

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

Community Stakeholder Survey (Qualitative Interviews)

PREPARED FOR

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

PREPARED BY

Corey, Canapary & Galanis Research

May 2010

Introduction

This report details the findings of a qualitative telephone survey of community stakeholders with influence over the San Joaquin Valley Area.

These stakeholders came from the private sector, the non-profit sector, and the government sector. Most stakeholders represented major industry sectors, such as transportation and energy; health/environment; agriculture/food; construction/real estate; and legal/consulting.

Stakeholders were contacted from various sources, including attendee lists from recent meetings/hearings at the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. Respondents were screened to ensure they were a key decision-maker as it pertained to air pollution/air quality matters for their organization.

Fieldwork for this survey was conducted in April and May, 2010. A total of 31 interviews were conducted.

Key objectives of the interviews include:

- More effectively direct the District's media campaigns.
- Determine educational priorities.
- Discover decision-makers' level of understanding about air quality.
- Assess what behavioral changes may be made with assistance at the organizational level.

Results are qualitative in nature because:

- Only 31 interviews were conducted – an insufficient number for quantitative results; and
- The questionnaire was planned in such a way as to elicit directional (qualitative) data, rather than quantitative statistics.

Therefore, results should be read as directional only.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Key Highlights

Respondents rated air quality 2.23 (out of 5.00), where “1” is poor and “5” is excellent. Notably, those based in or with operations in the Northern part of the District were more favorable about air quality (and later, indicated air quality programs were somewhat less important) than those in the Central and Southern regions of the District.

Respondents were mixed when it came to the source of pollution. While 18 indicated most pollution came from within the Valley, 11 said at least half came from sources outside the Valley. Notably, 9 respondents directly mentioned (unaided) the impact of vehicles and other mobile sources on air quality.

When asked about the health impacts of air quality, most respondents noted either:

1. Health-related impacts, including both short-term problems (such as asthma problems on particularly high pollutant days) and long-term problems (such as decreased lung function in long-time residents and death).
2. Cost-related impacts, from the cost of additional equipment to comply with regulations to the choice of business location based (in part) on the regulatory environment.

While respondents tended to mention the impacts most likely to pertain to them directly, most respondents, during the interview, indicated the need to balance both the health issues and cost.

Of the 31 respondents, 28 said they had heard of the Healthy Air Living program, while 1 said they ‘might’ have heard and 2 said they had not. (All respondents had heard of the Check Before You Burn program.)

When asked to describe what they knew about Healthy Air Living, however, some respondents gave incorrect information (e.g. that it only takes place during the summer or focuses on providing information to businesses) or found it difficult to recall many details. Three respondents directly likened it to Spare the Air.

When asked to rate Healthy Air Living and Check Before You Burn-type programs, respondents overall gave a mean score of 3.48 (out of 4.00). Those in the agricultural/food processing sector rated these programs among the least important, giving a rating of 3.11, while those in the health/environment sector rated the programs’ importance 3.86 (the highest mean rating by sector). Those in the North and Central portions of the District rated the importance of these programs lower than those in the South part of the District. Some respondents questioned whether these types of programs are really pertinent to their organization, since the programs focus so much on individual behavior.

The four attitudinal statements drew the most hesitation of any part of the questionnaire, and several respondents directly indicated their discomfort with being asked such questions. Most respondents were seeking a balance overall, with a more holistic approach that encouraged healthy environmental standards while also being sensitive to cost. Most respondents felt the District did a good job of walking this fine line, enforcing laws while also considering the financial impact on businesses.

Geography of Respondents

While the interviews were being made, attempts were made to ensure that those responding came from, and had influence over, various portions of the San Joaquin Valley, so that no one area was over- or under-represented.

Where Respondents Work (Work Base)

Of the 31 respondents:

- 5 were based in the Northern counties of the District;
- 12 were based in the Central counties of the District;
- 10 were based in the Southern counties of the District; and
- 4 were based outside of the District.

All 4 of those outside the District were in Northern California, either in the Sacramento or Bay Area regions. Three of the four organizations were industry groups, while one was a government agency. All of these organizations had members, clients, or constituents throughout the District.

Where Respondents Have Influence

Respondents have influence over various areas of the District. "Influence" in this case is defined as:

- a) Serving constituents or customers in a particular area; and/or
- b) If a membership organization, having members in a particular area.

Among the 31 respondents:

- 17 had influence over one or more Northern counties of the District
- 24 had influence over one or more Central counties of the District
- 23 had influence over one or more Southern counties of the District

Extent of Respondents' Personal Influence

Of those interviewed, 24 said they are involved in key decisions that impact the San Joaquin Valley within their organization, while another 7 said they were somewhat involved in these key decisions. Those indicating they were only somewhat involved were generally focused on an environmental, air quality, or regulatory portion of their organization's key decisions.

Perception of Air Quality

Q3. Overall, how would you rate air quality in this area on a 5-point scale, where 5 is Excellent and 1 is Poor?

Overall, respondents gave the air quality a below-average rating, with a mean score of 2.23 (out of 5.00). Notably, no respondents gave a “5” (Excellent) rating.

Those in the northern part of the District tend to have a more favorable view of air quality than those in central and southern regions of the District.

Industry sector also played a role in ratings, with those in agriculture rating air quality higher than those in health or real estate related industries.

Group (Size)	Mean Score
All Respondents (31)	2.23
Government (9)	1.44
CBO (4)	2.50
Private sector (18)	2.56
Transportation/Energy (4)	2.25
Health/Environment (7)	1.43
Agriculture/Food Processing (11)	2.82
Real Estate/Construction (3)	2.00
Legal/Consulting (6)	2.17
Influence - North (17)	2.53
Influence - Central (24)	2.38
Influence - South (23)	2.35
Location - North (5)	3.00
Location - Central (12)	2.25
Location - South (10)	1.90
Location - Out of District (4)	2.00

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Perception of Air Quality Changes (Last 5 Years)

Q4. Over the past 5 years, would you say the air quality in this area has gotten better, worse, or is about the same?

Scale: Much Better = 5.00
Somewhat Better = 4.00
About the Same = 3.00
Somewhat Worse = 2.00
Much Worse = 1.00

Overall, respondents rated the changes in air quality 4.00 (out of 5.00), or somewhat better. Those located in the south and those with influence in the southern part of the District were more likely to rate the change in air quality more favorably than those with influence over, or based in, the central and northern regions of the District.

By sector, those in agriculture rated the change in air quality most favorably, while those in the health/environment sector rated the change in air quality the least favorably.

Group (Size)	Mean Score
All Respondents (31)	4.00
Government (9)	3.56
CBO (4)	3.50
Private sector (18)	4.35
Transportation/Energy (4)	4.25
Health/Environment (7)	3.00
Agriculture/Food Processing (11)	4.50
Real Estate/Construction (3)	4.00
Legal/Consulting (6)	4.17
Influence - North (17)	4.06
Influence - Central (24)	4.22
Influence - South (23)	4.05
Location - North (5)	3.60
Location - Central (12)	4.42
Location - South (10)	3.70
Location - Out of District (4)	4.00

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Air Pollution Sources

Q5. Would you say most of the Valley's air pollution comes from within the San Joaquin Valley, or is it produced in other regions of California and blown by wind into this area?

(N=31)	#
Within San Joaquin Valley	18
Other regions of California	3
Equal amounts from within and outside	8
Not sure	2

While most (18 out of 31) said most of the Valley's air pollution comes from within the Valley, 11 (one third of respondents) said it came from other regions to some extent.

Notably, 9 respondents provided additional **unaided** information that they felt mobile sources (e.g. cars and trucks, mostly coming from outside the San Joaquin Valley) was a considerable source of pollution that was not being addressed, or not being regulated as fully as stationery sources. Two respondents cited the delay of requiring pollution-reduction devices on semi trucks as an example of mobile sources being under less stringent regulation and causing more harm to the San Joaquin Valley.

Some private sector businesses also felt this allowed individual citizens (who generally drive cars) to call for more stringent pollution controls without doing their part.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Impact of Air Quality

Q6. Could you describe how the air quality in this area [Q1] has impacted your [customers, employees, constituents, members], if at all?

Responses to this question tended to fall into two groups:

3. Health-related impacts, including both short-term problems (such as asthma problems on particularly high pollutant days) and long-term problems (such as decreased lung function in long-time residents and death).
4. Cost-related impacts, from the cost of additional equipment to comply with regulations to the choice of business location based (in part) on the regulatory environment.

Respondents tended to mention the impacts most likely to pertain to them directly, with private sector and non-health-related respondents citing cost, and health-related and non-profit respondents citing health impacts. However, each 'side' tended to be at least somewhat aware of the other concerns, and most respondents, during the interview, indicated the need to balance both the health issues and cost.

Q6. "Could you describe how the air quality in this area [Q1] has impacted your [customers, employees, constituents, members], if at all?"

IT HAS CREATED MORE DESIRE TO BE IN THE VANPOOLS WE OPERATE. MORE PEOPLE TELL ME THEY'RE DOING VANPOOLING TO KEEP THE AIR CLEAN; THEY SAVE MONEY, TOO, BUT THEY'RE DOING IT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL REASONS AS WELL.

WE'VE SEEN INCREASES IN ASTHMA [ADULT], COPD, AND CHILDHOOD ASTHMA. THOSE ARE OUR MAIN THINGS. WE'RE REALLY BATTLING CHILDHOOD ASTHMA. MORE AND MORE KIDS ARE GETTING ASTHMA.

THE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEE SICK DAYS IS HIGHER. MOST CUSTOMERS ARE IN THE DEVELOPMENT SECTOR, SO IT'S DEALING WITH THE REGULATIONS DEALING WITH DUST AND HOW IT IMPACTS THEIR OPERATIONS.

IT HAS IMPACTED OUR MEMBERS PRIMARILY DUE TO THE INCREASING STRICTNESS OF THE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.

BREATHING IRREGULARITIES, ESPECIALLY IN THE SUMMER, ARE EXPERIENCED BY EMPLOYEES AND THEIR FAMILIES.

LONG-TERM EXPOSURE TO THE LEVELS WE HAVE HERE ARE DETRIMENTAL OVER MANY YEARS. SOME OF THE EVENTS CAN BE HAZARDOUS SHORT-TERM, BUT IT'S MOSTLY LIVING HERE 20-30 YEARS WHERE YOU START TO LOSE LUNG FUNCTION. THE HIGHER PARTICULATE DAYS CAN BE A THREAT IF YOU HAVE HEART DISEASE, BUT THEY AREN'T AS COMMON AND MOST PEOPLE HAVE LEARNED TO STAY OUT OF THEM.

A LOT OF MY CUSTOMERS HAVE TO SPEND MORE MONEY ON COMPLIANCE.

WE HAVE NO HEAVY EQUIPMENT IN SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY. OUR LARGEST CLIENT . . . WE DO NOT DO ANY HEAVY WORK THERE FOR THEM BECAUSE WE CANNOT CONVERT EQUIPMENT IN A COST-EFFECTIVE MANNER TO MEET REGULATIONS. POSITIONS WITH WALKING/SMALL VEHICLES HAVE NOT BEEN IMPACTED.

GENERALLY, IT CONTRIBUTES TO A NEGATIVE IMAGE OF THE AREA.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Q6. “Could you describe how the air quality in this area [Q1] has impacted your [customers, employees, constituents, members], if at all?”

