

Federal Advisory Committee Act  
Clean Air Act Advisory Committee

**Mobile Sources Technical Review Subcommittee**

---

Co-Chairs: Mr. Drew Kodjak and Ms. Gay MacGregor

Designated Federal Official: Ms. Elizabeth Etchells

Summary of the Subcommittee's Meeting on May 7, 2014  
Chicago, IL

**Introduction/Opening Remarks**

The meeting was called to order at approximately 9:00 am on May 7, 2014. Mr. Drew Kodjak welcomed everyone to the meeting, reviewed the agenda, and asked all subcommittee members and persons in attendance to introduce themselves. Ms. Gay MacGregor asked for a vote on the minutes of the October 29, 2013 MSTRS meeting (approved).

Mr. Karl Simon welcomed everyone in attendance and stated that the Office of Transportation and Air Quality (OTAQ) director, Mr. Christopher Grundler, is in Washington D.C., where the EPA's light duty greenhouse gas team was nominated for a prestigious award. Mr. Simon gave an overview of the status of ongoing work at OTAQ. The Tier 3 vehicle emissions and fuel standards (Tier 3) have been a significant activity for OTAQ and have the potential to achieve very large emission reductions; however, there is significant work remaining to implement the rule. The EPA has continued efforts to reduce emissions from ocean going vessels by implementing emission control areas (ECA). A one-year progress report was released on the status of the light duty vehicle greenhouse gas (GHG) emission standards program that showed manufacturers were on track, and the EPA is pleased with the progress of the transition to the new standards. The EPA is also busy implementing Phase I of the heavy duty vehicle emission standards. Mr. Simon also highlighted the cooperation between the Canada and the U.S. on emission standards.

Mr. Simon stated that the EPA continues to operate with diminished resources and has shifted resources to compliance. The EPA's nonroad/offroad program is looking into compliance issues with imported Chinese products. The EPA is also focusing on reducing in-use gasoline sulfur levels through implementation of the Tier 3 standards. The EPA's regulatory agenda going forward will be climate-focused, and a key priority will be the development of a regulatory proposal for Phase II of the heavy duty vehicle GHG emission standards.

Activities to address aircraft emissions were also discussed, including an endangerment finding for GHG emissions from aircraft, and the development of international standards for particulate matter (PM) lead emissions from aviation gasoline. The EPA also plans to consider railway emission sources, nonroad engines, and the commercial marine sector. The EPA is moving towards a "place-based" approach in their activities, especially in situations where national solutions may not be the best option. Mr. Simon noted the EPA's ports initiative as an example of a place-based approach, and referred to the EPA's Port Stakeholders Summit held in Baltimore on April, 8, 2014.

Lastly, Mr. Simon stated that stakeholders to EPA regulatory actions have raised numerous concerns that, while not being actively pursued, are under consideration for potential future action. Mr. Simon thanked the SmartWay workgroup and stated that the SmartWay recommendations report was

received and is currently undergoing review by the EPA Administrator. Mr. Simon also remarked that 2014 is SmartWay's 10-year anniversary.

### *Discussion*

Mr. Don Anair expressed his approval of the progress report for implementation of light-duty vehicle GHG emission standards, and asked if the EPA was planning on developing a similar report for heavy duty vehicle emission standards. Mr. Simon stated that the EPA currently plans to develop a similar report.

Mr. Steve Flint stated that New York has been re-designated as in attainment for the PM<sub>2.5</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), and expressed appreciation to OTAQ for their assistance. Mr. Flint further stated that States are commencing monitoring for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub>, and OTAQ should be engaged in the monitoring process which will provide useful data for the EPA. Mr. Simon responded that OTAQ will consider the additional data. Ms. Meg Patulski stated that the EPA is closely following the progress of the monitoring program and especially how the monitoring program will be implemented. Mr. Kodjak asked when monitoring is expected to be completed. Mr. Flint responded that NO<sub>2</sub> monitors are currently on the ground and PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitoring may take another year.

