

Patrick Cummins (Western Governor's Association/WRAP)
Michael Reale (DaimlerChrysler)
Lori Schmidt (EPA/OPAR)
Carolyn Green (Sunoco)
Michael Stroben (Duke Energy)
Janet Cohen (EPA/OTAQ)
Brock Nicholson (North Carolina DENR)
Brian Gasiorowski (Lafarge NA)
Michael Sheehan (State of New York)
Janice Nolen (ALA)

Brenda Shine (EPA/OAQPS)
Jeff Whitlow (EPA/OAQPS)

- What changes do we envision?
 - Less complex regulations, more flexibility.
 - Prospective accountability (plan for measuring impacts of regulations – setting benchmarks)
 - Ecosystem focus
 - Expansion of concepts of market-based systems (fee systems, etc)
 - More systematic way to deal with legacy fleets
 - Replace arbitrary systems (Non-attainment areas and others)
 - Improving monitoring network – better inventories – better information
 - Need better information on smaller sources, better health based rules
 - Move to technology based standards to replace existing criteria pollutants– for new and existing; equity across states, areas; format -%, mass/unit; less modeling; more compliance
 - NO one size fits all. Do risk-based evaluation to determine controls. Consider geography.
 - One size fits all may be OK for less defined, new categories or economic incentives (Carbon tax)
 - Develop systematic way of assessing uncertainty in inventories. Acknowledgment of where uncertainties exist.
 - Look at what new problems are. Pay or control
 - Need multipollutant (criteria and toxics) planning; looking at sector by sector as opposed to across the entire sector; look at intermittent controls, possibly episodic controls
 - Are we defining NAAQS correctly?
-
- Improve public involvement – educate, data accessibility
 - Regulatory certainty is not realistic; will have increasing evidence of health issues – technology may be more reasonable; Issue of “chasing the NAAQS”

- Incorporate a measure to include carbon **now**; based on likely reality that it may be mandated later. Consider current context of multipollutant planning and analysis (example that reducing sulfur from diesel increases carbon emissions during the refining process) also N₂O? What are the effects of this? Reducing atmospheric ozone effects.
- There is conflicting policy on greenhouse gases
- Model: Look at airshed at multipollutant perspective. Set emission reduction goals; parse out responsibility; set 10 year timeframe. Reevaluate every 10 years
- **Single** SIP every 10 years (incorporate technology based standards)
 - Equity in burden areas across sectors in SIPs (major point sources, mobile sources)
 - Address land use (Sprawl); conformity not effective
 - No penalties for early reductions
 - Federal government role to drive technology >R&D, incentives
 - EPA to take lead in national modeling, technology review, setting of NAAQS
 - CAA: Health-no cost; Welfare – cost basis; Consider need for additional controls. Don't mix the statute's intent
 - Problems not being monitored
 - Periodic SIPS – review of technology, approaches, and co benefits of regional programs, CAIR model.
 - Establish declining CAP in West to deal with visibility
 - Trade-off for industry is certainty for 10 years