



Central Texas Clean Air Coalition | Agenda

1:00 pm, Wednesday, February 10, 2021

Zoom Meeting ID: 951 5881 6545; Passcode: 284700; Link:

<https://zoom.us/j/95158816545?pwd=dU9LOGpwWmxOY1Zzd2Mxajc1QWhXZz09>

Call-in Option: (346) 248 7799

Mayor Jane Hughson, <i>San Marcos</i> , Chair	VACANT, <i>Georgetown</i>
Council Member Matt Baker, <i>Round Rock</i> , First Vice Chair	Commissioner Walt Smith, <i>Hays County</i>
Council Member Paige Ellis, <i>Austin</i> , Second Vice Chair	Council Member Mike Snyder, <i>Hutto</i>
Mayor Pro-Tem Lyle Nelson, <i>Bastrop</i>	Council Member Robert Rizo, <i>Kyle</i>
Commissioner Mel Hamner, <i>Bastrop County</i>	Mayor Pro-Tem Laurie Higginbotham, <i>Lakeway</i>
Council Member Andrea Willott, <i>Bee Cave</i> ,	Council Member Kathryn Pantalion-Parker, <i>Leander</i>
Council Member Evan Ture, <i>Buda</i>	Mayor Lew White, <i>Lockhart</i>
Commissioner B.J. Westmoreland, <i>Caldwell County</i>	VACANT, <i>Luling</i>
Council Member Heather Jefts, <i>Cedar Park</i>	Council Member Mike Heath, <i>Pflugerville</i>
Council Member Jessica Bega, <i>Elgin</i>	Judge Andy Brown, <i>Travis County</i>
	Commissioner Terry Cook, <i>Williamson County</i>

- 1. Welcome and Introductions by City of San Marcos Mayor Jane Hughson, Chair**
- 2. Public Comments (3 minutes per speaker)**
- 3. ACTION ITEM: Consider Approval of November 4, 2020, Meeting Minutes**
City of San Marcos Mayor Jane Hughson, Chair
- 4. ACTION ITEM: Officer Elections for 2021**
City of San Marcos Mayor Jane Hughson, Chair
- 5. ACTION ITEM: Consider Approval of Huston-Tillotson University and St. Edwards University as Supporting Members of the Clean Air Coalition**
Christiane Alepuz, CAPCOG Regional Planning and Services Program Coordinator
- 6. Review and Discussion of Particulate Matter Emission Reduction Measures and Proposed Timeline and Process for Updating the Regional Air Quality Plan**
Andrew Hoekzema, CAPCOG Director of Regional Planning and Services
Christiane Alepuz, CAPCOG Regional Planning and Services Program Coordinator
- 7. Air Quality Legislative Update**
Andrew Hoekzema, Director of Regional Planning and Services
- 8. Other Business and Adjournment**

*Note – any members of the public who wish to make comments must notify CAPCOG staff by e-mail at calepuz@capcog.org no later than 4:00 pm on Tuesday, February 9, 2021, in order to speak during the public comment section of the meeting.



Central Texas Clean Air Coalition | Summary Minutes

11:00 am, Wednesday, November 4, 2020
Meeting held via Zoom

Committee Members Present

(15):

Mayor Jane Hughson, *San Marcos*, **Chair**
Council Member Matt Baker, *Round Rock*, **First Vice Chair**
Council Member Paige Ellis, *Austin*, **Second Vice Chair**
Mayor Pro-Tem Lyle Nelson, *Bastrop*
Commissioner Mel Hamner, *Bastrop County*
Council Member Andrea Willott, *Bee Cave*
Council Member Evan Ture, *Buda*
Commissioner B.J. Westmoreland, *Caldwell County*
Mayor Pro Tem Jessica Bega, *Elgin*
Commissioner Walt Smith, *Hays County*

Council Member Robert Rizo, *Kyle*
Mayor Pro-Tem Laurie Higginbotham, *Lakeway*
Mayor Lew White, *Lockhart*
Judge Sam Biscoe, *Travis County*
Commissioner Terry Cook, *Williamson County*

Committee Members Absent (4 + 2 vacancies):

Council Member Mel Kirkland, *Cedar Park*
Council Member Mike Snyder, *Hutto*
Council Member Kathryn Pantalion-Parker, *Leander*
Council Member Mike Heath, *Pflugerville*
VACANT, *Georgetown*
VACANT, *Luling*

Call to order –11:07 am with a quorum

1. **Welcome and Introductions by City of San Marcos Mayor Jane Hughson, Chair**

Mayor Hughson called the meeting to order and welcomed any public comments.

2. **Public Comments (3 minutes per speaker)**

None

3. **Ozone Season and Other Program Updates**

Christiane Alepuz, CAPCOG Regional Planning and Services Program Coordinator
Andrew Hoekzema, CAPCOG Director of Regional Planning and Services

Ms. Alepuz started the item with discussing monitoring updates, ozone season updates, and monitoring data for 2020. Ms. Alepuz discussed the one PurpleAir PM2.5 sensor that CAPCOG is looking to install at a CAPCOG ozone monitoring station. Mr. Hoekzema asked the committee if this sort of monitoring is something that they believe that CAPCOG should pursue, and the committee expressed interest in PM monitoring with low-cost sensors. Furthermore, Council Member Baker and Commissioner Cook indicated their support for more monitoring of air quality in the region. Ms. Alepuz discussed the outreach and education initiative of Air Central Texas, and she discussed the status of university and ISD recruitment for the CAC and the Regional Air Quality Plan. Mr. Hoekzema provided an update on the PM Advance Subcommittee and the status of the closure timeline of Decker Creek Power Plant. Mr. Hoekzema discussed the 2020 TCEQ Fuel Study that indicated that the Austin region's fuel sulfur levels have decreased from previous studies, so this will provide reduced NOx emissions from the transportation sector. Mr. Hoekzema discussed key air quality legislative issues that CAPCOG will track during the upcoming legislative session. Lastly, Mr. Hoekzema discussed the CAPCOG and City of Austin study to evaluate air quality impacts of behavior change related to COVID-19, particularly why some pollutants may have increased while others decreased, and what the impact of extensive telecommuting may be. Council Member Ellis added more details on why the City of Austin was pursuing this study.

