<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:05</td>
<td>I Approval of Minutes –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:05-9:20</td>
<td>II COVID–19 and Air Pollution</td>
<td>Kathy Strange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20-10:30</td>
<td>III Transportation Climate Planning Update</td>
<td>Phil Swartzendruber, Joel Creswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-10:35</td>
<td>IV Staff Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:35-10:40</td>
<td>V Advisory Council Member Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Craig Kenworthy called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. He asked members to introduce themselves. He also advised Advisory Council members how to respond with respect to contacts from groups and individuals regarding the recently closed PSE permit. He reiterated that Advisory Council members have no role in the permit decision.
I. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Kenworthy asked if there were any Advisory Council comments regarding the minutes of the July 10, 2019 meeting. There were none.

Mr. Kenworthy asked for approval of the minutes from the July 10, 2019, Advisory Council meeting as presented in the materials on the agency web site. There was quorum approval.

There was no Advisory Council discussion.

II. 2019 Wildfire Smoke Update

Della Kostelnik-Juarez provided an overview with respect to evolving communications around wildfires.

(Tim Gould arrived to join the Advisory Council.)

Erik Saganić said the EPA and the Department of Health have created guidelines on when to cancel events based on certain levels of air pollution.

Ronn Griffin asked if we are using those guidelines.

Mr. Saganić said yes.

Mr. Saganić continued speaking about the 2017-19 smoke seasons, exceptional events, and the display created at the Seattle Center from fallen trees from the Jolly Mountain fire.

Mr. Gould asked whether given the lack of relative wildfire impact this summer, what that means for prescribed burns this autumn.

Mr. Kenworthy said it sets up the possibility of DNR wanting to conduct more prescribed burns this fall.

There was no further Advisory Council discussion.
III. Update – Proposed Clean Fuel Standard

(Satwinder Kaur joined the Advisory Council meeting by phone.)

Phil Swartzendruber provided an overview of the history of the CFS, how it would work and the possible impacts, as well as outreach and next steps.

Mr. Griffin asked about a possible carbon tax.

Mr. Kenworthy said the legislature is still discussing possible cap and trade measures. He spoke briefly about the challenges of passing carbon reduction legislation.

Mr. Griffin asked if there is any plan to be able to see the carbon footprint for things like the gas you buy for your car, or Twinkies, or other products.

Mr. Kenworthy said this is part of the conversation, but right now we are more focused on the public health impacts of the item purchased, for example, the carcinogen benzene in gas.

Mr. Swartzendruber continued talking about the draft rule, key issues, and implementation decisions. 

Linda Lyshall spoke about the emission reduction target of 25% by 2030.

Mr. Gould asked if that is the only benchmark or are there intermediate targets before 2030.

Ms. Lyshall said yes, there is an annual benchmark every year.

Ms. Lyshall continued talking about implementation decisions, equity, and draft proposed exemptions.

Mr. Swartzendruber spoke about the economic analysis, policy analysis, and key modeling inputs/assumptions.

Mr. Gould asked whether any scenarios indicated a steep rise in carbon-based fuel prices.
Mr. Swartzendruber said they rise more slowly in the beginning, and more steeply later.

Mr. Swartzendruber continued with a breakdown of potential job impacts. He provided a graph on job growth under four compliance scenarios.

Kelly McGourty asked when the state did its study did it have similar results.

Mr. Swartzendruber said the results were similar and the impact was negligible.

Mr. Swartzendruber spoke about sectors with the highest changes in employment growth.

Ms. McGourty said it seems like a dual track, both expecting heavy investment in EVs and the continued use of low carbon fuels.

Mr. Kenworthy said it isn’t as if suddenly half of all vehicles will be electric. He said in the scenarios we assume gradual stepping to a percentage of all new car sales being electric. He said we used conservative estimates.

Mr. Swartzendruber continued his discussion of job impacts.

Allison Butcher said she heard that the projected construction job changes were attributed to a decline in construction of refineries. She asked if that was correct.

Mr. Swartzendruber explained the assumed changes related to a decreased demand for oil affecting support categories, including refineries, pipelines, engineering teams, maintenance facilities for trucks, etc. and how that trickles out into other types of construction. He said there is overall economic growth in alternate fuels that affects construction as well.

Mr. Swartzendruber continued talking about potential fuel and transportation costs related to implementation of a CFS.

Ms. Lyshall spoke about continued outreach, and opportunities for refineries to earn credits.

Ms. McGourty asked about feedback we are hearing so far.
Ms. Lyshall said it is primarily supportive and interested. She said it is helping staff to understand the sticking points for people.

Mr. Gould asked whether any electric utilities have expressed concern over not having sufficient distribution capacity in place to meet some of the expected EV increases.

Ms. Lyshall said we have mostly heard they are seeing this as an opportunity for growth.

