

Federal Advisory Committee Act

Clean Air Act Advisory Committee

Hybrid (In-Person & Virtual) Meeting
EPA HQ Conference Center – Colorado/Mississippi River room
December 7, 2023

Welcome & Introductions

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 Officer, opened the meeting and requested that CAAAC members introduce themselves. A list of attendees is provided in Attachment 1. Ms. Reddick reviewed the agenda, which is displayed below. Previous meeting minutes and as materials associated with this meeting will be available online at EPA’s CAAAC website (<https://www.epa.gov/caaac>).

Meeting Agenda

Time	Item	Presenters/Facilitators
9:00 – 9:30 am	Welcome and Introductions	John Shoaff and Lorraine Reddick <i>EPA Office of Air Policy and Program Support (OAPPS)</i>
9:30 - 10:15 am	OAD Highlights	Joe Goffman <i>Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator EPA Office of Air and Radiation</i>
10:15 – 11:00 am	National Climate Assessment NCA5	Allison Crimmins <i>U.S. Global Change Research Program</i> Marcus Sarofim <i>EPA Office of Atmospheric Protection</i>
11:00 – 11:15 am	Break	
11:15 - 11:45 am	IRA Update	Jennifer Macedonia and Maria Laverdiere <i>EPA Office of Air and Radiation</i> Jacob Burney <i>EPA Office of Environmental Justice and External Civil Rights</i>
11:45 – 12:30 am	Lunch	
12:30 – 1:00 pm	EPA Long-Term Strategic Plan	Trish Koman

	Goal 2 Environmental Justice and External Civil Rights Draft OAR Plan	<i>EPA Office of Air Policy and Program Support</i>
1:00 – 1:45 pm	EJ Technical Guidance	Ann Wolverton <i>EPA Office of Policy</i>
1:45 – 2:15 pm	Environmental Justice Analyses in EPA Air Quality Rulemakings	Sara Zelasky and Jennifer Sellers <i>EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards</i>
2:15 – 2:30 pm	Break	
2:30 – 3:30 pm	Discussion of Environmental Justice and Air Quality	CAAAC Members
<p>CAAAC member discussion of Environmental Justice and Air Quality Panel. The discussion will center around the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the key opportunities for addressing environmental justice concerns related to air quality or climate change that you or your organization are involved in? • How might we approach the most promising solutions? 		
3:30 – 3:45 pm	MSTRS Update	Rachel Muncrief <i>Chair, Mobile Sources Technical Review Subcommittee (MSTRS)</i>
	Update on Clean Air Excellence Award Program	Catrice Jefferson <i>EPA Office of Air Policy and Program Support</i>
3:45 – 4:00 pm	Public Comments	
4:00 pm	Close Meeting	Lorraine Reddick <i>EPA Office of Air Policy and Program Support</i>

OAR Highlights

Mr. Shoaff began the first presentation by introducing Joe Goffman, Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator of EPA’s Office of Air and Radiation, to discuss OAR highlights. Mr. Goffman began the discussion by mentioning the last time he addressed the CAAAC, when he mentioned the then pending supplemental proposal for the oil and gas methane rule. He stated that Administrator Regan announced the final rule last week, which consists of two parts: methane requirements for new and modified operations, and emissions guidelines for existing operations.

He went on to describe two features worth noting in the new rule. First, he stated that the Administrator finalized the super-emitter program, which is a program that allows third parties, certified by EPA, to report super-emitter events. Second, he stated that OAR is taking a new strategy for supporting and promoting technological innovation in leak detection. The new program provides a more streamlined approach to approving new technologies for detecting

fugitive methane releases. Mr. Goffman stated that the rule is anticipated to reduce methane emissions by 58 million tons. He described the details of the proposal process and stated that he is very optimistic about the anticipated effects of the rule.