4. **ACTION ITEM: Consider Submitting Comments to EPA on Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Revision Proposal**

Andrew Hoekzema, CAPCOG Director of Regional Planning and Services

Mr. Hoekzema mentioned that the CAC has previously strongly supported the CSAPR and efforts to curtail cross-state air pollution, especially from Louisiana, due to the extent to which it is impacting air quality in Central Texas. Mayor Pro Tem Nelson made a motion to approve the comment letter, and the motion was seconded by Council Member Ellis. The motion passed unanimously.

5. ACTION ITEM: Consider Approval of 2021 Work Plan

Andrew Hoekzema, Director of Regional Planning and Services

Mr. Hoekzema discussed the 2021 Work Plan and the Air Quality Program funding for 2021. Council Member Ellis requested the August meeting be moved to 8/18/21. However, there was a discussion amongst committee members as to whether the CAC meetings should continue to be held on the same day as CAPCOG's Executive Committee meetings. The committee decided that more discussion would need be done regarding the meeting dates, but that they should move forward with the approval of the work plan. Commissioner Cook made a motion to approve the work plan without the specific meeting dates, and the motion was seconded by Mayor White. The motion passed unanimously.

6. 2020 Air Central Texas Awards

Christiane Alepuz, CAPCOG Regional Planning and Services Program Coordinator

Ms. Alepuz presented the 2020 Air Central Texas Awards. City of Austin's Travel Demand Management Program received the Air Central Texas Outstanding Organization Award for their commitment to decreasing the drive alone rate within Austin in order to reduce transportation's impact on regional air quality. Travis County Judge Samuel Biscoe received the Bill Gill Central Texas Air Quality Leadership Award for his long and distinguished record of leadership and advocacy for the protection of air quality in Central Texas, through his role as a county judge and as a former chair of the Central Texas Clean Air Coalition.

7. Other Business and Adjournment

Mr. Hoekzema mentioned that a CAC and CACAC attendance summary was provided so that CAC members could be aware if their CACAC representative had not attended many meetings. Mr. Hoekzema stated that CAPCOG staff would be reaching out to those who have not attended to understand their lack of participation. Mayor Hughson requested an updated list with this meeting's attendance. Lastly, Council Member Ellis noted that Austin's two transportation bonds were approved on the Nov. 3 ballot, and those measures should assist in improving regional air quality.

The meeting adjourned at 12:27 pm.



6800 Burleson Road, Building 310, Suite 165
Austin, Texas 78744-2306
Ph: 512-916-6000 Fax: 512-916-6001
www.capcog.org

BASTROP BLANCO BURNET CALDWELL FAYETTE HAYS LEE LLANO TRAVIS WILLIAMSON

MEMORANDUM
February 3, 2021

TO: Clean Air Coalition

FROM: Andrew Hoekzema, Director of Regional Planning and Services

RE: Officer Elections for 2021

Under the Clean Air Coalition (CAC) bylaws adopted in May 2019, the CACAC elects a chair and up to two vice-chairs at the first meeting of the calendar year, with the following representation:

- At least one (1) officer from a general CAC member located in Travis County (which includes Austin);
- At least one (1) officer from a general CAC member located in either Williamson or Hays Counties (which does not include Austin); and
- Up to one (1) additional vice-chair from a local governing body in any of the five counties in the Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA).

Officers serve one-year terms and may serve a maximum of two (2) consecutive terms.

- Mayor Hughson has decided to not stand for re-election as chair.
- Round Rock Council Member Matt Baker, who is currently 1st vice-chair, has indicated a willingness to serve as chair this year, and Austin City Council Member Paige Ellis has indicated a willingness to serve as 1st vice chair.
- Please note that there is no requirement to have a 2nd vice chair, but if the chair and 1st vice chair are both from jurisdictions outside of Travis County, the CAC must appoint a 2nd vice chair from a jurisdiction in Travis County due to the representation requirements.



6800 Burleson Road, Building 310, Suite 165
Austin, Texas 78744-2306
Ph: 512-916-6000 Fax: 512-916-6001
www.capcog.org

BASTROP BLANCO BURNET CALDWELL FAYETTE HAYS LEE LLANO TRAVIS WILLIAMSON

MEMORANDUM
February 3, 2021

TO: Clean Air Coalition

FROM: Christiane Alepuz, CAPCOG Regional Planning and Services Program Coordinator

RE: Consider Approval of Huston-Tillotson University and St. Edwards University as Supporting Members of the Clean Air Coalition

Under the Clean Air Coalition (CAC) bylaws, the CAC includes both “General Members,” which are limited to local general purpose governments and independent school districts, and “Supporting Members.” Supporting members can include any other organization that supports the purpose of the CAC and wishes to participate in the Regional Air Quality Plan, including providing an annual report on its air quality activities. Certain slots on the CAC Advisory Committee are also designated for supporting members of the CAC.

