VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING STATE OF CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD

AND

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ZOOM PLATFORM

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 2022 4:01 P.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

Assembly Member Eduardo Garcia

Davina Hurt

Gideon Kracov

Senator Connie Leyva

Tania Pacheco-Werner, PhD

Barbara Riordan

Supervisor Phil Serna

Diane Takvorian

Supervisor Nora Vargas

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Martha Dina Argüello, Co-Chair, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Los Angeles

Sharifa Taylor, Co-Chair, Communities for a Better Environment

Paulina Torres, Co-Chair, Center for Race, Poverty & the Environment

Connie Cho, Communities for a Better Environment

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Demi Espinoza, Environmental Fellow Program/National Parks Conservation Association

Juan Flores, Center on Race, Poverty & the Environment

Catherine Garoupa White, PhD, Central Valley Air Quality Coalition

Kevin Hamilton, Central California Asthma Collaborative

John Harriel, Jr., International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers

Thomas Helme, Valley Improvement Projects

Matt Holmes, Little Manila Rising

John Kevin Jefferson, III, Deep Medicine Circle

Mayor Rey Léon, LEAP Institute

Colin Miller, Environmental Justice Solutions

Neena Mohan, California Environmental Justice Alliance

Luis Olmedo, Comité Civico del Valle

Amee Raval, Asian Pacific Environmental Network

Asha Sharma, Pesticide Action Network - North America

Jill Sherman-Warne, Native American Environmental Protection Coalition

Sarina Vega, Casa Familiar

STAFF:

Richard Corey, Executive Officer

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

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF:

Chanell Fletcher, Deputy Executive Officer, Office of Environmental Justice

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

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

Ambreen Afshan, Program Manager, Office of Environmental Justice (OEJ)

Dana Grubaugh, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

Trish Johnson, Staff Air Pollution Specialist, Environmental Justice Section, OEJ

Abigail May, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

ALSO PRESENT:

Havah Aisha Isray, Asian Pacific Environmental Network

Shayda Azamian, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability

John Bottorff, CleanEarth4Kids.org

Harvey Eder, Public Solar Power Coalition

Evan Edgar, Edgar Associates

Richard Grow

Kyle Heiskala, Environmental Health Coalition

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

ALSO PRESENT:

Gary Hughes, Biofuelwatch

Suzanne Hume, CleanEarth4Kids.org

Kathleen Kilpatrick, Safe Ag Safe Schools, Campaign for Organic and Regenerative Agriculture

Zolboo Namkhaidorj, Communities for a Better Environment
Torm Nompraseurt, Asian Pacific Environmental Network
Alma Ortega, Communities for a Better Environment
Lucero Rios

Alicia Rivera, Communities for a Better Environment Jane Sellen, Californians for Pesticide Reform

INDEX	PAGE
Call to Order	1
Roll Call	1
Opening Remarks	2
Item 22-4-1 Chair Randolph Executive Officer Corey Staff Presentation Matt Holmes Juan Flores Torm Nompraseurt Board Discussion and Q&A Motion Board Discussion and Q&A Vote	6 7 8 10 12 13 14 14 14
EJAC Roll Call CARB Chair Randolph DEO Fletcher CARB - EJAC Overview of Meeting EJAC Presentations Board and EJAC Discussion and Q&A Alicia Rivera Kathleen Kilpatrick Suzanne Hume Harvey Eder Richard Grow Evan Edgar Alma Ortega Gary Hughes Jane Sellen Kyle Heiskala Zolboo Namkhaidorj Lucero Rios Shayda Azamian John Bottorff Havah Aisha Board and EJAC Discussion and Q&A Closing remarks by Board and EJAC	17 23 24 27 84 132 133 134 139 143 147 145 147 149 153 156 158 160 177

INDEX CONTINUED PAGE Public Comment Harvey Eder 180 Adjournment 183 Reporter's Certificate 184

PROCEEDINGS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Good afternoon.

Welcome to the March 10th joint meeting of the California
Air Resources Board and Environmental Justice Advisory
Committee. Glad to be meeting with everyone today and
looking forward to the discussion with the members of the
EJAC regarding their draft recommendations for the draft
scoping plan. But before we get to that, I want to start
with an item for CARB Board consideration, which is the
appointment of new members to the EJAC. After the CARB
Board has addressed this action item, we will transition
to the joint meeting. So with that, I will ask the Board
Clerk to call the roll of CARB Board members.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes. Thank you, Chair Randolph.

Dr. Balmes?

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: Florez, here.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Assembly Member Garcia?

Ms. Hurt?

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Present.

2

```
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Kracov?
1
             BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Here.
2
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Leyva?
 3
             Dr. Pacheco-Werner?
             BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER:
 5
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mrs. Riordan?
 6
             BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.
7
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Supervisor Serna?
8
             BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Here.
9
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Professor Sperling?
10
             Ms. Takvorian?
11
             BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.
12
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Supervisor Vargas?
1.3
             BOARD MEMBER VARGAS: Vargas, here.
14
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Vice Chair Berg?
15
16
             VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair Randolph?
17
             CHAIR RANDOLPH:
                              Here.
18
19
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Madam Chair, we have a
20
   quorum.
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.
                                                       I will
21
   now take a moment to address a few housekeeping items. In
2.2
23
   accordance with Assembly Bill 361, as extended by Governor
   Newsom's Executive Order N-20 -- -1-22. We are conducting
24
25
    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 us -those of you joining us in the Zoom Environment.

2.2

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.

And I will take this opportunity to remind everyone to speak clearly and from a quiet location, whether you are joining us in Zoom or calling in by phone.

Interpretation services will be provided today in Spanish. If you are joining us using Zoom, there is a button labeled "Interpretation" on the Zoom screen. Click on that interpretation button and select Spanish to hear the meeting in Spanish. I want to remind all of our speakers to speak slowly to allow the interpreters to accurately interpret your comments.

(Interpreter translated in Spanish)

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

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes. Thank you, Chair Randolph. Good evening, everyone. My name is Katie Estabrook. I am one of CARB's Board Clerks and I'm going to provide some information on how the public participation will be organized for today's joint meeting.

If you wish to make a verbal comment on one of

the items or during the open comment period at the end of today's meeting, you must be joining using Zoom web -Zoom webinar or calling in by phone. If you are currently watching the webcast on CAL-SPAN, but you wish to comment, please make sure to register for the Zoom webinar or call in. Information for both can be found on the public agenda for today's meeting.

1.3

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 and let us know that 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 previously indicated which item you are wishing to speak on today when you registered for the Zoom webinar, you will need to raise your hand at the beginning of the item so that we can add you to the queue and 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 the 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 activate the commenter's audio when it is their turn to speak. For those calling in, I will identify you by the last three digits of your phone number.

2.2

We will not be showing a list of public commenters. However, I will announce the next three or so in the queue, so you are ready to testify and know who is coming up next. Please note that you will not appear by video during your testimony. I would always like to -- also like to remind everyone to please state your name for the record before you speak. This is especially important in this remote meeting setting and it is important for those calling in by phone for the court reporter.

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

If you do wish to submit a written comment letter

today, please visit CARB's send-us-your-comments page or look at the public agenda on our website for links to send these documents electronically. If you experience any -- I'm sorry. The comments will be accepted on the -- the written comments will be accepted until the Chair closes each item.

1.3

2.2

If you experience any technical difficulties, please call (805)772-2715, so that an IT person can assist you. This number is also noted on the public agenda. And that's it.

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

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Now, we will take up the agenda item which requires action by the CARB Board, and that's appointment of new members to the AB 32 Environmental Justice Advisory Committee. 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.

Last year, we began working on updating the Scoping Plan, which included reconvening the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee to advise the Board on developing the Scoping Plan. Two members appointed by the Board last May had to resign from the Committee. Staff received nominations for two individuals from the same

community-based organizations as the original members, and now propose that the Board appoint those nominated individuals to the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee.

1.3

2.2

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

And as you mentioned, the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee was convened last year to advise on the development of the 2022 Scoping Plan update. Since last June, CARB has hosted 15 virtual Environmental Justice Advisory Committee meetings. These meetings serve as an important forum for the EJAC to advise CARB on the process for developing the 2022 Scoping Plan and a key venue for the EJAC to share its perspective on the methods, assumptions, and associated analysis that will serve as the foundation for the Scoping Plan.

Two EJAC members are on unable to continue serving on the Committee, and their respective community based organizations submitted nominations for different individuals to serve on the Committee. Consistent with AB 32, the nominations staff received are from the environmental justice organizations representing regions of the state with the most significant exposure to air pollution, including communities with minority populations or low-income populations as well.

I'll now ask Trish Johnson of the Environmental Justice Section to begin the staff presentation.

Trish.

2.2

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:

Thank you, Executive officer Corey. And good afternoon, Chair Randolph, Vice Chair Berg, and members of the Board. Today, I will be presenting the appointment of new members to the AB 32 Environmental Justice Advisory Committee.

--000--

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:

During my presentation, I will provide a background on the AB 32 Environmental Justice Advisory Committee staff's proposed new members and staff's recommendations.

--000--

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: AB

32 directed CARB to convene an Environmental Justice

Advisory Committee to advise the Board in developing the

Scoping Plan and any other pertinent matter in

implementing the Act. The Advisory Committee shall be

comprised of representatives from communities in the state

with the most significant exposure to air pollution,

including, but not limited to, communities with minority

populations, or low income populations, or both.

--000--

1.3

2.2

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 32, CARB convened the first Environmental Justice Advisory Committee in January of 2007 to advise it on the development of California's initial Climate Change Scoping Plan and other AB 32 program areas.

AB 32 directs CARB to update the Scoping Plan at least once every five years. Therefore, the Committee was reconvened in 2013 to advise CARB on the development of the first Scoping Plan update. In 2015, the Committee was reconvened to advise the Board on the development of the 2017 Scoping Plan.

--000--

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: On May 20th of last year, the Board appointed seven new members to join four returning members to advise the Board on the development of the 2022 Scoping Plan update and delegated to the Executive Officer the authority to appoint additional committee members from underrepresented areas.

On July 22nd and February 25th, the Executive Officer appointed additional members from underrepresented areas. This month, two members that were appointed by the

Board last May had to resign from the Committee and CARB staff received nominations for replacement candidates from the same organizations.

1.3

2.2

--000--

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: The two proposed new Committee members are Matt Holmes from Little Manila Rising, and Juan Flores, from the Center on Race, Poverty, and the Environment.

--000--

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: In conclusion, staff recommends that the Board approve the two individuals proposed to serve on the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee.

Now, I'd like to introduce the two proposed new members, starting with Matt Holmes, Environmental Justice Director of Little Manila Rising in Stockton.

MATT HOLMES: Thank you, Trish. Appreciate you including me in all these processes over the past few years. Thank you, Chair, members of the Board. I am grateful to be included formally in the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee. I've served since last summer as a proxy for my boss and employer Dillon Delvo.

So even though I'm grateful to be included, I'm regretful for you all that Dillon has had to step away from this. His lived experience as a son of Little Manila

really provided a powerful backdrop for the implications of the plan that we're here to consider.

2.2

But still, I'm -- I come to this space as a history worker. You know, I'm not a scientist. I'm really an educator and a history worker, and I have an extensive background in the history of white violence.

And as it turns out, that background really has provided a useful framework for understanding the current status of poverty and pollution that really defines our state, and which the Scoping Plan can actually do something about while addressing this sort of fantastic relationship that we have with carbon dioxide.

So, you know, I'll just conclude by saying I look forward to participating in the rest of this process and reminding everybody that environmental justice isn't just a title and it isn't just a -- it just isn't -- isn't just en vogue. It really is a historic lens through which to envision environmental burdens and benefits. And I'm going continue to beat that drum and I hope you'll be patient with me as I do it.

So thanks everybody and I look forward to joining my colleagues on the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: Thank you. Now, I'd like to introduce Juan

Flores, community organizer for the Center on Race, Poverty, and the Environment.

2.2

JUAN FLORES: Good afternoon, Madam Chair, Board members. It's such a pleasure to put myself forward as a potential candidate and member of EJAC. I'm a community organizer. I live in Delano, California, Kern County right in the Central Valley. Delano it's a very historical place where the farmworker movement began and where many wonderful things were achieved for the farmworker community.

Now, we have an environmental justice movement that is perhaps as important as it was the farmworkers movement back in the day, as we're fighting for clean air, clean water, and more responsible ways to treat our lands. It would be a pleasure for me to be part of the EJAC to keep representing the communities that I have been representing for more than 11 years, something that is my passion, something that is what gives me hope every day, and gives me the energy to get up on my bed and keep doing what I do, which is wonderful hard working communities of color, low-income communities, migrant communities whose voices a lot of times are missed on spaces like this, but that my wonderful colleagues from different EJ organizations are here representing and giving that voice. And I hope that I can be -- bring that expertise, and

thought responsibility, and confidence that communities have in us.

1.3

2.2

So thank you so much and I hope to be part of the EJAC.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:

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

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

We will now hear from any members of the public who want to comment on this specific item.

Clerk, do we have any members of the public who'd like to comment.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, Chair. We currently have one person with their hand raise to speak on the appointment of the new members to the AB 32 Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, and that Torm Nompraseurt.

Torm, I will activate your microphone and then you'll receive a prompt and you can begin your comments.

TORM NOMPRASEURT: Yes. Thank you. I totally support these two gentlemen who have worked very hard in our community for environmental justice. And they will be great leadership with the EJAC and to advise the CARB and our California environmental justice. Thank you. I totally support both of them.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Chair, that concludes the hands that are raised

to speak on this item.

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

Dr. Balmes had a comment on this item.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Well, I was going to move that we move forward with accepting these candidates, but it looks like Craig has something to say. And since he's a lawyer, I would defer to him.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Craig, did you mean to have your hand up?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SEGALL: Nope, that's just unintentional. Sorry about that.

my hand up, I just want to say that I have a history of working with Matt Holmes. I totally support his appointment to EJAC. I don't know Mr. Flores, but I really appreciated his comments. I thought they were spot on. And it's important that Kern County and farmworkers in general be represented on EJAC, so I support both candidates and would be willing to make a motion to that effect, but my colleague Diane Takvorian has something to say.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I just wanted to second your motion and say that I don't know Matt as well, only met him over Zoom, but I do know Juan quite well. And I want to thank both of them for their service over many,

15

```
many years. I know that Juan has been stalwart in his --
1
    in his work in the valley, and has led many very effective
2
    community organizing efforts towards environmental
 3
    justice. So I know they are both people of good intention
    and good conscience. And so it's with a great deal of
5
   pleasure that I would second your nomination.
6
7
             Thanks.
8
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. We have a motion and
    a second. Will the Board Clerk please call the roll.
9
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes.
10
             Dr. Balmes?
11
             BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes.
12
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. De La Torre?
1.3
             BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yes.
14
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Eisenhut?
15
16
             BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Yes.
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Florez?
17
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Aye.
18
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Hurt?
19
             BOARD MEMBER HURT: Aye.
20
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Kracov?
21
             BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes.
2.2
23
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?
             BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes.
24
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mrs. Riordan?
25
```

