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PROCEEDINGS

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Good morning. The October 28th, 2021 public meeting of the California Air Resources Board will come to order.

Board Clerk, will you please call the roll?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Dr. Balmes?

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. De La Torre?

Mr. Eisenhut?

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Supervisor Fletcher?

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Fletcher here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Florez?

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Assemblymember Garcia?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER GARCIA: Present.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Hurt.

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Present.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Kracov?

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Leyva?

SENATOR LEYVA: Here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mrs. Riordan?
BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Supervisor Serna?

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Professor Sperling?

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Takvorian?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Vice Chair Berg?

VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair Randolph?

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Madam Chair, we have quorum.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. It's great to be meeting with everyone today. In accordance with the Assembly Bill 361, we are conducting today's meeting remotely with Zoom. We have organized the proceedings to mirror our normal Board meeting as closely as possible, but there will be some differences. We request your patience and understanding, if any technical problems arise.

A closed captioning feature is available for those of you joining us in the Zoom environment. In order to turn on subtitles, please look for a button labeled "CC" at the bottom of the Zoom window, as shown in the
example on the screen now. I would like to take this opportunity to remind everyone to speak clearly and from a quiet location, whether you are joining us in Zoom or calling in by phone.

Interpretation services will be provided today in Spanish. If you are joining us using Zoom, there is a button labeled "Interpretation" on the Zoom screen. Click on that interpretation button and select Spanish to hear the meeting in Spanish.

(Interpreter translated in Spanish.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: I will now ask the Board Clerk to provide more details on today's procedures.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you, Chair.

Good morning, everyone. My name is Katie Estabrook and I am one of the Board clerks. I will provide some information on how public participation will be organized for today's meeting. If you wish to make a verbal comment on one of the Board items or if you want to make a comment during open comment period at the end of today's meeting, you must be using the Zoom webinar or calling in by phone. If you are currently watching the webcast on CAL-SPAN, but you do wish to comment, please register for the Zoom webinar or call in. Information for both can be found on the public agenda.

To make a verbal comment, we will be using the
raise-hand feature in Zoom. If you wish to speak on a Board item, please virtually raise your hand as soon as the item has begun to let us know you wish to speak. To do this, if you are using a computer or tablet, there is a raise-hand button. If you are calling in on the telephone, dial star nine to raise your hand.

Even if you have previously registered and indicated which item you wish to speak on, please raise your hand at the beginning of the item that you wish to speak on. And if you don't raise your hand, the chance to speak may be missed. If you will be giving your verbal comment in Spanish and require translation, please indicate so at the beginning of your testimony and our translator will assist you. And during your comment, please pause after each sentence to allow for the interpreter to translate your comment into English.

When the comment period starts, the order of commenters will be determined by who raises their hand first. I will call each commenter by name and then activate each commenter when it is their turn to speak. For those calling in, I will identify you by the last three digits of your phone number.

We will not be showing a list of commenters. However, I will be announcing the next two or three commenters in the queue, so you are ready to testify and
know who is coming up next. Please note that you will not appear by video during your testimony.

I would also like to reminded everyone, commenters, Board members, and CARB staff to please state your name for the record before you speak. This is important in the remote meeting setting. It is especially important for those that are calling in by phone to testify on an item.

We will have a time limit for each commenter. The normal time limit is three minutes, though this could change based on the Chair's discretion. During public testimony, you will see a timer on the screen. For those calling in by phone, we will run the timer and let you know when you have 30 seconds left and when your time is up. If you require Spanish translation for your comment, your time will be doubled.

If you wish to submit written comments today, please visit CARB's send-us-your-comments page or look at the public agenda on our webpage for links to those documents electronically. Comments will be accepted on each item until the Chair closes the record for that item.

I would like to give a friendly reminder to our Board members and our CARB staff to please mute yourself when you are not speaking to avoid any background noise.

Also, when you speak, please speak from a quiet
location. If you experience any technical difficulties, please call (805)772-2715 so an IT person can assist you. This number is located on the public agenda.

Thank you. I'll turn it back to you, Chair Randolph.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

The first item on the agenda is Item number 21-11-1, which is an informational update on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Sixth Assessment Report: Findings and Implications for California.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or IPCC, is the United Nations body that assesses the climate system and climate change, its implications and potential future risks, as well as pathways for adaptation and mitigation options.

The recent IPCC report highlights the challenges we will face in combating climate change as its consequences become more extreme and widespread, as global greenhouse gas emissions continue to exacerbate global warming.

The science and data are clear that California is already experiencing the impacts of climate change. In some regions, California faces both existing and expected climate risks from coastal sea level rise, water supply shortages, drought severity, increasing frequency and
severity of wildfires, and extreme events. Such climate risks not only affect our environment, but the health and safety of our residents.

Climate change is and will continue to be most severely felt by the poorest and most vulnerable people in any population and we must help these communities to reduce environmental hazards and become more resilient in the face of these threats.

While we still have the opportunity to prevent catastrophic climate change related disasters, we must act now and we must act aggressively. The information from the previous IPCC assessment reports have been incorporated into California’s strategies, and having such international perspective on any program is critical, particularly on topics surrounding climate change.

Fundamental to our success on air quality and climate is our focus on strong science and data to inform our policies and programs. And as we consider action towards achieving carbon neutrality and eventually net negative emissions, we must continue to rely on the latest science and data to inform our plans and regulations.

And while California often ranks as one of the strongest economies in the world, our greenhouse gas emissions are less than one percent of the global total. As a result, we must continue to coordinate and
collaborated -- collaborate with like-minded partners to address this global threat.

Mr. Corey, will you please introduce this item?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

On August 2021, the IPCC released the first part of the Sixth Assessment Report, or AR6, "Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis", issued from Working Group 1. The IPCC AR6 provides an update on the latest assessment of the human influences on the wide range of climate characteristics, including extreme events, such as droughts and wildfires on both global and regional scales.

Scientist are observing, as you noted, changes in earth's climate in every region and across the whole climate system. These changes are unprecedented in thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of years, and the report projects that climate change will continue to affect all regions around the world in the coming decades.

The report also shows that climate actions still have potential to determine the future course of climate. Stabilizing the climate will require strong, rapid, and sustained reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reaching net zero carbon dioxide emissions. Limiting other greenhouse gases and air pollutants can also benefit both health and climate.

Staff will provide a high level summary of the
key findings of the recent IPCC report and how California can continue to lead and collaborate with subnational and national governments to address the global issue that climate change is.

A key strength of this agency and its programs is that science and data inform our policies. The latest IC -- IPCC report offers several scientific observations and findings that can help guide our climate programs and protect public health and the economy.

I'll now ask Dr. Nehzat Motallebi of the Research Division to give the staff presentation Nehzat.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:
Thank you, Mr. Corey. Good morning, Chair Randolph and the member of the Board. My name is Nehzat Motallebi and I will provide an informational update on part of the Sixth Assessment Report that was recently released by Working Group 1 of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or IPCC, talk about the implication of the future climate change for California, as well as our path to achieving the State climate goals.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:
CARB leadership is using science to uphold the highest scientific integrity when making decision on air
quality and climate change policies. Over the past 50 years, CARB has informed health-based air quality standard, air pollution exposure reduction pathway, air pollution control and mitigation strategy, climate change oriented-policy, and greenhouse gases emission reduction opportunities.

CARB's scientific expertise and dedication have also fostered action around subnational and national government to address air quality and climate change issue. CARB will continue conducting research on the causes and effect of air pollution emission and climate mitigation, and potential solution using the best available science and technology.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI: The years of the CARB's informed data-driven decision led to the improvement in regional air quality and public health. Los Angeles, one of the most populated city in California, experienced reduction in ozone design value over 40 percent and annual PM2.5 level of over 60 percent below early 1990 level.

The air quality improvement is met with the estimated statewide reduction in cancer risk associated with the exposure to diesel particulate matter and six of the major toxic air contaminants below 75 percent of what
California were exposed to in the early 1990s.

Despite progress, the intense heat wave and widespread wildfire smoke caused Southern California to experience worst air pollution reading and highest number of the health-damaging bad air days since mid-1990s. California is proof that science-based decision-making can effectively address complex air quality problem, but there are more that needs to be done to protect public health and environment.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI: The GHG emission inventory is further evidence that California set ambitious climate target that have overall benefited the state. The California GHG emission return to 1990 levels four years earlier than AB 32 2020 target and continue to decrease further.

The trend demonstrate that the economy carbon intensity, or the amount of the carbon emitted per million dollar of production, is declining in California. From 2000 to 2019, California economy carbon intensity decreased by 45 percent, even while the gross domestic product, or GDP, increased by 63 percent. We must continue to rely on science to make much measurable progress to protect our air quality, climate, environment, and health.
RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:

California climate initiative are informed by most up-to-date scientific report by Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or IPCC, which assessed climate system and climate change, its implication and potential future risk, as well as path to adaptation option and mitigation of those risk.

Since the first assessment report in 1990, IPCC have received input from thousand of the researcher across hundred of nation to determine the strength of scientific agreement on climate change, identify research gap, and provide information to all level of the government that develop climate policy.

Such a science-driven decision play key role -- key role in the United Nation Framework Convention on Climate Change and Paris Agreement, which is an international treaty on climate change with the goal of limiting global warming below two degree, preferably 1.5 degrees centigrade compared to industrial level. Future climate-related risk depend on the rate, peak, and duration of warming, and the lower temperature target reduce these risk, enabling greater opportunity and adaptation.
RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:

This figure illustrate the core reason behind the climate change. The long-term record demonstrate that average global carbon dioxide concentration in atmosphere near 1800 was around 280 ppb -- ppm. Industrial Revolution led to the activity that emit more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere and have since increased the carbon dioxide level to approximately 50 percent from pre-industrial era to 417 ppm, which currently increasing at least 2 ppm every year.

Carbon dioxide is a primary cause of global warming, because of its ability to absorb the sun energy and trap it within our atmosphere. Since the carbon dioxide can remain in atmosphere for hundred of thousand years, the carbon dioxide will accumulate over time, worsening global warming. This is unprecedented in our recent history and we must address ongoing and already emitted GHG emission to reduce its effect.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI: In August 2021, IPCC Working Group 1 released part of the Sixth Assessment report of AR6 titled, "Climate Change 2021: The Physics[SIC] Basis", which reaffirm with high confidence that there is a near linear relationship between cumulative anthropogenic carbon dioxide emission
and the global warming they cause.

The temperature response to increase carbon dioxide level in atmosphere is a critical metric that provide foresight into the potential adverse impact of climate change.

The report assessed the climate response to five GHG emission scenario that covered the range of the possible future development of anthropogenic driver of climate change and predict that temperature will reach 1.5 degrees centigrade above the pre-industrial level by 2040 under all GHG emission scenario.

To stabilize human-induced global temperature increase, we must achieve net zero CO2 emission and realize strong reduction in other GHG emission to give us more time to get there. The global surface temperature will decline once net zero GHG emission is achieved and sustained.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:

Many characteristic of climate change depend on the level of the global warming, but the consequence may different from region to region. For example, Arctic Sea ice that holds substantial amount of the water could melt away as a result of increased temperature, leading to the loss of the habitat, coastal erosion, and changes in
weather pattern.

It is very likely that human-induced global warming led to the retreat of glacier -- Arctic glaciers since 1990. Arctic is projected to experience the highest increase in temperature at about three times the rate of other region. The amount of the Arctic Sea ice area has since reached to its lower level in last decade.

Next.

The Arctic will practically -- the Arctic will practically be ice-free in September, at least once before 2050 under all GHG emission scenario and could practically remain ice-free near 2050. There are concern that melting could also release additional GHG into atmosphere, therefore significantly amplify climate change.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI: The effect of the temperature and subsequent melting of Arctic Sea ice will lead to an eminent sea level rise with its rate now nearly triple what it was between 1901 and 1971. Under all GHG emission scenario, it is expected that the average rise in the sea level will double that of the 2020 within the century.

As we can expect, average rise in sea level to double within the century. Extreme sea level event like tidal wave and storm surge along the coastal are projected
to occur annually at more than half of the tidal gauge location by 2100.

Coastal area will experience more frequent and severe coastal flooding in low-lying area and coastal erosion, which will lead to the loss of the land, resources, and life. And sea level rise of around two meter by the end of this century cannot be ruled out when considering ice-sheet instability.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:

However, achieving goal net zero carbon dioxide emission is challenging and will require additional intervention and time. Short-lived climate pollutant, or SLCP, are relatively short lived and can add up to as much climate forcing as carbon dioxide, which suggests that reducing SLCP can lead to quicker slow down of global warming and would give us more time to address global carbon dioxide emission reduction challenges. The joint report by United Nation Environment Program and World Meteorological Organization find that tackling CL -- CLCPs[SIC] is a key in maintaining the global mean temperature well below two degrees Centigrade while addressing near-term warming and allow longer time climate stabilization.
But the bottom line still require that the world to achieve -- to achieve sustained CO2 emission reduction to prevent irreversible damage to our environment. SLCP, such as methane and halogenated gas are expected to increase in coming year, which highlight the need for immediate action to give humanity the best chance at developing a remedy. Any additional delay would lock in more emission from equipment use and waste degradation.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:

IPCC reports that all the region would feel the impact of climate change with significant human and economic loss that far outweigh the cost of climate action. The international community now increasingly recognize that environmental degradation and climate change could potentially result in population displacement on a scale that the world is currently ill-equipment -- ill-equipped to prevent or address effectively.

Changes in snow, ice, river flooding, storm, drought, fire are projected to impact transport, energy, production of tourism throughout the world. The intensity of these changing behavior will continue affect livelihood, agriculture, water system, and sensitive ecosystem.

--o0o--
RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:

Limiting global warming to one point degree Centigrade by end of the century is still within the reach but require transformational changes. Scientists believe that if we can cut global GHG emission in half by 2030 and reach net zero by middle of this century, we can halt and possibly reverse the rise in global surface temperature and move away from irreversible damage to our environment. There is a still a path, but we need to aggressively act now to cut global GHG emission while achieving net zero in parallel.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI: I will now speak how climate change will affect California.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI: It is beyond any reasonable doubt, California -- it is without any reasonable doubt, climate change will affect human health, economy, and quality of the life in the coming decade. The impact of the climate change are largely determined by the population vulnerability and resilience. Since -- hence, the burden are more likely to be felt disproportionately by the community. Poor air quality from more frequent and intense wildfire can make us more vulnerable to respiratory diseases, including
COVID-19.

Record-setting fire can also directly affect human health and damage the property, land, and the surrounding ecosystem. The multi-billion dollar agricultural industry, which is one of the cornerstone of California will be hard hit by extended drought and extreme weather event, which put them in the high risk.

The well-being of public health, the economy, and climate are all interconnected even just within California.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:

Most significantly on health damage -- most significantly on health, climate change is creating a wide range of serious health and environmental concerns. Vulnerable population already experience adverse health impact from weather extreme, such as from heat, drought, and wildfire. An increase in the incidence of vector-borne disease has been linked to the climate variability and is expected to increase further. Climate change will continue to be most severely felt by the poorest and most vulnerable population and we must help these community to reduce environmental hazard and become more resilient in the face of these threat.

--o0o--
RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:

California wildfire are getting worse, with the increase fire risk, higher frequency of occurrence, larger area burn, and longer fire season. Tracking with the rising temperature, California's 2020 fire season has also been record breaking, not only in the total amount of the acres burned, but also wildfire size that destroy over 10,000 structure and caused over 12 billion in the damage.

Because of this wildfire, California's city cities dominated the top 10 city with the worst air quality in the U.S. in 2020. This year is already second biggest year on the record for wildfire in California, burning nearly 2.5 million acres in more than 7,800 fire across the state.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI: The effect of extreme drought have already started hurting agricultural productivity, decreasing our water reservoirs, and damaging our sensitive ecosystem. We can expect more extreme drought to continue into the end of 21st century with decreased precipitation from fewer non-atmospheric river storm and long-term decline in groundwater, which cannot be recovered readily.

California droughts condition not only affect places like San Joaquin Valley, but also Sierra and
surrounding ecosystem that rely on snow reserve as a source of the water.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:

California SB 32 called for a 40 percent reduction from 1990 levels by 2030. When Biden administration announced its climate change target, it sent a signal that the U.S. would embrace action on reducing GHG emission. This slide put the California and U.S. 2030 target into perspective. They are almost identical in ambition in the contents of reduction from 1990 level.

Beyond the base case, there are minor scope differences. During the -- due to the legislative direction, we include emission for power imported and consumed in the state and do not account for any sinks, since they would be included in the separate natural and working land inventory. As such, our scope include more source and no sink compared to the federal scope.

California has shown a portfolio of policies, thoughtful design, and delegate implementation that rely on strong enforcement to yield meaningful result. Our program are being looked by other state and country as they have delivered real GHG reductions.

--o0o--
RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:

California leader -- California leading passenger vehicle GHG emission regulation have led to expanded emission benefit beyond our border. Section 177 of U.S. Clean Air Act allows other states to adopt California vehicle standard, if their state have ambient air quality non-attainment area.

Currently, 13 other state have adopted our GHG regulation. This represents over 36 percent of U.S. passenger vehicle sales share when combined with California market. This leadership from California has not only resulted in emissions reduction from select state, but has also influenced federal action under prior administration. President Obama first followed the California original Pavley regulation and then partnered with CARB to create a stronger national GHG regulation through 2025.

CARB is now preparing a regulation proposal for hundred percent zero-emission vehicle and plug-in hybrid electrical vehicle sales by 2035. Staff continue to work with the partner states to ensure they remain on board and possibly to attract other state. This broader market help push automaker into larger technology investment that drives the innovation.

--o0o--
Trucks are the largest single sources of air pollution from vehicle statewide. Seventy percent of Californians live in the area that have unhealthy air. That air pollution coming from truck comes at the large cost to the community and to the economy in the form of the asthma, hospitalization, cancer, and now a link to the Alzheimer. And they are a significant contributor of GHG.

Six state are working toward adopting all heavy-duty regulation, which more than doubled the California GHG reduction. While zero-emission vehicle requirement are not yet being considered by U.S. EPA, this State-level action provide a foundation to more for -- to move forward at the national level. As with the action on the light-duty vehicle, the state level partnership will remain important to provide market certainty and alignment on infrastructure and alignment -- and alignment to the infrastructure.

Action to reduce SLCP emission are also being realized in the state. Hydrofluorocarbon, or HFC, are used as a refrigerant for the air conditioning and the refrigerant are fastest growing GHG, as they are replacing older refrigerant. The Refrigeration Management Program
require facility within -- with the re -- with the refrigerator system containing more than 50 pound of the high-GWP refrigerant to conduct and report periodic leak inspection and promptly repair leaks. To date, 16 states have adopted California regulation, thereby reducing national refrigerant emission.

Methane is emitted through the leakage from natural gas system and the -- and the life -- livestock operation, among others. It has a direct influence on climate and contribute to growing global background concentration of tropospheric river -- tropospheric ozone.

As required by SB 1383, California enacted methane emission reduction plan by reducing statewide methane emission by 40 percent from 2013 level to 2030. Its short life -- lifetime and high GWP that -- high GWP means that its emission reduction can provide climate benefit within a few decades. Carbon Mapper will help overcome technology barrier and will provide more timely data identifying methane and carbon dioxide sources to support mitigation effort.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:

IPCC indicate that an estimated 20 percent of total anthropogenic GHG emission drive from agriculture, forestry, and other land use. These net emissions are
mostly due to deforestation, land-use change, peatland
destruction, and agricultural emission. Forests
devastated by the drought may lose their ability to store
carbon over much longer period than previously thought.
IPCC places CO2 capture and storage in the
context of the climate change mitigation option with the
highlight on both biological and mechanical sink.
These option -- these option include, but not
limited to, improve and sustain forest management,
increased soil organic carbon content and carbon capture,
and usage storage. Importantly, net negative must reflect
global, national, regional action across all sector for
meeting global budget identified in IPCC.
The IPCC report maintain that some region may be
net sink, while other region net source, but it is global
GHG budget that ultimately drive climate change.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:
Staff is in the middle of developing 2020 Scoping
Plan update that is due to the Board by end of the 2022.
As part of that effort, staff is developing a set of the
scenario to chart a path toward achieving carbon
neutrality and assessing progress toward the 2030 target.
In developing scenario, staff will consider the latest
science, statutory requirement, direction in executive
order and the government -- Governor, as well as EJ Advisory Committee recommendation and public comment.

We will look at two endpoint of carbon neutrality, 2035 and 2045. All scenarios will either drastically reduce or eliminate fossil fuel combustion. We will have scenario that either include or exclude carbon capture and sequestration and direct air capture.

In parallel modeling effort -- in parallel modeling effort, staff will evaluate how to reduce emission and increase sequestration in natural working land sector.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI: As far, we have held nine joint agency CARB workshops and seven EJ Advisory Committee meeting to inform Scoping Plan development process.

Looking ahead, CARB will continue to hold public workshop, two standing monthly EJ Advisory Committee public meeting, as well as community engagement meeting. Starting early next year, we will schedule joint Board and EJ Advisory Committee meeting and informational updates meeting, along with the update on Draft Scoping Plan in June of 20--2022 and Final Scoping Plan for Board discussion and vote later in the year.

--o0o--
RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:

Over the next few months, the Board will be asked to consider several staff recommendation and take action. This slide includes some of the major item and will come before the Board that will reduce both harmful local air pollution and also reduce GHG. While Scoping Plan provide actionable blueprint for action, it is the design and implementation of the measure that ultimately drives action on reducing air pollution and GHG emission.

--o0o--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MOTALLEBI:

This conclude staff presentation and we look forward to the discussion.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you for the presentation. We will now hear from the public who raised their hands to speak on this item.

Will the Board Clerk please call the first few commenters.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes. Thanks, Chair. We currently have seven people with their hands raised to speak on this item. The first three are Sam Wade, Leah Silverthorn, and Robert Spiegel. I will be calling out the next few commenters as they come.

And, Sam, I have activated your microphone. You
can unmute yourself and begin your comment.

SAM WADE: Thanks very much, Katie.
Hello, Chair Randolph and Board members and
thanks for the opportunity to comment today. My name is
Sam Wade. I’m the Director of Public Policy for the
Coalition for Renewable Natural Gas and we’re the national trade association for the RNG industry.
The IPCC report identifies methane and recovery from solid waste management as one of the best short term win-win policies. In fact, it is has an entire chapter, chapter six, dedicated to the challenges of short-lived climate forcers. And you saw on slide 10 of today's presentation, the report makes it clear that methane is the heavy hitter within the SLCPs and that agriculture and waste management are the primary sources of non-fossil methane.

Methane reductions are very advantageous as a near-term GHG reduction strategy. The 2021 global methane assessment from the UN Environment Program and the Climate and Clean air Coalition, shows that human-caused methane emissions can reduce -- be reduced by up to 45 percent this decade, and that there are powerful local air pollution co-benefits from methane reduction globally.

And all these findings align well with the ongoing short-lived climate pollutant reduction strategies
already underway in California due to existing law. The hard work on minimizing methane from organic waste conducted by CARB, CalRecycle, CDFA, CEC, and CPUC, in part by promoting renewable natural gas projects is working. However, we need to accelerate that effort and not delay or backtrack to reach even our near term 2030 goals.

In the forthcoming Scoping Plan, the Board should double down on important policies, like the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, grants for anaerobic digestion facilities that process organic wastes, and gas utility procurement of RNG. Doing anything less than that, ignores the science that underpins the dire warnings from the IPCC report and risks missing a critical opportunity to reduce methane and therefore near-term warming.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Leah, I've activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

LEAH SILVERTHORN: Good morning, Chair and members. Leah Silverthorn with the California Chamber of Commerce. Thank you so much for that informational update on the IPCC report. We look forward to Governor Newsom's and CARB's participation in the UN conference next week and what comes out of that. I did want to emphasize that
while emission cuts are certainly important, there is a burgeoning tech market starting to develop and investors are interested in making those investments in California and elsewhere.

So I appreciated the slide that detailed the importance of both the IPCC's emphasis on emissions cuts, but also in emission sinks. And I think that whatever CARB is doing in this space, it should ensure that California companies are provided the appropriate incentives, whether policy or otherwise, to make these investments in climate emissions reduction technology, including CCUS, including carbon encapsulation, and future technologies that we may not even be aware of.

So thank you again for all your work in this area and we look forward to the next couple of weeks.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Robert Spiegel. After Robert will be Julia Levin, Daniel Nepstad, and Michael Skvarla.

Robert, I have activated your microphone. You may unmute yourself and begin.

ROBERT SPIEGEL: Thank you, Katie, and thank you, members. Good morning. Robert Spiegel, Senior Policy Director for the California Manufacturers and Technology Association, or CMTA. And we appreciate the opportunity
to provide a public comment related to the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report.

It is absolutely important that collectively the global community heed the findings and observations provided in the report. However, let us not forget that California is only about a one percent contributor and our state has been taking corrective and preventative action for about more than a decade. It is imperative that California act, and we have done so, and we will continue doing so. California's leadership in combating climate change will not be judged on how well individually we meet our goals, but whether we can forge a path that other states and nations can follow.

So California must develop a comprehensive approach that explores a broad range of options to achieve carbon goals in a cost effective and technologically feasible manner. If we want others to follow California, we have to demonstrate that it works. We're transforming our economy via energy policy, and that is a monumental and important task.

Ultimately, it's one that requires us to use all the tools at our disposal, to minimize leakage, encourage economic investment within the state, and also show the world that economic development and environmental stewardship are not mutually exclusive.
With that, CMTA appreciates this opportunity and we will continue our partnership to find solutions as part of the 2022 Scoping Plan update.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Julia Levin, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

JULIA LEVIN: Thank you very much and good morning, Madam Chair and members of the Board. Julia Levin with the Bioenergy Association of California.

I, too, want to thank the staff for their presentation on the latest IPCC report, and particularly underscore the urgency of reducing methane and other short-lived climate pollutant emissions. As President Biden and the President of the European Commission recently stated in a joint statement, and I am quoting directly, quote, "Rapidly reducing methane emissions is the single most effective strategy to reduce global warming in the near term". "The single most effective strategy".

As climate scientists around the globe have said reducing short-lived climate pollutant is the last lever we have left to avoid catastrophic climate change, so it is really critical that we keep short-lived climate pollutant reductions front and center and we strongly
agree with Sam Wade's comment to that effect.

The Air Board's own report to the Legislature earlier this year on the cost effectiveness and overall effectiveness of the State's climate investments underscores how beneficial and how cost effective the State's investments in reducing methane are. By far, the two most cost effective of all of the State's investments have been in reducing emissions from dairies and from diverted organic waste and we need to continue and accelerate those investments.

That brings me to my second point, which is a petition that was filed this week asking the Air board to exclude dairy methane from the Low Carbon Fuels Program. Not only would that fly in the face of the science, which only underscores the urgency of reducing dairy methane and other methane sources, but it would contradict the plain language of SB 1383, the State's short-lived climate pollutant law. That law requires a number of incentives for dairy biomethane reductions including specifically incentives under the Low Carbon Fuel Standard.

So granting petitioner's application would contradict the plain language of SB 1383, as well as the science, and the petition should be rejected.

My third and last point is back to the IPCC assessment and the staff presentation this morning.
we strongly support the focus on methane, California's largest source of short-lived climate pollutants is black carbon. And they are also far more damaging to public health. State law, SB 1383, requires that California reduce anthropogenic black carbon emissions 50 percent by 2030, even more than the requirement for methane reductions. And yet, the staff presentation this morning, and most of the presentations in the development of the next scoping plan, completely omit any mention of black carbon reductions.

So we urge the Air Board to incorporate black carbon, as well as methane, much more fully in our climate plans moving forward. We've got to address those emissions to meet State law and to meet our overall climate goals.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Daniel Nepstad, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

DANIEL NEPSTAD: Good morning, Madam Chair and Air Resources Board. It's -- I enjoy this opportunity to provide testimony on this critical issue.

I'm a scientist, a forest scientist, Executive Director and Founder of the Earth Innovation Institute with headquarters in the Bay Area, and a former lead
author of the IPCC SR5.

One of the biggest contributions that California can make to climate change solutions is to activate and invest in its partnership with tropical forest states and provinces around the world. That partnership was launched in 2009 in the context of AB 32 and the international offset provision.

To illustrate the potential impact of this partnership, let me go to a place I hold very dear, the Amazon forest. It contains in its trees and its wood bark, roots, and leaves an amount of carbon that, if released to the atmosphere, would be equivalent to the last decade of human economy-wide global emissions.

But it also effects our weather everywhere. So much energy is converted into water vapor through the Amazon forest that it affects the global circulation. Flying rivers they're sometimes called, that can affect our rainfall patterns, temperatures here in California.

The partners that California -- partnerships that California established are moving forward, even though the financial mechanism is not yet in place. They are starved for finance. Just to give one example, the State of Montegrosso, which is twice the size of California, has reduced deforestation 80 percent. In doing so, it's kept three billion tons of CO2 out of the atmosphere. It is
now formally committed to a net neutral economy by 2035. To get there, it's going to need about four or five billion dollars coming from forest carbon transactions. I've -- and achieving that finance is exactly what is needed to prevent a tipping point in the Amazon. Amazon rainfall is generated in part by the forest itself. That has received much greater attention under the new IPCC report, the importance of tipping points in the Amazon, and the Arctic, and elsewhere to really control climate change.

California is extremely well positioned to reactivate its partnership with states and provinces around the world and to do that taking the Tropical Forest Standard approved by the Board in 2019 and getting it regulated and operational.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Our next speaker will be Mikhael Skvarla. After Mikhael will be Michael Boccadoro, Mary Soleki, and Pete Montgomery.

Just a reminder that if you would like to comment on this item, please raise your hand in Zoom or dial star nine.

Mikhael, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute and begin.
MIKHAEL SKVARLA: Thank you. My name is Mikhael Skvarla. I'm with the Gualco Group here on behalf of the California Council for Environment. I'd like to thank you guys for the presentation today.

In general terms, California started this race in 2006 and a little bit before that with the Renewable Portfolio Standard and major regulations being promulgated in 2009. We've made great progress in the decade and a half that we've pursued climate change policies and continue to make progress with all the rulemakings and proceedings that are taking place this year.

With the IPCC Sixth Assessment, it's clear that we need every tool in the toolbox from renewable electricity to renewable gas, forestry management, methane mitigation, carbon capture and sequestration, hydrogen. And then we also need the lines, wires, and pipelines to move the zero carbon electrons and molecules to their end users. Infrastructure is going to be the key to this next decade.

Technological feasibility and cost effectiveness are also statutory requirements in California's climate policies and key tenets of AB 32. They protect the working class families and small businesses from being overly burdened with the financial costs of pursuing these climate reductions. We all need to protect the jobs and
the economy from environmental and economic leakage. Leakage is not just the loss of economic benefits, but also loss of those environmental protections that happen within our borders.

California is a small piece of a much larger issue. Our leadership comes from soundly designed and functioning programs that can be emulated and easily adopted in other jurisdictions. In this next decade, we need to continue to focus on linkage and exportable policy design, such as well designed cap-and-trade, the Renewable Portfolio Standard, and our Low Carbon Fuel Standard.

Again, I want to thank you guys for this presentation today and look forward to hearing more.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Michael, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

MICHAEL BOCCADORO: Thank you. Michael Boccadoro, Executive Director of Dairy Cares.

We heard this morning about the importance of rapidly reducing methane as our best opportunity to counteract global warming and improve air quality. The science is clear that reducing methane from livestock is part of the solution to stave off catastrophic impacts. California is now the world leader in reducing dairy
methane emissions. The State has invested $700 million of State funds. And that has been matched nearly 2 to 1 -- being matched nearly 2 to 1 by the dairy sector in California for a total investment of approaching $2 billion. It's a massive investment and one that is paying huge dividends.

Dairy digesters are the most cost effective and successful climate investment being made by the State of California. CDFA's Dairy Digester Program has received just 2.1 percent of the investments under the State's climate investment portfolio and is achieving a full 29 percent of the reductions of all investments to date. I want to make that point perfectly clear. 2.1 percent of the funds is leading to 29 percent of the reductions to date with more than 2.2 million tons of reduction annually. And it's really important to understand that's all methane, which is critical as we just heard this morning.

Other states are looking to California leadership and are beginning to follow our lead in developing programs of their own, including LCFS programs of their own. California's efforts are fully consistent with the Biden administration's Climate-smart ag policies and goes beyond the 30 percent global methane pledge signed by our own nation and the European Union and a number of other
California's approach is also fully consistent with the report we talked about this morning, the IPCC report. It's also fully consistent with the UN global methane assessment, which came out a number of months ago, which underscores the importance of dairy digesters as a core strategy to achieve needed reductions in the livestock sector. Chair Randolph this morning referred to strong science and data to inform our policies. We agree. The science and data strongly support development of dairy digesters as the leading way to reduce methane.

Stay the course. You're well on your way to achieving the State's goals, which are critical to achieving California's overall climate policies.

Thank you and we appreciate the opportunity to comment today.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Mary Soleki, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin your comment.

MARY SOLEKI: Thanks, Katie.

Hello, Chair Randolph and Board members. I'm Mary Soleki from AJW and we represent several emerging clean technology and climate leaders. The presentation that you provided here this morning was very useful. It wove together the recent IPCC report with California's
action plan. And all jurisdictions should be using the
IPCC report as a similar call to action.
Slide 14 says it all, the imperative to act now.
AJW and your clients wholeheartedly support CARB moving as
expeditiously as possible to curb the impacts of climate
change by maintaining the timeline and targets of CARB's
programs and accelerating where possible.
I want to point out that CARB started its
informal work on a 2022 Scoping Plan update over two years
ago already, back in August of 2019. The process started
with workshops on rapid decarbonization and other
advancements. This work -- this work has been done in
coordination with all stakeholders and other agencies.
So when CARB completes this scoping plan in late
2022 as intended, that will make the development process
over three years long. This seems to me to walk the line
between deliberative and moving quickly in the face of
climate's existential threat. I'm encouraged by CARB's
intentions to continue with the Scoping Plan timeline and
want to thank you for the careful process the agency has
conducted for the last two years already.
The market-based programs within CARB's
jurisdiction are achieving or even overachieving their
mandates on decarbonization. To boot, they're also
providing air quality benefits, especially the LCFS by
reducing the use of fossil fuels on-road and around the State.

Thank you for your time this morning.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Pete Montgomery. And after Pete, the last three commenters with their hands raised, at this time, are Brian Biering, Jon Costantino, and Danny Diele.

Pete, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

PETE MONTGOMERY: Good morning. Thank you Chair Randolph, Board members, and staff. Pete Montgomery on behalf of the California Carbon Capture Coalition. We appreciate the engagement with ARB over these last period of time on the Scoping Plan update. And as we've stated numerous times, the Scoping Plan update should reflect policies that are rooted in data, science, and economically achievable technology.

And in the report we were discussing this morning, the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report, it was made clear that the range of actions that are needed, including -- included carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration.

Numerous other expert analyses have also identified CCUS as a critical component of successful
climate action strategies in California, including analysis from Stanford, from Lawrence Livermore National Labs. And the Biden admission has also highlighted the key role that CCUS can play in national efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

California is uniquely positioned to benefit from taking a leading role in demonstrating the significant contributions that CCUS can make to the state climate efforts. Our state has an abundance of safe, high-quality, geological, sequestration capacity. California industries possess a depth of technological capability and technical expertise to quickly and safely deploy CCUS in ways that will drive down emissions and create and preserve thousands of high quality, high wage jobs across the state.

We appreciate the CARB presentation today highlighting the findings of the most recent IPCC report and the recognition that CCUS has an important role to play in California's efforts. We look forward to working with CARB and all stakeholders to ensure that California is taking full advantage of the range of technologies in existence today to help support achievement of State climate goals.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Brian Biering, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute and begin.

BRIAN BIERING: Good morning, Chair Randolph, members of the Board. My name is Brian Biering. I'm here this morning on behalf of the Dairy Environmental Justice Fund. I'd like to echo the comments of Mr. Boccadoro and others on the importance of addressing methane emissions in the short term and appreciate the Board's recognition of the methane reduction potential in California, as an effort to reduce and minimize effects of climate change in the near term.

I also want to respond to Ms. Levin's comments concerning the petition to change the LCFS rule to basically exclude dairy digesters. That would be catastrophic, both to the investments that dairy digesters developers have already made and dairy digesters reliance on the LCFS program, as well as emission reductions that are still needed within the dairy sector.

The Air Resources Board's preliminary SLCP analysis of dairy methane emissions found that the efforts to date have resulted in two million metric tons of CO2 equivalent reductions. But there's still a lot more work to be done. There's approximately seven million more metric tons that must be reduced to reach the SB 1383 goals.
The LCFS regulation is going to play very critical role in facilitating those reductions. It is a robust regulation that's been supported by science, facts, and more than five rulemakings to develop that regulation. So we would encourage the Air Resources Board to continue to support that regulation and reject the petition that was referenced by Ms. Levin.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Jon Costantino, I have activated your microphone.

You can unmute yourself and begin.

JON COSTANTINO: Good morning, Board and Chairman -- Board and Chair. Jon Costantino on behalf a variety of liquid and gaseous fuel clients. I wanted to echo many of what was said already. I think -- I don't disagree with anything that's been testified yet. My point is -- my main point is that the policies are working. Look at slide 4, and you can see that things are working, cap-and-trade, LCFS, price on carbon. The examples of just my clients, including bioenergy CCS projects, industrial heat decarbonization, refinery conversions, electrification, renewable natural gas, the signals that are being sent, the stability of the program, the leadership that's been established is making a difference.
I just want to point out lastly that this all takes time. It takes financing, and planning, and approval, and permitting. And it's really key that the State of California in its -- in its efforts to accelerate its goals don't veer left, veer right too hard, because then these policy decisions have impacts on financing, and permitting, and funding, and eventually getting the projects built that need to be done.

So with that, I will -- I'll cede my time. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

DANI DIELE: Good morning. My name is Dani Diele from the Agricultural Council of California. Ag Council is a member-supported organization that advocates for more than 15,000 farmers across California. Thank you for your time this morning.

As previously mentioned, we also recognize the importance of reducing methane emissions in the near term. The livestock and dairy community has made significant progress towards reaching the goals set out in SB 1383. Yet, it has been discussed that there should be a move away from traditional biofuels, such as biogas captured from landfills, dairies, and wastewater facilities.
It is important to note the significant investment the State has already made in dairy biofuel transition. The State should continue this commitment because of the significant methane reductions achieved through this program and the potential biofuel benefit.

As stated, California is on the forefront of designing and implementing programs that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Dairy digesters is one of these programs. Digesters continues to be one of the most effective tools in reducing methane emissions. Through the development of digesters alone, California dairies will reduce more than 2.2 million metric tons of greenhouse gas per year. Further, this program is oversubscribed showing that there is more potential for reductions through this program.

As previously mentioned, digesters alone have achieved more emission reductions than any other California climate investment, representing 29 percent of all emissions reductions, despite its funding allocation of only 2.1 percent. As we look at the goal of rapidly reducing emissions, it is important that we recognize that digesters is the most cost-effective investment of any program in the fight against climate change.

Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

And we have one more commenter, a phone number
ending in 528. Please state your name for the record and then you can begin your comment.

Are you there?

It does look like you have unmuted yourself, but we cannot hear you on this end.

Try dialing star six.

Okay. Do that one more time. It looks like that muted you.

Okay. Unfortunately, I cannot hear you on this end, so I'm going to ask that you maybe try to call in for the open comment, so that we can try again for that item.

LAURA ROSENBERGER HAIDER: Can you hear me now?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Oh, yes, I can.

LAURA ROSENBERGER HAIDER: Oh, yeah. The excess solar energy should be converted to green hydrogen to replace gasoline. And there should be a minimum energy performance standard for home appliances, so that they would work off solar.

All right. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank. And we do have one more hand that went up. Shayda Azamian. I have activated your microphone. You can unmute and begin.

SHAYDA AZAMIAN: Thank you. My name is Shayda Azamian, and I'm with Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability.
I'm here just to make a short comment that there really does need to be more understanding between community members, the agricultural community, local districts, and CARB about dairy digester technology before CARB and other agencies continue to permit dairy digesters in California, and specifically the valley, a region which continues to be the most polluted region in the country and is in dire need of transitions across industries to more sustainable practices.

We continue to urge agencies to stop its permitting of dairy digesters in the valley and across California. And we should all be very cautious that dairy digesters do not lead to real emissions reductions in greenhouse gases, in short-lived climate pollutants, or toxic pollution and that dairy digesters are, in fact, increasing local pollution by incentivizing increased herd sizes by the thousands.

Breathing in the San Joaquin Valley, merely existing in the valley, remains a lethal issue for most impacted communities. So the valley has to be pursuing the most sustainable zero-emission technologies and dairy digesters do not fall within that.

Thank you and look forward to commenting on this and future items today.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Mark Henin, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute and begin.

Mark, are you there?

Please try unmuting in Zoom. If you're on a tablet or computer, and then -- no. All right.

Chair, that looks like that is the end of commenters for this item.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you very much. Now, it's time for Board discussion on this item.

Board Member De La Torre has your hand up.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yes. Thank you. Because this is an intergovernmental report and from -- comes from Washington D.C., it reminded me of something that happened in the 1960s actually. And it's always good to remember how we got into this mess. And actually, I'll predate that another one from the 1950s, which is Edward Teller, who is the father of the hydrogen become. In 1959, he warned that the oil and gas industry directly about global warming and sea level rise in a presentation that he entitled energy patterns of the future, and I quote, "Carbon dioxide's presence in the atmosphere causes a greenhouse effect". This is 1959 and he was speaking to the oil and gas industry. So when we get this pushback on whether climate change is happening, the advertising, all of that stuff, clearly going back to the late 50s, we
knew. They knew.

So fast forward to 1965, President Johnson's Science Advisory Committee did a report that warned of the impacts of pollution and the human role in increasing atmospheric CO2, which would cause melting icecaps, rising sea levels, acidification of water sources, and more. This is 1965, not unlike this intergovernmental report that we have in front of us.

But here's -- here is the punch line, the American Petroleum Institute's President, at the time, 1965, Frank Ikard, agreed with the study from the President's science report. Now that wouldn't happen today. Today, they would pick it apart and point out little things and try to cast doubt on the science of a national report or international report for that matter.

So Frank Ikard, again head of the American Petroleum Institute, 1965, says, "One of the most important predictions of the report is that Carbon dioxide is being added to the earth's atmosphere by the burning of coal, oil, and natural gas at such a rate that by the year 2000 the heat balance will be so modified as possibly to cause marked changes in climate beyond local or even national efforts. 1965, head of the American Petroleum Institute acknowledging everything that's come to pass.

So I -- as I was hearing the report, I knew about
this speech from this API President, and I thought it just was important to know where we've been, how did we get here, and, you know, when -- what did they know and when did they know it? Well, clearly, they've known it for several decades and now it's about finding the solutions collectively as we move forward.

    Thank you.

    CHAIR RANDOLPH:  Thank you.

    Professor Sperling.

    BOARD MEMBER SPERLING:  Well, thank you. Let me and on to that statement. And I want to, first of all, reaffirm the importance of what we just heard this IPCC process. I personally was a part of that process. I was a lead author for it, you know, for about 10 years. And it is so important, because it's reaffirming the role of science and that is the history of CARB. That's the history of CARB and that's the strength of CARB. And that's why we've been so successful over the years. And so I think it's really important to reaffirm, and understand, and appreciate the importance of science.

    Now, having said that, the science we used to deal with was much easier than the science we're dealing with now, the science of local air pollution, and -- because we learned over the years that the most effective way of dealing with local pollution almost entirely was
technical fixes, you know, the smokes -- fixing the smoke, you know, end of the -- top of the smoke stack, the end of the tailpipe. And almost all of our solutions have been -- have been along those lines, these small technical fixes that were extremely effective. Our cars are 99 percent more lower emitting than they were before we started this process, and the same with trucks.

So climate is much more difficult. We're talking about the entire economy. There are no simple technical fixes. And so it's perhaps even more important that we focus on the science as we go forward. And it's not simple. You know, science is not definitive. You know, back in 1955, you know, they had a general idea of climate change, but really it's only been in the last decade or so where we've come to really appreciate exactly the nature of climate change, and the role of humans in it.

Okay. So my third point -- so I have three points here. My third point is that repeat, you know, that notion in the staff report that California is only one percent of the problem. But as we've heard is while we're one percent, we do suffer excessively from climate change more than many -- most places. But on top of that, we have been a model, we have been a leader, and we have been a partner.

Now, the partner part of it we're going to have
to get a lot better at, but we've been truly a model and a leader. You know, we've developed -- you know, you just look at this suite of policies, the Cap-and-Trade, the LCFS, ZEV rules, incentives, and our partners that have done the Renewable Portfolio Standards for electric utilities, which actually has been more effective than everything we've done, by the way, but we're going to catch up. And so it's -- we have been a model. But now, we have this suite of policies in place and now we just have to strengthen them, fix them in little ways as we go forward.

And a very important point on this is that I have not heard at all today, and it's often not in the discussions about climate, is at least for transportation -- surface transportation, cars, trucks, buses, this will not cost us money. This is going to save consumers money. It's going to save the economy money. And it won't be immediately, but within about five or six years, tip -- you know, in an aggregate way, we're going to be saving the economy money. And that really highlights the importance of this transition to electrification, and that's what it's all about, electrification of our vehicles.

Now, I do want to -- so we should move really quickly. In fact, Europe and China are -- have moved much
faster than us. They had 20 percent market share for EVs the last few months in both Europe and China. And so we think we're pretty good in California. We used to be the leader. Now, we're only about 10, 11 percent. So much lower than those much larger populations.

Now, we are about to adopt new rules and implement new ones and I think that's going to put us back in a leadership role, but I do want to -- the one caution note. So I think the ZEV rules are exactly right. That's -- we're on the right path, but I think -- I do want to caution about this carbon neutrality. We definitely are headed toward carbon neutrality. That has to be the goal. The question is how fast?

And, you know, I'll say frankly 2035 makes no sense. And I know that goes against a lot of what people are saying. It would be so disruptive. And again, remember, we're dealing with the economy here, the entire economy. This is not like local pollution, you know, simple technical fixes. This is the entire economy.

So, yes, you know, strongly committed. There are some things that are, you know, more effective than others. And let's figure that out. Let's use the science to figure that out and do it right.

Thank you

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.
Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Chair Randolph.

I'll try to be brief, but as the public health member of the Board, I would derelict if I didn't emphasize the impacts climate change on health, which are finally getting recognized beyond California. I think we've recognized because of our wildfires that are directly related to climate change, that there are health effects. You know, it's not just the environment. It's the health of humans. And who is most impacted? Our vulnerable communities that are already disproportionately exposed to air pollution.

The climate gap is the term that's used for low income communities of color who bear the brunt in this country of climate change impacts on health. But around the world, it's, you know, low-income countries that have contributed very little to the overall problem of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere that are suffering the most health impacts.

So I just want to remind everyone that climate change mitigation policies are about improving public health, not just improving the environment.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Board Member Hurt, you had your hand up earlier.
Do you still want to speak?

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Sure. Thank you. It's clear, you know, this is not a drill. It's code red for us to continue to transform and change all the sectors of our society to a more sustainable and equitable way of living. And I think we really need to keep those highly impacted communities, communities of color, low-income and front-line communities at the forefront for solutions that work, and I think that will be the test.

California's economy continues to grow as we implement vital climate action and adopt regulations to improve the state's climate resiliency. And I think it's an important message that we need to emphasize. Dr. Sperling said a little bit to it and that's the reason why I lowered my hand. But, you know, the cost of climate change far exceeds the cost of transitioning to a green, resilient economy. The cost of climate change is astronomical. And so I think we need to keep that in our mind as we move as quickly as we can forward.

I'm going to be really honored to participate starting this weekend in Scotland at the COP26. And I think it's really a grand opportunity to listen, learn, and exchange ideas. California has a good story to tell. We've had a lot of accomplishments, but we still have a long way to go.
And so I think the public expectation about what will happen in that space in Scotland is high and it's going to shape political and investor perceptions for the future. But again, California has been a leader and we've shown that public and private investments can make a difference. And I want to emphasize we can do this and still keep the economy going and growing, as long as we keep those highly impacted communities at the forefront.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: I definitely agree with Board members that -- that it -- the import -- about the importance of staying on course on what works and keeping in mind those that have been disproportionately impacted by pollution.

I do also think that it's important to think about those who often get left behind in fast-paced policy (inaudible) which tend to be the rural communities, those with low literacy and low disposal income, and those who lack digital and language access.

And so I think coordination among agencies and keeping everybody accountable to make sure that we are all transitioning into these new economies, into technologies together will be important, so that we don't keep
perpetuating the inequities that often we are trying to
remedy with policies.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Do any other Board members -- would any other
Board members like to speak?

Okay. Seeing none, I'll just say a few words.

Obviously, that presentation was sobering, but also, you
know, a clear inspiring call to action in terms of our
work here at CARB and with our communities and our sister
agencies.

I agree with the comments of other Board members
that there are opportunities for technical fixes, but
there also need to be opportunities for community-based
solutions as we make the transitions we need to make. I
completely agree that the -- we save costs in the short
term, but we also need to recognize that not everyone is
going to be able to bear those costs equally, so I think
it's our responsibility as policymakers to ensure that the
communities that are most impacted have the assistance and
the strategies needed to address the increase in costs
that will come from this transition in the short term, in
order to save money in the long term. So I think that's
important.