Mr. Barry Wallerstein thanked OTAQ for their efforts in promulgating the Tier 3 standards and referenced the recent federal court decision that will require the EPA to promulgate new standards for ground level ozone. He stated that if the EPA lowers the ozone standard from 75 parts per billion (ppb) to 60 or 70 ppb, then additional mobile source controls will need to be implemented, and specifically, the EPA will need to evaluate the progression of technologies and fuels. Emission standards for Southern California will result in a 75 percent reduction in NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. Mr. Wallerstein also stated that in the future, it will be important to evaluate the climate impacts of promulgated standards.

Mr. Kodjak remarked that the effective date of the North America ECA was upheld at the 66<sup>th</sup> session of the Maritime Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) of the International Maritime Organization (IMO). Mr. Kodjak also stated that the Tier 3 standards are significantly lower than the next most stringent standards in the world, the Euro VI standards.

### **Presentations**

Presentations are posted online at the MSTRS website: [http://www.epa.gov/air/caaac/mobile\\_sources.html](http://www.epa.gov/air/caaac/mobile_sources.html). As the presentations are posted for public view, the notes below primarily reflect the discussions that occurred in response to the presentations.

### **Canada-U.S. Collaboration, Vehicle and Engine Emission Control – Karl Simon, EPA, Ed Crupi, Environment Canada**

Mr. Ed Crupi commenced the presentation with a history of collaboration between Canada and the United States to reduce transportation emissions, including through the Canada-U.S. Air Quality Agreement (AQA). The Canada-U.S. Air Quality Committee (AQC) approved a work plan in 2007 for collaboration on vehicle and engine emission control. Environment Canada (EC) is currently developing regulations to align their standards with EPA's Tier 3 standards. Collaboration between EC and EPA has broadened to include GHG emission regulations for on-road vehicles. The EC and EPA are also collaborating on compliance testing, data sharing, research and development activities, and non-

mandatory programs such as the expansion of SmartWay into Canada. Canada and the U.S. collaborate to reduce marine emissions through the IMO, including through a joint ECA. In February 2011, Canada and the U.S. announced the creation of the Regulatory Cooperation Council (RCC) with the objective of better aligning regulatory approaches in several areas, including the environment, between the two countries. The RCC includes initiatives for light duty vehicles and locomotives in addition to other emission sources.

### *Discussion*

Dr. Robert Sawyer asked if the motor fuel standards of Canada and the U.S. are aligned. Mr. Crupi responded that the standards of the two countries, in general, are aligned. Standards for the amount of sulfur in fuel are aligned; although, Canada does not regulate some other components of fuels that are regulated in the U.S. Mr. Wallerstein asked if octane improvers were regulated in Canada, such as manganese. Mr. Crupi responded that there are no regulations for manganese octane improvers in Canada; however, manganese is not currently used in Canada.

Mr. Viera commended the cooperation efforts between EC and the EPA and asked what differences exist in regulations between the two countries. Mr. Crupi responded that although some regulations for components in fuel may not be the same, the real world fuel content in Canada is aligned with fuel content in the U.S. Regulations for key components of fuel, such as sulfur, are currently aligned with U.S. regulations or are planned to be aligned.

Mr. Wallerstein stated that the high level of cooperation between Canada and the U.S. is a tremendous success story and should be replicated with other countries, such as Mexico, and with broad support from the private sector. Mr. Simon responded that the EPA has worked on such a cooperation program with Mexico and believes that there is potential for progress in the future. Mexico's capacity (i.e., infrastructure) for regulatory cooperation with the U.S. has previously been an issue. Further, Mexico accepts both European and U.S. vehicle models, which makes standards collaboration more difficult. Mr. Wallerstein asked if the EPA's efforts included convincing the Mexican government of the benefits of such a collaboration. Mr. John Viera responded affirmatively and referenced talks with the Mexican government on how Mexico could align their standards with those of the U.S., though the alignment would not be on the same level of standards currently implemented in the U.S. Mr. Alberto Ayala stated that alignment of emission standards with Mexico is a priority for California's governor, Jerry Brown. There is a potential plan this year to align light duty and heavy duty vehicle emission standards between Mexico and the U.S. Mr. Kodjak stated that there have been many years of inactivity in Mexico in setting vehicle emission standards. However, Mr. Kodjak voiced optimism as there is a new administration there that has already promulgated light duty vehicle emission standards.