Mr. Goffman stated that OAR is in the process of delivering final actions for numerous proposals. He also stated that a proposal addressing air toxics emissions from manufacturing should be available in March. He stated that OAR is also in the process of implementing Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) funding programs, which will be described in more detail later.

Discussion

Paul Miller began the discussion by asking about the status of the Phase 3 rule for heavy-duty vehicles and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Mr. Goffman stated that it is currently under his review and is on its way out. Mr. Miller stated that the rule has big implications for ozone and environmental justice. He also mentioned coalition proposals for IRA funds, comparing internal coalitions to multi-state coalitions. He argued that multi-state coalitions are most effective. He asked whether the EPA has any guidance for states on how the EPA prioritizes coalition proposals in addressing the issue of e-infrastructure buildout. He stated that he is concerned that states may not take full advantage of multi-state proposals.

Mr. Goffman responded that the EPA uses the actions of other parties regarding the Bi-partisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) and IRA to inform their feasibility assessment. He stated that addressing transportation electrification infrastructure is an inter-agency exercise involving OAR, the Department of Transportation, Department of Energy, and Executive Office of the President. He also noted that states' interests in advancing this infrastructure may intensify when the standards are finalized.

Clay Pope requested that there be special attention to processing the voluntary bump-up in Texas. He stated that those in the industry are trying to figure out what is going to happen and when.

Shannon Broome brought up an issue with the final oil and gas New Source Performance Standard (NSPS): EPA changed the verbiage of the standard for closed vent systems from "no detectable emissions" to "no identifiable emissions." She asked whether this is a change in how the EPA is approaching other NSPSs also. She noted that the standards for closed vent systems have been to find leaks and fix them, but now the new final rule seems to require zero emissions at all times. Mr. Goffman said that the EPA will need to follow up on whether this is the correct interpretation of the rule.

Rosemary Ahtuanguak asked whether there have been any changes to ensure that small communities will be alerted if there is an event that leads to emissions of concern. Mr. Goffman responded that, when EPA receives reports of super emitter events, there will be a public reporting system.

Gillian Mittelstaedt stated that she was impressed with the outreach the EPA has done regarding the IRA grants. She is concerned that 36 months is not enough time to complete significant

interventions with the awarded grant funding and asked if there was any time flexibility for communities that have IRA funds. Mr. Goffman stated that OAR is getting a lot of this feedback and that Jennifer Macedonia should be able to speak to that issue later in the day.

National Climate Assessment (NCA5)

Allison Crimmins began her presentation on the Fifth National Climate Assessment, or NCA5. She introduced the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), in which 15 agencies work together to advance global change research and provide useful and usable information to decision-makers. She reviewed the legislative origins of the NCA and described the process for creating the assessment. She stated that the report is policy-relevant, but policy-neutral, as they do not make any policy recommendations. Instead, the report provides a range of future projections so that decision-makers understand the full extent of risks they face.

Ms. Crimmins went on to highlight the changes that have been made since NCA4 was released in 2018. She stated that Environmental Justice and Equity are major themes in NCA5, and the assessment contains several case studies that highlight local and state mitigation and adaptation actions. She stated that the report is being translated into Spanish, and the website is now more accessible. They revised the table of contents, which was a process influenced by the public engagement process.

Ms. Crimmins reviewed the key takeaways of the report:

1. Communities all over the country are taking action right now.
2. People in the U.S. are experiencing an increased risk from extreme events.
3. Climate change exacerbates social inequities.
4. Available mitigation strategies can deliver substantial emissions reductions, but additional options are needed to reach net zero emissions.
5. Climate action is an opportunity to create a more resilient and just nation.

Ms. Crimmins went on to review NCA5 resources, including the NCA5 website, nca2023.globalchange.gov; the USGCRP website, globalchange.gov; and the NCA5 Atlas, atlas.globalchange.gov. She also introduced the NCA5 webinar series, which is occurring from November 2023 to March 2024. This webinar series provides information regarding each specific NCA5 chapter. Ms. Crimmins then introduced Marcus Sarofim, one of the NCA5 authors.