Ms. Lyshall continued speaking about the timeline and next steps.

There was no further Advisory Council discussion.

**IV. Briefing – WSRP FY19 Results and FY20 Plans**

Amy Warren gave an overview and some statistics about the wood stove removal and replacement program (WSRP).

Kathy Ross asked if it is still drop-off only in Pierce County.

Ms. Warren said yes.

Ms. Ross asked whether a homeowner is required to disclose at time of sale whether a stove is certified or not.

Ms. Warren said in form 19 in the section on heating they are supposed to disclose, but often people don’t know if their wood stove is certified or are mistaken.

Bonnie Meyer said she would be interested to know whether the Pierce County rural areas will be receiving information on the WSRP program if they get a burn ban notice violation. She asked if there is a chance that they may be able to start getting the $1500 incentive again because we have a large number of uncertified devices throughout rural Pierce County and there are segments of the area that have very clear air quality issues.
Ms. Warren said we work closely with our compliance staff on burn ban compliance and share brochures with residents as an education opportunity.

Ms. Meyer asked about allowing natural gas.

Mr. Kenworthy said the agency’s strategy with wood stoves is to reduce particulate pollution.

There was general Advisory Council discussion around particulate matter, natural gas and electric appliances.

Ms. Warren provided information and some data about participation in the WSRP program.

There was no further Advisory Council discussion.

V. Update – Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Transportation Projects

Amy Fowler and Landon Bosisio provided an overview of EV projects the agency is working on.

Mr. Bosisio noted that full time drivers (those who drive 50 hours or more/week) could save $2500 just in fuel costs by switching to an EV.

Mr. Griffin asked if that is compared to a regular gas vehicle or a hybrid.

Mr. Bosisio said the comparison was for a regular gas car getting 25 mpg at $2.50/gallon. He went on to talk about cost savings, challenges, and outreach.

Ms. McGourty asked what proportion of Uber/Lyft trips are to/from the airport, and whether the companies are providing any support to their drivers to purchase EVs.

Mr. Bosisio said that data not available. He said so far Uber has only pursued electrification where required to do so. He said Lyft is a little different, in this area they have a green mode as well as in Portland where you can request a fuel efficient vehicle (hybrid or EV).

There was no further Advisory Council discussion.
VI. Staff Reports

Mr. Kenworthy asked for questions about the Director’s report. There were none.

Brad Wiggins, the new representative for Fire Chiefs on the Advisory Council introduced himself and spoke a little about himself and his work and interest in the agency’s work.

There was no further Advisory Council member discussion.

VII. Advisory Council Member Reports

There were no Advisory Council member reports.

Mr. Kenworthy said the proposed joint meeting with the Board in November may be on transportation or a possible update on the strategic plan.

There was no further Advisory Council member discussion.

VIII. ADJOURN

With no further business, the Advisory Council adjourned at 12:01 p.m.

I hereby certify this to be a true and correct record of the Minutes of the September 11, 2019, meeting of the Advisory Council of the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.

Attest:

_________________________
Craig T. Kenworthy
Executive Director
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PUGET SOUND CLEAN AIR AGENCY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND ADVISORY COUNCIL JOINT MEETING

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

February 27, 2020

Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
1904 3rd Avenue, Suite 105
Seattle, WA  98101

Board Members Present:
Eric Baker, representing Edward Wolfe, Kitsap County Commissioner
Stella Chao, representing the Public-at-Large
Bruce Dammeier, Pierce County Executive
Megan Dunn, Snohomish County Council Member
Jessica Finn-Coven, representing Mayor Jenny Durkan, City of Seattle
Katie Ketterer, representing Mayor Greg Wheeler, City of Bremerton (by phone)
Paul Roberts, City Council Member, City of Everett
Christie True, representing King County Executive Dow Constantine
Mayor Greg Wheeler, City of Bremerton (by phone)

Board Members Absent:
Chris Beale, City Council Member, City of Tacoma

Advisory Council Members Present:
Allan Giffen, representing Planning
Ronn Griffin, representing Kitsap County Public-at-Large
Tim Gould, representing King County Public-at-Large
Debbie Hannig, representing Area Sources (by phone)
Satwinder Kaur, representing King County Suburban Cities
Kristin Lynett, representing Pierce County Public-at-Large
Bonnie Meyer, representing Pierce County Suburban Cities
Suzy Oversvee, representing Snohomish County Public-at-Large
Michael Pollock, representing Kitsap County Suburban Cities
Kathy Ross, representing Education
Greg Tisdel, representing Small-Medium Industry
Graham VanderSchelden, representing Ports
Michael Verhaar, representing Large Industry
Brad Wiggins, representing the Fire Chiefs Association

Advisory Council Members Absent:
   Allison Butcher, representing Construction
   Bill Franz, representing Snohomish County Suburban Cities
   Jenna Leonard, representing Environment
   Kelly McGourty, representing Transportation
   Darrell Rodgers, representing Health

Paul Roberts called the meeting to order at 8:47 a.m.