Mr. Reynaldo Agama stated that a meeting between the Mexico and the U.S. is planned for June 8th to discuss the ECA. Dr. Kindberg supported additional discussions outside of the subcommittee meeting on establishing an ECA for Mexico.

Ms. Jacky Grimshaw asked the EPA if there was a timetable for addressing emissions from locomotive sources. Mr. Simon responded that the EPA plans to create a voluntary program for GHG locomotive emissions by the end of the year. He also stated that Canada is working to adopt the criteria pollutant emission standards the U.S. currently has in place for locomotives by next year.

Mr. Anair asked about the scope of the voluntary action plan for locative emissions. Mr. Simon responded that the program is still in the early stages, but additional information is provided in the public webinars posted at the RCC's website.

Dr. Lee Kindberg stated that the alignment of the ECA between Canada and the U.S. is helpful for vessels that travel internationally. However, the lack of enforcement of marine vessel emission standards by Europe is problematic because the same vessels can be subject to varying standards depending on their location.

### **Overview of Rail Operations in Chicago – Frank Acevedo, EPA**

Chicago is a primary transportation hub for the nation and is North America's primary rail hub. The railway is used to transport the largest percentage ton-miles of freight in the U.S. (39.5 percent). Marine, aircraft, and rail emission sources account for one percent of total VOC emitted by all sources (including point, on-road, area, etc.), five percent of PM, and 13 percent of NO<sub>x</sub>. Mr. Acevedo provided an overview of various rail yards in Chicago, many of which are located in close proximity to neighborhoods. The overview included potential emission sources and emission reduction programs at each rail yard.

#### *Discussion*

Mr. Wallerstein asked if any risk assessments for toxic emissions have been performed to determine the level of carcinogenic risk in areas surrounding the rail yards. Mr. Acevedo replied that risk assessments have not been performed for the rail yards. Mr. Wallerstein stated that the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has previously conducted risk assessments on rail yards, and the highest risk observed in these assessments was 500 in a million, which is substantial.

Mr. Ayala asked if there were any plans to conduct any risk assessments. Mr. Acevedo replied that first, an accurate inventory of emissions at rail yards is needed, which is difficult to obtain due to confidential business information (CBI) claims by industry. However, the EPA is moving in the direction of obtaining more data that could be used in risk assessments.

Mr. Anair asked how the EPA measures rail yard impacts to surrounding populations and if there have been any emission inventories performed. Mr. Acevedo responded that no detailed emission inventories have been developed and that most of the existing emissions information is estimated and is primarily for locomotives and switchers. Information necessary to inventory emissions from other sources, such as cranes, is difficult to obtain from industry.

Mr. Philip Heirigs asked if a local ordinance or rule was implemented to reduce emissions from idling trucks, in reference to a program implemented at a rail yard discussed during Mr. Acevedo's presentation. Mr. Acevedo responded that no local ordinances or restrictions were enacted, and the reductions were achieved through cooperation between rail companies and the trucking sector, noting that these actions may have been motivated by complaints from surrounding neighborhoods.