OUR MEMBERS ARE STATIONERY SOURCES, AND THOSE ARE 20% (OUR MEMBERS ARE PART OF THAT 20%, THOUGH, NOT ALL OF IT) OF THE POLLUTION IN THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY, WHILE 80% IS RELATED TO MOBILE SOURCES. THE DISTRICT ONLY HAS CONTROL OVER THE STATIONERY SOURCES. YOU CAN SHUT DOWN ALL OF MY MEMBER COMPANIES, AND WE (THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY) WOULD STILL BE OUT OF ATTAINMENT FOR PM 2.5 AND OZONE. IT'S EXTREMELY COSTLY, PARTICULARLY WHEN MY MEMBERS HAVE TO PUT IN NEW EQUIPMENT EVERY 3-4 YEARS BECAUSE OF NEW ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION. THE EQUIPMENT SHOULD HAVE 15-30 YEAR LIFECYCLES, AND NEW EQUIPMENT DOES NOT INCREASE THEIR PRODUCTIVITY. THE ISSUE NOW IS THAT BUSINESSES ARE CHOOSING TO GO ELSEWHERE, AND WHAT THAT MEANS FOR EMPLOYMENT IN THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY. THERE'S A BALANCE ISSUE, FROM A HEALTH PERSPECTIVE - YES, WE HAVE AN IMPACT WITH THESE REGULATIONS, THERE ARE HEALTH BENEFITS AND THEY ARE SIGNIFICANT, BUT PEOPLE WITHOUT JOBS HAVE OTHER STRESSORS THAT IMPACT THEIR QUALITY OF LIFE. HOW DO WE MAINTAIN THE ENVIRONMENT AND BE ECONOMICALLY VIABLE? WE NEED TO BALANCE THOSE TWO.

IT DRIVES A LOT OF THE DECISION-MAKING WHEN WE'RE WORKING ON DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS. THERE ARE ALSO REGULATIONS WE HAVE TO COMPLY WITH THAT DIDN'T EXIST 5 YEARS AGO. IN DOING EIRS WE HAVE TO DO GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION ANALYSES AND AIR QUALITY ANALYSES. WE'RE EVEN DOING A SOLAR PROJECT WHERE WE HAVE TO DO THAT, AND IT'S COSTING US THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS TO GO THROUGH THAT.

FOR OUR BOARD MEMBERS (FARMERS, BUSINESSPEOPLE), IT MAKES THINGS MORE DIFFICULT FOR THEM AS IT BALANCES IMPROVING AIR QUALITY AGAINST THE FINANCIAL IMPACT. IT MAKES DOING BUSINESS IN THE VALLEY MORE CHALLENGING AND IS A STRIKE AGAINST THE VALLEY IN TERMS OF THE LIVABILITY OF THE VALLEY. THE ISSUE MAKES AND EXACERBATES A LOT OF OTHER CHALLENGES IN THE VALLEY, IN TERMS OF THE VALLEY'S ATTRACTIVENESS. LET ME GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE ABOUT HOW ATTRACTIVE THE VALLEY IS AS A PLACE TO LIVE IN CALIFORNIA. THERE IS A LOT OF FUN POKED AT THE VALLEY AND WHEN YOU ADD, ON TOP OF THAT, THAT THE VALLEY HAS ONE OF THE MOST CHALLENGING AIR POLLUTION RATES IN THE COUNTRY, AND PEOPLE BRING UP THE ASTHMA RATES IN FRESNO, ETC., IT MAKES IT MORE CHALLENGING TO MARKET THE VALLEY.

OUR MEMBERS HAVE BEEN PART OF THE CONTRIBUTORS TO THE SUCCESS OF THE CLEAN-UP IN THE SENSE THAT AGRICULTURE OR FARMS HAVE BEEN COMING UNDER THE REGULATION OF THE DISTRICT AND HAVE BEEN A KEY PART OF THE WHOLE PROCESS.

I LIVE IN THE FOOTHILLS. IN 1998-2000, YOU COULDN'T SEE THE COASTAL RANGE WHERE I LIVE. NOW I CAN. THAT TELLS ME THE AIR QUALITY IS MUCH BETTER, ESPECIALLY WITH WHAT OUR FARMERS HAVE DONE TO HELP REDUCE PM, BUT THEY KEEP MOVING THE TARGET, TOO. THEY WENT FROM A 1-HOUR TO AN 8-HOUR STANDARD. OUT OF ALL INDUSTRIES, MOST HAVE HAD 20-30 YEARS TO GRADUALLY DEAL WITH AIR QUALITY ISSUES. AGRICULTURE WAS THROWN INTO IT IN 2004. WE SUDDENLY HAD TO DO ALL THIS STUFF, BUT LO AND BEHOLD, IN 1993 WE HAD DONE RESEARCH AND DONE A LOT (E.G. PM10) TO BE READY. THE DISTRICT IS THE ONLY ONE THAT HAS ATTAINED THE PM10 STANDARD (ATTAINED IN DEC 2007-2008). WE ACCOMPLISHED THAT BECAUSE OF AGRICULTURE'S REDUCTION OF POLLUTANTS AS PLANNED THROUGH THE FARMERS' ATTAINMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN, SO WE WERE ABLE TO QUANTIFY AND REDUCE THE PM10 EMISSIONS JUST BY AGRICULTURE (A REDUCTION OF 4.5 TONS OVER WHAT WAS NEEDED, PER DAY, WHICH WAS HUGE). WE WERE ALSO THROWN INTO THE ISSUE OF PORTABLE ENGINES, AND GETTING NEWER ENGINES. THAT WAS THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE NOX REDUCTION OF ANYTHING IN THE STATE (E.G. ABOUT \$1200 PER TON, WHEREAS MOST ARE AROUND \$25,000 PER TON). WE'VE DONE A LOT IN OUR INDUSTRY TO HELP CLEAN UP THE AIR, AND THE INDUSTRY HAS BEEN PROACTIVE - OILING OF ROADS, CLEANER BURNING DRYERS AND BURNERS, CLEANER PORTABLE ENGINES, AND NOW FARM EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT - BUT ONLY IF THERE'S A PROGRAM. IF THERE'S NO PROGRAM, COST-WISE, WE CAN'T DO IT.

THERE ARE A LOT MORE STRINGENT REGULATIONS, AND THE FEE SCHEDULE CONTINUES TO CLIMB. AS FAR AS THE ECONOMICS, IT'S HAD A BIG IMPACT ON OUR BUSINESS.

HEALTH IMPACTS - IT'S A LITTLE HARD TO QUANTIFY HOW MANY HAVE BEEN AFFECTED OR HOW MANY DAYS SICK, BUT THAT HAS BEEN DONE VALLEY-WIDE.

IT HAS IMPACTED MY FAMILY AS WELL. TWO OF MY 3 FAMILY MEMBERS HAVE TO TAKE INHALERS FOR ASTHMA, AND I KNOW FOR A FACT THAT MY COMMUNITY MEMBERS ARE ALSO AFFECTED. EVERYBODY BREATHES THE SAME AIR.

I DON'T KNOW HOW IT HAS IMPACTED OUR CUSTOMERS SPECIFICALLY, BUT I THINK IT CONTRIBUTES TO A VARIETY OF HEALTH ISSUES IN GENERAL [HERE], INCLUDING OUR CUSTOMERS.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Q6. “Could you describe how the air quality in this area [Q1] has impacted your [customers, employees, constituents, members], if at all?”

I WORK WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT MOSTLY, SO IT'S HARD TO SAY. WE TRY TO HELP LOCAL GOVERNMENTS DO THINGS THAT IMPROVE THE ENVIRONMENT, INCLUDING REDUCING AIR POLLUTION THROUGH OUTREACH AND EDUCATION, AS WELL AS SOME TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, BUT NOTHING REALLY AIR-RELATED.

THERE'S ABOUT 1400 PEOPLE WHO DIE IN SJV EVERY YEAR FROM AIR POLLUTION. SO DEATH, AND ASTHMA, AND QUALITY OF LIFE.

THE EXPENSE OF SAN JOAQUIN GOING TO EXTREME NON-ATTAINMENT FOR OZONE HAS REQUIRED US TO BE IN DIFFERENT PROGRAMS THAT ARE MORE EXPENSIVE, AND THERE ARE COSTS WITH THE CONTROLS PUT ON US AS A RESULT.

IT HAS VIRTUALLY NO IMPACT.

WE ARE THE FIRST MEDICAL SOCIETY TO DEVELOP AN AIR QUALITY PROGRAM BECAUSE WE HAVE PHYSICIANS WHO ARE VERY, VERY WORRIED ABOUT THE IMPACT IT'S HAVING ON THEIR PATIENTS AND COMMUNITIES, SO THEY TOOK IT UPON THEMSELVES TO WRITE A GRANT FOR THE MEDICAL SOCIETY. THOSE PHYSICIANS ARE NOW REACHING OUT TO OTHER PHYSICIANS TO GET THEM INVOLVED, AND ALSO REACHING OUT TO OTHER MEDICAL SOCIETIES WITHIN THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY. BECAUSE OF THE WORK LOCALLY, WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO HELP THOSE OUTSIDE OF OUR REGION AS WELL, INCLUDING THE LA MEDICAL SOCIETY, AND THEY JUST RECEIVED THEIR OWN GRANT TO RUN A SIMILAR PROGRAM.

THE LEVEL OF NON-ATTAINMENT THIS DISTRICT HAS EXPERIENCED HAS IMPACTED MY MEMBERS BECAUSE OF THE REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT THEY'VE BEEN BROUGHT INTO IN ORDER TO CLEAN UP THE AIR. ONE, THEY LIVE HERE, SO WE ARE ALL IMPACTED IN THAT WAY. BUT THEY ARE ALSO IMPACTED IN THEIR OPERATIONS BECAUSE THEY ARE NOW REQUIRED TO MEET MUCH MORE STRINGENT AIR QUALITY REGULATIONS. THERE IS DEFINITELY A COST FACTOR.

WE KNOW THAT ASTHMA RATES IN FRESNO ARE EXTREMELY HIGH. WE HAVE A LOT OF PEOPLE IN OUR COMMUNITY THAT SUFFER FROM ASTHMA AND HAVE ISSUES WITH HEART DISEASE AND LUNG IMPAIRMENTS. SOME OF THOSE ARE NOT CAUSED DIRECTLY BY AIR QUALITY BUT ARE EXACERBATED BY IT. WE KNOW AIR QUALITY, AS A REGIONAL ISSUE, MAKES IT HARD TO ATTRACT BUSINESS. OFTEN VIEWS WE COULD HAVE OF THE SIERRAS AND OTHER AREAS ARE OBSCURED BY AIR QUALITY. THERE ARE ALSO IMPACTS ON OUR AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY – OZONE DAMAGE TO CROPS AND THAT SORT OF THING. SO THERE ARE A LOT OF IMPACTS ON OUR CONSTITUENTS.

PROBABLY AN INCREASED BURDEN ON PARTICULAR PATIENTS WITH CHRONIC RESPIRATORY DISEASES. ALLERGIES – I DON'T HAVE ANY FIGURES TO CORRESPOND TO THIS, BUT IT SEEMS THAT PEOPLE WITH ALLERGIES ARE COMPLAINING ABOUT THEM MORE, AND THOSE WITH CHRONIC DISEASES ARE HAVING TO STAY IN ON MORE DAYS. (BOTH RESPONDENTS HAVE ALLERGIES AND BOTH SAY THEY ARE WORSE)

I HAVEN'T HAD TEACHERS WITH ANY HUGE ISSUES WITH AIR QUALITY - I'VE NEVER HAD ANYONE COME HERE AND NOT BE ABLE TO BREATHE. AS A NON-PROFIT, IT HAS IMPACTED THE PEOPLE WHO NORMALLY DONATE TO US (WHICH IS LOCAL), BASED ON BEING ABLE TO GROW THINGS, DONATE THINGS, AND THEIR OVERALL WELL-BEING. BUT IT DEPENDS - IF YOU'RE BREATHING EASIER BECAUSE OF NEWER, CLEANER ENGINES, THAT'S GOOD; IF YOU'RE THE ONE WHO HAS TO BUY THE ENGINE, YOU'RE SCREWED.

HIGHER FEES BEING CHARGED.

FROM A HEALTH STANDPOINT, IT IS IMPACTING THEM. WITH SOME NEW T4I STANDARDS, SOME ADDITIONAL COST TO THE EQUIPMENT OUR CUSTOMERS BUY. SO THERE'S AN ECONOMIC IMPACT IN THE FUTURE, WHICH IS GOOD IF IT HELPS THE HEALTH (AND IF SO, IT'S WARRANTED, BUT THAT'S ME PERSONALLY). WE DEFINITELY KNOW THAT DIESEL POLLUTION IS NOT GOOD FOR THE BODY.