The roll was called; a quorum was present.

(Jessica Finn-Coven and Christie True arrived to join the meeting at 8:48 a.m.)

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Roberts asked if there was any discussion regarding the minutes from the January 23, 2020 Board meeting. There was no Board discussion.

Stella Chao made a motion that the minutes of the January 23, 2020 Board meeting be approved as presented to the Board. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

II. PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Mr. Roberts opened the Petitions from the Public portion of the meeting

There were no petitions from the public.

Mr. Roberts closed the public petitions portion of the meeting.

III. PERSONNEL AND FINANCE MATTERS

Approval of Vouchers

Mr. Roberts asked if there was any discussion regarding the vouchers. There was no Board discussion.
Eric Baker made a motion that the vouchers be approved as presented to the Board. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

There was no Executive Session.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

There was no public hearing.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

VI.A. Resolution No. 1413 – Appointing Advisory Council Kitsap County Suburban Cities Position

Craig Kenworthy said the Kitsap County Suburban Cities Advisory Council position is currently vacant. He said it was held by Bainbridge Island City Council member Michael Scott until his resignation in March of 2018. He said the City of Bainbridge Island has asked that the currently vacant position be filled through the completion of the current term (June 30, 2021) by council member Michael Pollock.

Ms. True made a motion to approve Resolution No. 1413 as presented to the Board. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

There was no Board discussion.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

VII.A Briefing – FY21 Budget: CY21 Supplemental Income

Karen Houser gave an overview of the agency’s funding sources and expenses, and reviewed the proposed CY21 supplemental income (per capita) assessment and apportionment.

Bruce Dammeier asked about drawing down a reserve by 13%.
Ms. Houser said we drew about a million dollars from our civil penalty reserve (previously collected civil penalties). She said there are financial policies limiting the use of those funds and one of them is to fund extraordinary legal expenses.

Mr. Dammeier asked if there is a policy on how much should be in each reserve account.

Ms. Houser said it depends on the reserve – some of the reserves have targets. She said the financial policies go through all the key reserves we have. She said we don’t set a target for civil penalty reserves or for fee program reserves.

Mr. Kenworthy said the general reserve target was set a few years ago at $500,000 and the Board is part of the discussion regarding the use of those funds.

Ms. Houser continued giving an overview of expenses.

(Satwinder Kaur and Greg Wheeler joined the meeting by phone at 9:03 a.m.)

Ms. Houser explained the per capita rate and method, and noted that staff is proposing a one cent increase.

Ms. Chao noted that smaller cities seemed to show the largest increases. She asked whether there has been outreach to those jurisdictions to prepare them for the increase.

Ms. Houser said in June we sent out a letter to all jurisdictions, letting them know what the change would be for the coming calendar year. She added that even though the percentage increases are large, the actual dollar amounts are small, usually just a couple of hundred dollars. She said that people moving to outlying areas are pushing the percentages up with the population increase.

There was no further Board discussion.

**VII.B Resolution No. 1412 – Approving the FY21 Financial Policies**

Ms. Houser said the proposed language changes would allow us to use specific reserves potentially to address office relocation costs, etc.
Mr. Kenworthy said he will provide an update to the Board at the March meeting on the office move and potential costs.

Ms. Finn-Coven asked whether anything has changed since we discussed this at the January meeting.

Mr. Kenworthy said no.

Ms. Houser said the change in language would make it possible to also cover bridge funding in the event of the enactment of a CFS.

Mr. Roberts noted that this proposed change only adds flexibility. He said agency staff still has to come back to the Board for specific funding.

Mr. Kenworthy agreed.

Ms. True asked for verification that as part of civil penalty settlements, a source may negotiate a non-financial settlement.

Mr. Kenworthy said sources, if interested, can negotiate funding community projects, etc. as part of resolution of a civil penalty.

Ms. Houser said in addition to the civil penalty section, there are proposed changes to the interest income reserve section to earmark for using to provide funding for possible relocation costs.

Mr. Dammeier said it was mentioned that investments through the King County investment pool are not yielding good results.

Mr. Kenworthy said it is better than in the past, but not really high.

Ms. Houser said the pool is not interested in risk, it is mostly investment bonds. She said during the recession there were losses that have since been recouped.

Mr. Dammeier said Pierce County invests through the State of Washington and is very happy with the returns.

Mr. Kenworthy said we will look at that.
Mr. Dammeier said just to make sure he understands, staff has to come to the Board before it can actually use the funding.

Mr. Kenworthy said yes. He said the Board sets the possible uses a year in advance.

