VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

AIR RESOURCES BOARD

ZOOM PLATFORM

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 2022 9:02 A.M.

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

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS:

Liane Randolph, Chair

Sandra Berg, Vice Chair

John Balmes, MD

Hector De La Torre

John Eisenhut

Senator Dean Florez

Assemblymember Eduardo Garcia

Davina Hurt

Gideon Kracov

Senator Connie Leyva

Tania Pacheco-Werner, PhD

Barbara Riordan

Supervisor Phil Serna

Dan Sperling, PhD

Diane Takvorian

STAFF:

Richard Corey, Executive Officer

Edie Chang, Deputy Executive Officer, Planning, Freight, and Toxics

Chanell Fletcher, Deputy Executive Officer, Environmental Justice

Annette Hebert, Deputy Executive Officer, Southern California Headquarters and Mobile Source Compliance

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF:

Edna Murphy, Deputy Executive Officer, Internal Operations

Rajinder Sahota, Deputy Executive Officer, Climate Change and Research

Craig Segall, Deputy Executive Officer, Mobile Sources and Incentives

Ellen Peter, Chief Counsel

Ashley Arax, Deputy Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Chair's Office (CO)

Megan Cleveland, Legislative Analyst, Office of Legislative Affairs, CO

Sonya Collier, Staff Air Pollution Specialist, Research Planning Climate Analysis Section, Research Planning, Administration, and Emission Mitigation Branch, Research Division (RD)

Michael FitzGibbon, Branch Chief, Atmospheric Science and Climate Strategies Branch, RD

David Garcia, Legislative Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, CO

John Herner, Branch Chief, Research, Planning, Administration, and Emission Mitigation Branch, RD

Bonnie Holmes-Gen, Branch Chief, Health and Exposure Assessment Branch, RD

Margret Kim, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

Lucy Negrete, Air Pollution Specialist, Implementation Section, Air Quality Planning and Science Division (AQPSD)

Sarah Pittiglio, Manager, Research Planning Climate Analysis Section, RD

Margaret Sanchez, Creative and Social Media Manager, CO

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF:

Elizabeth Scheehle, Division Chief, RD

Melanie Zauscher, Manager, Emerging Strategies Section, Sustainable Transportation and Communities Division (STCD)

ALSO PRESENT:

Michael Boccadoro, Dairy Cares

John Bottorff, CleanEarth4Kids.org

Teresa Bui, Pacific Environment

Marie Camino, Mercy For Animals

Emma De La Rosa, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability

Tom Frantz, Association of Irritated Residents

Madeline Harris, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability

Gary Hughes, Biofuelwatch

Suzanne Hume, CleanEarth4Kids.org

Jamie Katz, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability

Kathleen Kilpatrick, Safe Ag Safe Schools

Patrick McDuff, California Fueling, LLC

Brent Newell, Public Justice

Patricia Ramos-Anderson, League of United Latin American Citizens

Mariela Ruacho, American Lung Association

John Velasco, Heart of Compassion

INDEX	PAGE
Call to Order	1
Roll Call	1
Opening Remarks	2
Item 22-1-1 Chair Randolph Executive Officer Corey Motion Vote	6 6 8 8
Item 22-1-2 Chair Randolph Executive Officer Corey Staff Presentation Kathleen Kilpatrick John Bottorff Suzanne Hume Board Discussion and Q&A Motion Vote	9 10 12 28 30 32 35 48 49
Item 22-1-3 Chair Randolph Executive Officer Corey Staff Presentation Board Discussion and Q&A	5 0 5 1 5 2 6 8
Item 22-1-4 Chair Randolph Executive Officer Corey Jamie Katz Tom Frantz Marie Camino Kathleen Kilpatrick Mariela Ruacho Teresa Bui Brent Newell Emma De La Rosa Gary Hughes Michael Boccadoro Madeline Harris Patrick McDuff	88 93 126 128 130 131 132 134 136 138 140 142 145 146

INDEX CONTINUED PAGE Item 22-1-4(continued) Suzanne Hume 149 Patricia Ramos-Anderson 151 Board Discussion and Q&A 153 Open Comment 175 John Velasco Patricia Ramos-Anderson 178 180 Adjournment Reporter's Certificate 181

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIR RANDOLPH: And good morning, everyone. 2 The January 27th, 2022 public meeting of the California Air 3 Resources Board will come to order. Before the Clerk 4 calls the role, I just wanted to note that San Diego 5 County Board of Supervisor Chairman Nathan Fletcher 6 recently resigned earlier this month from the San Diego 7 8 Air Pollution Control District and also from CARB due to his extensive duties as Chairman of the Board of 9 Supervisors. We're incredibly appreciative of Supervisor 10 Fletcher's work on the Board over the last three years. 11 We will miss his thoughtful public policy perspective, and 12 his kindness, and his sense of humor on the Board. 1.3 the residents of San Diego are very fortunate to have his 14 leadership and we will miss him. 15 16 So with that, Clerk, can you please call the roll. 17

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes. Thanks, Chair.

Dr. Balmes?

1

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. De La Torre?

Mr. Eisenhut?

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Florez?

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here.

```
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Assemblymember Garcia?
1
             ASSEMBLY MEMBER GARCIA: Present.
2
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Hurt?
 3
             BOARD MEMBER HURT: Present.
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Kracov?
 5
             BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Here.
 6
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Leyva?
7
8
             Dr. Pacheco-Werner?
9
             BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER:
                                          Here
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mrs. Riordan?
10
             BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.
11
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Supervisor Serna?
12
             BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Here.
1.3
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Professor Sperling?
14
             BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.
15
16
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Takvorian?
             BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.
17
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Vice Chair Berg?
18
             VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.
19
20
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair Randolph?
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: Here.
21
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: All right. Madam Chair,
22
23
   we have a quorum.
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.
24
25
             I'd like to being with few housekeeping items.
```

In accordance with Assembly Bill 361, we are conducting today's meeting remotely using Zoom with public participation options available both by phone and in Zoom. 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 quite location, whether you are joining us in Zoom or calling in by phone.

2.2

Interpretation services will be provided today in Spanish. If you were 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 here at CARB.

I'll be providing 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 during open comment period at the end of today's meeting, you must be joining using 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 for today's meeting.

2.2

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 by phone, dial star nine to raise your hand.

Even if you have previously indicated which item you wish to speak on when you registered, you must raise your hand at the beginning of the item, so you can be added to the queue so that your chance to speak will not be skipped.

If you will be giving your verbal comment in Spanish and require an interpreter's assistance, 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 will activate each commenter's audio when it is your turn so 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 three or so in the queue, so you are ready to testify and now who is coming up next.

2.2

Please, note that you will not appear by video during your testimony. I would also like to remind everyone to please state your name for the record before you speak. This is especially important in the remote meeting setting, and it is especially important for those 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 that 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 interpretation for your comment, your time will be doubled.

If you wish to submit a written comment 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. If you experience any technical difficulties, please call (805)772-2715, so an IT person can assist you. That number is also located on the public agenda.

2.2

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

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. The first item on the agenda is Item number 22-1-1, clean fuels for fleets certification for the 70 ppb ozone standard. If you wish the 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.

Mr. Corey, would you please summarize the item?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

The clean fuels for fleets certification for the 70 parts per billion ozone standard continues California's long tradition of being at the forefront of mobile source emission reductions. In 2015, U.S. EPA lowered the 8-hour ozone standard from 75 to 70 parts per billion. For non-attainment areas, above prescribed population thresholds classified as serious or above, the Clean Air Act requires that the area comply with the U.S. EPA clean fuel vehicle programs or opt out by submitting a substitute program that is at least at equal -- or equal

or more stringent than the emissions reductions otherwise delivered.

1.3

2.2

California has opted out of the program since the first California State Implementation Plan was submitted in 1994, and approved by the U.S. EPA in 1999.

California's low emission vehicle, or LEV, programs are implemented statewide and far exceed the level of reduction that would be achieved through the implementation of the U.S. EPA program. California has continued to strengthen the requirements for the light-duty passenger cars adopting LEV II in 1998 and LEV III in 2012 as part of the Advanced Clean Cars Program, which will also expand zero-emission vehicle requirements.

Therefore, it's appropriate that California continue to utilize the Act's opt-out provision by adopting this certification. The certification before you today is applicable to the Coachella Valley, Sacramento metropolitan area, San Joaquin Valley, South Coast Air Basin, Ventura County, and West Mojave Desert non-attainment areas. These areas are classified as serious or above for the 70 parts per billion zone standard and had a 1980 population of 250,000 or more.

CARB staff recommends that the Board adopt the California clean fuels for fleets certification for the 70 ppb ozone standard from the non-attainment areas

previously mentioned and direct me as Executive Officer to submit the certification to U.S. EPA as a revision to the California SIP.

That concludes my remarks.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. We will now hear from the public who raised their hand to speak on this item. Will the Board Clerk please call the commenters?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Madam Chair, there are no commenters with their hands raised to speak on this item.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. I will now close the record on this agenda item. The Board has before them Resolution number 22-1.

Do I have a motion and a second?

VICE CHAIR BERG: Berg, so moved.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Second.

16 BOARD MEMBER HURT: Second.

17 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Clerk, would you 18 please call the roll.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes.

Dr. Balmes?

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. De La Torre?

Mr. Eisenhut?

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Yes.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Florez?

```
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Yes
1
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Hurt?
2
             BOARD MEMBER HURT: Aye.
 3
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Kracov?
             BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes.
 5
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?
 6
             Mrs. Riordan?
7
8
             BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Aye.
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Supervisor Serna?
9
             BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Aye.
10
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Professor Sperling?
11
             BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Aye.
12
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Takvorian?
1.3
             BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Aye.
14
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Vice Chair Berg?
15
16
             VICE CHAIR BERG: Aye.
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair Randolph?
17
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.
18
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Madam Chair, the motion
19
20
   passes.
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.
21
             The next item on the agenda is Item number
2.2
23
    22-1-2, the proposed research projects for fiscal year
    2022 and 2023. If you wish to comment on this item,
24
25
    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.

2.2

CARB's Research Program was established in legislation with the recognition that robust science must be the foundation of the work we do to reduce air pollution in the State. For over 50 years, this agency has established a reputation for relying on the best science to support its mission and advancing science in monitoring, analyzing, and reducing air pollution.

The research program continues to support CARB's air quality planning efforts, provides a scientific foundation for regulatory decision making, aiding efforts to meet the Global Warming Solutions Act, State Implementation Plans, community air protection goals, environmental justice efforts and other commitments, and facilitates important collaborations with other research funding organizations. In addition, the research program strives to remain responsive to changing priorities.

As we will hear in a later item, the agency has multiple goals and priorities and the research program can support these with scientifically rigorous research.

Mr. Corey, would you please summarize the item.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair. Today, staff will present the proposed research projects for fiscal years 2022 through 2023, which includes seven

research projects and two white paper projects. The proposed research projects were developed through a public process which began in the spring of 2021, with a public solicitation of research concepts and comments.

2.2

Concepts were prioritized in consultation with CARB staff, community members, stakeholders, advocates and research partners through individual meetings and two public workshops on June 16th, and September 22nd. The project concept prioritization was also guided by the Triennial Strategic Research Plan for fiscal years 2021 through 2024, which was presented to the Board and approved on March of 2021.

The proposed research projects support CARB's regulatory priorities related to health, environmental justice, air pollution, and climate change. With a limited research budget to support the agency's long-term goals, CARB cannot fund all concepts and focuses on holistic projects addressing agency priorities.

The Research Program relies on partnerships in collaboration with other states and federal entities to make our research dollars go farther. If approved by the Board, the projects described through the 2022 through 2023 will be released for pre-proposal solicitation to the CSU and UC systems. UC and CSU researchers are encouraged to team up with non-academic partners where appropriate.

I'll now ask Sonya Collier of the Research Division to give the staff presentation.

Sonya.

2.2

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: Thank you, Mr. Corey. Good morning Chair Randolph and Board members. Today, we'll be presenting CARB's proposed research projects for fiscal years 2022 through 2023. The proposed projects were released for public comment on December 17th, 2021.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: CARB is seen as a world expert in monitoring, analyzing, and regulating air emissions. This reputation is the result of using sound science and up-to-date research to inform our work. The Research Program is key to providing that scientific foundation, as envisioned by the Legislature, when they created the Board's Research Program in 1971 specifically to support CARB's goal by providing the scientific foundation for effective air pollution control.

The Research Program encompasses all aspects of air pollution and plays an important role in meeting the challenges of increasingly stringent federal air quality standards and long-term climate goals, and it serves as the foundation for effective regulatory decisions. The

program enables research using the best available technology in key areas, such as environmental justice, economics, climate, air quality, and health.

1.3

2.2

The Triennial Strategic Research Plan is an important tool for collaboration and for communicating CARB's research priorities. Every three years, staff compiles information on our past and current research projects and future research priorities into the plan. The development of the future research priorities in the plan is also guided by public input. This document aids in our annual research planning process and is an important tool in our outreach efforts.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: The Research Program priorities are driven by CARB incentive and regulatory program needs. Additional research priorities remain responsive to the triennial plan, internal and external coordination, and emerging topics identified through external input and the scientific literature.

These Research Program priorities are then converted into research projects, which can be completed by leading scientists and community researchers through external research contracts and by CARB staff through in-house research or through collaborations with other

State, national, and international experts. We do remain committed to increasing coordination with large external research efforts to make our research dollars go further.

1.3

2.2

We have a variety of project types. These include robust scientific studies related to mobile sources, atmospheric measurements, and modeling, and community engagement projects amongst others. We also fund white paper projects to collect the latest information available on emerging topics or in response to community concerns. The research results derived through these various efforts inform CARB programs and help advance our mission to protect public health and the environment.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER:

CARB's in-house research expertise spans a broad set of disciplines including engineering, science, health and analytics, in topics such as air quality, health, behavioral economics, sustainable community strategies, climate science, emissions, and indoor air quality. CARB research staff make our research dollars go further by utilizing data and results from contracted research projects and doing further analysis or creating models.

CARB staff also conducts in-house measurements and develops scientific instruments to measure air quality

from various source types. Our staff's work has a large impact, since staff participates and contributes to these studies, and produce peer-reviewed publications. Staff also manages and contributes to the contracted research projects. CARB usually funds nine to 12 projects each year.

2.2

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: The Research Program is an important part of CARB's work and we are committed to operationalizing racial equity within the program. We are in the initial stages of developing an equity framework that will outline how CARB's Research Program will engage with communities, and how equity will play into the Research Program as a whole. The framework will also include new guidelines for staff and internal processes to operationalize racial equity in our research with criteria based on project type.

In addition, we will strive to maintain transparency on how public guidance is used and implemented in the program, and how we communicate research results to the public. The framework will consider all aspects of the research program, including research planning, project implementation, and outreach methods.

In response -- in response to public comments and

input from environmental justice and community advocates, we have started implementing changes to the Research Program. As part of this effort, CARB has funded community engagement projects focused on incorporating the voices of concerned community members interested in research on a specific air quality or public health issue occurring in their community. The objective is to create a research roadmap with community members that highlights potential research projects for future funding consideration.

2.2

CARB has pilot tested a project in the Salton Sea. And this year, we'll be kicking off a similar project in the remainder of the Imperial Valley.

A community engagement project is also being proposed in the list before you today for funding in 2022-2023. We have made our changes to annual research planning process, in response to comments we have received, to increase transparency, reduce burdens on the public, and have more touchpoints where community members can provide guidance on project selection.

In addition, the community -- in addition to community engagement projects, we will also consider projects focused on equitable outcomes. We will be examining how best to incorporate community voices and expertise throughout the Research Program.

Different types of projects will require different levels of engagement and outreach. We will discuss the preliminary changes we have made with the public to get further guidance on those changes, as well as ideas for additional changes.

2.2

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: We will now discuss the annual research process -- research planning process including additions we have made to incorporate more stakeholders in the process, encourage additional university proposals, and increase transparency. I will point out the opportunities for the public to guide the process. Text in blue points to changes we have made in response to public feedback.

Our research planning process begins each year by identifying research project concepts through a public concept solicitation. We also get input from CARB staff, Board members, and external stakeholders. In response to public input, we have increased engagement at this stage. We have already modified the comments and concept collection survey to be more flexible and allow for more open-ended comments to be submitted. We also hosted two public meetings in 2021 through this process.

After we have received all project ideas and prioritized them through internal and external engagement,

a final list of proposed projects is presented to the Board for approval. Right now, we are at this stage in the process.

2.2

After Board approval, we released the solicitation for proposals from the Universities of California and California State Universities. In order to increase the transparency of our solicitation award process and foster the development of multi-disciplinary research teams, this year we are holding solicitation meetings and hosting online forums.

Proposals are reviewed and winning proposals selected and finalized. Once proposals are finalized, the Research Screening Committee, composed of various subject matter experts, independent of CARB, reviews the proposals and provides comments. With their approval, proposals are accepted and then developed into contracts. The executive officer provides final approval and these projects become active research. During this phase, online progress updates and outreach are done. When appropriate, we establish project advisory committees to provide oversight and direction.

Once projects are finalized, the Research
Screening Committee approves final results, which are
disseminated to the public through seminars and online
documents. We have started requiring research contractors

to create accessible and clear outreach documents that can be used to disseminate results to the public.

At the end of every project, there is a public seminar where the contractors present their research results.

2.2

--000--

will now give a brief overview of the nine research projects we would like to fund in 2022-2023. For this funding year, we have a total budget of \$3.8 million. And the list of proposed project concepts covers topics in three general categories of health and exposure impacts, methods of evaluating emissions and mitigating exposure, and emerging pollutant issues.

Environmental justice and equity are a part of several projects within those categories. For example, the intergenerational impacts projects will look at the persistence of air pollution exposure impacts by race and ethnicity. In the next slides, I will provide highlights on some of the research topics that led up to the proposed projects and also provide additional background on each of the proposed projects.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: In the past, CARB's Research Program has investigated various

topics related to air quality impacts on health. These include total exposure to air pollution and noise, respiratory effects in communities near major sources such as freight corridors, air pollution and toxics impacts on diseases such as Alzheimer's and on birth outcomes, and impacts from wildfire smoke. And recently, we have started investigating community health indicators to better track how health outcomes change over time. We also examine statewide air pollution and asthma impacts.

2.2

This research helps support various programs, including community air protection. And our new focus on health analysis is critical for more comprehensively showing the benefits of our regulations and plans.

In addition, our health research is leveraged for community education, outreach, and health protection.

Research into the health impacts of air pollution and climate effects is ongoing and various future research needs remain. We will continue to expand health analysis research. A challenging and important topic includes investigating the health effects of multiple pollutants and toxics. It is also important to investigate the health benefits of various exposure and mitigation methods and sustainable community strategies.

Finally, an active area of research includes health impacts of buildings and indoor exposure.

--000--

2.2

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: The proposed projects related to health this year build on the remaining questions just outlined and focus on quantifying health and exposure impacts. We are proposing three new projects in this area. As a whole, these projects will help quantify health impacts and determine how health effects may persist over time.

The first project will help us to more comprehensively quantify, monetize, and communicate the health benefits of our regulations by identifying and measuring additional health outcomes. This work will identify additional health outcomes associated with air pollution using California-specific data and will augment quantification methods. This expanded health analysis will be used to support CARB's programs and regulations.

The second project will examine air pollution exposure impacts and persistence across generations and how these differ by race and ethnicity by analyzing air quality, residential, demographic, and health data.

Finally, we hope to initiate a community-engagement project focused on industrial sources of toxics and create a research roadmap incorporating the voices of concerned communities.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER:

2.2

Another critical research area involves investigating and evaluating different emission and exposure mitigation methods. We have proposed three new projects that will help answer what methods can be implemented to reduce exposure to criteria pollutants and lower carbon emissions, and how can we evaluate their effectiveness.

The first project focuses on identifying high priority subsectors for commercial building electrification, including analyzing costs, benefits, strategies, health risks, equity, and barriers to inform development of future regulatory actions. The project will emphasize impacts on frontline communities and on equitable decarbonization.

The second project will be an in-house project testing different messaging methods with quantified real-world measurements of efficacy, such as website and clean air center visits. The project will determine more efficient methods of communicating messages that can be applied to other CARB programs.

Each year, CARB also funds a handful of white paper projects. White papers consolidate all the known information on the particular topic and make recommendations for future research. In response to

public concern, we have proposed a white paper addressing public comments related to air cleaning devices. The objective of this project is to write a white paper summarizing the current knowledge on potential emissions and health impacts of non-ozone related air pollutants and outline knowledge gaps associated with electronic air cleaning technologies.

2.2

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: Our next category of projects includes wildfire research.

Over the last several years, CARB has been stricken with massive wildfires and this is expected to continue as an effect of climate change. Wildfires are a major source of air pollution and carbon in the atmosphere, and are impacting people across the State every year. CARB has performed a large body of research on fire and air quality including: measuring emissions from different types of vegetation to inform inventory models; measuring emissions from prescribed fires to determine what their air quality impacts are relative to wildfires and to inform future forest management practices; and collaborating on large wildfire emission measurement campaigns.

Additional research includes analyzing the impacts of wildfire smoke on air quality, examining the infiltration potential of smoke into different indoor

environments, examining the benefits of clean air centers during smoke exposure days, and also researching the health effects of short-term but acute smoke exposure events.

2.2

These various research efforts benefit CARB programs, such as the development of State Implementation Plans, the Scoping Plan, and the emission inventory. As wildfires increasingly encroach on urban areas, a crucial research need, and one that will be addressed in the proposed projects for fiscal year '22-'23, is characterizing emissions at the wildland urban interface.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: As noted in the last slide, wildfires are one research area that is changing significantly and becoming increasingly important. As emission sources shift and change over time, the relative impact of these different sources changes, and it is critical to characterize how emerging pollutant issues may affect public health. Here, we are proposing three research projects that will help us to quantify the potential effects of emerging pollution issues and to inform mitigation strategies.

This first project covers the research gap outlined in the previous slide, with an objective to quantify emissions from burning structures to characterize

the air quality and health impacts of fires at the wildland urban interface and to inform future policies on forest management and defensible space. We expect this project to leverage upcoming work in this area.

2.2

In the second project, we propose to measure and quantify real-world emissions and brake of brake and tire wear particulate matter emissions under various on-road conditions, including California representative light- and heavy-duty vehicles powered by various propulsion methods. This project could provide valuable information on how particulate matter emissions can be lowered from tire and brake wear.

In this last proposed project, the objective is to analyze air quality data from an intensive field campaign in the South Coast Air Basin. This will be to improve the understanding of the sources and processing of local particular matter and assess the relative role of recent pollutants.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER:

Additional funds for research to support sustainable community and transportation programs may become available later. This slide shows a list of additional project concepts related to sustainable transportation and communities that could be developed

into full project proposals if additional funding is secured.

2.2

These concepts include: emerging trends that may impact vehicle miles traveled; strategies to equitably advance building decarbonization; the interactions among policy, equity, and the secondary zero-emission vehicle market; research to improve quantification methodologies for California climate investments; housing and equity, including combined housing and transportation costs; and opportunities and barriers for climate action at the local government level.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: If the Board approves the proposed projects for fiscal year 2022-2023, staff will develop full project scopes and include them in a proposal solicitation. We are required by the Health and Safety Code to look for expertise in the University of California and California State University systems first. We are releasing this solicitation on an online platform called Empower Innovation, which will facilitate the development of partnerships between UC and CSU researchers and non-academic researchers and community partners.

We are also holding a solicitation meeting on Wednesday, February 23rd in order to provide guidance on

these projects and the use of the Empower Innovation website, particularly for researchers who have not worked with CARB previously. Future solicitation meetings will be held once funding becomes available for the additional research priorities noted earlier.

2.2

Will also continue the process to operationalize racial equity in CARB research by increasing engagement efforts, gathering new suggestions and feedback on changes we make to the program, and continuing to leverage internal CARB resources and efforts.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: Staff are recommending that the Board approve Resolution 22-2, which includes the proposed research projects for funding year 2022-2023 and concepts for future funding.

With that, I'd like to thank the Board and the public for your attention today.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you, Dr. Collier.

Now, we will hear from the public who raised their hand to speak on this item. Will the Board Clerk please call any public commenters?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes. We currently have three people with their hands raised to speak on the item. They are Kathleen Kilpatrick, John Bottorff, and Suzanne Hume.

Kathleen, I have activated your microphone. You should be to unmute and begin.

1.3

2.2

KATHLEEN KILPATRICK: Thank you. Yeah, again, I'm Kathleen Kilpatrick, I live in Watsonville. I'm a member of Safe Ag Safe Schools. And that's under the umbrella of California for Pesticide Perform -- Reform. And I also am in a group called Campaign for Organic and Regenerative Agriculture, which seeks to work toward the conversion of our Pajaro Valley for that type of agriculture.

So CARB has had a key role and has a key role now in mapping this state's roots to carbon neutrality. And CARB has also been a very reliable ally for those of us who are working on environmental justice. And I applaud those attempts. I do want to say that in spite of your efforts, that many or most of those -- most impacted by the issues that we work on have not been in a position to participate for a number of reasons.

So the members of our -- the coalitions that I worked with work -- we've been working for pesticide reduction and conversion to organic agriculture are repeatedly told that our work can't be included as a priority, because there's insufficient research. And yet, we're not included as a research priority.

The term "point source pollution" in the

industrial is a trigger for me, because that means that industrial ag often gets a pass. And the greenhouse gas emissions of their cycles and other forms of harmful emissions go largely unmeasured.

So the CPR has submitted a letter that covers some of the research that's been done. But as a clinician who sees environmental health entwined with the other -- all those other aspects of the pollutants, I want to remind you that fumigants are toxic air contaminants and many of those harmful chemicals are carcinogens and reproductive and developmental toxins. And just as with wildfire smoke, we don't yet know how those toxins are volatilized. We know they contribute to ozone, but how do they get into the lung and are they adhering to the PM10s and -- that are a soup over the San Joaquin Valley.

So I'm going to refer you back to your nice Venn diagram with holistic in the center and remind you that researching conversion to organic strategies covers all of those aspects, that it covers health, air quality, climate, environmental justice, and environmental impacts of those toxic chemicals, if they are really, truly measured, which I hope you will put more effort into including them in your measurements of economic and social impacts of toxic chemicals.

Thank you.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

2.2

Our next speaker will be John Bottorff. John, you can unmute yourself and begin.

JOHN BOTTORFF: Yes. Hello. Thank you. My name is John Bottorff with CleanEarth4Kids.org. Thank you for taking my comment.

In addition to the proposed wildfire smoke projects, I do ask CARB for a white paper on the effects of wood smoke from residential fireplaces and camp fire -- beach fires. People just don't know how toxic wood smoke is. Here in Oceanside, California, there fire rings at the harbor beach that fill the air with smoke almost every night. I've called our air control district and was told they don't have jurisdiction over fire rings or even people's fireplaces.

As far as I'm concerned, CARB should have jurisdiction over any source of air pollution, and, of course, has the duty to educate the public on the dangers in the air we breathe. As you all know, wood smoke is toxic. It's a complex mixture of gases and particulate matter. One of the main components of smoke is PM2.5, you know, roughly 120th diameter of a human hair. Would smoke travels for miles in the air. PM2.5 passes through the nose, mouth, and lungs, and makes their way to the bloodstream. Particulate matter irritates the lungs. And

there is a growing body of research that shows -- clearly shows that wood smoke increases the risk of serious health outcomes, including asthma, heart attacks, strokes, cancer and brain conditions, like Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and dementia.

1.3

2.2

Wood smoke also contains cancer-causing pollutants like benzene, formaldehyde, acrolein, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, along with carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, and methane. Burning 10 pounds of wood in one hour creates the same cancer-causing PAHs as 6,000 packs of cigarettes. Yes, we allow people to burn wood around the clock on our beaches and in our camp fires exposing people, especially children, to toxic pollution.

So please take action to educate the public about the dangers of wood smoke, work with local cities to stop wood fires, and please do a white paper to really document the health risks.

My other ask would be to fund a white paper on the health risks of pesticide drift. Absolutely agree and echo the comments from the previous speaker. There's a large amount of studies showing the health impacts from living near agricultural pesticides. We're talking increased cancer and other serious health effects. My wife and I we had to move from our home in Oceanside where

west coast tomato growers spray pesticides within -- you know, less than a few hundred feet from our home. And it's being sprayed right by a lot of people's homes in this area and even high school. And that's just one example of pesticides being sprayed right where people live, work, and go to school. You know pesticide drift is an absolute proven threat, but it's not a priority for CARB or DPR. So please fund a white paper on drift. You know, use it to create legislation. You know, use it to show the health risks, so that legislation can move forward.

2.2

Thank you so very much for your time. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Suzanne Hume.

You may unmute and begin.

And thank you for your very important work to protect clean air. My name is Suzanne Hume. I am the educational director and founder of CleanEarth4Kids.org. We enthusiastically support your very important proposed projects and white papers. Additionally, I will share four white papers that we hope that you will include. And, of course, we support these statements by the previous two speakers very important. Pesticide drift must be addressed by CARB. This is personal for me as I was poisoned by pesticides, because of pesticide drift.

We are absolutely not protected.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So much to say. The U.S. only bans 15 pesticides. China bans 51 and the EU bans 175 pesticides. We have kids living right next to pesticides and we have children working in the fields legally in California. is the Office of Pesticide Programs looking at this? No. They excluded inhalation risks for What do they do? children working in the fields from pesticides. They're only looking at the dermal risks. They're using studies from the 80s. And they are minimizing risks saying that because children work more slowly and touch things less, and that's dermal, that they're -- you know, that they have a reduced risk for working in these fields. So they limit the scope. We sit on meetings or we listen to meetings with the EPA, and the Office of Pesticide programs. Also, additionally, Senator Blumenthal spoke out about this and said that there is terrible problems happening there.

Also, we have tried very hard to work with DPR. And there are some good people at DPR for sure, but this is not being handled. We have kids living right next to pesticides that drift. I have all of my medical papers. We were asked to move, instead of suing the County of San Diego and the City of Oceanside, because of leasing to west coast tomato growers, we decided to start a