### **Norfolk Southern Locomotive Fleet Overview – Herbert Smith, Norfolk Southern**

High capital expenditures are necessary to operate a rail fleet, including the cost to purchase and maintain locomotives, invest in new technology, etc. There are more road/line-haul/long-distance

locomotives than yard/local/switching locomotives. Only new road locomotives are manufactured and purchased, so it is easier to meet regulations for road locomotives than for yard locomotives. Emission standards are phased in 4 tiers, and separate standards are provided for road and yard locomotives. Norfolk Southern is converting their road fleet to meet the higher tiered standards. While the majority of road fleet locomotives are Tier 1 and Tier 1+ with a substantial number of Tier 2 and Tier 3 locomotives, the majority of yard fleet locomotives are Tier 0 and Tier 0+. Numerous challenges exist for reducing emissions from yard locomotives, including that no true switcher or reliable yard locomotives are currently built, and older road locomotives can no longer be cascaded down to yard service because they are too big. Norfolk Southern has been experimenting with different technologies to reduce emissions from locomotives, including gensets, retrofit kits, slugs, electric layover systems, and battery powered locomotives.

### *Discussion*

Mr. Wallerstein stated that yard locomotives are a significant source of emissions that impact local communities, and cascading road locomotives down to yard locomotives as a means of reducing future yard locomotive emissions may be inadequate. Mr. Wallerstein would like to see fleet turnover be expedited, and stated that the EPA could have an important role in that. Further, it is important that consideration be given to the types of technologies and emission control strategies that could be incorporated into the new Tier 4 regulations. Mr. Wallerstein commented that very large cost savings could be realized from conversion to natural gas, which may motivate rail companies to act quicker. Natural gas would also eliminate or reduce the need to stop and refuel the locomotive, resulting in increased efficiency. Mr. Wallerstein further commented on the potential for battery powered locomotives, including the possibility of using battery power in urban areas and running on diesel in more remote areas. Everyone should work together to bring these new technologies to the locomotive fleet. Mr. Smith responded that the price of natural gas fluctuates, and building the infrastructure to support natural gas locomotives is a sunk cost. The railroad industry would gravitate towards natural gas locomotives if they determined that natural gas was cost-effective. Mr. Wallerstein responded that it may be possible that federal agencies could help with fueling infrastructure costs to encourage the rail industry to switch to natural gas.

Mr. Robert Babik asked why yard locomotives are no longer manufactured. Mr. Smith responded that, in the past, road locomotives were cascaded down to be used as yard locomotives, however, this is no longer feasible because modern road locomotives are too large. One reason that only road locomotives are manufactured is that railroad companies realize the largest return on investment by purchasing road locomotives. In addition, kits were devised to allow road locomotives to be used as yard locomotives. Mr. Dana Lowell commented that new locomotives are not built because you would have to comply with new regulations. Therefore, it is cheaper to retrofit old road locomotives with kits than to build new yard locomotives.

### **CREATE Overview – Yamilee Volcy, DOT/FHWA**

Ms. Volcy commenced the presentation with an overview of the Chicago area rail infrastructure, discussing track and rail yards in the area, daily activity, and the amount of freight that passes through Chicago. To improve transportation flow through the city, the Chicago Region Environmental and Transportation Efficiency Program (CREATE) was formed through a 3.8 billion public-private partnership. The program focuses on increasing capacity, speed and reliability for freight train traffic; separating freight and passenger trains at key junctions; and eliminating a number of road/rail grade

crossings. The CREATE program includes 70 construction projects that are in various phases of planning/implementation. Some of the benefits of CREATE projects include reduced wait time for commuters, reduced wait times at rail crossings for motorists, reduced noise from idling trucks and locomotives, and reduced emissions from cars, trucks and locomotives.

*Discussion*

Due to time constraints, questions were held until after the last presentation in this group of presentations about goods movement in the Chicago rail hub.

**Emission Reduction Strategies: Leveraging CMAQ Funding – John Donovan, DOT/FHWA**

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds projects that reduce congestion and improve air quality. Fiscal year 2014 funding includes \$2.2 billion nationally and \$100 million for the Chicago region. For a program to be eligible for CMAQ funding it must be a transportation project, generate an emissions reduction, and be located in or benefit a nonattainment region. CMAQ is administered by State DOTs and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and broad discretion is given to advance regional priorities. For fiscal year 2014-2018, \$582 million will be given out through CMAQ for over 50 regional projects.

*Discussion*

Due to time constraints, questions were held until after the last presentation in this group of presentations about goods movement in the Chicago rail hub.

