

JOINT MEETING  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
AIR RESOURCES BOARD  
AND  
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CALEPA HEADQUARTERS  
COASTAL HEARING ROOM  
SECOND FLOOR  
1001 I STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 2017

1:11 P.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  
Senator Dean Florez  
Supervisor John Gioia  
Ms. Judy Mitchell  
Mrs. Barbara Riordan  
Ms. Diane Takvorian(via teleconference)

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Dr. Martha Dina Argüello  
Ms. Katie Valenzuela Garcia  
Ms. Sekita Grant  
Mr. Kevin Hamilton  
Mr. Rey León  
Mr. Luis Olmedo(via teleconference)  
Ms. Mari Rose Taruc  
Ms. Eleanor Torres

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

STAFF:

Mr. Richard Corey, Executive Officer

Ms. Edie Chang, Deputy Executive Officer

Ms. Ellen Peter, Chief Counsel

Ms. Veronica Eady, Assistant Executive Officer

Ms. Emily Wimberger, Chief Economist

Ms. Trish Johnson, Staff Air Pollution Specialist

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. JP Cativiela, Dairy Cares

Dr. Amy Kyle

I N D E X

	PAGE
1. Welcome and Introductions	1
2. Discuss EJAC Recommendations	6 79
3. Public Comment	76 127
4. Discuss options for addressing the EJAC's Recommendations	132
5. Closing remarks	146
Adjournment	151
Reporter's Certificate	152

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

2 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Thanks, everybody for coming  
3 today to this joint meeting of the ARB and the EJAC.

4 My name is Caelan McGee. I'm a facilitator with  
5 Sac State. I'm going to be brief with the agenda review  
6 and then I'm going to invite us to be efficient with  
7 introductions and opening comments, because we have an  
8 ambitious agenda today. So let's save our time for -- for  
9 the juice.

10 For today's agenda, we have two types of  
11 discussions. We're going to start with some opening  
12 comments. But really the first discussion will be a big  
13 picture focus about strategies and approach to  
14 incorporating environmental justice concerns and  
15 strategies into the scoping plan. And if not there, then  
16 what might come next.

17 But then we're going to get specific by sector,  
18 and so we're going to save some time to have some specific  
19 comments about the scoping plan by sector. Towards the  
20 end of the meeting, taking a look at coordination and  
21 implementation looking forward. Also looking for  
22 opportunities for public comment.

23 For those in the room right now that may want to  
24 indicate -- may want to do a public comment today, would  
25 you mind raising your hand or just letting me at this

1 moment. I'll be checking later as well. Thanks. This is  
2 just for numbers.

3 If you'd be so kind, please do take an  
4 opportunity to sign a comment card, so that we can build a  
5 queue for y'all.

6 I'll be back in a minute, but why don't we do a  
7 round of introductions. If you'd be so kind please let us  
8 know who you are and your affiliation. I'm Caelan McGee.  
9 I'm from Sacramento State.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: I'm Mary Nichols. I'm the Chair  
11 of the California Air Resources Board. I'm from Los  
12 Angeles.

13 VICE CHAIR BERG: Sandy Berg also from ARB, Vice  
14 Chair, and I'm also from Los Angeles.

15 EJAC MEMBER TORRES: Eleanor Torres, Incredible  
16 Edible Community Gardens, San Bernardino County.

17 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Hector De La Torre Air  
18 Resources Board member from South Gate, California.

19 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Kevin Hamilton, EJAC  
20 member from Fresno, California.

21 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Katie Valenzuela  
22 Garcia EJAC member here from Sacramento.

23 EJAC MEMBER GRANT: Sekita Grant EJAC member,  
24 Greenlining Institute from Oakland.

25 EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: Martha Dina Argüello,

1 EJAC member from Los Angeles and Silver lake.

2 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: John Balmes, CARB Board  
3 member currently from Berkeley, from Chicago originally.

4 (Laughter.)

5 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Judy Mitchell, member of  
6 the CARB Board. I'm also on the South Coast Air Quality  
7 Management District Board. I live in Los Angeles in  
8 Rolling Hills Estates, represent 51 cities from the  
9 western half of L.A. County.

10 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Good afternoon. Mari Rose  
11 Taruc with the Asian Pacific Environmental Network on the  
12 EJAC, and coming from Oakland today.

13 ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER EADY: Veronica Eady,  
14 ARB staff, Assistant Executive Officer for Environmental  
15 Justice.

16 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: I'm Edie Chang,  
17 Deputy Executive Officer at the Air Resources Board.

18 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Richard Corey,  
19 Executive Officer, Air Resources Board.

20 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: Trish Johnson.  
21 I'm the ARB staff lead for the AB 32 Environmental Justice  
22 Advisory Committee. And now I want to turn it over to our  
23 second location in National City.

24 Can you please go ahead.

25 EJAC MEMBER OLMEDO: Hi. This is Luis Olmedo

1 with Comite Civico Del Valle, Environmental Justice  
2 Advisory Committee member.

3 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: And this is Diane  
4 Takvorian, ARB Board Member, San Diego, National City.

5 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: Thank you for  
6 that. I'm going to take one minute for the folks in the  
7 room here to provide logistical information and Emergency  
8 procedures.

9 There are restrooms and water fountains outside  
10 the door further down the atrium, past the green  
11 chandeliers. And there's also a cafe on the first floor.  
12 Please notice the emergency exit signs at the rear of the  
13 room. In the event of a fire alarm, we're required to  
14 evacuate this room and go downstairs and out the building  
15 to the park across the street. When the all-clear signal  
16 is given, we can return to the room and resume our  
17 meeting.

18 FACILITATOR MCGEE: We're schedule for 1:00 to  
19 5:00 today. I don't think we need guidelines for our  
20 discussions. But I will just remind us, it is important,  
21 especially with those Participating remotely, that we  
22 speak one at a time or it's very difficult for people to  
23 hear.

24 Always best if we speak for our own interests and  
25 our own needs. And then because we do have such an

1 ambitious agenda, if we could work to be efficient and  
2 brief, so that we can have as much room to talk about what  
3 we need teed to talk about.

4           And if things do get out of hand, we brought some  
5 extra resources today. We have Mutti, the attack dog,  
6 who --

7           (Laughter.)

8           FACILITATOR MCGEE: -- if things get sideways, if  
9 she senses that you're upset, she's very sensitive. She  
10 may come up and lick you and see what's wrong. So some  
11 extra resources today.

12           (Laughter.)

13           FACILITATOR MCGEE: With that, I wanted to make a  
14 chance for some opening comments. The order doesn't  
15 matter, but we did identify Chair Nichols and Vice Chair  
16 Berg and Mari Rose to speak.

17           Chair, would you like to start us off.

18           CHAIR NICHOLS: First of all, I'm just happy to  
19 be here and that we were able to get this meeting  
20 organized. I know it was difficult for people to find the  
21 time to make the time to be here. And so I appreciate the  
22 fact that we have a good representation, both from my  
23 Board and from the EJAC here today.

24           This is a very significant undertaking that we're  
25 involved in. And I think all of us take it very

1 seriously. But sometimes it feels like we're slogging  
2 through a very complicated and difficult set of issues.  
3 And so I guess my major wish for this meeting, I'll put it  
4 in the form of my hopes for the meeting, are that we can,  
5 as a group, reach some agreement on some aspect of how  
6 we're moving forward with the scoping plan, because I  
7 think if we can do that, that other things will come  
8 together more readily. But remembering that our purpose,  
9 at least for the Air Resources Board's perspective is to  
10 produce a plan that shows how we will meet our very  
11 ambitious climate goals by 2030, and do it in a way that  
12 also benefits the State as a whole, including our  
13 disadvantaged communities. So if we can -- if we can make  
14 some progress on that, I will be a very happy person, and  
15 Mutti will be happy, too.

16 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Thank you very much.

17 Thank you.

18 Vice Chair Berg let me know that she's fine at  
19 the moment. And so what we would like to do is Mari Rose  
20 can offer not only her opening comments, but this can be a  
21 transition into our big picture section, which will  
22 include a presentation about 1 -- and discussion about AB  
23 197.

24 As you're ready.

25 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Great. It's wonderful to be

1 here. Yes, I agree. It was hard to get folks here and on  
2 the phone. And I'm really glad we are all together. The  
3 first and last time that we met in February, we -- the  
4 EJAC has done quite a bit of work since. We've had an  
5 EJAC meeting. And then on top of that, several statewide  
6 community meetings to present our recomm -- our top  
7 recommendations, and also where we were seeing the -- our  
8 recommendations land in the scoping plan.

9           And so the staff has since -- thank you, staff of  
10 ARB, for producing the table of cross-referencing the EJAC  
11 recommendations and where they landed in the scoping plan.  
12 And so now that we have that, we were able to pull out  
13 the -- some priorities to discuss with our communities in  
14 Oakland, in L.A., in the Central Valley, and Sacramento.

15           And from there, we started to pull together some  
16 of the top ideas that we wanted to discuss today, so that  
17 we can try to get those, as Chair Nichols was saying, it's  
18 like let's get see concrete agreements on what we'd like  
19 to see in the scoping plan.

20           So it was also great to see, and as a request  
21 from the EJAC, a presentation on AB 197. We see that as a  
22 key feature of -- of how we move forward from 2017 on  
23 towards our 2030 goals, and the interest in making sure  
24 that the biggest stationary and mobile sources of the  
25 emissions are reduced and especially in fenceline

1 communities and environmental justice areas. So we look  
2 forward to hearing that presentation, and having a  
3 discussion on that.

4 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Thanks. And those opening  
5 comments reflect one of our challenges today, which is  
6 that some of these issues overlap, and are broader than  
7 the scope of the scoping plan, and are still important and  
8 need to be discussed. And this is an opportunity given  
9 the timing to talk about the scoping plan. So we'll to  
10 try to balance those today.

11 And in line with that is a -- was a request to  
12 have a discussion about AB 197, updates on that. And  
13 let's go right ahead. ARB staff worked to put together a  
14 presentation on that. We can follow that with some  
15 question and discussion.

16 I think you've got the controller, Edie.

17 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was  
18 presented as follows.)

19 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: I do have the  
20 controller.

21 So I'm going to kick off the discussion today by  
22 talking a little bit about some of the new statutory  
23 requirements.

24 Who's controlling that?

25 Before I get into the details on the new climate

1 change requirements, I wanted to back up just a little bit  
2 and review ARB's overall mission. The first pollutants  
3 that ARB addressed starting in the late 1960s were  
4 criteria pollutants like ozone and PM2.5. Both U.S. EPA  
5 and ARB have set ambient air quality standards for  
6 criteria pollutants. And the Clean Air Act requires us to  
7 develop State Implementation Plans, or SIPs, to show how  
8 we will meet those standards.

9           The Mobile Source Strategy that we incorporate  
10 into the scoping plan was also developed to meet those  
11 federal standards. In the 1980s, new California laws were  
12 passed to focus on air toxics. And the early part of the  
13 program focused on industrial sources, both large ones,  
14 like refineries, and then smaller ones like chrome  
15 platers. After the identification of diesel exhaust as a  
16 toxic air contaminant, in 1998, our efforts turned to  
17 diesel engines, and ARB had set a goal to reduce diesel  
18 emissions and exposure by 75 percent by 2010, and 85  
19 percent by 2020, and we're well on our way towards that  
20 goal.

21           A couple of years ago, OEHHA updated their health  
22 risk assessment methodology to reflect new science about  
23 the impact of toxics exposure to children. And this  
24 science shows that exposure to toxics is three times as  
25 harmful as we had previously thought.

1           So as a result, ARB and the districts are now  
2 reevaluating our toxics control programs, including the  
3 need for potentially additional controls to address these  
4 pollutants. And then finally, on climate change, in 2006,  
5 AB 32 was enacted setting up a statewide framework for  
6 addressing climate changing emissions. AB 32, SB 32, and  
7 AB 197 set out the statutory framework for addressing  
8 climate change and outlined priorities for the scoping  
9 plan and our regulatory efforts.

10           So I'm going to focus on the new statutory  
11 requirements that were enacted in 2016. That's SB 32, and  
12 AB 197.

13                           --o0o--

14           DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: SB 32 set a 2030  
15 greenhouse gas target of 40 percent below 2020 levels.  
16 And AB 197, the companion legislation, which was author --  
17 authored by Assembly Member Garcia, who is also our new  
18 Board member, set out additional new requirements. I've  
19 summarized the ones that are most relevant to the climate  
20 change program, and the scoping plan on this slide.

21           So AB 197 asks ARB to provide more access to  
22 emissions data for greenhouse gas, criteria pollutants,  
23 and air toxics. It also says that when we adopt  
24 greenhouse gas regulations, we should consider the social  
25 cost of carbon and we should prioritize direct emission

1 reductions, that is emission reductions at individual  
2 sources.

3 AB 197 also requires the scoping plan to identify  
4 for each evaluated measure the projected greenhouse gas  
5 emissions, the projected air pollution reductions, and the  
6 cost effectiveness. And we're also supposed to consider  
7 the societal costs of those greenhouse gas emissions.

8 --o0o--

9 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: So we put  
10 together this table, which shows how we're looking at  
11 these new statutory requirements. So, first, and perhaps  
12 most importantly, the scoping plan will meet the scoping  
13 plan -- will meet the target for 2030. This is because  
14 the cap-and-trade regulation limits emissions with a  
15 declining cap to ensure that we reduce emissions towards  
16 achieving our target, even if other measures fail to  
17 perform as anticipated.

18 To meet the requirements for transparent  
19 emissions information, we developed a tool. It's called  
20 IEVT, the Integrated Emission Visualization Tool. This is  
21 a web-based tool that's built on Google Maps, and it shows  
22 greenhouse gas and criteria pollutant emissions for all  
23 large stationary sources that report greenhouse gases  
24 under the mandatory reporting regulations.

25 This tool went live at the end of last year, and

1 we are working with local air districts on the toxics  
2 data. And as required by AB 197, we are going to make  
3 that information available by the end of this year.

4 One of the things that's become really clear as  
5 we've gone through this is that the type of data that we  
6 get from each of our programs is really different.

7 --o0o--

8 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: And this is a  
9 short slide that just sort of summarizes that. In January  
10 of this year, we did a presentation to the Board to talk  
11 about the inventory and how the different objectives of  
12 our programs have led to different responsibilities,  
13 different reporting regulations, different timelines,  
14 different levels of detail, and different methodologies  
15 for each of these programs.

16 We recognize we had to have to move beyond this  
17 parallel system that we've set up towards a more  
18 integrated system. This is a substantial effort that's  
19 going to take a little while, but it will allow us and the  
20 public to better connect emissions data for different  
21 pollutants enhancing our ability to compare trends, and  
22 evaluate our programs from a multi-pollutant perspective.

23 This slide also shows that there are different  
24 techn -- just like there are different technical tools for  
25 these different pollutants, we also have different

1 statutory authority and different regulatory tools to  
2 control these different emissions. And we can most  
3 effectively address pollutants with control strategies  
4 that are directly focused on them.

5 --o0o--

6 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: So I'm going to  
7 go back to the table to talk about the other requirements.  
8 These other requirements sort of focus more specifically  
9 on scoping plan related issues. 197 requires ARB to  
10 consider the social cost of carbon. And that is the value  
11 of the damage resulting from the emissions of greenhouse  
12 gases. So for every measure we evaluated in the scoping  
13 plan, we took the anticipated greenhouse gas reductions,  
14 and using that we calculated the cost of avoided damages  
15 from the -- from that.

16 For the scoping plan, we're using the federal  
17 social cost of carbon. It was calculated by the federal  
18 government. The National Academy of Sciences is currently  
19 initiating a process to evaluate the social cost of  
20 carbon, which we are participating in to make sure that we  
21 are keeping abreast of the most current thinking and also  
22 to evaluate whether we should be pursuing a California  
23 specific social cost of carbon to reflect specific sort of  
24 California unique things.

25 AB 197 also requires ARB to prioritize direct

1 emission reductions when we're developing regulations.  
2 We've incorporated that direction into our development of  
3 the scoping plan, and evaluated the potential for direct  
4 emission reductions from the scoping plan measures.

5           Our concepts from last year before the  
6 legislation was passed included programs to directly  
7 reduce emissions from the energy sector, transportation  
8 sector, and the industrial section from programs like  
9 renewable portfolio standard, energy efficiency, the Low  
10 Carbon Fuel Standard, Clean Car Program, and the  
11 Cap-and-Trade Program.

12           For the industrial sector, we were already  
13 working on a regulation to reduce methane emissions from  
14 oil and gas operations, but we had not proposed to pursue  
15 other direct regulations on other sources as part of the  
16 scoping plan.

17           We've added a measure that's focused on  
18 refineries, which is the largest source of industrial  
19 emissions, which also contributes to transportation, which  
20 is the largest sector for greenhouse gas emissions.

21           So with a relatively small number of refineries  
22 contributing a high percentage of the industrial  
23 emissions, this gives us the large potential emission  
24 reductions from a relatively small number of facilities.

25           AB 197 also asks ARB to include information about

1 potential greenhouse gas and air pollution reductions for  
2 each proposed measure in the scoping plan. So we've  
3 estimated potential reductions associated with each of the  
4 measures in the scoping plan. These are estimates, and we  
5 will only get these reductions if we're actually  
6 successful at adopting and implementing these regulations.

7 I think you all know we engage in a very  
8 extensive rulemaking process consulting with the public,  
9 with industry, with environmental and environmental  
10 justice stakeholders. And through that process, we find  
11 we may get more than we thought, or maybe we may get less  
12 than we originally thought.

13 As directed by the Board at the January Board  
14 meeting, we've also taken a more detailed look at the  
15 health benefits associated with the scoping plan. Based  
16 on the estimated air pollution reductions, we've estimated  
17 avoided health effects, such as hospital visits, lost work  
18 days, and premature deaths. And when we presented this  
19 information at a workshop in March, we noted that we --  
20 when we compared the health benefits from the different  
21 alternatives that we've looked at, the results were very  
22 much similar across all of the alternatives. On a -- at a  
23 statewide health perspective, no one alternative appears  
24 better than any of the other alternatives, although  
25 individual measures may provide different benefits.

1           We've also estimated the potential benefits of  
2 increased active transportation to meet the VMT reduction  
3 goal. This is a relatively new area for ARB, but we felt  
4 it was really important to include, because if we can  
5 actually increase active transportation, so actually  
6 getting people to really do more, the potential benefits  
7 can be much larger than those that are associated with  
8 reducing air pollution.

9           We're also evaluating how ARB can include public  
10 health considerations, like we're doing with the active  
11 transportation analysis, in the implementation of other  
12 scoping plan programs as we go forward.

13           And then lastly, 197 requires ARB to identify the  
14 cost effectiveness of each measure in the scoping plan and  
15 we've shown that in a table on -- in the scoping plan. So  
16 AB 197 provided important direction to ARB as we were  
17 developing the scoping plan that we've been working on.  
18 And we've provide information in this development of the  
19 plan that helps the public understand the differences  
20 between, and then the similarities between some of the  
21 alternatives.

22           Based on these analyses and the refinement of  
23 that work that we've been doing, we continue to believe  
24 that our proposed plan provides a cost effective, flexible  
25 and environmentally sound program.

1 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Thank you.

2 Let me open the floor for discussion.

3 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Thanks, Caelan.  
4 We have a system where we like to put up our typed cards,  
5 so that you know we don't have to like raise our hand and  
6 do that.

7 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Brilliant. Love it.

8 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Thank you for  
9 that, Edie.

10 So at one point, you mentioned that you're trying  
11 to integrate -- integrate the data sources across. What  
12 is the status of that?

13 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: So what we're  
14 doing right now is we're putting the information -- we're  
15 taking the information that we have, and we're showing  
16 it -- we're showing this -- it's kind of -- sort of in one  
17 place, right?

18 But what we're seeing is that we're going through  
19 is that, for example, the greenhouse gas data is collected  
20 on a different time frame, the process it's collected by  
21 is a little bit different. And the source that you're  
22 collecting from is a little bit different. It's like it's  
23 a facility based instead of equipment based.

24 So we've done our best to map the criteria  
25 pollutant inventory and the greenhouse gas inventory, so

1 that you're looking at sort of the same universe, and  
2 that's what you see on the visualization tool right now.  
3 That's what -- that's what we're in the process of doing  
4 on toxics also.

5           So what we're doing right now is we're kind of  
6 taking these three different things that aren't quite  
7 exactly the same, and we're trying to equalize them. In  
8 order to take this more -- this really more integrated  
9 approach, where we have more consistency across all three  
10 of them, that's going to be probably a multi-year program,  
11 because the data that we get some of it comes from the air  
12 districts. So facilities report to the air districts, the  
13 air districts report that data to us.

14           So it's a pretty complicated process. When we  
15 talked about it at the Board in January, sort of who has  
16 responsibility for the data and for quality assurance and  
17 quality control, who determines what the methodologies  
18 are, they're kind of different in everyone of those  
19 venues. So it's going to take us a little while to go  
20 through that. And so what we're doing right now is trying  
21 to make sure that we're still providing that information,  
22 but recognizing it's not an exact perfect fit.

