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CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Good morning. The June 23rd, 2022 public meeting of the California Air Resources Board will come to order.

Board Clerk, will you please call the roll.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dr. Balmes?

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. De La Torre?

Mr. Eisenhut?

Senator Florez?

Assembly Member Garcia?

Mr. Hurt?

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Present.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Kracov?

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Senator Leyva?

Dr. Pacheco-Werner?

Mrs. Riordan?

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Supervisor Serna?

Professor Sperling?

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ms. Takvorian?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Supervisor Vargas?
Vice Chair Berg?

VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Chair Randolph?

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Madam Chair, we have a quorum?

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

I will begin with a few housekeeping items. We are conducting today's meeting in person as well as offering remote options for public participation both by phone and in Zoom. There is also an overflow room next door in the Coastal Hearing Room where the webcast will be displayed.

If you will be commenting on today's item, we ask that you join from this auditorium so you do not miss your name when you are called on to testify. Anyone who wishes to testify on a Board item in person should fill out a request to speak card available in the foyer and turn it into the Board assistant as soon as possible. If you are participating remotely, you will raise your hand in Zoom or dial star nine if calling in by phone. The clerk will provide further details regarding how public participation will work in just a moment.

For safety reasons, please note the emergency exit to the rear of the room through the lobby. In the
event of a fire alarm, we are required to evacuate this room immediately and go down the stairs to the lobby and out of the building. When the all-clear signal is given, we will return to the auditorium and resume the hearing.

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

Interpretation services will be provided today in Spanish and Cantonese. 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 or Cantonese to hear the meeting in these languages. If you are joining us here in person and would like to listen to the meeting in Spanish or Cantonese, please see a Board assistant in the lobby and they will provide you with further instructions regarding how to check out a headset. I want to remind all of our speakers to speak slowly and pause intermittently to allow the interpreters the opportunity to accurately interpret your comment.
THE INTERPRETER: Thank you, Chair Randolph.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Finally, for your planning purposes, because today is a full day, we -- I will note we expect to take a 45-minute lunch break at approximately 12:30.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Can we have the Cantonese interpreter say that same statement briefly.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Oh, sorry.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: No worries.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: I forgot we were doing more than one language today. I apologize.

(Interpreter translated in Cantonese.)

(Technical difficulties.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Give us a few moments for the audio test.

Test.


Okay. You start again. Sorry.

(Interpreter translated in Cantonese.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Finally, as I noted, we will be taking a 45-minute lunch break at approximately 12:30 and then we may need to take some short breaks for the court reporter and interpreters.
I will now ask the Board Clerk to provide more details on how public participation will work at today's meeting.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you, Chair Randolph. Good morning, everyone. My name is Lindsay Garcia and I will be calling on commenters who are joining us remotely. And Katie Estabrook will be calling on commenters who have turned in a request to speak card and are joining us here in the room. I will provide information on how public participation will be organized for those who are joining us in Zoom or by calling in to today's meeting.

If you are joining us remotely and wish to make a verbal comment on the Board items, you will need to be using Zoom webinar or calling in by telephone. If you are currently watching the webcast on CAL-SPAN, but you wish to comment remotely, please register for the Zoom webinar or call in. Information for both can be found on the public agenda for today's meeting.

To make a verbal comment, we will be using the raise hand feature in Zoom. If you wish to speak on a Board item, please virtually raise your hand as soon as the item has begun to let us know you wish to speak. To do this, if you are using a computer or tablet, there is a raise hand button. If you are calling in on the telephone, dial star nine to raise your hand. Even if I
previously indicated which item you wished to speak when you registered, you must raise your hand at the beginning of the item, so that you can be added to the queue.

If you will be giving your verbal comment today in Spanish or Cantonese and require an interpreter's assistance, please indicate so at the beginning of your testimony and our translator will assist you. During your comment, please pause after each sentence to allow for the interpreter to translate your comment into English.

When the comment period starts, the order of commenters will be determined by who raises their hand first. I will call each commenter by name and will activate each commenter's audio when it is their turn to speak. For those calling in, I will identify you by the last three digits of your phone number. We will not show a list of commenters. However, I will be announcing the next three or so commenters in the queue, so you are ready to testify and know who is coming up next. Please note, you will not appear by video during your testimony.