Mr. Dammeier said he believes the proposed low carbon fuel standard exceeds the agency’s statutory authority and will oppose the resolution.

Mr. Kenworthy said should the majority of the Board choose to enact a low carbon fuel standard; staff here is proposing flexibility in a few financial policies.

Mr. Dammeier said Pierce County’s rates are going up more than 4%. He said he is not interested in granting any authorization for a policy that he thinks is contrary to state law.

Ms. Finn-Coven made a motion to approve Resolution No. 1412 as presented to the Board. The motion was seconded and passed, with Mr. Dammeier opposed.

Mr. Dammeier left the meeting at 9:36 a.m.

**VIII. STAFF REPORTS**

Mr. Kenworthy gave a legislative update.

(Ms. Kaur joined the meeting in person at 9:38 a.m.)

**IX. JOINT MEETING WITH THE ADVISORY COUNCIL AND THE BOARD**

All Board and Advisory Council members introduced themselves.

**IX.A. Draft Clean Fuel Standard**

Ms. Strange introduced her fellow presenters, Joel Creswell, Phil Swartzendruber, and Erik Saganić.

Rob Allen (sitting in for Bruce Dammeier) asked whether at some point all comments will be available to the Board.
Mr. Kenworthy said yes, after staff completes its analysis. He said we are not asking for any action by the Board today.

Ms. Strange said the objective of the presentation is that the Board and Advisory Council will have a high level understanding of the history and background of the draft CFS, and to present high level themes found in the comments.

Ms. Strange provided a background and history on the process that has brought about the draft CFS. There was general Board and Advisory Council discussion and questions about terminology, the process and background.

Mr. Creswell said we are going to talk at a high level about what we heard and saw in the comments we received. He said the total number of comments by all modes was about 6,400, the vast majority of that came in by email. He explained how we grouped unique comments for purposes of the meeting today. He said that based on how we broke down the comments by county, 90% plus of the total commenters in each jurisdiction support enacting a CFS.

Mr. Creswell continued with the most-voiced themes of support and opposition. He said the top supporting theme was that a CFS will protect people and improve air quality. He said other supporting themes we heard were that addressing climate change is urgent and this would help, and that CFSs that have been enacted in California and Oregon have been proven to be effective. He said that supporting comments stated that a CFS would contribute to economic development, and that highly-impacted communities would benefit from a CFS through reducing near-road emissions.

Mr. Allen asked whether the carbon intensity reductions Mr. Creswell described in Oregon were directly attributable to its Clean Fuels Program, or were those overall reductions in the state.

Mr. Creswell said they were directly attributable to the Clean Fuels Program. He said comparisons could be made looking at the effectiveness, and comparing costs, of a Clean Fuels Program to other programs that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. He said, for example, there’s a report from the California Legislative Analyst’s Office from 2018 that does this, which says the reduction from a CFS is half a percent or 1% of the statewide total. He said it is important to look at what is being reduced from the transportation fuel pool and not to average it out over the economy because transportation is a particularly hard to decarbonize sector.
Mr. Creswell said there are comments opposing a CFS by calling it economically inefficient and saying there are cheaper carbon offsets or cheaper greenhouse gas emissions reductions through other programs. He said there certainly are lower cost GHG tonnage reductions available if you look at an economy-wide program, like a cap and trade program for example, but that is not really an apples to apples comparison with the CFS, which is decarbonizing a difficult to decarbonize sector. He said what will happen over time is an economy-wide program will effectively use up all of those cheap offsets and will decarbonize all of the easier sectors, and over time the cost to offset a ton of carbon will go up, up, up, and if you do not address transportation, that is what you will be left with, however many years down the road it is, until you choose to invest in transportation de-carbonization.

Ms. Finn-Coven said the important thing to remember is that California reduced 11 million metric tons of carbon in one year from its CFS.

Suzy Oversvee said our transportation sector creates only 10 million metric tons.

Greg Tisdel asked if Oregon’s reduction number would get us to our goal.

Mr. Creswell said we predict that our draft CFS would net us 3-3.5 million metric tons, a substantial way to our goal but we would still need other methods.

Ms. Chao asked for more detail on health effects.

Mr. Swartzendruber said we looked at the simplest, most direct impact, which is fine particle emissions and that is primarily from diesel vehicles, with a significant percentage of them light duty vehicles. He said we found that with the maximum proposed target, it would reduce one to four premature deaths per year. He said there would also be reductions in other hospital admissions, asthma attacks, and lost work days.

Mr. Kenworthy said it is easier for California to look back now at health effects than for us to look forward.

Mr. Creswell said many of the opposing comments were about fuel pricing effects. He said a CFS is revenue neutral. He said a deficit-generating fuel will incur costs, a credit-generating fuel will receive benefits, and those costs and benefits change hands through the open market and not through the government.
Ms. Finn-Coven asked if there was any evidence BP has lost money producing clean fuel.