**Cicero RARE Rail Study – Frank Acevedo, EPA (for Carolyn Persoon, EPA)**

The goals of Phase 1 of the study are to develop an accurate inventory at rail yards, model PM concentrations from the inventory, and measure PM at three stationary monitoring sites. Modeling suggests that rail yards can be a significant source of diesel PM in adjacent neighborhoods. The study also showed that implementation of various control strategies for locomotive engines resulted in significant emission reductions. The goals of phase 2 of the study are to compare mobile monitoring to stationary modeling of black carbon and characterize the rail yard contributions to local air quality impacts. The stationary monitor was unable to attribute PM concentrations to specific sources. The mobile monitor showed high PM and black carbon concentrations during peak activity at the rail yard. The study is expected to be released in June.

*Discussion*

Mr. Ayala stated that he was surprised to see such weak correlations in the monitoring data derived from the study and asked if there were plans to conduct modeling to inform the correlations. Mr. Acevedo responded that the Office of Research and Development (ORD) would decide whether to conduct additional modeling. He noted that the research grant has ended, and currently, there are no plans for a Phase 3 of the study that would further investigate the results. He also stated that it would be difficult to fully evaluate the correlations observed in the study without a better emissions inventory.

## **MOVES Workgroup Recommendations – Gay MacGregor, EPA**

Ms. MacGregor stated that the MOVES workgroup recommendations report was recently finished, and the release of MOVES 2014 is imminent. Ms. MacGregor asked for comments on the recommendations report. Mr. Heirigs stated that more specificity is needed in the reports, such as in the tabulated section. For example, when the report identifies a research project that is being conducted, the report should state whether the research has been completed or is ongoing, and identify the full date of research progress (e.g., “beginning in the fall of 2014”, instead of “beginning in the fall”). Mr. Heirigs also requested that the report include more references and citations, where appropriate. Ms. MacGregor stated that the report would be sent back to the workgroup for revisions and would be resubmitted.

## **Assessing Port Emissions – Meg Patulski, EPA**

Ports are the main gateway for U.S. trade and are critical to the economies of many cities and regions. In recent years, there has been a growing emphasis on globalization of trade and the transportation infrastructure needed to support that trade. As port infrastructure continues to grow, the environmental impact of ports must be considered. The EPA has established a Ports Initiative, which has the goal of developing and implementing an environmentally sustainable port strategy to build a more sustainable ports system, create healthy air quality for communities, and reduce climate risk while supporting the economy and jobs. While existing emissions and exposure data is useful, additional work through this initiative will improve the understanding of port emissions, the impacts of those emissions, and the effectiveness of emission reduction strategies. Numerous previous port assessments were reviewed by EPA, including the 2008 OTAQ Port Study. The EPA plans to develop a port assessment and provide MSTRS with updates on future progress.

### *Discussion*

Ms. Grimshaw asked if there was an aggregate number for the amount of minority populations affected by ports based on the 2008 OTAQ port study. Ms. Patulski responded that of the total population affected (exposed to  $PM_{2.5} > 2 \text{ ug/m}^3$ ) by ports nationally, 31% are minorities and 10% earn lower income (< \$10,000).

Mr. Anair asked if the ports assessment would only be conducted in nonattainment areas. Ms. Patulski responded that, while nonattainment areas will be the focus of the assessment, they will not be the only areas included. Mr. Anair stated that it would also be useful to include ports in attainment areas, as there may still be local health impacts to populations in these areas. He also noted that freight is the fastest growing source of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, and when the EPA is considering control technologies, the levels of emission reductions needed to protect populations living in the vicinity of ports should be considered. There is a challenge in expanding the freight infrastructure in communities that are already overburdened.

Mr. Arthur Marin asked how monetized health benefits will incorporate emissions from ports as well as the ambient/background pollutant concentration. Ms. Patulski responded that background pollutant concentration will not be considered in the ports assessment, and only the contribution from ports will be considered. Mr. Marin stated that the sources of air pollution are irrelevant to the community, and noted that states frequently quantify background air pollution, including future air pollution, in State Implementation Plans (SIPs). Ms. Patulski stated that budget constraints of the EPA could limit the types of analyses included in the ports assessment.

