CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

The meeting of the Air Pollution Control Board was held Tuesday, February 24, 2011.
At the Municipal Services Building, 1401 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, 16th Floor, Room Y.

Eddie R. Battle, Chairman, presided:

ATTENDING:

MEMBERS: Eddie Battle, Chair of the APCB
Nan Feyler, Chief of Staff, Dept of Public Health Commissioner's Office
Joseph O. Minott, Member, APCB
Tom Edwards, Member, APCB
Dr. Arthur L Frank, Member, APCB
Eric Thumma, Member, APCB
Dr. Shannon P. Marquez, APCB

STAFF: Thomas Huynh, Director, Air Management Services (AMS)
Edward Braun, Program Manager, AMS
Henry Kim, Chief, Program Services, AMS
Roger Fey, Chief of Facility Compliance, AMS
Edward Wiener, Chief, Source Registration, AMS
Alison Riley, Voluntary Programs Coordinator, AMS
Kassahun Sellassie, Engineering Supervisor, AMS
Patrick O'Neill, Council for the City of Philadelphia
Dennis Yuen, Council for the City of Philadelphia

GUESTS: Scott Evans, Army Corps of Engineers

WELCOME

(Whereupon, the proceedings commenced at approximately 2:06 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN BATTLE: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Eddie Battle. I chair the Air Pollution Control Board.

Today is Thursday, February 24, 2011. It is two o'clock, and we are in session**.** I would like move on. We'll introduce ourselves and members of the Board.

MR. MILLER: Bill Miller, Temple University.

MR. THUMMA: Eric Thumma, Board Member, citizen of Philadelphia.

MS. FEYLER: Nan Feyler, Chief of Staff Department of Public Health.

CHAIRMAN BATTLE: You know me.

MR. MINOTT: Joe Minott, Board Member.

MR. HUYNH: Tom Huynh, Air Management Services Director

CHAIRMAN BATTLE: Tom is not a member of the Board, but he is -- he's Director of Air Management Services as he said.

2. ACTION ON MINUTES

CHAIRMAN BATTLE: Let's move to number two, Minutes. Have you had an opportunity to review your minutes? Do you have any additions or corrections to the minutes? Then with your permission, we'll accept the minutes.

PROGRAM UPDATE

CHAIRMAN BATTLE: Number three, Program Updates. Tom?

MR. HUYNH: (provided an update). (See attached).

(Questions about the Program Update)

MR. THUMMA: As far as the State Implementation Plan being in non-attainment - If the SIP is in non-attainment can we use other deductions to come into attainment?

MR. THUMMA: So what you mean is, if you have to write a SIP. What you put in your SIP has to be in your attainment area. We can't say we're going to use something not in our attainment area.

MR. HUYNH: Like from Delaware?

MS. FEYLER: You have to manage what Philly does.

MR. THUMMA: We're not going to rely on Pittsburgh?

MR. HUYNH: This is the proposal, and I guess we will have to work with DEP on the comments to EPA if there would be any comments that need to be submitted but I am not really sure at this time.

MR. THUMMA: Do you know how the rest of the State did on the 8-hour attainment? Is there any other data?

MR. HUYNH: I think they had some out in Allentown and Lancaster and also Allegheny but last year we had 25 in Philadelphia, but the State itself, I think, they had about 30. So they had days exceeding the standard when Philadelphia did not. Allegheny has more problems with PM 2.5 than we do.

MR. BATTLE: Staying on that point - Tom can you explain the 25 unhealthy days? Can you explain who is impacted by the unhealthy days? People with asthmas you say we had x number of unhealthy days. What does that look like for the population?

