Treasure Valley Air Quality Council Meeting

Date: September 5, 2006

Time: 6:00 PM

Location: Ada County Court House

MR. SHEALY: Is there anyone here tonight who wasn't at the last meeting? Let's just go around the table and intruduce ourselves.

MR. SHEALY: I'm Alan Shealy and I'm Co—chair, also on Boise City Counsel.

MR. ROMERO: I'm Dan Romero, also Co—chair.

MR. MULTANEN: I'm Gary Multanen.

MR. JOHNSON: Charles Johnson.

MR. TAYLOR: John Taylor, Ada County.

SPEAKER: Gene, Ada County.

MR. MILLER: Mark Miller, Ada County.

MR. STEPHENSON: Dale Stephenson, and I represent Ada County.

MARK: Mark, Department of Environmental Control.

MR. DAVIS: Jack Davis.

MR. MOORE: Trey Moore, Meridian Resident. I was going to go to the global warming party, but it was too hot.

MR. WEBER: John Weber, Boise resident.

MR. O'NIEL: Pete O'Niell, Department of Air Quality Council.

MR. KAMANN: Kris Kamann with Scott Peyron and Associates.

MR. ROMERO: Now, the first thing on the agenda that we're going to talk about today, would be Stage 1 vapor recovery.

MR. SHEALY: This is for the benefit of those who didn't attend the last meeting. We talked about the perception of Canyon County residents who feel, for whatever reason, they are having this thing forced down their throats by Ada County. And they just don't feel like there is much buying out here, for obvious reasons, that this was somewhat of a conspiracy. It was a second—shooter on a grass knoll and they really didn't think that the cost was going to justify the benefits. And that this is old technology and, so forth and so on. And in fact, it was based on old technology.

In other words, we don't have a carbon monoxide problem anymore. But we do have an ozone problem. And precursors to ozone, of course, are hydrocarbons, and the NOx, and the SOx. It knocks your socks off. Nitrogen oxide, we talked about really the notion, if your part of the problem, you have to be part of the solution.

And everybody living in this whole Treasure Valley meteorology anomaly really shares the burden of us cleaning up the air shed. If it's assumed that when Canyon County residents get in their cars and drive to Ada County, or anywhere for that matter, that they become part of this problem and that their contribution is part of the collective problem that we have.

And that there is a egalitarian philosophy that if people are contributing to the problem, they should be part of the solution, too.

We also discussed the fact that the pollution generally travels from west to east. Leonard, if I deviate from the truth here just let me know. Canyon County residents produce less pollution in the aggregate, but they do produce pollution and it does tend to gravitate from the west to the east.

So the perception problem, of course, from Ada County residents is that Canyon County residents do contribute to the problem. They can't really understand why there isn't an emissions testing program. Canyon County doesn't get the feed from the west because there is essentially —— there isn't anything out there. So by extension, they say we don't have a problem.

There is also, as I mentioned, significant work—related traffic from Canyon County to Ada County. That said, and I think this is really important, Ada County is not in a position to hammer Canyon County, to impose some sort of a testing regime on Canyon County. If that's going to happen, it's probably going to come from the legislator. It's not going to come from Ada County.

Certainly Ada County residents have suggested that Canyon County has an emissions testing program. It's not something that those residents can require.

SPEAKER: Isn't this going to go to the legislature so they can vote on it?

MR. SHEALY: Precisely. Correct.

SPEAKER: So, they would impose testing in Canyon County?

MR. SHEALY: Not necessarily. It depends on what the council recommends. And it depends on what the legislature warrants from those recommendations. I'm just telling —— trying to tell it from both sides so that you can get an idea of what we discussed last week. We talked about testing older versus newer cars, and we talked about testing the vehicles altogether.

Old cars emit up to 300 times the pollution of newer cars that are not in compliance with air quality standards. The testing standards also emit up to 300 times pollution of cars that are in compliance.

But dynamometer testing, which is probably the best and most comprehensive testing regime, is too costly and in some respects any testing on a dynamometer that screen for hydrocarbons or other pollutants can actually bump up the emissions of things like nitrogen oxide which can actually cause problems, given our current air conditions.

We talked about —— Dennis talked about remote sensing devices that would be bring in gross violators, including old cars. But again, that brings up the issue, if we bring them in, what do we do with the older cars?

We're going to have a nitrogen oxide problem if we do adjust these cars for other pollutants. Dynamometers are very expensive. Tail—pipe tests, which is the other side of it, is very inexpensive. But it doesn't give you the kind of robust information that you need from a car that's traveling under load.

On—board diagnostics would be the most cost effective way of obtaining critical information. It gets up to 50 percent of the cars on the road, and 75 percent of the vehicle miles driven.

And of course, that percentage is going to get larger as the older cars come off the road and the fleet gets newer on average. 10 percent of the cars produce 50 percent of the pollution, and half of those are older cars.

Again, what do we do with those older cars? Leonard gave a very nice comprehensive introduction on the problems that we face. The precursors of ozone and PM—2.5, the fact that half of our problem exist because of automobile emissions. And we also talked about the suggestion the cost of testing. Somebody brought up the cost of testing would be greater for those that drive more miles. We finished up with public education. What's the best way of getting the message out? We need a public awareness campaign. I think that was a consensus. But how and who will administer it, and where will it be targeted? Suggestions for targeting were drive—ups, banks, fast—food restaurants and the like, schools where parents tend to idle for a long period of time. Construction companies, they spend a lot of time in their vehicles, idling.

We talked about the truck stops, as perhaps, a means of addressing some of these construction problems. Who has responsibility for the program? DEQ has no public relations department. They do have a clean air zone Idaho program, but there's the age—old problem, lack of money, lack of constant funding. Which, of course, is going to translate into our own programs at the time they come out of the legislature. Who's going to fund it and who's going to administer these programs?

There was a suggestion that the Treasure Valley Air Quality Council fund this effort from its budget. But the state does not supply money. So, that's the wrap—up of the first meeting, and Dan, back to you.

MR. ROMERO: From the very beginning, we came up with one way to cut pollution, it's to drive less. I don't think we can sell that. Today

we're going to the state vapor recovery. There was Russ Hendricks, he couldn't make it today. He's not in opposition of the state plan on vapor recovery, except for the cost. If we're going to require that somehow somebody covers the cost for it because it's pretty costly. I'll open it up for discussion for that.

SPEAKER: There's an ethanol bill that required stage 1 because they were looking for that as part of the compromise to get their ethanol bill passed. I'm wondering if that's a new concern.

MR. ROMERO: We have no opposition to stage 1 vapor recovery, except for the cost. If it is to be required, then it should be made available to cover all, or at best, a major part of the cost to local retailer or distributors, problems with that is the cost. I didn't misquote him, that's his email.

SPEAKER: Vapor recovery, is that where you recovery it from the gas pump?

MR. ROMERO: Yes.

SPEAKER: Does everyone understand what stage 1 and stage 2 vapor recovery is?

SPEAKER: What the difference is, I defer to Leonard, will you talk about Russ's concern?

MR. HERR: Stage 1 vapor recovery is when a tanker truck goes to a gas station to drop gasoline into the underground storage tank. That tank is empty. It's full of fumes, when you drop the gasoline into the tank, it shoves those fumes out of the tank into the atmosphere. What stage 1 vapor recovery does is it takes an additional hose and it puts it back into the tanker truck, so you get displacement.

When the gasoline leaves the tanker truck, the vapors are going into the tanker truck and then it caps the fuel off. Then, that tanker truck will go back into the tanker drop, then go back to the bulk plant and do the same thing. It just keeps recycling the fumes. It will condensed as gasoline in the process of cooling and you actually recover gasoline in the process. And you keep it out of the air. That's stage 1 vapor recovery. Stage 2 vapor recover —— same thing, except it's what is going into your car when you pump gas into your car.

When you pump gas into your car the vapors from the gas tank in your car will be displaced as you put the gasoline in your car.

Now, stage 2 has a separate coaxial hose on the pump, and the vapors go back into the pump through the handle there and down into the underground storage tank. Modern cars have on—board vapor recovery —— and assist stage 2

vapor recovery system is actually a pump that sucks these fumes out and will defeat the on—board vapor recovery system and it kind of screws up the whole system.

So, the DEQ is not advocating the stage 2 recovery. Just for that purpose, Stage 1 vapor recovery is very common technology, something like 99 percent efficient and you get a big bang for your buck.

TOM: When you recover that, how many liters does it take to make a gallon of gas?