```
BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN:
                                    Aye.
1
2
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Supervisor Serna?
             BOARD MEMBER SERNA:
                                  Aye.
 3
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Takvorian?
             BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Ave.
 5
                                     Supervisor Vargas?
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK:
 6
             BOARD MEMBER VARGAS: Vargas, yes.
7
8
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Vice Chair Berg?
             VICE CHAIR BERG: Yes, and welcome.
9
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair Randolph?
10
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.
11
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Madam Chair, the motion
12
13
   passes.
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: Great. Thank you.
14
    Congratulations to Matt and Juan. And we look forward to
15
16
   working with you on the EJAC.
17
             So as we transition to the main focus of today's
    joint meeting, I will ask Trish Johnson to do a roll call
18
19
    of the EJAC members. And I will invite you as your name
    is being called to pop your camera on, if it's not already
20
    on, so folks can put a face to the name as we convene this
21
    evening.
2.2
23
             OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:
             Thank you very much. As we typically do, for
24
```

Environmental Justice Advisory Committee meetings, I'll be

25

calling on the EJAC members in alphabetical order by first name, so feel free to introduce yourself to the Board.

I'll start with Amee.

1.3

2.2

AMEE RAVAL: Hi. This is Amee with APEN. I'm here. Did you want more of an introduction, Trish?

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: It's completely up to you.

AMEE RAVAL: Okay. I'll just that I use she/he/her pronouns. I'm Policy Director. And APEN stands for the Asian Pacific Environmental Network. And we're a grassroots environmental justice organization in the Bay Area organizing in Richmond, Oakland Chinatown and expanding into Wilmington in LA.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:

Thank you. We have a proxy in attendance today for Angel Garcia, Asha please introduce yourself.

ASHA SHARMA: Hi, everyone. My name is Asha Sharma. I use she/her/hers pronouns. I'm the organizing co-director with Pesticide Action Network. Really excited to meet with you all today.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:
Thank you. Dr. Catherine.

DR. CATHERINE GAROUPA WHITE: Hi. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Dr. Catherine Garoupa White. I use they and she pronouns. I'm the Executive

Director for the Central Valley Air Quality Coalition, or CVAQ. And we've been working to restore clean air to the San Joaquin Valley, one of our nation's most polluted air basins, since two -- the early 2000s with a particular focus on environmental justice neighborhoods.

1.3

2.2

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: Thank you. Connie.

CONNIE CHO: Hello. My name is Connie Cho. I use she/her pronouns and I'm an Associate Attorney with Communities for a Better Environment. We're a statewide organization that organizes in Richmond, East Oakland, South East LA, and Wilmington, representing communities living next to fossil fuel infrastructure and industrial areas.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:

Thank you. The next Environmental Justice

Advisory Committee member is Demi, but I don't think that

Demi is here. Please speak up if you are.

The same as John Harriel, Jr. I know that you had some trouble joining.

JOHN HARRIEL, JR.: Yeah, I'm on now.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:

Great. Please go ahead and introduce yourself, if you'd like.

JOHN HARRIEL, JR.: Oh, John Harriel, better

known as Big John, IBEW Local 11, union electrician.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:

Thank you.

JILL SHERMAN-WARNE:

Jill.

1.3

2.2

Jill Sherman-Warne. (Spoke in native language)
My name is Jill Sherman-Warne and I'm very happy
to -- and honored to be here today. I am the Executive
Director of the Native American Environmental Protection
Coalition. That is a nonprofit that serves 27 tribes. I
consider myself an expert in engaging tribes and have met
with much success in having tribal engagement in many
processes. So I look forward to serving the tribes to the
best of my ability and engaging the 109 tribes that exist
in the state of California.

(Spoke in native language)

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:

Thank you. In alphabetical order Juan is our next member, but we have done Juan's introduction, so I'll move on to Kevin Hamilton.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Kevin Hamilton, co-Executive Director of Central California Asthma Collaborative. Thank you.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: Thank you. Kevin Jefferson.

JOHN KEVIN JEFFERSON III: Hello. My name is

John Kevin Jefferson, III. I am a current two-term member of California Urban Forestry Advisory Committee and I'm also a member of the newly formed Bay Area Air Quality Management District EJAC team as well. Look forward to seeing how those organizations can work together and have synergy. Hi to everyone.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:

Thank you. The next member is Luis. Although, I do not see Luis. Please let us know if you're here.

Next, I'll go to Martha Dina.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON RANDOLPH: You're muted, Martha.

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Martha Dina Argüello with Physicians for Social Responsibility, Los Angeles. We're a physician membership organization working alongside environmental justice organizations to promote a public health approach to environmental policy.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:
Thank you. Also Martha Dina's proxy Colin is here.

COLIN MILLER: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Colin Miller. I use we, he, and they pronouns. I'm were the Environmental Justice Solutions, and here to support the leadership of Martha Dina Argüello. Thank you. I'm currently on coastal Miwok land. Thank you.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:

Thank you. Next, I would call on Matt, but again, Matt has had that chance, so we will go to Neena.

NEENA MOHAN: Hey, good afternoon, everyone. My name is Neena Mohan. I use they and she pronouns and I currently serve as the Climate Justice Program Manage at the California Environmental Justice Alliance, also known as CEJA. And CEJA is an alliance of 10 different environmental justice groups across the state of California.

Thanks.

2.2

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:

Thank you. Mayor Rey.

MAYOR REY LEÓN: Good afternoon, everybody. Rey León, Executive Director and founder of the Latino Equity, Advocacy & Policy Institute. It's a long one, so I just say LEAP. And I'm also the Mayor of the City of Huron, the heart of the Valley. I've been organizing for quite a while here in the San Joaquin Valley and long time EJ advocate, Chicano organizer and continuing the duty here in the valley. Nice to see everybody. Adios.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON:

Thank you. Next is Sarina. Although, I do not see Sarina.

SARINA VEGA: I am here.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: Oh,

great. Thank you.

1.3

2.2

SARINA VEGA: Hi, everyone. Sarina Vega. I'm representing the transported community of San Diego. I'm formerly at Casa Familiar, but currently not organization affiliated. I use she/her pronouns.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: Thank you.

Sharifa.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Good evening, everyone. My name is Sharifa Taylor. My pronouns are she or they. I'm a researcher at CBE, for our two Norcal communities, in East Oakland and in Richmond. I am formally an urban planner by trade and I also am helping with our land-use work statewide

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: Thank you. And Thomas.

THOMAS HELME: Hey, everybody. Tom Helme. I'm the co-founder and co-project director of Valley

Improvement Projects, a social and environmental justice group based in Stanislaus County. I'm also the coordinator for the California Environmental Justice

Coalition, statewide EJ coalition. Just got our 80th member. Thanks for having me.

OEJ STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: Thank you.

Back to you, Chair.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you so much.

As a reminder, if you wish to speak during the public comment period for this item, please click the raise band button or dial star nine now and we will call on you when we get to the public comment portion of the meeting.

As we discussed earlier, AB 32 directed the California Air Resources Board to convene an Environmental Justice Advisory Committee to advise the Board in developing the Scoping Plan and any other pertinent matter in implementing AB 32.

Comprised of environmental justice leaders from throughout the state and a newly appointed tribal representative, the EJAC plays an important role in ensuring that the Scoping Plan addresses the concerns of residents from the state's most polluted -- pollution-burdened communities.

I'm looking forward to this conversation this evening as it offers the Board an important opportunity to hear directly from the EJAC and develop a shared understanding of the EJAC's initial set of draft recommendations.

And while we may not all agree on every issue, I believe we all share the commitment to addressing the

current climate crisis and doing so in a way that benefits our most burdened communities.

And I really just want to thank each and every member of the EJAC for taking on this task. It's -- I know it's very hard work. It's very emotionally draining work, and it means so much to the communities that are relying on your advocacy and representation. And I just can't tell you how much I appreciate the time, and the thoughtfulness, and careful understanding that you are bringing to this very difficult, and detailed, and lengthy process.

So I will now ask Chanell Fletcher, the Deputy Executive Officer of Environmental Justice to say a few words and to introduce the facilitator for today's joint meeting.

Chanell.

1.3

2.2

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you,
Chair Randolph. So good afternoon, EJAC members and Board
members. As all of you know and I think as the Chair has
already mentioned, the EJAC is currently advising the
Board on the development of the 2022 Scoping Plan update.
So today marks the 16th meeting of the EJAC since last
June.

In addition, EJAC members have participated as panelists at Scoping Plan workshops and at CARB Board

meetings, and they've also participated in topic-specific workgroup meetings in between the public EJAC meetings.

I, too, want to acknowledge and thank the EJAC members for all of the time and expertise that you have provided to date.

2.2

I also just wanted to take some time and highlight a few of the milestones that the EJAC has already accomplished. At the end of last year, the EJAC submitted responses for the CARB scoping plan scenario inputs. In that document, the EJAC responded to 24 Scoping Plan scenario input questions from CARB. And the EJAC recommendations were reflected in the Scoping Plan scenario modeling assumptions document.

EJAC members' successful Scoping Plan community engagement workshop they held last month. So the Central Valley Air Quality Coalition partnered with other San Joaquin Valley organizations from this event. In response to the EJAC's request, CARB provided monetary compensation for the community engagement. Over 100 participants from the San Joaquin Valley shared ideas and their priorities. So congratulations to all of the organizations who collaborated to make that event a success.

To build on the recognition that the Chair has already mentioned of the inaugural tribal member, I wanted

to share my excitement that Jill has been appointed to the EJAC. So CARB Board diligently ensured addition of a tribal member to the EJAC. And I would like to thank the EJAC members and the other State agencies that assisted with the outreach efforts to indigenous communities.

1.3

2.2

In less that two weeks, Jill's comments are highlighting ways that our programs can integrate the perspectives of California's tribal residents to address air quality concerns on tribal lands. So thank you, Jill.

I'm looking forward to today's discussion and continuing to work with all of you on the development of the 2022 Scoping Plan update. I will now hand it over to our a facilitator Alex Cole-Weiss.

Alex, I'll turn it over to you.

Thank you, Board Chair, Board members, EJAC members.

Hello. My name is Alex Cole-Weiss. I use she/her pronouns and I am honored to have been working with the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee for the last, goodness, almost eight months or so since we started. I can't believe we're at meeting 16.

I'm going to quickly go through some of our meeting objectives for today, present how this agenda item is going to flow, and then we will get right into the content.

So for today, as Chair Randolph mentioned, we're really focused on orienting the Board to EJAC's preliminary recommendations and developing shared understanding of EJAC's priorities and those recommendations.

2.2

We also want to create a space for questions and dialogue between EJAC members and Board members, on those recommendations and some of the other issues and concerns that have been coming up in this process. So for this agenda item what we can expect Co-Chairs -- our wonderful Co-Chairs Martha Dina Argüello and Sharifa Taylor will be giving and opening framing for the recommendations in their leadership role. We have seven work groups that are going to present -- seven or eight presenters who will go through some of the highlights of their recommendations. We know you have -- the Board members have just received those recommendations in the last couple days and weeks. We worked to finalize them as preliminary, so they'll get five minutes or so each to go through their presentation materials.

After we present, we anticipate that will be about 45 minutes or so in total, we'll take a short break, so you all can kind of digest, get a snack, come back, and then we'll go into that open dialogue space that we talked about really focusing on questions Board members have

about the recommendations, you know, how EJAC members want to see those recommendations incorporated and really what -- you know, what enhancements to this process can we make to really address some of the EJAC priorities and recommendations that are coming forward.

2.2

After that, we'll talk about some of the next steps in the EJAC process and wrap up. So that's what's -- that's the flow for this item. We typically start all EJAC meetings with our meeting agreements. I'm not going to go through them. I just want to invoke them. They're powerful. They were developed by the EJAC. And the one that I will raise up as your facilitator today is I'm here and I agree to help you keep your meeting agreements by asking you to summarize key points as you go along, so we can bring in other voices who are waiting. And, of course, I always ask if we can -- you know, every -- we need everyone's help to keep our -- a respectful and productive atmosphere. I don't think that's going to be a problem.

So I would like to hand it over to the Co-Chairs to take us through that presentation. If we could get their slides up, that would be great. Thank you so much.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Can you confirm who's on -- who's speaking next?

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Yes, I believe that our Co-Chairs are going to kick us off. Let's see. Great, we've got -- Great.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: I was going through the PowerPoint and I didn't realize we'd gotten this far this fast.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Yeah, we are MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: So I don't even know where to begin. This has been quite a process. It has felt Herculean at moments, but we're incredibly proud of the work that we're about to present. And it does present the -- you know, some of the deep thinking that many of us in the environmental justice community have been doing. As this is what we call community-driven solutions. we're going to present to you is a path that we think is based in justice. Justice isn't an add-on. It isn't a thing you sort of say you're going to do. We are providing actionable as much as possible. Keep in mind, it's a first draft and we're all -- you know, we're going to review it today and we still want to finalize. And as a Committee, we -- my advice to the rest of the EJAC Committee is to go through these really carefully and make sure that they're actionable, that they're -- that we can evaluate, that there's metrics, that we can continue to work with CARB around that accountability.

So next slide.

1.3

--000--

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: So this is the structure of the document. You're going to hear from us and then we're going to go through each of the sectors. Each members of the EJAC will be presenting on each of those sectors. Then Sharifa and I are going to come back to talk about some of the overarching issues and recommendations. And then I believe it will be Jill, Sharifa and myself who will be talking to you about some of the process issues that we continue to face as we work on the Scoping Plan.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: It's the one I've been waiting for. So this -- these sets of recommendations and many of the letters that you have received from the environmental justice community represents a better path. And I use those words very carefully, because they are -- they are the words of the letters we sent and presentations we did during the very first EJAC, that what the environmental justice community wants to present is a better path that leads us away from communities being sacrifices, and they're helped being sacrificed.

And what we are looking for is a new economy, a

regenerative economy. And we want the CARB Board and staff to travel with us on this road to make this path that's transformative. And this Scoping Plan has the opportunity to be transformative. In fact, it must be transformative. And what we have seen so far, and you'll see that throughout the recommendations, is not a Scoping Plan that lays out a bold vision for how California is going to achieve climate justice.

And so we're hoping that today's conversation can open up that space to talk, so we can walk this path towards environmental justice, where we actually set a course for a new economy that moves beyond extraction and addresses the long-standing environmental racism issues that we have faced in our communities.

And with that, I am going to hand it to Sharifa to talk about some of the recommendations and issues.

Thanks.

1.3

2.2

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Thank you so much Martha Dina for that opening and beginning to our presentation. Thank you Chair, Vice Chair, and Board members for your time today, and, of course, members of the public.

Oh, next slide, please.

--000--

SHARIFA TAYLOR: We wanted to just share these three main points to preface the recommendations that

you'll hear from each working group. We wanted to share these caveats essentially, because during our last EJAC meeting, while we came to consensus around the recommendations that we submitted and that you have copies of, they weren't complete, not just because they are, as this first bullet point says, preliminary, they're a pre-modeling, specifically the PATHWAYS, IMPLAN, and BenMAP modeling, but they also are not inclusive of our various communities, just because of the competing timelines that we have, as mentioned here on this second bullet.

2.2

And so we want you all to keep in mind that because we do this work so often, because we do this work with our communities in mind, it is informed by their concerns of the past, but we want to get their direct engagement as we continue, and so therefore, these are only preliminary recommendations.

Finally, we also just wanted to emphasize that our recommendations are promoting direct emission reductions and that our recommendations are also rejecting unproven technological and policy remedies, such as carbon capture, usage, and storage, and emissions trading, as well as other sources.

So I want to hand it over to our next presenter who I believe is Colin. So next slide, please.

--000--

2.2

COLIN MILLER: Thank you so much, Martha Dina and Sharifa for that really powerful and compelling opening and framing.

energy generation work group of the EJAC. And I'll start with overarching recommendations. This is an alignment with what the California Energy Commission loading order is, which is to prioritize throughout the Scoping Plan energy conservation first, energy efficiency second, and then focus on development of local clean energy resources. This is all to create the benefits that our communities so desperately need, local workforce opportunities and reductions in utility bills. It's also important to note that non-fossil fuel energy generation can have unintended harm and consequences and thus a full life cycle assessment for the potential or existing harm to environmental justice communities should also be done.

Nuclear energy and big hydro sources of energy are two notable examples that have harmed Black, indigenous, and people of color communities in particular.

You can go to the next slide, please.

--000--

COLIN MILLER: So regarding workforce development, we urge CARB to follow the recommendations of

the Building Energy, Equity, and Power, or BEEP, Coalition and prioritize creation of local-, union-, and family-sustaining high-road jobs, and to do so in partnership with labor unions, community colleges, and green jobs training centers. We want to especially note the barriers to employment faced by youth, people of color, formerly incarcerated people.

And the picture on the right is Eric Shanks, the Director of Cypress Mandela Training Center in Deep East Oakland who is doing precisely that work in a really beautiful way.

You can go to the next slide.

2.2

--000--

COLIN MILLER: Regarding building

decarbonization, again, we urge CARB to follow the

recommendations of the BEEP Coalition, as well as the

report done by Strategic Actions for a Just Economy.

SAJE. We ask that the Scoping Plan perform -- call for

performing decarbonization in phases to prioritize new

buildings, the largest buildings, and largest emitters, as

well as publicly owned buildings first, to do so in

partnership and in tandem with preserving affordable

housing to protect renters, and ensure policy protections

are in place to protect and empower small landlords, and

homeowners for existing buildings to prioritize energy

affordability and tenant protections from cost increases, harassment, displacement, evictions or energy debt burdens, and to pair building decarbonization with other renovation efforts to make our buildings healthier and more resilient to the impacts of climate change, as well as things like lead poisoning which are harming our communities and have for decades.

Next slide, please.

2.2

Seems to be a technical issues.

I'll just say while we're waiting --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: We're trying to pull your slides back up. Sorry about that.

COLIN MILLER: Okay. Thank you. No problem.

While we're waiting for the slide deck to reload, I just want to knowledge the over six months of work done by the Building Energy, Equity, and Power Coalition to conduct a series of community listening sessions about the equity, and justice, and workforce implications for building decarbonization in California done in Los Angeles, in the San Francisco Bay Area, in the San Joaquin Valley, and in the Eastern Coachella Valley. So these recommendations have been ground truthed with our community members.

--000--

COLIN MILLER: I think we are missing a slide --

yes, that is the next slide. Thank you.

2.2

So we call on CARB in the Scoping Plan to increase access to rooftop solar by prioritizing, supporting, and directing public dollars and investments in rooftop solar in order to benefit the most disadvantaged, low-income communities first, to create targeted incentives that enable low-income households to go solar and pay for energy efficiency, and to work with the CPUC and the CEC to promote community ownership and control of local solar and wind facilities.

Next slide.

--000--

energy, we ask that CARB in the Scoping Plan incorporate full cost accounting in order to correctly assess the economics savings that are possible from investing public dollars in community owned and community controlled local clean energy resources, rather than the extremely costly and wildfire provoking long distance transmission lines from remote sources, and second to develop guidelines for utility scale solar and wind projects that require them to prevent and mitigate environmental and social threats to sensitive ecosystems, endangered species, and indigenous sacred sites. The image on the top right is from the Wiyot Tribe which --

JOHN HARRIEL, JR.: Of course, Yeah.

COLIN MILLER: -- is where I reside opposing the Terra-Gen Wind Facility, which would have desecrated one of their sacred site.

Next slide, please.

1.3

2.2

--000--

COLIN MILLER: This is my last slide. Regarding electric vehicles, I'll just read the image on the left. Lithium ion is expanding here to make electric vehicle batteries and other so-called renewable energy storage infrastructure. In fact, investors and prospectors call lithium white gold, from the gold rush, to the black gold rush, to the white gold rush. But to indigenous peoples around, the world gold rushes have meant genocide and ecoside.

So we call on the Scoping Plan to conduct a full life cycle evaluation of lithium mining impacts on EJ and indigenous communities, to prioritize funding incentives for electrifying heavy-duty vehicles and mass transit first before single-passenger vehicles, and to eliminate equity barriers faced by low-income communities to EV adoption in California, such as affordability and access to charging stations.

Thank you so much and I'll pass it on to my EJAC colleague Connie Cho.

CONNIE CHO: Next slide, please.

--000--

1.3

2.2

CONNIE CHO: So the transportation and fossil fuel working group combined, I feel like I have to say, had immense amounts of spirited collaboration and discussion, and did not always come to complete consensus, but where there was complete consensus, I will be able to flag that.

So the majority of the group did agree on accelerating zero-emission targets and also sending interim targets in the meantime. The group really wanted CARB to rethink the scale of its equity investments, transportation being the largest sector of greenhouse gas emissions. The -- I believe CARB's last report or budget report had, you know, \$1.5 billion of historic investment in all of its clean transportation programs. But looking forward into this coming year, EJ coalitions are supporting \$1.5 billion in equity investments alone, so we really need to rethink the scale of where we're putting our investments and how much we're investing in disadvantaged communities.

Alongside those really aggressive electrification targets, or zero-emission targets, the EJAC would like CARB to direct staff to support policies that will change VMT reduction targets. And we have as evidence the

Caltrans -- the California Transportation Plan by 2050 that could help signal to the rest of the state the need for additional policy and investments in mass transit for environmental justice communities.

And finally, in the transportation recommendations section, as we know this is not the forum to detail Low Carbon Fuel Standard changes, but we would -- we would advise sending a strong signal to the market that California's fuels policy will actually reflect the limited need for alternative fuels, alternative liquid fuels, and that it will reflect the latest concerns, and climate, and sustainability, and the consequential life cycle analyses that go along with those alternative fuels, and a reconsideration -- or not a reconsideration, but for the first time visiting the issue of the limitations on the amount of feedstock available and what is sustainable for not just the nation but the planet.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

CONNIE CHO: Now, speaking to oil refineries and oil extraction. In particular, here, I want to acknowledge that our -- my colleague Dave Campbell with Local 5 -- or Local 675 from the U.S. steelworkers is not able to here to co-present with him as he originally

intended. I believe he's probably tied up in negotiations with the companies themselves right now.

2.2

And one area where we did have strong overlap was the need to sound the alarm for a fossil fuel worker and community safety net fund that will address and transition otherwise displaced fossil fuel workers and communities that are dependent on -- that are dependent on oil companies for a large amount of their tax revenue.

So this is not necessarily a venture that CARB would go on alone. But in discussing the rest of the recommendations, I wanted to urge CARB to think about the fact that for Dave and our discussions, it really felt like putting the cart before the horse to even think about or talk about phasing down, or regulating the phasedown of oil refineries -- oil refineries, because the transition -- the fact is that there's already a transition happening, and that transition is unjust.

Marathon workers lost their jobs a year ago and we've been seeing bankruptcies across the nation in fossil fuel communities. And that leaves a giant toxic mess for the city or the state to clean up and it also leaves workers without pensions.

