



BOARD MEETING MINUTES

March 9, 2006 9:30 a.m.
SPOKANE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING
LOWER LEVEL HEARING ROOM

PRESENT WERE:

Matthew Pederson
Jeff Corkill
Michele Pope
Commissioner Harris
Commissioner Mielke

STAFF:

Ron Edgar, Interim Director
Lisa Woodard, Public Information Officer
Barbara Nelson, Finance & Personnel Admin.
Mary McDermott, Secretary II

WORK SESSION: The work session of the board meeting was called to order at 9:31 a.m.

1. Award Presentation

Ron Edgar introduced Grant Pfeifer of the Department of Ecology (DOE).

Grant Pfeifer recognized the excellent work of SCAPCA staff member Mark Rowe who has been selected by his peers across Washington State, with the endorsement of the Air Quality Program at the DOE, as the 2005 “Operator of the Year”. Mark’s job is to run the monitoring instruments and collect the air quality data that is used for making decisions about how to manage air quality, air quality emissions and air contaminant emissions throughout the state. Mark is part of a network of people who work together to collect the information, service the instruments and make sure data is collected according to appropriate protocol procedures. The program for collecting air quality information in Washington State is often recognized as among the top in the nation, which means among the top in the world and it is the dedication of hard working individuals like Mark. The “Operator of the Year” Award is the gold medal in his profession. Ron then presented Mark with the “Air Monitoring of the Year” trophy which he will keep in the office for a year, an engraved mug and a check for \$200.

2. School Anti-Idling Program – Lisa Woodard

Lisa Woodard gave an overview of the anti-idling program. The “no idle zone” is about vehicles and clean air. This program was funded through the DOE and developed in partnership with them and the Northwest Air Quality Communicators Group which is a collaborative group of agencies that team up to develop educational programs that benefit all agencies and communities.

Some facts about idling are: Idling consumes ½ to 1 gallon of fuel per hour; Idling uses more fuel than turning your car on and off; A single vehicle dropping off or picking up kids at school puts out three pounds of air pollution a month; and vehicle exhaust is the leading cause of hazardous air pollution.

Public awareness about idling in a four-county survey in Washington, researchers were hired to develop the program through Ecology and the survey looked at people's perceptions, attitudes and awareness about idling. It was found that most people agree to some extent that adjusting vehicle emissions is important to improve air quality. Family, preserving air for future generations, personal health and mountain views are big motivators in how people are going to behave in operating a vehicle. Some health messages are: Each adult takes about 20,000 breaths each day; Children breathe 50 percent more air per pound than adults; Asthma is the most common chronic illness for children and the leading cause of school absences; and Children's asthma symptoms increase with their exposure to exhaust.

The no-idle zone program development goal is to reduce all idling at schools, particularly in the area where parents pick-up and drop-off their children and with school buses and delivery vehicles at the schools. The research phase consists of learning from others, understanding current behaviors and motivators, and having pilot projects. Part of the EPA funding criteria was to develop a program that is easily replicable across the nation. A toolkit has been developed for easy replication and SCAPCA is replicating the program at area schools. Program materials consist of parent letters, fact sheets, pledge forms and two "No Idle Zone" signs. The program outline for the schools is front office staff instructions, principal reminder and thank you letters, and vehicle idling measurement forms. Some incentive items are a no-idle key chain for the parents and ice cream parties for classrooms that get an 80 percent response from their parents signing the pledge cards. We are partnering with businesses like Yoke's to provide the incentives.

This was piloted at eight elementary schools statewide and at Control Schools with similar demographics. The pre and post campaign measurements at the participating schools and control schools show that more idling occurs in the afternoon. There has been a marked reduction observed at the pilot schools. The average afternoon idling reduction is at a 76 percent reduction at pilot schools compared with control schools.