THE COST OF REGULATIONS HAS FORCED SOME BUSINESS MEMBERS TO CLOSE AND HAS SEVERELY HAMPERED THE PROFITABILITY OF SEVERAL OTHERS.

IT'S INCREASED OUR REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS AND PUT MORE ONEROUS PRESSURES ON BUSINESSES BUT DOESN'T GET TO THE HEART OF THE MATTER - WHICH IS CAR POLLUTION AND OUTSIDE REGIONAL EFFECTS.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Awareness of the District

Q7a. Have you personally ever . . . visited the District website (www.valleyair.org)?

Q7b. Have you personally ever . . . participated in a District workshop or interacted with its staff?

(N=31)	#
Personally visited web site	31
Personally interacted with staff/attended workshop	30

Almost all respondents have had numerous interactions with District staff and resources. Common unaided responses when asked about the web site were, “Every day,” “Several times a week,” and “All the time.”

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Awareness of Healthy Air Living

Q8. Have you ever heard of the Healthy Air Living program?

Of the 31 respondents, 28 said they had heard of the Healthy Air Living program, while 1 said they 'might' have heard and 2 said they had not.

When asked to describe what they knew about the program, however, some respondents gave incorrect information (e.g. that it only takes place during the summer or focuses on providing information to businesses) or found it difficult to recall many details. Three respondents directly likened it to Spare the Air.

Q9. Briefly, what do you know about this program [Healthy Air Living]?

AS FAR AS I KNOW, IT'S THE MARKETING TOOL FOR THE AIR BOARD TO GET THE WORD OUT ON SPECIAL BURN DAYS AND TO LET PEOPLE KNOW WHAT THE AIR QUALITY IS. THEY ALSO PROVIDE PROGRAMS ON HOW EMPLOYERS CAN GET EMPLOYEES TO REDUCE THEIR MILEAGE TO WORK (CARPOOLS, BIKE RIDES, ETC.).

EVERYTHING! I HAPPEN TO BE ON ONE OF THE SUBCOMMITTEES AT THE DISTRICT THERE, SO I KNOW ALL ABOUT IT! I KNOW IT'S WORKING WITH BUSINESSES AND INDIVIDUALS AND GETTING EVERYBODY INVOLVED IN THE AIR QUALITY SOLUTIONS.

I KNOW IT'S A WEEK-LONG PROGRAM THAT TAKES PLACE DURING THE SUMMER AND REPLACED SPARE THE AIR, AND IT TRIES TO GET PEOPLE TO MAKE A CHANGE IN THEIR LIVES THAT MAKE A POSITIVE IMPACT ON AIR QUALITY.

I THINK IT STARTED A LITTLE MORE THAN A YEAR AGO. IT'S JUST TRYING TO PROMOTE AS MANY PEOPLE TO PARTICIPATE IN DOING ONE THING TO MAKE A BIG IMPACT - IF EVERYBODY DOES ONE THING. I KNOW JAMIE HAS PACKETS AND THINGS SHE'S PUTTING AROUND, AND THAT'S ALL THAT'S IN MY HEAD RIGHT NOW.

I THINK IT WAS KICKED OFF IN MAY OF 2009 IN ANTICIPATION OF THE SUMMER SEASON. IT'S AN EFFORT BY THE DISTRICT TO CREATE AWARENESS IN A LOT OF DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF INDIVIDUAL LIFESTYLES. I THINK THEY GIVE AWAY CARS OR SOMETHING, QUITE A PROMOTIONAL CAMPAIGN. I THINK THEY GOT VERY GOOD SUPPORT FOR IT, ACTUALLY.

I THINK IT'S A CAMPAIGN TO CHANGE THE BEHAVIOR OF THE PEOPLE SO THEY CAN, ON AN INDIVIDUAL LEVEL, REDUCE POLLUTION, WHICH I THINK IS A VERY GOOD APPROACH.

I'M NEW. I KNOW THEY'RE WORKING TO TRY TO CLEAN THE AIR AND CUT DOWN ON BUSINESSES' POLLUTION. THEY ALSO PUT FLAGS UP SO SCHOOLS CUT ACTIVITIES WHEN THE AIR'S BAD. THEY ALSO WORK WITH THE PUBLIC, TRYING TO EDUCATE THEM.

IT HELPS INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES BE LESS POLLUTING IN THEIR DAILY ACTIVITIES.

IT PROPOSES A LIFESTYLE THAT ENCOURAGES IMPROVING AIR QUALITY AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE AND AVOIDING EMISSIONS, SUCH AS CARPOOLING/BIKING/WALKING/ MINIMIZING TRIPS.

IT WAS A CHANGEOVER FROM SPARE THE AIR DAYS. IT WAS A PUBLIC FORUM PRESENTING SOME VERY COMMON-SENSE WAYS OF CLEANING UP THE AIR, WHETHER MAKING FEWER AND MORE EFFICIENTLY MAKING TRIPS, GOING TO GROCERY STORES, NOT GOING THROUGH DRIVE-THROUGHS, USING ELECTRIC LAWNMOWERS, AND JUST A WHOLE HOST OF COMMON SENSE. THE THEME WAS THAT EVERYONE DOING SOMETHING CAN ACCOMPLISH A LOT.

IT'S A PROGRAM DESIGNED TO ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO TAKE STEPS TO IMPROVE AIR QUALITY THROUGH LIFESTYLE CHANGES. IT'S DESIGNED TO GET PEOPLE TO TAKE A LOOK AT THEIR LIVES AND HOW THEY CARRY OUT DAILY ACTIVITIES IMPACTS THE AIR QUALITY, AND TO TAKE STEPS TO REDUCE THE IMPACT ON AIR QUALITY THEY MAY HAVE. IT ENCOURAGES RIDESHARING, TRANSIT, BIKING/WALKING, IMPROVING THE EFFICIENCY OF THE VEHICLES THEY OWN - IT'S A BROAD SPECTRUM OF THINGS PEOPLE CAN TAKE ADVANTAGE OF TO MAKE AIR QUALITY SOMETHING THEY CONSIDER.

IT'S A PROGRAM WHERE THE DISTRICT IS TRYING TO PUT ALL THEIR ASSETS TOGETHER TO GET THE WORD OUT SO PEOPLE DO THINGS TO IMPROVE AIR QUALITY.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Q9. Briefly, what do you know about this program [Healthy Air Living]?

IT'S A WIDESPREAD PROGRAM TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF AIR, ESPECIALLY IN AREAS OF NON-ATTAINMENT, AND INCLUDES THE FLAG PROGRAM THAT INFORMS SCHOOLS OF AIR QUALITY (DEPICTING HEALTHY AIR OR NOT, LIMITING TIME OUTSIDE IF NEEDED). IT HAS VARIOUS ASPECTS, E.G. LAWNMOWER EXCHANGE, WHICH IS A SEPARATE PROGRAM.

IT'S ENCOURAGING CITIZENS TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEIR PART IN KEEPING THE AIR CLEAN.

IT'S KIND OF A SPARE THE AIR ON STEROIDS. IT'S A MUCH MORE PROACTIVE VERSION OF THE SPARE THE AIR CAMPAIGN, WHERE THE DISTRICT IS EDUCATING PRIVATE CITIZENS ON WHAT THEY CAN DO TO IMPROVE AIR QUALITY IN A MORE OUTREACH-ORIENTED EFFORT (VISITING LIONS CLUBS, CHURCHES, SCHOOLS).

IT'S A PROGRAM THE DISTRICT CONDUCTS TO ENGAGE THE COMMUNITY.

IT'S A WAY FOR THE DISTRICT TO DO OUTREACH AND DRIVE PEOPLE TO THE PROGRAMS THAT THEY SPONSOR, TO TRY AND CAPTURE AS MUCH OF THE PUBLIC EDUCATION EFFORTS UNDER ONE UMBRELLA.

IT'S THE DISTRICT'S APPROACH TO GET PEOPLE TO VOLUNTARILY REDUCE EMISSIONS - NOT JUST BUSINESSES, BUT THE PUBLIC AS WELL.

IT'S THE SECOND GENESIS OF AIR QUALITY OUTREACH TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC AND IT LOOKS AT WAYS PEOPLE CAN BE MORE PROACTIVE IN THEIR EVERYDAY LIVES AND MAKE THE DECISIONS MORE PERSONAL, GETTING BUY-IN FROM PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THE DISTRICT, LIKE COMMUTER CONNECTIONS, CARPOOLING (EMPLOYEE TRIPS), ETC.

I'VE JUST SEEN THE LINK BUT DIDN'T READ IT IN DETAIL.

NOT A WHOLE LOT. I'M NOT REAL FAMILIAR WITH IT, BUT I BELIEVE IT'S A VARIETY OF PROJECTS/INITIATIVES FROM THE DISTRICT TO HELP IMPROVE AIR QUALITY.

PROMOTING THINGS YOU CAN DO TO REDUCE EMISSIONS AND TAKE ACTION ON A COMPANY/PERSONAL LEVEL

THE HEALTHY AIR LIVING PROGRAM HAS AN EVENT ONCE A YEAR - BUT NOW IT'S ALL YEAR LONG. WE'VE PARTICIPATED IN THEIR EVENTS AND THEIR CAR EXCHANGE AND LAWNMOWER PROGRAM - WE'RE VERY ACTIVE WITH IT. WE ALSO PARTICIPATED IN THE PLEDGES AND HAVE HAD PRESENTATIONS FROM THE DISTRICT. WE'VE PARTICIPATED IN THE COMMUTER GREEN CHALLENGE AS WELL - SO WHATEVER THEY'RE DOING, WE'RE PARTICIPATING RIGHT ALONG WITH THEM.

THE HEALTHY AIR LIVING PROGRAM IS A PACKAGE OF INCENTIVES AND TIPS FOR THE COMMUNITY AND BUSINESSES. I THINK IT MAY BE MORE FOCUSED ON BUSINESSES TO HELP THEM TO LEARN TO DO THINGS THAT WILL HELP CLEAN UP THE AIR.

THERE'S A LOT OF INFORMATION IN THERE AS FAR AS WHAT INDIVIDUALS CAN DO, HOW THEY CAN PARTICIPATE AND CLEAN UP THE AIR, WHETHER IT'S EMPLOYEE RIDESHARING OR OTHERWISE CUTTING DOWN ON VEHICLE MILES, USING MORE OF THE GREEN EQUIPMENT, THAT TYPE OF THING.

THEY LAUNCHED IT TO GET MORE OF A GRASSROOTS SUPPORT FOR CLEANING UP THE AIR; IT'S KIND OF A LIFESTYLE CHANGE THEY'RE TRYING TO PULL OFF.

THEY'LL TAKE A FEW DAYS AND TRY TO ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO COMMUTE TO WORK BY OTHER MEANS, RIDESHARE, GETTING NEW AND CLEANER LAWNMOWERS THROUGH THE GREEN MACHINE PROGRAM, AND THE FLAG DAYS/NOTIFYING PEOPLE. THEY DO A LOT OF OUTREACH THROUGH THE HEALTHY LIVING PROGRAM.

THEY'RE LOOKING FOR INPUT FROM INDUSTRY, THE PUBLIC, ANYONE WHO WANTS TO CONTRIBUTE IDEAS ON MINIMIZING AIR POLLUTION - TRIP REDUCTION, RIDESHARING, ETC.

WE ARE A HEALTHY AIR LIVING PARTNER. I KNOW IT WAS DEVELOPED AS A FOLLOW-UP PROGRAM OR NEXT GENERATION OF THE SPARE THE AIR PROGRAM, WHICH WAS MORE OF A SEASONAL THING. THIS IS YEAR ROUND AND DESIGNED TO ENCOURAGE BUSINESSES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND VALLEY RESIDENTS TO PROMOTE PRACTICES THAT HELP CLEAN THE AIR. AND THEY OFFER DIFFERENT TOOLS TO DO THAT. ONE KEY COMPONENT IS THE EMPLOYER TRIP REDUCTION ASPECT. IF YOU PARTICIPATE, YOU CAN GET A FEW POINTS FOR IT.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Rating Healthy Air Living

Q10. Healthy Air Living is a program designed to improve air quality on a daily basis. This includes reducing the number of miles driven each day; reducing pollution created by equipment such as leaf blowers and lawnmowers; and encouraging development of cleaner energy sources. The program provides specific information and incentives so San Joaquin Valley residents can voluntarily reduce air pollution.