23           EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Okay. Thank you  
24 for that. You also mentioned that AB 197 for the scoping  
25 plan requires you to do analysis of each measure within

1 the scoping plan, but what I see is sort of this overall  
2 scenario analysis. I think what I'd like to see is maybe  
3 a finer grain of detail within those scenarios of  
4 individual policies, and what their potential emissions  
5 reductions might be, what the target for those might be.

6           You know, since April when we met in San  
7 Bernardino, I've been talking about metrics. Like, I  
8 really want metrics. I want something so we know -- like  
9 saying globally a number is changing is one thing, but  
10 really understanding, oh, it's going down in  
11 transportation, or it's going down here, or it's not going  
12 down as much as we thought it would, in natural and  
13 working lands, makes it easier for us to track. And I  
14 think also, like one of the things -- because we know  
15 there's -- there's different regions in the State that  
16 experience these issues differently and they experience  
17 different sectors differently.

18           Like in certain regions like in Sacramento, our  
19 number one source of pollution is transportation.

20           DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: Right.

21           EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: So if we're able  
22 to break out those numbers more geographically, I think --  
23 because it's going to be different across all the regions  
24 in the State. So I think what I'd like to see us move  
25 towards is that type of emissions reduction production and

1 standards. Like, this is how much we're expecting this  
2 measure will achieve. This is -- and then this is where,  
3 even if it's regionally, we expect those emissions to go  
4 down, so that we can really understand more from an  
5 environmental justice perspective where changes are or are  
6 not happening geographically, moving away from  
7 sector-based numbers and towards more a finer tooth on  
8 that.

9 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: So just -- just  
10 so know, there is a table that's in the scoping plan that  
11 goes through each of the measures. So there's a table  
12 that goes through like for Low Carbon Fuel Standard and  
13 for the Renewable Portfolio Standard, here's the expected  
14 greenhouse gas reductions and criteria pollutant  
15 reductions. So that -- that actually is in the document.

16 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: But I think  
17 there's like a regional level, you know, like something  
18 that happens in the San Joaquin Valley versus what is it  
19 going to do in the Sacramento region. I mean really  
20 getting to a finer tooth on where we're expecting those  
21 emissions reductions to happen by region.

22 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: So that isn't in  
23 here. And I think that we could probably do something  
24 like that, but recognizing that it's -- it would be an  
25 estimate. So, for example, as we think about like

1 transportation reductions, what we would probably be doing  
2 is just saying, oh, you know, we know -- I'm making up  
3 numbers here -- 15 percent of the mobile source emissions  
4 are in Sac -- 15 percent of the statewide mobile source  
5 emissions are in Sacramento.

6 So we just take 15 percent of that number and say  
7 it's in Sacramento. Until we actually get further into a  
8 regulatory process, and we know a little bit more about  
9 exactly what it would look like, we wouldn't have more  
10 detailed information geographically.

11 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Okay.

12 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: My question actually  
13 piggy-backs on what Katie was trying to get answers on  
14 around geography and the emissions by area. So the --  
15 your list on AB 197 looks great. And I was just looking  
16 up the text of the law, a major part of the law that isn't  
17 actually on your document and in -- maybe in your radar is  
18 section C of AB 197.

19 It says, "Continuing to reduce greenhouse gas  
20 emissions is critical for the protection of all areas of  
21 the State, but especially for the State's most  
22 disadvantaged communities, as those communities are  
23 affected first and most frequently by adverse impacts of  
24 climate change, including increased frequency of extreme  
25 weather events such as drought, heat, and flooding. The

1 State's most disadvantaged communities are also  
2 disproportionately impacted by the deleterious effects of  
3 climate change on public health".

4           And so I'm trying to figure out where in ARB's  
5 implementation of AB 197 where you're looking at EJ  
6 communities. And I think where we would like to see you  
7 point to is are these fenceline communities, are these  
8 geographies that you are -- you have data on disadvantaged  
9 communities and how to make sure disadvantaged communities  
10 are protected. And so if you are not, I guess, parsing  
11 out data according to where EJ communities are at, it's  
12 almost like you're -- you're ignoring that. Like, I don't  
13 know how you do that without being specific about how it's  
14 impacting EJ communities.

15           So can I -- yeah, can we get some thoughts on  
16 that.

17           DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: So I can take a  
18 shot at this. I guess the way that I've been looking at  
19 197 is there is -- I think the language that you're  
20 reading is there, and then it says, you know, and then --  
21 so focus on direct emission reductions from the largest  
22 stationary sources, and from mobile sources, and from  
23 other sources.

24           And so the sort of task to ARB, recognizing the  
25 impact on disadvantaged communities, is let's focus on

1 those direct emission reductions, let's make sure that  
2 that data is available, so that people can see what's  
3 going on. We are looking at -- we have been looking at  
4 how we can get more granular and more regional in the --  
5 in the analysis that we are doing.

6           One of the things that we're doing in the  
7 refinements of the economic analysis is to look at a  
8 regional analysis of the economic impacts of the scoping  
9 plan, and whether in different regions, we would expect  
10 different economic impacts in disadvantaged communities  
11 versus other communities.

12           And so what we're seeing right now is that we  
13 don't see greater impacts in disadvantaged communities,  
14 based on the proposed scoping plan. In some cases, we're  
15 actually seeing, for example, more job growth in those  
16 areas than in other communities.

17           So we are trying to see where we can go more  
18 regional with this. To try to go to a census tract kind  
19 of level with the very broad strategy that we have right  
20 now I think would be -- we would be making so many  
21 assumptions about what -- what would be happening at a  
22 census tract level that I'm not -- I would be concerned  
23 that it would -- they wouldn't really be real results. So  
24 we've tried to do what we can on the economic side.

25           EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Well, that's the economic

1 side. So even on the public health and emission's side,  
2 I'm curious from Board members like how -- how are you  
3 hearing or seeing the EJ part of AB 197?

4 FACILITATOR MCGEE: That's a question.

5 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: That language that you  
6 read I take that there was nothing -- there was no direct  
7 mandate in it. It's a general order, expression of the  
8 goal of all of this. And so when I heard that language  
9 from last year, I just took it as that's what we need to  
10 be doing overall, that there isn't a specific mandate that  
11 we need to do X, Y, or Z.

12 So how do we go about doing it is to identify the  
13 sources of the emissions, whether they're stationary or  
14 mobile as Edie just pointed out, and we ratchet down on  
15 them.

16 So when I hear what you're saying, and I'm  
17 just -- I'm hearing what Edie is saying I'm thinking all  
18 right we're -- in granularity, we're not talking about zip  
19 code. We're talking about facilities. We're talking  
20 about highways. We're talking about the places that are  
21 emitting, and that's where we're going to be focused on.  
22 By definition if we're doing that, then that zip code,  
23 that region the emissions will come down, things will be  
24 better for those communities in turn.

25 So I'm thinking about the source. And I think

1 that's what Edie was referring to. We don't have the  
2 ability maybe to do -- right now. Hopefully in the next  
3 13 years we will -- to do a whole region. But we do know  
4 thought-specific sources. And so that's where we need to  
5 focus our energy is on the highways. And we've talked  
6 about this highways, stationary sources, other places that  
7 are causing our problems, and we have to ratchet down on  
8 them. I hope that's -- I hope that addressed it.

9 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I'd also like to respond to  
10 Mari Rose and do it in a more macro-level. I totally  
11 think we were asking the right question. You know, how  
12 does ARB see its mandate from AB 197 in terms of what  
13 we'll do about environmental justice concerns?

14 And I just want to say that I've been on the  
15 Board since 2008, environmental justice wasn't really  
16 there. I mean, it was probably in the language somewhere,  
17 but it wasn't really there. And I know from all my  
18 environmental justice advocacy friends here that you --  
19 you know, you want it to go a lot farther.

20 But I just want to say it's a big culture change  
21 that you guys are pushing on us appropriately. And we've  
22 made a lot of progress, believe it or not. And it's going  
23 to take awhile for the agency to really embrace everything  
24 that we're supposed to be doing under AB 197 in a  
25 meaningful way.

1           But I just want to say I think the Agency is  
2 trying. And I'm saying this as somebody who was skeptical  
3 for many years that we'd ever really get to think about  
4 health co-benefits and exposures at the local toxics  
5 level. And I'm just -- I'm not trying to be defensive  
6 about the Agency, but I really truly feel that the Agency  
7 is trying.

8           Not that you shouldn't keep pushing, but there is  
9 a culture shift that I sense, and it's going to take time,  
10 just like Hector said. But I think with the continuing  
11 nudging, we're going to, you know, make some real  
12 progress. But you can't turn this ship of State around as  
13 quickly as you'd like is what I'm also trying to say.

14           FACILITATOR MCGEE: Any other comments along this  
15 line of question? We do have some in the queue, but in  
16 response to Mari Rose's question, any other comments?

17           BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah, I have a comment.  
18 Can I get in the queue?

19           FACILITATOR MCGEE: Please go right ahead.

20           BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thanks. This is Diane  
21 Takvorian. I think it's a good question to ask, because  
22 it -- we are, I think as Dr. Balmes, I think, pointed out  
23 that we're in a culture shift at this point. And we're --  
24 I think we're feeling it. Just in the year that I've been  
25 on, I'm feeling the change. I'm feeling the openness. I

1 think there's a strong sense of how -- of everyone asking  
2 that question around a series of things.

3           But harkening back to Mary's goal for today and  
4 for, I think, maybe another meeting as well, how are we  
5 reaching agreement on the scoping plan, and how does AB  
6 197 fit in with that? You know, we have to push ourselves  
7 to answer that question in concrete ways that are  
8 reflected in the scoping plan itself. And I think that  
9 staff has attempted to do that, in part. And I recognize  
10 that there are a lot of unknowns as 197 just came into  
11 being, and so -- but I think that where we're -- where  
12 we're going to really show it as it goes beyond the  
13 culture shift will be in specific requirements and  
14 agreements that we make, if I can use that word, in the  
15 scoping plan itself.

16           So, for instance, the inventories that are due in  
17 the beginning of 2018, that's a real shift in terms of  
18 ARB's work and focus. And it's going to really require  
19 hopefully cooperation, but also setting a model with the  
20 districts on the stationary source emissions.

21           So I think some of that is what we really need to  
22 nail down as to what the approach will be, because this is  
23 a lot of data, and it can take a very long time to gather  
24 together, or we could really go on a fast track, and ARB  
25 can lead and really say this is the way we need the data,

1 and be directive.

2           So I'm just hoping that we can nail -- that it's  
3 good to have this general conversation, but that we have  
4 to nail it down for the scoping plan provisions.

5           FACILITATOR McGEE: Okay.

6           CHAIR NICHOLS: I think maybe this has been said,  
7 but I want to try to say it in a different way to reflect  
8 how I understand the question and what I think the answer  
9 is. So 197 focuses on what ARB is supposed to do in order  
10 to get a scoping plan done, but it also has some more  
11 general directives in it. And the question is sort of  
12 what gets done when and how.

13           I don't necessarily use the word "culture change"  
14 as other people are doing, because I don't think that's so  
15 much what the problem is, if it is a problem. I think the  
16 question is we have three -- at least three, actually  
17 maybe four, very distinct programs that we run. We have a  
18 program that's addressed at meeting federal ambient air  
19 quality standards, which are set on the regional basis,  
20 but are based on public health, and do not focus on  
21 anything smaller than a region, except in terms of taking  
22 data from sources, and looking at how you get to the  
23 regional numbers.

24           But your target number is not a community or a  
25 person, it's a monitoring station basically to achieve a

1 federal ambient air quality standard and showing that it  
2 violated that standard at a particular monitoring station  
3 for a certain period of time. That's just how the law is.  
4 That's how it's written.

5           Toxics, a completely different law. It's based  
6 on risk assessment of individual chemicals. It's not  
7 regional in approach. The data is collected in a  
8 different way. And as Edie said, it's collected by the  
9 districts who give it to us basically when they get around  
10 to it, to be perfectly honest.

11           And, you know, with CO2, and other greenhouse  
12 gases, we set up that program. We collect the data. It's  
13 verified. It's Done according to facilities in a certain  
14 way. And we have a data set about that.

15           These three things don't map to each other very  
16 well at all. And one of the best things about AB 197,  
17 from my perspective, is it gave us the ability and the  
18 mandate to go back and try to reconcile those three  
19 things, so -- oh, the fourth is we do direct emissions  
20 controls on vehicles, and fuels, and related things, which  
21 we do based on another set of data that we collect in a  
22 different fashion over different periods of time.

23           And there's -- it's incredibly difficult to  
24 figure out how to do the priorities, and the processes to  
25 make all of these things work together as efficiently as

1 possible.

2           It's exciting that we have the opportunity to do  
3 it. But this isn't just like a culture change, this is  
4 like reinventing our thinking about air pollution and its  
5 effect on public health, and what our job is. And, you  
6 know, you people -- you people, you the EJAC, you  
7 representatives of community groups, and others, have  
8 played a part in catalyzing that opportunity.

9           And, you know, you're part of the -- of the  
10 change that is going to be happening, but it's not a --  
11 it's not just a question of like let's -- let's think  
12 differently. It's, there's some -- there's some really  
13 hard analytical work that has to go on here, as well as  
14 data crunching, as well as -- as well as probably in the  
15 end some legal changes to actually get to a program where  
16 we can look simultaneously at all of these different  
17 things and prioritize what our actions are going to be  
18 with respect to them.

19           So maybe that's -- I'm not trying to make it  
20 sound bigger and -- just to make it sound bigger. I think  
21 it really is a very big question that we're dealing with.  
22 But again, to reference back to what Diane was just  
23 saying, we still have a scoping plan that we have to do.  
24 It's not the last one we'll ever do, but it's the first  
25 one since 197. And so, you know, we have to do our best

1 in producing it to comply with both the spirit and the  
2 letter of the statute.

3 FACILITATOR MCGEE: We have a request for one  
4 more response on this string. And I want to acknowledge  
5 the patience of those that want to get in. So after this  
6 comment, I want to do a check on where we are.

7 Please.

8 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yes. Sorry, I  
9 just wanted to respond directly, because I -- I always --  
10 I never really, like, like the bifurcation of intent from  
11 legislative mandate, right? Because it was written in the  
12 same piece of paper that we said here's what you're going  
13 to do when we say here's why we're doing it. And so it's  
14 important for us to recognize that. And I wanted to draw  
15 our attention to the sheet -- and I know you all didn't  
16 get this far in advance, and I want to apologize for that.  
17 It was much of my Sunday and our early week working on  
18 this more refined document for you all.

19 But this first bullet on equity, like, I think  
20 what we're really getting to here is that we know that  
21 there's an inequity. And we know the inequity is very  
22 geographic. We know there are communities, based on  
23 health data, based on emissions data that are seeing worse  
24 health outcomes more exposure to pollutants than other  
25 communities. We know that.

1           And when we look at point two here, partnership  
2 with EJ communities, we know we need to be monitoring that  
3 better. We know we need to do it in a more timely way.  
4 We need to partner with neighborhoods to make sure that we  
5 do everything in our power to address those inequities as  
6 early as possible.

7           As much as I know that we're in the middle of a  
8 scoping plan, AB 197 is also the law of the land. So if  
9 we're doing a scoping plan, now that this is the law of  
10 the land, we should be making every measure we can within  
11 the current scoping plan to get it as far as we can  
12 towards addressing this inequity and putting in place new  
13 data measures, and new tracking measures, new air monitor  
14 programs, new partnerships, so that we make sure that the  
15 intent of AB 197, as far as rectifying that inequity in  
16 health outcomes and exposure to pollution is corrected as  
17 quickly as possible.

18           FACILITATOR McGEE: Kevin and Sekita, you've been  
19 very patient. I do want to do a check. I am aware that  
20 our next conversation is going by sector and getting a  
21 little more specific about the scoping plan starting with  
22 transportation. And I'm aware that some people that need  
23 to be a part of that transportation conversation won't be  
24 here for all of the meeting. So we -- we're scheduled for  
25 about another seven minutes on this conversation. You've

1 been in line. Please take the time you need. And I'm  
2 also inviting and encouraging us to try to get to the  
3 by-sector response while we still have some folks we need.

4 Kevin.

5 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: I appreciate what -- so  
6 getting back to just a brief comment on this so far. I  
7 think all this is evident. I think the agency has been  
8 moving forward on this in this arena before there was 197.  
9 I was already sensing that and seeing that.

10 I agree with your statement there, Mary. I don't  
11 think it's so much a culture change, because working for a  
12 number of years with various staff and others here, I've  
13 never sensed that there wasn't a drive toward making this  
14 better, and creating clean air for all of us.

15 But there are some areas I think that we need to  
16 just buckle in and do the work. But we don't really have  
17 conformity here, and that was one thing that was  
18 illustrated well by the OEHHA reports and others in the  
19 meetings that we were in. In reviewing these, some of the  
20 things that popped to the top was again this lack of  
21 conformity in the reporting networks across both the air  
22 toxics and the air pollution world.

23 So just simple things like QA/QC. On the quality  
24 assurance and quality control in the equipment, I mean,  
25 everybody has a different mouse trap for how they're doing

1 this, based on the age of the legislation. The air toxics  
2 legislation goes back to the late eighties for goodness  
3 sake. You know, sampling frequency, reporting structures,  
4 the coordination and integration of the data, as it's  
5 revealed, this data is sitting in silos. It doesn't get  
6 integrated with other pieces or other data that could  
7 create a better story, and, in fact, maybe reveal some of  
8 this regional level information, and even some local level  
9 information that is there.

10 But because of the way the data was collected,  
11 and where it sits in the silo it sits in, it isn't readily  
12 available. If you don't know it's there, you're not going  
13 to go find it, and so it won't be used. I don't think  
14 there's any excuse at this point. Given the level of data  
15 that we have collected about these different sources, I'll  
16 go to the refinery, for instance.

17 Refineries don't -- aren't just popping up all  
18 over the place, okay? Refineries are built in places  
19 where it makes sense for them to build them, where the  
20 source of oil is -- the source that they're refining is  
21 most common and is reduced.

22 And so they will -- they will locate there and  
23 there will be clusters of them. And so we should be able  
24 to assess in those areas what impact they have on that  
25 region. So at the very least, for these really large

1 sources, large distributions centers that exist in the  
2 Inland Empire, for instance, or the shipping areas on the  
3 coast, or the large railyards, I think we should be able  
4 the better characterize the impacts of the different  
5 sources there, regardless of whether they fall out in the  
6 air toxic inventory, or if they're carbon producers, or if  
7 they're producing critieria pollutants, or whatever else  
8 they may be producing as part of their regular daily  
9 business work.

10           And then the last thing that I always like to  
11 focus on is the transparency. I'll step back. The  
12 resolution of the data though. I think we have enough  
13 data to get some decent resolution on the ground of being  
14 able to at least go to the regional level. It's just a  
15 matter of having the will and probably the dollars to put  
16 behind it, and therefore staff who can actually take on  
17 projects like this, but transparency is critical in this  
18 area.

19           And in some of the areas where this data sits,  
20 it's really hard to get to it. So you feel like was this  
21 buried over here intentionally or, you know, the idea  
22 again that we look at air toxics and we find out that with  
23 compliance comes this sort of grace of being able to only  
24 report once every four years, and notice if you have  
25 technology changes, and it's all self-report.

1           And so who's watch-dogging this? And you don't  
2 get the sense -- though it's the task of the Air Resources  
3 Board, we're talking about something that by its very  
4 name, "toxics", is toxic, is something that's incredibly  
5 dangerous, enough so that it was carved out separately  
6 from just the inventory general for air pollution. Not  
7 like PM2.5 isn't toxic enough by nature, we had to, you  
8 know, create this special category.

9           And again, this isn't a slam on any of the  
10 industries - these are things that we need - is to create  
11 things that we need, like I always point out, like these  
12 tables and this tech I'm talking into. So we need to  
13 better understand the emissions that come from these and  
14 how they're affecting the environment around us. The  
15 reporting network and mechanism that was put in place in  
16 the late eighties was what they had and based on what  
17 everybody knew then, but we know a lot better now.

18           So I think one of the things that ARB needs to  
19 do -- and you're in the unenviable position of being stuck  
20 with this. I'm sorry, but it falls for you, so -- is the  
21 idea of uncovering, as you're doing this evaluation,  
22 old -- I'm going to call it old legislation, is still  
23 driving us today, and requesting help from the legislature  
24 with people who are here from the legislature, and now  
25 assigned to this Board, that they can take back to their

1 various sectors, to the Assembly and the Senate, and say,  
2 you know, this is a problem, and we really need a  
3 legislative fix for this bill, that was great at the time,  
4 and it's not disrespectful at all, but here's what we need  
5 to do our job.

6           And then letting us know that this -- letting  
7 everybody know, you have transparency, that you made these  
8 kinds of requests so that I think the communities can get  
9 behind you on this, that you have more assets in place to  
10 help out with these kinds of things than you might  
11 realize, and a willingness to do that.