MR. HUYNH: Okay, the National Ambient Air Quality Standard is set by the EPA based on the health impact. I guess over 100. If you exceed the standard that means you have an unhealthy day. The index equals 100 which equals the national Ambient Air Quality Standard, so when you achieve that level with the first 100 that will be impacted are the sensitive population, the children, the elderly, ones with asthma, they will have difficulty breathing. Those days we have the alert to allow people to be aware that they shouldn't go outside, they shouldn't exercise. There are certain activities that should not be done and they should try to reduce emissions. Those are the things we try to do. But it impacts people differently. Children breathe more than adults. Their lungs are not fully developed as adults so it has more impact. People who are sick and elderly experience more impact, as well.

MR. BATTLE: Does anyone else have questions for Tom?

MR. EDWARDS: You collected $164,000 for the quarter is that typical?

MR. HYUNH: No it's not. I think we collected that amount because of SUNOCO CHEMICAL, isn't it? Do you know where that comes from?

MR. YUEN: No. It was SUNOCO REFINERY. We collected $101,000.

MS. FEYLER: It is higher than average then

MR. HUYNH: It is higher than average. It's because, in general, we get a lot more from the Refinery than the small company because of it's based on the ability to pay. We cannot collect more fine than their ability to pay. We do not want to put people out of business because they cannot pay the fine. It has to be affordable and also depends on the nature of the violation.

MR. MILLER: I guess the other question would be: What is the revenue destination of fines and penalties for that type of violation? General Funds or

MR. HUYNH: No, it's under - the PA State Act - Air Pollution Control Act….that is supposed to pay for Air Programs.

MR. MILLER: So its ear marked than…

MR. O'NEILL: Most of it is required to go into an air fund pursuant to the State Air Pollution Control Act.

MR.MILLER: But is it that fund that they then pay to themselves, to the City at some point? Is it open to the City to use?

MR. O'NEILL: That is a City fund. Any fines and penalties collected, particularly ones in any way related to the Title V program, must go into a pod that is designated to Title V. Any other fines and penalties, if they're related to other air penalties should go into a similar air account, but may be used more broadly for the air program.

MR. MILLER: Now, does any use of fines and penalties have to be justified on a case by case basis? Or does it just flow into the Health Department budget somehow?

MR. O'NEILL: Well, it's supposed to be used for the Air Program. So, I mean to be in support of the Air Program, and I don't know the specifics of the budget or how they cut it up, but it's -- as long as it's something supporting the Program.

MR. MILLER: The other issue is the annual license fees. It's the annual licensing fees that are being reduced not the permitting fees?

MR. HUYNH: The permitting fees also are being reduced, but it will not impact that much because --

MS. FEYLER: Tom, why don't you explain it's one specific fee.

MR. HUYNH: Okay, the fee was proposed for one specific fee. Right now in the license, they have a category that is for "Others" which covered gasoline station licenses for the amount of $400. The way Councilman Kenny put it in his proposal is "gasoline station". Instead of $400, because we do not have gasoline station category in the code; he spelled out gasoline station and he proposed $100. By doing this, gasoline stations that now pay $400 will pay $100, if the ordinance becomes effective. For 192 gasoline station that is about $57,600. The installation permit is about the same, but since we don't have that many gasoline stations coming in, the impact will be about 2 to 5 gasoline station coming in per year so the impact is not that significant.

MS. FEYLER: Here, too, if I may I could add that since Councilman Kenny proposed it we have done a closer analysis of our exact cost. As you know, our fees can't be more than the cost. We will be talking to him and his staff about whether or not we can come up with a compromise since our cost is far greater than $100. So, at this point, the hearing hasn't been scheduled so we will be in communication with the Councilman and the fiscal office to see if we can come up with a compromise.

