

**August 25, 2010 Comments on the EPA CASAC Particulate Matter Review Panel Draft Letter on
Policy Assessment for the Review of Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard—
Second External Review Draft (June 2010)**

**William E. Davis
Executive Vice President
Southern California Contractors Association
<http://www.sccaweb.org>
williamedavis@cox.net**

Good morning and greetings from Southern California where the news of the day is the 15 foot waves crashing in on our shore and wildfires roaring through our mountains, both events which are creating fine particulate matter.

My name is Bill Davis. I'm the Executive Vice President of the Southern California Contractors Association. Our organization represents the interests of union signatory heavy construction contractors, the people who build our basic infrastructure here. We've been engaged on issues regarding PM2.5 ever since 2003 as part of our work with California Air Resources Board on efforts to develop regulations to control PM and nox emissions from on road and off road equipment. While we do not oppose the goal of reducing these emissions, we have consistently asked that compliance solutions are both achievable and affordable. We are happy to report that CARB appears to be moving in that direction after finding that they had over estimated these emissions from 200 to 400 %.

As a part of the process, we studied the research projects, cited in your work relative to human health effects of fine particulates and to be quite honest, we were shocked to find that none of these studies, so far, have reached a relative risk of 2 or greater. Several demonstrate virtually no health effects at all, at least in California. But these regulations are going to cost our industry more than 25 billion dollars to remedy the emissions problem.

This bring up one issue, which so far has received little attention from the EPA staff reports. I'm 6 foot 6 inches tall and weigh in at about 280. I'm not a real big fan of one size fits all rules. They don't work on airline seat assignments for example and they certainly don't work in environmental regulation. Your burden is to make sure that the regional variation, in terms of both actual substances that make up PM2.5 and their effects on human health are the basis for any change in current rules. This should be the subject of additional research and actual proof of causation before adding to the regulatory burden faced by our industry and the rest of the troubled economy of this nation.

Before closing, we must address the idea expressed in the staff report as light extinction. This is an overreach based on the current evidence before you. It's a solution in search of a problem. It's also so absurd on its face that if you continue down this path you will find a wall of laughter burying your progress on other, possibly real, health issues. Please stop wasting your time with aesthetics, something that will be the source of monologs on Jay Leno, Conan O'Brien and Rush Limbaugh, not to mention congressional comedians.

Finally, I want to share with you a maxim from the construction industry regarding the need for any additional regulation on this topic. It's our rule, measure twice, cut once. Thank you.