Marcus Sarofim described some of the tools used to estimate the benefits of GHG reductions. For example, the FrEDI Framework, or the Framework for Evaluating Damages and Impacts, is a flexible climate impacts framework that looks at the impacts of climate change within the U.S. and addresses over 20 different impact categories. Mr. Sarofim also described the Community Multiscale Air Quality (CMAQ) model, which estimates the changes in ozone and particulate matter from different scenarios. He stated that FrEDI is not fully comprehensive but offers important information for policymakers.

Discussion

Aileen Nowlan stated that the national figures in the model are great, but since people are applying for grants at the city level, it may be useful for the model to use different metrics. She requested that the program allow people to view data on a smaller scale, such as on a city level. She also stated that many people don't understand the terms "mortality" and "morbidity." She stated that it would be helpful to provide resources for the public to understand this vocabulary. Mr. Sarofim responded that the program is designed to be "fast and flexible." He also stated that they are actively working on the morbidity/mortality education issue.

Luis Olmedo asked about the process to determine what research is reviewed and considered. He also asked whether the NCA has adopted environmental justice (EJ) priorities. Ms. Crimmins stated that authors are open to assessing any available literature that meets information quality guidance, but they prioritize literature that has been developed since the previous assessment. They aim to focus on what is new so that the new editions of the report have new information. She also stated that EJ is considered in the report by considering accessibility and applicability to EJ communities.

Bob Meyers inquired about policies and projections that inform data on criteria pollutants. Mr. Sarofim described the FrEDI climate air quality analysis, where they use a 2040 projection to estimate data. Mr. Meyers also mentioned that the southeast United States has seen a positive change in ozone and asked whether Mr. Sarofim knows why this phenomenon occurs. Mr. Sarofim stated that the answer is not definitive, but that it is possible that ozone decreases in the hottest days in the Gulf Coast due to water vapor from the Gulf. Mr. Meyers also asked if the programs use any retrospective data. Mr. Sarofim stated that he could talk to some authors of the economics chapters to answer that question.

Don Peters inquired about the available data for areas where methane is produced, like the hog facilities in the Carolinas. He asked whether the data shows that the production of methane is a proxy for the production of ammonia or ozone. Mr. Sarofim mentioned a program called AgSTAR that captures and repurposes methane.

Dan Greenbaum stated that he is impressed with the ways that the sophistication and utility of the NCA has improved.

IRA Update

Jennifer Macedonia, Associate Deputy Administrator, began her presentation on IRA updates. She began the discussion by describing the Climate Pollution Reduction Grants (CPRG) program, which has provided a historic level of funding for implementing GHG measures. The CPRG program is a 2-phase program that involves planning grants, issued in March of 2023, and implementation grants, announced in September 2023. The implementation grants include a \$4.3 billion general grant, with an application due on April 1, 2024, and a \$300 million grant, with an application due on May 1st.

She then went on to describe the CPRG program objectives. Objectives include:

- Implement ambitious measures that will achieve significant cumulative GHG reductions by 2030;
- Achieve substantial community benefits, particularly in low-income and disadvantaged communities;
- Complement other funding sources to maximize GHG reductions and community benefits; and
- Pursue innovative policies and programs that are replicable.

Ms. Macedonia described the Clean Ports Program, which helps the nation's ports address environmental impacts faced by their surrounding communities. She reviewed the program design, eligible entities, and program criteria.

She then reviewed the BIL's Clean School Bus program and IRA's Clean Heavy-Duty Vehicles program. The Clean School Bus program announced a second rebate cycle this fall, and there will be more news on the Clean Heavy-Duty Vehicles program in 2024.

The HFC (hydrofluorocarbons) program involves reclaim and innovative destruction grants, open until 2024. She stated that the program will include between four and nine grants, depending on the project type. The three different project types include: reclaim technology, reclaim market dynamics, and innovative destructive technologies.