So while this seems like not a direct -- doesn't seem necessarily like an obvious recommendation to make to CARB, we really need leadership from the State and from

CARB to take this request, this demand for a robust safety net fund really seriously. Otherwise, it will be really challenging to continue to move on to build a large coalition and to work with everyone -- all the stakeholders that are necessary to be involved.

1.3

2.2

So I'm going to move on to the last two recommendations here, which are for CARB to commit to an interagency planning process for refinery phasedown -- phaseout by 2045. Our recommendation is that by 2024, with -- in close collaboration with refinery workers and communities, to adopt an interagency plan to manage the decline that's happening now in oil refinery production in line with -- in line with California's current policies, as well as market effects. You can model the different levels of production across refineries. The idea is to set key milestones and time tables, and project the slate of liquid fuel demand across -- and assist workers and communities in their decision-making around what they would like to see this Transition to be.

Finally, our -- so end oil drilling in California by 2035. And similarly, there was a large discussion around having a safety net fund to protect workers and communities. These phaseouts are larger than just, you know, declining one piece of infrastructure or shutting down one piece of infrastructure in that respect so -- and

what is not on here also is -- I suppose, first, I'll flag that. The reason that Dave diverged from these last two recommendations is because we saw that there would be a natural market decline and to let that take its course as refineries lose their customer bases.

2.2

The -- there is a world in which an interagency planning process does take that into account as we would see this planning process as something akin to the retirement of say a gas-fired power plant. And we know that's a very intensive process through the CPUC where all of the stakeholders participate.

What's not on here also is the EJAC's recommendation to oppose carbon capture and sequestration on fossil fuel infrastructure in particular. We have yet to see any examples of effective carbon capture, especially on refineries. The data that's borne out on the one or two examples that are out there are tenuous at best, counterproductive, more likely.

So I think that will close it out and I'll turn it over to whoever is next.

AMEE RAVAL: Thanks, Connie. This is Amee with APEN. Good evening to the CARB Board, to EJAC members. We're going to move to the next slide --

--000--

AMEE RAVAL: -- and section, which covers

Cap-and-Trade recommendations. So JUST to reiterate, as part of this sort of specific set of recommendations, we want to underline that CARB must prioritize rules and regulations to achieve direct emissions reductions. And that focus and priority on direct emissions reductions will reduce our reliance on mechanisms that enable local pollution, like Cap-and-Trade.

1.3

2.2

To reiterate that, the more we put in place real climate solutions towards those direct emissions reductions, towards moving us towards a full coordinated phase out of fossil fuels, the less we need to rely on accounting gimmicks like Cap-and-Trade.

So that's the first sort of recommendation here that priority on direct emissions reductions and that Cap-and-Trade, based on the EJAC recommendations, does not qualify as a direct emissions reduction. And so part of this piece is just a strong urge that CARB treat Cap-and-Trade as a backstop measure.

Given the unpredictability of the carbon market, which I'll speak to next, CARB should plan for direct emissions reductions to account for the entirety of reductions necessary. If needed, Cap-and-Trade can then be used to close any gaps and bring further reductions, rather than sort of being represented as a centerpiece of the State Climate Strategy to achieving our greenhouse gas

emissions reductions targets and being relied upon as an assured way of meeting our targets. So that's the first piece.

And just to substantiate that, the Independent Emissions Market Advisory Committee Report, which has been gaining recent attention, and there was a hearing in the Legislature not too long ago to discuss this report, confirms and substantiates many of the environmental justice claims that, you know, we have been uplifting that offsets and free allowances are essentially accounting gimmicks. And that's enabling polluters to continue to concentrate pollution in working class communities of color like those we organize. And so banked allowances are undermining the potential to stay under the cap, according to the report. And so our EJAC recommendations uplift that report in its findings.

Next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

AMEE RAVAL: So related to that last recommendation, we here point to the need as a foundational recommendation to conduct a thorough analysis of the cap needed to meet the State's 2030 goals. This is a necessary step to provide certainty that Cap-and-Trade will lead us towards actual emissions reductions and especially necessary given the sheer number of banked

allowances that the IEMAC report highlights.

1.3

2.2

Additionally, there are recommendations related to Cap-and-Trade include closing loopholes that are preventing direct emissions reductions, specifically this includes a eliminating offsets and free allowances, which are policies that give cheap and free opportunities to avoid reducing what is coming out of smokestacks.

We also recommend establishing no trading zones in environmental justice communities, and that facilities and air pollution hotspots be restricted from using allowances to demonstrate compliance. Instead, they should be subject to regulations requiring direct emissions reductions.

And finally, we point to the need to increase evaluation and data transparency. During the Scoping Plan process and evaluating alternative scenarios, CARB should conduct further analysis on particular industrial sectors, such as refineries, to determine whether facility— and industry—specific emissions increases, as demonstrated in the recent OEHHA report, are the result of the state's reliance on Cap—and—Trade. And we also push for data on facility— and company—specific allowance allocations and trading patterns to be collected and publicly released.

And so that concludes our set of recommendations on Cap-and-Trade, and I'll pass it to the next speaker.

NEENA MOHAN: I believe that's me.

Next slide, please.

2.2

--000--

NEENA MOHAN: Thank you. Yeah, so I'll sharing out some of the top-line recommendations on behalf of the manufacturing subgroup, and also my colleagues on the subgroup to chime in as well, if you'd like to. So I want to preface by naming that, you know, this was a particularly difficult sector to develop detailed recommendations for, given that the EJAC was not provided with the necessary information to do so.

So, for example, our subgroup did request specific information and technical assistance from CARB regarding things like demand trends for all the different industries in this broad sector, alternative technology portfolios showing things like associated cost estimates, and scalability, and overall technology readiness levels, but we didn't receive that level of detailed information that we would have needed in order to make more specific recommendations.

However, given all of that, we did make recommendations that we believe can be applied across a variety of the various industries within this broad sector of manufacturing and rooted largely in the two biggest contributors of GHG emissions in that sector, which are

the fuels that are used to power these facilities, as well as the materials that are used to produce their final products, including how those materials are processed.

So if you take a look at the slide on the left side, you'll see that we recommended that in order to address all of the fuel-related GHG emissions, we want CARB to implement incremental, industrial, electrification, to reach 100 percent clean energy sources by 2045. And this was an analysis that was pulled from the achieving carbon neutrality report and was already done there. And so by clean energy, we really mean renewables and direct hydrogen combustion using truly clean hydrogen, not hydrogen from things like biogas, for example.

To address the materials and process emissions, we recommended that CARB fully consider existing alternatives. You know, I've been outreached to by a lot of folks in the private sector and in academia, and there are a lot of different alternatives out there that need to be seriously looked at and considered, and really channel investments into research and development in pilot projects to identify how can we reduce the maximum level of emissions directly.

Next slide, please

2.2

NEENA MOHAN: So additionally, you know, beyond the fuels and the materials, that are overarching environmental justice considerations and recommendations that we came up with that we believe should be included in the Scoping Plan, and again applied across the manufacturing sector more broadly.

1.3

2.2

So these are really -- the first is, you know, the idea to transition to alternatives now. As I mentioned, there are existing technologies and alternatives out there. And as we continue to do more research and public education around these, you know, emerging innovations, we can start to implement what already exists and start that transition now in EJ communities.

The second overall recommendation is to ensure that we are achieving significant direct reductions from the dirtiest polluters, so really focusing on how we can eliminate emissions first directly before turning to other mechanisms of doing so. And even in trying to reduce emissions directly, how can we ensure that we aren't doing further harm, right, regarding any switched fuels or new technologies that might be implemented to the communities that are living next to these facilities.

And additionally, in order to address the pollution issues as we figure out how to transition the

sector, can we do things like apply best available control technologies in the interim?

The last overarching recommendation speaks to what my colleague Connie was discussing earlier, which is this idea of ensuring that as we clean up this sector, we are providing adequate support for impacted workers and communities through something like a just transition. And ideally we would like to see a timeline and schedule of action steps included in the Scoping Plan for movement towards all of these recommendations, which we personally believe are readily actionable.

So that concludes my update on the manufacturing sector and I'll pass it to Dr. Garoupa White.

Thank you.

2.2

DR. CATHERINE GAROUPA WHITE: Hi. If we could go to the next slide, please.

--000--

DR. CATHERINE GAROUPA WHITE: Good afternoon.

Dr. Catherine Garoupa White. Thank you Colleagues. I

want to start by acknowledging the difficult process that

we went through meeting with workgroups, attending regular

EJAC meetings, and also my San Joaquin Valley colleagues

working together on our successful community engagement

event.

Despite tireless advocacy, the San Joaquin Valley

still suffers from some of the worst air pollution in the United States, especially concentrated in our neighborhoods where Black and indigenous people, and people of color live, and low-income neighborhoods.

2.2

Change for our communities will not come from more studies or deferring to local action. Change must come from the Air Resources Board and the integrated effort of all agencies co-powered with environmental justice communities and leadership. CARB's current analysis distributes changes equally across the state, which does not address the disproportionate impact to overburdened places, and, in fact, it sets up a likely scenario that pollution will continue to be concentrated in our environmental justice neighborhoods. CARB has been given clear legislative authority to prioritize public health, and direct emissions reductions at the source are the most effective.

The valley has been helped most by direct measures that came from this Board to regulate diesel vehicles reducing greenhouse gas emissions, while also reducing harmful co-pollutants that impact public health. That regulation is ensuring that all parties, truck drivers, and nearby communities benefit.

Effectiveness of those direct measures is well beyond market mechanisms like Cap-and-Trade. There's no

measurable way to determine what reductions come from Cap-and-Trade versus other measures. And despite that, many researchers, like unfortunately OEHHA's recent report, look at any emission reductions and assume that Cap-and-Trade is partially responsible for them without any evidence to support that claim.

2.2

By grouping heavy-duty vehicle standards for mobile sources with Cap-and-Trade, OEHHA's report failed to answer a fundamental question, how, if at all, can we quantify any measurable impacts Cap-and-Trade has had on emissions? The real question is not whether emissions have gone down at facilities as a result of current regulations, but whether they have gone down as much as they would have with stronger requirements and what the social cost and benefit would have been, if we had taken that path.

For example, would workers be getting more training in new and emerging sectors of our economy that will grow as clean technology use increases? What would have been the direct and indirect job impact of retrofitting old facilities with new lower-emitting equipment.

More importantly, would our workers and communities be more healthy, live more productive lives, because they weren't living with continued air pollution

and accelerating climate impacts. The social cost of carbon is intended to identify these costs and benefits, and should direct us to make the most strategic, most beneficial choices for everyone, not just industry.

1.3

2.2

While we're talking about industry, let's talk about workers. Workers in Kern County have to wear monitors on them to alert them if toxics levels around them are unsafe and go home to families that are just as impacted by air pollution as all of the rest of us. It is not okay that we continue to ask them and their families to trade good health for good jobs. There are projected to be three times as many jobs in oil well remediation as there are statewide in oil extraction, a win-win for all of us.

Continuing to use cost of -- for compliance as any benchmark, which is often the justification for Cap-and-Trade, negates the impacts those choices have on our community's health. AB 197 said we should prioritize direct emissions reductions and the social cost of carbon, because direct emissions measures are the path forward to better health for everyone.

The Community Air Protection Program does not remove the obligation to examine all of our state's climate policies through this lens. It did not override the language in AB 32, SB 32, or AB 197. Thus far, it

failed to result in tangible emissions reductions or State policy changes to improve air quality for our most impacted communities.

2.2

So as I wrap-up, I want to highlight just two of the overarching recommendations on public health and social costs, and name that there are many more in the document that has been shared with the Board and that is available to the public, highlight here on this slide.

Number one, there should be independent third-party analysis of the effectiveness and impacts of past lands, not the State assessing the State. Number two, the Scoping Plan should involve robust analysis going forward, including ground truthing quantitative data and modeling with qualitative and on-the-ground realities. The data that we generated at our community engagement event in the San Joaquin Valley, that the EJAC has been generating, and that community-based organizations working in EJ communities across the state are generating should be incorporated and included as a part of the analysis.

In conclusion, we must move from the CARB staff's framing at the recent public health and social cost workshop of quote unquote ensuring that burdens don't increase, instead to reducing burdens and increasing benefits for environmental justice communities.

Thank you for the opportunity to present and I'll

pass it to the next one.

1.3

2.2

ASHA SHARMA: Thanks. I believe I'm next. We can go to the next slide.

--000--

ASHA SHARMA: One more, I think.

--000--

ASHA SHARMA: Perfect. Great. So I'll go ahead and kick us off with the natural and working lands recommendations and pass it off to Jill. So our first recommendation is pretty straightforward. Concrete pesticide use reduction is still not included in the Scoping Plan or in the natural and working lands modeling to date.

So our first recommendation is just to include an ambitious pesticide reduction target. I'll let you go ahead and read the specific numbers that we're recommending. Our argument for including this target is twofold. One, many pesticides are petrochemicals. They're made with fossil fuels and they release greenhouse gases across their life cycle from production, to transportation, to application, and long-term soil effects.

Second, we need this target as an important guardrail to prevent any inadvertent incentivizing of increasing pesticide use through scoping plan activities.

The natural and working land scenarios continue to emphasize climate-smart agriculture practices and the CDFA Health Soils Program, neither of which include pesticide reduction.

However, when you change one management practice on farm, it can also affect other management practices. For instance, climate-smart practices like increasing no till or reduce till production of agriculture, which is currently included in the natural and working lands modeling, are associated with increased dependency on herbicides on conventional industrial firms. Therefore, at the same time that other practices are being incentivized under the Scoping Plan, pesticide reduction must also be included to prevent any such increases on dependency on pesticides due to changes and other management practices.

Next slide, please.

1.3

2.2

--000--

ASHA SHARMA: Secondly, we think it's critical to evaluate the public health and equity outcomes for all agricultural management strategies that will be included under the Scoping Plan, given agriculture is a top pollutant of air and water for many environmental justice communities across California. And importantly, the Scoping Plan currently is only modeling carbon in the

natural and working lands sector. This has the potential to lead to incorrect results as practices that may decrease carbon emissions or increase soil carbon sequestration can increase other types of greenhouse gas emissions like nitrous oxide. Therefore, CARB is not looking at the complete picture without including these other greenhouse gases.

As part of this, the Scoping Plan at a minimum should model the full life cycle of greenhouse gas emissions from fumigant pesticides. This is a particularly toxic class of pesticides. That has been a top concern of EJ communities that we work with and has been associated with extreme increases in nitrous oxide production after application.

Next slide, please.

1.3

2.2

--000--

ASHA SHARMA: And our third recommendation is to adopt or organic farming in and all scoping plan scenarios. And I can say, we appreciate and recognize that organic farming has now been incorporated in all modeling scenarios in the natural and working lands sector, but it hasn't been included at a very unambitious modeling target. The maximum feasible extent that CARB plans to model is 30 percent of all cultivated agricultural acres in organic agriculture by 2045.

If staff used our recommended rate organic agriculture should make seven -- make up 70 percent or 80 percent of total agricultural acreage by 2045, or alternatively, it should make up 30 percent of total agriculture by 2030. It takes years to build up soil carbon, so these unambitious targets barely scratch the surface of the contributions that organic agriculture could have to carbon neutrality and the reduction communities need in chemical pesticide use now.

Therefore, we need much more ambitious modeling targets.

And I'll pass it over to Jill.

JILL SHERMAN-WARNE: Did it freeze?

No.

1.3

2.2

All right. Next slide, please.

--000--

JILL SHERMAN-WARNE: So as you know, I'm new to the group and so these recommendations come from individuals who are working on this prior to my introduction to it.

And while I felt reluctant, because I felt that there isn't -- there hasn't been enough -- there hasn't been any consultation with tribal communities in the state of California. So I think one of the recommendations is to collaborate with native nations for traditional land practices. And pictured here is Ms. Robins with her child

and she is doing a cultural burn. Burns we know -traditional burns would alleviate extreme wildfire events
and also is a part of our traditional stewardship of the
lands for medicines and materials that we use in our
everyday life.

So when we think about fire and the use of fire to manage lands, we have to think of fire being the medicine for the lands. And there's a long history that's been corroborated since the first Jesuit priest came to California to recognize the state of the lands of California as being pristine and beautiful, and much of that is because of the symbiotic a relationship between tribes and the land itself.

Next slide, please

1.3

2.2

--000--

JILL SHERMAN-WARNE: So when we think about tribes, you know, I have the burden of having 109 tribes potentially depending upon me to advocate for them. We need to assess and report on the impacts to past and -- to past and future Scoping Plan activities on tribal lands and State lands, such as State Parks.

This map I wanted to give to everyone to -- it's made by EPA to identify all the tribes, the 109 tribes, that exist within the state of California. And I think we need to be very mindful about when we think about, oh,

yeah, there's 109 tribes. And my husband always says, yeah, we're the, "oh, yeah, people", because we say, "What about tribes", and then someone says, "Oh, yeah, what about tribes". We are an afterthought. And I challenge any one of you to think -- to name 10 tribes. Just name 10 tribes quickly. That's where we're at.

And this is why the Governor created the truth -the Truth and Healing Council, because there is a
persistent lack of engagement with tribal communities
within the state on all state efforts, and not just the
Scoping Plan, but in every -- at every level within every
agency. So I don't want you to feel that I'm picking on
CARB. There is a persistent lack of engagement with
tribes.

Next slide, please.

1.3

2.2

--000--

JILL SHERMAN-WARNE: So we need to seek non-traditional input. These are pictures of my son and myself. And when you are a part of the landscape, the picture -- one picture is when a fire was just starting -- a wildfire was starting. You can see -- I can see across the river. This is our traditional fishing spot for my family of the village of Me;dil'din, which is where my father's, father's, father's father has been for over 10,000 years.

And during the height of the wildfire, we could not see or our traditional village. We could not see across the river. My father was actually taken to the hospital because, although we had seven HEPA filters going 24 hours a day in the home, he still was having a very difficult time breathing.

1.3

2.2

And we rely on the landscape for our subsistence. I'm not just fishing because I want to show you, you know, yay, I have these two fish. Actually, if we took a picture of me when I was 12, you would see that these look like minnows. These fish that I'm holding up are much smaller. They're not -- you know, obviously I an -- they're not a hundred pounds. They're very small. And I was holding them up, because I'm like, yes, finally, after two weeks of fishing, I got two salmon. So that's -- you know, that would have been something I could have caught when I was 12 in an hour, but nowadays, it takes two weeks to do that.

Up above is my son holding a sturgeon, which is prehistoric fish that lives in our river. And believe it or not, this is a baby sturgeon. This sturgeon is probably less than 15 years old. It's not yet able to produce offspring. And then you have my son with a eel skin drum. He caught an eel -- a seal in his net and quickly made sure that he used every part of it. So we

ate ell -- he dried and smoked the seal blubber, and then has the drum that he sings our traditional songs on.

2.2

And so I think that -- you know, I provide these pictures to you to show that tribal people are still very much engaged in a subsistence lifestyle, having a relationship with the environment, depending upon the environment for subsistence. And it's not just subsistence, it is a lifestyle. We traditionally ate seal, but because it's been so many years since we've eaten seal the way we did in our past, people are a little, you know, reticent to eat seal. And so it is definitely -- I love fish. It's definitely an acquired taste, and I will still continue to eat it. As, you know, my son prepares it, I will definitely eat it.

But I think we need to look at non-traditional technical input, the people who are living in the environment, who are using the environment, and who depend upon the environment for their livelihood and for the sustainment of their traditional life ways. We can't forget our tribal communities. We have to remember how they may be impacted. And as the previous slide showed, we have a number of those in the Central Valley.

I regularly drive through the Central Valley and let's just say, you know, it almost looks like that smoke picture some of the times. You know, the air quality is

really horrendous. And I also challenge our Board members to go out to the communities and see for yourself the impacts that they're facing, whether it's an oil refinery or electrical grid overhead -- over the head of their home that really, once you've been out in the communities, you really begin to understand why people become impassioned about what they're experiencing.

And I look forward to the Board allowing the tribal communities to be engaged to their full extent, so that we can provide to the Board input that you might not otherwise have. And that's why I really believe that the work that we're doing here is important, and I really appreciate everything everyone has done to support me coming on as a new Board member.

Thank you.

2.2

MATT HOLMES: Am I up, Alex?

It looks like it. Thank you, Jill. Is everybody still with us? You've got blood flowing. A little Colin response is all right. We can hear you. Let us know you're breathing out there. So I --

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Move your hands.

MATT HOLMES: Yeah, yeah. Exactly. It's going to be okay. Nobody will get hurt.

COLIN MILLER: Yes.

MATT HOLMES: We're all on Zoom.

COLIN MILLER: Yes. Yes.

MATT HOLMES: Okay. Good. Thank you. So look, they gave me the overarching issues category, because there's lot of -- there's a lot of things that we need to talk about in the Scoping Plan. And I thank my colleagues for laying out in detail these specific scenarios, but the over -- oh, can we go to the next slide, Alex.

Thank you.

2.2

--000--

MATT HOLMES: So there's a -- there's a ton of issues. There's a lot of conversations that still need to happen, things like, you know, cross-sector accountability, interagency partnerships, water rights, landback strategies, you name it, but for the most part all we talk about is carbon capture and sequestration. It sucks all the oxygen out of the room. And that's most because we received really a dearth of information on the topic, while some of your communities are actually fielding active project proposals.

And so people like me, you know, probably aren't helping the process coming up with conjecture and being worried about what's happening to my community. Oh, I'm going too fast for translation. Sorry. Helping the process, but, you know, I really -- I really can't take responsibility for that. We've been asking questions for

several months and I feel like this secretive issue has cause a lot of its own problems. So I think we heard people sort of challenge the CCS issue, and I'll get to that in a section -- a second about like potentially narrowly applicable strategies and all that, but I want to point out that there's a lot of overarching issues that we haven't had a chance to get to, because of the accelerated timeline, and because a very pertinent issue to all our lives has really jumped in on the Scoping Plan process and nobody seems really ready to handle that.

2.2

So let's go to the next slide, please.

--000--

MATT HOLMES: Some of those overarching issues that we haven't dealt with enough are things like, you know CEQA reform. We need radical CEQA reform. We need Radical inclusion of communities. There's a lot more to be said about that. We know that there are people out there trying to gut CEQA right now. CEQA matters to CARB. It matters to this Board and it matters to any future that the Scoping Plan hopes to have.

Land back, we just heard from Jill on that. You know, this is not a virtue signal. I really want to impress to people that this is a practical call to action to learn from millennia of a balanced relationship to the land, that we need to stop mocking and we need to start

interrogating it and seeing how we can actually use indigenous practices in public lands. And there are private land partners that are open to this as well.

2.2

I think -- you know, I'm always frustrated by lots of government agencies who try to figure out how do we address this very complicated public health, scientific issue. I have like trauma from my AB 617 process. You know, a little literacy around racial equity would accelerate all of these conversations. It's no accident that Black infant mortality is what it is. It's no accident that there's a clustering of pollution sources in low income communities of color.