The program toolkit has three plan kits. The compact plan consists of pledges only. The medium plan includes the pre and post measurements at program schools only. The full-size plan includes pre and post measurements at a controlled school. This program is underway at Pasadena Park, Mt. View Middle and Franklin schools. This program is ready for any school to use now and the materials are on the web at www.airwatchnorthwest.org. SCAPCA would like to help startup this program at four to six schools per year. The cost would be approximately \$600 to \$1,300. This includes signs, parent letters, fact sheets and pledge cards at approximately \$300 to \$400; the ice cream parties for qualifying classes at \$0 to \$400; and the key rings for the parents at \$300 to \$500.

This is an opportunity to address a real air pollution problem: Vehicle exhaust is a major source of hazardous air pollution; Vehicle idling affects people's health, especially asthmatic kids; Kid's health is a major motivator to behavior change in parents; People are willing to change their behavior if they are given information; and Anti-idling is a simple behavior change that is proven to be effective. If you think you will be idling for more than 30 seconds, turn your engine off this will save

fuel and cause less exhaust emissions. We are finding that most of the idling at the schools happens in the afternoon when parents are picking up their children. Jeff Corkill asked if there was any emphasis on trying to get the kids to use school buses rather than being driven to school by their parents. Lisa stated that was not a component for this program.

BOARD MEETING: The board meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

Administrative Items:

1. Advisory Council Report – Tom Brattebo

Tom Brattebo is the coordinator for the Pasadena Elementary no-idle program. The Advisory Council talked last month about the new implementation of the proposed changes to the AOP permit program fees and the consensus was that SCAPCA should have a three part fee. This fee structure involves the base fee and the emissions fee, which SCAPCA currently has, and adding a time fee for the short-fall in the program that will cover the time spent on the sources. SCAPCA would calculate what percentage of time was spent at each source and then bill them accordingly. A letter explaining the proposed changes to the fee structure was sent out to the AOP sources.

Commissioner Mielke asked what dictates how much time is spent at a source. Ron Edgar replied that some of the sources are required to submit monthly or quarterly reports that have to be reviewed. Every five years their permit has to be completely renewed and those years there is more time spent with the source writing the permit. The sources are inspected every year and some are very large which takes more time to go through and if they have changed any of their equipment we have to do an NOC. These sources would no longer be charged a NOC fee, we would add the time into the time spent on that source and at the end of the year SCAPCA would calculate what the costs were for that facility and bill the source. Currently the base fee is a flat fee of \$3,000 and the emission fee is \$31.11 per ton of emissions. The amount we collect on emissions goes up and down depending on the emissions the source is emitting or if the source puts in new air pollution control equipment which drops their amount that they pay for emission fees and this makes it so that SCAPCA does not recover the full-cost of the program because SCAPCA still has the time they spend on the permit, inspection and emission inventory. The base fee was set to cover the underlying activities SCAPCA has that may not be specific to a source but all sources have to pay for it. The emissions fee was initially intended to pick up the difference between sources understanding that the larger more complex sources would have higher emissions. What we have found in the long run is that the emissions fee encourages them to reduce their emissions and thereby we end up short on the program. The additional fee would, in most cases, be a small amount added at the end for this time percentage. We are trying to keep the fees at a minimal increase to the sources by doing it this way. This will keep the program at just what it needs to run at full-cost recovery. There will be detailed time accounting which will show the sources exactly how much time has been spent at their facility. We will be doing a full presentation for the Board at a later date. Right now we are just getting a feel for what the Advisory Council and sources think about this plan. Tom Brattebo stated that the Advisory Council asks a lot of the same questions and that is why they are in favor of the three-part fee because if SCAPCA is spending a lot of time on one source, then that source will be charged accordingly in the end. SCAPCA has very detailed time accounting that show where SCAPCA's time was spent at each source. Jeff Corkill asked if the AOP Program doesn't pay for itself, where does the money come from. Ron replied it has been coming

from SCAPCA's general fund to make up the difference. The AOP Program is an EPA mandated program that SCPACA has been delegated and in that delegation it says it will be at full-cost recovery. We have had an audit and over the last 12 years SCAPCA is approximately \$45,000 short and EPA requires that we pick up this loss. We are suggesting to EPA that SCAPCA be allowed 10 years to make up that \$45,000, which means that each source will pay approximately \$500 per year.