She moved on to discussing the Wood Heaters Grant. An award of \$8.8 million was granted to NESCAUM (Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management). This grant supports independent testing and analysis of emissions from new models of wood stoves and wood heating devices.

Ms. Macedonia concluded her presentation by thanking the committee. Mr. Shoaff stated that there was limited time for questions, and any outstanding questions could be shared and addressed at a later time.

David Wooley asked whether there are other funding mechanisms available to NGOs that complement existing programs. He also asked whether an applicant could regrant some of its funding to an NGO. Ms. Macedonia stated that this question would be addressed further in the following presentation and that the organization is thinking about these issues.

Bob Meyers asked whether there would be a way for CAAAC members to submit written questions since there is not much time available for discussion. Mr. Shoaff responded that written questions are always welcome.

Luis Olmedo stated that future CAAAC agendas should better accommodate questions so that there can be meaningful engagement at these meetings.

Jacob Burney continued the IRA discussion by presenting information on the Environmental and Climate Justice Communities Grant Program. He described the four levels of community readiness relevant to the program.

The first level is community grant process technical assistance provided through Thriving Communities Technical Assistance Centers (TCTACs). This resource is for those just entering the grant space. There are currently 16 TCTACs in operation, each with numerous spokes.

The second level is accessible financial assistance, where EJ Thriving Communities grant-makers will issue thousands of subgrants over the next three years. Through this program, communities can access resources more easily, and have their applications evaluated quickly. This ensures that communities get the funding that they need as close to when they need it as possible. EPA will select 11 grant-makers to provide thousands of subgrants to community-based nonprofits and other eligible subrecipients for assessment, planning, and project development activities.

The third level is Pilots & Partnerships, which is for legacy EJ Grant programs. In this third level, 186 EJ Grant recipients were selected to receive \$128 million of assistance. These opportunities are long-standing and are directly funded by the EPA. Each of these grants is limited to a 3-year project period.

The fourth level is Implementation. This level involves transformational implementation projects. Applicants can apply for up to \$20 million for change grants. Applications will be evaluated on a monthly basis, and funds will be granted throughout the year.

Discussion

Luis Olmedo asked Mr. Burney to clarify that TCTAC centers don't write proposals. Mr. Olmedo stated that the current language may be misinterpreted. Mr. Burney clarified that these resources only provide technical assistance. Mr. Olmedo also stated that, in the past, some awards have gone to places that do not historically serve environmental justice. Mr. Olmedo mentioned the DOE Community Benefits Agreements and said that some elements of DOE's plans could be implemented to do this work.

Don Peters asked where he could find the contact for Region 4. Mr. Burney referenced his PowerPoint slide and stated that RTI could assist with Region 4 concerns.

Gillian Mittelstaedt stated that the Community Change Grant is "the best thing to come along in decades." She mentioned a few potential barriers of the program due to the 3-year implementation limitation. Mr. Burney stated that they will be helping recipients do as much work pre-award as possible, to allow the maximum amount of time possible for implementing their programs.

Jill Sherman-Warne described the difference between tribes and indigenous communities and noted that tribes are a political structure instead of a racial group. She said that she is concerned that there is not a tribe-specific TCTAC for these grants. She also stated that tribe representatives should be able to prove that they are an enrolled citizen of the tribe.

EJ Technical Guidance

Osmond Lindo, OAR Senior Economist, introduced Ann Wolverton. Ms. Wolverton reviewed the revised technical guidance for assessing environmental justice in regulatory analysis.

Ms. Wolverton began her presentation with the background informing this technical guidance. She reviewed Executive Order (EO) 12898 from 1994, which directs federal agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health/environmental effects of its programs on specific groups of concern. EO 14096, released in April, expands on the content in EO 12898, providing a broader understanding of the groups of concern. She reviewed a quote from Administrator Regan, which emphasizes EPA's commitment to EJ.