Mr. Creswell said we do not have that evidence and went on to discuss fuel price impacts.

Mr. Allen said it appears that from 2016-2019, in crude price compared to other prices it looks like there is some decoupling.

Mr. Creswell said analysts have looked at this and cannot identify any single reason for that.

Mr. Kenworthy said we need to look at long-term trends. He said there will be some impact from a CFS but the overall price of gasoline is still affected the most by the price of crude oil.

Mr. Creswell continued the presentation discussing potential economic impacts.

Bonnie Meyer asked about the jobs impact of a CFS.

Mr. Creswell said if you look in the technical report, which is on the website, it shows the number of jobs either gained or reduced on top of growth in the different scenarios that we modeled.

Katie Ketterer asked whether the economic report takes into consideration the negative impacts of climate change if we do nothing.

Mr. Kenworthy said we didn’t attempt that in our analysis.

Ms. Chao asked whether we included increases in jobs due to an increase in the local market for biofuels.

Mr. Creswell said we did not assume construction of any new biofuel facilities.

Graham VanderSchelden said it sounds like the conclusion of the report was that there was not a dampening effect on job growth; he asked whether there were significant shifts in how jobs were distributed by sector.
Mr. Kenworthy said the numbers were so small as to be inconclusive.

Mr. Creswell said what we did not hear in the comments were any suggestions about any proposal to significantly reduce GHGs by some other method.

Steve Nicholas asked if a CFS is adopted at a state level, what will the agency do?

Mr. Kenworthy said if the state adopts something of substance, the Board will probably tell us to put our pencils down.

Mr. Roberts said however the rule is drafted there needs to be flexibility to modify it.

Ms. Chao said as we continue analysis on public comments and develop a report, she would like to see more education on the economic cost if we don’t do anything versus the cost of enacting a CFS.

Mr. Allen said everything I have heard has been about the report but I have not heard any comments about the draft rule itself.

Mr. Kenworthy said staff is still working on comments.

Mr. Kenworthy said the next step will be to see what the Legislature does during the next 2 weeks. He said in staff will be back before the Board in March regarding next steps.

Ms. True said she would like to keep moving forward analyzing all the comments and making refinements to the rule as needed.

Megan Dunn asked whether the Board could write a letter of support to Sen. Hobbs.

Mr. Kenworthy said he has told the Legislature that this Board prefers a statewide CFS.

Mr. Kenworthy said the strategic plan as currently drafted goes thru 2020. He said we will begin discussing it with the Board in the next few months. He said the Advisory Council can expect we will start talking about it in the next few meetings.

Mr. Roberts thanked Advisory Council members for attending and engaging on this.

There was no further Board/Advisory Council discussion.
IX.B. Compliance Programs – Overview

The Compliance Programs overview was tabled until a future meeting due to time constraints.

With no further business, the joint Board/Advisory Council meeting adjourned at 11:43 a.m.

I hereby certify this to be a true and correct record of the Minutes of the February 27, 2020, joint meeting of the Board of Directors and Advisory Council of the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.

Attest:

___________________________________  ___________________________
Craig T. Kenworthy                        Paul Roberts
Executive Director                        Chair, Board of Directors
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Honorable Members:

At the next Advisory Council Meeting, we will provide a brief overview of air pollution and health impacts (including studies focused on air pollution and pandemics), an overview of populations particularly vulnerable to COVID-19, an update on recent air pollution levels, and a brief summary of media coverage.

We will also highlight our recent voluntary calls to action. In March and April, we’ve asked individuals to curtail indoor and more recently outdoor wood burning to help protect neighbors during this pandemic.

Respectfully submitted,

Craig T. Kenworthy
Executive Director

Attachment
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Outline

• Brief review of health impacts of air pollution

• Higher-risk populations, equity implications

• Brief review of studies linking air pollution to virus susceptibility

• Brief summary of recent air quality, voluntary call to action, media inquiries
Health Effects of Air Pollution

• Respiratory
  • Reduced lung function
  • Aggravation of lung disease
  • Increased lung infections
  • Asthma attacks

• Cardiovascular
  • Heart disease
  • Stroke

• Others include: immune system impacts, neurological system, reproductive, cognitive

COVID-19: Populations at Increased Risk

- Elderly, people with pre-existing conditions
- Equity: People of color and low-income residents
  - More pre-existing conditions, under-insured, racial bias, higher pollution exposure
  - Ability to work from home
    - High-income (60%), low-income (9%)
    - Asian (37%), White (30%), Black (20%), Hispanic (16%)

[References]
9. https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6915e3.htm?s_cid=mm6915e3_w
Air Pollution and Respiratory Impacts

