

MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
AIR RESOURCES BOARD

CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD
AUDITORIUM, ANNEX 4
9530 TELSTAR AVENUE
EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2016

9:03 A.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 10063

A P P E A R A N C E S

BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. Mary Nichols, Chair

Ms. Sandra Berg, Vice Chair

Dr. John Balmes

Mr. Hector De La Torre

Supervisor John Gioia

Mr. John Eisenhut

Senator Dean Florez

Ms. Judy Mitchell

Mrs. Barbara Riordan

Professor Daniel Sperling

Ms. Diane Takvorian

STAFF:

Mr. Richard Corey, Executive Officer

Dr. Alberto Ayala, Deputy Executive Officer

Ms. Edie Chang, Deputy Executive Officer

Mr. Kurt Karperos, Deputy Executive Officer

Ms. Ellen Peter, Chief Counsel

Ms. La Ronda Bowen, Ombudsman

Ms. Emily Wimberger, Chief Economist

A P P E A R A N C E S C O N T I N U E D

STAFF:

Ms. Analisa Bevan, Assistant Division Chief, ECARS

Mr. Kevin Curley, Air Pollution Engineer, Off-Road Spark-Ignited Engine Certification Section, Emission Compliance, Automotive Regulations and Science Division(ECARS)

Ms. Deidre Cyprian, Space Acquisition Manager, Space Acquisition Unit, Administrative Services Division(ASD)

Mr. Matthew Diener

Mr. Bob Fletcher, Project Manager, ASD

Mr. Eloy Florez

Mr. Mark Fuentes, Assistant Division Chief, Emissions, Compliance, Automotive Regulations, and Science Branch

Ms. Annette Hebert, Division Chief, ECARS

Ms. Sharon Lemieux

Mrs. Jackie Lourenco, Branch Chief, NVEPB, ECARS

Ms. April Molinelli, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

Ms. Alice Stebbins, Chief, ASD

Mr. Alex Wang, Senior Attorney, Legal office

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Matt Barth, University of California, Riverside

Mr. David Diaz, Bike SGV

Mr. Joel Griffith, Department of General Services

Mr. Robert Kleinhenz, Beacon Economics

Mr. David Lo, School of Medicine, University of California, Riverside

A P P E A R A N C E S C O N T I N U E D

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Ronald Loveridge, University of California, Riverside
Ms. Stephany Luevano, Cal Poly Pomona
Mr. Jorge Marquez, City of Covina Council Member
Ms. Anne Mayer, Riverside County Transportation Commission
Ms. David McElwain, Pomona Chamber of Commerce
Mr. Penny Newman, Center for Community Action and
Environmental Justice
Mr. Michael Pazzani, University of California, Riverside
Ms. Fabiola Perez, Cal Poly Pomona, College of Agriculture
Ms. Adriana Pinedo, Clean Air Pomona, Health in Pomona,
Pomona's Promise, Day One
Mr. Richard Rea, Senator Bob Huff
Ms. Ellen Robles, Congresswoman Grace Napolitano
Mr. Jesse Rodriguez, Professional Engineers in California
Government
Ms. Christina Romero, Cal Poly Pomona
Senator Richard Roth, Senate District 31
Mr. John Russo, City of Riverside
Mr. Manuel Saucedo, Senator Connie Leyva
Ms. Hilda Solis, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Mr. Amber Sommerville, San Gabriel Valley Economic
Partnership
Mr. John Tavaglione, County of Riverside

A P P E A R A N C E S C O N T I N U E D

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Robert Torres, Assembly Member Freddie Rodriguez

Ms. Amy Wong

Mr. Michael Woo, Cal Poly Pomona

I N D E X

	PAGE
Pledge of Allegiance	1
Roll Call	2
Opening remarks by Chair Nichols	3
Board Member comments	4
Item 16-3-1	
Chair Nichols	15
Executive Officer Corey	15
Staff Presentation	16
Board Discussion and Q&A	31
Item 16-3-2	
Chair Nichols	40
Executive Officer Corey	43
Staff Presentation	44
Kim Wilcox	65
Rob Field	70
Sylvia Alva	74
Mr. Rea	46
Ms. Solis	87
Mr. Saucedo	90
Ms. Robles	91
Mr. Torres	93
Mr. Marquez	94
Senator Roth	94
Mr. Tavaglione	97
Mr. Barth	99
Mr. Lo	103
Mr. Pazzani	105
Ms. Newman	107
Mr. Loveridge	110
Ms. Mayer	112
Mr. Kleinhenz	115
Mr. Russo	118
Ms. Romero	121
Ms. Luevano	125
Ms. Perez	126
Mr. Woo	129
Mr. McElwain	131
Mr. Diaz	133
Mr. Rodriguez	134
Ms. Lemieux	136
Mr. Diener	138

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

	PAGE
Mr. Florez	140
Ms. Sommerville	145
Ms. Pinedo	147
Ms. Wong	149
Board Discussion and Q&A	150
Motion	208
Vote	211
Public Comment	213
Adjournment	213
Reporter's Certificate	214

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning, everybody. I've
3 now figured out that a red light means on, which is not
4 usual, but the sound system is working. It's working
5 well. Thank you, engineers. Thank you to engineers in
6 general. This is Saint Patrick's Day for anyone who
7 hasn't been following world events. And Saint Patrick's
8 Day is a very important day for us, because Saint
9 Patrick's Day is celebrated with wearing of the green,
10 which of course is the color of the environmental
11 movement. And also as the daughter of an engineer, I grew
12 up with a song about how Saint Patrick was an engineer.
13 Now, I'm not planning on singing it for you all, but maybe
14 during a break we might, you know, have that discussion.

15 Anyway. Welcome to the March 17, 2016 meeting of
16 the Air Resources Board. And we will begin as we always
17 do by saying the Pledge of Allegiance. So if you'll
18 please stand.

19 (Thereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was
20 recited in unison.)

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: I suppose by rights, Mrs. Riordan
22 should be running the meeting this morning. Oh, well.
23 Some of us only wish that we were Irish.

24 BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Everybody is Irish on
25 Saint Patrick's Day.

1 CHAIR NICHOLS: No, by special dispensation.
2 Madam Clerk, wherever you are. Please call the roll.

3 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Over here. To your right.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Ah, there you go. There. Got
5 it.

6 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: All right. Dr. Balmes?

7 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.

8 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. De La Torre?

9 Mr. Eisenhut?

10 Senator Florez?

11 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here.

12 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Gioia?

13 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Here.

14 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Mitchell?

15 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Here.

16 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mrs. Riordan?

17 BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.

18 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Roberts?

19 Supervisor Serna?

20 Dr. Sherriffs?

21 Professor Sperling?

22 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.

23 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Takvorian?

24 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.

25 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Vice Chair Berg?

1 VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.

2 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Chair Nichols?

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: Here.

4 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Madam Chair we have a
5 quorum.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much. Okay. A
7 couple of announcements. Anyone who wishes to testify on
8 anything that's before us today should fill out a request
9 to speak card. They're available in the lobby outside the
10 Board room, and you can give it to the clerk. We
11 appreciate it if you do that prior to the item beginning.

12 Also, all speakers should be aware that the Board
13 enforces a three minute time limit, except when we have a
14 group presentation that has been previously been approved.
15 So we appreciate it, if when you come up to testify, you
16 would just state your name. And then particularly if you
17 have written testimony, if you would summarize it, rather
18 than trying to read it. It makes it much more effective
19 for us.

20 I'm also supposed to announce that there's an
21 emergency evacuation procedure in the event that a fire
22 alarm or other emergency happens that would require the
23 evacuation of the building. You can proceed out either of
24 the doors to the right -- to my right, your left, if
25 you're in the audience, down the corridors and out of the

1 main entrance.

2 Once outside the building, the evacuation point
3 is the grass lawn in the center of the parking lot of the
4 arbor courtyard. And there are staff will be available to
5 direct you to that point. So just be aware of that,
6 please.

7 Before we begin our regular noticed items this
8 morning, we always have a place for Board Member comments.
9 And I wanted to take a couple of minutes out of this
10 morning's time before we launch into the important
11 business that we have, because we are in Southern
12 California. And there's been a lot of publicity recently
13 about events at the South Coast Air Quality Management
14 District that people are concerned about, and rightly so,
15 I believe, with the precipitous firing of the executive
16 officer, which was preceded by perhaps an even more
17 substantive discussion about the reclaim program, the NOx
18 trading program, that's been on the books in the South
19 Coast for a long time.

20 And I thought it would be useful for the staff to
21 briefly go over what this issue of reclaim is about and
22 what the ARB's role is in dealing with it, because this is
23 going to be coming back before the Board at some point, I
24 imagine. Okay. Mr. Corey.

25 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

1 So I think from a context standpoint, it will help to
2 provide a little background on the program and the action
3 that was taken in December -- back in December. So
4 reclaim established in 1993, so it's been around a long
5 time. It's for larger industrial sources. It captures --
6 about today, there's about 270 sources captured under
7 reclaim. Larger meaning they emit more than four tons a
8 year NOx or SOx, so it was a market based program to
9 provide flexibility for those sources, but also yield
10 reductions. In fact, since '93 it's yielded about a 70
11 percent reduction in NOx, since that period of time.

12 But as part of the program, it's been a key
13 element in terms of reducing NOx as part of meeting SIP
14 obligations and demonstrating a path to achieve our
15 help-based air quality standards. And as part of the 2012
16 air quality management plan, there was a commitment to
17 further tighten the reclaim, and there was also a
18 commitment with respect to its contribution to the
19 upcoming SIP, basically meeting the 2023 80 parts per
20 billion standard of ozone, as well as the 2031 75 parts
21 per billion.

22 So staff, South Coast staff, went through an
23 analysis and developed a report. And part of that was
24 looking at individual sources, for instance, at
25 refineries, boilers, catalytic cracking units, basically

1 look in total at the level control that they're at today,
2 and what is achievable. And there's a specific definition
3 that achievable means. It's related to best available
4 control technology, retrofit technology they look at, that
5 ultimately informs a recommendation with some head space
6 as to how much to shave, how much to reduce the program
7 which issues basically credits to industry, but that is
8 basically a proxy for reducing emissions.

9 Staff proposed based on that analysis a shave of
10 14 tons per day of NOx, so -- and the rationale was this
11 is what this is more consistent with BARCT, this will
12 further bring refineries into alliance, into consistency,
13 more consistent with what is achieved by refinery control
14 elsewhere in the State, for instance the Bay Area, because
15 the refineries actually have a lesser level of control
16 here with respect to boilers, as an example, than they do
17 in other parts of the State for example.

18 The Board discussion deliberated. In fact, there
19 was considerable push-back on the proposal, particularly
20 by the refineries, because the refineries had really an
21 additional shave to do just what I described, to get them
22 closer to what's achieved at refineries elsewhere in the
23 State.

24 The South Coast Board ultimately approved a 12
25 ton per year shave. In response to that action, ARB,

1 under my signature, wrote a letter to the Director --
2 Executive Officer, Barry Wallerstein, identifying several
3 concerns we had. The fundamental concern was we had
4 concerns whether State law was being met. Reclaim needs
5 to meet this BARCT demonstration. In other words, it's
6 achieving emission reductions that you would otherwise
7 achieve had you gone command and control by individual
8 sources, and in the aggregate, does it get you to the same
9 place? So it was a fundamental question, does it do that?
10 We had some serious concerns as to whether it does or does
11 not, and said we're going to do our own independent
12 evaluation.

13 Two, on its face, it was leaving two tons a day
14 of NOx on the table, when we all know, and the South Coast
15 has been a very serious partner in this, we have a serious
16 air quality problem. We need to make progress towards
17 achieving the health based air quality standards, two tons
18 matters. And the other one was the additional time. The
19 proposal also provided additional time, a smoother
20 reduction curve, a declined curve.

21 In response to my letter, Barry Wallerstein laid
22 out a, one, disagreed with our assessment, in terms of the
23 legality. And my point was, we're looking at that. Let's
24 have that discussion. Two, there were two commitments in
25 that letter. It referred to the intent of the South Coast

1 to consider over the course of this year pulling some
2 additional credits out of the market, for instance, that
3 are associated with shutdowns. And it also identified the
4 intent to revisit, not necessarily the Board's action, but
5 other strengthening of reclaim. And where we left that
6 exchange was that there was to be a collaborative work
7 between myself and Barry, and possibly a board-to-board
8 discussion, with a subset of board members to see if we
9 could work through the issues.

10 Since that time, shortly after, because we were
11 involved, engaged in those conversations of putting these
12 discussions together, see if we could work through those
13 issues, the executive director was dismissed, released.
14 And, at this point, we are still discussing with staff.
15 But honestly, it threw a wrench into this, in terms of the
16 path that we were on, and the conversations that I was
17 having with the executive director.

18 So what we have been looking at is in terms of,
19 you know, the question that you asked, Chair, what are the
20 next steps? What do we with this, because we clear --
21 there's an issue in front us. And ultimately, Chair, you
22 made a point, this year -- later this year, we'll be
23 bringing before this Board a SIP submittal for South
24 Coast -- specifically for South Coast, in terms of
25 Demonstrating how we're going to achieve the 2031 75 ppb

1 standard. Not only does that include mobile source
2 measures, which we've been working very hard with South
3 Coast on, in terms of how we can get to an 80 percent
4 reduction from the mobile source sector, but stationary
5 sources matter a lot. In fact, if you look in 2031, today
6 they represent about 15 percent of the NOx emissions down
7 here, 2031, 40 percent.

8 The more we do on mobile, the greater share
9 stationary sources represent and the importance of taking
10 additional reduction opportunities for those sources.
11 So -- and that's going to be a proposal that we bring
12 before this Board later this year, and we want to bring a
13 proposal that the Board can support, can adopt, basically
14 because it moves on to EPA. And it's got to be the one --
15 the stationary and mobile source elements, basically the
16 SIP, go through this Board. The Board has to approve it
17 for it to advance to EPA. So working these issues out
18 with South Coast now are critically important.

19 The Health and Safety Code specifies some options
20 for us to work out. First of all is, in my -- from
21 perspective, continue to work with staff to see if we can
22 work through issues.

23 Two, there is in the Health and Safety Code a --
24 I'm going to call it a meet and confer provision that
25 basically says if we are unable to reach resolution at the

1 staff level, I'd return to you and report just that point.
2 The Board would appoint or identify a subset of members to
3 confer with South Coast board members. The whole
4 objective is can we find some common ground of an
5 approvable reduction strategy.

6 If that is unsuccessful, the Health and Safety
7 Code also calls out a more aggressive provision, where
8 this Board would have a hearing in South Coast and
9 consider adopting amending reclaim, adopting another
10 measures to ultimately have a SIP that is ultimately
11 approvable by this Board.

12 So we have some months to work through this. I
13 don't want to say it's not endless time. We're mindful of
14 the time frame. Staff is still doing the -- my staff is
15 still -- our staff is doing the evaluation of the reclaim
16 package that was submitted to us, in terms of this legal
17 requirement, as well as working with South Coast staff.
18 My plan is to report back to this Board on the
19 staff-to-staff discussions to see if the meet and confer
20 process needs to be initiated.

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, thank you. Obviously, this
22 was not an agenda item that was noticed. There's no
23 action before the Board. But if anyone has a question
24 that they would like to ask from staff. Yes, Mr. Florez.

25 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you. Thank you for

1 your report. Just a couple questions in terms of this
2 Board's ability, as you mentioned, and interim step in
3 terms of a subset talking to the current Board members
4 without executive director, what is the audit function of
5 CARB at this point in time, of this Board in terms of the
6 South Coast? What powers do we have to continue on? And
7 that's a question one.

8 The second is, we are building towards this
9 report, as you mentioned, with a deadline. And I guess I
10 wonder why do we wait so long in order to -- can we get a
11 monthly progress report from them. I know, you sent the
12 letter out in December. I applaud you for that. But just
13 how do we kind of stay on track with our statewide plan,
14 with you have boards out there making these types of
15 decisions? How does one account for that?

16 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I think there are a few
17 options. One, to the core of your question, in terms of
18 you referred to it as a audit function, which I'd
19 characterize the very review that we're doing of their
20 role and their rationale is that very point, basically.
21 And this is a complex evaluation. This is a 2,000 page
22 document. It's hundreds of sources that are under it.
23 And it's basically BARCT for those sources, and what would
24 BARCT have otherwise gotten you too to basically have an
25 informed basis for what it ought to be, in terms of where

1 you ought to land it, and what should have landed.

2 That evaluation is going -- taking place now. In
3 terms of keeping the Board informed, a few options for
4 that. One is individual briefings. Two, I could do a
5 regular report. That could be in writing or it could even
6 be as part of Board hearings, just to be informed as to
7 how we're proceeding, because there is certainly a lot of
8 work going on as I just described.

9 And the point I think -- your core point is
10 calling early enough. If really we get to an impasse,
11 from a staff standpoint, and really we need to --
12 assistance from the Board standpoint, that we've left
13 ample time to work through those issues. And I'm very
14 mindful of that point.

15 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: And just, what's the end
16 node for that type of analysis? When does this need to be
17 resolved, so we can work backwards from there?

18 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The ultimate resolution
19 is when the SIP -- proposed SIP is brought before this
20 Board towards the end of this year. But the whole point
21 of this is that that SIP be an approvable SIP. So the
22 markers, in my mind are, finishing our evaluation in about
23 the month to two month time frame. And if we, at that
24 point, have not resolved with staff, to me, that is the
25 board-to-board confer timing. And that allows a window so

1 that we are not in a position of getting jammed.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Ms. Mitchell, were you --

3 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Yes.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: -- about to speak?

5 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: I was getting the
6 microphone ready. As the representative from the South
7 Coast District, I want to say that, you know, I encourage
8 our two boards to work together to reach the resolution
9 that is needed here.

10 As you all are aware, there have been some major
11 changes on our board, some new people have come in, and
12 they are indicating a direction that they want to be more
13 friendly to business, to industry. And while I think we
14 can be friendly to industry, but we can still be green.
15 And so I think one of the things that we need to be
16 working on is the orientation of our new Board members.
17 And, you know, I will be helping with that.

18 We're also certainly in an unsettled state right
19 now with the loss of our executive director. As you know,
20 we are preparing a AQMP at this time, the 2016 AQMP. So
21 we have that in front of us. And we have in front of us
22 now a search for a new executive director, and immediately
23 a new interim director.

24 So there's a lot sitting on our plates, let me
25 say that. And all of you know that I worked for the 14

1 tons per day reduction. So I want to work with our staff
2 as well and with the ARB staff and the air
3 resources -- the district staff to try to get to a point
4 where we're on the same -- on the same plain. So anyway,
5 thank you for the work that you're doing, Richard, and the
6 work that you're doing, Chair Nichols. You've heard me
7 say here many times, we have to have those NOx reductions,
8 dramatic reductions by 2023 and then 2031.

9 And I don't know where we're going to get them,
10 but we need to work on where we're going to get them. So
11 thank you very much.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. And appreciate very
13 much your efforts to try to bring this to a successful
14 resolution. I do admire your careful choice of language.
15 Your Executive Director wasn't exactly lost. He was sent
16 packing. But be that as it may, I think Richard has laid
17 out a careful set of steps and a time frame for us to get
18 to a resolution here. But I've been asked many times what
19 power the Board has to deal with this situation?

20 And I think it is important that the Board
21 understand that it's a power, it's also a responsibility
22 that we have to act if we find, at the end of the day,
23 that the SIP is not adequate. We may and would have to
24 actually step in and fix the plan. So I don't think
25 that's anybody's desire. It's hardly a pleasant thing to

1 do, but it is something that we have to hold out there as
2 the ultimate potential resolution here, so -- but
3 hopefully we will be able to move on.

4 And moving on, as far as our agenda is concerned,
5 we have an informational item. I know that there are many
6 people here in the audience who are here to talk about the
7 site choice for the new laboratory.

8 But before we get to that, we do want to briefly
9 lay some groundwork here in terms of the Board's
10 implementation of our mobile source regulations. And this
11 is an opportunity to get a bigger picture on how staff
12 actually carries out these regulations, and hopefully at
13 least a little bit places the role of the laboratory in
14 that context.

15 So, Mr. Corey.

16 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thank you, Chair.
17 Today staff will present to the Board an overview of the
18 comprehensive process it uses to implement mobile sources
19 regulations to ensure that the emission benefits
20 associated with those regulations are fully realized after
21 those regulations are adopted by the board.

22 Typically, program implementation follows a
23 cradle-to-grave approach, that starts with certification
24 and on-board diagnostic system approval, continues with
25 new vehicle/engine compliance testing, and ends with

1 in-use compliance testing on vehicles and engines in
2 customer use.

3 Staff will also discuss the latest innovations in
4 implementation to address new vehicle technologies and
5 advancements in vehicle evaluations.

6 At this time, I'll ask Kevin Curley to begin the
7 staff presentation.

8 Kevin.

9 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
10 Presented as follows.)

11 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Thank you, Mr.
12 Corey. Good morning, Chair Nichols and members of the
13 Board.

14 Today, I will be presenting an overview of how
15 the Air Resources Board's mobile source regulations,
16 specifically emission standards, are implemented through
17 our certification and in-use compliance programs. I will
18 also discuss how those programs may need to evolve to
19 address lessons learned and future challenges.

20 --o0o--

21 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: The successful
22 implementation of mobile source emission standards is
23 critical in ensuring that the emissions benefits
24 associated with these regulations are realized. Once the
25 regulations are adopted, the implementation process

1 follows a cradle-to-grave approach beginning with the
2 certification that manufacturer products meet the emission
3 standards.

4 ARB signals approval of the products through
5 issuance of an Executive Order, over 3,000 each year,
6 which allows manufacturers to legally sell their products
7 in California. Staff tracks in-use emission compliance
8 through a variety of in-use testing programs and the
9 collection of in-use data. If violations of standards are
10 discovered, staff will follow up with enforcement
11 penalties.

12 Finally, staff from multiple ARB divisions
13 utilize information and knowledge obtained during
14 implementation to identify potential amendments to then
15 enhance the efficacy of future regulations.

16 --o0o--

17 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: So before we get
18 into more details, let's start with an overview of
19 approximate timelines of the implementation programs. As
20 you can see, it's a very active process that tracks the
21 life of the products. You may notice that dialogue
22 between staff and the manufacturers starts one to three
23 years before a manufacturer starts production of its
24 engine and vehicle, and it continues years after the
25 products are produced.

1 application for certification.

2 --o0o--

3 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: The red
4 highlighted rectangles highlight areas that require
5 extensive information exchange between ARB and
6 manufacturers. Starting from the top red box, first the
7 manufacturer must describe in engineering concepts how the
8 emissions will be controlled with both hardware and
9 software technologies.

10 Moving to the right box, the manufacturer must
11 discuss in detail the existence of all auxiliary emission
12 control devices, AECDs, which are basically computer
13 software programs that disable parts of the emission
14 control system under specific circumstances.

15 AECD documentation may be hundreds of pages long,
16 and I have an example of one AECD document here on the
17 table, just to give you an idea.

18 Next, manufacturers must put together a plan and
19 demonstrate how the emission control system will be
20 durable and control emissions for the full useful life of
21 the vehicles. In some cases, this can be 15 years or
22 150,000 miles.

23 Finally, a significant tool, on-board
24 diagnostics, or OBD, is now available on every vehicle
25 sold, not only in California, but nationally and around

1 the world, all of which was conceived, developed, and
2 implemented primarily by ARB for the United States. I
3 will cover OBD in more detail on the next slide.

4 The rest of the blue rectangles are primarily
5 submitted by the manufacturer and reviewed by staff for
6 meetings standards and requirements including the final
7 emission test results, the manufacturer's statement of
8 compliance, a description of how the vehicle will be
9 developed to be emission performance tamper resistant, and
10 finally a copy of the emission label that will be applied
11 to the vehicle and their emission warranty statement.

12 --o0o--

13 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: A significant
14 part of the certification review is the manufacturers'
15 planned OBD systems. Usually, one OBD monitoring system
16 application will cover several vehicle makes and models.
17 And I have an example of the OBD application here as well,
18 just to give you an idea of the size.

19 I can barely lift it.

20 The OBD system does not measure emissions
21 directly, but measures signals from the engine and
22 emission control system to determine if a malfunction is
23 practice. The system consists primarily of software and
24 an engine computer with minimal additional hardware. The
25 OBD system monitors virtually every emission related

1 pages to thousands of pages. And with the addition of new
2 categories and new regulatory requirements, the amount and
3 complexity of certification documents has been growing
4 over time.

5 --o0o--

6 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: A tremendous
7 amount of technical information is collected during the
8 mobile source certification process, and many entities
9 outside of the certification group rely on this data. For
10 example, regulatory groups use the data to identify
11 current emission control system trends, and they use the
12 emissions test data to establish current baseline emission
13 levels.

14 The Bureau of Automotive Repair, BAR, and the
15 service industry use our data, so Smog Check stations can
16 determine if tested vehicles comply with the regulations.
17 The public, and Section 177 states, use our certification
18 websites to find information about California certified
19 products.

20 And finally, ARB incentive programs and local
21 districts use certification data to identify potential
22 engines eligible for funding, such as under the Air
23 Quality Improvement Program, AQIP, and the Hybrid and
24 Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project,
25 HVIP.

1 --o0o--

2 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Now, let's move
3 on to programs that occur after the certification of new
4 products. Manufacturers build and sell after-market parts
5 performance improvements and retrofit kits with new
6 cleaner technology. In the next couple of slides, I will
7 discuss how the after-market parts and retrofit
8 verification programs are implemented.

9 --o0o--

10 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: To ensure that
11 the emission control systems operate as designed, the
12 California Vehicle Code prohibits modifications that
13 increase emissions from mobile sources. Staff evaluate
14 after-market parts to ensure that they do not increase
15 emissions, and will issue approvals in the form of
16 exemptions.

17 An exemption from California's anti-tampering law
18 in the Vehicle Code is required before any add-on or
19 modified part can be sold in California. One area of
20 importance is after-market catalytic converters. If your
21 vehicle fails Smog Check, you may use our databases of
22 approved after-market catalytic converters to find a
23 replacement, which is generally less expensive than the
24 original manufacturer parts, but has been evaluated by ARB
25 to ensure it performs as well as the original catalyst.

1 The after-market exemption program may also
2 evaluate the application of alternative fuel and hybrid
3 conversion systems, as well as other experimental
4 technologies.

5 --o0o--

6 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Another type of
7 after-market program is the diesel retrofit verification
8 program. This program supports the various heavy-duty
9 fleet rules by evaluating after-market diesel particulate
10 filters, or other technologies, that could be added to
11 existing vehicles and engines that obtain substantial
12 emission reductions.