I would also like to remind everyone to please state your name for the record before you speak. This is especially important for those calling in by phone to testify on an item.

We will have a time limit for each commenter. And per the Chair's direction, based on the commenters
signed up for this item, we will begin the comment period with a two minute time limit. This could change at the Chair's discretion.

    During public testimony, you will see a timer on the screen. For those calling in by phone, we will run the timer and let you know when you have 30 seconds left and when your time is up. If you require Spanish or Cantonese interpretation for your comment, your time will be doubled.

    If you wish to submit written comments today, please visit CARB's send-us-your-comments page or look at the public agenda on our webpage for links to send these documents electronically.

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

    Thank you. I'd like to turn the microphone back to Chair Randolph now.

    CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. Today's only agenda item is number 22-9-1, public meeting to hear an overview of the draft 2020 Climate Change Scoping Plan. As I noted earlier, if you're here with us in the room and wish to speak on this item, please fill out a request to speak card as soon as possible. And if you are joining us remotely and wish to comment, click the raise hand button
or dial star nine now. We will alternate calling on in-person and remote commenters when we get to the public comment portion of this item.

This is the first hearing to consider the proposed draft 2022 Scoping Plan update. Since the Legislature passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act in 2006, there have been three scoping plans approved by the Board. The first plan in 2008, first update in 2013. Both outlined actions to return to 1990 emissions levels by 2020, which California achieved ahead of schedule.

The 2017 Scoping Plan update built upon this progress by charting a path to achieve the 2030 GHG emission targets codified under AB 32 of 40 percent below -- sorry, SB 32 of 40 percent below 1990 emissions levels.

As we consider this Scoping Plan update, we must continue to monitor our progress toward existing goals while planning for the future. The sixth assessment by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change makes clear that we must achieve global carbon neutrality by mid-century to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. That means that in California and globally, we must achieve deep decarbonization across all sectors of the economy by 2045, if not before.
The proposed 2022 Scoping Plan update we are discussing today both assesses progress toward the statutory 2030 target and lays out a path to achieve carbon neutrality no later than 2045. The plan focuses on outcomes needed to achieve carbon neutrality by evaluating plans for clean technology, energy deployment, natural and working lands and others, and is designed to meet the State's long-term climate objectives and balance a range of economic, environmental, energy security, environmental justice, and public health priorities.

The path to implementation of these ambitious goals described in the plan will transform our society and achieve meaningful benefits for those communities hardest hit by fossil fuel combustion.

The proposed 2022 Scoping Plan strategies lead to a drastic reduction in the use of petroleum and other fossil fuels. As a result of this transition, California will be more energy secure, less impacted by volatile global oil prices, and the air will be cleaner. Successful implementation of the draft plan would lead to over a 90 percent reduction in petroleum liquid fuels. The draft plan proposes actions to move responsibly to clean energy, zero-emission cars and trucks, energy efficient homes, sustainable agriculture, resilient forests, and other strategies that can effectively reduce
emissions, remove carbon from the atmosphere and help us
achieve carbon neutrality.

An important new element of this proposed Scoping Plan update is its analysis of the critical role that
natural and working lands must play in helping us achieve
our climate goals. Although, they will likely be a net
source of emissions in the short term and in 2045, in the
long term climate-smart land management that focuses on
supporting healthy living systems can support our carbon
neutrality goal, reduce emissions, and advance carbon
sequestration.

But to achieve neutrality, California will need
to look beyond the capacity of our natural and working
lands and deploy additional methods of capturing carbon
dioxide that include pulling it from industrial
smokestacks or drawing it out of the atmosphere itself and
then safely and permanently storing it. The threats posed
by climate change to our communities, lands, and
environment, health and the economy signify an
all-hands-on-deck moment for California and this plan puts
all tools on the table.

The draft 2022 Scoping Plan update shows that
California can achieve its ambitious greenhouse gas
reduction targets by building on our historical success,
ensuring that we focus on communities impacted by air
pollution and climate change, and by taking a broad range of cost effective actions.

Climate change is the overriding crisis of this generation. We can see by the turnout at today's hearing just how many people are concerned about ensuring that California addresses the crisis with solutions for clean energy and decarbonization on a scale and at a pace that exceeds any previous efforts.