Mr. Wallerstein asked if the EPA has a unit risk estimate for cancer that is used in risk assessments, such as the cancer risk values used in California to assess the risk to local populations. Ms. Patulski responded that the risks associated with ports are not specifically related to cancer. Mr. Wallerstein stated that based on multiple air toxic exposure studies conducted in California, the port areas had especially high cancer risk relative to other areas. He also stated that the results of these analyses created pressure from multiple parties to address emissions from ports. Similar to CARB's work with diesel exhaust, he noted that it can be more effective to express risk assessment results in terms of cancer or other health indices. Mr. Wallerstein further mentioned that if the EPA does not do this type of risk assessment, other parties will conduct assessments using EPA emission inventories, which could lead to other issues. Ms. MacGregor stated that the EPA received a recommendation to establish a risk factor for cancer, however, no risk factor has currently been established. She noted that the EPA is aware of this issue.

Dr. Kindberg commented that the EPA is using a 2011 baseline emissions inventory, which is outdated in 2014. Dr. Kindberg asked if the EPA can acquire data on newer technologies so that the port assessment is based on more current information from the beginning. She noted that the ECA was passed after 2011, which will significantly affect baseline emissions. Also, there are currently fewer vessels with higher capacity utilization than in 2011. Further, Dr. Kindberg stated that the maritime industry is expecting three to four percent growth, as opposed to the 10 percent growth previously assumed by the EPA. For these reasons, she suggests the EPA consult with industry and a better baseline should be established for the port emissions assessment. Ms. Patulski responded that the 2011 National Emissions Inventory (NEI) is the most current version and takes into account all regulatory requirements at the time. She noted that future emission projections will account for any new technologies, and the 2011 NEI will be supplemented with EPA's own data. She also mentioned that future projections will be consistent with the ECA.

Dr. Kindberg commented that the international community does not understand that the number of cancer cases estimated in EPA's risk assessments are estimates and not diagnosed cases, and she suggested that such results need to be carefully communicated.

Dr. Kindberg commented that potential emissions from the Panama Canal expansion project will not be at the level that is projected by the media. She remarked that enlarging ports and the canal will not necessarily result in more containers traveling through the ports, but may result in fewer but larger ships that will be subject to newer standards.

Mr. Heirigs stated that the EPA should attempt to acquire activity data from ports, including data from other operations, such as cargo handling, to conduct a more useful and accurate assessment.

Mr. Ayala stated that risk assessments and the need for a current risk value would be a good discussion point for another meeting as it will also be important for other topics. Mr. Ayala also commented that the California freight strategy focused on how to get to zero or near zero emissions, and asked the EPA what role zero technologies will play in the ports assessment. Ms. Patulski thanked Mr. Ayala for the information and asked about the level of detail of the California freight strategy and if it focused on specific strategies. Mr. Ayala responded that he would be happy to have a dialogue about zero technologies with the EPA.



Mr. Kodjak asked if there was a general timeline for the ports assessment. Ms. Patulski responded that the EPA is doing preliminary work now and plans to work through the middle of next year. The EPA is exploring additional work that could take more time, and she hopes to have more details about the timeline at the next MSTRS meeting.

### **US Port Emissions Overview and Research Directions – Drew Kodjak, ICCT**

Port emissions are a health, climate, and environmental justice issue. Of the number of people exposed to diesel PM and experiencing a cancer risk near ports, a larger percentage are minorities as compared to the baseline percentage of minorities across the U.S.; while a smaller percentage of those exposed are white as compared to the percentage of white people across the U.S. There is a variety of approaches that can be used to address port emissions, including fuel standards, equipment standards, port electrification and voluntary programs. An example of an emission reduction plan for ports was presented for the Port of Long Beach. ICCT conducted a study to create recommendations for a voluntary port recognition program focused on air pollution. The study included the 18 largest container ports in the U.S., and found that ports are implementing a wide range of emission reduction programs at different stages. The study also found that the preferences of ports for an environmental recognition program include a tiered approach, a menu or multiple options approach, and self-determined benchmarks or indicators.