And then lastly, I will note there was a lot of
conversation in the presentation about the importance of
achieving carbon reductions through our natural and
working lands. And I think that's going to be a very,
very important strategy going forward. We've already
achieved opportunities in terms of removing carbon through
natural lands. Supporting actions to increase
sequestration in forests is very important and provides
ecosystem, and biodiversity, and watershed benefits.

And our Cap-and-Trade Program has supported the
achievements in terms of sustainable management of forests
to achieve that sequestration, but -- and also, you know,
I had the opportunity to meet with some tribal members
from both California and Oregon the other day who pointed
out what a huge opportunity the forest offset program has
been for them, but also how challenging it is to get these
projects approved, and the amount of time and work that
goes into putting together these projects.

But there are clearly still concerns about the
offset program, about all of the different factors that go
into the approval of offset projects, and the
additionality and sustainability of all of those projects.
And so I think that's a really important conversation to
have. As we discussed, we rely on science as much as we
can. And we always have to be open to looking at that
science and doing the analysis we need to do.
So the Scoping Plan is going to provide an opportunity to discuss all of these issues. But after the Scoping Plan is done, I think that gives us some time to really dive deep into some of the various aspects of our programs. It would give an opportunity for staff to take a look at some of the task force recommendations that were mandated by AB 398, and, you know, really take a look at some of the ongoing concerns and engage in a public discussion and process around the forestry program.

And so I'm really looking forward to working with staff to kick-off that process, so that we can ensure that we have full public engagement around that as a key issue and then other key issues that CARB will be dealing with in the coming years as it relates to our natural and working lands. We always have to be open to continued conversation and continued adjustments in all of our programs.

So with that, I think we are ready to move on to our next Board item, that is item number 21-11-2, the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy.

If you wish to comment on this item, please click the raise-hand button or dial star nine now. We will call on you when we get to the public comment portion of this item.

Since the creation of CARB over 50 years ago,
this agency has been leading the way in mobile source
controls and other programs to reduce harmful emissions
from vehicles, as Dr. Sperling was discussing earlier, and
in so doing has provided healthier air for millions of
Californians.

In more recent years, our zero-emission vehicle
programs have accelerated the development and deployment
of the technologies that are needed to reduce air
pollution across California and lessen climate impacts
around the world.

Last year, Governor Newsom signed an Executive
Order that created a first-in-the-nation goal that by 2035
all new cars and passenger trucks sold in California will
be zero-emission vehicles, while also setting similar
goals for greening California's heavy-duty vehicles and
off-road equipment.

The 2020 Mobile Source Strategy is a critical
first step toward meeting the goals laid out in the
Governor's Executive Order. This strategy builds on our
2016 Mobile Source Strategy, at the direction and
leadership of Senator Skinner, in Senate Bill 44, which
directs CARB to regularly update the Mobile Source
Strategy with the latest State targets in mind.

The 2020 strategy provides our most current
thinking on the mobile source emission reduction pathways
needed to meet California's air quality, climate, and community risk reduction goals.

Mr. Corey, would you please introduce the item?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

The Mobile Source Strategy that we developed in 2016 identified pathways and actions for reducing mobile source emissions to meet air quality standards, achieve greenhouse gas emission reduction targets, reduce petroleum consumption and significantly decrease community health risk by 2030.

Since the release of the 2016 Strategy four years ago, we've made tremendous progress in developing and adopting many of the regulations and programs envisioned in that strategy, including the Board's adoption of the Advanced Clean Truck and Heavy-Duty Omnibus Regulations. But even so, as you all know, we must do much more to accelerate the transition to California's on- and off-road fleets to the cleanest technologies possible, if we are to meet our air quality and climate goals.

The 2020 Mobile Source Strategy continues the multi-pollutant scenario planning approach pioneered by the 2016 Strategy. The proposed strategy meets the requirements of California Senate Bill 44, which requires an update to our Mobile Source Strategy and is consistent with Executive Order N-79-20, which Governor Newsom signed
last year and you mentioned.

In this 2020 Strategy, we have identified a suite of programmatic concepts that, if adopted, would enable the State to achieve the technology trajectories that will maximize criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas reductions going to zero emission everywhere feasible, and to cleaner combustion with renewable fuels only where zero-emission technology is not yet available.

In developing this latest Mobile Source Strategy, we've take into account not only the need to meet the State's long-term goals, but also the importance of striving to meet near-term air quality commitments.

Likewise, the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy recognizes that community concerns must be part of the process when developing and implementing proposed technology pathways especially as we move into the development of the 2022 State SIP Strategy.

Moving forward, the programs and concepts in the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy can be incorporated in other planning efforts, including State Implementation Plans, the 2022 Climate Change Scoping Plan update, and community emission reduction plans developed as part of Assembly Bill 617 Community Air Protection Program.

A significant next step for many of the concepts in the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy will be developing them
into SIP measures -- enforceable SIP measures for the next State SIP Strategy, which we're already developing and we'll bring to you all, the Board, for consideration mid-next year.

I'll now ask Ariel Fideldy of the Air Quality Planning and Science Division to give the staff presentation.

Ariel.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

AQPSD SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY PLANNING SECTION MANAGER FIDELDY: Thank you, Mr. Corey. Hello, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. I last briefed you in December 2020 and I'm glad to be back in front of you today to present for the final time on the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy.

This strategy outlines the technology mixes and timelines for transforming California's transportation and off-road equipment sectors. This effort serves as a critical policy roadmap for achieving our many air quality, climate, and community risk reduction mandates.

--o0o--

AQPSD SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY PLANNING SECTION MANAGER FIDELDY: Senate Bill 44, or SB 44, was the genesis of what we bring before you today and required CARB to update the Mobile Source Strategy every five years
with the first update due by January 2021. This bill was
passed by the California Legislature and signed into law
in September of 2019.

More specifically, SB 44 requires the update to
include a strategy for the deployment of clean medium- and
heavy-duty vehicles for the purpose of meeting federal
ambient air quality standards and reducing motor vehicle
greenhouse gas emissions. This bill also directed that
the strategy should include emission reduction goals for
2030 and 2050 consistent with air quality and climate
goals, in addition to various other requirements.

--o0o--

AQPSD SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY PLANNING SECTION
MANAGER FIDELDY: The 2020 Mobile Source Strategy builds
upon the 2016 Mobile Source Strategy and is a conceptual,
scenario-based approach for developing the upcoming State
Implementation Plans, or SIPs, and will complement
measures being developed for the Scoping Plan and other
efforts.

Our 2020 Strategy consists of scenarios and
trajectories for the various mobile sectors that
illustrate the technology mixes needed for the State to
meet its many air quality and climate commitments.

We want to note up front that the scenarios and
concepts included in the 2020 Strategy are bold, but are
needed if we want to attain a mid-term SIP requirements
and longer term climate goals. This scenarios are
aggressive, because the state's public health and climate
goals are aggressive and it is important that with a
document like the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy, and at the
start of planning for the next round of SIPs, to not
undershoot the emission reduction targets.

--o0o--

AQPSD SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY PLANNING SECTION
MANAGER FIDELDY: The State of California has an ambitious
suite of clean air requirements and climate goals we are
working to meet over the next 30 years. This graph shows
the various State Implementation Plan attainment years for
South Coast and San Joaquin Valley, the two areas with the
most challenging ozone and fine particulate air quality in
the nation.

There is also an immediate need to reduce
emissions and exposure in the State's most highly
impacted, low income, and disadvantaged communities.
Climate goals include the mid-term target in 2030 for 40
percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions below 1990
levels and longer term targets in 2045 for carbon
neutrality and 2050 for greenhouse gases 80 percent below
1990 levels.

--o0o--
AQPSD SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY PLANNING SECTION
MANAGER FIDELDY: In addition to all the goals laid out in
the previous slide, last year, recognizing the severity of
the climate crisis and the need for immediate action,
Governor Newsom signed Executive Order N-79-20. This
order established a first-in-the-nation goal for a hundred
percent of California sales of new passenger cars and
trucks to be zero emission by 2035.

In addition, the Governor's order set a goal to
transition 100 percent of the drayage truck fleet to
zero-emission by 2035, all off-road equipment, where
feasible, to zero emission by 2035, and the remainder of
the medium- and heavy-duty vehicles to zero emission,
where feasible, by 2045.

CARB is committed to achieving these goals, and
the 2020 Strategy is an important first step in moving us
forward.

--o0o--

AQPSD SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY PLANNING SECTION
MANAGER FIDELDY: As can be seen on this slide, staff has
provided many opportunities for public input and feedback
on the 2020 Strategy. We began the process in March 2020
when he held our first public webinar at which preliminary
scenarios were presented and discussed with stakeholders.

The following month, we presented the preliminary
scenarios and concepts to the Board in April to obtain
your feedback and also allow for additional public input.
Staff released the workshop discussion draft document in
late September of 2020 for public comment and then held
our second webinar several weeks later.

In November of 2020, we released the draft 2020
Mobile Source Strategy, in advance of our last
informational update to the Board the following month.

Taking into account feedback from late 2020 from
the Board and public workshops, staff revised the 2020
Mobile Source Strategy document and released a revised
draft in April of 2021, followed by a third public webinar
in May.

Public interest and engagement at all of our
Mobile Source Strategy webinars has been high, with more
than 200 participants attending each.

Finally, this past month, staff released the
final iteration of the 2020 Strategy in advance of today's
hearing. In developing the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy,
we also consulted with other State agencies as directed in
SB 44.

--o0o--

AQPSD SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY PLANNING SECTION
MANAGER FIDELDY: Over the course of the last year, in
response to what we've heard from both the public and the
Board, we've made significant updates and additions that are now included in the final 2020 Strategy.

As outlined here, we have added a chapter to the document focused on near-term benefits needed to meet 2023, 2024, and 2031 SIP attainment targets. A chapter was also added on environmental justice and outlined the various concepts that MSS could provide benefits to various types of disadvantaged communities.

Staff also expanded the discussion on the actions that are needed at the federal level to reduce emissions from national and international sources, like locomotives, ocean-going vessels, and aviation. We also fleshed out the section and strategy areas that are available to pursue reductions in vehicle miles traveled or VMT. Finally, there were other updates to scenarios and minor details as needed.

--o0o--

AQPSD SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY PLANNING SECTION

MANAGER FIDELDY: As I just mentioned, in response to Board direction last December and public comments, staff also added a chapter on the final version of the 2020 Strategy on near-term benefits of CARB's recently adopted and soon-to-be adopted programs.

Attainment of the ozone and fine particulate matter, or PM2.5, standards is going to rely on getting
significant reductions of oxides of nitrogen, or NOx.

This table shown on this slide will summarize the near-term measures described in the MSS for the on-road and off-road sectors that are expected to provide NOx emission reductions by 2023, 2024, and 2031.

Starting with items that were measures in our last Mobile Source Strategy and State SIP strategy, this includes adoption of Advanced Clean Cars II for on-road light-duty vehicles, Advanced Clean Trucks and Heavy-Duty Omnibus for heavy-duty trucks and buses, and potential reductions from U.S. EPA's Clean Trucks Plan.

For the off-road sector, prior 2016 SIP measures include the on OGV At Berth Rule, amendments to the Small Off-Road Engines Regulations, the upcoming Transport Refrigeration Unit action, and next year's action on zero-emission forklifts.

The Heavy-Duty Inspection and Maintenance Program, while included as a measure in previous SIPs, has been significantly expanded since what was envisioned at the time and current emission reduction estimates, including early deployment of PEAQS systems, are much higher than those included in the past SIPs.

The rest shown here in dark green and marked with an asterisk are new measures developed after the 2016 State SIP strategy, including the Advanced Clean Fleets
regulation for on-road. New measures for the off-road sector include amendments to the commercial harbor craft regulation, the in-use locomotive regulation currently being workshopped, potential amendments to the cargo handling equipment regulation, and new directions being pursued in the construction and mining equipment sectors.

As you can see, under their programs listed here, we'll achieve about 5.5 tons per day NOx reductions in 2023 in South Coast and 11.55 tons per day in San Joaquin Valley in 2024. By 2031, we will achieve 63 to 67 tons per day NOx reductions in South Coast with about 40 percent of these reductions coming from the new measures.

Beyond the items listed here and described in the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy, there are many newly identified actions that I will discuss later in this presentation that are being considered through the development process for the 2022 State SIP Strategy.

While the new SIP strategy will be targeting emission reductions needed to attain the 70 part per billion ozone standard, we understand the importance of reducing emissions for near-term attainment, especially in the South Coast and the San Joaquin Valley, and to reduce emissions and exposure in communities of concern across California.

--o0o--
MANAGER FIDELDY: Mobile sources and the fossil fuels that power them continue to contribute a majority of the ozone precursors like NOx. And they are the largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions in California.

The charts here show 2017 statewide NOx emissions on the left and greenhouse gas emissions on the right broken down into the specific mobile sectors, with on-road shown in the dark green color, off-road in light green, and stationary and area sources in gray.

--o0o--

MANAGER FIDELDY: The scenarios and trajectories -- technology trajectories outlined in the 2020 strategy would lead to significant reductions in mobile source emissions of NOx and greenhouse gases. Under the MSS scenarios, diesel PM, NOx, and greenhouse gases would all reduced more than 65 percent from base year levels by the relevant target outyears. And the on-road fleet would be dramatically transformed, such that 85 percent of passenger cars would be ZEV and PHEV in 2045, and 77 percent of heavy-duty trucks and buses would be ZEVs in 2045.

--o0o--
MANAGER FIDELDY: Although the 2020 Strategy will provide statewide and regional emissions benefits, we are keenly aware that emissions from mobile sources have a disproportionate impact on disadvantaged communities and people of color, many of whom live adjacent to transportation corridors and freight facilities.

The scenarios and concepts in the 2020 Strategy, especially those covering in the freight sector, have the potential to reduce emissions and exposure in communities of concern. The strategy seeks rapid transition to zero-emission technologies statewide across numerous sectors, but we know that we need to act even more quickly and target the introduction of zero-emission vehicles in the communities that for generations have been bearing the brunt of combustion emissions.

We intend for the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy to inform not just regional air quality plans, but also AB 617 community emission reduction plans, and other efforts to address historic air quality inequalities across California.

--o0o--

AQPSD SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY PLANNING SECTION

MANAGER FIDELDY: We simply cannot attain our clean air and climate targets in California without prompt and decisive action by the federal government to further
control emissions from trucks, trains, locomotives, and aircraft. Federal action to address these sources is also needed to improve health in communities living near transportation corridors and freight hubs, many of which are low-income, disadvantaged, communities of color. As can be seen on this plot, NOx emissions from mobile sources under State control in the South Coast Air Basin have decreased 75 percent relative to 2000 and are projected to continue decreasing as we implement the programs CARB has on the books and adopt additional mobile source regulations.

Without new emission standards at the federal level, the emissions for primarily federal-regulated sources is expected to decline only slightly over the next decade, such that they surpass emissions from California regulated mobile sources before 2030.

In addition to the actions that CARB staff is working on, action from federal and international entities is fundamental to meeting all of the state's goals.

--o0o--

AQPSD SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY PLANNING SECTION

MANAGER FIDELDY: For a little bit more detail, this slide will show an example of one of the scenarios that staff have developed for the 2020 Strategy. The scenario illustrates the evolving mix of cleaner heavy-duty trucks
needed to meet California's air quality and climate goals over the next 30 years.

Each portion of this graph will represent a different type of truck technology starting with the pre-2010 model year and will show how these older trucks and, including these and the 2010 certified engines would be phased out under the MSS scenarios.

The next portions here are the zero-emission trucks, which have started to penetrate into the fleet and will continue to occupy a growing share of the fleet into the future from both adopted regulations like the Advanced Clean Trucks Program and through accelerated turnover through new incentives and new regulations, including the proposed Advanced Clean Fleets Regulation.

Finally, there are cleaner combustion trucks certified to meet CARB's Heavy-Duty Omnibus Regulation or federally certified to a potential U.S. EPA standard, assumed for the purposes of this scenario to be set at 0.02 grams per brake horsepower hour in alignment with the final Heavy-Duty Omnibus Standard.

Starting on the far left side of the graph, we see that the current heavy-duty truck fleet in California consists primarily of pre-2010 and 2010 certified internal combustion trucks with small numbers of zero emission and advanced clean trucks.
Moving to the far right side of the slide, we see that the truck fleet will need to transition by 2050 to much cleaner technologies, primarily zero emissions, but with a limited number of clean combustion trucks in some vocations. Across the top of the chart, we have listed the resulting percentage of clean combustion and zero-emission vehicles on the road for the target years of 2031, 2037, and 2045. This shows, for example, that by 2045, 77 percent of the trucks on the road will need to be zero emission with 22 percent being cleaner combustion vehicles. This scenario was developed consistent with the Governor's Executive Order by assuming 100 percent of new vehicle sales are zero emission starting in 2035.

We developed multiple scenarios for the heavy-duty category, but only this scenario shows the level of technology transformation necessary to meet both our midterm air quality goals, as well as our long-term climate change goals.

With the population of heavy-duty vehicles represented, you can see in the solid green and green and white striped sections that this aggressive scenario resulted in a total of about 830,000 heavy-duty ZEVs statewide in 2045. While this number of ZEVs seems ambitious, we are seeing more and more new models of zero-emission vehicles being introduced into the
marketplace. There are currently 16 commercially available models of heavy-duty Class 7 and 8 zero-emission trucks in North America. CALSTART estimates in their Zero-Emission Technology Inventory Tool that within the next two years, we could see over 20 models of heavy-duty zero-emission trucks on the market and more than 80 models of medium-duty zero-emission trucks.

Zero-emission technology is out there and it's rapidly evolving, and as can be seen in our scenario here, it's what is needed for us to meet not just our air quality but also our climate goals.
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MANAGER FIDELDY: This slide translates the heavy-duty technology penetration scenario shown in the previous into NOx emission trends, with business as usual emissions from the heavy-duty truck fleet represented by the dashed brown line and anticipated emissions under clean fleet transition represented by the solid teal blue line. The arrows shown -- the arrows show the anticipated emission benefits from this fleet turnover with NOx emissions result -- reductions increasing from 67 percent in 2031 to 94 percent by 2045.
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MANAGER FIDELDY: The 2020 Strategy includes scenarios like the one I just went over for heavy-duty for all on-road and off-road mobile sectors. This slide summarizes the assumptions we made in developing all of these scenarios.

In alignment with EO N-79-20 and SB 44, for light-duty vehicles we are assuming 100 percent ZEV and PHEV sales in 2035, along with 25 percent reduction in statewide VMT per capita by 2035 relative to 2005. For heavy-duty vehicles, we are assuming 100 percent California fleet purchases being ZEV starting in 2035 combined with cleaner combustion. For the smaller off-road engine categories, the scenarios assume a full transition to zero emission by 2035. And for the heavier off-road categories, the technology mixes assume zero emission wherever feasible and cleaner combustion engines along with low carbon fuels in the hard-to-electrify sectors.

--o0o--
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MANAGER FIDELDY: The scenarios in the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy will provide significant emission reductions, especially in the mid and longer terms. These pie charts show the baseline emissions under current programs in the SIP target years of 2031 and 2037, along with the
estimated reductions in statewide NOx emissions that could be achieved under the MSS scenarios when including all sectors.

Including station area -- stationary and area source emissions, the graph shows a 49 percent reduction in NOx by 2031 and 51 -- 56 percent by 2037. Keep in mind these carts do not take into account actions the districts are also working on to control emissions from stationary and area-wide sources, so there is potential for even greater overall emission reductions than is shown here.
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MANAGER FIDELDY: Achieving the technology trajectories and emissions reductions in the MSS scenarios has the potential to provide substantial health benefits in communities near freight facilities and across California over the next 30 years. CARB staff conducted an analysis of the potential annual statewide health benefits from the PM2.5 reductions estimated under the scenarios. The slide here details the potential annual health benefits in 2050, the endpoint of the scenarios in the document. As you can see, we expect that implementation of the 2020 mobile source strategy will each year provide between 3,700 and 4,100 fewer premature deaths, 1,700 fewer emergency room visits, and 725 fewer hospital admissions, not to mention
reduced cancer risk.

While the numbers here are estimated for just the final year, because the concepts in the strategy are actively being developed and some have already been adopted, reductions in emissions and exposure will begin immediately and provide increasingly greater levels of health benefits over time as additional programs are adopted and implemented.

The figures here outlines our statewide estimates, but it must be noted that achieving reductions outlined in the 2020 strategy is especially critical for reducing exposure and minimizing the resulting detrimental health impacts to low-income, disadvantaged, communities of color near freight facilities. These communities experience increased risk of asthma and other respiratory illnesses, higher cancer risks, and increased risk of cardiovascular disease, all of which will be reduced through emissions reductions under the scenario trajectories in the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy.
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AQPSD SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY PLANNING SECTION

MANAGER FIDELDY: Having covered the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy and the potential health benefits under the scenarios, I'm now going to pivot and move forward to discuss the next important stage in the development of the
programmatic concepts, the 2022 State Strategy for the
State Implementation Plan, or State SIP Strategy.

Staff initiated the public process for the State
SIP Strategy over the last couple of months, and it's
through the State Strategy that we will further develop
the MSS concepts into formal SIP measures to support the
air quality plans for attaining the 70 parts per billion
ozone standard by 2037.

Given that this next round of SIPs are due to
U.S. EPA in August of 2022, it's imperative that CARB
staff focuses efforts going forward on translating the
concepts in the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy into
enforceable measures in the 2022 State SIP Strategy that
can be submitted to U.S. EPA next summer.
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MANAGER FIDELDY: Diving into this a little more, this
slide provides a graphical representation of the process
of how the programmatic concepts included in the 2020
Mobile Source Strategy form the basis for actions that
lead to actual air quality improvements. The concepts for
each sector that we have in the 2020 MSS are high level
and will continue to be developed as staff engages with
the public and stakeholders.

SIP measures require more detail and specify
timelines in order to establish the federally-enforceable commitments. Beyond that, each item will go through a formal rulemaking process including draft rule or program language, staff reports, economic and environmental analyses, and public workshops, working groups, and hearings prior to being proposed to the Board for adoption as a program to be implemented in California.

Implementation dates and timelines are firmly established as a part of that development and adoption process, which then define the point at which the regulation will be able to reduce emissions and provide real air quality benefits in communities across the state. This process is almost never a straight line and the public engagement for regulation or program is, in many cases, happening in parallel with the development of our planning documents.

This iterative process, beginning with the concepts and ending with air quality improvement, can take five to 10 years from start to finish.
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MANAGER FIDELDY: As a Board, you have recently adopted a number of regulations that are expected to provide significant emission reductions and air quality improvements. Some of the programs that have moved
forward in their development process that were measures in our previous 2016 State SIP strategy are listed here. These key regulations have all been adopted by the Board in the past year or will be brought to the Board for consideration through 2022.

For light- and medium-duty vehicles, a key undertaking will be the Advanced Clean Cars II. This suite of proposed new vehicle regulations builds on the first iteration of the Advanced Clean Cars Program and will include enhanced ZEV regulations to move beyond early adopters, and enhanced LEV regulations to reduce emissions from current combustion technologies.

For heavy-duty vehicles, the recently adopted Advanced Clean Trucks Regulation set sales targets beginning in 2024 that will serve as a substantial first step towards getting significant numbers of heavy-duty ZEVs onto California roads.

Recognizing that it will take time to transform the fleet, another key strategy will be cleaning up the remaining combustion technology. This will be accomplished through programs such as the Heavy-Duty Omnibus Regulation that will require lower NOx emissions from newly manufactured diesel engines, phase 2 greenhouse gas regulations, and the future Heavy-Duty Inspection and Maintenance Program, which staff continues to evaluate for
opportunities to achieve early reductions. There is also ongoing rulemaking to drive adoption of zero-emission technology for SORE, forklifts, and other off-road sections, and also reduce emissions from consumer products.

In addition to all of these things, previous SIP measures to achieve reductions from incentivized turnover of vehicles and equipment. Incentives are ongoing efforts and will continue to be vital to attainment of air quality standards into the future.
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MANAGER FIDEILOY: Looking forward, this slide will outline the potential measures that staff is considering for inclusion in the 2022 State SIP Strategy. Three weeks ago, we released a draft measures document that included a description of the measures currently being considered for the next round of ozone plans.

Starting with on-road mobile sources, this includes the Advanced Clean Fleets Regulation, and the new motorcycle emissions standards. There is also a suite of potential measures for the off-road sector, including a Tier 5 standard for off-road equipment, and potential spark ignition marine engine standards.

Staff is also looking at options for reducing
emissions from primarily federally regulated sources, including the in-use locomotive regulation currently under development, as well as potential controls for aviation and ocean-going vessels beyond CARB’s existing at berth and fuels requirements.

Finally, there are potential measures for other sources, including consumer products and space and water heaters. This list is a starting point and we expect that as we work with the local air districts to flesh out the full emission reduction needed from State sources, and identify carrying capacities for the various areas, that this list will grow.
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MANAGER FIDELDY: Beyond the items listed on the last slide, staff has received suggestions from the public for State measures to be included in the 2022 State SIP Strategy, through our outreach and engagement efforts thus far, some of which are highlighted in this table.

Many of the items listed here have been included or discussed as part of various community emission reduction programs developed by selected communities, together with the air district partners, under CARB’s AB 617 Community Air Protection Program. Staff is exploring the ways in which these concepts could be included as SIP
measures in the 2022 State SIP Strategy and is continuing
to take feedback and additional suggestions from the
public.

As you can see, the suggested measures include
the On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicle Useful Life Strategy
discussed by the Board at the September hearing, along
with a number of other on-road mobile strategies, as well
as potential strategies targeting reductions from
stationary and area sources.
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MANAGER FIDELDY: While CARB and the district are working
to identify all potential actions within our jurisdictions
to reduce emissions across sectors, actions are needed at
the federal and international levels in order to achieve
the magnitude of emission reductions necessary to attain
the 70 part per billion ozone standard in our extreme
non-attainment areas and across the state.

Staff is collaborating with U.S. EPA staff and
will continue to do so. But the need for immediate action
by U.S. EPA and other agencies on interstate on-road
heavy-duty vehicles preempted off-road equipment,
locomotives, aviation, and ocean-going vessels cannot be
overstated. We have only 15 years to attain these
federally mandated air quality standards. Attainment is
challenging, if not impossible, without action by U.S. EPA and other federal entities to control emissions from sources under their respective authorities.
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MANAGER FIDELDY: Having walked through all of the measures and actions included in our draft measures document that we are considering for inclusion in the 2022 State SIP Strategy, we want to also summarize some of the feedback we've heard at our workshops.

Staff held a kick-off workshop on the 2022 State SIP Strategy in July and just last week held a second workshop at which we took a deep dive into all of the potential SIP measures. We have received feedback during these workshops and through other individual meetings with various public stakeholders. The local air districts generally voiced strong support for potential CARB action on primarily federal regulated sources, especially a statewide vessel speed reduction program for OGVs.

From many advocates, we heard strong support for the incorporation of AB 617 CERP measures in the SIP, especially the heavy-duty useful life strategy. They also requested additional requirements to transition the light-duty fleet to zero emissions and accelerated action on all fronts.
Industry expects -- expressed concern with the
ability of ZEV-driving measures to provide near-term
reductions and express support for potential zero-emission
appliance standards.

--o0o--

AQPSD SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY PLANNING SECTION
MANAGER FIDELDY: One other thing we wanted to highlight
for you today is the need for contingency measures, which
we touched on at the September Board hearing. The federal
Clean Air Act, together with court decisions in the last
five years, have made it clear that SIP contingency
measures must be already adopted with triggering
provisions and themselves provide for the reductions
required for contingency. Staff is exploring options for
a triggered contingency measure in the context of all the
other actions being pursued as SIP measures and will
initiate the public process in the coming months as
directed by the Board.
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MANAGER FIDELDY: Throughout SIP development, CARB staff
is working very closely with the local air districts. We
kicked off the process for development of the 70 ppb ozone
SIPs over two years ago, and since that time, we have been
having regular working groups with district staff, as well
as numerous additional meetings with the various district
teams on foundational technical work, including emission
inventory development, air quality modeling, and many
other SIP requirements.

We work with the districts throughout development
of plans for attaining new air quality standards and
continue to work together after the plans have been
adopted, as we move through implementation and enforcement
of regulations.

One significant example of our collaboration with
the districts is CARB staff's engagement over the past
year with South Coast AQMD staff in holding a series of
mobile source working groups to help with the development
of the District's next Air Quality Management Plan. CARB
and District staff have jointly held multiple public
working group meetings on heavy-duty trucks, construction
and industrial equipment, aircraft, and ocean-going
vessels, all of which have helped to inform the concepts
and potential SIP measures that I've outlined for you
today.

Close collaboration between district and CARB
staff is vital to SIP development process and we will
continue to work over the next year with our district
partners to further define the emission reductions and
measures that are needed for attainment of the federal air
quality standards.
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MANAGER FIDELDY: Moving forward, staff will continue to provide opportunities to engage on the 2022 State SIP Strategy. As previously mentioned, staff kicked off the process in July with our first public workshop. We then released our draft measures document in early October before hosting our second public workshop just last week on October 19th.

Moving forward, we are planning for a release of the full draft 2022 State SIP Strategy in the winter timeframe prior to an informational update to the Board in early spring 2022, and a third public workshop. We will then be releasing the proposed 2022 State SIP Strategy in the early summer for Board adoption prior to the August 3rd SIP due date for the 70 part per billion 8-hour ozone standard.
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MANAGER FIDELDY: In terms of next steps, we intend to transmit the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy to the relevant policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature, as directed by SB 44. As I've described here today, the 2020 strategy scenarios and concepts establish a roadmap that
has the potential to achieve significant benefits, but this is only the beginning of the process.

Over the next year, staff will further develop the MSS concepts into proposals for SIP enforceable measures and commitments through the 2022 State SIP Strategy. Elements of the 2020 Strategy will also be incorporated into the 2022 Scoping plan and other CARB-planning efforts.

Staff is continuing to work with the districts to firmly define the levels of emission reductions needed for attainment of the 70 ppb ozone standard in the South Coast Air Basin, the San Joaquin Valley, and many other areas of the state.

We will be continuing the process as a part of the State SIP Strategy development, while also beginning the public process on development of contingency measures in the coming months.

Finally, for the 2022 State SIP Strategy, we will come back to the Board with an informational update in the first quarter of next year, as we continue forward on our path towards identifying all the measures needed to provide the critical reductions needed from State-regulated sources.
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MANAGER FIDELDY: Thank you, Chair Randolph and members of the Board.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you. Before we go to public comment and Board Member comment on this item, we need to take about a 10-minute break to deal with some technical issues. So we will be back at about 11:20 -- 11:20, 11:22. Okay. All right. Thanks.

(Off record: 11:12 a.m.)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record: 11:26 a.m.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Welcome back from the break. Thank you for your patience. It is now time for public comment on the Mobile Source Strategy item. Board Clerk will you please call the first few commenters.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes. Thank, Chair. We currently have 22 people with their hands raised to speak at this time. If you wish to verbally comment on this item, please raise your hand or dial star nine now. And I apologize in advance if I mispronounce your name.

The first three speakers will be Yasmine Agelidis, Daniel Barad, and Ian MacMillan.

Yasmine, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin your comment.

YASMINE AGELIDIS: Thank you so much. Good
morning, Chair Randolph and Board members. My name is Yasmine Agelidis with Earthjustice.

And CARB's Mobile Source Strategy framework is so important, because it sets a path for California to be able to meet the state's air quality and climate goals. It's a grounding document based on scientific reviews and analyses, that then informs the development of other planning efforts, including the State Implementation Plan, the Scoping Plan, the community emissions reduction plans, and importantly, CARB's own rulemakings on mobile sources.

Today, we ask that the Board vote to approve the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy that staff has proposed today. Even though we believe that the Mobile Source Strategy should be even more assertive in order to address our dire air quality and climate needs, it is the right move to get the strong clean air assumptions outlined in the strategy on our books as soon as possible.

Now, once the Mobile Source Strategy is adopted, it is critical that CARB staff actually rely on the assumptions in that analysis and that key rulemakings that are currently under way match the emissions reductions and sales targets assumed in the Mobile Source Strategy.

However, right now, many of the regulations currently in development do not match these targets, including most notably the Advanced Clean Fleets Rule and...
the Advanced Clean Cars II rule among others.

So our ask today is that CARB Board members take this time to direct staff to make sure that the rules that staff are currently working on and all future rules match the Mobile Source Strategy. So, for example, the Mobile Source Strategy clearly states that a hundred percent of all truck sales in California must be zero emissions by 2035. Yet, in the Advanced Clean Fleets Rule, staff have proposed that a hundred percent of all truck sales be zero emissions by 2040, five years later.

And this five year gap does create meaningful differences, including that it would allow tens of thousands more new combustion trucks to be sold that would remain on California's roads beyond 2045, which is when CARB and the Governor require all trucks to be zero emissions.

Similarly, right now, there's also a large gap between the Mobile Source Strategy and the sales requirements in the Advanced Clean Cars II rule, which means that we're foregoing ozone and GHG reductions that we need in order to have a chance at meeting our air quality and climate targets.

So just to summarize, we have two asks today, first, that the Board vote to adopt the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy, and second, that the Board direct staff to make
sure that the key rulemakings that it's already working on and all future rulemakings match the Mobile Source Strategy.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Daniel Barad, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute and begin.

DANIEL BARAD: Thank you. Good morning. Daniel Barad on behalf of Sierra Club California and our 500,000 members and supporters statewide. Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment. As the Mobile Source Strategy highlights, the transportation sector is responsible for 40 percent of the State's GHG emissions and more than 75 percent of its NOx emissions. Meanwhile, 28 million Californians live in areas that exceed the federal ozone and PM2.5 standards.

The Mobile Source Strategy makes represent -- recommendations that represent the bare minimum actions CARB must take to decrease the state's transportation emissions. The Board should view these recommendations as the regulatory floor, not the ceiling, and should advance more ambitious policies whenever possible.

In the upcoming year, CARB has opportunities in the Advanced Clean Cars II and Advanced Clean Fleets rulemakings to pass policies that rapidly bring emissions
from the light- and heavy-duty vehicle sectors down to zero.

As Yasmine also highlighted, these current drafts are not in line with what the Mobile Source Strategy says is necessary. The Mobile Source Strategy calls for 50 percent of light-duty vehicles sold in the State in 2027 to be zero emission, but the current draft of the ACC II rule would not hit that mark until 2030.

To work towards the state's electrification goals in the heavy-duty sector, the Mobile Source Strategy also shows that a hundred percent of heavy-duty vehicles sold in the state must be zero emission by 2035. The current ACF draft does not hit these sales milestones until 2040. The rapid transition of California's vehicle fleets to zero emission is not just necessary to achieve our long-term carbon neutrality goals, but it is also crucial for meeting attainment standards and to cleaning the air in the short-term.

While these regulations are not the only tools that CARB has to reduce vehicle emissions, they are by far the most effective. Limited tools, such as incentives, will be needed to transition more difficult-to-decarbonize sectors to zero emission.

We urge CARB to adopt the Mobile Source Strategy today, and at the very least, CARB should trust its own
work on the Strategy and align its current rulemakings with its own findings.

We look forward to continuing to work with the Board, members, and staff to clean the air in the state and to slow the climate crisis.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Next, we will have Ian MacMillan. After Ian will be Sasan Saadat, and William Barrett, and Sophie Ellinghouse.

Ian, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

IAN MACMILLAN: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Mobile Source Strategy. My name is Ian MacMillan and I am Assistant Deputy Executive Officer with South Coast AQMD.

We appreciate the willingness of CARB staff to engage with us on the development of this document and in related SIP-planning processes. We also recognize the value of the approach taken in the MSS to comprehensively evaluate the level of vehicle turnover needed to meet federal and State air quality standards.

We cannot lose site of the statutory mandate to protect the public from smog and toxic diesel pollution today. CARB recognizes this need. Just four years ago, CARB committed in the previous Mobile Source Strategy to
reducing NOx emissions from mobile sources in South Coast by 113 and 111 tons per day in 2023 and 2031.

South Coast AQMD relied on this commitment when we adopted our 2016 AQMP. We had no choice. With limited regulatory authority over mobile sources, we have to rely on CARB, the State Legislature, and the federal government to meet air quality standards. Absent action from these entities, our residents will continue to suffer from poor air quality and our region could face substantial economic impacts from federal sanctions.

The current proposed MSS does not address CARB's previous commitment for 2023 nor is it clear that the MSS will be sufficient to meet the 2031 or 2037 ozone deadlines. Even if federal air quality standards cannot be met on time, we both have an obligation, legally and to the public, to meet them as quickly as possible. In addition to not laying out how the mandates of the Clean Air Act will be achieved, the proposed MSS does not appear to meet the requirements of SB 44, which authorized the development of the MSS, in particular for coordinating plans to meet federal air quality standards and for evaluating cost effectiveness.

The analysis of potential costs of our transition to a zero-emissions future is critical. There are multiple pathways to achieve that vision and some
necessarily will be more expensive than others. We disagree with those who would argue that these costs are a reason not to act. Rather, we recommend that a comprehensive analysis be conducted of the anticipated all-in costs for these potential pathways. The most cost effective pathways can then be pursued, and importantly, new policy actions can be developed to reduce costs as much as possible.

Making cleaner technologies more affordable is critical, given the significant scale of vehicle turnover that is needed. South Coast AQMD stands ready to continue its partnership with CARB and achieving clean air. We stand side by side with CARB in pushing for widespread conversion of fleets to zero emissions as soon as feasible.

However, this partnership must come with a shared understanding of the obligations we both face. Non-attainment is not only South Coast AQMD's burden to bear, achieving clean air requires collective action by South Coast AQMD and the State and federal government. Given CARB's authority and mandate, it must lead.

However, this leadership must not prioritize long-term goals over previous commitments and federal and State statutory mandates for near-term action.

Thank you very much.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Sasan Saadat.

SASAN SAADAT: Thank you, members of the Board.

Sasan Saadat with Earthjustice. It's surreal to hear the last presentation on the IPCC findings and the need for transformational change and now to be here before you asking that your transportation regulations actually align with your own staff's research of what's needed to meet the state's goals.

Staff knows that their proposed regulations for cars and trucks fall way short of the Mobile Source Strategy. They don't deny it. Instead, their response has been that the gap for reaching our State goals could maybe be filled by some other indirect policy measures. We keep hearing it doesn't actually have to get done all by one rule, as if other policies could come to the rescue.

This is impossible to believe by anyone who's actually read the Mobile Source Strategy, which already relies to an unrealistic degree on policies that CARB has even less control over. For example, the Mobile Source Strategy assumes that we will spend money we don't yet have to accelerate the turnover of 8,500 trucks to zero emission every year starting this year. As a reminder, CARB's current ambition is 800 trucks. And on cars, the
Mobile Source Strategy says for cars to do their equal
call share, 16,000 of them need to be turned over every
year in the South Coast alone. That's a ten-fold increase
compared to what the basin achieves through Clean Cars 4
All or the worst excuse that low carbon fuels or carbon
dioxide removal can sop up the difference.

Not only would those do nothing for our
environmental injustice, but those finite solutions are
already barely enough to address the much more challenging
sectors like shipping and aviation. And we can't pretend
that they're going to bail out cars and trucks too.

Please don't take this to mean that we oppose
passing the Mobile Source Strategy. That's not what I'm
saying. What we're saying is that the Mobile Source
Strategy is the bare minimum our regulations need to match
and that it would be insane to believe that other measures
could plug an even wider gap left by undershooting our
sales requirements.

If CARB actually believes other measures could
happen to deliver the needed sales requirements, then
their should be no concern about securing that with a
regulatory mandate. CARB should either require the
outcomes it knows are necessary or admit to the Governor
and millions of Californians breathing unhealthy air that
they don't believe the goals are achievable, and that they
view them merely as aspirational.

I know you cannot take that latter view. I know you also believe that we can actually achieve this transformation. And I know you, like me, must tell yourself that every time you watch the common catastrophes around us unfold. I know you must tell it to yourselves each time you feel a pit in your stomach reading up apocalyptic headlines thinking of your family's future. And I know that you can take confidence in your own staff's cost analyses that prove that this transformation is within our reach.

So if you also believe the State's goals are not merely words, then please make the Mobile Source Strategy real by passing rules that align with it. Please honor your commitments to the public to deliver this transformation by directing your staff to design rules that at a minimum match the Mobile Source Strategy. It is the bare minimum we must do to do -- in the mammoth tasks that remain ahead of us.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Will Barrett, you can unmute yourself and begin.

WILL BARRETT: Thank you. This is Will Barrett. I'm the Director of Clean Air Advocacy with the American Lung Association. And we believe that the Mobile Source
Strategy concepts really do provide a good base for the State SIP and the State Scoping Plan that's going to come up next year. The focus on diesel clean-up, zero emissions, healthy transportation, and targeting clean-up in our most impacted and disadvantaged communities is critical.

I'm going to comment today just on two elements, legacy diesel fleets, and VMT reductions. So at the September hearing and throughout the Mobile Source Strategy development process, public health and clean air advocates raised the need for a comprehensive program to retire trucks reaching full useful life milestones. We greatly appreciated Mr. De La Torre, Mr. Kracov, and Senator Leyva raising this issue and the urgency of this issue at that time.

While the Advance Clean Fleets Rule proposes to retire drayage trucks at useful life, a retirement policy must be expanded fleet-wide. Ultimately, we and our health partners call for a comprehensive retirement to be included in the SIP as a clear measure in the SIP and expanded within the Advanced Clean Fleets Rule.

We appreciate in the presentation that the retirement concept was included on the list of potential new SIP measures. But really, we look to the Board to ensure a comprehensive truck retirement program is
included in the SIP.

Like the Heavy-Duty Inspection Maintenance Program that you'll hear in December, the retirement program could complement and really far surpass the benefits of many of the measures approved in the past few years by the Board in terms of reducing NOx, PM, and protecting lung health in our most impacted communities.

On the issue of vehicle miles traveled, the Mobile Source Strategy really did a great job of expanding the discussion of VMT measures that were -- we need to see implemented. And we appreciate Dr. Sperling's comments on this along the way throughout the development of the rule -- or the strategy.

Building on what's in the Mobile Source Strategy, we feel that the Scoping Plan and the SIP really have to provide clear measures for building healthier communities, reducing VMT, and expanding mobility choices. We know that ongoing increases in VMT are eating into the benefits of cleaner fuels and vehicles, and limiting opportunities to improve community health and resilience.

The Lung Association and the Local Government Commission submitted a joint comment letter noting that the Mobile Source Strategy lays out these good directions for VMT reduction, and we encourage you to bring these into the SIP, into the Scoping Plan, and really, you know,
take what's in the Mobile Source Strategy several key
strategies are noted, increasing transportation choices
and access, authorizing equitable pricing of
transportation, and really aligning State funding and
land-use planning with VMT and pollution reduction targets
is key. We also know that there needs to be partnership
with local and regional governments as well.

So in closing, really want to just say thank you
for the work that's gone into the Mobile Source Strategy.
It really is important to get a hold of the transportation
pollution reductions we know we need, especially in our
most impacted communities.

Thank you to Ms. Fideldy and the staff for all of
your work on this. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thanks.

Next will be Sophie Ellinghouse. After Sophie,
we will have Ryan Kenny, Bill Magavern, and Ryan Mack.

Sophie, I have activated your microphone. You
can unmute and begin.

SOPHIE ELLINGHOUSE: Great. Thank you. Good
morning, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. As
Katie just mentioned, my name is Sophie Ellinghouse. And
I am the Director of California Policy at the Western

WSPA believes that progress towards
sustainability -- sustainable energy future is best served
by an inclusive dialogue. And that's why we're both
disappointed and concerned that CARB staff has not
incorporated or addressed some of our recommendations.
For successful, scalable emission reduction, California
must approach our shared future intentionally and allow a
seat at the table for all stakeholders.

I just briefly want to go over two of our main
cconcerns. First, the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy fails to
address some of the requirements of SB 44, which were
outlined in the presentation earlier. In this regard, the
Mobile Source Strategy falls short of meeting California's
near-term obligations under the federal Clean Air Act for
both the San Joaquin Valley and South Coast Air Basin in
2023 and 2031.

Second, the Mobile Source Strategy fails to
recognize new generations of low carbon fuels being
introduced now in California, which we note that these
fuels are encouraged by State's own LCFS program.

Just a quick elaboration. Over the past year,
WSPA has submitted four comment letters into the record
that specifically provided examples of these new
technology and fuel combinations. In fact, WSPA
commissioned Ramboll to conduct a study, which showed the
deploying low-NOx vehicles running on renewable fuels,
which are now commercially available, the Mobile Source Strategy could actually allow criteria air pollutant reductions sooner as required under the SIP, including local benefits for AB 617 communities.

Unfortunately, we have seen no reference, or acknowledgement, or incorporation to consider these strategies for lower carbon fuels within the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy, while the LCFS Program and Scoping Plan have shown their potential for both on-road and off-road sources.

With all of that said, WSPA respectfully requests that the Board direct staff to reconsider our comments and incorporate low-NOx engine technologies and lower carbon fuels in this Mobile Source Strategy in the 2021 Mobile Source SIP effort as well as related rulemakings.

Thanks.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Ryan Kenny, you may unmute and begin.

RYAN KENNY: Yes. Hi. Good morning, Chair Randolph, members of the Board. My name is Ryan Kenny Clean Energy. Our company is the largest provider of renewable natural gas transportation fuel in the country.

And I'd like to just comment on this update version of the Mobile Source Strategy. We don't think it meets the direction that was given to the Board -- by the
Board to staff last December, which includes the expansion of the strategy on near-term efforts focused on meeting the SIP targets and also providing benefits to disadvantaged communities.

This Mobile Source Strategy focuses on long-term programs and long-term goals. And as mentioned previously, it does not really focus on 2023 attainment. It's mostly on 2031 and mostly even further on 2037 attainment. The Mobile Source Strategy per SB 44 requires a comprehensive strategy for the deployment of medium- and heavy-duty vehicles, and that is not covered much in here on -- for the near term. And also the Executive Order, which is used as justification for the Mobile Source Strategy in part requires electrification in the heavy-duty space by 2045 where feasible. And where feasible is not -- there's no safety net in the Mobile Source Strategy should heavy-duty electrification not be met by even 2045.

I also want to mention too that the Mobile Source Strategy relies heavily on federal involvement and also mentions the lack of time to really meet 2023 attainment. However, we have been talking about this since before the 2016 Mobile Source Strategy. And there has been plenty of time to meet those goal for 2023. And now we're looking down the barrel of 2031.
The Mobile Source Strategy also does not include what was in the 2016 Mobile Source Strategy, which was 900,000 low-NOx trucks to be deployed by 2030. That has been taken out. So the Mobile Source Strategy as it is before you does not include the cleanest engine available today and the cleanest fuel. Renewable natural gas is up to carbon negative and it's completely missing in the proposed measures in the Mobile Source Strategy.

Slide 13 of your presentation says it all. It mentions heavy-duty ZEV penetration will not really start until 2031. And again, here we are in 2021, 10 years before that, without any near-term emission reductions from heavy-duty ZEVs. We ask to be included in the regulatory programs, especially the State Strategy for the SIP and Advanced Clean Fleets to complement those programs and get near-term emission reductions today.

Thank you for considering my comments.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Bill Magavern, I have activated your microphone.

You can unmute and begin.

BILL MAGAVERN: Thank you. Good morning. Big Magavern with the Coalition for Clean Air. We supported SB 44 in the Legislature and we've been actively involved in the Mobile Source Strategy process. And there are so many important measures included in it that we expect to
be supporting in the next few years. And I'm definitely encouraged to see the addition of more robust measures to reduce vehicle miles traveled in this version of the strategy.

But despite everything that's in here, it's clear that we need to do more. And we need to do more at the federal, State, regional, and local levels to reduce pollution from mobile sources. We need only look at the situation right now at our major ports to see the impacts that transport is having on our communities, where we have ships backed up off the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, burning their fuel at anchor, and then putting the goods onto trucks, which are burning mostly diesel fuel. And we know that the impacts of these emissions are not borne proportionately, but have a disproportionate impact on low-income communities of color like those around the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

So there is a pressing need to do more. And we're not asking you to delay or change this Mobile Source Strategy, but this discussion is a good opportunity to give some direction on additional items that should go into the State Implementation Plan.

As we discussed at last month's Board hearing, and as Will Barrett said just a few moments ago, the best way, the way to get the most additional emission
reductions from mobile sources is to have a useful life strategy for on-road heavy-duty trucks, that they be retired from California roads after the expiration of the useful life, which is defined in law as 800,000 miles, no greater than 18 years and no fewer than 13 years.

That measure will do a lot to help us get closer to actually delivering healthy air, especially in the South Coast and San Joaquin air districts, which need it the most.

Also, when it comes to light-duty, we think that the Advanced Clean Cars II measure could ramp up more quickly, that we need to get more ZEVs in the 2026 to 2030 period. And secondly with light-duty, we should have a fleet strategy. In addition the Clean Miles Standard, there are other fleets which could be required to ramp up their purchases of light-duty zero-emission vehicles.

So we commend those items to you and thank you for listening.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Next will be Ryan Mack. After Ryan, we will have Tyler Harris, Tom Jordan, and Jon Costantino.

