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CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning. The March 24th, 2016 public meeting of the Air Resources Board will come to order. Before we begin, I want to say a word though about the sound system, because we do have members calling in from locations that were previously noticed. Board members who are calling in on the phones, I would appreciate it if when you're not speaking, you would mute your phones, because we get the background noise, and all of the conversations that you may be having in your office broadcast over the sound system here.

So if you can please mute your conversation, except when you want to speak obviously, then we want to hear from you.

Okay. At this point then, we will resume our normal order of business, which is to begin with the Pledge after Allegiance. So would everyone please rise.

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Madam Clerk, would you please call the roll.

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Dr. Balmes?
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. De La Torre?
BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. Eisenhut?
BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Senator Florez?
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Gioia?
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Mitchell?
Mrs. Riordan?
BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Roberts? Supervisor Serna?
BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Dr. Sherriffs?
Professor Sperling?
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Takvorian?
Ms. Takvorian?
Vice Chair Berg?
VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Chair Nichols?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Madam Chair, we have a quorum.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.
Can we adjust the sound system, so that those who
are calling in can be heard more clearly in the room?

    Okay. We could barely hear. We could hear, but it was difficult.

    Okay. So just couple of opening comments. As was noticed in the public agenda, this Board meeting is available by teleconference in El Cerrito, National City, and Redlands, California, and also in Dublin, Ireland, where Mr. De La Torre is currently. I would have to say that the rest of us wish we were there with him, but we haven't yet figured out how to extend our jurisdiction quite that far.

    So, for today, this is a vote only matter. We are not taking testimony on this item. But because of the far-flung nature, I am going to be calling for a roll call voice vote to make sure that everyone's votes are recorded. And for those calling in from the remote locations, if when you speak you would identify yourself also, just so we're sure to get the record correct. That would be much appreciated.

    Now, for those who are in the auditorium here, in Sacramento, I need to remind you that there are Emergency exits at the side, and in the back of the room. And in the event of a fire alarm, we're required to evacuate the room immediately and go out of the building, until we hear the all-clear signal when we're allowed to return. And I
think that is all for general preliminary comments.

(Thereupon interference occurred in the
sound system.)

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Could you repeat that?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.
BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Chair Nichols?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, Supervisor Serna
BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Sorry for the interruption.

I just wanted to state for the record that I was not at
the March 17th meeting in Southern California. However, I
have had an opportunity to review the transcripts.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Thank you for that.

Okay. So as I indicated, we're here today to
consider the Board recommending a site for the proposed
new motor vehicle and engine emissions testing and
research facility in Southern California, otherwise known
as a consolidated site. And as we indicated when we were
together before, and I know all the Board members have had
an opportunity to spend quite a lot of time getting
briefed and thinking about these issues, this is a
decision that's going to impact ARB's operations, both
today and for decades into the future.

The staff conducted a thorough evaluation of
three sites and determined that two of the sites are
suitable for development. These are Pomona Boulevard and
Iowa Avenue -- Pomona Boulevard in Pomona, and Riverside, Iowa Avenue sites. And there's a great deal of information that's contained within the staff report, as well as a large volume of supporting documentation regarding the evaluation of those sites.

In addition, the Board heard testimony last week from a broad range of representatives of both communities and campuses, and also from elected officials representatives of the universities themselves, city and county personnel, business organizations, our own staff, the Union that represents many of our employees and even a bicycle advocacy group. These commenters presented contrasting views, but they all made compelling cases about where to cite the proposed new facility.

The ARB's staff's preference for Pomona presents an important factor for us to consider, and it cannot be taken lightly, because we all know that the heart and soul of any operation is the people who do the work. But in the end, the decision needs to be made to choose a cite that the Board members themselves believe provides the greatest benefits to the State, while exercising our responsibility to be good stewards of State funds.

That said, regardless of the decision that we make today, the Board needs to be very active in addressing the concerns of our staff, if the Board selects
the Riverside site, our challenges to address staff issues will obviously be important and will need to begin right away.

While the Board is not accepting any public testimony, I want to appreciate the time and energy that people took to come and speak to us last week at our hearing in El Monte, and to assure you that your concerns and your comments have been taken into consideration.

I think I also -- well, I'll let it go at that. I would note that this is just a step in a long process for completing this project. Moving forward with a recommendation from this Board certainly brings us closer to making the project more of a reality. And we look forward to continuing to work with the Department of General Services and others on the next phase of this vitally important project for the State and for our mission.

So, in a moment, I'm going to open this up to my fellow board members. But I do want to take the opportunity to say a few words about my own perspective on this, because I have been thinking about the need for a new facility for Southern California ever since I got back to the Air Resources Board in 2007. And I realized that this is really a tremendous opportunity, which we have been afforded to continue to lead our State and our
country, and I would say the world in developing motor vehicle standards, implementing them, and enforcing them, as well as in providing state-of-the-art thinking and science to support this mission.