```
nonprofit. I didn't know if I would live a year. I'm here to beg you to take this on. Please help us.
```

1.3

2.2

Also, additional important things to say. As you know, that California studies are showing elevated childhood cancer risks from agricultural pesticides applied up to 2.5 miles away and we do have the kids there. Please include wood smoke and residential fireplaces, a white paper to show the harm. Also, health risks from inhalation of synthetic turf and crumb rubber. This is very important. And also look at PFAS, the boomerang effect. When PFAS get into our water, then they are volatilized into the air. So all of those things. And will follow up with a letter. Thank you from CleanEarth4Kids.org.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you so much. And just a reminder for the written comments that the send-us-your-comments page is available on the CARB website.

Chair, that concludes the list of speakers for the item.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you. Does staff want to address any issues before I close the record on this item?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: No further comments, Chair.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Great. So I am now officially closing the record. And Board members, if you have questions or comments, please raise your hand, or click the raise hand symbol on Zoom.

Dr. Balmes.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Chair Randolph. So first off, I wanted to remind the older Board members, I mean the ones that have been around longer, and perhaps the new Board members that our previous Chair Nichols charged Professor Sperling and me a few years ago with trying to get the Research Program of CARB to be a little bit more relevant to the regulatory actions we needed to take, both in terms of climate change mitigation, and air quality and public health.

And I'm pleased actually with the research plan that has been presented today. And I can't speak for Dr. Sperling, but I have had more engagement over the past year with the Research Division than I've had in previous years. So I really appreciate the Research Division trying to work with me and others to try to improve the quality of the projects that we fund.

So I just wanted to -- it's a shout-out to the Research Division for good work. And I especially applaud the effort to come up with projects through an equity lens to address environmental justice concerns. I have a

feeling that other Board members will speak to that, so I won't -- I won't go on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I wanted to address the specific comments of the three public speakers. So with regard to ambient pesticide exposure, pesticide drift, it's no secret to many of you that I have been concerned about this for a while. And it -- ambient pesticide exposure gets caught in the -- in between CARB and the Department of pesticide control -- Pesticide Regulation, DPR. And I've been upset about this for a long time. I think -- I actually don't even really know -- I don't think any of us really know how much of a problem ambient pesticides are in terms of health, because we just don't have good enough data. I think it's really a shame that California can't get it together. We have -- We're the biggest agricultural producing state in the country, one of the biggest agricultural producers in the world, and we should be in the forefront of dealing with pesticide toxicity, including ambient pesticides. So I feel that CARB should work with other parts of CalEPA, especially DPR, to come up with a Research Program to address health effects of pesticide drift. So I agree with the speakers on that.

With regard to Mr. Bottorff -- I'm probably mispronouncing his name -- Bottorff, and wood smoke, first off, you said that your local air district didn't have

authority to regulate fireplaces. I think that's probably not correct, because both in the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District - I don't know about other districts - fireplace and stove burning is regulated. And there are -- in the Bay Area we call them spare the night -- days, nights, and there's actually enforcement. Potentially Bay Area Air Quality Management District staff drive around to see if there is -- are problems with wood smoke on those days.

1.3

2.2

I don't think we need a white paper. I think we need public communication about the health risk of wildfire -- wild -- of wood smoke, not wildfire smoke, wood smoke -- residential wood smoke. You know, I've testified both before the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and local Berkeley -- the Planning Commission in Berkeley about whether there should be bans, for example, on fireplaces -- wood burning fireplaces in new homes. We -- I've been studying wood smoke for decades. We know that it's toxic just like Mr. Bottorff said. I don't think we need -- we don't need more research with regard to residential wood smoke. We need action and public communication. So I would support that. I mean, maybe that takes a white paper, but I think we could -- we don't have to use the research budget, which is limited, to fund

this public communication.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And then with regard to Ms. Hume and synthetic turf, I would reminder her that another CalEPA agency, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, has been engaged in studying synthetic turf for several years. I'm actually the Chair of the external advisory committee for that research project. So I would -- I would refer her to OEHHA, a sister agency in CalEPA.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you, Yes. Thank you, Elizabeth, Sonya, all the research Just seeing how these projects have evolved even in my short time here is really, really encouraging in particular. The push to include more community engagement in the projects, which I think is really absolutely In terms of the comments that were raised, one essential. of the -- one of the questions I think -- you know, just flat out question, but then also maybe an opportunity for the people that came -- is to be involved in the scoping plan process. And so I guess my question to staff is are we currently planning to include the pesticides into the Scoping Plan or anything about pesticide drift in the Scoping Plan? And if not, maybe, you know, this is

presenting an opportunity to understand this further.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Executive Officer Corey, do you want to respond to that?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yeah. Chair, I'll ask Rajinder, Deputy Executive Officer, because I know she's been directly engaging with DPR on this very topic in terms of pesticides in the context of the Scoping Plan update. So, Rajinder, if you can take that.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SAHOTA: Sure. And good morning, Board members. And Dr. Pacheco-Werner, that's a great question. We have been meeting with CalEPA. They have been doing a broader effort across several State agencies to coordinate research efforts, because when you look at the 3.8 million, it looks like a big number, but it's not in terms of the needs of the state and all of the different areas that we need to keep making progress on to support our programs, and answer some of these other broader health questions for the residents in the state.

We do think that there is a place for pesticide discussion in the Scoping Plan, but the Scoping Plan is more than just a place for one pollutant or one sector, because it is economy wide. We will be speaking to the way that pesticides are introduced and how you can limit the way they're introduced and used through farming

practices and changes there, as part of the natural and working lands piece. But we don't go into significant detail any one issue in that plan, because it is that broader piece.

2.2

But I think this idea of the -- being caught between ARB, that Dr. Balmes raised, and DPR is one of the things we are going to take back to the interagency group trying to figure out what those research gaps are and how we can get the right amount of money to actually deploy projects for research that won't make an incremental difference, but actually can answer more significant questions to actually move the needle in terms of the action with the Legislature, or the Governor, or regulatory process.

I feel like there's been research that's done on the health impacts. We know that these are harmful pollutants. We know that these are harmful compounds to be used out there, but what we really need is a targeted, comprehensive proposal for a research project that actually answers the question definitively in a way to actually push action now. And I think that takes joint resources.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Absolutely. And I think other members might agree, you know, not to speak for them. But however we can support that effort to get

that rolling, please, you know, would really love to understand that further and actually answer that question for our community on the ground. Thank you.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SAHOTA: Um-hmm.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. And I know Secretary Blumenfeld has been very engaged in working with the new Director of DPR to try to kind of, you know, build some of this communication and research to make progress in that area. And so we have been also, you know, speaking directly with the new Director and looking at opportunities, so we'll continue that work.

Okay. Board Member Hurt.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you, Chair. I want to thank the staff. They met with me and discussed the current framework, and really listened to my thoughts on how to operationalize diversity, equity, and inclusion in research. And what I've seen today from what I saw when I first got onto this Board is a great improvement, and difference, and change. And so I just want to thank them all for that.

When we talk about equity, you know, this should be integrated in everything we do just as a matter business. And so I know folks are looking at a framework. And an improved framework for me, it needs to be an objective review standard that includes metrics for

equity. Some of the topics that we discussed, I had discussed increased pathways for diverse voices and research, whether they're co-leads with communities. You know, we need to be more creative about how we bring community in at the beginning and bring in voices that are not often heard.

1.3

2.2

I also talked a little bit about the protection of highly impacted communities to prevent further trauma by making sure that the data that's being gathered through the CARB lens are true seeds of change in those communities. If we look to close past inequities, we really should focus on research that is truly needed in those communities. And so maybe similar to cities that have, for example, inclusive housing policies, maybe we should ensure we have at least 25 percent of these research projects directly for those highly impacted communities. Just a minimum percentage that would directly affect positively, for example, AB 617 communities.

The public commenter that discussed pesticides, really dedicating research to highly impacted communities and the things that they need, and want, and being true to that.

I also kind of think about all the historical inequities and just the true need for funding in those

impacted communities, and research is the foundation for change. And we should be driven by research to those who are highly exposed, and they often are our black and brown communities.

So a lot of good work has happened over the past year or so, and I look forward to this being refined, and again, a more equitable framework, but excited to see what's ahead in the changes, but it's a good start. And thank you, staff.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

BOARD Member Takvorian.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to add a couple of things. Much of what I wanted to say has already been said, which I appreciate, by our other Board members. I really appreciate the staff's work to continue to build a really robust research agenda. I agree with Ms. Hurt. And over the several years that I've been on the Board, I really feel like that it has really improved, and I'm really thrilled to hear that Dr. Balmes is satisfied and encouraged with the work going forward, particularly the emphasis on health and the inclusion of equity and environmental justice.

I really appreciate the staff's consultation with racial equity experts, understanding that those are both university scholars and community residents, both of whom

have expertise that's valuable for a complete understanding of the impacts of air pollution and informing CARB's ability to communicate about those issues more effectively. And I really agree with Ms. Hurt's comments about methods and ideas for expanding the focus on equity and making it more metric based.

I want to say that I'm very hopeful that the budget allows for the inclusion of the VMT research projects, as described, and also to include the role of transit. This is a critical environmental justice issue throughout California, and particularly in urban areas where freeways crisscross our communities and create quite a bit of air pollution that folks are impacted by. So I'm hopeful that the budget will allow for the inclusion of that project.

And I also appreciate Board members' responses to the public comments that have been raised and staff's responses. And I look forward to more action oriented --more action that's oriented towards these issues. And perhaps as Dr. Balmes has said, we don't necessarily need more research, but we can go forward with more action on those. So thank you very much.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Dr. Sperling.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Thank you.

I do want to support what Dr. Balmes said and the other Board members that I do think our Research Division has been using its resources well, but I'm not -- to follow on a word that Board Member Takvorian said, I am not satisfied, because we are not doing nearly enough, you know, with Building up our -- building up our research capacity. You know, this -- as the staff report said, CARB success is grounded in science, and that is why we have so much credibility, that is why we are impactful.

2.2

And I understand that more than anything this means strong technical staff. And we are, CARB is, delivering on that, you know, big time. We do attract some of the very best technical people from around the State and beyond. And I know that, because many of my best PhD and MS master students have sought and gotten positions at CARB. And that's not true. They don't seek out positions at other government agencies for the most part.

But I worry that we are letting our commitment to research funding and research collaborations with university researchers to atrophy. Our budget should be much more. You know, 3.9 million or 3.8 million, that's pathetic. That's tiny. You know, the -- four University of California Institutes of Transportation Studies, I head up the one at Davis, we spend more than 10 times that

every year, more than 10 times that, and we only do transportation.

2.2

And so, we've -- you know, and -- okay, on top of that, CARB has greatly expanded its mission over the last 10 years -- you know, 10, 15 years. We're now doing all of this regulation and policy on climate change. And that goes -- in so many ways, that's far more complicated than the air quality regulations we did the previous 40 or 50 years.

And now, on top of that, we're adding environmental justice. I mean all the Board members are talking about all the things more we should be doing, and we should, but -- and we're talking about wildfires as well. I mean, we probably tripled our mission over the last 15 years at CARB, and yet, you know, we've seen almost no -- we've seen no increase in the research.

Now, it doesn't mean we have to greatly expand our research budget. You know, we can get better at leveraging the capacity around the state of California and beyond, and partner better, and collaborate better. I know we're hindered, in some ways, by all kinds of rules about how, you know, research funding is spent. But I think we need a -- we really need a rethink on this. You know, just listening to these comments, there's -- you know, if we're going to be credible, if we're going to

continue to be adopting these nationally-leading, globally-leading regulations and policies, we've got to have the science behind it. We've got to have the technical capacity to support that. And I worry that we're falling behind in that.

Thank you.

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, again, Chair Randolph. Since I've already spoken, I'll just be brief. But I 125 percent agree with Dr. Sperling that we need to have a broader funding base for our research. And, you know, I don't know the actual numbers, but the four million, 3.8 million that this year's plan has is probably about the same, you know, as we had a decade ago. And we have increased our mission as Dr. Sperling so eloquently said.

And, you know, I just applied for a grant to the California Energy Commission for \$4 million about residential home electrification to try to improve childhood asthma. I mean that's over three years, but that's on grant from the CEC, for \$4 million. And yet, we're -- you know, we have a year's worth of research, whatever it is, nine different projects with more in the wings with a \$3.8 million budget. So it's really incumbent upon us to figure out a way to fund more.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

1.3

2.2

I'll just make a couple of quick comments. I think the point about additional funding for research is an excellent one. And I encourage Board members to share those thoughts widely, and we can also kind of think about what are some creative strategies around that going forward.

On the pesticide question, I appreciate all the comments. And as I noted, we are continuing to engage with CalEPA on this issue, but I do think that we need to make sure that the perfect is not the enemy of the good, meaning like if we -- we should continue to really coordinate and try to come up with a good overall research strategy. But to the extent we can identify, in our next round of research projects, opportunities where we might be able to take the lead in some of the aspects of pesticide issues, I really think it would be incumbent upon us to explore the potential for that opportunity, and, you know, continue the engagement with DPR and CalEPA as well. So those are kind of my two main comments. Do we have any other Board comments before we take up this resolution for a vote?

All right. Seeing none, do I have a motion and a second?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So moved, De La Torre.

49

