communities.

Dan Nickey asked where the money goes if states do not use it. Ms. Macedonia stated that, if states do not opt in, the money goes to the three largest metro areas in the state, and they can choose to opt in on the city level. In cases where one of the largest areas does not opt into the program, the money goes to the next largest metro area that did opt-in.

Jason Howanitz expressed concern about the flood of money into states, saying that there is no time to properly use the money. He stated that he wished the EPA would have done a better job of listening to communities about their timing concerns. Ms. Macedonia stated that the EPA is moving quickly so that state, local government and tribal partners can commence with climate planning and transition to implementation.

Gary Jones asked who is eligible for implementation grants. Ms. Macedonia responded that any entity that received a planning grant is eligible for an implementation grant. Additionally, any local government or tribal government that is covered by a planning grant is eligible. Mr. Jones followed up, asking how money is directed toward small businesses. Ms. Macedonia responded that the EPA is partnering with states, certain municipalities, tribes, and territories to develop plans for this and that small businesses are encouraged to be involved with their local governments during the planning process to ensure that their programs of interest are included in the broader plan.

Update on Thriving Community Technical Assistance Centers and the Office of Environmental Justice and External Civil Rights

Mr. Shoaff introduced Jacob Burney, Division Director of Environmental Justice Grants in EPA's Office of Environmental Justice and Civil Rights (OEJCR), to discuss the restructuring of the EJ Grants Program. Mr. Burney began with an overview, stating that the EPA received \$3 billion in the IRA: \$2.8 billion for grants and \$200 million for technical assistance. The EPA received \$100 million in the 2022 fiscal year, and \$108 million in the 2023 fiscal year to support EJ activities in OEJCR. Over half of these funds will be allocated to grants and technical assistance.

He went over the statutory language of the IRA Environmental & Climate Justice (E&CJ) Communities Grant Program, which states the applicable dates and requirements of the grants. To be eligible for the E&CJ Communities Grant program, the entity must involve a community-based organization, which necessitates a sub-award for that organization. The regulations also state that IRA funding must be spent by September 30th, 2026, and must be used within 36 months of the award date. This program hopes to be able to meet communities at their needs, get funding out as quickly as possible, and make meaningful and impactful changes in communities. The program has a four-step approach: assessment, planning & project development, pilots & partnerships, and implementation.

The assessment portion of the program involves assessment grants and awards for Thriving Community Technical Assistance Centers (TCTACs), which are in the process of being awarded in June/July 2023. Mr. Burney stated that these TCTAC awards are intended to provide fundamental technical assistance, including grant writing training, grant management training, and capacity-building support to underserved communities nationwide. These grants do not use IRA funding but are provided by baseline EJ appropriations and Department of Energy (DOE) funds. There is \$177 million total available for TCTAC awards with \$10-\$13 million per award. Mr. Burney stated that six TCTACs were awarded as of June 28th, and others are on track for award by mid-July.

Mr. Burney went on to describe step two of the grant program, which involves planning and project development grants. The EJ Thriving Communities Grantmaking Program (EJ TCGM) was designed to provide subgrants to community-based nonprofit organizations for assessment, planning, and project development activities. There is \$550 million total to be allocated to 11 pass-through entities, which comes almost entirely from IRA funds.

He went on to describe the "pilots and partnerships" step, which involves EJ Collaborative Problem-Solving Grants (EJ-CPS) and EJ Government to Government Grants (EJ-G2G). EJ-CPS is intended to be a cooperative agreement grant to community-based organizations. There is an allocated \$30 million of IRA funds for a target of 83 projects. Selections will be announced in September of 2023, and awards given in November or December. EJ-G2G grants are intended for government agencies partnered with community-based organizations, made up of \$40 million of IRA funds for a target of 70 projects. Selections will be announced in September of 2023 and awarded in December.

Mr. Burney described the final step of the program: implementation. The large implementation grants, or E&CJ Community Change Grants, will provide funding to communities to change infrastructure, perform revitalization work, and implement other activities related to EJ issues. This includes up to \$2 billion of IRA funds, which come directly from the EPA. The grant competition window opens in September 2023 and is open for one year. Applicants are welcome to provide written applications or oral presentations, and applications are considered on a rolling basis. Each award will be \$10 million - \$20 million for a 3-year project period. The number of awards allocated will depend on the volume of applications received.