12           So I'm just saying I get it. You don't have  
13 enough -- you don't have all the tools you need right now  
14 to do what we would really like you to do, but you're also  
15 not telling us what you need, what are those tools that  
16 you're missing. So we need to know what that list looks  
17 like, and again, start the work of remedy.

18           FACILITATOR McGEE: I'm seeing a lot of nodding  
19 and acknowledgement.

20           Sekita, please, and then I'll --

21           EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: When you state the  
22 obvious, I think it always happens that way.

23           (Laughter.)

24           EJAC MEMBER GRANT: Yeah. I -- that was  
25 absolutely one of the points that I was going to make.

1 This is Sekita with EJAC and The Greenlining Institute.  
2 That is really kind of continuing this conversation, so  
3 that we know -- you know, we're all -- kind of seem to be  
4 in agreement that -- and I'm glad -- thank you for Katie  
5 and Mari Rose for kicking this off, this conversation  
6 around data, and how we can be more granular -- as  
7 granular as possible in terms what are the pollution and  
8 the impacts are in the communities that we represent.

9           And to Kevin's point is, you know, yeah, let's  
10 just keep talking about it and seeing what's missing. Do  
11 we -- is it that we need to move resources, is it that we  
12 need to put more regular -- legislative pressure on these  
13 facilities, on the air quality management districts to  
14 ensure that the data, and the transparency, and the  
15 accountability is there?

16           One other thing I wanted to mention is I am  
17 encouraged, or at least for me it's very help helpful to  
18 see, Edie, how you're kind of approaching this with these  
19 three buckets and acknowledging that, you know, the Air  
20 Resources Board, you know, sees the need to kind of be a  
21 little bit more de-siloed and strategic in terms of how  
22 the State is addressing these three different categories.

23           But, you know, we have been, as a State, very  
24 aggressive and successful in how we legislate around and  
25 talk about greenhouse gases. And that's great. And, you

1    though, we need to continue that.

2            There is, you know, these other categories that  
3 really have the health impacts and -- or have been  
4 incredibly damaging in the communities that we represent.  
5 And so being able to, within these categories, really  
6 strengthen, which is -- I feel like I'm Repeating a lot of  
7 what other folks are saying or acknowledging the need for,  
8 but really strengthening those areas, and setting goals,  
9 and just being transparent and accountable about those  
10 goals.

11            So, you know, whether it's through the scoping  
12 plan, let's be very transparent in terms of how far can we  
13 get with our climate regulations when we're looking at the  
14 toxins and the air quality contaminants that we're, you  
15 though, experiencing in our communities? How far can we  
16 get? Let's be transparent and get the data, and then  
17 ensure that based on our targets and how we want to see  
18 the air quality improved in these communities, and health  
19 indicators that there are goals within -- you know, maybe  
20 our goal is to drastically reduce asthma for communities  
21 of color particularly that are being impacted the most by  
22 that.

23            But whatever the goals and targets are to ensure  
24 that we're using whatever regulatory abilities that we  
25 have as a State to reach those goals and targets. And if

1 those -- if that jurisdiction is not there, then go into  
2 the legislature, and to make sure that we have, you know,  
3 all the tools we need to address -- to address these  
4 issues.

5           And I just want to mention quickly that we've  
6 been working with the Energy Commission on -- in response  
7 to SB 350 on a report for equity -- well, different  
8 reports, but one thing that they're doing on their own is  
9 to create an equity indicators report, which ideally I  
10 think this agency is coordinated on, you know, covering  
11 GHGs, covering the health indicators, and also going  
12 beyond into kind of other kind of ways that we could look  
13 at whether or not the policies that we're pushing through  
14 as a State are actually maximizing all the co-benefits  
15 that we'd like to see in our communities. So I think  
16 there's opportunity to kind of collaborate with what's  
17 happening there.

18           FACILITATOR MCGEE: Let me check briefly if Mr.  
19 Luis Olmedo wants in on this conversation, another  
20 participant.

21           EJAC MEMBER OLMEDO: Yeah, I'm sorry. I'm just  
22 stepping back in. What was the question?

23           FACILITATOR MCGEE: Just wanted to see if you  
24 wanted in on this before I summarized this conversation  
25 and moved to the transportation sector.

1 EJAC MEMBER OLMEDO: I'm sorry, I missed the last  
2 few minutes.

3 FACILITATOR MCGEE: No, you're quite all right.  
4 I just wanted to see if you had a hanging item, and I  
5 wanted to make space for you. I'll do that as we go.

6 But in the way of summary, here's what I heard.  
7 I heard an acknowledgement of the inequity of the  
8 disadvantaged communities facing disproportionate share of  
9 pollutants. I heard from the ARB both inclination and  
10 action to incorporate 197 into the scoping plan, but that  
11 there aren't currently frameworks or mechanisms for that  
12 level of fine scale detail and monitoring, indeed partly  
13 because you're drawing upon several frameworks that  
14 collect in different ways.

15 So one strategy to mitigate that is to look at  
16 direct emissions is one way to try to go at that tension  
17 and that problem; that the scoping plan is new and  
18 evolving; and that the requests are there from the EJAC  
19 keep going. Let's get more specific on targets, goals,  
20 finer scale data, cleaning up legislation where necessary.

21 That's what I heard on this conversation.

22 Can we move -- we are scheduled for a break in a  
23 little bit, but are we ready to move to by-sector comments  
24 about the scoping plan, particularly transportation.

25 Please, as you're ready.

1 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Thank you. And  
2 thank you for letting me go first. It's legislative  
3 deadline to do bills, so I have to run to the Capitol and  
4 hopefully make it back before the end of this meeting in a  
5 few minutes.

6 So under transportation -- and again, with the  
7 sheet, and it's in bold at the very top, but again, like  
8 we want to keep reemphasizing that we do have fuller  
9 documentation. And I know you've seen it a zillion times.  
10 But in effort to better streamline our conversation today,  
11 we, at our March meeting, really identified what those key  
12 points were that kept coming up. And then further  
13 synthesized them by pulling out overarching themes in more  
14 detail.

15 But when you looked at transportation, which is  
16 mid-way through page three, the first is again around SB  
17 375. And I know we've talked about this a lot -- and  
18 obviously -- sorry -- the target setting process won't be  
19 done.

20 My folder is working against me.

21 But we want to -- at least, maybe we identify  
22 like of all the emissions reductions we're going to go  
23 forward to 2030, can we at least identify, like quantify  
24 that chunk that's supposed to come from 375, so that staff  
25 working on those targets that can continue to revise them

1 every few years has a really clear goal that they know  
2 they're supposed to achieve if they're going to meet their  
3 part of the bargain for the 2030 targets. We think that  
4 might be a good, like, middle-ground approach to recognize  
5 that target-setting process is still ongoing.

6 We mentioned the 350 studies, we mentioned this  
7 in other sectors as well, really looking to see how we can  
8 integrate those findings and recommendations from that  
9 report.

10 And to examine transportation regionally. As we  
11 mentioned before, and I think you're going to hear this  
12 again and again throughout the day, that each region  
13 really faces unique challenges, and has unique  
14 opportunities. And so to the degree to which within the  
15 scoping plan we can start analyzing those barriers and  
16 opportunities by region, to ensure that a region that's  
17 overburdened by freight has recommendations and policies  
18 put in place to address that. Regions that have  
19 opportunities that have different needs because they're  
20 more rural, before -- because they're trucking routes,  
21 because there's -- you know, there's a whole variety of  
22 reasons why we think a more regional approach within the  
23 transportation sector.

24 Again, you see we keep moving -- trying to move  
25 away from this like sector-based statewide thing towards

1 more regional specific recommendations and ideas within  
2 the scoping plan, so we can try to start to address the  
3 inequities that we see in different parts of the State.

4           The -- we would like to see off-road sources for  
5 transportation included in the analysis, such as  
6 agricultural equipment, and other construction equipment,  
7 and other off-road sources of emission and transportation  
8 included within the scoping plan. And we'd also like to  
9 see some of the innovative ideas that have come out from  
10 our workshops, like green transportation hubs.

11           And I know Rey has been working, has been a  
12 champion of this in his region for a long time. But How  
13 do we really identify those exciting things that will  
14 achieve multiple adaptation and energy-related goals  
15 within the scoping plan to give regions more guidance.

16           And finally, and I've personally been a champion  
17 of this, under local action, there's program that CAPCOA  
18 has been developing that would essentially allow -- they  
19 call it the GHG Rx program on CAPCOA's website. It's  
20 basically going to allow for local developers to offset  
21 increased vehicle miles traveled by purchasing credits  
22 from energy efficiency projects either within their region  
23 or across the State.

24           I think that's directly contradictory to the  
25 goals of the rest of the scoping plan. And I think a lot

1 of stakeholders would appreciate that program being  
2 stricken, and us really pushing local jurisdictions and  
3 local air districts to reduce VMT through projects and  
4 promote more infill and more equitable and sustainable  
5 development patterns.

6 FACILITATOR MCGEE: So our strategy for these  
7 by-sector discussions were to do just that, do an  
8 overview. And so that was a long list. Let's decide now  
9 to have -- how to have a conversation around this, because  
10 we can go back and talk about each of these items.

11 So let me open the floor, whether from EJAC or  
12 from ARB. Do you want to pick off this list and either  
13 respond generally or to start an item off this list -- and  
14 we've got some time to talk about this issue.

15 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Can we just go,  
16 yeah, one by one, and maybe start with the 375, like --  
17 and I think the overarching questions of is that something  
18 we can do within a scoping plan? And if not, specifically  
19 for 375, how do we make sure that those targets, since  
20 they haven't been set, do align with our larger goal that  
21 SB 375 is apart of.

22 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: So the scoping  
23 plan builds on the Mobile Source Strategy. And the Mobile  
24 Source Strategy calls for a 15 percent reduction in VMT,  
25 which is pretty aggressive. It's very, very aggressive.

1           The conversations that we've been having about  
2 the 375 targets are that we know that 375 isn't going to  
3 get us all the way to that 15 percent reduction. It's  
4 going to be a piece of it, but the State is going to have  
5 the step up and do more. And there have been a lot of  
6 conversations. In the scoping plan development process,  
7 we've had some sort of special workshops working with OPR  
8 and SGC, CalSTA, CalEPA, and ARB to talk about what else  
9 we can do.

10           And so I'm trying to -- I think your ask, Katie,  
11 was can we -- can we look to see what portion of 375 how  
12 much it's going to contribute? I'm trying to --

13           EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yeah.

14           DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: I guess I see  
15 the -- I see the target as being so big.

16           EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yeah.

17           DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: And I guess part  
18 of the question is -- I mean, obviously, the 375 targets  
19 are important, but the VMT reduction target is bigger than  
20 375.

21           EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: I guess when you  
22 look at the pie of reductions that we need to get to 2030,  
23 I'm looking for an estimation of how much of that needs to  
24 coming from 375 within the scoping plan.

25           I don't want us from day one of adopting the

1 scoping plan, you know, six months later we adopt targets  
2 that are already not aligned. So sending clear guidance  
3 to the MPOs that this is how much of our 2030 reductions  
4 we're anticipating. And I do think that we can get a lot  
5 more than we have gotten from land-use changes.

6 I mean, the way we develop and where people live  
7 in proximity to where they work and what resources they  
8 have to get around that aren't based on their car is a  
9 critical part of how we reach this strategy, and we're not  
10 seeing effective implementation of SB 375 in the regions  
11 across the State. So I think there's an opportunity for  
12 us to do a good chunk of that 15 percent within SB 375.

13 And we'd like to see a number identified, so that  
14 staff working on SB 375 align those goals with this  
15 overall statewide plan, so we're still on track and we  
16 don't fall off in six months.

17 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: I think that --  
18 Kurt is not here. Kurt who oversees 375. So it's great.  
19 I can like make commitments for him.

20 I think that there are --

21 (Laughter.)

22 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: I think that,  
23 you know, we can think about ways. I think what you're  
24 saying is how can we put something into the scoping plan  
25 to ensure that we are -- we are aiming high and that

1 there's a hook that we're just not letting folks off easy.  
2 And I think we can think about ways they could do that,  
3 but that maybe don't pre-suppose an outcome for the 375  
4 targets, but put that sort of -- that direction out there.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: I want to jump in on top of what  
6 Edie said, and maybe give a different spin, because I  
7 think we could do better than that actually, in response  
8 to your point. I think we could actually help to  
9 integrate our thoughts about transportation and land use  
10 with 375.

11 So 375, again, it's a separate program with its  
12 own set of rules, and its own implementers, and groupies  
13 and everything else, but it has a role to play. And I  
14 think we could find a way to come up with a better  
15 apportionment of reductions, the same as we're doing with  
16 working lands and natural resources, which is the same  
17 kind of problem. It doesn't integrate well into our  
18 existing regulatory system, but it still is really  
19 important. So I would like to make a commitment to  
20 respond to that one, okay?

21 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Thank you.

22 FACILITATOR MCGEE: I thought I might have heard  
23 someone trying to get in on the phone?

24 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah, I was. Thank you.  
25 Yeah. And thank you, Mary, you took the words right out

1 of my mouth, so -- I love that. And I think, you know,  
2 there's -- I really appreciate that the Board and you,  
3 Mary and Richard, have been open to pushing the timelines  
4 for the scoping plan. And as we've all said, you know,  
5 there's so many components to it, it could keep getting  
6 push until we have everything right in line, and that  
7 won't happen.

8 But SB 375 is critical. And we won't be firm  
9 with those -- we won't have solidified those targets until  
10 the fall. So I think this is a really good middle ground,  
11 as Katie said, that we can get to, which is what can we  
12 expect in terms of these emission reductions that can be  
13 incorporated as a commitment into the scoping plan with  
14 the understanding that then we can -- we, as a Board, can  
15 carry those forward as our vision for what we do in the  
16 375 target setting. So I really appreciate that.

17 Thank you.

18 EJAC MEMBER LEÓN: Good afternoon. Rey León,  
19 Valley LEAP. My apologies for arriving late. I've been  
20 battling a flu, but I think I'm winning.

21 (Laughter.)

22 EJAC MEMBER LEÓN: So in regards to the  
23 transportation, I guess it's perhaps more practical  
24 comments from the experience that we're having on the  
25 ground. And it seems like the good thing is

1 infrastructure seems to be rolling out. It will roll-out  
2 way -- way faster than the vehicles. But I still see it  
3 that for farm workers, it's really difficult to get those  
4 electric vehicles. We've got to work on that. That's, I  
5 think, a challenge that is before us. There's -- it's --  
6 yeah, it's something that needs to be taken care of  
7 through the program that we've got going on. We're  
8 helping with the infrastructure, and to the exposure of  
9 the EV plug-ins.

10 But I think there -- kind of like Covered  
11 California, how they did that big old campaign and getting  
12 people registered, something similar, if it existed, such  
13 as that for families -- low-income families to try to put  
14 in paperwork and get the support to get those vehicles  
15 would be really helpful, something of that sort.

16 But the other comment in regards to the  
17 Volkswagen settlement. You know, I think -- it falls, I  
18 think, within the parameters of this discussion, I  
19 believe. What it looks like is that their first phase of  
20 investment is just very -- it's very absent of impacting  
21 environmental justice communities, the DACs that we speak  
22 of here, the low income communities.

23 So I think we need to make sure that those  
24 investments fall within SB 375, AB 32, you know, all the  
25 parameters that we have here, so that we can ensure that

1 environmental justice is happening there with those monies  
2 as well.

3 That's all.

4 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Kevin, Sekita?

5 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: So this -- I want to  
6 compliment staff and ARB in developing -- by the way, I've  
7 been in transportation meetings lately, and developing  
8 this methodology to help the transportation folks assess  
9 the footprint of their projects, as far as criteria  
10 pollutants are concerned. So I think that's an evolving  
11 thing, and we made some real progress with staff this  
12 morning hitting on that.

13 I think that one of the things that the VW  
14 settlement - I'll refer to that - has sort of percolated  
15 to the top is something that we all know is important, and  
16 that's the idea of induced demand in this area. The idea  
17 of creating an actual demand for these vehicles. It was  
18 disturbing for me to look at data from our region, from  
19 the San Joaquin Valley, and see that the valley indeed has  
20 been an early adopter of zero emission and near zero  
21 emission technology, even at the individual level has  
22 exceeded most areas of the State and grabbing ahold and  
23 purchasing these vehicles, but that we're starting to see  
24 a little fall off there, because we're not seeing the  
25 infrastructure investment that we need to support that.

1           I have a personal story about my former associate  
2 director driving an EV vehicle to work. The only charging  
3 station is at a place called Grundfos Pumps about three  
4 miles from the office. The space that we rent was  
5 interesting in putting in any tech into their parking  
6 lots, because they don't see how it's going to fit in  
7 there quite yet. There's not quite enough money to  
8 actually support doing that for them, so -- and they're a  
9 large developer. They own shopping malls and other  
10 things. And if they don't see that, and that access, and  
11 that support for doing that, I'm not sure how it will  
12 happen.

13           And so in her new vehicle purchase, she's not  
14 going to purchase a new EV now. She's going to go to a  
15 hybrid at least. But, you know, she was very unhappy  
16 about having to make that decision.

17           So I think in SB 375, we actually have an  
18 opportunity to build on that relationship ARB's been  
19 building with the transportation people and to talk more  
20 about that. And ARB's role could be to create definitions  
21 here, because I don't think that's well understood.  
22 Concepts like this are not well understood.

23           What do we mean about these targets, and, you  
24 know, how do I develop this community, this county, this  
25 city? And in the case of our region again it's counties,

1 but SCAG and, you know, with five or whatever seven  
2 counties, and other areas that have multiple counties.

3 So how do we do that in a way that both supports  
4 the demand for residential, and commercial, and industrial  
5 properties, but still gets us to reducing these targets?

6 And so, you know, we need better definitions. We  
7 need better -- more clarification on exactly what kinds of  
8 methods they can use to make these changes. Substantive  
9 stuff that they can put on the ground, because again  
10 attending both sets of meetings and talking to staff, I  
11 can see there's not a lot of -- that they feel this hasn't  
12 been well clarified for them. And even though the  
13 leadership at the agency here and the Capitol is certainly  
14 on board, seeing that move to the local MPOs I think has  
15 been a lot more challenging.

16 And they would tell you the same thing, that  
17 while they've been overriding push-back from the MPOs,  
18 which is fine, but is that actually going to create  
19 changes on the ground.

20 EJAC MEMBER GRANT: This is Sekita with EJAC the  
21 Greenlining Institute. So when I -- when we approached  
22 transportation, you know, three areas that I'll address  
23 quickly. The -- you know, first starting with the goods  
24 movement sector with freight, which I think, to me,  
25 there's a lot of similar issues to what we began speaking

1 about when we're talking about really locating the sources  
2 of the pollution and getting the data and having the  
3 transparency, and, you know, what can we all do to help  
4 move that conversation forward and really work with and  
5 put pressure on, you know, entities like the ports, and  
6 large companies, and goods movement companies that are  
7 creating a lot of pollution in our communities.

8           So I think the increased data transparency and  
9 this continued conversation how we can support carrying  
10 out the freight -- the Sustainable Freight Plan, and other  
11 initiatives that the State is embarking on.

12           The second is people movement. So it's public  
13 transit, which is incredibly important for -- both from an  
14 air pollution standpoint, and just from a people mobility  
15 standpoint for the communities that we represent. And,  
16 you know, for me, it really is -- is, I think, a great  
17 opportunity for California to lead in its public  
18 transportation, to really bring in the electrification  
19 technologies early, and to really showcase that, you know,  
20 tech technology is here. We're seeing at least cost  
21 parity with electric buses. And if we can -- you know,  
22 the State can get serious about an effective conversation  
23 around financing for those technologies and buses, and  
24 really targeting the roll-out of the technologies in  
25 disadvantaged and low-income communities, it has --

1 there's so many wins that we can have across the Board.

2           And again, looking at, you know, who are the  
3 stakeholders, the MPOs, others? Who are the stakeholders  
4 in this -- this space and how do we provide the right  
5 carrots and sticks to ensure that we see, you know,  
6 whether it's school buses and public transportation,  
7 making sure that we're totally getting away from diesel.  
8 In my opinion we're skipping natural gas and we're getting  
9 electric out there into our communities.

10           And then the third is really, you know, going to  
11 Rey's points in looking at kind of the passenger vehicles  
12 and ride sharing, and those types of things, those other  
13 mobility options. And I think, you know, a lot of this is  
14 in -- this is where it kind of blends with what's  
15 happening with the climate investments, you know, what's  
16 happening with the 350 barrier studies, which, you know,  
17 you're -- the team here at CARB did a really, really great  
18 job on that.

19           And so I think really looking to that study,  
20 which identifies the barriers and opportunities to  
21 overcoming the barriers to really see the -- for us, it's  
22 about access. You know, it's great. We're moving to a  
23 clean energy technol -- clean energy economy, but our --  
24 you know, the communities that we represent should be  
25 benefiting, first and most, from that transition, and how

1 do we -- and that's really a question of access.