2. Public Information/Education Update – Lisa Woodard

Lisa Woodard highlighted a few items from February. SCAPCA was at St. George's School for an air quality presentation and at Sunrise Elementary School during their science night. Planning is still underway for the May 3, 2006, Spokane Youth Environmental conference. We are partnering with the American Lung Association to have SCAPCA's Clean Air Kids participate in the Asthma Walk on May 20, 2006. We are coordinating for May's "Clean Air Month" activities and we are partnering with Mobius. The "Chipping and Composting Event" on April 8th is coming together and the flyer has been developed and distributed. The CAP newsletter was printed and distributed. The CAP had its dry cleaning workshop and sent out a follow-up survey. February is the final month of wood heating ads and TV. The traveling display is at a wood stove retailer.

Special projects consist of the "It All Adds Up to Cleaner Air" campaign. The winter program is wrapping up. We developed and distributed surveys to participating worksites for their input. We ran an ad in Voices recognizing the 80 plus worksites that participated in the program. The "Car Care Fair" coordination is underway with partner agencies (Motion Auto) on April 15th at SCC. A new event called T2 (Technology and Transportation Fair) is being coordinated with partner agencies on Earth Day and SCAPCA is helping secure logistics, securing location, exhibitors, signage and publicity for auto dealers and different people to come to the event to showcase their different car technologies.

For media activities, we had a news release on the Advisory Council opening and an interview with the Spokesman Review. A news release was developed on the proposed PM presentation at the February board meeting which resulted in a couple of interviews and an interview with In Construction Magazine related to asbestos.

3. Activity Report for January 2006 – Ron Edgar

There was nothing outstanding in the activity report.

Mark Rowe, Air Quality Technician, gave a brief presentation on February's air quality. Jeff Corkill stated that something that would be interesting to do would be to plot pressure against the PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ and see how soon the pressure starts rising before the levels start rising. Mark stated that he did not know what the lead period is but he would get the recorded pressure from NOAA and use it as an overlay to the PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀.

4. Income/Expense Statement for January, 2006 – Ron Edgar and Barbara Nelson

Ron stated that it looks like SCAPCA is on line with everything at this point in the current budget. Commissioner Harris and Jeff Corkill asked some questions about the statement and Barbara Nelson answered them.

Action Items:

5. Approval of Minutes of the February 9, 2006 Board Meeting

Michelle Pope moved to approve the February 9, 2006, board meeting minutes and Commissioner Mielke seconded it. Motion passed with Matthew Peterson abstaining.

6. Voucher Approval for February \$152,322.20

Commissioner Harris moved to approve the February, 2006, voucher and Michele Pope seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

7. US Mayors Climate Protection Agreement – Ron Edgar

Ron Edgar stated that he had a request for SCAPCA to send a letter to the City of Spokane asking them if they would consider signing on to the US Mayors Climate Protection Agreement. He is bringing it to the Board to consider. He will take whatever direction the Board may have on this subject. Michele Pope asked who requested we send a letter to the Mayor. Ron replied a member of the Sierra Club.

Ron stated that at some point SCAPCA may be asked to do emission inventory for CO₂ (carbon dioxide) by the EPA. There are several advantages as far as air quality in general from this agreement and that is why he is asking the Board to consider asking the cities to consider it. He is looking mainly at the air quality issues that are involved. Under the agreement, it is asking the cities to consider starting to meet the Kyoto Protocols and targets through actions that they can take as far as land use, transportation, their own purchases and that kind of thing. It also asks the cities to urge the state governments and federal governments to strive for the same things. It again urges the U.S. Congress to pass the greenhouse gas reduction legislation. We would be sending a letter asking the Mayor to consider whether or not they wish to sign on to these types of issues and whether or not they agree with that. It suggests a dozen different ways in which a city can go about reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases (CO₂ in this case). There would be some advantages in the reduction and use of energy, the use of bio-fuels, etc. It will improve air quality in general for criteria pollutants that SCAPCA looks at. We look at things like inventorying the amount of CO₂; there is no comprehensive inventory in the Spokane area of how much carbon dioxide is emitted. As of February 27th there are 208 cities that have already signed on.