MR. MINOTT: There is a recent report on the economic impact of transported air pollution on Philadelphia businesses. I sent one to Tom, and maybe that can be circulated, but I do think it

would be interesting as a member of the Broad, to get a sense of what the impact is on the region's air quality of pollution as it comes into the City. I know, for instance, that in Allegheny County the mantra is "this is all Ohio's fault". That everything is prefect in Pittsburgh other than what comes in from Ohio. I don't suspect we can make an argument like that unless we can blame it on Pittsburg h but

MS. FEYLER: Or New Jersey

MR. MILLER: Or Delaware

MR. HUYNH: It's very interesting. Most air pollution comes in from Maryland, Delaware, along the 95 corridor. If you see how when they've been mixed …..So, I mean it's been accumulated and how it travels and it takes time, by the time it impacts Philadelphia most of it will impact Maryland and Delaware. Then it will be mixed with the air around Penn and Jersey.

MR. MINOTT: Is it particulate or is it different?

MR. HUYNH: The particulate is more local, I think. The ozone is mostly transported more impact than NOx or SO2, but the particulate has some impact. We still don't have sufficient ……..Henry can you elaborate on that?

MR. O'NEILL: How about the precursors? Do the precursors come is as transport too?

MR. KIM: PM is also transported in a vacuum, but not at the level that we find ozone.

MR. MINOTT: So the ITEP is moving forward with their Transport Regulation on 31 States which is going to affect a number of Western PA, Ohio coal burning power plants, will that have a positive impact on air quality in the Phila Region?

MR. HUYNH: I think that will have some impact but we don't really know how much the impact will be because you go down south of us in Chester (Eddystone)--

MR. O'NEILL: Within a year or two years, Eddystone is supposed to convert its last coal fire units to natural gas.

MR. HUYNH: So, that will be a benefit to Philadelphia. But as you go down to Delaware, you have to know what other power plants will have been converted. But that will have an impact.

MR. MILLER: Back in the period of the development of the so called "OZONE MAPS," back in the '90s, there was some research done on what is called "Back Trajectory". In other words back up the weather data and see where the air mass came from at this time. Most of them where you had high ozone concentrations went right back over some existing power plant. So, there is a pretty clear correlation in terms of transport and power plants because there is such a concentrated source. The mobile sources, not so much, because they are so disbursed. The other issue is that we see winter here in Philadelphia but not so much down in Georgia. It is not necessarily this climate. But if you go a couple hundred miters up in the atmosphere, well higher

than the highest building, let's say, in the winter time you'll find 100 PPM ozone just in terms of transport it's away from any surfaces, and so forth. But it will live longer in a higher atmosphere but it is still being transported as ozone not just as precursors. That is why I asked the question because you say it's coming in from Maryland and Delaware but that is just where it crossed the border into PA where it came from original, could be from many States - -

MS. FEYLER: Ohio

MR. MINOTT: We think Ohio, that's our story and we're sticking to it.

MR. MILLER: Historically, we've always seen a good vector let's say, there is an emotion coming directly from the West and there is sort of a gap between the SW and going around the Midwest some back up in the precursor.

MR. BATTLE: All right. Are there any more questions? Okay. Let's move to Number 4,

MR. O'NEILL: May I?

MR. BATTLE: Yes, Go ahead.

MR. O'NEILL: I apologize, but Tom mentioned that the Airport Project has been nominated for the Governor's Excellence Award, and I see that we have just sent over the final draft to you Tom. I just have a few things to say on it. This is a project that AMS filed an application for a grant thru ARRA and did a lot of work on the award and it turned out to be very burdensome, and the airport did a lot of work on it too. But it is the beginning of some larger projects at the Airport. Because of that, this project turned out so well. The request to make this nomination came directly from the State Director of the Air Program, Joyce Epps, herself. It doesn't guarantee that you're going to get it, but it shows you how happy they are about both Air Management and the Airport and how successful this is and how it's helping to lead to a green airport initiative and it's also an item that is in the Mayor's Dream Works Initiative. So I wanted to point out what a big deal that really is, credit to Tom and the Airport groups.

MS. FEYLER: Congratulations.