13 A successful retrofit reduces emissions, is
14 durable and compatible with normal operation, reduces
15 toxic exposures, and allows the continued use of existing
16 engines. A verified product must also supply a product
17 warranty and is subjected to in-use testing and compliance
18 requirements. To provide outreach to fleets, a retrofit
19 advocate facilitator assists fleet personnel with retrofit
20 technology and compliance issues.

21 --o0o--

22 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: The final step on
23 our timeline focuses on in-use compliance programs. In
24 addition to certifying vehicles prior to being sold in
25 California, ARB has established several programs aimed at

1 monitoring in-use vehicles for continued compliance with
2 emission standards. The primary objective of this program
3 is to verify that vehicles are produced as certified, and
4 that they are compliant throughout their useful life.

5 --o0o--

6 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Over the years,
7 ARB's in-use compliance program has been successful in
8 identifying non-compliant vehicles and has forced the
9 recall of over three million vehicles in the light-duty
10 sector alone. Traditionally, staff procure cars from
11 actual consumers, bring them into the laboratory, and test
12 their emissions.

13 To give you an idea of what type of impact the
14 program has had, in 1982, every vehicle group brought into
15 the laboratory for testing failed emission standards. The
16 threat of recall, encouraged manufacturers to produce
17 durable emission control systems. As a result, by 1999,
18 only 11 percent of the vehicles brought into the
19 laboratory for testing failed their compliance testing.

20 In 2000, the compliance assurance program, or
21 CAP2000, was adopted, which requires that manufacturers
22 conduct their own in-use testing and submit the data to
23 ARB. Using this test data, staff target vehicles most
24 likely to have noncompliance issues for testing in our
25 lab. Last year, all vehicle groups brought in for testing

1 failed their compliance testing, indicating that CAP2000
2 has helped ARB target non-complying vehicles. As a
3 result, in each case, the manufacturer recalled and fixed
4 the failing vehicles.

5 --o0o--

6 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: As you know, ARB
7 has testing facilities located in El Monte, Los Angeles,
8 and Sacramento that cover a large swath of mobile source
9 categories in support of our mobile source programs. This
10 is an example of the testing that takes place on
11 light-duty vehicles at ARB's Haagen-Smit laboratory, or
12 HSL, here in El Monte.

13 Typically each vehicle test can take from one to
14 three days to complete. ARB's lab conducted over 1,200
15 tests last year in support of various programs, including
16 confirmatory testing, special test cycles, investigatory
17 testing, regulatory development and in-use testing.

18 --o0o--

19 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: This is an
20 example of the evaporative emissions test equipment HSL.
21 It is called a Sealed Housing for Evaporative
22 Determination, or SHED. It is used for measuring
23 evaporative emissions from fuel systems in passenger cars,
24 recreational boats, and small equipment.

25 --o0o--

1 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: ARB also has
2 heavy-duty emissions test capabilities in Los Angeles and
3 Sacramento, where we conduct emissions tests on heavy-duty
4 vehicles and engines.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: I was going to flag you. You
6 used an acronym, HSL. That stands for Haagen-Smit
7 Laboratory, right.

8 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Yeah. Sorry, I
9 should have made that clear.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: That's here where we are.

11 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Yeah.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Just calling you.

13 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: That's where we
14 are right now.

15 (Laughter.)

16 --o0o--

17 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Moving on. Small
18 engines. This test cell here has the capability to test
19 emissions from small engines, such as lawn mowers,
20 generators, and hand-held lawn and garden equipment. New
21 engines can be brought in for audit testing and
22 confirmatory testing.

23 --o0o--

24 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: As part of the
25 in-use compliance monitoring efforts, staff also tracked

1 emission warranty claims and performed field evaluations.
2 Warranty information on defective emissions control
3 components is submitted by the manufacturer to ARB. If a
4 defect rate is found to be high, ARB will request the
5 manufacturer to initiate corrective action, usually in the
6 form of a recall or an extended warrantee.

7 The OBD system present on vehicles can identify
8 and pinpoint most of the component defects that would not
9 be detected otherwise. Field operations is an integral
10 part of the compliance program that provides staff on the
11 ground that can inspect dealerships for problems and
12 investigate and help mediate warranty complaints from
13 vehicle owners.

14 Staff will be bringing a regulation to the Board
15 later this year that will address warranty reporting based
16 recalls and extended warranties for heavy-duty engines.

17 --o0o--

18 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Corrective action
19 usually involves recalling and repairing vehicles to
20 replace a defective part. Updating the engine computer
21 software or offering an extended warranty to the owner to
22 replace a defective part for the full useful life of the
23 vehicle. Data collected from 2008 to 2015 indicates that
24 the number of total vehicles affected by corrective action
25 has increased almost three-fold evidence of the

1 effectiveness of warranty to capture emissions-related
2 defects.

3 --o0o--

4 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: So where do we go
5 next?

6 In recent years, there have been tremendous
7 advances in vehicle and engine technologies, such as
8 hybrid electric vehicles, plug-in hybrids, and very low
9 emitting gasoline and diesel vehicles. These advances
10 provide both opportunities and challenges for ARB staff on
11 the implementation side of our programs. As vehicle
12 regulations push for every lower criteria and greenhouse
13 gas emissions, vehicle technologies, as well as the tools
14 for evaluating those technologies must evolve.

15 --o0o--

16 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Real-world
17 emissions or actual emissions from vehicles in use are the
18 next milestone to target. Staff is developing and
19 investigating increased capabilities to evaluate
20 real-world emissions by expanding the use of OBD data,
21 expanding the use of special test cycles in the lab, and
22 expanding the use of on-road screening devices, such as
23 roadside remote sensing and on-vehicle portable emissions
24 measurement systems, or PEMS.

25 Finally, as connected vehicles become the norm,

1 staff will evaluate the ability to take advantage of the
2 connectivity to locate problem vehicles quicker.

3 If these new tools prove to be useful for
4 certification and in-use compliance purposes, staff will
5 likely propose regulatory changes in the future.

6 --o0o--

7 AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: But what can we
8 do now? Focusing on lessons learned from the recent
9 Volkswagen non-compliance case, this chart lists the
10 current, enhanced, and new pathways to improve targeting
11 of non-compliant vehicles. In addition to the traditional
12 screening methods, staff will conduct enhanced AECD
13 review, increased interrogation of OBD vehicle systems,
14 and better screening of vehicles on the road to identify
15 candidates for in-depth testing.

16 For example, roadside remote sensing may be used
17 to narrow in on likely violating vehicle models. These
18 candidate models would be tested in our laboratories, and
19 on the road using PEMS. They will be subjected to new
20 cycles and test approaches that are not restricted to only
21 the standard emissions test cycle.

22 These enhanced approaches should collectively
23 help ARB identify problem vehicles and focus our
24 laboratory testing on vehicles most likely to have
25 noncompliance issues.

1 being used and electronic controls being used.

2 So I wonder -- so I guess the question I have is,
3 going forward, what are you thinking about the kinds of
4 changes that will be needed in the equipment and the
5 testing and the facilities taking into -- and that it
6 seems to apply to both light-duty and heavy-duty.

7 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER AYALA: Let me --

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: Alberto.

9 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER AYALA: Let me take
10 that. You're absolutely right. One of the things that we
11 are very interested in doing is to make sure that our
12 program responds to the changing of technology. And even
13 though we didn't get into this, one of the major projects
14 that we're currently conducting, and perhaps you'll have
15 an opportunity to talk to staff about this, is we are
16 currently testing plug-in hybrids on the road very much
17 using the same tools with PEMS and other systems, because,
18 as you said, indeed, the technology is changing. But at
19 the same time, we continue to rely on the combustion
20 engine to some extent.

21 So, you know, one of the things that we need to
22 understand is in the context of electrification, what role
23 will these combustion engines will continue to play in the
24 future? So that is just one example. And clearly, the
25 lessons that we've learned, because of the VW scandal, we

1 need to take those lessons and also turn to the heavy-duty
2 sector where perhaps making sure that we're getting the
3 emission reductions that we're expecting is even more
4 important.

5 So we are definitely in a process of evolution.
6 The time is discrete. So, you know, we're thinking of
7 this in terms of not 10 years, not 20 years, but perhaps
8 two to three years. There's great interest around the
9 world. We have our counterparts approaching us, asking us
10 now that ARB uncovered this problem, what should we all
11 do? So there's a great deal of dialogue and interest in
12 terms of getting the perspective from us, in terms of how
13 do we evolve and go from here, taking the lessons that
14 we've learned, as the staff presentation suggested?

15 CHAIR NICHOLS: In addition to what you've just
16 described, I'm concerned that we may be sort of in the
17 situation that the FBI was in with respect to the cell
18 phone that they retrieved from the San Bernardino shooter,
19 in the sense that we've got mountains of software out
20 there which are difficult, if not impossible, to crack
21 from outside, may contain all kinds of information that we
22 don't want or need, but on the other hand we now know for
23 a fact that it's capable of being abused in a way that can
24 defeat our current ability to detect.

25 So we certainly can work on better detection

1 methodologies, but shouldn't we also be investing in
2 computer scientists to help us figure out, you know, how
3 to extract information that we need from those little tiny
4 chips that seem to control everything?

5 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER AYALA: Certainly. And
6 if I refer you back to the staff presentation, if you look
7 at what staff described as enhancements, one of our
8 priority areas is going to be to try to identify
9 additional time and resources to look at the OBD component
10 of things. And understanding that OBD is mostly software,
11 clearly that's an area that we are going to have to invest
12 some time and energy into it, in addition to other things.

13 I mean, you know, the key message that I want
14 you, as a Board, to understand, and I say this with
15 confidence, California has the most superior certification
16 and compliance program in the world. That's the reason we
17 identified the excess emissions in the diesel scandal.
18 But most importantly, that is the reason we were able to
19 determine why those emissions were happening.

20 And what we are doing is mobilizing our resources
21 to make sure that we respond, not only to the opportunity,
22 but perhaps more importantly to the responsibility we have
23 to share what we've learned in our experience as we go
24 forward.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: So lots of potential jobs for

1 software engineers --

2 (Laughter.)

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: -- aspiring lab technicians.

4 It's very exciting.

5 Okay. Any other comments. If not, we can move
6 on to the lab issue -- oh, sorry.

7 Hard to see people unless they wave their hands.

8 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you.

9 Just a quick question that probably will move
10 into our next agenda time conversation. But you mentioned
11 technology is changing very rapidly, evolving, software is
12 eating industries. So what does that do to the physical
13 plant of what we do here in El Monte? So what happens
14 when we build a new facility? What happens when we're
15 going to have things like remote sensing device screenings
16 and PEMS and those types of things? Is our new facility
17 going to be reflective of that? We have a budget request
18 of somewhere within the \$366 million of reformulating new
19 equipment for the new facility. How is that reflective in
20 terms of what you see in this new software age?

21 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER AYALA: The short answer
22 is yes. Certainly, the new lab is reflective of these
23 future needs that we currently don't have facilities for.

24 One concrete example is when you take a tour,
25 you're not going to see a dedicated test bay, where we can

1 do PEMS testing. Meaning, not only bringing the equipment
2 to the vehicle, but vice versa, putting the equipment and
3 the vehicle on the road and testing. In our new lab, we
4 are anticipating having a dedicated facility, so that we
5 can do more and more of this type of investigation.

6 The other thing is we obviously will continue to
7 collaborate and build the partnership with our friends at
8 the U.S. EPA. And they, themselves, have laboratory
9 facilities that, frankly, we need to leverage, because,
10 for example, EPA is developing capabilities to test at
11 cold temperatures, they are developing capabilities to
12 look at actual electrified system batteries and things of
13 that sort.

14 So to the extent that we can continue to work
15 with them, you know, let's not duplicate those
16 capabilities, but let us ask ourselves how do we build
17 from there?

18 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: So one follow up. I guess
19 the heart of my question is, given what you've just said,
20 and given what we do here in El Monte, given what we could
21 be doing in terms of workforce, physical folks at the
22 actual plant, is that changing? Could we do things more
23 remotely? Would people be doing things in other places
24 where they'd normally have to drive to somewhere? How
25 does that change in the new software environment? Are

1 some of the testings going to be what we're currently
2 doing here, you know, being able to offer somewhere else,
3 so that people aren't necessarily driving in or coming
4 into the plant itself? How does that change in this new
5 environment?

6 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER AYALA: Yeah, I mean --
7 unfortunately, we're still very much depending on -- I
8 mean, the core of what we do is experimentation. You
9 know, we're not able to operate in a -- yet, in a virtual
10 environment where we could be elsewhere and have the --
11 you know, the vehicle rolling on the dynamometer.

12 So we do need people to be on-site. We do need
13 the ability to, as we say, kick the tires. We're not at
14 the point yet where we can basically remotely, you know,
15 send a car off on the road, and we are sitting back in our
16 offices monitoring the emission performance that we're
17 interested in.

18 Perhaps in the future that's where we're going to
19 be, but right now -- and again, what we need to do to
20 respond to the scandal is short-term. You know, in the
21 next one, two, three years, we're going to have to come
22 back to you and give you our recommendations in terms of
23 how should we approach the future certification and in-use
24 performance. And for that, we are going to need to rely
25 on our engineers and scientists to essentially be kicking

1 the tires in the lab.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I think that's
3 probably -- sorry, Ms. Takvorian.

4 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: So the new lab will give
5 us -- could give us virtual transportation, right, and
6 then no one would need to be anywhere except --

7 (Laughter.)

8 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Sorry.

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: And we'll be out of business.

10 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Then we would accomplish
11 all of our goals. No, I did have a serious question.

12 So I wondered -- this was a great presentation
13 and primarily focused on the testing. And then the
14 compliance that results from that, what about the lack of
15 compliance and penalties, how are they directed? And in
16 light of the new rules related to SIPs, and the
17 percentages that need to go into environmental justice
18 communities, how do you see that? I know it's a new rule,
19 but I just wondered if you could give us some insight into
20 how you're handling that?

21 CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: In terms of the whole SIP
22 process, the CalEPA has set up a process going forward,
23 where they're going to actually set up a pool of projects.
24 And this will all go our for public comment. So it's
25 definitely in progress. Already, ARB's Enforcement

1 Division does direct a substantial number of it's own
2 staff resources to find these cases to EJ areas. And so
3 we're -- and then often the SIPs then would relate to that
4 area. So we're already in that process. We're very aware
5 of the new requirements and we are -- we have drafts in
6 progress. CalEPA is organizing it, so the different --
7 all the other, the Water Board, Pesticides, and so forth
8 would be in the same program.

9 So we're definitely moving along, and we can
10 brief, you know, individually if you'd like as to how that
11 process is going. There will be public comment on it. So
12 if that answers your question.

13 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. Great. Yes, it
14 does. And will that be coming back to the Board at some
15 point this year or --

16 CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: We could -- typically
17 it's -- it would not be a regulatory item. We can do an
18 informational item. We in the -- I think in June, the
19 Director of the Enforcement Division, Dr. Todd Sax was
20 going to do an update on the enforcement program that
21 occurred in 2015, because we'll have all of the stats and
22 all of the different settlements. So that would fit in
23 neatly into that.

24 He actually did cover that in -- as part of the
25 freight work. He talked about the increased enforcement.

1 That was the meeting before that you were on the Board.
2 But we can definitely put that as part of Dr. Sax's June
3 presentation. It's tentatively set for June. And if not,
4 we can do a separate briefing for the Board on as a Board
5 item, and we can also, at any time, answer any of your
6 questions personally. And I know Senator Florez is
7 particularly interested in this topic as well and many of
8 our other Board members.

9 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Great. All right.
11 Our final agenda item for today is consideration of a site
12 recommendation for the proposed new motor vehicle and
13 engine emissions testing and research facility in Southern
14 California. This does represent a milestone in a long
15 effort; it goes back actually to, at least in my
16 recollection, 2007 when I rejoined the Air Resources Board
17 and said to Tom Cackette, "What's going on with El Monte?
18 It seems to be a deteriorating facility," and just curious
19 about, you know, what can be done. And he informed me at
20 that time that actually he and the staff had done a lot of
21 work on a proposal to update -- upgrade the lab, but that
22 unfortunately to do that would require moving because
23 there simply wasn't enough land on site here.

24 So we're going to shift personnel a little bit
25 here. Do people want to take a brief break before, or are

1 you ready to launch into this item?

2 Okay. All right. Good.

3 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Chairman?

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

5 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: I'd like to first of all
6 say that I will recuse myself from this item. There is no
7 real conflict of interest, but there is the appearance of
8 a conflict. I sit on the South Coast Air District Board.
9 And so, I recused myself from motions that involved this
10 project on that board. But to avoid any appearance of
11 conflict, I will recuse myself from the discussion here
12 today. And I will at this point leave the meeting and
13 wish you all well in your further deliberations.

14 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I appreciate your
15 making that clear.

16 So let's just launch into the discussion. I do
17 want to say before we begin though that I find myself in a
18 position of in some ways wishing that this was a decision
19 that someone else would get to make, because we are
20 blessed with two very impressive and attractive site
21 opportunities and they both have a lot to offer. The
22 staff has done a lot of work, along with the Department of
23 General Services and the Department of Finance. And the
24 two universities and the communities that are represented
25 here represent a very high level of interest that has come

1 to us from both Riverside and Pomona, and both of these
2 groups and in particular the campuses and their leaders
3 have bent over backwards to find ways to meet our needs
4 and to accommodate all of our concerns, including making
5 significant modifications in their proposals, so that we
6 really have before us two potential sites that appear to
7 meet our needs. And so the challenge before the Air
8 Resources Board is to decide which of those two sites best
9 represents ARB's desires and goals for the future, and
10 where we can best put down a mark for the future of the
11 State's air program.

12 So with that, I want to thank all of our staff
13 for their patience in this process. These kinds of
14 efforts are inherently disruptive and it's particularly
15 true that moving and the thought of moving, the idea of
16 moving and then actually moving are among the most
17 psychologically stressful things that anyone can go
18 through, right up there with a death in the family or a
19 divorce, I think, in terms of the pressures that they put
20 on people. And the Air Resources Board functions in a way
21 that I think is maybe not perfect but is pretty close in
22 my mind to an ideal of an organization where people really
23 pay attention to the quality of life issues for their
24 colleagues and strive to work together for the good of the
25 organization and the good of the cause.

1 So I want to say at the outset how much I
2 appreciate the fact that there's been active engagement
3 but also a lot of listening that's gone on at every level
4 within the organization as we've gone through this
5 process. And of course whatever decision is made on the
6 part of the Board, we're still years away from actually
7 having a place to move to. So this is really not an end;
8 it's only the beginning of another phase.

9 And with that, I think I'm going to turn it over
10 to Mr. Corey to introduce the item.

11 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
12 Presented as follows.)

13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes, thanks, Chair
14 Nichols.

15 In cooperation with the Department of General
16 Services, ARB staff has completed its evaluation of three
17 potential sites. Two of those sites are in Riverside one
18 is in Pomona. And as you mentioned, this has been a
19 thorough process to evaluate the many attributes for each
20 site. And really, and as noted, most of the attributes
21 were comparable. We really have two sites that can work.

22 The staff identified proximity as an important
23 and distinguishing attribute relative to ARB's operational
24 needs. Now, I really wanted to iterate how appreciative
25 we are of the support that representatives of Riverside,

1 consist of about 135,000 square feet of space and
2 accommodate approximately 400 staff.

3 --o0o--

4 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The existing
5 facilities are now stretched beyond their capacity, cannot
6 support ARB's existing and future testing needs, do not
7 provide adequate infrastructure to expand or upgrade
8 equipment, and are not energy efficient.

9 --o0o--

10 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: In
11 recognition of the inadequacies, ARB is proposing to
12 relocate and consolidate existing operations at a new
13 emissions testing and research facility that will better
14 serve our current and future needs.

15 To support the project, a feasibility study was
16 completed in January 2015. This study provided
17 information on project scope, size, and cost, as well as
18 providing the basis for the current year's budget
19 proposal.

20 --o0o--

21 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The goals for
22 the project are listed on this slide and establish the
23 overall framework for not only site selection, but for the
24 construction and operation of the proposed new facility as
25 well.

1 --o0o--

2 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: As mentioned
3 previously, the feasibility study provided information
4 relevant to facility and site requirements. The study
5 concluded a facility size of approximately 299,000 square
6 feet is necessary to meet ARB's needs. The site
7 requirements are approximately 14 to 17 acres and the
8 total project cost is estimated at \$366 million. If all
9 goes well, ARB would take occupancy in 2020.

10 --o0o--

11 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: In the Fiscal
12 Year 2015-16 budget, ARB was authorized \$200,000 for site
13 evaluations and \$5.7 million for developing performance
14 criteria for the new facility. These criteria are used in
15 the process for selecting the team that will design and
16 build the facility. In approving the funding,
17 supplemental budget language requires ARB to allow
18 representatives from both Riverside and Pomona to make
19 formal presentations to the site evaluation team, and
20 provide a summary of the Board action to the Joint
21 Legislative Budget Committee for a 30-day review.

22 For the Fiscal Year 2017-18 budget year, ARB will
23 need to submit another budget proposal for the balance of
24 the funds needed for the project.

25 --o0o--

1 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide
2 identifies the various timelines associated with the
3 acquisition and performance criteria phases of the
4 project. These tasks will be completed with the
5 assistance of the Department of General Services and the
6 master architect. Maintaining this timeline will be
7 critical in moving the project forward expeditiously to
8 meet our testing needs and ensuring the project is within
9 the projected budget.

10 --o0o--

11 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide
12 identifies the various timelines associated with the
13 design build and construction phases of the project.
14 Please note that the Public Works Board must approve the
15 performance criteria prior to the design build contract
16 being awarded. ARB looks forward to breaking ground in
17 the November 2017 time frame, with occupancy around
18 November 2020.

19 --o0o--

20 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Since the
21 budget was approved, ARB and DGS have been working
22 diligently to evaluate three sites.

23 --o0o--

24 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: To provide a
25 common framework for this evaluation, ARB and DGS

1 developed a site evaluation matrix that included over 100
2 different attributes.

3 DGS hired four specialized contractors to support
4 environmental, nontechnical, zero net energy, and LEEDS
5 analyses. Representatives from Riverside and Pomona were
6 also very helpful in providing information, including
7 making formal presentations to ARB management and staff in
8 October of last year.

9 --o0o--

10 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The next two
11 slides provide some of the general attribute categories
12 used for the site evaluations. The categories include
13 site area, transportation and circulation, location,
14 zoning, local codes, and ownership, architectural and
15 engineering, and environmental.

16 --o0o--

17 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The remaining
18 general attribute categories are shown on this slide.
19 They include security, neighborhood characteristics and
20 surroundings, staff amenities and diverse uses, LEEDS
21 certification and zero net energy, and alternative
22 fueling. The results of all attribute analyses are
23 provided in more detail in the staff report.

24 --o0o--

25 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: As discussed

1 in our December 2015 update to the Board, we evaluated
2 three potential sites on this slide.

3 --o0o--

4 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide
5 shows an overall view of the three potential sites and the
6 existing ARB facilities.

7 --o0o--

8 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide
9 provides a view of the Pomona site. It is located on
10 non-prime agriculture land referred to as Innovation
11 Village 2 or, most recently, Spadra. The Spadra property
12 is about 165 acres and is currently used in a college of
13 agriculture's educational program. A proposed site for
14 the project is represented in light blue; however, the
15 precise boundaries are subject to change.

16 The Pomona site consists of about 19 acres. The
17 university has indicated that they would consider further
18 discussions on additional land to support ZNE, but has not
19 committed any specific property at this time. The site is
20 flat and relatively rectangular, allowing for flexibility
21 in project design.

22 Retail, shopping, and transit are within walking
23 distance and lodging is nearby. The center of the Cal
24 Poly Pomona campus is a little less than one mile away.
25 The cities of Pomona, Walnut, and Diamond Bar are nearby,

1 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide
2 provides a view of the Riverside 2 - Iowa Avenue - site.
3 The site is located on a 100-acre parcel that is planned
4 for campus development. The land is likely designated as
5 prime agricultural land and is currently being used as
6 part of UCR's agricultural research program. The
7 university has indicated that any ongoing research would
8 be relocated if ARB recommends this site.

9 The Iowa site consists of about 18 acres. The
10 university has indicated that they would consider further
11 discussions on ways to support ZNE, but has not committed
12 any specific property at this time. The topography is
13 flat and rectangular, which allows for flexibility in
14 project design.

15 As the slide reflects, retail, shopping, lodging,
16 and transit are within walking distance. The center of
17 the UCR campus is about three-quarters of a mile away and
18 the site is about two miles from downtown Riverside.

19 --o0o--

20 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: On December
21 17th, 2015, staff provided the Board with an informational
22 update. The update provided an overview of the project,
23 details of the site evaluation process, preliminary site
24 evaluation information, and the next steps. Based on the
25 information presented, there were several specific

1 follow-up items that Board members requested.

2 --o0o--

3 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The Board
4 directed staff to develop an open process for El Monte
5 staff to make their views known, conduct detailed
6 evaluations of the Pomona 1 and the Riverside 2 sites,
7 evaluate transit options for staff, and evaluate transit
8 options for people ARB routinely does business with or
9 interacts with in Southern California.

10 --o0o--

11 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The following
12 slides provide the results of the site evaluation
13 analysis, including the information developed in response
14 to the Board's direction

15 --o0o--

16 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: ARB and DGS
17 evaluated over 100 individual attributes for each site.
18 As indicated in December, all three sites are workable
19 from a site development perspective and all are available
20 at no cost to the State.

21 However, the Pomona number 1 and the Riverside
22 number 2 sites are preferred over the Riverside number 1 -
23 Technology Court - site. The Technology Court site has a
24 sloped topography and is elongated in orientation that
25 makes it a little more difficult to develop. In addition,

1 the site has very few amenities nearby. Therefore, the
2 rest of this presentation is focused on a comparison
3 between the Pomona site and the Riverside Number 2 - Iowa
4 Avenue - site.

5 --o0o--

6 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: For the vast
7 number of attributes evaluated, the results showed that
8 the results were similar. In several of the categories
9 related to site development, staff identified issues that
10 weren't further consideration during the site development
11 process. These are discussed in the following slides.
12 However, staff also found that none of these identified
13 issues would preclude site development or result in any
14 significant difference that would definitively favor one
15 site over another. These particular site development
16 issues are presented in the next few slides.

17 The staff did identify that there were
18 significant differences between the sites related to
19 certain proximity attributes identified in the site
20 evaluation matrix, and I will discuss these differences as
21 well.

22 --o0o--

23 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The staff
24 report details the various site development issues related
25 to the attributes identified in this slide. ARB would

1 need to fully evaluate each of these issues in accordance
2 with applicable requirements of the California
3 Environmental Quality Act and implement measures to
4 address the issues as appropriate.