MR. HERR: A lot. On an individual basis, if you multiply that by every tank in the valley, everyday, every time you do that, it's in the thousands of gallons a year.

TOM: That's not a lot of fuel, it's in the millions of gallons used.

MR. HERR: It's not a fuel saving mechanism.

SPEAKER: Would it cover the $1500?

MR. HERR: Sure it would. It will because the equipment that is used for that is not high maintenance. It's a drop tube. The equipment needed in the tank ——
It's just a big tank with a hole in the top, and when they pour the gasoline, it just splashes down at the bottom and gets all mixed up, and creates our grade level. In the stage system, the drop tube, a stainless steel tube, it's solid from the cap down to the bottom of the tank. About that far from the bottom of the tank. That way the feel goes down to the tube and raises up the level without splashing out. So that lessens the amount of vapors. So the drop tube is not real expensive.

You also need a coaxial fitting at the top of the tank. The coaxial tank returns those vapors. Now, those trucks should already have those. So this is an expensive bulk plant operation. It's probably going to have to incur. Maybe some trucks won't replace them. Most of them should have already. That's a federal law. Bulk plants are probably requiring it. Most stations are set up for coaxial cap.

MR. SHEALY: Leonard, thanks. Just for some background, I just did some research on the Internet and I came up with US Environmental Protection Agency memo, and this was actually written a few years ago, that does identify some of the cost set back. It was $6.00 to $8.00 per vehicle for the ORVR on—board, and it will save something like $2.00 to $4.00 per vehicle in gas just by recovering those vapors.

If you take that and apply it to the stage 1, I don't know, but it seems like it would be fairly significant.

MR. HERR: Over time, it probably would be. I've never really looked at those numbers or how long the pay off would take. The thing is, the station owners are not the ones that are recovering, it's the bulk plant. So there's no economic return with stage 2. That's different. That's not something we're advocating, is the stage 2 system. So the bulk plants is going to. Over time, yea, it probably —— dollar wise, it would pay for it. It would be a different benefit, economically speaking.

MR. LANGHORST: In your discussion, the cost benefits from the various measures, was there any prototype estimated —— I see that stage 1 vapor recovery is high in reductions. High recovery for dollar spent?

MR. HERR: Very close. Actually, that's a pretty easy one to look at. We can estimate pretty well what kind of emission reductions we're going to get. And in the valley, we're looking at about a thousand bucks a year. And then we can kind of guess how much it would cost.

The way we did that, we looked at other states that were similar to us in make—up and size. And they recently did a stage 1 with their tanks within the last 5 years. Say they were $1,500 to $2,500 per tank. If you look at that, that's not per gallon, it's per ton —— that's dollar per ton. It's per ton, their per ton reductions. We're looking at VOCs and it was one of the most cost effective ones that we looked at, very cheap.

MR. STEPHENSON: One area of cost benefit that we haven't looked at is that we may have some insight into the next council meeting, is health care cost benefit. Because this is a contribution towards ozone.

We've recently had some local air quality studies done, and the contribution incidentally increased into something like ozone, and the increased risk of adverse health effects. It goes up accordingly. And we're trying —— we want to tie that into cost benefits.

MR. KAPLAN: How are you addressing the vehicles that are running around without gas caps? I think that co insides with what we're talking about. What's going on there?

MR. HERR: Nothing in effect. That would be the kind of thing —— We don't have an accurate program. That's something you can certainly do. I don't know if there's actually a regulation prohibiting that. In some states, there are in Pennsylvania, in fact, that looks at things like that. The on—board system would catch that.

MR. KAPLAN: What about cars that don't have that? The older cars that need to be checked?

MR. HERR: You would need an enforcement program and an authority to do that, which we don't have.

MR. ROMERO: Do we have any retailers? A lot of those gas stations are chains. When you say 15 to 25 hundred that's where the numbers go up. Can you give us some input on that?

MS. SCHAEFER: I have asked Jack to come. He has done a fair amount of research on this, and so hopefully he can give that kind of input on that now. He represents that one end of the spectrum. The other end is the individual owners that are not here, that are going to be impacted.

MR. DAVIS: First of all, I would like to point out what I found was in California and counties in Washington, and in Oregon, they require what's known as enhanced vapor recovery stage 1 that requires a dual point system. In that scenario, you need two fill pipes, one to fill the tank, and the other one for the vapors to return.

As you mentioned before, the vapors are returned in the filling process. All of the tanks currently have drop tubes that reach to the bottom of the tank to minimize the vapors during that process.

But in the dual point system, the cost for the material alone is about $2,400. And a lot of the fuel storage tanks do not have the fitting on the tank. So the fitting would have to be installed on the tank and that could cost up to $3,000 to $5,000 per tank to install the fitting on the tank. It can be a dangerous process.

All of the gasoline has to be removed from the tank, if you have a fiberglass tank, if it's under warranty, the manufacturer has to come out and they have to pay to install the fittings. You could have several days of no business at all. That's pretty severe impact.

MR. HERR: Is that with the dual point system?

MR. DAVIS: That's correct. For the single point coaxial system that we referred to before, that is fairly accurate. My concern is that it's estimated at about $1,200 per tank. The down side to that, the delivery of the transportation industry is that it reduces the flow of 25 to 30 percent of that. Well that may not seem like a lot. If you multiply that by all the deliveries, the impact would be an additional truck on the road and drivers to run the truck.

And also the trucks are outfitted to deliver or is stage 1 vapor ready. But yet, additional components would have to be purchased for the truck for the job itself. Coaxial dropped to the associated hoses and the cost for that is $2,000 to $2,500. And then you have the ongoing maintenance of those items as well. Those are the pros and cons of the two different types of systems.

MR. HERR: Are you talking about the tanks in Idaho?

MR. DAVIS: Yes. That is a fire code that's to reduce static electricity during the building process.

MR. HERR: On the flow reduction on the coaxial we get a big drop in the flow. Is that because of the size?

MR. DAVIS: Correct.

MR. HERR: It's not back pressure?

MR. DAVIS: Correct. It reduces the size of the fill from a four inch to a three inch.

MR. HERR: If you have dual, you don't have that problem.

MR. DAVIS: That's correct. I've interviewed —— We operated in Washoe County in Reno, Nevada. And also in Lyons County in Utah where Stage 1 vapor recovery is required, and it's not the intent that I'm referring to, but it would take an average of ten minutes to manage the extra drop hoses.

The question raised from Northwest Pump and Equipment, which is a very large distributor on the West Coast. Their not stocking the traditional stage 1 vapor recovery equipment because of the mandates of enhanced vapor recovery.

The purpose of enhanced is a testable system. It has to be able to withhold the vacuum and the traditional components have to withstand the vacuum pressure.

MR. HERR: You think there might be a problem with the stage 1?

MR. DAVIS: Well, it's not a matter of —— I believe it's still a manufacturing question or concern that our company would have if stage 1 were mandated and then through the regulatory process has happened in California, in Oregon, in Washington and if it has basic recovery, it would also be required.

MR. SHEALY: Couple of questions. Judging by what you said, there wouldn't be any cost of punching through concrete or any of that or would there be?

MR. DAVIS: There would be. To add the second return pipe, there are some tanks that have available fittings. There have been some, a few that actually have stage 1 vapor recovery installed on the tanks.

In the early '80's, that was a fairly common practice for a short while. And I do recall a conversation of a DEQ official asking, "Why are you doing this? This is not a nonattainment area, nor do we ever expect it to be. Why are you spending that additional money to do this?"

MR. SHEALY: That was my second question. Have you totaled up what this would cost for the average service station? How much up front, and then on—going maintenance?

MR. DAVIS: I haven't researched it for every single location that we have. But I believe their cost would be $3,000 to $5,000 per tank to implement the dual point vapor recovery system.

MR. SHEALY: And how many tanks do you have typically?

MR. DAVIS: The containing gasoline and diesel is not addresses. And speaking of diesel, and this came up at one of the prior meetings, I read some notes talking about ultra low sulfur diesel, it should be implemented and mandated by October 15th of this year.

It poses a real problem for the transportation industry in this country, in that the gasoline has enough sulfur to contaminate a load of ultra low sulfur diesel.

What the plan is, so we don't contaminate ultra low sulfer diesel with gasoline, is to drip dry the compartment before it returns back the terminal. So that poses a problem doing that. So that's another dimension to this that we need to consider.