Mr. Burney concluded his presentation with a timeline of the key program milestones, set to occur between 2023 and 2025.

Discussion

Dan Greenbaum asked Mr. Burney how entities could reach out to TCTACs for information. He also asked what the plan was for creating a central understanding of the grants, including how to apply and how to use them. He stated that the bureaucratic administrative requirements for EPA grants are difficult to navigate and urges EPA to help applicants through the process. Mr. Burney responded that there are 3 national and 13 regional TCTACs, the 3 national TCTACs are assisting the 13 regional ones and are assimilating data on the various funding opportunities available. He also stated that the EPA is trying to shorten the grant application length, such as 4-5 pages, to make the application process easier. He also stated that Grantmakers are generally large non-governmental organizations that have experience with the grant process, and they have the capacity to help community organizations get sub-grants to complete their projects and comply with program requirements.

Adrienne Hollis registered concern that the TCTAC capacity-building function is not being used. She noted that the deadlines for application submission do not seem adequate to include both the time it takes time to get organizations up to speed about how to apply and also to develop and submit the applications. She stated that the train-the-trainer model the TCTACs use is not adequate and noted that the process should be more community-friendly and focused on capacity-building. Mr. Burney responded that this first effort is just the start of this process and that he expects the TCTAC network to grow. He also suggested that there may be a second round of funding.

Susan Annenberg asked if there was a requirement for communities to be classified as “disadvantaged.” Mr. Burney responded that there is a specific definition of “community-based nonprofit organization,” which includes a focus on disadvantaged communities that ties into the Justice 40 initiative. They are not requiring EJ tools like EJScreen to verify status, but strongly encourage it.

Mary Peveto stated that the process of applying for funding takes many hours and that it is difficult for smaller organizations to allocate a significant amount of their staff toward one funding opportunity. She encourages TCTACs to take over some of that burden.

Bob Wyman asked if a change grant could be used to upgrade the energy efficiency of refrigeration or air conditioning in low-income communities. Mr. Burney responded that the EPA is asking applicants to be as creative as possible in identifying actions that would reduce adverse environmental impacts, and this would be both acceptable and encouraged.

IRA Break Out Discussion 1

Mr. Shoaff introduced Patricia Koman, Senior EJ Coordinator and Scientist for U.S. EPA, to begin the Breakout Discussion on EJ and the IRA.

Susan Anenberg, Chair of the Environmental and Occupational Health Department at George Washington University, described the programs that can be used to address EJ concerns through the IRA. She stated that PM2.5 is trending downward due to the CAA but is starting to stagnate. She mentioned the importance of considering more than just tailpipe emissions in regulation, and that we need to consider more sources as the climate changes and wildfire smoke becomes a more prominent pollutant. Additionally, she mentioned that the Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool only measures PM2.5, and the tool is not resolved enough to effectively identify disadvantaged communities. This tool also neglects to identify who is most impacted by exposure, since there is no layering or indexing of components. Ms. Anenberg concluded by questioning how the EPA will determine whether grants are resulting in their intended benefits.

Mary Peveto, President of Neighbors for Clean Air, discussed the implications of “meaningful engagement. She stated that meaningful engagement is about transparency, honesty, and lifting environmental literacy, but it can also be a burden on the communities being engaged. She stated that the government needs to do its job of identifying problems and addressing them through regulations, permits, etc., but that standards are needed that require consideration of community input in making the decisions.

Clay Pope discussed the technical assistance necessary for Climate Pollution Reduction Grant entities to do meaningful engagement. He mentioned the transition to electric vehicles, stating that community groups have been inquiring about public-private partnerships to help middle and small businesses convert to better electric vehicles. He suggests charging hubs and better workforce training for electric vehicle mechanics to help with this transition.

Discussion

Mitch Hescox stated that the term “Environmental Justice” is problematic in right-leaning communities and suggests rebranding as a “fairness for all” approach. He recommended that EPA unpack the term so that we can access a broader scope of people with EJ initiatives.

Jason Howanitz stated that EJScreen provides a very crude overview that is not very helpful on the local level. He stated that most local governments know where their EJ communities are, but the use of specific metrics may not capture this. Mr. Howanitz closed by saying that every community is different, and we cannot apply a single model to every community. He also stated that communities do not necessarily care about EJ education and just want change.

Dan Nickey questioned how EJ communities are supposed to be identified if there are no specific criteria. Ms. Koman responded that there is guidance, but there is a limit to the data at this point.