5 --o0o--

6 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: In general,
7 the Riverside Number 2 site appears to be a somewhat
8 easier site to develop than the Pomona Number 1 site, as
9 the staff analysis identified fewer potential issues. The
10 staff report discusses these issues in detail.

11 As indicated previously, none of the identified
12 issues would preclude site development.

13 --o0o--

14 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The staff
15 found that there are significant differences between the
16 two sites related to proximity attributes. This slide
17 lists the various proximity attributes that were included
18 in the site evaluation matrix. In the next series of
19 slides I will discuss each of these proximity attributes.

20 --o0o--

21 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Is attribute
22 representing convenient access to the general public was
23 included in the site evaluation matrix to provide a
24 characterization of the location of the site relative to
25 the public, including common stakeholders.

1 The analysis showed that there are about 7
2 million more people located within 35 miles of the Pomona
3 site than the Riverside site. This is significant to the
4 extent that the new facility is a focal point for events,
5 symposia, and workshops, as well as educational
6 opportunities. Locating closer to more people would
7 provide more diverse opportunities for public
8 interactions.

9 ARB evaluated driving distances for common
10 stakeholders that included automotive manufacturers,
11 community and environmental justice organizations, various
12 independent emissions testing laboratories, ports, major
13 railyards, refineries, fuel terminals, and bulk plants.
14 Of the 82 entities evaluated, about 80 percent were
15 located closer to the Pomona site than the Riverside site
16 and 70 percent were located more than 20 one-way miles
17 further from the Riverside site than the Pomona site.

18 This analysis is significant in that it provides
19 an indication of access, both from the perspective of
20 stakeholders traveling to the new site as well as ARB
21 staff traveling to meet with stakeholders. Operational
22 needs are improved when less time is spent on the road.

23 --o0o--

24 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: ARB staff
25 conducted enforcement inspections at the various sources

1 shown on this slide and bring collected samples back to
2 the laboratory for analysis. As discussed above, most of
3 these sites are located closer to the Pomona Number 1
4 site. If the Pomona site is selected, ARB enforcement
5 staff would be reducing typical travel time by about 45
6 minutes to an hour and, in turn, increasing productivity
7 as less time is spent traveling.

8 --o0o--

9 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide
10 shows that both sites are close to Ontario Airport. The
11 Pomona site has some advantages based on the proximity to
12 other major Los Angeles airports, thus providing somewhat
13 more flexibility for travelers to select airlines, travel
14 times and air fares.

15 --o0o--

16 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The Pomona
17 site is approximately five miles from the South Coast Air
18 Quality Management District. By being located nearby, ARB
19 has more opportunity to facilitate coordination on a
20 variety of topics such as the State Implementation Plan
21 and the Sustainable Freight Initiative. In addition,
22 Sacramento ARB staff traveling to the ARB facilities could
23 visit both ARB and the South Coast in a single day. In
24 the past, ARB management typically did not visit ARB
25 facilities if they were attending meetings at the South

1 Coast AQMD or vice versa.

2 --o0o--

3 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Another one
4 of the proximity attributes included on the site
5 evaluation matrix was the impact on ARB staff commutes.
6 ARB used the current residences of ARB staff to analyze
7 the driving distance and time, and public transit options
8 and times to each proposed site.

9 --o0o--

10 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide
11 identifies the geographic location of current ARB
12 residences relative to ARB's El Monte facilities and the
13 proposed sites.

14 --o0o--

15 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The results
16 of the driving distance and driving time analysis are
17 represented in this slide. The median round-trip driving
18 distance and time to the Riverside site is approximately
19 50 miles and about an hour greater than to the Pomona
20 site. About 75 percent of the employees would have a
21 round-trip commute time of 90 minutes or less to the
22 Pomona site, as opposed to only 21 percent for the
23 Riverside site.

24 The incremental vehicle miles traveled is about
25 3-1/2 half million miles compared to the current commutes

1 to the El Monte facility if everyone drove. On average,
2 ARB employees would incur over \$6,000 in incremental
3 annual commute costs if the Riverside site was selected
4 and all staff drove to the new site.

5
6 --o0o--

7 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Our analysis
8 of the public transit options indicates that the
9 combination of buses and trains is challenging at both
10 sites, but Riverside is significantly more challenging.

11 The chart on this slide indicates that fewer than
12 30 percent of the staff would have a public one-way
13 transit travel time of 90 minutes or less, as opposed to
14 only 1 percent of staff for Riverside.

15 --o0o--

16 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Due to the
17 travel distances and times, most ARB staff would likely
18 have to relocate, retire, or resign if the Riverside
19 Number 2 site was selected. Public transit is not a
20 practical option for ARB staff traveling to Riverside from
21 their current residences.

22 Conversely, the travel distances and times to the
23 Pomona site would minimize the impacts on ARB's high
24 quality workforce and minimize impacts on ARB's
25 operations.

1 requirements in a separate analysis.

2 --o0o--

3 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide
4 shows that currently almost all of the ARB staff are
5 younger than 64 years of age. Projecting ten years into
6 the future with the assumptions listed on the previous
7 slide, over 75 percent of the staff are younger than 64
8 years of age. Therefore, the staff commute impacts would
9 still affect the significant number of staff assuming that
10 there are no early retirements at age 55.

11 --o0o--

12 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: To assess the
13 impact of potential retirements, we looked at both age and
14 state service time. The decision to retire is dependent
15 on many individual factors. For this analysis, we assumed
16 that staff could retire at the age of 55 if they had at
17 least 30 years of state service time.

18 Using these assumptions, the analysis shows that
19 in 2020 about 33 percent of the current staff would likely
20 be candidates for retirement. However, if all of these
21 staff retired, approximately two-thirds of the existing
22 staff might still be working at ARB. Therefore, the ARB
23 staff commute analysis is still valid for many employees
24 years into the future.

25 --o0o--

1 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Now I will
2 speak about public transit. Based on the staff commute
3 analysis, we concluded that stakeholders would have the
4 same regional transit options as ARB staff. This means
5 that regional transit options to either site are
6 challenging, with the Riverside site being somewhat more
7 challenging.

8 Note, we did not identify any future regional
9 improvements that would significantly reduce transit
10 times. Local transit options exist for both Pomona and
11 Riverside and are expected to improve in the future.

12 --o0o--

13 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The last
14 proximity attribute that we evaluated was the difference
15 from the existing ARB El Monte facility. The analysis
16 showed that the normal commute distance from the El Monte
17 facility to the Pomona site is about 17 miles, compared to
18 48 miles from the El Monte facility to the Riverside site.

19 The significance of this attribute is related to
20 the need for ARB to pay relocation expenses if the ARB
21 headquarters is moved to Riverside.

22 --o0o--

23 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Recent
24 changes in the bargaining unit contract for engineers and
25 specialists require that ARB pay relocation expenses under

1 certain conditions. The first criteria is that the new
2 headquarters must be at least 35 miles from the existing
3 headquarters. The previous slide shows that the normal
4 commute distance to the Riverside site is approximately 48
5 miles. Therefore, ARB would have to pay relocation
6 expenses for a move to Riverside if an employee meets all
7 of the qualifying criteria.

8 ARB estimated the costs to be in the range of
9 \$1,000,000 to \$7,000,000 based on the number of employees
10 that might choose to relocate.

11 --o0o--

12 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: In summary,
13 proximity is important to ARB's operational needs. The
14 Pomona Number 1 site facilitates coordination with
15 stakeholders, the public, and the South Coast AQMD, as
16 well as ARB enforcement.

17 In addition, the Pomona site minimizes the change
18 in staff commutes, thus minimizing disruption of the ARB
19 operations. Finally, regional public transit is not a
20 practical option for daily commutes to Riverside for
21 existing staff. Coupled with the long driving distances
22 and driving times to Riverside, ARB staff would likely
23 have to resign, retire, or relocate if the Riverside site
24 is selected.

25 --o0o--

1 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: In response
2 to Board direction, ARB conducted a survey of staff to
3 obtain their views on a potential site. The results
4 indicated that the top three attributes were proximity to
5 their current residence, availability of quality transit,
6 and the neighborhood surroundings and site esthetics. Due
7 to a variety of reasons related to personal and family
8 considerations, 85 percent of the El Monte staff preferred
9 the Pomona site.

10 --o0o--

11 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: About three
12 years ago, ARB first discussed the potential for locating
13 the proposed new facility next to a university to
14 facilitate various partnerships. At that time, ARB staff
15 visited with UC Riverside, UCLA, UC Irvine, and Cal Poly
16 Pomona. These universities were all located within a
17 50-mile radius of existing ARB headquarters and, at the
18 time, were consistent with State requirements that
19 provided an upper bound distance for paying relocation
20 expenses.

21 Since that time, we have carefully considered
22 whether proximity to a university is necessary for these
23 partnerships to flourish. The conclusion reached is that
24 it is useful but not critical. Therefore, the site
25 selection process proceeded without a component that

1 Thank you for the time and thank you for the
2 report.

3 It seems to me the Board this morning has a
4 choice. And the choice is between moving the Haagen-Smit
5 Laboratory and creating a world center for air quality
6 research. Both options clearly have advantages we just
7 heard. But it seems to me the first option, simply moving
8 the laboratory, are primarily short-term advantages.
9 Creating a world center for air quality research is about
10 long-term advantages. And if there's something that the
11 ARB stands for, it's the long term. We, in fact, wouldn't
12 be interested in air pollution or air quality if we
13 weren't interested in the long term - the long-term
14 implications on environment, the long-term implications on
15 health, and the long-term implications in society.

16 So why do I say world center? We already know
17 the attributes and then strengths of ARB and all that it
18 brings to the discussion. Well, let me tell you a little
19 bit about UCR.

20 We have dozens of faculty members, 46 of them
21 externally funded, doing research on air quality. And we
22 have hundreds - undergraduates, graduates, and
23 post-doctoral students - working in this area. Two of the
24 most respected entities in the country are ARB and UCR
25 when it comes to air quality. Putting those two together

1 will be dynamic.

2 Right now, we have about \$22 million worth of
3 funded research at UCR in air quality. 13 percent of that
4 is actually funded by ARB. But importantly, the other 87
5 percent is NIH, NSF, Department of Defense, Department of
6 Energy, key partners here in Riverside and in California
7 in thinking about the future of the quality of our air.

8 And those 50 some, 60 some faculty members aren't
9 just in engineering and chemistry. They're in public
10 policy, they're in medicine, they're in business. Because
11 as all of you know, science doesn't clear the air.
12 Science provides information. It's policy change, it's
13 funding, it's politics, it's social engagement - those are
14 the things that clear our air. And at UCR we're not just
15 a place that studies the particles in the air. We're a
16 place that thinks about our environmental future, in a way
17 that's going to be achievable and sustainable over the
18 long term.

19 And we're very proud at Riverside that we haven't
20 done this by ourselves. We've done it in lockstep with
21 ARB over decades. As Dr. Haagen-Smit was doing his
22 pioneering work, it was scientists at UCR who first
23 realized that the damage they were seeing in the leaves on
24 crops may well be related to air and the quality of the
25 air. It was James Pitts, arguably the first person to

1 argue for regulation of NOx's. And that's what led to the
2 work at ARB early on, which in turn led of course to the
3 work at EPA. This has not been a short term nor an
4 independent effort on our part. It's been a partnership
5 over a very long term with ARB.

6 So where are we today and where are we going if
7 this is about the long-term future?

8 Number one, following up on our discussion
9 earlier about the VW scandal. UCR -- and arguably we're
10 number one, we're number two discussion in the
11 universities is West Virginia University, that also does a
12 lot of air quality research because of the coal industry.
13 The two of us though, West Virginia and UCR, have combined
14 forces, and we are together lobbying our congressional
15 delegations and the EPA with a hope and the aspiration
16 that when there is a settlement in VW, that there will be
17 a fair amount of that money devoted to air quality
18 research; not just remediation but the future. We at UCR
19 feel a responsibility to the State and the nation to take
20 that kind of leadership.

21 We're presently adding 300 faculty members to our
22 campus - 300. And we're doing it in lots of ways. But
23 one of the key ways we're doing it is trying to identify
24 themes that are important to our university and our state
25 in the future.

1 Let me read you some of those themes: Air
2 quality and public health; global climate modeling;
3 renewable energy; policy impacts of air quality;
4 environmental toxicology. And one that has an acronym,
5 it's BREATHE, I'll tell you the A stands for aerosolized
6 and T stands for toxins. I won't -- the letters. But
7 it's medical school, it's engineering, it's the notion
8 that what we breathe now is -- we don't have to worry
9 about the big chunks of stuff. It's now the small things.
10 And it's not that they're small; its that they're dynamic
11 in your lungs and they do things once they're in your
12 body.

13 That's the kind of question that we need to be
14 addressing in the future. UCR's preparing for that.

15 I have to say to the staff really one important
16 thing: We want you very much in Riverside. I don't want
17 to diminish the short-term considerations. I don't want
18 to diminish the personal pieces. The Chair said it better
19 than anyone can say, it's physically hard, it's
20 emotionally hard, it's financially hard, it's tough to
21 move. And we appreciate that. But at the same time we
22 want to do all we can to make you feel welcome.

23 I have just -- we just passed out - and I have a
24 few extra copies for staff members as well. I'm afraid I
25 didn't bring enough - the list of things that we're

1 committed to at UCR to help them make this transition a
2 little easier: Our spousal job referral system, our
3 relocation system, our commuter and van pool system. We
4 intend to give every CARB member a faculty staff I.D. so
5 they can take full advantage of the things at the campus.
6 Priority at our child development center for their
7 children. We want to do everything we can to make this
8 not UCR and CARB, but UCR/CARB, an entity that is going to
9 be, in all candor, in all seriousness, the center for air
10 quality research in the world.

11 We're excited about the opportunity. We
12 certainly -- I certainly commiserate with your decision,
13 but I really do think it's an important one for decades.

14 And people have said, "Kim, how could you devote
15 property to this effort so easily?" It was a no-brainer
16 for me. And I can tell you, if this decision is made to
17 move to Riverside, future boards will never be in your
18 position again, because future chancellors will see it as
19 just as much a no-brainer, to add to the complex to make
20 sure that our position in California remains the
21 leadership one in the world.

22 I'd now like to ask Rob Field to take the mike.

23 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

24 MR. FIELD: Thank you, Chancellor.

25 Yes, good morning. Rob Field. I'm an assistant

1 county executive officer with the County of Riverside.

2 I've spoken with many of you before.

3 First of all, greetings and happy St. Patrick's
4 Day from a person who's got Irish blood. This is a
5 special day for us.

6 First, my remarks today is not to poke holes in
7 the ARB staff report. We did a lot of work with the staff
8 and we respect and admire the work that they have
9 performed.

10 However, there are some things that we think bear
11 additional consideration, and which will bear considerable
12 cost, have significant cost implications for the attempt
13 to relocate to Cal Poly Pomona. And, importantly, these
14 are not factors that would impact the relocation to
15 Riverside.

16 And, in particular, there are the concerns that
17 are articulated in the pages 61 through 64 of the staff
18 report with respect to the environmental challenges at the
19 Cal Poly site. There was a phase 1 analysis of that site
20 done. There was not, however, a phase 2 site analysis
21 done, which would have identified and confirmed the
22 existence of those challenges that are articulated in the
23 phase 1, define their extent, and potentially found other
24 site challenges.

25 It would be important to me -- we do a lot of

1 construction in the County of Riverside. I've personally
2 been involved in the construction of over a billion
3 dollars of public facilities. We do phase 2's routinely.
4 I think the absence of a phase 2 to influence this
5 decision is an important oversight that needs to be
6 corrected frankly before a final decision is rendered.

7 You do not know actually what the cost of site
8 development is going to be. A great deal of analysis and
9 a great deal of time has been paid to what it's going to
10 cost for relocation benefits. Frankly, the costs
11 associated with the environmental mitigations would likely
12 dwarf those costs. One of concerns that I would have is
13 delays. Right now construction costs are going up about 5
14 percent a year. You have about a \$400 million project
15 here. If you're delayed one year by these problems,
16 that's \$20,000,000 in site costs -- or in the cost
17 escalations for the project. That's far more than the
18 \$7,000,000 potential, and sort of speculative, relocation
19 cost that is associated with the Riverside site.

20 A couple of other things that were not really
21 touched on in any great detail in the ARB study.

22 Operational cost control. The City of Riverside
23 has a public utility - I think the city manager's going to
24 touch on that later - but there are significant cost
25 reductions available through Riverside public utilities

1 that would not be available through the investor-owned
2 utilities that serve Pomona.

3 Entitlement control. There is a note that the
4 UCR land is prime ag land. Actually it is not. It has
5 been the subject of several iterations of a long-range
6 development plan process. It has been evaluated several
7 times, as recently as 2011. The Board of Regents adopted
8 a statement of overriding considerations, that is no
9 longer a concern, a consideration at the Riverside site.

10 Finally - and I think the chancellor kind of
11 touched on this - there's -- it's difficult to put a
12 dollar value on opportunity costs or lost-opportunity
13 costs. But it seems that -- it seems to us important
14 that, despite the conclusions of the staff report,
15 co-locating with a major university that has a med school
16 and a public policy school and then various engineering
17 schools, there's a lot of value to that portion of the
18 assessment, wasn't really assessed. And I don't -- and
19 from our perspective - I'm a little biased naturally, and
20 partly as a UCR grad, also as a county guy - but it's
21 important to co-locate, to take advantage of all the
22 different assets that a major research university,
23 especially one that has all of the graduate programs and
24 of course the specialty program offered at Ce-Cert. To
25 miss that opportunity, I don't know how you assign a cost

1 to that, but it would be significant. And we would urge
2 you to at least take that into consideration as you're
3 going through your analysis and decision-making process on
4 that.

5 And with that I will close on my remarks. Thank
6 you.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I probably should
8 have said this at the outset, but I know we're taking up a
9 lot of time of some very high level folks. And I
10 understand if you may not and stay throughout entire
11 discussion with the Board. But I do hope we'll have an
12 opportunity to ask some questions. I know a number of my
13 fellow Board members are going to have things that they'd
14 like to ask.

15 Okay. Thank you.

16 And now...

17 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Now I'd like
18 to introduce Pomona.

19 MS. ALVA: Good morning. My name is Sylvia Alva.
20 I'm the vice president and provost at Cal Poly Pomona.

21 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
22 Presented as follows.)

23 MS. ALVA: Good morning, Chair Nichols and
24 members of the Board. Thank you for the opportunity to
25 make this presentation.

1 At Cal Poly Pomona, we are excited about the
2 prospect of welcoming the Air Resources Board to our
3 campus, and are pleased to see that so many of your
4 employees share our enthusiasm for making Cal Poly Pomona
5 the future site of the Air Resources Board.

6 As my time is limited, I'll jump right in. I'd
7 like to give -- my presentation focuses on the attributes
8 of Cal Poly Pomona as an ideal location, a great
9 workplace, a nationally recognized research and teaching
10 institution, and a committed sustainability partner.

11 We're also joined by strong supporters who would
12 like to say a few words and answer questions that you may
13 have following my presentation. We'll open our
14 presentation with a special message from our president,
15 Dr. Soraya Coley, who unfortunately not be here today.

16 See how this goes.

17 (The following is a video presentation.)

18 DR. COLEY: I'm Soraya M. Coley, President of
19 California State Polytechnic University Pomona.

20 On behalf of our university community, I want to
21 reaffirm our commitment to establishing a dynamic
22 partnership with this Board and your entire organization.
23 Both Cal Poly Pomona and CSU Chancellor White would be
24 honored to host ARB's new Southern California facility on
25 our campus. Here's some compelling reasons why we believe

1 Cal Poly Pomona fits with your stated goals and needs.

2 We have the right experience, resources, people,
3 and facilities. We're committed to emerging technology,
4 continued growth in research and development, and
5 attracting new public-private partnerships. Our core
6 values, especially in promoting sustainable practices,
7 intersect with the aims of the ARB. Given our polytechnic
8 identity and focus on learn by doing, there are many
9 opportunities for collaboration in the advancement of our
10 organizations.

11 Through our Center for Training, Technology and
12 Incubation, industry leaders and innovative startups have
13 space to exchange new ideas, collaborate, and explore new
14 research frontiers.

15 Organizations, large and small, have found Cal
16 Poly Pomona to be an ideal location, including Southern
17 California Edison and the American Red Cross, which
18 collectively bring 2,000 employees to our campus. They
19 have access to our extensive meeting facilities, academic
20 and public policy forums, student interns, and library and
21 database services.

22 We are a leader in environmental sustainability
23 and have been widely recognized for our green efforts,
24 especially in our work to become carbon neutral by 2030.

25 Not only does Cal Poly Pomona's commitment to

1 excellence make for a great partnership, but the
2 advantages of our location in Los Angeles County are
3 clear. Our site exceeds the Board's physical location
4 requirements and our campus offers great amenities and
5 easy access to entertainment, recreation, and quality
6 dining. We're at the crossroads of three major freeways,
7 several airports, and public transit systems with
8 additional plans for expansion. And we're located only
9 five miles from the offices of the South Coast Air Quality
10 Management District. A move to Cal Poly Pomona allows the
11 ARB to retain its long-standing connection to L.A. County
12 and its many partners in the region.

13 Additionally, we are proud of the widespread
14 support among our community and business leaders, elected
15 officials throughout the San Gabriel Valley and all five
16 members of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

17 Finally, we look forward to pursuing mutually
18 beneficial opportunities in education, science,
19 engineering, and innovation that will support the mission
20 of the Air Resources Board.

21 I am excited at the prospect of building a strong
22 and lasting partnership in this groundbreaking journey
23 together. Thank you.

24 (end of video.)

25 --o0o--

1 MS. ALVA: As President Coley underscores, Cal
2 Poly Pomona has a lot to offer and we're honored and
3 excited about the opportunity to partner with the Air
4 Resources Board.

5 As noted earlier, we are an ideal location for
6 the Air Resources Board. We're close in proximity
7 highly-trained and valued workforce and also to the South
8 Coast Air Quality Management District in Diamond Bar. As
9 the Air Resources staff has already noted, Cal Poly Pomona
10 offers the least disruptive option for your employees and
11 operations.

12 Cal Poly Pomona is also a great place to work,
13 offering a host of services and amenities for employees.

14 Cal Poly Pomona is also a nationally recognized
15 research and teaching institution. We're a polytechnic
16 university, one of only two in the State of California.
17 We have the top engineering program in the United States.
18 We take seriously our commitment to attracting and
19 graduating the talented and diverse workforce of the
20 future, and it shows. We're proud to acknowledge that
21 about 66 of your current employees are Cal Poly Pomona
22 graduates.

23 Finally, Cal Poly Pomona is a committed partner,
24 with a solid record in the area of sustainability. We're
25 ready to support your goals of reducing greenhouse gases

1 and carbon emissions. As noted in the staff report,
2 commuters would reduce about -- commuters would reduce
3 about 1,500 tons of carbon emissions annually if the Cal
4 Poly Pomona site were selected.

5 --o0o--

6 MS. ALVA: We think of Cal Poly Pomona as an
7 ideal location for the Air Resources Board. As this image
8 shows, the Air Resources Board will be located directly on
9 the campus of Cal Poly Pomona on a large parcel of land
10 known as Spadra. The proposed site for your facility is
11 also close to numerous resources and amenities on the
12 campus. Welcoming the Air Resources Board to this
13 location aligns very well with our campus plans to explore
14 ways to expand the use of this parcel.

15 --o0o--

16 MS. ALVA: Currently the Spadra parcel on campus
17 is primarily used by -- as an agricultural research field
18 lab. We recognize the value and importance this parcel
19 has on our academic mission particularly to the students
20 and faculty in the plant science program.

21 At the same time, we see our partnership with the
22 Air Resources Board as a win-win opportunity. The
23 opportunity is committed to building a strong partnership
24 with the Air Resources Board and others, all the while
25 limiting the deleterious impact of any future plans for

1 the parcel on our academic programs and instructional
2 needs.

3 --o0o--

4 MS. ALVA: Moving forward, the future use of the
5 Spadra parcel will be informed by three strategic planning
6 processes that are unfolding currently, and concurrently,
7 on the campus.

8 The first is the university strategic planning
9 process, a comprehensive review and planning process to
10 identify the priorities for the campus.

11 The academic master plan will involve
12 systematically reviewing our academic degree programs and
13 courses.

14 And, lastly, the academic master plan will inform
15 the physical layout of the campus and the vehicular and
16 pedestrian movement both into and throughout the campus.

17 Our strategic planning efforts will include
18 meaningful engagement and broad consultation with
19 students, faculty, staff, and external stakeholders, and
20 will include agricultural leaders and stakeholders to
21 provide counsel and input on the future of agriculture.

22 --o0o--

23 MS. ALVA: Looking ahead, we have much to offer
24 the Air Resources Board. We have had a solid track record
25 of partnering with other industry leaders who have thrived

1 on our campus and have in return expanded and enriched the
2 academic experience of our students and faculty.

3 Our Innovation Village, for example, is home to
4 1,200 employees of Southern California Edison and 800
5 employees of the American Red Cross. Collectively, they
6 have access to and benefit from our high quality programs
7 and academic resources, opportunities to pursue degrees
8 and certificate programs, research, and job-ready interns
9 and graduates, and, of course, a beautiful campus.

10 Allow me to spotlight one of Edison's most recent
11 graduates.

12 My niece, Melissa.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MS. ALVA: As a student, Melissa interned at
15 Southern California Edison. And upon completing her
16 engineering degree, she accepted a full-time job at
17 Southern California Edison. Today Edison offers her the
18 time and the financial support to return to Cal Poly
19 Pomona to work on her master's degree in engineering.

20 By the way, for the record, I had nothing to do
21 with her success.

22 (Laughter.)

23 MS. ALVA: She did all of this before I became
24 provost at Cal Poly Pomona.

25 Like Edison, our industry partners value our

1 appreciate the numerous amenities we offer on the campus.
2 We have modern a library, conference center, hotel,
3 children's center, and plenty of opportunities to engage
4 the cultural life of the region.

5 --o0o--

6 MS. ALVA: The potential opportunities for
7 collaboration with the Air Resources Board are numerous.
8 These win-win propositions will include shared use of
9 classrooms and specialized and state-of-the-art laboratory
10 spaces, such as the wind tunnel in our aerospace
11 engineering program.

12 Student internships, student mentoring, and
13 opportunities to engage in joint research, grants, and
14 design projects.

15 Our innovation idea lab on campus would give you
16 access to dynamic and talented students who are coming up
17 with and designing the products and solutions for the
18 future.