MR. ROMERO: I got a question. How about requiring it on new stations, would that be cost effective if it's there right from the very beginning it?

MR. DAVIS: It's relatively inexpensive to do. Your back to $1,000 to 1,200 per tank system.

MR. ROMERO: And that's the thing that we're looking at. If you're going to slap somebody with $15,000 to say that his tank isn't the best out there, you looking at $15,000, making it a requirement for the future. If a new station opens, then this is what's required. Would that be more feasible for the business?

MR. DAVIS: Sounds like a lot more practical approach.

MR. SHEALY: Leonard, what would happen if we did go into nonattainment? Is it likely that the EPA would mandate stage 1 vapor recovery, for instance, throughout the valley?

MR.HERR: The EPA doesn't mandate control measures. What is likely, is that would be one of the control measures that the EPA would use to compare those things.

MR. LANGHORST: Leonard, how many tanks are there in the Treasure Valley?

MR. HERR: 800, about 800 stations.

MR. LANGHORST: I thought there were 700 stations.

MR. HERR: There was some hope last year that we would be getting a grant to do just such things as this.

SPEAKER: Are we still coming closer to getting more money?

MR. HERR: No. Probably further away. There is a program. We did apply for a grant to try and fund this. And we got turned down. We're continuing to look for grants with the full benefit and this type of grant would be a private partnership. But it's not beyond the realm of possibility. I could talk about Russ. Russ's issue is that —— this is kind of a Farm Bureau issue, requiring that these gas stations, pay out of their pocket —— pay for public good, because it's not fair and if the public gets the benefit, the public deserves to pay for the benefits. They can assist these stations in obtaining their equipment.

MR. KAPLAN: The issue of health benefits is firmly established. By doing this vapor one control, isn't there a way for the legislature to grant service stations, such as Jacksons? That would offset what their cost is.

MR. SHEALY: Sure. Then they'll just tack it on to the sales tax.

MR. WEBER: Wouldn't the stations recover the costs by raising the price of gas? I mean, Jackson's isn't going to lose money because they put something in. They are going charge more for their gas and the people that are using the gas that are polluting are going to pay for the cleaner air. So instead of the state giving them money —— they're going to get their money anyway.

MR. SHEALY: Do you envision that going down once it's finally paid for? I don't see that happening.

MR. MILLER: So have other states tackled this stage 1? Obviously there has been other areas that have not had stage 1 and have had to implement stage 1, does anyone know?

MR. HERR: To my knowledge, it's all been mandated.

MR. SHEALY: Mark, actually I have here something from the State of New Hampshire that I pulled off the internet, they require —— this was written in 2004 —— they require stage 1 and stage 2 vapor recovery. And it doesn't go into the cost. Well, actually, it does go into the cost. The cost was for stage 2 —— is really exorbitant. It goes up to $30,000 per system. But they figured that it reduces the VOCs emissions by 95 percent.

My question to you, Leonard, would be, it seems that the on—board vapor recovery systems for all these cars does pretty much what stage 2 envisioned.

And given the fact that they're incompatible, it seems to me, that it's a heck of a lot more cost effective to just rely on the on—board system as opposed to mandating the stage 2 system.

MR. HERR: At some point, there's been a huge investment that's

not going to be carried forward.

MR. SHEALY: Where I'm coming from, as an investor, I love to look at these things this way. How many tons of VOCs are we going to be able to save from evaporating into the atmosphere? And what's it going to cost per ton?

It seems to me, that's really the gist of what we're discussing, and who pays for it? What are the health benefits, as Dale suggested. Who pays for them if it's 50 cents a ton or a dollar a ton. It seems to me, we're reducing it by 700 tons. That runs into significant money, but I think that's what we really have to look at. How much is it going to cost to reduce it? 95 percent is a pretty compelling number in my book.

MR. LANGHORST: I don't know if anybody has a calculator, but I don't know if all the data that you need has already been presented, and then there's one more piece of the equation, how much gasoline is sold out of an average tank? How much gas is sold in the Treasure Valley? In fact per gallon, I'd like to see how many tenths or hundredths of a cent ——

MR. SHEALY: Leonard you say, there are 800 tanks in the valley, or was it service stations? I'm sorry Susie, go ahead.

MS. SCHAEFER: If I could just clarify, they're actually contained in the original documents, 410 active retail gas stations in Ada and Canyon County. I think the 800 —— and there's also some discussion about the cost of stage 1. (Inaudible)

MR. HERR: I think we get volumes. There is some weights and measures, but it was by county.

MS. SCHAEFER: You will not get exact measures.

MR. DAVIS: I've heard industry benchmarks are based on millions of gallons per year, per location, nationwide.

MR. KESINGER: I think that's the benefit of recovering the gas at the tank. It's an obvious thing as far as determining who should pay for it. We should know what the benefit is to the tank for the recovery. How long, perhaps, that would pay for the expense itself.

And I think the idea of letting the market place pay for it, is a good idea. If the price of gas goes up per gallon, it might be insignificant to the gas station. That would be two methods for paying for those retrofits, the tank recovery of the gas, and the consumer.

MR. DAVIS: I found a company that manufactures a defuser that fits on the bottom of an existing fill pipe and it's designed —— it's slotted, and its whole purpose is to reduce the amount of turbulence that produced during the filling process. Their claim is a reduction of 1/10th

of one percent of what they call "wet stock".

We devised a plan that equates vapors and I've talked to the manufacture briefly on this. They're supposed to get back to me on any official information. It's a really inexpensive device, comparatively —— a couple hundred dollars to add to an existing fill pipe, very little reduction, not reduction, but very little time involved installing this.

That's just a little tid—bit in my research. It comes down to bang for your buck and reducing vapors. It would be interesting to compare that to the cost of stage 1 vapor recovery. It's something that might be very inexpensive.

MR. LANGHORST: I want to continue to put this burden of business into perspective. If you extend —— I think it would be passed on to the consumer. And I'm glad that you pointed out —— this is on page 735, the area that you were talking about, 3 percent of all VOCs in the valley are from filling tanks. 97 percent of that could be recaptured with stage 1 vapor recovery.

If there are 410 tanks, that's just $3,000 —— that's 1.3 million dollars. If you spend $6,000 per ton and you up that to 210,000, and that's almost half of the stations and compare what the largest —— one of the largest employers in Canyon County, amalgamated sugars. What we're looking at is bang for the buck.

MR. HERR: One of the things that we got here —— one of the things that got our attention in the vapor recovery, that thousands plus comes very close to what we call our sources in the valley. If I took and just erased them off the face of the earth, that's about the reduction you're going to see. It's not that many. There does in the valley, there's some in VOCs. It's a five percent reduction. In anything, that's a big number. When you as a citizen, when you look at some of these growth control measures, they're growing by less than a percent. Usually that’s what we have to work with. We've got the easy reductions. That's why we support vapor recovery. It's a pretty good size reduction. Who pays that price? That's open for interpretation. Cost benefit, it's not the best.

MR. ROMERO: When we make recommendations, some of them we need to make are cost effective. Just out there, what I'm looking at is part of the recommendations that I'm looking at are for new gas stations, which is probably the most suitable way to go is to require new ones. The other one could be, it is a recommendation also that we do vapor recovery and the cost is going to battled out wherever.

When you start to talk about cost, it gets touchy. Some people are

just sick and tired of doing business and breaking even. So, what might seem like —— okay, it's not a lot of money, $5,000. It's not that much to a business owner. To a business owner $5,000.00 could be the tipping edge. That's where I get concerned on the recommendation. Think, that we can actually say that all new gas stations going up should be required to carry this.

MR. KESINGER: Relating to cost, is this going to be a proposal to the state legislature. They're the ones that control the gas taxes. Can they set gas tax? Can they propose to the increase of gas tax by umpteenth percent per gallon of gas.

SPEAKER: We're talking about the —— I don't think they could raise —— I think passing it through the consumer is what makes sense. I think if you do the math, which I have not, we might be talking about 3.00 to $4.00 a gallon.

MR. STEPHENSON: The one thing I think Leonard would emphasize is three percent reduction VOCs, but the VOCs, too, are the precursors to ozone. Also they form secondary particulates in the air and they contribute to PM—2.5. Those are our two big particulars.

MS. SCHAEFER: Just a couple of comments on the cost. First of all, in combination to the Treasure Valley region, gas tax is constitutionally prohibited from being used on anything but roads and bridges. So you can pass the gas tax, but you can't use it to pay for this. It is not an option in terms of funding.