Now that you have some/more information about Healthy Air Living, (in general) do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion about the program? (Is that very or somewhat?)

Scale: Very Favorable = 4.00
 Somewhat Favorable = 3.00
 Somewhat Unfavorable = 2.00
 Very Unfavorable = 1.00

Respondents gave the Healthy Air Living program a mean score of 3.55 (out of 4.00) – a very favorable score. Notably, none of the respondents provided less than a “Somewhat Favorable” rating. Private sector respondents were more likely to rate the program somewhat lower, as were respondents based in Central and Southern regions of the District.

While generally positive, when asked the reasons behind their rating, some indicated there needed to be greater awareness of the Healthy Air Living program, while others questioned the extent of support individuals would provide voluntarily. Several respondents also pointed to the need for incentives, both in the form of cost subsidies/rebates as well as rewards for steps taken that reduced pollution.

Group (Size)	Mean Score
All Respondents (31)	3.55
Government (9)	3.63
CBO (4)	3.75
Private sector (18)	3.47
Transportation/Energy (4)	3.50
Health/Environment (7)	3.67
Agriculture/Food Processing (11)	3.60
Real Estate/Construction (3)	3.67
Legal/Consulting (6)	3.33
Influence – North (17)	3.67
Influence – Central (24)	3.54
Influence – South (23)	3.57
Location – North (5)	3.67
Location – Central (12)	3.40
Location – South (10)	3.50
Location – Out of District (4)	4.00

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Q11. Why is that? [rating of Healthy Air Living program]

BEYOND THE THINGS GOVERNMENT CAN CONTROL, CITIZENS NEED TO DO SOMETHING – ABOUT 25%-33% OF THE AIR POLLUTION IN THE VALLEY (DEPENDING ON THE SPECIFIC POLLUTANT) ARE THINGS CITIZENS CAN HAVE AN IMPACT ON THAT GOVERNMENT CAN'T REALLY CONTROL – E.G. AGE OF CAR, LAWNMOWER, MILES DRIVEN. IT'S ONE OF THE BETTER PROGRAMS.

CUMULATIVELY, BY EVERYBODY DOING SOMETHING, THERE IS A GREATER POSITIVE IMPACT. WE CAN'T CONTINUE TO PUT BURDENSOME REGULATIONS ON BUSINESS AND KEEP THE TAX BASE IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY, WHILE EVERYONE AS AN INDIVIDUAL DOES THE SAME OLD, SAME OLD, AND EXPECT IT TO GET BETTER. I'VE BEEN HERE ALL MY LIFE, AND THE ONLY THING THAT'S CHANGED IS THERE'S A HELL OF A LOT MORE PEOPLE.

FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, IT'S HARD TO GET THE PUBLIC TO BUY INTO THE CONCEPT, BECAUSE THEY WANT EVERYBODY ELSE TO DO IT, BUT NOT THEM. THIS IS A VERY LONG PROCESS, THOUGH, AND NOT SOMETHING THAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN OVERNIGHT.

I DON'T KNOW MUCH ABOUT IT, OTHER THAN WHAT YOU JUST TOLD ME.

I DON'T THINK A LOT OF PEOPLE KNOW THE SPECIFIC DETAILS, AND I DON'T THINK MANY PEOPLE USE IT.

I GOT RID OF MY CAR A YEAR AGO AND ONLY TRAVEL BY BICYCLE NOW - SO YOU'RE SINGING TO THE CHOIR.

I LIKE THAT THEY ARE PROVIDING INCENTIVES, AND WHILE I UNDERSTAND IT'S VOLUNTARY, I UNDERSTAND THE BEHAVIORAL ASPECT OF INDIVIDUALS TO CLEAN UP THE AIR – SO THERE NEEDS TO BE MORE INCENTIVES. IT'S NOT A CRITICISM OF THE AIR DISTRICT, IT'S JUST A REALITY OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR.

I RECALL WHEN THEY WERE TALKING ABOUT DOING IT, AND I THINK THEY DID A VERY GOOD JOB OF IT. I'M VERY FAVORABLE. THEY WERE ABLE TO TAKE THE MESSAGE OUT TO A LOT OF ORGANIZATIONS AND GROUPS. I WAS AT THE CHAMBER ONE DAY WHEN JAIME MADE A PRESENTATION – IT WAS A GOOD, STRONG PRESENTATION AND THEY HAD THE ABILITY TO GET FOLKS TO LISTEN. THEY PLANNED IT RIGHT.

I THINK IT COULD BE PROMOTED A LITTLE MORE. THE DISTRICT NEEDS TO SHOW MORE BY EXAMPLE, OR AT LEAST DEMONSTRATE THEY ARE TAKING THE LEAD ON SOME OF THESE THINGS WITH THEIR OWN EMPLOYEES, TO SHOW THE OTHER BUSINESSES HOW IT CAN BE DONE.

I THINK IT WILL BE HARD TO GET BROAD-BASED SUPPORT FOR IT. PEOPLE WANT TO JUST CONTINUE THEIR OWN CURRENT HABITS. PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT OR DEVELOPMENT ARE MORE AWARE OF THE NEED FOR IT, BUT PEOPLE IN GENERAL ARE NOT AS LIKELY TO PARTICIPATE IN IT.

I THINK IT'S A GOOD IDEA AND IT'S SOMETHING THAT NEEDS TO HAPPEN TO IMPROVE OUR AIR QUALITY. PART OF WHAT NEEDS TO HAPPEN IS THAT PEOPLE NEED TO UNDERSTAND THEIR ROLE IN THE AIR QUALITY EQUATION.

I THINK IT'S A GOOD EFFORT. IT'S AN EXTREMELY CHALLENGING ISSUE AND THE DISTRICT HAS BEEN SMART IN PACKAGING THESE PROGRAMS IN A WAY THAT INDUSTRY CAN UNDERSTAND AND MARKET ALL OF THE ISSUES AT ONCE. IT'S VERY WELL DONE, BUT IT'S A TOUGH ISSUE.

I THINK PEOPLE NEED TO BE EDUCATED, AND IT REACHES OUT AND EDUCATES EVERYBODY WHO LISTENS TO AND LOOKS AT THE MATERIAL, AND ALSO PROMPTS THEM TO TAKE ACTION.

I THINK THAT THERE'S A LOT THAT INDIVIDUALS CAN DO TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION. FOR EXAMPLE, I HAVE AN ELECTRIC LAWNMOWER.

I'M NOT SURE 'VOLUNTARILY' WILL WORK, ULTIMATELY, FOR EVERYONE, BUT I THINK IT'S A START, AND EDUCATING PEOPLE ABOUT WHAT THEY SHOULD BE DOING TO REDUCE POLLUTION AND GIVING THEM AN OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE A DECISION THAT FAVORABLY IMPACTS AIR QUALITY IS GOOD.

I'M NOT SURE HOW GOOD A JOB THEY DO OF REACHING THE AUDIENCES THEY NEED. FOR EXAMPLE, LEAF BLOWERS, THAT SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO LANDSCAPERS, BUT I'M NOT SURE HOW MUCH LANDSCAPERS REALLY PAY ATTENTION TO THE FLYERS THAT I PAY ATTENTION TO. I'M NOT SURE HOW THEY ARE APPROACHING THOSE PARTICULAR GROUPS. IF THOSE ARE THE GROUPS USING THE EQUIPMENT, THOSE ARE THE GROUPS THAT SHOULD BE MORE SPECIFICALLY TARGETED.

I'M NOT SURE IT'S THAT EFFECTIVE RIGHT NOW. I'VE JUST NEVER SEEN ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR THAT MADE ME BELIEVE IT'S PARTICULARLY EFFECTIVE.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Q11. Why is that? [rating of Healthy Air Living program]

I'M TALKING MORE AS A RESIDENT NOW, THAN AS A BUSINESS REPRESENTATIVE, BECAUSE A LOT OF WHAT COMES WITH HEALTHY AIR LIVING IS WHAT AN INDIVIDUAL CITIZEN CAN DO.

I'M NOT SURE IT WOULD HELP AIR POLLUTION [FROM THE SOUND OF IT]. I WAS THINKING OF ALTERNATE TRANSPORTATION. I DON'T KNOW HOW YOU ENFORCE THE 'DRIVING LESS'. I'M FROM CHICAGO WHERE WE DIDN'T DRIVE OUR CARS EVERYDAY AND HAD GREAT PUBLIC TRANSIT.

I'M NOT USED TO GIVING 'VERY'S' - THERE'S ALWAYS ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT. IT'S LIKE GIVING OUT THAT A+.

IMPROVEMENT IS MADE IN SMALL STEPS AND EVERYBODY HAS TO PARTICIPATE.

IT HELPS TO SHARE THE RESPONSIBILITY. IT GOES BACK TO THAT 80%/20% ISSUE. THE PUBLIC, THEY'LL GO BY A FACILITY AND SEE STEAM AND THINK 'THAT'S A POLLUTER' AS THEY DRIVE THEIR 1970 CAR THEY DIDN'T GET REGISTERED. IT HELPS THEM REALIZE THEY'RE PART OF THE PROBLEM AS WELL AS PART OF THE SOLUTION. IT FORCES THE RESPONSIBILITY TO INDIVIDUALS, RATHER THAN JUST PUSHING THE PROBLEM ONTO INDUSTRY. ALSO, WE'RE AT A POINT IN THIS STRUGGLE TO CLEAR THE AIR WHERE EVERY LITTLE BIT HELPS. THE BIG THINGS HAVE BEEN DONE, SO WE'RE DOWN TO THE SMALLER THINGS.

IT IS A POSITIVE PROGRAM, ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU DEAL WITH THE FIREPLACE REPLACEMENT PROGRAM. LISTENING TO THE MANUFACTURER SOMETIMES CAUSES PROBLEMS, BUT THESE ARE PROGRAMS THAT FIT THE NEEDS OF THE PUBLIC. REPLACING MY FARM ENGINES, MY DIESEL PUMP ENGINE - I PUT THE NEWEST CLEANEST-BURNING ENGINE IN BUT I GET FUNDS, SAME AS LAWNMOWERS, RIDESHARES, ETC. ALL OF THOSE HAVE POSITIVE THINGS FOR DIFFERENT PARTS OF THEIR COMMUNITY, SO THEY'RE GOOD. YOU MAY THROW A MILLION DOLLARS AT IT, AND IN SOME OF OUR PROGRAMS, WE'RE THROWING 10-15 MILLION DOLLARS AT IT, BUT THE DISTRICT HAS DONE A VERY GOOD JOB ON THE OUTREACH OF THAT ENTIRE PROCESS OF PROGRAMS.

IT'S ENCOURAGING PEOPLE TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO POOR AIR QUALITY AND SHOW THEM WAYS THEY CAN MAKE CHANGES TO IMPROVE AIR QUALITY. THINGS LIKE THE ELECTRIC LAWNMOWER PROGRAM THEY DO EVERY YEAR, ENCOURAGING PEOPLE TO CARPOOL OR TAKE TRANSIT. I THINK IT'S BEEN A VERY POSITIVE PROGRAM.

IT'S HARD TO QUANTIFY THE TRIPS NOT TAKEN - THE THINGS NOT OCCURRED - AND THEN MEASURE THAT TO SEE HOW FAR WE'VE COME DOWN THE ROAD. GRANTED, YOU CAN MEASURE CARS, BUT WHAT IF SOMEONE DECIDED NOT TO CUT GRASS TODAY? HOW DO YOU MEASURE THAT? BUT, WE HAVE TO START SOMEPLACE.