19 At Cal Poly Pomona we have a multitude of
20 outstanding academic support programs that shape our
21 students' learning through theory, experimentation, and
22 practice. These programs offer our students the
23 opportunity to work closely with faculty and industry
24 leaders in their journey of inquiry, and discovery.

25 --o0o--

1 MS. ALVA: I hope that you see what we see -
2 countless opportunities to engage with you in jointly
3 developed educational and research programs, co-sponsored
4 conferences, symposia, and training programs.

5 --o0o--

6 MS. ALVA: At Cal Poly Pomona we are working to
7 be carbon neutral by 2030, and some areas of the campus
8 have already achieved that. We're ready to work with you
9 to help promote sustainable communities and transportation
10 systems.

11 As the staff report indicates, they have
12 calculated that your employees would be driving more than
13 3.4 million extra miles a year if Pomona is not selected.
14 The EPA estimates that one mile of driving generates 411
15 grams of carbon. Multiplied by the mileage, that's more
16 than 1,500 tons of carbon emissions you could eliminate
17 annually by choosing Cal Poly Pomona.

18 --o0o--

19 MS. ALVA: In conclusion, Cal Poly Pomona is an
20 ideal location, a great place to work, a nationally
21 recognized research and teaching institution, and a
22 committed sustainability partner.

23 We hope you will vote to support the staff's
24 recommendation to select Cal Poly Pomona for your
25 relocation.

1 We look forward to building a strong partnership
2 with the Air Resources Board.

3 Thank you very much.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

5 We have a list of people who signed up to
6 testify, and I think we should probably just go right to
7 that. And then reserve all of our questions and
8 discussions until we've heard from the public.

9 We've tried to group them in according to their
10 own requests. But I have also honored our normal practice
11 of trying to call on elected officials or their
12 representatives first. It's always a good idea to know
13 where your budget comes from and also just to respect the
14 people who are here on behalf of others.

15 So with that, I hope people can read this chart.
16 I can barely read it myself. So I'll go ahead and call
17 names also. But if you can see where you are on the list
18 and be ready to come up, we would appreciate it.

19 Okay. We would begin with Richard Rae from
20 Senator Bob Huff's office.

21 MR. REA: Good morning, Chair Nichols and the
22 rest of the Board. I'm here on behalf of State Senator
23 Bob Huff. The senator has already submitted his letter in
24 support of the staff recommendation for the Pomona site,
25 so I'm going to read the whole letter again. I'm just

1 going to go over some of the points that he did talk about
2 on there.

3 Obviously he has been following this project
4 closely, as it does affect, you know, San Gabriel Valley,
5 his district, and L.A. County on the whole.

6 And I'm sorry if I sound a little horse. I'm a
7 little under the weather right now. So I'll try to get
8 through this quickly.

9 There's a couple points that he did bring up in
10 his letter that I wanted to go over. First of all is the
11 jobs -- the jobs factor. You know, there is that
12 uncertainty as to, well, what will happen with the
13 employees as to relocation or not if you go with the
14 Riverside site, not just to the employees but their
15 families; and the cost financially and the -- on them that
16 will go with that.

17 You know, we sat here and we looked at a lot of
18 the slides they were talking about, you know, two other
19 impacts as well. You know, you take a look at the
20 financial impact, but also the impact on the environment.
21 We have to make sure we're good stewards with our money
22 but good stewards to, you know, when we're thinking about,
23 you know, greening the future and so forth, and the
24 commute that they would have if they don't relocate and
25 the impact that it will have, you know, to everyone in the

1 south land.

2 You know, he does appreciate that the Board is
3 considering staff input on this. And we do hope that you
4 will take that into consideration, as over 85 percent of
5 the respondents did support the Pomona site. And I do,
6 you know, want to pass on his strong desire for you to
7 support the Pomona site.

8 So thank you so much.

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. And thanks for
10 staying within the three-minute time limit. You saved
11 extra time.

12 Mr. Saucedo from Senator Leyva's office.

13 MR. SAUCEDO: Good morning. I know that we have
14 Supervisor Hilda Solis, so I know her schedule's really
15 tight so I want to let her go ahead of me.

16 Supervisor.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay, great.

18 SUPERVISOR SOLIS: Thank you and good morning.
19 It's a pleasure to be here.

20 I also want to clarify for myself that -- I am a
21 graduate and alumni of Cal Poly Pomona. I majored in
22 political science. So we do have a very good public
23 policy school. And I would like to say that --

24 (Laughter.)

25 SUPERVISOR SOLIS: -- on behalf of the county

1 board of supervisors, now, and as chair, I represent the
2 first district. I represent this area right here in El
3 Monte as well as Pomona.

4 But more importantly, what I would like to say is
5 that your staff report indicates location, location,
6 location. And I have to tell you that there are people in
7 the audience that you're going to hear from, they're going
8 to have a more compelling argument than I am, that they
9 will have to face relocation if Pomona is not selected.
10 Some may retire sooner. Some will have to give up their
11 activities with their community and their families.

12 But I would like to say on my part as the County
13 Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County is going through
14 a fantastic recovery. In fact, I happen to also sit on
15 the Metro Board, and we are looking at expanding our light
16 rail system, our transit system, to help Cal Poly as well
17 as to achieve access all the way to the Ontario Airport
18 eventually. That may happen in the next few years. But
19 I'm telling you from the horse's mouth, from Metro Board,
20 is that we are very excited about the opportunities to
21 help fulfill job opportunities, transit, alleviate
22 congestion, get people where they need to go.

23 I definitely want to say that the people that I
24 represent here in El Monte where you saw the cluster of
25 households that were aggregated there as well as in west

1 Covina, those people have invested in their families and
2 their properties. To have to somehow uproot and have
3 their young children re-enroll in a foreign school or --
4 school that is unknown to them and have -- perhaps their
5 spouses have to leave their jobs as well, I think is also
6 a cost factor that isn't in your analysis, that I think is
7 also something that has to be weighted.

8 I am very proud of the collaborative projects
9 that we have ongoing with Cal Poly right now. In fact,
10 I'm a big supporter of their innovation project. And
11 having served there as an alumni and faculty member two
12 years ago, I saw for myself the technology that is
13 being -- that is emanating from that campus, in
14 manufacturing, in environmental industries, in IT, in --
15 but most importantly, what I think is important is that it
16 is going to be on campus. You will see the dynamic
17 interaction with the students. The students represent the
18 areas of El Monte and Pomona. That's who you're going to
19 see on campus. That interaction alone is going to help to
20 provide incentive for many of our young people to aspire
21 to work for ARB, to get into engineering, especially
22 women, females. And Cal Poly has an outstanding record of
23 graduating many female engineers.

24 And I'd like to say that they're also a premier
25 institution that graduates many, many more Hispanic

1 engineers. This is truly a dynamic institution, that has
2 changed far from when I was a student.

3 And I would just like to tell you that your staff
4 report is great. Want to also share that I received a
5 petition of 259 individuals from your -- that are your
6 employees that are saying they want to go to Pomona. And
7 also 24 organizations that represent not just Pomona, but
8 L.A. County and the San Gabriel Valley that are behind the
9 Pomona project.

10 Thank you very much.

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks. And thank you for all
12 the time you've put in. This is not the first time we've
13 had the opportunity to see you and to talk with you about
14 this project, and we really appreciate your support.

15 Mr. Saucedo.

16 MR. SAUCEDO: Good morning, Chair Nichols and
17 Board members. My name is Manuel Saucedo and I'm here
18 representing Senator Connie Leyva.

19 Senator Leyva supports the proposed location for
20 the ARB in Pomona for these reasons:

21 First, we can lose the approximately 400 jobs
22 from this region that could have a huge economic impact in
23 our local economy.

24 Second, moving to the Riverside location could
25 cause from 1 million to 7 million dollars for relocation

1 costs. Keeping ARB in Pomona would likely retain more ARB
2 existing and highly trained workforce necessary to support
3 ARB and those responsibilities and would be less
4 disruptive to ARB's operations.

5 Lastly, I commend the ARB and staff in
6 considering your employees' views in this decision where
7 85 percent of the staff prefers the Pomona site. We ask
8 that you approve the staff recommendation.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

11 Ms. Robles.

12 MS. ROBLES: Good morning. On behalf of
13 Congresswoman Napolitano I wanted to come and read this
14 letter that was mailed to the Board on March 3rd this
15 year.

16 "Dear Chairwoman Nichols and Board Members. I
17 write in strong support of the staff recommendation that
18 the Air Resources Board's consolidation facilities should
19 be located at the Pomona site.

20 "I am proud to represent the ARB's current
21 vehicle and engineer emission testing research facilities
22 in El Monte. The work that is done at these facilities is
23 incredibly important to maintain a clean environment and
24 the healthy communities in our State.

25 "I am also grateful for the economic benefit that

1 these facilities bring to the San Gabriel Valley and to
2 the constituents of mine that work here.

3 "As you are aware, your internal pooling
4 concluded that 85 percent of the employees supported the
5 Pomona site location. I ask that you respect the
6 overwhelming request of your employees and my constituents
7 so they are not further burdened by this relocation.

8 I applaud Cal Poly Pomona and the CSU system for
9 their commitment to keeping ARB in L.A. County. I am glad
10 that Cal Poly Pomona signed an MOU with the State for the
11 acquisition of the former Lanterman Development Center
12 that requires the university to accommodate the real
13 property needs of ARB.

14 "This proposal will be beneficial for both ARB
15 and Cal Poly by creating partnerships within state
16 scientists, regulators, professors and students which will
17 improve ARB's current work and create hands-on workforce
18 development opportunities for the next generation of ARB
19 scientists and staff.

20 "Thank you for your careful consideration of your
21 staff recommendation."

22 Signed "Congresswoman Grace Napolitano." And she
23 wanted me to thank you for your consideration, and she's
24 available to talk to any of you if you'd like.

25 Thank you.

1 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Please extend my
2 personal best wishes to Congresswoman Napolitano.

3 Mr. Torres.

4 MR. TORRES: Good morning, Chair Nichols and
5 members of the Board. Robert Torres representing Assembly
6 Member Freddie Rodriguez, whose district is directly
7 impacted by this project.

8 Our apologies. The Assembly Member made every
9 attempt to come down here and speak before this body. But
10 unfortunately legislative business required that he remain
11 in Sacramento for the duration of the week. But like many
12 of the folks here today, the Assembly Member is supporting
13 staff recommendation to relocate to Cal Poly Pomona for
14 these three reasons:

15 It's the jobs. Losing approximately 400 jobs to
16 Riverside County is unacceptable. And it's not just the
17 jobs. It's the economic development opportunities that
18 come with housing, retail, and the potential to increase
19 the area's tax base.

20 The second reason, which we've heard today from
21 many folks, is the direct and immediate cost to relocate
22 many of these employees.

23 And last, and certainly not least, the Assembly
24 Member would ask that you take under heavy consideration
25 the will of your employees. Many studies have shown that

1 unhappy employees lead to low productivity levels, poor
2 customer service, and costly high employee turnover rates.
3 Some studies that I've read say that the employee turnover
4 costs half of the employee's salary. Sometimes more,
5 depending on how high the level of expertise the job
6 requires.

7 But we really thank you very much for considering
8 Cal Poly Pomona and the city as a whole. And the Assembly
9 Member sends his apologies and thanks you very much for
10 taking this under consideration.

11 Thank you very much.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

13 Mr. Marquez.

14 MR. MARQUEZ: Well, good morning, Madam Chair and
15 the Board. I had a speech ready, but it seems like all
16 the points were already made, so I'll keep it very brief.

17 My name's Jorge Marquez. I'm on the city council
18 over in the City of Covina, and I'm here just to support
19 the families and also the employees of ARB to keep it in
20 the City of Pomona. And that's all I have.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

23 Senator Roth.

24 SENATOR ROTH: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of
25 the Board. I'm Richard Roth, member of the State Senate,

1 privileged to represent western Riverside County. And I
2 want to thank you for the opportunity to speak in favor of
3 the UCR proposal.

4 In that regard I would urge you to carefully
5 consider the staff report and the recommendation, both
6 what it contains and what it does not contain. I ask you
7 to consider the site issues identified, specifically the
8 liquefaction and the environmental issues associated with
9 the Pomona site that one of the prior speakers referenced,
10 and the absence of any consideration of transportation
11 mitigation measures such as vanpooling or ride sharing for
12 the Air Resources Board.

13 I ask you to do an overall cost benefit analysis
14 of the proposals, because apparently neither the
15 Department of General Services nor the Department of
16 Finance did a formal written analysis with cost benefit
17 contained there in.

18 I ask you also to consider the demographics of
19 the workforce that we've spent some time discussing here
20 this morning, both now and at the point four or five or
21 six years from today when this facility is actually
22 occupied. Frankly, I was told by your staff during my
23 staff briefing that today about 20 percent, perhaps a
24 little less, of your workforce currently is over 50 and
25 moving toward retirement eligibility. I don't quite know

1 how to respond to the demographic analysis that was
2 presented this morning since it wasn't in the staff report
3 and was not posted, so I don't know how the analysis was
4 derived or the methodology used.

5 But bottom line, this State project, we're
6 building not for the workforce today but for the workforce
7 of the future, 40 50, and 60 years from today, wherever
8 that workforce is located.

9 Now, with respect to the relocation cost issue on
10 that point: It's my understanding that your senior staff
11 has been briefed, and I'm certainly here to confirm as
12 budget subchair, that the legislature is committed to
13 covering the cost of relocation in this capital cost
14 project budget on a going-forward basis to the extent
15 relocation cost is implicated.

16 Finally, let me say this: Inland California and
17 our most vulnerable communities, areas that the Air
18 Resources Board is chartered to protect, have been
19 underserved across the board for decades. And I don't
20 think I need to tell you that.

21 They say our air is bad. They say that the
22 quality of our job applicants is poor. Frankly, it's not
23 true. You know that. But it's as if we don't count.

24 So I ask you to consider the strong signal that
25 siting this facility at the University of California

1 Riverside would send to all in Sacramento and throughout
2 this State; and that signal is this: That inland
3 California counts.

4 Thank you for listening to me. Thank you for
5 giving me an opportunity to present, Madam Chair.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Thank you also for
7 the time you've put in on this project. Really appreciate
8 it.

9 Mr. Tavaglione.

10 MR. TAVAGLIONE: Thank you, Madam Chair,
11 Honorable Chair and members of the Board. It is my honor
12 to be here in front of you again today, or some of you
13 today. We had the opportunity to meet before Christmas.

14 I just want to say another -- one more time. We
15 would love to have the CARB headquarters in Riverside, the
16 City of Riverside. Born and raised as I was, and seeing
17 the community grow and prosper and become a dynamic region
18 that it has become over the last number of years, has been
19 tremendous for us. And there's a reason that it has
20 become what it is today. And that's because people are
21 deciding to come out here from Orange County, from L.A.
22 County, out to Riverside to join and to raise their
23 families. Why? Because of affordability.

24 And I was a bit perplexed. I have to say, I was
25 a bit perplexed by the staff report. I don't like to talk

1 about my past life. But my past life prior to my 20 years
2 in public service with the board of supervisors was in
3 commercial real estate. The largest commercial real
4 estate firm still in the country. And one of the things I
5 did was represent corporate, corporations, corporations
6 that were relocating. And I also represented the GSA on
7 the federal and state level. And I will tell you this:
8 When they look into the future for a new location, I will
9 tell you they do not look nine years down the road. They
10 look 25, 30, 35 years down the road because they're going
11 to be there for that long. And they're also looking at
12 their future employees and who their employees are going
13 to be; and what they can afford, most importantly what
14 they can afford in terms of housing, schools, quality
15 schools, recreation. And we provide all of that, as you
16 saw in our presentation when we were down -- when you were
17 down in Riverside.

18 You have to look into the future. We're not
19 talking -- yes, we are talking about some of the employees
20 of today. But as it was mentioned, many of them are going
21 to be retiring over the next five to seven years. You
22 have to look at the ones that are going to be getting
23 their degrees, bringing their families out to
24 affordability, affordability and quality schools; and the
25 ones that are going to be your next generation of

1 employees, that are going to be there for decades to
2 follow. And so that's all that I ask you to consider,
3 please, when you look at this relocation.

4 As the senator who preceded me, our fine senator
5 from Riverside, Senator Roth, mentioned, let's do a very
6 detailed analysis as I recall that there was done when I
7 worked with GSA at the state level. Let's make sure that
8 that's done so that you're getting all the right answers
9 on behalf of your employees who will treat you and -- not
10 treat you, but serve you for many, many decades in the
11 future.

12 I have a letter here from our five-member
13 delegation in the Congress for Riverside and San
14 Bernardino County that I think you all have copies of.
15 And also my distinguished colleague, Josie Gonzales from
16 our county to the north, she wished she could have been
17 here today. I talked to her yesterday afternoon. So she
18 says -- gives her blessing to all of you.

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. And we do have the
21 letters, so they have been distributed to the Board
22 members.

23 Mr. Barth.

24 MR. BARTH: Good morning, everyone. My name is
25 Matt Barth. I'm a professor at the University of

1 California Riverside. I've been there for 25 years. And
2 also serve as the director for the Center for
3 Environmental Research and Technology, a role I've had now
4 for ten years.

5 So normally I like to talk about all the great
6 things that we're doing at Ce-Cert and how it really
7 aligns well with what the Air Resources Board does in
8 terms of air quality, global climate change, and a lot of
9 other issues. But today I really wanted to speak on, you
10 know, what we're doing now with the Air Resources Board
11 and potentially what we could do well into the future.

12 So as you heard our chancellor say, if you take a
13 snapshot over the last year, UCR as a whole is doing about
14 \$22 million in research projects dealing with air quality.
15 About 20 million of that is directory at Ce-Cert. In
16 fact, around 15 percent of our funding at Ce-Cert does
17 come from the Air Resources Board. So we're obviously
18 doing quite a bit in terms of research contracts and
19 grants.

20 There's certainly more than that. There's a lot
21 of outreach. There's a lot of technology transfer. In
22 fact, right now we're hosting an international conference
23 on portable emissions measurement systems, something we
24 heard earlier today. It's a two-day conference. We have
25 over 200 participants. And I believe - I checked the

1 registration before I came this morning - about 20, 22,
2 are ARB staff members that are attending that today.

3 So that's what we're doing now in today. But
4 certainly in the future, that's the critical part. So if
5 ARB does come to UCR -- you know, we heard a lot about
6 proximity and how, you know, it's not really critical if
7 you move close to a higher -- a university with higher
8 education. But it really does matter, and I'll give you a
9 few examples of that.

10 So, first of all, if ARB does come to UCR, you
11 know, we're going to have a formalized internship program.
12 And this is not just at the bachelor's levels, but it's
13 master's, its Ph.D.'s. It's where the students get to
14 come into the lab, work with the ARB staff members, and
15 really create a win-win situation, obviously for the
16 students - they get to learn about real-world problems -
17 but in addition, you know, ARB gets the benefit of that
18 additional workforce.

19 But the key thing, there is pipeline, right? So
20 you're creating now student that are going to move into
21 these staff positions and grow the ARB well into the
22 future.

23 We're also looking at this AQM -- South Coast
24 AQMD endowment. That's another critical piece that's
25 going to go into the training that's necessary for the ARB

1 staff members. So that's going to be focused on
2 professional education. So, you know, a staff member
3 could go off and take a class and simply just walk across
4 campus and take a course perhaps in health effects; they
5 could take my course in embedded systems, learn about OBD.
6 So there's a lot of different options there.

7 And proximity does matter. I mean, simply doing
8 that in an afternoon is easy to do. But if you're off
9 site, it's much harder to do.

10 We heard a little bit about our faculty. We are
11 embarked on a very big comprehensive cluster hire program,
12 and we're really filling in the gaps of what we already
13 have in terms of air quality, public policy, and school of
14 medicine. And so you're going to hear a little bit more
15 about those different cluster hires. And, you know, we're
16 going for at least five faculty hires this year that fit
17 very well with what the Air Resources Board is aiming at.

18 So I just want you to consider the long-term
19 value of this educational piece. And when you weigh that
20 compared to the short-term cost of relocating, it's clear
21 to me that this long-term benefit is the most important
22 decision.

23 Thank you.

24 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

25 Mr. Lo.

1 MR. LO: Good morning. Happy St. Patrick's Day.
2 I'm David Lo. I'm a distinguished professor of biomedical
3 sciences and senior associate dean of research in the UCR
4 School of Medicine.

5 If the concern of the ARB is air quality, it's
6 likely because of health. So I think it's appropriate to
7 represent the views of the School of Medicine.

8 I'm very happy to report that the School of
9 Medicine is a new school of medicine. It's growing very
10 fast. We'll be graduating our first class of medical
11 students next summer; as well as expanding program in
12 medical residents, all who will serve the inland Southern
13 California area.

14 The stated mission of the School of Medicine is
15 unique in that it is specifically to improve the health of
16 inland Southern California. And so part of that is
17 through the expanding UC health system where there's an
18 emphasis on primary care. But as one of the six UC
19 Medical School campuses, it is also expected that we bring
20 world-class research to the Southern California area. And
21 so I'm going to highlight one of the programs that we've
22 initiated. It's called the BREATHE initiative and it
23 stands for bridging regional ecology, aerosolized toxins,
24 and health effects. And it brings together the School of
25 Medicine, Ce-Cert, the School of Public Policy, as well as

1 the Center for Conservation Biology. And the importance
2 of that is that as an interdisciplinary program, we're
3 looking at the impacts of air quality in a lot of
4 different aspects.

5 For example, the Center for Conservation Biology
6 looks at climate change, invasive plant species,
7 allergenic pollens, soil microbes as they are aerosolized.
8 So we have efforts ongoing in places as the Coachella
9 Valley to look at those kinds of particulates as well as
10 their impact on pulmonary cardiovascular health.

11 We have concerns, for example, in the drying of
12 the Salton Sea and the drying lake beds and the
13 aerosolized particulates including the concentrated
14 pesticides and toxins.

15 In collaboration with Ce-Cert, we are doing
16 modeling studies and impacts of pulmonary inhaled
17 particles on health.

18 And the ongoing cluster hires, with the Breathe
19 initiative, for example, we're right now recruiting a
20 climate modeling faculty position. We have positions in
21 public health, environmental microbiology, as well.

22 There are also ongoing searches in environmental
23 toxicology that also fit with the missions of the BREATHE
24 initiative as well as Ce-Cert.

25 So in some there's ongoing growth in research

1 that directly affect air quality and health impacts and we
2 look forward to working with you all soon.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

5 Mr. Pazzani.

6 MR. PAZZANI: Good morning. I'm Michael Pazzani.
7 I'm the Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic
8 Development at University of California Riverside.

9 In my life I've lived in Marina del Rey as a
10 student at UCLA. As a faculty member at UC Irvine I've
11 lived in Irvine. And four years ago I moved to Riverside
12 where I'm now the vice chancellor for research.

13 I love Riverside. The skies are blue. It smells
14 of citrus. There's no longer something called a smog
15 cough. Children in Riverside grew up with that 20 years
16 ago. And in part we have CARB to thank for that. But we
17 also have the results of research to thank for that.

18 What research is, it's the discovery of new knowledge.
19 And in the California system it's the University of
20 California in particular that has the goal of awarding
21 doctoral degrees and doing research that discovers new
22 knowledge.

23 The Cal State system and Cal Poly should be very
24 proud of what they do. They offer master's degrees, where
25 you master current knowledge and apply it to current

1 problems. But you don't have the quest for new knowledge.
2 And to me it's the new knowledge that's going to solve our
3 air quality problems, the nitrous oxide problems that we
4 talked about earlier.

5 I really don't want to compare our universities,
6 but they have different missions. If you try to compare
7 Cal Poly to us as a research university, well, for
8 publications, we're ranked 44th of all universities; Cal
9 Poly's not on the list of the top 750. We have \$133
10 million of research funding; Cal Poly has 5-1/2, less than
11 4 percent of what we have. We have 300 patents, 20 of
12 which are related to air quality; Cal Poly has two patents
13 for the entire university.

14 But it's not their mission. We've used Cal Poly,
15 for instance, to do landscape architecture at our
16 chancellor's house. We don't have the landscape
17 architecture program. They've done a wonderful job of
18 that.

19 It wouldn't be simple for Cal Poly to replicate
20 what we have at UC Riverside. In Ce-Cert alone we have
21 50,000 square feet of space, \$20,000,000 of equipment.
22 We've got a medical school, atmospheric chemistry
23 statistics. And so there's a much greater activity
24 happening here.

25 Chairman Nichols, earlier today you talked about

1 computer science. If you were located at UC Riverside,
2 you'd be a mile away from someone who's decompiled the
3 Android phone, found flaws in it, and has reported them to
4 Google and others. They can report them to Volkswagen and
5 to you as well.

6 (Laughter.)

7 MR. PAZZANI: That's the sort of research that
8 happens at a top-class research university.

9 I do understand the difficulties in relocating.
10 I've done it myself, and I love Riverside. I'd like to
11 welcome you there as well.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

13 Penny Newman.

14 CHAIR NICHOLS: It's been a long time.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MS. NEWMAN: It's nice to see you.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Nice to see you.

18 MS. NEWMAN: My name is Penny Newman. I'm the
19 Executive Director of the Center for Community Action and
20 Environmental Justice. We've been there for 38 years
21 serving the communities, the really disproportionately hit
22 communities, low income communities of color in Riverside
23 and San Bernardino. I don't work for UCR, so I'm a little
24 out of place.

25 I first want to congratulate the State for the

1 new Board members that have been added. With Diane
2 Takvorian and Senator Florez.

3 It is a recognition that those most directly and
4 most heavily hit by air pollution need to be at the table.
5 And I hope that today that recognition carries into your
6 discussions in this decision.

7 We thank you for the opportunity to add to and
8 assist in that decision that you're going to make. We
9 know that the amenities offered by the universities are
10 important. We respect the concerns of the staff. But
11 there's also the issue of fairness and equity. And I
12 think that needs to be highlighted.

13 I have to say as a long-time, life-long resident
14 of Riverside County, I was fighting really not to be
15 insulted by some of the discussion that has taken place.
16 It sounds as if the staff would be condemned to some
17 outlying area in a foreign frontier for the rest of their
18 lives to suffer under very severe conditions; and it is
19 not that case. Riverside is a delightful place to live.
20 We have great art and culture. We have a lot of
21 recreation to offer. We have a lot there. Affordable
22 housing.

23 We also have some challenges. And for
24 communities, especially communities of color, those
25 challenges are immense. We have the highest ozone

1 pollution in San Bernardino. We have a railyard with the
2 highest cancer risk of all railyards in the State of
3 California, at a whopping 3300 in a million. We have Mira
4 Loma, which is consistently high for particulate
5 pollution, and is keeping our basin from meeting the Clean
6 Air Act standards. And we face the prospect of a major
7 warehouse coming in that would have the highest greenhouse
8 gas emissions in the State.