So it's a transition that we will be working through. I personally will be voting for the resolution that will be coming forth in a few minutes, but I want to hear from all the Board members and to give them an opportunity to speak and make sure that everybody's voice is heard.

So I would like to start by recognizing Senator Florez.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll be brief. Just -- you know, obviously had a great hearing, lots of input. I appreciate the employees at El Monte. There was some very poignant testimony. I thought it was very heartfelt. I think overall I agree with you that as we move in a certain direction today that we ought to make the staff needs and concerns front and center. So I very much appreciate that. And I think I believe we ought to move in a direction that continues to be focused on what is the best transition as we move forward.

I would also like to say -- I don't know if -- it's on and off.

I'd also like to say that I really would like to
thank the cities of each of the entities, both Riverside and Pomona, for their testimony last week. And I look forward to hearing other comments from other Board members.

Okay. Is this on?

Can everybody hear?

Okay. Great. I look forward to hearing from other members of the Panel. But, however, Madam Chair, I would like to move that the site known as Riverside Site 2 be selected as the location for the Southern California consolidation project.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Did you make a motion?

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: I did Madam Chair, let me reread that.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I was being whispered to about the sound system. I apologize.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: And the sound was on and off, so let me say it again. I would like to move that the site known as Riverside Site 2 be selected as the location for the Southern California consolidation project.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Do I have a second for that motion?

VICE CHAIR BERG: And I'll second that motion.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Ms. Berg.
Okay. We can now open this then for discussion on the motion. And, at this point, I think in addition to stating their reasoning or asking questions, it would also be appropriate for Board members to articulate instructions that they would like to make sure that the staff hear from us moving forward with the site, because it's clear that there's a lot of work left to be done, a lot of interest on the part of the Board in watching this project as it goes forward to make sure that commitments that were made at the front end are followed through on by our partners in the process. And so I think we can have both of those elements under discussion. And I think I'll start by recognizing Dr. Sperling.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So it is a really tough decision and, you know, clearly the -- you know, I've seen the Riverside site. I've heard others that have seen the Pomona that in many ways the sites are comparable -- not comparable, but equally attractive. And it's really impressive what both campuses have done in providing, you know, really good spaces near the campuses, near areas that are very attractive.

When I look at it, I say, okay, what is good -- to kind of play off of what Chairwoman Nichols just said, what's good for ARB, what's good for this State, what's good for the country, and even the world? We've seen how
important ARB is, for instance, with the VW issue. And, of course, many of the things we do, our OBD work, and a lot of other technical work that's been done really is instrumental internationally as well.

So when I look at it, I see that kind of in the most conservative case the two campuses are roughly, you know, comparable. The -- there's the downside of -- you know, Riverside would be a little more problematic -- would be more problematic for staff. On the other hand, UC Riverside provides a lot of opportunities to really meet that goal, that mission of providing high value to ARB, the State, and the country.

But then I look -- the more I think about it and the more I've talked to people is I just see the potential -- the upside potential is so huge at Riverside. There's so many opportunities to really enhance the ARB labs and the ARB. And it will take work on both sides, both the Riverside campus and ARB to really realize those upside potentials. But to, me they're large.

It's -- there's so -- and I trust that there's a -- I believe that those upside potentials will be realized because when I talk to the Riverside campus, the community, the leaders there, over and over again, I hear about all the things that they plan to and could do, everything from extension programs for workers,
apprenticeship internship programs, hiring new faculty, tailoring their research programs more.

And the Riverside is attractive to me, because Riverside is kind of like the ideal campus to be associated with, in the sense that it's not like Caltech that already has its reputation, its high quality research. It's not like UCLA which is a big huge campus. Riverside is a growing campus. It already has a focus on environment, but it's really expanding. And there's a real opportunity there for to create really strong synergies.