During the fall, CAPCOG staff contacted institutions of higher education throughout the region to recruit new supporting members of the CAC. Huston-Tillotson University and St. Edwards University both have indicated that they wish to join. Their formal membership in the CAC as supporting members is subject to approval from the CAC, so staff is bringing this for consideration for action at the February meeting. As of today, we have received a formal letter from St. Edwards and while we have not yet received a letter from Huston-Tillotson, our point of contact has indicated that we should expect to receive one by the CAC meeting on 2/10/2021.



Office of the President

January 19, 2021

Mayor Jane Hughson (City of San Marcos), Chair
Council Member Mathew Baker (City of Round Rock), 1st Vice Chair
Council Member Paige Ellis (City of Austin), 2nd Vice Chair

Central Texas Clean Air Coalition
6800 Burleson Road, Building 310
Suite 165
Austin, TX 78744

Dear Mayor Hughson/Council Members Baker & Ellis:

Thank you for your invitation for St. Edward's University to join the Central Texas Clean Air Commission (CAC) as a supporting member. As an institution of higher learning in the Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), we will be proud to support the CAC both by helping to improve air quality and setting the example for our staff and students in the importance of improving public health in this MSA. Additionally, with as critically close as this MSA has been to being designated as a "nonattainment" area for federal ground-level ozone standards, we understand and appreciate the economic importance that the CAC represents as well. In joining as a supporting member, we intend to support the coalition and its goals in a number of ways, including:

- Continuing to offer distanced learning opportunities for students;
- Providing discounted passes for students and employees that use mass transit;
- Continuing to work with Cap Metro and Movability to promote safe public transportation and carpooling options;
- Encouraging staff and students to be aware of daily air quality forecasts, and in particular understand the significance of Ozone Action days;
- Encouraging the campus community to use alternate means of transportation, such as biking or walking, to get to campus, particularly on Ozone Action Days;
- Replacing gas-powered carts and vehicles with electric and hybrid options;
- Enforcing "no-idling" policies on campus, particularly on Ozone Action Days;
- Proving Alternate Work Arrangement programs to allow employees to work remotely;

- Conserve energy and participate in demand-response programs to help reduce grid stress during peak energy load times; and
- Continuing to support important causes that promote clean air stewardship, such as Movability, Tree Campus USA, the Texas Regional Alliance for Campus Sustainability (TRACS), and our own Students for Sustainability and Climate Justice Council organizations.

Doing our part to promote a healthy environment aligns with our goals as a Holy Cross Institution. We recognize that, unfortunately, the impact of poor air quality disproportionately affects the most vulnerable populations. St. Edward's University is proud to join the CAC as a supporting member to help improve the air quality in our region.

Sincerely,



George E. Martin, Ph.D.
President, St. Edward's University

cc: Kim Kvaal, Vice President, Finance & Administration
James H. Morris, III, Associate Vice President,
University Operations/Sustainability Coordinator

Proposed PM_{2.5} Emission Reduction and Planning Measures for the Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown MSA Regional Air Quality Plan

February 3, 2021

Background

In December 2020, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) concluded its periodic review of the particulate matter (PM) National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) by deciding to retain all of the existing PM NAAQS. However, as part of this review, EPA staff indicated that there is no clear threshold below which exposure to PM pollution will not cause significant health problems, and EPA staff had recommended consideration of a tighter annual fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) NAAQS. During the next PM NAAQS review in 2025, the new EPA Administrator could easily decide that a tighter NAAQS is necessary. Therefore, both from a public health perspective and a regulatory perspective, the Central Texas Clean Air Coalition (CAC) has decided to update the region's voluntary air quality plan, *2019-2023 Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) Regional Air Quality Plan*, to include additional measures targeted at reducing regional PM_{2.5} air pollution and enhancing awareness of PM air pollution. Currently, the region's air pollution levels continue to be much closer to exceeding the ozone (O₃) NAAQS than any of the PM NAAQS. However, the region's PM air pollution levels pose a much more significant public health threat than O₃, and the PM pollution levels may pose a more significant regulatory threat as well in the coming years. This list of proposed measures targeted at regional PM_{2.5} pollution were developed by a subcommittee of the Clean Air Coalition Advisory Committee (CACAC) that included staff from Austin, Round Rock, Travis County, Bastrop County, EPA, and Public Citizen. The list is intended to provide a "menu" of options for current and potential future CAC members to consider implementing as part of the regional plan. CAPCOG is requesting that current CAC members consider this list of measures and notify CAPCOG of any new measures that the CAC organization plans to implement moving forward no later than May 31, 2021. Then, CAPCOG staff will incorporate these commitments into an update to the regional plan that will be presented to the CAC at its August 11, 2021, meeting.

Proposed Measures

CAPCOG is proposing that the following measures be taken for consideration by CAC members and that CAC members identify potential methods of implementation. Methods of implementation can range from passive controls such as encouraging and sharing best management practices (BMPs) or more aggressive controls such as contractor requirements that BMPs are implemented. Additionally, cities have the authority to influence private business behavior of PM_{2.5} emission generating activities occurring within their jurisdiction by ordinance. The proposed PM_{2.5} emission reductions are listed on the next page in a table. Several of the measures are new and specific to major sources of PM emissions that differ from the list of major sources of O₃-forming emissions. However, organizations are encouraged to consider implementing any of the existing measures in the plan that they are not already implementing since it will also help reduce PM emissions and concentrations. The appendix contains detailed emission reduction activities that can occur under each sector. The appendix is provided as a reference to provide additional background and to help understand the multiple ways in which certain sectors could reduce emissions. CAPCOG is not requesting that CAC members list in detail each specific action. However, CAPCOG is requesting that CAC members indicate which general measures they will commit to implementing and the level of commitment (i.e., encouraging best management practices, ordinances, contractual specifications, outreach and education, etc.).