I've got to agree with Dan in that it seems like not a lot of money to those of you sitting around the table. A service station is already under extreme pressure with these high gas prices. The prices are not determined by the station owners 90 percent of the time. The price is determined by the distributor.

What you may also not be aware of is the federal government had a significant number of new requirements that's all going into place in the next two or three years, starting in '07, as well as the transfusion of diesel. So you're not looking at isolation. You're looking at that on top of federal increase to the costs.

So if your goal is to raise some opposition, passing this cost on to them is a good way to do it. I guess I'm encouraging you to be somewhat conscientious on impact on the cost of small businesses, the ability to pass it onto the consumer. Sounds good.

It just isn't the way it works in the market place. And you've got stations competing against Wal-mart, Costco, Fred Meyer who are now selling

their fuel at cost or often below cost. A lot of stations are not going to be able to pass it on. Today we've been below the national average for the last three or four or five months, which is totally extraordinary, to our normal value market place. I think small business owners —— they can't pass the cost on.

MR. MILLER: So these requirements that will be starting in '07, would any of these dual systems, when we talk about stage 1, would they be able to be retrofitted with those modifications?

MS. SCHAEFER: Well, the new requirements involve at least half a dozen new requirements including: Operator certification and training, including liability. And it's a fairly rigorous move. (Inaudible)

SPEAKER: So again, if they are pulling tanks to get a double wall tank, could they then operate under ——

MS. SCHAEFER: Well, you might want to address this to Jack. You're talking about a lot of business decisions along the way. On a new station, it is totally a business call.

When you talk about retrofit, the cost in some ways are different to project because you're talking about variables. You have dig up where the fittings are in a retrofitting. New stations —— that's a whole different ball game.

MR. MILLER: (Inaudible)

MS. SCHAEFER: When you say —— if they're over certain sizes, underground tanks, again that's fairly comprehensive. If they are pulling tanks to get a double wall tank ——

MR. MILLER: Could an operator incorporate on a new station, a totally different retrofit in existing tanks? So when you talk about the cost, in some ways it's difficult to project a lot to these stations. It's not just the equipment that is involved in retrofitting. It's a whole different ball game.

SPEAKER: So are they effected by this or are they all —— Susie when you say ——

MR. MILLER: By the federal mandated versus, if they were federally regulated tanks, meaning they are over a certain size than the undergrounds tanks.

MR. HERR: On the issue of the economic impact, all business need to address it as if you pump less than X amount of gallons per month or per year. They are very small compared to a large station. That takes those little ma and pop stations that really sell groceries and it leaves it in the big stations.

MS. SCHAEFER: If you want, Alan, if you're curious about that, we did a little bit of research on that already. Arizona is a state where stage 1 and stage 2 were required, only in Phoenix area and nowhere else. On volume —— so if you search on volume, you have to meet those requirements.

Utah, two counties have stage 1 required due to control measures in Salt Lake. We were added in '99 as a proactive measure. So you got four counties in the metro Utah, Salt Lake City area, nothing in Montana. I didn't get feed back from states beyond those.

MR. O'NIEL: When we spent the time on this earlier, as a council earlier on, we kind of got to the point to where the bang for the buck was so strong and so pervasive, we didn't spend a whole lot of time and the details we heard some people, and Jack's got first hand experience, Suzie's got first hand experience, I guess the thought I would have, I think, is going to be indisputable. I think the major bang for the buck here in terms of air quality what it does to small operators is a very important issue as well.

So what I would certainly encourage is that if Jack and Suzie, if your colleagues would work with us on —— okay, let's assume this is something we should do, How should we do it? Are there some economic incentives? Are there some ways that we offset the initial capital costs and recoup it as money that was saved on the vapor recovery?

I would certainly think we would want the work collectively with the industry on this before we send something up to the legislature, than have the arguments there. Let's have it ahead of time.

MR. ROMERO: It might. If you would write something up to that effect, ahead of time that would be good for everybody. So that might be the route to go on. As you know, like you said, there's a bigger bang for the volume. If there is nothing else —— does anyone else have anything they ——

MR. LANGHORST: For those interested, on page 709, the actual recommendation providing funding mechanisms of low interest loans, so it's kind of open—ended. Recommendation rule making procedure that's where our legislature and all the interested parties, you folks, businesses would patch out some of these details. There is mechanism for that to happen.

MR. ROMERO: Now we're going to be moving on to regional.

MR. SHEALY: We've asked John Barrett, who is a co—director of Idaho Smart Growth to join us. He works with Mike very closely, patriot Elaine Clegg. I apologize for going over, John. In you needs to head out, just whack us over the head. John is an expert in land use planning and Idaho Smart Growth has been working, integrated with the county and cities to help formulate policies that will hopefully improve our transportation

planning and our —— put a curve on some of the rapid sprawl. So John, thanks again. We appreciate you being here.

MR. BARRETT: I know many of you are at least familiar with Idaho Smart Growth. If you're not, I just brought some brochures and I'll just ask that they be passed around and take one if you would like to be introduced or reintroduced to Idaho Smart Growth. Our current efforts now are focused on working with the Boise Chamber and other organizations in the Treasure Valley to advocate for regional transits in the Treasure Valley. You may have seen in the paper, the valley region transit is about to offer some limited services out to Eagle, Star, and Middleton, and out that corridor and over the river. I think it's great news. We've also been putting a lot of effort and energy into educating the public about the difference of good growth and growth here in Ada County. The counties in motion, and I know both of those have been discussed by the Air Quality Council, and we'll get into the plans a little bit I'm sure.

As soon as I was asked to come speak to you, I knew what I wanted to share as far as a leave—behind piece for you. And I'd like to give you that as well. By the way, I want to say that just thinking about coming to talk to you, with doing some preparation research really wet my appetite to do more research and information gathering on this whole topic on the relationship between land use planning and air quality.

MR. SHEALY: Where did you get this? I looked all over the internet for something like this.

MR. BARRETT: Thank you for asking that. The funders network for Smart Growth in communities that is a national network of foundations that fund good planning advocacy, Smart Growth advocacy around the country. That's both statewide at a local and regional level. And they approximately, quarterly or twice a year they put out these translation papers and each one addresses a different topic. And I knew about a year and a half ago they put out this one specifically about air quality and lands use. I brought 25.

I hope that's enough because I'm going to ask you to look at a couple of pages with me as we continue talking. And I also want to say I just want to start the discussion, I know some of you, perhaps, many of you come to this topic with some experience and knowledge and I know all of you have questions and opinions. I just want to get it started. I really want to hear where you're at and what you think about lands use and air quality.

I also looked at chapter five and six of the working draft of the draft plan. The one I have is dated June 27th. I just wanted to get us started. I wanted to point out something, table 5.4, the title of the table is labeled

potential control measures for local government and I have it here. This is not what I handed you, this is actually the recommended plan. It says on this table, it says lands use planning as one of the control measures and you can see across the table, those spaces are left blank and that's really curious to me.

And to me that says something about the complexity and the difficulty in measuring. What are the actual air quality benefits of better lands use and better development, and I think that's a challenge. I want to get back to that in just a moment.

Here's how I look at this relationship. I'm going to use there acronym VMT a lot here in the next few minutes. You probably have all heard it, vehicle miles traveled. That's the thing, the more we drive our vehicles, the more they emit. And the simplest way I can describe this relationship to you is lower density, isolating disconnecting lands uses, add those two things together equals greater distances between origins and destinations. Greater distances between origins and destinations equals what? Greater VMT producing greater emissions.

I know it's true and I know you all are aware of this that there have been a lot of advancements in vehicle technology and fuel in the last 30 years. So my uncles 1975 Pinto driven hundred miles produces much more pollution than a 2006 Toyota Matrix.

Most of our air quality improvements have been through vehicle technology, fuel logistics. We haven't spent a lot of energy and effort trying to reduce VMTs as much as those other two. So my sense is that if we don't pay attention to VMTs and we just stay focused on newer vehicle technology and fuel characteristics, then the percentage of the problem coming from VMTs is going to grow because we're not addressing the VMT part of the equation.

I wanted to point out that these are referenced in the funders network handout that I just gave you. There's a few studies that talk about the relationship between land use and vehicle miles traveled. Reviewing it is professor at Simpson University, he made a study in 2002, studying 83 metro areas. They found that the degree sprawl which is low density disconnected development was the strongest influence on the person —— had a greater influence than income. The rate of population growth in the area and other factors. Frank of Idaho Research Group, in 2002 did —— he or she did a study in the Seattle area and found that households located in the most connected areas of Seattle emitted less than half of the VMTs than the households located in the disconnected areas of the region.