#### *Discussion*

There were no questions or discussion following this presentation.

### **Advancing More Sustainable Ports – Cheryl Bynum, EPA, Lee Kindberg, Maersk, Mike Moltzen, EPA**

The EPA has held multiple meetings on ports with stakeholders, scientists and community groups. All webinar presentations, transcripts and Q&As are posted on EPA's ports website: <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/ports>. The EPA also held the Advancing Sustainable Ports summit and technical workshop in April, 2014 in Baltimore, MD. Many people at the summit were new to the process, leading to dynamic discussions. The EPA heard significant concerns from the Environmental Justice community. Dr. Kindberg commented that a voluntary recognition program for ports would need to be more than a "plaque on the wall" program, and would need to actually drive change. An example of such a program is the Leadership in Environmental Engineering and Design (LEED) program. There is also a need for harmonization of programs for emission reductions at ports.

The creation of a workgroup within MSTRS to advise EPA on port sustainability was proposed. The charge of the workgroup will be to inform the development and implementation of an EPA-led voluntary ports initiative and to determine how to effectively measure air quality and GHG performance of ports.

#### *Discussion*

Ms. MacGregor read the charge of the new workgroup and stated that the workgroup would help drive change at ports. Workgroup members are typically added based on need, such as the addition of a community member who can express environmental justice concerns. A work plan will need to be developed for the new workgroup.

Mr. Simon stated that other activities that the EPA is undertaking regarding ports will harmonize with the workgroup process.

Ms. Grimshaw asked how the workgroup will define ports (i.e., sea or inland). Ms. MacGregor responded that the EPA would appreciate recommendations on the scope of the workgroup.

Mr. Flint stated that the charge of the workgroup is broad, considering the term “environmental achievement.” Mr. Flint asked if the workgroup would only focus on mobile sources, considering that there are other non-mobile sources at ports, such as refineries. Ms. MacGregor responded that the intent is for the workgroup to only focus on mobile source air emissions, but may include other emissions sources in the future.

Mr. Luke Tonachel asked if electric utilities have been engaged as stakeholders in the ports assessment process. Mr. Tonachel suggested that the EPA include electric utilities in the process and should also consider involving ports who have implemented electrification strategies for emission reductions. Ms. MacGregor responded that electric utilities have not been engaged to her knowledge.

Mr. Anair asked the EPA if any goals have been defined for the workgroup in terms of outcomes. Dr. Kindberg stated that some work has been done to develop guiding principles, but stated that this should be one of the first tasks of the workgroup.

Ms. Pamela Campos asked how the workgroup will be structured to enable the broader goal of serving particular communities, considering that the workgroup is a technical advisory workgroup with science and policy-related expertise. She suggested that the EPA should consider whether effective local community advocacy experience is a type of expertise worth seeking to include as part of the workgroup. She also asked whether financial assistance will be provided. Ms. Macgregor stated that community members with technical expertise could be included in the workgroup. Further, speakers can be invited to inform the workgroup without the speakers necessarily being members. Ms. Grimshaw commented that community members have a sufficient base of knowledge and would be able to participate well within the workgroup, as many community members do extensive research on pollutants that are affecting their communities. Mr. Mike Moltzen stated that the workgroup can draw from the work of the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council (NEJAC) to inform the community involvement process. Ms. MacGregor stated that the EPA office of Environmental Justice was helpful in assisting community members to attend the ports summit in Baltimore.

Mr. Kodjak commented that given the close cooperation between Canada and the U.S., Canada (and possibly Mexico) could be included in the workgroup process.