Ryan, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

RYAN MACK: Hello, members of the Board. My name is Ryan Mack. I'm a proud graduate of the California
Maritime Academy and currently run a maritime think tank. I preside in the Long Beach area and have witnessed firsthand the backlog of ocean-going vessels building up off our cost. Diesel engines, especially marine engines, are least efficient at idle. These ocean-going vessels often have two or three auxiliary power units and when adrift are required to be running one mine engine due to Coast Guard coastwise and safety regulations.

According to the ARB emissions impact of recent congestion at California's ports published on June 23rd, to 2021 rated vessel peak NOx generation for February 2021 at over 10 tons per day. This report cited a maximum of 40 vessels per day. We are now nearing triple that number.

Based on data just presented, CARB regulations reduce emissions by 63 tons of NOx per day with 40 percent of that coming from new regulations. Mathematically, that works out to 25.2 tons of NOx per day with new regulations. I fear that these vessels at anchorage will completely negate the positive benefits outlined in the Ocean-Going Vessels at Berth Regulation as well as the Commercial Harbor Craft Regulations.

After reading both the CHC and OGV proposed regulations, it's clear that more work needs to be done to
understand the needs of the maritime industry. The ARB needs to work with California maritime companies to understand the unique nature of marine transportation and develop new technologies that are truly feasible.

The CHC regulations cite the Cal Maritime Tier 4 Feasibility Study. However, the study clearly states that most vessels cannot be upgraded to Tier 4. Despite this, the CHC Regulations will regulate California-based maritime companies out of business.

I agree that nitrous oxide, sulfur oxide, and particulate matter needs to be reduced, but I fear that this regulation will drive marine innovation out of California.

If we want to move ocean-going vessels off our coast, then we need to take a series look at short sea shipping. This method of transportation can reduce emissions by up to 90 percent when compared to diesel trucks and requires no new technologies to implement. The cargo volumes exist for this method of transportation to be feasible, but shippers and freight forwarders must be incentivized or mandated to use this method. This is a proven concept and works on the east coast as well as in Europe.

I highly encourage the ARB to take a serious look at short sea shipping, as I believe it is the key to
solving our supply chain crisis, as well as significantly reducing diesel emissions throughout the state.

Thank you for your time and consideration. If this is something that ARB would like to hear more about, please feel free to contact me. Thank you so much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Tyler Harris, you may unmute and begin.

TYLER HARRIS: Thank you. Can you hear me?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can.

TYLER HARRIS: Okay. Chair Randolph and members of the Board, thank you for the opportunity to comment. My name is Tyler Harris and I am a supervising air quality engineer with Ventura County Air Pollution Control District. Our Air Pollution Control Officer, Dr. Laki Tisopulos submitted written comments on this item.

I want to commented CARB for preparing a comprehensive and far-reaching strategy for reducing air pollution from mobile sources. Ventura County is a serious non-attainment area for the federal 70 ppb ozone standard and is a non-attainment area for the California ozone standard.

Emission reductions from mobile sources are absolutely necessary for Ventura County to achieve attainment of these health-based standards. A large and growing portion of our ozone precursor emissions in the
Ventura County inventory is from ocean-going vessels, such as container ships, car carriers, and other large cargo vessels that transit the near-shore waters off the Santa Barbara channel and surrounding area.

The Mobile Source Strategy under consideration today addresses ocean-going vessels, but the focus is on advanced technology engines, which are expected to begin visiting California ports in 2030 or later. Since Ventura County's statutory deadline for attaining the federal ozone standard is in 2027, with need emission reductions from ocean-going vessels sooner.

In our written comments, Ventura County APCD proposes CARB develop regulations limiting the speed of ocean-going vessels in California's coastal waters to 10 knots. Such regulations could reduce ozone precursor emissions and particular nitrogen oxides by approximately 6.5 tons per day. These emission reductions require no new technology and will happen immediately on the effective date of speed restrictions.

We believe a speed limit of 10 knots for ocean-going vessels should be considered a reasonably available control measure under federal Clean Air Act once it is technically feasible (inaudible) will likely advance the attainment date of Ventura County for the federal ozone standard by at least one year.
A reasonably available control measure must be adopted under California's federal Clean Air Act responsibilities. It is also clear that reducing the speed of ocean-going vessels is the only (inaudible) method for obtaining near-term emission reductions in the source category.

Thank you for your consideration.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Tom Jordan, I have activated your microphone.

You may unmute and begin.

TOM JORDAN: Good morning, Chair Randolph and members of the Board I am Tom Jordan, Senior Policy Advisor with the San Joaquin Valley Air District.

Thank you -- thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy. It is our understanding that this document will help guide CARB's update to its State SIP Strategy that will be adopted next year. So the opportunity to review and comment on this (inaudible) has been (inaudible).

The San Joaquin Valley has significant air quality challenges and we need significant ongoing reductions from all categories in order to meet federal ozone --

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Mr. Jordan, can you hold on for one moment, we're having a bit of a technical issue. Hang
on for one second.

TOM JORDAN: Thank you. I was having difficult
on my end as well.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. We have fixed the
problem, Mr. Jordan. Please go ahead.

TOM JORDAN: All right. Thank you, Madam Chair.

So, the San Joaquin Valley, as you guys are all
aware, faces significant air quality challenges and we
need significant emission reductions from all categories
in order to meet federal ozone and PM2.5 standards.

Mobile source emissions contribute the majority
of the NOx emissions in the valleys, so the Mobile Source
Strategy is critical to our success. This is particularly
true when you look at goods movement. And the valley is
the main north/south corridor in the state. I-5 and
Highway 99 not only serve as a farm-to-market route for
valley goods, but we also see significant pass-through
from heavy-duty trucks.

Health studies have shown that the detrimental
health impacts that mobile sources and diesel PM has on
residents living near these goods movement corridors and
given the number of disadvantaged communities in the
valley that are clustered along these routes, it is
vitaly important that we make progress on reducing
emissions from those sources.
We commented on the earlier drafts of the mobile Source Strategy and we appreciate that the CARB staff has expanded the discussion on the need for near-term emission reductions for areas like the San Joaquin Valley and South Coast. However, I do have a couple of observations for the documents before you today.

First of all, we do realize that the valley -- the valley's need for near-term emission reductions in the 24-25 time frame, as well as South Coast's near-term reductions are a significant challenge, but we think it's a challenge that can be met.

As outlined in your staff's analysis, even with the Governor's Executive Order and aggressive efforts to deploy zero-emission heavy-duty trucks, internal combustion heavy-duty equipment will be part of the fleet for decades to come. With that in mind, CARB should include a focus in the Mobile Source Strategy and resources to ensure that these legacy internal combustion trucks utilize the cleanest technologies possible.

Additionally, the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy relies heavily on -- for near-term reductions on the Heavy-Duty Truck Inspection and Maintenance Program that has been under development.

In the valley, 11 out of 11 and a half tons that we are going to get from mobile source reductions in the
near term come from this one measure alone. Given that,
we think it's vitally important that we all understand how
those reductions will be achieved by the I&M Program, and
that we continue to monitor the Program to ensure that
it's meeting the goals necessary to actually achieve those
near-term reductions.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on
the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy and we look forward to
continue working with CARB staff on the development of the
upcoming State Mobile SIP Strategy.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Next, we have --

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Board Clerk.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Katie, I'm going to go ahead and
give folks the call to raise their hands, cause we're
going to close the queue in about five minutes. So if you
want to comment on this item, please make sure that you
have your hand raised.

Thanks. Bye.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thanks.

So we -- next will be Jon Costantino. After Jon
will be David Rothbart, Brent Newell, and Ben Granholm.

So Jon, I have activated your microphone. You
can unmute and begin.

JON COSTANTINO: Thanks, Katie.

Chair Randolph and members of the Board, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. There's a lot of really important items in this Mobile Source Strategy, including off-road and light-duty. My comments are directly related to near-term heavy-duty reductions that are achievable and being left off the table.

I have to respectfully disagree with staff that this Mobile Source Strategy builds upon the 2016 strategy. That strategy included 900,000 low-NOx trucks to deal with that big gray block in the middle of slide 13 that was referenced earlier. And that whole strategy went off the table. And as was mentioned before, it's a technology that's available today and the Omnibus Rule is hopeful that diesel gets to where natural gas, renewable natural gas, low carbon fuel is today.

The presentation showed that there is a whole -- there's a goal of 800,000 ZEV heavy-duty trucks by 2045. The previous plan had 900,000 low NOx by 2030. So I think the ask here is that renewable fuels, low carbon fuels, existing low-NOx technology be added into this Mobile Source Strategy, because as was stated, this will go -- this plan will go into the SIP, will go into the Scoping Plan, will be used for years to come. And if it's -- if
this cleanest technology is not even mentioned or -- as an acceptable alternative, then it's an opportunity lost.

And I'll sort of wrap up with the way air pollution control has historically worked is you go for the best -- best available control technology, which in this case is zero-emission heavy-duty. Well, when that's not available, you don't default to the status quo, which is diesel. You go to the next best thing.

So in stationary source world, you go best available control, then the very next thing, and then the very next thing. And this Mobile Source Strategy seems to say we're going for the home run, and if we don't get it, we're going to stick with the status quo of diesel.

So I think you need the interim measure of renewable natural gas low NOx heavy-duty to help as a backstop to both near-term and as the combustion fleet ages over the years.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

David Rothbart, you may unmute and begin.

DAVID ROTHBART: Thank you. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and Board members. I'm David Rothbart and I'm representing the California Association of Sanitation Agencies, or CASA. CASA members are public, local agencies responsible for providing wastewater treatment...
for over 90 percent of the sewer population across California. The wastewater treatment process produces a non-fossil fuel biogas that can be used as a low carbon fuel that also removes diesel trucks from the road immediately. I want to emphasize immediately.

In this light, CASA is concerned that SB 1383's efforts to reduce methane emissions from landfills will be unsuccessful without the ability to use biogas in vehicles. Specifically, this is related to California's New Source Review requirements CalRecycle had planned on food waste being processed at compost facilities. These requirements -- new Source Review requirements will limit that ability. Fortunately, waste water treatment plants have existing digestion capacity to take all this food waste, so we could achieve the methane reductions sought after by SB 1383.

Unfortunately, these same NSR requirements are going to limit how much biogas can be used at a stationary source. So the upshot is to be successful SB 1383, we need a home for this low carbon biogas to be used in vehicle fuels. So I really encourage CARB to work with CalRecycle and the air districts to find a way to have low carbon fuels used in vehicles.

The other issue that our members have specifically in South Coast and other extreme
non-attainment areas, like South Coast had expressed, is the Mobile Source Strategy does not have enough reductions included in it. It only proposes 5.7 tons per day reductions by 2023. South Coast needs over a hundred tons per day reductions.

That's something, if we do not achieve attainment, I want to emphasize, that there will be penalties. There will be withholding of highway funding. And for my employer, the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts, we've calculated the penalty upon our facilities would be over $1 million per year until we achieve attainment.

It makes a lot of sense to find ways to get to attainment as quickly as possible. If we only look at electrifying mobile sources, we're actually foregoing emission reductions we need now in the communities that need it right now. So I really encourage you to work with all the entities, looking at all these regulations and find a way to get emission reductions as quickly as possible.

And we're not opposed to electrification, but let's look at all the tools in the toolbox to get to clean air as quickly as possible.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Brent Newell, you may unmute and begin.

BRENT NEWELL: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and
members of the Board. My name is Brent Newell and I'm an
attorney with Public Justice. Thank you for the
opportunity to comment today on the 2020 Mobile Source
Strategy.

I have three points to share. First, yesterday,
several organizations filed a petition for rulemaking to
amend the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to remove all fuels
derived from factory farm gas from the Low Carbon Fuel
Standard. Factory farm gas is what the industry has
branded manure to energy or biogas. The problem with the
Low Carbon Fuel Standard and factory farm gas is that CARB
has inflated the greenhouse gas reductions associated with
that by excluding all the upstream and downstream
emissions with the production of methane at dairy and hog
operations. This creates the illusion that factory farm
gas achieves negative emissions reductions.

CARB is also allowing reductions that would have
happened any way to account for the generation of LCF
credits. This is because there are other financial
mechanisms funding factory farm gas, including the Dairy
Digester Research and Development Program and the Aliso
Canyon methane settlement agreement. These
non-additional, illusory reductions should not count in
any pollution trading scheme. And factory farm gas operations pollute San Joaquin Valley communities while producers of transportation fuels are allowed to emit excess greenhouse gas emissions by using these inflated and illusory factory farm gas LCFS credits.

In the alternative, the petition asks for CARB to amend the LCFS to define the pathway for factory farm gas and mandate the exclusion of non-additional credits. So what does this have to do with the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy. My following second and third points answer this question.

First, CARB needs to revise the greenhouse gas inventory for emissions from fuels to the extent they rely on the negative emissions that CARB incorrectly ascribes to factory farm gas. A helpful illustration of this problem are Tables 19 and 20, and especially figure 56, which is located on page 201 of the draft strategy.

Figure 56 shows how the inventory for natural gas as a fuel is assumed negative until 2033, when factory farm gas can no longer be used to generate LCFS credits.

My third point, for the reasons stated in the petition, CARB should further prioritize zero-emission transportation sources and not authorize factory farm gas as a fuel source for electric vehicles or for gas-powered heavy-duty trucks.
Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Ben Granholm, you may unmute and begin.

BEN GRANHOLM: Well, good afternoon, Chair Randolph and board. My name is Ben Granholm on behalf of the Western Propane Gas Association. Thank you for the opportunity to comment today.

WPGA would like to align ourselves with comments made by a number of previous speakers working to clean California's air and help the state meet its greenhouse gas emission goals and NOx reduction goals. WPGA, along with, you know, many others are strong supporters of clean energy. And we appreciate the time and effort that the Board and staff have dedicated to the Mobile Source Strategy.

Unfortunately, we respectfully believe that the proposed strategy is inherently flawed, as much of it focuses on solely moving to zero emission or electric. When data shows that low-NOx technologies and renewable fuels can provide equal to or, in some cases, even greater emissions reductions at a lower more efficient cost to fleet owners.

WPGA advocates for supporting all low carbon solutions, based on the full fuel cycle to address environmental challenges, specifically propane, which
provides reliability, affordability, stability, and resiliency, which are all key when looking to transition California's transportation sector to cleaner fuels.

We believe that low-NOx technologies in the on- and off-road sector using renewable fuels must be a vital piece of any strategy to reduce emissions in the transportation sector. As you've heard from us before, both during public comment and in meetings with staff, renewable propane's carbon intensity is on par with that of electric and provides vital reliability and resiliency for goods movement.

Renewable propane is a drop-in solution, meaning there is no added infrastructure costs for fleets transitioning from conventional to renewable, which will result in greater immediate emission reductions.

WPGA would respectfully urge the board to rethink the path CARB is currently taking toward emissions reductions and include low-NOx and renewable fuels as a vital strategy in the upcoming forklift rule, and all strategies regulating the on- and off-road sectors.

We appreciate your work and look forward to continuing that work as the State strives to reduce greenhouse emissions through comprehensive green energy solutions.

Thank you.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next three speakers will be Nicole Cheng, Paul Cort, and Shayda Azamian.

Nicole, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute and begin.

NICOLE CHENG: Hello. Thank you to the Board for this opportunity to comment and for the staff's work on the Mobile Source Strategy.

I wanted to echo the need to approve for the Mobile Source Strategy, mainly because we believe it provides much needed guidance to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and provides leadership in future transportation decisions.

I also want to echo the comments from Clean Air Coalition and American Lung Association around the importance of vehicle miles traveled reduction strategies. As it states in the document and the multiple CARB staff reports, emission reductions for the transportation sector can not be met without reduction from -- without reduction of vehicle miles traveled.

And since we touched on the State Implementation Plan, we highly urge that the approval of the Mobile Source Strategy will mean that there are more VMT reduction strategies in the State Implementation Plan and other CARB regulatory plans.
Thank you so much again.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Paul Cort, you may unmute and begin.

PAUL CORT: Good afternoon. My name is Paul Cort. I'm the Director of the Right to Zero Campaign at Earthjustice. I am here today with my colleagues to support approval of the Mobile Source Strategy and to ask you again to tell staff that the upcoming fleets and cars rules must match the strategy.

Beyond the simple fact that the Mobile Source Strategy is not, in fact, a strategy if CARB does not actually follow it, I want to offer three reasons why ensuring CARB's regulations match the Mobile Source Strategy is important.

The first reason is that we can. EU countries are showing us today that higher sales targets of zero-emission vehicles are achievable. So committing to the Mobile Source Strategy is a way for California to reclaim its leadership in this space.

Second, being clear that CARB is committed to the actual Mobile Source Strategy is key to its success. At this point, the biggest challenges to transitioning away from combustion to a zero-emission future are more about investment than technology, and the key to unlocking that investment is certainty.
If you are a facility manager looking for headquarters approval to install depot chargers or an EVSE company looking for investors, the worst thing CARB could do is approve a Mobile Source Strategy and then immediately abandon it by proposing regulations that do not match it. It undermines certainty and confidence in the future.

If you believe we need complementary policies and investments for strong zero-emission mandates to succeed, you should ask yourself whether we are more likely to see those policies and investments if CARB signals that it is not really committed to implementing its adopted strategy.

Finally, the rules outlined in the Mobile Source Strategy are not just necessary for California, they are necessary for other states as well. Many of our 177 partners have their own statutory obligations to clean the air and meet greenhouse reduction targets.

The math of what is necessary in California is consistent across most of these states. Strong California standards that match the Mobile Source Strategy are the only realistic path for them to succeed as well.

It is up to California to lead and to move the market to make it possible for everyone. Please tell staff that the upcoming proposed fleet and cars rules must do what is necessary to clean the air, meet our greenhouse
gas commitments by matching the assumptions of the Mobile Source Strategy.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be --

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Board Clerk.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yep.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: I just want to remind folks that this your last chance to raise hand to go into the queue.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Okay. Thanks. So the witness list is now cutoff.

So Shayda Azamian will be our next speaker.

After Shayda will be Alison Torres, Mariela Ruacho, and Stephen Jepsen.

Shayda, you may unmute and begin.

SHAYDA AZAMIAN: Thank you. My name is Shayda Azamian with Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Mobile Source Strategy.

I'd first like to further comments made by Brent at Public Justice and speak on the role of dairy biogas and strategy in the recent petition and letter that was submitted to CARB. We do have serious concerns about the proposed strategy's reliance on dairy-produced fuels. The strategy elevates a variety of tactics to reduce mobile
source emissions in disadvantaged communities.

However, it fails to address the impact of dairies especially on disadvantaged communities. The strategy includes an increased reliance and production of dairy-produced fuels. Dairy digesters are not a clean technology for reducing short-lived climate pollutants and, in fact, they incentivize significant methane emissions and pollution. Dairies, especially those of scale, required to even generate dairy-produced fuels crowd thousands, sometimes more than 10,000 animals in a single facility. This concentration of livestock has a massive and demonstrated impact on nearby residents ranging from polluted air, water unfit for human consumption, and odor and flies so potent that residents often cannot leave their homes.

These communities are the same communities the proposed strategy claims to protect in the name of environmental justice. By expanding the use of dairy-produced fuels, the proposed strategy would undermine its own stated goals by entrenching polluting technology and agricultural practices in environmental justice communities.

In fact, this proposal would likely result in an increase in pollution burden and greenhouse gas emissions by incentivizing the expansion of these dairies in order
to generate manure and methane for profit, as we are currently seeing dairies in Merced County.

The strategy's reliance on dairy-produced fuels is premised upon the carbon intensity analysis as part of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard. We have raised elsewhere many times that this analysis fails to account for the full lifecycle of the fuels, including the emissions from the cattle themselves and the handling of digesters.

As such, the substantially negative carbon intensity reported through the LCFS analysis inaccurately inflates the climate benefits for dairy-produced fuels and hides substantial ongoing greenhouse gas emissions.

For these reasons, and as you can see in the petitioner and letter we were sent listed in with partners, we urge CARB to exclude dairy-produced fuels from the Mobile Source Strategy.

Moving on to an additional topic within the strategy, we appreciate CARB's recognition of the lethal impacts of trucks in disadvantaged communities and agree with commenters today pushing for a feasibly strong Advanced Clean Fleets Rule. However, we continue to see rules framing natural gas, biofuels, and other dirty tech -- dirty fuels that still emit dangerous levels of pollution as near zero-emission technologies. And the Mobile Source Strategy underpins this continued branding
of natural gas.

We urge CARB to discontinue branding natural gas and biofuels as near zero, especially in its upcoming rules and in the Mobile Source Strategy.

Thank you for the time to comment and I urge CARB to include the actions that I and EJ partners have just described to direct intentional benefits and reparations to impacted communities.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

ALISON TORRES:  Good afternoon, Madam Chair and Board members. My name is Alison Torres with Eastern Municipal Water District. EMWD is a water, wastewater, and recycled water agency located in western Riverside County with a 555 square mile service area serving more than 827,000 people. Our four wastewater treatment plants currently treat a combined total of approximately 46 million gallons per day.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment here today on the Mobile Source Strategy. The implementation of the concepts in the 2020 Mobile Source Strategy will heavily impact our agency as and essential public service provider. A reliable, available, and resilient equipment options are extremely important to our agency, as an essential public service, especially as our state more --
moves towards electrification in numerous areas.

We support California's climate goals as well as strategies to meet near-term attainment with the criteria pollutant standards. We also support ZEV technologies where feasible, but we have not seen these technologies commercially available for our specialty heavy-duty equipment. It is critical that essential public services maintain the ability to obtain equipment essential to provide water and wastewater services. Our facilities collect and treat waste water.

A natural by-product of our wastewater treatment process is wastewater biogas, which is a non-fossil, renewable, low carbon transportation fuel and must go somewhere. Beneficial use as a low carbon non-fossil fuel is a technology available today and should be included in the State Strategy.

We urge CARB to include these near zero-emission strategies in the Mobile Source Strategy to provide pathways to near-term reductions and attainment goals, and ensure technol - technologically feasible options that provide resilience to public services.

I appreciate the consideration of our comments, and as a member of the both CASA and SCAP, EMWD strongly supports the comments made here today by those representatives.
Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Mariela Ruacho, I have activated your mic, you can unmute yourself and begin.

MARIELA RUACHO: Hi. Can you hear me?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can.

MARIELA RUACHO: Perfect. Hi. Chair and Board members. I am Mariela Ruacho from the American Lung Association. Thank you for the opportunity to comment today. California continues to have unhealthy air quality. In fact, the Lung Association's State of the Air report found that California is home to seven of the 10 most ozone-polluted cities in the United States, and six of the 10 most impacted by particle pollution. Some of the locations are Los Angeles, Fresno, Bakersfield, and the Bay Area to name a few.

We know that there are inequities when it comes to the burden of unhealthy air for many of our most vulnerable residents. Low-income communities, Black and Brown communities face increased health impacts. We support the staff's work and appreciate the effort that has gone into the Mobile Source Strategy. We view today's hearing as an opportunity to move on to the State Implementation Plan, the Scoping Plan, and associated measures. I'd like to make two quick points for your
consideration related to ongoing rules on zero-emission vehicles.

We appreciate staff continuing to develop the Advance clean cars 2 Rule to achieve a hundred percent ZEV sales by 2035. We note that the proposals shown in the workshops to date rely on much lower sales requirements in earlier years for the -- of the program, when compared to the Mobile Source Strategy modeling. We believe CARB should develop ZEV regulations consistent with the Mobile Source Strategy with higher levels of ZEV sales in earlier years to ensure program success.

We also noted that -- we also note that the ZEV assumptions for heavy-duty -- for the heavy-duty sector are more ambitious in the Mobile Source Strategy than the staff proposes for the Advanced Clean Fleets Rules. Again, we call on the Board to set stands that are at least or as ambitious as the sales projections in the Mobile Source Strategy to maximize health benefits and communities most impacted by pollution.

In closing, we thank the staff and Board members for completing this Mobile Source Strategy process today and moving on to the measures that will clean air for all of us.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Our next speaker will be Stephen Jepsen. After Stephen will be David Reichmuth, Sean Edgar, Teresa Bui.

Stephen, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute and begin.

STEPHEN JEPSEN: Hello. This is Steve Jepsen the Executive Director for the Southern California Alliance of Publicly Owned Treatment Works, or SCAP. We represent over 80 public water, wastewater, recycled water agencies in Southern California. Wastewater treatment plants generate a non-fossil biogas as part of the process of cleaning the public's wastewater to protect public health and the environment.

This wastewater-derived, non-fossil biogas is currently used in a few ways, including generating on-site heat and power for the treatment plant and as a low carbon truck and vehicle fuel, which has 90 percent less NOx than diesel fuel.

State greenhouse gas reduction policies, such as SB 1383, will divert food waste away from landfills to existing digesters at wastewater treatment plants in order to reduce methane discharges to the environment.

These plants are located in all types of communities. This will significantly increase the amount of waste-derived, non-fossil biogas generated. Using this low carbon renewable fuel source to power our essential
public service, maintenance, and emergency equipment will expedite the transition from diesel-powered trucks.

The wastewater derived renewable gas engines and equipment we need to maintain wastewater systems are very specialized, but they are currently available and in some cases already in use with renewable natural gas engines, whereas zero-emission equipment are not available for our specialized needs, and based on communication with equipment suppliers not feasible with current technologies.

We are not opposed to zero-emission light-duty vehicles and many of our agencies already have them in their fleets. To achieve clean air goals and be consistent with federal Clean Air Act requirements, we need to use all the low-emission technologies available, especially in non-attainment air districts.

In summary, the wastewater sector has a non-fossil renewable fuel source derived from society's waste that cannot be turned off. Engines and our specialty equipment that can use this fuel already exist. Embracing this non-fossil renewable fuel will expedite getting diesel trucks off the road, allow the wastewater sector to continue our mission of protecting public health and be consistent with Federal Clean Air Act requirements.

We ask that CARB policies include the wastewater
sector's non-fossil, wastewater derived, renewable natural
gas fueled vehicles and equipment as part of a clean air
solution.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment today
and we support previous comments by David Rothbart for
CASA and Alison Torres for Eastern Municipal Water
District.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

David Reichmuth, you may unmute and begin.

DR. DAVID REICHMUTH: Hi. My name is David
Reichmuth and I am speaking on behalf of the Union of
Concerned Scientists. First, I'd like to thank staff for
all their work on the Mobile Source Strategy and urge the
Board to adopt the strategy. But I have to highlight the
disconnect between the Mobile Source Strategy and some of
the regulations that are under development, specifically
the electrification of on-road vehicles in the Strategy is
not being reflected in regulations under development.

For example, there's a tremendous disconnect
between the Mobile Source Strategy, which shows 40 percent
ZEVs and PHEVs by -- sorry plug-in electric vehicles by
2025. Yet, the light-duty ZEV target in ACC II is now
below 25 percent for model year 2026. The Mobile Source
Strategy also hits 70 percent ZEVs by 2030, while the ACC
II regulation right now doesn't hit 50 percent until 2030.
So I mean the Mobile Source Strategy is clear that even an aggressive ZEV Program alone is insufficient to meet the State's goals, so there's really no room for a weak ACC II or ZEV regulation.

So the Board needs to ask why sales targets consistent with the Mobile Source Strategy are not included the ZEV rule, not even as alternative scenarios. We shouldn't waste the effort that has been put into the Mobile Source Strategy and we can't treat it as merely aspirational. It actually needs to be used to guide ARB's work. The science is clear that we need to act now and ARB's regulations need to be consistent with the Mobile Source Strategy.

Finally, the Mobile Source Strategy and the ACC II analysis should assess cumulative emissions not just annual rates or single-year targets like a hundred percent light-duty vehicle electrification by 2035. This is especially true for GHG emissions, since cumulative GHG emissions are the driver for climate change.

I'd like to thank you for your attention to this effort and again would like to urge the Board to adopt the Mobile Source Strategy.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Sean Edgar. Sean,
please unmute yourself and begin your comment.

SEAN EDGAR: Hi. Good afternoon. Can you hear me?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can.

SEAN EDGAR: Great. Thank you. This is Sean Edgar. I'm the Director of Clean Fleets based here in Sacramento. I've been working on mobile source strategies since the first document was developed. I've taken my red pencil to this version and I would give a solid D minus, based on the staff discussion that the purpose of this document was to describe meeting attainment.

And really all you need to know is what you heard from the major air districts in the state. Both South Coast and San Joaquin laid out their objections to the document that's proposed, in that it does not help them meet attainment. You heard San Joaquin talk about the need for clean low-NOx vehicles, the purchase of which are currently stalled based on the bad market signals that CARB has put out.

You heard South Coast tell you that the vehicle -- the proposed plan does not meet Senate Bill 44. It doesn't help them get to attainment and that it really removes the 2016 commitment that the Board had to clean low-NOx vehicles.

So similar to other speakers, I also observed
that near-term emissions reductions are essentially left off the table, especially for the waste industry. We're about 50 percent of the collection fleet, especially in the urban areas have already migrated away from diesel. CARB and the air districts have no better friend for the last 20 years than the waste industry.

This plan unfortunately stalls progress and really provides no linkage to 1383, as you've heard by others. You heard from the wastewater industry, a provider of essential public service, of their objections. And I will add -- echo their remarks on behalf of the solid waste industry. We know that the organics diversion mandates are serious. We know that family-operated companies are going into a bank, and borrowing, and bonding money to make local carbon-negative projects, making their own fuel, putting it back in the collection vehicles. You heard compelling testimony from Mr. Wade and Ms. Levin on the last item, from Mr. Rothbart on this item. And unfortunately, the plan as proposed I believe is a solid D minus, and really it's a drop back to diesel plan unfortunately.

So there are three recommendations that I'll ask. First of all, don't ignore the waste industry's contribution and the need for RNG and 1383 contributions in the future. Tell staff to model the RNG benefits and
include a transition plan in the upcoming ACF proposal, the Scoping Plan, and the forthcoming State Implementation Plan documents.

Also, you heard AQMD talk about the need for all-in costs, estimate in terms of what all-in costs are on future programs, and specifically cost effectiveness needs to be part of this discussion going forward.

I don't believe that ZEVs are going to be cost effective in the near future, so this plan needs to have a home for RNG. Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Teresa. After Teresa, will be Mikhail Skvarla, Michael Boccadoro, and Todd Campbell.

Teresa, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

TERESA BUI: Thank you so much. Good afternoon. My name is Teresa Bui with Pacific Environment. We're an environmental non-profit with a consultative status at the International Maritime Organization. Thank you, Ariel, for the great presentation.

We're -- our comments are the -- specific to the marine vessels. The Mobile Source Strategy is focused on long-term goals and it's not ambitious enough. Ships are one of the worst air polluters in California and will
surpass heavy-duty trucks in about a year. And in this area surrounding the San Pedro Bay, OGVs and harbor craft constitutes as one of the top three sources of cancer risk because of the diesel particulate matter.

So what we're asking is for CARB to accelerate the hundred percent zero-emission transition for the off-road marine vessels by setting emission standards and fleet phase-in requirements to reach a hundred percent zero emission for OGVs by 2045.

The LA City Council already is considering a resolution for ship it zero for the OGVs. And just this Tuesday, Amazon, Ikea, and Unilever have committed to moving their products off of fossil fuel ships and purchasing a hundred percent zero-emission ocean shipping by 2040.

And for the commercial harbor craft part, we urge CARB to set all ferries, tugboats, dredges, and barges on an electrification pathway now, and require full electrification by 2035 for all the harbor crafts.

So with that, we're not asking to delay the Mobile Source Strategy, but we are urging you to consider in all of your different tools to set a more ambitious standard.

Thank you so much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
MIKHAEL SKVARLA: Thank you. Mikhael Skvarla with the Gualco Group here on behalf of the California Hydrogen Coalition. I want to thank the Board and staff for this opportunity.

One main overarching issue is infrastructure. With the transition to zero-emission vehicles, infrastructure is going to be the key and most important thing that we can do in the next decade. We appreciate ARB staff and the recent self-sufficiency report. I wanted to highlight that an additional $300 million beyond the AB 8 funds that have been already allocated will bring the light-duty hydrogen sector to self sufficiency. This is an incredibly low cost when compared to other technologies that the State has adopted and supported through their commercialization and think that we should double down while the budget years are good to make sure that these funds are appropriated in the next year with the reauthorization of AB 8.

Additionally, I want to emphasize the positive policy work that the Low Carbon Fuel Standard has -- and the signals that it has sent to this market. The light-duty HRI crediting, hydrogen, refueling, infrastructure crediting, through the LCFS has
tremendously expanded the use of renewable fuels, as well as underlined the investment opportunity there.

We would like to continue to work with staff and the Board to make sure that an additional two and a half percent is extended to the heavy-duty sector in the next year to two years to make sure that we have enough stuff in place for the Advanced Clean Fleets, so that people can make the decision to use hydrogen trucks, buses, and, vehicles in the future.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Michael Boccadoro, you may unmute and begin.

MICHAEL BOCCADORO: Thank you. Michael Boccadoro, Executive Director of Dairy Cares. I wasn't planning to speak on this issue today, but felt compelled after the false narrative offered by Mr. Newell and others about the petition was filed yesterday.

I want CARB to fully recognize what this petition is asking of you. It's asking you to ignore what we heard this morning about the importance of rapidly reducing methane as our best opportunity to counteract global warming and improve air quality. It's asking you to ignore the clear science that reducing methane from livestock is part of the solution to stave off catastrophic impacts. It's asking you to abandon being
the world leader in reducing dairy methane emissions. It's asking you to ignore what the IPCC and UN are recommending. It's asking you to strand $700 million that the State has invested and another $1.3 billion that the industry will be matching the State funding on. It's asking you to abandon the most cost effective and successful climate investment being made by California. It's asking you to abandon market-based approaches that are clearly working.

Understand, without these markets, these projects cannot and will not be implemented. Massive consolidation and leakage will occur, and global livestock methane emissions will increase as dairy production simply shifts to other regions of the country and world where per unit production of emissions is much higher with every gallon of milk produced. And often in developing countries, this involves deforestation to make room for increased livestock and feed production.

They're asking you to abandon the partnerships that Mr. Sperling alluded to, a partnership with the Biden administration, which is clearly working on market-based incentives to climate-smart dairy and climate-smart agriculture.

They're asking you to ignore what Chair Randolph referred to this morning, strong science and data to
inform our policies. The data and science are clear and support the development of digesters as a leading way to reduce methane. We need to move beyond polarizing petitions, rhetoric, and ideology and follow the science-seeking solutions that are technologically, economically, and politically sound and achievable.

Unfortunately, the petition is long on polarizing rhetoric and void of any science, data, legal basis. And finally, as Ms. Levin suggested this morning, it's fully inconsistent with Senate Bill 1383.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will the Todd Campbell. After Todd, our final three speakers are Nicole Rise, Brian Price, and Kevin Hamilton.

Todd, you may unmute yourself and begin.

TODD CAMPBELL: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. Clean Energy -- this is Todd Campbell, Vice President of Public Policy and Regulatory Affairs for Clean Energy.

Clean Energy and our clean tech space partners are committed to a zero-emission future and we are demonstrating our commitment with actual investments in renewable fuels, and hydrogen fueling, and electric charging stations.
That said, when a Mobile Source Strategy emphasizes the health benefits of 2050, the presentation to me starts to lose someone like me who has spent the majority of my career toward protecting public health because we should care equally about how communities are being impacted today.

As a historian, there's a famous saying that if we don't learn from our history, we are bound to repeat it. The zero-emission vehicle light-duty program was initiated in 1990 and market penetration remains in the single digits. So I'm just trying to be a little bit realistic in terms of where we're going in the future.

Whether we want to admit it or not, this proposal relies heavily on technology projections and estimates that have yet to prove themselves in the heavy-duty truck space, the number one source of pollution for NOx in our most vulnerable regions. This state needs a safety net. We, as an industry, are committed to achieving significant emissions reductions today and well into the future for the state's number one source of pollution, heavy-duty trucks. To do so, we must include low-NOx trucks as an option, not remove it from inclusion from prior Mobile Source Strategy plans that once called for 900,000 low-NOx trucks to be deployed.

The Clean Air Act is a statutory mandate to
protect public health. Both the South Coast and the San Joaquin air districts rely heavily upon CARB to deliver life-saving tons of NOx and toxic emissions reductions. The current proposal does not recognize CARB's prior commitment to 2023. Specifically achieving less than 0.1 tons per day from zero-emission drayage and Advanced Clean Fleets rules by 2023 is not acceptable.

This plan certainly does not meet the statutory requirements of SB 44 that requires that the 2016 Mobile Source Strategy be updated to include a comprehensive strategy for the deployment of medium- and heavy-duty vehicles for the purpose of meeting air quality standards and reducing GHG emissions.

Successful attainment of Clean Air Act standards by our districts will require actual State and local coordination and cooperation, not just lip service. We cannot afford to agree to disagree. We certainly should not prioritize long-term goals over near-term commitments. We need to do both to deny the largest threat to air quality and climate change, which is black carbon, otherwise known as diesel.

Please include low NOx as a tool within the Mobile Source Strategy and I thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Nicole Rice, you may unmute yourself and begin.
NICOLE RICE: Thank you. Good afternoon Chair Randolph and members. This is Nicole Rice, the President of the California Natural Gas Vehicle Coalition.

I want to associate myself with the comments that were just made by Tom -- Todd Campbell from Clean Energy, and to emphasize a few points that were made.

So in the presentation we saw this morning and as required under SB 44, it is important to have a comprehensive and inclusive strategy in order to achieve federal attainment and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We cannot accomplish this without including all clean transportation fuels and technologies that are commercially available, which is why we join in the chorus of urging staff and the Board to expressly include low-NOx trucks into the Mobile Source Strategy, as a near-term strategy to achieve these emission reductions in the near term, and as an alternative under the strategy, so that as zero-emission vehicles are currently not available or cannot meet the duty cycle demands of existing vehicles in fleets or are experiencing production delays, that low-NOx trucks would be an alternative and an option to be used.

This will send a clear signal to the market to start investing in cleaner transportation solutions, which is the goal.

And I know there is a prevailing view that
zero-emission truck deployment in the heavy-duty sector is just around the corner, but we are hearing every day in the news and in the field that this is still years off. And, in fact, that there is data to suggest otherwise, we would appreciate hearing that information and seeing that data, because as we talk to OEMs, manufacturers, and fleets daily, we have heard that it could be at least a decade before we see full commercial deployment of zero-emission trucks.

The Governor's Executive Order requires that the transition happen with heavy-duty and medium-duty trucks where feasible. And when you have a situation where you have technology that is not available, that it has delayed production, that cannot replace the duty cycle for existing vehicles, then that is a signal that it is not feasible.

We should not allow the status quo, which is the use of diesel to continue to be an acceptable alternative, when we have cleaner technology available today that can meet the goals. We continue to urge the Board to listen to local air districts and their needs, and once again, to include the use and deployment of low-NOx heavy-duty trucks under the Mobile Source Strategy.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Brandon Price, you may unmute yourself and begin.

MR. PRICE: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. My name is Brandon Price and I am the Director of Environmental Commodities at Maas Energy Works. Maas Energy Works is one of the largest developers of dairy biogas projects in the state of California.

And I'm here really to echo the comments made earlier by Michael Boccadoro of Dairy Cares and the earlier speakers in the first agenda item addressing the Scoping Plan. Really, what we heard this morning is that the main issue we need to be addressing is our methane emissions. And the proposal submitted through the petition yesterday to remove dairy biogas from the LCFS is simply not an answer. It is not -- and will not lead us to the greenhouse gas reductions that we need as a state.

You know, I can talk from experience as working with a number of dairy farmers here in California and across the country that without the LCFS Program, these dairy projects simply will not get built. You know, echoing on Michael's point earlier that without the LCFS, these projects -- nobody will be investigating capital into these projects and methane emission reductions simply won't occur. And the point made in the petition that there is inaccurate calculation of avoided methane emissions through the LCFS is just simply inaccurate. The
petition seems to ignore the fact that these -- that these
dairy farms are actually emitting methane today, which is
a powerful short-lived climate pollutant, and that these
projects that we are actually investing real capital into
is reducing those methane emissions and providing real
impacts for climate change.

And what we need to recognize is that California
is only one aspect of the global -- wider global
emissions. And if California proposes this type of
policy, there will be significant methane leakage as other
states will not adopt similar policies and other dairy
farms across the country will not invest in these types of
projects either.

So we need to be good stewards of sound policy
that actually drives reduction in methane emissions and
not actually incentivizing dairies to continue to emit,
which if the -- if the Board approves this petition, dairy
farmers will not -- you know, will not seek to reduce
methane emissions. They will just continue to
uninhibited.

So I urge the Board to reject this petition and
allow dairy -- and allow dairy farmers to continue the
progress made.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Our final speaker is Kevin Hamilton. Kevin, you may unmute and begin.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Good afternoon. Kevin Hamilton from Central California Asthma Collaborative.

I want to first start out by supporting the petition, but addressing the regulation proposed here today, the strategy.

Light- and heavy-duty OEMs are launching fleets of EVs starting in the 2021 to 2023 period. CARB staff are aware of this, yet still aim for only 25 percent in 2025 new light-duty ZEV sales, even though OEMs have indicated they can meet a higher target. I don't understand why that's happening and that needs to change. We need to move that target up 25 -- 2025 target should be easily approaching 50 percent.

With regard to HD ZEVs, we see a sales target of a hundred percent by 2035, but the pathway there is uncertain in this plan and needs to be developed more fully. And the incentives that might support this need to be clearly described and signal the industry appropriately.

With rare exceptions, we oppose near-zero fuels and fuel technology as they require expensive infrastructure and equipment investment, which will be outdated within 10 to 15 years, especially when ZEV
solutions are readily available for most of these duty cycles.

With regard to methane reduction, methane reduction should first emphasize prevention of its formation. Various supporters of the climate pollutant as a transportation fuel would have you believe that this is inevitable and yet science also provides us with pathways that would markedly reduce its production. Yet, the State continues to pour millions even billions of dollars into end-use solutions, rather than primary prevention.

Our approach to this is prevent the methane from forming in the first place. What's leftover, we have to capture and use. Utilization of that needs to be spread across different industries and technologies and I think we have a lot more work to do there.

The primary one we see as beneficial, certainly here in the dairy industry and what's already proven out in the water world and in the landfill world is recovering those gases and using it to power equipment on the facilities to create electricity to replace diesel engines on the facilities. We're not seeing that happen in the dairy industry and that's a real problem.

So why isn't that happening, and why aren't we investing in that, and why aren't we investing in preventing methane from forming in the first place in
those organic processes? I have no idea, but we need to
move forward with that.

The technology is there to today. Thank you.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Chair, the concludes the list Of commenters.
I'll turn it back to you.
CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. I'm
going to bring this discussion to the board. Senator
Leyva and then Board Member Kracov.

SENATOR LEYVA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good
afternoon, everyone. I want to thank everyone for this
great discussion. I want to thank staff for both
presentations, this presentation and the previous
presentation. We heard staff member Motallebi when she
talked about trucks and saying that they are the single
largest source of GHGs. And when we hear that, I think
that makes us all realize, if we haven't before, that this
is where we can make a significant difference. This is
where we can really move the needle so to speak. And I
think we have, but I think we can do more.

I would like to bring to the attention of the
Board a letter that myself and several colleagues
submitted yesterday. I believe the letter was forwarded
to you this morning. And the letter -- the thrust of the
letter is is that there just must be more done to protect
our communities from trucking pollution. When you read
the letters, you will read that 70 percent of Californians
live and breathe unhealthy air, 70 percent. That is
just -- it's just shocking.

So everything we're doing is working, because I
vacillated between hopefulness and despair in both of
these presentations. There are some things that we are
doing really well. But my God, we have to do more and we
have to do it faster.

When Mr. Balmes talked about public health, this
is absolutely a public health crisis, which we all know.
I also want to thank Board Member De La Torre for the
history -- the brief history he gave us on the oil
industry. They have known. They have known for 40 years
that it is problem and we can't just blame them, because
we have allowed them to continue to pollute. We have to
say no to all of these pollutants. We have to be more
aggressive.

I wore my "Be Bold" shirt today, because I think
we have to be bolder in what we're doing and I know we can
do it. Sometimes there's a saying that I like to refer
to. It's not a lack of how-to, it's a lack of will-to.
We have to have the will to do everything we can to reduce
the truck pollution on our roads.

I appreciate everyone who called in with their
very thoughtful comments as a current sitting legislator,
I just want people to know that I stand ready to do
whatever I can to help us move along this goal of turning
over trucks. We have to get combustion engine trucks off
the road. Even at the rate we're going, in 2045, we will
still have one million combustion engine trucks on the
road. That's bad.

So we have to figure out how we can do this
faster. I am ready to help in any way that I can. I know
everyone on the Board is committed to this. And thank you
to everyone again who called in on public comment.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you, Senator Leyva.
Board Member Kracov.
BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Thank you, Chair and thank
you (inaudible).

CHAIR RANDOLPH: We can't quite hear you.
BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: (Inaudible.)
CHAIR RANDOLPH: You're cutting -- you're cutting
in and out.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Board Member -- Board
Member Kracov, I think if you can try using the same audio
from that you have your video feed in.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Are you still there?
Okay. I think we may need to come back to him.
Dr. Sperling.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Thank you very much.

So I'm going to be a little policy wonk-ish here. I have one tiny idea and one huge idea. So I'll start with the tiny.

One idea that I did not hear from anyone, but I think is a really compelling important one is with aviation, that why don't we bring intrastate aviation into the LCFS. And we've given credit offsets for aviation fuels -- sustainable aviation fuel. But I think that goes way back to the beginning when we didn't really know how to handle aviation, but -- anyway, so that's one idea.

Here's the big idea and this is -- I've been waiting 10 years to say this, and that is that as many people know, the SIP process is fundamentally flawed, but it is federal law, so we have to follow it, but it's fundamentally flawed in the sense that it does not address the actual health impacts on people. It does not address exposure. Basically, what it says is if there's one monitor in one region that's out of compliance, then we call the whole region out of compliance and non-attainment. That's -- you know, it came about because in 1970, they didn't have the sophistication in data or models to do it any differently, but now we do. So I was -- when 617 was passed, I was very excited, because
the principle behind 617 -- AB 617 is to focus on exposure to focus on health impacts and that's the principle it's built on.

So what I'm going to suggest is -- so we have to keep complying with the Clean Air Act and the SIP rules, but at the same time, we can, in a very formal way, focus on where are the health impacts and restructure many of our incentives, regulations, policies to really benefit those who are impacted.

Now, we kind of do that with 617, but, you know, that's just for a certain number of communities, but there's many other people that are impacted by unhealthy air, as we've just heard many times today. So there are -- the staff is already starting to work in that direction a little bit. And I just want to endorse it and actually elevate it to be more formal.

So we do have -- we have some kind of small proposals to accelerate regs that are -- to accelerate the implementation of regs in those impacted communities. That's probably the best example I know, but -- well, we also -- incentive money we direct towards, you know, what we call the 617 communities. But we can restructure some of these regs and these incentives. We can do things. There's a concept geofencing. So let's identify the communities, the neighborhoods that are especially
impacted. And like with trucks, like the Senator was just
talking about, let's make sure those trucks don't go
through those neighborhoods. And we can use either
pricing. We can use technology. There's different ways
of doing that.

So it is -- when 617 was passed, I said this is
revolutionary, but -- and it started the path, but I guess
what I'm saying is let's really go all in on it and do
it -- and do it right, and still comply with, you know,
the Feds. We've got to do what we have to do, but let's
do what's right also.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

I just wanted to check and see if we have Board
Member Kracov back.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: I hope so, Chair. Can you
hear me?

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes, now we can hear you.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Thank you so much, Chair.

And thank you, Dr. Fideldy -- Ms. Fideldy, Dr. Benjamin,
and the team for working so hard and being so thoughtful
about the Mobile Source Strategy documents, and all the
terrific commenters today and in the docket. I'm
traveling, making these comments today, in Redlands in
Riverside County. I probably should have taken the call
from -- or asked to take the call from your home Board Member Riordan, but instead, I'm in a Famous Dave's Barbecue off Lugonia Avenue, so I apologize, Chair, for the bad cell service.

Colleagues, the South Cost Air Basin that I represent on this Board is in extreme non-attainment for ozone smog. This is the worst in the nation. Our District sent in a letter today noting that mobile sources make up more than 80 percent of the smog-forming emissions in our region and that medium- and heavy-duty trucks amount for only six percent of the on-road vehicle population, but 72 percent of the NOx emissions from vehicles.

And just four years ago in the previous Mobile Source Strategy, CARB committed to reducing NOx for mobile sources by 113 tons a day in 2023, and 111 tons a day in 2031 in the South Coast Air Basin alone and our staff determined then that approximately 31,000 heavy-duty model year 2023 and older vehicles would need to be turned over in the South Coast before their end-of-life time.

Colleagues, we are way behind in these commitments. Our own CARB analysis, we saw it in PowerPoint slide 13. If somebody could pull that back up while I'm talking, it would be great. Slide 13. It shows that after accounting for all of CARB and EPA's current
and proposed regulations, by 2031 still over half of the heavy-duty truck fleet will still consist of older diesel vehicles.

This loophole in time between our Truck and Bus Rule at the end of 2022 and our forthcoming Fleet Rule this regulatory gap, this poisonous persistence of diesel trucks means that we likely cannot meet attainment in the South Coast, not in 2023, 2031, or even 2037. This is the worrying fact that we face in the agenda item today, colleagues.