And so that's what's compelling to me. And you look through the statistics, you know, how much research. Obviously, UC Riverside is far superior as a research campus, but it goes well beyond that. So I've -- actually, the more I've thought about it, and the more I talk to -- when I talk to even the university leaders at Pomona, they don't come forward with a lot of these ideas about how to create these synergies with ARB. And we talked to Riverside and they do. It comes just flowing out of them. Everyone we talk to they have how to set up these different programs, how to create these synergies, working with the staff, working in terms of training, in terms of creating a pipeline of employees that are targeted for Riverside for -- excuse me, for the ARB labs.
So at the end of the day, we're putting something in place here for many, many decades and something that's really very important to all of us. And so at the end of the day, I've come to feel strongly that Riverside is not only a better choice, a far better choice. And I understand it's going to be a difficult transition. We do want to worry about the morale of the staff and how to transition. But this is a long-term thing, and I think we need to be thinking about that in terms of the greater benefits.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I'd like to go to the phone so we don't leave them dangling till the last. And I'll try to do this in alphabetical order, if I can. So I'll start with John Balmes. Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Hi, Chair Nichols. So I won't be long. I think I outlined a framework for my decision making at the Board meeting last week. I agree that both universities have made -- presented very compelling cases. It's a difficult decision, and I have to say that scientifically the potential synergies with the Riverside atmospheric chemistry and environmental engineering groups with our own laboratory that potential synergy is really great. And going through the points that the staff had in their presentation last week to try to create a world class facility -- I would say maintain
the world class facility, because I think we already have that, and push it to either -- even greater heights, and to have an international impact, national/international impact, and to do the best for the State of California that we can, that the Riverside location looks somewhat better than the very good Cal Poly Pomona site.

That said, I'm very mindful of the impact on staff. So it's -- like I said last week, it's a hard decision for me, because we already have a world class laboratory, and the Cal Poly proposal is not a bad one. I just think that for the long term, the investment in the Riverside location provides more bang for the buck. And I think as stewards -- good stewards of California taxpayer dollars, that it's the better investment.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I just would also say, we really have to work hard to try to mitigate the negative impact on staff from a move to Riverside. So I am supportive of whatever we can do to provide help to the staff.

CHAIR NICHOLS: So before we leave here this morning, I do want to have a discussion with Mr. Corey about some of the specifics of what the staff will be working on going forward here. But I also feel a need to, before I go to Mr. De La Torre just to make one point,
because when we talk about synergies, I want to be clear
to everyone, our staff, our stakeholders, the public that
we are not becoming a unit of either campus. We are going
to be receiving free land to build a free-standing
laboratory. And there are opportunities for synergy and
they are certainly important to consider, but I think it's
also important to understand and to reiterate that Air
Resources Board is not giving up its independence or its
authority.

This is going to be a laboratory that's going to
be created and operated by the Air Resources Board to
support our mission. So it's a great advantage, not only
because we've been given the opportunity to do this with
free land, but also to consider ways in which we can
enhance and expand our work and our access to research and
to students and faculty and so forth. But there shouldn't
be any confusion that we're somehow becoming an arm of the
university.

With that, I will go to Mr. De La Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you. I said a
lot last week, and I have a little bit more to say today.
I think that staff's -- and again, it's not just our
staff. It's DGS and others who have worked on this
recommendation based it on knowable facts, and based on
those knowable facts, made a recommendation.
I appreciate the comments that have been made so far by my colleagues, but many of those things that have been cited are future hypotheticals, not known facts. They are parts of a pitch that was made to us to have this facility located at one or the other place. And so, yes, maybe one of the two campuses is better at their pitch than the other. We're not here to buy a car or a house. We're not dealing with a real estate broker or a car salesman. We are dealing with analysis from our own staff of which would be the better location for our employees. I think the recommendation speaks for itself, that we should go with Cal Poly Pomona.

So what are some of the facts that we know? We know that significant numbers of our staff, over 80 percent, are going to have to drive further to get to Riverside. So that is increased emissions, that is increased greenhouse gases, and that is increased cap -- increased cost for the movement of those employees, if they decide to move out there.

That's not a hypothetical. That's not a maybe. That's not possible synergies. That's real. Those -- we're going to have to figure out significant issues with that with each of those points.

One thing that we learned last week is, in addition to the relocation costs, our employees have
bumping rights. Because of the distance -- the additional
distance that they are going to have to move, they will
now have bumping rights at all State agencies in the Los
Angeles area to move and leave CARB. Because there's
another opportunity in another agency that they can go
work in, they will have better quality of life, because
they won't have to commute as far. That's significant.
That's real. That's tangible.

In terms of diversity, last week we had the
presentations. And there was, I think, a few people spoke
about the diversity in Riverside. Well, Pomona's economic
and ethnic diversity is every bit as much as Riverside.
There's not very much difference at all there. We're not
talking about Beverly Hills versus Riverside side. We're
talking about Pomona versus Riverside, so there is no
tangible difference there.

And I think we kind of oversold what we were
offering. Maybe it was to get that really good deal from
one of these universities way back in the beginning when
this proposal was put together, but this is, and will
continue to be, fundamentally a vehicle lab. Sixty-six
percent of our employees at the Haagen-Smit laboratory are
directly involved in motor vehicle testing. Another 13
percent are not involved in the testing, but are directly
involved in the data analysis from the vehicle testing.
That's 79 percent of the employees who are doing vehicle -- direct vehicle testing work, another 12 percent are doing enforcement, and nine percent are doing general admin work. There are no non-vehicle related researchers at the Haagen-Smit Laboratory. Let me repeat that. There are no non-vehicle laboratory workers or research workers at El Monte. That is -- that's a fact. That's real. That's what this lab is.