IT'S NOT UP TO THEM TO REGULATE LAWNMOWERS - I'M IN FAVOR OF THE PROGRAM, BUT THAT [LEAF BLOWERS AND LAWNMOWERS] DOES NOT MAKE SENSE TO ME - THEY SAY THEY DON'T HAVE JURISDICTION, BUT THEY DO HAVE JURISDICTION. IT'S A POLITICAL THING. THEY THROW IT BACK TO LOCAL JURISDICTIONS BECAUSE IT'S AN ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ISSUE.

MORE THAN ANYTHING ELSE, IT DRAWS ATTENTION TO THE NEED FOR EVERYONE TO BECOME INVOLVED.

SOME OF THE FOLKS ARE ALREADY FAIRLY HEAVILY REGULATED, AND ASKING THEM TO VOLUNTEER MUCH OF ANYTHING, IT JUST ISN'T GOING TO HAPPEN.

THEY'RE DOING ALL THEY CAN AND THEY'RE GOING OUT IN THE COMMUNITY AND PROVIDING RESOURCES. THEY'RE VERY APPROACHABLE AND THIS IS ONE OF THE THINGS - IN THE PAST WE DIDN'T WORK TOGETHER AND NOW WE'RE CONNECTED AT THE HIP. THEY'VE BEEN VERY PROACTIVE IN GETTING OUT AND FORMING PARTNERSHIPS WITH THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY TO GET PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THE HEALTHY AIR PROGRAM. IT'S A WAY FOR BUSINESS PARTNERS TO PROMOTE THEIR OWN BUSINESS WHILE ALSO CONTRIBUTING TO HEALTHY AIR. FOR EXAMPLE, THEY MAY SUBSIDIZE SOMETHING (E.G. A CLEANER WOOD-BURNING STOVE) THAT ALSO PROVIDES PUBLICITY FOR THE BUSINESS PARTNER. IT'S SO EASY TO SELL A WIN-WIN PROGRAM.

WE WANT TO HELP THEM ACHIEVE THEIR GOALS. WE'RE VERY MUCH IN FAVOR OF IT.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Importance of Healthy Air Living and Check Before You Burn

Q12. Have you ever heard of the Check Before You Burn program?

Q13. In your opinion, how important are Healthy Air Living and Check Before You Burn type programs in encouraging your organization to reduce air pollution in the San Joaquin Valley area?

Scale: Very Important = 4.00
Somewhat Important = 3.00
Not Too Important = 2.00
Not At All Important = 1.00

All 31 respondents indicated they had heard of the Check Before You Burn program.

When asked to rate these types of programs, respondents overall gave a mean score of 3.48 (out of 4.00). Those in the agricultural/food processing sector rated these programs among the least important, giving a rating of 3.11, while those in the health/environment sector rated the programs' importance 3.86 (the highest mean rating by sector). Those in the North and South portions of the District rated the importance of these programs lower than those in the Central part of the District.

Some respondents questioned whether these types of programs are really pertinent to their organization, since the programs focus so much on individual behavior.

Group (Size)	Mean Score
All Respondents (31)	3.48
Government (9)	3.89
CBO (4)	3.75
Private sector (18)	3.19
Transportation/Energy (4)	3.50
Health/Environment (7)	3.86
Agriculture/Food Processing (11)	3.11
Real Estate/Construction (3)	3.67
Legal/Consulting (6)	3.50
Influence - North (17)	3.40
Influence - Central (24)	3.41
Influence - South (23)	3.52
Location - North (5)	3.25
Location - Central (12)	3.33
Location - South (10)	3.70
Location - Out of District (4)	3.67

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Q14. Why is that? [Healthy Air Living-type programs are important]

AT THE END, IT WILL IMPACT EVERYONE - I TELL OUR BUSINESSES . . . THAT THEY NEED TO COMPLY WITH THAT.

BECAUSE EVERYBODY WANTS TO IMPROVE AIR QUALITY.

BECAUSE EVERYONE NEEDS TO BE ENGAGED.

BECAUSE OF THE PERCENTAGE OF POLLUTION CAUSED BY CITIZENS THAT GOVERNMENT CANNOT TYPICALLY CONTROL. AND WITH THE STUFF THE GOVERNMENT CAN CONTROL - E.G. FIREPLACE BURNING BANS - EDUCATION IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF THAT.

CBYB IS PROBABLY NOT AS IMPORTANT AS HEALTHY AIR LIVING, BECAUSE IT'S JUST CAUGHT ON. PEOPLE ARE BECOMING MORE AWARE OF FIREPLACES AND THE IMPACT THAT BURNING WOOD IN FIREPLACES IN AN URBAN ENVIRONMENT CAN HAVE ON VERY LOCAL POOR AIR QUALITY (E.G. NEIGHBORS COMPLAINING BECAUSE SOMEONE IS BURNING ON A DAY THEY SHOULDN'T BE AND SOMEONE CAN'T WALK OR JOG BECAUSE OF THE SMOKE). WHEN IT WAS FIRST STARTED, I DON'T THINK PEOPLE REALLY PAID ATTENTION TO IT. AND WE'VE HAD SOME BAD WINTERS WHEN THE INVERSION LAYER WAS REALLY THICK AND THE PARTICULATE MATTER LEVELS GOT REALLY HIGH AND PEOPLE GOT REALLY SUFFOCATED WHEN [OTHER] PEOPLE BURNED IN THEIR FIREPLACES.

CHECK BEFORE YOU BURN IS ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT PROGRAMS, BECAUSE IT'S DIRECTED AT A SOURCE OF POLLUTION DRIVEN BY RESIDENTIAL BURNING AND PEOPLE CAN REALLY MAKE AN IMPACT. THE OTHER PARTS OF HEALTHY AIR LIVING ARE PART OF A MUCH LARGER POOL. PEOPLE WHO BURN OLDER STOVES ARE A MUCH SMALLER POOL, YET CREATE A MUCH LARGER IMPACT, SO CHECK BEFORE YOU BURN HAS A MUCH GREATER IMPACT THAN OTHER THINGS THAT ARE BEING ASKED OF PEOPLE.

EVERYBODY NEEDS TO CONTRIBUTE TO IT.

FOR OUR CUSTOMERS, IT'S EFFECTIVE. FOR OUR COMPANY, WE ALREADY KNEW THIS STUFF. WE WERE THE FIRST TO GO PUBLIC IN THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY TO SAY WE WOULDN'T USE WOOD-BURNING FIREPLACES IN HOMES ANY MORE. WE'RE SORT OF PREACHING TO THE CHOIR, I THINK. WE ALSO PROMOTE USE OF ELECTRIC VEHICLES ON A CITY-WIDE BASIS AND PROMOTING LEGISLATION AT THE STATE LEVEL TO ALLOW THE CITY TO DO THAT.

I DON'T THINK WE SERVE AS A GOOD CONDUIT FOR THE INFORMATION, AS THE PROGRAMS ARE VERY PERSONAL.

I HAVE A RANGE OF WHO IT WOULD AFFECT - AND A RANGE OF WHO WOULD NEED TO KNOW (E.G. DONORS - MORE; TEACHERS - LESS). IT WOULD BE IMPORTANT FOR THE LOCAL TEACHERS TO KNOW, BUT MOST TEACHERS COME FROM OUT OF THE AREA, SO IT'S LESS IMPORTANT.

I THINK THAT THERE IS MORE OF AN ISSUE WITH DIESEL ENGINES THAN WITH FIREPLACES, BUT I DON'T HAVE SCIENTIFIC NUMBERS TO BACK THAT UP. I KNOW THAT THERE'S SOME FEDERAL REGULATIONS COMING DOWN THAT IMPACT THE TRUCKING INDUSTRY AND I THINK THAT THOSE ARE GOOD, ESPECIALLY WHEN IT'S 65%-75% OF THE PROBLEM HERE IN THE VALLEY.

I THINK THEY'RE IMPORTANT TO CONTINUE TO EDUCATE PEOPLE, BECAUSE THAT'S WHEN YOU CHANGE BEHAVIOR. RATHER THAN JUST TELLING SOMEBODY THEY CAN/CANNOT DO SOMETHING, THEY BUY INTO WHAT YOU'RE TRYING TO DO AND BECOME A WILLING PARTICIPANT. FOR EXAMPLE, WHEN THE FIREPLACE RULE WAS ADOPTED IN THE AREA THERE WAS CONSIDERABLE PUSHBACK. WE'RE NOW 3-4 YEARS INTO IT AND A LOT MORE PEOPLE HAVE BOUGHT INTO IT AND DO PAY ATTENTION. I THINK THEY'RE APPROPRIATE AND DOING A GOOD JOB.

I THINK THEY'VE SHOWN THAT CUTTING DOWN ON THE WOOD BURNING HAS HAD A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE AIR QUALITY.

IT'S ABOUT THE PERSONAL ROLE AND WHAT INDIVIDUALS CAN DO TO IMPROVE AIR QUALITY.

IT'S THE ONLY AGENCY OUT THERE ENCOURAGING PEOPLE TO PROTECT THE AIR IN OUR AREA; EFFECTIVENESS, THOUGH, I'M NOT SURE. AGAIN, IT'S HOW EVERYONE IS TARGETED. I'M FAMILIAR WITH A LOT OF THESE ENVIRONMENTAL THINGS, BUT I'M NOT SURE HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS FOR THE REST OF THE OFFICE. EFFECTIVE AREAS FOR ME, BESIDES WORK, ARE MESSAGING ON PUBLIC RADIO AND ON THE BILLBOARDS ALONG THE HIGHWAY - THE BILLBOARDS ARE PROBABLY THE ONES THAT GET THE MOST ATTENTION.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Q14. Why is that? [Healthy Air Living-type programs are important]

IT'S AN EDUCATION PROCESS, WITH CHECK BEFORE YOU BURN ESPECIALLY, AND THEY'VE DONE A GOOD JOB OF PUTTING TOGETHER A PROGRAM TO CONVINCE FOLKS THEY CAN'T BURN ON THOSE DAYS. IT'S A GOOD WAY OF SEEING A DEFINED PROBLEM AND FIGURING OUT A WAY TO ADDRESS IT.

MY REASONS ARE TWOFOLD – EDUCATION IS IMPORTANT AND BOTH OF THOSE PROGRAMS PROVIDE EDUCATION; AND, SECONDLY, IT HELPS HOMEOWNERS TAKE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR AIR QUALITY.

ON DAYS WHEN WE'RE INUNDATED WITH FOG OR HIGH OZONE, PARTICULARLY DURING FOGGY SEASON, ANYTHING WE CAN DO TO REDUCE THE LOAD IS A POSITIVE OUTCOME.

SOME DON'T HAVE FIREPLACES, BUT OVERALL IT'S IMPORTANT. ON A FARM, THE FIREPLACE ISSUE WOULD BE MUCH MORE IMPORTANT.

THE CHECK BEFORE YOU BURN PROGRAM HAS SIGNIFICANTLY SHOWED A REDUCTION IN PARTICULATES. TO ME, ALL PARTIES, NOT JUST THE BUSINESS SECTOR, HAVE TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEANING UP THE AIR. IF I CAN'T BURN MY AGRICULTURAL WASTE BECAUSE IT'S A BAD EMISSIONS DAY, IT'S NO DIFFERENT [FROM BURNING IN FIREPLACES]. CHECK BEFORE YOU LIGHT YOUR FIREPLACE, AND THERE ARE, I THINK, 160 MONITORING SITES, SO YOU CAN CHECK JUST WHETHER YOU CAN BURN IN YOUR PARTICULAR AREA. THERE ARE NOT THAT MANY BURN DAYS THAT ARE TAKEN AWAY FROM THE PUBLIC. IT COULD BE JUST 35 OR 40 DAYS OUT OF 6-7 MONTHS.

THERE'S AN INCREASING AWARENESS THAT INDIVIDUALS DO CONTRIBUTE OVERALL TO THE AIR QUALITY, AND WHEN PEOPLE ARE GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN MAKING THINGS BETTER IN THEIR COMMUNITY, MOST PEOPLE WILL. A LOT ARE HOLDING OUT, BUT I THINK THERE'S A LOT OF PEER PRESSURE AND INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY KICKING IN TO HELP OUT. THESE ARE VERY EMPOWERING PROGRAMS THAT GIVE INDIVIDUALS THE POWER TO MAKE AN IMPACT.