- Air pollution contributes to the health conditions that could increase risk from a virus or bacteria (like COVID-19)\(^1\)

- Particle pollution impairs the body’s built-in protection mechanisms\(^1\)

- Linked to hospital admission for respiratory infection\(^1\) and Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS)\(^2\)

- Led to a higher viral load in-vitro\(^3\) and higher mortality from influenza in mice\(^4\)

Pandemics and Air Quality

- Limited research—difficult to estimate effect because of many confounders

- **1918 flu**
  - Tens of thousands of excess deaths due to air pollution
  - A loss of $45.9 billion; 6 percent of GDP

- **SARS**
  - Somewhat limited study with five cities in China
  - Showed positive association between air pollution and SARS case fatality

- **COVID-19**
  - A very recent study looking at 3,000 counties across the US
  - A small increase in long-term exposure to PM$_{2.5}$ leads to a large increase in COVID-19 death rate
  - A "1 $\mu$g/m$^3$ in PM2.5 is associated with a 15% increase in the COVID-19 death rate”
  - Interesting result – will need to be more vetted with more analysis and duration
Recent Air Quality

In our region:

- Traffic pollutants, such as black carbon and NOx, are down 20-30% (preliminary analysis)
- Fine particle pollution has been higher than expected
- Meteorology has a large effect, difficult to isolate the response to COVID-19

Image source: Satellite Sentinel-5P NRTI NO2 - near real time nitrogen dioxide as imaged from space by satellite. Provided by the European Union/ESA/Copernicus, Scripps Institution of Oceanography

Actions

• Media inquiries and social media

• Voluntary burn ban
  • Our message: *To reduce local pollution and help our most at-risk friends and neighbors during the COVID-19 pandemic, please burn wood only for heating purposes and avoid any outdoor fires.*
  • Coordination with other local air quality agencies and state
Media Inquiries

• “One good thing about the stay-at-home order – better air quality. With fewer cars on the road, there’s less tailpipe pollution. While roadway pollution is down, the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (CAA) has noticed an increase in very small particle pollution, the type of pollution created by burning things.”12 KOMO, 4/7, author and Phil Swartzendruber

• “the amount of very small particular pollution is actually up, probably because so many people are home burning fireplaces and wood stoves.”13 Seattle Times, 3/31, Craig Kenworthy

• “having a viral pandemic isn’t the way we want to see air pollution improve.”14 Crosscut, 4/6, Erik Saganić

• “more extensive research is necessary to understand how polluted air could impact the outcomes of coronavirus patients.”15 KOMO, 4/8, Erik Saganić

Thank you and Questions
Honorable Members:

At the next Advisory Council Meeting, staff will update you on the transportation related climate planning process and share the draft criteria we propose to use to evaluate potential actions. The presentation will include recent updates to assumptions regarding vehicle technology, vehicle use and mode shift, and fuels.

Staff will ask Advisory Council members to weigh in on issue identification as we begin to identify and evaluate potential short- and long-term transportation GHG reduction actions, particularly in light of COVID-19 impacts.

We look forward to a robust discussion.

Respectfully submitted,

Craig T. Kenworthy
Executive Director
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Transportation Climate Planning Update

Advisory Council
Climate Work, History and Path Forward

May 13, 2020

Outline

Recent history

- Greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction target & wedges
- Strategic Plan Strategies and Actions

Moving forward

- Staff process
- What’s changed
- Soliciting Input
2014 Strategic Plan

Goal 2: “Become the most climate-friendly region in the United States”
Updated Regional GHG Targets

In February 2017, the Clean Air Agency Board of Directors adopted updated Goal 2 targets:

• Reduce regional greenhouse gas equivalent emissions:
  ➢ 50% by 2030
  ➢ 80% by 2050
  ➢ compared to 1990

• Return to 1990 levels by 2020

• Focus on transportation
Draft Puget Sound All Mobile GHG Emissions:
History, Projection, and Goals

- Vehicle standards
- WA Renewable Energy Portfolio
- Building Efficiency
- Clean Air Rule

New On-the-Books
Wedge Analysis

• Builds from “on the books” reductions
• CAFE (now slowed), Renewable Energy Portfolio, Building Efficiency, Clean Air Rule
• Includes mobile sources (more than on-road), aircraft taxi & land/take-off, off-road equipment, construction
• Doesn’t include ocean-going vessels, aircraft cruise
Strategies and Actions

A. Secure adoption of state and local carbon-reducing policies
   1) Clean Fuels (unsuccessful at State, local level)
   2) ZEV mandate (successful at State level 2020)

B. Target vehicle and infrastructure projects that accelerate uptake of electric vehicles

C. Inventory regional greenhouse gases to guide efforts

D. Motivate people to make more climate-friendly choices

E. Host Western Washington Clean Cities Coalition

F. Influence regional transportation planning
Moving Forward

- Refreshing our list of “Candidate Actions”
  - How has the world changed since 2018?
- Staff process:
  1. Refresh evaluation criteria
  2. Identify & research actions
  3. Evaluate actions, apply criteria
  4. Get stakeholder feedback

