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Background
Ocean-Going Vessels

Vessel Types
- Container Ships
- Tankers
- Bulk Carriers
- Auto Carriers
- General Cargo
- Passenger Cruise Ships

Vessel Statistics
- 10,000 visits annually
- 2,000 unique vessels annually
- Majority visiting the ports of LA, Long Beach, and Oakland
Need for Emission Reductions from Ocean-Going Vessels

- Large and growing source of PM, NOx, and SOx emissions
- Emissions concentrated near population centers
- Significant localized and regional impacts
- Major contributor to PM mortality and cancer risk
- Major contributor to ambient levels of PM and ozone
Ocean-Going Vessels are a Large Source of Statewide Diesel PM Emissions*

* Sources: 2003 ARB Emissions Inventory and 2005 Ship ISOR
What is an Auxiliary Engine?

♦ Engine used primarily for activities other than propulsion (i.e. electricity for shipboard lighting, refrigeration, and equipment)
  – Used by vessels at dockside and at sea

♦ Most vessels have one very large main propulsion engine and several large auxiliary engines

♦ Diesel-electric vessels are a special case where several large engines provide electrical power for both propulsion and shipboard electricity
Estimated Growth in Diesel PM Emissions from Ship Auxiliary Engines
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Significant Contribution to Community Health Risks

Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach Exposure Assessment Study found ship auxiliary emissions were most significant contributor to high near source risk levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cancer Risk Level (chances/million)</th>
<th>Square Miles Impacted</th>
<th>Population Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk &gt; 200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk &gt; 100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk &gt; 10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Regulation
Regulatory Development Process

- Began process in 2001 with the formation of the Maritime Working Group
- Five public workshops and work group meetings
- Input from ship operators, ports, engine manufacturers, government agencies, environmental & community groups
- Ongoing consideration of verbal and written comments
Proposed Regulation Applies to Auxiliary Engines on Ocean-going Vessels

Motor-Ship

Main Engine for Propulsion (not covered)

Auxiliary Engines for Electricity (covered)

Diesel-Electric

Engines Provide Electricity for both Propulsion & Shipboard Uses (covered)
Proposed Regulation Applies Within 24 Nautical Miles of the California Coastline

- Retains the majority of health benefits
- Reduces the cost
- Utilizes international boundary
Emission Limit Based on Use of Cleaner Distillate Marine Fuels

♦ January 1, 2007 Emission Limit
  – Use marine gas oil
  – Use marine diesel oil with a 0.5% sulfur limit
  – Use equally effective emission control strategies

♦ January 1, 2010 Emission Limit
  – Use marine gas oil with a 0.1% sulfur limit
  – Use equally effective emission control strategies
  – Fuel supply review in 2008
Alternative Compliance Plan (ACP)

- Operators may comply using alternative emission control strategies
- Must achieve equivalent or greater reductions
- Applicants may use fleet average emission reductions
- Special provision encourages the use of shore-side power
Noncompliance Fee Provision

♦ Option to pay a noncompliance fee
  – Unexpected redirection to a California port
  – Inability to purchase complying distillate fuel
  – Fuel found to be noncompliant enroute to CA
  – Extension needed for vessel modifications
  – Vessel modifications needed on infrequent visitor

♦ Funds to be used for port air quality projects
## Noncompliance Fee Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Port Visits</th>
<th>Diesel-Electric Vessels</th>
<th>Other Vessels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or More</td>
<td>$162,500</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enforcement of the Proposed Regulation

- ARB staff will enforce by inspecting records and sampling fuels
- Fines will be issued for violations
Impacts
Air Quality Benefits

♦ Large reductions in diesel PM, NOx, & SOx
♦ Reductions in ozone and “secondarily formed” PM (PM formed in the atmosphere)
♦ Reduced cancer risk to populations near California ports
♦ Avoid 520 premature deaths by 2020 due to diesel PM reductions
♦ Significant additional health benefits from NOx and SOx reductions
## Estimated Percent Emission Reductions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diesel PM</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOx</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Emission reductions estimated from the use of 0.5% sulfur MGO in 2007, and 0.1% sulfur MGO in 2010, relative to the use of heavy fuel oil at 2.5% sulfur
Estimated Emissions of Diesel PM with and without the Regulation in the 24 nm Zone

- **Without Regulation**
- **With Regulation**
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Estimated Costs and Benefits

♦ Total Annual Cost to Industry of $40 million

♦ Added Fuel Costs
  – Typical cargo ship: $3,500 per visit
  – Typical cruise ship: $20,000 per visit

♦ Capital Costs for Ship Modifications
  – Most vessels (>90%) will not require modifications
  – Cost per vessel: $100,000-$500,000

♦ Value of Non-Cancer Health Effects
  – $200 to $300 million annually
The Proposal is Cost-Effective Compared to Other Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Measure</th>
<th>$/pound of diesel PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ship Auxiliary Engine Proposal</td>
<td>$27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Collection Vehicle Rule</td>
<td>$28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Diesel Engine ATCM</td>
<td>$4-$26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Refrigeration Unit ATCM</td>
<td>$10-$20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic Impacts of Proposal

- No significant economic impacts anticipated on ship operators or the California economy
  - An increase of $1 per shipping container for a typical trans-Pacific voyage
  - An increase of $8 per passenger for a typical LA to Mexico cruise expected
Issues
ARB Authority

♦ ARB has the authority to regulate vessel emissions under both state and federal law
♦ Proposed regulation does not conflict with federal laws and regulations
♦ Proposed regulation does not violate the “Commerce Clause”
Inclusion of Diesel-Electric Vessels in the Proposal

- Large source of emissions
  - Engines account for about 25% of emissions subject to rule
- Engines are similar to other auxiliary engines
- No additional technical barriers to controlling these engines
Fuel Switching

♦ Fuel switching is a compliance option, not a mandate
♦ Many operators currently switch fuels
♦ Fuel switching can be done safely
Proposed 15-Day Changes

- Add safety exemption
- Modify ACP to ensure that emission reductions occur where ships visit
- Clarify target pollutants for noncompliance fee provision funds
- Define noncompliance
- Miscellaneous clarifications
Summary and Recommendation

♦ The proposal for auxiliary diesel engines:
  – would quickly and substantially reduce emissions
  – improves regional air quality and reduces cancer and noncancer health impacts
  – is cost-effective

♦ We recommend that the Board adopt the proposal with the suggested 15-day changes