THESE PROGRAMS ARE SEEKING A HIGHER POPULATED AREA, AND OUR CONSTITUENTS ARE MORE RURAL. THEY'RE IMPORTANT BECAUSE THEY DO BRING GREATER AWARENESS TO AREAS WHERE PRESSURE IS FELT BY OUR CONSTITUENTS IN RURAL AREAS.

THESE PROGRAMS, INCLUDING CHECK BEFORE YOU BURN, EDUCATE PEOPLE/THE COMMUNITY ABOUT SOME OF THE CAUSES OF AIR POLLUTION, AND ALSO ON THE PRACTICAL SIDE, KEEPS PEOPLE FROM CONTRIBUTING TO POLLUTION WHEN WE HAVE BAD AIR QUALITY.

THEY ARE IMPORTANT PROGRAMS AND WE ALSO PROMOTE THEM, BUT WE ALSO HAVE A HIGH EMPHASIS ON THE POLICY KIND OF WORK. THESE PROGRAMS WILL HELP TO A CERTAIN EXTENT, BUT WE ALSO NEED THE POLICY SIDE OF IT – MORE DOLLARS FOR INCENTIVES OR RULES IN PLACE.

THIS IS SOMETHING VERY IMPORTANT FOR OUR HEALTH AND THE HEALTH OF OUR CHILDREN, ESPECIALLY THE YOUNGER ONES, SO KEEPING THE AIR CLEAN IS IMPORTANT. THIS IS ANOTHER MEASURE THAT HELPS TO KEEP THE POLLUTION LOW ON BAD DAYS.

WE GET DAILY EMAILS FROM THEM SHOWING THE AIR QUALITY (RED, YELLOW, GREEN). WE ADVISE THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN OUR PROGRAM, SO THEY KNOW NOT TO LET KIDS OUT AT THAT TIME. THE CHECK BEFORE YOU BURN PROGRAM HAS BEEN VERY EFFECTIVE IN CUTTING DOWN AIR POLLUTION IN BAKERSFIELD.

WE'RE CONCERNED ABOUT THE AIR QUALITY.

YOU HAVE TO TAKE CONCRETE ACTIONS TO REDUCE THE EMISSIONS AND THAT WILL ONLY HAPPEN THROUGH PROGRAMS. LIKE CHECK BEFORE YOU BURN, THAT'S A SIGNIFICANT PORTION OF PARTICULATE POLLUTION.

YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT JOHN Q PUBLIC GETTING INVOLVED, AND I HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH THAT. IF YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT SOMEONE WHO IS UNDER THE WEIGHT OF ALL THE REGULATIONS, THAT'S VERY DIFFERENT. THAT DOESN'T GO OVER WITH SOME OF MY MEMBERS. IT'S IMPORTANT FOR JOHN Q PUBLIC, BECAUSE THEY'RE ALWAYS YELLING FOR CLEAN AIR AND [THEY NEED] TO UNDERSTAND IT AND DO THEIR PART. WE'RE A STATIONERY SOURCE, SO WE'RE AN EASY TARGET. THE POLITICS GO WITH THE MAJORITY, WHICH WOULD BE JOHN Q. PUBLIC. SO, IF JOHN Q. PUBLIC WANTS CLEAN AIR, THEY SHOULD BE A PART OF CLEANING IT UP.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Q14. Why is that? [Healthy Air Living-type programs are NOT important]

OUR MEMBERS ARE BUSINESSES, SO IT DOESN'T REALLY APPLY. I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO THE VALLEY IN REDUCING AIR POLLUTION – A LARGE PORTION OF UNCONTROLLED PM 2.5 HAS COME FROM WOOD-BURNING STOVES. IT DOES HELP SOME OF OUR MEMBER COMPANIES, BUT WE HAVE DISPUTED WITH THE VALLEY OVER THE VEHICLE-MILES-TRAVELED ISSUE. IT'S ALSO A MATTER OF EFFICIENT VEHICLES. ALSO, GOING TO PUBLIC TRANSIT – IS IT REALLY COST-EFFECTIVE, FOR THE EMISSIONS GENERATED PER RIDER, OR ARE THERE OTHER WAYS, SUCH AS FURTHER IMPROVING EMISSION CONTROL SYSTEMS ON VEHICLES?

THEY'RE BUSINESSES, AND THESE ARE GEARED TOWARDS THE PUBLIC. AS INDIVIDUALS, THEY MIGHT FOLLOW IT, BUT IT DOESN'T APPLY TO OUR BUSINESSES.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Attitudinal Statements

Q15a. Tougher regulations are needed on businesses to reduce the air pollution caused by manufacturing facilities, refineries, and farms in the region.

Q15b. Economic growth and prosperity are more important than environmental issues.

Q15c. Government laws regarding air quality are too strict.

Q15d. The Valley Air District has been too aggressive in enforcing air pollution regulations on businesses and residents.

The four attitudinal statements drew the most hesitation of any part of the questionnaire, and several respondents directly indicated their discomfort with being asked such questions.

Most respondents were seeking a balance overall, with a more holistic approach that encouraged healthy environmental standards while also being sensitive to cost – and ensuring laws were applied fairly and in a straightforward manner. For example, while most disagreed that tougher regulations are needed on businesses, almost the same number also disagreed that government laws are too strict.

Those in the agricultural industry highlighted this paradox – on the one hand, many in this sector noted that any environmental harm will have a direct impact on their product. However, they also noted that, because they compete globally, increased costs (through the implementation of regulations) makes them less competitive. Respondents didn't necessarily disagree with the regulation per se, but with the relative speed of implementation and the complexity, both of which drive up their costs.

Most respondents felt the District did a good job of walking this fine line, enforcing laws while also considering the financial impact on businesses.

(N=31)	Agree	Disagree	Not Sure/Refused
Tougher regulations are needed on businesses to reduce the air pollution caused by manufacturing facilities, refineries, and farms in the region.	11	19	1
Economic growth and prosperity are more important than environmental issues.	10	15	6
Government laws regarding air quality are too strict.	9	21	1
The Valley Air District has been too aggressive in enforcing air pollution regulations on businesses and residents.	2	25	4

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Comments on: 15a. Tougher regulations are needed on businesses to reduce the air pollution caused by manufacturing facilities, refineries, and farms in the region.

BUSINESSES SHOULD BE ACCOUNTABLE FOR THE HARM THEY DO TO AIR QUALITY.

BUT THERE'S THE OFFSETTING ISSUE OF COST FOR THOSE BUSINESSES THAT HAS AN ECONOMIC IMPACT.

DISAGREE SOMEWHAT – A LOT OF THE INDUSTRY AROUND HERE THINKS THEY'RE OVER-REGULATED, AND RATHER THAN REGULATORY APPROACHES, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO TRY A BUSINESS PARTNERSHIP APPROACH WHERE THERE'S A WIN-WIN SITUATION.

I AGREE – SOMETHING HAS TO BE DONE. IT WOULD BE NICE TO GET THERE WITH LESS, AS OPPOSED TO MORE, GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT, LESS 'THOU SHALT' AND MORE ENCOURAGEMENT, BUT SOMETIMES PEOPLE DON'T CHANGE UNLESS THERE'S A CLUB IN YOUR HAND.

I AGREE TO AN EXTENT - BUT I'M NOT SURE HOW MUCH BUSINESSES WILL DO IT WITHOUT FEES - THEY NEED TO BE TOUGHER.

I THINK INDUSTRY HAS BEEN CALLED ON TO DO JUST ABOUT AS MUCH AS IT CAN DO AND STILL REMAIN COMPETITIVE WITH BUSINESSES IN OTHER STATES.

I'M SURPRISED THEY'RE LETTING YOU ASK SUCH A BROAD QUESTION – SOME THINGS ARE CONTROLLED VERY WELL.

MY DISAGREEMENT IS THIS: WHILE THERE MAY BE ADDITIONAL NEED FOR REGULATION IN CERTAIN AREAS (SUCH AS REGULATION FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT CONTINUES TO SPRAWL OUT FROM THE URBAN CORE AND LEADS TO INCREASED VMT), IN TERMS OF EXISTING BUSINESSES AND ORGANIZATIONS IN THE VALLEY, THEY HAVE BEEN VERY HEAVILY REGULATED UP TO THIS POINT AND HAD A LOT OF STUFF THROWN AT THEM. THE BIG STUFF IS NOT STATIONERY SOURCES, IT'S MOBILE SOURCES. WE'VE HAD SOME SETBACKS THERE, SUCH AS THE RELAXATION OF RULES FOR DIESEL TRUCKS THAT WOULD HAVE REDUCED EMISSIONS BY 90%, AND I THINK THAT HAS HURT THE VALLEY VERY BADLY IN TERMS OF MEETING AIR QUALITY GOALS (FROM 99 AND I-5). THAT RULE WAS POISED, I THOUGHT, TO PROVIDE SOME VERY GOOD RELIEF IN PARTICULATES AND OZONE. A LOT OF THOSE EMISSIONS FROM THOSE TRUCKS ARE OZONE PRECURSORS, WHICH ADD TO THE OZONE IN THE SUMMER, AND IN THE WINTER, ADD TO PARTICULATE LEVELS.

OUR BUSINESSES HERE ARE REGULATED BEYOND ANYBODY IN THE COUNTRY, AND IT PUTS US AT A SEVERE DISADVANTAGE, ESPECIALLY IN AGRICULTURE, WHERE WE COMPETE ON WORLD PRICES. WE DO THINGS NOBODY ELSE IS DOING, AND QUITE FRANKLY, I'M NOT SURE HOW MUCH MORE WE CAN DO.

THAT IS A LOADED STATEMENT. TOUGHER RESTRICTIONS WILL DRIVE THEM OUT OF BUSINESS. THE ANSWER IS TECHNOLOGY TO MAKE THEM OPERATE MORE CLEANLY.

THE CURRENT REGULATIONS NEED TO BE MORE STRICTLY FOLLOWED BEFORE INTRODUCING NEW ONES.

THERE ARE ALREADY MANY REGULATIONS ON BUSINESSES. I HAVE A FARM AND A BUSINESS MYSELF. WE ALREADY HAVE ENOUGH.

THEY DO NEED TO BE COST-EFFECTIVE AND REASONABLE MEASURES, BUT I AGREE WITH IT.

WE ALREADY HAVE THE TOUGHEST RULES IN THE NATION AND WE AREN'T GOING TO GET THE REDUCTION IN EMISSIONS THERE. WE NEED TO REVIEW THE REGULATIONS WE HAVE TO BE SURE THEY'RE APPROPRIATE BUT ALSO BE COGNIZANT OF THE FACT THAT NO ONE [NO BUSINESSES] CAN EVEN LOCATE IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY ANY MORE.

WE DON'T AGREE THAT THE WHOLE BURDEN SHOULD BE PLACED ON INDUSTRY. WE KNOW THERE'S A BIG CONTRIBUTION THERE, BUT WE ALSO KNOW THEY AREN'T THE ONLY PROBLEMATIC AREA, THAT'S WHY WE REALLY FIGHT FOR INCENTIVES INSTEAD OF STRONG REGULATIONS – THERE NEEDS TO BE A BALANCE.

Comments on: 15b. Economic growth and prosperity are more important than environmental issues.

BASED ON LONG-TERM VS SHORT-TERM, LONG-TERM, NO; LONG-TERM WE CAN'T AFFORD IT.

FOR THE PUBLIC, THAT IS A TRUE STATEMENT. THE PUBLIC STILL VALUES THE ECONOMY OVER THE ENVIRONMENT. I THINK THAT THE ROLLBACK OF THE TRUCK EMISSIONS IS A GOOD EXAMPLE – IT WAS FROM PRESSURE FROM THE TRUCKING INDUSTRY SAYING IT WOULD HAVE DEVASTATED THEM ECONOMICALLY. IF YOU LOOK AT THE PUBLIC HEALTH IMPACTS OF POOR AIR QUALITY, THEY HAVE NOT GAINED TRACTION WITH THE PUBLIC. SOME SECTORS ARE OVERLY IMPACTED BY IT AND THEY TEND TO BE THE UNDER-REPRESENTED GROUPS, SO THEY TEND NOT TO HAVE AS MUCH OF A VOICE AS THOSE NOT AS IMPACTED. YOU HAVE THIS DISPROPORTIONATE SITUATION GOING ON WHERE THOSE IMPACTED MORE DON'T HAVE A GREAT VOICE BUT THOSE IMPACTED MORE BY THE CONTROL EFFORTS ARE SPEAKING UP MORE AND HAVE MORE OF A SAY.