Bob Meyers stated that if the goal is to reduce pollution in a certain community or type of community, the EPA should review the CAA for the mechanisms that are already there.

IRA Break Out Discussion 2

Patricia Koman began the second discussion about data and impact and the IRA. Investments made through the IRA, Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL), and American Recovery Plan (ARP) will generate significant amounts of data.

Dan Greenbaum stated that to ensure GHG emissions and disparities in exposure are reduced, the EPA should endeavor to collect data on the actions taken through these funding opportunities and the outcomes they had.

Adrienne Hollis noted that she will be looking to see where the funding from these programs went, specifically to which communities throughout the country. She will also be trying to understand the health and environmental impacts of these programs. In addition, it is important to determine whether community capacity was expanded through these programs or not to continue work when the funding is gone. Results-based accountability is important.

Bob Hodanbosi stated that there should be some way to quantify benefits in phase 2 of grant funding. He stated that if organizations are to be awarded money, it is important to be able to show how the money will be used and the environmental impacts of those actions.

Discussion

Mary Peveto stated that grant money from the BIL, ARP, etc., is not only going to the EPA, and they include funding for building and expanding roadways. She stated that everyone needs to be cognizant of the limitations of the EPA's investments in the big picture and remember there are other potential influencers. She also noted that some issues are outside the scope of the Clean Air Act and provided zoning as an example.

William Spratlin stated that we need more detailed information for local governments, and suggested investment in more sensor technology and community monitors to achieve this. Adrienne Hollis added that this could be an opportunity to enhance community science and the use of low-cost sensors. She also stated that there needs to be oversight to ensure that the funding goes where it needs to be.

Dan Greenbaum stated that citizen involvement can be very powerful in collecting EJ-related data and gave community pollutant reporting in China as an example. He also stated that satellite tools can be useful in understanding air pollutant levels.

Clay Pope thanked the EPA for using this two-way discussion format and stated that the CAAAC meetings should continue to use this discussion format in the future. John Shoaff replied that the EPA is attempting to redesign the meeting format based on the group's input.

Public Comment

There were no members of the public who wished to speak. Bob Hodanbosi mentioned that a previous speaker stated that the EPA would be looking for input from CAAAC for exceptional events, which he encourages. Bob Meyers added that there is a burden on the states in making exceptional events demonstrations. Mr. Shoaff said that he would follow up.

Summary/Next Steps

Mr. Shoaff stated that the EPA would send an email to the CAAAC soon to check if there are any additional substantive comments on the indoor air quality recommendations and whether another meeting might be necessary or if it could be adopted. He thanked committee members and support staff for their participation and work in preparing for the meeting and thanked each of the members rotating off the Committee by name. He stated that new membership decisions are upcoming. Mr. Shoaff and Ms. Reddick adjourned the meeting.

Attachment 1

CAAAC Virtual Meeting Attendance List		
CAAAC Members	EPA Staff	Other Attendees
Susan Anenberg	Jacob Burney	Jeffrey Brastpies
Rosemary Ahtuanguaruak	Laureen Burton	Laurence Cohen
Shannon Broome	Tomas Carbonell	Joley Clodfelter
Deborah Brown	Amanda Chapin	Judy Englund
Natalene Cummings	Isabel Deluca	Lauren Ferner
Veronica Figueroa	Robin Dunkins	Alex Guillen
Gail Good	Jonathan Edwards	Renee Madden
Dan Greenbaum	Joe Goffman	Abigail Mihaly
Sara Hayes	Richard Haeuber	Lesley Stobert
Mitch Hescox	Julie Henning	Stuart Parker
Bob Hodanbosi	Vito Ilacqua	Sean Reilly
Adrienne Hollis	Toni Jones	Laura Seidman
Jason Howanitz	Trish Koman	Gary Steinbauer
Gary Jones	Jonathan Lubetsky	Linda Wilson
Eric Massey	Jennifer Madedonia	
Bob Meyers	Vicky Mei	
Dan Nickey	John Mooney	
Mary Peveto	Ruth Morgan	
Clay Pope	Cindy Newberg	
Kim Scarborough	William Niebling	
William (Art) Spratlin	Alajandra Nunez	
Vicki Sullivan	Lorraine Reddick	
Tim Wallington	David Rowson	
Bob Wyman	Tamara Saltman	
	John Shoaff	