Question: How do we get stakeholder feedback during this challenging time?
Draft Criteria

1. 2030 emissions reduction (top goal)
2. Air pollution co-benefits
3. Probability of achieving reductions
4. Ability to implement
5. Ability to begin soon
6. Compatibility with other rules/policies
7. Consistency with state/national efforts
8. Likelihood of providing a useful example for others
9. Legal feasibility
10. Economic benefits & costs
11. Community benefits & costs
How has the world changed since 2018?

- Technology changes
- Policy changes
- Vehicle use changes
- Post-COVID-19 realities:
  - Fuels
  - Mode shift & Vehicle Use
  - Vehicle Technology
  - Other?
Technology Changes – Battery Prices

Lithium-ion battery price outlook

Lithium-ion battery pack price (real 2018 $/kWh)

Source: BloombergNEF
Technology Changes – New Charging Concepts
Technology Changes – Charging Infrastructure

- Number of stations increasing
- Maximum power delivered by DC fast chargers is increasing (50 kW → 350 kW)
  - Most cars today top out at 150 kW
Technology Changes – Vehicle Models & Sales
Policy Changes

- Twelve states now have Zero Emissions Vehicle mandates like California’s
  - Vehicle manufacturers must sell an increasing percentage of ZEVs in each state or buy credits

- Clean Fuel Standards
  - Currently in CA, OR, BC
  - In rulemaking in Canada (Federal)
  - Being considered in CO, NY, MN

- Rollback of federal vehicle standards; California agreements with individual manufacturers
Vehicle Use Changes

- Transportation Network Company (TNC) ridership increasing (*right*)
- Free-floating car share (e.g. Car2Go) ended
- Transit ridership increasing/leveling off (*below*)

![Graph showing vehicle use changes](image-url)
Post-COVID-19 Realities: Fuels

- Gas & diesel prices collapse
- Transportation budget shortfalls
  - Decreased gas tax revenue
  - Initiative 976 ("$30 Car Tab Fees")
Post-COVID-19 Realities: Mode Shift & Vehicle Use

- Transit ridership down
- Teleworking up
- TNC ridership down
- Many who still commute choose single-occupancy vehicles
- People may be hesitant to return to shared mobility (transit, TNC, etc.)
Post-COVID-19 Realities: Vehicle Technology

- Forecasts of slowed vehicle purchasing due to recession
  - BUT an April 2020 survey* found only 8% plan to delay vehicle purchases indefinitely

- Some anticipate Electric Vehicle purchases will be even more impacted
  - Purchase price still greater, even with lower total cost of ownership

*https://www.cargurus.com/press/cargurus_study_finds_several_bright_spots_for_auto_sector_during_covid19.html
Questions

• Issue identification – individual or cross-cutting?
  • Fuels
  • Mode shift & vehicle use
  • Vehicle technology
  • Other policies

• What other GHG-reducing actions/opportunities should we consider?

• What additional threats/barriers should we be aware of?
Honorable Members:

We’re still doing our work to reduce air pollution, a task made even more vital in the midst of a respiratory pandemic. As part of that and to help our most at-risk friends and neighbors during the COVID-19 pandemic, we’ve asked the public to burn wood only for heating purposes and avoid any outdoor fires.

Here are some highlights on what we’ve been doing to clean the air and protect the climate.

**GOAL ONE – PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT FROM AIR POLLUTION**

**Objective 1.2 – Reduce transportation emissions, especially diesel particulate, in highly impacted locations**

After submitting a Letter of Intent to the Washington Department of Commerce to apply for a grant to install infrastructure for electric chargers for up to 16 electric yard hostlers at the BNSF South Seattle railyard in Tukwila’s Allentown neighborhood, we are now crafting the actual grant application for this project. Allentown is in one of our focus area communities; we expect that this project, if selected for funding, will not only reduce harmful diesel particle pollution emissions in the area, it will also serve as a model for electrifying cargo-handling equipment at other rail yards and container terminals.

**Objective 1.3 – Reduce emissions and exposures from wood smoke and outdoor burning**

As of April 8\(^{th}\), our FY20-21 Ecology grant-funded Wood Stove Program had 233 households follow through with their recycling projects (99 in King County, 72 in Pierce County, and 62 in Snohomish County) and have been issued their $350 reward check for scrapping their old wood stove. Another 91 households have funds reserved or redeemed for their $1,500 Replacement Discount project (offered only in Snohomish County) to upgrade to a cleaner heating appliance.
For our agency-funded Kitsap County drop-off recycling effort, so far 97 households have followed through with their recycling project and have been issued a $350 reward for scrapping their old wood stove.