I AGREE SOMEWHAT, IN THAT THEY GO HAND IN HAND.

I DISAGREE WITH THE STATEMENT, BUT THEY ARE IMPORTANT, IF NOT AS IMPORTANT. DELTA SMELT IS THE PERFECT EXAMPLE [OF OVEREMPHASIS ON ENVIRONMENT]. HOW MANY THOUSANDS OF ACRES HAVE BEEN DENIED WATER BECAUSE OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE THAT IS PROBABLY NOT ALL THAT CRITICAL?

I DON'T LIKE THAT QUESTION BECAUSE IT PITS ONE AGAINST THE OTHER, AND THEY ARE NOT MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE GOALS. I DON'T THINK IT'S AN EITHER/OR PROPOSITION AND I THINK IT'S A CHALLENGE, BECAUSE THERE HAS BEEN THAT MENTALITY – BUT WE HAVE TO DO BOTH.

I THINK IT'S DIFFICULT TO MAKE A BLANKET STATEMENT THAT ONE IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE OTHER. ECONOMIC REALITY IS IMPORTANT HERE BECAUSE THINGS ARE NOT TOO GOOD RIGHT NOW, BUT AT THE SAME TIME, ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS NEED TO BE A PART OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES.

I'D ALMOST REALLY RATHER ABSTAIN FROM ANSWERING THIS. I AGREE THAT ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS ARE EXTREMELY IMPORTANT, BUT SO ARE ECONOMIC ISSUES, BUT IF I WERE TO TIP THE SCALES, IT WOULD JUST BARELY BE ENVIRONMENTAL.

I'M NOT GOING TO SAY THAT THIS IS GENERALLY THE CASE IN KERN COUNTY. I THINK IF YOU WENT OUT AND STOOD IN FRONT OF COSTCO THEY'D TELL YOU OVERWHELMINGLY THEY NEED THE JOBS MORE RIGHT NOW. THE TIMING HAS A LOT TO DO WITH THAT. BUT OVERALL, IF YOU GAVE PEOPLE TIME AND LET THEM DO SOME SOUL-SEARCHING, I THINK THEY'D COME TO THE REALIZATION THAT THE ENVIRONMENT IS MORE IMPORTANT, BUT NOT RIGHT NOW.

I'M RIGHT IN THE MIDDLE ON THAT ONE. THEY NEED TO BE BALANCED. THERE'S A WAY TO MAKE THE TWO COEXIST.

IT'S DIFFICULT TO SAY – WE FIND OURSELVES, FOR THE MOST PART, IN BETWEEN. WE ARE VERY MUCH FOR HEALTHY BUSINESSES AND COMMUNITIES, BUT WE ALSO WANT TO CLEAN UP THE AIR, SO WE'RE ALWAYS KIND OF IN BETWEEN.

IT'S KIND OF IN THE MIDDLE. I THINK THEY NEED TO BE IN BALANCE WITH EACH OTHER.

THAT'S A BADLY WORDED QUESTION. THE CAVEAT IS THAT WITHOUT THE ECONOMICS, THERE IS NO COMMUNITY. YOU HAVE TO HAVE BOTH, BUT THE ECONOMICS HAS TO BE THE KEY. WHEN PEOPLE SAY THEY DON'T CARE IF BUSINESSES SHUT DOWN – WELL, IF I'VE LOST MY JOB BECAUSE OF A REGULATION. WHAT HAPPENS TO THAT PERSON'S PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH? THEY'RE STRESSED NOW THAT THEY DON'T HAVE A JOB. THEY HAVE HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE, AND THEY BECOME VULNERABLE TO OTHER HEALTH ISSUES THAT WERE WORSE THAN THE ORIGINAL AIR QUALITY. SO WHEN PEOPLE SAY IT'S OK IF YOU LOSE YOUR JOB, IT'S NOT – BECAUSE THAT IS GOING TO HAVE A HUGE PHYSICAL AND MENTAL IMPACT.

THAT'S ANOTHER WEIRD QUESTION. I THINK THEY CAN BOTH BE HAD. THEY ARE NOT EXCLUSIVE OF EACH OTHER – THEY CAN BOTH HAPPEN.

THAT'S YES AND NO. WE ALL WANT TO HAVE A CLEAN ENVIRONMENT, BUT IF YOU WANT PEOPLE HEALTHY, THEY ALSO HAVE TO MAKE A DECENT LIVING. THAT'S NOT A GOOD QUESTION. I SEE MORE TURMOIL OVER SOMEONE NOT BEING ABLE TO PROVIDE FOOD FOR HIS FAMILY THAN SOMEONE WITH A LITTLE BIT OF DUST IN HIS NOSE.

THE TWO ARE INTER-RELATED. IF YOU HAVE ECONOMIC GROWTH, YOU HAVE GREATER ABILITY TO DEAL WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT.

THEY ARE BOTH JUST AS IMPORTANT.

THEY GO HAND IN HAND.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Comments on: 15b. Economic growth and prosperity are more important than environmental issues.

TO HAVE A STRONG ECONOMIC BASE FOR A STATE OR REGION IS CRITICAL. WITHOUT AN ECONOMIC BASE, ALL THE OTHER THINGS THAT ARE CRITICAL CANNOT HAPPEN. IF WE'VE GOT CRUMMY AIR AND YOU WANT BUSINESSES TO UPGRADE TO THE NEXT LEVEL, THEY NEED RESOURCES TO DO THAT.

TODAY I'LL SAY YES, IT IS, GIVEN WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE HOUSING INDUSTRY RIGHT NOW.

WE WANT TO TRY AND RESPECT BOTH AND FIND A GOOD BALANCE.

IT'S COMPLICATED; ONE FEEDS INTO THE OTHER. WE'VE HAD A DROUGHT AND CUT OFF WATER TO THE WEST SIDE; THERE'S 40,000 FARMS AND THEIR EMPLOYEES AND RELATED BUSINESSES ARE OUT OF WORK. THERE'S 15% UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE VALLEY. WITHOUT THE WATER, WE HAVE A HUGE DUSTBOWL, AND TODAY'S A WINDY DAY. NOW THE DUST IS GOING IN THE AIR, ACROSS FREEWAYS, ACROSS ROADS, YOU KNOW. IT'S KIND OF A CHICKEN AND EGG THING. IF WE HAD WATER, SOMETHING WOULD BE PLANTED, THE DUST WOULDN'T BE IN THE AIR, PLANTS WOULD BE RELEASING OXYGEN - SO IT WOULD BE BETTER FOR EVERYONE, AND BETTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT. AND THE AIR QUALITY DOES HAVE AN IMPACT - E.G. TREES' GROWTH ARE STUNTED. THE BUSINESSES SPENT SOME BIG BUCKS AND GOT HUGE REDUCTIONS IN EMISSIONS. BUT NOW WE'RE AT A POINT WHERE THEY'LL HAVE TO PAY 5X AS MUCH MONEY AND GET ONLY REALLY MINUTE RETURNS. AND THE BUSINESSES WILL LEAVE, WITH ONLY THE FOOD-BASED BUSINESSES LEFT.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.

Comments on: 15c. Government laws regarding air quality are too strict.

GOOD LIMITS ARE NEEDED, BUT THERE NEEDS TO BE FLEXIBILITY OR YOU'RE AT CROSS-PURPOSES. FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU WANT TO PUT IN A NEW PIECE OF EQUIPMENT TO RECYCLE, OR DO SOME OTHER ENVIRONMENTALLY GOOD PROJECT, YOU HAVE TO GET A PERMIT FROM THE DISTRICT TO DO IT. I'M ALL FOR REGULATIONS TO GET THINGS INTO LINE, BUT LET'S MAKE MAJOR ALLOWANCES FOR FOLKS WHO WANT TO DO SOMETHING NEW AND INNOVATIVE TO ALLOW THEM TO RECOVER THEIR COSTS.

GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS ON AIR QUALITY, EACH REGULATION AND ITS COST-EFFECTIVENESS, IS DEVELOPED IN A VACUUM. AT NO POINT IS THERE ANYONE WHO HAS OVERSIGHT ON THE CUMULATIVE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THESE REGULATIONS, SO WHAT WE HAVE NOW ARE REGULATIONS THAT ARE COSTING INDUSTRY IN THE BILLIONS OF DOLLARS EACH YEAR, AND IT'S ALL COMING OUT OF ONE CHECKBOOK. THEY SAY, "THIS REGULATION IS COST-EFFECTIVE," AND IT MAY BE, BUT WHAT ABOUT THE OTHER 10 SOMEONE ELSE DEVELOPED ON AIR QUALITY? AT NO POINT ARE THESE REGULATIONS BEING BROUGHT TOGETHER AND EVALUATED AS AN OVERALL IMPACT.

I DISAGREE - I DON'T THINK THEY'RE TOO STRICT, BUT I THINK MOST RESIDENTS WOULD AGREE. AGAIN, I THINK IF WE'RE LOOKING AT APPROACHES, REGULATORY IS SOMETHING THAT WILL FIND MORE RESISTANCE THAN A BUY-IN/WIN-WIN APPROACH.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSISTENCY, HOWEVER, IS PROBLEMATIC.

IN SOME SPECIFIC AREAS, THEY HAVE GONE TOO FAR. IN GENERAL, I DISAGREE THOUGH. FOR THE MOST PART, MOST OF THEM HAVE BEEN PRODUCTIVE, BUT SOME OF THE TIMELINES GIVEN ARE TOO ABBREVIATED BECAUSE OF THE ECONOMICS INVOLVED.

IT DEPENDS ON WHAT SIDE YOU LOOK AT IT. IN SOME WAYS, THEY ARE PRETTY RIDICULOUS. WE HAVE SUCH BURDENSOME REGULATIONS, WE'VE SPENT BILLIONS OF DOLLARS ON THE RULEMAKING PROCESS TO CLEAN UP DIFFERENT SOURCES OF POLLUTION IN THE VALLEY TO THE POINT WHERE THE LOW-HANGING FRUIT IS GONE, AND NOW WE'RE LOOKING AT ASKING PEOPLE TO SPEND EXORBITANT AMOUNTS OF MONEY FOR VERY LOW RETURNS ON POLLUTION REDUCTION. AS A RESULT, WE'RE HAVING BUSINESSES LEAVING THE STATE. THE DISTRICT HAS TO RELY ON FEDERAL AND AIR RESOURCES BOARD REGULATIONS, AND THOSE DON'T TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE FACT THAT WE CAN'T GET THERE FROM HERE, BASED ON THE TOPOGRAPHY OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY.

LAWS ARE THERE FOR A REASON. WE HAVE AIR POLLUTION PROBLEMS SO WE HAVE TO HAVE LAWS IN PLACE TO CURTAIL IT.

STRICT IS ONE WORD - BUT COMPLEX IS ANOTHER. YOU CAN BE STRICT, BUT IF THE RULES ARE VERY CLEAR, THAT'S ONE THING. THE COMPLEXITY IS A PART OF THAT STRICT. IF THERE'S 10 POUNDS YOU HAVE TO TAKE OUT OF THE ATMOSPHERE, TELL US TO TAKE IT OUT AND WE'LL DO IT. IF IT TAKES 10-12 PAGES, THEN YOU'RE NOT SURE WHAT THEY SAID. COMPLEXITY IS MORE OF A PROBLEM THAN STRICTNESS. ONE EXAMPLE IS THAT MOST PEOPLE PUTTING IN NEW EQUIPMENT HAVE TO HIRE A CONSULTANT BECAUSE THE RULES ARE SO COMPLEX, AND IT SHOULDN'T BE THAT WAY.