And our Los Angeles ports are doing us no favors at all. A September report from our staff here at CARB found that increased cargo congestion at the ports this year resulted in 14 and a half extra tons a day of smog-causing NOx and now the emissions may even be higher. I read yesterday's article from the Long Beach Post, the fact is our long -- our low-income communities of color in the South Coast are literally choking on goods movement traffic.

CARB is doing so much, working so hard, regulations on ocean-going vessels, ACF, Omnibus, TRUs, and rules next year, I&M, in-use locomotives, harbor craft. The South Coast District also is working hard. We passed a rule to clean up warehouses and we're actively looking now at MOUs and Indirect Source Rules to reduce
freight industries injurious impacts at the ports, and
railways, and neighborhoods throughout our region. And
hopefully, the federal NOx rules for trucks will be in
place soon.

Now, some write to Governor Newsom on the eve of
the Glasgow summit, that we should rollback and, in fact,
cancel all of our labor and environmental regulations. I
sympathize that compliance is difficult, yet that approach
takes us backwards. We need to look ahead to a better
world. And if we can see it through, the fact is that the
goods movement industry, critical to the California
economy will be on, in fact, a stronger more sustainable
foundation for future growth.

So finishing up, let's look forward to a pivot
from the Mobile Source Strategy today to our statewide SIP
Strategy next year in Q1 or Q2, as identified in the last
couple of slides today, pages 27 and 28. Let's get all these
measures in a compliant statewide SIP that truly pencils
out. Let's do the tough work together, colleagues, on the
SIP enforceable and rule-based, and hold ourselves
accountable to close the regulatory gap.

Forgive me in advance, but I'll probably be on my
soap box then too. This is job number one, priority
number one for any South Coast rep to this Board. And we
heard from the other districts today too, Valley, Ventura.
In particular, let's focus on the heavy-duty vehicle useful life regulation for mandatory retirement of old tractor trucks after the SB 1 useful life, and incentive problems to fund this. These measures were identified on slide 22 today and we heard from folks like Bill Magavern about the useful life measure.

We in the South Coast will be counting on your support, colleagues, please, to be bold, as Senator Leyva said, for these measures as part of the upcoming SIP.

As page 140 of the Strategy document today indicates to meet our targets in '21 and '37 require additional reductions through accelerated scrappage of older and high emitting vehicles. We need to get the dirty diesels off the road soon for attainment, for public health.

I imagine we all would like to see ozone attainment in our lifetimes, no? And our Mobile Source Strategy, enforced in the upcoming SIP, is the single critical element. So let's get to work. Let's go for it. And again, I want to thank staff so much for their efforts today.

Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Supervisor Serna.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you, Chair. That's
going to be a difficult set of comments to follow, but I
do appreciate what my colleague, Member Kracov, stated so
eloquently. I also wanted to share an idea. I guess it's
best explained in the form of a question though for staff.
And it really has much to do with the comments that were
made by, I think, a handful of commenters today about the
wastewater treatment connection and the fact that, you
know, there's this opportunity to use biogas for -- if I
understood their argument clearly, to use it for low-NOx
truck fuels or for heavy-duty fuels.

What I didn't hear in our staff presentation nor
did I hear from those speakers, however, was the
possibility or the prospect of actually using biogas for
hydrogen generation and whether or not that should be in
our strategy in terms of the other connection with the
fact that we have legislation that is going to require
diversion of food waste now. So we have -- we have a
feedstock that is going to be much more sustainable in the
future. And it seems to me that the possibility of having
a more robust infrastructure around hydrogen production
and hydrogen fueling for fuel cell vehicles, both light-, and medium-, and heavy-duty would be a missed opportunity
in the context of the Strategy.

And I'm speaking a bit from local experience. I
also serve on a local sanitation district board of
directors here and we're actually having the conversation now. This is not science fiction. This is something that's been done around the state, albeit not -- not -- there aren't a whole lot of examples, but we're having the discussion here in the Sacramento region about how best to use the biogas from our regional facility to actually augment, add to the availability of hydrogen, specifically for fuel cell vehicles.

So I don't know if staff is prepare to respond to that, but I'd like to hear whether or not there's some opportunity to include that in the Strategy.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Mr. Corey, did you want to first say anything?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yeah. I'll take a quick shot at it. So a few points that the Supervisor mentioned. In terms of the efforts on renewable natural gas, no doubt we're going to be in natural gas, both on transportation - we use it today for garbage trucks and other trucks as well - as well as stationary in natural gas in the existing commercial and residential fleet.

What we're trying to do though is ensure that the gas that's generated gets into the pipeline and there's an opportunity -- a progressive opportunity on the stationary side, because the use on transportation will decline over
time, as we transition to electrification.

So that is playing out, but there's a connection here and I'll wrap-up on this point, Supervisor, and that is there's a connection on 1383, basically the diversion of organics from landfills. One of the paths is to direct those organics to wastewater treatment facilities to process there also generating renewable natural gas. And considerable work that's taken place to think about that methane renewable natural gas as an energy carrier, just as you noted, and reforming it at a fuel cell or other sources to generate renewable hydrogen, so for either transportation or stationary applications.

So there's considerable work to do still on the infrastructure side, just on the 1383 example I gave. The view of the opportunities to generate renewable natural gas and the opportunities for its application and role it could potentially play in terms of our needs, which I would say will be growing needs for renewable hydrogen, both on the transportation side and on the stationary side, are well taken.

In fact, both Deputy Executive Officer Sahota and I were just meeting with the CalRecycle yesterday, the Director, about these issues, basically the connections between CARB's work, the Scoping Plan, and 1383, and the work that CalRecycle is doing, basically the integration
between agencies in terms of how do we better handshake these efforts in terms of long game, in terms of where we're going on transportation and the stationary side.

So maybe I'll end on that point.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

Board Member Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Chair. I just want to thank everyone from the staff, to public commenters, to fellow Board members for this amazing report. There's clearly a lot of support for the adoption of the Mobile Source Strategy. It may not be universal, but it's very broad. And I think that's a huge achievement.

So I wanted to point out a few things that I think are real improvements from the last Strategy that we, the Board, saw. And there's a very meaningful analysis and considerations of environmental justice in this -- in this strategy.

It's much more comprehensive and broader than the previous Mobile Source Strategy and it's much more focused on the amount and the impact of pollution on low-income communities of color. And I just wanted to acknowledge that and really represent that this is -- this really represents a lot of movement and change within CARB, I think. And so I think we should all celebrate that and
acknowledge it.

The health analysis I think is much improved. We all know that cancer, respiratory, and heart disease are all exacerbated by pollution and the health disparities are really clear in communities of color. This historical discriminatory rulemaking at really every level of government has not only disadvantaged communities of color, but has cost lives with thousands of premature deaths.

So it's important that we -- that we recognize it and acknowledge that, and I think the report does a good job of it. And as the staff presentation on the IPCC report and the Board comments indicated -- excuse me -- we need to take stronger action and we really need to take it now. The Mobile Source Strategy gives us one of the opportunities to demonstrate our commitments. And I really align with Senator Leyva's comments that we really need to be bold.

So on the concern side, I would like to hear staff's response about the lack of alignment with the ACC and ACF rules. Those I think are coming pretty fast and this gives us this opportunity to really do more. So I wanted to hear your thoughts about that, since I know you pointed out that those comments had come forward.

I also want to endorse the inclusion of a truck...
retirement strategy within the Mobile Source Strategy as Board Member Kracov has very well described. This is a great opportunity. It's something that we can do right now to accelerate reductions in pollution that threaten public health. And again, in California's most vulnerable and pollution-impacted communities.

And we know that the trucking industry is a dominant source of harmful pollution in all of our communities and these health disparities really are emergencies that need to be addressed right away. And if we could adopt this retirement strategy, we really could serve our communities in such an important way.

I think the other thing about trucking is that incentives really need to be focused on low income and independent drivers. These are the ones that have put their life savings into these trucks. It's going to be very difficult for them to make this transition and we need to focus our incentives and our assistance on those -- on those truckers.

Moving to transportation and housing, which I know the report references, it also imposes and often reinforces longstanding racial and economic injustices by placing a disproportionate burden on low-income Californians. It's very true, and there are a variety of opportunities for preventing future land use
incompatibility. It was mentioned in almost every single one of the CERPs, so we know that it's something that folks are aware of and that they want to change.

The reality, however, is that due to discriminatory decision making, environmental justice communities are at the intersection of multiple freeways and adjacent to warehouses and ports all sources of mobile source pollution. So those structures aren't going anywhere any time fast. And so the communities that are there, we want to retain, and we need to reinforce and support them.

So the strategies in the Mobile Source Strategy have to compensate for the historical legacy of decisions, because new land use regulations will not alleviate the health burden on these communities. And so I really think that that's another call for why these strategies have to be bolder. I totally support focusing on land use as well, but it just isn't going to have the impact that we need to have right away.

And lastly, I look forward to the discussion later today and in the future on the Scoping Plan, because I think that the emphasis on Mobile Source Strategy and transportation-oriented strategies really needs to be more prominent in the Scoping Plan. So I look forward to that as well. So those are my comments. Thank you very much.
CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.
So Craig Segall, would you like to address this -- the question of alignment and the -- and ACC II and ACF very briefly?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SEGALL: Sure. What I -- what I'll very briefly say is that I agree. I think there is a lot more that we can do. There -- this will necessarily be a portfolio approach. So there's a question about how much stringency can we get out of those two rule sets? There's also how much can we do with additional sets of rules, including the, I think, really interesting idea that Senator Leyva proposed earlier today, what we can do with incentives, and what we can do, as Board Member Takvorian has observed, on land use, VMT, and other strategies.

So I think we need to press in every front. We'll be doing that over the course of the public process. And I think we need to figure out all of the tools we can bring to bear here, including making those rules as stringent as possible. So I appreciate it.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Chair. And I, too, want to thank a number of people for their discussion today. I want to commend the staff for the revision of
the Mobile Source Strategy to include more about near term emission reductions and the inclusion of an environmental justice chapter.

I want to thank all the thoughtful comments that I heard during the testimony. Even though people are often at odds, I appreciated the degree of thoughtfulness of their comments and I heard the various positions and I'm taking them in.

I want to thanking Professor Sperling for acknowledging the revolutionary nature of AB 617 and the fact that it really was -- is focused on reducing health disparities through reduce -- reduction of exposures not just emissions.

And then Ms. Takvorian as usual laid out the public health benefits of focusing on reducing diesel emissions in our most impacted communities of color, so I won't go back -- I won't got there. She did it so well.

I do want to kind of take a big picture approach following from what Board Member Kracov said. Yes, we have a huge lift to get to our goals with both climate change and air quality. And I appreciate the Mobile Source Strategy being more bold than maybe it was in the past, but I don't think it's bold enough, because the costs of moving forward at the speed we need to move to turnover combustion-powered cars and trucks to ZEVs, you
know, the costs are incredible. And I don't see this Board or this State really making the commitment to the level investment that is going to be needed to get anywhere near these goals. I mean, the number of trucks that have to be turned over in the South Coast and across the state is immense.

And, you know, I agree with Paul Cort, it's really not about the technology. It's about the investment. And I'm just saying as one Board member that we need to do -- we really need to invest more than we have considered.

And, you know, I'm also very concerned about the infrastructure costs. You know, it's not just about the vehicles as somebody said. You know, the infrastructure costs -- I have a battery electric vehicle and I have trouble getting It charged outside of my home. How are we going to do all the charging for these heavy-duty, and light-duty, and medium-duty trucks that we need to get on the road?

And I don't -- I realize that's a little bit out of our bailiwick, but I think it's an important component of a mobile source strategy that I think wasn't focused on enough in the document. I said this to staff, you know, during my briefing, but I wanted to say it publicly now. And, you know, near-term reductions of diesel emissions,
everybody has been saying we need that. Well, you know, I know we're trying hard to have cleaner diesels, but there's a huge number of legacy diesels out there, a huge number. So I very much support a useful life truck retirement as has been suggested by, I think, Mr. Kracov, Ms. Takvorian, Will Barrett, Bill McGovern -- Magavern. But that -- I don't even think that's enough.

You know, I think we have to figure out how to get the current diesel fleet cleaner, because we don't have -- we won't have a ZEV fleet, no matter how hard we try, in time to really make a difference in terms of reducing diesel emissions, especially those impacting our low-income communities of color.

So I see a disconnect between our desire to move to ZEVs, which is totally appropriate, and I'm a hundred percent supportive of, and the fact that diesel emissions are going to be around for a long time.

So that's where I think that the Mobile Source Strategy -- and I'm not beating up staff. I think they did a great job. But I think as a Board, as a state, we need to come to terms with the fact that it's going to take major investment, which I don't see yet. So I think I'll stop there before I get into anymore trouble.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Supervisor Fletcher,
you're up.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Thank you. I'll be brief. So many of the points I wanted to make have been made and at times multiple points over. I just want to add on to my support, echoing in part Dr. Balmes and so many others that have talked about the useful life of some of these older diesel trucks, you know, a decade or so old. How we can more rapidly and more quickly replace those and have it be complementary to everything else we're doing, both in Advance Clean Fleet, the inspection programs, really aligning with some of the legislative input we've heard on this issue and I think that's something as a Board we have to tackle and look forward.

The second thing is I just want to mention that some of the VMT strategies, you know, we're really trying. In the short run, we know how long it is going to take to get the electrification of the transportation sector, both with the Executive Order with that just applying to new vehicle purchases and how long that will take to phase-in along with points we just heard from Dr. Balmes about the challenges surrounding charging infrastructure and all of that. And so really between now and whenever that point at which we have an entirely electrified zero-emission transportation sector, we've got to continue to focus on VMT issues and how we align and support those issues.
around lowering VMT.

As Chair of a transit agency, it still remains incredibly hard to get dedicated funding to construct new transit projects. And I'm not even talking about rail, dedicated bus lanes. Zero-emission buses continue to be very expensive. You've got to build out the charging infrastructure. Like transit agencies are killing themselves to both try and increase service in ways people will use it and be able to make the investments there.

Those are things we know will lower VMTs. And so I think continuing to assess and look at some of these VMT strategies can be a helpful component, in addition to everything else, a lot of really on-point comments we've heard from a number of Board members.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you, Chair.

I just wanted to briefly say that I do think that there's a world in which we allow the waste management of the world to plan for the use of their fuel and look more closely at the issues raised by the groups working with impacted communities to ensure we have all of the facts on these types of fuels before moving forward on our next vote. And we really can't see the Mobile Source Strategy as a separate aspirational document to the SIP.
I want to reemphasize what I've said before that we all have responsibilities for the SIP. We cannot leave the districts alone and pursue paths that set them up to fail.

The useful life measure I think is a way in which we can thread the use of natural gas from those places, which already have infrastructure in place by the trucks that are available online today and not just available to order and our extremely important goal of reaching our zero-emission goals by 2045.

I think Dr. Balmes alluding to the infrastructure is key, in particular when it comes to 24-hour trucking operations. And we can't brush these practicalities away, but I think we can address those and also respond to what communities are telling us terms of needing clean air now, without further sacrificing them, particularly as some mentioned stronger investments now in the technologies that we can rollout right now.

Furthermore, I want to thank you to all the staff for your hard work on this and really thank you to each and every one of the commenters. We're hearing you and we look forward to continuing to address the issues that you've raised today on all fronts. Really appreciate you.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Vice Chair Berg.
VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much. You know, I so appreciate Senator Leyva starting out with her "Be Bold" red. And Senator, I'll turn on my video for you, because see I am coordinated in "Be Bold" as well, and yet, I also appreciated the fact of expressing the range of emotion of such inspiration and hopefulness and such overwhelmingness, and specially when we have testimony that -- of really smart and very dedicated people that say let's push this to 50 percent by 2030, a hundred percent within three years.

And the problem that I see is that we need a little bit more of a unified position. And I got to thinking about, you know, an historical bold move that we met -- that we did as a country. And, of course, we go back to when President Kennedy -- and since my good friend Hector De La Torre was quoting history, who said we choose not to go to the moon in this decade, and this was his -- from his famous speech in 1962 -- and do other things not because they are easy, because they are hard. And then we landed on the moon in 1969. But we did not do that with multiple agencies, multiple jurisdictions, with funding year after year unknown. No. We assigned that to one agency, well funded. Citizens accepted the risk, including space capsules that sank in the ocean. We had to start all over again. Heaven forbid those three
deaths, because the -- things caught fire.

We were willing to do it. And so, I start with Senator Leyva and all of my colleagues that are just so spot on. But -- and with Dr. Balmes, I can't agree more. I feel like we are in such a vice and staff is in such a vice, being so polarized between this cry for absolute acceleration, and yet we don't have the ability to do that.

And what is crucial to me is that we have to get this right, because all eyes are on us, especially in the United States. And I'm not suggesting we slow down. I am just saying that the next five years is going to be the make or break as to how fast we go forward, how quickly can we get in in infrastructure, how quickly can we get these trucks and get through the first generation to get the next generation of the duty cycle, how quickly are we going to listen to our vocational people and what they need, and build on these things because there will be failures. You can count on it. And if we don't have the stamina to get through the failures, to get to the success, we're going to go over the cliff and the rest of the United States isn't going to go at all.

We have to succeed at this. We have to. And so I'm very committed. I'm probably more cautious, but we have to be inclusive. Our vulnerable communities have to
become number one on this technology. I really appreciated what Dr. Sperling suggested. It does also remind me that maybe one size doesn't fit all regulations. Maybe there is an opportunity to think outside the box and take South Coast or San Joaquin Valley and accelerate in some way in those two regions that need it most. I think we do need to think a little bit more outside the box.

And then we do have to understand that things like useful life, a really important concept, the consequence to that is only to small and medium-sized people that use trucks in small- and medium-size, because they're the ones that keep those trucks for longer. And so we will -- Amazon are trucking, because only large companies will be able to make this transition in this amount of time that we want to. And we have to step up along with all the people that have been pushing us to say to small- and medium-sized businesses that need these trucks, I'm sorry, we have made this public health decision.

So I appreciate the passion and I am fully committed, but I really do feel that we're all in and we all have to stand up and agree when we have the consequences.

So thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you, Vice Chair Berg.
I just want to echo a lot of what my fellow Board members said. A lot of really great, inspiring, and insightful comments and a lot of thoughtfulness that was raised. In particular -- I don't want to repeat anything, but in particular I'm very intrigued by Supervisor Serna's comments about renewable gas as an opportunity to generate hydrogen. And I will definitely follow up with you to learn a little bit more about the work that you're doing in that -- in that space, because I think that's an exciting opportunity.

So my understanding, and Executive Officer Corey correct me if I'm wrong, is that we do not need to actually take a formal vote on this plan, that we can forward this to the Legislature pursuant to SB 44?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: That's correct.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. That is correct.

All right. Now, so staff you will now be forwarding that to the Legislature.

Logistics. Our Board Clerk has not had a break and I think there's probably a lot of hungry people. So my proposal is that we go ahead and take a 45-minute lunch break and then come back for a round of public comment, because the second part of our Board meeting will likely go quite late, and so I figured I would give folks an opportunity to do public comment, and then we will take up
our 4 p.m. Board item at 4 p.m.

So that would mean that we would come back at 2:20 and do some public comment and then our next Board item will be at 4 p.m. All right. That's it. Thank you.

(Off record: 1:37 p.m.)

(Thereupon a lunch break was taken.)
AFTERNOON SESSION

(On record: 2:22 p.m.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Good afternoon, everyone. We are resuming our Board meeting. We will be taking public comment on items not on the agenda. Board Clerk, will you please call any commenters who have raised their hands?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, thank you. We currently have four people with their hands raised to comment. If you wish to comment on this item, please do raise your hand in Zoom or dial star nine. I apologize in advance if I mispronounce any of your names.

The first three speakers will be Ritobrata Sur, Cliff Gallagher and Cameron Demetre.

Ritobrata, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

RITOBRATA SUR: Thank you very much. Can you guys hear me?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can.

DR. RITOBRATA SUR: Hello, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. My name is Rito Sur, PhD, and I am the CEO and Founder of Indrio Technologies based in San Jose, California. Today, I'll talk about our laser-based chemical sensors that are available to help you meet your air quality and climate change goals.
The core technology was developed by me and my colleagues at Stanford University after a decade of research. Indrio makes two main types of sensors, sampled or open path gas sensors we call Zephyr, which can be used for environmental sensing. We have delivered several units of these sensors to CARB with Walter Ham and (inaudible).

And the second type of sensors from Indrio are developed -- deployed directly inside the high temperature exhaust of vehicles, locomotives, ships, power plants, et cetera, we call igneous. Our igneous sensors are currently under development.

Our Zephyr sensors are currently being piloted by CARB staff to flag high emitting trucks on the road as a part of your Portable Emissions Acquisition System program, commonly referred to as PEAQS. Our Igneous sensor technology is currently under development for studying NOx and ammonia emissions for Portable Emissions Monitoring System, or PEMS, and OBD applications in vehicles.

We're currently funded by the National Science Foundation, NSF, and the U.S. Department of Energy, DOE, to develop these sensors. We have also received a portion of the grant provider by CARB to the UC Riverside CE-CERT team led by Dr. Kent Johnson to contribute ten of our next
These Igneous sensors can play a critical role in your near-zero NOx heavy-duty diesel engine emission standards program. Our sensors can detect ultra low levels of NOx without interference from ammonia, which is a fundamental problem in achieving accurate controls and next generation after-treatment systems. My company has been working with different engine manufacturers to test and validate our technology and we welcome your support in this endeavor.

Other applications for the sensor from Indrio Technologies include Continuous Emissions Monitoring Systems, or CEMS, monitoring at power plants, oil refineries, and other industrial sources, fenceline monitoring of methane, ammonia, and other gases around refineries, oil and gas fields, and similar facilities. Indrio technologies is also researching sensor applications for hydrogen infrastructure.

Indrio technologies develops tools to support CARB's goals. Please consider us for small business grants and other funding opportunities. We welcome any advice, direction, and support you can provide to us as we are a California-based start-up company. We are available to meet with you and your staff at any time to further discuss our sensor technologies and welcome you to visit
our -- and tour our facilities in San Jose, California.

Please visit our website and indriotech.com and contact me at rsur@indriotech.co or via cell at (408)410-7486.

Thank you very much for your attention and my team at Indrio Technologies look forward to working with you and your staff to support your air quality and climate change goals.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Cliff Gallagher. Cliff, you may unmute yourself and begin.

CLIFF BERG: Thanks. This is Cliff Berg, not Cliff Gallagher. Hopefully, that is correct. If there's not a Cliff Gallagher out there. I was unmuted, so I want to thank the Board. Cliff Berg here in behalf of Visa, U.S.A. Visa, as you may know, is a national financial technology leader in our country and is headquartered in San Francisco, California.

I am here today in their behalf to explain to you why the Board should not require EMV chip readers as part of your requirements. The payment landscape has largely shifted to contactless technology and beyond and requiring a particular technology really is just unworkable. Open payments are the wave of the future and important to expanding the state's network of EV charging stations.
Visa's latest data shows nine out of 10 of the top card issuers are rolling out contactless cards. Four hundred million contactless cards are in the U.S. market, which is quadruple the number two years ago and we're projecting 450 million by the end of 2021.

On the issue of equity, the underbanked can utilize solutions such as Square Cash with no monthly fees, no bank account needed, load cash onto mobile devices, while the unbanked can use the Square Cash app cash card, which allows people to load paper cash onto a contactless card at many participating merchants.

For these reasons, we urge you not to require EMV chip readers, an expensive and outdated technology, that really would be pointless. So thank you very much.

Appreciate the time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Cameron Demetre. After Cameron will be Matt Smoot, Ben Foss, and Cesar Diaz.

Cameron, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

CAMERON DEMETRE: Dear, Board Members. My name is Cameron Demetre. I'm the Executive Director for California and the Southwest at TechNet. TechNet is the national bipartisan network of innovation economy CEOs and seniors executives. Our diverse membership includes
dynamic American businesses, ranging from the revolutionary start-ups to some of the most recognizable companies in the world. We represent over four million employees and countless customers in the fields of Internet -- or information technology, E-commerce, sharing and gig economies, advanced energy, cybersecurity, venture capital, and finance.

TechNet supports the industry proposal as referenced in their letter to Chair Randolph to expand the types of credit card readers that public charging stations can use under the CARB rules to allow contactless readers in addition to EMV chip readers. The financial technology market is quickly evolving to meet the needs of consumers and provide consumers with new secure and reliable payment systems and financial tools.

We have several financial technology companies, which in recent years have launched digital wallets and payment products you might be familiar with that you can pay with your smartphone, or via QR code, or contactless payment, including, amongst many others, Visa.

I wish to share some of the latest stats from Visa that you just heard from Cliff as well on contactless payments and how rapidly they're issuing credit cards that allow for contactless payments. Nine out of ten card issuers are rolling out contactless cards. In 2017, Visa
embarked on an initiative to -- in the U.S. to stimulate
the contactless payments. At the time, here were only 15
million contactless Visa cards in the U.S. Fast forward
to July 2021, there are 372 million contactless Visa cards
in the U.S. alone. Visa expects to get 450 million
contactless Visa cards in the U.S. by the end of this
year.

And since 2017, there's been a 900 percent
increase in contactless transactions. In April of 2021,
the U.S. was the fourth largest market in terms of monthly
contactless transactions. And as of July 2021, the U.S.
is now the third largest country in terms of monthly
contactless transactions.

With this abundantly clear and widely adopted
trend and innovation expected to continue, I encourage the
Board and staff in their technology study to look at
Emerging peer-to-peer payment platforms that have
accelerated even since 2019, such as the growing adoption
of mobile transfers via consumers. Some have been
historically under and unbanked.

When it comes to equity, these services helped
users receive their stimulus payments and direct deposits
through these platforms, which they can access from the
ease of their mobile phones. Thank you for your time and
we appreciate CARB's continued efforts to electrify the
transportation sector and support innovation in achieving their long-term climate goals.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Matt Smoot, you may unmute yourself and begin.

MATT SMOOT: I want to thank you for the opportunity to address the Board today. My name is Matt Smoot from SureCan, Incorporated. We are a portable gas can manufacturer and I'm coming before the Board today to request a change or an exemption in the testing procedures to allow caps to remain on the spouts during the diurnal testing. The inventor and owner of SureCan got tired of using hard-to-use gas cans that spill gas every time you use them, so he invented the SureCan.

SureCan is unlike any gas can in the market. It is designed with a flexible spout that rotates 180 degrees and releases fuel from the bottom of the can, so you no longer have to tip the can to dispense fuel. It has a thumb trigger at the top of the can that activates a vent that is allowed -- that allows the fuel to flow smoothly without glugging, and gives the user the ability to control the flow with ease, and thus reducing spilling to near zero.

CARB's mission is to promote and protect public health, welfare, and ecological resources through
effective reduction of air pollutants, while recognizing and considering the effects of the economy. SureCan helps fulfill that mission.

The biggest problem with portable fuel can containers is not the hydrocarbons that are released while the fuel is being stored, because those hydrocarbons are released when the fuel is dispensed, it is the fuel that is spilled on the ground when dispensing the fuel.

The EPA estimates that 17 million gallons of gas is spilled each year filling lawn mower equipment. That is 35 percent more than Exxon Valdez, which spilled 11 million gallons. If you take the population of California versus the United States, that means two million gallons of gas is spilled each year on the ground in California.

I want to ask for a chance -- a change to the testing procedure or an exemption to be able to accept the results of the diurnal test with our spout caps on. With our spout caps on, we pass the diurnal test. I know that California -- California's goal is to eliminate gas. But until that goal is achieved, let's focus on dramatically reducing the amount of gas that is spilled by rewarding innovation that helps eliminate or dramatically reduce the spills. The SureCan has done that.

With the change or exemption to the diurnal testing procedure, SureCan can be introduced into the
California market and dramatically reduce or eliminate the
two million gallons of gas that is spilled each year from
portable gas cans.

A video demonstrating the ease of use with the
SureCan has been uploaded to the docket. I appreciate
your consideration in this matter.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Ben Foss, you may unmute yourself and begin.

BEN FOSS: Thank you very much. My name is
Benjamin Perkins Foss and I work for Volta, an electric
vehicle charging company based in San Francisco. I'm here
today to speak on behalf of an industry coalition that is
interested in the letter that we have delivered to the --
to Chair Randolph. In particular, we want to talk about
CARB rules about contactless readers in electric -- in
electric vehicle charging payments and putting them in
addition to the EMV mag stripe readers that are currently
in the marketplace and is a requirement.

We are interested in this, because of a couple of
specific points. We believe that this will increase the
reliability that electric vehicle charging users have in
terms of doing their payments. It means that people will
be able to use a safe, reliable technology through
contactless payment that allows them to make their
payments without using mag stripe, which can be a lot less effective.

    It will allow you to reach many more people from the perspective that there are over 372 million contactless cards in the United States as of July of this year. And as we heard earlier from Visa, they plan to expand the number of cards that they have issued, such that there will be over 450 million contactless payment cards by the end of this year.

    We would also highlight that this is a payment method that is on the rise in California transit. The California Department of General Services has actually recently issued an RFP to help transit providers in the state acquire the necessary hardware and software to support contactless payment. And so this is a technology that we anticipate seeing more and more in the marketplace.

    If California wants to achieve its goals of getting more charging available for more people and having it be more reliable, this is a great path forward and we would like to refer the Chair to the letter that we have submitted and supported from both Volta and from our larger industry coalition.

    Thank you very much.

    BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Our next speaker will be Cesar Diaz. After Cesar will be Marc Monbouquette, Francesca Wahl, and Dominic Dimare.

Cesar, I have activated your microphone. You may unmute and begin.

CESAR DIAZ: Good afternoon, Board and Chair. My name is Cesar Diaz. I'm with ChargePoint. ChargePoint is a provider of DC Fast and Level 2 charging stations and network services.

I'm here to strongly urge you to modify the existing EVSE regulations to allow for both EMV chip or EMV contactless credit card technology to comply with EVSE regulations. This is an issue that impacts an entire industry as we seek to deploy reliable, secure, and cost effective EV charging stations that will be in place for years to come. Just today at the federal level, the House draft the Build Back Better bill allows public charging stations using 30C tax credit to use EV contactless to comply with the credit card reader provisions.

Contactless technology is here and widely available today. Visa and others have already said that by the end of the year, there will be 450 million contactless cards in the U.S. And Pulse, a Discover card company, estimates that 94 percent of all debit cards will be contactless by 2023.
EMV chip readers will increase the cost of deploying charging stations. These costs will be passed on to the EV drivers similar to how the cost of our milk increases when the cost of fuel rises. As cited in CARB's own study in 2019, installing an EMV chip reader will cost $327, plus the annual maintenance of 227 over a 10-year life span equals $3,000 per station.

When you consider the one million charging stations the CEC estimates will be needed between now and 2030 to meet California's goals, the cost of this regulation will add $3 billion to an entire industry. EMV chip readers are less secure than contactless. Adding the chip reader will expose EV charging systems to credit card fraud or theft, such as skimming and shimming. In fact, Experian, whose mission is to drive financial inclusion, and advisors consumers to use contactless features or to use mobile payment methods, such as Apple or Google Pay, whenever possible to avoid inserting the card in a chip reader.

Unlike the gas station experience, many public charge stations are in unsupervised locations placing customers who would use EMV chip readers at a greater risk. EMV chip readers will not increase taxes. As stated earlier, contactless credit cards are readily available from all major providers. Adding an EMV chip
reader will not alone increase access to the unbanked or underbanked.

           CARB notes in final statement for reason that regulations of EMV chip readers alone may not increase low income access to charging stations. The coalition supports access for all and we want to deploy EV charging as fast as possible in a cost-efficient manner. Data presented to carbon in 2019 by one of the two existing EV charging service providers with EMV chip readers showed that only one percent of charging stations were initiated by a physical credit card.

           That means that 99 percent of charging stations were initiated using one other -- or the other payment methods readily available. As payment methods continue to evolve, we encourage CARB to allow our industry to innovate, expand payment options, and keep stations that are tied to EMV chip readers from being deployed by having the contactless option.

           Thank you for your time and we look forward to working with you respectfully.

           Thank you.

           BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

           Marc Monbouquette. You may unmute yourself and begin.

           And it looks like you're on the phone.
MARK MONBOUQUETTE: Good afternoon.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yep, go ahead.

MARC MONBOUQUETTE: Okay. Thanks. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and Board members. My name is Marc Monbouquette and I'm with Enel X. We're a provider of EV charging technologies and part of the coalition of EVSE companies providing comments today.

So Enel X joins our industry colleagues in supporting an option for contactless credit and debit card readers alongside EMV chip readers in the CARB regulations for public EV charging stations, as described in a recent letter to Chair Randolph.

So as my colleagues have noted, contactless cards are becoming a ubiquitous feature of retail transactions and will only continue to grow in proliferation. Contactless cards bring many benefits in terms of security and ease of use. A chief of concerns to Enel X is allowing flexibility for providers to install payment hardware that reflects the evolution of payment methods, rather than locking in the single solution that is already becoming outdated.

We note that review of payment technologies that was launched at the initial Board approval of the regulations in 2019 has not yet been completed. And as Mr. Foss from Volta noted, other State agencies are
starting to look at deploying contactless payment technologies for transit customers. So we see a lot of similarities in deploying these solutions for EV charging.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments today and as always appreciate the Board's leadership in overseeing the transition to electrified transportation.

We urge your consideration of contactless technology for public charging.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

FRANCESCA WAHL: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. My name is Francesca Wahl and I'm with Tesla. We're, as you all may know, both a manufacturer of electric vehicles and a provider of EV charging infrastructure in California. Similar to my colleagues from the other companies, I'm here today to speak regarding the CARB rules on EV charging payment options that were recently brought forward for additional modification and consideration by the industry coalition.

Tesla currently has approximately 245 fast-charging stations, known as super chargers, with 3,574 ports in California. This represents approximately 50 percent of the fast-charging capacity available to EV drivers in California today. Per statute, Tesla is
actually not subject to the regulation before you. However, Tesla has an interest in the implementation of this regulation on payment standards, given Tesla vehicles and our EV customers also represent a significant portion of the California EV market.

Overall, we support the industry proposal to expand the types of credit card readers that public charging stations can use under the CARB rules to allow for contactless readers, in addition to the EMV magnetic stripe chip readers. As many have noted, payment technologies and consumer preferences on them are changing rapidly, especially since the initial discussion of this regulation. And it's important for the Board to be able to consider these changes prior to the rules going into effect.

For us, providing a seamless and transparent customer charging experience has always been key. And it's one of the primary objectives in our development of our fast-charging network in California. During Tesla's recent earnings calls and in previous years, there has been discussion regarding the potential opening of the Tesla network to other EV drivers. The current regulatory framework, however, on payment standards provides a significant disincentive for ever opening the network to non-Tesla drivers in California, so we take that into
consideration in those discussions.

Therefore, along with the other charging providers and those statements articulated regarding the current state of the technology, we appreciate consideration of this item by the Board and your leadership on this issue in expanding payment options for EV drivers in California.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Our next speaker will be Dominic Dimare. After Dominic will be Sean Edgar, Dylan Jaff, and Kelsey Johnson.

Dominic, you may unmute yourself and begin.

DOMINIC DIMARE: Thank you. Dominic Dimare here on behalf of Blink Charging, also an EV charging company doing business here in California. I join -- am a member of the coalition of companies in support of our efforts to allow and have the amendments -- or excuse me, regulations amended to allow contactless payments for EV charging in California.

I endorse and support all the comments that you've heard prior and only add that ARB has been a leader in adopting technologies in its mission to clean the air and protect the environment and public health and safety, and that our request for the allowance of contactless payments as part of the regs that govern EV charging in
California is consistent with its past practice of being a leader in the adoption of technologies as they develop to make ease of use easier for consumers, citizens, and California.

So once again Dominic Dimare on behalf of Blink in support of our efforts to amend the regulations as they apply to EV charging stations to allow contactless payments.

And I thank you for your time and your consideration of this matter.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Sean Edgar, you can unmute yourself and begin.

SEAN EDGAR: Good afternoon, Can you hear me?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can, but there is feedback if there's another device that you have the audio coming in on.

SEAN EDGAR: Great. Thank you. This is Sean Edgar the Director of Clean Fleets and I capture from the prior spirited Board comments just before the break that the following items were really focused. First, billions of new investment to begin the transition to ZEV trucks is needed, but unfunded. Dr. Balmes made that point pretty clearly. Small- and medium-truck fleet owners will not get to the cleanest trucks available on their own. I think Vice Chair Berg did a good job of describing that.
Collaboration and buy-in is really needed from all stakeholders. Mr. Kracov's testimony was on point, as well as all Board members I think can agree on that. And then finally, the waste organics to biogas pathway and perhaps the hydrogen after that, Supervisor Serna talked about that, Dr. Pacheco-Werner and the Chair also express and interest in learning more about that.

So as a student of history that has spent the last 31 years in waste transportation and public policy, I'm just going to offer a few perspectives on this, because I've spent the last 21 years implementing the Diesel Risk Reduction Plan of the year 2000 and our members have spent several hundreds of millions of dollars to exceed that plan.

So I'm just going to take a brief walk down memory lane. First, when I worked at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Director Emeritus Edward Teller provided us staff with occasionally history lessons. Among those lessons he told me personally was that he was the uncle of hydrogen bomb and not the father. This was in recognition that it took a massive team and collaboration, as Vice Chair Berg alluded to.

I reiterate my prior testimony to the Board that a Manhattan style project is needed and you need to be at the tip of the spear not simply a bystander or note taker.
in that process. PG&E, as an example, announced their Marshall Plan. Can we do both? If so, how are we going to do both? And your Mobile Source Strategy is inadequate to describe that at all.

Second, the waste companies that I'm proud to represent are a large part of the $1 billion investment over the past 20 years in low-NOx trucks and are in the process of bonding, borrowing, and paying for long-term loans toward the 20 to 40 billion dollars that your sister agency, CalRecycle, estimates for the organics diversion under Senate Bill 1383. So a one-size-fits-all ZEV mandate on an industry that's approaching a 50 percent transition away from diesel and black carbon is really not welcome at this time, especially when the conversion of your food and green waste to biogas to the tank of a low-NOx, carbon-negative truck is delivering benefits to all Californians every day of the week that you set your waste out to the curb for us to collect.

Force-feeding technology that is not ready for our duty cycle has new unfunded costs in the hundreds of million of dollars just in our sector and forces the abandonment of RNG projects underway is no way for the Board to get the collaboration that you need. You heard from CASA and other public agencies that are in the same boat. Once again, your Mobile Source Strategy has been
inadequate to address the concerns of South Coast or San Joaquin in this manner.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Dylan Jaff, you can unmute yourself and begin your comment.

DYLAN JAFF: Hi. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and Board members. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Board today. My name is Dylan Jaff and I'm commenting on behalf of the Electric Vehicle Charging Association also known as EVCA. EVCA is made up of 12 leading EV charging industry member companies and one zero-emission autonomous fleet operator with the goal of advancing clean transportation systems in which market forces of innovation, competition, and consumer choice drive the expeditious and efficient adoption of EVs and deployment of EV infrastructure.

Echoing the comments made by our industry partners, EVCA strongly supports the industry proposal, as referenced in our letter to Chair Randolph, to expand the types of credit card readers that public charging stations can use under the CARB rules to allow contactless readers in addition to EMV chip readers and respectfully request reconsideration of this regulation.

Thank you.
KELSEY JOHNSON: Great. Thanks, Katie. Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you to Chair Randolph and the Board for the opportunity to comment. My name is Kelsey Johnson with Rivian Automotive. We're a U.S. based electric vehicle manufacturer, as well as an electric vehicle service provider developing our own charging stations. My comments today are to voice Rivian's support for amending the current EVSE standards regulation to allow for EMV chip reader or contactless credit card payment technology for both DCFC and L2AC product categories.

The support, as you've heard from my various colleagues, are in line with various industry trends that were outlined in the industry coalition letter and subsequent communications to Chair Randolph, as well as the current draft legislation that's being considered by both the U.S. Congress and the European Commission, both of which specifically call out contactless payments for EVSEs as a viable qualified method of payment.
If the Board is not willing to move ahead with this suggested change, we support the industry coalition's proposal for CARB to suspend the regulations pending the outcome of the technology review that's currently underway and leverage those learnings to evaluate both DCFC and L2AC requirements upon completion.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment and we look forward to discussing this topic in the future.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

David, you can unmute yourself and begin.

DR. DAVID REICHMUTH: Hi. My name is David Reichmuth and I'm speaking on behalf of the Union of Concerned Scientists. I'd like to comment on the EVSE regulations.

I think we all know that access to charging is critical to enable transportation electrification and to ensure access having multiple payment methods at the charging station are critical. You know, for EV enthusiasts, early adopters, people with five or six credit cards in their wallet, you know, app based and tap based systems are probably likely the easiest to use. But for a lot of the new ER drivers that we're going to be getting over the next five to 10 years, they may not want
to invest the time and effort to figure out the details of EV charging and apps. And we need to make this as easy and familiar as possible. And access is also an equity issue as not everyone has access to a tap payment card.

So to be clear, the proposed requirement does -- to have a chip reader does not preclude tap or mobile payments. Again this is a false choice that's being presented. It's not about chip readers or contactless readers. They can be -- both be used.

And this really isn't a theoretical issue. It's one that I've seen in practice. You know, the last time I was charging my car, the charger would not work with the tap reader. You had to use an app. I saw somebody else pull up and they had to like go through their phone and try to download new apps, figure out what their log-in was, et cetera.

You know, having a chip-based card reader means that somebody that doesn't have a tap card or the all apps can still charge. It means it's someone who is in an underground parking garage, someone without a data plan, and someone with a bad or no cell signal can still charge the car, as long as they have the most simple basic chip regard that almost everyone has right now.

And chip readers are not some new or challenging technologies. The companies in this space have had lead
time to incorporate the readers. And as we look to broaden the EV market having this sort of simple zero friction payment method is important for access. So again, this doesn't -- having the requirement for a chip reader does not preclude having mobile payments or any other new technology. What it does do is ensure that the broadest amount of drivers can potentially use an EV charging station, and that's what the regulation should ensure.

Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
PATRICIO PORTILLO: Yes. Thank you. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. My name is Patricio Portillo speaking on behalf of the Natural Resources Defense Council here really in strong opposition to what are frankly pretty bizarre and nonsensical requests to modify CARB's EVSE payment standards.

Now, end-running the outcome of CARB's regulatory process, you know, which was the result of robust stakeholder review, would undermine equitable access by undoing what we think to be very sensible requirements to provide easy and consistent payment options that serve all drivers. Customers should be able to pay for charging the
same way they pay gas stations or parking meters. They shouldn't be resigned to a technology that many customers lack.

CARB explicitly evaluated the appropriateness of contactless payments in the rulemaking process, and ultimately decided that allowing companies to install contactless readers in lieu of chip card readers would leave underbanked and low-income drivers behind. To meet California's statewide goals of creating a mainstream market for electric vehicles, increasing access to EVs for low-income households and residents in disadvantaged communities, it is imperative that all drivers have convenient and reliable access to electricity as a transportation fuel where they live, work, and play.

Notably, these payment standards merely -- they merely set a floor. You know, charging station providers are still free to exceed these minimum requirements and install any additional payment options they desire, such as contactless card readers.

Although the landscape of payment technology is slowly changing, unbanked or underbanked drivers relying on prepaid debit cards still face barriers to paying for charging without chip card readers. Many prepaid debit cards available today still lack contactless capability. And the majority of prepaid debit cards still aren't
compatible with mobile wallets, like Apple Pay or Google Pay. If these drivers can't pull up and pay for charging with their prepaid debit cards without calling a 1-800 number, we'll be making EVs even less accessible to low and moderate income drivers.

Leapfrogging the EMV chip card readers without a technology review and independent evaluation of the current ability of contactless cards to equitably serve the broader EV market would effectively be an end-run around the rulemaking process. The appropriate solution is to meet the market where it is today, while allowing for changes in the future if and when the market changes. And that's exactly what the technology review would do.

Thank you and I appreciate the opportunity to comment today and look forward to working with ARB to achieve California's climate, air quality, and equity goals.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Jay Friedland. After Jay our final four speakers are Bill Magavern, Cory Bullis, Sasan Saadat, and Eileen Tutt.

Jay, you can unmute yourself and begin.

JAY FRIEDLAND: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph, ARB Board members, ARB staff. My name is Jay Friedland and I'm the Senior Policy Advisor
for Plug In America. We're a non-profit advocating for hundreds of thousands of EV drivers. I'm representing a broad coalition, which includes EV changer manufacturers, EV charging networks, environmental groups, and consumer organizations. And we speak for an even broader group who want to become EV drivers, especially those in underserved communities.

We were the original sponsor or Senator Corbett's SB 454 in 2013 which created the ARB EVSE regulation. We've been working on this consumer protection issue for more than ten years and with ARB staff for the last four. They have tried hard to balance the concerns of all the stakeholders.

Imagine how you would feel if you pulled into a gas station and didn't know if it would take your credit card, or debit card, or prepaid card for payment and how much the fuel costs. And then in order to fuel, you had to download an app, or call an 800 number, or find a specific prepaid tap card, or join a club just to fill your car. SB 454 was created to make sure this didn't happen.

Card readers, and I do want to include that, you know, in terms of EMV chips credit, debit, and prepared, are the most basic ways to solve the issue of never leaving any driver stranded at a public charger. In fact,
in the recent report, Electrify America indicated that one-third of their transactions via cards. Consumers will buy more EVs, if we eliminate this barrier and fueling is a familiar experience, which is what the regulation does.

We're here today to encourage not relitigating the important work that ARB staff and this Board did two years ago. We have two core principles, one to ensure open and universal access to publicly available charging stations, especially given many of them were deployed with public taxpayer funding, and two, to ensure that open access takes into consideration the needs of disadvantaged communities, many of whom do not possess smartphones, credit cards, bank accounts, and yet are considering purchases of EVs to save their -- on their transportation costs.

This underserved consumers will not have broad access to prepaid contactless cards for potentially a number of years, as EMV chip cards, prepaid cards, are just entering the market after almost 10 years.

The regulations opponents you'll hear from today want you to believe their cost to add card readers would place an extreme burden on them, while other fuel options, you know -- but we believe that while other fuel options still have card readers, EV charging should provide this basic access feature. Isn't it reasonable to ask them to
provide real open access meeting the consumers where they are, rather than where they say they will be.

Thank you again for your consideration and I'm also happy to answer questions, if you have questions.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Bill Magavern, please unmute yourself and begin.

BILL MAGAVERN: Thank you. Bill Magavern with the Coalition for Clean Air weighing in on this topic of the EV charging payments. And I agree with the comments of Dave Reichmuth, Patricio Portillo, and Jay Friedland, so I'll be brief.

You know, I also remember the law that called for this regulation and I remember that its author, Senator Corbett, came to the Board to testify in support of the regulation. I believe that was in 2019. And now with the rule scheduled to go into effect in just about two months from now is certainly not the time to diverge and change course.

In fact, one of the key pillars of smart regulation is regulatory certainty. And so I would think that by now since new charging installations will be required by January 1st to have the equipment, I would think that that equipment has been ordered. And so to pull the rug out from under the regulation now would be a real mistake.
The main goal that we have in this is to democratize electric transportation. We want it to be accessible to all Californians, even those who are unbanked or may not have smartphones. And for those folks, we need to make the charging accessible. They shouldn't have to download an app in order to charge their cars. I don't think Californians would tolerate that situation if, in order to fuel a car with gasoline, they had to download an app.

So please stay the course and continue with this smart and sensible rule. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Cory Bullis, you can unmute and begin.

CORY BULLIS: Good afternoon Chair and Board members. Corey Bullis on behalf of FLO. We are also a manufacturer and provider of EV charging stations and we have over, you know, 50,000 stations sold and deployed across North America.

I would like to first just take a moment to say we want to thank the Board for their work on this development of this regulation. It's been a long process. It hasn't been an easy process. And we're certainly appreciative of the fact that the Board is working expeditiously to try to accelerate its completion of the technology assessment, given how pertinent and relevant it
is to our manufacturing and deployment of stations in California.

You know and I certainly acknowledge the comments made by a lot of my colleagues from NRDC, and Plug In America, and Coalition for Clean Air, and others, because I think we all share a vision here that is to help drivers to get infrastructure deployed. I think we care about the success and the future of this industry. I think ultimately we are aligned with our industry colleagues that technology has been evolving for some time in the payment industry here and that it's important that we continue to focus on what's happening now in the technology space and what's -- and how that's only becoming even more prevalent in terms of contactless payment.

The truth is I don't think we're trying to present this as a binary choice. It's more to say that contactless cards are here, and they're here to stay, and they're only increasing in prevalence. And so by mandating EMV chip readers, you know, we're ultimately getting saddled with additional costs, and operations and maintenance complexities that we don't think truly furthers the market when it comes to deploying and scaling up EV charging infrastructure.

So thank you for your consideration today.
Sasan Saadat, you can unmute and begin.

Sasan Saadat with Earthjustice. And I'll keep my comments brief, because mostly we'd like to echo the comments made by Union of Concerned Scientist, NRDC, Coalition for Clean Air.