2           And so I think the 350 Barriers Study is to have  
3 that connection with the scoping plan is key, because  
4 all -- that whole transition is what's helping us meet the  
5 targets laid out into -- in the scoping plan. And, you  
6 know, for us, it's our communities that are really show --  
7 showcasing the future of clean energy. That's how we --  
8 we don't want to -- we're not here for trickle-down  
9 benefits. It's really about, you know, the communities  
10 that have been hit first and worst by the pollution  
11 benefiting first and most by the solutions.

12           And so with that kind of expression of  
13 enthusiasm, I think from the scoping plan -- even though  
14 as I've acknowledged, a lot of this sits in other spaces,  
15 but recognizing the connection and kind of expressing that  
16 enthusiasm for what disadvantaged and marginalized  
17 communities can represent within a policy structure around  
18 air quality and climate, that is something that could and  
19 should be replicated outside of this State. But for  
20 California to be -- really be a leader in that way, I  
21 think would be incredible.

22           FACILITATOR McGEE: Let me check with our  
23 participants on the phone.

24           Then here's what I'd like to do. Let's do  
25 another check and see. I have one comment form submitted.

1 Just wanted to check with those in the room.

2 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: I think I heard someone on  
3 the phone.

4 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Oh, well, then I should make  
5 space for that.

6 Pardon. Please. Diane, would you like in?

7 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: No, I was saying I'm  
8 fine. And I think Luis is fine, too.

9 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Thank you very much.

10 Just by raise of hands, are there other people  
11 that would like to make a public comment during the public  
12 comment section today?

13 And have I already received your card, speaker  
14 card maybe?

15 Great. Thank you.

16 Well, then here's what I'd like to do. We're  
17 scheduled for a 2:30 break. Is that a good idea or does  
18 this group want to press through.

19 Want to keep going.

20 Okay. Great. Then I'm going to hold on to  
21 comment for a moment.

22 Let me do a last call on transportation  
23 discussion.

24 Okay. Great.

25 Martha Argüello, are you willing to help us kick

1 off the discussion on industry?

2 EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: I just realized, oh,  
3 my God. I had An assignment.

4 (Laughter.)

5 EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: Thank you, because  
6 I'm not at all prepared. I will -- I won't lie.

7 So the top priorities from the EJAC continue --  
8 well, emissions reductions from -- I don't need to look at  
9 the notes. I actually know this.

10 (Laughter.)

11 EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: We continue to really  
12 want to focus on those major polluters that are the big  
13 problems in our communities that are driving the major  
14 emissions, and, you know, power plants, cement plants, and  
15 we need to have some more specific strategies within the  
16 scoping plan to achieve those reductions. And I have to  
17 say this was probably written before we saw the 197  
18 presentation, because I think there's a lot, so I will  
19 acknowledge that, right, so...

20 And then we need to continue to work with OEHHA  
21 on these studies around emissions. So a lot of this first  
22 bullet is really related to the things we already heard,  
23 right? Our -- we've got to improve how we collect data.  
24 We have to be able to verify that data. So all that kind  
25 of got said during our earlier conversations.

1           And CARB should abandon cap-and-trade systems for  
2 non-trading systems options like cap and tax, also  
3 referred as cap and -- a carbon tax, also referred as a  
4 cap and tax, cap and dividend, fee and dividend, or  
5 command and control regulations. And we think that  
6 those -- that we should.

7           (Thereupon automated voice regarding  
8 conference call came on.)

9           EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: It's on. And so  
10 the -- I mean we continue to think that we need to  
11 eliminate free allowances and offsets and allow CARB to  
12 set facilities caps. CARB should conduct a full economic  
13 analysis of those alternatives. And we feel that again,  
14 you know, we sort of the -- we felt that there was a bit  
15 of a finger on the scale in support of what we already  
16 know. And which is -- you know, I understand why that  
17 happens, but we need to have a robust, fair analysis of  
18 the other measures in terms of the air benefits, but  
19 financial benefits, in terms of being able to generate  
20 funds that folks are now very accustomed to having through  
21 the GGRF funds.

22           So we -- we're not saying that those should be  
23 replaced, but that we should find more equitable sources  
24 to continue to generate those funds. And then we've got  
25 to commit to reducing our consumption of oil and include

1 a -- we'd love to see a moratorium and an end to all  
2 fossil fuel infrastructure, whether that's refineries.  
3 But we'd certainly like -- certainly, you know, my work a  
4 lot is around urban oil drilling, and we would love to see  
5 stronger ways to protect communities from this practice.

6           Imagine Aliso Canyon next to you every day, so --  
7 and then also we don't want -- do not authorize CAPCOA to  
8 create a new carbon market. We want to say -- we actually  
9 want a sentence removed from the scoping plan that says,  
10 "Where further project design or regional investments are  
11 infeasible or not proven to be effective, it may be  
12 appropriate and feasible to mitigate project emissions  
13 through purchasing and retiring carbon credits issued by a  
14 recognized and reputable accredited carbon registry.

15           So again, I mean, really an industry is like  
16 these pollutants -- these facilities, whether they're  
17 large refineries, cement kilns, small oil and gas  
18 facilities in neighborhoods are having a tremendous impact  
19 within air quality and health, and we need to move  
20 quicker. And then again the full analysis around other  
21 options.

22           FACILITATOR MCGEE: As you see, your strategy for  
23 this meeting is to start general and then get specific.  
24 Other general comments at the moment, and then we can take  
25 items off this list as we like.

1 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I'm going to take a  
2 stab at a response, and I think others will fill in. But,  
3 Martha, I want to go to your point, because I think it's  
4 an important one about petroleum. I mean, we make no  
5 bones about it, the fact is that we're looking to  
6 phase-out the use of petroleum. We're approaching it from  
7 both ends, pushing vehicles forward, not just light-duty  
8 vehicles, trucks, and heavy-duty vehicle applications to  
9 electrify new zero emission electrification, fuel cell  
10 technology.

11 So on one end that obviously takes time. I  
12 mean -- and it doesn't move fast enough for us, and we are  
13 looking to -- I think the comment that Rey, Kevin, and  
14 others made about the important role that infrastructure  
15 investments play. The IOU investments are going to be  
16 huge. VW, and the fact that many of those investments are  
17 going to be in DCs matters a lot. That's on one side of  
18 it.

19 The other side, to me, is not only increasing  
20 competition for alternative fuels that are outside of  
21 petroleum, they are cleaner traditional fuels. How do you  
22 lower the carbon intensity. Low Carbon Fuel Standard we  
23 clearly are tightening down on that regulation. And in  
24 putting the, you know, investments in some of these other  
25 areas on the infrastructure side.

1           So pushing both sides of this. Recognizing a  
2 point that you made, and I think it's one I wanted to add  
3 to here as well, and that's with respect to the industrial  
4 sector. You know, I was thinking about Edie's  
5 presentation talking about GHGs, criteria, and toxic  
6 pollutants, and I was also thinking about traditional  
7 authority more stationary sources traditionally have been  
8 in the district's role.

9           One of the efforts, and this is really in  
10 response to these conversations and in response to 197,  
11 I've called together the CAPCOA Board, California Air  
12 Pollution Control District, and through them have  
13 established an industry work group that's going to be  
14 focused on industrial measures.

15           The first one is refineries. I've put that in a  
16 letter to the Bay Area. And I think many of you are  
17 familiar with that letter. I've already sat down with  
18 Jack, Wane, the large district representatives. We're  
19 starting on that work. Now -- and they are supportive and  
20 on board with doing that. That's important.

21           You know, and does more need to be done? No  
22 doubt. But these are specific incremental commitments to  
23 move forward, both in terms of being very clear of the  
24 increasing role that electrification and zero emission  
25 transportation is going -- needs to play, but also really

1 a different strategy to get the industrial sector,  
2 recognizing historical authority. And the fact is we're  
3 really talking about community exposure to criteria and  
4 particularly toxic pollutants.

5 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Let me open the floor. Oh,  
6 Martha, please.

7 EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: No, actually, go  
8 ahead. Go head. I have to think about all that.

9 FACILITATOR MCGEE: I think you're actually the  
10 only in the queue.

11 EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: Okay.

12 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Not anymore.

13 EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: Go for it. Yeah, go  
14 for it. I want to formulate this question.

15 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: So I'm trying to see if we  
16 can get a little more concrete around public health and EJ  
17 communities, and exposures of environmental justice  
18 communities, as we were trying to do in the AB 197  
19 conversation.

20 And so we had an EJAC work group call with the  
21 industry folks, including CARB staff yesterday, and we  
22 were -- we were -- we were at a standstill. It was like a  
23 repeating conversation. And I wanted to offer a  
24 perspective on how we're looking at the industrial sector,  
25 and including cap and trade and alternative scenarios to

1 cap and trade as we move forward to reach the 2030 goals.

2           So right now, we see that there are data gaps.  
3 So as the OEHHA report also pointed out, we need more --  
4 and as we've been talking today, we need more of the those  
5 data sources to figure out where toxic and criteria  
6 pollutants are along with the GHG data, and where these  
7 are.

8           So right now, what we're seeing is there's early  
9 indications that there are increased localized emissions  
10 for fenceline communities. We already know, through  
11 CalEnviroScreen, that these are the communities that have  
12 the highest pollution burden of various cumulative impacts  
13 and sources. And so it's not like they're starting out  
14 healthy. And so when -- when we are seeing the -- so we  
15 know at least that cap and trade is going to probably  
16 continue through 2020.

17           And so even now, what we're seeing is there  
18 are -- so from whether the OEHHA report or the Cushing  
19 report indications that offsets, for instance, are  
20 potentially allowing for those emissions increases free  
21 allowances, and so basically the carbon trading happening  
22 with these facilities in the most disadvantaged  
23 communities.

24           And so with -- there's -- staff is looking at  
25 closing the data gap, but we don't know when you're going

1 to have that data. And until you get there -- what we've  
2 been hearing is until you get there, you're not  
3 necessarily going to be proactive about preventing harm to  
4 the EJ -- the fenceline communities to these facilities.

5 And so what we're trying to see is, is there a  
6 way and direction or signal from -- from CARB and the  
7 Board to be able to prevent further harm to the most  
8 vulnerable communities now. And so if -- if, for  
9 instance, between now and 2020, the Cap-and-Trade Program  
10 is -- is -- is allowing vulnerabilities or loopholes  
11 through offsets, or trading, or free allowances, is there  
12 a way to hold -- hold those from happening until we have  
13 the data that it's not actually -- that cap and trade is  
14 not harming these fenceline communities?

15 So I guess that's -- that's being specific, and a  
16 question to the Board, which -- and the staff, is there a  
17 way to prevent further harm to EJ communities in the  
18 industrial Cap-and-Trade Program now, so that -- so that  
19 you don't cause further harm?

20 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Let me take a stab at  
21 this. And I wanted to challenge a little bit the  
22 assertion Mari Rose, and first, though, there's no doubt  
23 there's need for more reductions, more reductions at the  
24 community levels of industrial sources, and actually  
25 smaller sources as well that generally are -- can be very

1 close to receptors. Auto body shops actually can lead to  
2 really high exposures, so can chrome plating.

3 But my point about challenging the assertion is  
4 that the action that the Board just took last month in  
5 terms of SIP measures, mobile source, on-road, heavy duty,  
6 off-road, it was about NOx, it was about diesel PM,  
7 significant reductions that we're going to get in  
8 communities. Our transportation -- we all know that  
9 transportation contributes a significant share of our  
10 emissions in the State, about 80 percent of our NOx, about  
11 95 percent of our diesel PM.

12 It's important, and it plays a key roll in the  
13 overall strategy when we think about toxics-related  
14 exposure as well as regional air quality. But it doesn't  
15 stop there. It goes back to the point I made earlier  
16 about traditional industry sources. And the fact is that  
17 traditional industrial sources have been permitted at the  
18 local level, and we need further reductions. And that is  
19 the work we are doing, will do with CAPCOA, in terms of  
20 ratcheting down emissions from industrial sources. And it  
21 also is where there are opportunities for further  
22 reductions from traditional toxic sources.

23 And several mentioned the history of the toxics  
24 program, where there's about 30 measures they've adopted  
25 over the years. The updated OEHHA data and analysis, in

1 terms of the risk methodology tell us, and Edie mentioned  
2 it earlier, the youth are particularly vulnerable, even  
3 more so than previously thought. The whole revisiting of  
4 our historical toxics program is what is the level of  
5 protection it provided, and what is that residual risk,  
6 where do we need to ratchet down?

7           So it is -- it is not a one-size-fit-all. It's  
8 not a silver bullet. It is going at toxic, it's going at  
9 criteria, and it's going at transportation and stationary.  
10 And it's partnering, honestly, to a stronger partnership  
11 with the air districts, given the key role that they play  
12 on this. So it is the package of strategies to get at the  
13 issue.

14           But I would argue right here we're already seeing  
15 reductions from those mobile source and historical  
16 measures. We just need to do more and the monitoring  
17 supports that, the work near ports and diesel PM. I think  
18 in the last ten years, we've seen a reduction, and this is  
19 of diesel PM, about 70 to 80 percent near the Port of LA,  
20 Port of Long Beach due to a whole series of measures, many  
21 of which we adopted.

22           I'll be the first to say that's not sufficient,  
23 because the residual risk and exposure is still too high  
24 and we need to do more, but I think there's something to  
25 be learned from the successes we've already had, and see

1 what we can build on them.

2 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: I think CARB has been better  
3 at mobile sources in the -- and the programs that you  
4 have. What we are also pointing out is around stationary  
5 sources where refineries, and oil drilling, and power  
6 plants are. And so -- and you did say yes there's a lot  
7 of authority on the local district level on that. But ARB  
8 has authority on cap and trade, and where trading happens,  
9 and when -- offsets and free allowances. And I think  
10 that's -- that's what I'm pointing out is that you have  
11 authority to design and -- and fix -- and shape that  
12 program.

13 And right now, the early indications from the  
14 OEHHA report and the Cushing report are that these -- the  
15 design of the program as it comes to trading and offsets  
16 and free allowances are possibly increasing harm to the  
17 fenceline communities. And so you have an authority to  
18 change the design of the Cap-and-Trade Program.

19 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Two in the queue.

20 EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: So I want to -- so  
21 what's in the SIP is great, but I live in the South Coast,  
22 and many of their measures are pending all in -- some  
23 magical -- oh, sorry.

24 So, you know, the SIP is great, and it's good  
25 that it was strong on the NOx and SOx. But many of the

1 measures in the South Coast are supposed to come from --  
2 and I'm just really tired. The words are not coming to  
3 me, so the only thing I can think of is magical money,  
4 right that may or may not come from the federal  
5 government, may or may not come from other sources. So  
6 many of those key reductions are guaranteed.

7           And so I guess I want to go back to saying, you  
8 know, we -- from the -- you know, from 2006 knew that  
9 there were potential design flaws in a Cap-and-Trade  
10 Program that could potentially drive up emissions in  
11 communities. That was sort of universally acknowledged as  
12 one of the challenges, right, even from CARB staff about  
13 the design issues.

14           And so now we have to report that begin to show  
15 some indications that those design flaws and issues that  
16 all of us are concerned, not just the EJAC, but staff at  
17 ARB. I remember the presentation of how to get this  
18 right. So now we're starting to see that. So that's  
19 where I have a real challenge when there's sort of an  
20 unwillingness to acknowledge that there may be a challenge  
21 in these communities and that we could actually do things,  
22 like stop giving them away, no trading in any place where  
23 until we have the verified data, if it looks like things  
24 are going up, no trading, right? You can't trade in.

25           So -- and these were all actually things that we

1 said into 2006 and '07, '08, '09, and '10 around some --  
2 how to do some of this.

3           And so now -- and we waited patiently for the  
4 data, right, because we're told no. It may not happen,  
5 but now -- and I understand all the caveats with the  
6 quality of the data and all of those things. But it seems  
7 to me if folks that know more about this than aye, they're  
8 talking about these major design flaws, now we're seeing  
9 them verified in early data, then we want a response to  
10 that. And, yeah -- I don't know how else to put it.

11           BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you. Maybe tying  
12 both of your comments together. Martha, I think when we  
13 did or when AB 32 was passed, obviously ten years later  
14 we're looking at -- maybe not design flaws, but structural  
15 problems. And Mari Rose's comment, I think we spoke about  
16 this many times in the past on offsets, so we just focused  
17 there.

18           So there is really no adequate structure, in my  
19 view, and maybe the staff could correct me, on engagement  
20 with disadvantaged communities in the offset programming  
21 truly. I mean, we don't have a metric that says  
22 co-benefits and offsets.

23           And I think the frustration is when we talk about  
24 offsets, we tend to leave that part out of the equation,  
25 so we're not really talking about health benefits but in

1 the offset program. And I think the frustration has been  
2 if you look at whether we have required investments in the  
3 offset program in disadvantaged communities. No.

4 Do we have -- are these located in disadvantaged  
5 communities offset programs? We don't know. I don't  
6 think we know. And if we ask staff to say show us where  
7 our offset program is in disadvantaged communities, I'm  
8 not sure we could have that data set. I'm not sure we  
9 have a benefit for disadvantaged communities in the offset  
10 program. I'm not sure we have co-benefits or actual  
11 co-benefits quantified.

12 So I think we have a data gap, and a transparency  
13 gap that leads to a lot of mistrust. And I think it leads  
14 to the fact that you want us to point to the benefits of  
15 the program. I'm not sure structurally we have the data  
16 to do that, and maybe I'm wrong. I'm -- if -- but I'm not  
17 sure the staff themselves and CARB itself can actually  
18 look at that co-benefit side of the offset program to  
19 provide, you know, that map. So if you think about  
20 disadvantaged communities on CalEnvironmentalScreen[sic],  
21 and you look exactly where those might be, I think you'd  
22 come up to the conclusion that we don't know, can't  
23 quantify, can't prove.

24 And that leads to a lot of mistrust. So I'm not  
25 sure if that's the case, but it seems to me that's where a

1 lot of this comes in.

2 Let me use an example, so I'm not just kind of --  
3 so we have urban off -- urban forestry offsets. So one of  
4 the problems is we have a GGRF fund that does a lot of  
5 that on that side of the equation, but when you get to the  
6 offset program here on the CARB side, you know, we know  
7 that actually that reduces pollution. I think we can  
8 agree on that, right?

9 So if you have, you know, urban off -- forestry  
10 offsets, in a sense are a co-benefit. It is part of our  
11 set program. But I don't think we can prove we have one  
12 offset program implemented in that category at CARB. So  
13 we have no zero offset urban forestry program.

14 Now, if we did, you'd say we could say to you,  
15 ah, co-benefit, works, offset program, quantifiable, I can  
16 tell you where it's at, you can point to it. But the fact  
17 that we can't do that I think leads to a lot of this  
18 dialogue of the program itself as an offset program just  
19 doesn't work, so let's eliminate it.

20 And I think what I hear you saying are either two  
21 things, either the improvement of the program -- eliminate  
22 the offset program all together, because you haven't  
23 really proven to us any sort of offset benefit on the  
24 co-health benefit side. And without the data set  
25 necessary, I think it's very difficult for us to show you,

1 particularly on forests. I mean we know that's a  
2 co-benefit, but we don't have a program that we've  
3 actually implemented in this. Your criticism is correct,  
4 because we should be doing that. We should have more  
5 dialogue with disadvantaged communities in that particular  
6 category.

7           So I think from the Board side what we need to do  
8 is try to figure out, you know, in the co-benefit arena  
9 how we can actually include more disadvantaged communities  
10 in the structure, in the design, and maybe the -- you  
11 know, we try to find something that works, and we can go  
12 into other items. It's not just foreign -- the forestry  
13 program. We can go into transportation. We can go into a  
14 whole host of other things.

15           But I would just say that I think it's a great  
16 comment both of you have mentioned. I think it's proven  
17 that we don't necessarily have the co-benefit discussion  
18 in this category. And I think it's incumbent on the staff  
19 and the Board to try to figure out either fix that,  
20 include a structure, include disadvantaged communities,  
21 and have a more robust discussion about it, or you're  
22 probably correct is my view.

23           FACILITATOR McGEE: Open floor.  
24           Please.

25           EJAC MEMBER TARUC: On that co-benefit point,

1 what I understand, for instance, the offsets program or  
2 even the carbon trading program, it's not one of the goals  
3 as of right now around that program, or those programs, to  
4 be beneficial to most impacted communities or  
5 disadvantaged communities.

6           So I would love to see -- if that's a direction  
7 that the Board wants to go in actually putting co-benefits  
8 alongside cost effectiveness, I -- I would love to see how  
9 that works.

10           FACILITATOR MCGEE: Seeking additional comments  
11 regarding the industrial sector.

12           And let me do a check. We've been at it for a  
13 little under two hours. How is this group? We have a bit  
14 to go. Should we press on? Should we take a break?

15           I would suggest a 10-minute break coming back at  
16 3:00 o'clock, when we'll pick up again talking about  
17 natural and working lands and waste. Does that work for  
18 everyone?

19           Thank you so much. See you at 3:00 o'clock.

20           (Off record: 2:50 p.m.)

21           (Thereupon a recess was taken.)

22           (On record: 3:00 p.m.)

23           FACILITATOR MCGEE: As the last are taking their  
24 seats, I have a suggestion for how we get going. So  
25 here's my request or suggestion.