Commissioner Mielke asked if this was a proposal that was developed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors. Ron replied it is the U.S. Conference of Mayors and he believes Mayor Nickels of Seattle was the main proponent of it. Commissioner Mielke asked if Mayor Hession and Wilhite are participating members. Ron replied he did not know. Jeff Corkill stated that he would support sending a recommendation to the City of Spokane because he feels that it really fits in with the mission of SCAPCA in that this would afford us to try to improve air quality in the United States or the world.

Michele Pope asked if Ron was looking for direction from the Board. Ron stated that he originally drafted a letter that was asking the Mayor of the City of Spokane to consider signing onto this agreement and some concerns were raised by the Board. It was suggested that we bring it to the board meeting so that we could address those concerns and see what direction the Board wanted to

take. Matthew Pederson stated that he agrees with all of the components of the Kyoto Protocol but is it within the mission of the SCAPCA Board of Directors to put political pressure on another jurisdiction or government agency. Ron asked if it is in regard to clean air, is it political pressure. If the Board considers it to be that then he will not send the letter. Michele added that it looks to her like it is lobbying for more regulations; a government agency asking for more regulations that it's in charge of and to her it doesn't sit well. She thinks that if the Sierra Club wants to write letters or any other group wants to write letters to the Mayors, they are free to do so. Personally she doesn't think it is a place for an agency to get in there and do that and she has questions as far as the validity of the science of a lot of this when the United States doesn't even participate in the Kyoto Protocol. The papers say that they've been looking at data or climate trends from the last decade and you have to look farther back than 10 years. She thinks this is very tenebrous and if there are potential for regulations that are restrictive and unnecessary and secrete, and she doesn't think that it is the Boards place to get involved in this. Jeff added that he disagrees completely and thinks that it would behoove the SCAPCA Board to at least recommend to the City of Spokane, that's not lobbying and on behalf of the Science, he believes something like 800 scientists including 400 of them from the National Academy of Science has recognized that global warming is for real and that ignoring it is to the detriment of the future generations of Spokane, Washington and the United States. Jeff thinks that if you look at all of the cities in the U.S. that have signed on for this, it is not an extreme point of view to be proactive in this case.

Matthew Pederson stated that he sees this as being a grassroots movement amongst the Cities moving towards the national level and he does support that but what he is afraid of is overstepping his authority and the bounds of the SCAPCA Board and going in a different direction than they may have in the past. It may be more appropriate if the Board was in favor of communicating that these are our goals and we do support this action if it were to come in a resolution form and not to another particular government agency such as the City of Spokane and City of Spokane Valley.

Commissioner Harris stated that the problem is everybody knows this is a hot potato nationally; it is a political quagmire. If the Mayors of the nation decide that they want to support it, then that's up to the Mayors of the nation. Right now there are 130 U.S. Mayors out of thousands of U.S. Mayors that are supporting this. His concern with the SCAPCA Board is that they leave their politics outside the door when they come in; they try to look at the greater of the common good for the whole County. If we do this and one of the cities disagrees with it, we put the SCAPCA Board right in the middle of politics. We should be driven to go by our mission statement and the laws that we enforce and say that this is as far as we are going to go. Because if we say we support it, all of the people that like it will love us and the ones that don't will be upset with us. He has a passion for clean air and water but just does not believe it is a good move for the SCAPCA Board to take a position of recommending to the City of Spokane to do this when the City hasn't asked for input. We're stepping onto somebody else's turf. He believes that they will be making a major political blunder and it would not be in the best interest or the greater of the common good for the whole County to get ourselves in this situation where they could be criticized by either side.