Today's item is broader than just California. And this discussion is the first hearing that will provide our board the opportunity to hear from the public and provide direction to staff to ensure that the final plan will serve as an example for other industrialized economies around the world as they consider how to make their transition to a clean energy economy that provides health benefits and economic opportunities.

California will continue to set the bar high by developing a plan that achieves deep carbon -- deep decarbonization of our entire economy, protects public health, provides a solid foundation for continued economic growth, and a reliable electrical grid and distribution system to support it, drastically reducing the state's dependence on fossil fuels.

I want to remind -- to reemphasize that the draft plan we are discussing today is not the final plan and I'm
looking forward to the discussion today as we consider how
to further refine the plan -- the draft that we have
before us.

So Ms. Sahota, will you please introduce the
item.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SAHOTA: Thank you,
Chair Randolph. Good morning, everyone. The draft plan
before you provides a path to achieving carbon neutrality
with the tools available today. It's set an achievable
and ambitious standard for other jurisdictions to emulate.

I want to first start a little bit with how we
got here. The draft plan was developed through an
extensive process of collaboration and coordination with
multiple State agencies. That broad-based coordination
lays the foundation for a whole-of-government approach to
future implementation. As such, you will also hear from
several Administration officials directly after the staff
presentation. This whole-of-government approach is
reflected throughout the Newsom administration with
coordinated climate action on the part of numerous
agencies and unprecedented commitment in the Governor's
budget to advance the State's climate agenda.

Development of the draft plan also included
robust public engagement including over a dozen workshops,
webinars, or public meetings, including with tribes over
the past year. In addition, the draft plan was informed by an extensive list of recommendations from the AB 32 EJ Advisory Committee. Around 60 of the over 200 recommendations are referenced in the draft plan. We are making every effort to ensure that environmental justice concerns are front and center in the state's efforts to address the climate emergency that we face today.

The modeling and analyses show that achieving carbon neutrality will take tremendous action to deploy clean energy and technology. Because of this, the work to achieve carbon neutrality by mid-century must start with action in this decade. That action will deliver near-term air quality benefits and help achieve our GHG goals. The plan is designed to mobilize private funding, send clear market signals, and leverage federal funding for the types clean energy and technologies we will need.

The draft plan has actions across all sectors and now with the addition of national -- natural and working lands in this plan, there is no sector left behind. I want to emphasize how important it is that for the first time we have built and actually used an in-house model to quantify the emissions from that natural and working lands and integrate them into the State's climate policies.

There is also the reality that California alone cannot stop climate change. We need partners, and this
plan provides ambitious and actionable steps others can take. If other government don't take action, we will still continue to face climate catastrophes here in California.

And the plan can only deliver results if we ourselves can deliver action. There are multiple specific challenges ahead, including reducing VMT, vehicle miles traveled, and market and implementation barriers for the clean energy options we want and that we need. These will need to be addressed as soon as possible. Turning things off with no transition in place is not exportable policy, but policy that just simply exports emissions.

Ultimately, success depends on building new and utilizing existing energy infrastructure. For a transition off of fossil energy, we need both paths. I will now ask Jordan Ramalingam to begin the staff presentation.

Jordan.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: Thank you, Ms. Sahota and good morning, Chair Randolph, and members of the Board.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: Today, I will be presenting an overview of the draft 2022 Scoping
Plan, which we just released last month. This is an important opportunity to collect feedback and direction on the draft plan prior to publishing the final plan and returning to the Board for a vote later this year. I will also speak to activities that will occur over the summer as we work toward finalizing the plan.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: The Scoping Plan is required by statute and is an actionable plan that lays out a cost-effective and technologically feasible path to ensure we meet these statewide greenhouse Gas reduction targets. The plan leverages traditional air quality policies to achieve both greenhouse gas and air pollution emissions reductions.

CARB is required by AB 32 to update the Scoping Plan at least once every five years. And as the Chair mentioned in her opening remarks, this is our fourth Scoping Plan. When staff updates the Scoping Plan, there are several statutory requirements that we must meet. We are required by statute to minimize emissions leakage, where goods and energy production move out of state. Leakage can give the appearance that we've reduced emissions under our accounting even if, in reality, activities have increased out of state to meet our ongoing demand for goods and energy.
AB 32 also requires that policies in the plan are cost effective with flexible compliance options and it directs CARB to facilitate subnational and national collaboration.