Racial equity could really accelerate the benefits of incentives and investments, if we just recognize the history happened and maybe I wouldn't have to run on so many fool's errands with community air grants in the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, if we just believed our own eyes and saw that white people got a head start and we can expect more from what people and a little more discomfort from white communities and be honest about we're incentives need to go.

There's another issue that's really close to my heart and it ties directly to this Climate Scoping Plan. You see that pretty blue and brown slide in the corner -- picture in the corner of the slide, where is the water

conversation? You know, we have a 60 million year old piece of green infrastructure that is designed to sequester carbon. It's designed to grow forests and we've broken it. You know, it would not be -- it would not be hyperbole to say that, you know, the Department of Water Resources is planning against you CARB. There are other State agencies that are planning to continue dangerous and unauthorized exports of water to bad ideas that increase methane production and decrease that infrastructure's ability to sequester carbon.

2.2

You know, it really is a -- it really is a -- it's like there's somebody at the dinner table who's not helping pass the food around. They're stealing from the plan. So somebody has got to bring together these interagency groups. I want to thank you Kevin Jefferson and Connie for calling that out, because you have -- you have other State agencies, some of which are doing really cool stuff that could be helping the Scoping Plan and some of which are not helping. And that's a leadership conversation that little old Matt can't handle. That happens at a higher altitude. And so that's something that -- you know, that's the leadership that a Governor pulls together.

So I'll move on from that to the one issue that I'm kind of prepared to talk about that's not CC -- CCS,

and that's short-lived climate pollutants. Say it with me, short-lived climate pollutants are out there. There's a bunch of things that rapidly accelerate global climate instability. You know, they response -- you know, while CO2 is responsible for 55 to 60 percent of global warming, you know, that means there's still 40 and 45 percent of short-lived climate pollutants that are out there.

Black -- you know, black carbon, tropospheric ozone, methane, hydrofluorocarbons, you know, these pollutants have -- you know, they may not have the same lifetime in the sky, but they're also something that we can do something about now.

2.2

So, you know, the Scoping Plan, I know it's -it's kind of got a myopia for CO2. And we seem to have a
fantastic relationship with that one molecule. But
anybody that wants us to die on a cross of carbon needs to
be exited from this process. We have to be talking about
methane. We have to be talking about black carbon and all
the rest. You know, we can really shave the warming
potential of California's emissions, which would -- which
would really help us get to a place where we don't have a
fire sale on how to survive global climate instability.
And we don't have to like give money to the people who've
painted us into this corner to bury their pollution
underneath poor communities.

You know, it may be that like -- and I want to challenge everybody to consider that the IPCC recommendation included a very like qualified, nuanced recommendation that may be CCS is a part of the future. And they really said that that's the last worst strategy that we should have to turn to.

So with that, let's -- you know, let's move to the next slide and I'll just say that --

--000--

MATT HOLMES: -- the Department of Water
Resources needs to be reined in by the -- by the global warming conversation and I hope somebody can help me do that, because they -- they've injured my community and many other communities.

So moving right along.

2.2

So to the -- to the topic that's really occupied the overarching working group's imagination, this is CCS, CCUS, ECR, you know, whatever you want to call it.

It's -- it really raises a lot of questions about what we're trying to do here. You know, everybody should know that currently the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and the CCS protocols at CARB allow for enhanced oil recovery, like, you know, there's sort of a -- there should be real cognitive dissonance in everybody's head at the idea that we're going to -- we're going to incentivize with climate

change dollars pulling more stuff out of the ground to set it on fire. I just -- you know, that -- for that to -- for that to remain included in the CCS protocol will be devastating to the credibility of an agency that stands behind that.

2.2

So, you know, moving along, I'll just say that there are some things that we can do. I mean, obviously, no enhanced oil recovery, no prolongation of the fossil fuel industry, no increases or perpetuation of pollution in overburdened communities. But say there's some Fantastic scenario where you want communities to support this strategy, we've got a lot of trust to build and we've got a lot of information to share. So I'll just point you to the slide and say, you know, there's California there's the map of poverty and pollution, and those are the communities that are targeted with CCS projects. And so it's hard for us to really think creatively about this process when it's been so secretive -- or secretive.

So the first step is disclosure. You know, what are the proposals in California? Why can't CARB tell us those? These communities have a right to know and they also have a right to refuse. To the second point, you know, what is the -- what is the purpose of CCS? We're told it's going to save us all from global climate change, but we see in the stats on all of the projects that have

unfolded you this far and they're not hitting their numbers. They are not going to get us to a place where we're staving off global climate instability.

2.2

So what really is the purpose of this? Like, you can tell me it's to get somebody out of contributions to Cap-and-Trade and then I'll start to take folks seriously, but right now, it looks like we're funding compliance for very large companies that count their money with "B's" and "T's". And I'm in a California where people can barely put food on the table or go to the doctor. So it's very frustrating to imagine transferring wealth to already wealthy people.

So I'll move on to number three. I already covered enhanced soil recovery.

Say there is a scenario where we're talking about things that we need, you know, cement, glass, steel. There's no climate resilient strategy that doesn't involve at least one or all those. I can accept that. I am not a puritan about this issue. My house is on fire and I will reach for a fire extinguisher. I just want to know that I own it, and that it works, and that it's been maintained well. And so I want to know more about the narrowly acceptable applications of carbon capture and storage.

You know, I think -- I think environmental justice communities and advocates have been put into the

corner that there are certain factions in California that have said it's a non-starter with these guys. They're all puritans. Don't even bother talking to them.

2.2

They're not talking about me. I'm up for all sorts of engineering solutions, because I have very little faith that we will make that cultural reforms that we need to be more sustainable with this planet. I've met us. We've got a long ways to go, so give me a practical, reasonable engineering solution that I can trust, and I'll be the first guy to help you flesh it out.

But I'll tell you, I need that strategy to address this map, this super racist map with racist outcomes. The idea that we would pay a company -- like the people that approach me in my community, we're going to pay some company that has international shareholders that's headquartered on the other side of the company, we're going to give them money to bury their own pollution. What's going to happen when something goes wrong? We all know something goes wrong with pipes, right? OIl and gas pipes leak all the time. If you're a homeowner, you know I'm telling the truth.

If you remember the oil and gas lease -- leaks on the South Coast last year, you know I'm telling the truth. And you should also -- we should also be really frank about the fact that this is an unproven strategy that

really has some like ivory tower academic support for this, and that there's a very big difference between the scientific controls laid out in a national lab versus like industrial applications.

Like, if you've ever done a contract, most people make money on contracts by cutting corners. And we can absolutely expect people to cut corners on the CCS process. Whatever -- you know there's a host of permits. Nobody has cleared up who's in charge of that. There's no sequencing to that. And still, projects are getting kicked off in our communities already. So somebody is asleep at the wheel on this project and. You know, if there's a way for it to move forward, I want it to move forward in a CARB house, where I know how to get ahold of people and there's some sort of transparency around it.

But again, it's kept --

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Hey, Matt --

MATT HOLMES: Yeah.

2.2

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Just real quick, just a time check. I wanted to make sure that can get to the next --

MATT HOLMES: Yeah, totally. Am I --

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Just giving you a flag.

No, it's not done. You've got a lot to share. Thank you.

MATT HOLMES: Yeah. Okay. Yeah. No problem.

Let's see, well I can skip some of this. Let's see, participatory research on this one is a major deal. When we meet with a national lab, we say did anybody ask you about acidi -- acidification of the estuary or groundwater? They said, golly, no. Those are good questions. So anyone endorsing CCS is doing so in an uninformed way. You have not received the worst case modeling scenario, so anybody behind this cannot say that they've made an informed choice about carbon capture and sequestration.

And then I'll just try to close on this issue by saying that map right there is the truth. That map --well, part of the truth, right? It's where poverty and pollution is. And these projects are headed to that exact same place. So the strategy is very likely to continue or even increase pollution in those communities. And from where I sit, that's a crime. Can we go to the -- you know, if you want to build one in Montecito, you won't a peep from me.

Can we go to the next slide, please.

--000--

MATT HOLMES: This is just a little more CCS information that I'll try to move through a little bit more quickly. Those are pictures of how they want to move it around. These are the undiscussed aspects of how

carbon is going to come to low-income communities of color. They want to float frozen super critical CO2 down the Delta to my community. I think that's a terrifying like movie scenario that somebody needs to think through more.

2.2

I'll say that, you know, why they say it has to come to the Central Valley based off an inherently racist data set that oil and gas exploration companies never had the temerity to explore for oil and gas in wealth white communities.

And then the final questions I'll just close with is, you know, who's going to watch this? This is a publicly funded process. Are we going to -- are we really going to allow implementing parties to provide the hundred year oversight, because companies don't -- you know, they all last a hundred years, right, or are we going to have a public agency do that? And then are we going to be frank about the public agency trust that we have with people like CalGEM.

So let's move to the next slid. I can skip some of that.

--000--

MATT HOLMES: I just want to remember for the overarching issues that the point of the plan is to globe -- is to halt global climate instability. AB 32 is

not just about CO2. It is absolutely about global warming and the threats it presents. I appreciate the focus on CO2, because it's a tough nut to crack. But I think we've missed the big picture in a lot of these, and we can focus on short-lived climate pollutants.

2.2

I'll say that the geography and demography of these processes is -- looks like we're set to overburden already overburdened communities, and that's a crime in so many different ways. If we want to be seen as a leader, California, if we want to go around the world and talk about the California model, we better prove that we can do a good job here in California, because the global south isn't responsible for this. And why would anybody take us seriously, if we're going to leave out the most poverty impacted region in the country, and increase its burden, and advance its already advanced mortality rates.

And so with that, I'll clam up. Thank you.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you so much, Matt.

Let's go to the next slide real quick.

--000--

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: There is a little bit more. I want to give a real deep gratitude to all of the presenters. Great job going through that and pulling that together.

We are going to hear some final process

considerations and concerns from our Co-Chairs and then probably want to take a short break to digest, have Board members jot down some questions and thoughts, and go from there. So I just wanted to let you know where we are.

2.2

So Martha Dina and Sharifa, who's next on this one?

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Well, it's Sharifa and Jill that will, but I'll be go through --

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you, yeah.

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: -- the -- one, as you can see, and we presented a lot, we have -- we have felt very rushed through this process to meet the deadlines and incorporating the necessary community input. That is still something we ned to continue to do. That's why we've said these are preliminary. And, you know, one of the things -- and, you know, I will -- reiterating what Jill said, it is really hard to do this knowing that you're not doing it the way it should be done. And that has weighed incredibly heavy on us, because we want to be in right relationship with all of our environmental justice communities and indigenous communities. And this process has made that incredibly difficult. And so I'll hand it over to Sharifa, do want to -- and Jill.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Yeah. I can just say that, yes,

I -- excuse me -- we can say that we're also concerned

about language access -- language and access justice for non-English, non-Spanish, and disabled Californians who want to participate in this process. And so we need CARB to step up and offer full translation of all written and spoken materials as part of the EJAC process. We also need for CARB's community-facing workshops to be explained at the community level rather than at the practitioner level.

That being said, we still need access to the technical information pertaining to the plan, but it should also be translated in response to local level concerns, meaning that we want the community to be able to understand how the Scoping Plan's policies will address their local issues. Folks don't really care about what CCUS is, but they care about that CCUS address the air quality in my community or any other suggested remedy. And that being said, I want to hand it over to Jill just to speak more about some concerns we're having with engagement.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

JILL SHERMAN-WARNE: Hi, everyone. As you know, the -- Governor Newsom -- excuse me, I'm tangled up -- Governor Newsom created the Truth and Healing Council through Executive Order N-15-19. And the whole point of that document, and I believe the Truth and Healing Council

itself is to really examine the relationship, examine processes that have existed within the State, that have prevented persistently, consistently to not engage tribes, whether it's the history or it's happening in the present day.

2.2

When I first came on, you know, I get to come into the conversation saying, I don't know that I can vote yes on the work that has been done already, because there wasn't tribal engagement. And as all of you know, my appointment to the Board, and I was really surprised, because during the whole process nobody had told me that I would be the first indigenous person appointed to the Environmental Justice Committee after 16 years. That's almost a child. You know, that's -- and that's not to say that people in the past didn't -- because I understand that -- the lack of knowledge that everyone in this process has had about how to engage tribes.

We -- I didn't even learn my own tribal policy history until I got to college. I thought that the things that had happened to my grandparents only happened to Hoopa people. I didn't know that there was this whole effort out there, a concerted effort by the government, that we -- we all should be mad at the education that we've received, because it has kept us ignorant. We are all ignorant. And I'm not blaming anyone, but I -- you

know, I am uncomfortable with the idea of moving forward so quickly without even trying to attempt to reach one tribe out of 109.

2.2

Like let's call one and yet they are engaged.

CARB has provided grants to tribes who are operating clean air monitoring stations. None of those were contacted.

They are operating funding mobility grants, shared mobility grants. We're doing outreach on clean car incentives. So, you know, the processes are there. And I I'm going to say it again, because I have to be on record to say, I think this process needs to be extended, so that we can engage tribes and other disadvantaged groups in this process to the full meaning of it.

And I -- and I understand. You know, I didn't even realize that the EJAC, over the -- over the last 16 years has just been, you know, disbanded and then rebanded with new people. And what does that do? That does nothing but -- and I give kudos to Martha for bringing that up, like we need to have consistency. So having consistency and engagement -- and that's -- you know, that's my job. Maybe they'll be like why did we appoint her. We -- you know, we need to be having this conversation and not just going oh, yeah, thanks. Thanks for that, because, you know, that doesn't -- that doesn't do anything.

And I'm ready to roll up my sleeves. I'm going to roll my sleeves up here to make sure that we get this done. And I can't understand that, okay, let's go ahead and get this draft out, so that we can have something for tribes to look at and our disadvantaged communities to look at, so that we can start those conversations with, you know, the steak so to speak, not just cake. We want to -- we want to eat and have a sustained meal together to really discuss the impacts that they should be conscious of, because sometimes in our -- in our dis- -- in communities that don't have wealth, you know, right now, Hoopa, my tribe that I come from, has a 66.2 percent poverty rate. Families are living below the federal poverty.

2.2

And so how do you take people who are just trying to live every single day, just trying to put food on the table to be engaged in these processes? We need to do that. And I think we can do better. And I think together -- like, the team that you guys have here with the EJAC, man, I don't even know if I'm up to their caliber. They are amazing and they are all doers. We've been on meetings at 7 a.m., and 7 at night. You know, like everone wants to roll and do their sleeves.

And so CARB, you have an amazing opportunity to make this Scoping Plan the best one yet. Never mind 20,

you know, 13, 2017, but we can make 2022 the best Scoping Plan that has been done to date, but I think we need to have some more tools. And I'm here ready to work, do what I can, but I have the weight of 109 tribes sitting on my shoulders, and I need to do the best job that I can to engage them and to speak up for them, because their voices have been lost in this process. And we wouldn't have to have Governor Newsom doing a Truth and Healing Council if it doesn't really mean that we're working on healing the system, because the system has been broke to this point.

2.2

And I see -- I just signed up for a thing, a meeting because, you know, they're taking comments right now. Well, one of my comments will be that in these State processes, we don't take the time to truly engage the communities who are the most vulnerable and the most open to impacts. You know, I'm with my colleague there, let's take and build and oil plant in Beverly Hills or something, you know. Like, let's put something down there, because then we'll hear about, right, but it doesn't matter if it's, you know, in a rural area where nobody goes except for the people who live there or who are indigenous to the area.

So, I really -- I really would like CARB Board members to consider extending the Scoping Plan process. I know you've been asked before and it's kind of fallen on

deaf ears, because, you know, I'm just coming on new, and I think if we really want to make this the most robust system and something we can all be super proud of, that just -- that's what make sense.

2.2

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you, Jill.

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Thanks. I think the last thing, you know, I think you've heard it said in multiple ways with every work group, we want to be real partners with you, in getting to real emissions reductions, having a conversation about what technologies and tools are there that are rooted in justice. I was speaking to a group of green chemists the other day or a couple weeks ago, and I said where's the justice molecule in the work that you're doing to find new processes?

And I'm going to say it here, right, the core of the Scoping Plan has to be achieving justice and figuring out how to do that, moving away from -- and actually, what we're want -- you know, we want that interagency collaboration. We think it's a statewide issue to solve and CARB has the power to convene those groups, so that the recommendations that we make that are about pushing justice, when we understand that it's sometimes beyond the scope of the Scoping Plan, but it is not beyond the scope of CARB to help us achieve racial justice in our

communities and actually bring real solutions that make it easier for us to breathe and ensure that we actually have a transition to a new economy.

2.2

Mill it be easy? No. But we have no choice.

And our -- and we need a scoping plan that does not continue to treat our communities like sacrifice zones.

And we want to partner with Board -- the CARB staff and Board to get that done, so we can chart that path toward regenerative -- a regenerative economy that repairs the harm that's been done. Yeah, I'm going to stop there, because I could go on and I know we need a break.

Thank you Co-Chairs. Thank you EJAC members for sharing.
Thank you, Board members for listening. I see some of you have been taking notes. It's wonderful to have this space today. So I do want to acknowledge that we've been here for a while, heard a lot of great information, great perspective.

And what we're going to do next is open up that dialogue space. So let's get our other needs met too.

Let's take a 10-minute break. I'm hoping that's good enough. And then we'll come back at 6:05 for our discussion. I will be giving a two-minute warning when it's time to get ready to come back into this space. And you'll hear that if you leave your sound on. So go ahead

and break.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

CARB team managing the in-person and the other webcasts, I don't know if you have any break slides. It's okay if you don't. I'm sure you have something figured out. So appreciate your support on that.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yeah, we do. Thank you. And we'll also just remind everyone to make sure that your -- if you're going to step away from your computer, just make sure that you stay on mute with your video off, but don't leave the webinar, and then we'll see you soon.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you.

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(Off record: 5:56 p.m.)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record: 6:05 p.m.)

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: All right. It is 6:05. So I wrote -- invite you all to come back into this space here. If you could turn on your cameras, let us know that you are back, we will get back into this swing of things.

All right. I see some folks coming back.

22 Wonderful.

I had a successful break, ate half a burrito, and I'm ready to go. Shout out to Rey -- I and tacos that I'm sure were missing. I'm in Huron.

So here's what we have planned for the rest of our time on this item. We really want to spend the next hour or so at least, start there, reflecting on and discussing what's been shared so far. We know that Board members just received the full list of preliminary recommendations in the last day or so, so we don't -- you know, don't expect anybody to have fully read or digested all of them, but really reflecting on some of the highlights here that EJAC members have shared, most on the substantive recommendations for the Scoping Plan -- for the draft Scoping Plan, as well as some of the other process considerations and concerns that are coming up.

2.2

So we have some framing questions to initiate the discussion. I'll offer those as a place to start. We've been sort of thinking through these. And the first one is really, you know, for Board members to share with us any questions you all have about the recommendations, about what you've hear, any immediate kind of clarifications or things that stood out to you that you want to -- want to raise.

And then for EJAC members to think about, this is a, you know, kind of an ongoing question, how do you EJAC members want to see the recommendations incorporated into the plan? What would successful incorporation look like? Thoughts about that.

And then really thinking about this work that, you know, EJAC is doing along with the Board, along with, you know, CARB staff, really for the Board and EJAC members to consider together what are key ways to enhance the Scoping Plan process between now and the completion of that process to better serve EJAC members, in creating and sharing their advice. So speaking to, you know, what are some ideas of enhancing the process to address some of the concerns within the constraints that are present?

So my suggestion is that we start with Board member questions and sort of be in that space for about 15 minutes or so and then decide, based on the conversation, if we want to shift to some of the other questions that we've raised. Happy to check in with both the -- you know, with Chair Randolph and our Co-Chairs from EJAC to see kind of where we are in the conversation and where we need to go.

Is that all right with folks?

Yes?

1.3

2.2

Okay.

A quick reminder to please use raise hand for Board members, and EJAC members, and I'm sure we've all used it. Sometimes we forget. So if we want to get that started.

And I apologize if I refer to any of the Board

members with an incorrect title. I'm still learning and really glad to be meeting some of you for the first time.

2.2

So I see we've -- so I'll give you all a second again. So any questions from Board members. How do EJAC members want to see their recommendations incorporated, and then what are key ways to enhance the Scoping Plan.

All right. I see we've got Kevin Jefferson and Chair Randolph hands are up. If you don't mind, shall we go -- I'm going to just go with the order that we -- they got raised, is that okay?

We'll go there first. Thank you. Go ahead Kevin Jefferson.

JOHN KEVIN JEFFERSON III: Hello. I just am looking for a little verification on offsets. So the American Carbon Registry has 536 projects registered. And 31 those 536 are in the state of California, so meaning 505 are out of the state of California. I just want some verification on how could organization like GreenTrees, LLC receive six million credits -- six million plus credits for doing an 89,000 acre project in the state of Arkansas? And, in particular, how does that reduce carbon in California or help with the health -- or help increase or decrease the health benefits in EJAC communities in the state of California?

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thanks, Kevin. I'm just

make -- want to make a note that we do have a notetaker. Our technical writer is here today, so I'm going to note that down that question about verification on carbon offsets, if we don't get a chance to get to it directly today.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

JOHN KEVIN JEFFERSON III: Thank you.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Chair Randolph.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thanks. I was just kind of wanting to key off the initial question that you raised about sort of how to reflect the EJAC recommendations in the plan. And in particular, I sort of -- I liked Connie's framing about, you know, CARB's ability to kind of, you know, highlight an issue, convene around it, but also a recognition that, you know, something like a significant fiscal step, like developing a fund, would be a multi-agency process that would need to include the Legislature.

And so I guess I would just love to hear any thoughts about how best to kind of reflect the interest on the part of the Board to kind of highlight various issues and how -- what the best way to reflect that in the Scoping Plan itself.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you. All right.

I see -- oh, goodness, I'm going to get -- is it Senator