Then finally John studies 6 million households in Chicago and Los Angeles and found that increased accessibility means making destinations and origins closer together. Mixing uses and more compact developments decreased vehicles use and ownership.

Now going back to this difficulty of measurement there just seems to me to be a big crux of this problem of being an advocate of better land use planning as in air quality strategy. I want to take you to the funders network handout on page 8.

MR. SHEALY: When the study was done with respect to best connected versus least connected what is —— how is it determined? How connected a community actually is? Is there some record or did they just pull it out of their hat?

MR. BARRETT: I'd actually have to find the study to see how they define it. I believe it's the degree to which people have choices about how they get from point A to point B. If there's more than one route, the more routes people have to get from place to place, the more connected the place is. You can reduce VMTs to give people more choices.

MR. SHEALY: It's not just the location. It's more from getting one place to another.

MR. BARRETT: Right. So on the left hand column of page 8, at the bottom here, they gave specific strategies that improve air quality through better land planning and development and urban design. Activity centers, for example, downtown increasing density near transits stations.

I would add that along corridors, interconnecting travel networks, that basically refers to what Alan is bringing up. Designing for more walkable environment, bringing origins and destinations closer together. I don't know about parking management. Everyone of these other strategies are the main goals of the Blue Prints for good growth and these strategies are inherent in the preferred land use scenarios used in the communities in motion.

I would say as a Smart Growth advocate, the best thing we can do to improve air quality, from a land use standpoint, is to advocate the use of implantation for good growth and put these in motion.

Here's the frustration I was referring to at the top of page 8, at the right hand column, reduction from VMTs, resulting from building more walkable places are gained from reducing existing vehicle strips by eliminating, it's the result —— The result is reduction of exterior air pollution, as well as greenhouse gases.

Here's my frustration, and maybe you all share this, by how much it says that planning —— and this strategy will reduce emissions, but it never

says by how much. We've got to solve that problem, figure it out so that land use planning can be compared equally with other strategies so that we don't leave the boxes blank. But it says, what's the benefit of air quality from better lands use planning?

And the very next page, page 9, you see that table there showing several different cities or metro areas showing how they developed regional land use plans, that are very significant things that are going to produce regional reductions in VMTs. So they are measuring a reduction in VMTs.

So if we agree that reduced VMTs equals reduced emissions. It just makes sense. To do a better job in this valley of showing the VMT reduction or possible VMT reduction from alternative transportation improvement, alternatives on either a small or larger scale.

MR. SHEALY: John, are these reductions —— are these on findings based on the plans that have been mandated in these areas?

MR. BARRETT: I think some of them yes, and some of them no. They're more than hypothetical. They're actually plans that have been adopted. What I don't know is are they mandated by law or are they done at the option of the local or regional area. I would suspect there is a mandate that they have instituted this planning because they have to more than by choice. The last thing I want to point out on in this hand out is the end note section.

I want to point out some other documents that I think would be helpful. I tried to find the first one on the net and did some surfing and didn't come up with it. And I just couldn’t come up with it, that's number 2. It's an EPA publication, this is page 19 of the document, EPA final policy improving air quality through lands use activities.

And again, I want to define that for you and I wanted to bring at least one copy of it. I just didn't have the time to do it. And then 535 general accounting office federal incentive could help air and water quality. That document goes into why aren't we paying more attention to lands use planning and air quality. And gives recommendations.

Again, I wasn't able to find it. And I just wanted to highlight those and encourage you to put a little star by them and find them. I wanted to maybe conclude and open it up for some new discussion by talking a little bit about transit because it is such a big part of our work right now. You can find a whole lot of support in the Treasure Valley.

I think there's a belief or just a perception that's it's simply buying more buses, and more trains, putting them on the railroad corridor, buying some fancy things and away we go. We've got this great transit system. We

can't do that without federal funding and we can't do that without a source of local funding.

I want to talk about federal funding here for just a minute. To get that federal funding we're going to have to improve transit significantly. We going to have to compete with lots of other metropolitan areas, there's one website I know called Light Rail now it has a list of all the metro areas in the country that are concepting or planning some kind of rail-based transit. The list is about 50 metro areas right now. Every time gas goes up 5 or 10 cents, it's we need light rail. That's a motivation.

I think that's why a lot of people feel we need other transit is the lack of certainty about gas prices and oil visibility in the future. My point here is to compete will all those —— by the way, Treasure Valley, we're not even on the list of 50 yet. We're not that far along in our plans to be on the list. I think potentially that may change in the next year or maybe two.

My point here is that one of the criteria that the federal administration looks when deciding who's going to get funded and who's not going to get funded, they look at metro areas and they ask themselves, is this metro area being proactive about planning and encouraging the kind of development patterns that are going to support transit and make it successful?

If we can show that we're serious, not necessarily, just having a plan that shows what we want but if we can show that we're actually implementing it, then we're going to get that. We're actually changing those policies and encouraging those kind of development pattern that are very favorable to those conditions. Now I hear a lot of people say well we need better leadership, it takes better leadership, that's what's lacking. And I want to say that has to come from all of us. That has to come from everybody in the Treasure Valley, not just the people that represent this. We as citizens that this is the place we want to live in, we don't live in Phoenix, we live in the Treasure Valley, we have these qualities and we want to have them 10 or 20 years from now.

So with that, I want to open it up and I'm curious what discussions happened at the air quality counsel level. Pete, I'm glad you're here.

MR. SHEALY: This is our first discussion here. You're to the lead off on this discussion, John.

MR. BARRETT: I'm just going to open it up to the table. Do you think that this —— do you think that land use has a major role in the air quality discussions or are you skeptical? I would really love to hear it.

MR. KESINGER: When you showed us a chart —— you showed us a chart of cities in areas in the State of California for one that by using Smart Growth and smart transit they saved approximately 3 to 10 percent in California from vehicle miles —— vehicle miles traveled and I would assume that here in the Treasure Valley a major source of our pollution is caused by vehicles mile traveled.

And if these locations on our chart can reduce that by 3 percent, 10 percent, 14 percent, 20 percent from Puget Sound, that sounds like one of the major sources of pollution that could be addressed if Smart Growth could be implemented to encourage those kinds of savings in vehicle miles traveled.

I'd be curious to address the Smart Growth issue and whether the communities in motion proposal, whether they calculated by their proposal how much vehicle miles traveled could be reduced by their proposal. How much air pollution could be reduced by their proposal?

SPEAKER: Yeah. And whether we could also qualify based on that plan. We can we can add the Treasure Valley to that plan and say compared to the current trend —— compared to how we have been building and developing in the last 10 years, the preferred scenario in communities is called community choices.

I forget the exact percentage but it does show the exact vehicles miles traveled. If we develop according to that scenario, that's the challenge, that's what requires changing the local land use policies. So that over time that scenario is actually realized on the grounds.

MR. BARRETT: I think the environmental progression business for about 20 years. I think there is a real valid connection between land use planning and air quality. I think we've seen that in the last say 15 years this influx in population, more vehicles on the roads, I think just adding lanes to I84 is not improving the quality of life. I think we've become very proactive about public health and the environment.

And that none really wants talk about the real issues in the cities, counties between number of jurisdiction. Something to say about anything, and that's really one of the reasons for the new involvement by Smart Growth, by communities in motion and Treasure Valley partnership have never really gotten off the ground. Great start. A lot of great messages.

How do we put to the Treasure Valley Air Quality Council, that really talks about this being a collaborative public number, a private industry or think we're trying to citizens local use of, the government municipal, state or federal and one collective partnership that says, we have one air shed. How to be persuade the council into taking those first steps, and there are a

lot of difficult choices ahead. I think it starts with agreeing on the goal, agreeing on —— what are those interest that you just named, that we can all agree to work toward.

MS. JOHNSON: That's been the sticking point on the compass board. Folks not coming together around the table so that we can all gain the same perspective.

MR. KAPLAN: Just a few things, in New York times magazine within the last year and a half there was a very big article —— I didn't know this was going do be brought up about subdivisions and what kind of subdivisions foster less miles traveled and it's a particular design, there are several designs that maybe could be given to the developers or mandated to the developers.