For global pollutants, such as greenhouse gases, a reduction anywhere is a benefit everywhere. Our goal has always been to develop scalable and exportable programs that other jurisdictions can implement and use to reduce emissions within their borders. California going to carbon neutrality will not shield us from climate impacts, unless other regions also take action to reduce their GHGs.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM:

Achieving carbon neutrality is California's most ambitious climate goal ever. It requires slashing our GHG emissions and an unprecedented deployment of low carbon technology and energy.

This slide shows the scale of transformation being called for by the draft Scoping Plan. In the draft, Staff proposed that California commit to achieving carbon neutrality no later than 2045. To be successful in this economy-wide transition, we need to build clean energy and infrastructure at rates never seen before and rapidly deploy clean technology supported by strong consumer
adoption.

In summary, the draft Scoping Plan identified that by 2045, we need 30 times as many light-, medium-, and heavy-duty zero-emission vehicles on the road, a six -- six times as many electric appliances in homes, 60 times as much hydrogen supply to meet demand, and four times as much installed wind and solar generation capacity.

These key outcomes are part of what drives the substantial GHG reductions in the draft plan. If we are successful in achieving the outcomes for clean energy and technology deployment, we would see a 91 percent decrease in petroleum demand, meaning gasoline and diesel used in vehicle, a 91 percent decrease in fossil natural gas used in buildings, and a 66 percent decrease in methane emissions from agriculture.

Our ultimate success depends on how quickly we build and deploy clean energy infrastructure to support this transition. And that work must begin this decade to be able to achieve carbon neutrality no later than 2045.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: For the first time in any Scoping Plan, we conducted atmospheric and transport modeling to evaluate the statewide emissions reductions in NOx, PM2.5, and ozone for the proposed
scenario. The episodic, atmospheric, and transport modeling looked at the months of January and July in 2045. The episodic modeling shows that NOx emissions are reduced 60 percent in the months evaluated. The modeling also shows that the proposed scenario has 25 percent fewer exceedances of the PM2.5 standard and 12.5 percent fewer exceedances of the ozone standard.

Many studies have shown that reducing air pollution reduces the incidence of harmful health endpoints. So for this Scoping Plan, we increased the number of health endpoints evaluated to a total of 17, such as premature mortality, cardiovascular and respiratory disease onset, work loss days, and hospital admissions. All of these demonstrate avoided incidences resulting from emissions reductions achieved by reducing fossil fuel combustion.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: In addition to quantifying endpoints to demonstrate health benefits related to reductions in air pollution, we included a robust public health analysis for eight co-benefit areas comparing status quo to a decarbonized economy. This public health analysis included review and input from the California Department of Public Health and the Office of Health Hazard Assessment [SIC].
Decarbonizing the economy will lead to changes in traffic pollution, wildfire smoke, mobility, and physical activity, urban greening, heat, affordable housing, food security, and economic security. Each of these co-benefit areas lead to health improvements and increased community resilience, which includes the ability to withstand and bounce back from climate effects.

For example, replacing travel in vehicles with walking, biking, and other active transport could avoid almost 8,000 deaths from chronic illness based on an analysis for 2050. And reducing wildfire smoke could avoid hundreds of deaths, hospitalizations, and emergency room visits based on an analysis for 2045.

While we quantify benefits where we can, there are many benefits we cannot quantify today and the public health analysis shows known directional health benefits for the co-benefit areas.

In general, transitioning away from fossil fuels reduces a number of physical and mental health outcomes. Children's health is improved. And there is a general improvement in the health status and life expectancy. Equitable implementation can ensure benefits are realized in all communities. Community resiliency increases if we successfully implement the proposed Scoping Plan.

--o0o--
ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: As part of the technical analysis, we also used the most recent social cost of carbon values to estimate the cost of avoided damages. The actions highlighted in the draft would avoid economic damages of $9.9 billion in 2045. Health benefits from improved air quality would also be substantial due in large part to drastic reductions in fossil fuel combustion. Looking at just episodic modeling for January and July, we estimated $10 billion in health benefits by reducing incidences of asthma, heart and respiratory diseases, and more.