```
Florez? I'm so sorry. What did I write down?
1
             Senator Florez and Supervisor Serna. Let's go to
2
    you, Senator Florez.
 3
             FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Can you hear us, Senator
 4
5
    Florez?
             I think we -- are we frozen? Can you hear us?
 6
7
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ:
                                  No.
8
             FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Oh, there it goes.
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: We're having trouble
9
   hearing you. The connection is unstable. So let's go
10
    ahead and let's see if we can get your connection worked
11
    out real quick.
12
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Can everybody hear me okay?
1.3
             FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Go ahead.
14
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: (Inaudible).
15
16
             FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS:
                                      Nope.
17
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: You might want to try turning
    off your camera and see if that helps.
18
19
             FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Yeah. All right.
                                                         Let's
    come back to you in just a minute. Let's try turning off
20
    the camera and then I'm going to go to Supervisor Serna
21
    and then we will come back to you. Apologies.
2.2
23
             Go ahead.
             BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Great.
24
                                          Thank you.
             So first of all, I just want to start by saying
25
```

thank you to everyone who gave us some very, very thoughtful testimony today. I think it gives us a lot to consider. And quite frankly, I think it reflects not just the current effort to, you know, make reference to and help shape a sound Scoping Plan this time, but I think over the years --

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Yeah. Let me try -BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Someone is not muted.

Sorry. Who's not muted?

1.3

2.2

All right.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Sorry to interrupt. I'll just note that --

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Do I still -- do I still have the floor.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yeah. Sorry, there was a -- his mic was muted, but somehow the feed was still coming through, so it's still on you.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Okay. Thank you.

Anyhow, I just wanted to first express my appreciation for all those that have taken the time to give us very thoughtful comments.

I did have one very, I guess, very specific question. I suppose it's best addressed to Richard and he can designate the appropriate staff perhaps to respond.

But I thought the comment about pesticides and the use of

petroleum in the production of pesticides was extremely enlightening, and in terms of, you know, the life cycle of pesticide impacts. And I think that's something for us to consider. And so I would like, in terms of the notetaker's responsibilities tonight, to at least register that question in terms of what CARB can and cannot consider or should or should not consider relative to our charge concerning pesticides, but speci -- more specifically the suggestion that because of the composition of pesticides, we perhaps do have that responsibility.

Thank you.

2.2

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you.

I've noted that and it's -- at any point in time, we want to directly respond to that, there -- just let me know.

All right. I see CARB staff team on the webinar. If we could go ahead and take down Kevin Jefferson's hand, that would be helpful. And then I see Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: So I was going to wait a bit, but Supervisor Serna sort of beat me to the punch about pesticides. So I'll start off by echoing his comment that I'm very impressed with the work that EJAC has done. You know, each sector presentation was thoughtful, researched, and, you know, I know you've had

zillion meetings -- public meetings, what was it 17 or whatever, and there's been a lot of meetings aside from the public ones. So I really appreciate the level of commitment from EJAC to try to make this Scoping Plan more environmental and social justice focused.

2.2

But specifically on the issue of pesticides, as I've said, you know, multiple times at CARB meetings, you know, I've been concerned about the health impacts of pesticides in California for a long time. I've, you know, published multiple -- multiple papers about pesticide use in agriculture, particularly in the Salinas Valley where I was fortunate to be able to do some collaborative research with colleagues at the School of Public Health at Berkeley.

But I also had a grant to study pesticide drift into Fresno. It was misinformed because there actually wasn't much pesticide drift into Fresno, except for, you know, peripheral areas of Fresno, but I understand how important pesticide drift is in the actual agricultural lens in the San Joaquin Valley and other parts of California.

So it's a problem to start with that I hear a lot about from communities, and especially communities that I work with in San Joaquin Valley. And while I don't think the Scoping Plan is the only way to address this problem,

I think it's an important enough problem that the Scoping Plan should address it. And I really like the suggestion to look at a life-cycle analysis, as Supervisor Serna just said. That fits with how we look at, you know, Low Carbon Fuel Standard designations. And I think a life-cycle analysis is something that the Board could apply to pesticides -- chemical pesticides.

2.2

And while I'm on the pesticide topic, I also appreciated the focus on trying to change the way we do agriculture in California. You know, we're a -- we're the most important state in the country in terms of agricultural production. It's a big part of the California economy. But just like we're transforming the transportation -- trying to transform the transportation sector, the power generation sector, I think we need to be trying to transform that agricultural sector as well. You know, for both climate change and air quality -- climate change mitigation and air quality reasons.

And as I've said, I'll just reiterate, the public health impacts of pesticide production and unnatural agricultural production are huge. And I don't think we can do this overnight, but I think we should be trying to move towards a more organic and regenerative approach to agriculture production in general, but specifically I think we should be pushing for -- I mean, I agree we're

pushing for stronger organic agriculture targets, and to try to incorporate a life-cycle analysis with regard to chemical pesticide production.

Thank you.

2.2

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you. I see Ms. Takvorian, that Chair, and then again Senator Florez hopefully your sound is back on.

Let's go ahead, Ms. Takvorian first.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thanks, Alex. Thank you, so much for facilitating for us tonight. I'm sure it's not an easy task, so thank you.

Also, most importantly, really gratitude to the EJAC. I just want to say this is an enormous amount of work that's really broad, deep, and visionary. And to have hit all of those parameters in one document, a draft document, is pretty extraordinary. And I think that it — the recommendations are overwhelming in a lot of ways, which I think is a real reflection and is completely understandable given the climate and air quality crisis that we're currently in.

So it's really true that all of the things that you've addressed are in need of being incorporated into -- I don't -- I don't know if they all need to be incorporated into the Scoping Plan, but they all need to be addressed in one way or another.

And I see that some are quite specific, like accelerating transportation mandates, increasing equity investments, including pesticides in the Scoping Plan, phasing out fossil fuel, but others are representing the significant paradigm and value shift that addresses environmental racism, and the legacy of neglect that our communities continue to struggle with.

2.2

So I think we often think of the Scoping Plan as very high level. What we really need to incorporate in some way or another all of those direct measures, because if they're not incorporated even as considerations in the Scoping Plan, then they don't get addressed in future years. I don't think any of us think that these issues are going to be resolved in the Scoping Plan. The way I think about it is they're getting framed up and put into the Scoping Plan as viable measures that have the opportunity to really achieve the goals that we -- that we need to achieve.

So I have the -- I want to jump to, or my question is, what is the way that we will corporate these recommendations, because the first thing for me would be that I really think we have to evaluate the 2017 measures. Some of these recommendations that EJAC is making are -- are similar to ones that were made in the 2017 Scoping Plan from EJAC. And then there are a series of others

that were incorporated. And I don't know when we'll see what -- what the status is of those measures and what kind of impact they've had in the Scoping Plan. And I think that we really need to see that.

And the other is that I really agree with everything that Board Member Serna and Balmes have said about pesticides. I want to lift up transportation as being something that CARB has been very active in in regards to light-duty vehicles and edging into heavy-duty vehicles. And I think the call is for us to really accelerate what we're doing in those areas, but also to transition to clean transportation systems that include transit.

So I'm hopeful that we can see a full analysis of how that can really help us to reach our goals, by reducing VMT and not relying on passenger vehicles for everyone, whether they're -- whether they're electric or zero emission, or not. I think we really have to invest in transportation systems. And that really hasn't been addressed, I think, by the Scoping Plan.

There's so much more in the Scoping Plan to say, but I just -- I think that's one of those very major issues that needs to be incorporated into a significant way.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Chair Randolph, do you want to yield to Senator Florez for a moment?

CHAIR RANDOLPH: (Nods head.)

1.3

2.2

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Okay. Thank you. Go ahead, Senator Florez.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Sure. Then I'll go after him.

Sounds good.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Hi. Is that a better connection now?

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Yes.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS:

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Great. Well, I wanted to beat my colleague Diane to the punch, but I guess I didn't, so I'm going to have to echo her comments, Dr. Balmes. I do want to say one different thing that has not been mentioned, and just for other members of the Board to consider, first and foremost, I want to thank you for your work, as Diane mentioned. It's very powerful. It's a good narrative. I was really appreciative of bringing in the Native American aspect of this, and the working lands aspect of this now being combined in some sense, not being separate. I thought that was super powerful.

But I will say that elephant in the room, you folks have really called out, and that is our Cap-and-Trade system, and the issue with allowances that, in some sense, are so old. And I would really like to

see -- I don't know if I'll be voting for a Scoping Plan that does not call for some reform on our Cap-and-Trade Program. And I think that you called it out very, very well.

2.2

And as I read the report, at least in draft form, I was very happy to see that you called for no trade zones. You know, these are things you're drawing lines that I think make a lot of sense. I think what you're really telling CARB is that we're long overdue in terms of doing our own true analysis of the allowance issue, of the -- you know, the things that we're doing in some sense in the program itself. I really thought you did a really good job of -- not only in your presentation, but I think in the narrative within the document of laying out some concrete things that we ourselves as an agency should look at.

And I -- and I go back to, you know, look the RECLAIM program at South Coast, the Fresno issue with our Central Valley Air District, you know. In some sense we've really played a role in helping folks reform how they look at their Cap-and-Trade Program, the mechanisms for it, but we -- I still feel we can do a much deeper dive and a much better job on looking at, you know, our own program.

You know, I, too, worry about the offset program.

I, too, worry about the oversupply of allowances. I think recommendations of calling for, you know, in some instances, no trade zones, and more importantly looking at, you know, some of the abuses in some cases. And there was a hearing in the Legislature. We can't ignore that. There was a report. You know, we need to put a marker down somewhere as an agency and us members to really look at our own program in a very serious way.

2.2

The rest of the recommendations are amazing.

They're great. But I feel like for me, the thing that really stood out more than anything was your ability to, in some sense, say that the Scoping Plan with its reliance on the Cap-and-Trade Program -- I think it's mentioned in the narrative in your presentation of kind of -- you know, not using it as a last resort, but as the only resort, and then somehow filling it in with some of the recommendations that we all agree on. I think that was very powerful. I hope the Board takes that very seriously. We do have to find a way to incorporate those reforms, I think, in this Scoping Plan.

As Diane said, if not, we're just going to be keeping adding things on from 2017 to 2022 and it's going to add up to something I think we're not going to be very proud of. So I just want to say thank you for calling it out and really putting it right in front of the Board that

we have to really look at this issue of allowances and offset systems straight on. So I just want to say thank you for making that front and center.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you, Senator Florez.

Chair Randolph.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIR RANDOLPH: I guess as I -- a couple things. As I think about how we think about incorporating the recommendations, I think, you know, it's -- it's helpful to think about it as sort of different kind of levels of follow up that would -- that would be reflected with regard to each recommendation, right? Some of these recommendations, like Cap-and-Trade for instance, are squarely within, you know, CARB's wheelhouse. It is our responsibility to review the issue. And as I think we talked about a little bit at the last meeting, you know, we do have to take a look at the analysis of the -- of the program as it is currently structured and develop recommendations that would both be, you know, sort of regulatory steps for ourselves to take, as well as recommendations for potential legislative action, because so much of the program is currently laid out in legislation. So that's one example that's very -- kind of very clear within CARB's wheelhouse.

Then there are others, as I was mentioning

earlier, that are really going to be more about how do we highlight issues, how do we identify issues, you know, sort of what Board Member Takvorian was talking about where you -- you name specific strategies like the importance of transit and ways to support transit as a strategy for reducing VMT.

2.2

But at the end of the day, that's going to be a -- a convened conversation that, you know, we can identify in the Scoping Plan. We can identify some strategies, but at the end of the day, as we try to identify where we will be achieving GHG reductions, we have to also be identifying where the potential uncertainties are. And so for strategies like that, you know, we will need to be able to be clear that, yes, we support this as a goal, here are some ideas about how to do that, but it is going to require a step beyond just what this agency can directly implement.

And so I think a lot of about how -- what is the best way to frame that in an actionable way, because there are issues, strategies that were called out in the 2017 Scoping Plan that we did do a lot of follow up. We did take a lot of action on. And there were others that we identified at a high level that we haven't identified as much of a strategy to -- to complete them, because we don't -- we don't necessarily -- aren't necessarily able

to implement the specifics around those goals.

1.3

2.2

And so trying to unpack the best -- it is going to be really important to try to unpack the best way that we can articulate the -- and reflect back the hard work of EJAC, but also that's -- recognizing that it's just going to necessarily be at a different level of detail than our own programs.

And the other thing I would say is I think there is an opportunity within our own -- further issues that are within our jurisdiction, that are a part of our own program to really lay out a roadmap for what the next steps are. I was in a conversation with Martha Dina with the last week or so, and she said, you know, I want to know what's coming next with some of this stuff? And I think that's a complete -- it's an excellent question, right?

And so as we think about finishing the plan itself, moving towards the next steps, I think we need to be really intentional about identifying what those next steps are and being clear about how we're going to be implementing what we need to implement. And I think that's another reason why our commitment to have an ongoing environmental justice advisory structure is so important, because I think that this is not the beginning of the conversation, and the completion of the Scoping

Plan is not the end of the work. It's a start. And so we need to make sure that this -- the level of engagement gets better, and gets consistent, and stays consistent.

2.2

So those were just a few high-level thoughts. I also kind of wanted to make sure that, you know, to the extent that folks have specific questions of staff or anything, I just want to make sure that we have the opportunity for, you know, any responses.

I think we kind of -- I think we had a fair amount of time to talk about the pesticide issue, so I'm not sure if Supervisor Serna still needs his question answered, but I just kind of wanted to encourage you, Alex, if -- you know, if somebody wants a specific question answered to go ahead and pause for a moment to get that answered.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you.

So I saw -- I just want to check in on the Q&A.

I did see Ms. Hurt, her hands up, and so I just want to
make sure that that didn't go unnecessarily. And then

Supervisor Serna, did you want to have a direct answer at
this time?

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: I don't want to interrupt the flow --

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: -- of questions and answers

here. I think maybe at the end, if --

2.2

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: I mean, I assume our staff are taking copious notes about our inquiries and we'll get answers at the end.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: And then I see Dr. Pacheco-Werner's hand up as well. Ms. Hurt --

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yeah.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: -- if you want to put your hand back up, just to let us know if you still had a question, that would be great.

Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: She's having internet troubles, so she may come back on and then raise her hand again. Yeah.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: So I guess I just want a little bit of clarity in terms of like what's next in terms of these recommendations, because the caveats talk about like the modeling, and -- and so, you know -- and then obviously like the crunch for time and the ongoing engagement. So if someone could just tell me like are we going to see updated recommendations? Is there a timeline for that? Yeah, just trying to -- because these had caveats, so is there a point where we will get some

without caveats, and if so, when -- when would that be? Thank you.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Great. Thank you, Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

Do we want to go to that question talk about the process and where we're headed?

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Well, I -- we were hoping that we would finalize these at the next EJAC meeting, which gives -- and I'm not remembering the date. So, Sharifa, feel free to interrupt me if I'm saying anything that's not right.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: April.

1.3

2.2

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: April, yeah.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: It's not the 1st. It's like the very beginning of April, because we canceled the one at the end of this month in favor of this one, just so we have time to cool off, you know.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: All right. I can -- Chair Randolph, did you have a direct response to that.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: I guess I just also wanted to add a point about process that -- that, you know, I'm hopeful that the engagement will continue. You know, the finalized recommendations in April, but also, you know, the Board will be considering a draft in June. So there will be an opportunity to have a conver -- well, an

opportunity to have a conversation about modeling. There will be an opportunity to have a conversation about the draft in June. There will be an opportunity for the community engagement meetings that are going to be happening during this time, and then more, and so more comment during that time as well.

2.2

So I guess I just wanted to make sure that this is -- it was clear that this -- this work is far from completed.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you.

If folks have other comments, I do want to just share that this round of recommendations were always intended to be preliminary to go into the Draft Scoping Plan, because CARB is going to go and do that process, right? And so then there's a whole other round of final recommendations based on the Final Scoping Plan, once that is released in May.

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: And I do -- I know that, you know, we want -- we are going to be -- you know, we still have more to say about the modeling and there will be -- something comes out in five days, and we'll be definitely looking at that. We want -- I think one thing that will be really critical is ongoing and continued access to CARB staff who are working on this. And, you know, in the spirit transparency, we really need to know

if there's already staff working on regs that are related to what's all -- you know, sort of -- I mean, there's been a pretty direct and clear direction of the Scoping Plan.

And we -- you know, our anxiety is that people are already working on regs, and that we don't know, right, because -- and this is this issue of transparency and being told ahead of time so we are not blindsided by things. Having that information is really critical.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: All right. I see a couple other hands, so I see Mr. Kracov and then EJAC Member Kevin Hamilton.

So Mr. Kracov, you want to go.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yeah. Hi. Thank you all so much for this. Just a couple observations. You know, first, I want to thank the EJAC. You know, 15 meetings and all the incredible work, and passion, and diligence that you're demonstrating with these recommendations, and how orderly it was all presented in the document, and how orderly and thoughtful it was presented tonight. It's just really fantastic for this organization to have that kind of feedback, and to have that kind of participation. So thank you so much for this.

You know, I'm also pleased that the Chair has committed to continuing the EJAC, even after the Scoping Plan is potentially adopted by the Board later this year.

So as we actually implement the rules and the measures in furtherance of the plan, EJAC is going to still be around, right, Chair, to monitor those, to continue to give us feedback. So, you know, this process and the work of EJAC is going to continue on past the adoption of the plan. And I think that's a terrific initiative and it's something we're really going to benefit from as we move forward.

1.3

2.2

The other thing I want to commend our staff for putting, you know, so much time and effort, Chanell's team, the folks at Industrial Services, in supporting the EJAC's work. I know there's a lot more work to do and it hasn't although been easy, but supporting this and helping the EJAC, and also I believe, you know, CARB staff and CARB have stepped up to help fund some of the community meetings that EJAC is advocating for in terms of community outreach.

And so we're trying our best to improve this process this time, both with our terrific staff work, and continuing the EJAC's work even after the Scoping Plan, and also I believe in terms of people power and also financial assistance with regard to the EJAC outreach meetings, which I know were very important. So I want to just make a couple of those observations, Chair.

I'm a new Board member. There's several of us

here. This whole process is a little overwhelming, at least for this Board member. Haven't lived through this before. So I see the EJAC document. I think somebody counted it up. It's 177 recommendations. You know, I haven't lived through a Scoping Plan process before with all the scenarios, and all the different sectors, and how the whole thing works out, and so sort of how the sausage is going to be made on this.

1.3

2.2

So, you know, trying to learn. I know this Board member and many of the other Board members are committed to continue the process, and learn, and figure out what the best way to sort of, you know, approach and tackle this thing is.

Really appreciate the comments of the other Board members tonight, and, you know, trying to sort of prioritize some of the thinking and not get lost with 177 recommendations. And that's going to be a continual challenge. We do have a lot of major issues to discuss in this Scoping Plan. I do appreciate Member Florez's comments that we should tackle, even the toughest ones, and have an honest and open discussion about how to improve these types of programs.

And I ran into Assembly Member Garcia today, the author of AB 617 and also AB 197. You know, and that reminds me something that I think is going to be a tether

for me as I look at some of these difficult issues, which is that, you know, 197 says that we're going to be required to considle[SIC] -- consider the social costs of the emissions of greenhouse gases and prioritize direct emissions reductions at large stationary sources of greenhouse gas emissions. So when it comes to some these difficult issues we're going to be tackling with, I'm going to be, as a lawyer, looking to make sure we're complying with AB 197, which says we are to prioritize direct emissions reductions.

And I want to make sure that folks know that's going to be a perspective that I'm going to be looking at, as we move forward for the remainder of the year, and continue to learn, and move forward towards adopting this Scoping Plan.

So thank you, everyone, for the great participation tonight, thank all my other Board members, Chair, and staff. I think we're really working well together. I look forward to assisting and doing my part to continuing this good working relationship. And I look forward to continued collaboration through the remainder of the year.

Thank you, Chair.

1.3

2.2

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you.

Kevin Hamilton and then Ms. Hurt.

thank, first of all the Board, for taking this time tonight to meet directly with the EJAC. For me, it was one of the highlights of the previous EJAC in 2017, where I felt we had that opportunity to shore -- sort of come together and share our ideas and thoughts. And I really felt after that, that we had an actual relationship versus prior to that, where I -- we weren't quite sure who we were talking to or about what, whether or not it was going to be heard. I'm absolutely sure now that it's at least going to be heard and I thank you for that tonight.

2.2

Thank you also, Mr. Kracov, for mentioning the direct versus indirect. You know, the OEHHA report was mentioned by Matt earlier. And for those of us who have been hanging around this for a while, we've been repeatedly frustrated by the fact that we do not seem to be able to get reports of directly emitted climate emissions, only through the co-benefits as it's being called I think incorrectly, as we're not quite sure even about that, of the criteria Pollutants that are reduced in those same facilities, often, at least from my observations and poor information I suppose, due to regulations about them, rather than climate regulations, Cap-and-Trade, or participation in other credit schemes like LCFS.