She moved on to provide an overview of the technical guidance and update the committee on the status of the review process. The guidance outlines analytic expectations, best practices, and approaches for evaluating EJ for regulatory actions. The intended audience is EPA analysts, but the document is publicly available.

She stated that this new guidance was created to reflect the latest state of the science, new peer-reviewed agency guidance, and new terminology. This new guidance includes an expanded discussion of how meaningful involvement can inform regulatory analysis and EJ analysis.

She stated that the organization is in the process of collecting public comments, and the comment period is open from November 15th to January 15th. They are also doing a tribal consultation, involving two webinars that are scheduled just for tribes.

She reviewed each of the seven chapters of the guidance and highlighted some of the revisions. The chapters are as follows:

- Chapter 1: Introduction
- Chapter 2: Key Definitions
- Chapter 3: Key Analytic Considerations
- Chapter 4: Contributors to Environmental Justice Concerns
- Chapter 5: Considering Environmental Justice when Planning Human Health Risk Assessment
- Chapter 6: Conducting Regulatory Analyses to Assess Environmental Justice Concerns
- Chapter 7: Research Priorities to Fill Key Data and Methodological Gaps

Discussion

Jason Sloan discussed the meaningful involvement policy and asked about the difference between meaningful engagement and meaningful involvement. Ms. Wolverton stated that “meaningful involvement” is used in the Executive Order, and the EPA decided to use that in the EJ Technical Guidance. She stated that this guidance document is not currently applicable to states.

Luis Olmedo discussed the ways that different EJ terminologies are used and manipulated. He suggested that the EPA adopt the policy that California has which gives communities funding to hire people to review technical information and provide advice to the communities.

Rosemary Ahtuanguaruak asked Ms. Wolverton if the EPA has any reassurance that they can prevent concerns from repeating. Ms. Wolverton stated that one goal in producing EJ technical guidance is to integrate it in the way that analyses are conducted.

Aileen Nowlan stated that “you can only analyze the data that you have” and that health data is often difficult to access, making health impact analyses difficult to develop. She stated that the same issue is true for heavy-duty vehicles and that it is difficult to analyze data on where trucks are idling. Ms. Wolverton agreed that these limitations pose a difficult challenge. However, she noted that the EPA has access to a lot of data and that data is used in its modeling and analyses.

Gillian Mittelstaedt stated that air quality sensors are useful, but that there is no funding to process the data.

Ms. Wolverton stated that she would be happy to answer additional questions via email.

Environmental Justice Analyses in EPA Air Quality Rulemakings

Mr. Shoaff introduced Jennifer Sellers and Sarah Zelasky for their presentation about EJ Analyses in EPA Air Quality Rulemakings.

Ms. Sellers began her presentation by describing the EPA’s definition of EJ, which has recently been updated to include persons with disabilities and tribal affiliations.

She stated that EJ analytics are designed around three guiding questions:

1. Are there potential EJ concerns associated with environmental stressors affected by the regulatory action for population groups of concern in the baseline?
2. Are there potential EJ concerns associated with environmental stressors affected by the regulatory action for population groups of concern for the regulatory option(s) under consideration?
3. For the regulatory option(s) under consideration, are potential EJ concerns exacerbated or mitigated compared to the baseline?

She went on to review the numerous recent and upcoming EPA rulemakings leveraging the EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS) EJ analytics. Rulemakings include the Good Neighbor Plan (GNP), Mercury and Air Toxics Standards – Risk & Technology Review, and more.

EJ analyses utilized by OAQPS can include the following analyses when relevant and appropriate to the rulemaking:

- Tribal Proximity Screen;
- Demographics Proximity Analyses;
- Risk-Based Demographics Analyses of HAP Emissions; and
- PM_{2.5} and Ozone Exposure/Health Impact Analyses.