Really our comments are just that anyone on the Board that considers themselves an environmental justice champion, anyone whose vision of clean mobility extends beyond the affluent and early adopters should just stand by these requirements. Bending to these last minute demands, which are frankly really unbefitting of the EVSE industry, which models itself as a -- as partners and access to clean mobility, would be unjust.

We're not requiring you to take away contactless payment. We're just making sure that everyone has access to EVSE charging, so please just stay the course.

Thank you.

Eileen Tutt, you can unmute and begin.

It looks like Eileen dropped off.

Let's go next to Adam Mohabbat.

ADAM MOHABBAT: Hello. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph, Board members, and staff. Adam Mohabbat here
with EVgo. We are the nation's largest network of public
EV fast charging stations and really appreciate the
opportunity to comment today.

First, we'd like to thank staff and Board members
for their time and willingness to discuss EVSE standards,
as well as moving expeditiously on the technology already
by staff. It is important for us to note that while EVgo
is in position to comply with the currently requirements,
we concur with the industry proposal that allowing
contactless credit card readers to fulfill the minimum
credit card payment methodology requirement is frankly
good policy and would allow industry to scale deployment
of infrastructure on an accelerated case, while adding
accessibility to all drivers.

In addition to what other industry stakeholders
have mentioned today, I would mention that California is
likely to receive hundreds of millions of dollars in
infrastructure funding from the bipartisan infrastructure
package happening on the federal level. And this funding
will allow for contactless as an option to fulfill their
respective credit card reader requirements.

So really, we would encourage congruence between
ARB's requirements and that of the federal funding. Thank
you for your consideration and we look forward to
continued engagement with ARB to help decarbonize our
transportation sector and bring cleaner air benefits to us. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Eileen, I see that you're back on. You can unmute yourself and begin.

EILEEN TUTT: Thank you. My name is Eileen Tutt and I am the Executive Director of the California Electric Transportation Coalition.

I do want to echo the comments made by Plug In America with regard to the card reader, or chip reader, or the choices between how consumers pay. I think it is -- I think what's important here is the process. CARB has a very thorough and inclusive process that where changes are made to regulations on a regular basis to update them to more adequately represent the technologies that are available in today's market. So I'm not going to suggest one way or the other that we should have card readers or chip readers. I think we need to -- if we want to make modifications to the regulation, it's a fair request, but that doesn't mean we, you know, put on hold the regulation that is in current -- currently in place in order to provide more equitable access to charging infrastructure to all Californians.

So while I understand that the technology advancements are moving fast, and it's important that we
recognize that, I also think that the CARB process inclusivity and any equity requirements are all -- were all considered during the very extensive public process. And it is important not to just modify those regulations randomly a month before they're -- or two months before they're about to go into place. So although I have some sympathy and I understand the technology advancements, I also support the original CARB staff proposal, the CARB Board action. And if we are going to change that action, then I think it requires a whole public process and not letters to the Chair of the Air Resources Board or letters from the Legislature. I think those are important, but they cannot change a regulation that was adopted by the full Board and was supported by many, many interested stakeholders.

So thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next two speakers will be Todd Campbell and Chris King. Todd, you may unmute yourself and begin.

TODD CAMPBELL: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. Todd Campbell, Vice President of Public Policy and Regulatory Affairs for Clean Energy.

You know, I just wanted to further comment on today's Mobile Source Strategy, and that -- many Board members mentioned that we need to get combustion trucks
off the road and we don't disagree. We think ultimately we need to move zero-emission platforms. You know, I think what we're trying to say is we need to set the bar higher when it comes to combustion technology and make sure that we don't choose a diesel truck known to cause cancer and reproductive harm, that we don't choose a diesel truck that we know is the number one source of pollution, that we create scenarios where fleets if they cannot find a zero-emission truck or a near zero-emission truck as defined under the Advanced Clean Fleet Rule as operational if feasible or commercially available, that they're able to get into a low-NOx truck that cuts NOx emissions by 90 percent, that can use a renewable fuel system, renewable natural gas, which is a negative carbon fuel. That provides immediate relief to disadvantaged communities today.

We are very concerned that our Attorney General Bonta is going to the Environmental Protection Agency arguing for a 0.02 gram standard in 2027. We already meet that standard. We don't know if diesel can meet that standard. And I think that's why that lobbying effort is going forward. I also am very concerned that my reports from them still are that battery electric technology and hydrogen technology isn't around the corner. It's going to take some time, and that's okay. I
mean, we're willing to put in the work, but what do we do in the meantime? What do we do in terms of charming?

    Our customers are telling us, for example - in fact our members are telling us - that they have facilities in Southern California that would demand 119 megawatts of power to power the 329-fleet vehicle operation. And they're a 24 hour, 7 operation. I was a Mayor that put in a 329-megawatt facility, the Magnolia Power Plant. It's a combined cycle natural gas plant in Burbank that supplied power to five cities. One facility taking 119 megawatts is significant. So there needs to be some major coordination to be able to move to zero.

    In the meantime, all we are saying is don't let us fall through the cracks. Don't let the communities fall through the cracks by just accepting the baseline.

    Thank you.

    BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

    Chris King, you can unmute yourself and begin.

    CHRIS KING: Thank you, Chair and the Board. I'm Senior Vice President eMobility at Siemens, and we are one of the largest manufacturers of EVSEs globally and are actually building a plant in California where we expect to manufacture over a million units over the next few years, adding to our existing base where we -- of employees, where we employ over 4,000 Californians in good-paying
clean tech jobs.

I wanted to express our support for maintaining the current regulation around credit card readers for EVSE. We were an active participant in the process -- the lengthy process and very open and active stakeholder process to adopt the regulation and continue to support it for the very reason that open payment remains a significant issue. There's range anxiety being able to find a charger and then there's charge anxiety, being able to use it when you actually find the charger, and that's being able to pay for it, if it's a public charger, of course. So again, we continue to support the regulation and thank you for the opportunity to comment.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Chair Randolph, that concludes the commenters.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. I have a couple of board members who would like to speak. Board Member Florez.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to say a couple comments and I do have a request for the consideration of the Chair and the Board, but first let me say, in my time on the ARB, I guess in those years I've learned a couple of things. The first is the Board, under Mary Nichols and now you Madam Chair, we have a tendency to always look to the future. Almost on every
issue, we make these very large leaps.

And, in fact, I think my colleague Diane will remember I think it was my first Board meeting where we had a very strenuous conversation regarding the jump from CNG buses to electrified buses. And I remember the arguments were, you know, the data tells us today that -- and the infrastructure speaks to CNG, but I remember us all talking about what the future is going to look like, and without much data in hand, you know, we kind of leaped to why would we ask people to build more CNG facilities when we know we're going to turn the corner and we're going to electrify our buses, and our fleets, and everything else. And I remember that contentious debate late into the evening, it felt like, really about what the choices were for the Board and whether we're going to look out to the future, in some cases or not. So I just want to make sure I feel like that has always been a guiding principle for us.

The second principle, since I've been on the Board, is using good data. In fact, we're a science based board. We always rely on the science, sometimes the science cuts way one. Sometimes it cuts the other, but I always feel like the Board's been good about being flexible enough to utilize data. And in this case, the discussions seems to be around technology, chip,
contactless, you know, whatever that may be, but it feels to me like we have an upcoming technology review that is incomplete. It's still not here. Very hard for us to make that leap without something like that in hand.

So it's interesting to hear folks say keep things the same, you know, even though we know the future is going to be there, you know, we're better with just keeping the rule. But in this case, it's kind of like the CNGs. You know, it's kind of like saying to -- in my view, it's kind of like saying to the companies put something in the ground that you're probably going to have to service for 10 years, five years. It's going to be out of date, but yet, the whole time we knew we were going to made you switch. We're going to make you go to electric. In this case, we're going to make you go to contactless.

And I guess my worry is in that type of thinking with very little data in hand, with, you know, a technology discussion that's yet to be had or presented, you know, it feels like we're in this really odd space for the next five months, where, you know, the data may show lots of these folks that were on earlier today have done a good job of rattling the cages. I don't know if any of you are -- you know, have gotten the calls that I've gotten from folks - i'm sure you all have - legislators, people involved in the industry, EJ groups, others.
But I think this -- I think the reason we're having so much trouble with this is that it really is a choice about whether we're going to make people do stuff that we all know is going to change. We all know it's going to cost money. Like the CNG buses, they were saying, you know, if we go to electrification, it's going to cost riders more money. You know, in this case, we're saying, you know, build the old infrastructure and service this, costs will go up even according to our own reports, and those folks who are worried about affording it, it's actually going to be more.

You know, those are the kind of things I worry about. So I don't really -- you know, in some sense, it's interesting to hear groups, EJ groups, business groups, and others kind of switch places, you know, depending on, you know, this particular issue.

I would say that our two guiding principles that we've always utilized should be a good, you know, compass us. You know, we should look to the future. We should really think hard about whether we have the data in hand, and the studies, and the things necessary to make a big decision like infrastructure on anything, CNG, charging stations, dairy digesters, you know, things that we've talked about today.

You know, we make big bets here, but it feels
like we always have something to rely on in terms of the science. I'm not sure we have that today. So I'm going to request that we have an information item next month at our November 19th meeting to just get an update, you know, try to figure out in some sense where we're at. And I do know we're heading into that January 1st implementation stage. And I know some folks want to -- that not to happen. And I know the other folks today said it should happen, but we're the Board, and it feels like if we're not comfortable with what the data, and the technology, and the thrust of what we've always done is telling us, no slight on anyone. It just feels like we should try to struggle with what that nexus looks like.

If our study isn't going to be done till January, and it's been reviewed, it's been in place that we've asked for since '19, it kind of feels like bad on us if we aren't waiting for data that would give us a better decision that actually has to do with true infrastructure going into the ground. And if the data cuts the other way, then, you know, bad on companies and let's move forward.

But it just feels like -- Madam Chair, it just feels like as a request, if we can just put this on the agenda for the 19th meeting of November, when we come back, you know, allow our staff to continue to do what
they do well, which is pull people in and try to find things that work. And if the report is the same, then the report is the same. But I do feel like at least from my perspective, you know, it would be good to get an update. I'm not saying a motion to change the rule in January. I'm not saying put it off. I'm not -- you know, I think I -- my comments earlier kind of point to that's a big decision we have to make.

But I would say we've done it, in many cases. I mean, you know, this whole electric bus thing and CNG always sticks in my mind as this huge leap. In fact, I remember my colleague Diane saying we know it's coming, so why are -- why are we waiting for the interim? We do the same with all of the arguments we have on natural gas. You know, we have -- we make these leaps.

But in this case, it seems like we are sticking to what the state of State is today. And I'm worried that if we're looking for EV adoption, if we're looking for people to really take this on, you know, we should have both for sure, but we shouldn't leave one out. I mean, that's kind of my overall thought and thrust.

So just request, I don't know if -- I would love to hear what my other colleagues how they feel about it, but it just feels like just at least agendizing this for, you know, a discussion would be great. And if the staff
could please, you know, obviously meet with these stakeholders, it would save us a lot of calls, and letters, and all the things that we all get on contentious items.

But it does feel, and it's never an issue, I know for Richard and staff to meet with folks, but I would also request that that happen as well.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

I'll just note a few things before I turn this over to my colleagues who want to speak on it as well.

There were a lot of good comments made. I want to particularly note, I thought Eileen Tutt's comments were excellent. I mean she pointed out that the technology is moving and we understand that, but we also need to understand that there is a process. The Board adopted the regulation based on an extensive public process. And now staff has a technology review underway that unfortunately is taking longer than I would have hoped, but will not be ready unfortunately for November.

So as we think about this issue and how we want to move forward, I'm hesitant to put it on the agenda for November, because we won't have any new data. We won't have any information until closer to January. And so I think what the Executive Officer has proposed, which I
think makes a lot of sense, is get that technology review, have the opportunity to get some input from folks, some additional data from folks, and then the Board can agendize this item after that and sort of lay out a path forward based on what we see in that technology review.

So I think that kind of achieves the goal of taking a look at this issue and trying to make sure we're as up-to-date as possible, but also recognizing that this all needs to be part of the standard regulatory process of really engaging with all of the stakeholders to understand what the various issues are.

And I really appreciate commenters who pointed out that there is nothing in the rule that precludes the addition of contactless, so long as the chip readers are still available for the broader swath of customers. And the technology review I think will help us understand what the pace of that transition is and what point we can start feeling confident that other types of payments will be as ubiquitous as the chip readers are at this point.

And I do think it's important in the conversation around that technology review to understand sort of what we're looking for, like what do we want to see in terms of adoption and trying to understand what most customers need. So I'm hoping that the technology review itself or input from the Board after seeing the technology review
can help inform kind of the standard that we're going to be looking for as we -- as we think about reopening the regulation.

And then lastly, I will note. I think -- I completely agree with the point that, you know, we should certainly meet with companies, and stakeholders, and make sure that we're conveying as much information as possible, and that we're receiving as much information from them as possible. So I certainly want to keep those lines of communication open.

So I see several Board member hands up. So Dr. Pacheco-Werner is next.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you, Chair and thank you for what you're offering. I do think that we do need to consider it and I do understand the need to have the open process that we need to have. I would just ask that when we have the review come back to us, that part of it includes talking to actual unbanked people. Because while I understand and I am very committed to equity, the unbanked people that I interact with through my work on -- in COVID don't use chip cards. They use Zelle, they use Cash App.

And so I do think that there's a little bit of a dysfunctional rescuing happening that like my colleague Dean has talked about, you know, really let's base it on
data and facts on the ground, as well as these broader 
swaths of where technology is going as a whole. Let's 
actually talk to and understand who the people that we're 
trying to get equity for actually live and experience on a 
daily basis.

   Thank you.

   CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

   Board Member Riordan.

   BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Thank you. I need to 
unmute myself.

   I'd just like to agree with you, Madam Chair, and 
to understand we have sort of a difficult situation,
whereby we don't have the technology report in front of 
us. It should and hopefully will be done in January. And 
I hope that staff will move it forward as fast as they 
can. But I would feel very uncomfortable making any kind 
of a decision at this point in time and believe that until 
we see that technology report, I couldn't possibly make a 
rational decision at this moment and would think that it 
is best to have that input that you talked about as well 
with the stakeholders and to, you know, follow through on 
people who actually use these that we're trying to help be 
a part of the electrification of automobiles, and probably 
in this case many of them who we want to encourage.

   And particularly, there's going to be a secondary
market very soon and people who may not have access to credit cards we'll want to encourage them and we won't be encouraging them if we put some road blocks in their -- in their way. So I would definitely want to wait. And I've told those who have spoken to me, part of the industry, that I would just simply have to have that report before I would ever want to make a decision, if I were to change what we already have on the books.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Board Member Hurt.

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you, Chair.

Dr. Pacheco-Werner hit my comments. And I just want to uplift what she said, which I think is really important for all of us is to truly get an accurate picture of what equity and access is in this space by understanding how unbanked individuals are paying for all things in this environment. And also, I'd like to get the data around how folks in highly impacted communities are paying for everyday purchases, so that we can really understand the lay of the land on this topic.

I want to uplift also the comments with regards to getting that technology review faster than ever. I know it's been on the table for a bit, but I want us to use our monies wisely and use it towards infrastructure in
a way that complements all the work that we're doing here and not putting us back as it has been expressed by Senator Florez.

So again, getting a clear picture about equity and access and how folks are spending money in highly impacted communities I think is the data we need along with that of technology.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Board Member De La Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you.

I will echo the comments of my colleagues who are committed to following through on the regulation that we approved, that we went through a whole process with and that we need. If we're going to have an intelligent discussion, having that data the report, is vital to that. Otherwise, essentially, you know, if we -- whether it's in November or December, we would essentially be having a conversation like what we just had for the last 45 minutes.

So having, you know, a bunch of folks expressing their opinions is not a substitute for a full, robust CARB process, like we had leading up to this regulation that's going to kick-in in January. Once we have new data, once that -- once we've touched on those points that some of my colleagues just mentioned, then we can have a discussion about whether we expand, or modify, et cetera.
And I find it interesting that there's this fixation on the payment method. I think it's more important to focus on the service itself. I, for one, have gotten a lot more complaints from people who have EVs trying to get charging infrastructure, trying to get the charging infrastructure to work for their vehicle up and down the state of California, and I've never heard from them about payment problems. The problem is with the service.

So I'd love to have a conversation about all of these charging companies and the service that they are provided or not to consumers.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Board Member Kracov.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes, I also agree for the need. We're talking about all of this in response to public comment on a non-agendized item. It's not the way to do it. And I appreciate Board Member Florez's comments about trying to get to the bottom of this before the regulations starts to take effect. On the other hand, it has to be a well-informed process. And it's interesting to hear from Board members Pacheco-Werner and Hurt, you know, that many of the unbanked possibly are not using the chips in the first place.
So I'm looking forward to this being and
agendized item soon, that have the information on --
again, we don't want to be investing in costly
infrastructure without the promised technology review that
I think was the subject of the Board meeting, of course,
before I was on the Board. When that happens, also
interested in metrics. You know, what are the goal posts
here to satisfy our staff and to satisfy our Board about a
certain technology, whether it be contactless or
otherwise? What is the metric that we're trying to
satisfy to show that something has the kind of acceptance
that can be used.

So hopeful that when our staff get back to us,
this concept of the metric vetted by the stakeholders and
openly by the Board, can be discussed.

Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Very quickly, because I
know we need a break, I just want to endorse Board Member
De La Torre's comment about service. It was just ironic
to meet, I just attended the Institute for Transportation
Studies future of transportation and climate conference at
Asilomar, and neither one of the two charging stations --
I won't mention the company, so as not to embarrass them,
neither one of them worked. It was pretty ironic at a
future of transportation discussion.

And I -- you know, up and down California, as
a -- I said this morning, as a battery electric vehicle
driver, I'm incredibly frustrated about trying to get, you
know, access to decent charging. Half the time the
chargers, you know, don't work and I -- or if they work,
you have to call in an 800 number to get access to it, and
that's even with the -- a company card that you're
supposed to tap. So that -- I just couldn't resist
chiming in after Hector.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you much very much.

Well, at the risk of making the technology review
add more information, I will say I thought Board Member
Hurt and Dr. Pacheco-Werner's comments were really spot
on. To the extent we can get some information about how
folks are actually accessing, that would be excellent.

So I think I hear a plan going forward that, you
know, we will bring this back to the Board not right away
in November, but after we have some more data and some
more information to discuss. And in the meantime, I'm
sure our Executive Officer will make our staff available
to meet with those who are interested in this regulation
and the implementation of it.

So with that, we will be taking a break and our
next agenda item will begin at 4 p.m.

Thank you.

(Off record: 3:35 p.m.)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record 4:02 p.m.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Welcome back. As a reminder, I'm going to go through the meeting procedures again for those of you who are just joining us today.

So in accordance with Assembly Bill 361, we are conducting this evening's meeting with Zoom. And I've organized the proceedings to mirror our normal Board meeting as closely as possible, but there will be some differences and we request your patience and understanding, if any technical problems arise.

A closed captioning feature is available for those of you joining us in the Zoom environment. In order to turn on subtitles, please look for a button labeled "CC" at the bottom of the Zoom window, as shown in the example on the screen now.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind everyone to speak clearly, and from a quiet location, whether you are joining us in Zoom or calling in by phone. Interpretation services will be provided in Spanish. If you are joining us using Zoom, there is a button labeled "Interpretation" on the Zoom screen. Click on that
interpretation button and select Spanish to hear the
meeting in Spanish.

(Interpreter translated in Spanish.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: For those who are just joining
us, I will ask the Board Clerk to provide more details on
our procedures.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thanks, Chair.

Good evening, everyone. My name is Katie
Estabrook and I'm one of the Board Clerks. I will provide
some information on how to participate -- how the public
participation will work for today's meeting. If you wish
to make a verbal comment on one of these Board items in
Zoom, you will need to raise your hand or -- raise your
hand if you're calling in the Zoom webinar or if -- dial
start nine if you're calling in by phone.

If you are currently watching the webcast on
CAL-SPAN, but you do wish to comment, please register for
the Zoom webinar or call in. Information for both can be
found on the public agenda. To make a verbal comment, we
will be using the raise hand feature in Zoom. If you wish
to speak on a Board item, please virtually raise your hand
as soon as the item has begun and let us know you wish to
speak. To do this, If you are using a computer or tablet,
there is a raise hand button. If you are calling in on
the telephone, dial star nine to raise you hand. Even if
you've previously registered and indicated which item you wish to speak on, please raise your hand at the beginning of the item that you wish to speak on. If you don't raise your hand, your chance to speak will be missed.

If you'll be giving your verbal comment in Spanish and require translation, please indicate so at the beginning of your testimony and our translator will assist you. During your comment, please pause after each sentence to allow for the interpreter to translate your comment into English. When the comment period starts, the order of commenters will be determined by who raises their hand first. I will call each commenter by name and then activate each commenter when it is their turn to speak.

For those calling in, I will identify you by the last three digits of your phone number.

We will not show a list of commenters. However, I will be announcing the next three or so commenters in the queue, so your ready and -- to testify and know who is coming up next. Please note, that you will not appear by video during your testimony.

I would like to remind everyone, commenters, Board members, and CARB staff to please state your name for the record before you speak. This is especially important if you are calling in by phone.

We will have a time limit for each commenter.
The normal time limit is three minutes, though this could change based on the Chair's discretion. During public testimony, you will see a timer on the screen. For those calling in by phone, we will run the timer and let you know when you have 30 seconds left and when your time is up.

If you require Spanish translation for your comment, your time will be doubled. If you wish to submit written comments today, please visit CARB's send-us-your-comments page or look at the public agenda on our webpage for links to send these documents electronically. Comments will be accepted on each item until the Chair closes the record for that item.

I would like to give a friendly reminder to our Board members and our CARB staff to please mute yourself when you are not speaking to avoid background noise. And also when you do speak, please speak from a quiet location.

If you experience any technical difficulties, please call (805)772-2715 so an IT person can assist you. That number is located on the public agenda. Thank you.

I'll turn it back to you, Chair Randolph.

Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is item number 21-11-3, informational update on the AB 617 Community Air
Protection and Air Toxics programs. If you wish to comment on this item, please click the raise hand button or dial star nine now. We will call on you when we get to the public comment portion of this item.

AB 617 is a significant step to transform California's air quality programs to address air pollution disparities at the community level. AB 617 requires enhanced stationary source reporting requirements for both criteria and toxic air pollutants, accelerated retrofit of pollution controls on certain stationary industrial sources, increased penalties, greater transparency and availability of air quality and emissions data, and incentive funding to reduce emissions and exposures locally within communities ahead of regulation deadlines.

AB 617 is also helping to refocus the Air Toxics Program to prioritize reducing toxics exposures in communities most impacted by air pollution.

To realize the goals of community air protection and the Air Toxics Programs, CARB is taking a holistic approach that brings in staff from multiple CARB divisions to improve air quality in our communities. Together, staff works to create and foster strong working relationships between community members, community advocates, air districts, and industry.

Just as AB 617 and the Air Toxics Program demand
a new approach to air quality planning, this update will take a new form for this Board. There will be panels representing some of our community members, air district partners, and key CARB division partners, so that we can hear directly from those who are instrumental in understanding the challenges and working toward the successful implementation of these programs.

Mr. Corey, would you please introduce the item?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair.

Just three years ago, the Board approved The AB 617 program blueprint, the statewide strategy called for in the law that has guided the now 15 communities in the program. Expectations were high, but we know three years is a short time to see improvements in air quality. CARB and air districts have been in the business of air quality protection for over 50 years, on climate for over 20, and at a focused community scale for only about four, the first year, which was spent in launching the program.

Tonight's item, as you noted, sets the stage for the necessary program refinement and resetting. AB 617 calls on CARB and air districts to take significant action to address disproportionate air pollution burden suffered by disadvantaged communities, and in the process, developed a new model for reducing air pollution exposure and emissions at the community level. And just as
important, working at the community scale has taught CARB
and air districts many lessons, the importance of
community engagement and co-learning is fundamental to a
successful and effective program.

AB 617 has been a catalyst for necessary growth
and change. For example, the commitment to a pesticide
notification program as a priority in the emission
reductions plan for Shafter has led to the Department of
Pesticide Regulation to move forward on a statewide
notification system, a system that will benefit many
communities.

Tonight, as you noted, you'll hear from a
coordinated update from our Office of Community Air
Protection and Air Toxics Program. Both programs rely on
each other. For example, our Air Toxics Program reviews
community emission reduction plans to better understand
community priorities and guides its work.

Since the early 1980s, our comprehensive Air
Toxics Program has focused on identifying and controlling
toxic air contaminants, informing the public of
significant emissions of air toxics from stationary
sources and assessing and reducing the health risks from
those exposures. The Air Toxics Program addresses the
health impacts of air toxics exposures to communities, and
includes measures to protect children and other sensitive
receptors.

Both the AB 617 and Air Toxics Programs require air districts, CARB, and communities to work together to be successful. Within CARB, we rely on staff from many divisions to carry out the requirements of these programs.

In today's update, we're fortunate to have the opportunity to hear from external and internal partners directly through two panel discussions, as you noted. The first panel will highlight community environmental justice leaders who participate on AB 617 community steering committees, some of who have also worked to institute positive change through AB 617 community air grants or supplemental environmental projects. We'll also hear the valuable insights and experiences of three air district representatives who are front-line public servants charged with implementing the AB 617 community emissions reduction and air monitoring plans.

The second panel, CARB staff, represents many divisions who work on both air toxics and community air protection programs. Staff will share their experiences and strategies supporting key aspects of the Community Air Protection Program as well as how the AB 617 program has changed they way they do their work.

We'll also hear about the work that is being done within the Air Toxics Program as well as efforts to extend
program benefits to other disadvantaged communities across the state.

Chanell Fletcher, our Deputy Executive Officer of Environmental Justice, will moderate the panels. AB 617 requires us -- requires us to rethink the way we have historically engaged with stakeholders. The charge to ensure that no California residents are left behind as we work to achieve our air quality goals is rooted in equity, and we cannot be successful in advancing equity if we do not work effectively with others.

I'll now ask Deputy Executive Officer Fletcher to introduce the panels and guide the panel discussions.

Chanell.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Richard. So as Richard shared, I'm the Deputy Executive Officer for Environmental Justice and I am responsible for the integration of environmental justice and equity across CARB, which is a very big job.

Our environmental justice and our equity team focuses on working with programs throughout CARB to support their capacity to better engage with communities. And for AB 617, our environmental justice unit was instrumental along with the Office of Community Air Protection in launching the AB 617 Program three years
And our EJ unit continues to support AB 617 by
managing the Community Air Grants Program.

The Office of Community Air Protection, charged
with a lead role of implementing AB 617, represents a
unique opportunity to work towards equity in the hundreds
of communities disproportionately impacted by poor air
quality. OCAP is not only responsible for coordinating
the implementation of AB 617, it must also lead a reset of
the program to both strengthen the existing model of
community steering committees, but also developed
strategies to bring the benefits to more communities. We
don't have all the answers and we must be ready to learn
from each other, if we are to move forward.

---o0o---

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: So tonight,
we will hear directly from partners in AB 617
implementation. That includes community steering
committee members, some of who are co-leads, and some of
who are also recipients of community air grants, and
funding from the supplemental environmental projects, plus
three air districts who together support 13 of the 15
communities currently in the program

---o0o---

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: The goal of
AB 617 is to focus efforts to reduce air pollution with a
focus on PM2.5 and toxic air contaminants. So tonight, we'll also hear an update from our air toxic programs, which is led by our Transportation and Toxics Division.

Both the Air Toxics Program and the Community Air Protection Program rely on other divisions within CARB, so our second panel will feature a number of key Division partners. They'll share how we work together within CARB to advance the goals of AB 617 and how the program has changed the way they do their work.

To set the table for our first panel, I'll ask Deldi Reyes, the Director of the Office of Community Air Protection, to share some background about our work with our community and air district partners.

OCAP DIVISION CHIEF REYES: Thank you so much, Chanell. And I do just want to note that for you and I, we've started at CARB in our respective roles together on February 1st. It's been nine months. It has flown by. And I just want to thank you for your leadership and your vision. It has been a joy, and a pleasure, and a learning experience to work under you in this program.

Thank you.

Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and Board members. What I'd like to share with you in informed by the nine months I've served in this role as the Director of OCAP, where I've learned a lot from air districts and community
leaders, and also through the recent convening organized by UC Davis, but finally, and most importantly, by what is presented in the People's Blueprint.

Our goal tonight is to share with you a broad overview of where we are now four years into the program. Then in December, we will provide our annual update report, which will be informed by the convening, our review of air district-submitted annual reports, and our own reflections and analysis.

As Richard noted, our purpose now is to set the table for the deliberation that will form -- inform a reset and strengthening of the Community Air Protection Program. Future proposals we bring to you will be shaped by engagement with partners and stakeholders.

I'd like to reflect on the purpose of AB 617. For those who follow clean air law, AB 617 represents a novel approach, clean air protection at the community scale. For those who understand the history of racism in this country and the origin of environmental injustice, we understand why the law calls for a community-focused approach and why the law calls for CARB and air districts to use all existing authorities, permitting, enforcement, and rulemaking to address both mobile and stationary source emissions in communities.

Again, the reason for this is that although air
quality has improved significantly overall, many communities, communities of color and low-income communities, have been left behind.

The learning curve for me has been steep, but one thing I learned quickly is that CARB sees this program as a catalyst to change the way we work with communities. This is appropriate, because AB 617 is just one law of many. And if we really are going to operationalize racial equity in our work, it's not going to happen because of only one law or program.

And to be clear, when we talk about racial equity, we're talking about working toward a future where race does not predict poor air quality. And we understand that environmental justice must inform all of our work, not just what happens in this program.

--o0o--

OCAP DIVISION CHIEF REYES: In this next slide you'll see that our approach to AB 617 focuses on four main strategies. At the foundation is partnering and collaboration. This strategy is essential, because AB 617 doesn't give either CARB or air districts new legal tools or incentives to compel others to come to the table. This is why trust and relationships are so important. And we know that much needs to be done to build trust, to move from a tactical frame of negotiation to one of
collaboration and shared goals.

A key to doing that is sharing power across air districts, CARB, and communities, addressing conflicts, and taking actions that are consistent with community priorities. This is also why we see such a strong focus in the People's Blueprint on conflict resolution and collaboration.

I have a small but powerful example of sharing power. This example focuses on process. Process is important in that more equitable processes are more likely to lead to more equitable outcomes. When community steering committees first began to meet and engage with air districts and CARB, the value and role of the third-party facilitator was not readily accepted by most air districts. However, over time, we've seen a common practice emerge on relying on third-party facilitators to support decision-making.

In the last few months, we've seen two air districts engage in highly inclusive efforts to share power in the selection of facilitators, inviting community co-leads to review and edit the Request for Proposals and to participate in interviews of facilitator candidates, and in each case facilitators were selected that were ranked the highest by the community.

Just two weeks ago, we brought to you the
emission reductions plan for the Portside community.

There were many factors that led to the development by
this community of a strong plan. Adequate time to build
trust, shared and ambitious goals, high capacity and a
clear vision from environmental justice community leaders,
an air district willing to share power, and a trusted
third-party facilitator.

Our second strategy is to better understand
community history, concerns, and priorities. One change
that Chanell and I made in the operation of the program
was to make clear to the staff of the Office of Community
Air Protection that their role is to engage with those air
districts and community members. We also set expectations
internally and with air districts that communities have an
open door to communicate with us directly without gate
keeping by any party.

I'd like to address the criticism that too many
CARB staff attend community meetings. Sometimes we hear
this and sometimes we hear that not enough staff attend.
The reality is that many CARB divisions have important
roles to play in this program, as you'll hear during our
second panel. It really is an integrated and cross-agency
effort for us, as is also represented by our partnership
with the Department of Pesticide Regulation and the Office
of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment.
The promise of AB 617 is that it calls for a renewed focus at the community scale using every authority we have. This is our third strategy. Again, I emphasize it, because we did not get the new authority to, for example, regulate pesticides that we did not already have. But as we heard from Richard, the catalyst that spurred DPR's current move to adopt the statewide pesticide notification program came from the hard work of communities in Shafter.

And we do see that air districts are using their authorities in focused ways in communities. You'll hear more about that in our first panel and we will include additional statewide commitments in the next update to the blueprint.

Our fourth strategy is about building capacity, both through funding for community air grants. And you'll get to hear from some of the recipients of those air grants in our first panel. Also under 617, we are responsible for increasing the transparency and accessibility of air quality data, including stationary source permitting. Specifically, the statutory requirement to ensure that existing stationary sources are retrofitted with the best available control technology, or BARCT.

We're currently working with air districts to
develop a frequently asked questions and answers
reference, based on questions we hear from communities
about stationary source permitting, including BARCT. The
questions we heard surfaced during over 14 interviews with
community members last month. And we've been working
closely with air districts to develop responses to the
many questions that were identified.

We plan to publish responses to an initial set of
these questions by November 18th and we intend to continue
working with air districts and U.S. EPA to complete this
effort by the end of this year.

As Richard noted, last month marked the
three-year anniversary of the approval by this Board of
the program blueprint, the statewide strategy that AB 617
called on CARB to develop. CARB developed the program
blueprint in the first year of the program and much
criticism has been levied at this document. For example,
it is true that equity is not explicitly mentioned and
that while environmental justice is included as a term,
it's used only to describe organizations that should be
engaged with.

But in acknowledging this criticism, it's
important to note that CARB's statewide strategy does, in
fact, recognize inequity and attempts to address it. For
example, we see today that in many of the 15 community
steering committees, the majority of members are residents. This is called for in the blueprint. That's just one example in the third year community of Arvin/Lamont, Fuller Acres, and Hilltop, 76 percent of the 71 steering committee members are residents.

AB 617 calls for the blueprint to be updated every five years, in this first round, by September 2023. Members of the AB 617 Consultation Group did not want to wait that long. They called on CARB to begin this process early. A small group of environmental justice leaders within the consultation group emerged to take on the drafting of the People's Blueprint. CARB committed to this effort by providing facilitation and technical writing support. This is an example of sharing power, so that we can shift the starting point for the deliberation that will result in a program blueprint 2.0.

The People's Blueprint was completed in mid-September and it can be found on CARB's webpage. In it, we see strong themes of accountability, equity, civil rights, and capacity building for air districts, CARB, and communities.

Our plan is to support the consultation group in productive discussions of the People's Blueprint, so as to inform staff development of the program blueprint 2.0 that will be brought to this Board for consideration in 2022.
Next slide, please.

--o0o--

OCAP DIVISION CHIEF REYES: We understand that legislators, the public, and communities are eager for change and want to see results. As Richard noted, CARB and air districts have been in the business of local scale air quality improvement for only four years. The first year was to launch the program.

A key takeaway from this slide is that of the 15 communities selected to date, only seven are in their second year of implementation. When a community is selected for the program, it represents at least an 11-year commitment for both CARB and air districts, one year or longer as necessary to write a plan, five years to implement it, and another five to monitor the impact of implementation.

Next slide.

--o0o--

OCAP DIVISION CHIEF REYES: What can we say now about emissions expected to be reduced via the hundreds of strategies contained in the 11 approved emission reduction plans?

Every year, annual progress reports are provided to CARB by air districts for communities in the program. Reports include estimates of anticipated emission
reduction benefits to each community from both local and statewide measures with PM2.5, diesel particulate matter, volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides.

These estimates are updated every year based on the level of implementation for each measure in each emission reduction program. Here's an example looking at just PM2.5.

Together, for all 11 communities that are in the implementation phase, we see that 75 tons of total PM2.5 emission reductions are anticipated to occur within these communities from either baseline 2024 or 2025 emission levels. And as a reminder, each ton of PM2.5 is about the same as taking a thousand Class 8 heavy-duty diesel trucks off the road. And you can see some of the examples of strategies to achieve these reductions on the right.

So the statute and previous Board direction were clear, we are to consider our work with the 15 communities and others that will be selected as opportunities to learn what works, as well as what doesn't, and apply those lessons elsewhere. That's the only way to expand the benefits to disproportionately impacted communities more equitably. And we know that work to advance equity cannot be done in isolation. We must do this in partnership with those whom we work to benefit. And this means being open to experimenting and learning from each other.
In addition to direction from the Board, we've been paying close attention to community insights and intentions for this program, as reflected in the People's Blueprint and elsewhere. Again, that's the purpose of our conversation, to air what's working and what needs to be strengthened.

In addition to the four strategies I described, we also have to integrate some lessons. First, we must appreciate that better health is what communities want. That's the end goal of improving air quality and efforts to reduce both emissions and exposures are essential.

Equity needs to be the primary lens through which we do this work. Second, sharing power. From priority setting of strategies, to participatory budgeting, to shared design of exchange of practices and strategies is essential. CARB and air districts should support community-led efforts to share knowledge, solutions, and training. And we must issue a call to action and an invitation to partner to other agencies, such as those charged with land-use decisions, transportation planning, and pesticides regulation.

Most critically, all of our work with communities in the program must drive the implementation of strategies that benefit more communities outside of the current competitive model of community selection.
To sum up again, our sharing of this overview is to set the table for continued deliberation and discussion. We know this will inform a reset and strengthening of our program at the community scale. For the communities currently in the program, it means refining our approaches in keeping with the feedback we're hearing and for the many communities that are eligible but not yet selected, it means we need to come up with strategies to scale up what we've learned, as the law intended.

The community leaders and air district representatives on our first panel this evening have been deeply involved in implementing the program. We'll now hear directly from them.

Chanell, I'll hand it back to you to moderate that discussion.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Deldi.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Could I just jump in for a second, Chanell?

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Sorry.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: I guess so. Go for it.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: No. Sorry to interrupt.
But I just -- just like Deldi praised you, I have to praise Deldi. You know having worked with her for, I don't know, since she came on board with regard to AB 617 and especially the consultation group, I really appreciate her spirit and commitment to the program.

So I just had to say that.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: No, you took the words right out of my mouth so -- in an unscripted moment. So high five for that. Oh, you just went off camera, so you couldn't high five me back. That's okay.

I think Dr. Balmes said what I wanted to say as well, which is that it's been such a pleasure, I think, to work with Deldi, to learn from Deldi. And I think, you know, as she pointed out we both started on February 1st. And so it's been I think -- it's been great to have a partner in this work. So Deldi is off camera. Dr. Balmes is off camera, but I just wanted to say thank you, Dr. Balmes, for jumping in. And I think Deldi I hope you know that like I feel the same way about working with you.

With that said, I'm excited for us to hear from the panelists. So panelists if your cameras aren't already on, feel free to go ahead and turn them on. I think everybody -- Nayamin has hers on. Yay, Ryan has his on. There we go, Angie, Kevin, awesome.

Okay. Everybody's cameras are on. I'm going to
ask that folks if you guys can please introduce yourself and briefly tell us about your connection to AB 617. And Angie, we'll start with you.

ANGIE BALDERAS: All right. Hello, everyone. Good after -- good evening. My name is Angie Balderas. My pronouns are she, her, hers. I am a longtime resident here in the IE. I was born in LA, but raised IE for over about three decades. I belong to the San Bernardino, Muscoy CSC and I'm a community organizer, where I've been organizing here in the region for about 25 years or so, but I'm still 21, so just keep that in mind.

(Laughter.)

ANGIE BALDERAS: But I'm very excited to be here and talk with you all. So thank you for having me.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Angie. I feel you. I'm still 21 too, so we're on the same page there.

Nayamin, you are next up.

NAYAMIN MARTINEZ: Okay. Buenas tardes. Good afternoon. Nayamin Martinez. I'm the Executive Director of the Central California Environmental Justice Network or CCEJN for short. And I have been involved in implementation of AB 617 in multiple roles. I am part of the South Central Fresno steering committee. I have been also -- the organization that I work for has been a
recipient of two AB 617 grants. And then I have also been part of the People's Blueprint writing team. And finally, I'm part of a research project that is trying to evaluate the implementation of AB 617 in Shafter and Fresno.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Nayamin. And I was just thinking as you were going through all your roles, I was like, wow, that is like so much. We are glad and honored to have both you and Angie on.

And, Kevin, you are next.

KEVIN RUANO HERNANDEZ: Good evening, everyone. My name is Kevin Ruano Hernandez. My pronouns are he, him, el. I am college student and also an environmental justice organizer representing Richmond and San Pablo and also the community steering committee over here in Richmond and San Pablo. It's great to be here. I actually don't know what else to say. It just -- I feel really grateful to be here.

Thank you.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Well, we are grateful to have you as somebody from the Bay Area -- reflect the Bay Area there.

Paula, you are next.

PAULA TORRADO PLAZAS: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Paula Torrado Plazas and
I am with Physicians for Social Responsibility, Los Angeles based in Los Angeles, and have been working with South Los Angeles communities to deal with capacity around air quality and community air monitoring. Our organization has been recipient of two CARB community air grants twice as well. And we participate in both the AB 617 Consultation Group and the EJAC. I think Martha is here and she represents the EJAC. And we have been involved in -- or the organization has been involved, because obviously not me, in the AB 617 process since AB 32 and all the way up to AB 617 was passed. And we're also the co-leads of the AB 617 South LA community steering committee.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Paula. We are grateful, PSR-LA, for all that you guys continue to offer and to give to CARB in terms of wisdom and input. Those are our community representatives. I'm going to turn it over to our air district representatives and I am going to start with Veronica.

VERONICA EADY: Hello, Chanell. Hello, everybody. I'm Veronica Eady. I am Senior Deputy Executive Officer of Policy and Equity at the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, quite a mouthful.

The AB 617 work is under my portfolio. And I will also note -- as many of you know, I worked at CARB
when AB 617 was first passed and had the great joy of
working with some great folks at CARB to build the
infrastructure of the program.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you,
Veronica. And, yes, she was my predecessor, so I'm always
everally grateful and happy. Like it's (inaudible) with
Veronica.

Wayne, you are up.

WAYNE NASTRI: Thanks, Chanell. I'm Wayne
Nastri. I'm the Executive Officer with the South Coast
Air Quality Management District. I grew up in one of our
community steering -- in one of our communities
designated. And 617 has been a very important program.
You know, we testified at the onset, I remember, with
Richard and with Steve Cliff when 617 was being discussed.
And I think that there was a lot of promise for the
program. And our District has the most communities
throughout the state of any district. So we do have a
pretty good experience and base in terms of the diversity
of communities and type of issues that we're faced with
and I look forward to talking about those a little bit
later this evening.

Thank you.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you,
Wayne.
And, Ryan, you are going to round us out.

RYAN HAYASHI: Thank you so much, Chanell. It's a pleasure to here. Good evening -- or afternoon everyone. My name is Ryan Hayashi. I'm a Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.

Similar to Wayne, I, too, grew up in the South Central AB 617 community. One of the tasks when I became -- stepped into this position was to oversee the work. And I couldn't be any more appreciative both for the opportunity, because this program is so important, and it holds a special place for me. I really appreciate the opportunity to work with all the community members and, you know, receive the feedback and, you know, work with them to really improve the air quality and the health outcomes for the people that live in those communities. And I'm just really happy to be able to speak on that a little bit later as well.

Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Thank you all so much for being here with us. And I think I keep getting good evening good afternoon confused because it's only 4:30, but it feels like it's evening.

I'm going to start off with kind of our first question for our panelists. And we'll start kind of with
I think our community representatives and then I'll shift the question a little bit when we get to our air district representatives.

But with the community representatives, I'm really curious to hear how has AB 617 brought your community together to work on air quality issues? And we'll start with you Angie.

ANGIE BALDERAS: I think it's -- well, for us, I believe it's -- I mean, we have always been working on these issues, I mean, grassroots organizing and folks on the ground who have been, you know, work on environmental issues and air quality. But to bring us together as in the aspect of building a bridge with agencies like yourselves, like AQMD and CARB. I think that's something that's been pretty new to our communities. I feel like the CSC has been successful in building a bridge between South Coast and the community. It's helped open lines of communication and established some trust.

I mean, is it all great? I mean, there's a lot of work to be done, right? But I think we're heading in a -- you know, in some direction, but I really think that -- that, you know, CARB and AQMD really, really -- I believe someone said earlier that it's a fundamental thing for you all to really, really work with community, but I think it's vital. I really think it's supposed to be
community led. And what does that look like for you all?

I mean, this is nothing about checking off boxes. This is really, really, really like what does that look like? How do we let the experts on the ground show us how it's done?

And to step back and take a moment and be like, okay, they've been doing this not for luxury, not because they're getting paid, but because this is, you know, a survival for folks over here. Folks are trying to live out here. Folks are dying every day. So this is not something we just, oh, okay, folks are getting paid to do this. Folks have to fight, because that's the only choice they have. So, you know, in building these relationships with community and so forth, I really think, you know, CARB, and AQMD, and others need to really, you know, breakdown, like what does that look like? Does that look like really fund -- bringing funding, bringing resources, and what does that look like, the relationship?

Just as a simple thing as relationship. Ask yourselves, have you all had -- you know, folks from CARB, AQMD, have you all really had a one-on-one with me? Have you all really taken the time to sit with your CSC members and really, really talk to them, and -- you know, we have to have the mentality that we're not the -- we're not the ones leading this. The community is, so how do we work
alongside them, you know?

And that's with respecting folks time. You know, folks are, you know, working two, three jobs trying to make ends meet. They would love to volunteer. They would love to be outreaching for this, for the CSC meetings, canvassing for this, being on a core meeting for this, bringing all CSCs together. I mean, there's so much we could be doing, so many resources that we need. Funding, what does that look like?

And so for -- I mean, I could get into it a little bit more. I'll let some folks jump in, but I think we need genuine, authentic relationships with community. We can't just be talking about it. We've got to be about it. And if you're just here to check off boxes, that's not going to work, because you're going to get what you give. And, I mean, like I said, folks are just trying to survive, so this is not something folks take lightly.

So thank you.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Angie. And I was seeing Nayamin, she was nodding a lot. And then to Nayamin to you if you want to build off of what Angie was already sharing.

NAYAMIN MARTINEZ: Wow. Echo to everything that Angie shared. I will just elaborate a little bit more my personal experience here in the Central Valley.
So I think that definitely having the residents move from one side of the table, where they were only able to give public comments at the end of a meeting, to being at the table where decisions are made is significant. That, to me, is probably the main difference about AB 617. However, you know, the process has had, you know, ups and downs, and many things that have worked, but others that can be and should be improved. I think that for CCEJN we're a network, so we have always been used to collaborate with other organizations from across the state. But with AB 617, it became more intentional. And I think it has been critical to learn how other things have been done in other regions and then try to bring some of those best practices to our area. And allow me to give some concrete examples.

In February 2020, there was a convening led by UC Davis in their university when we still were able to meet in person. And that was an eye-opener. I almost fell off my chair when I heard that in other communities, they were paying the residents a stipend, something that we were not doing. They were co-leads in the process, something that we were not doing, that they were doing participatory budgeting processes, something again that we were not doing in the Central Valley. Fast forward since then, a
lot of those things that we learned about, we have been able to bring to our communities. Now, we're paying the stipend to residents. A parenthesis, my personal opinion, it is not enough. We are paying them a stipend for the monthly meetings. But for goodness sake, it's so -- it's a marathon of meetings. We have some committee meetings. We have agenda setting meetings. We have -- so I think -- I hope that we should give more retribution for the enormous amount of time that residents are putting into this.

I think that we have been able to move from, you know, just being spectators to actually a colleague model. Right now, the most recent community, Arvin-Lamont, it's really going really good in that regard. We went through, you know, like practices. We were -- I have to say I was at some point invited to be co-host. I didn't like that model, because we were tokens. We were only allowed to say welcome to the meeting, goodbye, and thank you for being here. I mean, that is participation? That is not meaningful participation to me.

So I'm glad that we're making strides in the right direction. However, in terms of the budget, I do still have to say that unfortunately we do not have a participatory budgeting processes in the San Joaquin Valley and that is something that we are still working
with air district and with CARB to fix, because, you know, one thing is to say you are at the table to make decisions and suggest CERP strategies. But if we don't know how much money is allocated -- could be allocated for that, and we don't have the power to decide how to allocate the money, then I think we're not really fulfilling the spirit of AB 617 at its, you know, full extent.

And, you know, the other thing I think we have done differently, how we have been brought with other stakeholders to together, at least that is new to me, is being at the table with industry and business representatives.

Some experiences have gone well. You know, I was surprised that, you know, in Fresno, business reps were okay with some of the strategies that we suggested. They were okay with us moving a million dollars from the locomotive to urban greening projects in South Central Fresno. I hope I could say the same about pesticides. We were able to sit at the table with Farm Bureau representatives through the invitation of the former DPR Director, but that didn't take us anywhere. And unfortunately, I'm very saddened to say that on the contrary, industry, in some instances, have been not only not willing to be at the table and be respectful, but actually engaging in very dirty campaigns.
I'm sad to say that CCEJN and me personally were targets of a slandering campaign by ag industry reinforced by Tulare County Ag Commissioners, and that is not fair. So my own experience of meeting at these tables has ups and downs. It has its positive, but it has its negatives as well.

So, I mean, I could be hear all night, because I have a lot to say about AB 617. I'll leave space for others.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Nayamin so much. I did want to check in and, Kevin, did you have any thoughts on that first question?

KEVIN RUANO HERNANDEZ: Yeah, definitely. I mean, my experience with AB 617, I mean, as a young person, it's very -- just like a new experience for me, you know, working with stakeholders and working with these community members and like learning more about how do we really uplift these voices and like really like capture these, you know, community members' voices, these underrepresented community members, who've, you know, been in the community for so long and haven't really had, you know, a word on the table.