Usually they have like a post office or convenience store that's in their subdivision so that if someone needs a bottle of milk or aspirin or whatever, they can drive to the local maverick or can they encourage bike paths in the subdivision themselves, built in such a way so that they foster traveled within their subdivision as opposed to going outside the subdivision.

If those designs could be made available to all the local Idaho cities, that could mandate that new subdivisions would actually have to adhere to these kinds of designs that foster less miles traveled, I think that would be something that could be beneficial.

And the other thing concerning light rail. I know with Caldwell, downtown being revitalized and Nampa as well. How are we going do get people to the downtown area? By having light rail coming into that area.

But it would encourage if there were light rail transportation were open in Caldwell, Nampa or wherever that rail line was going. That would just bring people and would encourage business, and that would be another reason to have the light rail being built. In order to increase business and business is kind of the driving force behind it —— behind everybody.

MR. STEPHENSON: You know Pete, and correct me if I'm wrong, and Gary, if I'm wrong and from the council's perspective —— and we really listen very carefully. And we have several council members who think this is the most important issue for air quality in the future.

And if you look at that plan, I think we are fairly vague, and we heard from Blue Print communities in motion. We have a pretty broad endorsement of their continued activities to have Smart Growth, and will enhance air quality. You hit on something here tonight that may be the most important aspect that you'll provide that I didn't here during there course of the

meeting. The idea of bringing these —— some sort of voice from the council, to bring these separate entities together so that we can move forward, than just voices and that may be one of the strongest voices that we have as a council. And so that was very, very interesting.

MR. SHEALY: I think, perhaps, apropos that's probably on the political side of this but anytime we get validation of this concept, it adds more to the whole idea. I think that lands use planning is joined totally with air quality and water quality. But I think we're talking about two issues. We're talking about things like mixed use development which can encourage a reduction in vehicle miles traveled by having amenities close. By having employment opportunities, by having retails, by having some light commercial right there so people don't have to travel.

The other aspect of it is doing what is called trans—oriented development, which means putting people in concentrated areas. So we can connect those developments with light rail. But let's face it, we got to walk before we can run. Light rail is years down the road folks. It's very expensive.

We can't even ask ourselves whether we want to tax ourselves through a local facility for improved bus service, and forget about light rail. Union pacific wants 46 million dollars per quarter going from Boise out to Nampa. We're going to have to find a permanent source of funding a spicket that we can turn on to finance some of these —— more comprehensive means of transit.

I guess my point is that we really need to focus on land use. And John, are you still down here? I would have been interested to here his comments because in council, we hear a lot of four—letter words like density and infill and things of that nature of planned communities. Planned communities is a huge issue right now. How do we incorporate planned communities for the full benefit of land use planning.

We like planned communities but if you drive ten miles out where they're not connected to anything and they don't deliver what they promise which are employment opportunities, recreation opportunities, shopping opportunities, and if they don't that, and believe me, it takes years to develop the critical mass for those entities to provide that.

Then we're just shooting ourselves the foot. For all this space kind of integrates and they all need to be answered individually, but they are all part of the solution —— and correct me if I'm wrong on this.

MR. ROMERO: On this Smart Growth, when you look at regional, you're looking at —— not what seems logical, and Boise may not be logical in Caldwell or Parma. You're looking at the total difference. You're also

looking at something that will always come up and that's property rights. Your right to develop your land.

If you're losing X amount of dollars that you're trying to make a living off of farming and you can sell your land to build a thousand houses, you're not looking at how far you are from Wal-mart. You're looking at, I want to dump this. This is my retirement, I'm selling this house, I'm getting out of here.

You're looking at regional values, you've got to look at that also. You've got to look at the person that owns the land, why he's making the move. We don't have a comprehensive plan, and I'm talking for Canyon County. We don't have a comprehensive plan that we agree with. We've got capital going on. We're still trying to decide where to build the next house. All you have to do is drive down the freeway, it's all houses now. Nampa, we just opened our Costco. Great. It just happens that everybody lives on the opposite side of town. That's the way it is.

I think when we look at planning and zoning, there would be some type of regional planning and zoning. You also have to look at those cities. Those cities are actually competing against each other. You know, Caldwell's out there and Nampa wanted a Costco. Costco wants business in both cities. There were going to go where they would make the most money.

There's a lot of consideration to take when you start a regional plan. You also have land owners that will tell you, this is my land, and if I want to sell it to put a thousand houses here, that's my right because you aren't going to pay me for this land.

We talked a lot about this —— we talked a lot about saving farm land. California and Colorado are really the ones using the federal funds. It's takes matching funds. I grew up in Nampa and I can tell you there's a lot of places in Idaho where, now, it's just houses —— houses around Lake Lowell.

Everybody wants to live around the lake, they want to live around the river. I know that they have problems out there because they have septic. All that stuff has got to be going somewhere. But I think we need —— when you start to look at land uses, you're talking about people's private lives.

If you tell these farmers not to sell their land to developers, they'll tell you to go fly a kite. This developer is going to pay me $10 million. And it really seems logical. Like I said, even in Kuna you've got the same problem. We've got to start looking —— Smart Growth is a good plan. You have to think about those things and go with it.

I chose to live in Nampa because I like open areas, but that is all going away. The south side of Nampa, all the way across town, that's where

Costco is. And I know they're doing it in the best interest of profit.

MR. BARRETT: I appreciate what you just said, and I think —— and I agree property rights are important. I would say if you're going to have these thousands of home built, then let's be honest about it. There's going to be consequences about air quality if this is the kind of development we're going to have.

This is the impact we're going to have. Just to throw out a potential role, as of right now, and I think this is what the impact is on air quality, AKA impact of VMT of a particular development. I think that needs to be part of the development review and permitting process. Has that come up before?

MR. SHEALY: If I could ask Deanna —— if I could just put you on the spot and ask you, of this impacts neighborhoods, from a neighborhood standpoint I'd like to hear your thoughts, you've got a lot of experience on the neighborhood side of things. How all of this impacts the neighborhoods you dealt with this in the east end, southeast part of Boise. But we're talking about dynamics in the different parts of the valley. Have you discussed this with other people, in other parts of the valley, and are the concerned about the negative impacts of this kind of development?

MS. SMITH: Definitely. All the time. I think probably good news —— is leadership in the neighborhoods, in my opinion. It's slowly becoming educated. It's definitely one of the challenges along with all of those things you just mentioned.

In my opinion, one of the key goals of the neighborhood is helping them do that. Is having them partner with some of the businesses and etc. It makes a huge difference in their perspective and understanding of the compromises. They have arrived at the other things about neighborhoods. There are no two alike.

I'm kind of a rare entity, but I do a lot of regional work too. I look at it both ways. I have a hard time with —— I don't agree. I think this is moving slowly. I think a lot of it is how they're being presented.

MR. SHEALY: Where I was going with this part of the Smart Growth plan is ordinary development. It creates a sense of place. And I think with the sprawl, you're really militating against it. You're not creating places. You're creating these large kinds of models where there is a lot of sterility.

And I think people are reacting to that. Hidden Springs created a planned community —— A more creative community. They're concept really works. It accomplishes two things, it combats sprawl, it also creates a real livable community. So, I hear what Dan's saying. The really downside to

that ——

MR. ROMERO: Yes, there is a downside. And I'll give you an example right now, they're planning to build a community in Wilder. We know what the shopping is in Wilder. Everybody that buys in that nice community, in Wilder, their going to have to drive to downtown Nampa to go to Costco to shop.

That's a reality that we have to face. You tell them you can't put these thousand units out here and sell them at a half million dollars a piece. You're looking at land use. But you're also looking at, you know, a big argument about preserving land. There is some selfish reasons for it.

I also see what's going on in Canyon County. I see where you have a drive—by in one part of town. You move four miles out of town, you can build your house then you can drive into town. You don't have to deal with people. And you're seeing a lot of that happening in Caldwell.

Caldwell has done extraordinary things. Their mayor's been building up downtown Caldwell. How many homes do see being built in down town Caldwell? It's no where near downtown Caldwell. In fact, if you go to the northside of Caldwell, I won't even drive through it, and it's not far from the improvements. If you go right across town there, you can see they're in despair. They're not rebuilding, they're not putting homes there where people can use downtown Caldwell. That's because people live in the outskirts of Caldwell.

It doesn't take a mental genius to know where they're shopping. It doesn't take a mental genius to know that Wal-mart is on Nampa Caldwell Blvd. Smart Growth is great, but we also have to see a lot of this is driven by economics. The person that builds Wal-mart, knew that Caldwell was not a place to build it and moved it out. People building homes know that downtown Caldwell is not a place to build. Nampa is facing the same problem.

