

State of California
AIR RESOURCES BOARD

Summary of Board Meeting
March 27, 2003

Location
Central Valley Auditorium, Second Floor
1001 I Street
Sacramento, California 95814

MEMBERS PRESENT: Hons. Alan C. Lloyd, Ph.D., Chairman
Dr. William A. Burke
Joseph C. Calhoun, PE
Dorene D'Adamo
Mark DeSaulnier
C. Hugh Friedman
William F. Friedman, M.D.
Matthew R. McKinnon
Barbara Riordan
Ron Roberts

AGENDA ITEM #

03-2-1 Public Meeting to Consider a Health Update

SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM:

Staff presented a Netherlands study assessing the relation between traffic-related air pollution and mortality in the elderly.

Long-term exposure to traffic-related air pollutants was estimated. Traffic-related pollutant exposure was measured as black smoke and nitrogen dioxides. The results show that for this elderly study group, living near a major roadway was more strongly associated with cardiopulmonary mortality than urban ambient background levels. Major roads used for this type of study carry between 80,000 and 152,000 vehicles a day. The truck traffic density was approximately between 8,000 and 17,500 per day. These findings are important in the context of California's ambient air quality standards for particulate matter. The findings also lend support to the conclusion that those people living near freeways and major roadways in California may represent a population with a greater vulnerability to air pollution health effects.

To ensure that the State's ambient air quality standards are protective of all Californians, potentially susceptible populations, such as the elderly, must be thoroughly evaluated. The Air Resources Board (ARB or Board), through the Vulnerable Populations Research Program, has committed to understanding and attempting to quantify the adverse health effects of air pollution in California's vulnerable populations.

ORAL TESTIMONY: None

FORMAL BOARD ACTION: None

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION: Research Division

STAFF REPORT: None

03-2-2 Public Meeting to Consider Appointments to the Research Screening Committee

This item was postponed to the April 24, 2003 Board meeting.

03-2-3 Public Meeting to Consider Proposition 40 and Amendments to the Carl Moyer Program and School Bus Program Guidelines

SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM:

Staff proposed changes to both the Carl Moyer Program and the Lower-Emission School Bus Program. However, the Board took on the Lower-Emission School Bus Program guidelines, only, at the March 27, 2003, meeting. Formal Board action on the Carl Moyer Program guidelines was postponed to April 24, 2003. Therefore, this summary addresses the School Bus Program.

For the past two years, the ARB and the California Energy Commission (CEC), has administered the Lower-Emission School Bus Program, designed to reduce school children's exposure to toxic particulate matter (PM) emissions and smog-forming oxides of nitrogen (NOx). The Board approved the original School Bus Program Guidelines in December 2000. At the program's inception in December 2000, it received a \$50 million allocation in the state budget. The next year, it received an additional budget allocation of \$16 million.

During these first two years of the School Bus Program, emission reductions were achieved through two program components: 1) a school bus purchase and infrastructure component to replace the oldest, highest-polluting buses with new, lower-emitting buses meeting the latest federal motor vehicle safety standards; and 2) a retrofit component to significantly reduce PM emissions from the in-use diesel school bus fleet.

In 2002, California voters approved Proposition 40, known as the California Clean Water, Clean Air, Safe Neighborhood Parks, and Coastal Protection Act. It is the only current source of funding for both the Carl Moyer and the Lower-Emission School Bus Programs and provides approximately \$25 million per year for two years. Assembly Bill 425 (Statutes of 2002, Chapter 379) directs that 20% of these moneys be used for the "acquisition of clean, safe, school buses for use in California's public schools that serve pupils in kindergarten and grades 1 to 12, inclusive." For this fiscal year, that means \$4,920,000 is available to replace about 40 - 45 old school buses, statewide, with new lower-emitting models. Neither Proposition 40 nor AB 425 provided funding to continue the retrofit component of the program.

The proposed revisions to the School Bus guidelines are mostly administrative: 1) updated regional funding allocations based on the \$4,290,000 available this fiscal year; 2) an updated timeline with an enforceable delivery deadline; 3) elimination of the match requirement for air districts that self-administer the program; 4) more program administration focused at the CEC; and 5) reduced match requirements for schools severely affected by transportation service costs.

In addition to the above, staff also proposed two significant changes: 1) updated eligibility criteria for funding new school buses with 2003 model year engines based on recent changes in engine emission requirements; and 2) a mechanism for assessing a monetary penalty on the business entity responsible for a delay that results in school buses being delivered late to school districts.

ORAL TESTIMONY:

Mr. Michael Conlon, Automotive Engine Rebuilders Association
Mr. Steve Hoke, Automotive Engine Rebuilders Association
Mr. Bill Mirth, Federal-Mogul
Mr. Jay Wagner, Dana Corporation
Mr. Steve Hurd, Caterpillar
Mr. Clayton Miller, Construction Industry Air Quality Coalition
Mr. Rick McCourt, Sukut Construction
Ms. Gretchen Knudsen*, International Truck and Engine Corporation

Ms. Sandra Spelliscy*, Planning and Conservation League
Ms. Bonnie Holmes-Gen*, American Lung Association
Mr. Mark Nordheim*, Western States Petroleum Association
Mr. Dean Taylor, California Electric Transportation Coalition
Mr. Tom Addison, Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Mr. Henry Hogo*, South Coast Air Quality Management District
(* indicates that the speaker provided either general or specific comments
pertaining to the Lower-Emission School Bus Program; the remaining speakers
only provided comments pertaining to the Carl Moyer Program.)

FORMAL BOARD ACTION:

The Board voted unanimously to approve the proposed Guideline revisions with two minor modifications. First, the Board directed the staff to require that school buses with alternative fuel engines be equipped with oxidation catalysts to further reduce toxic PM emissions. Second, because Proposition 40 does not provide funds for retrofits, the Board asked staff to allow school bus retrofit projects to be funded through match funding contributions provided by the local air districts.

RESPONSIBLE DIVISION: Mobile Source Control Division

STAFF REPORT: Yes

03-2-4

Public Hearing to Consider Amendments to the Zero Emission Vehicle Regulations

This item was continued to the April 24, 2003 Board meeting.