You know, despite if they're pro, you know, industry, or they're activists, like they -- their voices are -- like deserve to be on the table. And so that's one
thing that AB 617, or my CSC, is focusing on is uplifting voices and hosting town halls. However, we're still in the planning phase. You know, we're still in like the -- we're still in the first -- like the first step. And, you know, though it's going slow, I feel it has progress for us just to like learn how to like include more voices on the table, and, you know, experiment like how do we really be able to fulfill our mission, how do we -- our vision, our missions statement, and like not just say, like, we're going to be doing something, but, you know, like being assured that we are going to do it.

And so as a young person, if I'm being honest, it's super overwhelming, you know, just meeting like a lot of people. And I'm a college student. I'm a full-time college student. I work three jobs. It's like -- it's a lot. You know, it's a lot. And, you know, going through these meetings, like these are the meetings that I feel like me personally I have to be in, mainly because this is my community. Like my personal goal, as an environmental justice organizer, is to fulfill health equity for my community, not just my community, but all disadvantaged communities all across California and maybe all across the country.

But, I mean, yeah, I mean, we're really focusing on, you know, uplifting these voices. And if I'm being
honest, it's not always rainbows and sunshine. It's not always going to be like that, and that's the truth of it. You know, how do we just like -- not even find the middle ground, but like really just hold ourselves accountable for like -- for everything, you know, in the end. You know finding how can we hold industry accountable however the Air District -- and also ourselves as community members, because at the end of the day, we also are contributing to climate change and also the pollution.

But, you know, we also need to confront these problems head on and just have this conversation. And so, however one thing that I am like holding within me is just mainly just -- well, two things, is even though like things are looking really bad, there's still time to like turn things back around and, you know, make things better. Another thing is just really prioritizing listening as the first step, listening to community voices, and really just listening to those who are underrepresented.

And so I just want to emphasize that and that's one of the things that I brought to my co-chairs and like the committee as well just like focusing how do we uplift these underrepresented voices in our -- in our community? And hopefully we could be a model for, you know, different other future AB 617 areas all across California.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you,
Kevin. Paula, I saw a lot of nods there too, so I wanted
to see kind of what's your response to that question and
then feel free to build on it obviously what you've heard.

PAULA TORRADO PLAZAS: Yeah. Thanks, Chanell.
Yeah, I think a lot has already been mentioned by Angie
and Nayamin and Kevin. But I think one of the things that
I wanted to mention is that starting the process or at
least for South LA that a community that has had so much
organizing -- environmental justice organizing around air
quality, economic justice, it was challenging to get the
resources necessary to get South LA voices to the mic, to
get the communities being heard.

And while AB 617 has a lot of challenges and it's
not perfect as a program, and it's working as it was made
to -- made to be, it gave us -- it gave South LA
communities' voices and other communities that platform to
focus our energy, and resources, and capacity on --
towards trying to get to solutions, towards being more
effective at this paradigm of air quality regulation
from -- all the way from AB 32 focusing on co-pollutants
and greenhouse gases all the way to AB 617.

And I think the way we're looking at it now and
how it brought our community together to work on 617 is
that it's a mixed blessing. While it has given us a lot
of opportunities to be at the mic, and to be at the
decision-making table, and participation in air quality
pollution and regulations decisions, it's also come at the
expense of extractive relationships between regulatory
agencies and communities, where we see that the resources
are just not enough and the resources need to be extended
and expanded for communities to -- and in the community
steering committees to actually have the support that they
need to be effective and shift the relationships that AB
617 has -- yeah, has had with communities towards one that
is more effective, towards one that is co-designing,
co-developing, co-governance.

And I really resonate with what Kevin said around
listening and taking a step back, because, you know, as we
went into this process and we're fairly -- we're a fairly
new community. We were just elected, South LA. We
quickly realized how much work that was needed towards
being engaged fully in this process. It's a lot of work,
so committee meetings as Nayamin said, and, you know, we
spent almost kind of full time in this -- in this issue.
And it's like how do we shift that power dynamic and how
do we step back and listen to the communities to build
trust, so that we can get to really effectively start
putting to the table the solutions that the communities
actually want.

Because we are seeing in the spaces that we have
in South LA that folks are asking good questions and they're interested. But the bureaucracy of the process, the -- like I said, the exploitative nature of the program and the commitment needed of -- from AB 617 is making folks feel disengaged and disempowered. And I think that's a really important key thing that we need to address in terms of how do we want to re-shift the program.

But I guess I'll say again, it's a platform that has given the community an opportunity to be part of the process of building a path towards healthier and thriving communities for all. And then the last thing I'll say is, you know, the competitive nature of AB 617 is one thing that PSR-LA has always brought up, because, you know, South LA was just selected. And we've been at this fight for, you know, many years. PSR-LA has been working with South LA for over 15 years around these issues.

And so how many of other communities are in the same page that have not been selected? How do we start getting to translating solutions to other communities?

So I think we need to get back to expanding the resources needed to the community steering committees to get to real solutions, step back from regulatory agencies to build trust and get to solutions.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you.
Okay. And I just got my text message about time, so I'm going to shift over to the Air District representatives. And I'm going to -- I'm going to change the question a little bit to how has AB 617 changed the way you approach your work on air quality issues and priorities?

And I will -- I'll start with Veronica, then we'll go to Wayne, and then we'll go to Ryan.

VERONICA EADY: Okay. Great. Thanks, Chanell. Well, first of all, you know, in the early 2000s and 2004, so the Air District had its CARE Program, which is Community Air Risk Evaluation Program that kind of had a similar approach to AB 617 and it focused on the localized air pollution. When AB 617 was passed, we put our resources into AB 617.

And it's been really interesting from an air district perspective. First of all, we've had to realize and acknowledge that every community is different. So, you know, the approach that we have in West Oakland is not necessarily the approach that's going to work in Richmond and it's not necessarily the approach that would work in East Oakland.

So every community is different and it's required us to think differently and give the community a chance to lead, you know, based on the sources in their community,
the culture, the principles that they function on. So that's been really interesting for us.

We've also heard a lot from the communities that we work with around training. And it's not just, you know, training and capacity building that the communities need or we think that the communities need, it's training our staff. So we have invested in developing trainings around AB 617, around environmental justice and the principles of environmental justice, structural racism, community problem solving. And when we put those trainings on - we just did one yesterday - we have our staff learning side by side with the community members on our steering committee.

So, you know, we're not just talking to Richmond steering committee members. We're talking to our own staff to make sure that our staff is grounded in environmental justice and that there's a shared understanding of what these principles are.

So, for example, with respect to participatory budgeting, we've been really interested in that and we have staff that will be putting through participatory budgeting training. But we really want to make sure that when we do a larger effort -- like right now, we're sticking our toe in the water and learning a little bit about it.
But, you know, ultimately, we're going to be doing a training -- a larger training effort with our staff and with the steering committee. I think that that's really important for -- to develop a shared understanding, so that when, you know, Ms. Margaret Gordon is talking about participatory budgeting, we understand what she's talking about and have the same context and concept of what that is.

Some of the other things are -- and, you know, I'm kind of sticking with Richmond a little bit. It's great to be here with Kevin. We decided that although -- and we decided with the community not the air district alone. But although, you know, there are sources in Richmond that everybody knows about, we can agree that there are major sources in Richmond, whether it's, you know, the Port of Richmond, or, you know, a railyard, or a refinery. That doesn't really necessarily mean that we as an air district have a good understanding of -- or the same understanding the community has about what those sources are.

So we created a small grant fund for community-based organizations not necessarily people on the steering committee, but to do community organizing to bring residents to the table, so that they can be identifying the sources in their community.
So we're using a -- I guess it's called air pollution and community asset mapping tool called Social Pinpoint. And the organizations that we're funding, and there's six of them, are doing community organizing. They're talking to residents and residents are going to this portal and they are marking what the assets are in their community.

So whether it's a place where people gather, like a church, or it's a source of pollution, like a parking lot or some kind magnet source, we're able to allow the community to lead us to those sources that we might not yet be aware of.

So those are just a couple of things that I wanted point out, but I guess the larger thing is that it has taught us that we need to be working with communities and we need to be partnering with communities, and that means sharing power. Sharing power is not always a comfortable thing for a regulatory agency, but we've got some great folks like Kevin G. who's here, who have helped us to learn how to share power.

And I want to say that it is a continuum. I can't say that we know how to share power in every instance or that we're going to do it perfectly, but we've taken a step back and it's required us to really humble ourselves as an organization to be able to take direction
and really honor the democracy of the communities that we're working with.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Veronica.

That's like I was just like pausing, because I was like that is so much that's going on.

Wayne, I will turn it over to you.

WAYNE NASTRI: Thanks, Chanell. You know, I think like Veronica said there's many similarities in terms of how we approach the work. And I think that if you ask yourself, you know, how has it changed the work that the districts do? You know, I'd say the districts have been involved at the local level, certainly South Coast, for the last 45 years since its inception. And we do that through local rule development. We do that through working group outreach. We do that through a number of different efforts.

What AB 617 does, unlike any other program, is bring the community together with district staff to identify a lot of these issues. It's one thing for district staff to say, you know, we understand the inventories. We understand the sources. We understand the amount of emission reductions, but it's a different thing to hear directly from the community when you have somebody say my neighbors on my street have died and where
were you?

And to hear where some of these sources are, it's very important for us to hear that. And we're fully supportive of that. But there were some key issues that were brought up that I really want to hit on. One is this program takes a lot of time. And the way that the program is set up, it doesn't allow that accommodation of time.

We have one year from the date of designation to come up with your CERP. And when you're trying to build a relationship with the community and understand the basic issues, it's hard for the community to have trust when you're going in there and saying I've got to get this information. I've got to start writing the CERP. And the perception is you're not listening to me.

Yet, the perception on the staff side is I have a commitment to get this done. And if I don't get it done, I am not meeting the legal requirement set forth in the statute to do it. So you have this conflict right at the very beginning. And there has to be a change that allows that relationship building and that trust to coalesce, so that you can have an environment where there is mutual respect, where there is a healthy dialogue, where there is an understanding.

And that doesn't happen easily. And I would say that there are communities where it's easier and other
communities where it's not.

And that's why I think it's so important that there be time in the very beginning to build those relationships and have that common frame of understanding where you move forward.

To do that, you need the resources. And you heard from community members that they have three jobs, and yet, they're expected to come to the community steering committee meetings and provide a significant amount of hours, prep for those meetings, all without any compensation. And I say this because I know some districts provide those kind of funding. Some districts don't. I think everybody now does that, because we realized that's something where we need to go, but there was never an increase in funding to do that.

And so we have the challenge of the need for expanded resources. This program, when it was first concede, the air districts, CAPCOA, all said that the program was grossly underfunded at the very start. And there has not been any significant increase in funds. And, in fact, we took on the last two communities with no funding made directly for those communities.

So we have got to have a change in the program from my perspective. You know, when you ask how has it changed the way that we do our work? It has made us
realize that extent of work necessary to work with the community in a collaborative fashion to get where you have agreement and you can advocate for a common plan to reduce those emissions.

But it takes a commitment in terms of the resources to develop that plan, and then more importantly it takes a resource commitment to implement those plans, because if develop those plans without being able to have the resources to get them done, then what have we really done? And so to me, it's the constant push for funding and fighting on an annual basis that's changed how we try to get this program going. There are some things in this program that I think have worked very well. From our perspective, the push on the best available retrofit control technology.

We have nine rules that have been developed in accelerated fashion with over 5.4 tons per day of NOx emission reduction commitments. We have four more that are coming up. We have one that's coming up that can give us 7.9 tons per day of NOx emission reductions. All of these will get us toward attainment, and the goal is attainment, because that is where we meet the public health goals.

And so how has it changed us? It's changed us and made it realize that the resource funding and the
timing are critical. It's changed us in terms of it's accelerated our work, where we can, in fact, put the resources to do that. And it's changed in the sense that we recognize that we have to have a common understanding with the community and that takes time and training. And we're very much in support of all of those aspects in terms of bringing the resources to the community members, working with staff, so that we have that common framework, so that we can move toward.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Wayne. That was definitely a sobering outline of the challenges around AB 617.

Ryan, you will round us out. I know it -- my -- it's like -- that was very sobering, so Ryan, I'll turn it over to you.

RYAN HAYASHI: No. No, I appreciate the CARB, and you Chanell, and Deldi, and everybody else that worked on this item, and kind of how it was designed and allowed the community voices to be heard first, and then, you know, following up with Air District voices, because I think that just highlights really one of the things that we've consistently heard and that we continue to look to improve upon, which is, you know, listening to the community members throughout this process.

You know, I'm very thankful that I work for a
board and an executive officer who one of the strongest beliefs that we hold as an organization is that change is constant, change is good. And so, you know, when we're looking at this program, it's definitely a situation where it's like how can we do this better.

You know, I'm appreciative of Nayamin's comments, and, you know, highlighting areas where there have been changes that have been a direct result from listening to community members throughout this process. We spent an extensive amount of time, both, you know, working through the community steering committees, but, you know, touching on a point that Angie brought up, you know, how important it is to connect with individual community steering committee members and to ask them how their experience has been, what are the -- what are the challenges that they're facing to participating in this program, and, you know, how we can do it better?

You know and when we transitioned to a virtual environment, that was like one of the first things that we did, we reached out to the community steering committee members and talked with them, and, you know, got an understanding from them what they would need to be able to participate on an equal level, you know, understanding that not everybody has computers, not everybody has good Internet. And so through that, I mean, we developed a
system, and procured computers, and Internet to provide to them, so that everybody is participating on the same level.

One of the things that we also really value is the need for bringing all the parties together, which has been talked about. And it is one of the wonderful things to see in this process. It's residents, it's community-based organizations, it's environmental justice advocates, it's businesses, it's cities, counties, and all these other agencies all sitting around a table together, all sharing their experiences in the community, the challenges that they're facing, and hearing those perspectives. And from that, we're developing community emission reduction programs to address those challenges.

You know, some of the things I want to highlight through this, and some of them brought up -- I really appreciate Deldi talking about the facilitation process that we -- you know, we've had facilitators at our community steering committee meetings from the beginning. And they've served a very important role to address the things that Wayne was talking about, the challenges with getting all of this huge volume of work done in very, very tight time frames. Facilitation is crucial.

And so having the process to allow, then working with community members to select their own facilitator who
they think will best be able to work with the District and
the community steering committees to meet those goals it
was just a tremendous job and we appreciated all the
steering committee members participating in that.

Similarly, you know, for example, in Stockton, we
had a desire from the steering committee members to
reevaluate their charter, you know, basically the
governance document about how we go about doing this work.
When we developed the charter, we were in a in-person
setting. That drastically changed when we went to a
virtual setting and there were a lot of challenges that we
faced, and have been raised, and discussed, you know, not
only at the CARB Board meetings, but in -- within the CSC
meeting themselves.

And so by, you know, working with the community
steering committee and incorporating their suggestions and
recommendations on how to improve the governance document,
I think we're on a great trajectory and a great path with
the -- working with that group to implement their
community emission reduction program.

Another one, and Nayamin mentioned this, it's the
co-lead process. We're extremely appreciative of the CSC
members in Arvin-Lamont that volunteered to be, well, A,
we listened to the steering committee members. They
wanted a process where we had co-leads. And then we had
some recommendations and, you know, very appreciative of
the two members, one of an environmental justice
organization and another who is a resident, to step up and
serve in that role. And we're seeing tremendous benefits
from that. We're working with them. We're getting their
input on how we can present information to the steering
committees to make sure that everybody is understanding of
the information that we're providing and its benefit to
them.

The last thing I want to highlight is just like
the community air monitoring deployment updates. There's
a process where we go through developing the plans and
understanding all the areas and types of sources of
community concern. And we developed plans in response to
that and we deployed vast networks that now we're
presenting real-time data to all the steering committees.
We're providing weekly updates both in English and
Spanish, as well as quarterly updates.

And then like we're listening to the communities
explain to us that they want more opportunity to discuss
what the information means, and we've set up subcommittees
and done other things. And then we use mobile vans to
then also go to the areas where they have concerns, and
collect data, and bring that back and share that
information.
And the last thing I want to highlight is just, you know, we had a great plan set up in Stockton. We thought we were going to be able to deploy all the equipment in a really rapid manner. And unfortunately, there were some circumstances that basically threw that plan out and we had to go back to the steering committee.

And I can't express to you how much appreciation we have of the level of ownership that all of our steering committees have shown in always wanting to step up, take on more responsibilities, and helping to improve and move this process forward. In Stockton, they worked hard to identify new locations where we can, they got contacts for us, and now we're well on our way to deploying that equipment, so just another example.

At the same time, I just want to talk about a couple of challenges similar to what Wayne is talking about. You know, community involvement, it's crucial to the success of this program. Some of the things that we think about and that we have concerns about is if we don't see real emissions reductions happening in the community, that the program could lose energy and enthusiasm, and could see participation drop as a result of it.

We don't want that at all. So I mean, working with the steering committees to implement the measures in these in rapid order is essential.
Wayne talked about the intensity of this process. It is tough. You know, Kevin nicely said it. It's not always rainbows and sunshine. It is tough conversation. We're not here because the problems happened overnight. We're here because those happen -- the problems and the challenges in these communities happened over decades. And, you know, the fact that we've been working now with the committees on implementing, in the year one communities, for 18 months, the level of progress that we've seen is tremendous.

And I'm -- you know, I look forward to seeing the CERPs in -- 11 years down the road when, you know, the measures have been fully implemented and the successes are seen.

And the last thing I'll just talk about is just trust. I feel like we've done a tremendous job of building trust, but it's a continuous process. We're not -- we're not thinking that the trust has fully been built. We understand that it needs to continue to be worked on, and not only for us, but also for everybody that's participating in this process, for air districts, but also for CARB and other agencies that participated in this process. And that only happens through continued dialogue with the communities.

And so we're fully committed and fully committed
to working with all the -- our partner agencies who we value so much, to see all that good work done.

So thank you.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you so much. And just and FYI to everybody, you'll probably see my kids pop in and out, because evening meeting and my kids are here, but that's just an FYI.

So we have a little bit of time left. I'm going to ask a pretty big question and we'll start with community representatives. We'll go to air districts.

But especially I think after all that we heard with kind of that first question around really kind of like how has AB 617 changed, I think either the way that you're doing your work or the community and some of those challenges? I'm really curious, because you've kind of heard CARB in our intro remarks. We all said a lot and shared a lot about kind of our thoughts around AB 617. Are we missing kind of any other, you know, shorter term opportunities?

The other part of this question is what are some of the long term kind of actions that CARB or air districts can take, right? So I think either it's like short-term, what are we missing, right? So you kind of heard all of us speak. And then longer term, what are some of the key opportunities?

I'll start with community reps. Anyone can kind
of chime in, not to go in a specific order.

NAYAMIN MARTINEZ: I can go. I think short term -- I think it's short/medium term, but I think that the -- I think that the fact that we have been competing against each other to be selected, it's against the EJ principles that we -- a lot of us hold, you know, really strong. And I think that what could be done in the meantime is understanding which are strategies that can be replicated statewide are paired with things that CARB or the air districts are already doing, so that we don't have to be waiting for more money and for more communities to be selected. So like just replication of those best practices or strategies.

Also, in terms of the long term, I think that our big frustration, and I'm sure it's not only in the Central Valley but across the state, is the lack of authority over land-use decisions. And I feel that we are, you know, like spinning our wheels trying to clean this and then we turn around and the city and the counties are rubber stamping permits for all kinds of industry that are polluting our air even more. So I think, you know, definitely we need more efforts, probably a clean-up bill or something, that can address that. I'm not a -- you know, a land use expert, but, you know, I think that the big concept is there and I would let the details to be
worked out by the experts.

PAULA TORRADO PLAZAS: I can go next and I'll build on to what Nayamin said. I think for short term -- well, primarily reflecting of the last three years of the AB 617, it needs to focus on actual emissions reduction and stricter air quality measures and metrics that actually reflect the community's concerns and priorities in terms of air quality improvements, if the program is ever to achieve any improved air quality.

And second, successful implementation of the program has been largely gauged by the robustness of its community engagement, rather than their actual meaningful participation coupled with tangible strategies. And while it is commendable that the program has included communities at the decision-making table, this should not be substituted for real emissions reductions strategies that lead to lessening pollution burden.

Another thing to address immediately is the problem around overlooked conflicts of interest of stakeholders involved who representing industry. Industries are uninterested parties in reducing the pollution burden in most impacted communities. I think those three things are for shorter term things to fix for the program.

And for the longer term, I think speaking to what
Nayamin mentioned around the competitive nature of AB 617, I think that's again against environmental justice principles. But also I think we've talked about this around the sector-based hybrid community approach to achieve equal or greater emissions reductions of all emissions, particularly of air and toxics -- or air, toxics, and greenhouse gases throughout many communities that can help transition and transform toxic industries that are concentrated in EJ communities. And this approach can help develop best practices and focus on best available control technologies, emissions reduction strategies that can be shared and implemented in all communities, not just the selected few in the CERPs.

And third thing is to continuing the grants and expand the grants in all AB 617 communities, because that additional funding creates support in the communities that are -- that have a community steering committee and beyond, that can -- so that folks have their support needed to engage in the process more meaningfully.

And that every community should get at least an additional hundred K funding for the community steering committee process, because it's a lot of work. And I think speaking to what everybody said, extending and expanding the financial resources for this project -- for this work it's necessary.
Thank you.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, both. Before I switch it over to air district representatives, anyone else kind of wanted to chime in on that question around short-term opportunities, long term kind of like what are we kind of missing?

ANGIE BALDERAS: I just wanted to add to what was previously said. It would be nice for CSC to have some extra time for education too, I believe and for both community members and the district to set expectations on what we can and can't accomplish with time and funding available.

And then also too, like be respectful of the community's time, instead of, you know, us talking about -- districts constantly talking about what they can do or offer to bring outside government agencies to the table to start that conversation. I really feel like we all need to be at the table, electeds, our city councils, counties, land use authority, like -- and these agencies and community, like we really need to be on the same page.

Like, AB 617 could be so -- like the greatest program, but if we're not all on the same page and it's not community driven, then we're setting it up to fail. And if we're not really supporting it with the funding it deserves and needs, and, yeah -- really, it needs to be --
we need to take that step back, like some folks said, and really let it be a community-led.

And AB 617 also needs a way to hold these other agencies accountable. I feel like we need to, like I said, figure out how to all work together. We can't just put all the burden and everything on community, and just show up, and feel like, all right, you all take care of us. Tell us what to do and figure out how to do it. Like, we really need to have those resources. And how are you all going to work alongside us, so...

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Angie. I'm going to turn it over. We've got about five minutes left before I turn it over to the Chair.

Are there any responses that air district representatives wanted to share kind of like in response to what you've heard?

WAYNE NASTRI: Well, first off, let me say that Angie is always right, so we should do what Angie says.

You know, with regards to bringing in other agencies that is one of the biggest challenges. And one of the biggest frustrations I think that we've heard tonight is that it's the land use agencies and the lack of participation in the overall CSC process that is the most frustrating aspect. And I can tell you from my perspective having reached out to other agencies and
literally being told I don't have the resources to do that. Until I get those, good luck.

That's not acceptable and we need to be able to have some kind of mechanism, whether that's statutory or whether that's the State exerting more influence. But to be honest, I've had trouble intra-State agencies trying to do it, but it's because of the lack of resources for them to come to the table and get engaged.

So from that perspective, trying to either write the authority and the ability for other agencies to get involved, I think is critical. And I think, as has been said before, providing the resources to the community and the time, so that we can build up those relationships, establish the trust, and so that we can work in an actual collegial format the development of these, where we can explain all of these things without rushing to a date, that I think needs a statutory change. Those are the most important aspects I think for this program to be successful.

ANGIE BALDERAS: And I just wanted to thank Wayne for speaking truth, Angie is always right.

(Laughter.)

ANGIE BALDERAS: I'm just kidding. WAYNE NASTRI: It's true. VERONICA EADY: I'll just jump in there. I agree
with what Wayne said, what Nayamin, Angie -- I missing somebody -- Paula, around communities competing against each other. I just want to say that, you know, the air district is -- or Bay Area is going to be putting forward a new committee and -- or a new community this year, and it was a really wonderful discovery that the community groups who -- of the communities that are on our list, East Oakland, Vallejo, San Francisco, Bayview Hunters Point, they came together, and they met, and then they told us who they thought should be the next community, which I thought was really great.

And I just want to also just lift up Bayview Hunters Point, because Bayview community advocates, they actually told us that they weren't ready to be on the list, because they needed to do community organizing and reach out to their partner organizations. And, you know, they've told us when they think they will be ready. And it's been really a great experience to be able to defer to them. So that's one thing that I wanted to point out.

Replicable strategies, if there were a place where we could see these strategies -- the statewide strategies that can be replicated, whether it's a sector-based approach or just kind of an inventory of what's happening in other communities and other CERPs, that would be great.
And then the last thing that I'll say is that -- and give one minute to Ryan, is that we're really interested in providing tools to community groups and community leaders, whether it's funding, whether it's technical assistance from us, so that they're able to work on their own CERPs. And so we're thinking about that at Bay Area and what that might look like. So I just wanted to throw that out there as a short-term thing.

WAYNE NASTRI: Hey, Ryan, before you go, I just want to add one thing, and that is that when we talk about replicable strategies, one of the things that, you know, we focus on is rule development. And those rule developments are applicable district wide. So, for instance, whether we were working on hex chrome issues, we didn't do something just for the City of Paramount. We did it for the entire South Coast Air Quality Management District.

When we're working on these BARCT rules, they benefit all communities. And I think it's important that we highlight the benefit that's going on with the rule development, because it is for all communities. It's not just for one. And when I think of where do we see some of the specific enhanced benefits on the community level, it comes from enforcement. It comes from being in the community and having a presence. And it comes from making
sure that we have rules that are applicable to everybody so that everybody benefits.

So thanks, Ryan, for giving me the extra two minutes.

RYAN HAYASHI: No, I appreciate it, Wayne, because it just gives me more opportunity to say, you know, I'm in agreement with all the previous speakers. And, you know, speaking for the valley, I think one of the things that we definitely want to do more of is engage with additional communities, you know, throughout the valley, understanding that, you know, the program has limited abilities to touch all communities, but there is ample opportunity, especially in working with community based organizations, to do more of the outreach and the education of the services and the opportunities that our organization provides to residents, either through enforcement, incentives to, you know, get cleaner equipment.

So we are definitely looking at partnering with, you know, organizations that are doing this work and providing that outreach and that education, and, you know, in addition to talking about the AB 617 Program and how it's changing communities throughout the San Joaquin Valley.

Thank you.
DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Ryan. Thanks for giving your time, too.

I will be really brief, because I definitely want to turn it over to Chair Randolph, so that we can get questions from the Board. I just wanted to say thank you to, I think, all of our panelists for being here with us tonight. I think as -- you know, I think as I noted in my -- you know, my talking points, I know that Deldi kind of reinforced, we really see this as kind of an opportunity for a reset I think in some ways with this program and having this conversation. And I think even having it in a different format in a different structure really allows for us to kind of hear directly from communities, hear directly from the air districts and kind of have that dialogue, to start to think about what does that reset look like and how do we do this in a thoughtful manner.

So with that said, I'm going to turn it back over to Chair Randolph who will moderate the questions from the Board members.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you, Chanell. That was -- that was a great discussion.

Okay. I'm going to turn it over to my colleagues and ask you all if you have any questions for the panel.

Board member Riordan.
BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted -- I don't have a particular question. I just wanted to express my appreciation to all of you who participate in this effort. It's brand new, in the sense that, yes, it has -- it's been here a few years, but I know takes time and you have enlightened us. And I hope that as the Legislature kind reviews some of the work that's being done, we should bring attention to them, so that they know what you're doing. It's very clear to me you do need the funding. The funding is very critical. Oh, and I'm glad Senator Leyva is on the line with us, because it really is important that you have adequate financial resources to be successful.

And I can see where you need training. I know that training can be so helpful, especially in the beginning, when you bring your groups together and look at the work that you have to do. And it isn't necessarily something that everybody has done before. They know what the problems seem to be in the community, but they need to understand the full scope of what can be done and how it happens in the air districts and even with CARB.

So, one, thank you very much, and secondly, I hope we can get you more funding for your efforts.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Supervisor Serna.
BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you, Chair.
Yeah, so I, too, want to thank all the community members, those that have been very patient and understanding, but also very willing to be candid. I'm glad there wasn't any sugar coating. It didn't sound like it was -- there was today, which I think we all appreciate that honest assessment of where there needs to be improvement. So that's very helpful for me and I would speculate for the rest of the Board.

Just to emphasize what Member Riordan just said about funding. To me, that has been the common theme to almost every single comment. And someone -- one of the commenters mentioned this is something that we knew from the get-go, from the very outset of 617 that it was underfunded. And certainly we've heard plenty from local air districts. I know I have from the five air districts that I represent in the Sacramento Valley that it's a -- it's a program that is woefully underfunded.

So I would like to suggest that -- and this is really I guess for Mr. Corey, that we think about the next session. And I, too, am glad that Senator Leyva is listening intently here. But for the next session, I think we ought to think carefully about how CAPCOA, CARB, the representatives that have given us their input here tonight can march lockstep down to the Capitol. And I
don't know how -- I don't know the mechanics of this. I
don't know if it's a committee hearing. I don't know how
it manifests itself, but I think it's time that the
Legislature understand that when they give CARB and local
air districts the charge to do the right thing -- and I do
firmly believe this in concept is absolutely about doing
the right thing for public health and for a very
democratic process involving local communities, but
without those resources, it becomes quickly very academic.

And so I think we need to have a singular voice
that really stresses to the right people and makes the
right case for improving the resource base for AB 617
implementation.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Dr. Balmes.

You're muted.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Dr. Balmes, you're on
mute.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Well, I can start my thanks
all over again. I wanted to express my appreciation for
the time for -- that all the community representatives and
air districts have put in today and the many hours and
days they put in to trying to make AB 617 implementation
successful. As most of you have heard me say ad nauseam,
I'm really -- my heart and soul is behind trying to make AB 617 successful, because to me, this is really the frontier of air quality regulation and improvement.

Overall, we've done really well with improving the air quality in California, but there's still this disparate proportion of exposure burden in our AB 617 and other low-income communities of color. So this is really important work. And what I heard today, you know, was that the program, warts and all, is making a difference. The community representatives who, you know as Supervisor Serna said, were candid about where they think there are -- there have been problems and shortcomings. But I didn't hear anybody say they wanted to junk the program. And likewise, Veronica, Wayne, and Ryan, representing the districts, didn't say we should junk the program. Everybody said we should work hard to make the program work and that more resources are really imperative.

So we have a long way to go to make the program successful in the designated AB 617 communities. And I heartily endorse trying to figure out a way to involve more communities in a noncompetitive process and I think we can do that, you know, over time.

But I guess I'm glad that, as everybody else said, that Senator Leyva, who I think may be next, can address, I think, our universal concern that this great --
this program with incredible potential to improve air quality and public health in the communities that most need that improvement, but I think we need more resources.

You know this is somewhat -- it's not unfunded, but it's a -- it's an inadequately funded mandate and it -- that's caused tension between the community steering committees, and districts, and CARB, the districts and community steering committees and it's sort of unnecessary tension if we had adequate resources.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

Senator Leyva.

SENATOR LEYVA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

First, let me also add my thanks to all of our community groups. You are the boots on the ground. When I'm working on legislation, you are the folks that I listen to, because you're living this every day. You're hearing from your community members, as well as I am, but only really from folks in Senate District 20, and you're all over the state.

I just want to say that I think that with AB 617, you know, also SB 1000, where cities have to update their general plan and provide an environmental justice piece every 10 years, and then SB 1072, which helps cities -- small cities and disadvantaged cities know how they can obtain money to make sure that they -- that they have
access to money, so that they can implement some of these plans, I think that all of them work together. And I think it was Angie who said that we all have to work together and we really do, and everyone needs to be at the table.

Funding is the fundamental problem and, you know, SB 1072 is a bill that I did three years ago, four years ago, and we just got funding for it in this budget. So what I would say is tell me what you need. We have to try. And if we are going to make change, real positive change, the money has to be there. And I agree with Dr. Balmes, it's not an unfunded mandate, but it's close to an unfunded mandate. So we should try every single year for more money.

And I'll tell you a little secret, all 111 people that are on this call, we're going to have even more money in the budget again next year. So this is another year, where we should really try to put forward the effort to make these things happen.

Let me know what we're looking for, give me a dollar amount. If you have specific legislation, I would love to hear about it. Thank you all for what you do, and let's work together, and let's be in it to win it.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.
Board Member Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you very much.

I think we're all calling you right now, Senator. So thank you so much for offering that. And I also wanted to thank you for reminding us all about SB 1000, which is where I think we first crossed paths, because that -- the requirement for an environmental justice element in the general plans really speaks to what we need as a model, I think, for what we're talking about with AB 617 as well.

We need that level of integration where you're looking at it across the Board, and looking at how can environmental justice be elevated in every way that a general -- in every place that a general plan touches.

And so that's -- I want to thank everybody. I really agree with almost everything that folks said. The problem I have is we keep referring to this as the AB 617 program. And I really would love it if we could move towards this is the way we do business in the air districts and at CARB in regards to authentic community participation and really reducing emissions. Because if we think of this as a program and something that needs to get funded, like a separate program that only happens in certain communities or only happens when we have funding, I think we're going to miss the big picture here.

We have to fundamentally change the way that
districts do business and the way that community members are regarded or else it will -- it may be successful for a while and then it's going to go away, because we may have more funding next year, but my guess is in a few years, that won't be the case.

So how do we integrate and institutionalize the kinds of changes that are happening right now, which are really exciting across the board? And I think that the community representatives have really talked about one fundamental change and that is participatory budgeting, that really needs to be baked in to the districts so that we're looking at how the budgets are allocated for rulemaking, for community participation.

I really appreciate what Wayne was saying. And I think it's really important that we look at how industry is related to when rulemaking is occurring and how is -- how are communities related to during that period and how is the budget allocated to allow for all of those stakeholders to have their participation, their say?

And I think it's not all in the form of public comments in writing or in hearing. You know, we know that those relationships with industry are built over time and there's trusting relationships between the District and those industries. The same thing has to happen with that and that has to be built into, I think, the way districts
do business. And that, in my view, is true power sharing as Deldi was talking about initially.

So I'm really looking for how we can get that level of partnership and power sharing across the Board. And I think it's really built on some of the elements that we currently have and that we're hearing about in the 617 program, and I'll say it.

But I think that's what the blueprint -- the new blueprint is going to have to really speak. We shouldn't be wasting time on whether or not people should get stipends. They absolutely should get stipends. There should be full-time staff that are staffing the community members that are on these steering committees. There should be technical assistance that are staffing the community members. Those are really not debatable in my view. Those are the kinds of resources that people need to really do the kind of work that we're asking them to do. So if we could get all that out of the way, then we can move forward, I think, with real change. And so I look forward to the discussion about that also in the future.

Thanks.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Board Member Florez.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: I had put my hand down
because I think a lot had been said. By I just -- I really wanted to just say thank you also to both Nayamin and also to Wayne. I do feel like we should take some time as a Board to talk about the land use planning issue. I find it's getting, you know, almost incomprehensible in terms of what we're fighting against. And I know Connie, the Senator, knows this as well from Kern County to San Bernardino. You know, the warehousing there coming in, we're having legislation to just keep up. But there needs to be, you know, a really big discussion I think at some point in time about this whole land use issue.

And I feel particularly hard for the poor rural communities, who are looking for jobs, but in some cases have to tradeoff some of these for lungs. And, you know, I just want to say thank you to all the EJ groups who continue to pound the drum on this issue. I think it's the fundamental issue, and keep going, and hopefully we'll continue to be there with you.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Board Member De La Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you. I want to also echo all of my colleagues who thanked the panelists and all of the of 617 folks who are listening in today. Thank you for what you've done. This was a grand
experiment five years ago, or however long it's been already. But as Deldi pointed out in the beginning, we're only in year three of implementation and only seven are in year two, which is -- you know, we're -- it's still early, but I will go back to the thing that I've said over and over again that this is a sampler platter of California, the 15 are. And so we're going to learn things and find successes that can be replicated, and then at that point, we take those things statewide.

We don't need a community to be a 617 community to benefit from what we are undertaking in these 15 communities, and again, the successes that we have that we can take up and down the state. And I think that's when the push for funding is really going to be key. You know, don't know how much -- don't know what it is that's going to be successful, so we don't know how much it's going to cost.

But I think at that point, we're going to have to make sure that we have the funds to implement the successful strategies in like communities up and down the state. So I'm as positive about this program with its -- with its bumps and successes that we've had so far. I'm as positive about it today as I was when the legislation was signed into law and when we started to implement it. I'm really hopeful about what we can do here and I want to
remind everybody there is nothing like this on planet Earth. There's no country that's doing this. There's no state that's doing this. We are really on the cutting edge here of community based mitigation and addressing all of the disparities, all of the equity concerns in terms of air quality that are out there in the state of California. So I just want to thank Deldi, thank Chanell, thank you, Chair and staff for pushing ahead, and our partners at the air districts as well.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Assemblymember Garcia.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER GARCIA: Yes. Madam Chair, good evening and colleagues. I wanted to just make a few remarks. The camera is off as we're traveling back and forth in the district.

But I wanted just to kind of build on Board Member Takvorian's comments and Mr. De La Torre's. This is a program that is unlike any program ever seen or attempted to be implemented. And so, yes, there will be a tremendous amount of bumps and bruises along the way.

That being said, I think it's always important to remind ourselves that the program was set up for the purpose of allowing our community residents who are directly being impacted by air pollution to drive the
conversation, to set the priorities and ultimately be part of the implementation resolution efforts.

And there's been a lot of questions in certain part of the state if, in fact, that has been the way that the discussions have been taking place. And maybe it's because of the stringent timelines that are in place that air districts have rushed to set up, you know, the frameworks and lead discussions to end in certain places with certain issues to be at the top of the list. And I know, because that's how some of our local stakeholders in the Coachella Valley feel about the process that's been undertaken.

I also wanted to speak to Ms. Takvorian's points about, you know, the idea is that this work become normalized throughout the air districts, that this not be the other program that we constantly say, well, because we don't have the adequate funding, we are unable to do X, Y, and Z. And really for many residents in my district, whether it be in the eastern parts of the Coachella Valley or Imperial County, they believe that this is work that the air quality districts should have been doing already.

And I know that a couple comments were made that, you know, the lack of founding creates tension and this competitiveness with other regions, but the fact of the matter is is that we need to acknowledge that tension
between the air quality districts and our community has existed far before the adoption, and implementation, and selection of communities for AB 617. And I think it's important to recognize that.

And so when we have air districts beginning to work closely with the community and establish trust in developing priorities, there's a lot of courtship that needs to happen before that. There's still a long way to go to establishing the lines of communication and then getting into the trust. I mean, this is like speed dating times 10 that we're asking the community to engage in on issues that are far more real, as we heard from our guests. You know, people are sick. People are getting -- are dying. People are Desperate for jobs and economic development and investment. And there are some serious tradeoffs that are happening. And Board Member Florez gave an example of that that's happening in the Inland Empire with the development of warehouses and the impact that that has overall on the air quality of the region.

Without a doubt, and the offer that Senator Connie Leyva puts on the table is the same offer that we put forward in terms of, you know, pushing for additional resources, but -- and if there needs to be considerations for adjusting the policy timelines, and goals, and objective without compromising the principality of the
policies in 617, then that's something that we ought to entertain.

And I know that my colleague Cristina Garcia has considered that in the recent past looking also at the best available technology implementation piece to AB 617 and how we support the air districts moving forward.

So I just -- I just wanted to just mention that, you know, it's great to hear from stakeholders participating in the process. It's good to hear from the air districts. I'm happy that Wayne was as candid, I think, as he has been in the past about, you know, the challenges, the opportunities, but I also know that there are a lot of people that are expecting, you know, the air districts to go even further, above and beyond, with the limited resources. And that's just based on the belief that this work that's being done is work that should have already been in progress in our communities to address air pollution issues that are impacting the public health and well-being of our constituents.

So thank you for allowing me to just say a few words, some of it repetitive, but nevertheless I think it would be important to lend my voice to the subject.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

I'm not seeing any other Board members raising
their hand, so I will -- I will thank Chanell and the panel for your great insights. I mean, there was a lot of -- there were a lot of important values that were expressed right, the values of having this be community led, the values of ensuring that there are enough resources, the values of getting other agencies to participate, the values of funding and the control of that funding and making sure that communities can lead when it comes to the use of the funding that supports the strategies that they develop, and the need to get away from a competitive process to build an AB 617 process that, where communities aren't competing with each other and that we're really scaling up solutions that work for all communities.

So I really appreciate that discussion and I think it's a good segue into our next panel, which is about how CARB itself is focusing on the enforcement, and toxic strategies, and other programs throughout the agency and really bring to bear all of the resources that we have to work with communities and make the improvements that we need.

So CARB staff member Ugo Eke-Simmons will start by providing instruction and background of how CARB divisions work together on AB 617.

Ugo, take it away.
(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

TTD AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER EKE-SIMMONS: Thank you, Chair Randolph. And good evening to you and also to all the members of the Board.

In this second panel discussion, we will begin with a brief presentation highlighting the role of the Air Toxics Program in supplementing and implementing the goals of AB 617.

--o0o--

TTD AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER EKE-SIMMONS:

California's Air Toxics Program identifies and controls air toxics, informs the public of significant air toxics exposures from stationary sources and requires facilities to reduce those risks, and addresses the health impacts of toxics exposures to communities to ensure our measures adequately protect children and other sensitive receptors, such as hospitals, schools, day care facilities, and residential care facilities.

AB 617 is an integral part of the Air Toxics Program building upon key pieces of legislation that drive air toxics priorities. AB 617 has helped inform the Air Toxics Program by changing our understanding of air toxics in California, particularly in the communities most impacts by toxic air pollution.

Last September, we presented an informational
update to the Board outlining Air Toxics program priorities for 2020 and beyond. One of the priorities was to evaluate the work AB 617 has done and its influence on how the Air Toxics Program can be enhanced to address localized air toxics exposures to communities impacted by air pollution.

Since that time, we have engaged in a suite of activities and actions to guide this work moving toward. This work has and will continue to involve coordination across multiple divisions in CARB with air toxics related programs, as you will see reflected in the upcoming slides.

--00o--

TTD AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER EKE-SIMMONS:
Currently Air Toxics Program actions include amending air toxics control measures. Staff are currently working on amendments to the chrome plating control measure;

Developing a ranking criteria to help prioritize future emission reduction strategies, which may include Airborne Toxic Control Measures, suggestion control measures, guidance documents and incentives;

Providing health risk assessment guidance for gas stations. Staff held a public workshop earlier this month on the technical and supplemental gas station guidance documents, and anticipate publishing both documents early
next year;

Staff has been evaluating toxic metals from emission sources within communities, including hexavalent chrome emissions not covered under the existing chrome plating amendments, as potential candidates for a future Airborne Toxic Control Measure;

Supporting and following Research Division's work to develop a more comprehensive analysis of the health benefits of California's air quality actions, and continuing current research into air toxics health impacts, such as affects on respiratory disease in communities;

And community engagement and education through air toxics publications summarizing activities in the Air Toxics Program, as well as holding air toxics listening and capacity building sessions. And integral part of this process will be partnering with communities to enhance co-learning efforts to inform future Air Toxics Program actions.

--o0o--

TTD AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER EKE-SIMMONS: Future Air Toxics Program actions include work in areas such as:

Assessing cumulative impacts and developing tools and metrics to incorporate them into risk management strategies;
Developing new air toxic reduction strategies, including Airborne Toxic Control Measures, and amending existing Airborne Toxic Control Measures as needed, while prioritizing community and regional air toxics risk reduction efforts;

Updating CARB's air toxics monitoring network to continue to document regional and statewide trends, while also focusing on emerging areas of concern to help assess exposure and document progress as controls are implemented;

Updating the emission inventory to include more current and comprehensive toxics data to support Air Toxics Program work and prioritizing and developing community scale emission reduction strategies;

Updating CARB's approach to air toxics enforcement by considering ways to enhance the processes and methods CARB currently uses to engage air districts in enforcement of air toxics-related programs;

And continued community engagement and education, including opportunities for co-learning as we work to develop and implement future Air Toxics Program actions.

--o0o--

TTD AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER EKE-SIMMONS: Now, we'll talk more about the health risk research and health analysis work that the Research Division is doing,
specifically how AB 617 is informing research priorities. CARB research is focusing on ways to incorporate more community voices into research, enhance community engagement, and include projects which strive for equitable outcomes. The projects on this slide are examples of current research projects that are driven by AB 617 community needs.

The first project will investigate what air and noise pollution levels residents in disadvantaged communities are subjected to, both indoors and outdoors, to gain a better understanding of which sources and activities may have the greatest impacts.

The second project is focused on collaborating with community groups and researchers in the Imperial Valley to jointly develop a research roadmap and decide on priority research needs to benefit this impacted region.

The third project will engage members community members in selected key health metrics associated with air pollutant exposures in their communities and develop a publicly available dashboard to track health metrics over time. Projects such as these will help CARB achieve its goals of improved community engagement, community-focused research, and community awareness for current and future research projects. These research efforts will also help promote equity in CARB air quality and climate policies.
and programs.

Chanell, I'll hand it back to you to moderate the panel discussion.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: There we go. Thank you, Ugo, so, so much.

There are just a few things that I'd want to reinforce from Ugo's remarks. So I think that idea of co-learning with communities. So engagement informs the work of our air toxic programs. Two, I think the connection to AB 617. So CARB staff have reviewed the CERPs to better understand community priorities to inform the work of the Air Toxics Program. And finally, the need to more fully capture health benefits and how our Research Division is supporting us.

So kind of in our next slide --

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: -- or, I mean, in our next panel, we will hear from other divisions that play a role in implementing AB 617. And so there are a lot of moving parts. So in this slide right here you're going to see the role that each division plays in AB 617.

Now, one of the things that we wanted to emphasize here is that there are so many divisions who work to support our commitments and we were not able to bring them all to this panel. And there are actually two
divisions at the very end. So you'll see it's our Monitoring and Laboratory and our Mobile Source Control Division that I think aren't on this panel, but again I think are -- really have been instrumental in I think our AB 617 work.

And then I think there are even divisions there aren't listed here that support our AB 617 Program. So there's our legal office for one and then there are the three databases that AB 617 called on CARB to develop, so that means that we rely on our Administrative Services Division for contract and its support to help launch them.

So I think the point we really want to emphasize here is that it really does take a village when we're talking about implementation of AB 617. With that said, let's focus on our panelists here to learn about how they have been reshaping and rethinking their programs in response to AB 617.

So if everybody who's our panelists, if your cameras can be on, that would be awesome. Yay. I think Rich -- there we go. High five. I will ask each one to introduce themselves and let them know -- or let us know your role at CARB.

And I'll start with you, Elizabeth.

RESEARCH DIVISION CHIEF SCHEEHLE: Thanks, Chanell. Hi. I'm Elizabeth Scheehle. I'm the Chief of
the Research Division at CARB. So my Division conducts research that provides a scientific foundation for many of the policies throughout the entire agency. And the research is designed to help inform rules and regulations. This can range from atmospheric measurement campaigns to epidemiological health studies, source-specific field studies, health disparities analysis and much more.

My Division also conducts the health analysis that describes the health benefits of regulations and plans. We're currently expanding that analysis to include more qualitative and quantitative analysis. We'll be holding a workshop later this year to actually introduce some new health endpoints, many of those will be incorporated into the next Scoping Plan.

So we recognize the importance of including equity and community voices, and as such have incorporated changes into our approach and will continue to evolve those processes and introduce new approaches over time.

Thanks.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Elizabeth.

And then, Michael, I'll turn it over to you.

AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: Good evening. I'm Michael Benjamin and I'm Chief of CARB's Air Quality Planning and Science Division. The Air Quality Planning and Science
Division is responsible for developing planning documents and strategies known as State Implementations Plans, or SIPs, which are needed to meet federal air quality standards to address smog and fine particulate pollution.

In developing the SIPs, we develop emission inventories. We analyze air quality data and we conduct air quality modeling. We also develop regulations to collect criteria and toxics emission data from stationary sources of pollution. More recently, we've expanded our responsibilities to also include developing technical analyses in support of the AB 617 Program.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Michael.

Okay. Rich, I'm going to have you go first and then Robert I'll have you go right after, since you guys are both representing Transportation and Toxics Division.

TTD ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF BOYD: Thanks, Chanell. I'm Rich Boyd. I'm the Assistant Division Chief of the Transportation and Toxics Division.

Our Division develops regulations for both diesel PM and non-diesel toxic source. And we rely on data that's produce by AQPSD, work that's done by our Monitoring and Laboratory Divisions to help inform us as we're developing those regulations. We also do conduct health risk assessments as part of our work in developing
regs. And we also do play a role in supporting our Enforcement Division in implementing many of those regulations.

TTD RISK REDUCTION BRANCH CHIEF KRIEGER: Thanks, Rich, and thanks, Chanell. And as Rich mentioned, he talked about a lot of things that we do obviously. I'm the Chief of the Risk Reduction Branch within Transportation and Toxics Division.