She went on to describe each of these analyses in detail, including the scenarios that they are useful for and the specific utilities of each. For each example, she described the ways that each analysis can answer the three guiding questions.

Sarah Zelasky continued the presentation by describing some examples of how the EJ analyses have been used in recent rulemakings. The first example involved the use of EPA's EJ software for criteria pollutants to estimate nationwide ozone concentrations for various demographic subgroups of the population for different policy options. The second example involved performance standards for the synthetic organic chemical manufacturing industry, and she explained how cancer risks were estimated for various demographic subgroups of the population. Ms. Zelasky reviewed the results from each of the examples and described their implications in the context of EJ.

Discussion

Clay Pope inquired about the use of statewide averages in interpreting results about the average ozone concentration that each demographic subgroup may experience. He mentioned larger states like Alaska and Texas, saying that it would be difficult to get meaningful information from such large areas of land. Ms. Zelasky agreed that this is a limitation of using state averages.

Luis Olmedo asked the presenters how they address areas near national borders, since they are greatly impacted by activities on the other side of the border. Ms. Zelasky stated that for the air toxics rules discussed, the EPA is modeling air quality based on estimated emissions release information from facilities in the United States. She was unsure of how data from other countries is incorporated into modeling for ozone and suggested that the modeling team would know more about the data used for those analytical efforts.

Jason Sloan asked whether EPA does any retroactive analysis to see whether the projections were accurate. Ms. Zelasky stated that the modeling team may be better suited to answer that question. Clay Pope stated that it would be useful to have the technical staff available during the next presentation to answer more specific questions.

Rosemary Ahtuanguak asked when the oil and gas rule will go into effect and whether it will impact enhanced recovery. She also asked about how the agency handles projected emissions when facilities later expand their operations. Ms. Zelasky responded that the industry has two years to comply with the oil and gas rule. She also replied that the modeling is based on data received from the industry, with some review and validation of the data.

Luis Olmedo emphasized the importance of considering sources across the border so that people near the national border get a full picture of their pollution exposure. Ms. Zelasky stated that she would communicate the importance of this issue with the modelers.

John Shoaff stated that the EPA would provide the CAAAC with responses to the questions regarding air quality modeling that could not be answered during the meeting.

Goal 2 Overview

Trish Koman, Senior National EJ Coordinator at the EPA's OAR, reviewed the EPA's Long-Term Strategic Plan from FY 2022-2026. She briefly reviewed each of the seven goals, and described Goal 2, "take decisive action to advance EJ and external civil rights." For FY 2023, EPA published a summary of the EJ and External Civil Rights Implementation Plan, which focused on:

- Meaningful engagement related to OAR rulemaking;
- Capacity-building for State, local, and Tribal governments;
- EJ and air permitting principles; and
- Strengthening EPA capacity (e.g., tools, data sets, training, work groups).

Ms. Koman opened the floor for questions.

Discussion

David Wooley had an inquiry about the term "hot spot analysis." Ms. Koman stated that it is very specific to transportation conformity and is an analysis for new projects in non-attainment and maintenance areas for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

Mr. Wooley followed up by asking whether the EPA had considered a hot spots policy like that of AB617 in California and suggested it could be useful for other states. Wayne Natri added that California's South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has the largest number of hot spots in the state. They found that they needed to focus on community trust while also moving quickly. He noted that there is a lot of discussion about how AB617 could translate to other states. Mr. Wooley also remarked that the program worked better in some areas of California than others.

EJ and Air Quality Discussion

Ms. Koman opened the EJ and Air Quality Discussion by asking several CAAAC members to share their thoughts regarding EJ centered around the following questions:

- What are the key opportunities for addressing EJ concerns related to air quality or climate change that you or your organization are involved in?
- How might we approach the most promising solutions?