Jeff Corkill added that a lot of things that are in this recommendation are the very same things that SCAPCA would use as efforts to improve and maintain air quality. It is just a way of demonstrating support of what SCAPCA's mission is to the city and maybe if it hasn't come up yet we should find out from the Mayors and not just the Mayor of Spokane but all the other Mayors and where they are with this concept. Commissioner Harris asked if the Mayors want the SCAPCA Board to say

something. Michele Pope added that she thinks that would be what's needed to be driving us rather than an outside group driving our action, that doesn't seem appropriate. If they want to lobby with the mayors, that's their option and their choice. Come and ask us when nobody else has asked our opinion is another thing and we are here to promulgate laws. Matthew Pederson stated that he has the highest respect for the Sierra Club and he holds them in high regard. He knows that the work they do has had a tremendous impact on cleaning up the region and nation. If we do lobby on their behalf to the Mayor of Spokane, that does open the door to other groups and if you do it for one you have to do it for others. We don't have the luxury of being able to select which groups we want to legislate on the side of. Jeff stated that since he represents the City of Spokane, he will find out where the city is going on this and report back to the Board.

Commissioner Harris added that Jeff can talk to the Mayor and even if the Mayor says yes I would like something from the SCAPCA Board, he's not sure he's going to go there because it is up to the Mayor to make the decision of what he feels is best for the people of the County. I think Dennis Hession will do that, he doesn't need any encouragement to do what he feels is right.

Commissioner Mielke stated that his concern is that there are a number of things that may help us get to the goals of SCAPCA but many of these things fall outside of SCAPCA's parameters. We are an air quality agency and yet some of the points talk about taking an active position with regard to land use policies. It is not within SCAPCA's primary mission to intervene with regard to land use decisions at local jurisdictions. When you look at the issue of public transit, outside of the air quality notion, we have the STA and there are other agencies in this community that are designated as the lead and that's their primary focus. It talks about the issue of landfills, methane for energy, that's solid waste, it's not air quality. He believes that there are many items within the list that go outside air quality issues. He would rather see SCAPCA's time spent on a specific item in the agreement that directly affects air quality and get behind specific measures as opposed to taking a position on a much more global document that by default puts the Board taking a position on issues outside of their focus. This is a conference of U.S. Mayors and whether they are active participants or not, they get information with regard to that activity. Jeff Corkill stated that he agrees with Commissioner Mielke on that. He thinks that if SCAPCA wants to make a decision, it would have to preface it by saying we're only concerned with air quality issues. Commissioner Harris added that he wouldn't have a problem with sending a letter to all the Mayors in the County and say that enclosed is a copy of the SCAPCA Mission Statement and what we are trying to accomplish and this is what we look at. Michele Pope stated that we are being pulled into this by an entity and I don't think that it is appropriate for SCAPCA to respond. If the Mayors want to here from us, we can then deal with it, but if they don't then she doesn't think that they should do anything. Jeff Corkill added that what they could do is write to all of those in Spokane County and point out to them some of the issues that are being brought up in this document are not in consensus with the SCAPCA Mission. Matthew Pederson added that maybe the Mayors have already considered this action and they may have decided on their own not to participate in this program and if this did happen and a third party asked this Board to lobby on their behalf to put pressure on those Mayors to take part in the program which they may or may not agree with, he believes that this is outside the parameters of SCAPCA's Mission.

Commissioner Harris stated that the Board not take any action on this today, wait until they get further information before taking action. Matthew Pederson stated that with no motion being made, there is no action on this item.

8. Report on the Executive Director Search Committee – Matthew Pederson

Matthew Pederson gave an overview of the search for the Executive Director position. The job posting closed on February 28th. The search committee met March 1st to start the evaluation process of applications. We received 36 applications of which have been narrowed down to eight applicants. We will meet again March 9th at 6:00 p.m. and further the process to bring it to five applicants and then begin phone interviews at a later date. Michele Pope elaborated that once they've done the five interviews, they will cut it down to three applicants and then it will come to the Board for final decision.