I understand about all of the potential research possibilities, but we have those no matter where it is located, because we have those today. We already farm out all of this wonderful research to these fantastic universities we have in the State of California.

And as I pointed out as the employees who came up and spoke last week pointed out in terms of how many Cal Poly graduates we have already working for us just in the lab, we have about 50 Cal Poly Pomona employees. They are already producing the kind of workers that we use, not the ones we'd like to use, not the ones that we potentially could use in the future, 20, 30 years down the road, but the ones we already use. That's not going to change.

So if I look at this, I appreciate my colleagues being inspired by the possibilities, but we have an obligation to the realities. And the realities are that this is a vehicle lab. It's been in an industrial park in
El Monte for decades. And it's going to be in a better place, with better possible possibilities attached to a university in the great State of California, regardless of which we choose. It will be a step up.

I believe that fundamentally what this -- what this has turned into is a bias towards UC, and against the Cal State, in this case the Cal Poly campus, which is no regular Cal State campus.

I think that we have a recommendation from our staff that tells us which is the better -- not the best, the better, most cost effective choice, and we know, as I said last week, 85 percent of our employees want to move to Pomona. And as I pointed out just right now, the facts are very clear about what this lab is. Unless, we are going to completely restructure CARB to move significant portions of what we do from Sacramento down to Riverside, and maybe we should have that conversation, then we are talking about two different things. We should be talking about this lab moving to the best place for what it does in these next few years, because in the long term, everything can change.

So by putting -- making references to things 20, 30 years down the road, none of us knows. I'm not going to be on this Board, chances are no one of us is going to be on this Board. Therefore, we should stick with what we
know, we should stick with the recommendation that's before us, and we should keep face with our employees who have made their views clear on something that's not outrageous. All they're asking for us to do is to follow staff's recommendation to us, of which is the better site, and that is Cal Poly Pomona.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much, Hector and thank you for all the time that you put in during the earlier stages of this process, where we were out visiting the campuses and meeting with faculty and students, et cetera, as well as your work with the staff.

I would like to hear next -- I guess I'm going to trying to be in alphabetical order here, to Mr. Eisenhut.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Thank you, Chair Nichols. I raised last week questions regarding the impact of the site on the potential effectiveness of folks doing their job, specifically with regard to Enforcement Division. And since I raised the issue, and had a chance to become more informed in some of the details the work that the staff had done, I want to report back the results of that conversation.

That impact would accrue specifically on enforcement folks, about half of whom already work remotely, either from their homes or from a remote
location, and their interaction with the lab is sporadic, maybe every other week or once a month. There are half a dozen, approximately, folks whose daily task includes sampling of fuels and return of those samples back to the lab. It's judged that given the traffic complexities that already exist, that there will need to be some arrangements made, pooling of those samples.

And so the impact operationally -- this was not the term that the staff used, but I would say it's a manageable impact, and has a pretty limited impact in terms of the number of employees whose daily task would be affected. So I need to raise the issue and I wanted to share that information.

I am -- my decision process. We have a committee, and I haven't heard yet from Barbara, but assuming that she is consistent with her position of last week, the recommendation of the Committee is bifurcated. We have a staff recommendation which is clear. And in that regard, I disagree with my friend Hector. It's our responsibility to study and honor that recommendation, but not necessarily to adopt it. The adoption is our responsibility.

Having said that, for a variety of reasons, and including the one I think best just articulated by Hector, I am in opposition to the motion.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. We will now hear from --

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Mary? Mary, sorry, we
got -- we didn't hear the end of John's testimony -- or
his comments.

CHAIR NICHOLS: John, you want to repeat what you
said?

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Did I pull away from the
mic. I'm sorry, that I am in opposition to the motion.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Make sure you stay close to
the mic.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: I'm in opposition to the
motion. Sorry, I had to say that three times.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. We heard you. I think we
heard you now.

I think actually I was going to call on you next,
Supervisor Gioia.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Thank you. And first, let
me start by again acknowledging the really heartfelt
testimony by the supporters of both Pomona and Riverside.
It's clear to me that those committees really think highly
of their advantages and the benefits that they would offer
to ARB's consolidation efforts, and I appreciate that.

I'm not going to be long. I want to also say
that it is a difficult decision. I think there's some
short-term, medium-term, and long-term issues here at
stake.