So I think it's -- it's critical that we know, not that we think, or that the calculus says that these emissions are being reducted -- reduced, but for the sake of the planet that we know that they are actually being reduced. And so we need to do a lot better about measuring them and measuring what happens with carbon once it leaves them.

1.3

2.2

And that brings me around to the CCS conversation. I think as a whole, the EJAC hasn't completely opposed CCS. It's the process restoring it that has been more of concern than the fact that we might try to. And so in examining that technology, we find fault in the fact that the technology that would guard that storage, and determine whether it's being effective, in fact, especially with underground storage of the gas, whether or not it's actually leaking back out again is —it's just not there.

And so, you know, there's -- there's nobody guarding the door. And so we don't know if it's cracked open or not and we're not confident in that, and I don't think anybody should be.

But the problem lies in the lack of information. And in the committee, one of several that I'm on that worked on that, we repeatedly asked for information about the storage and strategies for it, and storage that some

industries are claiming in things like con -- concrete, and trucks, and steel, and, you know the provide us with the technical information that we need to make these kinds of decisions and either support, oppose, or at least have a conversation about it, and the state of the technology.

2.2

So it's so critical that when we ask -- if it's going to go in this plan, that should be available. It shouldn't even be a question. If it's being considered for the plan and pieces of it actually showing up, and, in fact, technology, it appears, again, I'm trusting in colleagues who have witnessed this firsthand that technology is even being, in some cases, permitted, if not deployed yet in anticipation of it, and industries are gearing up, because they're sure that it's going to happen.

And yet, you know, the request for information about it that's solid and reliable that shows that there's literature that supports that it's safe and effective can't be brought to hand quickly and handed off to the EJAC. That -- or anybody else apparently for that matter, but certainly for us on request as part of this work. So if we're going to take the time with all these meetings, and what my grandfather would have called the bum's rush to the final goal line here, then it's only fair that we get -- get the information that we need.

Now, I do want to credit staff with participating with us in that rush. And really, really it's a marathon, I'll tell you right now. You know, when you're strapped with two, three, four, five meetings a month that you didn't anticipate because of a compressed timeline that you didn't agree to, then it's pretty challenging to move that direction.

2.2

And so my last comment goes to the Board, because I -- and again, I apologize if this has already been said. I had a, as did several appears it appears an internet glitch, and had to restart my modem, and the garbage that goes with that, you know, has -- has the Board responded to Jill's concerns? I think those concerns are very legitimate that this group, this 109 tribes, and these independent nations that are also citizens of California as well, residents here, have their voices not been heard in this conversation? Yet, they'll be seriously affected by whatever happens here and are being affected today. So, you know, how do we reconcile that? How does the Board make that whole, make Jill's request whole?

I think -- and I'm only suggesting this, I wouldn't presume to make a -- to say yes this is true. This would work. But I think moving expeditiously to impanel this permanent EJAC to oversee this plan long term with full membership of that group of Jill and anyone else

she feels is suitable to join, could go a long way toward getting us there.

But again, she would have to comment on that one way or another. So there -- there may be a mechanism there that if -- if some folks agree then that could move forward. And I appreciate that the Chair in the last Board meeting called out that this is something that she was committing to and I thank you for keeping your commitment there.

But again, that specter rises, and won't be -won't be dropping at any given moment, until we see the
evidence of this moving forward and the commitment in more
than just words, because we've had those words before. In
2013, we had those words. I was there. In 2017, we had
those words again. I was there, and it's sad that I was
there --

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.2

KEVIN HAMILTON: -- for all of that, and I know that Martha was there five years before that to hear the same thing. And so -- and there was a technical committee as well that would have satisfied the need to bring members from all of the other agencies who definitely need to be included in these conversations. And it was formed and then went away.

And so instead of a technical committee, we're

now dealing with one of the divisions of CARB responsible for the Cap-and-Trade plan mainly, but this Climate Plan as well moving forward. So we are by no means engaging with other agencies in having those kinds of iterative discussions that could really inform this plan and certainly the EJAC side moving forward. I think that would be critical to have and we're just not given the benefit of that.

1.3

2.2

In the last round, at least in our work groups, we did have some folks from these other agencies like the CAISO for instance coming to talk to us. But in this present iteration in those work groups, we're not getting that kind of expertise again at the table for us to talk to and question. So while again I --

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you, Kevin.

Give me 30 seconds here at most. So while I thank again staff for this marathon run on -- with us and sticking with us here, and I really appreciate the EJ team for working to make sure that the community outreach is being funded, and I hope the Board will continue to support that and whatever decisions have to be made to support that, I do see these other things that are hanging around on us and are going to haunt us moving forward for the duration.

Thank you very much for your time tonight.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you, Kevin.

2.2

I just want to raise up the -- some considerations about the role of the permanent EJAC and what might -- how might that be supportive of some of the concerns that have been raised to, absolutely, and then again that -- the call for technical -- technical information, so we can form decisions about emerging technologies.

I see Ms. Hurt and then again Dr. Pacheco-Werner.
Ms. Hurt, Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you. And pardon the internet connection. Hopefully, I can stay with you -- through my -- all my comments.

Just first off, I want to thank the EJAC for the many hours of work under the compressed timelines. I've been sitting in on those workshops and have been really impressed with everyone's commitment to community and getting this right. I think we all feel the urgency to get moving, especially when we hear, you know, such dire reports from the IPCC.

I will state though that as much as this Scoping Plan is supposed to be big picture, it's not going into the fine details or regulations and actions. We still need to find more time or we need to figure out a different work plan to ensure that the EJAC can

authentically participate and engage.

2.2

And I'm especially thinking about our new tribal representative Jill Sherman-Warne, because I can understand, and I did see in the workshops where, as much as she wanted to participate authentically, she could not declare, yes, to all the recommendations without that time to really dig in. So I challenge all of us to think how we can work differently moving forward, but still working and moving forward with urgency.

I'm really glad that we've included more health impact analysis. I've said many times before, it's not good enough that the numbers show positive lowering of emissions, but it must be felt on the ground in highly impacted communities, and at what speed is very important for us to get right. Generations have been negatively impacted and how much longer must these highly impacted communities feel the impact of other's consumptions?

As we just received the recommendations last night, I just have overarching kind of thoughts about them, and have not really dug into the details, but will do so in the coming days. But I think there is a real intersection of land use decision-making. Local electeds, local air districts, there's a real opportunity for air districts to support the Scoping Plan work. And I even think about different counties' congestion management

agencies, such as C/CAG that I sit on, where a close integration into the work that we do locally and the work that we're thinking at the State level should be really factored into the Scoping Plan.

2.2

I support recommendations that center people and health and just again giving everyday relief from the traumas of environmental racism. I also am really supportive of a thorough evaluation of nature-based solutions, and I am -- have a close eye to those action items. I think we need to take cues and lessons from our indigenous brothers and sisters. When I was at the climate conference in Scotland, this was a really powerful conversation. And I'm wondering here in the west, as they say, how much we're really absorbing the possibilities and just changing culture around being more sustainable with our environment?

And I, too, am looking really closely at Cap-and-Trade. It's done the numbers where you see it lowering emissions, but what more can we do to refine it and to help those highly impacted communities? So I'm looking to the staff to see how the Scoping Plan will talk about different reformation pieces around Cap-and-Trade.

And, of course, just a thought of decoupling emissions from our economy. That's -- I mean, we're on track to do that, but is it fast enough, and how much more

do we need to do, so that we can definitely improve our future as it comes to climate change?

I have a daughter. And when I think about this Scoping Plan, I think we've got to dig deep about our children's future and what we're going to do about that. And the EJ -- the EJAC recommendations I think are that future that's going to dig deep. And so similar to Board Member Takvorian, I had some questions of how do we compare the recommendations from the last set of EJAC recommendations to that which we received today? Have they received an up or down? And if it doesn't work, why not?

And just more level table setting and transparency and accountability. I look forward to seeing in response to all the work that EJAC has done in these recommendations and how we figure them in successfully into the Scoping Plan. But I am thankful that we're all a part of this community and we're trying to make a difference in what we're doing. And I look forward to seeing again how locally electeds and local air districts can really support the Scoping Plan.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you.

I see Dr. Pacheco-Werner and then Senator Leyva.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yeah. Thank you.

You know, I realized listening to the conversation and some of the questions of -- and comments from the Board members that some of this we've kind of received in staff responses previously in previous meetings, but maybe haven't made it into like a written presentation, or, you know -- and so like I'm thinking about, for example, the Cap-and-Trade specifically. And I know, because I asked that question at the last update. And, you know, we were given, and I think it was specifically Rajinder who answered this question about, you know, what's going to be done in this Scoping Plan, and then what's sort of a timeline of external things happening beyond the Scoping Plan that are sort of like legislative and things like that.

2.2

And so, you know, I think that a lot of frustration is -- sometimes stems from miscommunication. And I would just think that some of those -- some of those things that we've already received answers to may be could make it into -- and I'm assuming they haven't. And my apologies if they have made it into formal presentation at the EJAC, but I think it would be really helpful, so that we -- we all get a sense of like what's happening. I'm thinking about pesticides as. Well, you know, the Chair has talked about, you know, ongoing -- and I'll turn off my camera, because my internet just -- another victim.

You know, I've been -- you know, we've been -we've gotten updates from the chair and others about like
ongoing coordination with other State agencies, but that
hasn't kind of made it into -- into like presentations or
briefings that I've been a part of that sort of has that
stuff written down. And I do think that as much as we can
have that whole picture of what's happening Scoping Plan
and beyond, you know, sort of that 3D view, it will be
helpful I think to give us the full picture and certainly
give the respect of the time for our EJAC members that
have poured already so many hours to really kind of get
what all of this is happening.

2.2

And maybe -- and I don't know, but I would hope, and maybe open up this space for EJAC members to engage in some of these external processes that are happening as well.

And so I do think -- I'd love to see some of that -- those things that we received in responses before more written down, and just kind of seeing -- understanding the external things that are happening. And I think that goes to -- to the Co-Chair, Martha Dina, you know, comment about wanting to know about what other regulations or what other things are sort of being worked on. Just that sort of like 3D picture of these issues that they're raising.

1 Thank you.

1.3

2.2

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you.

Senator Leyva.

SENATOR LEYVA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Good evening everyone. Before I make my brief comments, I just want to take a moment of personal privilege and congratulate Dr. Pacheco-Werner being named Woman of the Year by Assembly Member Arambula.

Congratulations, a well-deserved honor.

So I just wanted to kind of point out the differences between, you know, CARB is very data driven, which is incredibly important, because if we don't have good data, then we won't always make good decisions. But also I want to thank our EJAC presenters for being so passionate. And I think that we need to marry the two, and being data driven is very important, but also being passionate and really -- really knowing these communities and knowing the effects are so important.

So I just thought it was a very great stark difference today, and I just appreciate all of the work that EJAC has done, obviously all the work that CARB has done. And just I think we can both learn a little bit more from each other. We need the data, but we've got to be passionate about it as well.

And I'm very excited about the Scoping Plan. I

think some of the things that we have learned today can be helpful to us moving forward. And I just -- I want to leave us with one thing, let's be bold. Let's be bold, because if we reach for the stars and we fall a little bit short, we're still going to do great work. So thank you to everyone, every -- all the presentations were very well thought out. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

2.2

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Great. So we have been in discussion for about an hour. Lots of really great observations and reflections shared, some questions for -- that I heard Board members indicate for follow up and kind of, you know, where do we go from here, questions about what happens next with recommendations.

Definitely some good feedback on areas that Board members are -- where they're resonating with, right, and then some questions about -- you know, aware that there are some -- further areas to be explored.

I want to -- I'm just noting that I see seven folks in public comment and so just thinking about keeping kind of time for that. So I would suggest we go probably till 7:30, if that's -- if that makes sense to pause for public comment. I'll look for the CARB steam to kind of help me, you know, understand why you want to pause there.

But other -- other folks who want to get into the conversation, there's that question still that is on the

table about how EJAC wants to see the recommendations incorporated. I think Chair Randolph also, you know, emphasized that. So if other Board members or other EJAC members who haven't spoken yet want to get into the conversation, please -- you know, this is the opportunity to do so.

1.3

2.2

I see Supervisor Vargas. Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER VARGAS: Thank you. And I just wanted to say good evening, everyone. You know, I'm the newest member of the Board and I wanted to say thank you to all the EJAC members. I'm learning a lot. And thank you for the information. We received it and reading through it already to the recommendations

And so I just want to really emphasize that I really look forward to continuing to advance our collective environmental justice work. I really do believe that these are really critical times for us to —for all levels of government to really tackle our climate crisis at the same time we address our long-standing environmental injustices in our communities, those overburdened with issues that have impacted our health, safety, and quality of life. And I strongly believe that equity has to be a key consideration across all of this for all of our communities, especially those who are disproportionately impacted more than others.

You know, I think once this roadmap is established, once we've identified the issue that need to be tackled, and -- all levels of government need to help bring about solutions for implementation of the plan.

The -- all of us have to do our part, government, business, labor, and other stakeholders.

2.2

And I really appreciate the comments about the responsibility of government to integrate meet our -- do our part as part of the Scoping Plan. And I know that in our country, we're doing our -- we have created our own unique conversation and framework as an example of this. And so we are really tackling this piece.

And so as I'm thinking about it, and listening to, and reading a lot of the recommendations from the EJAC groups, I'm looking at -- I'm thinking about what does it look like as we're moving forward. Perhaps, as -- as we're doing this in terms of maybe a regional certification or something that looks at -- looking at our work being outside and being meaningful about different mechanisms to engage some of our local groups and EJ issues, so that they're geographically -- geographically concentrated as we're moving forward, right, so that -- so that any of our different entities have opportunity to really, you know, work together with our local EJ organizations to really address or work groups to be able

to address some the issues that have been brought forth as we're looking at different policies, and we're looking at big picture and long-term solutions to address many of the issues that are coming before us.

And so I think there's a lot of opportunities as we're moving forward. I really appreciated and I hear loud and clear our EJ community and our EJAC members what they're -- what they have mentioned and I know that there's been a lot of different presentations throughout the county. I don't -- throughout the State, I'm sorry. I know that it's -- you know, there are always opportunities to do more as we're moving forward.

But again, I really appreciate the thoroughness of -- and -- of the presentations and I have been diligently taking notes and will continue to review more and look forward to the meeting -- upcoming meetings as we move forward.

Thank you.

2.2

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you.

Martha Dina.

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: I want to start to address some of the questions about how to integrate it. And I think it's deeply related to the next run-through of the recommendations that the EJAC wants to do, so that we're actually giving you measurable time, you know, data, the

whole SMARTIE Goals, but also to give us -- you know, we understand that when we're asking you to do more integration and coordination outside of the agency, but in many ways, it also will require a lot more of these internal conversations, right, because many of us are involved in this process. We're involved in the 617 process. We're involved in the SIP process. And we know that all of those things together are part of a holistic way to get us to cleaner air along with the Scoping Plan.

1.3

2.2

So -- and so we want -- I think, you know, we want to think that through and then -- you know, but -- yeah, I'll stop there and hopefully if some of my other EJAC members want to save me from myself before I commit us to doing something we don't want to do. I'll stop talking.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you, Martha Dina.

I'm just highlighting, you know, not only are EJAC members involved in a lot of these other processes, but some of the very programs sort of that CARB does have jurisdiction over designed to address of some these issues, how do those things move forward and that's the intention. Yeah.

Implementation remains a key them, right?

There's a plan, but then what happens with the implementation of that plan?

Other ideas or responses to these two questions about recommendations being incorporated? You know, we've -- we've certainly been in discussion at the EJAC meetings about not being a appendicized. I'm sure the Board has heard that and thinking through, well, what does that really look like to integrate the recommendations. What are some meaningful ways for that to happen. And then, you know, are there other comments that folks want to think about the -- how to enhance this process?

Folks moving around I think that want to go up, or if you're having trouble with raise hand, if you just want to come off unmute, that's all right.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Perhaps now would be a good time to hear from the public.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Okay. Great.

CARB staff, go ahead.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Let me turn on -- I know it's probably helpful if I have my camera on in Zoom also so you can see me.

All right. So what we'll do is I will call -- it looks like as of right now, there's 13 people with their hands raised to comment. And I just want to give a reminder to everyone that if you can speak slowly and clearly for the sake of the court reporter and for the interpreters who are interpreting into Spanish. And then

if you are going to give your verbal comment in Spanish, please let us know at the beginning of your comment and we'll have a translator that's here to assist you and do consecutive translation.

2.2

Our first three commenters with their hands raised are Alicia Rivera, Kathleen Kilpatrick, and Suzanne Hume.

So Alicia, I will activate your microphone and then you can unmute and begin.

ALICIA RIVERA: Okay. Can you hear me?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can.

ALICIA RIVERA: My name is Alicia Rivera. I'm with Communities for a Better Environment and I'm an organizer here at the Port area of Los Angeles in Wilmington, where the majority of refineries are located, and working here with the communities that are really affected by all these pollution with asthma and respiratory, and that have suffered a lot through the pandemic, because of all -- you know, their immune system is compromised.

We really need a plan to phase out oil refineries people are really suffering from it, Cap-and-Trade, have not reduced emissions here at the source. And what happened with Cap-and-Trade is that the State and the cities have become dependent on that funding to even fund

the cleaner options. And so that is a false solution that has not helped environmental justice communities such as Wilmington nor will it help to have other false options, such as carbon sequestration or capturing, because that only allows these refineries and fossil fuel companies to make us feel that they are doing something about the greenhouse gases and the carbon, while they continue to pollute.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And so that is going to expand, you know, enlarge the suffering of people. And we're not going to be able to achieve the climate goals if we continue with false solutions. What we really need is not be dependent on fossil fuels. As we can see now, we are at the whims of the oil industry at the gas bump. And even -- you know, they keep us -- they keep gas and oil as a weapon. You know, and so we wouldn't have to be in this predicament if we had invested more money already in more electric vehicles and in expanding public transportation. People cannot afford to buy gas right now. Members tell me that they have to consider whether they're going to buy gas or buy groceries. And so if they want to use the public transportation to get to work, it's not reliable. So we know we definitely need a plan that would start to phase out fossil fuel industries and refineries.

And that's all I want to say. Thank you very

much.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Kathleen Kilpatrick, you can unmute and begin.

KATHLEEN KILPATRICK: Kathleen Kilpatrick. I'm from Watsonville Safe Ag Safe Schools and the Campaign for Organic and Regenerative Agriculture are the two groups that I work with. I also have 40 years in community-based health care and social and environmental justice work.

So I want to start with the public health perspective, that again the social and environmental costs of agricultural chemicals and pesticides have not adequately been assessed. Air quality is one aspect. We also see cumulatively that those interact with the climate impacts and they are multifactorial. They affect all age groups and multiple body systems. And that has impacts on both the health care system and also the educational and the employment systems. All those things need better measurements.

The impacts of the existing agricultural system fall disproportionately on ag workers and farm communities, and that's again the chemicals, the heat, the housing, health care, education. And those communities also need safety nets and workforce training for conversion to healthier methods.

I agree with Asha, full life-cycle analysis is

important and we want to make sure we don't replicate the flaws of Cap-and-Trade, where you emit here and sequester there by industrial methods that are untested and unquantifiable. And bearing in mind that agriculture has not had to be accountable for their emissions from day one, and that doesn't come from the tailpipe or a smoke stack, so we'll need new methods.

1.3

2.2

Transition to organic and regenerative agriculture has multiple benefits. And, yes, I agree, we need more ambitious targets. I also would support the engagement and input from our indigenous communities who have had years of generations of models for our agroecological methods. And I think that -- yeah, this needs more emphasis in the plan. I had to scroll all the way to the end of the plan to find the part that I was hoping to comment on.

And I agree with Dr. Balmes and some of the other Board members that pesticides are one aspect of this in transformation of our agricultural system are the big picture thing where we can sequester carbon, we can have a healthier environment, and we can speed up that conversion to a healthier future for our disadvantaged families and for everyone in the state of California. California can be a model for this kind of transformation. So please include it at a higher level.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Suzanne Hume. After Suzanne will be a phone number ending in 433, and then Richard Grow, and Evan edgar.

Suzanne, you can unmute and begin.

SUZANNE HUME: Thank you so much. Hello, everybody. My name is Suzanne Hume and I'm the Educational Director and founder of CleanEarth4Kids.org. We support the statements of the former public speaker Kathleen Kilpatrick about pesticides and California must be a model. Health soils are a climate solution and Cap-and-Trade must be reformed, and we must support our tribal communities.

Good evening Chair Randolph, CARB Board members, and dedicated EJAC leadership and community members. To our Board members, we are very -- to the CARB Board members, we are very encouraged by your comments tonight. A special shout-out to the beloved Dr. Balmes for your work on pesticides and efforts to protect workers, children, families, and communities. It chokes me up. Thank you.

And to Phil Serna and Ms. Pacheco-Werner, your comments about pesticides, thank you. And to Ms. Florez and Ms. Hunt[SIC], we agree, Cap-and-Trade must be

reformed. And to Mr. Kracov, yes, we must comply with the social costs of carbon and also focus on the public health impacts and emissions and work to reduce them. And to Mr. Hamilton, yes, we need reports of criteria pollutants. And thank you for calling out CCS, carbon capture as a scheme

1.3

2.2

And to Ms. Hunt[SIC], yes, we must dig deep for our children's future and the local air boards must support and participate with the plan. And to Ms. Tavorkian[SIC] for your decades of work. Thank you.