If you look at downtown Nampa, it's very different from Boise. You know how I see downtown, try to get to the freeway, I have to go through downtown. I never stop there.

MR. BARRETT: In Nampa?

MR. ROMERO: Yeah. It's just a hassle to go down through the town to get out of there. You're looking at Smart Growth. You've also got to look at the where the people have already developed. But unfortunately, that is just not feasible for Smart Growth right now. But then you also have to find some way to officially trust, land trust is a good way to go if somebody can make money off of their land, by God, he's going to do it.

MR. BARRETT: I think I agree that economics plays a big part in it. Land owners and developers need to be able to make a profit. I think the economics are changing.

And I think the cities that are going to get ahead are the ones that see that coming and change their policies to be better prepared for the future. People are going to appreciate these place more and not want to travel six or eight miles to go to Costco for every little thing. So, I think it is changing.

SPEAKER: You talked about open spaces. What relationship is the context? Downtown Nampa and downtown Caldwell are really good examples, they are continually going through and building back in there. Some residential — — would be an excellent example of Smart Growth and mixed uses. Right now, if you look at the cities that are older like Boise, where they lost that over time or maybe never had it really. On that time period, I think the struggling communities that are small or even Meridian is even trying to. That's really the sort of thing. I served on the Blue Print Committee. You don't need a huge percent making people live in condos.

We're talking about a small percentage of the overall population to shift dynamics in the Treasure Valley. By putting a small percentage of —— I think would draw people to downtown Nampa, Meridian, and downtown Caldwell. The rest of the plans are really excellent.

I think that's part of what we're talking about. Correct me if I'm wrong, VMT data —— and there is data out there about what potential VMT savings could occur particularly from these communities in motion. I think you could translate that to ——

MR. BARRETT: I think where I want to go is not just thinking about VMT savings on a regional big savings on a project scale. Look at the VMT —— we get so caught up on the number of trips generated by a development. But we don't talk about VMT, and how we make that shift. I don't know, but I think it's important because that's how we're really going to start to understand this air quality connection.

MR. KESINGER: First of all, I don't know how property rights would equate to cleaner air. I do think that planning and zoning would make a contribution to our air. I think that there are other recommendations that could be made that could contribute to the air quality in the community. One of them —— I would like to mention is well, okay, we were talking about neighborhoods —— how the neighborhoods relate to the air issue.

I wonder whether in the neighborhoods are concerned about the air quality on the streets —— from traffic on their streets. Whether the air

quality is worse on streets with high traffic volumes and whether the place to put that traffic is on residential streets.

And whether that would be a consideration for the traffic planning. Traffic should go —— whether that would be an issue from Smart Growth. And to address where traffic goes. Another issue about traffic and road design that I wonder if it's been considered whether traffic circles would result in cleaner air.

Or instead, equating vehicle miles traveled, you could also equate vehicle miles traveled to vehicle time operated. We've got cars that are operating at traffic signals. Traffic circles save gas.

MR. O'NIEL: As Dan pointed out earlier, there's and enormous amount of data in the communities in motion and Blue Print work of the task forces and the technical task forces and so and so forth, in terms of vehicle miles traveled. Speed of traffic level S, level B, grades more pollution than that of cars moving at a constant rate of speed.

First I would like to make an observation, my friend Dan here regional plan land use can't resist going back to the number one recommendation that the Urban Land Policy Advisory. They were invited in to help us manage our growth in the future —— This was 1995.

The number one recommendation was as soon as you folks recognize you're in a large and growing metropolitan area and start behaving in that way in your planning, the better off you'll be. And we're still arguing ten years later over the same issues.

Should we have even plan, because not everybody likes planning and not everybody likes the result of it. You've got to start somewhere. Chairman of the redevelopment agency in Boise in 1985, 20 years ago nobody lived in downtown. It was bombed out.

Nobody wanted to live downtown and how many, but you have to start somewhere. There are how many, two thousand eight hundred residential units on the drawing board in downtown Boise because it's a nice place to live. It will happen in your lifetime in Caldwell. You got to start somewhere. You got to let the foundation form.

That's what the Blue Print in the community in motion has pointed out. That is something I have pointed out and that's something that the Treasure Valley Air Quality Council has pointed out. It's been pointed out by others to us that that section of our draft plan is weak. It's short, It's soft and we had a presentation at our last council meeting. Would you be a supporter of public transportation funding coalition? I think we all took the position at that time that we need to learn more about that because it's important for

the Treasure Valley Air Quality Council to endorse that and to endorse Blue Print in motion. We have to have a stronger statement to the plan because we have to pull those three things together to make land use transportation planning and some kind of way to fund public transportation. So the question I would raise to you is whether you're reading and planning. That's something that you ought to take a little stronger position on.

MR. SHEALY: Yes.

MS. NICHOL: I live in the north end of Boise and every block or maybe at least every other block has some kind of renovation or some kind of remodeling going on. The vehicles parked in front, the construction people are all in big cars —— big pick—ups, a lot of them diesel. And they sit in those vehicles for 30 to 40 minutes to talk on their phones. I'm just about ready to prepare a little note, to put it on their window, saying we don't like breathing your exhaust.

I think education of every single person is what our community needs to emphasize is what air quality. It's an individual responsibility, not just for a guy who is driving a truck but for me the crabby old lady who likes to bitch about things like that.

MR. ROMERO: Air quality, I think everyone is concerned about it and it's very much an individual responsibility of everyone. But I live between two elementary schools and that road is full of people with their cars idling and I have to weave around them to get out of my place.

It is the education part that needs to be done. That's what I was saying, make them take the bus, save me the hassle. But you know, I could honestly say, my wife did the same thing when our kids were small. We don't trust the system, we don't trust other people with our kids, so it's really tough. So I think when more and more people become aware of the health benefits, they'll realize it's not healthy to sit in front of the school for 30 minutes with your car idling just to see that your car made it to the building. It is a tough call. I could knock on each one of those windows and say you're polluting my air. And they would say, "will you please leave me alone, I'm waiting for my kids". I think we need to do something different. There is some education that needs to go with it.

MR. KESINGER: Well, the city gives building permits for those people that are working on the construction sites. Does the city have any authority of how those construction sites are operated or are we dealing strictly with the state, to make a proposal to the state. So I don't know that we can necessarily address city issues. That's probably a city ——

MR. SHEALY: I can certainly address that. There are a lot of

things we can do, going up and telling people to turn there cars off is not one of them.

MR. KESINGER: What I said was make a city policy relating to building permits, not telling people to turn their engines off, but asking the city to make a proposal in relation to it's building permits.

MR. SHEALY: Well, I'm a big believer in volunteerism. And I think it gets kind of personal. That said, you can't legislate based on personal areas in our lives. I'd love to be able to. I'm in small government kind of guy. There are limits to what we can do.

MR. KESINGER: I only present my opinion, because the only thing I heard was leave it to the individual. I only expressed alternative ways of educating for that issue.

MR. LANGHORST: This is where the education part of this plan comes in. Whether the council goes in the direction of something like this, is to be determined, but I don't see that it's any different than littering. If we started coming up with ads that equate don't throw your trash out the window and don't let your car idle for a half an hour. We're getting there, but it just takes time.

MR. ROMERO: It seems really pitiful, it's common sense, especially with the price of gas. You'd think common sense would kick in. But sometimes we just have to tell people, idling your car is doing this much damage. Wouldn't it be nicer if you just turn it off? That's a process we grew up with.

People in the United States are very fortunate. We grew up having four or five cars. You know, people don't have all these cars in some areas of the world. They're lucky if they own a car. We have become spoiled and now we're trying to change the way people think. We're doing a paradigm shift and it does take time.

MR. KAPLAN: It was just a variation talking about Canyon County and not saying that farmers can't sell their land to developers to make a lot of money, but the city —— when developers go to the city for planning and zoning that the city has specific design requirements that the developers have to meet in order to fulfill this proper land use.

I think that if it comes from the city, the developers aren't going to go away, least of all California and they're going to come here and spend another half million dollars on the development and they'll make ten million dollars. I think that's perfectly reasonable request that they make on the developers. And it's like in Caldwell where now suddenly we're going to get impacted by all these houses. Where all the other developers in the last two

years and the amount of money they were paying for the services in the city. So that's coming around, but I think the cities have a responsibility.