Proposed Regional PM_{2.5} Emission Reduction and Planning Measures for the Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown
MSA Regional Air Quality Plan – February 3, 2021

Organization: _____

Table 1 - PM_{2.5} Emission Reduction and Planning Measures for Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown MSA Air Quality Plan

Measure and Status (i.e., new or existing)	Implement within own organization's operations	Encourage or require 3 rd party organizations to implement	Educate and encourage the public at large to implement
1: Reduce PM emissions from construction and demolition activities (new)	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A
2: Reduce PM emissions from commercial cooking/charbroiling (new)	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A
3: Reduce PM emissions from road dust (new)	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A
4: Reduce PM emissions from mining and quarrying activities (new)	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A
5: Reducing PM emissions from open burning (new)	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A
6: Reduce PM emissions or impact of PM emissions from prescribed burning on high PM days (new)	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A
7: Reduce emissions from mobile sources year-round (existing)	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A
8: Reduce emissions from stationary combustion sources year-round (existing)	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A
9: Installation additional PM_{2.5} monitors/sensors within the region (new)	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A
10: Promote awareness of health effects of PM air pollution (new)	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A	Yes No N/A

Next Steps

Below is the timeline that CAPCOG plans to follow regarding collecting public comments, soliciting emission reduction commitments from CAC members, and updating the Regional Air Quality Plan.

Additionally, CAPCOG plans to monitor new state legislation that may result in emission reduction activities from certain sectors (e.g., mining and quarry operations) from the private industry. On that note, the Texas Emission Reduction Plan (TERP) has the ability to open new grants that could target PM emissions, and CAPCOG staff will keep track of such changes.

Table 2 - Timeline for 2021 Update to the 2019-2023 Regional Air Quality Plan Update for PM_{2.5}

Date or Timeframe	Milestone
February 10, 2021	CAC meeting; present list of measures and open public comment period
March 12, 2021	End of public comment period
March 12- 31, 2021	CAPCOG will compile comments and disseminate to CAC and CACAC
May 3 – 7, 2021	National Air Quality Awareness Week
April 29, 2021	CACAC meeting; review progress
May 12, 2021	CAC Meeting; review progress
May 31, 2021	Target date for existing CAC members to update commitments
June 25, 2021	Target date for commitments from new CAC members
July 22, 2021	Target date for drafting plan & distribution to CACAC for review
July 29, 2021	CACAC meeting to consider recommendation of plan update (tentative)
August 11, 2021	CAC considers approval of update to plan
August 13, 2021	CAPCOG submits the updated plan to EPA as “Path Forward” for participation Advance Program

Appendix A: Additional Background

Health Effects and Sensitive Populations from Particulate Matter

As noted above, the EPA's review of the PM NAAQS indicated that there is not a threshold below which effects do not occur for either short-term or long-term exposure to fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5})¹. Therefore, there are public health benefits of reducing both long-term and short-term exposure to PM_{2.5} even if an area is attaining the PM_{2.5} NAAQS. Exposure to PM_{2.5} pollution can affect the lungs and heart as PM_{2.5} particles are small enough to penetrate those body systems. According to the EPA, numerous scientific studies have linked particle pollution exposure to a variety of problems, including:

- Premature death in people with heart or lung disease;
- Nonfatal heart attacks;
- Irregular heartbeat;
- Aggravated asthma;
- Decreased lung function; and
- Increased respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing or difficulty breathing.

People with heart or lung diseases, children, and older adults are the most likely to be affected by PM_{2.5} pollution exposure. These sensitive groups comprise at least 40% of the population in the MSA. Additionally, people of color and people with low incomes tend to have disproportionate exposure to high PM_{2.5} levels.

Types and Sources of PM_{2.5} Pollution in the Region

PM_{2.5} is both a primary pollutant (i.e., directly emitted from different sources) and a secondary pollutant (i.e., formed in the atmosphere through chemical reactions and processes from other direct emissions).

Sources of PM_{2.5} include:

- Crustal PM_{2.5} – particles from dust/soil;
- Elemental carbon (EC) PM_{2.5} – particles that contain the elemental form of carbon (i.e., graphite);
- Organic carbon (OC) PM_{2.5} – particles that contain organic molecules (hydrocarbons);
- Sulfate PM_{2.5} – particles that contain SO₄ molecules;
- Nitrate PM_{2.5} – particles that contain NO₃ molecules; and
- Ammonium PM_{2.5} – particles that contain NH₄ molecules.

Of these types of PM_{2.5}, the one that appears to be contributing the most to variations in annual PM_{2.5} concentrations within the region is organic carbon PM_{2.5}. While the local and background components of these totals is not known, the large variation in the organic carbon PM_{2.5} contributions at the two regional regulatory monitors in 2014-2018 accounts for the entire difference in the annual PM_{2.5} concentrations between these locations. This suggests that reducing organic carbon PM_{2.5} emissions would be the most important step that the region can take towards reducing the highest annual PM_{2.5} concentrations, which are located in the urban core.

The largest sources of PM_{2.5} and organic carbon PM_{2.5} within the Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown MSA are listed below:

¹ EPA. *Integrated Science Assessment for Particulate Matter*. December 2019. EPA/600/R-19/188, http://ofmpub.epa.gov/eims/eimscomm.getfile?p_download_id=539935.