1 Diane, do we have you back?

2 Maybe we never lost you.

3 EJAC MEMBER OLMEDO: Yeah, this is San Ysidro.  
4 I'm back. This is Luis Olmedo on the call. Diane is --  
5 she's moved on to another meeting, I believe. I'm here  
6 alone.

7 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Glad we have you Luis. Thank  
8 you. Feel free to make a noise or hit a dial button if --  
9 if you're feeling neglected, if I haven't checked in with  
10 you.

11 So here's my suggestion for starting off the next  
12 part of our meeting. I have it on good info that the one  
13 comment card that has been submitted is a relatively brief  
14 public comment. I'd like to accommodate now, if that's  
15 okay with the group. Then I'd like to make space for  
16 general comments on our discussion so far, and then I'd  
17 like to move us into our next specific discussion, which  
18 is natural and working lands, and also waste.

19 Does that work for everybody? Or rather, if it  
20 doesn't work, would you let me know?

21 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: There's not  
22 many people in the room. Is that okay with her?

23 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Yeah, let me ask our public  
24 commenter. We're still collecting some of our folk back.  
25 Would you like to wait till you have a bigger audience or

1 is it okay on the record now?

2 Either way is fine. I can work with it.

3 That's great. Please let us know who you are.

4 And if that doesn't work, you're welcome to use  
5 one of these mics at the table.

6 DR. KYLE: Is this on?

7 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Not -- no. So please feel  
8 free to use that.

9 DR. KYLE: Thank you for giving me a moment.

10 My name is Amy Kyle. And I'm recently retired  
11 from active duty at UC Berkeley, but now I have more time  
12 for fun stuff like this.

13 And I just wanted to comment a bit on the data  
14 related suite of issues, because I've been working with  
15 some members in this room on some of that stuff, and  
16 suggest that perhaps you might consider adding to the  
17 scoping plan something about attributes of your data  
18 systems, because you need data to assess whether you have  
19 achieved everything you're doing in the plan. So you have  
20 measures that you're adopting, which have some metrics  
21 associated with them that are supported by data.

22 And some of those are about health, and some of  
23 them are about air pollution, and some of them are about  
24 carbon, et cetera. And yet, the data system part that  
25 would support that seems very underdeveloped so far. And

1 so we're talking a lot about all the issues with data.

2           Maybe, you've had enough comment and this is the  
3 system's way of shutting down.

4           So my suggestion is maybe -- I would suggest  
5 considering perhaps adding to the scoping plan some  
6 attributes of what your data systems might look like that  
7 would include that they're interoperable, so that you can  
8 get all the different things you need out of all the  
9 different pieces to answer the questions you have today,  
10 and tomorrow, and then ten years from now, that they be  
11 transparent, and so that they're fully documented, and  
12 have a public access component; georeference so we can see  
13 where -- and georeference so we can see where some things  
14 are.

15           And then as we think about all of this, we need a  
16 public interface for them, that lets the public understand  
17 this whole process beyond the kind of we're seeing in the  
18 scoping plan. And I think that needs an intentional  
19 design, because it's -- it's -- honestly, I found the  
20 scoping plan almost incomprehensible. And I know a lot  
21 about this. And I know how that happens. You know, it  
22 gets put together and from different things.

23           But we need a more consistent interface that  
24 people can go to to see where are we, what did we say  
25 we're going to do, did we do that, how do we know, what

1 was the metric, what data supports that, did it work or  
2 not? Okay. Where now?

3 And there are all these pieces of this thing  
4 that, you know, part of it's yours, part of it's somebody  
5 else's, and it's -- we need a design to deal with that I  
6 would suggest to you with respect.

7 So thank you.

8 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Thank you very much.

9 So I wanted to open this up for general comments  
10 so far. And I also know what's coming, and we need some  
11 folks that aren't in the room. So I actually -- please  
12 take just a moment, I'm going to step outside, and give an  
13 eyebrow and a sideways glance to folks that --

14 VICE CHAIR BERG: Do you want me to do that?

15 FACILITATOR MCGREE: Please. That would be  
16 great. Thank you for help rounding.

17 VICE CHAIR BERG: I'm good at herding the cats.

18 (Laughter.)

19 FACILITATOR MCGEE: That would be great.

20 Thanks. Thank you for that.

21 And also, we have a couple Board members that  
22 have joined us. Let me just invite an opportunity to say  
23 hello and let us know that you're here.

24 BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Thank you. I'm Barbara  
25 Riordan. I'm delighted to be here. And sorry for the

1 delay, but I drove in today. So it's the best time I can  
2 make.

3 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Thank you.

4 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Hi. John Gioia. I'm on the  
5 Bay Area Air Quality Management District Board and from  
6 Contra Costa. So better late than never, as they say.

7 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Thanks very much for coming.

8 So again we're about to jump into more discussion  
9 by sectors. But after substantial discussion, two hours  
10 of discussion so far, let me just open the floor and see  
11 if there's general comments, something that was missed,  
12 something that you wanted to get in before we go back into  
13 specific discussions.

14 Okay.

15 Well, I don't mean to put you on the spot, just  
16 as you're sitting down, Mr. Hamilton, but are you ready to  
17 lead us off on the conversation on natural and working  
18 lands and waste.

19 As you're ready.

20 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Sure. Thank you.

21 So I had a question that I wanted to ask to sort  
22 of start this. Can anybody show me in this area of  
23 natural lands where the EJAC recommendations are?

24 Anybody point those out to me?

25 Because I can't really find them.

1           You know, this goes back to sort of a core issue  
2 that we started talking about about six or eight months  
3 ago. And I just wanted to raise it, because I don't see  
4 any space for it on here. So I'm going to inject it into  
5 my conversation right now.

6           We had talked with staff about how we might be  
7 able to better -- this goes back almost two years when  
8 folks were recruiting people like me to be on this  
9 committee to talk about where the EJAC, the environmental  
10 justice lens would be placed in a way that everyone could  
11 see it that was transparent to everyone, and that it had a  
12 meaningful place in the scoping plan.

13           And while there has been a meaningful process for  
14 me personally, and I feel that staff has been very  
15 committed to assisting us in every way possible, and in  
16 fact they've developed all these really cool tolls like,  
17 you know -- if you don't mind, Mr. De La Torre, to hold  
18 this up -- so now I've got this crosswalk document, which  
19 is 108 pages thick. I've got a scoping plan, and I have  
20 the EJAC -- EJ recommendations located with a lot of other  
21 ones here in this big appendix document.

22           And so what we had requested, and what I had  
23 asked for, and what I thought we had agreement on was that  
24 this -- by this point in time, we would have obviated the  
25 need for something like a crosswalk document, which forces

1 me to constantly go back and forth and look here and here,  
2 back to the scoping plan, and try to assure myself that  
3 what I'm seeing I'm really seeing. And I know my  
4 counterparts on EJAC feel the same way.

5           So unfortunately, I have to suggest that there's  
6 been a failure to communicate maybe on my part. I'm not  
7 quite sure. And I'm feeling, and I know others on the  
8 EJAC are feeling, somewhat frustrated by this. And I  
9 would wonder from, Mary, to tell me specifically, or  
10 Richard, since you're the leaders of the respective  
11 entities here, what seems to be the problem?

12           We asked for a simple annotation where the  
13 recommendations from the scoping plan were actually  
14 annotated with footnotes into -- into the scoping plan.  
15 So I understand there's a lot of different, I think --  
16 maybe I'm misunderstood staff, and I won't call anybody  
17 out, who mentioned to me well, there's a lot of people who  
18 want things in the scoping plan, or something similar to  
19 that.

20           And I thought to myself later, you know, we're  
21 not people. We're actually in here because of statute.  
22 The EJAC is actually, you know, constructed by statute and  
23 our participation is mandated there. And so I see no  
24 reason that most people would go to that particular  
25 appendix. I don't know about you, when I you look at

1 appendices, I'm usually looking at bibliography  
2 expansions, because I've seen a footnote that interests  
3 me, and I want to go and look for it in the appendix or  
4 I've seen a reference to a table, or a graph that I want  
5 to see better illustrated in the appendix.

6           But I see almost nothing. And I was looking  
7 through natural and working lands trying to find, you  
8 know, exactly where I could call it out. I actually  
9 recognized a number of things in here that align with the  
10 EJAC recommendations. So I know there's stuff that's  
11 there, so -- but the only reason I know it is because,  
12 hey, I helped construct it.

13           So I think that the communities that we serve  
14 would like to see where their voices are being raised and  
15 put in a substantive way into the plan. And that a simple  
16 process that somebody like Dr. Balmes, I'll speak since --  
17 for him since he's not here -- I'm sure he would agree  
18 with me, might assign to one of his grad students, on a  
19 paper that he's working on, is a -- is a prospect that  
20 again we called out to staff here back in -- was it  
21 October guys, something like that, or August, last year,  
22 where we identified, well, we're getting to the point  
23 where we need to start seeing that, and then we started  
24 seeing this crosswalk document.

25           And it kept getting more and more developed over

1 time. And we're asking like why are we continuing to put  
2 so much energy into this document? You're looking for  
3 clarity there. I think we've had that.

4 And then recently, we went through a set of deep  
5 dive phone calls where some of us thought we were going to  
6 be looking at that. And instead, it was just are you  
7 happy with what's in the crosswalk document?

8 Yeah. Yeah, I'm happy with what's in the  
9 crosswalk document. We, you know, have been looking at it  
10 now for three months, so -- and it's the third version.  
11 So, yes.

12 But I really just want to call that out to start  
13 with, that I don't understand. So I'm going to give you  
14 guys a chance if you could answer me please just that  
15 simple question and then I'll move on to the rest of  
16 natural and working lands.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: I would like you -- Kevin, I'm  
18 going to answer your question simple. The decision has  
19 been made not to do that.

20 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Why would you make a  
21 decision like that?

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: I made the decision that way, and  
23 communicated to staff because this is an ARB document.  
24 The EJAC was created by statute. Actually, there were  
25 several committees that were created by statute to advise

1 us. We have never used the work of any advisory committee  
2 as ARB's work. We've had economic advisory committees,  
3 we've had other advisory committees. We meet with you, we  
4 ask your advice, and as you've pointed out, we take your  
5 advice much of the time, although not always, because  
6 we're not required to take your advice. We're only  
7 required to seek your advice at pay attention to it.

8           But we believe that the correct way to deal with  
9 an advisory committee, yours or any other advisory  
10 committee, is to do what I just said, listen, meet,  
11 incorporate where we can, and is consistent with our other  
12 responsibilities, and then note, in a separate document,  
13 which is what we're doing, every piece of advice that you  
14 gave us, so that if you, or anybody else, ever wants to go  
15 back and look at it and see what you said, and whether it  
16 was followed or not, you have the ability to do that.

17           But the document that we are putting out, the  
18 scoping plan is the administration's scoping plan for  
19 meeting the goals of SB 32. We take responsibility for  
20 it. It's not an academic work. It's not a published work  
21 for, you know, anything other than being the official  
22 scoping plan for meeting the SB 32 goals. And I don't  
23 think it's right to do it in the manner that you're  
24 suggesting, unless we were going to footnote it for  
25 everybody else whose advice we took who would want it

1 acknowledged to. And we're not going to do that. It  
2 doesn't make it a workable document.

3 Now, I could probably be overruled. I could be  
4 overruled by the Governor for sure. I'm not sure that  
5 it's a votable item for the Board to vote on. Although,  
6 maybe they could if they wanted to, but that was -- that's  
7 the reason for the decision. And I'm sorry if it wasn't  
8 communicated to you clearly, if you felt like you were  
9 just being kind of led along.

10 But the reason why you didn't get the answer that  
11 you wanted was because you didn't get the answer that you  
12 wanted. And I hope you at least consider it as a -- you  
13 know, an honest response on my part, because it is.  
14 That's all that's happened.

15 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: I do. And I appreciate  
16 your honesty and your forthrightness on this. I'm  
17 interested that you made this decision unilaterally as an  
18 individual who has a lot of power here obviously. And you  
19 made this decision, it sounds like, without taking it to  
20 the Board, which is certainly your prerogative --

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: No, I made it in conjunction with  
22 staff.

23 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: -- at least I didn't see  
24 it on the agenda.

25 I will credit your staff with never giving you

1 up. They never stepped up and said Mary told us we can't  
2 do this, so -- I'm not sure why.

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, I'm taking the credit or  
4 the blame, but I had -- I consulted with the people who  
5 were writing the scoping plan, Kevin. I didn't mean to  
6 say I only, sitting in a room by myself, came up with this  
7 idea. We sat together, as we have -- you know, I work  
8 here. I work full time at this job, and we've -- we meet  
9 frequently about what's going on with the scoping plan.

10 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Absolutely, of course.

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: And so I had the conversation on  
12 a number of different occasions with Richard, with Edie,  
13 probably with other people - Although, I don't remember  
14 who they all were at this point - at every meeting.

15 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Sure. So that's  
16 frustrating, in the extreme, as you can imagine. We've  
17 certainly talked about this enough in various open  
18 meetings. And it would have been great to hear that to  
19 begin with, so then we could have done the work of  
20 potentially, quite honestly, challenging that decision,  
21 and maybe developing a process that we felt made this  
22 more -- these recommendations and this several years worth  
23 of work that we put in, and some of us who worked on the  
24 previous one for a short while put in, and the opportunity  
25 to make sure that the communities' voices were raised in a

1 fashion that we felt, as representatives of those  
2 communities who have been appointed to be that, as you  
3 mentioned by statute.

4           The statute often doesn't construct exactly how  
5 that input will happen. I won't disagree with that  
6 either. But I think there's a certain amount of fidelity  
7 here that could be kept by doing something as simple as  
8 this. I don't believe that there are that many entities  
9 providing input here that rise to the level of  
10 statute-driven input.

11           I think most of those are areas where you've  
12 quite rightfully and intelligently consulted for  
13 information. And so I think there's -- there is a  
14 difference there between the two, at least it would seem  
15 so to me. And I think others might agree with me and  
16 others might disagree certainly. Obviously, you do.

17           So I'll just sort of let that stand for right  
18 now, because obviously we're not going to change that  
19 here. The Board members are now completely aware of our  
20 concerns here. I -- if I wasn't clear about it in our  
21 last joint meeting as an ask, I'm still asking for it. I  
22 see no reason for this decision, other than the various  
23 examples that you've brought to the table about others who  
24 have input who you would have to include all of those as  
25 well, or you have chosen not to, because there's so many

1 of them. I'm not quite sure which, but either one of  
2 those things.

3           It's your choice. You have the ability to make  
4 that decision. So I'm certainly not suggesting that you  
5 don't. I think that should be a more public discussion,  
6 quite honestly, with the Board, as the scoping plan is  
7 essentially the voice of not only the agency, but the  
8 Board.

9           And so -- and it speaks also to all of  
10 California, including those communities who, I think,  
11 would not be as supportive of that kind of decision.

12           But again, I can't speak for all of them either.  
13 So it looks like there's some other comment on this. So  
14 I'll let this sit before we move on to natural and working  
15 lands.

16           I had mentioned that I was going to bring this up  
17 today to staff. And I hope maybe to see it agendized or  
18 something at least briefly, but -- so I apologize for sort  
19 of hijacking this spot in the meeting and bringing it up,  
20 but I couldn't see where else I might be able to do that.  
21 And I did talk to the boss here, Mari Rose and Katie.

22           FACILITATOR MCGEE: We have two in the queue. I  
23 want to do a quick time check. It's 3:20. We're talking  
24 about natural and working lands. And what I observed so  
25 far is we've been focused on procedure and procedural

1 concerns. I see mutual understanding, though not  
2 agreement, around procedural concerns.

3 I wanted to check the time. Let's talk about  
4 procedural as much as we need to. And I'm also inviting  
5 us to move into the substance of natural and working  
6 lands.

7 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Quick comment.

8 FACILITATOR MCGREE: We have Mari Rose and Hector  
9 in the queue. Thank you.

10 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: I just want to echo what  
11 Kevin was saying, in that the Environmental Justice  
12 Advisory Committee has been taking the scoping plan out  
13 into the public and in communities. Thousands of people  
14 now know about the scoping plan, and have sent their ideas  
15 through the EJAC. They want to see themselves in the  
16 scoping plan. And I just want to honor that spirit and  
17 why it is that we have wanted to see them, and see us in  
18 the scoping plan document.

19 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I would approach it a  
20 couple of other ways from -- with the full understanding  
21 of what Mary just said.

22 One is, and you referenced it, Kevin, that there  
23 are some things in the scoping plan that look an awful lot  
24 like your recommendations.

25 So the interaction that you're talking about is

1 happening, and it is reflected there. It may not be all  
2 of them, but it's there. And so there is an  
3 acknowledgement, an implicit acknowledgement, that we are  
4 listening, and we are taking those things to heart. And  
5 they're reflected in it.

6 Are they, you know, called out as something that  
7 came from the EJAC? No. That's just, you know, to Mary's  
8 point why that wasn't done. So that's number one.

9 Number two, this other document to me -- and this  
10 goes back to our last joint meeting, last month, two  
11 months ago, which is that we want to address every single  
12 one of the hundred something recommendations that you gave  
13 us, whether it's in the scoping plan, outside the scoping,  
14 plan, in our day-to-day functions, wherever we're doing  
15 it, whether it's us or another agency, which we had  
16 conversations about as well, that it gets done.

17 And, to me, that's why we're here is -- from my  
18 perspective, is we've got to get this stuff done. And so  
19 at the end of the day, to me, that's what's the ultimate  
20 goal. The scoping plan is part of this to me, but it's  
21 not all of it. And so we need to identify these things.  
22 Again, if they're not going to be in the scoping plan,  
23 then where are they? Where are we going to be managing  
24 them?

25 If it's another agency, who is that, and how are

1 we going to engage them with our already oversized egos --  
2 according to other people --

3 (Laughter.)

4 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: -- that we're going to  
5 be engaging with these each other agencies to get them to  
6 do the things that we want them to do.

7 And then pivoting off of that to a very pragmatic  
8 thing, I had a conversation before our meeting today,  
9 based on the letter that I think we all got from a number  
10 of folks regarding the working land -- natural and working  
11 lands asking that we put a target there. And it seemed --  
12 I thought that was an eminently reasonable proposal.

13 Five million metric tons. We have a 50 million  
14 gap. And so it seems to me that to put a -- plant a flag  
15 there for natural and working lands and say we're going to  
16 achieve it through any of these number of recommendations,  
17 or maybe there are others, carbon stock -- increase carbon  
18 stocks, urban forestry, reforestation, wetland  
19 restoration, avoided conversion in a variety of range  
20 land, and agriculture and management activities, or  
21 others.

22 But I think that is something we should put in  
23 here, set a target, and let's go after it. So I know I  
24 covered two different things, but thank you.

25 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Trish, can you make sure the

1 EJAC gets a copy of that letter?

2 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: (Nods head)

3 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Thank you.

4 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Great. So we'll just  
5 respectfully agree to disagree on this, I think, and move  
6 forward, and hopefully have some bigger discussion.

7 I do want to clarify that simply referencing  
8 something doesn't mean that that's where it came from 6789  
9 so I wouldn't want the conflate the two at all. We do  
10 reference an awful lot of things inside the document,  
11 which is appropriate for a document of this level of  
12 complexity. There should be multiple references here, and  
13 they should even cross over and some times conflict with  
14 each other as do some of these parts of the plan.

15 For instance, moving into natural lands, the idea  
16 of a healthy soil initiative versus a biomass initiative.  
17 So I spent the last week in the company of Edie on a panel  
18 looking at renewable natural gas and how it's going to be  
19 produced.

20 We were talking about dairy digesters to begin  
21 with, but we kind of went afield there - I did at least -  
22 and we talked about all the different areas where this  
23 could happen. And a group of people who for them this  
24 is -- this is a really stellar way to approach climate  
25 change. And I was impressed by their commitment and

1 passion around this issue to generate some very lively  
2 conversations, I thought, and turned what could have been  
3 a very boring panel into something that was kind of  
4 entertaining I think in the end.

5           But -- so it's good to have options. But in the  
6 end, I think the EJAC's stand from day one has been the  
7 best place for CARB in this return to the soil. So every  
8 strategy should lead there.

9           We understand that short-term we need better  
10 solutions that can be activated fairly quickly, and  
11 possible other ways to deal with this mess, literally, a  
12 mess that we can perhaps turn to our benefit, and have --  
13 be converted into something more useful than soil carbon,  
14 though I can't quite imagine that it is.

15           But the idea of taking that energy, and instead  
16 of taking that carbon and putting it into something like  
17 composting, which is actually discussed in here, at length  
18 and very well.

19           But the flip side of that is to take that same  
20 waste, and then through various methods, turn it into  
21 energy.

22           And I find having the two being conflicting for  
23 me, one produces very little subsequent criteria  
24 pollution. It certainly doesn't emit any more carbon. It  
25 sequesters that carbon or prepares it for sequestration.

1           And then the other does have, unfortunately, at  
2 least with the process that we have to date, quite a bit  
3 concomitant criteria pollution, especially in the form of  
4 PM2.5. So we've seen that in the creation of some of  
5 these different generation facilities.