```
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Second, Sperling.
1
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: Board Clerk, would you please
2
    call the roll.
 3
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes.
 4
             Dr. Balmes?
5
             BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes.
 6
7
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. De La Torre?
8
             BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yes.
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Eisenhut?
9
             BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Yes.
10
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Florez?
11
             Ms. Hurt?
12
             BOARD MEMBER HURT: Aye.
13
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez, aye. Sorry about
14
15
   that guys.
16
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. No problem.
             Mr. Kracov?
17
             BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes.
18
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?
19
20
             Mrs. Riordan?
             BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Aye.
21
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Supervisor Serna?
22
23
             BOARD MEMBER SERNA:
                                 Aye.
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Professor Sperling?
24
             BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Aye.
25
```

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Takvorian?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Aye.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Vice Chair Berg?

VICE CHAIR BERG: Aye.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair Randolph?

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Madam Chair, the motion

passes.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

Okay. The next item on the agenda is item number 21-1-3[SIC], the 2021 legislative update. 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.

The Legislature continues to show interest in our programs, and 2021 was no exception, with the Legislature enacting a number of notable bills related to CARB's programs and regulations. I'm pleased that the Legislature has continued to focus investment on our funding programs that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality, particularly in impacted communities.

Additionally, the Legislature made unprecedented investments in zero-emission vehicle and infrastructure programs, providing critical support to our State efforts to transition our transportation system to zero emissions,

while ensuring that the benefits of this transition are shared by all Californians.

1.3

2.2

The support of the Legislature is critical to CARB's success in ensuring clean air for all Californians and preventing the worst impacts of climate change.

Mr. Corey, would you please introduce this item? EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair.

And as you mentioned, last year, the Legislature and Governor made significant appropriations to CARB programs that support our agency's work to achieve diverse and ambitious goals to better protect priority populations, improve air quality, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The 2021 budget also made historic investments in the state's efforts to accelerate the transition to zero-emission technologies across a wide range of economic sectors and industries.

enacted a number of notable bills. Senate Bill 372 by
Senator and Board Member Leyva establishes a new CARB
program that will provide support to fleets transitioning
to zero-emission vehicles. Assembly Bill 1261 by Assembly
Member Burke provides CARB the opportunity to further
improve our transportation incentive programs in
accordance with the recommendations made by the State
auditor following its audit last year.

Additionally, AB 1346 by Assembly Member Berman directs CARB to develop regulations to essentially eliminate emissions from small off-road engines. In line with AB 1346, the Board approved staff's proposed SORE regulation in December of 2021.

The Legislature also enacted legislation to include labor co-benefits in the state's air quality and climate work.

And Assembly Bill 794 by Assembly Member Carrillo and Assembly Bill 680 by Assembly Member Burke integrate labor standards and equity goals into several of CARB's funding and incentive programs. We recognize that our path forward on air quality and climate must include fair labor standards and equity, which supports high-road job development and working conditions.

I'll now ask Megan Cleveland of the Office of Legislative Affairs to give the staff presentation.

Megan.

1.3

2.2

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: I'm sorry. I was still on mute. Thank you, Mr. Corey. Good morning, Chair and members. My name is Megan Cleveland and I'm a legislative analyst with the CARB Office of Legislative Affairs. And today, I have the pleasure of providing you with the 2021 legislative update.

--000--

1.3

2.2

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: First, a quick overview of the items that I will be covering this morning. To begin, I will share a summary of the notable legislation enacted last year, followed by key bill statistics from 2021. Then I will briefly discuss the challenges and uncertainties that are facing the Legislature in 2022.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: As Chair Randolph said, the Legislature continued to show interest in CARB's programs in 2021. Key legislation that we saw last year included bills supporting the state's transition to zero-emission technologies in a variety of sectors, implementing recommendations made by the California State Auditor in response to audit of CARB's incentive programs, integrating labor and equity into CARB's work, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the cement sector.

Additionally, last year's budget appropriated unprecedented funds to support CARB'S work and programs and made historic investments in the State's efforts to accelerate our transition to zero-emission vehicles.

In the next several slides, I will discuss each of these bills in further detail.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: Building on this -- on CARB's existing vehicle incentive programs, SB 372 by Senator and Board Member Leyva directs CARB to establish a new financing assistance program to support the deployment of zero-emission vehicles in the medium-and heavy-duty sectors. CARB is directed to develop this new program by January 1, 2023, which will be administered by the California Pollution Control Financing Authority. The program will make financing tools, such as grants and vouchers, as well as non-financial supports, including calculators and outreach, available to the operators of medium- and heavy-duty vehicle fleets. The bill places particular emphasis on small fleets, which have some of the highest barriers ZEV adoption.

2.2

Additionally, SB 372 ensures that at least 75 percent of these funds will be directed towards fleets that directly impact or operate in priority communities, including low-income and disadvantaged communities. The new program established by SB 732 will support California's air quality, equity, transportation electrification, and climate goals consistent with CARB's mission.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: The Legislature also enacted AB 1261 by Assembly Member Burke to codify a

subset of the recommendations made by the California State
Auditor in the 2021 report based on its audit of CARB
incentive programs. AB 1261 directs CARB to better
isolate the greenhouse gas emission reductions across our
various transportation related incentive programs.

1.3

2.2

The bill also directs CARB to create a process to define, collect, and evaluate data on behavioral changes resulting from and the socioeconomic benefits ascribed to these programs. AB 1261 requires CARB to use this data when making funding and design recommendations in funding plans and annual reports to the Legislature. In implementing this bill, CARB will contract with the University of California or California State University systems to collect data and conduct analyses. The work outlined in AB 1261 is contingent upon appropriation and must be completed within three years of that appropriation. Given the immensity of the work established by this bill, and required by the audit, additional resources are critical to CARB in completing this work.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: AB 1346, by Assembly Member Berman, was enacted to address emissions from small off-road engines, or SORE, which include equipment such as lawn mowers and leaf blowers.

The bill provides Legislative support for CARB's cost effective and technologically feasible regulation adopted last year that will effectively eliminate engine exhaust and evaporative emissions from new small off-road engines. AB 1346 also requires CARB to identify and make available funding for incentives to support the transition to zero-emission small off-road equipment.

1.3

2.2

The 2021 budget appropriated \$30 million to CARB to establish a new SORE incentive program, which will support greater deployment of these zero-emission technologies. In advance of AB 1346 becoming law, the Board approved CARB staff's proposed SORE regulation last month in December.

Additionally, in accordance with the 2021 budget, the Board also approved the annual funding plan that included SORE incentive money as part of the Clean Off-Road Equipment Voucher Incentive Project in November of 2021.

--000--

also demonstrated interest in integrating labor and equity into the state's air quality and climate work. Two bills, SB 794 by Assembly Member Carrillo and AB 680 by Assembly Member Burke were enacted in 2021 to incorporate fair labor standards into CARB's funding and incentive

programs.

2.2

Work -- our path forward on air quality and climate supports labor and equity goals. AB 794 establishes new -- new requirements related to workforce and labor standards for drayage and short haul trucking fleets participating in certain CARB incentive programs, such as the Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project, or HVIP, and the Carl Moyer Program amongst others.

Beginning in fiscal year 2022-2023, AB 794 directs CARB to implement new compliance verification requirements for labor standards for participating fleets. Under the bill, fleets must provide a self-attestation and demonstrate that they do not have any applicable labor law violations. Furthermore, fleet purchasers who receive CARB incentive funds are required to sign contracts conditioning any incentives received on compliance with the requirements of the bill.

Finally, AB 794 requires CARB to evaluate third-party claims of untruthful attestations. CARB will coordinate with the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement to implement these new requirements. AB 794 will allow the State to simultaneously incentivize cleaner vehicles as well as increase the compliance of

participating fleets with existing labor and workforce standards.

2.2

--000--

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: Similarly, AB 680, by Assembly Member Burke, directs CARB to work with the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency to update the California Climate Investments funding guidelines by July 1, 2025. The updated guidelines will ensure that all applicants to grant projects that receive continuous appropriations from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, also known as GGRF, meet fair and responsible labor standards, have inclusive procurement policies, and pay prevailing wage for any construction work funded by the grant.

The bill also requires that applicants seeking GGRF funds for construction projects over \$1 million provide evidence of a community workforce agreement. Additionally, AB 680 gives preference to projects that create high quality jobs, projects that are in priority population regions, and projects that demonstrate a partnership with an educational institution or training program targeting residents of disadvantaged, tribal, and low income communities. In sum, this bill will allow CARB to ensure fair and responsible labor and workforce practices are incorporated into GGRF funded grant

projects.

2.2

--000--

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: Last year, the Legislature also enacted bills focused on reducing greenhouse gas emissions and addressing climate change. One such bill was AB -- sorry, SB 596 by Senator Becker requiring CARB, by July 1, 2023, to develop a comprehensive strategy to reduce cement sector emissions to net zero no later than December 31st, 2045. The bill also outlines specific guidelines for CARB in developing the strategy.

Additionally, SB 596 directs CARB to establish interim greenhouse gas intensity targets with the goal of reducing the greenhouse gas intensity of cement used in the state to 40 percent below the 2019 average by December 30 -- December 2035.

The bill also authorizes CARB to adjust the interim targets to reflect technological advancements and process -- and progress in addressing barriers to the deployment of GHG emission reduction technologies and processes. Finally, SB 596 requires CARB to implement the strategy upon appropriation by the Legislature.

By directing the cement sector to reduce GHG emissions beyond 2030, this bill will contribute to the state's efforts to achieve the 2045 carbon neutrality

goal.

1.3

2.2

--000--

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: Consistent with previous years, the Legislature prioritized accelerating the transition to zero-emission vehicles in all sectors, enacting bills including those supporting increased electric vehicle charging infrastructure and establishing expedited zero-emission requirements for certain autonomous vehicles.

Adequate electric vehicle charging infrastructure is essential to meeting California's ZEV goals. However, permitting delays can slow the buildout of charging stations, hindering California's efforts to spur adoption of and increased access to EVs. AB 970 by Assembly Member McCarty further streamlines local permitting of EV infrastructure projects. The bill provides default approval to certain EV charging station permits that meet specified conditions after 20 or 40 business days, depending on the number of charging stations at the site.

The bill will ensure that permits are approved in a timely manner allowing for the safe and more rapid deployment of the EV infrastructure needed for California to achieve its ZEV, clean air, and greenhouse gas reduction goals.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: SB 500 by Senator Min requires that to the extent allowed by federal law, by 2030, any new light-duty autonomous vehicle, or AV, that is equipped with Level 2 -- Level 3, 4, or 5, excuse me, automation be a zero-emission vehicle. The bill expedites the ZEV targets established by Governor Newsom's 2020 ZEV Executive Order by requiring new light-duty autonomous vehicles to be ZEVs five years earlier than the 2035 requirement for new passenger vehicles.

2.2

While AVs offer several potential benefits including increased safety and mobility, among others, their deployment could adversely impact climate and air quality by increasing GHG and air pollutant emissions, due to more congestion and sprawl. SB 500 will allow California to benefit from the opportunities provide by autonomous vehicles without adversely impacting our climate and air quality goals.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: Due to a sizable surplus and federal aid money, 2021 was an extraordinary year for California's budget. Last year, the Legislature and Governor approved several budget bills that appropriated unprecedented funds to CARB. Cumulatively, more than two and a half billion dollars were appropriated to CARB for investments in low carbon transportation and

zero-emission vehicles, community air protection incentives for the most disproportionately impacted communities, incentives to modernize the agricultural sector fleet through the Funding Agricultural Replacement Measures for Emission Reductions Program, also known as the FARMER Program, and funding for several other existing CARB programs.

1.3

2.2

The Legislature also approved several important CARB budget change proposals that provided resources to critical programs, including continued funding for 22 permanent positions with CARB's Office of Community Air Protection, as well as more than 30 new positions and additional resources for CARB's new Southern California headquarters in Riverside.

Additionally, the budget appropriated funding to CARB to establish two new incentive programs, including \$30 million for a small off-road equipment incentive program, and \$180 million for an incentive program for alternatives to agricultural burning in the San Joaquin Valley.

The CARB funding appropriated in last year's budget also included more than \$1.5 billion from the ZEV package, which is discussed in more detail on the next slide.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: Among the notable budget actions last year, was the approval of a historic ZEV package that promises more than \$3.9 billion through fiscal year 2023-2024 to the CARB, the California Energy Commission, the California State Transportation Agency, and the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development. These investments will provide significant support for zero-emission vehicle and infrastructure programs.

1.3

2.2

Although this funding is promised, the current Legislature cannot dictate the actions of future legislatures and it will be up to legislative members to -- excuse me -- up to legislative members to make the corresponding annual appropriations in future budget bills.

Of the funding, CARB will receive more than \$1.5 billion this fiscal year to support increased zero-emission vehicle adoption in the light-, medium-, and heavy-duty sectors with a cumulative total of \$2.3 billion promised through fiscal year 2023-2024. The light-duty and mobility ZEV investments include \$150 million for CARB's suite of clean transportation equity projects in this budget year, with at least half of those funds earmarked for the Clean Cars 4 All Program. The ZEV package also promises additional \$250 million over the

next two years to expand the Clean Cars 4 All Program statewide.

1.3

2.2

In addition, the budget included \$525 million for the Clean Vehicle Rebate Project, or CVRP, over the next three years. For the first time, the Legislature appropriated this funding up front allowing CARB to formulate a multi-year funding plan to focus these rebates where they're needed most. The Legislature also gave CARB the direction to incrementally phase down CVRP over the coming years.

These appropriations to CARB will provide timely investments in communities and industries across the state to achieve a diverse and ambitious set of goals to empower and better protect priority populations, improve air quality, reduce GHGs, and catalyze transitions to new technologies and economies in the near future.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: Next, I will provide a brief overview of some of the key bill statistics from 2021. Last year, legislative members introduced 2,421 bills. A total of 836 bills reached Governor Newsom's desk, or approximately 34 percent. Of those bills, Governor Newsom signed 770 bills, roughly 92 percent, and vetoed 66 bills, or approximately eight percent.

The key bill statistics from 2021 are more consistent with pre-pandemic years in terms of legislation introduced and sent to the Governor. However, you will note there was an increase in the number of bills signed and a corresponding decrease in the number of bills vetoed compared to the previous two years.

2.2

Despite the variation in overall bill statistics over the past three years, the number of CARB bills tracked and analyzed by our office remained fairly consistent. CARB's office of Legislative Affairs tracked 405 bills and resolutions related to air quality and climate change last year. And of those, we analyzed 112.

The bills we analyzed generally -- were generally those that the Governor's office requested CARB to analyze, or those that were of particular importance to CARB and our programs and regulations. A full summary of the bills that we tracked can be found in the 2021 annual legislative summary. Beginning in 2020, our office moved the annual legislative summary to a new modernized online format. This year's summary can be accessed on CARB's website using the link included on this slide.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: As this graph illustrates, the number of bills that the Office of Legislative Affairs tracked and analyzed over the past

decade shows an upward trend. The oscillation that you generally see coincides with the first and second year of the two-year legislative cycle, with the second year typically having more bills than the first. We expect this upward trend to continue in 2022 as new bills are introduced and added to the number of remaining bills that didn't make it across the finish line in 2021.

2.2

--000--

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: This year, the Legislature and staff will be grappling with several challenges. It remains unclear how the COVID-19 pandemic will impact the work of the Legislature in 2022. As in previous years, as new variants emerge, the Legislature will have to adapt to ever-changing conditions. The Legislature could also face continued challenges in providing pre-pandemic level opportunities for committees to meet due to COVID policies and procedures.

Additionally, last year, the Legislature embarked on demolishing and rebuilding the East Annex of the Capitol building, which houses the Governor's office, the vast majority of legislative offices, and several legislative committee hearings rooms, including two of the largest committee rooms. In preparation for the demolition of the East Annex, legislators and their staff have been located -- relocated to a swing space that is

approximately two blocks from the Capitol bidding.

2.2

As the Legislature will continue to meet in their respective chambers in the State Capitol, the distance between member offices and legislative chambers will likely create logistical challenges for members and staff. Regardless, the Legislature has continued to show interest in CARB's work and programs in 2022 and we look forward to updating you at the end of this session on the legislate -- on what the Legislature was interested in and how that will impact our work on air quality and climate in the future.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST CLEVELAND: The Office of Legislative Affairs relies on close coordination from a dedicated team, as well as collaboration with staff in nearly every division of CARB.

We are incredibly grateful for all the support of the CARB staff that make our work possible. Their assistance and expertise are invaluable. It is an honor to be part of the Office of Legislative Affairs and to work alongside amazing and hard working colleagues. We would specifically like to acknowledge the contributions of two legislative analysts, Natalya Eagan and Andrew Tsiu, who each served as our Interim Deputy Legislative Director last year as we went through the hiring process.

They each took on immense managerial and administrative responsibilities at a critical time.

1.3

2.2

In addition, our office welcomed two new members last year, Ashley Arax, who returned to the Office of Legislative Affairs as Deputy Legislative Director, and DeShannon Correa who joined our office as an administrative assistance. Ashley and DeShannon are wonderful additions to our team.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to provide you with this update on the legislative actions from last year. Our Legislative Director, David Garcia, and I are happy to answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

Okay. Next, we will hear from the public on this agenda item. Will the Board clerk please call any members of the public who would like to speak?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you, Chair. If you would like to speak on this item, please raise your hand in Zoom or dial star nine.

There are currently no public members with their hands raised to speak on this item, Chair.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. This is an informational item, so we don't need to worry about closing the record, so we can bring this to Board members for discussion.

Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Chair Randolph. Just because Dr. Sperling already made a point of the fact that his students go on to work for our agency, I just want to welcome Ashley Arax to her new position as Deputy Director of the Legislative Liaison Office, because Ashley was my student. Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Very nice.

Board Member De La Torre.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you and thank the legislative team. That was a busy year last year and got some good stuff that we're going to be implementing. And I look forward to making it all happen. This year, obviously the budget is another big item and there have been a couple of things that the Board has requested that are kind of floating around out there and we'll see whether that leads to legislation that could help us move ahead.

I also wanted to speak to something that happened, and it's kind of legislative, but it's important to me. You'll recall -- the Board will recall that five years ago when we did our mid-term review on the vehicles standards, I spoke about the tension between California and Washington D.C., namely the Trump administration at the time, and it all came to pass unfortunately. There was a division with us and the auto manufacturers. And a

few of the auto manufacturers stood up with California, Ford, Honda, BMW, Volkswagen, and Volvo, and other auto manufacturers did not. And as a result of that, General Motors is one of the companies that did not. They clearly took President Trump's side in that division that took place, and so they were prohibited from selling vehicles to the California fleet because of that. And I don't know if that was legislative or administrative. I don't recall what the circumstances were, but this Board was very supportive of that.

2.2

Well, on a Sunday, January 9th -- which is interesting, usually you dump bad news on a Friday night. This was so bad they dumped it on a Sunday -- said that it had agreed to recognize California's authority to set vehicle emission standards under the Clean Air Act. And in return, they could be eligible for government fleet purchases by the State of California. So they get to sell California cars in return for saying something that is useless. They -- we know we have authority under the Clean Air Act. We know we have a waiver that has been approved by every president, Democrat or Republican, since Richard Nixon up until President Trump, at that time.