Proposed Regional PM_{2.5} Emission Reduction and Planning Measures for the Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown
MSA Regional Air Quality Plan - January 22, 2021

Table 3 – Largest sources of PM_{2.5} Emissions in the region, 2017

Source Category	Tons per year PM _{2.5}	% of Total PM _{2.5} Emissions	Tons per year OC PM _{2.5}	% of Total OC PM _{2.5} Emissions
Road Dust	2,325	22%	153	6%
Construction Dust	1,693	16%	78	3%
Open Burning	1,574	15%	611	26%
Prescribed Fires	861	8%	403	17%
Agricultural Dust	793	8%	24	1%
Commercial Cooking	417	4%	279	12%
Mining and Quarrying	326	3%	0	0%
Subtotal	7,989	76%	1,548	65%

Significantly, this list of sources is very different than the list of main sources of emissions contributing to peak O₃ formation, which is dominated by mobile sources and point sources. While measures to reduce O₃-forming emissions from mobile sources and point sources will also help reduce PM_{2.5}, those sources do not contribute nearly as much to the region’s PM_{2.5} concentrations as they do to peak O₃ formation.

Detailed Emission Reduction Measures

This section outlines in detail the specific emission reduction activities that could occur under each sector. This is meant to provide an idea of specific activities, and it is not required that CAC members list in detail which specific action (e.g., water application) is planned to be implemented.

1. Reduce emissions from construction and demolition activities
 - a. There are a number of ways to reduce PM emissions during construction and demolition. The list below is compiled from the WRAP Fugitive Dust Handbook² and a best practice document from Canada³
 - b. Water application
 - c. Dust suppressants
 - d. Reschedule large dust generating activities from high wind days or forecasted high PM days
 - e. Design:
 - i. Plan for minimizing dust generation
 - ii. Choosing building material to reduce dust generation
 - iii. Minimize distances travelled for delivery of materials
 - iv. Use of green building materials
 - v. Design and construction for maximum energy efficiency
 - f. Site preparation
 - i. Grade the construction site in phases
 - ii. Use wind fencing
 - iii. Stabilize surfaces of completed earthworks with vegetation
 - iv. Stabilize earthworks with stone/soil/geotextiles

² Western Regional Air Partnership’s (WRAP’s) Fugitive Dust Handbook, https://www.wrapair.org//forums/deif/fdh/content/FDHandbook_Rev_06.pdf

³Best Practices for the Reduction of Air Emissions From Construction and Demolition Activities, <http://www.bv.transports.gouv.qc.ca/mono/1173259.pdf>

Proposed Regional PM_{2.5} Emission Reduction and Planning Measures for the Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown
MSA Regional Air Quality Plan - January 22, 2021

- v. Create ridges to prevent dust
 - vi. Compact disturbed soil
 - vii. Eliminate open burning
 - viii. Reduce certain activities during windy conditions
 - g. Storage piles:
 - i. Storage pile activity should be conducted downwind
 - ii. Utilize enclosures/coverings for storage piles
 - iii. Utilize wind fences/screens for storage piles
 - iv. Use vegetation cover as a wind break
 - v. Properly shape storage piles
 - vi. Properly schedule the delivery of landscaping materials
 - h. Material Handling & Transfer Systems
 - i. Control mud and dirt trackout and carryout
 - ii. Minimize material drop at the transfer point and enclosure
 - iii. Utilize foam suppression systems
 - iv. Secure loads on haul trucks
 - v. Prevent PM emissions from spills
 - vi. Minimize material handling operations
 - vii. Capture fugitive dust emissions
 - viii. Utilize wind barriers
 - ix. Reduce certain activities during windy conditions
 - i. Road surfaces
 - i. Establish on-site vehicle restrictions
 - ii. Surface improvements to unpaved road surfaces
 - iii. Proper maintenance of unpaved roads
 - iv. Work practices associated with de-icing materials
 - j. Fabrication
 - i. On high PM days, reschedule the following:
 - 1. Cutting and grinding
 - 2. Sand and grit blasting and façade cleaning
 - 3. Concrete cutting
 - 4. Mixing processes
 - 5. Internal and external finishing and refurbishment
 - k. Demolition and Deconstruction
 - i. Apply deconstruction techniques
 - ii. Minimize drop heights for debris
 - iii. Enclose chutes and cover bins
 - iv. Use fogging systems
 - v. Construct barriers to prevent dispersion
 - vi. Avoid blasting when feasible
 - vii. Vacuum debris
 - viii. Work practices for loading debris
 - ix. Avoid prolonged storage of debris
2. Reduce emissions from commercial cooking/charbroiling, possibly through some kind of grant program

Proposed Regional PM_{2.5} Emission Reduction and Planning Measures for the Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown
MSA Regional Air Quality Plan - January 22, 2021