6           So, you know, there's a concern there that the  
7 emphasis isn't strongly enough placed on the idea of  
8 carbon sequestration, and carbon conversion over the idea  
9 of using this refuse, this waste to produce energy through  
10 creation of say natural gas, biodiesel - I still see that  
11 talked about - and biogas as in liquid gas versus natural  
12 gas.

13           So many of these things are going to happen, and  
14 I concede the fact that they are. I think one of the  
15 things that I'm concerned about is who's watch-dogging  
16 these pilots and these processes. So an entity like the  
17 EJAC, or other group, I think should be formed to closely  
18 watch these pilots as they evolve. I think the EJAC  
19 agrees with this.

20           I think that this is the only way to be sure that  
21 again the fidelity to the communities, the promises that  
22 have been made to ensure that in our rush to reduce these  
23 carbon emissions, we don't accidentally increase the  
24 burden, and this is carved out in legislation, of criteria  
25 pollutant emissions on these communities or their

1 precursors.

2           So while we talk about the pollutants themselves,  
3 I don't think we're quite as clear on the precursors. So  
4 we want to make sure that we're not producing more  
5 ammonia, we're not producing more black carbon, we're not  
6 producing more oxides of sulfur, or oxides of nitrogen. I  
7 think NOx is handled pretty well, but the rest I don't  
8 see -- and the various volatile organic compounds.

9           So we just want to be very sure there that that  
10 doesn't happen, and we really need to -- and the term that  
11 we're using is repair the fractured ecology that has moved  
12 our agriculture to more of a corporate sort of industrial  
13 process, that has really proven itself in some cases, not  
14 in all causes, but in some cases, to be unfriendly to the  
15 land, and the people who live on it.

16           I'll cite the example again. I hate to keep  
17 beating up on the dairy industry, because I really like  
18 dairies overall, just not the big industrial style. But  
19 the idea of taking waste that we would like to compost,  
20 and put back on the land naturally -- cows kind of do that  
21 when they wander around the pasture-based environment.  
22 And it really doesn't insert a lot of nitrogen back into  
23 the soil. Yet, in the San Joaquin Valley, we've got a  
24 huge problem with nitrate poisoning happening in our water  
25 reservoirs.

1           So we have wells that are not just dry now, but  
2 even if they weren't, couldn't be used because of the  
3 nitrate levels in them. And the geologist I talked to, my  
4 friends who some of them I went to school with, suggested  
5 we may have reached a point of no return in some of these  
6 areas, where the nitrogen seepage into the water table is  
7 beyond repair in these -- in smaller local areas.

8           So we don't want to see that expand, so we want  
9 to make sure that that way of doing business is  
10 discouraged. And I'm afraid that the digester approach at  
11 the high level, not so much at the smaller level operation  
12 to power equipment on the dairy, but the idea of injecting  
13 transportation or energy gas into a pipeline and there  
14 into storage, or for transport could lead to a continue of  
15 that practice -- continuation of that practice to grow  
16 feed for the dairy, which they have to do. If you've got  
17 10,000 cows, may, you've got to feed them, so...

18           And the only way to do that really in an economic  
19 fashion is to grow your crops, as much as possibly locally  
20 on a high level. And the way to fertilize those crops is  
21 to use a liquid nitrogen compound that also  
22 unfortunately -- and the plan does call out the idea of  
23 reversing that purchase of that particular fertilizer from  
24 other countries, while we're dropping the existing waste  
25 into our landfills, or burning it, or selling it to other

1 people, so they can process it and sell it back to us.

2           So this is an area that I think is --  
3 demonstrates this fracturing of the ecology of what is  
4 really an operation that is pretty much necessary, whether  
5 the people agree with that or not, moving forward to our  
6 health. The products that come from this kind of  
7 operation are good products. We may overuse them a bit,  
8 but the reality is they've been contributing to our health  
9 as human beings for tens of thousands of years. People  
10 suggest we can do without that. I challenge that  
11 assertion.

12           So the second thing we need is we need to look at  
13 the urban forestry piece and be more clear on urban  
14 forestry. I think, and in talking to folks at the local  
15 level, who are trying to get these projects off the  
16 ground, I think it's still difficult for cities to  
17 understand local jurisdictions and their land-use  
18 planning, not necessarily now to put them in place, but  
19 how to support them long term.

20           These are expensive maintenance projects. You  
21 can't just plant a tree and leave it next to a sidewalk  
22 for the rest of its life. You will eventually have to  
23 tear it up or it will tear up the sidewalk. And you've  
24 got a water. And if you're going to do it in a way that  
25 creates greenbelts, or protective layers around, for

1 instance, secondary highways that have high density of  
2 travel, or freeways, which I think is very useful for,  
3 again somebody has to plant this stuff, somebody has to  
4 maintain the stuff, and it all costs money.

5           And so how that might happen, it's great to talk  
6 about doing it, but I don't see any long-term planning  
7 that's going to assist those entities in helping them make  
8 that happen.

9           So moving on in the forestry level, this idea --  
10 and I heard this very much in San Francisco the other day,  
11 about the idea of actually thinning forests. Wow,  
12 that's -- that's just so amazing. So I was reviewing the  
13 mediterranean forest policies, just looking around the  
14 world to see what other people have done, and then looking  
15 at some of this stuff in the western region forestry  
16 planning documents to see what's happening outside sort of  
17 the hotbed here of rhetoric around this, that has really  
18 driven it, to some extent, at least about getting better  
19 access to the deep forestlands.

20           And I still find the same solutions that they  
21 suggest as being best is low to moderate intensity  
22 burning, for instance. That forest thinning isn't really  
23 an option, if you truly want to reduce the fire risk in  
24 these large areas of property. And that if you -- if you  
25 do that in the smaller areas where they've tried that, it

1 doesn't appear that it's been successful as these older  
2 more common strategies that kind of fell out of favor here  
3 in California for a while and put them in conflict  
4 sometimes with local air districts who are trying to  
5 reduce black carbon.

6           So this can be done, as it turns out, but it has  
7 to be done in cooperation. And we need that interagency,  
8 both at the federal and State level, of folks working  
9 together to make sure that when the -- those controlled  
10 burns, for instance, are happening. And then again, we're  
11 looking at putting that carbon back in the soil. I think  
12 some of us concede. I don't know that the whole EJAC  
13 agrees with this, but that at the local level in cities  
14 and communities in the mountains where safety becomes an  
15 issue, we have to move more quickly, and we have to remove  
16 that -- that waste.

17           I think my friend Tom Frantz would -- would jump  
18 on me for referring it as waste. He's schooled me a  
19 number of times, in fact, that it's -- it's just carbon  
20 waiting to go back into the soil. But once it's cut down  
21 and -- or if it falls down across your road or your house,  
22 you really look at it in a different way.

23           So if there's -- and there's a lot of that.  
24 There's tons and tons of that stuff. So helping to  
25 dispose of that quickly through various processes that

1 communities decide in those local communities should be  
2 supported, and is within the document. And I think we  
3 need to move forward with that.

4           However, I don't think we should give people  
5 carbon offsets for that, and the EJAC agrees with that,  
6 and it's in one of our recommendations. And I don't think  
7 that that's necessarily putting carbon back into the soil.  
8 And it's great if you want to do that, if you can get  
9 people to pay for it, and the community wants to invest in  
10 it. And I also don't think it's a long-term solution,  
11 because the forest is going to change in the way that it  
12 looks and the way it's built. And that amount of fuel  
13 will slowly disappear, and so what will those communities  
14 and those installations that have been built 20 years from  
15 now, when that forest -- when that fuel runs out, where  
16 will they turn to to find more fuel to continue that  
17 processes, and to honor that investment they made which  
18 often is in the millions of dollars? And for those small  
19 communities, it can be pretty significant.

20           So I just think the plan is a scoping plan, so  
21 scoping out the 2050 is completely appropriate.

22           You know, the idea of emphasizing recycled water  
23 in the development is hugely important, so -- and then  
24 increasing the access, the money piece, really comes into  
25 play here, and incentives for community recycling is

1   incredibly important.

2                   So I'll kind of leave it at that. I think I ran  
3 the clock a little hard there, but not too bad.

4                   FACILITATOR MCGREE: That's okay. I just wanted  
5 to know --

6                   EJAC MEMBER OLMEDO: You just let me know when I  
7 can -- I just need a minute. I'll be signing off.

8                   FACILITATOR MCGEE: Now is a great time, Luis.

9                   EJAC MEMBER OLMEDO: Okay. Thank you.

10                   Yeah. So I -- just a couple of things, not  
11 necessarily substantive to any of the scoping plan  
12 discussion, and everything that's being said. I just  
13 wanted to reinforce and express my strong support for  
14 these meetings -- these joint meetings to continue, and  
15 continue to expand the role of the EJAC, continue to  
16 strengthen its utility, and institutionalize. I know  
17 that -- at least some of the -- one of the meetings, I  
18 know one of the Board members and others have mentioned  
19 the institutional component of it, and I'd like to  
20 continue to support that -- the progress of that -- that  
21 effort.

22                   And just in closing, I wanted to also thank --  
23 you know, before the EJAC members and as well the Air  
24 Resources Board members, I want to thank Richard Corey and  
25 Veronica Eady for spending an entire day. I know it's not

1 easy to get to imperial, take a tour from border to the  
2 Salton Sea and everything in between. We spent an  
3 enormous amount of hours. And I know that they became  
4 very familiar with our area, you know, got very familiar  
5 with our air monitoring network and met some of the  
6 community members, our local leaders, our educators, and  
7 some opportunities that would be a good fit for the  
8 climate investment, climate goals and so on.

9 So I just want to thank them, you know. And I  
10 have to sign off. I look forward to getting the minutes  
11 and proceedings of the rest of the meeting.

12 Thank you.

13 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Thank you.

14 And, Kevin, thanks for framing that up for us.

15 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Sure. I do want to  
16 mention briefly that we haven't had a chance to take it to  
17 the EJAC yet, but I do want to support personally Mr. De  
18 La Torre's suggestion that this idea of setting a hard  
19 target of five million metric tons of carbon is a great  
20 idea. I think we have the breadth to do that, and we  
21 should set hard targets wherever we can.

22 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Excellent. Let me open the  
23 floor.

24 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: So that target that you all  
25 talked about, like what -- where does that -- where can

1 that happen, and what process?

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Through the Climate Action Team,  
3 which has convened discussions with the Natural Resources  
4 Agencies that are responsible for implementing the kinds  
5 of programs that would be included here.

6 I think that discussion is actually already  
7 underway. I had a conversation yesterday with Secretary  
8 Laird of the Natural Resources Agency, and they're  
9 actually interested in proposing a target. So obviously  
10 that will have to be discussed, vetted, and the rationale  
11 on how it would be implemented would be written into the  
12 plan, at least to some degree to give it some detail, so  
13 you don't just pick a number out of nowhere.

14 But I think they're -- they're looking at a  
15 number, which is actually more ambitious than what was in  
16 the letter.

17 So we're very interested.

18 (Laughter.)

19 CHAIR NICHOLS: We're very interested.

20 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Kevin, I'd actually like to  
21 give you one more chance. Anything you'd like to say by  
22 way of summary on this?

23 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: No. I think I've said  
24 enough. Thanks.

25 (Laughter.)

1 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: You know, I think  
2 everybody is -- we've met a lot now with CDFA, and with  
3 CalRecycle and others. And I think this is probably one  
4 of the most complex of all the sectors to be quite honest  
5 with you. How we deal with our trash, I mean, has been  
6 haunting mankind and informing it. I mean, my minor was  
7 in anthropology. So we would -- we learn more about  
8 society from the trash, by the way, than we have just  
9 about anything else.

10 So maybe we can change that, so we can do  
11 something with our trash that people won't dig up later  
12 and talk bad about us, so...

13 (Laughter.)

14 FACILITATOR MCGEE: This probably doesn't matter  
15 to anybody, but I started the new year in Haiti where  
16 trash is a way of life.

17 My goodness.

18 May I transition us to our next sector discussion  
19 on energy?

20 Mari Rose, are you ready for us?

21 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Yeah.

22 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Please.

23 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: I actually want to start by  
24 echoing my favorite quote of the day, which is, "We're not  
25 here for trickle down benefits", says Sekita Grant.

1 (Laughter.)

2 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: That was great.

3 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: And so in the energy sector,  
4 and energy development is exactly cap -- trying to capture  
5 exactly that sentiment. I'm curious -- I know that it's  
6 late in the afternoon -- who here -- I'm going to do a  
7 little hand raising, and see if you're still awake. Who  
8 here either lives in or works in a building that has solar  
9 panels?

10 (Hand raised.)

11 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: And who here owns an electric  
12 car?

13 (Hands raised.)

14 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Okay. So I'm also noticing a  
15 lot of the EJAC members not raise their hands.

16 (Laughter.)

17 EJAC MEMBER LEÓN: Who wants to be able to  
18 forward it?

19 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Raise your hand if you want  
20 to be able to afford an electric vehicle or solar on your  
21 home or office?

22 (Hand raised.)

23 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Yeah. Yeah. So solar  
24 backpack, powering all things.

25 So the energy section of the scoping plan points

1 to the excitement around clean energy development in  
2 California. And why Sekita's quote is so particularly  
3 important is that if you don't do that with -- with  
4 specificity around benefiting disadvantaged communities,  
5 we are -- we are going to be ignored. And so right now,  
6 the way we see the scoping plan is it doesn't really talk  
7 about directing those benefits or making sure those  
8 investments, or those projects land in EJ communities.

9           And even though we -- I don't see the ARB as an  
10 economic engine, a lot of the economic benefits of the  
11 clean energy economy actually can be found or have already  
12 started within the clean energy sector. And so there's  
13 not much discussion there. I see the discussion on clean  
14 energy -- the clean energy economy in the first part of  
15 the scoping plan around the themes, but it doesn't make it  
16 into this -- the energy sector.

17           And so there's a -- there's a part that needs to  
18 be reconciled with the themes of the scoping plan, or  
19 these big goals, and to make sure that they're echoed in  
20 the different sections of the scoping plan. And so this  
21 is one of them.

22           And so in the priority EJAC recommendations,  
23 document in the energy, green buildings, and water  
24 section, is around prioritizing distributed generation or  
25 small-scale solar, and renewables in EJ communities. As

1 we have seen that, yes, you know, it's also important to  
2 have the large scale renewable projects to have them  
3 appear in EJ communities brings so many benefits as well  
4 as the feeling that that -- that ARB, or the CPUC, or our  
5 State agencies actually care about these communities.

6           And so when we're talking about environmental  
7 justice goals, and implementation of the scoping plan, or  
8 other programs, if they don't see it in EJ communities,  
9 they think that you don't care. And so you all and we all  
10 have to do a better job in making sure these projects --  
11 these good projects land in the communities that need them  
12 the most.

13           And so the SB 350 studies are actually  
14 identifying what those barriers are, and so there are  
15 recommendations in how to overcome them. And so that  
16 needs to have some discussion. We want to see some of  
17 that discussion. There's mention of SB 350 in the scoping  
18 plan in the energy section, but not about -- but not  
19 necessarily about overcoming the barriers for low income  
20 folks to be able to get access to these clean energy  
21 technologies projects, et cetera.

22           What else is in here?

23           In -- let me finish and then let's get to your  
24 question Mary.

25           The other thing is I want to choose the analogy

1 of whack-a-mole -- whack-a-mole game. This applies to  
2 industry as well as energy, where we might be from  
3 cleaning up in one place, and then it's -- it's popping up  
4 somewhere else. And so the same with greenhouse gas  
5 reduction, we might be an energy -- promoting clean energy  
6 projects in one hand, and then we're allowing for fossil  
7 fuel power plants to come on line. And so where is the  
8 reconciliation there around the whole sector? For  
9 instance, that the energy sector needs to decrease its  
10 emissions, not just that we're putting clean energy on  
11 line, but also there has to be some statement around we  
12 should not be allowing for new fossil fuel infrastructure  
13 to be built.

14           And we're seeing that. You know, there's a  
15 proposal right now in Oxnard for a big power plant and  
16 other types of fossil fuel infrastructure, including in  
17 the -- under industry. And we have to make sure that the  
18 sector as a whole, whether the industry sector, the energy  
19 sector, should have goals to reduce their emissions.

20           So that's the part on setting a moratorium on new  
21 infrastructure. And then stop investing in dirty energy,  
22 including related to the natural and working lands and  
23 waste recommendation, and biomass burn -- so don't --  
24 don't subsidize biomass burning waste-to-energy projects,  
25 et cetera.

1 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Please, and then we'll come  
2 back.

3 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Thanks for that. I wanted  
4 to ask you. I know there's some discussion in the  
5 environ -- the sort of, what I would call, the general  
6 environmental justice section, which I realize is maybe  
7 not as long as it should be. It's on -- starts on page  
8 20, that recognizes it is critical that environmental  
9 justice communities share in the benefits of the cleaner  
10 economy, and so forth.

11 And so there's some general language that gets at  
12 the importance of having benefit to EJ communities for  
13 these projects. I -- are you suggesting or recommending  
14 that some of that language and some of that expression of  
15 priority should occur more throughout the document in the  
16 individual sections? I mean, I take the document and say  
17 this is -- when I read this, it's important in all these  
18 areas. But you're saying to highlight it more, it should  
19 be discussed in these different sections a little more.

20 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Absolutely. And I think what  
21 we potentially could see is once the scoping plan is  
22 approved -- yea, end of June --

23 (Laughter.)

24 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: -- is that there are agencies  
25 or folks interested in certain sectors will just look at

1 that sector --

2 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yeah.

3 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: -- and if it's not --

4 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yeah, right.

5 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: -- if it doesn't say, hey, in  
6 the energy sector you should be --

7 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

8 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: -- making sure there's  
9 benefits to disadvantaged communities. That's going to be  
10 completely lost.

11 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right. I think that's a  
12 really good suggestion. I think while this lang --  
13 general language expresses and intent, that this is a  
14 priority throughout the document, it may not be --  
15 sometimes what's intended and what's perceived are two  
16 different things. And so maybe -- and having some  
17 additional discussion about this priority in the context  
18 of those other sections may make some sense. Yeah, I hear  
19 you. I think that's a good point.

20 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Great. And then in the  
21 middle was a question about specific suggestions or  
22 recommendations, I think, regarding the scoping plan.

23 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: What was the question?

24 CHAIR NICHOLS: It's really on access by lower  
25 income -- EJ community residents to the benefits of a

1 electric transportation, whether beyond the sort of things  
2 that have already been identified, the -- you know,  
3 getting zero emission vehicles into ride sharing, and  
4 getting more zero emission buses. Were there other  
5 suggestions that you all had or priorities that you had  
6 that you thought should be emphasized?

7 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Sekita also is one of the  
8 leads on this, especially around electrification of  
9 transportation. And I know she stepped out.

10 I think there are beginnings of those equity type  
11 programs, and programs to make sure that EVs and solar  
12 gets into disadvantaged communities. But they're so, so  
13 initial. They're not -- they're not like a substantial  
14 part of the programs yet. And so I think that's also why,  
15 you know, in the scoping plan it's good to reiterate that  
16 that is a value or a goal of the Air Resources Board to  
17 specify that.

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: I think it's a great thing to do.  
19 I'm not pushing back on that at all. I'm just looking for  
20 even more ideas.

21 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: And that is -- and I want to  
22 reiterate or emphasize small scale solar and distributed  
23 generation around that, because there's a lot of benefits  
24 that don't necessarily happen when it's large scale  
25 industrial solar or renewable development. And so rooftop

1 solar, and these community scale projects are really  
2 important to see in the communities.

3 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Open floor.

4 Sorry, Kevin. I'm sorry. Please.

5 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: No. I think if you're  
6 looking for a programmatic -- Mary, were you looking for  
7 programmatic level suggestions? I think we could probably  
8 get together as a -- as the energy team, again Sekita,  
9 myself and a few others have been working on that and be  
10 happy to provide you.

11 There are some barriers that have occurred in  
12 things like the trade-up -- trade-up programs and things  
13 like that that have been -- made it challenging for a lot  
14 of our communities to participate in. Local air districts  
15 I think have been particularly creative around this, so it  
16 kind of leads away from the -- the San Joaquin has done, I  
17 think, a pretty good there through the EJAC that I sit on  
18 where we've taken away some of those paper barriers, if  
19 you will, that some of these communities can't meet, as  
20 far as say having the car already registered or title  
21 moved and things like that that prevent some folks that --  
22 State run programs may not allow this to happen. And so  
23 we need to talk about, at some point, how that can work  
24 better.

25 I did want to mention with regard to energy. So

1 the thing that I recognized, as I look at this  
2 conversation, and I think we all do, is that the demand  
3 for energy insatiable and growing. We have to recognize  
4 that. So the demand to produce it and the monetary profit  
5 that essentially that can come from that is also  
6 recognized as an issue.