And so after one year with no changes in their -in their performance, no changes in their compliance with
California standards, we just say, okay, let's sing

Kumbaya. We'll embrace you in return for telling us something we already now. And so I was very frustrated to see that one year in to the Biden Administration with no demonstrable change by GM, except for this empty statement. They're going to be able to sell cars to California, which is all they want to do anyway, and I understand that.

But the conditions that were there in November of 2020 are the same today. Nothing has changed. And so I was very frustrated to see that they are going to be allowed to sell cars to California without changing their behavior.

So with that, I know that was a long comment, but I just felt it needed to be said, because this is our first meeting since that took place on January 9th.

Thank you, Chair.

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes. Hi. Thank you, David and team. You know, in terms of the breakdown that you gave on the slide 13 on the ZEV package, I know that we have some pretty significant legislation -- I'm sorry, regulation coming up on marine vessels. And I'm sure pretty much with what's happening at the ports, as we were trying to -- there will be something, you know, to

come in the future. And I'm wondering if there's room for a line or a, you know, subcategory on marine vessels, and if the -- you know, any type of harbor craft, any of that? And if the amount is zero, then, you know, that's something that will be informative to us. But I think if there's any information you can give now, that would be really helpful. But definitely, I think as we start enacting some of these upcoming rules, it would be helpful to have as a breakdown as well.

2.2

Thank you for that question, Board member. There is nothing specific in this budget carved out for marine vessels. However, we do have existing incentive programs that can be used to fund that turnover. And for that, I would ask the Deputies or Division Chiefs over some of these incentive programs, like the Carl Moyer Program, or the Volkswagen settlement, if they have anything they would want to add regarding the existing incentive programs.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: This is Richard. I'll just note that there are some off-road heavy-duty, which captures marine in the budget, but I will also note that those dollars are stretched along several categories. So as the budget process plays itself out over the next several months, and as you noted, Dr. Pacheco-Werner, as

we're discussing some of the regulations going forward including the marine work, which has a lead time, that's time for those funds to be directed at projects for early action and securing early reductions.

So we could expect those conversations to continue in terms of where are the opportunities for additional funding, the additional projects that can --funding pots that can fund off-road, including marine as well as the current budget process, are there additional opportunities?

So really appreciate you bringing this up and it's the right time in considering the range of actions that will be coming before the Board and that I'll be talking about in a few minutes.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Oh, wonderful.

Yeah, especially because, you know, as we heard during our first hearing on harbor craft, you know, from the community, we're talking about significant money that's not just like the same to replace an individual car or even a truck. So thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

Dr. Sperling.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Thank you. On this issue of money, you know, a little bit ago -- you know, connecting up to the research discussion, a moment ago I

talked about how and Dr. Balmes talked about how the mission and activities of CARB have greatly increased. Well, another way it's greatly increase is we're spending massive amounts of money that we never did before, \$1.5 billion. Are we evaluating which of these programs are working, and how well, lessons learned, so that we can keep doing it better? And the answer is mostly no, as much as I know. And this is something that plagues all government agencies. You know, a rule of thumb is three to five percent of funding should be used for evaluation.

2.2

And so this is not strictly research, but it's kind of quasi-research. And this is something I would urge more attention to. We're spending -- I know some programs I'm familiar with, you know, we're spending a lot of money and we have no idea how well they're really working. We ask for a little reporting, but it's kind of very minor and not very useful for evaluation. So let's do evaluation better and learn from the past.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Supervisor Serna.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you, Chair.

First, let me start by thanking our leg team for a great presentation and they're ongoing work to inform this Board about the connection that we share by design with the Legislature and our activities relative to mostly implementation of the product of what goes on at the

Capitol.

2.2

One of the things that I found a little disappointing, however, in the presentation, and forgive if I may have missed it, is a reflection of what this Board, especially over the last year, has addressed and commented on several times, and that is the lack of funding for AB 617 implementation. And as a member of our local air district board of directors, I can tell you that there is ongoing growing frustration over the fact that we have very, very limited resources at the local level to, you know, commit to that directive.

And so as Board Member De La Torre referenced, and I think as we all know, we're in a very unique place with the very healthy robust budget that we have -- that we're fortunate to have at the State right now, it seems to me that this should be an elevated priority for us and for our partnership with our local air districts to really work very hard to make the case for, you know, finding those financial resources to assist local districts and carry out the mission of AB 617. So I just wanted to make sure that I was on record, you know, mentioning that in the context of this update I think it's very relative. So I don't if staff has any thoughts on that, but I'd be curious to know if there's any intent to do what I've suggested.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Executive Officer Corey, would you like to address that?

1.3

2.2

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes, supervisor, thanks for raising the question. In fact, we returned to the Board for the February 10th Board hearing, so next month -- early next month to discuss some additional 617 communities. And in the context of that discussion, we're going to be talking about this very thing, which is capacity under the program. How do we take on progressively more communities, when we're getting pinched from an operations standpoint? We really do need to rethink the approach and the program, but also in the budget side. And we're talking with communities. We're talking with districts and there clearly are a number of conversations legislatively to build on the experiences with the program and how do we take it on to expand it to a much, much larger number of communities.

So we'll be discussing -- the point is really quite timely, appropriate, and useful. So that will be on the docket for discussion when we bring the additional communities, but also over the next several months as the budget process works through the process, because your recognition of the challenges is a very real issue.

And I'd like to just -- and I'll do this in one minute. It went quickly to the next comment with respect

to the observation that Dr. Sperling made about tracking the dollars, how they move through. There's a number of efforts that I really want all you to know about. One, the contractual agreements, the grant agreements, there's additional reporting requirements that we're putting in those that we're reporting and having more transparency access, public access to the reporting metrics in terms of what's being funded, where it's being funded, all that information in one Place. Also, I have a research contract in place to help us on this. And there were elements responding to the audit in terms of what programs are working, how are they working, how are those dollars being distributed geographically across the state.

So we're taking no doubt, those appropriations, which are unprecedented, very, very seriously. And they do present a real opportunity to learn where -- how can we be more effective in delivering reductions, particularly delivering benefits at a community level, and the underlying metrics that you need to have to be able to quantitatively make that determination. So to both of you, thanks for those questions.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you, Richard.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Dr. Balmes.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I want to thank Supervisor

Serna for bringing up the AB 617 budget issue. I knew about the -- or I know about the February meeting where we're going to be addressing AB 617, as Mr. Corey just outlined. But I should have brought up the issue about AB 617, because as you all know, I Chair the AB 617 Consultation Group, which has stakeholders from communities, environmental justice groups, business interests, and the local air districts. And the Consultation Group this diverse body doesn't agree on much, but everybody agrees that more funding is needed to make the program successful, especially if we want to reach out to all the communities that deserve the activities that come along with implementation of AB 617.

2.2

So I just wanted to strongly echo what Supervisor Serna said about the need for AB 617 and going to the Legislature to try to get more funding for the program. And I would just say that the Executive Officer of the South Coast Air Quality Management District, Wayne Nastri, has been already going to the Legislature about AB 617 funding. So I just hope that we are working in tandem with -- ASSEMBLY MEMBER GARCIA has got his hand up. I think I might hear something, hopefully good. Anyway, thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Board Member Riordan.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Yes. I want to also

underscore more funding for our communities under the program. While we do not have one in the district that I'm involved in, I know how the districts that do have those community programs are really stretched for funding. And we need to make these efforts successful. And it can only really be done with some additional funding, so hopefully that will come.

2.2

My question is to the staff. I think the reauthorization of the Carl Moyer Program is about to be needed. And what is happening there? That program I think is a terrific program. And from a district point of view, it's a big success, so what do we know about that?

LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR GARCIA: So thank you, Ms. Riordan, for that question. As you probably are aware, last year, the administration did propose to reauthorize the programs through the budget via a trailer bill, and that effort was unsuccessful. We are aware that there are -- there's nothing public yet. There's no bill that's been introduced. However, I have had conversations with several offices confidentially, so I don't want to betray their confidence too much in this space --

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Yeah.

LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR GARCIA: -- that they are working on reauthorizing the program this year or at least there are efforts that are being considered for action

this year.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: So are they looking for sponsors of a bill then at this time?

LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR GARCIA: Anyone who would like to support the bill should definitely engage in the process. And as best I can tell, AB 8, and the fees and programs that they support are wildly popular with support -- broad spectrum support from agriculture, and business, to environmentalists, and they should definitely talk to their legislators about the need to reauthorize these programs.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Okay. Great. Thank you. CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER GARCIA.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER GARCIA: Good morning, everyone. Thank you for the opportunity to chime in a bit here. I am very interested in working on some type of permanent funding source for AB 617 this session. I think with the amount of money that we've seen before us in the legislature last budget and projected surplus revenues this budget, there is absolutely no reason why we could not put forward a plan that could go out, you know, five years, 10 years, as it relates to funding AB 617 programs.

I think of what the Legislature did with the safe clean drinking water, you know, efforts, where we

identified a funding source for 10 years. I know it's been, you know, debated and deliberated whether that was the right funding source or not, but it was identified and it was agreed to, ensure that there are 10 years of funding available for addressing clean water efforts throughout the state. That's happening. We can do that with AB 617. I have had preliminary conversations with some of the air quality districts who would get behind an effort of that sort and I've had some conversations with some of our colleagues in the Legislature who would get behind that type of effort. So I look forward to, you know, getting the support of the members here on CARB to make that push. We've had some preliminary discussions with some of the administrative -- administration representatives who work in this space, and, you know, they, of course, just kind of nodded and said we're receptive to the idea. This is -- this is the time that we really fulfill our commitment to this work as it relates to our AB 617 communities, especially if we're going to continue to add communities to the list and the work that comes with that.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I want to make another comment, and that is, you know, I've been approached to consider the reauthorization to the Carl Moyer Program via a piece of legislation. I want to get some feedback on the program. You know, the

proposal that has been put in front of us is a simple, you know, straightforward extension. That probably shouldn't be that difficult running a bill of that sort, but I'd rather, you know, kind roll up our sleeves and look at the program, what it's done, its effectiveness, where it's worked, where it hasn't, and is there need to revamp the program in a way where we are far more intentional and prioritizing where we can have the biggest impact with the program and not just a simple extension and it be business as usual.

2.2

So I look forward to having that conversation. If it's not me, I'm sure it will be someone who we work very closely with that will reintroduce this program for an extension and -- but I would like to see us consider how do we make this program more effective, get a bigger bang for the buck, as they say, and overlap it with programs like AB 617, so that we are more intentional with our outcomes with these specific Investments.

So I just wanted to just make it known that we're listening and not just listening, but we're hearing loud and clear what needs to be done as it pertains to the AB 617 communities and the sustainable continuous funding that is necessary in order for us to achieve those objectives. So those are my comments and appreciate the attention on the matter.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Board Member Hurt.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you, Chair.

Air Quality Management District would really like to see a dedicated funding source. So for all the folks who are going to be working to that end, please let us know how we can support those efforts. People I think sometimes underestimate the need for community engagement and the money that's required behind it. And so we definitely are struggling to make sure we do the job right and additional resources, when it comes to funding, is really key.

And I was curious, based upon Board Member
Riordan's question about the Carl Moyer Program, if Mr.
Corey had any updates on the Board member led working
group in partnership with the air district and
stakeholders about the Carl Moyer Program? Do you have a
status update on that?

there's two elements to this, so it's a great question.

At the November Board hearing, November 2021, where the Board authorized the -- last year's expenditures, the last year appropriations, there was discussion about some near-term adjustments to Moyer. One, it was move forward with the air districts, get those dollars and communities,

but it was direction to change the cost effectiveness provisions for zero emission and lower emission technologies.

2.2

That's the process we initiated in our -- in that workshop process right now with districts and other stakeholders to land that in the very near term, so we can get those grant agreements in place and get the funding going on.

There was also step two, a broader discussion for more significant changes to Moyer, including the smaller fleet related provisions, in terms of benefiting and partnering with smaller fleets.

There was also how to more effectively, and you indicated this earlier, integrate equity, environmental justice in a basic design and implementation of Moyer.

We're initiating a process to establish a incentive working group that will include Board members, include district, include other stakeholders. That's launching in the next -- I believe it's, if not next month, March we're pulling that together. And over the course of this year, we'll be working through multiple work group meetings, public workshops to inform really what I'm calling reforming, a strengthening, a shoring up the learnings from the Moyer Program.

So two steps, one was immediate acting on the

direction we already got from the Board, get those past dollars out and partner with the districts on doing that. Two, the reimagined Moyer and that process. We've initiated it and are pulling together and it will play itself out over the course of this year.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: And if I could just also briefly add that I asked Vice Chair Berg to start kind of pulling together that group. And so she and I spoke earlier this week with staff. And so the Board members who expressed interest in participating in this process already will be getting some calendar outreach, in terms of scheduling a meeting. And if there are any other Board members that haven't yet indicated their interest in participating in that process, please do let me know.

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Great. That's all great to hear. I know I recently saw a workshop posted on the Carl Moyer Program. So I was just curious about that group, that working group put together. And I look forward to Vice Chair Berg leading that effort and make sure that happens.

Thank you.

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Board Member Kracov.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yeah. Thank you very much, Chair. And, Mr. Corey, just following up on this Moyer discussion. It's very important to the South Coast Air

District as well. Really excited that we're going to be embarking on a process including the Board members and potentially Vice Chair Berg's leadership on that. Just a clarification, I know that a workshop notice did come out for March 1st on Moyer that's referred to the November Board hearing, and says that during the hearing, stakeholders indicated a desire for further administrative changes outside the immediate scope of the Board hearing to streamline requirements and processes to ensure program participation is better and accountability.

2.2

That's the kind of stuff that really matters to the South Coast District. Is this workshop in March different than the one that's going to happen with the Board members? And if so, I'm a little concerned about that. It seems like this should be an integrated approach.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The -- Board Member
Kracov, the workshop you're referring to was to act on
Board direction to get those near-term changes done,
because it's a condition of moving the dollars and getting
grant agreements in place, so we're trying to move very
quickly, not that there won't be some broader discussion,
but the second step that I spoke about is right on the
heals of finishing the near-term changes, which will occur
quickly as just described. And then we will launch, just

as the Chair indicated, the working group with Board members and the public process associated with that.

1.3

2.2

So we were trying to act on Board direction, which is a precursor of basically funding those projects. So change the cost effectiveness, get that done. We've started that public process. We'll land that really in the next several weeks and be done with it and move on to the broader reimagined Moyer Program going forward.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Okay. Thank you very much and thank you, Chair, for helping get this off the ground, and potentially Vice Chair Berg for helping lead the efforts.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Board Member Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to chime in and appreciate the discussion of the need for the increase in permanent funding for the 617 program. I realize that without our San Diego Air Pollution Control District representative in Supervisor Fletcher, I just wanted to be sure that San Diego's voice was included in the conversation. And I think certainly staff and Board members know that there's consideration of adding another community, being the border community, in San Diego and we're excited about that consideration and concerned about how that can be a successful program with

flat funding or reduced funding.

2.2

So I real appreciate Assemby Member Garcia's statement that perhaps we could work together on increased and permanent funding for the program, not only obviously for San Diego, but throughout the State there's so many communities that really could benefit from this program. So I really look forward to the subquorum meeting and look forward to working with you all to make that happen.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right.

Vice Chair Berg, did you have anything else you wanted to add?

VICE CHAIR BERG: (Shakes head.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: You're good. Okay. All right. So that was an informational item, so we don't need to take a vote. So thank you for all of your engagement in this discussion. And thank you to staff for doing a great job with the Legislature and this is a ton of work and a lot of both detailed and big picture engagement. So I appreciate all of your work and your effort, so thank you.

Okay. The last item on our agenda is item number 22-1-4, a report on the California Air Resources Board's program priorities for 2022. 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.

1.3

2.2

So it's been almost -- basically a year since my first meeting of the Board as Chair. And over this past year, I've really enjoyed rolling up my sleeves and working with you all and the comprehensive range of programs and efforts CARB is engaged in. And I've experience first hand the impressive level of expertise, acumen, and commitment at every level of this organization.

During my trip in the fall to Glasgow to represent California and CARB at COP26, I was able to really appreciate the impact of CARB's work beyond our borders more fully. While I was there, I had numerous conversations on engaging issues ranging from how do we transition to zero-emission vehicles in all sectors and how do we deploy those electric vehicles at scale, what are the best regulatory strategies to accomplish that, to how is California working, to implement the only statutory short-lived climate pollutant target, to how can governments work with indigenous communities to protect forests.

California seeks to set an example globally, not just by working towards a carbon neutral future with the urgency that the current climate crisis demands, but trying to achieve clean air in our frontline communities

with the urgency required by the pollution burdens they continue to face.

1.3

2.2

I emphasized to our international partners that CARB and California are committed to ensuring that our actions on climate clean the air and improve quality of life in communities that are disproportionately impacted by the negative impacts of air pollution and climate change. And that same commitment to equity informs the Governor's proposed \$15 billion climate budget allowed -- announced earlier this month. The proposed budget's unprecedented investments in zero-emission vehicles and infrastructure, as we discussed earlier, reflect the administration's commitment to ensuring that transformation of the transportation sector is conducted equitably, and that our most burdened communities have access to clean vehicles and alternative mobility options.

And the budget also proposes investments in our community based transportation equity projects that expand clean transportation options, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and increase access to zero-emission mobility in low-income communities. And so together, those investments place an emphasis on moving away from combustion, but also moving away from cars as our primary mode of transportation.

Successfully transforming our transportation

sector means doing more than simply replacing combustion engines one-for-one with ZEVs on California's roads.

1.3

2.2

So when we talk about California leading the world, we want that leadership to reflect our commitment to all of our communities and especially to underserved frontline communities, bearing the brunt of health impacts of freeways packed with diesel trucks and of freight movement from ships, to ports, to railyards, and distribution centers.

I emphasize this, because 2022 is, in many ways, going to be a momentous year on that front. It is the year when CARB and California will set the course to move definitively away from fossil fuels and away from combustion, and transition on all fronts into a new paradigm built on a commitment to cleaning up our hardest hit communities and the equitable acceleration of zero-emission technologies, in all sectors.

Our work this year will have three major anchor points, Advanced Clean Cars II, which will move us to 100 percent zero-emission car sales by 2035; the State Clean Air Implementation Strategy, which will enable us to meet stringent federal air standards in 2037; and the Scoping Plan, which will lay out a path for California to achieve a 40 reduction in GHG from 1990 levels by 2030 and carbon neutrality by 2045 or sooner.