9 And a lot of our pollution blows in from L.A.

10 And yet we have no presence of ARB.

11 While the statistics are often used to emphasize
12 the problems, we rarely receive the resources to correct
13 those problems. We have four and a half million people
14 who live in our area. We have five major universities.
15 We're the fastest growing area. You've heard the
16 offerings of UCR.

17 But the other consideration is that we suffer
18 from pollution. It is often overlooked. Our region is
19 often overwhelmed by Los Angeles. If ARB staff lived and
20 worked in our region, we would have greater appreciation
21 for the challenges that we face and the urgencies in which
22 it must be addressed.

23 So on behalf of all the members in the
24 disadvantaged communities throughout Riverside and San
25 Bernardino, we strongly urge the Board to vote to relocate

1 the El Monte facility to UCR. You have an opportunity to
2 recognize a disadvantaged region, much like the San
3 Joaquin area, to recognize us as somebody who is important
4 and that you recognize the problems we're facing and are
5 there to help us.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. And thanks for your
8 letter also.

9 Professor Loveridge.

10 PROFESSOR LOVERIDGE: My name is Ron Loveridge.
11 I was a local elected official for 33 years, 19 as mayor
12 and 14 on the council. I was honored to serve for 20
13 years on the South Coast Board and eight years with CARB.

14 2016 marks the 50th academic year which I've
15 taught at least one course in political science at UCR.
16 The CARB lab relocation is a 50-year decision. It is a
17 major public investment by the State of California. It is
18 a decision that should not be primarily decided by VMT and
19 commute times. Rather, it should be a decision made in
20 the public interest.

21 Well, what's the public interest?

22 Here is a widely accepted definition. It is the
23 welfare of the general public in which the whole society
24 has a stake and which warrants recognition, promotion, and
25 protection by the government and its agencies.

1 The public interest is represented in three
2 choices:

3 First is a choice between UCR and Cal Poly. It
4 is in the public interest that CARB labs should be located
5 at a major public research university. As you heard from
6 the chancellor, or read in the letter from President
7 Napolitano, University of Riverside is such a choice. Its
8 programs, research, and students will enhance the CARB
9 labs and the public health of all of us in California.

10 The second choice is between the Inland Empire,
11 counties of Riverside and San Bernardino, and Los Angeles
12 County. There is unanimous agreement that California's
13 divided by income between the coastal and inland counties.
14 Whatever the measurements, the incomes of four and a half
15 million people in the Inland Empire lag, and significantly
16 so, behind Los Angeles, Orange, and Ventura. It is time
17 for the State of California to invest in its inland
18 counties.

19 And the third choice is between Riverside and
20 Pomona.

21 Riverside is the largest city in the Inland
22 Empire. It is a city that's long championed clean air.
23 It took place at UCR with the leadership John Middleton
24 and Jim Pitts, Art Winer, Alan Lloyd and now Matt Barth.
25 It took place in citizen advocacy groups such as Clean Air

1 Now. It took place when Mayor Ben Lewis declared a state
2 of emergency and sued EPA. It took place in the city's
3 green action plan, ranked as the national best practice.
4 It took place in 2015 when Riverside won the CARB
5 CoolCalifornia Challenge.

6 Riverside has walked the talk of being an
7 advocate for clean air.

8 Equally important, Riverside and the Inland
9 Empire are impacted by bad air with too many days that
10 exceed health limits. Every morning when I walk Mount
11 Rubidoux I can see the public interest choices where the
12 welfare of the general public is at stake are those of
13 UCR, the Inland Empire, and the City of Riverside.

14 Thanks for your attention.

15 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much. And good to
16 see you again.

17 Anne Mayer.

18 MS. MAYER: Good morning. Thank you. I'm Anne
19 Mayer, the Executive Director of the Riverside County
20 Transportation Commission.

21 Mobility or the lack of mobility is certainly a
22 driving factor related to quality of life and economic
23 vitality in the Southern California region and
24 particularly in the Inland Empire. And since mobility and
25 proximity seem to be a driving factor in the decision

1 you're going to be making, I think it's important to
2 really talk about some details related to proximity and
3 mobility.

4 The staff report seems at first glance to offer
5 significant data justifying the Pomona site from a
6 commuter and proximity standpoint. However, until today
7 we didn't see any simplistic or realistic scenarios for
8 comparison purposes.

9 The staff report accurately notes that over time
10 it appears that many employees have located their
11 residences near the El Monte facilities. And it certainly
12 is reasonable to assume that over time the same thing
13 would occur for a CARB facility located in Riverside,
14 particularly given the significant housing costs and
15 quality of life advantages that we have.

16 The staff comparative analyses regarding commute
17 distance and times assume status quo for residential
18 locations without incorporating reasonable assumptions
19 regarding residential relocations, resulting in
20 exaggerated, skewed, and unrealistic data for the
21 Riverside site. It also contains vehicle miles traveled
22 compared or that again exaggerates the disadvantages of
23 Riverside because it neglects to acknowledge the likely
24 impacts of attrition and staff relocation to residences
25 closer to the Riverside location.

1 The staff report has significant analyses of
2 public transit comparators which again exaggerate the
3 negative impact, but it doesn't put this information into
4 perspective given that right now we have usually about
5 less than 10 percent of our commuters are using public
6 transit. And that's something that we're working very
7 hard to change in Riverside County. And we are committed
8 to ensuring that public transit is a sustainable option
9 now and in the future.

10 The report does not recognize our very
11 significant ongoing investments being made to expand rail
12 and bus interconnectivity both within Riverside County and
13 externally to and from other Southern California counties.

14 RCTC and Metrolink are opening the Perris Valley
15 line this spring, which will extend rail service 24 miles
16 into Riverside and add four stations. Three of these
17 stations will be in proximity to the UCR location with
18 bus, shuttle, and biking options readily available.

19 Additional rail capacity improvements are also in
20 the works throughout the Southern California system which
21 will allow the addition of reverse commute trains to
22 better serve Riverside County job hubs.

23 These investments in integration of enhanced
24 multi-modal and commuter programs directly enhance
25 mobility options for existing and future CARB employees

1 and stakeholders.

2 A compelling case has been made here today for
3 the location of the CARB facilities in Riverside. And the
4 Riverside County Transportation Commission strongly urges
5 this Board to consider the reasonableness of the data with
6 respect to transportation impacts.

7 Thank you.

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

9 Mr. Kleinhenz.

10 MR. KLEINHENZ: Good morning, Chair Nichols,
11 Board members, ARB staff, and everyone else. I'm Robert
12 Kleinhenz. I'm an economist and Executive Director of
13 Research at Beacon Economics. I have over 30 years of
14 experience in the economics of cities and regions, and
15 particularly here in Southern California.

16 Beacon Economics has partnered with UCR and has
17 had a working relationship with the County of Riverside,
18 and so we were asked to offer a third-party perspective on
19 the report that was submitted by the ARB staff.

20 And while we have the -- we only had a limited
21 amount of time to review the report, and we don't have the
22 in-house expertise to scrutinize it all, but I would like
23 to make some key observations especially on the cost
24 estimates contained in the report that I think should, you
25 know, prompt perhaps a reassessment of some of these

1 reported costs.

2 You've heard from so many speakers, I don't want
3 to go over the same territory. But this is a location
4 decision that will be in effect for decades, during which
5 the Southern California region will go through many
6 changes. The Air Resources Board can control many aspects
7 of that facility decision: The location, various
8 attributes of the facility itself. But its ability to a
9 priori influence the locations decisions of its future
10 workforce and its stakeholders over the next 25 years or
11 even 50 is limited. These decisions are made by
12 individuals, by households, companies, and other
13 organizations in the future. It won't be made by the
14 Board, and they will generally not be made by the
15 facility's current staff of employees.

16 But much of the report and many of the costs are
17 based on what we know about current staff, their location,
18 their commutes, and so on. It's somewhat static exercise
19 to evaluate the commuting and housing costs associated
20 with a future facility based on what we know about the
21 current staff. Here's why.

22 We already heard that -- there were the original
23 estimates of cost that were submitted in the report, table
24 12, with respect to location costs and so on. And then we
25 heard this morning about some revised estimates based on

1 some assumptions of relocation and so on. The normal
2 staff turnover for an organization is about 15 percent per
3 year. Now, I'm not saying this is the right number to
4 use, but I'm just saying let's consider that number for
5 the moment and we apply that to CARB's current staffing.
6 Within five years less than half of the current staff will
7 still be employed at CARB. Within ten years less than 20
8 percent. So the individuals who replace those people may
9 or may not be -- and those who may be added to the staff
10 may or may not make the same kinds of living and commuting
11 decisions that the current staff does. So that's just so
12 important I think to keep in mind.

13 Demographics show that the Inland Empire will get
14 a million and a half new residents over the next 20 years
15 versus 900,000 for L.A. County. The center of gravity for
16 the Southern California region is moving inland.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: I need you to wind up. I'm
18 sorry.

19 MR. KLEINHENZ: I understand. I will.

20 And so finally I would just observe that there
21 are so many assumptions that have to do with the current
22 staffing situation for the current Air Resources Board
23 location, I would urge you to reassess especially the
24 estimated cost of relocation in light of what may be some
25 more reasonable assumptions about cost, commuting, and so

1 on.

2 Thank you very much.

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

4 Mr. Russo.

5 MR. RUSSO: Well, good morning. I'm very, very
6 happy to be here to discuss why the City of Riverside and
7 UC Riverside are such an obvious choice I think for this
8 organization. And I'm not going to go over a lot of what
9 was said. And I'm going to apologize in advance to our
10 friends from Cal Poly Pomona. I have two 17-year olds,
11 both of whom want to go there. So I hope you won't hold
12 this against them.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. RUSSO: Look, you've heard -- you've heard
15 what the questions are about the staff analysis. And I
16 run an organization, it's a large and a very diverse
17 organization of more than 2400 employees. And I know how
18 important employees are, how critical they are to the
19 success of an organization, and how important their moral
20 is and their feelings are. But with all due respect, when
21 85 percent of the employees have taken a position and the
22 employees are in charge of the analysis, you are bound to
23 get an analysis that has some biases in it. There are
24 some small ways in which that bias was apparent during the
25 presentation. Let me just pick one. And I don't mean to

1 be nitpicking. And one of the speakers said -- Rob Field
2 said he wasn't here to poke holes in the staff
3 presentation. I am.

4 (Laughter.)

5 MR. RUSSO: At one point there was a discussion
6 that talked about: The Riverside site has hotels nearby.
7 It has walking distance -- walking distance, but
8 Riverside's downtown is two miles away.

9 Then when discussing Pomona, the discussion was:
10 Well, these other cities are nearby, and no mileage was
11 given.

12 Why? I don't know. I didn't look. I don't
13 really know. But it seems to me those are the small ways.

14 Now, here are the big ways and the ones that
15 really matter to the Board.

16 Because the stewards of the public board, as I
17 am, these costs are very important to you and to the
18 state, and time is money. So first, there is no dispute
19 in Riverside. We all want you there. There is not
20 unanimity in the Pomona community. That creates
21 entitlement risk for you. It creates political risk for
22 you. It can hold you up.

23 Two, as noted in the staff -- as noted in our
24 earlier critique of the staff report, the UCR site does
25 not have any potential remediation costs. At Pomona

1 you're buying a pig in a poke. You don't know what your
2 remediation costs are going to be and how long it will
3 take to remediate them.

4 Third, Girish, are you here?

5 That gentleman is in charge of the utility for
6 the City of Riverside. And his people tell me that the
7 costs of the utility development on the UCR site are
8 overstated in this report by nearly \$2-1/2 million. But
9 more importantly, we own our own utility. And its
10 estimated that we will cost you 500- to 800,000 less a
11 year in Riverside. So consider that over 40 years.

12 I'm going to wrap up.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. RUSSO: Over 40 years. That is a huge
15 differential that dwarfs the 1- to \$7 million relocation
16 costs.

17 Please, embrace the rational and dynamic choice;
18 reject the easy and comfortable choice. I just moved to
19 Riverside. I hated moving. I told my wife, "I'm never
20 moving again. I'm in this house till we die." But I am
21 so grateful now when I smelled the orange blossoms this
22 spring that I made the decision to move my family to
23 Riverside. You will be grateful in no time too.

24 Thank you very much for your attention.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

1 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Us East Bay folks still
2 remember you from the East Bay, John.

3 MR. RUSSO: Many are glad I'm gone.

4 (Laughter.)

5 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I didn't say I was one of
6 them.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. RUSSO: I love you too, pal.

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay, folks. We actually have a
10 second page of witnesses coming. So we are about 10 away
11 from our court reporter break, which we will take when we
12 complete the witness list and before we bring it back for
13 discussion, just like a 10-minute break.

14 So, let's move forward.

15 We I think are shifting gears here, because I see
16 a number of X's in the support for staff report position.
17 So let's begin with Christina Romero.

18 MS. ROMERO: Hi. Good morning, Chair Nichols and
19 members of the Board. My name is Christina Romero and I'm
20 a graduate student at Cal Poly Pomona in the College of
21 Agriculture.

22 The decision to be made by the Board is very
23 personal to us because we will be sharing our educational
24 farm with the new CARB facility, which is extremely
25 important to us. I am here today on behalf of the

1 concerned agriculture students of Cal Poly Pomona to
2 express support for the proposed site recommendation as
3 Pomona for the new CARB facility. We acknowledge CARB to
4 be a valuable asset to Cal Poly Pomona, the surrounding
5 community, and Los Angeles County.

6 As you know, we are strong advocates for Spadra,
7 our educational farm, which is proposed to house the new
8 CARB facility, and we understand about 10 percent of the
9 farm will be allocated for this development. However, we
10 feel as long as the rest of the farmland is left to still
11 meet our learn-by-doing philosophy, we will be able to
12 meet the needs of our students, our program, and our
13 agricultural mission. We are in support of this
14 development.

15 We are entering into a new long-term strategic
16 planning process with the university, and we feel that the
17 CARB facility coming to Pomona is a huge new opportunity
18 for the College of Agriculture to collaborate and partner
19 with CARB to conduct cutting-edge research in regards to
20 agricultural practices and equipment, to reduce greenhouse
21 gas emissions, to bring about long-term policy and
22 solutions for the agriculture community.

23 We are more than willing to do our part to
24 address Governor Brown's mandate setting a target to
25 reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the State to 40 percent

1 below 1990 levels by 2030, helping making it possible for
2 California to achieve reductions of 80 percent below 1990
3 levels by year 2050.

4 We are in a unique setting in urban Los Angeles
5 County; and because of our valuable agriculture resource,
6 we have the ability to enter into long-term research
7 projects and collaborations to address increasing green
8 gas emissions in agriculture practices and helps to
9 achieve state-of-the-art improvements in agriculture for
10 California, the nation, and the world.

11 By choosing Cal Poly Pomona, ARB will get a bonus
12 lab area to address air quality in another area of need,
13 which is agriculture.

14 So I would like to reiterate again on behalf of
15 the concerned students of agriculture, we are encouraging
16 the Board to choose Pomona as the site for the new CARB
17 facility with the condition that the rest of our farm be
18 left intact for educational purposes.

19 And we'd like to thank you all for letting us be
20 a part of this process and listening to us and being open
21 and willing to communicate.

22 Thank you.

23 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

24 VICE CHAIR BERG: Chair Nichols, could I just ask
25 a question please of Ms. Romero?

1 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

2 VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you so much for coming
3 and testifying today. At the last Board meeting where we
4 had a presentation, the ag students came up and they were
5 pretty strongly against this project. That was just a few
6 months ago.

7 Could you just help us walk through -- I know
8 you've had a lot of meetings and -- but the process that
9 allowed you to reconsider this.

10 MS. ROMERO: Well, because we reestablished our
11 position on factual information about how agriculture's
12 important to the community, especially in an urban area
13 like this. We were -- with the help of the agriculture
14 industry and a lot of political officials and our
15 university coming together, we've all decided
16 collaboratively that it's best for us to work together.
17 They have recognized the value that we bring to the table.
18 They've allowed us now to be part of the process. And we
19 feel that we can forge a very strong partnership both with
20 ARB and our university and agriculture moving forward.
21 And it would be very unique in Los Angeles County because
22 it's something that you don't normally see in this
23 setting.

24 So it's a very positive movement forward.

25 VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.

1 MS. ROMERO: Thank you.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: It's really quite a remarkable
3 piece of this whole process that this has been able to
4 happen.

5 MS. ROMERO: Yes. And we're really pleased and
6 we really appreciate, like I say, everybody's willingness
7 to work with us and listen to us and take into account
8 what we have to offer and what we bring to the table.

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

10 MS. ROMERO: Thank you.

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: Stephany Luevano, also from Cal
12 Poly.

13 MS. LUEVANO: Hello. Good morning. My name is
14 Stephany Luevano. I'm a business student at Cal Poly
15 Pomona, a resident of unincorporated La Puente, and a
16 small business owner as well.

17 So through these multiple descriptions I have
18 realized the importance of being civically engaged, so
19 that is why I'm here today.

20 So I'm going to be the first in my family to
21 receive my bachelor's degree this year, so I'm super
22 excited about that. But I want be able to use all this
23 great education and hard work in my own community, to
24 reinvest what I have learned into the cities that have
25 given me so much already. So I've spoken to a lot of

1 students, and we are all having issues finding jobs
2 locally. That's an issue. There are over 23,000 students
3 at Cal Poly Pomona. And as a business student, I know the
4 importance of keeping jobs locally; more so how these jobs
5 would help for economic development. And that location is
6 very, very important.

7 So, as the analysis had said earlier, 33 percent
8 of the employees will retire, and that there are over 7
9 million people that reside in Pomona. So out of these 7
10 million people, there are more skilled students that come
11 not only from Cal Poly Pomona but also by local
12 universities and schools like Mt. SAC, APU, and Citrus
13 College.

14 So all in all, us students may not all have the
15 same major or share similarities, but we all have the same
16 end goal which is to get internships and jobs within our
17 local cities that we have come to love. So use us because
18 we're great.

19 Thank you.

20 (Laughter.)

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Fabiola Perez.

22 Nice to see you again too.

23 MS. PEREZ: Nice to see you -- all of you.

24 Hello, Chair Nichols and members of the Board.

25 My name is Fabiola Perez, and I'm here on behalf of the

1 concerned agriculture students at Cal Poly Pomona, to
2 express our support for the California Air Resources Board
3 Southern California Consolidation Project proposed site in
4 Pomona for the new CARB facility, with the condition that
5 no further development take place on Spadra farm.

6 I am the first in my family to attend a
7 university. And as a child I grew up working and watching
8 my parents work in strawberry fields and wine vineyards in
9 the Central Coast. It is hard work that my parents
10 endured for years. And I'm continuing my education
11 because I know how hard it is to work in the fields, and I
12 want better for myself. Cal Poly Pomona has given me the
13 opportunity to continue my education and do better for
14 myself.

15 Currently Spadra farm is used by different majors
16 and several educational disciplines such as plant science,
17 irrigation science, agriculture science, agriculture
18 education, urban agriculture, pest management, and
19 environmental biology. It is on this property that
20 students learn how to grow crops using fewer pesticide
21 applications, utilizing biological control, minimizing
22 water use for crop production, practicing new and
23 efficient technologies for locally grown vegetables, and
24 managing soil erosion and agriculture water runoff.

25 Agriculture education and research is vitally

1 important in the agriculture industry and in the world as
2 the world moves into the second part of the century, and
3 we need the meet the new needs of the world.

4 My career aspirations would be to pursue a
5 license in agriculture pest management and to work as a
6 pest control advisor to help farmers in California
7 integrate better pest management methods. My goal is to
8 help farmers better regulate how they spray their fields
9 for the protection of the field workers and the
10 environment.

11 The learn-by-doing philosophy at Cal Poly Pomona
12 has helped me gain the skills necessary to achieve those
13 goals. And a partnership with CARB would further
14 supplement developing and integrating better agricultural
15 practices.

16 As we support CARB coming to our farm, we also
17 respectfully request that no further development take
18 place on this land. Spadra farm is an extremely important
19 source to our students, our college, and the region.

20 And I want to take this opportunity to thank you
21 for being cooperative with us and being -- taking us into
22 consideration. And we really look forward to working with
23 you.

24 Thank you.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

1 Michael Woo. I should say Dean Woo.

2 MR. WOO: Thank you. Thank you very much, Madam
3 Chair, members of the Board. It is a great honor to come
4 before you today in this hearing. I am dean of the
5 College of Environmental Design, and I'm accompanied by
6 several of our other deans of other colleges at Cal Poly
7 Pomona.

8 I do not envy you your choice. You are faced
9 with two great universities with many strong attributes.
10 I don't want to dispute the figures you heard from the
11 UC Riverside speakers about pure research. I would say
12 that Cal Poly Pomona really excels at applied research.
13 The learn-by-doing statement is more than just a slogan.
14 It really reflects the involvement of our faculty and our
15 students at taking research and making a difference in the
16 real world, which I think would be a great asset to the
17 Air Resources Board.

18 I also want to be perhaps the only
19 Pomona-affiliated speaker who is going to quote Chancellor
20 Wilcox. In his remarks to you a few minutes ago, he
21 pointed out to you that it's not just science, but it's
22 going to be changing public policy which will really clean
23 the air. I couldn't agree more. As you may know, I am
24 your appointee -- I was your appointee to the Regional
25 Targets Advisory Committee set up by the Air Resources

1 Board to help figure out how to implement SB 375. And I
2 think my involvement with your committee helped to show me
3 that there are many opportunities that we could use to
4 work with Air Resources Board to work on that mission of
5 cleaning up the air.

6 Ultimately, however, this is not a question of
7 what is best for either of the two universities. The main
8 question before you is what is best for the Air Resources
9 Board, for its employees, and for the people of the State
10 of California. In view of your mission under AB 32 and SB
11 375, to reduce emissions and to reduce climate change
12 especially as it relates to land use and transportation,
13 including commuting, it seems to me the facts provided in
14 the analysis basically point to one choice. And this is
15 not just a choice for the year 2016, but it is actually a
16 choice for the future in terms of what can you do to
17 reduce vehicle miles traveled, what can you do to reduce
18 commuting and reduce the impact in terms of air quality
19 and climate change. So it seems to me that it is very
20 clear based on the evidence that Pomona should be your
21 choice.

22 And, again, as I said, this is not just for 2016.
23 As many of you know, the voters of Los Angeles County are
24 being asked this November to consider again raising the
25 sales tax to pay for expansion of transit. This is

1 another test, but a test we have passed before and a test
2 I think we will pass again, to demonstrate our commitment
3 to non-vehicle alternatives for people. And so, with the
4 expansion of the rail system and the expansion of other
5 alternatives, I think that means that Pomona could clearly
6 be the superior low emission choice for this Board.

7 Thank you.

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

9 David McElwain.

10 MR. McELWAIN: GOOD morning, Chair Nichols,
11 members of the California Air Resources Board. My name is
12 David McElwain. I'm a resident the City of La Verne, and
13 I work in the City of Pomona managing an employment
14 assistants program for low income residents.

15 (Laughter.)

16 CHAIR NICHOLS: Wait, that's not fair. Somebody
17 hit the wrong button.

18 MR. McELWAIN: I'm also a member of the board of
19 directors of the Pomona Chamber of Commerce. I'm here
20 today representing the chamber and our business community.

21 We strongly support the staff recommendation to
22 your board to approve relocating the ARB operations to the
23 beautiful city of Pomona.

24 Pomona, is part of Los Angeles County, but
25 economically, environmentally it's also part of the Inland

1 Empire. I mean, we're over the hill right over there. I
2 am a proud Cal Poly Bronco, but my two children are
3 graduates of UCR.

4 (Laughter.)

5 MR. McELWAIN: There are sound arguments from
6 both institutions, both with strong engineering and
7 research capabilities. I think, however, these
8 considerations are less significant, since I'm sure both
9 Cal Poly and UCR will happily compete for any and all
10 future research grants. After all, we all do have email.
11 May the best proposals win.

12 I'm a 100 percent jobs employment guy. I've
13 spent 25 years helping to build self-sufficiency through
14 employment. Of course Pomona, with a higher unemployment
15 rate than the averages of Los Angeles and San Bernardino
16 and Riverside counties, needs and deserves the solid jobs
17 and economic benefits that will result from consolidation
18 at the beautiful facility at Cal Poly campus. However, in
19 training hundreds of job seekers each year, I always
20 emphasize to our students that it's not enough to have an
21 outstanding resume or even to successfully describe your
22 transferable skills in a interview. The final and
23 critical step is to ask the employer for this -- for the
24 opportunity to do the job.

25 On behalf of the Pomona Chamber of Commerce, our

1 business and residents, I'm asking your board for this
2 opportunity to do the job of serving the air quality needs
3 of California in the next century.

4 Thank you. --

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

6 We next will hear from David Diaz with Bike San
7 Gabriel Valley. And then we're going to hear from some of
8 our staff.

9 Hi.

10 MR. DIAZ: Good morning. I could still say that
11 when I wrote this speech. I initially put "Good morning,"
12 but we're now into the afternoon. My name is name David
13 Diaz Avilar. I'm here to represent Bike San Gabriel
14 Valley, which represents the local bicycle coalition. I'm
15 the programs director.

16 We're working on creating a healthier, safer,
17 more enjoyable place for walking, biking, and transit
18 within the region, and we strongly support staff's
19 recommendation to locate the new facility at Cal Poly
20 Pomona and keep jobs and opportunities here in the San
21 Gabriel Valley.

22 The connectivity and access to this site is of
23 particular importance to provide employees with a high
24 quality of life; providing multiple transportation
25 options; and, as people have alluded, L.A. and the region

1 setting into a more multi-modal-type place.

2 So as someone who works with young people and
3 everyone across the region, empowering young people with
4 opportunities to become the leaders of their next
5 generation is critical. I recognize that there are issues
6 and challenges in other counties. However, there are
7 issues - social, environmental justice and equity issues -
8 that still need to be resolved here. With that being
9 said, let's continue to connect Angelinos with people,
10 places and opportunities to thrive.

11 Many thanks for your time today. I hope you guys
12 have a great St. Patrick's Day and a great weekend. Thank
13 you.

14 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Thanks for taking the
15 time to come.

16 Okay. Next we here from Jesse Rodriguez from
17 Professional Engineers in California Government.

18 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Good early afternoon, and thank
19 you all for the opportunity to provide comments.

20 I represent the Professional Engineers in
21 California Government. We represent approximately 13,000
22 engineers, land surveyors, and related professionals
23 across the state, including approximately 250 employees
24 who work at this building, and that's both rank and file
25 and supervisory and managerial.