So my final analysis is to think about the long-term implications of the decision. And in that regard, I essentially agree with the comments that have been made by my colleagues who agree with the selection of Riverside. So I will state it that way, because I don't want to repeat the comments that they made. And in saying that, that there really needs to be, I think, a lot of work with employees to understand their needs as this goes forward, so we could assist them and maintain the high quality employees that we've had.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.
I think it's next -- excuse me?
I'm skipping over the maker and seconder of the motion for the moment, and I will turn now to Mrs. Riordan.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Thank you very much. I have continued and thought about what I heard from the speakers of our last meeting, as well as my opportunities to be able to visit both sites and to hear very personal pleas to locate in either Pomona or Riverside. But as I had said at our last meeting, I feel that the opportunities that are in Riverside for the future, the long-term future of our operation, of our laboratory, clearly, in my opinion, Riverside is the site that I would
support.

And so, Madam Chair, I would support the motion that is on the floor. And having said that, would recognize clearly that the responsibility for mitigating some of the impact of that choice for our current staff will be our responsibility. And I will pledge myself to do that, along, I'm sure, with everyone else that is supporting this particular motion.

And so with that, I will conclude.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

Supervisor Serna.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you, Chair Nichols.

So as I stated earlier, I was -- I did not have an opportunity to attend in person the hearing last week in El Monte. So I want to preface my comments with the fact that I did do my best to glean from the transcript some of nuanced consideration of this important decision, as it was discussed then.

And I certainly have had an opportunity to be briefed by staff, even on the latest developments of the subject.

I guess I would start from a place of reflecting on the fact that we have an extraordinary army of staff here that do incredible work on all the subjects that come before this Board, and do very, very detailed analysis to
make sure that we are making the most informed decisions we can. And this is -- this is no different for me. I guess what I'm struggling with is I am hearing from the maker of the motion and the seconder and those that are supportive of thus far, and I understand some of the rationale that they've explained here today, and again, I've been able to try and read for myself earlier comments last week in the same vein from those supporters of the Riverside site. But for me I guess I would say that Member De La Torre has really articulated very well the fact that we have some very good facts in front of us that are presented to us no differently than other very detailed facts that staff routinely present this Board again to make informed decisions is it's difficult for me to try and reconcile and interest in looking at the long term, which I certainly appreciate the long term as it relates to the opportunities presented at the Riverside site.

But I guess, you know, given the facts that are presented by staff and the fact that I think that because we're talking about the long term, and, for me, that's measured not in years but decades, I've yet to hear a good reason why the Pomona site can't offer the same opportunities? I mean, there's a lot that can happen in the course of decades. There's a lot that can change in
terms of curricula that's offered. There's a lot that can
be offered at both sites, in terms of grooming a
partnership with ARB, a research partnership. And so the
argument that we ought to stay focused on the long term,
and, in fact, for some perhaps that's what tips them to
the site of supporting the motion, I would respectfully
say that, for me, that doesn't negate the same opportunity
as present for the Pomona site.

That combined with what I'm understanding would
be a tremendous burden on our staff to consider relocation
in many cases, combined with some of the extraordinary
differences -- side-by-side differences that have been
presented in the staff report and recommendation, most
notably for me that nearly 80 percent of staff would have
a round trip commute in excess of 90 minutes for the
Riverside site is very compelling, and that our employees,
if the Riverside site were selected, would incur an
additional $6,400 a year in their annual driving costs.
These are very compelling points for me.

So if we're looking, as Supervisor Gioia
mentioned, at the short, medium, and long term, for me,
the short and medium term is -- it's pretty obvious that
there would be much less impact, much less disruption for
our employees if the Pomona site is selected. And again,
I will -- and by again referencing the fact that I don't
think that the selection of the Pomona site somehow
negates the -- some of the same opportunities that we
would have for long-term enhancement of our research
capabilities there as opposed to Riverside.

And so for these reasons, I will not be able to
support the resolution.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. We'll turn now to Ms.
Takvorian, if you wish to make any comments. You're not
required to, but if you would like to, please do.

I thought she was on the line, no?

Apparently not. All right. We'll check and
we'll move on.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I am on the line. Can
you hear me?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Oh, there you are. Okay. Good.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Can you hear me?

You were on mute before. Hi. Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Hi. Thank you very
much. Sorry about the difficulty with that. I have been
able to hear -- I have been able to hear everything that's
been said, so thanks so much. I wanted to say that I
really appreciate everyone's comments, and appreciate,
particularly Mr. De La Torre's comments and his hard work
on the Committee. I think very good points have been made
regarding the lab, and the enforcement functions. I want
to say that I want to reiterate my concerns that I 
expressed last week about the decision being continued 
only one week to this meeting, with, for me anyway, 
virtually no time to talk to staff, or respond, get 
responses to questions. And that's not staff's fault. 
It's just the matter of scheduling. It just wasn't enough 
time. And it certainly wasn't enough time to explore 
alternatives that I think a number of Board members, 
including myself, raised at the last meeting.