And as Rich mentioned, we -- it takes -- it takes a village. As you mentioned too, Chanell, it takes a village from our different divisions to help run the Air Toxics Program. Our Branch specifically works on Airborne Toxic Control Measures. They -- we also do health risk assessments, as Rich mentioned. But we also do things like responding to CEQA letters, to providing CEQA comments on different projects and those types of things. And we are engaging in more community outreach than ever before because of the results of some of the 617. So thank you again for having us.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Rich and Robert. So Todd, you were going to round us out.

ENFORCEMENT DIVISION CHIEF SAX: Great. Well, so hi. I'm Todd Sax. I'm Chief of CARB's Enforcement Division. You know what you've heard from the others is
there are staff who develop plans, and then staff who
develop regulations. The Enforcement Division is the
group that's responsible for enforcing all of these
regulations to ensure that the emissions and the health
benefits of our regulations are actually achieved in
practice.

And so for the past 15 years, CARB developed and
implemented rules that are designed to reduce diesel
particulate emissions from trucks, for example, by more
than 90 percent. And ensuring these reductions are met is
the most important thing that we can do to improve
conditions in these communities to reduce toxic diesel
particulate emissions and health risks.

And over the past four years a fraction of
California's registered vehicles that are complying with
our regulations has increased from 66 percent in 2016 to
98 percent today for trucks with the Truck and Bus Rule.
So we know that rule is working and we're continuing to go
after the remaining trucks that don't meet our
requirements.

And so to date, AB 617 has really resulted in our
bringing our existing enforcement programs into
disadvantaged communities. So, for example, in 2020, we
inspected more than 13,000 vehicles and equipment with 73
percent of them in disadvantaged communities. And we also
run a supplemental environmental projects program that in 2020 diverted $6.8 million to local community projects, including providing high-efficiency air filtration to students in schools.

And, in fact, we've diverted more than $20 million in penalties since we redesigned our SEP program to disadvantaged communities. So thank you.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thanks, Todd.

So I'm going to ask this first question, but I feel like in some of the intros we've already kind of tackled it. So if you have, it's okay.

But the first questions I wanted to kind of ask and have us think about is how is what we're learning from AB 617 informing our work? And if you feel like you've answered that question, a different take on it could be how has AB 617 changed the way that you're doing your work?

So take either one, depending on how you've -- if you've already that first question. And I will start with you, Elizabeth.

RESEARCH DIVISION CHIEF SCHEEHLE: Thanks, Cheryl. So as we're conducting research and considering the health benefits, it is really important to consider how equity plays a part in the research projects and to listen to community voices.
As such, and you've heard a little bit about this, we've embarked on an effort to operationalize racial equity in research. So we're making changes in both how we do the research to incorporate more community voices, and in the research itself, including creating projects that focus on community needs.

So in the near term, we're attending community meetings and listening sessions to hear those community concerns, hosting discussion sessions that focus on the Research Program, and utilizing other avenues to collect ideas and also to increase transparency of our process.

In addition, we're encouraging compensated community partners in research projects where appropriate and implementing additional criteria and components in our research project implementation. These can include things like partnerships between academic researchers and community researchers, as well as implicit bias training, community engagement plans, and cultural competency statements.

Finally, we're disseminating results with more public facing progress updates and requiring summaries of the research with accessible language. So these steps will evolve as we continue to listen to feedback on the processes.

And in the longer term -- just a little bit more.
In the longer term, we're working on a more detailed equity framework for research. We'll be seeking public input on that and looking to expand coordination and collaboration, assess our research baseline and track progress, and provide an update to the Board on that.

In addition, we have ongoing and upcoming research that you've heard about in the presentation that's really directly influenced by concerns voiced by 617 communities. One of the projects mentioned was the research roadmap in collaboration with communities in Imperial Valley.

And we're aiming to collaborate with additional communities in the coming years. And in also listening to some of the earlier panel, making sure that we take some results from that and see if there are ways that we can broaden those results to apply to additional communities as well is something that we'll try to incorporate.

I wanted to touch on another project mentioned in the presentation directly related to concerns we've heard from communities, which is on the health related metrics to track progress and health outcomes over time. We have heard this concern over time. And in response to that, we suggested and the Board approved a project on this last year. It's in the process of being executed. It will include discussions with communities of what metrics to
consider, what would communities be interested in, and what is feasible to actual measure to see results in health in the near term.

So with that, I will hand it -- I believe Michael maybe now hand it back to you.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Yeah, Michael, if you can chime in.

AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: Thanks, Chanelle.

Well, you know, historically, we've focused our air quality planning efforts on addressing regional air quality challenges and sources of pollution. And that's been both in terms of our focus on technical work as well as policy development. So AB 617 has been transformational for us in three fundamental ways.

First, making sure that we have information on air quality and sources of pollution, not just at the regional scale, but also the community scale, which is important when we start to think about developing effective mitigation strategies.

Second, recognizing that we need more web-based tools and other ways of sharing emissions and air quality information that's understandable not just to the regulated industry, or policymakers, or scientists, but also to community members and the public at large.

And finally, realizing that we need to reach out
and solicit input from community members much earlier in
the process of developing our air quality plans, whether
those plans are regional, State Implementation Plans, or
community scale emission reduction plans.

TTD RISK REDUCTION BRANCH CHIEF KRIEGER: Thanks,
Michael. Robert Krieger. And as Michael indicated, AB
617 is really helping CARB to improve efforts in obtaining
relevant air toxics emissions data, not just from a
regional area, but from a community, so the impacted

This is one piece of the information needed to
enhance our efforts to provide additional priorities to
reducing hot -- air toxics exposures in communities most
impacted by this air pollution. Information gathered and
the lessons learned through AB 617 and the Community Air
Protection Program will help inform our Air Toxics Program
about the renewed community focus as well as we work to
identify and control air toxic contaminants and assess and
reduce the health risk of those exposures.

Interactions with communities and knowledge
gained from AB 617 will also help us to identify new and
emerging chemicals and how these could impact health risks
to local communities, as well as how we should be
addressing these impacts in our programs.

Finally, information gathered from our community
listening sessions, such as those that we've had for air
toxics, freight days, and locomotive actions, along with
community meetings and our community outreach sessions,
community monitoring programs, and evaluating CERPs are
helping us to prioritize sources for future emission
control strategies.

This information has helped us underscore the
need to expand community engagement and efforts and
opportunities to be in communities into regulatory
development activities at the start of our processes. And
this is something that the Chair -- Diane has mentioned
too, that it's not just the 617 communities, but it's
across all of our Air Toxic Control Measures in our
programs.

Thank you.

TTD ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF BOYD: And this is
Richard. I mean, the one thing that I would add with
respect to our, you know, listening sessions, because --
and just kind of reflecting back a little bit on the first
panel from a couple of comments we heard there about
things being community driven. When we first started, you
know, doing those listening sessions, I'll be honest, it
was a new thing to us. It's not something that we had
done a whole lot -- actually, we just really hadn't done
it all with respect to developing those regulations.
We used information that came from that very early listening session to drive the topics of discussion for the future listening sessions. So that includes the freight days that we had, the locomotive session that we had, and the upcoming session in December on health risk assessment. And so we directly used that information that we heard from community members who were attending those sessions, you know, to inform what we were doing -- you know, doing next on that.

The other thing I wanted to add, there were, you know, a couple of comments at the end of the last session regarding, you know, warehouses and some of the activities that were going on there. That's really getting toward the diesel PM side of the shop.

One of the other functions that goes on within, you know, our Division is we do comment on, you know, freight projects. Right -- you know, right now, we are looking to expand to, you know, toxics projects. We're -- and in those letters, we advocate for the accelerated deployment of zero-emission technology including the related infrastructure, you know, time of construction as soon as it is commercially available.

And one of the things we started doing there is we do accept input from communities in terms of the projects they would like us to look like -- you know, look
at. And that has had a big influence in terms of the projects that we actually submit comments on. So I just wanted to add that real quickly.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Oh, Todd, you're on mute.

ENFORCEMENT DIVISION CHIEF SAX: Yeah. Sorry about that. I'll round it out by just saying, you know, we've really, over the last five, six years, tried to build into the DNA of our Division the idea that we're trying to address environmental injustice. And so we've really seen our programs evolve on that front. We started with just having one staff person who was working on trying to get no idling signs into communities where communities wanted it. And we expanded to having a team of staff that started conducting outreach, visiting, going out to community like IVAN meetings, and the like, to try to understand what communities were facing.

And that's evolved into now more community-focused enforcement efforts in each of the 617 communities. We have a lot to learn and we have a lot to do, but we've also come a long way in a relatively short time.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, Todd. And so I think I love like panels and conver -- for me it's a conversation -- for conversations like this,
because of after kind of hearing like basically what --
what and how AB 617 has changed or informed the work that
we're doing, the next question that I always have is so
what are the actions, right? What are the outcomes, I
think, that are currently happening to reduce community
exposures to air toxics and how do we ensure that
communities will see improvements in air quality.

And so I think for this one, I'm going start with
Michael.

AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: Thanks, Channell. Well,
you know, reducing community exposure to air toxics
requires having a good understanding of how much air
pollution is being released and where it's coming from, so
that we can develop the most effective strategies for
improving air quality at the community scale.

There are a couple of actions -- very significant
actions that the Board took this past year that I think
really are going to expand our understanding of what those
emissions are and what their impacts are for public health
and what sort of strategies make sense for addressing
them.

So the first action that the Board took was
adopting the Criteria and Toxics Regulation that we refer
to as CTR. And this regulation, which is being phased in
over a seven-year period is going to dramatically increase
the number of facilities in California that need to report their toxics and criteria emissions on an annual basis. And so this is going to be extremely helpful for Robert and his team as he thinks about strategies and regulations, Air Toxic Control Measures that he may want to pursue to reduce risk at the community scale.

Another action that the Board took that is also going to be extremely beneficial is were the amendments to the Emission Inventory Criteria and Guidelines, or EICG, which significantly expanded the number of chemicals that need to be reported from about five or six hundred to more than 1,400. So we're adding another 900 chemicals that need to be considered as we develop risk assessments. And so in combination, these two Board actions I think are going to be very important in terms of understanding what the sources of emissions are and what the risk is to communities.

We're also doing a few other things in terms of going back to what I was saying about the importance of having access to information and making it really understandable, we are developing a tool that's going to allow us to import and manage this community scale emissions data and we're rolling that tool out over the next year or two. That is going to be, I think, extremely useful for us, but also for community members. And then
we're also developing AQ-VIEW, which is a new data portal that's going to visualize make available all of this low cost sort of air quality sensor data that's being collected by community members through the AB 617 Program. And so this combination of community scale emissions data and community scale air monitoring data that's going to be much more readily available and accessible to community members we think is going to go a long way towards empowering communities and giving them much more control in terms of really helping them to understand what they may be exposed to in their communities.

TTD RISK REDUCTION BRANCH CHIEF KRIEGER: Thanks, Michael.

AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: So I don't know, is Robert, maybe this is a good hand off to you.

TTD RISK REDUCTION BRANCH CHIEF KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate everything that Michael has said too. And I think I just want to echo some of the information that Michael presented. And some of that has to do with the emissions inventory criteria and guidelines in the number of compounds that were identified and the expansive list of compounds that were identified. This will definitely help us in our ranking and prioritization of new emission reduction strategies as well as any of our
Air Toxic Control Measures in the future.

A couple actions that we're doing in TTD, Transportation and Toxics Division, is that, first of all, as stated before in the presentation, we are amending our chrome plating regulation to reduce the risk posed by the use of hexavalent chrome in these operations.

We're also developing -- in the process of developing a ranking criteria and creating a scoring matrix to help CARB staff determine future air toxics emission reduction strategies, whether that's new ATCMs -- amended ATCMs, suggested control measures incentives, guidance documents, publications, that sort of thing.

Staff anticipate a draft framework of this ranking criteria yeah and scoring matrix early next year. What's really important about this is that this will be done with community members for their input as well. So it will be coordinated with the community members. And this will be very important for us to determine what emission reduction strategies we have in these communities.

Based on the data from the CERPs, I feel we're the beneficiaries of all 617 work and shared at the listening sessions. We're valuating toxics metals as a candidate for our future Airborne Toxic Control Measure.

Some of the toxic metals we are evaluating
include, but are not limited to, hexavalent chrome emission, not covered in the existing chrome plating amendments, but also arsenic, cadmium, copper, lead, and mercury, and nickel to name a few.

We are also in the process of publishing gas station industry-wide technical and supplemental guidance -- policy guidance. The technical guidance provides procedures for guiding air districts in conducting health risk assessments on gas stations. The supplemental guidance provide recommendations for districts and local governments on the siting and permitting of gas stations, and underscores the need to consider cumulative impacts in our actions.

As mentioned before, in all of our programs, we are engaging in ongoing community outreach, listening sessions, capacity building sessions, including upcoming sessions on health risk assessments. We are also engaging in the process, much more than we have before, in our air toxics regulation development and our amendments as well.

We're continuing to provide comments and offer suggested mitigation measures on several CEQA-related projects that have significant impacts to California communities. In these letters, we advocate for the deployment of zero-emission technologies and the supporting infrastructure as soon as they become
commercially available.

ENFORCEMENT DIVISION CHIEF SAX: So I think I'll take it from here. So from the enforcement perspective, we want to make sure we're building stronger and more lasting partnerships with disadvantaged communities, whether they're AB 617, or selected, or not, to facilitate more effective enforcement over time.

Over the past several years, even though we've focused our enforcement programs in disadvantaged communities as places, this hasn't always translated into addressing the concerns of the people who actually live in these communities.

So what we're going to try to do is expand our enforcement approach based on three fundamental ideas. First, we're going to work with communities across the state to better prioritize our work where it's most needed. Rather than simply bringing our programs to a community, we want to instead bring our expertise and our labor, and ask people in the community how they think we might be able to address the problems they see in their community.

Second, we're going to provide a more comprehensive suite of services to communities. This will, of course, include our regular mobile source inspections, vehicle idling assessments and inspections,
but it's also going to include things like odor investigations and local agency coordination, stationary source inspections in collaboration with air district enforcement staff, training - we can help train communities on how to submit, for example, more actionable complaints, but we can also be trained by the communities in the process of working with them on how to do that more effectively.

We can engage in interagency collaboration on multi-media issues, like toxics issues. We will continue to expand our supplemental environmental projects programs, and we can also work on special projects.

Third and finally, we really want to focus on transparency, accountability, and leveraging from what we learn from our boots on the ground work in these communities.

So going forward, we're going to be providing a report to each community documenting our understanding of concerns and issues, the results of our enforcement work, the lessons learned from our work in the community, and the next steps that we think could be taken to address underlying community issues.

In this capacity, staff, we will be working as investigators in the community, but also serving as consultants to local community groups. We will post the
results of any new types of inspections that we conduct, 
including inspections in industrial sources on our 
enforcement data visualization system, in addition to all 
the work that we are doing at -- in our mobile source 
inspections. And we will summarize the results and 
lessons learned across all these communities in our annual 
enforcement report each year.

We're already starting to implement this new 
approach now, and it's going to require more work in 
communities and more conversations with people in 
communities. And we're really excited, I think, about 
what the -- what the approach has to offer.

Enforcement is not a tool to solve all problems. 
But as both inspectors with communities experience --
community level experience and air quality experts, we can 
help identify ways to help address the issues that 
communities face, both in the near term, and to better 
understand the underlying issues that will need to be 
solved over the longer term.

So thank you.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you, 
Todd so much. And I just found out that we are out of 
time. So with that, I think I will say this. One, I just 
wanted to say a huge, huge thank you to everybody on this 
panel just for sharing out about the programs and helping
everyone understand how equity and a focus on community is being incorporated throughout CARB, right? And so it's not just in these certain, you know, what is it, certain programs, but really all throughout that we're trying to do. This works. So thank you guys so much.

Before I hand it back over to the Chair, I did want to kind of highlight one slide to talk about some of the next steps. And I just wanted to do this very, very briefly.

--o0o--

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: And I just wanted to highlight some of the activities for both air toxics and Community Air Protection Program over the next nine months. So we can just put it on the screen. I won't spend a lot of time necessarily walking through all of this, but I just wanted again to put it on the screen, and I think -- so folks can kind of see what we're doing, again from over -- from like December 2021 ongoing. We really do have things really coming out that we're really focused on, in terms of this action and some of those next steps.

And so with that, I would turn it back over to Chair Randolph to allow for more questions and comments from the Board.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. That was a great
panel. And it I was really an excellent sort of taste of what Board Member Takvorian was talking about, like what are we doing to build the community engagement, and partnership, and strategizing, and data gathering, and sharing information, and exchanging expertise into all of our programs. So it was really encouraging to hear a lot of the work that's currently happening.

So I will turn it over to the Board members who would like to ask questions of the panel.

Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I don't really need to ask questions. I just want to really express my appreciation for the -- all the divisions that are working hard to try to help AB 617 be successful. I mean, this panel was music to my ears. And I just want to go back to what Mr. Corey said at the start of this part of our agenda about how CARB's culture is changing as a result of AB 617.

And Ms. Takvorian said it well, this should be not just AB 617, it should be for all of our work. And what I'm hearing is progress towards that. I really want to express my appreciation for all the staff members in all the divisions that are working hard to help AB 617 move forward and to change the culture of our agency to be more equity focused. It's really heartening to hear people like Rich Boyd and Todd Sax talk about community
listening, and actually more. Todd actually said learning from the community. That's what this is all about.

And as I've often said, what's transformational about AB 617 is the mandate to worry about local air pollution not the regional air pollution that the federal Clean Air Act prescribes. And, you know, it was again music to my ears to hear Michael Benjamin talking about how we considers AB 617 transformational to his Division's work, moving from the regional level to the community level.

And I also -- because I've been pushing this for a long time, I hope AQ-VIEW finally, you know, fulfills the promise that we've made for years to have monitoring data available to community members in an understandable way.

And finally, because I have been very supportive of the Research Division and they've briefed me more than once on their efforts to have AB 617-focused research and research inspired by AB 617 that would be also applicable to other communities that are not AB 617 designated. And I particularly want to say that it may not be the first time, but the fact that we're supporting a community-based participatory research project in Imperial Valley is really exciting to me, that that -- you know, our research has not been that community partnered before. So I really
appreciate that.

And the health metrics research project out of UCLA that we're funding is also really important to try to move AB 617 implementation into accountability with regards to health outcomes, not just emission reductions. So I'm just really excited about this presentation and I appreciate it.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you, Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you.

Yes, thank you so much panel. I really appreciate all of you and especially have appreciated seeing you on the ground, getting to know some of the issues that you're facing on the ground. I've really appreciated seeing some of you in my district. And I hope that that continues to be part of the engagement.

I do have a question for you and just anybody can answer. What do you feel like, aside from the 617 communities, is a venue of community engagement or something that we could support you in in terms of trying to access those that are on the ground to help inform the work that you do?

TTD RISK REDUCTION BRANCH CHIEF KRIEGER: Well, I can -- I can address part of that. I think when we -- when we look at our Airborne Toxic Control Measures or when we start to develop an Airborne Toxic Control
Measure, such as the one we're amending now with chrome plating, community input is very important. And the more community input we have from the communities that have these facilities and these sources within their communities, the better we have to opportunities to co-learn about those sources in emissions, and what your concerns are in the community. So that's very important for us.

Anything that we do, as far as -- and I mentioned this before in the presentation, we're developing kind of a ranking criteria to determine what next we can do within each community. And that's going to be very important to have community involvement in those opportunities, where we can share and develop this in a partnership, so that we can -- we can hear what you have to say and hear your voices. So that's at least two areas for sure we would definitely need your input.

TTD ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF BOYD: I think the other thing -- this is Rich again -- that I would, you know, add to that is, you know, we're trying to do a better job and consistently improve with our, you know, listening sessions. And that's -- that's, you know, our opportunity -- at least we think that's a good opportunity where there's the opportunity for that cross-dialogue, where we can hear from the communities, they can educate
us about what's going on, and then we can really have that
discussion about how we move forward with, you know,
our -- you know, our actions, and whatnot.

You know, and so things that put a spotlight on
that just so more folks know about it, you know, are
helpful. You know, as part of those listening session,
you know, we do try to do a fair amount of advertising on
it. You know, and so we do reach out to specific
community members. We do ask them for their -- you know,
for their input. You know, our Office of Environmental
Justice they have a blog and so we post things on a blog
and additionally to, you know, using our listserv
broadcast and -- you know, and whatnot just so folks can
be aware about it.

But one of the things that, you know, has
cconcerned me is are we reaching all the people that we
need to reach? You know, are we making that space for
everybody who wants to, you know, participate. And so I'm
not certain of that. And so that's another area where we
could some use assistance.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you.

AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: Yeah, and this is Michael.
I just wanted to add.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: I just wanted to add that
I think one of the things that we're hearing from our partners in the communities is that they are really feeling stretched in so many different directions and it's very encouraging to hear the discussion today about additional resources, stipends for community members, because honestly I think many of the community groups are understaffed, they're under-resourced, and it's really challenging for them to engage in a meaningful way on a lot of these topics that quite honestly some of them are quite complex and technical. And unless they have the time and the ability to really be able to focus, it's, in some ways, unfair to expect them to be able to comment in a meaningful way on some of the products that we produce. So I think that's one of the things that really needs to be addressed.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: And I'd like -- if it's okay, I was just going to chime in really quickly and say that I think this has been, I think, one of -- one of the top priorities for me and I think with the Office of Environmental Justice. And I think part of why I'm really glad that I think like Robert, and Rich, and Michael kind of jumped in and answered that is because I think sometimes the onus is all on, like, well, what is Office of Environmental Justice doing?

And I think we're doing a lot, right? We're
doing a lot behind the scenes. We're working kind of like with divisions really thinking about like how do we start to kind of like look at like what we're doing? How do we explain like why is this important? Why you should get involved, why you should get engaged, how are we kind of like changing up how we're doing community engagement, what are the limitations. So we're having these conversations, but I think the point is to me is that it can't all rest, right -- it can't all rest on like the Office of Environmental Justice to change everything.

And I think what's been really -- what's been really to me really powerful about, you know, all the CARB staff, even the ones that aren't, you know, able to speak tonight, is that I think everyone is realizing we can't keep doing things the way we've been doing them. And I think there's a lot of momentum and a lot of energy around how do we change, transform, and I think as I mentioned before, like we reshape what we're doing to better fit and adjust to what the reality is, right?

And I think there's a lot of community practitioners who have said, like time and time again, you know, here is what you guys need to be doing. I think there's apologies that it's been taking us so long, but we are listening and we are making those changes. And I think it's slow, but we are committed.
CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Board Member Takvorian?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah. Thank you, Chair.

Really quickly. I wish that we could turn our raise hand into a thumbs up, because there so many things that were said in this last panel that I wanted to use my thumbs up that I don't have here.

So just to say, I think there's a huge amount of progress that's been made. I think Dr. Balmes mentioned a lot of it and I won't repeat that. But I think the key things really are about building trust that has to do with institutionalizing these programs, where one community is utilizing them and then can tell another community or another set of stakeholders that this really works for them. And so that's something that they can take advantage of. You know, that's how you build institutional trust, I think, because you can't possibly build trust with every single individual in every community. So it's really got to be baked in as we were saying.

And the other thing I think about capacity that Robert was talking about is we really do have to integrate. And that's what the beauty of like the environmental justice element is that Senator Leyva really championed, because you're looking at it across the board.
And I think these CERPs have the ability to really view environmental justice issues and air quality issues across the Board. So I'm hoping that we can really utilize those to continue to thread all of this together.

And then the last thing is on the chrome plating ATCM, I think that's a perfect link to land use. You know, we keep talking about land use. Well, chrome platers are zone -- or are allowed to be near homes and schools. It's discriminatory zoning. And it's the kind of thing that the cities really need to step up on, and engage with CARB, and engage with the air districts on.

So I'm hoping that we can figure out a way that that's a way in, as we've been talking about the frustration of having municipalities joining on land use issues, because that's a key one that I know we've experienced in communities I work in and it happens in almost every EJ community.

So thank you all so much.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Vice Chair Berg.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much. I also wanted to weigh in here, because this has been -- both panels were amazing. And this one was no different.

I want to encourage that as we look -- as I listen to what you said, and the great ideas, and the new
ways of thinking, be bold and keep thinking about how to
do things outside the box. When Michael was talking about
the fact that we need to reach out earlier and to
interact, and with the communities to drive solutions, I
almost was thinking an advanced team, a year early,
because we've got to come up with a way that for these
communities don't feel like they're drinking from a fire
hose every time we call.

So it would be interesting as you go down this
path and you're interacting and sharing with each other
what ideas do we have to go out earlier, to be more
consistent with what we're coming up, with things that are
on our plate in advance, so to get people input earlier
just as you had said.

And I guess I really want to follow up on Tania's
anything that we can do as a Board to support you,
including letting us know when you're reaching out to
communities, if we can show up, if we can, you know, be a
bigger support, I think this is going to be important also
to build trust.

And I realize we all have way too much to do.
And everything is a stretch when you take on another new
thing, but this is a priority and very important. So I
wanted to say bravo to both panels, and thank you very
much, and great job tonight.
Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Board Member Kracov.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Well, we've been going almost 10 hours here today, so I don't whether to laugh or cry, or, you know, shut up, but I just can't help myself, Chair.

So I'll just go really quickly. I know I talk fast normally, so I'll go even faster today. I'm not even going to try to thank all of the people involved in this program. It's too much to mention, both at the local air districts and also with CARB and all the community folks that are all serving on the CSCs, and the legislators that are helping on this. The only ones I'll just point out are the folks that participated in the panels from my district today. I want to thank Wayne Nastri and Paula Torrado, and Angie Balderas for coming and helping.

I'm really interested in the next steps, Chair, that last slide, and, you know, want to find ways for the Board, you know, to lean in here and to focus -- help focus this and help it be successful. I do think Dr. Balmes has really carried a -- had the yeoman's oar here and he needs some help. And I think we've got to figure out how to get the Board involved to lean in and to help. And I, for one, am willing to do that. I know that there are others as well.
There's some real positives with the program that I want to highlight before I stop here. The BACT/BARCT, I know in our air district, we've been working super hard on the BACT/BARCT rules quite successfully. I know other districts have as well. San Joaquin has a glass manufacturing rule coming up shortly. These are success stories and these are success stories that I think also are going to be taken statewide, as you look at the program. So I think an objective view of the BACT/BARCT on this program is that it's been successful and we should build on it.

Another thing is the pesticide notification. One of the things that helps with this program is if we can show results. I'm so happy for the Governor and the Legislature have put $10 million into this program this year. I know CARB has to help. But if we can get that off the ground, that's the kind of results that could really change dynamics. So let's get that pesticide notification done. I know many Board members De La Torre, Eisenhut are very interested in that as well.

We want to hold ourselves accountable. I think the yearly reports are very important for us as CARB Board members and as the members from the districts each year to look at each of the communities to see how we're doing. And those annual reports are going to be important metrics.
in ways to hold ourselves accountable for the goals of the program, including the biggest goal, which, of course, is emissions reductions.

Finally, you know, we want to find ways to support the districts. This is very tough work. Executive Officer Nastri indicated that today from the District level. And it's a combination of -- and there's no magic touch. You know, resources and support, yet also maybe greater flexibility on things like timelines. And I know that Wayne is really thinking about that and trying to think about best practices moving forward.

So thank you all. Thank you, Ms. Fletcher, Ms. Reyes, all the staff. I said I wasn't going to name names. I can't help myself. Looking forward to leaning in, looking forward to the next steps, and trying to make the promise of this program be reached.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. Okay. Thanks to the Boards for all the -- your questions and engagement. And we will now be hearing from the public who raised their hand to speak on this item. Will the Board clerk please call the first few commenters.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes. Thanks, Chair. We currently have four members with their hands raised to speak on this item. The first is Matt Holmes. After Matt
will be Robina Suwol, Chris Chavez, and Shayda Azamian.

Matt, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

MATT HOLMES: Thanks, Katie. Can you hear me.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can.

MATT HOLMES: Great. So thanks Chair Randolph and members of the Board for this opportunity to address 617. I want to thank staff for framing this program many hours ago as a credibility building opportunity for CARB that depends entirely on power sharing. You guys know that I'm from Stockton, Little Manila Rising. Of course, I prefer he/him pronouns.

I'm really hear to talk about Board member guidance within context of 617 and in particular I'm going to use the 617 convening to frame that. The convening last month was an important opportunity to course correct 617. This is a reparatory process designed to address tough issues in the regulation of air quality, monitoring, and emissions reduction, so naturally it's fraught with conflict.

You know, unfortunately, this hugely significant opportunity -- you know, well, I'll just leave out, you know, the overwhelming failure to recruit the medical world or local land use authorities that I heard people identify tonight. I'm glad to hear that.
I'll just focus on, you know, who we funded in CARB staff and their performance. CARB's performance was troubling for the past three years. I'm convinced that much of the conflict in this process could have been avoided, not because your staff don't have the skills, but because your staff didn't have permission to show us their best work.

One of the key elements identified across the state at the convening, had any of you been there, was that staff -- it wasn't that there was too many people -- just that there was too many people at meetings, but they attend and don't contribute. Passive participation of CARB experts and a process implemented at the regional air district level delayed learning and, in some cases, precluded important learning benchmarks that community steering committees needed and deserved to make informed choices.

Board members must know that non-disclosure by CARB staff is not how trust is built, however many people sit through a meeting. Even if it does keep you out of trouble with the regional air districts or CAPCOA, not telling us what you know doesn't help.

So, you know, I'll just tell you as a newcomer to all of this in the past few years, I feel like CARB is more worried about upsetting air districts and CAPCOA than
they are about failing communities with advanced mortality rates. And so, you know, that's something you guys could have heard about firsthand had you been there.

So I'll get to my main point, which is that Board member attendance was restricted at your own convening by the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. I find it absurd that some bizarro interpretation of a law designed to increase transparency for the public was used to effectively isolate members of the Board from direct input from the most impacted members of the public.

The convening was planned for months by UC Davis, under contract with CARB. We made efforts to say who can be there, why can't they be there, and, you know, you guys -- you guys missed your opportunity to hear from us directly. You know, those aren't excused absences.

So please, revisit your good from Legal staff. If necessary, get a second opinion. It makes no sense at this -- you know, that you weren't there. This program is too important to lose. You met brave panelists I guess like three hours ago when we started talking about this, before we had an internal staff meeting that explained how you're supposed to work together.

So please Bagley-Keen was not designed to keep you from the public. And if you need to find a different lawyer, they'll usually do what you tell them, what you
pay them to tell you, and maybe that's why we're in this problem in the first place.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Robina Suwol, you may unmute yourself and begin.

ROBINA SUWOL: Hi. Good evening. My name is Robina Suwol and I'm the Executive Director of California Safe Schools. And we're a children's environmental health and environmental justice coalition working statewide since 1998.

We greatly appreciate all of the speakers and all of the dedicated efforts made by the Chair and Board, and staff. And I'd especially wish to thank Deldi Reyes for her presentation and for her incredible team that she works with.

This evening I just want to comment very briefly on the Air Toxics Program. And we'd like to stress the importance of CARB continuing to identify the types of stationary sources with public health concerns that are currently excluded from the criteria pollutants and toxic emissions, and to bring the program -- please bring it up to date surrounding toxics released to, not just a list that was created 20 years ago.

And as many speakers have said today, and I know I've testified, you know, in prior meetings, that
pesticide should be included and that we hope that CARB will continue to work toward phasing out the use of chromium(VI), and formaldehyde, and to develop tools that will evaluate and mitigate cumulative impacts. And that's what I'd like to say this evening and to thank you very much for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Christopher Chavez, you may unmute yourself and begin.

CHRISTOPHER CHAVEZ: Yes. This is Chris Chavez, Deputy Policy Director at Coalition for Clean Air and member of the Wilmington, Carson, and West Long Beach AB 617 community steering committee.

First, just want to thank the staff members for their presentation today and also thank both the CARB staff and South Coast AQMD staff for their work on the 617 program over the last couple of years. I certainly -- you know, I guess I'm going to divide my comments into two points.

One, I do want to express my appreciation and agreement with the community members who talk -- who spoke at the beginning of the presentation and really emphasize the need for community control and community ownership over this process. I understand that it may not work for every single steering committee, but certainly the more
folks have a direct hand in how AB 617 operates, I think the more accepted, the more community buy-in you'll have with that process.

I also would repeat my comments to -- regarding the reset that has been discussed that really any sort of reset needs to be done in conjunction with -- in consultation with the community members who part of the 617 process as well. I certainly understand and agree that the amount of staff work that has been put into this process is enormous, but this is also a significant part of what -- of -- this is really the main way how agencies can engage directly with constituents, with communities that have long experienced environmental racism, long have experienced, you know, multiple pollution sources that have impacted their health, their quality of life, and their longevity.

Regarding the Air Toxics Program, I really want to align with what Robina had mentioned earlier. We really need to start approaching air toxics more robustly through the 617 process. The -- so far, it has taken a very heavy approach to criteria air pollutants, what certainly is an important area, an important topic to address.

But we also need to start paying more attention to the tox -- air toxics portion of it, both in terms of,
you know, of course the mobile sources, diesel particulate matter, things like that, but also the toxics from stationary sources, so revamping our approach with that and giving that section due attention I think is going to be important for the next steps of the AB 617 process.

    Again, just want to express my appreciation for the AB 617 process, for the engagement with the communities, and certainly look forward to continuing working with CARB and the air districts in the implementation of the law.

    Thank you very much for your time.

    BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

    Next will be Shayda Azamian. After Shayda will be Bianca Lopez, Amy Kyle, and Luis Olmedo.

    Shayda, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

    SHAYDA AZAMIAN: Thank you. This is Shayda Azamian with the Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability.

    My colleagues work with community members and serve on many steering committees throughout inland California. Thank you for the opportunity to comment tonight and for the valuable stories of cooperation and rippling 617 impacts across CARB.

    The conversation was heartening. And the purpose
of my comments will really be to emphasize the gravity of this moment and 617 right now. As we've heard, communities still saying why don't we have a say about how the funds are used, or in some cases, why is it so hard to create new regulatory protections when all the agencies who have the power to do this are in the room.

And because of this, I do appreciate the term "reset", and have to wonder what will constitute the reset, and what agencies are willing yet to commit to new practices. I think making information on stationary source permitting more accessible is important and what will -- and what will be the commitment from agencies that follows to prohibit continued colluding industrial development in 617 communities.

The conversation tonight emphasizing the importance of land use in CARB's and the districts' work shows promise and should be met with strategy. Trying out just decision-making structures is indeed a process of learning and it is important to recognize that 617 in its three years so far has not yet fulfilled its purpose to turn the priorities of impacted community members into actual protective regulations specific to their community boundary area.

This is one of the key findings that John Jonathan London at UC Davis had reported on as well. The
program on the whole is not leading to specific regulatory protections within community boundary areas that it is meant to. 617 cannot merely function as an incentive program. It must have regulatory strategies that protect communities. And this is a dual core purpose of 617, as Cristina Garcia reaffirmed at the convening last month as well.

I agree that the shift from community members being behind the public comment podiums and at the decision-making table itself is significant. But unfortunately, I also think it's the case that many local districts continue to effectively treat the AB 617 Program as a vehicle for additional funds that they get to allocate, while continuing to leave communities out of important decisions and implementation processes.

Many agency staff in this process have not shown enough willingness to step aside and take a strong supportive position in a truly empowered community-led implementation process.

And in the Blueprint update, I also feel that we keep saying and hearing the same things without seeing the learning reflected in ongoing processes. The best practices in participatory process from some communities have not been standardized and practiced with other communities as well. So until there are major corrections
in the program's implementation across all districts and
communities, we will keep drawing attention to these
existing deficiencies.

I would also like to know what CARB can do and
will do to effectively steer straight implementation of
the program and uplift the culture of 617 from one of
regulatory avoidance. Residents and stakeholders alike
are feeling like engaging in 617 is no longer worthwhile
in many cases. And so we'd like to know how CARB, as the
overseeing agency, plans to engage at the local level to
address these issues.

Finally, I must restate an original and constant
ask of the 617 program, which is that CERPs must include
quantifiable emission reductions rules with enforceable
timelines co-developed with the CSC. That we still
struggle with this outcome and that CERPs have been passed
anyways without regulatory emissions reduction measures is
unacceptable for the program that is meant to do, as we've
heard tonight, what it's supposed to do.

So we do appreciate the time and efforts going
into the Blueprint update process, but must recognize how
convoluted that has been as well. To date, it remains
unclear to me how aligned the changes in the final revised
Blueprint update will be to the intent of the 617 statute.
I do -- would love -- I would love to know if the updated
Blueprint also will include a framework for a non-competitive component such as the sector-based approach. And I worry the Blueprint update process may be overshadowing efforts that can be taken a lot sooner to make these improvements as we wait all through next year according to the Blueprint's current timeline.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Shayda, your quite over time. If you could just wrap up really quick, that would be great.

SHAYDA AZAMIAN: Thank you for that. Yeah, I'll just wrap up by saying thank you to the agency staff and community members for your excellent insights and for advancing our collective understanding of where we need to be.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. And I just wanted to note, I wanted to ask folks if you want to be in the queue to go ahead and raise your hand, because we're going to close the queue in just a few minutes.

Thanks.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Bianco Lopez will be our next speaker. I've activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

BIANCO LOPEZ: Thank you. Good evening. As state, my name is Bianco Lopez, she/her/elle are my
pronouns. I'm with Valley Improvement Projects in Stanislaus County. We are for social and environmental justice.

My comment today is about the Air Toxics Program. You mentioned evaluating community exposure to toxic air contaminants and I'm interested to know about the risks associated with incineration -- waste incineration, specifically after decades-long of toxic exposure in disadvantaged communities.

I live in Stanislaus County and we have one of two incinerators -- waste incinerators in the state. And it's been -- it will be, when its contract ends, will have polluted our communities for about 38 years.

I don't -- I don't recall hearing anything about your -- you considering cumulative impacts. The Crows Landing -- I'm sorry the incinerate is located in Crows Landing, which is predominantly Latino, who is also by -- off of the 5, close to the warehouses in a farming community exposed to pesticides. And now, you know, COVID has really exacerbated some of these effects on our community. So I'd also like to request that when you do look into these risks associated with the incinerator to please reach out to Valley Improvement Projects, because we would like to be more involved with that.

Covanta does brag about how they emit less than
what is allowable, but we know that, you know, after 38 years of their service, or disservice, to our community, that that must be taken into consideration.

And I'd just like to say thank you to the presenters today, to all of the front-line communities who are doing the do and are present here today.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Amy Kyle. After Amy will be Luis Olmedo, Catherine Garoupa White, and then Kevin Hamilton.

Amy I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

DR. AMY KYLE: Thank you. My name is Amy Kyle and I'm an environmental health scientist and I've worked a lot on some of these toxics issues that were in the rules described tonight. And I have a few things I wanted to say, and -- but first, I want to acknowledge just the advances in thinking about this that have occurred over the last year and tonight, and, you know, bringing into focus the community expertise, leadership, this focus on action, and then the need to move to community scale. It feels like it's taking hold and I'm, like other people, very thrilled to hear that.

My first thing is along the lines of Ms.
Takvorian's comments about thinking about this whole issue is I think we need to start talking about solving this problem of disproportionate burdens on communities, rather than implementing this 617 program, because the 617 isn't enough. You know, it's a good start. It's done a lot of good things, but we need other things too. And so I think we're at a point that we should move up a level in how we talk about this is really key.

Secondly, I did a deep dive into the gruesome 12 volumes of the emissions inventory guidance documents, et cetera, for the Toxics Program a year or two ago. And one thing I learned from that and other things I've looked at too is that there is a lot of institutional stuff at CARB and the districts that is pointed away from communities. And it's in rules, it's in methods, it's in monitoring approaches, it's in analyses. It's in consultation processes. It's in who's on somebody's phone.

And somehow that I think is going to have to be reset too. You know, there's not one button you can push to reset it, but there's an awful lot of stuff there. That's how business is done and who talks to who, and what you have to write in your report that is wrong when we think the way we are. So there's an institutional component of this that will need to be fixed, and once fixed, I think will make some other things easier.
And then third thing I wanted to say is that somehow I think there has to be a deeper form of institutional support for the communities, because the communities are being asked to carry a huge part of this burden, and yet, they don't have any of the resources, or money, or jobs, or anything. And it's more than more stipends. You know, I think there's something different about this institutional arrangement that is going to need to be thought about further too. So I thank you all for everything that has been cussed here tonight.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Luis Olmedo, you can unmute yourself and begin.

LUIS OLMEDO: Good evening, Madam Chair and members of the Board. There's been quite a number of years in the implementation of 617. And there still remains so many challenges and opportunities to make it better and to, you know, deliver on that promise. I mean, those of us who were there to took a bitter pill, you know, on Cap-and-Trade and some of us were expecting 617 to be -- deliver on some of these promises in a much sooner, much more engaged process.

And I do want to just recognize all the frustration and the concerns that have come to this Board, and to the executive, and to management for years now. And just -- you know, I just hope that we find ways to
accelerate solutions to some of these remaining concerns that seem to me don't have to be difficult fixes.

But I do want to -- I do have one ask and that is that we need much greater investment in the environmental justice program. I'm not saying that that's a solution for all environmental justice, but it would be very helpful to have a more robust environmental justice program, because I certainly feel that we need that external support.

But I'm not necessarily here to just convey a negative message. There have been many positive outcomes that were of as a result of 617 that were weren't expecting, you know, at the local level, changing relationships. Not saying it's good and I'm not saying that every community has benefited, but I can say in Imperial we have had some positive outcomes. And it looks like we're on a journey, where before there wasn't even a conversation.

So I do want to take the moment to just uplift a few people that have been influential in the work that we do in this region, the Salton Sea region. Ryan Atencio, Trish Johnson, Todd Sax, Elizabeth Scheehle, Catherine Dunwoody, Richard Corey, they know that we still have a long way to go, but have gradually and consistently we've been making progress on issues that certainly I have
brought, but doesn't mean that we have resolved all environmental justice issues.

I want to thank the Board members, Madam Chair and all the Board members that consistently call environmental justice, and care, and are concerned about what issues either we're bringing up or you're asking us about to make sure that our voices are represented. And that's it. You know, just a lot of work to be done, but thank you for -- so far for, you know --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
LUIS OLMEDO: -- the opportunities to have a voice in these -- in the Board. Thank you Madam Chair and Board members.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Catherine Garoupa White, you can unmute yourself and begin.

DR. CATHERINE GAROUPA WHITE: Good evening. This is Catherine Garoupa White with the Central Valley Air Quality Coalition and the Stockton community steering committee. Thank you to the tonight's panelists.

I want to comment briefly on AB 617 and say that CVAQ and our partners welcome the opportunity to deepen collaboration through all regulatory processes and heartily agree that this work should already have been done by our local air districts and must continue to be
While AB 617 may be relatively new, environmental just issues certainly are not. I also cannot agree that more funding is needed until transparency and accountability is proven with the use of existing resources. It's well known at this point that funding and transparency has been a huge issue and barrier in the Stockton process that hopefully with training and engagement on processes, like participatory budgeting, we will be able to work past.

I want to thank staff that are helping lead these efforts towards co-learning, collaboration, and true integration around allocation of resources, and the way that these programs are run, particularly the advanced attention to equity and planning in the Enforcement Division and the EJ Division.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Kevin Hamilton, you can unmute yourself and begin.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Good evening, Madam Chair and members of the Board. And thank you for this opportunity to speak this evening, this incredibly long day that we've all had.

I want to certainly support and reflect the
comments of my colleagues, Luis Olmedo, Shayda, and Caroline and others tonight. This is a long journey. We have embarked on this journey not really knowing what the end looks like. And so when you do that, you have to accept that you're going to have to make adjustments along the way, depending on what you find as you move through it. And that's the way I would like to think that our organization, CCAC, and others have been approaching it.

You're going to find obstacles in your path and you're going to have to overcome those one way or another, or the journey ends, and so that's happened. Some of those have been essentially the as-is, if you will, agencies, the rules and regulations they have to operate under. Some of those have been falling over our own two feet as we try to learn the pathway through this and through that learning occasionally go down the wrong path and have to turn around and come back.

But, you know, the thing that encourages me is the opportunity is still there. It hasn't gone away. I believe firmly, as several Board members, I think one of my colleagues and friend Diane Takvorian said and I think Hector said this as well, this is -- this is not for the moment. This is forever. So this is not 15 communities. That is the state of California. This is the way we need to be doing business. But we haven't quit -- finished
finding our way yet. The journey is not over. We haven't mapped this ground.

And so until we finish that, we don't know what it looks like in its completeness. Now, I feel we're making progress. Not enough. We're still fighting about things. We're still running up against some of the same walls we've continued to run up against. You know, where this sort of intransigence around things like land-use planning and engaging with other agencies in the area that have influence over what our communities look like and the environmental disasters they have to face.

So we continue to work through those and fight through those. Money is always going to be an issue. It's never going to end, so we're going to need to figure that out as well and how to use the money that we have available most efficiently and direct it where it's most needed. But again, I feel strongly those opportunities are there and we're going to take advantage of those and push as hard as we can to get to the end of this journey.

So thank you very much for your time tonight and I guess I'll be talking to you again in a minute. Thanks.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thanks. Chair, that concludes the list of commenters.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you very much.
I see Board Member Hurt has her hand up. Did you need to comment on this item before we wrap it up?

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Yeah, I just wanted to just say a couple things. I wanted to wait until the community spoke before I did. I'm hoping I have a moment to do so. I know it's getting late, but I wanted to thank everybody who gave their truths on this and I know it's been a really long and a lot of work with all the communities.

I wanted to namely thank the leadership of Chanell and Deldi. They are just leading an important program that's working hard to unpack, I mean, decades of inequity, environmental racism, and systems that have created these disproportionately impacted communities. And I think these sources did not happen over night and they're not going to be solved overnight.

But what I'm happy to hear and I hope others are too is that there's a true commitment to listening, learning, and acting with change to better serve the communities through this program. And I'm hearing this reimagining of the program from the lessons we've learned thus far. And I think this is exactly where we should be today, and so I'm glad to see we're here.

And I'm also glad that I'm hearing a lot of my fellow Board members talk about expanded resources, which I think is so needed and supporting air districts who
really want to do great work in the communities. I'm working with Veronica Eady in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. And folks really want to make a difference, and I hear that, and I want folks to remember that when they think about this program.

It's absolutely important too that we facilitate local electeds and councils, such as myself, a councilwoman, to be at the table with the community when we're talking about these issues, because implementation can only happen, I think, with locals. And everyone needs to see and feel a difference in the community sooner than later.

I also just wanted to thank the community members for working in this process. I know it's not easy and they've kept us strongly advocating with community-driven work. I've heard participatory budgeting, our board and BAAQMD is going to do a training, so that we can put policy around participatory budgeting. I hear the need for technical assistance.

I just wanted to just thank everybody for continuing to work on this program, and eventually -- I know the journey is long someone talked about it, but the goal was in each step. And I think eventually we're going to get it right and you're going to see the pace pick up as we continue to improve and listen.
And I just want to thank everybody for working on this and I want to let folks know that I'm willing to do all I can, so that this can be a success.

That's all, Chair.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you very much. I just want to echo my thanks to Chanell, and Deldi, and all their incredible hard work on all of the 617 efforts and our efforts to really build equity through everything that the agency does.

So we need to give our court reporter a break, so we're going to take a 10 minute break. And so we will be back promptly at 7:34 for our last item of the evening.

Thank you.

(Off record: 7:24 p.m.)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record: 7:34 p.m.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you, everyone.

The last item on the agenda is Item number 21-11-4, a report from the leadership of the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, or EJAC, on efforts related to the 2022 Scoping Plan. If you wish to comment on this item, please click the raise hand button or dial star nine now. We will call on you when we get to the public comment portion of this item.
So CARB convened the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee earlier this year and has since hosted seven virtual Environmental Justice Advisory Committee meetings. These meetings serve as an important forum for the EJAC to advise CARB on the process for developing the 2022 Scoping Plan and it's a key venue for the EJAC to share its perspectives on the methods, assumptions, and associated analysis that will serve as the foundation for the Scoping Plan.

At the Committee's most recent meeting on October 15th, there was a request for CARB to add an informational item to today's Board meeting agenda concerning EJAC's perspectives on the 2022 Scoping Plan and providing an opportunity for them to express concerns about the timeline for the development of the Plan. So in response to that request, we modified the previously posted agenda and posted an amended version on October 18th.

I just want to note that I have had the opportunity to participate in a few of the EJAC meetings, as well as to meet directly with the EJAC leadership. I cannot overstate my appreciation for their commitment and passion in advising CARB on the development of the Scoping Plan to ensure that it leads to actions that deliver substantial benefits in our most impacted communities throughout the state and meets our need to act on the
existential threat that climate change poses.

I recognize that racist policies perpetuated over
generations by government action has created harm in
environmental justice communities, and that over the
decades these same communities have had bureaucracy at all
levels of government deployed against them.

As Chair of the Air Resources Board, I'm
committed to ensuring that our agency works with
environmental justice leaders to develop policies to
address the ongoing climate crisis, and reduce the
disproportionate burdens experienced by residents of
front-line communities.

This is not an either/or situation. We must do
both. We must move forward with our 2022 Scoping Plan and
complete it as soon as we can and we must work with
Environmental Justice Advisory Committee to ensure that
their input is incorporated into and reflected in the
Scoping Plan.