7           So getting folks to invest in these renewable  
8 energy projects that make it difficult for them to  
9 monetize their investment I think has been challenging,  
10 other than doing it on a very large scale. So this really  
11 was illustrated to me recently looking at the CEC  
12 contracts going out to the three big energy companies in  
13 the State initially around renewables and the idea of --  
14 and where they participate on the transportation system  
15 infrastructure development, and the fact that they  
16 were -- that those who are not -- that didn't own energy  
17 transmission facilities -- generation and transmission  
18 facilities were actually excluded from participating.

19           So Community Choice, for instance, couldn't  
20 participate in that RFP process, because they didn't meet  
21 that standard. They don't own any facilities. And so  
22 just being part of the transmission piece was not  
23 adequate. And so there's a lot of interesting pieces  
24 there that need to fit together that I don't think come  
25 together very well.

1           But one of the things about this voracious  
2 appetite we have for energy and need for energy that I  
3 worry about, and I'm going to go connect it back to  
4 natural lands and the forestry discussion. So let's say  
5 that I put up these one megawatt or I put up, you know,  
6 500 megawatt transportable tech or whatever in the forest,  
7 so what happens again when I run out of that particular  
8 energy? How do I manage that going forward?

9           There is a finite -- there are a finite numbers  
10 of trees. So we can only cut and process these things to  
11 a certain point when we start looking at, wow, we don't  
12 have enough here. But if it is in the goals of an  
13 industry to keep producing that energy, and if we now  
14 create a demand for that, and in fact that section of the  
15 production of energy, that area within that sector that's  
16 producing that percentage of the energy we need it, we  
17 become dependent on it.

18           So once we crack that egg, we can't put it back  
19 together again at that point. So we really need to be  
20 thinking about things like that when we suggest that means  
21 opportunities within something like the scoping plan.  
22 Again scoping out 2030, 2050, thinking about what happens  
23 when.

24           So it seems great right now, because we need  
25 this. But, yet again, once we're committed, and we

1 invest, and we're talking about millions of dollars, and  
2 we have jobs attached to it, and a demand for the product,  
3 turning that switch off -- you know, Governor Gray Davis  
4 found out right away what happens when you try to flip a  
5 switch when the commitment Pete Wilson made in the  
6 registration of automobiles to say that we're going to  
7 give everybody this money back right now, but if the  
8 economy tanks, we're going to have to switch back again.  
9 How well did that work out for him?

10           Okay. So once we get committed to something, and  
11 get used to it as a population, it's really hard to flip  
12 that switch and go backwards again.

13           So once we start harvesting forests to create  
14 energy, once we start taking waste from various points to  
15 create energy, we need to really think about what that's  
16 going to look like when those stocks of that, because we  
17 have become less wasteful over time. Or maybe the energy  
18 demand outstrips the need for the product that created the  
19 waste in the first place, so it turns around and just  
20 starts creating waste, because there's more money in the  
21 energy business.

22           So these kinds of dynamics do happen in real life  
23 and we have to be thinking about those. And I think  
24 within this scoping plan, that's not well addressed what  
25 those outcomes might be.

1           So, I don't mean to be the profit doom --

2           FACILITATOR MCGEE: I've got two in the queue.

3 Martha -- and John, do you mind muting your mic for just a  
4 moment --

5           EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Oh, yeah.

6           FACILITATOR MCGEE: -- I'm getting some echoes,  
7 if it's still on.

8           Thank you.

9           EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: Well, if you're  
10 looking for specific projects -- oh, yes it is. I'm just  
11 not close enough.

12           So if we're looking for specific projects, we  
13 just learned the other day that there is now ways to --  
14 there's electric trash trucks. So it would be great to  
15 figure out how to --

16           (Thereupon an automated voice regarding  
17 the conference call came on.)

18           EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: Why does this guy  
19 keep interrupting me.

20           (Laughter.)

21           EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: Only one who has the  
22 balls.

23           Sorry. Sorry.

24           So electric trash trucks is one. And, you know,  
25 I keep -- and I know it's out of order, but sorry, I keep

1 going back to this auto body stuff. And one of the things  
2 that's sort of missing, I think, in the plan and just sort  
3 of overall at CARB is how do you develop -- you know,  
4 Boston did an amazing project to clean up auto body shops.  
5 And they did it through the health department. You know,  
6 why aren't we developing programs like that that entail  
7 some outreach and education? And you can talk to us  
8 health educators who actually know how to talk to  
9 community and get them to sign up to programs, right?

10 Because whether it's the vehicle program -- I  
11 mean, Dr. Balmes is here telling me how affordable it is.  
12 I'm like it was really hard to figure that out, right? So  
13 how --

14 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Specifically in the San  
15 Joaquin Valley. There's extra money for it.

16 EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: And now I want to  
17 move there so I can get in -- I can afford and electric  
18 vehicle. But so --

19 (Laughter.)

20 EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: -- that piece, right?  
21 And I -- you know, we need to figure that out. And EJAC  
22 is sort of a perfect place, right, because you've got  
23 collectively hundreds of years of experience of doing, you  
24 know, grass roots organizing, community-based programming,  
25 so that when you develop a program, you actually know how

1 to get people to sign up for it. So that's one. And then  
2 just the trash trucks and auto body shops. Like, let's  
3 figure out how to clean those up.

4 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Any comments, thoughts, or  
5 responses?

6 Please, Mari Rose, as you're ready.

7 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: So, I guess the specific  
8 question to the staff and Board, so when I gave the  
9 example of a whack-a-mole, where we are reducing emissions  
10 through clean energy projects through the RPS, and then  
11 there's facilities that are opening up, new facilities --  
12 fossil fuel facilities that are opening up, power plants.  
13 How -- well, I guess the idea is should there be an energy  
14 sector-wide emissions reduction goal that isn't just  
15 reliant on clean energy and RPS, because right now it's --  
16 there's a loophole for facilities to come up or to be  
17 built.

18 Mike, I don't know -- like, so the CPUC or the  
19 CEC like how do they -- when they read the scoping plan,  
20 what signals to them that they shouldn't be allowing for  
21 the operations of new facilities and new infrastructures  
22 that are fossil fuel based?

23 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: In my mind, and this  
24 isn't me speaking for CARB, we're allowing new facilities  
25 to be come on board. They're not necessarily the problem.

1 The problem are the oldest, dirtiest that are still there.  
2 So we need to do something about the oldest dirtiest.  
3 We're going to need, for the foreseeable future, some  
4 natural gas facilities in addition to our hydro and  
5 others, in order to have stability in our system.  
6 Renewables don't do it all by themselves. We need to have  
7 a mix, right?

8           And so -- so that's what we know today. It could  
9 change five years from now, ten years from now, 20 years  
10 from now. Who knows? But for right now, we know we  
11 need -- we need a mix.

12           As new facilities are coming on line, we need to  
13 do a better job of identifying those older dirtier ones,  
14 and getting them off line. And so -- that's -- that's a  
15 conversation that obviously, to my point earlier about  
16 other agencies, we need to engage those other agencies and  
17 have that conversation, because I don't think, as long as  
18 folks are making money from older dirtier, they're going  
19 to.

20           And so that does take some intervention,  
21 some -- something on our part, if there's this broader  
22 mandate, this broader goal that we have for 2030 and 2050.

23           EJAC MEMBER TARUC: So, yes, around taking down  
24 old, bigger polluting power plants. Now -- so what we're  
25 seeing is with new infrastructure and new facilities is

1 that once they're built, they're like, what, a 30 to 50  
2 year commitment to that. And so I know we're planning for  
3 2030, but with an eye towards 2050. And so that will  
4 blast through that. And so how are we going to get to 80  
5 percent emissions reduction of the 1990 levels, if we're  
6 allowing new facilities to come up also?

7 We should -- so there -- there's that, and then  
8 also where these facilities are going to be located. And  
9 almost all the time it will be in EJ communities. And so  
10 that is a -- that's a huge concern and does not meet  
11 environmental justice goals if we allow new facilities to  
12 be built in EJ communities.

13 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: So just to the point of  
14 the older dirtier facilities, I agree, but it's my  
15 understanding, and please correct me if I'm wrong, that  
16 the majority of those facilities are peak -- peak-time  
17 facilities. So they come on line when the demand is at  
18 peak. And so we have to incentivize those folks to shut  
19 those plants down.

20 I think that's -- again, you're talking -- we  
21 talk about investments. And so I -- I always feel at a  
22 certain level I have to honor the fact that people spend a  
23 lot of money to create these things. And so -- and they  
24 did it with the best of intentions, again because we have  
25 this huge demand for energy and power. And that was kind

1 of the way you did it when they created those.

2           So we need to figure out how to down-cycle those  
3 things and remove and replace them with -- with better  
4 alternatives that we have available today. And then the  
5 second step is when we're building new things today, we  
6 need to be taking advantage of that -- of that newer  
7 technology whenever and however possible.

8           I know that right now some of that tech is not  
9 reliable 24 hours a day. And I think that's -- you know,  
10 we're all waiting -- I mentioned this the other day just  
11 in passing as a joke, for Elon Musk to save us all with  
12 the cool battery tech that allows us to start storing some  
13 of this solar energy we create in the daytime, so that we  
14 can use it at night.

15           But right now, you know, that's just not there.  
16 So -- but it doesn't excuse us continuing to build --

17           (Laughter.) --

18           EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: -- build --

19           Is that a yes, yes, yes?

20           CHAIR NICHOLS: No. It is there.

21           EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Oh, it is? Okay.

22           CHAIR NICHOLS: Last week, I attended a ribbon  
23 cutting where Southern California Edison took a peaker  
24 plant that they built after 2000, because remember we were  
25 worried that the lights were going to go out.

1 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Right. Yeah, Yeah.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: They have five peaker plants in  
3 their service territory. Everyone of them is going to be  
4 paired up with a new G.E. solar battery array, which can  
5 take solar energy and store it off peak, so they don't  
6 have to fire those puppies up when they need to. They are  
7 amazing.

8 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: That should be front page  
9 news.

10 (Laughter.)

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: It exists. It just -- it took a  
12 little while, but the reason why Edison is doing it is  
13 because of the need to reduce carbon, because they don't  
14 want to have to buy allowances and they had to buy  
15 allowances to cover the cost of starting up the peaker  
16 plants.

17 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Then why are we building a  
18 new plant in Oxnard?

19 CHAIR NICHOLS: I don't know.

20 (Laughter.)

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: I don't know. Nobody asked me.

22 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So the generator is  
23 the same, the fuel is different.

24 CHAIR NICHOLS: The diesel -- it's not diesel.  
25 It's natural gas. The natural gas peaking plant, which

1 is, you know, still more efficient than your average power  
2 plant, is still there, but it doesn't have to be fired up  
3 as often. And when it is fired up, it's fired up using  
4 the battery as a ignition.

5 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So it's not on --

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah. Yeah, much less. There  
7 just not operating much at all. Apparently -- I mean,  
8 according to the statistics that they were giving out,  
9 it's going to cut the overall emissions of that plant, of  
10 conventional and CO2, down to, you know, just like a tiny  
11 percent of what they were before.

12 And it's because General Electric went into this  
13 business. They have these big battery arrays. And it's  
14 more than the battery. It's not just Elon Musk and his  
15 batteries. It's also some very fancy switching equipment,  
16 so you've got sensors that work like almost  
17 instantaneously, but that's all happening because of the  
18 need to deal with reducing carbon.

19 So right on. Yeah. Good stuff.

20 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: So actually I was going  
21 to mention that, because I read it in --

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: I was there.

23 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: I saw the notice that you  
24 had attended that. But one of the other things that's  
25 happening with power plants is they're remodeling and

1 adding new turbines --

2 FACILITATOR McGEE: There's a little bit of  
3 chaos in the room. If we could go with one voice, please.

4 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: -- because the old peaker  
5 plants it took a long time for them to gear up. And that  
6 was always -- you know, that's carbon intensive.

7 So the new turbines gear up immediately, and it  
8 reduces the time that a peaker plant has to come on line,  
9 so -- and I think this plant may have been combined with  
10 turbines, the one Mary is talking about. That it has  
11 batteries that store and turbines are included in -- new  
12 turbines, I think, are included in --

13 CHAIR NICHOLS: (Shakes head.)

14 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: No, you didn't think it  
15 was the way. It was all battery. Okay. Anyway, there's  
16 some very new technologies out there that are going to be  
17 a lot cleaner than what we've seen. I don't know about  
18 that --

19 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: But I think there's a  
20 difference between a batter that's -- I'm sorry.

21 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: No. I was just going to  
22 say I don't know about Oxnard either.

23 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: So I don't -- I think  
24 there's a difference between a battery being -- using --  
25 stored for igniter purposes and a battery storage for

1 powering the grid.

2           So, I -- so, Mary, was it one or the other. I  
3 just want to --

4           CHAIR NICHOLS: Again, my understanding is I  
5 should -- I should have brought the brochure with me. I'm  
6 very bad with this stuff.

7           EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: That's okay. I'll look it  
8 up. It's fine. I Just --

9           CHAIR NICHOLS: But it's easy to find. But I  
10 believe that they can use the stored electricity on a  
11 routine basis, not just -- and because --

12           EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Because that's -- that's  
13 the trick.

14           CHAIR NICHOLS: -- we've got excess solar. Yeah,  
15 we've got excess solar that we can store there. So it is  
16 going to be used to even out the operation of the  
17 renewables when the renewables are not available.

18           EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Because I don't need to  
19 fire a generator, if I've got power in the battery to  
20 start. I just flip a switch, right, and --

21           CHAIR NICHOLS: Right, but there's not enough, I  
22 think.

23           EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: -- or actually there's  
24 sensors that let you know when the power drops and it  
25 kicks it on. Sort of like what's in your solar on your

1 house going out to the grid right now, yeah.

2 EJAC MEMBER LEÓN: So my question naturally is  
3 when do we get that technology to the valley?

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, Edison operates into  
5 what -- up only to --

6 EJAC MEMBER LEÓN: Tulare and part of Kings  
7 County.

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah, so they've got some.

9 EJAC MEMBER LEÓN: I know we got somebody from  
10 Edison here somewhere.

11 Raise your hand.

12 How about does -- PG&E, they've got the greater  
13 majority of the valley.

14 CHAIR NICHOLS: They've made other commitments on  
15 the renewable side of things, but who's proposing this new  
16 plant though, this new gas plant that you're talking  
17 about? Is that Edison or probably the local muni  
18 probably.

19 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I'm sure it's an  
20 independent, because Edison sold all their power plants  
21 during the electricity crisis. So it's probably an  
22 independent that's planning to sell to the Edison grid.

23 FACILITATOR MCGEE: You can tell the interest in  
24 this conversation. Good conversation. I want to draw us  
25 back to the scoping plan.

1           Please.

2           EJAC MEMBER LEÓN: Oh, I just want to make a  
3 really quick comment. There's money out there for a dam.  
4 And I guess they're going to build a dam. No matter what,  
5 it's going to happen. It's a decision between two  
6 locations, one in the San Joaquin Valley up the hill, and  
7 one up north around here somewhere.

8           But, you know, I'm just thinking what -- pumping  
9 storage. You know, I wonder if that's going to come with  
10 it. Maybe not, but I just wanted to throw it out there.

11          FACILITATOR MCGEE: Excellent.

12          I want to acknowledge your patience and your  
13 stamina. It's been a great meeting so far. We're at  
14 4:10. I want to see if this is a good time to wrap up the  
15 energy sector conversation regarding the scoping plan?

16          By way of transition and efficient use of time, I  
17 have one more comment card here. Is this an okay time for  
18 me to do a public comment?

19          JP Cativiela(co-way-la).

20          MR. CATIVIELA: Cativiela(cat-a-vee-el-a)

21          FACILITATOR MCGEE: Can I blame the handwriting  
22 and not my terrible pronunciation of your word -- of your  
23 name?

24          (Laughter.)

25          FACILITATOR MCGREE: I'll take any excuse.

1 MR. CATIVIELA: I'm HP Cativiela. I'm here today  
2 representing the Dairy Cares coalition. I just wanted to  
3 both respond to some of the meeting materials and also to  
4 some of Kevin's comments. I do appreciate, Kevin, you  
5 talking about how much you like dairies today, so thank  
6 you for that.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. CATIVIELA: In the crosswalk document, there  
9 is a fairly good discussion of some of the issues that  
10 Kevin brought up today and some others that have been  
11 brought up by the EJ. And I just want to thank ARB for  
12 their thorough responses to those comments. I'm not going  
13 to repeat that discussion that's in the document, but we  
14 only had about half of the conversation today. And the  
15 other half is in the ARB responses. They're very well  
16 researched and have developed over time. And I think ARB  
17 has done a good job responding to the EJ concerns on those  
18 issues.

19 And, in particular, the clarifications on things  
20 like whether or not it's a good idea to put methane from  
21 dairies into pipelines, the LCFS credit policy, and some  
22 of the limitations on alternatives to digesters.

23 With regard to some of Kevin's comments on  
24 digesters, I just wanted to clarify a few things. I think  
25 it's really important to understand. I say this a lot, so

1 hopefully I'm not repeating myself to too much -- to too  
2 many of you.

3           Digesters do not evaporate manure. Almost as  
4 much manure comes out of a digester as goes in. Yes,  
5 methane is extracted, but there's still quite a bit of  
6 great organic fertilizer that comes out of that other end  
7 of that digester.

8           So this sort of false choice of we have to choose  
9 between energy or soil amendment, it's not real. We can  
10 still use that digestate as a soil amendment. There's a  
11 lot of it, and it will sequester carbon. It will build  
12 the soil. You can get both.

13           Now, that still requires us to build the most  
14 environmentally friendly digesters we can, but I don't  
15 think it makes us make that choice. You can compost what  
16 comes out of a digester. So you don't have to choose  
17 between composting and digesting.

18           It's important to understand, and I'm a big fan  
19 of composting. I do it myself in my home -- in my -- at  
20 my home, but composting does also produce emissions. So  
21 the same lens that we're looking at digesters through the  
22 pros and cons need to be looked at with composting. And  
23 in response to that, that fact, the State has put together  
24 some fairly comprehensive rules for composting that are  
25 going to make it tough for widespread adoption of

1 composting by dairies. So we need to think about other  
2 alternatives.

3           Digesters do reduce other emissions. We've  
4 talked a lot about NOx today. It is true that NOx is  
5 emitted by digesters. Fortunately, it's a smaller number  
6 than what -- even by tens or hundreds of times than --  
7 depending on how far back you look at the pollution  
8 standards for natural gas engines.

9           It's getting better and it's dropping. And the  
10 fuel projects that we're looking at have the actual  
11 potential to reduce NOx emissions, a net reduction that's  
12 very significant.

13           By some of our estimates, one dairy with a  
14 digester that -- that has -- that use -- where it is used  
15 as fuel to replace older diesel trucks fuel, you could  
16 reduce the emissions from the equivalent of six or seven  
17 old-style digesters. So that's something I think that we  
18 can't dismiss.

19           Digesters also reduce ammonia, hydrogen sulfide,  
20 and VOCs. So I think that -- and odors. So there are a  
21 lot of benefits to digesters that I think need to be  
22 considered. They're not the solution for every case, but  
23 they're in the -- they should be in the mix.

24           Finally, I want to kind of address the -- there  
25 seems to be this sort of ongoing narrative about, well,

1 that's fine for small dairies, but big dairies shouldn't  
2 get that, or, you know, big dairies should be discouraged  
3 because they pollute.

4           And I just want to say I'm here representing a  
5 wide variety of sizes of dairies. Our members have  
6 dairies as small as 25 cows and all the way up to  
7 thousands of cows. So I care about all of them, but I  
8 think it's really important to judge a business by its  
9 environmental performance, not by its size, and certainly  
10 not in a blanket way.

11           What if we bought cell phones, cars, or coffee  
12 the way we're hearing the conversation talked about with  
13 dairies today? Would we only buy our cell phones from a  
14 company that had five employees? Would we only buy our  
15 cars from a company that had ten employees?

16           It's not a fair analysis. We should judge those  
17 companies on what they're willing to do and commit to in  
18 terms of environmental performance.

19           I give the example of Walmart. On April 19, they  
20 announced the Project Gigaton, which is a commitment to  
21 reduce one billion tons of CO2, which is, you know, a huge  
22 amount by 2030. That one company's decision could make a  
23 much bigger difference than any one small decision.

24           So I think it's important to think big and think  
25 that it's -- that we can accomplish things by going big

1 and small. One very large dairy in the valley converted  
2 with the help of a grant from the San Joaquin Air District  
3 to an electric feed mixing system that's reduced its NOx  
4 emissions by 20 tons a year. So we need to support those  
5 types of projects. And, frankly, we won't get to the 40  
6 percent goal that's in SB 1383 without including the  
7 larger dairies in that mix.

8 Thank you.

9 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Thank you. Excellent.

10 Our homestretch conversation is about looking  
11 forward, coordination and implementation both on the  
12 scoping plan and beyond. And I think maybe a member of  
13 the EJAC might want to tee us up on this conversation?

14 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: I can start. So I wanted to  
15 echo what Hector was saying around staff taking the EJAC  
16 recommendations, and then figuring out which ones are in  
17 the scoping plan, which are in other programs or other  
18 agencies, and in what timeline. Is that something that  
19 staff is going to do?