There are many other programs and actions we will take this year to support our efforts, many of which look decades ahead. We are not taking on these challenges alone. To succeed, we need to work with a wide range of partners, not only within the administration, but with stakeholders in our communities, industry, and the academic community, as well as with our federal partners. So it will really be an all-hands-on-deck effort.

2.2

I believe the actions that we take this year will be recognized as examples of California leading the nation and the world, not only with innovative science-based programs, but with the full and steady commitment to those actions improving the health and lives of all of our communities, and particularly those who have suffered the most from our dependency on fossil fuels.

This year, more than ever, we have the opportunity to set California on a clear course to transform our society and build a hopeful future, where everyone here at CARB and all of our partners can proudly say we did our best to make the difference that is needed, that we did our best to make a clean and healthy future for all.

And with that, I am pleased to turn things over to Executive Officer Corey, for an overview of what this year holds for CARB and the people of California.

Mr. Corey.

1.3

2.2

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Thanks, Chair. And that captured it quite well. 2022 is indeed an important year for CARB and for California. We have a series of major efforts before us that are going to set the stage for the next -- at least the next two decades, signature plans and regulations that will focus on addressing community needs, cleaning the air, and mitigating climate change.

My presentation is going to cover a lot of ground in keeping with the broad role and authority of the Board. Thus, by necessity, the treatment of any given tonic will be brief realizing that each will be subject to consideration, public process, and future Board engagement, so put the seat belts on.

The signal -- single element that binds these efforts and drives them all is the transition away from combustion. We have a 50-plus year history of implementing science-based policies to mitigate the impacts of combustion by cleaning up sources of pollution, but we're now at a key turning point.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: This year, we're moving beyond cleaning up the engines and sources that pump

toxics and pollution from combustion into the air. To that point, 2022 is the year when we set a course to liberate ourselves from the century-long dependence on fossil fuels and move into a era of zero-emission alternatives for virtually every source category. This will benefit all Californians, but especially communities overburdened by air pollution.

1.3

2.2

We take this course of action anchoring off a direction from the Legislature, Executive Orders from the Governor, and our mission to deliver clean air to all Californians and achieve our climate goals. As was the case in 2021, many of the actions the Board will be considering are world-leading measures.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: This is how we envision California's passenger vehicle population evolving over the next 30 years. To achieve our ambition -- ambitious emission emission-reduction targets, 100 percent of light-duty vehicle sales in 2035 should be either zero-emission and plug-in electric vehicles. And as recognized, here our approach encourages competition and does not define a single solution.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: A theme that will come through in my remarks is that the transition away from

combustion will require multiple strategies working together, including regulations and incentives, built on strong partnerships throughout government, academia, communities, and industry.

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: We also need to continue to reduce emissions of diesel PM, NOx, and GHGs as we move forward with the transition from combustion. This means a continued focus on those emissions if we're to achieve our health-based air quality standards, protect communities, and meet our GHG reduction targets. It's clear that we need to explore additional strategies to hasten the turnover of the existing combustion fleet.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: To better understand where we're going, let's take a look at the major strides that we made in the past year that helped lay the foundation for achieving a zero-emission future and provide a reference point for optimism.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: As a Board last year, you adopted the first ever sales requirement for heavy-duty emission trucks -- zero-emission trucks. The Advanced Clean Trucks Regulation or ACT, will drive zero-emission truck supply and provide expanded choices

for fleets.

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The ACT Regulation also provides critical certainty for product planning and private investment in infrastructure buildout, part of a broader multi-agency approach that includes all aspects of the ZEV transition. In keeping with the thrust of our efforts to address environmental justice issues, it will provide much needed relief to communities burdened by trucks.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: ACT also sends a signal to other states and really the rest of the world.

California has already assisted five states in the last year in successfully adopting the Advanced Clean Truck Rule and more are expected to join.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Internationally, California continues to work through new and existing channels to support zero-emission truck policies.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: This includes the actions of Chair Randolph and Secretary Blumenfeld, who are leading the Transportation Decarbonization Alliance, or TDA, group of cities, countries, and companies. Chair

Randolph presented TDA's call for action on zero-emission transport infrastructure at COP26 in Glasgow.

1.3

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: As mentioned, we need to continue to ensure existing combustion-based vehicles do not pollute our communities. Just last year, the Board approved a first-of-its-kind comprehensive Inspection and Maintenance Program for heavy-duty trucks and buses. The equivalent of Smog Check for trucks was authorized by legislation penned by Senator and Board Member Connie Leyva and begins in 2023. The program includes a roadside emissions monitoring network, periodic vehicle testing and reporting of on-board diagnostics data, and enhanced enforcement efforts.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: This comprehensive regulation will deliver the largest reduction of NOx and PM emissions from heavy-duty vehicles since CARB's pioneering Truck and Bus Regulation and its a foundational measure in the SIP.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Last month, the Board also took historic action by requiring small off-road engines, mainly used in landscaping, such as leaf blowers and lawn mowers to transition new sales entirely to

zero-emission alternatives in 2024. This is the first complete transition from combustion for any source.

1.3

2.2

--000--

engines, as you know, they're highly polluting and are a major source of smog-forming emissions, and without action the you took, would have exceeded emissions from passenger cars in the coming years.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: As we implement this regulation, we'll continue to raise awareness amongst user groups by loaning equipment through demonstration programs and enhancing outreach efforts, particularly to the smallest businesses to ensure a successful transition to zero-emission equipment. This will provide significant health benefits to current users, especially low-income communities of color and those who work in the landscaping industry. We're working closely with our air district partners to implement incentives for the program.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: In February of last year, the Board acted to phase down agricultural burning in the San Joaquin Valley by 2025, taking a major step toward ensuring all residents in the valley have healthy air to breathe. The action requires effectively

eliminating burning, which releases fine particulate

Matter or PM2.5 into the air causing or contributing to a

number of adverse health effects including asthma.

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The Governor's budget provided 180 million toward that transition. And I'm pleased to report that the funding the San Joaquin Valley Air District set aside to purchase chippers and grinders is oversubscribed, and grower demand for incentives is also strong. As the burning season has started, very little of the chipped biomass is being shipped off-site. Most of it is being incorporated into the soil on-site and open burning has dropped 25 percent from 2020 to 2021. We'll continue to update the Board on the progress of phasing out ag burning.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: We have aggressive air quality targets and substantial challenges, but I'm optimistic about our chances of success. My optimism is built on CARB's history of success predicated on science, extraordinary talented staff, strong partnerships, and a visionary Board, all of which will be essential elements going forward.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: As you can see from

these maps, the actions the Board has taken continue to improve air quality, cutting ozone, fine particulate pollution, and greenhouse gases.

1.3

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: And over the next two decades, we'll need to meet increasingly stringent standards for ozone and PM, as well as challenging climate targets and elevate our focus and effectiveness on addressing California's hardest hit communities. Our challenge is daunting. Future regulations will become increasingly more challenging to implement as we seek emission reductions from smaller sources.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: We've consistently demonstrated that we can make progress in reducing emissions while growing the economy and benefiting impacted communities. In fact, California's leadership is creating opportunities, including becoming a hub for the production and use of cleaner fuels and zero-emission transportation. We need to continue moving in that direction. But to be clear, achieving the needed reductions will require an unprecedented effort by the Board and all our partners.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: That leads us to this

year. What the Board does in 2022 and sets -- set the course for how we redouble our efforts to meet those goals. To help demonstrate the benefits and outcomes related to our actions this year, I want to focus on three main areas, communities, clean air, and climate.

1.3

2.2

--000--

engagement, and environmental justice are the responsibility of all CARB's offices and divisions, we'll look to our Equity, Communities and Environmental Justice Division to lead the way. This newly formed division, led up by Chanell Fletcher -- Deputy Executive Officer Chanell Fletcher includes an Office of Environmental justice, an Office of Community Air Protection, and soon to be launched Office of Racial Equity. This slide includes CARB staff and community representatives at the Office of the West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project preparing for an enforcement tour of West Oakland.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: At the October Board Hearing, we provided an update on the Community Air Protection Program in the form of powerful testimony from community and air district leaders. We are reminded that our work needs to center on communities. We also shared lessons learned so far and reinforced that AB 617 requires

us to address a much larger number of communities throughout the state than we're currently able to do so with the existing model.

1.3

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: 2022 will be a transformative year for the Community Air Protection Program as discussed with you all a short while ago. Next month, you'll hear our recommendations for two more communities, as well as the process to reset, and expand the program.

In May, we'll provide an update on our equity work. One example is the development of the People's Blueprint, an effort to capture the experiences and perspectives of a number of environmental justice leaders who have helped implement the program since the beginning. The approach for expanding the program will be built on robust engagement with all stakeholders that will occur in the spring and summer of 2022, along with continued engagement with our AB 617 Consultation Group.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The program's 15 communities offers lessons learned that we can use to benefit all communities in California. Currently, the air districts are working with communities to develop and implement their emission reduction plans. This include

replacing dirty engines with cleaner ones, controlling hexavalent chromium emissions at small businesses, and incentivizing alternative approaches to open burning of agricultural materials.

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Effective engagement must be the foundation of all CARB's programs. We'll take the lessons we've learned from the Community Air Protection Program, other CARB engagement efforts throughout the agency, and our relationships with communities to create training tools for all CARB staff.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: And now you'll see a video about the Richmond Air Ranger team, a community air grant recipient who's doing community air quality monitoring.

(Thereupon a video was played.)

VIDEO MODERATOR: When I think of clean air, I think of my home town, Richmond, California. I love Richmond, which is why I chose to be a part of groundwork Richmond's Air Rangers team

I grew up hear, my family is from here, and my son is hear. To me, making a difference is about servicing those in need. By installing high quality air monitors across Richmond, we're able to track and

safeguard our air now and for future generations. Clean air for all (inhales), that's work of an Air Ranger.

(End of video.)

1.3

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: And I can't move on without just noting how inspiring that video is, truly inspiring.

In May, we'll bring the statewide strategy to the Board as an informational item. And you're going to hear directly from EJ leaders whose foundational work on the People's Blueprint underscores our commitment to equity. You'll also hear from our air district partners about their goals for the program, and you'll hear from staff about additional approaches to bring benefits to more communities.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I'll now turn to some of the regulations the Board will consider in 2022 that have impacts statewide but will provide the most air quality and climate benefits to communities impacted by vehicle emissions. In all these regulations, we are escalating the focus on equity. That means developing solutions to ensure that frontline communities benefit. Let me start with the heavy-duty trucks.

Almost everyone of our communities -- or priority

communities is heavily impacted by trucks. It comes up in virtually every community meeting. And central to our effort of moving away from combustion is continuing to accelerate the rate at which heavy-duty trucks transition to zero-emission.

1.3

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The Advanced Clean

Fleet Regulation will help speed up this transition. The regulation is focused on the most effective opportunities for expanding the zero-emission truck fleet. For example, the proposed regulation pushes drayage trucks to make a complete transition to zero-emission technologies by 2035. The regulation also quickly ramps up zero-emission truck purchases for public fleets, and it strikes a balance between moving the rest of the market to zero emissions as quickly as possible by focusing on the fleets that are most suited for electrification. Importantly, the regulation will send a clear signal regarding the end of combustion trucks sales by 2040.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Cleaning up railyards is crucial to cleaning up the air in our hardest hit communities. CARB is developing an In-Use Locomotive Regulation to reduce local exposure and help reach attainment by increasing the turnover of old locomotives

and moving the market toward zero-emission technology. The regulation under development would apply to all line haul, switch, and passenger locomotives that operate within the state. Staff anticipates that the proposed regulation will be presented to the Board for consideration this fall.

1.3

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: And in November, staff presented the proposal to transition several types of harbor craft in California to much cleaner options, including everything from fishing vessels, to ferries, to tugboats. Continuing our efforts to clean the air and port-adjacent communities, staff will return to the Board within the next few months for the second hearing and final vote on the proposed amendments to the Commercial Harbor Craft Regulation.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: And as you can see, the rule will achieve much needed criteria emission reductions and reduce local exposure to toxic diesel emissions. As directed by the Board, we're currently following up with stakeholders to streamline the extension process, develop the scope for the program implementation review, and evaluate opportunities for funding. We're also planning a tour of the San Diego ports to further discuss how to

effectively implement the program.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: A continuing issues of concern for many communities is addressing toxics from chrome plating facilities. Chrome plating and chromic acid anodizing are used in wide ranging applications from decorative coatings for the automotive sector to high wear resistant coatings in aerospace and military equipment.

In 2022, staff will propose amendments to the Chrome Plating Air Toxic Control Measure to further reduce or eliminate hexavalent chromium emissions from chrome plating operations. The current regulatory concepts are geared toward replacement of hexavalent chrome plating, commonly referred to as Chrome VI with less toxic alternatives.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Communities throughout California are seeing more days of smoke and unhealthy air. This is clearly an outcome of insufficient fuels management funding for decades as well as the accelerated impacts of climate change.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: CARB is continuing to mitigate the impacts of wildfires by supporting the state's forest management priorities, including an

increase in prescribed fires and learning from indigenous practitioners who have been safeguarding lands for thousands of years. Here's an example of a prescribed fire in Ukiah using heli-torch, a California Climate Investment Project, funded by proceeds from Cap-and-Trade. We're also supporting communities, districts, and personnel in the field with a number of tools, including enhanced monitoring capabilities and improved public outreach.

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: CARB has distributed 100 portable PM2.5 monitors, known as EBAMs, to five strategically caches across the state to monitor wildfire smoke. We've also provided over 700 PurpleAir sensors to local air districts to expand wildfire smoke monitoring efforts statewide with plans to distribute an additional 200 sensors this year. To help people proactively prepare for wildfire smoke in 202, CARB will expand the successful Smoke Ready California social media campaign.

--000--

is California's Smoke Spotter, California's first mobile app, launched in 2021 to help Californian's plan for potential smoke impacts from prescribed fires. CARB staff is currently working to integrate wildfire information,

wildfire smoke forecasting, and real-time PurpleAir sensor data.

1.3

2.2

--000--

entirely new effort to protect communities and individuals from wildfire smoke with the opening of the first Clean Air Centers. In response to AB 836, by Assembly Member Buffy Wicks, CARB is partnering with air districts and CAPCOA to develop a network of Clean Air Centers across the state that will be easily identified with CARB-developed branding and signage. Funding will provide updated facility filtration and ventilation or portable air cleaning devices.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Protecting communities also means providing residents with a broad range of alternatives to having a vehicle to get around. We've been working to increase sustainable transportation options like walking and biking, but recent analyses indicate that the number of miles driven statewide, or VMT, continues to rise despite the implementation of the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Program known as SB 375.

Clearly, ZEVs alone are not going to be enough. We need to reenvision our developed landscape and the

transportation system that supports it to provide viable, efficient, and equitable mobility options other than single occupancy vehicles. And we'll only be effective by partnering with local governments, communities, and developers to better align incentives with the needed outcomes.

1.3

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: We're partnering with the Department of Housing and Community Development to develop and implement a new incentive program that provides grants to Metropolitan Planning Organizations to further the implementation of Sustainable Communities Strategies, reduce VMT, promote housing development, and advance equity.

This year, we'll continue to work closely with our State partners on a range of activities, including implementation of the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure and our joint board meetings with the California Transportation Commission and HCD, among many other initiatives.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: As noted, getting at the VMT issue will require many efforts, including pilots and experimentation. For example, with seven million from the California Climate Investments and four million of

resource contributions, the Los Angeles Department of Transportation in collaboration with a diverse set of partners launched the South Los Angeles Universal Basic Mobility Pilot. This initiative, and it -- was co-created with community residents and representatives. The pilot will increase mobility and reduce transportation-related GHG emissions through projects that meet the specific needs of South LA's residents.

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Residential and commercial buildings account for one-quarter of our GHG emissions. Decarbonizing all buildings, moving away from natural gas, and making them more energy efficient will result in significant air quality, public health, and greenhouse gas benefits.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: There are several important considerations that CARB is keeping in mind as we move forward with our partners on building decarbonization efforts. As noted earlier, building decarbonization supports the achievement of climate targets as well as improved indoor and outdoor air quality and improved health. Momentum to decarbonize buildings is accelerating and we'll be working closely with our sister agencies, the California Energy Commission, the California

Public Utilities Commission, and the California Department of Housing and Community Development, to accelerate this work, while focusing on the need for affordable energy rates.

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The second major focus this year is setting our course to achieve clean air for all Californians. This is driven by the need for California to meet increasingly stringent air quality standards, but will also provide benefits to communities and reduce GHG emissions.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: As you can see, we're facing a significant challenge. The areas in orange are air districts that are not meeting the 70 parts per billion 8-hour ozone standard now or even the less stringent standards. This is the year when we'll set out our strategy to meet those goals by no later than 2037 and achieve other standards along the way.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: In areas like the LA basin, even with all existing programs in place, we still face a shortfall, securing the needed reductions in NOx to achieve our ozone standards, including the 8-hour 70 ppb standard. And rising temperatures resulting from climate

change, especially in the summer, create a climate penalty that will make it even more difficult to get there.

2.2

But we will get there, and this year, we're developing the document that will guide us, the State Implementation Strategy. The SIP is often considered just a technical discussion of tons per day and parts per billion. In fact, the SIP serves a crucial function to align all our programs statewide in pursuit of a common goal of meeting federal air quality standards. And I should mention that not meeting the commitments we make in the SIP can result in sanctions and even the loss of federal funding. Consideration of the new SIP in 2022 will be one of the most significant items coming before the Board this year.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Because of the aggressive control programs that California and local air districts have put in place, federal sources dominate our emissions. Attaining health-based air quality standards is simply not possible without the federal government doing its part on locomotives, off-road diesel equipment, ships, and planes. The State commitments will be confined with air district commitments to create the final SIPs, which are due to U.S. EPA in August. We'll be updating you on the SIP Strategy approach this February, next

month, as well as efforts to secure federal action on sources it regulates.

1.3

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The third focus for the year is climate. Linked to our efforts to protect communities and clean the air, our actions to address climate change will need to escalate. After all, the primary sources are generally the same, the combustion of fossil fuels. As you well know, California is seeking the impacts -- or rather seeing the impacts of climate change, record-setting wildfires, extended droughts, and exacerbated poor air quality. And much of this is adding to the already disproportionate burdens experienced by frontline communities. But we have the tools to change this trajectory and a track record of successfully developing and implementing programs that work.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The time to double down on our efforts is now, and so CARB has begun the process to update the State's AB 32 Climate Change Scoping Plan and chart a path toward achieving carbon neutrality no later than 2045. Achieving carbon neutrality is ambitious, but absolutely necessary to achieve the worst -- or to avoid the worst impacts of climate change.