The combined programs, serving all our four counties, have incentivized the removal of 421 old wood stoves/inserts since the beginning of the fiscal year.

In early March we ran a short series of print ads in the *Everett Herald, Marysville Globe,* and *Arlington Times.* We are currently holding off on other planned springtime advertising, given the public attention focused on the COVID-19 pandemic. The Wood Stove Program team has updated its program web page with special messaging regarding COVID-19 and have been reaching out to pre-qualified program customers to offer extensions for their projects so they can comfortably follow through after the “Stay Home, Stay Healthy” order is lifted.

1.5 Characterize and communicate air quality throughout the region, with the active participation of the public

As local health departments’ technical and communications teams are in high demand right now, we’ve offered help to each of the four counties this month from our technical staff and communications staff. With the importance of reducing the burden to our local health departments, we can dedicate some of our skills in mapping, public health and risk analysis, and risk communication to the situation if they want.

With the arrival of COVID-19, we have received many questions from the media about air quality impacts. Some of the topics covered in the resulting stories include: our request to voluntarily curtail wood burning, how air pollution impacts respiratory health; increases in wood smoke due to people spending more time at home, near-road air pollution and greenhouse gas reductions from decreased traffic, and, of course, how a global pandemic is not how we would like to air quality in our region improve. We have been in contact with the following media outlets: KIRO, *KOMO Radio* and *KOMOTV,* *Daily Herald,* *Crosscut,* *Seattle Times,* and Q13.

**Objective 1.6 – Reduce inequities in air pollution exposure**

Duwamish engagement team members, Nina Lawonn, Adam Petrusky, and Joanna Gangi, participated in the most recent Clean Air Program meeting hosted by the Duwamish River Cleanup Coalition. The goal of the program is to share resources and build strategies to create clean air for the Duwamish Valley residents and workers. There are multiple stakeholders that are
part of the program including King County Public Health, Port of Seattle, NW Seaport Alliance, American Lung Association, and multiple community based organizations.

Agency staff is also actively working with Villa Communitaria, a well-known community-based organization, to design and support a low-income EV car-share pilot program located in the community of South Park.

During the latter part of 2019 and the first few months of 2020 we have been working on a project that could become a blueprint for future community engagement. With input from different Agency departments, we developed a health training curriculum focused on the definition of air pollution, the relation between air pollution and health, and its impact on health conditions such as asthma, heart disease, etc.

We are working with community members and peer health educators to review the modules to ensure our message is relevant and valuable to their audience. This style of information sharing will help both the Agency disseminate in-depth education and build awareness, as well as add what we hope is meaningful content for our communities by providing a capacity-building resource.

**GOAL TWO – BECOME THE MOST CLIMATE–FRIENDLY REGION IN THE UNITED STATES**

**Objective 2.1 – Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases from transportation**

The Agency has hosted the Western Washington Clean Cities Coalition (WWCCC), a program of the Department of Energy, for over a decade, having taken over host status from the City of Seattle. Over the past year we have worked closely with the Columbia–Willamette Clean Cities Coalition (CWCCC), which covers western Oregon and the southern–most counties of western Washington, to take a Pacific Northwest–sized approach to clean fuels and petroleum reduction. We are continuing to work with CWCCC to transition many of our Coalition’s educational and technical activities to CWCCC under a new subcontract with them to administer the bulk of WWCCC’s deliverables from our annual agreement with the US Department of Energy. This will enable us to further support and develop events and webinars that offer a regional approach to clean transportation initiatives.

**EXCELLENCE GOAL – EMPLOY THE BEST PEOPLE, POLICIES, AND PRACTICES TO ACHIEVE OUR WORK**

**Objective 3.2 – Develop a culture that integrates environmental justice and equity principles into our day–to–day work and decisions**
The equity team hosted the latest Equity Workshop Series via a virtual platform where we viewed a portion of the documentary Race: The Power of Illusion, and discussed race on a broader level as well as how our country’s history around race impacts our work at the Agency.

**2020 REMAINING BOARD MEETING DATES (as of May 1)**

May 28 (Typically budget approval)  
June 18  
July 23 (Typically Executive Directors performance review)  
August – no meeting  
September 24  
October 22  
November 19 (Possible joint meeting with the Advisory Council)  
December 17

**GENERAL**

In my role as co-chair for the funding committee of our national association, I’ve been working on some potential enhanced funding at the federal level. More on that when we brief you on the budget.

We have attached Board memos and supporting documents to this report for the FY19 Audit Results Briefing and the First Half FY20 Financial Performance agenda items. These are normally short briefing items, so please let me know what questions you have.

Respectfully submitted,

Craig T. Kenworthy  
Executive Director

Attachment

jwc