Looking into the 2017 recommendations is so important and focusing on public transportation strategies to cut emissions. And to Supervisor Vargas, excellent job with regional decarbonization. I was at the meeting last night. We must support looking at regional plans to address policies, long-term solutions, and environmental justice. And to Ms. LaVoya[SIC], we must be bold. Cross-agency strategies support and actions must take place. And to the CARB staff for all of the regulations, we're so proud to live in California. Thank you.

The conversations and decisions that are made by CARB directly affect the lives of children, families, neighborhoods, tribal communities, air we breathe, the water we drink, natural and working lands, wildlife, ecosystems, our climate, and our future.

Again, my name is Suzanne Hume. I'm the Educational Director and founder of CleanEarth4Kids, a 501(c)(3) non-profit that was started after I was poisoned by pesticides used on leased lands owned by the County of San Diego and this is continuing, where a synthetic toxic pesticides are used about 100 feet from people's homes near a bike trail where children play in a river.

1.3

2.2

The U.S. only bans 15 pesticides, Chian bans 51, the EU bans 175 pesticides. Cancer-causing and disease-causing pesticides float through the air, some 2.5 miles, some 50 miles. We need to do this. Please accelerate your targets for reducing synthetic pesticides by 25 percent by 2024, 50 percent by 2028, and 75 percent by 2030.

Thank you for the EJAC community, presentations, and the modeling. We echo the comments of Mr. Matt Holmes. Thank you so much for everything.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker is the phone number ending in 433. If you can please state your name for the record before you begin your comment and then you can unmute and begin. And you should have a prompt to -- oh, there you go. It looks like you're unmuted.

HARVEY EDER: Hello. Am I being heard?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, you are. And I'll

give -- since you're on the phone, I'll give you a warning when you have 30 seconds left and then when your time is up.

HARVEY EDER: Okay.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Please just state your name for the record before you begin.

HARVEY EDER: My name is Harvey Eder, E-d-e-r, and I'm the founder/director of the Public Solar Power Coalition going back 40, 50 years.

Also, on back 52 years, I was the first environmental studies student in the state in UC. Got a living Christmas tree in The White House (inaudible) in '70. And there is business we transplanted 10,000 trees a year.

Anyway, we -- some stuff that's really important to know about CARB, and South Coast, and EPA, and the Scoping Plan, the SIP, the 22 plans, okay. We put in the 2016 solar new deal in the '16 plan for South Coast working with Dr. Burke, et cetera.

We put in a hundred exhibits based on -- this was the '16 solar new deal -- based on the SunShot Program.

And I'm -- there's a need to educate here. The SunShot Program was from 19 -- from 2010 to 2020 under Obama, et cetera, to make solar cost effective, commercial, industrial, residential and utility, with fossil fuels,

lowest cost without any subsidies, six cents a kilowatt hour for utilities by 2016, did it by 2017. It's made everything cost effective. It was modeled after the Moonshot from the '60s, okay?

2.2

And for 30 -- in 10 years in events, they say they're going to get it down like two, three cents a kilowatt hour. And that was the market if you were buying it within the last few years. Okay.

None of this was analyzed, no due diligence, cover-up, obstruction, you know, waste, fraud, and abuse. Okay. We got run out of the Ninth Circuit Court on the 3rd of December of '19 by the Federal Marshals and the FBI trying to respond to the Federal Register, and the SIP and all this stuff. We put stuff in the SIP from -- in '19 in September the cover article of National Geographic, that Arctic is warming and melting

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thirty seconds remaining.

HARVEY EDER: Okay. There's twice the amount of

CO2. We put this in August 12th of the '16 plan. Nothing

was analyzed at all. It's in the Constitution. They're

violating your -- if you're a lawyer, if you have a public

office, you swear the Constitution. Science and the -- to

do the practical act is in there, and you're violating the

oath. You've never discussed this and it's outrageous.

And we're litigating the --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

2.2

HARVEY EDER: -- SIP, and all this has to be included. This is the controlling plan for everything.

 $\label{eq:board_clerk} \mbox{BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK:} \quad \mbox{That concludes your time.}$ Thank you.

HARVEY EDER: And equity is the issue.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Our next speaker is Richard Grow. Richard, you can unmute and begin.

RICHARD GROW: Greetings. My name is Richard Grow. I retired two years ago after 40 years at the U.S. EPA during which I worked on the air program and on several emissions trading programs developing guidance, protocols, carrying oversight helping audit the RECLAIM Program. And for the last 24 years on EJ and civil rights. And overall, a fair amount of experience working at the intersection of air quality, market-based systems, and environmental justice.

And relevant to my comments is a resolution you passed in October of 2020, five months after the murder of George Floyd, in which you, the Board, committed to quote, "Actively participate in changing processes, protocols, and policies within your control to ensure racial equity and social justice remains a key objective in the reduction of air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions".

My sense is maybe you don't always hear what

you're saying. And I don't mean in the resolution, but for instance in the February 24th Board update on the Scoping Plan in reaction to a request from EJAC asking for some more time and a better process, I heard Board members saying things like we just can't do quote what everybody wants. It just seems like we can't do quote every bell and whistle. And I heard nother Board member wearily referring to dragging out the planning phase.

2.2

And then when a Board member, one of the ones that made one of the statements above threw a softball to senior staff to explain why we don't -- why we don't think delay is a good idea, staff stated there just wasn't time for a quote unquote perfect solution.

I was kind of shocked to see the Board just let that go by, these EJ folks who just keep asking for perfect, bells and whistles, killing time. And then I heard two other expressions, senior staff saying that taking time to accommodate the request or leave everything in the status quote, as if there is truly nothing underway at CARB. Also, I heard it's important to complete the Scoping Plan to send signals, was the expression, soon to industry and investors as if CARB couldn't actually send a signal now, that it was, in fact, time to get serious and go to direct controls, move away from carbon generation they can cover up by burying it underground or offsite.

What's most hard for me to understand in all this signaling is how in the world -- what is the signal you send by continuing with this nearly completely uncapped, unregulated Cap-and-Trade Program when in which to quote one of your Deputy Executive Officers, There are truly no caps on any facility, no company, and not on any sector.

To go back to your resolution to ensure racial equity and social justice remain key objectives in the reduction of air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions, I recommend that you really rethink this commitment and see if you can live up to it. Listen to the EJAC, provide the time and the process changes they're asking for, and the resources, so they can do their part effectively -- part effectively -- excuse me -- and hopefully help you live up to your own resolution.

Thank you.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Evan Edgar. After Evan will Alma Ortega, Gary Hughes, and then Jane Sellen.

Evan, you can unmute and begin your comment.

EVAN EDGAR: Chair, and Board members, and EJAC members. My name is Evan Edgar. I'm the engineer at Edgar Associates. My clients are technology neutral and carbon neutral. We believe in life-cycle analysis as the most cost effective programs with the lowest carbon

intensity should be promoted by CARB. We produce organic compost and carbon-negative fuel.

CARB should not pick technology winners, but should be based upon the life-cycle analysis with technical documentation.

1.3

2.2

I will be filing comments with that technical documentation regarding the carbon intensity of ZEV batteries. Using the California grid, right now the carbon intensity is plus 25 to 30 for electricity.

Manufacturing the ZEV battery is plus 40 to 60, based upon several European studies. CARB has a goal to minimize leakage for non-California greenhouse gas emissions where CARB met -- where ZEV manufacturing the batteries is leaking about 40 to 60 carbon intensity in other places.

The Scoping Plan should recognize that ZEVs are with electricity is plus 65 to plus 85 and that zero-emission vehicles are not zero. It is disingenuous to have a tailpipe mentality.

Biden's White House report came out last year regarding the security of the minerals that go into ZEV batteries. It is from the Congo, to South Africa, to South America with cobalt. And the dirty secret about lithium batteries is the use of digging up these first nations with child labor in the Congo, and South Africa, and South America. Environmental injustice is happening

worldwide. The EJAC and CARB need to consider these impacts of environmental degradation and child labor practices.

Where is the environmental justice with ZEV manufacturing away from California? Where is justice for all?

We'll be filing comments on Monday. Thank you. BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Alma Ortega. Alma, you can unmute and begin.

Alma, are you there?

1.3

2.2

ALMA ORTEGA(through interpreter): Can you hear me?

(The interpreter communicated with Alma Ortega in Spanish.)

ALMA ORTEGA(through interpreter): My name is Alma Ortega. So I live in -- I live close to the Port of Los Angeles. I'm less than a half a mile from a couple of refineries in that area, the Phillips refinery. The Phillips gas and petroleum is always quite intense and it generate -- it causes for me headaches, nausea, and dizziness.

A little after moving to Wilmington here, myself and one of my children were diagnosed with asthma. And now, we have to constantly use asthma inhalers and other

devices to be able to breathe. We know what it means to live with health impacts because of the refinery and the Port. And since we are low income, these costs affect -- greatly affect our income. I think we need to replace our sources of energy that come from hydrocarbons and replace them with solar energy, wind energy, wave energy among other types of energies.

1.3

2.2

Sometimes I feel like we live in a hole. You look up and all you see is the port, the smokestacks, the freeway, and there's no helping hand to help us out. We can stop depending on fossil fuels. We have to invest in clean fuels, and clean transportation, clean vehicles to be able to protect our planet. And we also need to eliminate all the programs that enable the Cap-and-Trade system, so that they can pollute more cheaply.

(The interpreter communicated with Alma Ortega in Spanish.)

ALMA ORTEGA(through interpreter): And we also have to fix these fake programs like the Cap-and-Trade Program, which all it does is enable companies to pollute more, more cheaply, and to emit GHG -- more GHG.

And we're at a point -- we've reached a point where we really have to change the way that we produce energy. We should stop -- we should limit the use of crude oil and search for clean alternatives. And please

take into account my comments for your future actions. Thank you very much.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you and thank you to the interpreter.

Next, will be Gary Hughes. Gary, you can unmute and begin

GARY HUGHES: Thank you. Thank you so much.

Thank you, Chair Randolph, all the members of the Board.

And in particular, I want to thank all the members of

Environmental Justice Advisory Committee for an incredible
set of presentations. Just for the record, my name is

Gary Hughes and I work with the organization Biofuelwatch.

Our organization has definitely tried to communicate concerns to the Air Resources Board around this focus on engineered carbon removal, which I'll just really briefly put out to folks is kind of a euphemism really for geoengineering, carbon dioxide removal being one of the primary fields of climate geoengineering. So we've expressed some concern about that. And I hope that members of board hear what the EJAC is saying, that there are a great many of scientific and justice concerns about reliance on these unproven technologies.

But what I really want to bring some attention to right now is the recommendation of the EJAC regarding the imperative of there being a complete and thorough review

with the objective of amending the Low Carbon Fuel Standard. As someone who's been working on these issues for a long time, it's heartening to hear so many stakeholders and members of the Board showing an interest in reviewing and reforming Cap-and-Trade, but the Low Carbon Fuel Standard is definitely a problem that needs to be addressed.

2.2

And as an example, I want to bring folks attention, once again, to the conversion of refineries in the Bay Area to processing basically high deforestation risk commodities, like soy, into drop-in biodiesel to renewable diesel and perhaps even an aviation jet fuel. And these projects are just being rammed through.

The California Environmental Quality Act review process has been very inadequate. And, you know, you should know that just yesterday, the Final Environmental Impact Report on the massive Marathon-Neste joint venture project was released, providing folks only two weeks. So it's on the -- it's on March 23rd, less than two weeks now that there's going to be a public hearing.

So clearly, there's no interest in really ensuring that there's robust public engagement when there is so little public notice given for folks to participate in a hearing. And there was no hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for this refinery conversion.

So I just want to flag that the EJAC is right on the money when it says that there needs to be a really close look taken at the Low Carbon Fuel Standard with the intent of reforming this mechanism that's making the situation worse.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

We're now going to close. It's 7:40. We're going to close the queue for signing up to speak

Our next speaker will be Jane Sellen. After Jane, will be Kyle Heiskala, and then Zolboo Namkhaidorj, and Lucero Rios.

SO Jane, you can unmute and begin.

JANE SELLEN: Hi. Thanks. Jane Sellen Californian's for Pesticide Reform.

Yeah, I just want to acknowledge the powerful collected body of testimony we heard tonight and the extraordinary wok of the EJAC. I heard many important themes tonight. But one that jumped out as an overarching demand across sectors was for actual reductions of emissions at the source and not engineered solutions or accounting schemes.

So I want to echo this demand when it comes to pesticides. And thanks to Asha Sharma for her excellent presentation, in which she highlighted the problem when

you fail to include actual pesticide use reduction targets. Without those targets, there's a real risk that so-called climate-smart solutions that CARB does embrace could actually result in more pesticide use.

1.3

2.2

So I do want to acknowledge some progress in this Scoping Plan process, not least the inclusion of organic agriculture in the modeling scenarios - thank you for that - and also the inclusion of DPR as a official partnering department.

Thank you, Supervisor Serna, for naming the need for a life-cycle analysis of pesticides. As you noted, emissions from transportation, production, and all the rest of the life cycle are not counted as part of Pesticide's contribution when it's measured, meaning that it's a gross over -- undercount.

And thank you to the Board -- CARB Board members that echoed Supervisor Serna's comments and to those who've done so much to raise the profile of pesticides in the context of the Scoping Plan, especially Dr. Balmes, Ms. Takvorian, Vice Chair Berg, and Mr. De La Torre.

And I also want to echo Dr. Pacheco-Werner's call for formalizing that partnership with other departments and putting actual steps in writing. Coordination with the Department of Pesticide Regulation is critical. There should be no space between two sister departments within

CalEPA when it comes to reducing emissions from pesticide toxic air contaminants that are exacerbating climate change.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Kyle Heiskala, you can unmute and begin.

KYLE HEISKALA: Good evening EJAC and CARB Board members. My name is Kyle Heiskala and I'm a Climate Justice Policy Advocate with Environmental Health Coalition.

I wanted to note that EHC joined a coalition of over 20 environmental justice and public health organizations in submitting a letter yesterday to CARB calling for a bold 2022 Scoping Plan. And I wanted to highlight the four areas that we are advocating for: one, a robust health equity analysis that informs the selection of the policies; two, to prioritize the direct emission reductions at the source; three, eliminating or minimizing the need for market mechanisms or engineered carbon removal; and four, the plan needs to be implemented equitably.

Our letter is intended to supplement and complement the EJAC recommendations. And specifically, I wanted to share more thoughts on the transportation sector. We have a community rooted transportation justice

campaign that we feel could serve as a potential model for what we're doing in San Diego and at SANDAG for other community-led mass transit solutions, as an example, for the types of investments that CARB can amplify across the State.

1.3

2.2

As we know, half of California's GHGs come from transportation. And EVs alone are not going to meet our climate goals and will not solve the problems of traffic congestion, and high costs of ownership, and operating cars. With soaring gas prices, pain at the pump hurts low-income communities the hardest. And there's never been a better time for CARB to map out a transition away from fossil fuel powered transportation and away from our reliance on cars.

So we believe that the State can center equity into its transportation policies, because EJ communities are set up to be left behind in the transition to electric vehicles without targeted investments. We need to make sure that low-income Californians can be able to make that switch first.

And a note on the Caltrans California

Transportation Plan, it models a 30 percent VMT reduction with a corresponding 11 percent mode share in transit statewide. It can be implemented and accelerated to be done by 2035, if we have the political will and the

resources to get there. So let's use this opportunity to create access to opportunity for environmental justice communities, in investing in real viable mass transit solutions for low-income communities of color, and would ask that the CARB Board please support our recommendations and ask that staff work to integrate our recommendations into the Draft Scoping Plan at this point in the process.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Zolboo Namkhaidorj, you can unmute and begin.

ZOLBOO NAMKHAIDORJ: Hello. Can you hear me?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can.

ZOLBOO NAMKHAIDORJ: Hello.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: We can hear you.

ZOLBOO NAMKHAIDORJ: Hello.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: We can hear you. Can you

17 hear me?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

ZOLBOO NAMKHAIDORJ: Okay. Great. Thank you. I had my volume down.

Okay. Hi there. Zolboo Namkhaidorj and I am with Communities for a Better Environment.

Members of the Board, I don't know how any of you came to be in this work, but I can only guess it was because you had a deep desire to take on the role of a public servant and use your power to create transformative

changes for our most vulnerable and impacted communities. Environmental justice communities have long borne the brunt of our needs and demands of living in a polluted environment that has no reliable mass transit, that is accessible, zero emission, nor cost friendly.

2.2

The State Cap-and-Trade Report didn't compare how much we could have saved in terms of greenhouse gas emissions if we had actually just directly phased out our fossil fuel system. What it did show is that greenhouse gases and PM2.5 pollution has increased in refinery communities. I don't understand why that wasn't on the front cover or even in the front-page summary. And that's a matter of life or death in refinery communities.

During the height of the pandemic that we're in, environmental justice communities suffered greatly with high rates of COVID-19 infection, while fossil fuel corporations banked in billions of dollars in tax break funds, while also almost every single one of those companies laid off thousands of workers.

We're in the midst of a crisis and we need everyone to do their part. We need the State and CARB to be courageous and be the leaders to do the work that you've all been called to do. This is the only way to ensure that environmental justice communities, a lot of the people who don't even have the privilege to be here or

participate in these meetings and discussions once again don't get screwed over.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Lucero Rios. After Lucero will be Shayda Azamian, John Bottorff, and then Havah Aisha.

Lucero, you can unmute and begin.

LUCERO RIOS: Hello. Can you hear me?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes.

LUCERO RIOS: Okay. Hello. My name is Lucero
Rios and I have lived in Richmond and San Pablo ever since
I was a little kid. The Chevron refinery has always been
a toxic neighbor in my city, polluting not only our air,
water, and environment, but our politics and the state of
our city.

There are times when I'm walking home and I see the flames caused by flaring coming from the refinery, making the constant smell of unpleasantness and rotten eggs even stronger.

I soon learned that this smell is not just a bad smell, but actual toxins that create respiratory and long-term health issues for way too many of my family members and loved ones. Three of my family members have asthma and I have another family member with diabetes.

The fact that my family members can't go outside when the air is especially polluted to get exercise and sunshine, especially during a time when we've all been cooped up inside for two plus years is not fair.

It's not just that I have to close my windows, because of another flaring incident or to block out the blaring noise from the trains that carry petroleum tanks through neighborhoods of families like mine only to hope -- only to hope that they don't explode. It's that time and time again the oil industry gets its way when it's time for poli -- politicians and decision-makers, like you, to do something about it.

I don't want to live in this cycle of toxicity anymore and we need a future beyond toxic refineries.

Thank you.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Shayda, you can unmute and begin.

SHAYDA AZAMIAN: Hello. This is Shayda Azamian from the Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability calling in to say tonight the EJAC presentation was an incredibly impressive feat and I'd first like to show support for all of the substantive recommendations made by EJAC members tonight and for your overarching framing about prioritizing reductions at the source.

I also want to appreciate the Board comments

saying that the Scoping Plan must incorporate these specific EJAC measures throughout the Scoping Plan, because otherwise they won't be considered over time and climate policy for years to come.

1.3

2.2

And I look forward to supporting the EJAC on these recommendations. I -- and I ask the Board -- I ask the CARB Board to request a staff update soon about how each of these recommendations are bring incorporated into the Scoping plan itself.

Themes a bolder path of the Scoping Plan becomes more clear when we make the space to understand the uncomfortable realities of environmental injustices and racial inequities caused by our polluting economic status quo. And I want to request that all staff and Board members continuously look back to this meeting and the comments that were made about the substance needing to be in the plan or a robust health equity analysis that determines the final scenario, Cap-and-Trade and LCFS reform, minimizing reliance on polluting alternative fuels, a clean robust transit system, regulation of pesticides, and a regenerative transition and agriculture.

The bottom line is we're living in the consequences of polluting economic activities that need transitioning and I think we got closer to understanding the absolute necessity of a transition for impacted

communities and what that transition must entail.

1.3

2.2

So thank you. And I look forward to seeing these recommendations reflected in the Final Scoping Plan scenario.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Next is John Bottorff. John, you may unmute and begin.

JOHN BOTTORFF: Good evening, everyone. My name is John Bottorff with CleanEarth4Kids.org. I want to thank the EJAC Committee for their incredible work. It was all so well done and very, very thoughtful. I'm looking to CARB taking action on what EJAC brought forth.

I'm very concerned about the use of Cap-and-Trade and offsets. Polluters will just continue to pollute if we allow them to just pay a fee or just pass the cost off to consumers. Industry has to be held accountable for the impacts of their pollution, especially to children and communities of color. There is a social cost of pollution that need -- they need to pay. We must stop sacrifices zones. We must stop the sources of pollution with no allowances for industry. We must transition to a economy that does not poison people.

I also wanted to say I agree with comments on stopping these pesticides. Not only does it protect human and environmental health, but pesticides damage the soil

and health soils can hold a massive amount of carbon. It would also greatly reduce the use of petrochemicals as the vast majority of pesticides come from fossil fuels. Stopping these pesticides is so important to protect everyone's health, including the planet. Please make it a priority in the Scoping Plan.

2.2

members that carbon capture and storage is a false solution. We need to take immediate action to stop the use of fossil fuels, not prolong its use. CCS is not only unproven technology, it is not needed. The work by researchers like Mark Z. Jacobson from Stanford make it very clear that we already have the technology we need to complete the transition from fossil fuels. We just need to do it. After decade and billions of dollars, there are no carbon capture successes. Carbon capture systems take an incredible amount of energy. They actually put out more CO2 into the atmosphere than they remove.

I'm also very concerned about the idea of transporting and storing millions of tons of carbon dioxide. Carbon dioxide is lethal. What happens when these facilities leak? What is the environmental damage to groundwater and soil? We know fracking causes earthquakes from the injection of water. Will injecting carbon dioxide deep underground have similar impacts?

The fossil fuel industry says it's safe and a great solution because it makes them money and extends their monopoly on energy. This is the same industry that still insists fracking is safe, the same industry that has a long history of leaks from everything they do, just like at the -- very recently at Huntington Beach, the destruction-in the Gulf of Mexico by Deepwater Horizon and don't forget the massive methane leak at Aliso Canyon and so many more.

1.3

2.2

Carbon capture and storage would just repeat the same chain of disasters. The leak of carbon dioxide would be deadly. In the end, carbon capture and storage is a multi-billion dollar greenwashing boondoggle promoted by the fossil fuel industry that will do nothing to solve the climate crisis. Please do not waste time and resources on false solutions. Please remove carbon capture as a possible solution from the Scoping Plan.

Those resources need to be focused on real solutions like solar and wind. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our last speaker for the item is Havah Aisha. Havah, you can unmute and begin.

HAVAH AISHA ISRAY: Good evening. My name is
Havah Aisha Isray. I am a student at the University of
California, Berkeley and have been living in Richmond for

four -- for 16 years. I am also a Youth leader in the Asian Pacific Environmental Network, otherwise known as APEN, an organization based in Richmond that fights for environmental justice.

2.2

I am speaking up today to support the phasing out of oil refineries by 2045, as a key part of California's 20-year climate policy roadmap. I am here to represent the underprivileged, underrepresented, and underserved. Additionally, I am here because I love my community and I care about the health and safety of my friends, family, and poor and working class neighbors.

Personally, I love Richmond for its diverse culture and community. I love the way we come together to improve each other's lives. There are scholarship programs and non-profits like APEN and RYSE that bring youth together to enact their visions of fighting for justice. The Richmond community is my home and I want to help protect it allow it to prosper.