Over the course of this year, we'll identify the

actions we can take this decade and beyond to reduce and replace fossil fuel use, transition away from combustion, and restore and enhance our natural and working lands.

We'll do this in partnership and coordination with other State agencies, the Environmental Justice Advisory

Committee, and the public.

2.2

We'll present an update on the Scoping Plan at the February and March Board meetings and expect to present the draft Scoping Plan to the Board this summer.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: At the time AB 32 was adopted, many claimed meeting the 2020 target was not achievable or would lead to massive price run-ups, job losses, and leakage with businesses fleeing California. As you know, we achieved our 2020 target four years ahead of schedule as the economy grew. With the direction in SB 32, as well as the science, we know that our path to reductions must be much steeper going forward, as illustrated by the future targets noted here.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: 2022 will be a pivotal year with the most comprehensive Scoping Plan to date, laying out a path to keep us on track to achieve our 2030 target, as well as for the first time presenting a strategy to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045 per an

Executive Order, as well as a explore the potential for even earlier achievement.

1.3

2.2

The effort to transition California to a clean energy economy is focused on several fronts. These include reducing GHG emissions through cost effective policies and programs that promote clean energy industries and green jobs. And, of course, we're targeting clean energy investments and other efforts to support the state's most impacted communities.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: But we will not and cannot do that alone. CARB will continue to consult with the EJAC on the AB 32 implementation activities to ensure that California achieves its ambitious climate targets while addressing environmental justice and providing direct benefits to low-income communities of color and disadvantaged communities. As you know, the EJAC is comprised of 19 individuals from environmental justice communities across California.

In December of 2021, the EJAC developed comprehensive recommendations to the Scoping Plan scenario design that CARB incorporated into its modeling assumptions. This year, we'll continue to work with the environmental justice community -- or committee and throughout the development of the update to the Scoping

Plan 35 that we'll be discussing with the Board multiple times over the year.

1.3

2.2

Our goal is to support meaningful engagement with the EJAC to ensure its recommendations help shape and influence the Scoping Plan.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: One of the most significant climate and clean air efforts for 2022 is the Advanced Clean Car Regulation. This regulation will accelerate the transition to zero-emission transportation by strengthening the emission standards for criteria pollutants and ZEVs for new light-duty passenger cars and trucks sold in California. The few requirement would start with the 2026 model year and move to 100 percent sales of ZEVs in 2035 and beyond consistent with Governor Newsom's Executive Order.

As part of this rulemaking, we're proposing that all ZEVs meet durability and warranty requirements to assure consumers that ZEVs can serve as truly replacements to conventional vehicles. This will support providing dependable, high-quality, zero-emission vehicles in the secondary market as well.

And for the first time, this program is proposing to provide auto manufacturers credits for actions that help to advance environmental justice.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Charting a path to 100 percent ZEV sales also requires a focus on providing charging and refueling infrastructure for all the vehicles that are transitioning to zero-emission technologies from cars and pickups, to delivery vans and box trucks, and from transit buses to heavy-duty big rig trucks.

Focusing on equity includes providing charging for Californian's who live in apartment buildings or who must park their cars on the street or away from where they live. Ensuring open access to infrastructure is a key component of CARB's existing infrastructure regulation and one we're committed to.

We must also ensure that enough charging infrastructure to support over one million zero-emission trucks and buses by 2045 or earlier. To address these challenges, we'll be working hand in hand with our partners in this effort, including GO-Biz and the California Energy Commission. And to help support this effort to expand and accelerate infrastructure, we recently appointed Analisa Bevan as Zero-Emission Infrastructure Specialist, a new position at CARB, to work closely with State and local partners on infrastructure.

--000--

--000--

1.3

2.2

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: And Analisa is not the only new appointment at CARB. Since my last report, we've pointed three new Deputies in our Executive Office to ensure we have the right leadership in place to handle the range of new challenges we face. Rajinder Sahota leads the Climate Change and Research; Craig Segall is the lead for Mobile Sources and Incentives, and Edna Murphy is leading Internal Operations.

1.3

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Now, I'd like to address you on camera. This past year was a pivotal turning point in regard to racial equity. During the global pandemic, we were all forced to see how deeply entrenched America's legacy of racism is in our society. At CARB, we've committed to advancing racial equity and continue to build upon the work we began in 2020.

A key effort we initiated over a year ago

Diversity and Racial Equity Task Force that I established.

DaRE is helping to DaRE provide the tools and training

built on the principles that every CARB employee, every

CARB employee, has a role in our efforts to better infuse

equity in our programs.

We've recently appointed new members to DaRE to join along with several existing members as their teams -- or rather terms are staggered to support continuity. This

new class of leaders will help position CARB to face the challenges of 2022 and beyond. Specifically, we're taking internal steps to ensure that we address every aspect of diversity within our workforce and in our attitudes with the public and one another, including various trainings.

2.2

This year, we move forward on the Board resolution to create an Office of Racial Equity to support DaRE to coordinate CARB's racial equity efforts, as well as partner with communities across the state to ensure that CARB advances racial equity in all of our programs, policies, and regulations.

The Governor's proposed budget provides 1.8 million for the Office of Racial Equity, including four new positions. This will help the Office coordinate, integrate, and implement racial equity into policy development with an initial focus on research, incentive programs, and regulations.

The Office will help develop trainings for staff to engage communities and advance racial equity. We plan to provide the Board a comprehensive report on our diversity and equity efforts at a hearing this spring.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Cleaning the air is a multi-dimensional problem that crosses economic, geographic, and governmental lines. Because of that, we

cannot work in a silo. Rather, our programs can only succeed if they're built on strong partnerships. Working together drives us towards shared goals and increase buy-in for CARB's programs.

1.3

2.2

Our partners are varied. We depend on universities for cutting edge research and policy that propels technology-forcing regulations. We collaborate with communities to build local solutions. We rely on industry to pilot new technologies to work with us to develop regulations that are implementable and to put clean equipment into service to reduce emissions. Our stakeholders, from environmental and environmental justice organizations to industry associations, hold us accountable and are key to achieving our mission. And our sister agencies are valuable partners as we work together to transform the energy, transportation, and natural land sectors.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: One of our key partners is the federal government. Since the start of the Biden administration last year, we built an improved and collaborative relationship. We've worked closely with U.S. EPA staff on rulemakings to restore California's clean car program as a national benchmark and to advocate for federal regulations to clean up heavy-duty trucks.

With new Region 9 Administration Martha Guzman, who is acutely aware of the challenges that we face in California, we see additional opportunities to strengthen that partnership.

1.3

2.2

As noted before, we must also press our case with U.S. EPA must step up to more effectively address federal sources that will surpass State-regulated sources -- emission sources in the coming years.

--000--

want to highlight is with California's 35 local air districts. State law splits responsibility for air pollution regulation between CARB and local air districts with CARB focusing on mobile sources and the districts concentrating on stationary sources. However, it's not always that clear cut. We collaborate with the air districts on developing integrated SIPs to meet federal air quality standards. We team up to develop CERPs for AB 617 communities -- with the communities. We work together to secure and deploy billions of dollars in incentive funds. And we partner on enforcement. It's fair to say the districts are one of our key, key partners in delivering emission reductions and clean air.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: We could not make

progress on our ambitious programs without the resources to incentivize clean technology and to support for communities. For example, the Governor's proposed budget boosts funding for programs like Clean Cars 4 All, which makes the cleanest vehicles available to low-income consumers. And here, the ten thousandth grant recipient is pictured.

1.3

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The Governor's proposed 2022 budget combined with ZEV investments from the previous year brings the total to 10 billion. That's an unprecedented funding for California's zero-emission future and provides substantial investments in community-driven projects, support for low-income consumers, and makes possible transformational investments in the medium-duty, heavy-duty, and off-road sectors. It's important to note that this infusion of funding builds on successful existing programs that the Governor and Legislature supported in last year's budget. It also greatly expanded innovative mobility pilot programs that have demonstrated both on-the-ground success and broad statewide demand.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: And as you heard in this presentation, we have an ambitious schedule for 2022.

And with that comes an ambitious Board calendar. We have 23 separate Board meetings scheduled for this year, a daunting number, unprecedented. These Board items reflect the work that you do ever day, from day-to-day implementation of regulations to pushing technological advances, to building partnerships for more effective programs.

1.3

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The Board knows that delivering emission reductions requires effective implementation. And when you adopt regulations, you often ask staff to report back, so you can track how things are going. Accordingly, this year, you'll hear reports on regulations like the Innovative Clean Transit Regulation and ZEV infrastructure, so that you can hear how we, along with our stakeholders, are doing on getting cleaner equipment on the ground.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: In addition, throughout the year, the Board will consider first-in-the-world policies, plans, and regulations that will lead the way, not only for California, but for our partners in the United States and around the world, including the Advanced Clean Cars II program regulation, ozone SIPs, and the GHG Scoping Plan.

--000--

2.2

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: And you'll also participate in numerous joint meetings with the California Transportation Commission, Housing and Community Development, and the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, as we partner to clean the air.

--000--

we'll be substantially escalating our efforts to address the themes of community, clean air, and climate. But I am convinced that if we continue to focus on internal actions to make us more effectively -- effective, particularly with respect to diversity, build on our partnerships with others, and continue to be guided by strong science, effective community engagement, and implementation, we'll help California make the quantum leap to a world beyond combustion, a world beyond reliance on fossil fuels.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: 2022 is indeed a critical year for CARB and for California. The world is watching and so too is the next generation of Californians. This is the year we must change the ark of the world they will inherit by leading the way on actions focused on communities to provide clean air and a health environment for all.

And I know that our amazing team with our partners, along with an extraordinary Board and Chair, is up to the challenge that this unique point in history presents. And it's an honor to be serve on this Board as the Executive Officer.

2.2

And with that, Chair, I conclude my remarks.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you very much.

Okay. Now, we will hear from the public, who raised their hands to speak on this item.

Board Clerk, will you please call the commenters.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes. We currently have nine people with their hands raised to speak. I will be announcing the next three or so commenters. And then I will be unmuting you -- or giving you access to speak and you will unmute yourself and begin.

So our first three speakers are Jamie Katz, Tom Frantz, and Marie Camino.

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

JAMIE KATZ: Thank you so much. Yes. Jamie
Katz, attorney with Leadership Counsel for Justice and
Accountability. In October of last year, Public Justice
and Vermont Environmental Justice Clinic submitted a
petition on behalf of Leadership Counsel, Food and Water
Watch, the Animal Legal Defense Fund, and the Association

of Irritated Residents to remove factory farm gas from the Low Carbon Fuel Standard or, at a minimum, amend the regulation to ensure the calculation of the carbon intensity reflects the full lifecycle of factory farm gas pathways.

2.2

As the petition lays out, the inflated and non-additional methane reductions claimed by these pathways undermines the integrity of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and entrenches and intensifies the impact of factory farms on pollution-burdened communities near these facilities, disproportionately low-income communities of color.

The response we received to our petition yesterday is wholly inadequate, laying out a rulemaking process that does not begin until 2023, while factory farm gas pathways continue to be certified. The petition raised real concerns about the integrity of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and its disproportionate impact on low-income communities of color in the San Joaquin Valley and throughout the state.

A staff-level decision means these important issues are being considered without the oversight of the public or even the Board. Given the disproportionate impact the Low Carbon Fuel Standard is having on low-income communities of color throughout the state, we

call on the Board to live up to the commitment it made to racial equity and social justice by speaking up and out whenever they become aware of racism or bias that may adversely affect the work of CARB, its employees, and the people it services.

The Board has the authority to pause certification of factor farm gas pathways and to add this to the agenda for the next Board meeting. At the next Board meeting, the Board must consider both accelerating the rulemaking and a pause on factory farm gas pathway certifications until this rulemaking addresses these problems.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Tom Frantz, you may unmute and begin.

members, this is Tom Frantz of the Association of
Irritated Residents. I wish to comment on the 2022 Board
priorities, which should include manure and the Low Carbon
Fuel Standard, especially as this relates to the stated
goals of moving away from combustion and improving air
quality.

AIR, together with a few other groups, have submitted a petition asking for fundamental changes to the dairy digester program. This follows our more than 22

years of unsuccessful advocacy for regulations that would effectively reduce air and water pollution from industrial sized dairies. Similar to our past experiences, this petition has been brushed aside with empty promises. It will be considered in the future, in other words, blah, blah was the response to us.

1.3

2.2

We, therefore, request Board members to make our petition part of your personal concern today and ask for a formal response from CARB staff as soon as possible, which addresses directly the issues we have raised. We also ask in the meantime that new applications for inclusion of manure gas under the Low Carbon Fuel Standard be put on hold.

In closing, please remember this important fact, the most efficient, sustainable, and least polluting way to handle valuable manure is to collect it in a dry manner, compost it, and return it to the soil for growing future crops.

Thank you for your consideration.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Marie Camino. After Marie will be Kathleen Kilpatrick, Mariela Ruacho, and then Teresa Bui.

Marie, you can unmute yourself and begin.

MARIE CAMINO: Hello. My name is Marie Camino

and I'm providing public comment on behalf of Mercy For Animals. We are a non-profit organization based in Los Angeles and we have approximately 24,000 supporters in California.

2.2

I am providing comment on the petition for rulemaking to exclude all fuels derived from biomethane and dairy and swine manure from the Low Carbon Fuel Standard Program. As of now, the LCFS overvalues credit -- credits awarded to industrial animal agriculture operations by omitting significant emissions from these operations.

It also does not account for the fact that these emissions are intentionally created and that there are more environmentally friendly alternatives. To be most effective, LC -- LCFS, excuse me, must account for the inputs and infrastructure necessary to sustain a dairy, cow, or pig, its food and water, the methane animals produce through and enteric fermentation, and the construction and maintenance of lagoons required to hold manure, trucking livestock, and other inputs, combust -- as well as combustion of fuels at the dairy facility for electricity and more. Mercy For Animals requests the immediate initiation of rulemaking to fix the problems identified here.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

1.3

2.2

Kathleen Kilpatrick, you can unmute and begin.

KATHLEEN KILPATRICK: Yeah. I want to follow up on my earlier comments on the inclusion of pesticides and conversion to organic agriculture. I see in the overall priorities that agriculture is only mentioned as a source of direct combustion. The word "pesticide" I know does appear.

But when I -- I want to -- I've worked 40 years in health care, and most of those I've lived in rural ag or agricultural communities, so I tend to focus on human health, but I want to say a little bit more about climate changes. When we look at how that is framed, it's most framed that agriculture is going to be impacted adversely by climate changes, but the impact of agriculture -- agricultural systems on emissions and its role in solutions don't get as much emphasis.

So, for example, besides the dairy digesters, we should be looking at the full cycle emissions of fumigants from production to their release into the atmosphere as direct greenhouse gases. And then also, we should be looking at the inclusion of those volatile organic compounds that pesticides often are and how they're emitted into the environment and contributing to tropos — tropospheric ozone. And we also don't know the

disposition and fate of those toxics into our environment or into the human body.

And I do want to emphasize again that the health impacts of pesticide exposure, especially those long-term multiple chemical exposures, has not been quantified how much does that affect our social and economic health. And I think that that is something that could be included as a research priority again.

And once again, the -- looking at agricultural systems has multiple benefits. It has the impacts on carbon sequestration. It has air quality benefits, which are not being adequately monitored at this time in rural areas, and it also has a very large component of environmental justice. So it seems like we need to up your attention on agriculture systems from the cows to the plastic that covers the fields, where I live in the Pajaro Valley. So please consider those as a key component of your work.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Mariela Ruacho.

MARIELA RUACHO: Hi, Chair and Board members. I am Mariela Ruacho from the American Lung Association.

Thank you for the important updates today on research legislation and CARB's year ahead.

We think it is important to comment briefly on major progress made at the tail end of 2021. The Board made robust conver -- had robust conversations about strategies needed to deal with legacy diesel trucks within the context of the Mobile Source Strategy and the SIP. You set the stage for greater protections from TRUs and commercial harbor craft. You took major health protective actions on small off-road engines and the massively important Heavy-Duty Inspection and Maintenance Program to close the year.

1.3

2.2

Thank you for all these -- all those actions. We look forward to continuing engagement on the useful life, retirement and TRUs in the commercial harbor craft in the upcoming weeks and months.

Looking out to -- at the year ahead, we appreciate the major focus on electrification of the transportation sector. California has the opportunity to continue to lead the nation and the world through strong and comprehensive actions to accelerate the transition to zero-emission across the Board. That includes cars, trucks, and trains, all of the above.

We also support CARB's ongoing work to advance progress on VMT reductions as a key pathway to improving public health and curbing harmful pollution. These are top priorities for the American Lung Association and we

look forward to working with the staff, Board, stakeholders to ensure CARB, and the Legislature, and the Governor -- Governor Newsom commits to achieving healthy air and reducing inequities and burdens that are -- that low income and disadvantaged communities are having currently.

That's it. Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Our next speaker will be Teresa Bui. After Teresa will be Brent Newell, Maria Martinez, and then Gary Hughes.

Teresa, you may unmute and begin.

TERESA BUI: Thank you so much. Good morning.

This is Teresa Bui with the environmental non-profit group called Pacific Environment. We have been working on getting ships off of fossil fuel at the global, federal, and State level. Thank you to CARB for all your leadership in addressing and trying to combat climate change, and sharing CARB's 2022 priorities, as well as the opportunity to comment.

We would urge CARB to act urgently to reduce fossil fuel pollution from the maritime shipping sector, especially from ocean-going vessels as well -- and commercial harbor craft.

CARB's own data shows that port congestion has led to an increase in NOx emissions that's equivalent to

5.8 million passenger cars in South Coast and about a hundred thousand big rig trucks from the diesel particulate measure. And port-adjacent families including those in San Pedro, Wilmington, and West Long Beach experience up to eight years lower life expectancy than the LA County average and higher risk of cancer, so it's imperative that CARB act now.

2.2

We would be asking CARB to look at enacting an advanced clean ship standard to help reduce fossil fuel pollution from ocean-going vessels. We'd be happy to share the specifics in a letter. But specifically, an advanced clean ship standard should phase out all Tier 0, 1, and 2 ocean-going vessels from calling California and then phasing in a clean ship standard that's similar to CARB's landmark approach to heavy-duty trucks.

CARB could play a leadership role in accelerating the zero-emission vessel market. Similarly for -- we know that the harbor craft is coming back to the Board for a final hearing soon, and we would just urge CARB to adopt the Commercial Harbor Craft Regulation as soon as possible and include a resolution that allows for a contingency measure for areas that are in nonattainment, so that they would get on a pathway to zero-emission tugboats and ferries.

And then lastly, in terms of recreational marine

vessels, you were anticipating a regulation in 2026, and we would urge CARB to conduct a regulation in this year, since there's a lot of marine vessels that are -- that can be electrified and we need to send a market signal as soon as possible.

Thank you again for all your leadership and for taking comments.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

1.3

2.2

Brent Newell, you can unmute and begin.

BRENT NEWELL: Madam Chair, members of the Board, may name is Brent Newell, and I'm an attorney with Public Justice. Public Justice joins the comments made earlier by Jamie Katz and Tom Frantz concerning the LCFS petition to and agenda item to review the Low Carbon Fuel Standard with respect to factory farm gas and consider whether to suspend LCFS pathway certifications for factory farm gas based fuels pending the planned 2023 LCFS rulemaking.

I will address two points today. First, the petition to raise the issue of how credits derived from projects receiving money from other programs could somehow meet the additionality requirement and thus generate valid credits.

A disturbing example of this is the treatment of factory farm gas projects at eight dairies that are supposedly mitigating the Aliso Canyon methane disaster