MR. MILLER: I'd like to make just one more comment. Historically, I work with Delaware County, Joe Sestak when he was a Congressman on the airport noise situation. So I think the airport could benefit because they get painted with anything that goes wrong down there even though it is the FAA that does it. I think it would really be good to emphasis this or do what you can to emphasis this as it would probably offset a little bit of the noise problem which is always blamed on the airport when it is really the FAA. And their studies and changing of the take off patterns.

MR. EDWARDS: Is there anything we can do?

MR. O'NEILL: Well, it's in nominations right now, knock on wood; with the Air Director's nomination you will have a pretty good shot. But I don't know who up there makes the final decision.

MS. FEYLER: Make sure, Tom, I'm sure that when you get the award you will notify the Mayor's office so we can get the word out.

MR. HUYNH: Okay

MR. MINOTT: Or if there is an opportunity for us to write letters of support let us know.

MR. O'NIELL: I'll look into that.

MR. HUYNH: We'll look into that, too.

MR. BATTLE: We'll look forward to that. Let's move on to Number 4 on the agenda

4. Delaware River Dredging Project

MR. HUYNH: I'd like to introduce Scott Evans. Mr. Evans is the Project Manager for the Army Corps of Engineers'. He will be making a presentation.

MR. EVANS: Thank you. Thank you for allowing me to make the following presentation. (See attached)

Questions:

MR. MINOTT: For clarification, when you say the construction period is for five years in the funding …so all the funding is not in a bank account so you can draw down. It has to be allocated each year?

MR. EVANS: We get allocations or appropriations each year

MR. MINOTT: For that specific project?

MR. EVANS: For that project. Either from the President's budget or Congress has it earmarked, and I presume that is how it has been.

MR. MINOTT: And I assume that if they are talking about slashing budgets in DC. So I assume that the cost will go up if it is slowed down?

MR. EVANS: The cost would only go up with inflation. That is the current cost estimated for the work now, assuming a five year description. When this project was authorized back in1992 that cost estimate was low but that was in those dollars. There is a base year that the technology is based on. Yes, should it be delayed for 10 years that cost would go up.

MR. MINOTT: The Crude oil doesn't come all the way up does it? It's further down the river toward Tioga, correct?

MR. EVANS: Yes, that is correct**.** There are a couple different refineries along the way. The further you get into Philly the more you looking at container use.

MR. MINOTT: The appeal was in Federal Court?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Federal Court.

MR. MINOTT: You said that Delaware did not appeal. NJ did appeal and then there are some Environmental that have appealed?

MR. EVANS: That is correct.

MR. MINOTT: It would not make any sense for Delaware to appeal as their bit is done.

MR. EVANS: Well, no, there are still some bits to be done in Delaware.

MR MILLER: I just have one question about the comparison along the Atlantic coast among the ports. Are the rivers similar? You're basing this on sort of a competitive number with the depth of the port. Are the rivers pretty much the same in terms of how they use technology and that sort of thing?

MR EVANS: I don't know for sure. But I do know for sure that not many of them have a 100 mile long channel. NY, NJ are in the ocean. I'm not very certain about that.

MR MINOTT: Could the Army Corps have suggested going to 50 feet or is that not possible?

MR EVANS: That was evaluated in the feasibility study**.**

MR MINOTT: So it could be done but they just decided not to do it**.**

MR EVANS: I Believe it was….I don't believe it would have a positive BCR

MR MINOTT: Right.

MR O'NIELL: A positive what?

MR EVANS: A positive benefit cost ratio

MR MINOTT: I'm with you**.**

MR EVANS: The way the Corps evaluates a project is to look at a range of alternative and figure out a BCR but one project could have a higher BCR but not be the chosen alternative

because the alternative might have a higher debt economic development. It is counter intuitive but obviously for negative, but not positive**.**

MR. MILLER: The benefit cost is just a ratio; it doesn't say which one makes more money.

MR. EVANS: Correct.

MR. HUYNH: When you do 40 feet, in general, do you know how much the percent traffic will be increased?