For generations, the Richmond Chevron refinery
has been poisoning our air and the people we love. As a
young kid, I remember seeing a black cloud from the 2012
Chevron fire. At the time, I did not understand what was
happening except that I had to stay indoors. Years later,
I know that over 16,000 residents went to the hospital.
Many Richmond residents do not have medical insurance and

cannot afford hospital care. So if accidents continue to reoccur, a lot of us will be put at an economic disadvantage.

I had a friend who moved to Richmond from Idaho and her mother had lung cancer. I watched her get sicker and cough more and more the longer she lived here. I want to see a future for Richmond beyond oil, beyond the pollution that makes our families sick. I want to see environmentally sustainable jobs for everyone, so that we can have a better future. Living near Chevron, we can lead -- we can take the lead in building a regenerative sustainable economy to improve the lives of everyone and be an example to other communities like ours.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. That concludes our list of public commenters. Back to you, Chair.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you. I know

Catherine had her hand up and then I would like to say a

few kind of words kind of reflecting back after Catherine
has had a chance to speak.

DR. CATHERINE GAROUPA WHITE: Thank you, Chair Randolph and thank you to all of the members of the public for listening, and sticking with us, and offering your thoughtful comments. And than you to the Board for your

commitment to incorporate EJAC's recommendations and figure out in the immediate and long term how we can do this work differently.

1.3

2.2

Just a few points that I did want to underscore, because it's been a long day and a long meeting, and I think there's been a lot said that's important. And I do also want to close with one specific ask.

I definitely heard a lot of conversation about the need to align our timelines better, especially as the EJAC moves to being long term to ensure that the community engagement can be aligned meaningfully with the modeling and the other analysis that's going on. It absolutely needs to be a ground-truthed effort that incorporates community data, and is collaborative, and cross-cutting across the divisions of CARB and inclusive of other State agencies.

It should be Industrial Strategies Division,
Office of Environmental Justice, Transportation and
Toxics, Enforcement, all relative -- all relevant CARB
divisions should be involved in ongoing and integrated
analysis.

Appreciate Dr. Pacheco-Werner's request earlier to have clarification in writing. And in addition, my specific request would be that the Board direct staff of all divisions to determine what goes in the models and

plans, including the Enforcement Division, so that we know whether these rules are actually working on the ground.

2.2

Thank you again everybody for your participation and for the opportunity to speak.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thanks, Catherine.

I just wanted to highlight a couple points that we were hearing fairly consistently. I mean at a high level, I think the fundamental goal of moving away from fossil fuels is something we -- that we all agree and I think, you know, there is a lot -- there are a lot of efforts going on in a lot of different ways to make that transition. And so ensuring that we are prioritizing ways to shift our economy away from a fossil based economy is absolutely a key goal, and we clearly have a lot of alignment and agreement on that.

I do think it would be really useful for staff to provide some more information about our interagency work around pesticides and plan to come back with more information on that and discussion about that topic. And I think it's really important to highlight sort of a timeline process for some of these key issues, and I think that's going to take some time. So I don't necessarily expect staff to be back at the next meeting on that, but, you know, perhaps after the draft is completed or during the community engagement phase, we can really kind of

drill down on -- on the plan for some of these key implementation steps, so folks know what to expect and they know how that's going to tie into the ongoing EJ structure going forward.

And staff is already in -- working hard on the community engagement part, and providing resources and support for that effort, and ensuring that the -- that the work with tribal communities is supported and is -- and moves forward as soon as possible to inform this work is also going to be an important part of that effort.

So those were some kind of high level follow-ups that I wanted to make sure to put on the table and make clear that we will be following up more specifically on. And that's it for me. So I will -- I'll turn it back to Alex, so she can call on people as they raise their hand.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Great. I see a couple more comments. We are -- we're at 8:01. Just a quick time check. And I see Luis Olmedo and then Ms. Takvorian.

Go ahead, Luis.

1.3

2.2

LUIS OLMEDO: Thank you, Alex.

I have very brief comments. While I wasn't able to engage in the dialogue as I would have liked to, it was -- there were well -- my comments and my -- and our -- well, my participation I felt was well represented by leadership in the EJAC and, you know, all members of the

EJAC. Madam Chair, I look forward to seeing you soon and -- as we're hoping to see you out here in Imperial.

I did want to also do a little quick shout-out to Board member, Supervisor Vargas. I'm here ready to work with you. I'm so happy you're there, boarder region. We needs lots of representation out here and I see a lot of that happening already. So thank you to the Board, Madam Chair, for your leadership and certainly here to work, you know, with you, Board Member Vargas.

I think it's exciting times for the border region and having the level of representation that we have and the level of commitment. I think we can really do some good things. But other than that, thank you to everyone and to the members of the public, really great comments, and I hope that we're able to steer the ship in the right direction.

Thank you.

2.2

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you, Luis.

Ms. Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you. Excuse me.

Thanks to -- I just did my like jam food down my throat.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Sorry.

I just want to thank everyone again.

LUIS OLMEDO: Yeah. Diane, I apologize. I left

you out. Supervisor Vargas, that we have a tremendous representation on the border with both of you, so I didn't mean to cut you out at all.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: No. No. I -- no offense taken. Supervisor Vargas is amazing and we're so excited that she's here on the Board. So good to see you, Luis.

I just want to thank everyone again. And I'm very excited about the sense of unity that I think the Chair just talked about in terms of our move away from fossil fuels. I think that's critically important. And I agree that we -- that we really do have unity and some solidarity around that. I think the key issue is how do we do it? And it would seem that we've got a lot of different ideas about how that should happen. And honestly, I think we have not only different ideas, we probably have conflicting strategies.

And so those are the issues that really need to get put on the table and I am having trouble thinking about that not being in the Draft Scoping Plan, because if we don't see the discussion about pesticides, transportation, Cap-and-Trade, some of the ambitious plans within the natural and working lands, and the list goes on, I don't -- I guess I just don't understand how we can adopt a draft plan to go out for public discussion without

addressing those issues. And I understand that we would not thoroughly discuss them and thoroughly make decisions about them.

2.2

But I do think that that's the moment where we do need to talk about additional time, because if the draft plan doesn't reflect these recommendations that the EJAC has worked so hard on and that we seem to have some real unity on, I just don't understand what we would be asking the public to comment on, because it would seem that we would essentially be saying we're -- we're kicking the can down the -- down the road on these things.

so that's the piece where I'm -- I think I really need more clarity and some commitment from the Board that we would be seeing these issues reflected in the draft plan. And if that means the draft plan is a couple months later, then that seems to be okay to me, because of all of this incredibly deep and valuable information. I'm not trying to extend way beyond the legislative requirements at all. I'm trying to figure out how do we do it all, but I -- I just don't see us taking on a draft plan that isn't more substantive in the ways that have been pointed out this evening. So that's my question for us to discuss I hope before we leave tonight.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Can I just jump in for a moment, because I -- I think that's an important point, because I

167

think we do need to make sure that we are responding to and addressing the recommendations of the -- of the EJAC. And I guess that was sort of getting to my earlier point, like we're going to be addressing those in different ways, In some ways, we're -- it's going to be okay this is a very specific thing we need to address, and in some ways it's going to be more of what are our higher level goals, what are the values that we are going to express, what is the interaction that we see with other agencies, other stakeholders, et cetera, so -- and that's one of the reasons why I think the importance of getting that draft on paper, and getting to really rolling up our sleeves, and looking at it, and getting specific feedback on it, because right now it's very in the abstract in a sense that we don't know exactly how staff is going to address some of these -- some of these important issues. And so I think that there are opportunities to really respond to what we're hearing. And I think that's -- I think that's the goal.

Okay. I will leave it to others.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you, Chair Randolph.

Dr. Balmes, and then Vice Chair Berg, and then I see you, Sharifa.

Dr. Balmes.

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

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: So I will try to be brief.

I want to echo Ms. Takvorian's and Chair Randolph's

comments both. I really appreciate the Chair saying that

the draft needs to be responsive to EJAC. I think that's

an incredibly powerful statement. You kind of -- you have

a tendency to make big statements in understated way, but

I really appreciate what you said. And I agree with Ms.

Takvorian about what needs to be there.

But I want to make a plea for another thing that I think we all agree on, but I think needs to be clearly stated, that the Scoping Plan, you know, for the future of climate change, mitigation policy in California has to be through an equity and social justice lens. You know, I think we take that -- the Scoping Plan may take that in the past as sort of taking that for granted. I mean, there's been sections, but I think it needs to be right up front, you know, first paragraph of the executive summary, that we, you know, have that equity and social justice lens to our climate change mitigation, you know, policy.

And, yeah, maybe I'll stop there.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you. Putting it right up front.

Vice Chair Berg.

2.2

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you so very much. I absolutely want to echo not only my fellow Board members,

but also all the public testimony that highlighted the amazing presentation that EJAC did. You guys really were awesome tonight. The presentations were absolutely first rate. The communication was first rate and I just want to make sure that I echo. I, too, have had the privilege of being able to listen in on several of your meetings, but not near the amount of meetings that you have done. So again, thank you very much.

2.2

As I've been listening tonight and as I've listened every time I have attended the EJAC meetings, this is an a -- we all know that this is beyond a heavy lift. And it is -- I worry -- and I've said this for as long as we have been addressing. I worry about where expectations meet the reality of what's happening on -- on the ground, and the extreme disappointment when it doesn't meet what the expectations were. I worry about what one EJ is hearing versus what maybe CARB is hearing and the Board is hearing. How does that all come together where we really are truly aligned?

I'm very concerned that we don't -- we don't have anybody here from -- you know, nobody attended from industry. Nobody attended from the communities that are really producing the greenhouse gases. Our EJ communities do not have a high footprint. They are not the ones that have to change their behavior. They are not running

Amazon trucks all over to get their, you know, groceries, one -- one item, one delivery at a time.

1.3

2.2

There are a lot of behaviors and a lot of things. And I did pull out my 2017 EJAC Advisory. And the first item that you had in 2017 was really addressing the cultural shift in California and step up our plan to get everyday people on board. You absolutely nailed it there, but it is just so difficult.

So I guess one of the things that would be very helpful to me is that this is going to be a five-year plan and -- and we're going to update it just like we updated this last one. As we look at even just the titles, because I don't want it to be onerous here, but what would be the measures we could do over the next five years that would be meaningful that you as an EJAC group would feel if we nailed the things over the next five years would truly make a difference, would show that we're on the right path?

And then the other thing is we have to get the other people at the table. We've got to get the people at the table that have got to make the changes. And -- and so we -- we can't have these silos that -- where we all agree what needs to be done, but they don't get done because the other players know how to go and create barriers, or do it differently, or don't take the EJAC and

the social justice -- the equity and the social justice the way that we do.

2.2

And so I hope that we can continue these conversations, because it's going to be crucial in order for us to truly thwart climate change and truly bring through the -- as Dr. Balmes said, and as all of you said, through the lens of equity and social justice. And so I look forward to broadening the conversation. I absolutely support many of these things that have been said tonight. And again, congratulations. The work that has been done from a equity and a social justice perspective is really remarkable and you should all be very proud.

The last thing I would like to close is that understanding that we've brought our Native Americans in, and Jill, at this point, I would like to encourage Chanell and her group as to getting back to us as to what additional resources, and truly connecting with Jill to find out how can we bring them up to -- well, bringing up to speed might be an unfair or unreal -- we've got -- they need extra resources coming in at this stage of the game, and so what do they need, how can we help, and -- and as you've heard from the Board, we stand by to also help.

So thank you very much, Chair.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you, Vice Chair Berg. So I see Sharifa, and then Matt Holmes, and then

Kevin Hamilton.

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

Sharifa.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Thank you, Alex.

I wanted to thank both the members of the public and the Board members for your comments. Definitely gave us a lot to think about. Also appreciate the folks that supported seeing our recommendations enacted in this draft of the plan. One thing that came up for me later in the meeting was just a concern or a question rather of how once we get the Draft Plan out there and then there's that period between the Draft Plan and the finalized Plan, the question is more about how much time do we have to be -to revise the plan and how much we're actually able to make revisions during that period, so that it's not like, oh, well, we've put so much effort into drafting this plan that whatever the community says or whatever the EJAC says, if it's not in line with the initial draft, you know, it's too much work or too much effort to amend it. And so that's just a concern that's coming up for me.

I believe in good faith that there will be changes made during that period. I'm just concerned about like some of the areas where maybe EJ and CARB disagrees about seeing those changes. So, yeah, just something for us to stay aware of and hopefully see more alignment like we have seen alignment on issues like with the fossil

fuels and other areas.

1.3

2.2

So thanks, everyone.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you Sharifa.

Matt.

MATT HOLMES: Yeah. Sorry to raise my hand so late after the hour. I want to respect everybody's time. I really appreciate the input that we're getting from Board members and I appreciate the frustration at the -- you know, the lack of traction and the dissonance between --

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Oh, you went on mute but accident. Can you come back.

MATT HOLMES: Ask for Board members, or at least your staff, to be involved in the meeting process. You know, Bagely-Keene was not designed to sequester you from our families, from us and our communities. It was designed to sequester from you the untoward influence of industry.

So I'm sorry I'm speaking quickly. I'm picking my kids up 15 minutes late from a dance recital. And I think -- you know, I think there's a way for us to get traction and I don't think we can wait until September to have a presented draft to you to hear vital important questions, and realize that we didn't agendize them appropriately.

So I hope there's a way for actual Board members to actually vote on this plan to actually be involved in the process, because this is important input that's coming in frankly way too late. These are questions that we needed to hear and these are concerns that we needed to hear in June and July, when we were asking for where this goes.

2.2

So thank you for the signals of unity. And I think unity looks like time and attendance. Thank you, everyone.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you, Matt.

Kevin. Kevin Hamilton.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Hi. Thanks. And I -- as you can see the sun is setting, and setting on this meeting, and certainly will set quickly on my comments here.

I want to thank the residence and members of the public -- other members of the public who stayed around to make comments tonight. I'm really grateful for that. And I really appreciate the scientists and engineers who called out the issues that we've all sort of felt about, especially gaseous carbon sequestration underground or transporting it. So hopefully those will be addressed in a more constructive way moving forward.

Sandy, I couldn't resist when you called out, you know, what could we do that would be substantive in the

next five years? I think we could do a lot, but starting with continuing with some of the work that -- that is looking at health and the impacts that these decisions are having on health in our communities, and the potential exposures, or the improvements there, which we don't seem to be able to get done, but certainly could be done. But even if we started today, we wouldn't see results for another two to three years most likely, and two years would be like a dream.

2.2

But going to that and with a permanent EJAC and a technical committee, there's nothing that I've seen in the statute that says that this Plan can't be a living plan and that subsections of the Plan can't be examined as we move it along, and improved, you know, by a -- through a public process.

And that's certainly something to consider, rather than putting our eggs all in one basket for five years and coming back again in five years and say, "Oh, wow. Yeah, you guys called this out back then and yeah, you know, we really wished we'd done that", or, "Yeah, we chose that last time, but, you know, it just didn't quite work out the way that we'd hoped".

You know, let's -- let's be a little smarter about that, a little more intentional, and a little more flexible in that way. And so I think there's

opportunities here that need to be explored and should be moved on by this Board.

Thanks. And everybody have a great evening.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Jill, I see your hand. You're the last hand up for now. So before we go to you, I'm going to suggest that we go to Jill and then I'm going to check in with EJAC Co-Chairs and then Chair Randolph to again sort of close-up our evening for now, if that's okay with folks.

So let's go to Jill.

1.3

2.2

Much. I just want to say thank you for lifting up tribal issues and including them, because that's really what we were talking about. And I appreciate all of the work that the community had in bringing this in. So I really thank everyone and it just makes me feel really good inside to know that people believe that tribal issues are very important and should have a voice in this process, because they are involved in Cap-and-Trade, they are involved in agricultural efforts, and they're actually leading the way in organic growing. So I think, you know, there's — there is time for us to included.

Thank you.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Sharifa and Martha Dina, do you all want to share some closing thoughts about what

you're heard. And Sharifa I know -- I think you were going to speak a little bit of what comes next with some of the community engagement, if you want to do that.

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: You know what, I think in the interests of getting us home, go ahead -- well, we are home, but getting us off work.

Go ahead. Go for it Sharifa.

2.2

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Yeah, I'm going to keep this short and suite. This is mostly just an update for the Board. The rest of us EJAC members should be somewhat aware of this already. We are starting our community engagement workshops, the bulk of them coming up in the next month here. We've already had the San Joaquin Valley workshop hosted -- or led rather by CVAQ, and that's Dr. Catherine's organization.

We've also had a workshop led by the BEEP Coalition that Colin mentioned earlier about building decarbonization that's also happened, and that was a statewide effort. We're planning to have an approach to community engagement where we have regional and topical workshops, so that means that we need to have a NorCal and a SoCal workshop. Of course, included in that regional approach is the indigenous community. We are unsure, at this point, how many workshops we need to have for them, since they're just now coming on board to this process.

For the topical workshops, we're planning to have two fossil fuel related workshops, since there are a plethora of topics that could be covered with that just one industry. We're also going to have a public health social cost workshop, as well as a natural working lands workshop. That was recently recommended.

2.2

We also are planning to have an interactive document tool where the public can directly comment on the text of the Scoping Plan, especially since we've heard some alignment with that from Board members tonight. And so that's the short and sweet of our -- of our community engagement strategy up to this point.

Yeah, we're just looking forward to having parallel timelines with community engagement as well as the drafting and finalization of this version of the Scoping Plan. So handing it back over to you, Alex. Thank you.

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: And if I can add, you know, we -- I think we will be giving more thought to what does the working together look like, given that we are doing the community engagement and refining the recommendations, how we do more integrate -- you know, work more with your staff who's working on the different segments and the regs. And so figure out a working process and then -- yeah, because I think that's how we

get them integrated into the Scoping Plan.

2.2

And I really want to lift up what Member
Takvorian said, right this can't -- can the plan as
envisioned right now and presented as what has been
presented thus far move us in the direction of this -- of
being bolder? And that's really what, you know, we're
asking the Board to think about. And maybe we can follow
up with meetings about what that means in terms of
direction with staff and how we interact with staff to
develop the Plan.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you, Martha Dina. Thank you, Sharifa.

Chair Randolph, other reflections or closing thoughts you want to give?

CHAIR RANDOLPH: No. I will -- I think we covered a lot. And I was able to kind of articulate sort of, you know, some of the follow-up.

So I just want to thank everyone for all the incredible hard work, and -- and the presentations were just, you know, really well done, like, you know, efficient, you know, clear, and so it was super helpful to frame up these issues as we kind of dive a little deeper into the specifics of the recommendation. So I really appreciated the dialogue.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Well, thank you, all.

It sounds like we could probably -- I don't know if there's still the open public comment period. I defer to the CARB Board Clerk team about that.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes. I can take over from here.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you so much for your facilitation, Alex. I appreciate it.

FACILITATOR COLE-WEISS: Thank you so much.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. So we do have our final item, which is open public comment on items not on the agenda. So if it relates to this agenda item, now is not the time to speak. Now is the time to speak on things that we did not discuss this evening.

All right. Board Clerk, will you please call the commenters?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, Chair. There is currently one person with their hand raised to speak. And this is phone number ending in 433.

I will activate your microphone and then you will be prompted to unmute and I will let you know when you have 30 seconds remaining and when your time is up.

HARVEY EDER: Hello.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Go ahead. We can hear you.

HARVEY EDER: Am I being -- okay. Thank you. My

name is Harvey Eder. I'm speaking for myself and the Public Solar Power Coalition and like-minded folks.

1.3

2.2

First of all, the Plan is required by law to be done every five years, at least. My understanding is that if stuff wasn't addressed, it could be done again next year, a special plan. Anyway, I wanted to throw that out there.

On equity, 40 years ago, we did the first study on equity through the PUC, the Low Income Solar Equity Program that was through the PUC. That was \$180 million to finance a demonstration solar in the late '70s. It was done in '80 and '81 with Commissioner Leonard Grimes, first Black Commissioner on the PUC. His family goes back to being a minster in Methodists in Boston, the Underground Railroad, organizing the 54th. It's the movie Glory is based on, right?

So what we -- what we've said that is we had the first concept of 10 percent for low income for equity to solve equity. And we also litigated and got the support of Rose Bird on taxing through the rate base and extending the IOUs of monopolies in the solar financing and whatnot.

Okay. Stuff that still isn't being dealt with.

We got big picture here. The reports coming out of the

IPCC, the Arctic is melting and whatnot. It is not looked

at -- not these -- not part of IPCC. Those numbers are

big. Just -- nitrous oxide and methane, okay? All of that, that deficit, goes to us, Europe, and some other places. Now, these people want to take trash from 150 dairies and from human waste, and methane, and all the stuff, and the carbon capture to expend fossil fuels, huh-uh, it don't work. Sorry. And they have to pay for the doubling or tripling of the numbers that's coming out of the Arctic, et cetera. Straight up. That's on them.

Enough. Enough. This is out -- they should not -- totally -- and then everything that was done by DOE and the SunShot program. That's got be grandfathered in by EPA and it's got to be a request. We're doing that and trying to get that done.

They've got all kinds of demonstrations here and other places. And all you're pushing is fossil fuel and the renewable natural gas. And just -- it's outrageous, it's garbage, and when people realize that you're not doing what's required by the law, they're going to be pissed, all right in the vernacular.

I'm sorry.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: All right. Chair, that concludes the open comments.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. Thanks, everone for their participation. Have a good evening and this meeting is adjourned.

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 28th day of March, 2022.

James & Patter

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 10063