and are part of your Aliso Canyon settlement agreement. These dairies also receive million of dollars in dairy digester research and development program grants to install the same methane recovery infrastructure. Yet, CARB staff, nevertheless, approved those projects selling credits into the LCFS market, so the transportation fuel producers can then emit more CO2 and air toxics like diesel PM2.5 from their fossil fuels. Something is terribly wrong here and the Board should not wait until 2023 to consider the integrity of the LCFS.

2.2

Second, I want to address one point that the Executive Officer raised in his letter denying the petition and which also has been repeated by proponents of factory farm gas. The Executive Officer claims that Senate Bill 1383, specifically section 39730.7 subsection (e) of the Health and Safety Code, directs CARB to ensure LCFS crediting for factory farm gas methane reductions. Senate Bill 1383 does not do that. It directs CARB -- the plain language says that CARB shall ensure the project is developed before the implementation of regulations receive credit for at least 10 years. This provision plainly creates a grandfathering process to ensure the adoption of regulations to limit manure methane emissions called for in Senate Bill 1383 does not negate credits generated before those regulations take effect. It does not say

that you have to implement a corrupted program that is awarding inflated credits, grossly overestimating climate benefits, or illusory non-additional additional credits like the Aliso Canyon triple dipping.

2.2

As Board members, you have the ultimate -- you are the ultimate decision-makers. And I urge you to fulfill your duty and your stated commitment to environmental justice. You have heard a lot about environmental justice and the Executive Officer's presentation, including promises of racial justice and equity in CARB's programs and a hearing on that plan for this spring.

If you are serious about your commitment to environmental and racial justice, you should set an LCFS program review agenda item for your next Board hearing, including considering whether to stop certifying inflated and illusory LCFS credits until a rulemaking two years from now.

Thank you very much. I appreciate you, and your service, your commitment to environmental justice.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Maria Martinez, you may unmute and begin.

EMMA DE LA ROSA: Good afternoon. My name is Emma De La Rosa, policy advocate with Leadership Counsel.

25 | I am making this comment on behalf of Maria Martinez.

I want to comment on the contamination that comes from dairies. Dairies do a lot of damage. The damage is great. For example, the water is contaminated. Dairies consume a lot of water, more than what a person -- an everyday person would use. Another concern is the deforestation that occurs in order to feed the cows, which also contributes to the high emissions and the gases in the air.

1.3

2.2

Dairies are guilty and responsible for the emissions that affect our atmosphere. The gases cows emit are damaging.

Lastly, more cows equal more manure and that has -- and for my community, there has been occasions where fires have been set because of the manure and it takes a very long time for it to stop burning. The fire department came out and they didn't it turn it off. They just left it burning, which is another gas that is not being accounted for.

In addition, I would like to give a comment on behalf of Minerva Contreras. I wanted to comment on the credits that you're giving to dairies. I'm not comfortable and do not agree with that, because it implicates our communities. In a short time, we will see an increased number of dairies and more air pollution and environmental contamination.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Could I ask you to state your name for the court reporter. Yes. Emma De La Rosa.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Perfect. Thank you.

Our next speaker is Gary Hughes. Gary, you may
unmute and begin

MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, members of the Board. My name is Gary Hughes representing the international organization Biofuelwatch. Our organization is in support of the community of stakeholders that are elevating the imperative of a thorough reevaluation of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard. And we also request that the Board initiate a process that will result in serious reform of this clearly flawed mechanism.

As an example, I want to illuminate the serious problems with governance of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and the conversion of refineries in the San Francisco Bay Area to biofuels, namely to drop in biofuels such as renewable diesel and sustainable aviation fuel. Board members should know that both the Phillips 66 and Marathon Martinez refineries are currently in the process of California Environmental Quality Act review.

25 Unfortunately, the Contra Costa County led CEQA process

regarding these refinery conversions is severely inadequate and a broad coalition of organizations have weighed in on the Draft EIRs of both refineries articulating detailed concerns about the flawed assumptions and factual emissions characteristic of the Draft EIRs.

1.3

2.2

Curiously, although the Phillips 66 refinery conversion proposal is far from having finished the CEQA review to convert to running soy feed stocks at the refinery, the refinery has already begun processing soy and the Air Resources Board has already certified LCFS credits for the manufacturing of renewable diesel from soy feedstocks that actually began in April of 2021, even though the draft EIR for the refinery conversion to biofuels was not even released until October of 2021.

Phillips 66 has not yet secured CEQA approval to process soy at their facility and actually -- is actually being investigated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District for having implemented unpermitted modifications to the refinery to be able to run soy, but the Air Resources Board has already granted Phillips 66 fuel pathway access to lucrative credits in the LCFS mechanism.

This is a grotesque abuse of bedrock environmental law and it turns the logic of how environmental review processes should proceed on its head.

This crisis in governance is happening in the context of the growing body of evidence that increasing demand for making liquid fuels from vegetable oil feedstocks will without doubt result in increased global deforestation.

1.3

2.2

At the same time, the LCFS methodologies are unprepared to accurately evaluate the greenhouse gas emissions from the processing at the refineries of these vegetable oils to make these biofuels. The climate impacts of the feedstocks and the refining process for making renewable diesel are grossly underestimated by the LCFS. This is a political and environmental emergency. I really am emphasizing the need for the Board to take action on addressing the flaws of the Low Carbon Fuel Standard.

Thank you for your attention to this comment. BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Just a reminder, if you'd like to speak on this item, please raise your hand or dial star nine. We currently have four remaining hands raised in Zoom. That is Michael Boccadoro, Madeline Harris, Patrick McDuff, and Suzanne Hume.

Michael, you may unmute yourself and begin.

MICHAEL BOCCADORO: Thank you very much. Michael Boccadoro on behalf of Dairy Cares. And we, first of all, recognize Mr. Corey and CARB Legal staff for their

dedication and insistence on a science-based discussion of climate issues, including the LCFS --

(Dog barks.)

2.2

MICHAEL BOCCADORO: -- recognizing the importance of dairy methane reduction efforts here in California. California's climate change policies are critical. As Chair Randolph alluded to earlier, California is the only jurisdiction with a 40 percent methane reduction statute, including dairy and livestock. The rest of the world, including the U.S., signed on to a much less ambitious 30 percent reduction pledge at COP26.

California is truly leading the world and has the most ambitious goal. Please also recognize that the dairy sector is well on our way to achieving that 40 percent reduction in California, and we remain committed to achieving that significant reduction.

To do so will require an all-of-the-above strategy of greater efficiency, methane avoidance, research, enteric solutions, and the center piece, the effort will continue to need digester development in California. Let me be very clear on this point, without digesters, there is no way to achieve the 40 percent goal, and that is borne out by your own staff's analysis published last summer.

It cannot and will not be achieved without digesters, which capture and utilize methane. And without markets like the LCFS for utilization of the methane that is captured, these projects are not economic and cannot be financed and implemented. The LCFS Program and utility procurement will be critical as we move forward.

Hopefully, I think we can all agree climate change cannot be denied. As part of that, we have to also agree that we cannot deny the basic facts and we cannot allow parties to deny real solutions that are being put in place to ensure California achieves its climate goals and policies, including dairy methane reduction.

As Mr. Corey earlier, we must do so in an environmentally justice manner. And on that point, the benefits of these projects to disadvantaged communities is also well documented. Jobs, air quality benefits, nuisance benefits, and water quality benefits, they cannot be ignored.

In closing, we cannot allow that to continue or the rhetoric around these projects, such as they somehow cause deforestation, nothing could be further from the truth. We need to proceed with an open, honest, and science-based solutions as we undertake California's ambitious climate efforts.

Thank you.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

2.2

Madeline Harris, you may unmute and begin.

MADELINE HARRIS: I just wanted to say it's really disappointing to hear language around the importance of environmental justice, racial justice, equity in communities and not see action to back that up.

Yesterday, Richard Corey issued us a denial to our petition on factory farm credits in the LCFS, which are perpetuating disproportionate impacts on low-income communities and communities of color, particularly predominantly Latino/Latina communities in the San Joaquin Valley.

I work with residents in communities in Merced County, where following the construction of biogas pipeline infrastructure through Merced and Madera counties. There are nine Merced county dairies seeking to massively expand their herd size undergoing environmental review currently. One of the most massive proposed herd size expansions at Melo Dairy in Atwater would be to expand herd size by 125 percent from 4,070 cows to 9,128 cows and to install a digester.

This is a classic example of the ways in which factory farm gas incentivize herd size expansions and herd size expansions in turn worsen the already unacceptable impacts on communities living near dairies.

Dairy digesters do not alleviate the water and air quality impacts, not to mention nuisance impacts from odor and flies to nearby community. So until CARB will stop paying dairies to produce factory farm gas, thus incentivizing their production of manure and biomethane, which, by the way, creates the same GHG emissions as natural gas, when it is burdened for energy, your speeches about the importance of environmental justice are not only meaningless, but also frankly hypocritical. We need CARB to schedule a public hearing ASAP to evaluate the future of LCF credits for factory farm gas, so that we can address this problem through a public process and not what, at least on its face, appears to be a staff decision to reject environmental justice organizations' petition.

To summarize, we are asking for a public process on this issue and an end to LCF credits for factory farm gas. Until then, your words around environmental justice seem a little bit meaningless to us and to residents experiencing the disproportionate impacts of dairies, which digesters do not alleviate, but rather exacerbate.

Thank you.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Patrick McDuff, you may unmute and begin.

PATRICK MCDUFF: Greetings. My name is Pat

25 McDuff. I'm the CEO of California Fueling, a family-owned

and operating business that was started in response to staff's implementation of the Alternate Diesel Fuel Regulation.

1.3

2.2

In 2009, an ethanol manufacturer sued CARB for allowing the use of biodiesel, because biodiesel increases NOx emissions. After 10 years of litigation, CARB was forced to address the NOx from biodiesel. During these 10 years, CARB continued to allow the use of biodiesel noting -- knowing it increased NOx. One can say water under the bridge, but what if I was to tell you that an even bigger concern has recently surfaced.

Biodiesel and renewable diesel generate over two million LCFS credits with over \$300 million annually.

CARB has sold renewable diesel to all stakeholders as the be-all end-all. CARB allows its unlimited use. CARB crafted a rob-Peter-to-pay-Paul scheme when developing the term "offset factor".

Let me tell you how it works. CARB requires refiners to make CARB diesel, which is one of the world's cleanest diesels. They then allow five percent diesel to be blended with CARB diesel knowingly increasing NOx, and they justify that by saying that a completely unrelated fuel, renewable diesel, more than makes up for the NOx emission increases. A recent CARB study indicates that renewable diesel doesn't decrease NOx emissions at all.

Renewable diesel in combination with biodiesel increases NOx emissions. CARB staff knew this was the case before implementing the modified ADF Regulation in May of 2021. Staff suppressed its own data, and as of today, continues to allow for the unlimited use of renewable diesel and combinations of renewable diesel and biodiesel.

Senator Leyva, your efforts associated with SB 210 will ensure that the emission control systems on heavy-duty engines perform as they should, reducing harmful emissions. Staff's actions associated with the implementation of the modified ADF, which will increase NOx emissions undermines SB 210.

In summary, in addition to biodiesel increasing NOx, so does combinations of biodiesel and renewable diesel. Staff have the data right now that supports what I've said. And instead of acting through regulating, they have solicited feedbacks from stakeholders in an apparent attempt to debate the merits of its results. A debate is not needed. Action is what's needed. This Board must compel staff to act, starting with the repeal of the modified ADF.

Thank you.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Suzanne Hume. And then after Suzanne will be Patricia Ramos-Anderson.

Suzanne, you may unmute and begin.

2.2

SUZANNE HUME: Hello and thank you so much. Good afternoon, members of CARB and stakeholders. Thank you so much for your work to protect clean air. My name is Suzanne Hume. I'm the educational director and founder of CleanEarth4Kids.org.

Thank you for the outstanding and very helpful presentation by Board -- by the Board's Executive Director, Richard Corey. As was said today, more is needed. Work is needed on offsets and LCF. We all agree we must have clean air, healthy communities, and take action on climate. We're so excited about the important things that were said in that presentation, the research, legislation, policy, and the 2022 priorities. We're so hopeful, and thank you for all of your important work.

The tragic impacts of toxic pesticides on our public, our kids, our water, our air, farmworkers, and our soil must be accounted. Healthy soils absorb carbon. Also, thank you for the Board's comments about the seriousness of wood smoke and all that you're doing to educate the public about wood smoke. More is needed. And in response, local -- just to say hey, local -- the local air board in San Diego County is not addressing wood smoke or wood burning fireplaces. Hopefully, they will do that if the future. We have worked on that.

Anyway, I would like to say that absolutely, we echo the need for the EPA to adopt better standards for our air. And thank you so much to CARB and California for your very, very important work. It's shown in the graphs. It's shown in the work, and we're just so proud to be Californians.

2.2

CleanEarth4Kids.org on, of course, things locally, and with the State we're here today, but also with the EPA. Stronger regulations and standards must happen. So what we would like to know is the specifics about how the upcoming -- how CARB is communicating with the EPA about the standards. Thank you so much for pursuing the Trump administration with the rollbacks, but it would be great to have a clear and concise list of what you're doing. So, for example, GHG standards for power plants, methane standards for oil and gas, cross-state air pollution rule, national ambient air quality standards, power plant emissions, NEPA, oil and gas on federal lands, et cetera.

So if we could have a list, that would be great. On CleanEarth4Kids, our homepage, we have a link to the trackers and what's going to be happening with these things that are coming out.

Thank you so much from CleanEarthForKids.org.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Patricia Ramos-Anderson, you may unmute and begin.

2.2

PATRICIA RAMOS-ANDERSON: Hello. My name is
Patricia Ramos-Anderson. I'm president of the Council
3072 of the League of United Latin American Citizens in
Merced County. It's very, very important is that don't
put the public health versus corporate profits. The
issues that we live with some of these dairies in our
communities and we also live with their violations
unfortunately. And for us, the biggest issue is the
accountability of these dairies when they do violate and
they get caught.

It took one individual, dairy man second generation, to finally get caught dumping our -- the cow doo-doo, like children would say, into our canal water for drinking water. He's been doing it for a long time, but he couldn't get caught. And that's our biggest concern is that if we're going to be creating something new, it has to be at the public's interest of health first, not what you can benefit or profit from, because you don't live there. We're the ones that are going to be impacted. It's our immediate communities. And public safety should also be first and not go along with corporate.

The standards need to be followed, but also there has to be severe action taken. That person that violated

that issue with dumping of the -- contaminating the canal water, that was also drinking, only got a \$25,000 fine and they made it a misdemeanor, because he's part of that (inaudible). If we had been a minority or person of color, they would have had prison time, high -- it would have been much, much different. This is what we're dealing with in the Central Valley where you're proposing all these projects, because you don't know the people that are in control in those counties of those regions. Is there going to be an equitable, fair process of going after violators as well as at the State level.

2.2

This is our community. We have a vested interest in protecting the health of our children, our parents, the grandparents, the elderly, the handicapped, because we have (inaudible) not being caught to be a reality and that's what we're living currently. I'm suggesting Los Banos, South Dos Palos that continue up the valley where these dairies are located.

And I sit on a water board, the only female

Latina in the whole area over the past 50 years that's

been on the Water Board with experience and education in

that background. This is troublesome, because we need

people that are going to protect the public's interest and
their health.

With all due respect, we don't support this

project. Thank you.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Chair, that concludes the commenters for the item.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. This is an informational item, so we don't need to close the record. So I will bring it to the Board. And if you want to speak on this item, please raise your hand and I'll call on you. Thank you.

Sorry. BOARD Member Kracov.

Executive Officer Corey and staff, Chair, fellow Board members, what an exciting presentation, what a year, what an agenda for the year ahead, and what else would we all rather be working on together. Advanced Clean Fleets, Scoping Plan, statewide SIPs, in-use locomotives, toxic rules, wow. Thank you so much, Mr. Corey, for the presentation and you and staff's service to California, to our communities. You know, usually my eyes glaze over during a 70-slide PowerPoint presentation, but this one had us on the edge of our seats, Mr. Corey. Really, it's inspirational, so thank you very much.

And just a question for you though, Mr. Corey. We heard from many commenters today on the dairy LCFS petition. I know a lot of time was spent by the

petitioners. I read the petition and have heard from many regarding the important role of LCFS, carbon intensity factors for dairies, landfills, and concerns raised in the petition, and we've heard it during the Scoping Plan process, that we ensure that LCFS and our climate actions do not exacerbate local pollution. So can you briefly comment and perhaps just summarize the response to the petition, Mr. Corey?

2.2

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Absolutely, Board

Member Kracov. So a little context is probably useful,

and that is Low Carbon Fuel Standard initial work was back

in 2008. It became effective 2010, so it's been

implemented over the last 11 years really to signal the

use of alternatives traditional diesel and gasoline,

basically to incent cleaner, lower carbon intensity fuels.

So the data, which we report on our website -there's a dashboard in terms of year by year, even quarter
by quarter, what are we seeing with the program in terms
of what's generating credits, what's the fuel mix. And
what you're seeing is a significant reduction in
traditional diesel. You're seeing an increase in
electrification. You're seeing certainly renewable
diesel, renewable -- some renewable hydrogen and other
fuels.

So it clearly is having that impact. But my

point here is that the regulation was adopted through a full public process, which you all know takes several years and amended a few times along the way, also which took several careers of public -- series -- many, many public workshops, public comments, responses to all those comments, all in the public record reflecting the current regulation.

2.2

So a number of the claims here are not new. They've been certainly raised before, vetted, discussed, and also discussed last time at the Scoping Plan. But we also know information changes, there's updates, new things. So the conversation we've had is an openness. In fact, I was in a few of the meetings with the petitioners, and honestly I thought had very good conversations about their perspective, our interest in data, evidence, background, the kind of things that ultimately you would all expect us to any recommendation, any recommended amendments. So we're in that fact finding as we go forward, and not just the elements, many elements in terms of the low carbon fuel standard.

But the issue is not new and we have -- some of the claims honestly, I have not seen the evidence of the claims that are being made, but there's an openness to continue workshops going forward in 2022, gather the -- as much information to inform potential amendments to the Low

Carbon Fuel Standard in 2023 when we plan to open up the regulation.

1.3

2.2

So to your point, the response of the petition was, hey, we want to continue that dialogue. We're completely open and interested in talking the full spectrum of stakeholders, any information that's out there. Where we stopped short was the request to immediately open up the regulation.

One, we need to finish the Scoping Plan. Two, we need to do the fact finding over the next several months to -- if there truly is new data that is contrary to the historical record and the underlying analysis. Very interesting in seeing that in an openness. So the letter also underscored very intentionally the interest in keeping the engagement open to petitioners, and obviously many others as we have a broader open engagement on these related issues.

So on that point, I'll end.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you.

Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes. Thank you. I think that, you know, I just -- I want to thank the Executive Officer on the program priorities, and just the entire staff on moving forward all of the work you have done.

To the commenters, you know, I think that, personally, I want to see resolution of this as quickly as possible, not just on the environmental issues side, but because, you know, currently there are more than -- you know, in some of the numbers that I've seen, there's more than a dozen dairy digesters in the pipeline for development in the Central Valley, in the San Joaquin Valley. And I think that everyone really needs guidance on this matter as quickly as possible, especially when we think about some of the issues that have been raised in the petition, if anything could be answered, not as part of opening up a rulemaking, but just as part of what we would with any other rulemaking that's in effect, you know, a technical review, something that, you know, is updating. You know, since the regulation came into effect, you know, has there been new information? So not necessarily opening up the rulemaking, but really just an update on where is the science, where is the understanding.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And then certainly I would hope that when we do open up the rulemaking, how to strengthen some of those enforcements and really, you know, I would say, have as close as possible to a zero tolerance policy when it comes to knowingly, you know, and neglectfully injuring the communities around them.

So I'm hoping that there can be some sort of middle ground where we have some sort of technical review and -- or update -- you know, Board update on this, where the science is, just because there is so much in development right now in these communities. And I think we need to bring certainty as soon as possible.

Thank you.

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you.

Board Member Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Chair.

I want to make comments on the priorities overall, and on the year that we've been through, and that we're moving into, and then comment particularly on the issue of the LCFS petition.

I want to start, and I probably should have done this earlier, I want to appreciate the Chair for her acknowledgement for Supervisor Nathan Fletcher's role with the CARB Board during the last few years. I really appreciate his leadership. And in the transition for the San Diego Air Pollution Control District and his contribution to CARB, he's been a really effective champion for San Diego and a great colleague for me and for all of us. And I think we all agree that he will definitely be missed.

As many of you know, the San Diego Air Pollution