I'm sure that I'm at more of a disadvantage as a 
new member, but I just want to say that I would have 
appreciated more time to process some of that and to 
explore some of the alternatives.

But we're here today, and I wanted to say that I 
really appreciated the staff's work to develop the report, 
and also particularly the staff testimony, which I thought 
was compelling and very heartfelt. Staff morale and 
satisfaction is critically important to me. And I think 
that if this were a decision that impacted the next five 
or 10 years, I would be fine with the Pomona site, because 
I think it would just affect those staff that are 
currently in place.

But it's not a decision for just the next five to 
10 years, and I think it is multiple decades. And I do 
believe that the site at UCR, the attributes are more
clearly relevant, given the historical relationship CE-CERT, the new medical school, and the fact that the university has been on the edge of cutting -- the cutting edge of air quality research. And I also think that there's a point to be made that Riverside is more of an environmental justice community. And investment in a disadvantaged community, I think is something that we, as a Board, should think about in terms of allocation of State resources.

So that is compelling to me, as well as what I think the university's benefits are. This is one of the most transportation emission polluted areas of California. And I think it would be compelling to have the Air Resources Board there. And as a resident of San Diego, I have to say that having most State and other kinds of resources centered in Los Angeles doesn't really speak to Southern California, and doesn't provide access to San Diego, Orange, Imperial Counties. So I think there's that kind of proximity as well.

So for those reasons, as well as many that have been cited by fellow Board members, I'm -- I will support the motion. I do hope, however, that we can explore alternatives for staff transition for a period after the facility is built. I've been told that that isn't practical, but I want to -- I hope we can explore whether
it's possible to have some of those transitions, so that potentially may have staff in two locations. So I appreciate everyone's consideration and I'll support the motion.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you for those comments. I will now return to the maker and seconder of the motion to see if they have any additional comments that they would like to make, at this time.

Ms. Berg, go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: We're going to twist the Chair's neck.

Thank you. Actually, Madam Chair, I'm just anxious to hear your direction and conversation with Mr. Corey in terms of how that might work. So I will hold my comments, if I have any comment at all after that.


VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you. This has been quite a journey. And as I thought about this on my plane ride up this morning, I thought about the fact that it started out with a vision, and the vision from Chair Nichols, really to create an opportunity to catapult ARB's world class intellectual expertise with building an equally impressive world class facility. And over this last week, I, too, have been struggling between the impacts of staff and making this decision.
In looking at making change, we do know that our current facility we've outgrown it. It will not take us into the next decade, much less several decades. And so in feeling that discomfort, exchanging the current frustration of not having a world class facility, with the disruption that any change would make, whether it was Pomona or Riverside, understanding that the Riverside site will have more disruption on staff and understanding, too, that we, as decision makers, can appreciate that on paper, but we won't live through that personally, and I'm very mindful of that as I make that decision.

To that end, I personally went and visited both sites again last week, and had a long conversation with staff, and I wish I could tell you that that really cleared things up for me. Actually, it just, depending on who I was leaving, made it even more apparent how we had two good choices.

After all of that, the tipping point for me is towards the vision, and is towards the possibility. And I will commit myself, along with the other Board members that I have heard from, to help staff, because I will support the resolution for Riverside, and I will be part of the solution to try to find every possible way to not only mitigate, but also to encourage.

I go back to my commute this morning. I live in
Long Beach and only had to go to the Orange County Airport in bumper-to-bumper traffic wondering if I would make my flight. And maybe this is an opportunity that in 20 or 30 years we will address the transportation issues that we have in Southern California that are clearly keeping us gridlocked. And so I will hold on to that as part of our vision as well.

So there's no question, if the vote is upheld for Riverside, I personally want to challenge Riverside, because we have a lot of work in front of us, and we expect more than business as usual, and -- both for our employees, for ARB, for the State of California, and of all the UCs, as well as our partners -- to reach out to our partners of our State universities. And I think it's going to be incumbent on UCR to really help us make this a tremendous reality.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much. So I guess it's back to me, and -- unless you want to make a comment.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: No.

CHAIR NICHOLS: You're going to wait anyway. So here's the -- here's what I think, at this point. First of all, this is a very major investment on the part of the State of California in Southern California. And it's great to have an opportunity to be part of making that
happen.