MR. SHEALY: There's one inescapable thing. My secondary concern is when you tell somebody what they can and can not do with their property, you end up impacting upon their ability to profit. And it's legally defendable in court.

I believe the incentive to business centers, as a way of preserving our own space, it's a really torturous process. I've been involved with it in the city council. I'm sure you've all been involved with it seen it and it's been a really very, very difficult concept to breach. This battle between property rights and effective land use plan, now if anybody in the forum has an answer to that, I think it's going to be an evolutionary process and thinks it's going to be a process where bit by bit we can chip away at it.

I worked with somebody in this realm a couple of years ago, who shall remain nameless, at the leadership conference. It will pass in time where people can buy a piece of property and do whatever they want to do with it. And I think it's the notion, it's gradually taking hold. But that is the crux of the issue. In my humble opinion, that is the impact of property rights upon effective land use rights. Until we solve that, I think we're going to be spinning our wheels.

MR.ROMERO: And one of the things that we did together, and I was pretty shocked how well they got along. That's one of our big selling points, we got all this open space, which is all gone now. I think when they come together, they say, "Hey, something's going wrong here." Because the farmers don't want us building houses next to canals.

That's a big problem we're dealing with today. To build right next to a canal that a farmer is using. And then the property owner says, "I don't like the canal there, my kid doesn't know how to swim." And Smart Growth is the answer.

But it always gets down to the property rights issue in Idaho. It's big. It's one of those things you get open up a whole can of worms. And the other thing that you've got to remember, you couldn't give Idaho land away and it wasn't that long ago. My parents, they owned 40 acres in Nampa, they've got rid of it now. But before you couldn't give it away. I mean, people didn't want it.

MR. KESINGER: With the things that we're proposing, do you think that arguments of copyrights would prevail over the argument for clean air?

MR. ROMERO: I would let Dave go tell the folks you know, when it comes to property rights there's a whole different psyche, you know,

everything goes out the window, even common sense.

MS. NICHOL: I used to live in Nevada, then Colorado from 1960 to 1976. The area where I lived it's just outside of Denver, when a developer built a bunch of houses, he was required by the county to allocate property for schools, property for parks, all of the infrastructure had to be paid for by the developers and that got passed on to the people. If it happened in Colorado, why could it not happen here?

MR. ROMERO: It just started, you know those impact fees in Caldwell, those are new.

MS. NICHOL: This requires a designated approach, a piece of land, like a desirable piece of land, not the left over corner that nobody wants.

MR. ROMERO: Well, we tried. And I'm speaking for Nampa, I'm talking about that little park we put out there. We had to by the land. The developers said, "No." He wouldn't put the park in. We had to buy land from the developer to put that park in. You've got these 3,000 houses and we need a central location for the kids.

SPEAKER: Now, at least from my point of view, we need to solve land use problems or property rights problems. There's an undeniable connection between land use transportation and air quality.

And the question is that I asked before, and I would like some feedback on that whether we get it tonight or report to us later on that. But we should make a stronger point of that in the final plan. That we need to strengthen the lineage between land use transportation and air quality. We've been told by others that that's a big part of the plan. And I would think the citizens would like to weigh in on it. It's all an interesting thing. And I've spent, I don't know how many hundreds of hours talking about land use planning and I've been drummed out of the core. But I am one of the supporters of impact fees because most of our developers, they aren't big enough to have a school on it or a park on it, but collectively, they all contribute to the need for schools the need for parks. That's a whole different argument.

I don't think we're going to solve that in the Treasure Valley Air Quality Council, but those are issues that have to be dealt with it. We're not going to be able to handle those in the Air Quality Council. Should we make the ——

MR. KESINGER: I think we would be better served improving our air quality and pay little regard, at this point in time, to the issues of land ownership property rights. We can try to come up with more ideas on how

to improve the air quality.

I would like to know if traffic circles would be a consideration or if they contribute to air quality directly in residential areas would be a consideration. I also wanted to present another possibility with the Boise airport.

Perhaps we could find out pollution results from the airport and whether there are methods for improving air quality for the airport. I think there is actually a green airport plan in which they incorporate methods of landing and take off which utilize the wind. I've heard there is such a plan at the Boise airport. That is a major source of pollution and it should be addressed.

SPEAKER: I would love to see a stronger argument. There is adequate data out there and the primary reason, as we acknowledged earlier, we're trying to make a shift here.

We've acknowledged our alleged leaders. Air quality is a very significant economic challenge in this valley. And critical leadership knows that. And so I think anything that you could bring to the table that shows the reduction of VMTs would bring cleaner air and be cost effective.

Any other things that you can do containing emissions, that's great. And I'm not against getting people out of their cars. I don't know, but it would be kind of interesting, if there data out there about the traffic stop signs versus traffic circlers. There is a lot of data could be brought into this argument.

MR. BARRETT: That's a big question I have too. Does the Air Quality Council see itself as continuing to be active advocates beyond the completion of the plan? Can somebody answer that for me?

MR. SHEALY: That's on our agenda next week.

MR. BARRETT: If the answer to that question is, yes, I think there's a need to get active in the Treasure Valley. This question about growth and VMT, are we measuring it accurately? Can we do a better job of estimating VMT growth by any particular project and development? We're don't seem to be doing that at all. So, is the role for the Air Quality Council, it's a monitoring kind of role that would track VMT on an annual or project by project or on some kind of basis you could measure. So you could see how the land use strategies are working. What's going on with the growth and VMT's. Is it increasing rapidly?

SPEAKER: Compass had it. We used it in a lot of our data. It was used in Blue Print. I don't happen to agree with you, we'll have that as a side comment. I think you start trying to govern this on a subdivision by

subdivision basis, you got the wrong thing. You've got to look at it on a broader scale than that.

To answer your question, the legislature —— and correct me if I'm wrong, suggested a seven year life and it also suggested that we submit a plan for this years legislation.

It is my thought, at the moment, my original thought six months ago, we ought to go for the whole enchilada the first time out of the box. Realistically, if this doesn't make any sense —— if you stop and think about it, in our second recommendation, there's two things that would have the regulatory authority.

One is the recommendations for Stage 1 vapor recovery, the other is a new vehicle emission testing program for the air shed. The others are good citizenship using your head. Don't idle your car outside of your construction site and the whole list of those things. Public education, and it doesn't cost anybody anything if we can get the 7th graders to go home and tell their parents. That's one part may be as simple as endorsing Blue Prints Recommendation, endorsing regional transportation. By endorsing those kinds of things and we're going to be around, so what are some things that we can do around the airport that —— we've heard some conflicting data. Most of the airports, what their doing is electrifying the airport vehicles.

It's not the airplanes themselves, its all the service vehicles that run around. There is all kinds of other things that are on the horizon. But what we've done is two things that have tried and true proven technology were not on the edge. We're just following stuff that's been done everywhere else that has this kind of problem. And we're not that different.

MR. KESINGER: Besides those ones with the greatest potential for passing the legislation, is it possible to tack on recommendations for future studies?

SPEAKER: Absolutely. That's in the initial plan. I think it could be sharpened.

MR. ROMERO: One of the things that I understood was regional land use makes it a little stronger. Like you said, go for the whole thing. We're not going to be there to be getting beat up on. I think that's a good way to present it. This is the whole thing, and they'll have their say.

SPEAKER: My first addition of that, Dan, is going to help line up all the delegation. As I see it, and this is based on the model, this was based on the Payette Lake Management, that would be when the legislature passes this plan and collectively comes together.

This council was indebted to be a multi-jurisdictional problem. These

things were not getting done or these things weren't happening fast enough. This is an attempt to create clean air for everybody in that air shed to try to solve the problem itself. But going forward, you will come up with technology. Technology will change the dynamics of the air shed.

MR. SHEALY: We're falling further and further behind.

MR. ROMERO: I want to thank all of you for coming. Personally, this is my home even though I travel all over the place. I'm concerned about the future of Idaho. And like myself, there is many of us that like it here. Idaho is real small.

I think that's why it's important that we start to look at how we can preserve some of the things that keep Idaho great. I've traveled quite a bit and this is home. I'm sort of stuck here. Thank you.

MR. SHEALY: The next meeting is going to be Wednesday, September 27th at Meridian City Police Department from 6:00 to 8:00 pm. I'll be speaking with Dan, and we'll get an agenda for that meeting. Part of the reasoning for the sign in sheet is so I can keep you folks informed of the next meeting. So please fill out the sheet.

(Concluded at 8:15 PM)