- a. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) Menu of Control Measures⁴ identifies one control for commercial cooking, catalytic oxidizers, which are estimated to achieve an 83% control efficiency at a cost of \$3,252 per ton of PM + volatile organic compounds (VOCs).
 - i. This measure focuses on the control of PM emissions from over-fire and conveyor charbroilers. The use of a catalytic oxidizer, placed above the charbroiler in the stack and activated by heat from the cooking, appears to be the best and most cost-effective emission control device for charbroilers.
 - ii. Cities in California and New York have established exemptions for establishments that charbroil less than 400 – 1,000 pounds of meat per week.
 - b. If funds are available, a grant program could be implemented to assist restaurants and food service businesses, that charbroil a certain threshold of meat, in purchasing and installing a catalytic oxidizer.
3. Reduce road dust emissions²
 - a. Paved roads and parking lots:
 - i. Water flushing/sweeping
 - ii. Improvements in sanding/salting applications and materials
 - iii. Covering haul trucks
 - iv. Prevention of vehicle dust trackout
 1. Curb installation
 2. Shoulder stabilization
 - b. Unpaved roads & parking lots
 - i. Paving
 - ii. Chemical stabilization/dust suppressant
 - iii. Surface improvement (e.g., gravel)
 - iv. Vehicle speed reduction (to 25 miles/hour or less)
 - v. Watering twice a day for industrial unpaved road
 4. Reduce emissions from mining and quarrying activities
 - a. EPA⁴ identifies the following control measures for direct PM emissions from “Mineral Products – Stone Quarrying & Processing” at stationary facilities at which materials are being handled after quarrying.
 - i. Dry Electrostatic Precipitator (ESP) – Wire Plate Type
 - ii. Fabric Filter
 - iii. Paper/Nonwoven Filters – Cartridge Collector
 - iv. Venturi Scrubber
 - v. Wet Electrostatic Precipitator (ESP) – Wire Plate Type
 - b. PM reduction measures at the mining and quarrying site are^{2,5}:
 - i. Reschedule blasting and other large dust generating activities from days with high winds or high PM levels

⁴ EPA Point & Non-Point PM Menu of Control Measures, <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-02/documents/menuofcontrolmeasures.pdf>

⁵ Public Citizen Urges Texas Legislature to Rein in Aggregate Pollution, <https://www.citizen.org/article/public-citizen-urges-texas-legislature-to-rein-in-aggregate-pollution/>

Proposed Regional PM_{2.5} Emission Reduction and Planning Measures for the Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown
MSA Regional Air Quality Plan - January 22, 2021

- ii. Implement wet suppression
 - iii. Enclose or cover storage piles
 - iv. Plant vegetation as a windbreak and/or erect artificial wind barriers
 - v. Control mud and dirt trackout
 - vi. Secure loads on haul trucks
 - vii. Vehicle wash stations upon exiting property
 - viii. Route optimization to avoid neighborhoods and school zone times
 - ix. Vacuuming dust
- c. The control measures for unpaved roads² are potentially applicable to mines and quarries. These measures include:
- i. Pave roads and high-traffic areas
 - ii. Chemical stabilization/dust suppressant
 - iii. Surface improvement (e.g., gravel)
 - iv. Vehicle speed reduction to 25 miles/hour
 - v. Watering twice a day for industrial unpaved road
5. Reducing open burning
- a. Working with the Capital Area Regional Environmental Task Force (RETF) and other city or county environmental enforcement staff to enforce burn bans and the state's Outdoor Burning Rule
 - i. Outdoor Burning Rule, Title 30, Texas Administrative Code, Sections 111.201–221
 - 1. The Outdoor Burning Rule requires that certain kinds of burning be conducted downwind of, or at least 300 feet from, any structure containing sensitive receptors located on adjacent properties unless written approval is obtained beforehand from the owner or occupant—the one who will suffer adverse effects—of the adjacent or downwind property. Also, the burning must not cause a nuisance or traffic hazard.
 - 2. See the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality's (TCEQ's) Outdoor Burning in Texas Guide - https://www.tceq.texas.gov/assets/public/comm_exec/pubs/rg/rg-049.pdf
 - b. Educating the public on fire and air quality hazards from open burning
6. Working to ensure prescribed burning activities do not coincide with projected high PM days, if possible
- a. According to Travis County's Park Land Manager, prescribed burn windows are identified the week before the prescribed burn. Therefore, it is recommended that prescribed burning staff consider the air quality forecast for the timeframe in which the burns are being considered. There a lot of factors that go into selecting the day of a prescribed burn such as meteorology and staff availability, so it may not be possible to avoid some high PM days. Note that this measure would be expected to reduce peak daily 24-hour PM_{2.5} concentrations, but not annual PM_{2.5} concentrations.

CAPCOG can also encourage consideration of co-benefits of PM air pollution reductions from other actions/measures that are already in the Regional Air Quality⁶ plan for O₃ that also could impact regional 24-hour or annual PM_{2.5} concentrations

7. Measures to reduce air pollution from the use of fleet/commercial vehicles and equipment:

⁶ 2019-2023 Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown MSA Regional Air Quality Plan, https://www.capcog.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/2019-2023_Regional_Air_Quality_Plan.pdf

Proposed Regional PM_{2.5} Emission Reduction and Planning Measures for the Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown
MSA Regional Air Quality Plan - January 22, 2021

- a. Tier 1
 - i. Establish and enforce idling restriction policies for use of the organization's vehicles, equipment, and property
 - ii. Establish fleet management policies that prioritize the use of vehicles and equipment with low emission rates
 - iii. Educate fleet users on driving and equipment operation practices that can reduce emissions
 - iv. Seek funding to accelerate replacement of older, higher-emitting vehicles and equipment with newer, cleaner vehicles and equipment, such as TERP grants
 - b. Tier 2
 - i. Establish low-emission purchasing policies for new on-road vehicles, non-road equipment, and stationary equipment
 - ii. Enforce vehicle idling restrictions within the community [either through an ordinance if a city or a memorandum of agreement with TCEQ if a county].
8. Measures to reduce air pollution from power plants and other stationary combustion sources:
- a. Conserve energy
 - b. Schedule discretionary emission-generating activities such as engine testing to periods that would avoid peak 8-hour O₃ or 24-hour PM_{2.5} concentrations

The following measures would also be expected to generally improve understanding and awareness of PM_{2.5} air pollution, which could lead to emission reduction or exposure reduction by the community at large.