Matthew Pederson had a concern that in the beginning when the search committee was set up there were three Board Members on that committee. With the addition of Jeff Corkill to the SCAPCA Board, who came from the Advisory Council of SCAPCA where he was chosen to be on the search committee, makes four Board Members on the search committee. He does not believe that the committee can operate independently of the Board with the majority of the search committee being Board Members. Michele Pope stated that there are three other members that are very active in their input. Matthew Pederson added that Beth Fifield-Hodgson has done a tremendous job at leading this search committee. Commissioner Mielke stated that the Board should make an offer to Tom Brattebo to take the seat as the Advisory Council representative on the selection committee in place of Jeff Corkill. Commissioner Harris stated that one of the four Board Members cannot be at the meeting because it was not advertised as a public meeting and the majority of this Board will be setting in that meeting and it would be a violation of the meeting laws. Commissioner Harris withdrew from the search committee and the decision was made for Tom Brattebo to sit on the search committee from the Advisory Council.

9. Board Concerns

a. Selection of Chair and Vice-Chair for 2006

Commissioner Harris moved to reappoint Matthew Pederson as Chair for the year 2006 and delay the Vice-Chair appointment to the next regularly scheduled meeting and Jeff Corkill seconded it. Motion passed unanimously.

b. Informational item only “Proposed Rulemaking for Asbestos Program Amendment & Fee Schedule” Memo

Ron Edgar put this item in the board packet to keep the Board up-to-date. It has been sent out for stakeholder comment and to the asbestos abatement people for comments. Prior to it going to the public, etc. it will come back to the Board for review.

c. Other

Ron Edgar and the Board welcomed Jeff Corkill to the SCAPCA Board. There were no other concerns.

10. Public Forum

Dale Smith of Elk Chattaroy questioned who was patrolling and taking care of the smoke that is coming out of some of the houses. He sees more of it all the time and knows there is one less person patrolling the area. His main concern is out in the urban and rural areas very few people are being reprimanded for burning garbage or whatever. When the fire departments see smoke, they don't even go in to check on it unless the conditions are dry. It seems to him that the Ecology Department, Fire Department and DNR would get together so that they can catch more people burning illegally. It is getting worse especially on Saturday and Sundays. Ron Edgar stated that staff is not assigned to weekends except when it gets closer to the eight yard and garden burning days. The inspectors do industrial inspections and this limits the time they have to respond to complaints and limits the time they have to be out patrolling areas. Dale stated that he sees more and more burning on the weekends because these people know that there is nobody around and by the time Monday comes, all the evidence is gone. It seems like we need somebody on a Saturday and Sunday and how do you work with the Fire Departments in the different rural areas when there is smoke and so on. Ron replied that if a Fire Department forwards a complaint or run report to SCAPCA, a complaint is drawn up and an inspector goes out and collects information, photos, etc. to determine if there was illegal material being burned and they also get information from the Fire Department and then possibly issue a Notice of Violation. The Fire Department's responsibility is when there is a threat to public safety because of the fire. DNR's jurisdiction is the forested areas around your home and outside of your yard and garden areas. Dale believes that there should be rules that state the time when fires are to be put out. DNR's fires burn for days and that isn't right when other people have to have their fires out by 5:00 p.m. Ron replied that because of the way the legislation has been written by the state, SCAPCA cannot stop DNR fires. SCAPCA and DNR try to work together when writing permits that are close to the urban/rural boundaries so that the fires have to be out by 5:00 p.m. Larger forest debris operations where there are harvests, etc. and the piles are large, it is not practical to put them out every night. Jeff Corkill told Dale that he should do a complaint because they can be kept anonymous. Brenda Smits added that the fire department and DNR do refer burning complaints to SCAPCA and SCAPCA does respond to them.

The meeting adjourned at 11:39 a.m.

The next Board Meeting will be April 6, 2006 at 9:30 a.m. in the lower level of the Public Works Building.

MATTHEW PEDERSON, CHAIR

RON EDGAR, SECRETARY