1 We have already provided written comment
2 expressing our support for staff recommendation for the
3 Pomona site. And contrary to some of the statements made
4 by some of the folks, we do believe the City of Riverside
5 is beautiful; it's just far.

6 So, a lot of the staff comments that we've heard
7 so far from the employees themselves is that if they are
8 forced to relocate to Riverside, they will have to also
9 look for employment elsewhere. And though we support the
10 staff report, there was one thing that was not mentioned
11 that we think should have been; and that is, a provision
12 in our contract which states departments filling vacancies
13 shall offer positions to employees facing mandatory
14 geographic transfer who meet the minimum qualifications
15 for the vacancy being filled. Which is otherwise referred
16 to as Super SROA.

17 So in addition to losing staff via natural
18 attrition and retirement, they will also be given kind of
19 super surplus status for any other department or agency
20 that's filling vacancies during that period, which
21 means -- and it applies to all counties, both L.A. County
22 and all counties neighboring. Now, there are many
23 departments or other agencies that are in L.A. County and
24 that neighbor them and they will be hiring and filling
25 vacancies.

1 These folks, though they love the work they do
2 for the CARB, they live to fulfill the mission of CARB,
3 they've got to think of their families, they've got to
4 think of their own well-being, they've got to think about
5 the additional expense of \$7500 a year that it's going to
6 cost them just to travel to and from work.

7 And so, as pegged, we strongly support the Pomona
8 site and we hope you do as well.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

11 Eloy Florez.

12 Hi.

13 MR. FLOREZ: Good afternoon, Madam Chair --

14 CHAIR NICHOLS: Our photographer.

15 MR. FLOREZ: Yes.

16 Good afternoon, Madam Chair. There will be three
17 of us speaking together, so we're hoping that we will be
18 able to put -- combine our time. Is that okay?

19 CHAIR NICHOLS: That would be fine.

20 IN-USE VEHICLES PROGRAMS BRANCH CHIEF LEMIEUX:

21 Good afternoon, Chair Nichols and Board members.
22 My name's Sharon Lemieux and I'm branch chief here in El
23 Monte; and I'm also an engineering grad of Cal Poly, so I
24 am one of the 66 alumni from Cal Poly here at Haagen-Smit
25 Laboratory.

1 I should also mention, of those 66, 12 of those
2 alumni are either branch chiefs or supervisors. So Cal
3 Poly has a long history here with ARB.

4 We really would like to thank you for locating
5 the Board meeting here at El Monte. And we want to thank
6 you for the opportunity to voice our opinion on supporting
7 the staff recommendation of Pomona in person.

8 We would also like to commend our colleagues on
9 the site evaluation team, especially Deidre and Bob
10 Fletcher that was -- and also the Board members and
11 co-chairs, Barbara Riordan and also Hector De La Torre.
12 So we really appreciate your hard work on that.

13 I along with my colleagues, Matt Diener and Eloy
14 Florez, are here today, and we're representing over 259 of
15 our colleagues here in El Monte. And we thought it would
16 be nice for you to hear from Matt and Eloy, who kind of
17 represent two spectrums of points in their career, where
18 matt's a young engineer just starting his career here with
19 ARB, And Eloy is more seasoned staff here.

20 As you know, we have submitted a letter
21 supporting the staff recommendation, and we have over 259
22 signatures. And I'd just like to mention real quickly why
23 we came together, and we thought it was important to
24 submit a letter.

25 Basically the Haagen-Smit Laboratory, as you

1 know, the most important resource is our highly skilled
2 and specialized staff. And the Pomona site is the least
3 impactful to that staff.

4 Secondly, the Pomona location allows us to better
5 retain that staff and help us as ARB continue our unique
6 capabilities for motor vehicle testing to meet our
7 clean-air goals for 2030 and beyond.

8 And I'd like to just mention that when we're
9 talking about 2030, that means that we're putting programs
10 in place today. So we're doing research, we're doing
11 testing; and that's things that we have to do today to
12 plan for the future.

13 Thirdly, the Pomona location is a really great
14 location that helps us draw future staff from all of
15 Southern California communities. So that means Riverside,
16 the inland valley, San Bernardino, as well as Los Angeles.
17 So it's a very nice location.

18 So with that, I'd like to turn the talk over to
19 Matt.

20 MR. DIENER: Madam Chair, members of the Board.
21 My name is Matthew Diener, and I'm an air pollution
22 specialist in the Mobile Source Control Division of ARB
23 here in El Monte.

24 I'd like to provide my testimony today to
25 emphasize the issues that are important to junior members,

1 the staff, like myself, who are still early in their
2 careers and continue to weigh the balance of where to
3 choose to live and where to choose to work in Southern
4 California.

5 Before I arrived at ARB I was a contractor to the
6 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. I worked as a field
7 chemist on superfund sites across the west. After five
8 years of working for EPA, I sought a career change that
9 would permanently allow me to continue to engage in aiding
10 both the public and the environment. It was because of
11 ARB's close alignment with my values of working to benefit
12 the people of California and a sustainable environment as
13 well as their centralized location in Southern California
14 that I applied for the position I hold now.

15 After speaking with many of my colleagues, it is
16 clear that many of them share the same values.

17 The position I gratefully hold today is one that
18 I hope to continue to have for years to come. I, as well
19 as many other members of ARB, its management, staff, and
20 yourselves, are conscious members of a generation that
21 believe in personal responsibility and a service of the
22 greater good. The passion and dedication of the staff
23 here for the programs and goals of the agency runs very
24 deep in our commitment to the environment and the people
25 of California.

1 The culture, dedication, professionalism, and
2 mentorship of our managing staff also reinforces the sense
3 of pride in the work that we do.

4 Many of us have grown up in the region. We're
5 instilled with the belief that living and working in
6 Southern California simply meant living where you want to
7 and working where you have to. The new reality is that we
8 should work where we can collaborate and have the greatest
9 impact for the common good and live where we leave the
10 smallest footprint in its endeavor.

11 The truth is that changing traffic patterns and
12 increased congestion now make long-distance commuting, at
13 the very -- you know, challenging at the very least, but
14 also impractical and unsustainable. It's unfortunate that
15 the possibility of a pending move to the Inland Empire has
16 caused me as well many other colleagues to reconsider if
17 our current positions should remain our lifelong career.

18 Conversely, the relocation of ARB's facility to
19 Pomona would allow for many of our current and future
20 staff members to retain with this agency.

21 The majority of the staff also believe that
22 relocating to Cal Poly Pomona would allow ARB to continue
23 to draw from the diverse and high quality applicant pool
24 not only from Los Angeles County but from Orange County
25 and the Inland Empire. It is critical that we not

1 underestimate the value of remaining strategically located
2 to provide the people of California with the retention of
3 ARB's already high-quality staff that are dedicated to its
4 cause, a cause that they believe in and one which the view
5 is much greater than themselves.

6 I would now like to introduce my co-worker and
7 peer, Eloy Florez, to discuss the impacts the relocation
8 of our facility could have on vested employees and their
9 families.

10 Thank you.

11 MR. FLOREZ: Madam Chair, members of the Board.
12 My name's Eloy Florez - also with a Z. I'm an air
13 pollution specialist with the Air Pollu -- with the Mobile
14 Source Control Division here at the Air Resources Board.

15 A little over eight years ago I was employed as a
16 project manager. The position paid well, but came with a
17 lengthy commute. I was a new father. But for the better
18 part my son's first year I was never home early enough to
19 spend time with him as we was awake -- when he was awake.
20 I quickly came to realize that no amount of money I was
21 earning could make up for what I was missing.

22 I was attracted to ARB because my father was a
23 mechanic. I grew up turning wrenches, as they say, and we
24 lived in a small town. So it was a big deal when my dad's
25 shop was one of the first repair businesses to have the

1 new smog machine. I can remember distinctively being at
2 my father's shop as he raised his voice in frustration
3 after a smog test and he would say, (Spoke in Spanish) -
4 "This one barely failed."

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. FLOREZ: And then he would -- then he would
7 look up with his scowl and point to heavy trucks --
8 heavy-duty trucks smoking across a highway, (Spoke in
9 Spanish) - "Why aren't they doing anything about that?"

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. FLOREZ: Little did I know those prophetic
12 words would resonate and by 2008 find me working on
13 controlling diesel emissions from heavy-duty vehicles.

14 Anyone that has been to our lab and offices has
15 seen the decades of wear. If you look around -- I'm
16 sorry. If you look around the world, there are new
17 facilities operated by manufacturers, agencies, and
18 governments alike. But none have achieved what we have
19 here at the Haagen-Smit Lab. From off-road to
20 zero-emission vehicles, truck and bus to fuels, on-board
21 diagnostics to greenhouse gas reduction, this office has
22 not stopped working. So you quickly realize ARB's
23 reputation as a leader does not come from machines or
24 fancy offices; it comes from the staff who work hard. The
25 people are here because they are dedicated to the mission

1 of ARB.

2 Like all of us here at ARB, I have great pride in
3 being able to work on issues that have positive impacts on
4 families and our community. We are here because we seek
5 purpose and to be a part of something bigger than us. But
6 we also choose to work here because it allows us a balance
7 to be professionals and to be good parents and serve the
8 communities we live in. We are intertwined in the fabric
9 that is our community.

10 I have three kids now, a great home, and a
11 wonderful wife. But yet again, while I truly enjoy my job
12 and the people that I work with, I can't help but to think
13 and wonder will I be forced to decide again: Do I want a
14 career with a commute or moments with my family?

15 I now turn it over to Ms. Lemieux for final
16 comments.

17 Thank you so much.

18 IN-USE VEHICLES PROGRAMS BRANCH CHIEF LEMIEUX:
19 Okay. Thank you so much.

20 So we'd just like to close with how excited we
21 all are about the new facility. But the facility is more
22 than just equipment and building, as you've heard; it is
23 the skills and the collective knowledge of the people who
24 dedicate their lives to the service of the people of
25 California. We feel that it's important to select a

1 location that will result in the continuity of current
2 capabilities, while still providing an environment for
3 innovation and technical excellence; and that location is
4 Pomona.

5 So we would ask that the Board confirm the
6 staff's recommendation of the Pomona location.

7 However, we would also like to ask, if the
8 decision is to set aside the staff's recommendation, we
9 ask that the Board delay a final decision until a full
10 analysis of staff impact and mitigation measures can be
11 evaluated to eliminate serious impacts, not only on ARB
12 employees, but also on the program, services, and goals of
13 the Air Resources Board.

14 So, again, I'd like to thank you. And we
15 appreciate the opportunity to address the Board today.
16 Thank you very much.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you so much. It was a
18 excellent presentation.

19 I personally am hoping that some day in a new
20 laboratory with an auditorium there will be HVAC system
21 that works.

22 (Laughter.)

23 CHAIR NICHOLS: If you see me up here looking
24 like I'm disapproving because my arms are folded, it's
25 because I'm freezing.

1 (Laughter.)

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: And there doesn't seem to be any
3 alternative other than to freeze or to broil everybody.
4 So we apologize to all of you, but now you know something
5 about what we live with.

6 (Applause.)

7 (Laughter.)

8 (Thereupon Board Member De La Torre took
9 his coat off and put it on Chair Nichols.)

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Ah, what a gentleman.
11 That earns you I think an extra vote at least.
12 (Laughter.)

13 CHAIR NICHOLS: Oh, my goodness.

14 All right. So we've got a couple more witnesses
15 to hear from and then we will wrap up this phase.

16 Okay. Ms. Sommerville.

17 MS. SOMMERVILLE: Good afternoon. I'm Amber
18 Sommerville. I'm director of Market and Communications
19 for the San Gabriel Valley Economic partnership. We're a
20 regional business organization, and we're here to express
21 our support for Cal Poly Pomona as the new site for the
22 Resource Board testing and research facility.

23 Many of the reasons that we have are reasons that
24 you've heard previously today, but just in interest of
25 reviewing those.

1 Cal Poly we believe is a better location because
2 of the impact on employees who currently reside in and
3 around Los Angeles and El Monte offices. If a new
4 facility were built in Pomona, most CARB employees would
5 have to relocate their families, more than 400 employees.

6 We also believe that Cal Poly Pomona is much
7 better situated, with easy access to the I-10, the 57, 60
8 and 71 freeways, and the Ontario Airport.

9 Officials flying from Sacramento and Ontario
10 would find it much more convenient to visit the new
11 facility if it were located in Pomona.

12 Air quality officials and key trucking industry
13 leaders from across Southern California, especially
14 Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, and San Bernardino counties,
15 would find it much more convenient to reach a CARB
16 facility in Pomona than in Riverside.

17 And it also would be a ten-minute drive from the
18 South Coast Air Quality Management District in Diamond
19 Bar.

20 Above all, we believe that Cal Poly Pomona is a
21 premier research institution in the state, that there's
22 extraordinary potential for scientific collaboration with
23 the students and the faculty at Cal Poly Pomona, and we
24 desperately are interested in ways that college graduates
25 can be prepared to enter our local high tech industry in

1 the San Gabriel Valley.

2 So we strongly urge you to consider Pomona as the
3 location for the research facility.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

6 Ms. Pinedo.

7 MS. PINEDO: Good afternoon, Madam Chair. I've
8 been practicing my "Good morning" up until now.

9 But good morning to you and to the members of the
10 Board and the members of the audience. My name is Adriana
11 Pinedo, and I am here to speak to you in support of moving
12 the CARB location over to Cal Poly Pomona. As a resident,
13 as someone that works with community members, as someone
14 that works in a public health agency, I saw that the staff
15 report spoke to the 7 million people around the Cal Poly
16 site, 80 percent of those being stakeholders, and I'm here
17 to speak as one of those 7 million, as one of that 80
18 percent of stakeholders in the community.

19 I'm a policy coordinator by trade, but I've been
20 an organizer in Pomona since I was in high school, since I
21 was a member of the Pomona Unified School District. I
22 later graduated from PUSD and then graduated from Cal Poly
23 back in 2011.

24 I know we keep talking about the orange smell in
25 Riverside. We also have orange fields in Pomona.

1 (Laughter.)

2 MS. PINEDO: They're trickled with cows. You
3 will get used to them and you will love them as much as we
4 do.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MS. PINEDO: And now I'm a member of HIP, Healthy
7 in Pomona, the city's initiative to look at public health
8 in our community and how we can work with city officials,
9 public agencies, and residents more importantly, on
10 improving our quality of life overall. And I'm happy to
11 say I was also part of an effort with Clean Air Pomona to
12 bring smoke-free parks and recreational areas, from
13 students and by community, to our city as of April 2nd of
14 2015. And hopefully we can continue to collaborate. And
15 that's really what I want to talk about today.

16 We serve 47,000 learners in PUSD, both adult
17 learners and K through 12 learners, and they're all
18 looking for a beacon of hope - just as I'm sure that CARB
19 is - a beacon of hope as we look into sustainability and
20 how to maintain the environment as it is now.

21 We're also looking for a beacon of hope in
22 Pomona, for our students and for our families that want to
23 stay in the SGV but a lot of times have to relocate, not
24 because they want to, but because they have to.

25 Last October of 2015, PUSD and Cal Poly formed

1 the Transformation Program, which was recognized by the
2 White House for its efforts to create a pipeline for PUSD
3 students and to two- and four-year institutions. And CARB
4 Pomona would not only be that beacon, but it would really
5 help establish our families and keep them in the SGV.

6 As we look for long-term advantages of relocating
7 to Pomona, I urge you to also consider the students in
8 Pomona and our neighboring areas that are ready to become
9 the new generation of environmental sustainability
10 researchers, professionals, and farmers. And may you
11 consider coming to us, and may we all work together. I'm
12 sure after this decision process I would love to see us
13 all as friends, especially with Riverside.

14 Thank you. Please come to Pomona and "Go,
15 Broncos!"

16 (Laughter.)

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

18 Amy Wong. You are the final witness, unless
19 there's somebody I missed.

20 MS. WONG: Hi. Good afternoon. I'm Amy Wong. I
21 work at Day One and Bike SGV, working with Adriana on the
22 Clean Air Pomona campaign. And I personally am an El
23 Monte resident who's very passionate about the
24 intersectionality of public health and environmental
25 justice. And so I'm here to support moving the CARB

1 location to Pomona, to invest in our San Gabriel Valley
2 region.

3 So in our region we have a lot of communities of
4 color who do suffer from asthma, diabetes, and other
5 health-related issues in relation to air quality. So I
6 urge you to again be reminded of mission -- your own
7 mission, to promote and protect public health, welfare,
8 and ecological resources through the reduction of air
9 pollutants, and to again just support the Pomona location.
10 Pomona is the largest city in the San Gabriel Valley, and
11 politically this would be very important to again retain
12 our identity in the San Gabriel Valley.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

15 Thanks to all.

16 We're now going to recess. It's 12:15 or 17 or
17 close to. Let's get back together at 12:30 please and
18 we'll resume this conversation.

19 (Off record: 12:18 PM)

20 (Thereupon a recess was taken.)

21 (On record: 12:36 PM)

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. The Board is back in
23 session. And this is where we get to do our work.

24 So I think it's time for Board member questions
25 and comments. Sometimes we try to get people to ask

1 questions and then make their comments in a separate
2 round. This time I think I'd rather just hear from the
3 members sort of individually on what their concerns and
4 questions are, and then we'll see where we are after that
5 happens.

6 So since I oftentimes ignore the people on my
7 right, I am going to start -- I've been accused of that,
8 and it's fair actually.

9 However, Mr. De La Torre is not back. So in that
10 case I am going to call on Ms. Takvorian, if you are
11 ready.

12 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. Thank you very
13 much. I was just talking with some folks and said that,
14 you know, as the newest -- one of the two newer Board
15 members -- newest Board members, I think I'll just vote
16 for San Diego since that's where I'm from.

17 (Laughter.)

18 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: This situation is far
19 more complex than I anticipated it to be. But I would
20 like to thank the staff and the Board members who have
21 worked really hard on this issue. It's clearly complex.
22 And thanks to everyone who's here today and everyone who's
23 communicated with ARB and have been part of this process.
24 There's great information, important perspectives.

25 It's clearly an important issue that signifies

1 the future of the agency and, more importantly, our shared
2 State goal of clean air. It's so much more than a
3 decision about a facility or an office building; that's
4 very, very clear.

5 I have to say that the sites are obviously quite
6 comparable on many levels and I think that that's very
7 clear.

8 Staff satisfaction is critically important. As a
9 nonprofit director, it's something I spent a whole -- I
10 spend a whole lot of time on every day. And we don't have
11 the resources in nonprofits to provide the kinds of
12 incentives and benefits to our staff that others might
13 have, so we have to be very creative about it, so we think
14 about it a lot.

15 And so I guess I want to say that it's
16 something -- I want to say to staff, I really appreciate
17 the work that you've done. I really appreciate the
18 organizing that you've done as an organizer. And that is
19 probably the most difficult aspect of this, because I am
20 really working hard to kind of balance that with what's
21 the right decision for the future of the State of
22 California and the people here.

23 And I certainly think that proximity is a
24 critical issue; but I don't think it can be a driving
25 issue because, as others have said, this really is a

1 decades-long decision. It's a 50-year decision minimally.
2 And that's the perspective that I think we have to have.

3 So I do think we need to dig in more to what
4 turnover looks like, what the -- what the projection will
5 be for staff going forward for the next 20 years at a
6 minimum, because, you know, if we used our economist's
7 perspective about it, 50 percent of staff may be gone in a
8 few years; I'm hearing strongly from other members that
9 that's not true, that CARB staff have longer rates of
10 retention. So we need to hear more about that.

11 I think that both Cal Poly and UCR provide great
12 opportunities for partnership. But I have to say that UCR
13 I think really does provide the kinds of partnerships that
14 are more on point and more relevant given the historical
15 relationship, the top transportation and health research
16 facilities, the medical school, they've been on the
17 cutting edge of quality -- air quality research. So those
18 things are compelling me. And if I'm not hearing some of
19 those same kinds of things from Cal Poly, I would be open
20 to hearing more about that, but that's not my
21 understanding.

22 I also think that the Riverside site provides
23 better opportunities for advancing transportation programs
24 and environmental justice. It's not lost on any of us
25 that the investment in the Riverside community and the UCR

1 partnerships will I think better enhance CARB's programs
2 through innovation, inclusion, and economic opportunities
3 for students that are often struggling with high levels of
4 pollution and high levels of poverty.

5 Equity and fairness have been discussed here. An
6 investment in disadvantaged communities I think is
7 critical. And I think that obviously Pomona may be a
8 better site today, but will it be a better site in 20
9 years, in 30 years, in 40 years? Well, it might continue
10 to be if we don't invest in the places that are -- need
11 that investment now. And I think that's how some of our
12 sites around the State have become those premiere sites,
13 is because the State, our public agencies have taken that
14 initiative. So I'm compelled by that.

15 And I also think that for CARB to be located in
16 one of the most transportation-challenged and
17 emissions-impacted communities in the State would actually
18 provide incentives, would provide motivation. And I just
19 can't imagine that an agency like -- if an agency like
20 CARB was there, I just think they'll be benefits for all
21 of us to think about how do we move ourselves around in a
22 more sustainable manner. And I think we all need those
23 lessons.

24 So I would say though that I support the staff,
25 the CARB staff recommendation that there should be fuller

1 analysis of what the impacts are to staff. I think
2 there's a variety of other questions that I would have
3 about the site at Pomona I'm hearing in terms of the
4 cleanup costs, what are those? I would like to look at
5 what the economic impacts of that might be. And I would
6 also be interested in looking at transportation
7 alternatives for staff, very specifically, as so what
8 those incentives could be, what the benefits could be, and
9 that those need to be laid out.

10 I have other questions, but I'm sure that other
11 Board members will add to those. But those are my initial
12 ones.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

15 Hector, we started without you. You were making
16 your way back into the room. So I'm going to turn it back
17 to you before we just move on down the line.

18 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you.

19 CHAIR NICHOLS: We're just doing questions and
20 comments together.

21 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Okay. Thank you,
22 Chair.

23 I was on the subcommittee with Barbara for this,
24 and we received both presentations on the first proposals
25 that each of the schools had way back in the fall. And

1 then when we asked both schools to upgrade their
2 proposals, both did; and I think we got some very good
3 second proposals from both schools. In the case of
4 Pomona, it was more of a clarification. But we got two
5 good -- very good proposals.

6 I agree with Diane, that they are very comparable
7 in a vacuum. In terms of it's farmland, you're not going
8 to have to knock down a whole bunch of stuff or any stuff.
9 You're going to -- the sites themselves are, you know,
10 flat, et cetera, et cetera. So that part of it isn't much
11 different. But I do want to share my thoughts from there
12 forward.

13 There -- as was mentioned, staff identified a
14 hundred attributes; and on most of those they were very
15 comparable. And so it does come down to just a handful of
16 things. We had four specialized contractors who worked on
17 this processing and outside agencies, like DGS, who were a
18 key part of the team in terms of analyzing the proposals.
19 So in terms of input, this was not -- someone alluded to
20 kind of an inside-staff process. It wasn't at all. The
21 team was specialized consultants and DGS and others. It
22 was not a CARB inside-staff process at all.

23 I think -- the question of time frame has come up
24 over and over again. Are we just talking about employees
25 today and who's here today versus 20, 30, 40 years? Both

1 places -- I live in what I consider central L.A. County.
2 To me, this is far.

3 (Laughter.)

4 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: And to go even further
5 east to Pomona is far. And then Riverside obviously is
6 further out than that. So none of these proposals to me,
7 if I was an employee, would I be happy with. So then
8 you're talking about, you know, what is the least distance
9 at the end of day for all of that. And I'm sure we have
10 employees who live -- in fact, I know live in places like
11 Long Beach and have to come here and will have to go to
12 Pomona or Riverside or move. So I think that is very
13 important in terms of your catchment area for employees
14 who want to come and work for CARB.

15 That's going to be the case five years from now,
16 it's going to be the case 30 years from now, that you have
17 a bigger catchment area the closer in you are to the big
18 population center, which is Los Angeles County.

19 In terms of the relocation costs, there was some,
20 you know, questioning of economic models, et cetera. I
21 think we can all agree it's not going to be zero, and we
22 know that we have a contract with our employees that
23 requires us to do relocation costs for them outside of a
24 certain radius. So whether the number is 1 or 7 or 3-1/2,
25 there is going to be a cost to going further out. That's

1 a given. And so, you know, you can question what that
2 number is. None of us really know. But staff has done I
3 think a very good job of trying to put it within the
4 framework, and I think that's very important in terms of
5 the cost estimates.

6 The environmental mitigation costs were
7 questioned for Pomona. Well, it's -- again, both are
8 farmland. It's not like there's an industrial site on one
9 and farmland on the other. They're both farmland. So
10 whatever -- odds are, that whatever is on one is on the
11 other, pesticides -- you know, whatever normally happens
12 on farms, that's what you're going to have to be
13 mitigating for.

14 The knowledge base and intellectual property
15 issues. I think the knowledge base -- they're both
16 universities. That was our number one goal when we
17 started this process. I remember several years ago when
18 we approached UCLA and UC Irvine, the other schools that
19 were mentioned in the report, that was our number one
20 goal, was to be associated with a university. Not because
21 we have to, because clearly here we are not. We're in an
22 industrial park in El Monte.

23 But we wanted to, in order to get some human
24 resource possibilities and some other resource
25 possibilities just in terms of the day-to-day functioning,

1 to be able to access professors, et cetera, that could
2 supplement what we do. Not because we're going to be
3 locked in with that university for research and other
4 things that we're going to do, because we farm that out
5 today. As was mentioned by UCR, they get 15 percent of
6 their funding for their research from us. That's not
7 going to change. It's going to be based on the merit of
8 the skillful people that they have there.

9 Pomona, I don't know what amount of work we do
10 with them, but I'm sure we do something, and that will
11 continue, as it will with Berkeley and Davis and any
12 number of other wonderful institutions that we have in
13 California.

14 That was not the driving reason -- the research
15 part of it was not the driving reason. It was having
16 access to the university community and being able to have
17 interns and students coming and -- coming into the flow of
18 CARB and hopefully staying around and being employees long
19 term like we heard earlier.

20 I'll tell a brief story. The last time I was
21 here, there was a student -- or an employee that I didn't
22 remember. He came up and said hi. And I had spoken at an
23 environmental law class at USC a few years back, and he
24 came up to me and he said -- because I talked about CARB,
25 he said that he wanted to do something in the environment

1 and he was an engineering student. And he didn't know
2 what CARB did until I went and spoke at this class. And
3 he's now an employee, and he thanks me for talking about
4 CARB in this class at USC. USC of all places.

5 (Laughter.)

6 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: If they were in the
7 bidding, then I would be a little more less discreet, I
8 think

9 (Laughter.)