To my colleagues who don't come from the region, I feel a little bit like I'm in the decision making that sometimes the local officials are on a land-use decision, you know, looking at the traffic impacts, looking at the jobs impacts, looking at other kind of synergies in the community. And frankly, it was the advantages of Riverside more as a community which came together to make the very strong presentation and commitments that they did that swayed me more than the benefits of the university. Not that I'm unmindful of, you know, the benefits of being with the University of California, but that we had our former Board Member Ron Loveridge who I see is in the audience today, who spent so many years both as Mayor and as a South Coast Board member working on air quality issues, the reality that Riverside is the epicenter historically of the air in California, not a distinction that I'm sure they wish to be reminded of, but it is a part of the reality, and that the community, as a whole, is a place that has done so much to try and address its own problems as well makes this an appealing opportunity to be a strategic partner for Riverside in this effort.

Clearly, however, the success of ARB's motor vehicle program is a direct result of the work that's done at the Haagen-Smit Laboratory. And while observing that
we have many graduates of UC Riverside and Cal Poly, I don't think either one of them is going to stop sending us very fine graduates or providing opportunities to work with.

So I think we have to recognize that a move is going to have a serious impact on our programs from the moment we start seriously working on it. And we have to make sure that whatever we're doing in furtherance of this project does not jeopardize our hard earned respect and our reputation with the industries that we regulate or cost us in any way that we can possibly avoid the retention of our expert staff, because they are at the core of our work.

I have a list of ideas and suggestions, which I have -- which actually are in writing. I'm just going to read them, because I think it's important for everybody to hear, but I assure you that I will give it to Richard to have in writing as well, because I think they could become part of our direction to the Executive Officer as part of our action here today.

So clearly, we've heard that we need to move quickly on assuring our employees that we're hearing them, and that we're going to work with them as they consider their options for moving, flexible schedules, tele-working, working non-standard hours, mobile work
stations. All of those are issues that they all have
challenges, but they all are things that we have to give
serious consideration to, given the horrific traffic that
we already deal with. But now that we're thinking about
the move, it becomes very timely to start working on them
now.

The transportation options needs of our current
employees, what we can do as citizens of Southern
California to be working with the transit agencies, but
also to be working with our employees, in terms of helping
to overcome additional costs of commuting for them is
going to have to be a part of the consideration here, as
well as the possibility for the enforcement and field
staff to be able to work, not only from home, as many of
them do, but also to be able to have access to vehicles
there, and whether there could be courier options, as Mr.
Eisenhut mentioned, for fuels and samples and so forth.

We already do this between our heavy-duty testing
facility and the main laboratory. We have a shuttle going
back and forth with samples. It's not ideal, but given
the challenges of getting around, it's -- it may be that
we should be doing more of that on a regular basis.

Looking at reimbursable expenses in connection
with relocating, as well as temporary living expenses and
moving, options for reimbursing relocation for staff that
are not covered by the professional engineers in California government contract, because that unit has authorization to receive relocation costs, but the others do not. So we're going to have to figure out what we do for the non-represented employees as well.

Looking to our new partners with the University of California as well as the City and County of Riverside to look at what the amenities are. We heard mention of many of these things at the hearing, but we have to try to put meat on the bones in terms of help and attention for relocation of spousal jobs, the amenities that Chancellor Wilcox mentioned in his handout that included access to child care facilities, adjunct faculty positions. I mean, these are all things that are hypothetical now. And obviously it depends on individuals and their interests and choices, but we need to start figuring out how we're going to make those things real opportunities, as Ms. Berg has stated before.

We know that employees are, in some cases, apprehensive about moving from their relatively safe area where they are comfortable now to the big City of Riverside. And there may be some issues there about security. And I think also looking ahead, as has been mentioned before, this move is going to take place in roughly five years. Not everybody will make the move,
either because they were already planning to retire or
because their career choices focus them in other areas.

But in every instance, we need to be enhancing
our succession planning, recruiting, things that have come
up really through the ARB staff surveys. And again, using
ARB staff as a focus group to help develop these ideas as
was done during the earlier stages of this process is
going to be very important, I think.

I also want to say, and I've aye already been
contacted by the Chamber of Commerce in Riverside offering
to do this, but plans to acquaint the staff early with
opportunities that exist for them in the Riverside area,
including schools, housing, et cetera, entertainment
opportunities and so forth, we should really be starting
that soon, even if we're not going to be moving right
away, just so people have a better idea of what their
future opportunities might be.

Lastly, in order that this not just languish, I
want to say staff reporting back within 60 days about what
they've done to implement these suggestions, and to put
together a real plan for transition. I expect we're going
to want to be hearing at least quarterly reports on the
progress of this project anyhow, given its importance to
ARB.

But I think on this particular issue of outreach
to the employees, mobilizing whatever staff resources we
need from Sacramento to assist in this effort, as well as
seeking additional resources, if you need them, as part of
the budget process to not just do designing and building,
but also to look at the employee side of this, those are
all going to be important concerns.