Mr. Lowell asked how the new workgroup would fit with the SmartWay program, given that recommendations for SmartWay include consideration of expanding to other modalities. Ms. Bynum responded that SmartWay addresses emissions from the route, whereas the new workgroup would be the first attempt to cover emission from a place or node. The two programs would complement each other. Dr. Kindberg stated that SmartWay would help inform the process of implementing a new workgroup. Mr. Lowell stated that there could be issues with double counting between the programs.

Dr. Sawyer asked about the level of competition between ports, which could affect the ports’ willingness to comply with emission reduction programs, and whether ports are expanding capabilities

to attract more shipping. Dr. Kindberg stated that some ports are more competitive than others, and ports do court the large shippers. There was also discussion about carriers and shippers and how each would be involved in the new workgroup or in a ports initiative.

Ms. MacGregor asked subcommittee members to contact her by e-mail if they are interested in joining the workgroup by the end of the week. She said that after including MSTRS members, other people will be added and can be drawn from people the MSTRS members suggest. She stated that the goal would be to have 15 people total on the workgroup.

Mr. Anair asked what the commitment level of the workgroup would be. Ms. MacGregor responded that there are typically meetings in the afternoon before the MSTRS meeting, in addition to periodic webinars and conference calls. The time commitment varies. The EPA staff also does a lot of work in addition to the workgroup. Ms. MacGregor asked for feedback on how everyone likes meeting in a regional office as compared to Washington D.C.

Ms. Amy Lily voiced support for including site visits with meetings.

Ms. MacGregor informed the subcommittee that a survey monkey or doodle poll would be sent out to request information about dates for the fall MSTRS meeting.

Mr. Kodjak thanked the subcommittee members and adjourned the meeting.

**Mobile Sources Technical Review Subcommittee**

May 7, 2014

**Presenters and Subcommittee Members in Attendance**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Acevedo, Frank	EPA	X
Adler, Ken	EPA	
Agama, Reynaldo	Caterpillar	X
Anair, Don	Union of Concerned Scientists	X
Ayala, Alberto	California Air Resources Board	X
Babik, Robert	General Motors	X
Bynum, Cheryl	EPA	X
Campos, Pamela	Environmental Defense Fund	X
Chason Lindsay	Home Depot	X
Crupi, Ed	Environment Canada	X
Donovan, John	DOT/FHWA	X
Flint, Steve	NYDEP	X
Gautam, Mridul	Mid-Atlantic Research Institute	X
Grimshaw, Jacky	Center for Neighborhood Technology	X
Heirigs, Philip	Chevron	X
Jorgensen, Robert	Cummins	X
Kairis, Mindy (for Mike Leister)	Marathon Petroleum	X
Kindberg, Lee	Maersk	X
Kodjak, Drew	ICCT	X
Kubsh, Joseph	MECA	X
Lilly, Amy (for Deborah Baker)	Hyundai	X
Lowell, Dana (for Thomas Balon)	MJ Bradley and Associates	X
MacGregor, Gay	EPA	X
Marin, Arthur	NESCAUM	X
Moltzen, Mike	EPA	X
Patulski, Meg	EPA	X

Persoon, Carolyn	EPA	X
Polovick, Buddy	EPA	
Sakai, Ichiro	American Hondo Motor Co.	
Sawyer, Robert	American Lung Association in CA	X
Simon, Karl	EPA	X
Smith, Herbert	Norfolk Southern	X
Standlee, Christopher	Abengoa Energy	
Tennent, Christine	Corning	X
Viera, John	Ford	X
Tonachel, Luke (for Roland Hwang)	NRDC	X
Volcy, Yamilee	DOT/FHWA	X
Wallerstein, Barry	SCAQMD	X

#### Attendees

Name	Organization	Attendance
Fred Walas	Marathon Petroleum	X
Roy Mann	CNH	X
Jim Kliesch	Honda	X
Patty Strabbing	Chrysler	X
Mark Monohan	NGK	X

#### Contractor Support

Name	Organization	Attendance
Lesley Stobert	EC/R Incorporated	X
Alden West	EC/R Incorporated	X