The discussion began with Paul Miller. Mr. Miller stated that NESCAUM will be helping states identify and perform analyses for EJ communities. He states that they could use help with quantitative analyses for co-benefits of air quality improvements that are outside of air quality impacts, such as the benefits of job development and green space. He also stated that air agencies do not perform analyses for buildings, so they have formed an advisory group for building improvements. He noted that suggested improvements to buildings for air quality improvement, such as heat pumps, are not always feasible. He also noted that there are no quantitative tools they are aware of to determine how well states are performing on Justice40 initiatives.

Jason Sloan offered a perspective from the state of Kentucky. He described some opportunities around EJ and some pitfalls that are related to those opportunities. Through low-cost sensors and monitoring, there is a lot more data available, but it is difficult to communicate the meaning of the information from those sensors, which is different from the 50+ years of data and related communication that has come from the official EPA monitors. He also mentioned the challenges that come with executing EJ provisions, including zoning issues and state statute issues. Third, he commented on resources for state and local agencies. He stated that agencies are already struggling to do the work that they have, and it will be tough for them to implement all the new air rules.

Ms. Koman directed the conversation to Mayor Hammoud, the mayor of Dearborn, Michigan, which is the fastest-growing city in the state of Michigan. He stated that Dearborn is the first city in Michigan to voluntarily institute a “health in all policies” approach. He listed some of the city’s air quality-related projects, including streets where 16-wheeler trucks are not permitted to travel. Also, they have installed ten “Just Air” air quality monitors throughout the city, which have lights that indicate air quality to pedestrians. They have established conservation zoning that provides residential neighborhoods with green buffers to improve air quality and reduce noise pollution. They are also working on a bulk storage ordinance for cancer-causing particles in fugitive dust and are discussing this with the companies that would be affected by the ordinance.

Jaron Burke discussed the state of environmental interventions in Northern Manhattan. He discussed a program designed to shift tolling to reduce traffic congestion, which has the potential to reduce traffic but could also divert traffic into EJ communities. He explained how a number of these programs have downstream consequences, and EJ must be considered in all aspects of programs. He also mentioned that his organization, WEACT, is a TCTAC hub, mentioning that not all TCTAC hubs are large academic institutions. In addition, WEACT has a monitoring

program that they are working to make into a gold standard that others can look to as an example.

Ms. Koman recommended that the committee read the National Environmental Justice Advisory Committee (NEJAC) report.

Luis Olmedo asked what challenges exist that prevent the proper implementation of the Clean Air Act. He stated that staffing and budgets impact how well the Act is implemented. He stated that performance measures are necessary to keep people accountable and on track in implementing effective CAA initiatives. He stated more than air sensors is needed, including training and the expertise to turn air sensor data into science. He noted that there should also be consumer protections from predatory air sensor dealers.

Lacy Wood commented that staffing is a huge issue, and a lack of resources at the state and local level prevents industry from moving forward.

Gillian Mittelstaedt discussed resource limitations, stating that the EPA does not have a large budget, and its actions are highly litigated. She stated that Congress is responsible for funding the Agency, and it needs to ensure the EPA is provided with the resources to do its job well. She also commented that “overburdened and underserved” is the common current vernacular for EJ communities.

Leigh Raymond began a discussion of the definition of “justice” in EJ and how different types of justice have different definitions, noting that in some contexts it means participation in the process, and in others, it means equal distribution of emissions and health impacts. He stated that it would be helpful to standardize the meaning of “justice” in the context of air quality policymaking.

Jeremy Hancher remarked that small businesses are the economic engine of the country. He also noted that many small businesses employ people from EJ communities, and many others are impacted by environmental issues, making them relevant for EJ consideration.

Rosemary Ahtuanguak stated that she focuses heavily on education and mentoring to further EJ initiatives and strengthen the community.

Wayne Nastri stated that learning how to win trust and communicate effectively with communities is extremely important. He noted that when authorities meet with communities, it is essential to recognize that EJ for them is not a narrow issue focused only on air quality, and communities will want to be able to discuss water issues, pesticides, air, and other environmental issues all at the same meeting.