MR. EVANS: You mean between a 40 foot and 45 foot increase?

MR. HUYNH: Yes.

MR. EVANS: No. It would be no increase in traffic. Our analysis says it would be a decrease, if anything, because we are looking at more efficient use of vessels. Instead of bringing two smaller ships up we will be bringing one large ship. It's not that simple because ships come in from the ocean and are 55 feet or more and their lighter and have only 38 feet at the keel clearance at high tide. They still have the lighter ones but they only have the lighter at high tide.

MR. BATTLE: Any other questions?

MR. EVANS: Someone had a question about where the material is going. As I mentioned before, we went to the Killcohook disposal area but for the remainder of the area we will be going to be using our other Federal Uplink disposal areas called CDF's. Most are located in NJ and Delaware. Fort Mifflin is in PA but we are only going to use that one for the rock that has to be disposed of.

MR. (?) My understanding is that this is the real controversial part of the project.

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MS. FEYLER: What is the problem?

MR.(?) The dredging throws off……

MR. MINOTT: Well it seems to have worked out well. Philadelphia will get the benefit of the extra traffic.

MR. O'NEILL: At one time Philadelphia had offered to take the entire dredging throw off.

MR. MONOTT: Yeah, I remember that.

MR. O'NEILL: I'm not sure what happened. They talked about coal reclamation. When the airport last did a runway extension they had raised it 20 or 30 feet and the airport took tons and tons of dredge material to use as the fill material under the runways.

MR. MILLER: That is going to happen again. It's because they want to extend that short runway at the other end, and they have to build it up to the original bypass.

MR. O'NEILL: Assuming that happens, it is about 8 or 9 years away.

MR. MILLER: But they can use that stuff. That's why I can see them using Fort Mifflin.

MR. EVANS: One of the reasons that the rock is going to Fort Mifflin is that there are facilities to off load it because that can't be pumped. It is easy to get into Fort Mifflin. That material has some value; it can be used for construction or other things. That is true also of some of the other dredging material. The airport is one use. Some of it is more valuable than other. Some of it is too silty to use. Placing it in a disposal area is a good idea.

MR. MINOTT: Is that dredging from the ships? Or the dredges that the ships use.

MR. EVANS: This is the dredge right …

MR. O"NEILL: It's a power diesel engine.

MR. EVANS: Yes, being powerful locomotive engines they have minimal emission controls on them and they do put out a minimum amount of emissions.

MR. HUYNH: I thought you proposed some kind of SCR control for those vehicles.

MR. EVANS: Yes, that is one of the first things we did was to calculate the emission on each one and the criteria. We have to do a conformity determination that exceeds within this level. Only thing within this area is NOx. We then evaluated how to offset those emissions and the most cost effect for the project to purchase emission reduction credits from NJ, PA Del. ERPA actually has the project sponsor and they purchase the credit and that will offset part of their cash share.

MR. MINOTT: So, all of the credits were within the non-attainment area.

MR. EVANS: Well, because it is such a large project and it falls within more than one non attainment area we treated it as one area, but we took a worse case for the entire project area. There were so many counties that were non-attainment and for PM2.5. And of course this is based on five year project schedule and it could be stretched out because of funding, and we might need to have more credits than we actually do.

MR. MINOTT; what happens if the national ambient air quality standard that you base this on, the standard that you should be looking out is changed? Do you have to go back and recalculate? Or is it grandfathered in at that point?

MR. EVANS: I don't know the answer to that question.

MR. O"NEILL: I think the answer is that you are grandfathered in at the time but there is some provisos over time as it goes on they can discount the value of ERC's so it is possibly conceivable that you'll be told to get additional ERC.

MR. EVANS: The report analysis that we did in 2009 is actually the second one. We did one five years earlier in 2004. The project would have to be reevaluated. We are in construction but we have the dredge out of the water.

MR. MINOTT: Is it a seasonal thing? Do you have to do it at a certain season of the year?