Control District has been in transition over the last couple of years. And an important announcement was made last week when Paula Forbis was announced -- her appointment was announced as the new San Diego Air Pollution Control District Officer. And we really welcome her appointment and the election of Supervisor Nora Vargas and Mayor Esther Sanchez, as Chair and Vice Chair of San Diego Air Pollution Control District. I think this is a huge signal for 2022 that the District has succeeded in its initial transition. We have a strong governing board, strong leadership with the APCO and we're excited about that. So I just wanted to make that announcement as we're -- as we're kind of kicking off the year.

2.2

In regards to the CARB's priorities. Overall, I want to thank, Mr. Corey and the staff. It's an amazing amount of work and nearly every accomplishment cited and planned action includes a strong emphasis on environmental justice communities. I appreciated that you lifted it up communities, clean air, and climate. I think it's a great way to focus our work.

I think oddly the relationship between climate action and clean air is often not made. And I felt like your presentation is making that very clearly, both yours Mr. Corey's and the Chair's. I think it's odd that the California Air Resources Board would need to make that

point so clearly, but I do think that we do need to, and that not only your words, but our actions are really doing that.

1.3

2.2

As we discussed in the previous item, the 617 program is critically important and we really need to work on expanding and stabilizing the program. However, I think that all impacted communities deserve the attention that the 617 communities are receiving. And like other CARB programs that began with kind of a narrow focus, the 617 model must be applied to communities across the state. So, for me, that's the goal. It's really that this -- we no longer refer to it as 617 communities, but that all impacted communities are receiving this kind of attention and this kind of model, because this is a racial justice imperative, as nearly all of the impacted communities are communities of color.

The 617 framework is not a perfect one, but it does provide an emphasis on authentic community engagement that should be the baseline for CARB and the local air district's work in local communities. At its best, the community steering committees are exercising not just participation but really some authority to determine the future of their communities. And I think that's the standard that we need to achieve.

The other point about the local priorities is the

importance of local action, and as you say -- as you cited, you know, it's obvious CARB, as well as the districts, but it goes beyond that. But I just want to really give credit to the local districts who have taken action, like South Coast's Indirect Source Rule, the Port of San Diego's Maritime Clean Air Strategy that aims to beat the state's drayage truck ZEV rule by five years, and the San Diego's Regional Transportation Plan that is looking to achieve more GHG reduction than required. So I think that the partnerships are really, really important, and I appreciate that those are included in your discussion.

2.2

So now to the issue of the LCFS petition. I really appreciate the petitioners bringing this important issue to the attention of CARB. This Board has expressed concern in multiple ways over the years about the air pollution and health impacts of the dairy industry. And these petitioners, I think, are raising critical issues related to the LCFS credit system that may be resulting in an overstatement of the climate benefits using methane sourced from factory farms as a transportation fuel.

So while I appreciate the response from Mr. Corey both today and in your letter, acknowledging both the importance of the issues raised by the petitioners and the importance role the petitioner organizations have played

in development of the LCFS rules in the past, I also appreciate Mr. Corey's commitment to launching the rulemaking process in early 2023.

2.2

But given the seriousness of the issues raised, we would have hoped that the rulemaking could have begun sooner, but I understand the enormous workload of CARB as we've just heard in this report. It's huge and we'll be busy with 23 meetings, as you -- as you emphasized.

But I also understand the relationship between the rulemaking and the Scoping Plan. However, I want to caution that the petition challenges the efficacy of the fuel pathways for biomethane from dairy and swine manure, which may not be fully analyzed in the Scoping Plan. So I don't believe we can fully completely rely on the Scoping Plan as the place where we're getting the information.

So I think that both the petitioners and the dairy industry have said that they want a full on -- full on research and conversation. So I'd like to join what I think was Dr. Pacheco-Werner's request and ask that the staff start the research into the rulemaking beyond the Scoping Plan during 2022, and that Mr. Corey provide the Board with an update, perhaps a technical update, as was described in a Board meeting in the next few months that would allow a Board discussion of the issue in 2022, including a discussion of the proposal for a pause on

permits, because I think it's really important that the Board have an opportunity to weigh in on the context for the LCFS rulemaking. So I'm hoping that we can schedule that soon in the next few months, so that the Board can have a full discussion, which we really can't have at this point, given the context for it.

So that's my request and I appreciate your consideration of it.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. I have some thoughts about that idea, but I'll let Vice Chair Berg and Board Member Florez go first.

Vice Chair Berg.

2.2

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much, Chair Randolph. I, too, want to extend my hearty thanks to Nathan Fletcher. Really appreciate, Chair Randolph, you leading off with that today, and thank you, Board Member Takvorian, for also just chiming in as to the importance of his work with us. He will be missed and we wish him all the best. And you are so eloquent in saying San Diego is very fortunate to have a leader of his caliber. And so I also wanted to wish Nathan the very, very best.

Every -- so this is my 17th update on -- from Richard Corey. And I can specifically remember starting in 2005 was my -- January of 2005 was the first update, feeling absolutely, oh, my gosh, how are we possibly going

to tackle all of this work. And yet, over the 17 years, it's been remarkable as to what our incredible staff, led by our Executive Officers, and our extremely talented Chairs what we have accomplished.

2.2

And so I am very excited. What we see is we are now going to implement this transition. The path has been laid. We've been working on it for many, many decades, and it's happening worldwide, so it isn't just California. But now we are in implementation mode and implementation does not go smoothly when you're talking about a wholesale transformation of our energy, of our transportation system, about how we behave, as consumers, all the intricacies of the various businesses. And so this is complicated and there are many ways leading to Rome. But people who like a particular pathway, that's what we need to deal with as a Board, is how to accomplish this transformation in relatively a short period of time, because now it is about implementation.

So I know we have the bandwidth. I know that we have the ability to sustain the ups and downs, because there will be plenty. And I look forward to this, being my last year on the Board, being the crowning year for me personally. I started in 2004. That was the first year that we adopted the Pavley first greenhouse gas regulations for vehicles.

So I think that brings me to my last point. At the end of this year, there's either four or five Board members that will be ending their terms. Some might be throwing their name in the hat to be reappointed, but we've had a lot of Board turnover and very positive. Our new Board members are amazing, bringing new energy, just -- and renewed commitment. But I really would encourage both the Chair and the Executive Officer to take a bit of time and talk about new Board Member onboarding, because there -- we've got -- we've got -- it's going to be half of the Board will have been changed over possibly within a two-year period, and you've got a huge amount of work to accomplish over these next five to -- well, five plus years.

And so I look forward to absolutely participating strongly in this -- in this last year and capsizing my 18 years on the Board. And congratulations, Chair Randolph, on a dynamic first year. And it looks like you have got this dog by the tail, no question about it. And congratulations, Richard Corey, and absolutely your team. Amazing group of people and my fellow Board members.

Thank you very much.

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

Board Member Florez.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you. I'd just echo

congratulations to everyone. I would just real quick a comment. I would like to ask the Chair, and I know you're going to comment on it, both the -- I want to echo Diane's sentiment on the impact of the dairy consolidation and its inclusion in the LCFS. I would simply say -- I remember -- this is where the old memories go back, but I remember back when we put CAFOs into the federal Clean Air Act and the Legislature in 2000. I carried a bill that really dealt with a transition of dairies from Chino to Kern County and particularly the Central Valley. And the rationale for that was really the large consolidation and the amount of dairies coming into, let's say, a City of Bakersfield with 250,000 residents at having dairies that, you know, numbered near 300,000. And the -- not only the nuisance issues, smell issues, but now, you know, really I think the methane issues that, you know, far, far exceed even some of the things we've read about with methane leaks et cetera. This is a daily occurrence in the Central Valley.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And I would say that I get the fact that we have created a fuel path for the dairies. In some sense, I'm still questioning whether or not the impact of that might lead to a consequence that actually works in reverse of what we're trying to do. Example is I think in order to really make a credible market — a credit market with

dairies, it seems as though you have to have a larger concentration, you have to have, in a sense, more -- you know, larger dairies in order to make, you know, this work. I think it incentivizes dairies to come into areas now with a credit in front of them to -- you know, and in some sense making the methane problem much worse.

2.2

I do feel that the Board should spend some time -- and I understand that the letter of rejection that was sent out by Mr. Corey, you know, laid out a -- kind of a half and half. So in other words, you know, we are listening to you, but at the same time, we have a process. And I do respect the process, but in some sense, as a Board, I think we can pay a little more attention to what are the unintended consequences of, you know -- and I did watch Ricardo Lara's bill when it was introduced, and passed, and signed by the Governor.

And I understand there -- you know, in my reading of it, I maybe not as clear that it has to be implemented the way that we are talking about it here at CARB, but I do feel that the impact to the community -- I mean, Aliso Pico -- I mean this whole -- the Aliso leak that we all read about and everyone moved so quickly in Sacramento to solve, I mean, this is like and everyday occurrence for Central Valley. I mean, this -- the amount of methane that surrounds these communities is -- we wouldn't stand

for it. We would just literally have the same type of reaction as we had to that methane leak, but this is happening on an everyday basis.

2.2

And I feel like we should spend some extra time just on this aspect and not let it just kind of roll into a larger conversation about, you know -- you know, credits and the amount of, you know, climate change impact it has on our models. I really feel like there is a true impact to everyone who lives within a small radius of a dairy and now these mega dairies. And I just want to echo, you know, I think both what Tania and Diane said, I think this is a real huge, impactful health issue for people in the Central Valley. I mean, they're crying out truly to the Board to, in some sense, say please don't wait until we get way down the road and, you know, these credits become the creators of larger, concentrated, bigger herds and dairies, because it really is impacting people's lives.

And I'm sorry to digress a bit, but I can just tell you that there isn't -- and I represented this area for, I don't know, probably a decade plus. And I think more than pollution, believe it or not, this is an issue that is a silent killer and it's not just the methane that is -- that we're dealing with in terms of climate change and the powerful impact it has on it. But I think from an everyday health perspective, I think most of the residents

there worry that, you know, somehow this will be just part of the emission inventory or some piece of a spreadsheet that says we're reducing by creating, you know, in some sense, you know, fuels, et cetera.

I really feel like -- I really strongly feel that the Board should spend an enormous amount of time, outside of our process if we have to, really discussing and really getting more data on, you know, what this impact will be. So I just wanted to just raise my hand and simply say that I hope we can do that, Madam Chair, and I hope that we can spend enormous amounts of time, much more than we will, you know, in a paragraph or two talking about the Scoping Plan. But I do hope that we will spend maybe even a session, at some point in time, getting an update on this.

Thank you.

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Chair Randolph.

And I wanted to follow Senator Florez's comments about the petition and about the larger issue really of confined animal feeding operations, CAFOs, the consolidation of not just dairy, but of actually animal husbandry both cows and pigs. They are a health -- a public health as well as environmental problem.

And so I really appreciated Senator Florez's framing of the issue. I mean, he's a -- was born and

raised in the San Joaquin Valley. I'm just an interloper. I do research in the valley. But I have heard from many of my contacts in and around Fresno and the San Joaquin Valley about their concern, just as Senator Florez just outlined. So I wanted to add my voice to Dr. Pacheco-Werner, and Senator Florez's, and actually Diane Takvorian's call for a deeper dive into this issue. I don't have some magic solution, but I do think it's a big enough issue and there's enough public concern that we have to pay attention.

2.2

So, in addition, I wanted to echo Ms. Takvorian's appreciation of outgoing Board Member Fletcher. And I'm glad she made those comments, as well as you, Chair Randolph, because I have appreciated his thoughtfulness. But I also want to acknowledge Vice Chair Berg, since she just announced that this is going to be her last year and she's not going to seek reappointment. I don't know of a harder working Board member during the entire time that I've been on the Board since 2008 than Sandy Berg.

And she's brought so much thoughtfulness and hard work to dealing with issue after issue. You know, she -- I guess she was -- she's appointed as the small business representative on the Board, but she's had a much larger portfolio, if you will. And I especially appreciate how she's developed a commitment to helping communities,

low-income communities of color. The compassion that she's shown at our public meetings for approving AB 617 CERPs has amazed me and has been, I think, incredibly helpful to focusing the Board's work. So I just wanted to give a shout-out to Vice Chair Berg and all her hard work.

And I have a final content comment. I, too, appreciated the -- Mr. Corey's presentation, both what we've accomplished and what he hopes we accomplish in this next year, but one area that I think needs to be highlighted more and beyond just chrome plating, which I was glad he highlighted is, as I've said many times, as we improve overall air quality in terms of the criteria pollutants, which we've done very well, we have to remember that there are stationary sources of air toxics that impact, especially the low-income communities of color. And I just feel like we need to have more attention, not just on the research side, because the Research Division is trying to move that way, but also in the action side to try to reduce toxic emissions in our most disadvantaged and impacted communities.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. That was a good discussion. All right. So I think the -- several Board members have raised kind of the same sort of concerns, intentions around recognizing that the dairy

participation in LCFS is an important issue, is dairies do affect communities, but also recognizing that there's a lot of issues around that. There's a lot of factual issues, there's policy issues, and there's also kind of a learning curve that I think we want to make sure that all Board members have an opportunity to participate in with regard to LCFS generally and with regard to this issue specifically.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So my suggestion to Executive Officer Corey is, recognizing the heavy lift that we're doing with the Scoping Plan and with the 23 Board meetings this year, and also recognizing that there -- you know, we have received this petition, but there hasn't been any sort of public process or discussion about that, my suggestion is that there be a -- and this kind of dovetails nicely with Exec -- the Executive Officer's concerns about making sure there's a robust opportunity for information sharing and My suggestion is that we do a public workshop engagement. specifically on this issue, ideally within the next few months, and then come back to the Board with an item after that public workshop, and -- where staff could share the findings and the discussion and really kind of allow the Board to hear about the issues in more detail and provide quidance in terms of moving forward with a rulemaking process.

And so that would help kind of get some of the groundwork that we need to do before the formal process happening sooner rather than later with a recognition that opening the full formal process is going to be a big undertaking that's going to take a bit more time.

2.2

I would like to get the -- Mr. Corey's thoughts on that.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair and Board members for the discussion -- really thoughtful discussion. And to your suggestion, Chair, absolutely, I think that's on point within the next few months. We'll get going on the full conversation that -- including petitioners and others in a workshop setting that I think will help and be part honestly a pre-rulemaking, because it will pull additional information together. So we'll develop a schedule over the next few months that would include the workshop that you just -- a public workshop that you just referred to as well as report back to the Board, how did the workshop go, what are the learnings, what's the process going forward. So we'll get going on that.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. All right. This is not a voting item. This is an informational item. So any other comments are welcome before we move on to open comment.

Vice Chair Berg.

VICE CHAIR BERG: I would just thank you so much for your leadership on that Chair Randolph. And I would just like to encourage as soon as that date was set, please let the Board members know, because, you know, hearing the testimony and getting the presentation. So I hope that the workshop would allow for data to come in from both sides, because there's two sides to the story, and that we would be able to be informed as to when the workshop took place, so those of us that would like to listen in and hear firsthand, that we would be able to do that. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Will do, Vice Chair.

In fact, it's common that -- there have been a number of workshops that Board members have listened in, or, in some cases, even attended. So we will make that a priority as we pull these together. So thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Board Member Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Just quickly. Thank you, Chair. I think that's a good resolution and a good path forward. And thank you, Mr. Corey, for your willingness to go forward with that.

Thank you.

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yeah, please ignore

the picture. That's not me.

1.3

2.2

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: I'm having technical issues today, but I just really want to thank the Executive Officer. I know this is a really hard process and I just want to thank you and your staff for going this extra step. And, you know, hopefully our communities can see that, you know, the staff and, you know, this Board is tying to make every effort to be responsive to the community. And hopefully, the industry sees that we're also attempting to bring certainty to this issue as well for them. So thank you so much for this work.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. That was a great discussion. Thank you.

Okay. That is the last agenda item. We -- now it is time to go to open public comment for -- to comment on items that are not on the agenda. Board Clerk, will you please call any commenters.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes. Thank you. We have one person with their hand raised to speak, that is John Velasco. And, John, I've unmuted you, and you may begin.

I apologize. It looks like there's a -- there should be a prompt for you to unmute on your end.

JOHN VELASCO: I got it. Sorry about that.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: No problem.

2.2

JOHN VELASCO: Chair Randolph and CARB members, my name is John Velasco. I'm the Vice President and also serve on the board of directors of an independent food bank called Heart of Compassion, which is in Montebello, California. I'm going to read a letter that's been provided to the docket that opened at 9 a.m. And also, there's -- since you don't -- the Board doesn't know our organization, I got letters of support from our State Senator Bob Archuleta and our Assembly Member Cristina Garcia, who also is the author of AB 617.

Heart of Compassion distribution is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit food bank assisting those in need since 2003. Our mission is to be a lighthouse of volunteers fighting poverty and restoring hope. Our current week -- twice weekly food distribution impacts facilities and individuals in multiple cities across L.A. County, including, but not limited to, Whittier, Norwalk, Downey, Santa Fe Springs, Los Angeles, Montebello, and San Gabriel Valley. We also distribute weekly to smaller food pantries and other organizations across the county.

During fiscal year 20-21, we distributed more than \$44 million worth of food, PPE, cleaning supplies, and other household necessities to those in need and to our partner agencies. We were able to accomplish this

with a 100 percent volunteer labor force. During the COVID pandemic, we partnered with local elected officials, including State Senator Bob Archuleta, Assembly Members Cristina Garcia, and Blanca Rubio, Los Angeles County Supervisors Hilda Solis and Janice Hahn, LA County Sheriff Alex Villanueva, and the Mayor and City Councils of Montebello, Whittier, Maywood, Azusa.

2.2

environmental footprint by recycling cardboard and plastics, and by having an on-site compost pile to divert additional refuse from the landfills. We've been extraordinarily impacted by the high cost of fuel. We've received a \$350,000 grant from the South Coast Air Quality Management District to purchase electric TRU-equipped trailers. We want to transition from diesel and gas fueled bobtail trucks to an electric fleet, which would not only be more cost efficient, but also beneficial for the environment as we make our many donation pickups and deliveries to disadvantaged communities.

We are requesting the Board to help in identifying and secure funding originally it was for one 2018 BYD truck, new and never sold, and presently at the factor in Lancaster with an electric motor and refrigerated box. We've been told by BYD they actually have two that we're looking into.

I'm setting this background information, so the Board will be able to reflect upon this letter during my remarks, which I making right now. Thank you for partnering with us and fighting food insecurity in Los Angeles County. Your wonderful team has been instrumental in helping on and off for the past 10 plus years. This started around 2012 when we ran into a compliance issue.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. That concludes your time. Thank you so much.

JOHN VELASCO: Thank you.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Patricia Ramos-Anderson, you may unmute and begin.

PATRICIA RAMO-ANDERSON: Hello again. My name is Patricia Ramos-Anderson. I'm the President of the League of United Latin American Citizens Council 3072 in Merced County.

For me, the comment has to do about public hearings. Those are very important, but most importantly is having meaningful engagement with the community and making sure that it's language accessible, because of multiple languages and dialects throughout Central Valley. And it's just not down in the southern part of the Central Valley. It's the whole region, because we are going through the same needs of having our voices be heard, but also understood.

And the other thing, well, also is that the regions need to be considered that some of them are very different and unique in their nature. So when we talk about meaningful engagement, you also have to be able to identify and map it out, so then the part -- the representatives can see on the map what it is and how different it can be from region to region, but still -- and understand where the residents are coming from.

You know, we live here. We want to make sure we continue to create a safe environment with public engagement for making sure it's being meaningful, it's being understood, and it's being respected as well.

Without that, we wouldn't know what was actually happening out in the field or in our communities from a government level, and also direction and where they're going to go. It's not about just one side or the other side. It's about "we". We are one, we live in the community, and we will be part of the process, because we will be impacted, either positively or in a negative manner, but have a process that provides us to engage.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Chair, that concludes the comments.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

That concludes our meeting for today. We are

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 11th day of February, 2022.

James & Title

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 10063