It's our responsibility to build a schedule that
targets the completion of the Scoping Plan by the end of
2022 and work as hard as we can to provide the EJAC with
the tools and support they need to get the work done. I
won't deny that we at CARB have made mistakes in clearly
communicating how we considered advice from the EJAC and
in creating effective environmental justice collaborations
and we are learning from those mistakes.

    We are committed both at the Board and the staff level to gain the trust of the environmental justice community. And I am personally committed to carefully monitoring the process for developing the Scoping Plan over the next year, and making myself available to meet with EJAC leadership to identify any needs, as well as provide additional accommodations and resources that may be appropriate.

    As I've said many times, the Scoping Plan is the first step. Once the plan has laid out the high level strategies, then we can work on implementation and ensure that communities have the opportunity to help build those implementation steps. To ensure environmental justice communities are engaged in the implementation of the Scoping Plan, I have supported creating a permanent environmental justice advisory structure that will last beyond the Scoping Plan updates and build continuity.

    So as we move forward, I look forward to continuing to work with you all and hearing your perspectives on this process.

    This item is informational and the Board will not be taking formal action today, but look forward to the discussion and guidance.

    Mr. Corey, would you please introduce the item?
EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair.

And as you noted, the EJAC was reconvened earlier this year to advise in the development of the 2022 Scoping Plan update. The 2022 Scoping Plan update will assess progress towards achieving the SB 32 2030 GHG reduction target as well as lay out a path to carbon neutrality no later than 2045.

Each of the Scoping Plans have included a suite of policies to help the State achieve its GHG reduction targets, in part by leveraging existing programs through -- whose primary goal is to reduce harmful air pollution. The 2022 Scoping Plan will need to build on those policies and actions designed to provide healthy air for all Californians, especially those in heavily burdened communities.

Staff is committed, as you noted, to integrating environmental justice and equity considerations throughout the Scoping Plan and will continue to seek the EJAC's advice on how best to do so.

We also acknowledge the statutory schedule for completing the Scoping Plan is tight, and -- but believe that with the EJAC's advice throughout the process coupled with the engagement of other stakeholders, we'll be able to deliver a Scoping Plan we can all be proud of.

And with that, I also wanted to note that
completion of the Scoping Plan next year is not the end of
the process. In many respects, it's the beginning of the
process to take additional effective actions, mitigation
to deliver on the vision of the administration and
Legislature to put the state on track to meet its
greenhouse gas reduction commitments.

The actions are expected to include new
regulations, as well as further tightening regulations we
and our partner agencies have previously acted on. With
that, I'll now turn it over to CARB's Deputy Executive
Officer for Environmental Justice, Ms. Chanell Fletcher,
to introduce the EJAC leadership.

Chanell.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you so
much, Chair and Richard. I just wanted to do a very, very
quick introduction and say that I think, as the Chair and
Richard noted, we've reconvened the EJAC in May of this
year. I think this item is really for, I think, the EJAC
leadership and Kevin to kind of share out their kind of
updates for the entire Board. And so I think we are very
happy to have Martha Dina Argüello, Sharifa Taylor, and
Paulina Torres as the EJAC co-lead -- co-chairs. And
Kevin Hamilton can share this presentation.

With that said, I will turn it over to you Martha
Dina to have the presentation.
(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: So good evening. I would love to have control over my PowerPoint, but I know that I don't get everything I want. So I want to say good evening and than you to the Chair and to -- oh, it is that -- and to CARB staff for giving us this opportunity to present. As has been said, I will give a brief sort of framing and over -- and introduction. Kevin will talk about what we see as our tasks moving toward, and then Sharifa Taylor and Paulina Torres will talk about some of the requests that have emerged from our work so far.

And we -- today, we really hope to convey the views, and perspectives, and questions that have -- that we've heard expressed in the EJAC meetings by our fellow members. And I also want to say that a lot of this really builds on what we've just heard around the 617, those same themes about authentic engagement, being resources, the technical assistance. All of those things are things that we are also finding are absolutely necessary. So I want us to sort of remember the things that were said earlier, because they do also, in many ways, apply to the work we're doing at the EJAC.

And I want to start -- you know, one of the things that is -- that addressing the climate crisis is going to take is changing how we govern, changing how we
regulate, and that means really making -- you know, figuring out how to deeply democratize this process.

And I want to start with a quote by Chair Randolph, whose leadership we deeply respect. I want to make sure that we are take -- we're not talking just about process, but about substance. We need to make sure that the opportunities for the constant views and lived experience of the EJAC members are not just noted in the document, but to influence and advise the content.

We wholeheartedly agree and want to support Chair Randolph in her role and in getting this done. And my comments are also rooted in my long history of serving on the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, and working with the staff and Board over many, many years. I have and will continue to approach my engagement with this agency as a partner in creating the change we need to see in our communities, but also the change we need to make at the institutional level to address the scale of the climate and justice crisis, and creating a restorative economy. And as always, the devil is in the detail, both in terms of substance and process.

While it may difficult -- be difficult to hear, it is still true that more time could have and should have been built in to the Scoping Plan process to ensure real participation and collaboration with the EJAC and the
impacted communities more broadly.

It's important for our own learning and our commitment to working with CARB to -- that we support you in making this cultural shift that will achieve racial and environmental justice.

Throughout our presentation, we will share the reasoning behind each of our asks. For us, this is not about delay. We take our job at EJAC very seriously. It's about getting the substance right.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MARTHA DINÁ ARGÜELLO: So we've done a lot of community engagement over the years with the EJAC. And the first photo is from the first EJAC. The others are from some of the community workshops that we did in 2017. And what we want to see is a move from participation, from inception to evaluation versus just the consultation, right? The question is how do we deepen the collaboration? And that means -- and we understand that that means give and take, but we also have to acknowledge that the way this process has been designed has not always helped us get to the things as quickly as we would like from the environmental justice, certainly -- I can speak for myself -- certainly not as fast as we would like.

And as the EJAC we're ready to move to meaningful
participation with front-line communities, again from inception to evaluation. And so we're delighted to hear that EJAC will be permanent, because we've been saying that since 2006. So we want to thank you for acknowledging that, that we shouldn't be sent away when the details are being developed.

To understand the ask that we're making tonight, based on these conversations, I'm going to talk a little bit about the process.

So next slide.

---o0o---

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: So this has been the process. And I eliminated the dates on purpose. So I don't know if you can see my -- oh, you can't see me moving my pointer. But on top has been the EJAC process. On the bottom is -- I sorry, on top is the CARB process, right, with the workshops, the way you traditionally do your work, right, you do public workshops, and in the bottom is the EJAC process. These have been parallel processes. And the only points of intersection have actually been flash points for confusion, for feeling blind-sided. And, you know, we went into this with this expectation that there would be a greater degree of co-design.

And so each time there's -- we're moving along,
we get asked a series of questions. We're still, you know, coalescing as a group, but yet, we've got to answer these scenario questions that we don't have a level playing field of understanding throughout the EJAC. That makes our job harder, right, when we show up at a workshop around carbon capture and sequestration and we see that again this route is a route that will leave our community again bearing the burden for climate policies where benefits are going somewhere else. That again is a flash point for I thought we were going to do things differently.

And so we need to do this differently, if want a different outcome. If we're going to build trust, build collaboration, tap into the deep knowledge and experience that the EJAC brings, then these -- this has to stop. We can't have siloed, parallel processes. And my co-chairs will be making other more specific asks about how to fix this.

And next slide.

---00---

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: So this is also -- this is actually a slide taken from the community workshops that we did in 2017. And it struck me that these questions are still questions that the EJAC is trying to answer and we need to have the time and care to actually do this well.
How does this issue impact your community?

    Well, us on the EJAC are still trying to figure that out, right, including what is -- what do the scenarios mean? How -- you know, how do we include an environmental justice scenario that is taken seriously? That again taps into the solutions that we know will work in our communities that also reduce emissions and don't continue to push the burdens onto -- into -- onto our communities.

    And so again, these are still questions that we need to answer. We need to answer these as EJAC. We need to work with CARB to figure out how that happens with the process? And then our communities, we need to go back to our communities to ground truth what's going on. And we need the time, and the resources, and the commitment from CARB to work with us in a collaborative way to get this done.

    And with that, next slide.

    --o0o--

    MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: I hope I'm on time. I talked really fast. Sorry translators. And so I'm going to hand it over to Kevin who's going to talk about the work that -- as we see moving forward.

    KEVIN HAMILTON: Hi. Good evening. And thank you for this evening.
Please advance the slide.

--o0o--

KEVIN HAMILTON: Thank you.

My name is Kevin Hamilton. I'm the co-director of Central California Asthma Collaborative. Also this is my third EJAC. Martha Dina beats me out by one.

A little history, Martha Dina, she was one of the leaders in an agency called -- an organization called Physicians for Social Responsibility. At the time, I was lucky enough to receive a reward -- an award from them for practicing social responsibility medicine.

It's 2005 and I really didn't understand the concept of environmental justice, at that point, to be quite honest with you. But I paired it up and I understand now that it means social justice. It means justice. And that's what we're looking to find here is justice.

And so Martha Dina has shared with you the as-is and sort of the problems that have come from that. We've talked about the legislation. I reviewed AB 32 earlier today and I noted that in the last section, it actually gave the Governor the room to allow up to a one-year extension on any program related to AB 32, and Scoping Plans, and any other programs that come out of this. So I thought that was interesting, because there's been so much
discussion about the timeline and who has the authority to
do what with it.

   But again, we are where we are, so we'll move
forward. You know, there's this sort of myth that somehow
the EJAC has been stalling along over this timeline issue,
when, in fact, we've been trying to do our job. And so
many EJAC members have expressed concern regarding their
lack of knowledge around both the models and the inputs
they're being asked to give.

   These are folks who are very responsible people.
They are not going to provide advice on something they
have no knowledge about when they know that it -- one
thing they do know is that it may have a negative impact
on their already severely impacted community.

   So CARB's attempt to address this knowledge gap
has been, first, to send invitations to already planned
and scheduled workshops, as you've seen in the timeline,
and two, to increase the frequency and intensity of those
EJAC meetings.

   And as demonstrated by the request for more time
and general lack of progress, both of these strategies,
though well intentioned, have been failures unfortunately.
The solution will allow EJAC to engage outside technical
advisors and/or create peer-to-peer knowledge sharing
opportunities as needed, and engage with each other.
Create a tool to assess the existing level of understanding each EJAC member has regarding these models. If you're going to come at people with a highly technical tool and ask for input on it, and it's such a critical tool. We need this tool to work. We understand that very well. But when you do it in the very first meeting and then you find out in that meeting it's very clear that most of the room is silent because people don't really know what this means and they don't know what you're really asking. So, you know, you have to take a step back at that point and essentially you're being socially responsible.

And so these folks want to understand how these inputs interact with the model and how that accumulation of model outputs, when fed into the final model, result in reduced climate emissions, but also protect their communities from unintended health and economic impacts, and they've asked that question time and time again and been told, well, the models don't do that.

Well, I think that's a really poor response. And I'm sure that that's from the people who are -- who run the models. And, you know, they're like mathematicians, right? They don't think outside that box. But I really expect that our agencies will, that our -- that our -- this Board will. And I know they can, because I've seen
it happen.

So how the inputs of the model tie back to the concerns they have about climate-driven health impacts in their communities and what CARB hopes to achieve with them. And again, they've asked this question time and time again, almost every meeting -- in fact, the last couple meetings they haven't bothered, because they haven't been getting the answers that they need -- and to allow responsible reasonable amount of time for members to both attend regular EJAC meetings and separate from formal EJAC, and participate in targeted learning activities at times convenient to their schedule. The results of that I can guarantee will be that all members are able to actively and competently participate and provide usable input recommendations to the various models. And that's what we all want here. That's -- you want it. We want it. Everybody wants this.

But we can't ask people to do that without the knowledge of what's going to happen with the -- as a result of the inputs they might give to something they really don't understand clearly.

And we also want to ensure authentic and timely community engagement and they've asked for this time multiple times and still don't have that. So an existing meeting schedule that pushes community engagement well
outside the window, this existing one, for EJAC member
organizations to authentically and intentionally engage
with communities.

Inform them of the imminent creating of the
Scoping Plan and its potential meaning for them and their
families. There's a rumor that that can't happen, but in
fact it did, and it happened well in 2017. We had to push
for more time. We got it and we made it happen.

So it does happen. We had meetings where we had
70, 80 community residents show up to give their feelings
and their concerns and bring them in a way that really met
the needs that we had for that information. And we did it
not once, but a number of times all over California.

So the EJAC is calling on the Board, not only to
make the EJAC permanent, but also during the Scoping Plan
process, wherever we end up with this, to have regular and
quarterly -- quarterly meetings with EJAC to revisit the
Scoping Plan timeline and alignment with the progress of
the EJAC.

So we think -- and this is a workman's like --
workman like way to approach this. This is the way I
approach my work and I would think that most of you do as
well.

So we need indicators. What's successful look
like here? These regular quarterly EJAC meetings with
CARB Board will strengthen transparency, accountability, and the effectiveness of the EJAC and the Scoping Plan process. And we'll create milestones along the way to ensure that progress is measured.

So these are the -- what I consider very simple things that are being asked for. However, they can't be compressed into an already broken timeline. So I'm not sure how you do that. I see one in writing. And what I see is a really compressed timeline.

Well, one thing we don't want out the other side of this is failure. And we certainly don't want a plan that hasn't been adequately informed as required by the Legislation by the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee. And if the committee comes out the end of it and says we don't feel that, you know, we adequately were able -- we were adequately able to inform this process, you know, that's not going to work for anybody. And we've done that once already back in 2014. Let's not do that again. We did better in 2017 and I have high hopes for this time.

So I've taken up all the time that I have and probably a minute or two more. I'm going to pass this on now to Sharifa to share about EJAC's vision and a proposal for what we want to see in terms of community engagement in the Scoping Plan, and I thank you for your time this
evening.

Sharifa.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Yes. Thank you.

Thank you both, Kevin and Martha Dina for your words before me and thank you, Board Members and staff for your time today. We as EJAC members -- oh, next slide, please.

--o0o--

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Thank you. We as EJAC members want to move from CARB's current model of community engagement of informing and consultation to one of true collaboration. The following slides provide specific recommendations for how the CARB Board can support us in accomplishing this goal.

Next slide, please.
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SHARIFA TAYLOR: Thank you.

CARB's current community engagement model falls into the first three tiers shown on this slide, where staff are informing, consulting, and involving the EJAC in the Scoping Plan process. It is important for their to be a shift from these lower three tiers of community engagement to collaboration and a deference of power for community members.

Next slide, please.
SHARIFA TAYLOR: Community engagement has been a focal point in our ask for an extended timeline during this process, because we're at a turning point for climate change and environmental justice. The IPCC report that was published in August 2021 indicated a code red for humanity, making meaningful community engagement even more important for this Scoping Plan process, so that we can reverse the harmful effects of climate change and also address environmental, health, and economic disparities in these same communities.

Also wanting to note that the infographic from this slide and from the previous slide are from the spectrum for community engagement, which was created by Rosa González of Facilitating Power. And this was also a resource that was shared with us during one of our EJAC meetings.

Next slide, please.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: So here we pose two questions. What is meaningful community engagement and ownership, and what does community engagement matter -- excuse me, why does meaningful community engagement matter for the 2022 AB 32 Scoping Plan?

So for the first question, we like to think of it
as meaningful community engagement allowing the community
to lead the decision-making process, while integrating
community needs into process and outcomes, ultimately
bridging the divide between community and government.

For the second question, we like to think that
this plan provides the opportunity for EJ advocates,
community members, and government to walk into greater
trust and into a greener future.

Front-line communities, priorities, and solutions
must directly inform the Scoping Plan development in order
to truly center EJ in the final adopted plan, especially
as -- what we've discussed substantively, there are four
separate scenarios with the views of EJ on one end of the
spectrum and the industry at the complete opposite end of
the spectrum and we just want to align those better moving
forward.

And so we see meaningful engagement helping us to
do that, to reach a more balanced scenario and a more
balanced plan approach. We want to shift how public
engagement activities and presentations are being informed
and organized, so as to not marginalize front-line
community members, such as hosting these engagement
opportunities outside of traditional business hours,
providing support services for working families,
translation and interpretation support, and also extending
the public commenting periods at EJAC-related events. We also are requesting additional funding for independent technical assistance for the EJAC.

Next slide, please.
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SHARIFA TAYLOR: Thank you.

I'll now pass it on to our co-chair Paulina to discuss what co-designing the Scoping Plan can look like, opportunities for collaboration, and the need for an honest evaluation of cap-and-trade and climate policies.

Thank you so much for your time.

PAULING TORRES: Thank you, Sharifa. And good evening, Chair Randolph and Board Members. So I will walk us through a non-exhaustive list or think of it as a starting point of how we believe CARB staff and this Board can support and work with the EJAC in more efficient and meaningful ways, some of which were already shared by my colleagues tonight.

And I'd just like to emphasize, first, that while we are speaking on behalf of the EJAC tonight, these requests have not yet been vetted with the entire EJAC body and so what we've done is we've a few requests that have either been raised at previous EJAC meetings or that as leadership we've identified as being necessary for the progress of the EJAC. And our hope is that at the next
EJAC meeting we will have a more robust conversation about this very issue, and hopefully be able to report back to this Board.

So in terms of a co-design process, we would like to start with proposing what the EJAC has consistently recommended for years. And just deeply appreciate Chair Randolph's commitment to us tonight on this, which is to make the EJAC permanent. For co-design to really work, the EJAC needs to be at the table from inception, to implementation, to evaluation. And for that to work, we believe the EJAC must be permanent.

Oh, sorry. Next slide.
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PAULING TORRES: I should have said that. I'm just seeing a white screen. Oh, now I don't see the slides, but --

VICE CHAIR BERG: I'm sorry. We're having just a little bit of technical difficulty.

PAULING TORRES: Okay. Is it okay if I go ahead and then we can put up the slides when they're ready?

VICE CHAIR BERG: Okay. I'm sorry.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.

PAULING TORRES: Okay. So second, we'd like to see EJAC and CARB co-developing public workshops and materials, and ensure that EJ issues and concerns are
infused throughout the public workshops. And so this is in contrast to what has actually been happening, which is a few days, or at best a week, before the work -- the public workshop, we are reaching out to and we try to rally and identify someone at the 11th hour who can present, and sometimes to no avail. And then we're asked to make comments as EJAC members.

And so I think that interaction and kind of rushed constraint, I believe contributed to why EJAC really felt like this process needed to slow town, or one of the reasons at least. And so I think this goes beyond a commitment merely to give EJAC and the public materials three, or four, or five days in advance. EJAC being a part of the public workshop process from the beginning, from the planning phase ensures that the EJAC engagement is not just a check mark. And so these are simply two -- excuse me, two asks we'd love Board support on tonight. And as this co-design process unveils, we can share those updates with the Board.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

PAULING TORRES: I think we can all recognize that EJAC has been experiencing a less-than-ideal process, but -- or and as co-chairs, we are optimistic in rebuilding this process with CARB and have identified
critical opportunities to ensure that EJAC and CARB can work together in a manner that is rooted in EJ principles. And so, first, we think that -- we believe that a joint EJAC and public health workshop for the Scoping Plan to ensure that we hear from health experts. Second, we'd like to see a joint EJAC and CARB Board meeting every three months, or alternatively we'd be open to and welcome the creation of subcommittee of this Board exclusively for EJAC related matters. The third thing is an independent technical assistance to be provided to the EJAC.

And next slide, please.
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PAULING TORRES: And lastly, so the Scoping Plan process has started before the meaningful review of the Cap-and-Trade system was conducted, both pursuant to CARB Resolution 18-51, pertaining to unused allowances, and the June 18th, 2020 letter from Secretary Blumenfeld.

Given that the last Scoping Plan assumed Cap-and-Trade would be responsible for over half of the reductions needed to reach a 2030 target, such reviews of Cap-and-Trade are critical to complete before moving too far into the modeling of the next plan. And I will just share that at -- I believe at almost every single EJAC meeting that is happened thus far, EJAC members have asked CARB about the status of Cap-and-Trade. And, you know,
we're still waiting on that information.

And so I think in order to move us along, EJAC should not be left in the dark about these very important questions regarding Cap-and-Trade and current climate policies and the impacts on EJAC communities.

And so before I close, I just want to reiterate something I hope resonates with this Board and something that has become a de facto EJAC adage, at least among co-chairs. Community engagement shouldn't be a phase in your scope of work. It should be a continuous task in all phases, because engagement is a practice from ideation to implementation. And so with that, I just want to thank you all for your time and we look forward to working with this Board and CARB staff in continuing to build relationships and collaborate to make this Scoping Plan reflective of environmental justice and the needs of our community.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you so much for that presentation. I think that we -- there's a lot of sort of commonality in this discussion, having a continuing role for the EJAC going forward, having some technical assistance provided. One of the things that I know has been discussed is the concept of sitting down and having specific meetings on specific topics that we usually sort
of call the deep dives. And so providing an opportunity
to really dig into the weighty issues that are involved in
the different segments of the economy, I think that's an
important part of this process.

I think our schedule that we envisioned does
include two joint meetings between EJAC and the Board, and
that is sort of, you know, something we can certainly talk
about going forward. And I do think it is important to
build more time into the workshop process, so that there
are some -- there's more of an opportunity to build in the
input in terms of teeing up the important EJ topics that
need to be discussed in the workshop. So we want to make
sure that we allow for some more time for that. I think
that's really important.

And, you know, the Scoping Plan is really about
how do we get -- how do we meet our climate goals, how do
we meet our climate targets, and how do get off of fossil
fuels. And so much of the impacts are as a result of
fossil fuels. And so having that robust discussion and
talking about and understanding the opportunities and
solutions in building a plan that gets us there with the
joint effort of the EJAC and the Board I think is the goal
that we all have.

I think there's a lot to do in terms of making
process improvements. And I am very confident that
Chanell Fletcher with her great leadership and dedicated staff can work with the EJAC members and sort of tackle some of these -- some of the suggestions that we've talked about and some of the guidance that I'm sure will be provided by my fellow Board members in our discussion.

So I really, really appreciate these sort of, you know, well thought out and presented concerns and requests. I think it's a really important conversation that needs to continue to happen throughout the scoping plan process.

Oh, and the one other thing I wanted to make sure to highlight is we are absolutely prepared to provide whatever assistance that we can in terms of community engagement, meetings, and supporting the community engagement process that the EJAC develops. And that's another area where I know staff will be very engaged in understanding what the -- what the needs are and what the opportunities are for being supportive of that and the community engagement work.

So I will now turn it over to my fellow Board members for any comments?

Oh, sorry. I was doing this out of order. We need to do public comment first, then comments from the Board. Sorry about that. I got all carried away.

So Board Clerk, will you please call the
commenters?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes. Thanks. We currently have five commenters with their hands raised at this time. The first few are Matt Holmes, Catherine Garoupa White, and Richard Grow.

Matt, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute and begin.

MATT HOLMES: Thank you, Board Chair, members of the Board, and staff for this opportunity to comment. My name is Matt Homes. I'm kind of a proxy for EJAC member Dillon Delvo from Stockton.

I deeply regret the comments I'm about to submit, but I've been left with no choice in the matter. My comments were originally about my disappointment that CARB staff resisted requesting an extension from the Governor's office and that we had to go around CARB to submit our request to the Governor. That could have been a really easy request that allowed us to deliver our region's support for the Scoping Plan. For whatever reason, CARB leadership chose a different path. It's like we don't know people in each other's office and could have just passed that message along.

I've since been informed, however, and, you know, this is worse that the Chair spoke on behalf of the EJAC to tell the Governor that the extension wasn't necessary.
I'm sure the Chair felt like they had permission from our colleagues on the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, but for the record, they did not. This is an EJAC -- this is an issue for the EJAC to resolve and one that I will work diligently to protect the Chair from in the future.

For the record, no one discussed giving up our position requesting an extension with us. Whoever informed the Chair clearly cut a non-transparent deal with you and silenced valley advocates. Whoever had the temerity to speak on behalf of the EJAC, did a 180 on the very transparent and unanimous decision that our collective dialogue arrived at during our formal meeting on the 15th. Don't take my word for it, there's a recording.

I'm really surprised that environmental justice means carrying water for agency staff after private meetings. We've learned a painful lesson. We'll certainly need to reevaluate whether or not valley advocates can rely on our counterparts in Los Angeles and the Bay Area.

For the record, we're tracking the conversation. We have clear thoughts on the issues, but as a matter of principle, we communicate with our communities instead of presuming to speak for them with our college degrees. I
wish more EJ leaders shared those values.

But instead of diving into the full details, I'm actually going to pivot to delivering comments from a college student who sat here for four hours to deliver her own message, but had to give in and requested that I deliver her message. You may have to cut my mic.

I'm Gloria Alonso Cruz. I'm here on behalf of Restore the Delta. I'm here to ask CARB to slow down and rethink mechanical carbon sequestration before beginning the modeling process. While some EJ groups are okay with modeling advancing to the Scoping Plan, what is not being taken into consideration are which environmental justice communities will be living with the direct impacts from CCS.

There are several efforts already underway that will place these projects under the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Stockton, which is the Delta's largest city, has the largest EJ community percentage ways, and South Stockton, an AB 617 community, will be directly impacted. We are a community already at the bottom 99 percentile for environmental health indicators. However, our community just began learning about CCS when Restore The Delta hosted an event with Lawrence Livermore Lab, Little Manila Rising, and local delta landowners just last week.

There needs to be more careful study about the
potential impacts and dangers of the project. We learned
that these wells will require 100 years of community
monitoring for safety and no project has truly analyzed
localized emissions of air pollution, transportation of
carbon to the area, or carbon dioxide leaks into the
precious Delta waterways.

Delta and Stockton can not be made into a dumping
ground for other areas outsourcing their pollution without
the community being fully involved in the process. To do
less would continue the State's practices of disinvesting
and using the Central Valley for the benefit of other
regions of California. It's time for CARB to change how
it treats the impacts of our air pollution.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Catherine Garoupa White, you can unmute and
begin.

DR. CATHERINE GAROUPA WHITE: Good evening. This
is Catherine Garoupa White with the Central Valley Air
Quality Coalition, or CVAQ, co-powering efforts to restore
clean air to the San Joaquin Valley, one of our nation's
most polluted and unequal places. I also represent our
region on the EJAC.

I support the comments made by Matt, Gloria,
Kevin Hamilton and want to make three overall points.
Number one, front-line communities across the state are being hit by crisis upon crisis with little relief. We are still in a pandemic. The San Joaquin Valley has been hit hard with high cases and death rates, inadequate health care infrastructure, emerging research connecting higher case rates of COVID-19 linked to air pollution exposures, and numerous other ongoing challenges, as ground zero for oil and gas extraction, industrialized agribusiness, and a rapidly expanding goods movement infrastructure, all which link back to air pollution and greenhouse emissions.

Our region knows the urgency of the climate crisis firsthand. We are already suffering impacts, such as extreme heat and weather events, such as the past two seasons of catastrophic wildfires that cause weeks of being heavily impacted by wildfire smoke.

As an EJAC member, I need time to assimilate, analyze, and provide substantive feedback. I have not been able to keep pace with the volume and complexity of information and cannot sustain 10 to 20 hours a week of work just on this.

Community engagement should happen early and often. EJAC has examples, information, materials, and some leaders from previous plans that we were appointed in May, convened in June, still are not fully formed without
an indigenous representative, and in many other ways EJAC
is still at a significant deficit. Overall, environmental
justice communities need increased benefits and reduced
burdens from CARB's actions. Business-as-usual is not
working. As the fifth largest economy in the world, the
quote, unquote Golden State has a golden opportunity to
show how centering equity improves health and the
environment for everyone.

While clearly CARB is not the owner nor the
decision-maker in charge of fixing every problem our
communities are facing, the Scoping Plan and associated
regulatory efforts inform billions of dollars in
investments that shape the material circumstances and
built environments of environmental justice communities.

If we do not improve upon the plan's assumptions,
we are unlikely to improve upon its outcomes. I ask that
you support efforts to strive toward co-design including
and extended timeline.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next commenters will be Richard Grow and then
Kyle Heiskala, Cynthia Pinto-Cabrera, and Luis Olmedo.

Richard, I have activated your microphone. You
can unmute yourself and begin.

RICHARD GROW: Okay. Let me try -- and. Okay,
you don't have the video.
My name is Richard Grow. I'm calling in from Berkeley. Some of you may know me from the 40 years of working at EPA's Region 9 office in the air program, the environmental justice program, a time during which I felt I had a really good working relationship with many of the CARB staff at a senior and a working level. Retired two years ago and have kept working at an informal advisory role ever since then on several fronts.

My comment goes to health -- public health and public health and the environmental justice sense, meaning health at the community or the local level. And my comment actually has to do with the -- has implications with regard to timing and the schedule, but especially to do with meaningful community engagement, because communities really need the information in order to meaningfully engage and understand the program. They need the data. They need the information on how this affects them at the community scale level.

What I've seen so far in the AB 32 Program and the Scoping Plan over the past many years, I'm not seeing the kind of attention that's needed to this. What I am seeing so far is health treated basically as an ancillary aspect, sort of along the lines of this program not only saves money, but has health benefits. And I'm not seeing it in the sense of the distribution of health effects
among and between communities.

My perspective comes from seeing health is affected, not just by greenhouse gases but by the co-pollutants, which are real, and predictable, and must be taken into account. And their distribution needs to be assessed and evaluated also. And it needs to be assessed against options in terms of the mixture of measures and strategies under consideration, but it also needs to be evaluated in terms of the Cap-and-Trade Program, which inherently is a burden-shifting program and redistributes these impacts, but it also needs to be analyzed in all of these regards at a time in which it can play a role in the choices being made between these alternative courses of moving forward.

My impression is that there's some combination of either a lack of capacity and/or interest by CARB, which seems rather unfortunate. Whatever it is, it amounts to a lack of due diligence with regard to this most basic environmental justice aspect of the climate change program.

Whatever it is, lack of priority, capacity, or interest, it must be fixed. It probably requires more time and it probably requires assistance, if necessary from other agencies, CalEPA, OEHHA, Department of Public Health, or consultants. But to not take time to do this,
to not take this basic exercise in due diligence would actually betray the two goals I heard laid out by Chair Randolph earlier, which is the twin goals of not only addressing climate change, but reducing disproportionate impact.

If you don't take time to deal with community level health aspects and the distributional aspects, you will not really meet both goals. So I'd urge you to take the time, get the resources, and take seriously the issue of public health, environmental justice related public health in the climate change program.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Kyle Heiskala, you can unmute yourself and begin.

KYLE HEISKALA: Thank you. Good evening, CARB Board. My name is Kyle Heiskala and I'm a Climate Justice Policy Advocate with Environmental Health Coalition, an environmental justice non-profit leading in advocacy and community organizing in the San Diego Tijuana region for over four decades. First off, I'd like to support the EJAC leadership in their calls for additional resources, like independent technical assistance, coupled with enough time to meaningfully weigh in on the complicated set of policy questions that have been put before EJ advocates.

The process is not there yet and can be improved.
One thing that was mentioned earlier, joint EJAC and Board hearings would be very helpful. There are some things that I'd like to acknowledge that we feel like are on the right track with what CARB staff is considering for the potential Scoping Plan. Some of the big problems -- in tackling some of the big problems and inequities that exist in our communities. 

Portside neighborhoods in San Diego experience an asthma rate that is three times higher than the county average and as much as five times higher than most affluent communities in like La Jolla in San Diego, being in the 98th and 99th percentile for diesel particulate levels. That means a family in Barrio Logan is getting -- likely getting the news this week that their child has asthma, a life-long respiratory illnesses connected with these high concentrations of pollution. So transition to a hundred percent ZEV for heavy-duty trucks is a really good step in the right direction.

Some additional points of feedback based on the experience so far is that there seems to be some collective concern among EJ advocates that already overburdened communities across the state are potentially going to be impacted or left out of the benefits by what is being proposed.

We need more productive dialogue between EJ
advocates, community members, and CARB staff around how
the Scoping Plan can prevent further harm in EJ
communities. Thus far, it seems like the potential
burdens are not being evaluated across all the scenarios.
There needs to be an analysis for how each greenhouse gas
reduction strategy is being proposed. So we would like to
recommend that the recommendations and priorities from
environmental justice orgs and the EJAC are not being
relegated into a single scenario, but there can be some
sort of criteria to evaluate the potential harm across all
of the strategies and not just with what the potential
health benefits can be from greenhouse gas reductions.

So I want to make sure that we can have criteria
across the EJ scenarios and ensure that we are having
meaningful dialogue with CARB staff. We're ready to work
with you to ensure that this plan uplifts front-line
communities.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Cynthia Pinto-Cabrera, you can unmute yourself
and begin.

CYNTHIA PINTO-CABRERA: Hello. Good evening,
Chair Randolph and Board members. I'm Cynthia
Pinto-Cabrera, Policy Assistant with the Central Valley
Air Quality Coalition. And I am here today in support of
the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee's request to extend the timeline for the Scoping Plan to incorporate more meaningful community input.

Environmental justice communities and disadvantaged communities in the San Joaquin Valley are truly at the forefront of the climate crisis and are being heavily and disproportionately impacted by human-caused climate change with the intensifying wildfire season and the extreme drought.

Climate change is making the public health crisis in the valley worse and is impacting all families throughout the state including my own. My father, and my brother, and I have asthma. My mother has diabetes. In a family of five, four of us fall under sensitive receptors who will be impacted by climate change. This is the case for many families not only in the San Joaquin Valley, but throughout the state.

Rushing this plan has significant health implications for millions of health peoples -- for millions of people and is response -- and is irresponsible and goes against the public health protections of CARB's mission. CARB must listen to community priorities in order to meet the state's climate goals. Hosting EJAC's meetings in the middle of the day, while those who are most impacted are at work, is not an equitable process,
and upholds institutional racism that has continuously dismissed EJ communities and their voices.

As many mentioned, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report states targeted reductions of air pollutant emissions lead more -- will lead to more rapid improvements in air quality within years compared to reductions of greenhouse gas emissions only. These targeted reductions can be identified by communities that have a long history of seeking targeted emissions reductions.

CARB must recognize the expertise of community -- of communities and -- CARB must recognize the expertise amongst communities that they have done -- and all of the work that they have done to identify solutions against their local impacts to climate change. These communities understand the urgency and the need for the 2022 Scoping Plan and it needs to be done right. Tapping into expert -- into the community expertise will not only support CARB's climate goals, but it will also ensure solutions to address the concerns of communities that have been most impacted by climate change.

I urge the Board to use this authority and extend the timeline for the '22 -- 2022 Scoping Plan. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Our next speaker will be Luis Olmedo. After Luis will be Todd Campbell and Shayda Azamian.

Luis, you can unmute yourself and begin.

LUIS OLMEDO: Thank you. Luis Olmedo with Commite Civico del Valle. And thank you, Madam Chair, again for allowing me to speak on this matter. I'm also a member of the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee and I want to support what has been brought to -- before the Board from the environmental justice colleagues and leadership.

I also want to support a lot of these concerns and other pressing issues that have been brought before the Board. One thing that I've learned in the years that I've been an advocate for environmental justice is we need to be able to walk away with next steps, with actionable items. And there's a lot that has been put before you, Madam Chair and before the Board. I would like to see if in let's say a perfect world where we would find a path forward to get -- keep the process moving, while at the same time not neglecting and ignoring the issues being brought before the Board before you, Madam Chair.

It would be great if there would be Board directive to the leadership, to the Executive Officer to begin to put a lot of these actions, a lot of these ideas that have been brought before you to work immediately,
especially those that can be actionable immediately.

Next step would be to assure that we set clear, measurable, metrics, timelines, deliverables, and monitor the process entirely, and -- I mean, that would -- that would be -- offer me the opportunity to really continue to push this process forward, while not ignoring the deep concerns that if much of this doesn't work, that certainly I don't think it's going to be the last time that the concern of extending the timeline will be brought before the Board. But again, I would really hope that we can immediately see some of these proposed strategies. I don't whether we call it a compromise, a monitoring plan, but I think at this point, we do need -- you know, we need you, Madam Chair, and the Board to hopefully give the Executive Officer and his team direction to work with the EJAC urgently.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Todd Campbell, you can unmute yourself and begin.

TODD CAMPBELL: Good evening, Madam Chair and members of the Board. My name is Todd Campbell. I represent Clean Energy and I'm the Vice President of Public Policy and Regulatory Affairs.

I wanted to reach out to the environmental justice community and express strong support for extending
process and helping communities understand complex modeling, et cetera. Martha and I have worked a long time together. Many of my colleagues in my past life have been really supportive and collectively sympathetic to disadvantaged communities. And from a, you know, company perspective, we really would like to reach out to the environmental justice community in trying to solve the pollution issues in disadvantaged communities, which are severe and significant today.

We are all in support of a zero-emission future. I can say that with authority. And I also want to make sure that no one is left behind. Part of my environmental background tells me and encourages me to push that very agenda. I want to make sure that we identify the real culprit, which is diesel exhaust, known to be a toxic air contaminant and a reproductive hazard.

And I want to make sure that if we can't get to zero immediately, we at least do all our best to reduce emissions to the maximum. And if that's wrong, I apologize, but I really think that's important for us to work together. And perhaps we haven't done a good enough job, and for that I apologize. But I really would like to -- me, personally, would like to work with the environmental justice community in trying to reduce harmful emissions, both NOx, PM, criteria pollutants,
greenhouse gas emissions in a way that significantly improves your communities. And if there's a way that we can do that, I really appreciate it.

   In the meantime, thank you, CARB, for reaching out to these communities and working with these communities. You have done a great job. I know there's always room for improvement. There's room for improvement for us too, but I want to thank you all for having this important dialogue and have a great night.

   BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
   Shayda, you can unmute yourself and begin.

   SHAYDA AZAMIAN: Hello. Thank you. This is Shayda with Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability.

   I first want to echo Dr. Garoupa White, Kyle Heiskala, Luis Olmedo's and many others comments just now and the calls for additional resources to the EJAC and specific TA that will support the substance feedback prior to CARB's quickly approaching November 24th deadline.

   I also have two top points that I ask the CARB board to ensure are incorporated by staff working on the Scoping Plan. Firstly, CARB staff must assume unprecedented innovation dollars and investment into the sustainable technologies identified by the EJAC. As we see it, the EJAC conditions put forward are most reflected
in alternative one, but we're wary that without proper investment into developing the cleanest solutions, this alternative will be rendered infeasible by CARB's analysis. And we're wary that EJ communities are going to be in a position where EJAC has to defend why this alternative is most economically feasible.

Selective technology assumptions, which we do see across the scenarios right now, will paint this alternative the cleanest scenario for now, as economically infeasible. On the other hand, policy and investment direction by CARB in the Scoping Plan will accelerate the deployment of technologies that benefit environmental justice communities. And this should be accounted for, even at this stage, in the assumptions and inputs.

So we ask that CARB balance the ambitious policies set forth in alternative one with just as equal ambitious innovation investment in zero-emission solutions. And I'm heartened by Dr. Balmes and Sandra Berg's statements today that it's not about if the technology is ready, but it's about investment. And the next five or so years will make or break how fast we can go forward and how quickly we can get this clean infrastructure to trucks and other technology.

So the ask here is that EJAC be part of determining what level investment these clean alternatives
get or that CARB is assuming in the Scoping Plan and that
they are very aware of this at this stage for the four
alternatives.

Secondly, there does need to be a more
comprehensive health and EJ analysis that goes beyond
BenMAP. We're also wary that it might give the case where
another alternative of it in the first is selected, and
because of that, no EJ recommendations or policy from the
first alternative make it into the Scoping Plan.

And I do appreciate the conversations we've had
with the Chair before this point about what mixing and
matching can happen, how EJ can still be incorporated,
even outside of the first alternative. And so we are
eager to hear about that later on. But we are
particularly cautious of BenMAP which we believe does not
detect local air and water pollution associated with the
process of capturing greenhouse gas emissions, but rather
just analyzes the benefits from the greenhouse gas
reductions itself.

And yeah, thank you for the time to comment. I
do support the EJAC and all the needs that they've
requested, in addition to Dr. Garoupa White's comments
about the extension and how valid it was to request that,
given the -- given the history of collaboration so far.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Our final speaker will be Thomas -- Tom Helme. Tom, you can unmute yourself and begin.

THOMAS HELME: Hi. Good evening. Tom Helme from Valley Improvement Projects and Central -- the California Environmental Justice Coalition, also a member of the EJAC.

I wanted to speak tonight in support of my colleagues, other EJAC members that have asked for an extension to this plan. It seems from the very beginning being appointed to the EJAC and the meetings that we've had, there was definitely a lot of talk about making sure that environmental justice is incorporated into this process and improving on the last Scoping Plan, that -- I wasn't a part of that process, but I heard a lot of things and was, you know, as I expressed, skeptical from the beginning of the process.

There was a lot of meetings that we were invited to and asked to speak about our experiences and going into this process. And it seems the first time that the rubber hit the road where we kind of said we need to slow this down, take a step back, the way we do things as environmental justice groups is to inform communities, and get feedback, and make sure we're not speaking for communities all the time, and actually getting their
thoughts on the process. And as soon as there was some
tension there, that -- it didn't seem as important to take
the environmental justice perspective that was being given
in the way that the process should go.

I know we've heard that there will be
opportunities throughout this process to get feedback from
communities, but it seems that once you've already gone so
far in a process, you've already started kind of directing
the conversation in one way or another and then getting
that feedback is not going to be as productive as getting
that from the beginning.

So, you know, really this was the first main ask
that EJAC had and I would have liked to have seen it been
given a little more -- the kind of thought that it seemed
like EJAC was being given when I was first appointed. And
again, there was -- there was a lot of talk about how
important getting this feedback from EJAC -- EJ groups and
getting the perspective from these disadvantaged
communities, and at the moment, you know, we want to see
some action on that.

It seems like there's disagreement on the way we
see things should go forward with having community
outreach and having more meetings in these areas that were
going to be affected. I'll give -- I know my time is
running out -- a quick example. A community member just a
few weeks ago let me know about a dairy digester pipeline that's being put in in unincorporated Stanislaus County that I hadn't even heard about. And I try -- I'm obviously trying to keep an eye on as many of these issues as possible in my backyard. But that came directly just from a community member that I know and I had to then look into it. So that's just an example of why it's important to take those steps and thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Chair, that concludes the commenters for this item.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. Do any Board members have any questions or comments?

Okay. Oh, sorry. Board Member Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'm sorry, getting slower on the draw there as the evening goes on. I just wanted to thank everyone, thank the EJAC members for being here tonight. And I know that this isn't a decision-making meeting, but I do think that our very long meeting today has -- excuse me -- really set us up for this conversation. And from the IPPC[SIC] report that requires that we take bold action on climate, the Mobile Source Strategy that calls out very specifically environmental racism and the disproportionate impact on communities of color, and then our in-depth discussion of the AB 617
program, which is why we regard it as CARB's premier EJ program that calls for power sharing between CARB, districts, and community.

So here we are discussing the overarching plan for California's climate strategy and hearing that there has not been meaningful involvement of the EJAC and somewhat worse that the unsuccessful approach used in previous Scoping Plan efforts is being used again, which is dismaying to me. I have a lot of gratitude to the EJAC leaders who have come forward, who I've known and served on the EJAC with and in other environmental justice spaces for decades now.

So I really want to pull back the lens on this issue and acknowledge that this is about much, much more than a timeline or an extension of time. That is an essential issue, but I believe the Board would be remiss if we focused on that alone. And I don't -- I think you have expanded that, Chair Randolph and I really, really appreciate that.

The timeline extension is not going to resolve the concerns I'm hearing, if some of the fundamental ways the process is being implemented doesn't change. I do think more time would be beneficial, but it doesn't mean anything if the structure and the process doesn't change. We can't be in this check-the-box mode if we're truly
embracing power sharing.

So my suggestion is that the CARB, as the
commenters have -- or the EJAC members have suggested, the
CARB Board needs to be more engaged and directive in the
development of the Scoping Plan, and that there should be
a joint Board/EJAC meeting in November or December. I was
told in my briefing that it would be in June, which I
think is way too late. I think we really need to
meaningfully engage in the Scoping Plan now with the EJAC,
and the CARB Board should be very involved and figure out
what it's really going to take. I'm guessing it's going
to take more time, but I think it would be important for
the CARB Board to get involved, engage with the EJAC,
figure out how environmental justice impacts are evaluated
in each alternative and not segregated.

We've talked a lot about not siloing EJ. So that
would be my recommendation and I would hope that we could
schedule the joint meeting as soon as possible.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Hi. Yes. Sorry.

I have my toddler with me.

So I just want to echo Board Member Takvorian's
comments about really needing to make sure that the EJAC
feels like they are participating in the same process that we're participating in, and I think joint meetings help us get there. And I do hope that the Committee heard the Chair in terms of the commitment about the increased technical assistance. And I just hope that when we meet again with the EJAC, we can get to a place where they're feeling like they are understanding and grasping the concepts that they are being asked to comment on.

I don't know if there's a benchmark now or if that's part of the facilitation piece to ensure during meetings that they feel like they understand, but I do think that we need to be able to somehow evaluate that.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Board Member Hurt.

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you, Chair.

I'll make this quick. I just wanted to thank the EJAC as well for embracing this difficult work. I hear and see all of you. I know this is not easy. I hope we can, as a Board, support meeting the timeline that we already have etched out, but really bulking up on the additional resources that are being asked of and needed. And I think I've heard from the Chair as well as staff that we can make this happen. So I look forward sitting side by side with EJAC, learning these issues as well, but
I want to thank all of you for embracing this really difficult hard work. You are helping us. We're all helping each other and I look forward to again just bulking up the resources they need to make things happen.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Board Member Kracov.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes. I want to thank everyone for participating tonight in this Board meeting. I think we're going on almost 12 hours here. And really appreciated Board Member Takvorian's comments on how it seems like one item sort of built on the other here today. And do appreciate the EJAC, you know, leadership trying to work, you know, constructively.

And as Member Takvorian indicated, you know, maybe this is about more than an extension. It's really about the process improvements and extension of our own will improve the dynamic.

So I did try to distill, Chair, you know, sort of asks tonight from the EJAC. So one was to make the EJAC permanent. I don't know what that means exactly, but maybe that can be worked out in the future. The second is interaction with the Board on a regular basis. I don't know if it was quarterly or something along those lines. The third was more defined opportunities for community outreach. And I think the fourth was a technical
assessment -- assistance question.

I tried to distill the presentation, so maybe I missed something. But I think these are the things that we do have to sort of consider tonight and maybe hear from our staff about these, and if we can try to incorporate these, get commitments to do so, check in on how it's going. Perhaps those are some of the key elements that can change the dynamic here. We have spent 13 hours trying to incorporate -- and I think meaningfully incorporating equity and EJ into all the work that we're doing.

You know, we are trying as an agency here. It's a bit of a slog. But, you know, everybody on this Zoom call tonight, we're partners in this. We're all stuck with each other, you know, for better or for worse. This has been a difficult process, you know, but maybe it -- and it's been a difficult episode, but maybe it creates a little bit of a foundation of -- a working relationship, you know, rolling up the sleeves a little bit as we move forward together on this issue and all the other ones we've discussed today.

Thanks, Chair.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

I just want to not that I agree with Board Member Takvorian's point about the first opportunity for a joint
EJAC/Board meeting. I think trying to do November, December might be a little optimistic, but I think June is far too late. And so I definitely want to make sure staff figures out how to build in the first joint meeting sooner than that, so we can have an earlier conversation.

Okay. I think -- yes, I got it.

Sorry. So I see Martha Dina's hand up. Did you want to say something?

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Yes, I did. You know, I want to reiterate that the request for an extension was a unanimous request from the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee. And as the co-chairs, we stand by the word of our fellow EJAC members. And also, you know, to -- that in the request for more time and more resources, we don't forget that we've also asked for an evaluation of existing programs and an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Cap-and-Trade Program, and that we do a better analysis of benefits and burdens, because those things were just never finished, right? We never got the Adaptive Management Plan and we really need those to continue our work.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you. And I will just note that it was very clear to me that this was a unanimous request of the EJAC. And so I was never under any other impression and never indicated that I was under any other impression. So I'm not sure why that belief was
out there, but I understand the vote that the EJAC took.

Okay. So I think, at this point, I would like to convey to our Executive Officer and our staff, I think we got some really important requests from the EJAC with regard to improvements to the process that are absolutely necessary and some feedback from Board members about improvements to the process that are necessary.

And, you know, I think as the Executive Officer mentioned at one of the EJAC meetings, I think we recognize that it's our responsibility to do this work and to make the improvements in the process that we're talking about. And as issues come up, and we need to make adjustments, we need to be open to doing that. And while adjustments to the timeline are not the first go-to, I think increasing capacity, increasing resources, making available some of the substantive work is going to be the first go-to. But, you know, we are always going to be staying in contact, as I mentioned in my opening remarks. And we will do the best we can to meet the two goals that I spoke about.

So I really appreciate everyone's time and thoughtfulness in discussing these really, really important issues. And we -- as I said before, I commit to continuing to work with staff and doing things better as we move forward with the -- with this really, really
important work.

So thank you and our meeting is adjourned for this evening.

(Thereupon the Air Resources Board meeting adjourned at 8:52 p.m.)
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