MR. EVANS: It depends on the type of work that is being done. It depends on what time of year and where we are in the river. Not everything will be done in the summer.

MR. MINOTT: And can the river be used while it is being done?

MR. EVANS: They only dredge a portion of the river at a time.

MR. BATTLE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Evans.

5. New Business

MR. BATTLE: Okay, let's move on to New Business

MR. HUYNH: Can you please ask everyone to look at the list of tentative dates for the future APCB meeting.

MR. BATTLE: Will everyone please look at the list and check your calendars and get back to Tom with any problems.

MR. BATTLE: If there is no further business can I have a motion to adjourn. So moved

6. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 pm.

MR. BATTLE: Everyone have a great day.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
AIR MANAGEMENT SERVICES

February 24, 2011

MEMORANDUM

TO: Air Pollution Control Board Members
FROM: Thomas Huynh, AMS Director
RE: Air Program Update

Air Quality

- From January 1 – December 31, 2010, there were 181 Good Days (50%), 158 Moderate Days (43%), and 26 Unhealthy Days (7%). 21 of these Unhealthy Days were due to high Ozone levels.
- The highest 4th daily maximum 8-hour ozone concentration for 2010 was 0.088 ppm as measured at the NEA air monitoring site.
- Philadelphia has been classified as a nonattainment area for ozone for the 8-hour concentration (standard = 0.075 ppm), and for particulate matter of less than 2.5 microns in diameter for the 24-hour concentration (standard = 35 ug/m^3) and the annual arithmetic mean (standard = 15 ug/m^3).

Air Monitoring

The River Ports air monitoring station (PAC) has been moved from storage at the Southwest Water Pollution Control Plant to the site at pier 53 park behind the Steel Workers Union Building (near the intersection of S. Columbus Boulevard & Washington Avenue). Arrangements for power to the site and a perimeter security fence are in progress.

Regulatory Services Activities

From November 1, 2010 to January 31, 2011, AMS reviewed 50 air permits, 278 operating licenses, and 84 asbestos permits and licenses. AMS serviced a total of 137 citizen complaints – (71) involving air pollution, (26) involving asbestos, and (40) involving noise. AMS also performed 279 air and noise inspections, and 555 asbestos inspections. In addition, AMS observed 610 vehicles at 26 locations and issued 4 citations for violations of the City's anti-idling rules. For this period, AMS issued 141 violations, resolved 137 Notices of Violation and collected $163,943 in fines and penalties.

State Implementation Plan

- On January 21, 2011, EPA extended the attainment date for the Delaware, Maryland, and Pennsylvania portions of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City moderate 1997 8-hour ozone nonattainment area (Philadelphia Area) from June 15, 2010 to June 15, 2011. This

extension was based, in part, on air quality data recorded during the 2009 ozone season. This final rule became effective on February 22, 2011.

- On February 7, 2011, EPA approved the State Implementation Plan (SIP) revision submitted by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The approved revision contained a 2002 base year emissions inventory, a reasonable further progress (RFP) plan, a RFP contingency measures demonstration, and a reasonably available control measure (RACM) demonstration for the Pennsylvania portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City moderate 1997 8-hour ozone nonattainment area. This final rule becomes effective on March 9, 2011.

Regulation X - Complex Source Review

AMS staff continues to work with the Commerce, City Planning, Streets, and Law Departments to draft the regulation.

Regulation XIV - Control of Perchloroethylene from Dry Cleaning Facilities

On December 13, 2010, Air Management Regulation XIV – Control of Emissions from Dry Cleaning Facilities, as approved by the Air Pollution Control Board, entered into effect. AMS has held five compliance workshops in conjunction with the Pennsylvania Small Business Development Center and assisted approximately 90 dry cleaners. We also conducted compliance assistant inspections at 12 dry cleaners.

