

Activity: CARS AND TRUCKS WITH VISIBLE EMISSIONS (SMOKERS)

Impact/Benefit

- **Source of emission:** Vehicles with visible emissions.
- **Quantity:** Believed significant by scientists.
- **Reduction potential:** Large.
- **Number of similar sources:** Large.

Roughly 2,000 – 4,000, including interstate freeway traffic (based on California estimates of percent of smokers; 1-2 percent and estimated vehicles per day at about 200,000). Local traffic is probably a much smaller number; maybe 20,000 total cars of which 200-400 are smokers.

- **Severity of the impacts to be mitigated:**

Significant. The exposure to particulates-related health effects are believed significant.

- **Visibility of the impacts:**

Visible. Smokers are clearly visible.

Plan

There is already a state rule (Minn.R. 7023.0105) prohibiting use of a vehicle with visible emissions. The rule has never been marketed or enforced. The short-term plan is for the community leaders, city and state to use the rule as an educational tool. An education action plan would need development. It is unclear whether enforcement is a good idea, especially if people cannot afford to replace their vehicle. Further research is needed to address this concern. In the longer term, we should continue to benchmark and explore a program similar to the one in Bakersfield, California. That plan involving voluntary testing, vouchers to reduce fix it costs, and use of local labor for testing and repair.

Implementability

- **General feasibility:**

Education will be easy. A more extensive effort will be moderate to hard.

- **Cost of implementing:**

Labor and perhaps a limited budget for educational materials. For the future effort some time needs to be committed to benchmarking and lining up partners.

- **Need for additional funding, list of possible funding sources:**

The city or state can attempt to carve out a limited (5K?) education materials budget. Maybe Clean Air Minnesota can help with other costs?

- **Recommendation on how to and who should pursue funding:**

Lisa Smeastead and Dave Richfield can pursue education funding as part of normal budgeting process.

- **Labor required and available to implement activity:**

The combination of community volunteer labor and city and state labor should work to carve out a humble level of effort. A more elaborate effort will require labor for benchmarking, securing funding, securing partners, and labor from partners for car repair. Car owners will also need to set aside time to participate.

- **Timeframe to implement:**

Developing and deploying an education effort could start right away. It will take a while to sort out the other issues.

Ripeness for action

- **This activity can be initiated immediately:**

Education	yes
Benchmarking	yes
Preliminary design of a car testing and repair program.	yes

- **This activity needs funding:**

Marketing materials	yes
---------------------	-----

- **Funding for the activity can be secured immediately or soon:**

Education funding can probably be secured by August.

Recommendation:

- **Implement as soon as possible, implement as resources are available, or do not implement:**

Implement education after funding secured this summer.

Continue ongoing benchmarking.

Re-assess additional action after further study.