9. Encourage installation of additional PM_{2.5} monitors/sensors within the region
- a. More PM_{2.5} monitors and sensors in the MSA would allow a better understanding of where elevated PM_{2.5} levels are occurring and the populations that are most affected by high PM_{2.5}.
10. Promote awareness of health effects of PM air pollution
- a. PM_{2.5} poses the greater risk to human health than ozone as PM_{2.5} can be inhaled deep into the lungs and can enter the bloodstream. According to the EPA, numerous scientific studies have linked particle pollution exposure to a variety of problems, including:
 - i. Premature death in people with heart or lung disease
 - ii. Nonfatal heart attacks
 - iii. Irregular heartbeat
 - iv. Aggravated asthma
 - v. Decreased lung function
 - vi. Increased respiratory symptoms, such as irritation of the airways, coughing or difficulty breathing.
 - b. People with heart or lung diseases, children, and older adults are the most likely to be affected by particle pollution exposure.
 - i. AirNow, www.airnow.gov, can help the public view the air quality in their area in order to avoid elevated PM levels.



6800 Burleson Road, Building 310, Suite 165
Austin, Texas 78744-2306
Ph: 512-916-6000 Fax: 512-916-6001
www.capcog.org

BASTROP BLANCO BURNET CALDWELL FAYETTE HAYS LEE LLANO TRAVIS WILLIAMSON

MEMORANDUM
February 3, 2021

TO: Clean Air Coalition Members

FROM: Andrew Hoekzema, CAPCOG Director of Regional Planning and Services

RE: Air Quality Legislative Update

Rider 7 Local Air Quality Planning Grant

- Both the House and Senate versions of the base appropriations bill retain Rider 7 with text identical to the text in the final General Appropriations Act for 2020-2021.
- If enacted as-is and TCEQ does not change its interpretation of the list of “areas” identified, this would mean that the Austin area and eight other “near-nonattainment” areas would again receive \$281,250 each for ozone (O₃)-related monitoring and emissions inventory projects, but could not use the money for any modeling, controls strategy analysis, planning, or outreach activities, or for any activities related to particulate matter (PM) or any other air pollutant.
- Unlike the other areas, the seven suburban counties in the San Antonio area that are listed would also each individually receive \$281,250, rather than being treated as part of a single area, and would therefore collectively receive a total of \$1,968,750, which is *more* than the approximately \$1.4 - \$1.5 million the area received for 2016-2017 when it included Bexar County (which is now a nonattainment area and therefore ineligible).
- The Texas Clean Air Working Group (TCAWG) developed a recommended definition of a “near-nonattainment area” for O₃ that could help address the issue of the difference in the way the San Antonio and all other areas of the state are treated for this grant.
- Other potential changes that could reduce the need for local air quality funding would be to expand the eligible activities to include modeling, control strategy analysis, general planning, and the inclusion of PM-related activities.
- The appropriations bill will be taken up by the Senate Finance Committee and the House Appropriations Committee, which has a Subcommittee that will be first be reviewing the TCEQ’s budget. Appointments to House committees have not yet been made. Senators who represent the Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown MSA who are on the Senate Finance Committee include Dawn Buckingham (R-South-

Western Travis County), Donna Campbell (R – most of Hays County and small parts of Southern Travis County), and Charles Schwertner (R-Williamson County).

Texas Emission Reduction Plan

- Legislation passed during the last session is slated to transition the TERP program at the end of this fiscal year from being subject to the biannual appropriations process, which has resulted in over \$2 billion in fees that have been collected but not appropriated in order to balance other parts of the budget over the years. The TERP program is moving to a trust fund that would enable all of the revenues collected to be used for these grants (hundreds of millions of dollars). The annual review affected by this amounts to more than \$250 million per year.
- A discrepancy has arisen between the Senate and House versions of the budget in whether the entire \$250 million+ of TERP revenue will be going into the new trust fund or if the roughly \$150 million per year in vehicle title transfer fees will continue to go into the general revenue-dedicated fund that would need to be appropriated. The House version includes an interpretation that only about \$100 million per year goes into the trust account, while the Senate version includes an interpretation that all \$250 million per year would go into the trust account.
- There are also efforts underway to try to get the Legislature to spend additional funding on TERP grants out of the \$2.1 billion fund balance projected for the end of FY 2021, although this would likely require reducing General Revenue spending elsewhere or the use of the Economic Stabilization Fund.
- Due to the budget shortfall, there is likely going to be an effort to postpone this change by 2 years in order to use a majority of the revenues collected for TERP to help balance the budget elsewhere.
- The base budget bills in the House and Senate both replace the existing TERP Rider (#19 in TCEQ's budget), that specified the amount that will be appropriated and how those funds would be allocated amongst the various TERP programs, with a rider that would simply allow the TCEQ to temporarily cash-flow the TERP trust fund at the beginning of FY 2022 as this transition takes place.
- There are two bills filed so far that would affect TERP grants:
 - HB 286 (Cortez) – would allow transit authorities in nonattainment counties with populations of more than 1 million (Bexar, Dallas, Harris, and Tarrant) to qualify for alternative fueling facility grants for their fleets without needing to make the facilities available to the public
 - This bill could expand the pool of eligible applicants in other metro areas, which could make applications in the Austin-Round Rock-Georgetown MSA less competitive.
 - HB 963 (Lozano) – would allow a used, 2017 or newer model year natural gas vehicle to be purchased under the Natural Gas Vehicle Grant program (up to 6 years old), and would require that the grant cover at least 80% of the cost of the purchase, lease, or other commercial finance (currently, there is an upper limit of 90%, but no lower limit)
 - This bill could potentially increase the cost-effectiveness of the program to the extent that it would allow less expensive vehicles to be purchased, but it could reduce cost-effectiveness to the extent that it would require that grants pay for at least 80% of the cost of the project, when they could currently be used to pay for less than that amount
- There is another bill that is being developed by TxETRA – an electric vehicle lobbying group – that would allow TCEQ to award grants from the light-duty vehicle grant program directly to vehicle vendors for alternative fuel vehicle sales in order to improve program participation.