Strategic Plan

AMS staff continues to develop a 5-year strategic plan for the agency. This plan will address potential organizational and regulatory changes, resource needs and constraints, and likely future agency obligations per local, EPA and DEP priorities. AMS is in the process of gathering initial stakeholder data via online questionnaire.

Philadelphia Airport

AMS has finalized a project that utilized a federal ARRA grant to fund the replacement of diesel GSE vehicles operated by US Airways with 38 eGSE vehicles. The vehicles are working with no reported problems and the airline has received positive feedback from airport ground staff.

Diesel Emission Reduction Act

- In partnership with CSX Transportation, AMS applied for $1,312,500 in funding to retrofit a South Philadelphia-based, 2,100 hp switch locomotive with a more efficiency engine. This retrofit, if funded, will reduce 80 tons of NO_x emissions and 2 tons of particulate emissions over a 10-year period.
- AMS is working with the Clean Air Council to issue grants to retrofit diesel engines powered construction equipment with emissions controls.

City Council Updates

On February 10, 2011, City Council Bill No. 110070 was introduced by Councilman Kenney, and was referred to the Committee on Public Health and Human Services. The Bill, if passed by City Council, would amend certain Sections of Title 3 ("Air Management Code") of The Philadelphia Code relating to license and permit fees. These amendments could reduce the annual license fees, collected by AMS, by $57,600.

PA DEP Updates

On December 25, 2010, the Environmental Quality Board (Board) amended Chapters 121 and 129 (relating to general provisions; and standards for sources), and added Subchapter D (relating to adhesives, sealants, primers and solvents) to Chapter 130 (relating to standards for products) of Title 25 of the Pa. Code. The purpose of this final-form rulemaking was to establish a program to limit the emissions of VOCs from the industrial and commercial use of certain adhesive; sealant; adhesive primer and sealant primers ; adhesives and sealants applied to certain substrates; and surface preparation solvent and cleanup solvent products.

EPA Updates

- On November 29, 2010, EPA announced national Renewable Fuels Standards (RFS) for cellulosic biofuel, biomass-based diesel advanced biofuel and total renewable fuels that will apply to all gasoline and diesel fuel produced or imported in 2011.
- On December 15, 2010, EPA issued a proposal to revise the requirements for reasonable further progress (RFP) under the 1997 8-hour ozone standard. Under this proposal, state would no longer be allowed to take credit for emission reductions outside a nonattainment area. Comments on the proposal are due by February 7, 2011.
- On December 27, 2010, EPA finalized the Lead Ambient Air Monitoring Requirements. New monitors required by the rule must be in place by December 27, 2011. This includes lead monitoring at urban multi-pollutant ambient monitoring sites, known as "NCore" sites. Lead will be monitored at the NCORE site (BAX). No known source in Philadelphia emits more than 0.5 tons of lead per year.
- On January 24, 2011, EPA issued final amendments to the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Gasoline Distribution Bulk Terminals; Bulk Plants and Pipeline Facilities; and Gasoline Dispensing Facilities. These amendments clarify definitions, and the applicability of the provisions in response to requests for reconsideration submitted to EPA.
- On January 28, 2011, EPA proposed to keep the current National Ambient Air Quality Standards for carbon monoxide (CO), while taking steps to gather additional data through more focused monitoring. The current health standards are 9 parts per million (ppm) measured over 8 hours, and 35 ppm measured over 1 hour. If requested, EPA will hold a

public hearing on the proposed rule on Feb. 18, 2011. EPA will take final action by Aug. 12, 2011.

- On February 14, President Obama proposed the FY 2012 budget which included a 12.9 % cut from the FY 2010 enacted budget for the EPA. The President requested $305.5 million for state and local air grants under Sections 103 and 105 of the Clean Air Act (The request for FY 2011 was $309.1 million). The President also proposed to eliminate $80 million in funding for the Clean Diesel Grant Program and $10 million in funding for the Local Government Climate Change Grant Program.