10 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: But -- that's a joke.

11 (Laughter.)

12 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So it is very
13 important to get young students, undergraduates, graduate
14 students, into our pipeline to have those skilled people
15 that will help drive this agency forward; and that's a
16 20-, 30-, 40-year decision.

17 So being close to a university where you can get
18 those students that are undergrads preferably, or graduate
19 students, is a wonderful thing. And that's part of the
20 decision I think that's very important, and equal at both
21 places.

22 There was mention of this AQMD \$1,000,000
23 endowment at UCR. Well, both Pomona and Riverside are in
24 the South Coast Air Quality Management District. I find
25 it hard to believe that if the decision was to go with

1 Pomona, that the South Coast Air Quality Management
2 District would not shift that dollar amount over to Pomona
3 to augment what we do. It would make no sense for them to
4 keep the money -- or not spend the money because we didn't
5 choose Riverside.

6 So that was not a compelling argument to me.

7 Some of the other points that were made were
8 about people moving and choosing to move for jobs and
9 making that individual decision of what was best for their
10 family and that they moved and that they have had a
11 wonderful time.

12 That's different than this situation. This
13 situation is not an individual move. This is a wholesale
14 move of hundreds of people potentially, impacting hundreds
15 of people's lives, without them making a conscious
16 decision to take that move. That's the difference between
17 the situations that -- the anecdotes that were described
18 earlier and what we face here.

19 There is a great history at UCR, a great
20 commitment to what we do. That -- none of that goes away.
21 That continues. As I said earlier, the contracts that we
22 do with UCR, as we do with the other UCs and other schools
23 around California, those will continue. So that's a wash.
24 Being physically located next to it or not is not going to
25 make a difference.

1 What we have here before us as a board is a
2 binary decision. This is unlike most of our decisions.
3 Most of our decisions on regulatory process or other
4 actions that we take are very complex, and there's give
5 and take, and we make adjustments. Sometimes we don't
6 like some component of something. This Board regularly
7 edits staff's work at this point. The core is always the
8 same, but we tweak things. That's what we do. That's why
9 we're here. But it's never a binary decision. These
10 are com -- those are usually complicated decisions where
11 we make adjustments and then we move ahead or not. But
12 most of the time we do.

13 This case it is one or the other. There is no
14 tweaking to be done. We're not going to send part of the
15 staff out to Riverside and keep part in Pomona. So that
16 is where this is different. And to me, it comes down to a
17 staff report. And, again, I was on the subcommittee. And
18 I said this to Chair Nichols, I was ready to support
19 whatever result the staff came up with, whether I liked it
20 or not. And so when they came out with this result, I was
21 pleasantly surprised because I didn't know. I wasn't sure
22 that this is what they were going to recommend.

23 We created a process. This Board created a
24 process. The legislature gave us money to do this
25 process. We did this process. We have a recommendation

1 based on this process with a hundred attributes,
2 specialized staff, including other agencies, and we have a
3 recommendation before us. And now we're going to say, you
4 know, that process that we put all of that effort into, it
5 didn't yield the result we wanted so we're going to change
6 it. And I have a problem with that.

7 I've been on other boards, I've been in the
8 legislature, where there are processes like this. If
9 you're going to create something to bring back a
10 recommendation, then it's your obligation to follow
11 through on that recommendation. There was input along the
12 way. And so I feel very strongly that we need to support
13 the staff recommendation.

14 And I'll close with this. We, the Board, are
15 management. We are the employers in this case of 400
16 staff. 400 staff who -- of which 85 percent have told us
17 to support the staff recommendation. They've given us
18 their view.

19 In addition to the air conditioning, maybe we can
20 work at that for the next place.

21 (Laughter.)

22 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So we are the
23 employers, we are management, we have a recommendation
24 from a process that we created, and we have 85 percent of
25 our employees telling us what their preference is, which

1 is to follow that recommendation.

2 Again, had staff recommended the other way and
3 the employees expressed their opposition, I would have a
4 really hard time but I would still stick with what we
5 committed to. In this case, we have a staff
6 recommendation and we have 85 percent of our employees who
7 want this, 85 percent of our employees who are going to be
8 here for five, 10, 15, 20 years. That young man that I
9 saw from USC, he's going to be here in 20 years probably.
10 He loves this place.

11 So to me, that is the core of the question here.
12 The rest of it -- again, we can -- we don't need to be
13 physically located there. We don't -- there are wonderful
14 amenities in other places, et cetera. You could quibble
15 about all of that. But the core thing here is a process
16 yielded a result, a process we created, and our employees
17 are absolutely supportive of it. It's pretty, to me,
18 clear at its core of where we need to go.

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

21 Mr. Eisenhut.

22 Questions also are welcome at this -- if you have
23 questions of staff, I think we'll just ask them to kind of
24 make some notes and respond at the end.

25 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Thank you, Chairman

1 Nichols.

2 Hector used the term binary. I will point out
3 that I feel a little bit like Bachelor Ben.

4 (Laughter.)

5 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: I have two very quality
6 choices to make.

7 (Laughter.)

8 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: And I need -- we need to
9 make a choice.

10 We have as a group studied and critiqued and
11 asked questions about staff report. We've listened over
12 the past period of time to advocates. We -- I have -- I'm
13 on the short part of this list, but we will listen to our
14 comments from colleagues before the final decision is
15 reached. And so I think it's a very full and transparent
16 process. And as Hector outlined, it's a process that
17 started some time ago and I believe is well vetted.

18 We -- there may be questions -- there will be
19 questions, our questions that accrue as part of this
20 discussion, and it will be a decision of the group as to
21 whether we need those questions answered before we reach a
22 final decision or not. I don't want to presuppose that at
23 the moment.

24 On a personal level, I feel -- as someone from
25 and familiar with the San Joaquin valley, I feel a

1 relationship, a kinship to Riverside. We are I think
2 uniformly areas that are underappreciated and sometimes
3 forgotten. And I want to acknowledge that about the -- to
4 the Riverside folks. But we still -- so I just wanted to
5 say that on a personal level.

6 I'm not going to go down the list of things that
7 I think are -- that have and will be enumerated, those
8 things that I think are basically outlined and are, for
9 me, not -- I'll go to the tie breaker. That was -- that
10 was, for me, as I went down the list of very, very similar
11 issues, similar results. And with the exception of one,
12 I'm not prepared to choose one institution -- one learning
13 institution over another. That -- that is a direction I
14 don't think I have to go and I'm not prepared to go.

15 For me, the pivotal event -- this is, after all,
16 a lab. Probably 50 or so -- 50 or more of the employees
17 on a daily basis are engaged in outside-the-facility work.
18 That involves going to freight centers, ports, railyards,
19 freeway intersections, sampling, testing. I think very
20 simply -- and I'd be interested, if we do do additional
21 research, on how much time is spent by staff, not so much
22 in their personal relocation but in their daily
23 enterprise, how much time is spent by staff and what the
24 impact would be of a relocation to Riverside, a further
25 distance from those freight centers and the sampling

1 centers, how it would impact our use. So my pivotal
2 choice, my tie breaker is what I see as an efficient use
3 of our resources at that lab. And so for that very simple
4 and uncomplicated reason, I am inclined to support the
5 staff recommendation.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes

7 VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

8 Well, I really feel that Board Member Takvorian
9 really summed up comments from me as well. And so I'm not
10 going to go through the same, but I really appreciated
11 your summary, so thank you very much for that.

12 For me, I also was involved in this from the very
13 beginning and, with Mary's vision, had the opportunity to
14 visit several sites. And I do feel a bit like I'm
15 choosing between two chil -- my two children which one
16 would best be suited to go for an opportunity. So like my
17 fellow Board members, this is not a cavalier vote for me.

18 But today what I would really like to encourage
19 is I would like to see some more data. And, Chair
20 Nichols, I would really support the fact of firming up
21 some data. And I appreciate Member De La Torre's comment
22 on the process, because I do trust process. But I have
23 not seen, and don't really understand within the staff
24 report, how we analyzed and measured a couple of the key
25 goals that we set forward on slide 7. So really how did

1 we measure a world-class facility and becoming a national
2 and international center; and looking at these locations,
3 how did we line those up? It seems that the report was a
4 little bit light certainly from today. I'd be interested
5 in going over some of the analysis and see how that
6 measured up.

7 I also am interested in firming up some of the
8 data. It does here from our testimony today that some of
9 the data isn't clear, and I would like to see that. So I
10 do want to honor the process. I would like firming up on
11 the data.

12 I would like to thank our own ARB staff, both
13 from those that have tackled this project and also El
14 Monte staff. It's done a great job and I -- I really want
15 to recognize them.

16 I think for me, first and foremost, I want to see
17 this facility built. And I'd like to see it built within
18 the time frame that we have set forth, and I often
19 facetiously say "and while I'm on solid foods," but --

20 (Laughter.)

21 VICE CHAIR BERG: -- I think that keeping the
22 goal in front of us, and really being able to determine
23 how to get this done, and understanding the nuances that
24 this isn't going to be an easy move whichever site that we
25 select, and making that decision and then moving forward.

1 So thank you.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: I would just interject here that
3 answers to some of these questions may either be available
4 here or within the record of what's behind this very short
5 staff presentation, because this -- the presentation that
6 we had this morning, the slides, represent very summary
7 information based on hundreds of pages of documents. So
8 Board members who want to get into questions about how
9 things were analyzed or what was taken into consideration,
10 that information is available now.

11 Dr. Balmes.

12 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Chair Nichols.

13 So first, in terms of transparency, I'm a
14 professor at two UC campuses, UCSF at the Medical School
15 and UC Berkeley at the School of Public Health. That
16 said, my wife teaches at San Francisco State. So I
17 support both UC and CSU.

18 (Laughter.)

19 CHAIR NICHOLS: And like to see the governor and
20 the legislature give more money to both.

21 (Laughter.)

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Hear! Hear!

23 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I just say I think it's
24 actually -- to the legislators here, it's incredibly
25 shortsighted to not be investing -- no, really --

1 (Laughter.)

2 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: -- really. We're talking
3 about the future, we're talking about 50 years. What --
4 part of what makes this state great is the investment in
5 public education at the higher education level. And, you
6 know, I think it's incumbent upon our current leadership
7 in Sacramento to do more for CSU and UCs.

8 After I got that off my chest --

9 (Laughter.)

10 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: -- let me just tell you, I
11 think this is an incredibly tough decision. And, to me,
12 I'm balancing research opportunities versus this respect
13 for the staff. And I'll start with the staff.

14 You know, part of the reason I love being a Board
15 member of this agency is that we have an incredible staff,
16 that is dedicated, works hard for the people of
17 California. And so when they -- when we have a process
18 that the staff has followed through with and when we have
19 an 85 percent staff support of that process
20 recommendation, I respect that. But -- and I actually
21 would say that the -- that the data that staff put
22 together in terms of vehicle miles traveled is a good
23 example of, you know, what we do here. We're a
24 data-driven agency; you know, we need the data from the
25 lab.

1 That said, I also do air pollution research and
2 I've done it for a long time. And, you know, the first
3 book on atmospheric chemistry that I read was by Jim
4 Pitts. I don't think the UC Riverside folks exaggerated
5 the importance of the work that's been done here with
6 regard to atmospheric chemistry. And a lot of what we do
7 at CARB was made possible by the research -- the basic
8 research that's been done at Riverside.

9 And the synergism of being co-located is
10 important. I started out my career with the UC - was at
11 UCSF, I'm still there - and I have a laboratory, the human
12 exposure laboratory where we expose, not animals, but
13 people to air pollution in a chamber. But I can only
14 study acute effects. I obviously can't make people sick.

15 (Laughter.)

16 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I got lured over to the
17 School of Public Health at Berkeley to be able to study
18 chronic effects of air pollution with colleagues who do
19 epidemiology population-based research. And then through
20 my -- you know, when I put out my shingle as the pulmonary
21 physician who is interested in chronic effects of air
22 pollution, I started working with atmospheric chemists at
23 UC Berkeley. And not to say anything disparaging about UC
24 Riverside, but we have some pretty good atmospheric
25 chemists at Berkeley as well. And I work with

1 environmental engineers, which Riverside also has.

2 So -- and my research has flourished because of
3 that synergism of being co-located with multiple
4 disciplines where -- you know, at UCSF there aren't that
5 many folks that are actually that interested in air
6 pollution health effects research. So I don't think we
7 can minimize the synergism that can come from being
8 co-located.

9 And, again, I teach master's students at UC
10 Berkeley and I greatly appreciate what Cal Poly does with
11 regard to their master's students, but I do think having
12 doctoral students does enrich a research program, another
13 thing that UC Riverside has.

14 And I guess I would stop -- or try to conclude by
15 bringing up something that Vice Chair Berg mentioned, the
16 project goals on slide 7. I think that's where we have to
17 start: A world-class facility to support motor vehicle
18 emission standards development, implementation, and
19 enforcement; national and international center for air
20 pollution and climate change research. So it's a tough
21 decision. I have an open mind. I'm trying to weigh the
22 staff, the great respect I have for the staff, and wanting
23 to keep them happy so they continue to do good work; with
24 my great respect for what's already a national and
25 international center for air pollution and climate change

1 research at UC Riverside.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

3 Start down at the other end with Supervisor
4 Gioia, who does not live in the Southern California area.

5 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I do not. I'm actually
6 coming from the Bay Area. And having attended UC Berkeley
7 for seven years, I have a way out of this. I could think
8 of a couple of good locations in Bay Area that will cause
9 us to get out of this dispute between Pomona and
10 Riverside.

11 (Laughter.)

12 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: How's that?

13 Let me just start by saying I think that the
14 residents of Pomona and Riverside can be very proud that
15 they have representatives, political representatives,
16 business representatives, community representatives, and
17 educational representatives, who are passionate and
18 knowledgeable about advocating for their community. And
19 I'm very impressed with that. And I think that's, to me,
20 just a positive reflection on the leadership in both of
21 these communities. So I think both communities can be
22 proud of all of you who came today to advocate for either
23 Pomona or Riverside.

24 So for me, and I've -- and I think there's been
25 some request for good information here. And I know we're

1 probably not going to be making a final decision here
2 today. But I want to say, I mean, this is a really
3 difficult decision, because we're trying to balance
4 short-term needs and issues with medium to long term, and
5 they often cut different ways. I think convenience and
6 proximity for employees means -- is a factor. Proximity
7 for facilities and stakeholders, that's a factor.
8 Opportunities for sort of synergies for research, and the
9 example that has been given clearly by several is the
10 opportunities with UC Riverside is also significant. The
11 slide that was depicted indicating really what our goals
12 are, which is, you know, a world-class research institute.
13 All of these are very significant.

14 And I think ultimately whichever lo -- both of
15 these are good locations. But, you know, we're tasked
16 with coming up with the best. And I do think that the
17 statement we make of where to locate is significant,
18 because, you know, we do also want to show this agency's
19 commitment to communities that have been impacted by air
20 quality issues. So, I mean, to me, that's a factor.
21 There's both symbolism here as well. And, you know, that
22 cuts in one direction as well.

23 So I think there's some strong arguments for
24 both. And I'm going into this still with an open mind and
25 looking at the materials, the letter -- letters that have

1 been provided.

2 But those from Riverside make some, I thought,
3 very compelling arguments in favor of Riverside. The
4 listings of Pomona and the employees also are compelling.
5 So I think our task is to review all of this information,
6 get some more information back from the questions, and
7 ultimately make a final decision.

8 But the -- and the final decision may rest on
9 whether we're going to sort of look at some of the
10 long-term implications more than the shorter-term
11 implications. So we will be evaluating that.

12 And thank you all for really your heartfelt and
13 strong advocacy for both these sites.

14 CHAIR NICHOLS: Senator Florez.

15 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you.

16 It's been a long hearing, but I -- you know, we
17 heard proponents for and against. But I would like to
18 take some time, Madam Chair, if I could. We have a
19 wonderful panel sitting right in front of us who actually
20 wrote this report. And I think I would like to actually,
21 with your forbearance, ask about 10 to 12 questions, will
22 help me tend to make my mind up definitely, and kind of
23 get to the conclusion whether we're ready to vote on this
24 or not, if that's okay with the Chair.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Absolutely.

1 Could I just ask though that if you put the
2 questions out, we could sort of group the questions
3 together and then have them answer all of them; is that
4 all right?

5 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: I will -- I think we've
6 got -- you guys can jump in I think in terms of who can
7 answer, it would be great. I think the Chair did mention
8 there are stuff behind the recommendations. I want to
9 talk a little about the behind stuff, if that's okay.
10 That really helps me.

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: Sure.

12 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: My first question would be
13 anyone who wrote the report who is responsible: You know,
14 how do you define Southern California?

15 (Laughter.)

16 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: It is kind of the major
17 premise. It says it's the Southern California
18 Consolidation Project. So could you define what Southern
19 California is to me.

20 I'm from the Central Valley, so you can -- and
21 John's from up north, so we kind of know where our area --

22 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: To us it's all the same
23 thing.

24 (Laughter.)

25 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: But why don't -- I think

1 that's a very big threshold question. I really mean that
2 with all seriousness. You know, what is Southern
3 California?

4 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, when we did
5 the analysis of general access for the public we actually
6 looked at, you know, Southern California as being sort of
7 anything below Bakersfield. So we -- you know, we looked
8 at sort of up the coast a little bit, into Ventura, down
9 to San Diego. So that was sort of the range.

10 And you can see how that was done. There's a
11 table in the staff report that kind of maps that out.

12 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Yeah, I saw it.

13 So if we define Southern California in the way
14 you've just mentioned, I'm wondering why we keep talking
15 about this 35-mile radius as the only radius that could
16 actually be the Southern California site. That's my -- I
17 guess that's my -- you know, we have kind of come down to
18 all of these things as a proximity issue.

19 So Southern California is from Bakersfield to San
20 Diego. It really isn't a choice, right? We can only
21 really go 35 miles from ground 0, which is here. And
22 that's where we're going to be paying these relocation
23 costs.

24 So I guess my larger question is -- proximity is
25 such a huge factor; in fact, I've heard just about

1 everyone here today say that everything's pretty much
2 equal. Which I do have some questions on. But if
3 everything is equal, why did we ask Riverside to even
4 apply? They're 48 miles away. I mean, if truly that is
5 the criteria, proximity as the overriding factor, why
6 didn't we start this process by just telling folks that
7 everybody should apply but they should only be about 35
8 miles and under to this facility?

9 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, there's some
10 history with that. When we first started this process,
11 the bargaining unit contract was at 50 miles. So it
12 wasn't changed -- the 35 miles wasn't changed until
13 actually this July 1st from 50 --

14 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. So the process
15 changed in the middle of this?

16 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, it did and
17 it didn't. And I think the consideration is, I mean when
18 we found this out, we -- you know, we immediately told the
19 folks of Riverside, look, there's another consideration
20 here. And the question that we got back was, "Well, does
21 this affect our ability to compete?" And we said, "No, it
22 doesn't." That we were -- you know, at that point we had
23 just initiated the analysis, we did not have all the
24 factual information about how long it takes to get there,
25 what the staff -- we didn't have the analysis of where the

1 staff lived. So --

2 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Well, looking at today's
3 decision, was that the right answer to give to Riverside,
4 that it didn't affect them? Because it seems to me that's
5 the overriding factor today.

6 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER:
7 Well, absolutely. I mean, the 35 miles affects the
8 relocation costs, for sure.

9 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: So the rules changed
10 somewhere in the process?

11 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: No, I wouldn't say
12 that, Senator Florez, because we did -- we did -- our
13 commitment here was to do a fair and equitable process of
14 the impacts. And when we started the process -- certainly
15 Pomona is closer, you know, the L.A. area. But we didn't
16 know where the staff lived and -- you know. So we
17 couldn't do the analysis. We didn't know what that staff
18 commute driving distance and time was going to be. And
19 had we got a different result from that analysis, we may
20 have had a different conclusion.

21 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Because I think --
22 My good friend, Hector De La Torre, who I respect
23 immensely, mentioned the process the legislature set up
24 with you during the budget portion of this, because you
25 went to the legislature, you asked for 5.9 million, but

1 was a kind of, well, you have to look at Riverside and
2 Riverside has to be part of the process. Correct?

3 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Yes. Yes, we did
4 a request for information to see if there were any other
5 sites that were --

6 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Was that before the
7 50-mile change or after?

8 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: That was before.

9 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. So the process
10 changed?

11 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Our process did
12 not change.

13 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Well, let me just
14 ask another question, if I could.

15 In terms of going to the legislature for funding,
16 I think it was -- has been mentioned in your PowerPoint
17 that there was a date of '17-'18 budget where the balance
18 of funds will actually fund this project. Is that
19 correct?

20 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER:
21 That's correct.

22 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. So I'm kind of
23 wondering, given the path this is going, and the Board
24 having to make a decision, you know, how do you see that
25 going with the legislature in terms of giving them, you

1 know, the assurance that this has been a process that has
2 actually -- that they called for in their 30-day notice --
3 I know it goes to Joint Budget Committee -- how does that
4 process work?

5 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, I think the
6 process works that if the Board makes a recommendation, we
7 follow the commitments that were specified in the
8 supplemental budget language, and we submit the review.
9 And as appropriate, we would address comments that came
10 up. If they were significant enough to affect the Board
11 decision, we would certainly notify the Board of that.
12 How it goes from there is certainly up to the legislatures
13 that are involved.

14 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Right. So the legislature
15 set a budget of 366 million, 102 million for equipment.
16 And now we have this relocation cost factor, depending on
17 what this Board decides, of 7 to 10 million. Are those
18 basically the numbers that will go before the legislature?

19 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: You know, we have
20 a master architect that we're bringing under contract. So
21 we would be looking at all of those numbers. We would be
22 evaluating the site in more detail to determine whether or
23 not, you know, things like is there enough space that we
24 don't have to build a four-story, five-story parking
25 garage so we can, you know, save some money there. So we

1 would be relooking at the costs.

2 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Is the cost under the -- is
3 there a cap on the budget, 366 million?

4 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: The only money
5 that the legislature has authorized is the \$200,000 for
6 the site evaluations, which is this process, and the 5.7
7 for the master architect and developing the contract. So
8 we have not submitted any requests and have no
9 authorization at this point for the 366 million.

10 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: So where does that number
11 come from, the 366 million?

12 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: We did a -- we did
13 a study in 2006 when -- as Mary mentioned, we started this
14 quite awhile ago. When -- a couple years ago it was
15 pretty clear that there was a lot of programs that were
16 not even in place in then, so we -- through Department of
17 General Services, we contracted with IBI Group who did a
18 new feasibility study and looked and provided us with that
19 additional updated cost number.

20 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: So I guess the reason I'm
21 asking this is that you -- you've got some number in your
22 mind of 366 million. And so what happens if we look at
23 remediation and you ask us to pick a site but we haven't
24 done a phase 2 on remediation at Pomona, we haven't looked
25 at any of those remediation costs, we don't have any

1 design costs? Are any design costs included in this
2 presentation?

3 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: I'm not sure what
4 you mean by design costs.

5 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: In other words the site
6 plans themselves, do we actually have some good, hard,
7 solid numbers that it will actually --

8 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: No, that's what
9 the master architect will do for the 5.7. But they have
10 to have a site to work from to do that so we don't end up
11 doing, you know -- we'll have -- if we -- you know, we
12 would also have to do a phase 2 evaluation on the
13 Riverside site as well, I mean, so there's -- you know,
14 these are done typically to assist in the site selection
15 process; and phase 2 is not usually done until we have --
16 you know, till we are proceeding along the line.

17 So if -- you know, I think these are considered
18 normal sort of development costs. You know, I would point
19 out that the phase 1 assessments that were flagged - you
20 know, DGS can joke and speak to this - but they did not
21 identify anything that was considered significant enough
22 that would affect the site development costs.

23 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Just a few more
24 questions.

25 So DGS has obviously been mentioned a couple of

1 times during the hearing. Were you a partner in this
2 project or are you overseeing this project? I mean, I
3 guess I -- I chaired a committee that oversaw DGS for
4 about six years in Sacramento, the GO Committee, so I'm
5 fairly familiar with moves and how contentious they can
6 be. But I just always have seen DGS run these processes,
7 not necessarily be a partner with an agency. What's the
8 change there? Why isn't DGS giving us this report versus
9 the CARB staff?

10 DGS PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
11 PROJECT DIRECTOR III GRIFFITH: Well, this is a -- it was
12 a staff report to the ARB Board for their recommendation.
13 So --

14 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Have you analyzed the staff
15 report formally at DGS?

16 DGS PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
17 PROJECT DIRECTOR III GRIFFITH: We contributed to this
18 staff report.

19 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: But have you analyzed it?
20 You're our real estate agent.

21 DGS PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
22 PROJECT DIRECTOR III GRIFFITH: I personally have looked
23 at it, the report, in its entirety.

24 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Because I do know
25 the legislature as this -- even if we pass this is going

1 to ask the question whether or not DGS has actually done a
2 cost benefit analysis of staff report.

3 We're asked to do a staff benefit ourselves to
4 try to make a decision. But I guess my training would be
5 that you're our real estate agent. Have you actually
6 taken the final staff report and done a cost benefit
7 analysis of it?

8 DGS PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
9 PROJECT DIRECTOR III GRIFFITH: We did a cost analysis.
10 I'm not exactly sure what you mean by a cost benefit
11 analysis. Typically, we do cost benefit analysis when
12 we're looking at different delivery methods; for example,
13 comparing a lease build-to-suit project versus doing it as
14 a cap outlay project. And from a site selection
15 perspective, there's not typically a lot of parameters
16 that you would put into a -- you know, a lifecycle, if
17 that's what you mean, kind of an over time --

18 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: No, I'm just in the
19 realistic world of moving this through. We're not funding
20 this. We're actually sending it to a place called the
21 legislature that will fund it. And they're going to ask
22 us, as Hector mentioned, was the process followed; number
23 2, was everything in the process -- did we agree to it in
24 some sense? And of course they're going to let staff
25 formulate that. But then they're going to ask DGS, as our

1 real estate, as our -- the folks that come to us and give
2 us the decision, "Have you analyzed this?" I think that's
3 the question I'm asking.

4 And, for me, I think it's important only because
5 I'd like to know how you feel about it formally. I really
6 would. Not that I say I can't judge and go through our
7 staff report, but I just would like to know kind of
8 formally, you know, what DGS itself feels, how it feels
9 about the final report.

10 DGS PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
11 PROJECT DIRECTOR III GRIFFITH: Right. Well, you know, we
12 were an advisor to ARB. I mean, it's their report. And
13 one of my recommendations, I don't know how formal it was,
14 but was that, you know, I didn't think the Riverside 1
15 site was very good from a design perspective. And that
16 was in my advice. And they took that into account and
17 pretty much took Riverside 1 off the table.