- There was some discussion at the January 28, 2021, CACAC meeting about the possibility of funding some PM reduction equipment through TERP since there are provisions that allow TCEQ to create new programs that reduce NO_x and/or PM pollution.
- On ongoing issue for TERP is the proliferation of different specialized programs and the allocation of funding among these programs.
 - There are two programs that are always significantly under-subscribed, and they are also relatively inefficient in terms of cost per ton of NO_x reduced (or which don't track that data) based on their legislative structures:
 - The Texas Natural Gas Grant program, which is a 1st-come, first-served program to replace heavy-duty diesel vehicles with natural gas vehicles, had a cost/ton ratio of \$72,212 and as of 1/12/2021, only \$3 million had been requested of the \$7.7 million that was allocated to the program.
 - The Light Duty Vehicle Grant program is a 1st-come, first-served program; cost-per-ton ratios are not directly tracked but prior analyses by CAPCOG and NCTCOG indicated that the ratio is potentially more than \$1 million per ton of NO_x reduced; TCEQ has indicated that it received enough applications for electric vehicles, but far fewer than available for CNG vehicles.
 - Last biennium, the New Technology Implementation Grant (NTIG) program awarded only \$3.6 million of the \$4.6 million available, and it does not provide summaries of cost/ton ratios.
 - There are two programs that tend to be over-subscribed that are highly efficient in terms of reducing NO_x emissions:
 - The Seaport and Railyard Grant program (which the Austin area is not eligible for) – there was almost fully subscribed (\$9.2 million awarded out of \$9.3 million available) at \$25,000 per ton of NO_x reduced.
 - The Rebate Grant program (part of the Diesel Emission Reduction Incentive grant program) very quickly ran out of the \$10 million that was allocated to it, with the cost/ton ratio at \$17,500.
 - The Emission Reduction Incentive Grant (ERIG) program recently closed, and had more than \$60 million in applications, but only \$30 million available. During the last biennium, the average cost/ton ratio was \$11,611.
 - There are other programs that are over-subscribed, but they also have a high cost/ton ratio or for which cost/ton is not directly assessed:
 - The Clean School Bus program quickly awarded all \$8.3 million of its funding, at a cost/ton ratio of \$137,173.
 - The Texas Clean Fleet program grants doesn't have a list of awards this year, but they have previously been over-subscribed with an average cost/ton of NO_x reduced of \$170,597.
 - There are several other uses of funding that are research-based:
 - \$6 million for air toxics monitoring in North Texas
 - \$1.5 million for air quality research
 - \$1 million for “cargo movement studies/pilot programs”
 - \$432,000 for a contract with energy systems lab
 - \$400,000 for “health effects study”

Aggregate Production Interim Report

- A House committee on aggregate production facilities recently issued a report:
<https://house.texas.gov/media/pdf/committees/reports/86interim/Aggregate-Production-Operations-Committee-Interim-Report-2018.pdf>
- Recommendations related to air quality include:
 - Require on-site monitoring of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}
 - Commission a study to determine cumulative effects of multiple PM sources with each outputting what would be compliant levels of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} were they the only source
 - TCEQ's public meeting process for standard permits on APO equipment should include members from other agencies whose areas of expertise are heavily impacted by APOs

Bills Related to Concrete Plants

- HB 50 (Johnson, Jarvis) – permitting concrete plants in municipalities not subject to zoning
- HB 56 (Johnson, Jarvis) – prohibiting concrete plants and crushing facilities at certain locations
- HB 65 (Johnson, Jarvis) – notice requirements for standard permits for certain concrete plants
- HB 289 (Collier) – relating to who may request a public hearing for construction of a concrete plant
- HB 416 (Walle) – plot plan requirements for standard permit for concrete batch plants
- HB 889 (Dutton) – public hearings on construction of concrete plants
- HB 1267 (Walle) – public hearings on construction of concrete plants
- SB 368 (Miles) – related to issuance of air quality

Revenue Estimates for Clean Air Fund (151) and TERP

- The Comptroller's revenue estimate is available at:
<https://comptroller.texas.gov/transparency/reports/biennial-revenue-estimate/2022-23/>
- The Clean Air Fund, which includes funding for Rider 7 grants, is projected to have 4.8% less revenue (a reduction of \$6.8 million) for 2022-2023 compared to the revenue estimate for 2020-2021
 - The projected \$312 million balance in the Clean Air Fund at the end of FY 2021 is primarily the result of LIRAP/DACM fees that were previously collected but not appropriated back out to the counties for this program. Prior to its suspension, this program has been used to balance prior budgets, but it was also the result of on-going revenues exceeding expenditures (\$58 million spent/transferred out in FY 2021 compared to \$79 million in revenues)
- The TERP fund's projections are not included due to the legislature transferring the program's revenues to a trust fund, but it would be expected to be about \$240 million per year
 - For FY 2021, total revenue of \$238 million far exceeded the \$98 million in expected expenditures and the \$77 million annual allocation
 - The projected FY 2021 year-end fund balance for TERP is \$2.1 billion, up from \$2.0 billion at the beginning of the fiscal year.