THEY ARE HEALTH-BASED STANDARDS, SO NO, I DO NOT AGREE THEY ARE TOO STRICT. HOWEVER, THE SPECIFIC RULES THAT ARE DEVELOPED TO TRY AND MEET THOSE STANDARDS CAN BE. WE DON'T DISAGREE WITH THE STANDARDS, JUST HOW WE GET THERE.

WE'RE OK IF WE FOLLOW THE CURRENT RULES MORE EFFECTIVELY.

Comments on: 15d. The Valley Air District has been too aggressive in enforcing air pollution regulations on businesses and residents.

I AGREE THAT IT IS TOO STRICT ON BUSINESSES, BUT NOT ON RESIDENTS.

I WAS KIND OF LOOKING FOR A MIDDLE CHOICE, BUT IT DOESN'T LOOK LIKE ONE'S AVAILABLE.

I WORK WITH THEM CLOSELY AND THEY HAVE NO OTHER WAY TO GO AT THIS, NO OTHER CHOICE. IF THERE WERE ANOTHER OPTION, I AM SURE THEY WOULD TAKE IT.

IF YOU LOOK AT SOUTH COAST OR SACRAMENTO AIR DISTRICTS, THEIR REGULATIONS ARE FAR MORE STRINGENT THAN THE VALLEY, BUT THEY CAN REGULATE MOBILE SOURCES AS WELL, SO IT GIVES THEM ADDITIONAL CLOUT AND IT'S WHY IT'S MADE THEM MORE SUCCESSFUL IN REGULATING THEIR AIR QUALITY. THAT IS REALLY ONE OF OUR FAILINGS, IN THAT WE'RE LIMITED AND CAN ONLY REGULATE STATIONERY SOURCES.

IN TERMS OF PORRIDGE TEMPERATURE, I THINK THEY'RE ABOUT RIGHT (GOLDILOCKS ANALOGY).

THEY HAVE NOT BEEN TOO HEAVY HANDED AT ALL, AT LEAST IN THE AREAS I DEAL WITH. ALSO, THEY HAVE A LOT OF VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS, SO THEY TRY TO ENCOURAGE RATHER THAN ENFORCE.

THEY'RE JUST DOING THEIR JOB – I CAN'T AGREE OR DISAGREE. THEY DON'T HAVE A CHOICE.

THEY'RE RIGHT ON; THEY DO OK. THEY'RE NOT REFUSING TO WORK WITH PEOPLE BUT THEY'RE NOT IGNORING EVERYTHING EITHER. I'M NEUTRAL. BUT IF I HAD TO CHOOSE, I WOULD SAY THEY'RE TOO AGGRESSIVE.

WE'RE NOT GETTING ANY FREE LUNCHES, BUT AS FAR AS AGGRESSIVE, IT'S NOT. IT'S A MATTER OF DO WE ADHERE TO THE REGULATIONS OR NOT. WE'VE HAD A COUPLE OF BONEHEADS, BUT . . . LOOK, I'M A FOOTBALL REF AND I DON'T MAKE A CALL EVERY PLAY, SO THERE ARE SOME WHO TRY TO DO THAT. BUT GENERALLY, THEY DO A GOOD JOB.

YOU'RE LUMPING EVERYTHING TOGETHER, OTHERWISE IT WOULD BE DIFFERENT [WOULD NOT ELABORATE].

“Do you have any additional comments?”

WE KNOW THAT THE AIR HAS IMPROVED. THAT'S SCIENTIFICALLY PROVEN, AND AIR AND EPA WERE PART OF THAT STUDY. IT'S A LONG-ARM TYPE STUDY, IT'S NOT AN INDUSTRY OR AGENCY STUDY.

I DEAL WITH THE AIR BOARD ON A REGULAR BASIS, AND I FIND THEM VERY OPEN AND EASY TO DEAL WITH – MY WHOLE LIFE, I HAVE DEALT WITH GOVERNMENT ENTITIES, AND THE DISTRICT IS VERY OPEN TO IDEAS AND PROGRESSIVE IN TERMS OF COMING UP WITH REGULATION AND INVOLVING EVERYONE – IT'S REGULATION AND IT COSTS MONEY, BUT YOU DON'T FEEL TOO BAD WORKING WITH THE DISTRICT. I HAVE NICE THINGS TO SAY ABOUT THEM.

I SUPPORT THE DISTRICT'S EFFORTS. I WISH THERE WERE ANOTHER WAY TO GET THERE FROM HERE.

I THINK THAT THE DISTRICT IS DOING A FANTASTIC JOB. OVER THE PAST 5 YEARS, THEY HAVE DONE A LOT TO MAKE IT INTO AN AGENCY THAT IS VERY RESPONSIVE, SMART ABOUT WHAT THEY DO, THAT REALLY CARES ABOUT THEIR MISSION, AND DOES A FANTASTIC JOB. IT'S BEEN A HUGE TURNAROUND IN THAT AGENCY.

I THINK THAT THE DISTRICT NEEDS TO DO A BETTER JOB OF ENFORCING THE REGULATIONS THEY HAVE AND UNDERSTANDING THE LIMITATIONS OF BUSINESS WHILE AT THE SAME TIME EDUCATING THE PUBLIC – AND THAT'S THEIR BIGGEST PROBLEM. THEY'VE DONE A TERRIBLE JOB OF EDUCATING – PEOPLE STILL BELIEVE POLLUTION COMES FROM THE BAY AREA. THEY HAVE TO DO THIS EVERY TIME THEY PUT TOGETHER AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN. THEY ALSO NEED TO LOOK AT IMPLEMENTATION PLANS OF OTHER STATES AND INCLUDE URBAN FORESTRY AS PART OF THEIR IMPLEMENTATION PLANS.

I THINK THE DISTRICT IS FACED WITH AN AWESOME TASK AND BEING UNABLE TO CONTROL MOBILE SOURCES IS DETRIMENTAL TO THEM BEING ABLE TO ACHIEVE WHAT THEY NEED TO ACHIEVE.

I WAS ASKED TO GIVE A PRESENTATION AT AN EVENT ABOUT AIR QUALITY, AND PULLED A LOT OF INFO FROM THE DISTRICT WEB SITE – NOT MY INTERPRETATION, BUT SHOWING THE DATA DIRECTLY AND HOW MUCH IT HAS IMPROVED OVER THE LAST 15 YEARS. I ACTUALLY HAD SOMEONE IN THE AUDIENCE SAY “I DON'T BELIEVE YOU.” I'VE NEVER ENCOUNTERED THAT BEFORE. I TRIED TO EXPLAIN, I'M JUST SHOWING THEM THE DATA AND THEY SAID, “I STILL CAN'T BELIEVE IT.” I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT THE DISTRICT DOES DO THIS KIND OF WORK. THERE'S A REALITY THAT THE MONITORING STATIONS ARE REVEALING BUT THERE'S AN URBAN LEGEND, IF YOU WILL, THAT IS COUNTER TO THAT. WHILE MANUFACTURING JUST LOOKS AT HOW COSTLY IT IS, THESE STANDARDS ARE HEALTH-BASED STANDARDS AND WE UNDERSTAND WE HAVE TO ATTAIN THAT. WE JUST HAVE DIFFERENCES OF OPINION ABOUT HOW WE DO THAT. IT'S NOT THAT WE DON'T CARE ABOUT HEALTH – WE DO.

I WOULD LIKE MORE SELECTION OF ANSWERS! [REFERRING TO 15A-15D PARTICULARLY]

IF THE AIR DISTRICT IS LOOKING FOR WAYS TO HAVE LONG TERM AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS, TARGETING THE YOUTH IN OUR AREA WOULD BE A GOOD IDEA. I DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY'RE DOING ALREADY, BUT WITH MY FRIENDS, SOMETIMES, THEIR KIDS TELL THEM SOMETHING, AND THAT'S HOW THEY LEARN ABOUT IT.

OUT OF ALL THE REGULATORY AGENCIES WE DEAL WITH, THE AIR DISTRICT, THEIR EXECUTIVE STAFF, AND REGULAR STAFF ARE BY FAR THE BEST REGULATORY AGENCY WE WORK WITH ON A DAILY BASIS. I WISH THE REST OF THE REGULATORY AGENCIES WOULD FOLLOW THE PROCESS THEY HAVE. I GIVE THE AIR DISTRICT A LOT OF KUDOS.

THE TWO POINTED QUESTIONS IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SURVEY [AGREE/DISAGREE] - THERE'S A HEALTHY BALANCE THAT HAS TO BE ACHIEVED IN TERMS OF ENVIRONMENT AND BUSINESS CONDITIONS. I THINK THERE'S SOME MUTUAL GOALS - IT'S IN AGRICULTURE'S BEST INTERESTS TO HAVE CLEAN WATER AND AIR FOR THEIR FAMILIES AND FOR THEIR CROPS, TOO. SO TO DEFINE THE TWO AS MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE IS NOT REALLY A TRUE ANSWER. WE UNDERSTAND THOSE QUESTIONS NEED TO BE ASKED, BUT THERE'S A BALANCE THAT HAS TO BE ACHIEVED IN ALL OF THOSE OPTIONS.

THEY'VE RATCHETED DOWN ON EMISSIONS IN INDUSTRY. THERE'S NO MORE THERE TO GIVE WITHOUT ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSING IMPLICATIONS FOR MINOR GAINS IN POLLUTION REDUCTION. A BIG PART OF THE PROBLEM IS THE MOBILE SOURCES, AND I KNOW THAT THEY HAVE RULES COMING, BUT THEY'RE LAGGING BEHIND AND WE'RE ALL PAYING A PRICE UNTIL THEY CATCH UP. AS FAR AS INDUSTRY IS CONCERNED, WE'VE GOT NO MORE TO GIVE.

“Do you have any additional comments?”

THIS DISTRICT IS THE NUMBER ONE AIR DISTRICT IN THE COUNTRY ON FACILITATING AND IMPLEMENTING PROJECTS THAT ARE TO BE FUNDED. THAT IS, THE MONEY THEY ARE GRANTED/GIVEN THEY EFFECTIVELY PUT OUT FOR INDUSTRY TO USE. I DON'T SEE THAT IN ANY OTHER DISTRICT, AND WE HAVE MEMBERS ALL OVER THE STATE. THE BOARD OF THIS DISTRICT - TODAY'S BOARD - THE 15 BOARD MEMBERS - ARE VERY SHARP AND ARE CONCERNED ABOUT AIR QUALITY, BUT ARE ALSO GREATLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE ECONOMICS AND PEOPLE'S LIVES, RATHER THAN JUST BEING ONE-SIDED. THERE ARE 35 DIFFERENT AIR DISTRICTS IN THE STATE, AND I WOULD RATE THIS DISTRICT AS #1. THE STAFF IS EXCELLENT. WE DON'T AGREE ALL THE TIME, BUT THAT DOESN'T MAKE THEM BAD. THEY ABSOLUTELY DO HOLD WORKSHOPS FOR ALL LEVELS OF PEOPLE - PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THE POORER REGIONS OF THE VALLEY, LOW-INCOME FAMILIES. THEY OUTREACH TO ALL ETHNIC GROUPS. THEIR OUTREACH IS SUPERIOR. THEY ABSOLUTELY REACH OUT TO ALL ETHNIC GROUPS, INCLUDING WHAT YOU CALL ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AREAS - HOLD MEETINGS AFTER WORK, AT NIGHT. THIS DISTRICT HAS WORKED WELL WITH EVERYONE AND HAS GONE BEYOND THE CALL OF DUTY.

WE HAVE A GOOD PARTNERSHIP WITH THE DISTRICT. THEY'RE RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING A LOT OF TOUGH REGULATIONS, BUT THEY'VE DONE A GOOD JOB WITH THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY TO TRY AND MAKE THOSE WORK.

WE SUPPORT THE EFFORTS OF THE DISTRICT, BUT WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE MORE AGGRESSIVE WORK, ESPECIALLY FOR INDUSTRY.

This type of qualitative inquiry permits directional rather than statistical analysis.