Don Peters observed that industry measures its performance by money and schedules but noted that it is difficult to discern how the government measures its performance.

Luis Olmedo expressed concern that the government doesn't have effective ways to measure its performance and therefore doesn't have effective ways to improve its organizations over time.

MSTRS Update

Rachel Muncrief, chairperson of the Mobile Sources Technical Review Subcommittee, provided an update on the MSTRS. She briefly introduced herself, described the scope of the MSTRS, and reviewed the information covered in last week's meeting. She stated that there will be two MSTRS meetings per year: a virtual fall meeting and an in-person spring meeting. She also noted that work groups are being formed within the MSTRS to address emissions from the rail sector, consumer information for electric vehicles (EVs), and accelerating cleaner vehicle adoption.

Discussion

David Wooley asked whether CAAAC members could be on the MSTRS. Ms. Muncrief replied that people can be on both the CAAAC and the MSTRS.

Luis Olmedo asked whether the MSTRS has had any discussions about EV infrastructure. Ms. Muncrief responded that it has been discussed, but there is not a work group that is devoted solely to that issue. Mr. Olmedo offered that he would like to be part of an MSTRS work group if that group would be addressing the issue of EV infrastructure in some manner.

Jill Sherman-Warne stated that many EV chargers, even if installed, may not be functional unless utilities can upgrade to provide the electricity for them. She also stated that EVs are expensive, and many people in rural communities cannot afford them.

Update on the Clean Air Excellence Awards Program

Catrice Jefferson, an EPA senior staff member, reviewed the Clean Air Excellence Awards Program. The program was established at the recommendation of the CAAAC to recognize "outstanding innovative efforts" to help make progress in achieving clean air. There are several award categories, and winners in each category must directly or indirectly reduce pollutant emissions, demonstrate innovation, offer sustainable outcomes, and provide a model for others to follow. Ms. Jefferson reviewed the seven categories:

- Clean Air Technology
- Community Action
- Education Outreach
- State/Tribal/Local Air Quality Policy Innovations
- Transportation Efficiency Innovations
- Cooke Visionary Program
- Thomas W. Zosel Outstanding Individual Achievement outstanding

She described the nomination and review process for awards. She stated that the EPA welcomes the CAAAC's input on outreach and involvement to ensure a diverse pool of applicants.

Public Comment

Mr. Shoaff opened the floor for public comment. No members of the public offered comment.

Final Remarks and Closing

Ms. Reddick thanked the CAAAC for their participation and officially adjourned the meeting.

Attachment 1

CAAAC Meeting Attendance List	
CAAAC Members	Other Attendees
Rosemary Ahtuanguaruak	Jacob Burney
Jay Baker	Allison Crimmins
Shannon Broome	Seth Evans
Deb Brown	Lauren Ferner
Jason Burke	Joe Goffman
Veronica Figueroa	Christopher Grundler
Gail Good	
Dan Greenbaum	Catrice Jefferson
Abdullah Hammoud	John Kinsman
Jeremy Hancher	Patricia Koman
Kathleen Horchler	Maria Laverdiere
Wanda R. Kintz	Osmund Lindo
Bob Meyers	Jennifer Macedonia
Paul Miller	Rachel Muncrief
Gillian Mittelstaedt	Doug Obey
Wayne Nastri	Kole Pederson
Aileen Nowlan	Jerome Proctor
Luis Olmedo	Sarah Rees
Don Peters	Lorraine Reddick
Clay Pope	Lovina Redner
Leigh Raymond	Marcus Sarofim
Jason Sloan	Jennifer Sellers
Vicky Sullivan	Jill Sherman-Warne
Dan Wilkus	John Shoaff
Lacy Wood	Kermit Snow
David Wooley	Mikayla Steele
	Lesley Stobert
	Linda Wilson
	Ann Wolverton
	Sarah Zelasky
	Steve Zuiss