18 But you speak to process. And I do want to point
19 out that we did have this matrix, we put it out to
20 everybody for input. And cost benefit analysis never came
21 up as something that we were tasked to do --

22 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. I get it. So let's
23 just -- so, as you said, the driving force for this whole
24 discussion today is proximity. And I guess I'm just
25 wondering how much people really knew about that. So you

1 mentioned the matrix you put out. So that was a -- here's
2 where I found proximity. It was a subcategory on page 11
3 in the sub -- in something that the Board put out as, I
4 brief in August or last year, you laid out a matrix. But
5 I'm just wondering how this tiny little cell called
6 "proximity" out of the hundred factors became the
7 overwhelming -- the overwhelming deciding point for this.
8 I mean, why would we make that an outstanding, you know,
9 this is where the big points are in order to kind of
10 win the -- you know, win this particular site? Why was it
11 kind of put as some subfactor under "Transportation,"
12 buried in a hundred other, you know, approximate cells?
13 Why didn't we make that a much larger criteria?

14 Because I think if we would have had that
15 criteria, then I think some of the responses might have
16 been different. I think Riverside would have had maybe a
17 different response. I think Pomona may have had a
18 different response. But it seemed to -- we took all of
19 these factors, and at the end of it we kind of said, "All
20 being even, proximity is the outstanding factor." And I'm
21 just kind of wondering why that wasn't laid out in your
22 matrix prominently --

23 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: When we --

24 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: -- not as a subcontext
25 of -- on page 11 as a sub-item.

1 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, I think
2 there's a couple answers to that. One is that we've
3 used -- in the staff report we've used "proximity," you
4 know, that term as a surrogate for a number of different
5 attributes that were identified in the original matrix.
6 So in our staff report there was a half a dozen items that
7 were identified. Those are taken directly from the
8 matrix. So they may have been in different categories.
9 But they were represented in the staff report, both as
10 general access to the public as well as staff -- ARB staff
11 commutes.

12 We couldn't say this -- at the time wrote the
13 matrix we couldn't say that this factor was more important
14 than the other factor because we had only recently gotten
15 the funding to initiate the analysis, so we didn't know
16 what the outcome was going to be.

17 We had no predetermined information about how
18 these attributes were going to play out. We've -- you
19 know, we worked with DGS to define these, and we could
20 have found very significant differences in some of the
21 others.

22 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: But somebody makes a value
23 judgment. I mean, you say proximity to staff. You could
24 say proximity to a major research institution as well.
25 That could be just as important as proximity to staff.

1 Somebody makes in your report a value judgment that
2 actually is the defining factor, correct?

3 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: I wouldn't call it
4 a value judgment. I would call it a fact-based analysis
5 of the attributes that we in August.

6 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Right. But then somebody
7 said one is more important -- more top line than the
8 other, correct?

9 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: You know, our
10 staff recommendation when we looked at all of the
11 attributes was just that. And, you know, the significant
12 differences were in proximity. We did -- we had a lot of
13 discussion about the proximity to the university, and that
14 goes back a couple years prior to even the staff report
15 itself.

16 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: I think, you know, I'm
17 going to just end a lot of the questioning but simply say
18 I am in support of you going a little deeper, getting this
19 Board a little more answers. I'm one of those folks that
20 read reports too many times. So I actually have 14 things
21 I'd like you to look at, I would submit to the Chair, if
22 we're actually going to do that, that go a little deeper
23 into this, rather than go into all 14 of them.

24 I will say that the end result of this is
25 going -- it's going to go to the legislature; and the

1 legislature from a DGS perspective, they're going to ask
2 you at some point -- not this CARB staff. They're going
3 to ask DGS, you know, what should we do? You're the
4 advisors of the legislature nine times out of ten
5 particularly in these issues, and I don't think the
6 legislature at least according to the statutes I've seen
7 has allowed you to advocate those types of
8 responsibilities to a client agent -- agencies. It
9 just -- I don't see that. There are exceptions in the law
10 for that, but the Air Board isn't one of those.

11 So I would just hope that you get that process
12 going as well and you report back to this Board what
13 that's going to look like. Because we'd like success for
14 the legislature obviously. But if we're not going to be
15 successful because we haven't taken that next step, I
16 think that's going to be an important piece of something I
17 would actually really, really like to see if that works
18 with you.

19 One last comment. From a legislative point of
20 view - and I know Hector knows this as well - but, you
21 know, one of the things that, having overseen DGS for a
22 lot of years and a lot of real estate moves, you know, I
23 have never really seen in my five years there proximity
24 used in this way. I've never even seen proximity used.
25 So if I see that from my old vantage point in the

1 legislature, I can certainly tell you that you should, you
2 know, well be prepared for that from a DGS perspective of
3 why in this case proximity became the overriding factor
4 when it's never been used for most moves in the State of
5 California. And you can come and show us five or six
6 moves they've actually used that term and actually been
7 the basis for a move, I think that would -- I'd be open
8 for that. But I think it would be highly doubtful you
9 would do that.

10 So I'm going to end my comments. I just am
11 looking forward to getting about 14 things back from you
12 hopefully.

13 Thanks.

14 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Dr. Sperling.

15 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Well, I'm getting hungry
16 myself.

17 (Laughter.)

18 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So I'm going to be very
19 brief. I usually address these in big-picture what, you
20 know --

21 (Laughter.)

22 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: But I'm going to go
23 narrow here. I'm going to go back to my core competence.
24 And I'm going to just point to one table, 36, and it
25 says -- I don't want to overstate the proximity issue

1 either, but that is what I am -- I know a lot about.

2 There was just a line there. It said percentage of
3 employees driving more than -- driving less than 90
4 minutes. So 25 -- even for Pomona, there's going to be 25
5 percent of the employees driving more than 90 minutes a
6 day. And I suspect it's actually -- driving around this
7 area, I can't believe it's even that low for that
8 distance.

9 But -- so I'm just making a point here. Don't
10 worry about it.

11 Oh, you changed it?

12 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, I just want
13 to point out this is public transit time and not driving
14 time.

15 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Oh, no. I -- okay.
16 You're looking at the wrong -- table 35.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Another table?

18 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: It's such small print
19 here.

20 CHAIR NICHOLS: 35 was driving time?

21 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: There's 75 percent are
22 less than 90 minutes. So that means 25 percent are more
23 than 90 minutes. You're getting into some really long
24 commutes. And so even for Pomona, if we were to choose
25 Pomona, there's got to be some work here at trying to deal

1 with that issue. And so --

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: The traffic is getting worse too.
3 It's going to get worse, no matter what.

4 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: And it's going to get
5 even worse than that.

6 So I think the point here is that, as we go
7 forward, we've got to think about how to mitigate some of
8 these costs, some of these downsides. And whether that's
9 through telecommuting and conferencing -- teleconferencing
10 or perhaps moving certain parts of the lab that are not
11 intricately involved in the lab, maybe enforcement, you
12 know, somewhere else. But there's a lot of ways of
13 mitigating this. And I would think it has to be done,
14 whether it's Pomona or Riverside.

15 And on the other side is the synergy. We really
16 need to be thinking about how do we maximize these
17 synergies. And clearly, there's opportunities with
18 Pomona, probably a lot more even with Riverside, and we
19 want to make sure we get those benefits. And as Professor
20 Balmes -- Dr. Balmes said, you know, this is where a lot
21 of the primary air pollution research was conducted. It's
22 evolved in different ways. There's a lot of good
23 research. But I think there's a lot of opportunities to
24 make these ties much stronger and much more impactful than
25 even what it is now. And I think that's what we really --

1 we really want to create something really special and
2 important and that is making a major contribution.

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

4 Mrs. Riordan.

5 BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

6 Let me just follow up on Dr. Sperling's comments
7 for just a moment, because I couldn't agree more.

8 There are times when we really need to look to
9 the future. And we have so many opportunities if we pick
10 up on the synergy and the research and making a worldwide
11 center for the study of air quality and perhaps climate
12 change and others; things that we really haven't thought
13 of, or at least I haven't thought of. I think those of
14 you who are in the research business and profession do
15 that all the time. But just the general public, and I
16 believe I'm sort of the general public, but I can clearly
17 see things that we've not thought about.

18 And while I know our staff report says, in
19 essence, it's good to locate near a university but not
20 necessarily a high priority; but it truly is in my mind.
21 I think we have so much potential with the co-location of
22 our facilities with something -- with a heritage of the
23 University of California, the heritage of research. There
24 are -- and I sympathize and empathize with our staff, and
25 I respect the staff completely for the work that they have

1 done and the work that they will be doing. But I also
2 know that your work may be getting even more interesting
3 and more challenging as you locate near a university that
4 has a high priority for air quality research.

5 Madam Chair, I don't have many questions because
6 I had the good benefit of being on the subcommittee and
7 traveling to these sites and to hear the presentations
8 that were made to us, and they were all excellent
9 presentations.

10 But I do believe that there may not be a way to
11 quantify it in terms of numbers, but there was
12 certainly -- the synergy is, in my mind, so critical to
13 making a decision.

14 Having said that, I respectfully disagree with my
15 other committee member for just a moment. Had we accepted
16 the fact that we would just have staff go through a
17 process and make a recommendation, then we wouldn't be
18 involved, in my mind, with making a decision over this
19 final recommendation. I think the process includes our
20 ultimate support of the staff recommendation or the
21 respectful disagreement with staff recommendation. And
22 I've certainly told that to staff, particularly
23 Mr. Fletcher, that I may respectfully disagree with the
24 staff report

25 But, looking to the future, that's how I believe

1 it ought to be.

2 Now, I do think there are questions of other
3 Board members, and maybe they -- because of more detailed
4 analysis that would need to be done, you may want to
5 continue it for, you know, some time. But I personally
6 can make a decision now or into the future, whatever.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Well, thank you.

8 Having now heard from all of our Board members, I
9 think I'd like to make a few comments and a suggestion
10 about how to proceed.

11 So first, I want to say that when I first started
12 to get seriously involved in this issue, I spoke with our
13 then executive officer - this is prior to Richard Corey
14 coming on board - and I believe it was at that point that
15 we made the decision that we needed a person who could
16 devote themselves full-time to working on this. Was it
17 Richard who made the decision?

18 Okay. I apologize then. Okay. You get the
19 credit.

20 (Laughter.)

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Richard, congratulations. You
22 made a brilliant decision --

23 (Laughter.)

24 CHAIR NICHOLS: -- to call in a former senior
25 staff person who had acted in various important capacities

1 at ARB to actually be the leader of this effort, and that
2 was Bob Fletcher. So Bob is retired in theory --

3 (Laughter.)

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: -- and has been working
5 tirelessly at this task, holding weekly meetings, meeting
6 with staff, meeting with external stakeholders, meeting
7 with other agencies. And we owe him a real debt of
8 gratitude for having gotten us to this point.

9 I think the staff report is a very good piece of
10 work. And I think if you go back to the data that
11 underlies it and you have questions, you might possibly
12 disagree with the conclusions that they came to, you might
13 disagree with their decision not to get into issues about
14 opportunity costs or potential synergies or things that
15 are perhaps not within their areas of expertise, frankly,
16 but the fact is that for what they set out to do, I don't
17 think there's any point in sending them back to do more of
18 it. Because I don't think you'd get a different answer or
19 a particularly different -- a different product.

20 I think the issues that I just mentioned are more
21 on the realm of the intangibles.

22 I'm going to take some personal credit here for
23 having pushed us in the direction of looking at a
24 university as a partner. Although at the time, I wasn't
25 even aware of the fact that we might be able to actually

1 get two offers of land that would cost us nothing and in
2 some cases, you know, pay us to move to places that would
3 be so appealing and so much of an upgrade from where we
4 are today. So I'm excited in that respect.

5 I also need to say about process, that to my
6 astonishment, because I expected we would get told by
7 either DGS or the Department of Finance or both of them
8 where we were going, that in fact the Governor's office
9 made it clear from the beginning that ARB was the client
10 here - it's our lab - and that subject of course to the
11 legislature deciding whether they want to fund it or not,
12 that this was our decision to make based on our assessment
13 of the needs and the opportunities here.

14 So I wish I could buck this decision up, or
15 sideways in some ways, but that's not going to be
16 possible, at least when it comes to giving advice.

17 I also agree that there are questions that Board
18 members have that clearly would make them more comfortable
19 with making a decision if they had more chance to interact
20 with the staff on this. I don't think anybody wants
21 another public hearing on this or another round. But it
22 may be beneficial to take a short delay.

23 My question is really not a question, it's more
24 of a hype -- it's more of a dialogue I guess that I'd like
25 to get out there. Has to do with the timing. So a couple

1 of things.

2 First of all, assuming we were to make a decision
3 today or whenever: Then what happens next? How much time
4 do you really see things happening? And what would be
5 going on during that period of time, again regardless of
6 the site decision, in terms of interaction with staff and
7 opportunities to follow up on the things that Ms. Berg and
8 others have suggested we really need to be working on with
9 staff? Again, regardless of where we go. This is not
10 going to be something that just happens and then it's
11 done.

12 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER:

13 Challenged. I think it depends upon what the scope of
14 that is. I mean, we clearly recognize that the public
15 transit aspects to both sites are challenging. I think we
16 would initiate that sort of effort once we had decided on
17 a site. And then we can start breaking, you know, down
18 explicitly what sorts of transit opportunities exist, I
19 mean, that would be useful. And we did look at van pools,
20 we did look at those sorts of things. But with the metric
21 of -- you know, if we went to Riverside, then you still
22 have the same timing considerations, you still have that
23 distance.

24 So I think we'd want to probably wait for a year
25 or two and let -- make sure that we actually have a

1 facility that's approved by the legislature before we
2 launched in too much. And then my recommendation would be
3 that we engage into a transit -- you know, we engage a
4 transit coordinator, an expert that can help us sort of,
5 you know, not only define the options but figure out ways
6 that we can encourage the staff to use it.

7 I mean we found in even El -- at this facility
8 there are some public transit options. They're not great.
9 We do have a really good transit facility close by. But,
10 quite frankly, staff don't use it. And so I think, you
11 know, we need to do our behavioral efforts and look at
12 ways to incentivize how we can get people on to public
13 transit. And you heard Supervisor Solis and, you know,
14 talking about their options. You heard the representative
15 from Riverside as well talking about options as well.

16 So we're going to have to work very closely I
17 think with the staff on this one -- I mean, with -- yeah,
18 with the staff on this one. But I think we have to have a
19 facility first.

20 CHAIR NICHOLS: So, okay. We have a site. We --
21 assuming we have a site. Then what? How do we get to
22 groundbreaking, which is where I want to be?

23 (Laughter.)

24 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, there was a
25 couple slides in the staff presentation that talk a little

1 bit about that, the project -- the key project steps. And
2 the next step is to work with a master architect to have a
3 series of design specifications and performance criteria
4 for the building. And that occurs over, you know, a
5 period of time. The objective here is to have a vetted
6 bid that is ready to go to a design build contractor,
7 assuming that the budget gets approved for the money,
8 beginning July 1st, 2017. So that would initiate -- we
9 could award that in August of 2017, and then the design
10 build contractor goes to work. It'd probably take them a
11 little bit of time. I think we indicated in these charts
12 that it would be November 2017 where we would actually
13 start looking at a groundbreaking consideration.

14 But we do have a fair amount of work to do with a
15 master architect and developing the detailed design
16 guidelines and performance specifications. And they get
17 down to incredibly gory detail, like do you want a chain
18 door or do you want an electric door for your test cells.
19 So this gets down into really -- you know, that's why
20 there's 5.7 million allocated.

21 We also have to do our environmental impact
22 analysis for the facility. We're looking -- you know,
23 once a site is selected, then you can launch in and do
24 your EIR work, which we would hope to finish up I think at
25 the end of the year.

1 So there are steps. But it's a little bit
2 predicated -- I mean we are working on -- with a master
3 architect now. We are working with the staff to define,
4 you know, some -- you know, kind of reevaluating the needs
5 and that sort of thing. So there's work that's going on
6 that can be done in the absence of the site, but it really
7 gets nailed down once the site's selected.

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: You got to have that decision.

9 Okay. Great.

10 Let's see if there were any other questions?

11 In terms of things that we could ask you for more
12 analysis on, I think a lot was included before that
13 isn't -- you know, it just didn't come up today or that
14 wasn't really responded to today but that individual Board
15 members might want to talk to you about.

16 And I think -- I'm hoping that you and others
17 would be available to come up with the answers from the
18 documentation from what work you've already done.

19 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER:

20 Absolutely, or work that we could do.

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah, or additional work that you
22 could do.

23 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER:

24 Right.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, I just -- I sort of balance

1 the need to move quickly versus the need for people to
2 feel comfortable. And I guess what I am going to
3 recommend then would be that we again close the public
4 hearing portion of this discussion, but that we adjourn
5 for a vote at a subsequent meeting.

6 And I don't want to make that drag on very long.
7 I don't -- I know you don't either.

8 And I'm hoping that we can find a date quickly,
9 like within the next week, that would be possible, if
10 people would then be willing to take the time on their own
11 to ask the questions to get the additional information
12 that they need, so that we'd have at least a quorum
13 willing to vote. And that would also allow for members
14 who aren't here, other than Judy of course who recused
15 herself, but for the other Board members hopefully to look
16 at what is already here and feel comfortable adding their
17 voices to this decision as well.

18 So have you had a chance to talk to the Board
19 members about whether there are dates that are available?
20 Because I know if we adjourn, it has to be to a specific
21 date.

22 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: It does. And Chief
23 Counsel Ellen Peter may want to add to my remarks. But if
24 we adjourned and picked up next week, we'd need to get a
25 notice out by tomorrow. We had asked the secretary of the

1 Board to do some polling, and it did look like we had a
2 quorum for next Thursday, Thursday morning, in Sacramento.
3 We had a facility just as a standby. So that would be an
4 option for us.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: And then if there are members who
6 wanted to participate but could not be in Sacramento,
7 would they be able to join us by phone?

8 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Ellen can add to this.
9 But the bottom line is the location where they're calling
10 from needs to be -- would need to be posted as part of the
11 notice tomorrow, and the site would have to be available
12 if the members of the public wanted to join them for when
13 they call in. But, Ellen, maybe you should add to that.

14 CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: That's absolutely correct.
15 So, for example, if one of the -- you know, and I don't
16 know who's available and who's not. But, for example, it
17 could be in the office of one of the public Board members
18 like Supervisor Gioia, if he could make it, and other
19 people could join him there. But it would have to be
20 noticed. So I wouldn't recommend you doing it from your
21 home, unless --

22 (Laughter.)

23 CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: Though you could. People
24 have done that. But we just -- we need to know when --
25 before the notice goes out.

1 And also in terms of the information -- and there
2 was some discussion if we should have further public
3 comment or not. If you're only looking at the information
4 that's before you, and including the more detailed staff
5 report, then you could basically rely on the information
6 that is before you.

7 There's been some suggestion, both by Member
8 Takvorian and Vice Chair Berg, about staff things, and
9 also one of other Board members about future kind of
10 activities. Those could be taken up later. So there's
11 not a preclusion of getting additional information at a
12 later point too.

13 CHAIR NICHOLS: As long as people are able to
14 make a decision currently based on the information that's
15 available to them, yeah.

16 CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: That's correct.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Okay. Can I then get an
18 indication from the Board if you're willing to go along
19 with this procedure that I'm proposing --

20 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Can I just make a comment?

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Heads nodding.

22 Yes, Mr. Florez.

23 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Just not a motion to do
24 just -- it's a comment.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

1 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: So I think the issue is I'm
2 not sure we want to have a telephonic vote on a facility
3 that's going to be in our midst for the next 50 years. I
4 just don't think that's good optics. I don't think that's
5 the right signal to send to the public.

6 And there were four Board members missing here as
7 well today. I guess they could review the transcript.
8 But I'm just not sure -- and I'm going to ask
9 Mr. Fletcher: Does a month or two really slow us down
10 that much?

11 And give me the reason why?

12 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, every month
13 that we delay delays the schedule back, and it makes it
14 that much more difficult to complete the project on
15 schedule.

16 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Is it impossible?

17 ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER:

18 Well, nothing's impossible.

19 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Great.

20 Then I'll stick to the not impossible. And I
21 think a public -- when we have a chance, I think -- I know
22 there's a wish to do that. I'm just going to give my --
23 you can take a vote on it, but I guess I would feel more
24 comfortable having a public hearing on it.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: We've never -- to my knowledge,

1 in my time on this Board we've never had a telephonic
2 board meeting. This would be something new. It was -- my
3 idea was actually just to indulge those who have felt
4 strongly but who might not be able to be at the meeting.

5 Personally, my sense of the timing of this is so
6 critical, I'd rather go for a vote right now than postpone
7 this to even the next Board meeting. So I think that's
8 really what the choice is, is whether --

9 VICE CHAIR BERG: Could I just ask a point of
10 clarification?

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: Sure.

12 VICE CHAIR BERG: Because I thought you were
13 suggesting that we would have a Board meeting in
14 Sacramento on the 24th. But that if there was a Board
15 member that just wasn't able to attend the meeting, where
16 we would have a quorum, they would be able to also call in
17 by phone.

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. What Mr. Corey indicated
19 was that we have a quorum for the 24th. So it's not a
20 matter of needing the telephonic vote in order to have a
21 meeting. It was a question whether we would allow someone
22 to phone in.

23 So maybe this had better be done in the form of a
24 motion then just to be clear, if somebody would be able
25 to -- pardon me -- to make the motion, or to do the

1 decision.

2 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Chair, can I just -- can
3 I -- before you make a motion, I just have a question.

4 Do you want to take a vote today? I guess we
5 could. So, you know, I guess we could take a vote. It
6 fails or doesn't fail. Then we can then reconvene. But I
7 didn't know if that was --

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: My thought had been -- and again,
9 you know, this is a board, actually, and so we need a
10 majority to make any decision. My thought had been that
11 there were enough people who had expressed a desire to
12 think about it some more or may -- you know, with a little
13 more information, that it was a good idea.

14 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: So I'll make a motion that
15 we have a meeting in Sacramento next week - sounds like it
16 may be Thursday - to take up a vote.

17 VICE CHAIR BERG: And I'll second.

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Then you've heard the
19 motion and the second.

20 All those in favor of holding a meeting --

21 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Madam Chair?

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Sorry.

23 BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Could I just now --

24 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Question.

25 BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Does that anticipate

1 somebody like myself, who cannot be there, to be able to
2 go -- to find a telephone in a public place that would be
3 noticed?

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, it did.

5 BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Okay. All right.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Questions or comments?

7 Yes.

8 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.

9 So on that motion, I -- I guess I -- I agree with
10 Senator Florez. I think this should be done in a -- I
11 cannot attend. And if I just couldn't attend a public
12 CARB meeting that had actually been noticed -- I mean, you
13 have a tradition of monthly meetings. So to have a
14 meeting in a week doesn't seem like we can get the
15 information that at least I've asked for. I mean, there's
16 a number of paragraphs under the description of the Pomona
17 site that talk about environmental hazards, for instance.
18 And I don't see - and maybe I just don't see it - but a
19 cost associated with that. So if that's not there, then I
20 don't think that's going to be there in a week. So I
21 don't --

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: No, it won't be. But with
23 respect to your comment - and perhaps I should have
24 addressed it at the time or should have had staff address
25 it - that is part of what goes on in the next phase; that

1 is, we are making a decision based on what we think is
2 roughly equivalent. The actual cost of building this
3 project, which includes site remediation, will not -- we
4 will not know that before we decide which of these two
5 offers in effect we are going to entertain. There's no
6 way that we would know that and be able to proceed in any
7 kind of a normal pattern towards a -- towards conception.

8 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Well, actually phase 2s
9 are -- excuse me -- phase 2s are normally done for both
10 considered sites. So you can get closer. I totally agree
11 with you that there are surprises whenever you build
12 anything. And I fully expect that that will be the case
13 and we won't be right on point. But it seems like we're a
14 long way away on that particular point. That's not the
15 only point. But I just -- my major point is that I don't
16 think we can get all the questions answered to -- answered
17 in a week and that we should do this business -- it's
18 obviously critically important. Look at all of you who
19 must be starving who are still sitting here.

20 (Laughter.)

21 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I think we ought to do
22 it in the public view, and a meeting that folks expect the
23 CARB to be meeting in.

24 So I would actually have to say that I would vote
25 against the motion to do it in a week and vote to do it in

1 a month or whenever staff feel like we can come back and
2 have that information.

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Well, we have a
4 motion and a second. The motion is to hold a meeting in a
5 week, on Thursday, with the opportunity for people to call
6 in if they choose to do so, at which time we would be
7 voting on the Board's recommendation as to which of the
8 two sites that are before us we would choose to accept.

9 So I think we better have a roll call on this
10 vote.

11 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Dr. Balmes.

12 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes, or in favor.

13 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. De La Torre.

14 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Aye.

15 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. Eisenhut.

16 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Aye.

17 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Senator Florez.

18 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: No.

19 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Gioia.

20 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yes.

21 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Riordan.

22 BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Aye.

23 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Professor Sperling.

24 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Yes.

25 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Takvorian.

1 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: No

2 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Vice Chair Berg.

3 VICE CHAIR BERG: Yes.

4 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Chair Nichols.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

6 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: The motion passes 8 to 2.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. So that will be our next
8 move. We will see or hear from as many of you as we can.
9 But there will not be any further public testimony taken
10 on this.

11 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Do you have a time it's
12 going to be held?

13 CHAIR NICHOLS: A time. Do we know what time
14 it's going to be.

15 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: 9 a.m.

16 CHAIR NICHOLS: 9 a.m.

17 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: 24th, Thursday.

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: On Thursday, the 24th.

19 We will recess until then.

20 VICE CHAIR BERG: I don't want to be
21 argumentative on the time. But is this the only agenda
22 item?

23 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Correct, it is.

24 VICE CHAIR BERG: So could we just make it a
25 little bit later so we could fly in on Thursday morning?

1 (Laughter.)

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: How about it?

3 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: 10 a.m.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: 10 a.m., is that --

5 VICE CHAIR BERG: Yeah, then I could fly in.

6 Thanks.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. That's great. It will be
8 10 a.m. on Thursday then.

9 All right. Great.

10 Thanks, everybody.

11 This is a public meeting where we have to also
12 acknowledge if there's any member of the public who just
13 wants to make a comment on any topic while we're here?

14 Nobody signed up for public comment.

15 Okay. Then thank you all very much.

16 (Thereupon the Air Resources Board
17 adjourned at 2:04 PM)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E O F R E P O R T E R

I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing California Air Resources Board meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and was thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by computer-assisted transcription;

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 21st day of March, 2016.



JAMES F. PETERS, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 10063