20 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: My understanding of the  
21 role of the crosswalk was to identify each of the  
22 recommendations, and indicate where they were treated in  
23 the scoping plans where there's citations, in terms of  
24 page numbers and so on, as well as flag those areas that  
25 are really outside of the scope of the scoping plan, in

1 terms of even the conversation here about auto body shops.

2 That's clearly a toxics issue that needs  
3 attention. There's no doubt about it, not so much a  
4 sloping plan. So my short response to your point is  
5 that's the intent, even with the draft that we have right  
6 now. And that was the intent with the crosswalk to be  
7 clear where those opportunities lie within the scoping  
8 plan or outside of it.

9 VICE CHAIR BERG: Do you feel it doesn't cover  
10 it?

11 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: So Sandy asked if we felt it  
12 wasn't. So when the EJAC met in -- last met, we were  
13 looking at the crosswalk document and there -- the parts  
14 that I read, I know that there were problems with it in  
15 terms of whether the staff even understood what the EJAC  
16 recommendation was - there were parts there - and then  
17 also what to do about it.

18 And so, I mean, we can all look at this document.  
19 And maybe, Hector, you can also say is this what you are  
20 looking for or is there something -- a different format of  
21 this that we can have, so that it lives beyond the scoping  
22 plan process. It's not just taking the scoping -- the  
23 EJAC recommendations, but there's something that we're  
24 addressing environmental justice issues in different  
25 programs?

1           Yeah.

2           BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I'm just flipping  
3 through it right now as you were talking. And there are  
4 some that don't have that at all. And so, clearly, it's  
5 not -- some may have it, not all do. And so maybe there's  
6 just some simple coding that can be, is it a CARB thing,  
7 is it a scoping plan thing, is it some other agency? You  
8 know, some -- that everyone of these has a location where  
9 it belongs.

10           EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Well, and these,  
11 like -- I think 29. I counted quickly, so I might be  
12 missing some shorter recommendations that we have. I  
13 mean, the reason -- I mean, part of why we kept pulling  
14 this out and we created this longer narrative at the front  
15 is because we do not believe that it was appropriately  
16 addressed within the cross-link table. So I don't want us  
17 to keep going back to the cross-link table and so the  
18 answers were there, because that's why we created another  
19 document that said, no, no, we're still missing it. And I  
20 think -- I know I obviously missed a solid chunk of the  
21 discussion today.

22           But before I left, I mean, there were items that  
23 came up like around 375 and a few other things that they  
24 said, oh, we'll get you a response on that. Like, that  
25 makes sense. So I think I'd like to see more movement

1 within the actual scoping plan document around equity and  
2 environmental justice analysis, here's what we've heard,  
3 here's what we're changing, here's what we're not  
4 changing, here's why as we move towards a final plan,  
5 because the plan is going to be revised hopefully to  
6 include some of our recommendations, as well as other  
7 recommendations of stakeholders.

8           So I guess we're looking for -- that crossing  
9 table for me was based on the last draft, so I guess I'm  
10 looking for a new analysis of now that we're working on a  
11 final plan, what is in there, what isn't in there, and  
12 why, in a greater level of detail.

13           Yes.

14           EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yeah, and just to add  
15 to that, Katie, and I actually think that this  
16 conversation/exchange has actually been really helpful.  
17 Honestly, the crosswalk impact we worked really hard to  
18 put it in a format that was responsive to what you all had  
19 asked for, but it is a overwhelming document. It's  
20 overwhelming, and that can make it really difficult to  
21 process and even relay.

22           And this conversation, at least for me, has been  
23 a much more targeted on a subset. In other words, I've  
24 been thinking all along in this conversation a few points.  
25 In fact, just to call out a point that just as one example

1 that Mari Rose made with respect to SB 350. And talking  
2 about the barriers. And that's actually -- it's more than  
3 barriers to EVs. SB 350 also talked about barriers to  
4 solar voltaics, and went through a whole process that CEC  
5 had been going through. I know you were all aware of in  
6 terms of barriers for multi-unit dwellings, barriers for  
7 renters in terms of gaining and the opportunity to engage  
8 in those technologies.

9           The same point with the EV. In fact, we're going  
10 to the Board next month with the process that we've been  
11 going through. And what I picked up from you, as this  
12 example, Mari Rose, is we do a better job in the document  
13 of even linking to that -- there's specific  
14 recommendations in both those SB 350 reports, in terms of  
15 how -- one, recognizing the barriers is one thing, it's  
16 how do you move forward and trying to do a stronger  
17 connection?

18           That's kind of the filter of trying to apply with  
19 the team, in terms of this conversation, seeing where they  
20 can relate to, I'm going to say, more effective treatment  
21 in the document. But it's a more manageable set this  
22 conversation, because I think it's been a lot more  
23 focused.

24           FACILITATOR MCGEE: I've heard at least one --  
25 please.

1 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: One way to start  
2 approaching this, I think, Supervisor Gioia had a great  
3 suggestion there about taking the EJAC -- EJ piece that is  
4 discussed in the initial part of the plan and taking some  
5 of those elements and making sure that they reach the  
6 sector level at the lead-in to again meet the needs of  
7 those folks who say are in the energy sector and really  
8 just kind of look at it through the lens of the energy  
9 sector, and those recommendations.

10 So, for me, that would -- that would be a huge  
11 step forward and really create a little bit more  
12 resolution for communities that we are trying to speak  
13 for, as best we can, and keep fidelity with, so that they  
14 could look and say, oh, yeah, that overarching theme that  
15 we at least expressed to you in all those meetings that we  
16 showed up for those nights, is there. So that -- that, I  
17 think, was a great suggestion. It might start down that  
18 road at any rate.

19 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: It came from Mari Rose.  
20 Reiterating it.

21 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: So, yeah.

22 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Hearing at least two  
23 suggestions. One is using this recently prepared document  
24 as the next foundation to do an analysis of which of these  
25 are making it into the scoping plan. The second is a

1 desire or request to integrate the language, the tone into  
2 the different chapters and sectors.

3 Other discussions or ideas about next steps,  
4 especially about the scoping plan or other.

5 Please.

6 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: And I -- again, I  
7 apologize if this came up while I was gone, but I know  
8 there was an email sent this morning, I think, about  
9 possibly a May meeting with the Board, when we thought  
10 that we might not be able to pull today off, that, you  
11 know, they started polling Board members to say, oh, okay  
12 when are with free in May? And we were kind of like, hey,  
13 that would be cool, because we keep not quite having  
14 enough time to feel like we have a clear list of this is  
15 making it into the final scoping plan, this isn't, but  
16 this is what we're going to do about it to make sure that  
17 it gets addressed in our larger ARB or just California  
18 role. So I wonder if that's -- has that come up yet?

19 No.

20 Okay.

21 FACILITATOR MCGEE: First time.

22 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Oh, wow. Good.

23 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Is that a request.

24 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: That is a  
25 request.

1           So I'm imagining that like there's -- you know,  
2 obviously staff will have made a lot more work on the  
3 final plan and been able to probably create a different  
4 chart based on this now much shorter list of  
5 recommendation of, okay, now that we're revising the plan  
6 moving towards a final plan, here's what's in there,  
7 here's what's not, here's why.

8           And then our May meeting would really be about  
9 sort of starting to tie up those continued issue that  
10 still aren't in the plan and thinking about how we move  
11 forward on those.

12           FACILITATOR MCGEE: Please, Sandra.

13           VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

14           I just want to clarify -- and thank you so much.  
15 This list will be really helpful to start working on this.  
16 But I just want to clarity on some things that -- where  
17 you have made a request, which would be going back to  
18 other stakeholders, and to my view would be brought in  
19 front of the Board, and then there would be ultimately a  
20 Board discussion about it, and whether it went forward, or  
21 didn't go forward, or was changed.

22           So if staff indicated that this would be up  
23 for -- that this would be under the Board's preview,  
24 that's acceptable, as you understand why it wouldn't be  
25 included.

1 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: I think I'm  
2 hearing like a -- sort of different levels of response.  
3 Like one response being, yeah, we're going to put it in  
4 the scoping plan. That's a great idea, and like another  
5 response being, no, it's not in the scoping plan, but we  
6 believe it's still under the Board's authority, and maybe  
7 just in a different program. And maybe a third option of  
8 not within the Board's authority and something we need to  
9 talk about how we move forward working with sister  
10 agencies or the legislature.

11 VICE CHAIR BERG: Yeah. For example, I just  
12 don't think it would be under the preview of this group to  
13 decide not to authorize CAPCOA to create new carbon  
14 markets, for example.

15 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Oh.

16 VICE CHAIR BERG: I just don't think we have that  
17 ability around this table to make that decision, and --

18 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yeah, I think you  
19 do when it comes to across jurisdictions for the local air  
20 districts.

21 VICE CHAIR BERG: Well, I understand.

22 EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yeah.

23 VICE CHAIR BERG: I'm not bringing it up to  
24 debate. I'm just letting you know that, you know, from  
25 staff's perspective, I would imagine that it would be

1 helpful if we could go down and really identify, just as  
2 you said, which things from this discussion and with  
3 further discussions within the process of ARB, yes, we'll  
4 put those in the scoping plan; which ones will go into  
5 maybe a different program as all of us have talked about,  
6 but Hector reiterated; and then which ones are outside of  
7 ARB's preview, maybe another agency and a reference to  
8 that; and then which ones we're going to agree to  
9 disagree.

10           But even in agreeing to disagree, they still can  
11 come back in front of the Board, and we can have Board  
12 discussion, and then the final vote is taken.

13           Does that sound right?

14           EJAC MEMBER TARUC: And will we have a May  
15 meeting to discuss that?

16           EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: At this point, I'd like  
17 to -- short answer, I think the next step is we've got  
18 about a -- well, we've got about a month, next few weeks  
19 to work on revisions to the scoping plan. This  
20 conversation, I mean, has been really useful, in terms of,  
21 one, focusing on a subset of the highest priority issues.  
22 I'd like to regroup with the team on that. And the short  
23 of it is -- the short answer is, I'm not sure.

24           I need to circle with the -- with Mary. But  
25 what's clear to me is that the document you provided is a

1 pretty rolled up synthesis of your highest priority  
2 issues. And I'm keying off what Sandy just said, and  
3 really this is going to be the follow up that we do with  
4 the team is look at this rolled up list and see where they  
5 map to or can translate into revisions, and communicate  
6 with you all where those revisions will be, before --  
7 that's absolutely I'm committed to do that and have that  
8 conversation with you all.

9           Whether that means a full-on, full-on follow-up  
10 EJAC Board meeting, I think that's something we need to  
11 follow up and discuss. But irrespective of the answer to  
12 that question, the follow up with you all, in terms of the  
13 treatment of the issues, whether or not it will translate  
14 into revisions to the scoping plan, you'll know that. You  
15 know, and we'll give our best summary of that -- how that  
16 treatment will be handled.

17           EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yeah, and  
18 that's -- we definitely requested of staff another EJAC  
19 meeting in late May or early June when the final plan was  
20 out, so that we could discuss, and look -- review and  
21 figure out what sort of final comments we want to provide  
22 to the Board.

23           I just feel like we keep -- like, we're edging  
24 closer to some resolution on some of these bigger issues,  
25 but we're not quite there. And it's hard to do that, and

1 we've talked about this, in front of a Board hearing,  
2 because we get three minutes, and you all are up on a  
3 dais, and there's about 10,000 other people that are also  
4 trying to have their own issues discussed.

5           So if there's a way for us to potentially, around  
6 the next May meeting when you know you'll have a full  
7 draft available, and staff will be potentially prepared to  
8 have a more in-depth conversation, and Board members will  
9 in theory be in town, because you have a meeting on the  
10 25th, if we could try to make that work, even if only for  
11 a few hours, I think that would be really -- it would help  
12 me feel like I got a little bit more resolution on some of  
13 these continued sticking points, and at least know who we  
14 need to talk to about moving forward with our communities'  
15 needs and getting them addressed.

16           EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Can I also ask, so when the  
17 final draft of the scoping plan comes out, is staff going  
18 to brief the Board before the vote in June?

19           CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes

20           EJAC MEMBER TARUC: So you'll brief them in the  
21 May meeting, separately?

22           CHAIR NICHOLS: Staff briefs Board members  
23 individually or in groups of less than a quorum.

24           EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Okay. So this --

25           CHAIR NICHOLS: They're allowed to do that and

1 they're required -- I mean, it's expected that they will  
2 do that.

3 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Okay, but not necessarily in  
4 a group where you can have conversation about the draft?

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: (Shakes head.)

6 EJAC MEMBER TARUC: Okay. So, I mean, that's  
7 another point for it might be good to have a May meeting,  
8 so that there is discussion about what we see in the  
9 draft.

10 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yeah. I think the --  
11 again, I've taken the request. And my point is  
12 irrespective of a full on meeting or not, we will circle  
13 back with you, because that's the point is what is the --  
14 what is the impact of this discussion, and how does that  
15 translate into treatment and revisions to the document?  
16 That's going to happen. So I'm saying that will happen.

17 But I also recognize that the timing on -- staff  
18 has a lot of work to do to get the report completed, and  
19 to have a responsive report. I think we're going to be  
20 jammed getting that out to about the end of May, early  
21 June. So I just wanted to make sure that I'm not  
22 overcommitting, overpromising with respect to timing. But  
23 the follow up with you is going to happen.

24 VICE CHAIR BERG: And I just want to circle back  
25 that there is a process to the once we get the final plan

1 out on the street, and I think we want to be respectful of  
2 that process. So my understanding is once we have  
3 published the final plan, there isn't an opportunity to  
4 meet with individual groups and revise it before we get to  
5 the Board meeting. That is part of the public process  
6 that needs to be honored.

7           And so if -- I do think it's important whether we  
8 can meet in this particular venue or meet with staff with  
9 some Board members to hear what the continuing concerns  
10 are, that that would be part of the process. And I'll  
11 just leave that to Richard to figure out what will be the  
12 best to handle on that.

13           EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yeah, it's  
14 just -- it's tough when we're both publicly noticed  
15 entities, because like we're limited on who -- how we can  
16 talk to each other. You are limited on how you can talk  
17 to each other. That, by de facto, limits how we can talk  
18 to each other. So, I mean, we can be flexible to ARB's  
19 timeline. If you say, oh, it's not going to come out till  
20 early June. Cool, like, we can meet -- we can meet in  
21 early June. Like, I'm not in any super rush, but  
22 recognizing how much work you all have ahead of you.

23           But I just -- I think given like sort of these  
24 big old mandates, and obviously timing is an issue, but if  
25 there's something that we say cool, we can commit to

1 working on it, like -- or hey, we need to go talk to the  
2 legislature, because that's not in our authority right  
3 now, or hey we need to go pull CalTrans in here, because  
4 this is clearly their thing and they're just not doing it  
5 the right sway. Whatever that looks like, we can be  
6 flexible.

7 But I do think, given the nature of our  
8 Bagley-Keene requirements that that just might be what we  
9 need to do, if we can squeeze it in before your June  
10 meeting.

11 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Item 10 says that I'm to  
12 summarize key themes.

13 But that sounds too hard, so I'm just going to  
14 ask the stenographer to read back the transcript.

15 (Laughter.)

16 CHAIR NICHOLS: That's a first.

17 (Laughter.)

18 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Please, let me open the floor  
19 for closing comments and we'll wrap this meeting.

20 Please.

21 As you like. I'm going to stop moderating. Jump  
22 in as you like.

23 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: So I'll jump in. I just  
24 want to thank staff and the Board and my counterparts  
25 here, companions in this journey that we're on. This is a

1 lot of work. And I don't ever want to suggest that  
2 we're -- that I am or any of us disrespecting the amount  
3 of work that everybody puts into this, or any product that  
4 comes from it.

5 I appreciate the fact that we have this chance  
6 for open dialogue with the Board. I think -- and I hope  
7 you find value in that as well, Board members. I think  
8 it's helped us to develop a better understanding of what  
9 your concerns and needs are. And I would like to think  
10 that that has happened in return.

11 And the same goes for the leadership here at ARB,  
12 who you're ably represented by Floyd and his team.  
13 However, we -- we also don't get much face time with  
14 either. So I think having that arena to be able to  
15 express our concerns and have them addressed, and not  
16 always dealt with in a way we might like, but accepting  
17 the fact that that's going to happen as well, and we can  
18 work to consensus or compromise on a lot of these issues.

19 So we'll continue to do this work until it's not  
20 heeded my more. And I don't think that point will ever  
21 happen, but when it does, yeah, we'll all put it down. So  
22 thank you.

23 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: First off, I just want to  
24 apologize for missing a good chunk of the meeting. But  
25 I'm participating in a -- or was participating in an

1 environmental justice and children symposium next door.

2 So --

3 (Laughter.)

4 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: But, you know, that said,  
5 what I did hear, I think it's -- you know, it's incredibly  
6 important to have the input from EJAC. I know it makes me  
7 feel more empowered to work with staff. And staff, as I  
8 indicated before, staff has reached out to me like never  
9 before with regard to co-benefits in terms of health, and  
10 local impacts in terms of health.

11 So I just want to say that I will keep holding  
12 staff's feet to the fire in that regard. But again, as I  
13 tried to indicate, not to be Pollyanna-ish about it, but I  
14 think there's actual genuine, believe it or not, for  
15 certainly dealing with local impacts.

16 It's -- that enthusiasm is certainly spurred by  
17 AB 197, and other efforts. But what I really like is that  
18 staff has embraced this as a new challenge that they  
19 actually want to do something about.

20 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I just -- I want to thank  
21 the EJAC members for staying with this really long  
22 process. This is like been a multi-year process. And I  
23 think if one looks at the scoping plan, one will see a lot  
24 of influence in that plan that came out of the  
25 environmental justice community. Sometimes it's obvious,

1 sometimes it may be less obvious.

2           And I think, you know, even before AB 197, let me  
3 just say, I think there's been a lot of discussion at the  
4 Air Resources Board about how policies impact  
5 environmental justice communities, how they should benefit  
6 the community. So I just want to say your efforts to stay  
7 involved are impactful, they're significant, and they're  
8 important to us.

9           VICE CHAIR BERG: I also want to join in to say  
10 thank you. You know, I appreciated, Mary, when you opened  
11 up the session and described it as we're slogging through.  
12 And we are. And if we don't do that, we don't get to the  
13 easier run.

14           And I really appreciate each and every one of  
15 you. Articulate, you know the issues, you work very hard  
16 to present them very fairly, and yet passionately, and I  
17 really love that. And so I really thank you very much.  
18 It is really, really hard work and you're doing the lion's  
19 share.

20           I also appreciate staff. You know, one of the  
21 discussions I had with Susan Kennedy, as a matter of fact,  
22 before we vote -- before we did the early action items,  
23 and every -- we were creating everything from scratch.  
24 And you look at the original scoping plan, and then when  
25 Mary came aboard, and we were looking at -- the discussion

1 was how is this going to be different from criteria  
2 pollutants?

3           And it's vastly different. And it -- and we all  
4 learned on the job. And then as Mary has led us through  
5 to this point, and we realize actually they're coming  
6 together, and how the new wave. And so I do agree that  
7 it's different than a culture change, because a culture  
8 change to me is something that you do differently because  
9 you believe differently.

10           I think we believe very much in the health and  
11 the protection of our air. And I think that what we're  
12 seeing is an evolving. And we're going through that. And  
13 with that, it's painful to get to where we want to go.  
14 And so I want to thank everybody for really sticking with  
15 us, getting through this, because I do believe that we  
16 will see some changes.

17           Thanks.

18           BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: And I just want to say  
19 before we even began the meeting today, Eleanor Torres  
20 said to me, this is remarkable we're actually meeting  
21 again.

22           And this is a first time for me to go through  
23 this process. But it really is valuable, I think, to sit  
24 around the table and talk to each other, and hear what  
25 your concerns are, and try to address them. And the

1 cross-link document is so comprehensive. And I can see  
2 how much work went into this on both sides. And so I just  
3 want to say that it was well worth it. It was well worth  
4 the work that everybody put in it.

5 And hopefully, we'll get there. We've got a goal  
6 in front of us. Let's keep reaching and we'll get there.

7 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Do I have any recommendations  
8 from additional discussion items that will keep us here  
9 after 5:00.

10 (Laughter.)

11 EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Now, that you mention it.

12 (Laughter.)

13 FACILITATOR MCGEE: Thank you for a fine meeting.  
14 A lot of work went into this meeting. Good discussion.  
15 Thank you very much.

16 (Thereupon the Air Resources Board and EJAC  
17 joint meeting adjourned at 4:44 p.m.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 C E R T I F I C A T E O F R E P O R T E R

2 I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand  
3 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

4 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the  
5 foregoing California Air Resources Board meeting was  
6 reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified  
7 Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and was  
8 thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by  
9 computer-assisted transcription;

10 I further certify that I am not of counsel or  
11 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any  
12 way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
14 this 10th day of May, 2017.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19 

20  
21  
22 JAMES F. PETERS, CSR  
23 Certified Shorthand Reporter  
24 License No. 10063  
25