So I have this all down in writing. You do, too,
I think. So I don't have to ask you to recite it all back
to me, but I think I would appreciate some comments from
you, Mr. Corey.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thank you, Chair.
And the theme that came through, and is coming through
loud and clear from the Board, is the respect of the and
appreciation of the extraordinary staff, I mean, that is
crystal clear. And you all know it's the life-blood of
the effectiveness of this organization. I heard, you
know, significant concerns about the need to mitigate and
really minimize disruption. And you called out, Chair,
just a few examples, in terms of the impact and
opportunities, options for dealing with the transportation
the -- the very real transportation issue. I mean, I
won't sugarcoat it. It's an issue we're going to have to
deal with and take head on and work through.

The relocation related issues, the comment that
was made about enforcement and how we can effectively
continue to operate that element of the program, which may mean some additional satellite related activities. And looking at exploring flexible work schedules, that's something that we're going to need to look at as well.

But to kind of -- to get to the heart of the point that you just made, which was although breaking ground is still a few years out, there's a lot to do. And although occupancy is targeted for 2020, we'll get to work on this now. And the way we're going to do this is go right back to the amazing team that we have, sit down with them, and their creativity, as well as that of this Board, Riverside, and a range of other partners, in terms of walking through each of these issues, calling them out, and really beginning to dive in in terms of what are our opportunities, what are the options, what the trade-offs, and develop a plan.

And, Chair, we'll report back in 60 days the progress on that plan. And as you requested, because I'll need, as the Executive Officer of this organization, continued interaction and assistance from this Board, as issues are identified, as also as opportunities. You'll get quarterly reports, how's it going, are the problems, are there issues, areas where I need help or the team needs help.

I'll also be reaching out very quickly to
Riverside and UCR and following up on Chancellor Wilcox's
commitment last -- at last week's Board hearing in terms
of number of opportunities that were on the table to fully
explore those and work with them, because I think that's
part of the overall strategy.

So at this point, providing, you know, the
direction as I understand it going, it's going to be get
to work, get to work with the team, get to work on an
overall timetable while we're working on the facility plan
as well.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Just as a practical
matter, once this Board votes, our recommendation, along
with all the other materials, are due to the Joint
Legislative Budget Committee. That's our next step in
this process, correct?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: It's correct. It's
actually is submitted to Department of Finance, Department
of Finance will transmit it to the Joint Legislative
Budget Committee, which will have 30 days to provide
comments. We'll be responding to those comments. If
there's any issues, I'll be reporting back to the Board on
that as well. And then the next stop would be back to
Department of General Services to begin the site prep and
associated transfer -- land transfer.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Do we have any additional
comments before we proceed to a roll call?

Mr. Corey.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Chair, I wanted to add, my colleagues here pointed out two additional areas that we will need to follow up on as well. In terms of the follow up on the site, it will include a full CEQA evaluation. And we also want to work with Riverside and the commitment in terms of zero net energy and how that could potentially factor into the project.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, the need to acquire sufficient land, so that we can actually generate our own electricity on site is one of the factors that we've been looking at.

All right. Seeing no additional --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yes. This is --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, excuse me?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yes, this is Hector.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Hector, yes, go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: One more data point as this moves forward, which is I'm sure we are going to be losing employees, I'd like to have a running count of how much employees we lose who, in their exit interviews or in other ways, let us know that they are leaving because of this move.

CHAIR NICHOLS: You know, I'm sure we can keep
track of what's going on with our staffing in El Monte. You are perhaps deliberately doing your best to send a message. I would like to say that I hope that that is not the way it's heard, because I realize, having met with the employees, with the group, including the leaders of the laboratory day before yesterday, that while their feelings, you know, ranged from concern to, in a few cases, support, but in many, many cases opposition to the decision, that, you know, our job is to reach out to them and talk to them about the Board's thinking.

And I think driving a wedge between the staff and the Board is the opposite of what we should be trying to do. But we will certainly be keeping track of what's going on with employment in El Monte, and, you know, you'll have access to that information, absolutely.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you.
CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Madam Clerk, would you please call the roll.

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Dr. Balmes?
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Aye.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. De La Torre?
BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: No.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. Eisenhut?
BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: No.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Senator Florez?
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Aye.

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Gioia?

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Aye.

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mrs. Riordan?

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Aye.

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Serna?

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: No.

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Professor Sperling?

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Aye.

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Takvorian?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Aye.

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Vice Chair Berg?

VICE CHAIR BERG: Aye.

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Chair Nichols?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Aye.

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: The motion passes 8 to 3.

Thank you, and thanks to all for an extremely cordial and high level discussion.

And we'll now move on to the next stages. And I think -- did anyone sign up for general public comment?

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: (Shakes head.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Then we can be adjourned.

All right.

(Thereupon the Air Resources Board adjourned at 11:15 a.m.)
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