We know between now and 2045, our workforce and economy will continue to grow. The proposed scenario achieves significant benefits while having some of the least impacts to the economy, household income, overall costs for the transition, and jobs.

We know achieving carbon neutrality sooner by 2035 would yield even greater health impacts due to the more rapid phaseout of fossil fuel combustion, but statutes direct us to balance across many factors. Based on our analyses, the proposed scenario is not only the most feasible, but also the one that delivers significant benefits with the least disruption to the economy and jobs.

--o0o--
ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: This Scoping Plan includes the emissions and sequestration from natural and working lands as part of the path to carbon neutrality, a significant addition that is new to the Scoping Plan process. This first-of-its-kind analysis demonstrated that increasing actions on lands can improve carbon storage and reduce emissions from this sector.

The draft recommends significant increases in climate-smart management of California's land, relative to historical levels. Increasing climate-smart management on lands will reduce GHG emissions, reduce air quality impacts from wildfire emissions, improve soil health, protect and restore lands for future generations, and provide numerous other benefits.

For example, we estimate that the increase in forest management shown here would reduce particulate matter emissions from wildfires, which in turn would result in $3 billion in annual health cost savings and hundreds of lives saved.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: We recognize that the recommendations and implementation of the Scoping Plan must prioritize uplifting and benefiting our vulnerable communities. This starts with the outcomes called for in the plan. Cutting combustion, cutting
petroleum extraction and supply as demand reduces, and reducing harmful agricultural practices are just a few examples. And these outcomes are amplified by the implementation priorities called for in the plan, such as prioritizing heavy-duty ZEV deployment in regions with the highest concentrations of harmful criteria and toxics emissions.

When taken together, the drastic reductions in fossil fuel combustion and the implementation priorities called for in the plan will provide some of the greatest benefits to communities located adjacent to freeways and stationary sources, who have disproportionately high exposure to harmful pollutants.

In addition, research has shown that not all communities face the same risks of damage from climate change and not all communities are equally equipped to manage climate change impacts. The existing social cost of carbon values are global and do not capture the additional burdens in vulnerable communities. A new tool known as the Community Vulnerability Metric that CARB is developing with UC Santa Barbara will help to quantify these differences in cost at the census tract level and will assist in identifying where and how to build community resiliency. Staff expects to incorporate findings from the CVM for the final 2022 Scoping Plan.
taking a step back, let's quickly cover what a Scoping Plan is. As mentioned, direction on Scoping Plan goals and objectives are informed by statutes and Executive Orders. Each Scoping Plan is a high level actionable plan that spans across all sectors where we tell a comprehensive story of how all the pieces fit together. And after each Scoping Plan is approved, CARB and other State agencies start the process of reviewing and updating related programs or developing new programs to align with any outcomes identified in the plan. Aligning these programs relies on multiple divisions across CARB and other State agencies taking action based on their established roles and authority.

So for CARB, that means we bring forth dozens of regulations and programs to the Board to adopt, which will help implement the plan. Each of these has their own public process and detailed analyses. Some regulations can take at least a couple of years to develop through a public process, and then go before the Board for adoption, and follow the rest of their required regulatory steps, including approval by the Office of Administrative Law and filing with the Secretary of State before becoming effective.
effective. As an example, earlier this month, you heard staff present on the Advanced Clean Cars II proposed regulation. This proposed regulation was called for in the 2017 Scoping Plan update, but is more stringent than what the Scoping Plan identified.

Once regulations and programs are in effect, there is additional time for projects to be constructed or for equipment turnover or retrofits to occur. Therefore, the emissions reductions from these actions will take some time to show up in our GHG inventory.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: This slide gives a sense of the multi-agency coordination that happens during plan development as well as during the implementation phase after plan approval. This list is not exhaustive, but it's intended to show that the successful development and implementation of any plan requires close coordination and understanding of the jurisdiction of other agencies.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: The EJ Advisory Committee has played an important role in the development of the draft 2022 Scoping Plan. Since the initiation of the Scoping Plan process in early summer 2021, the Committee has met over a dozen times and
developed over 200 draft recommendations for the plan. EJ Advisory Committee modeling input was incorporated into the design of the scenarios that we evaluated for achieving carbon neutrality. And in drafting the Scoping Plan, CARB staff reviewed each of the EJ Advisory Committee's recommendations and included as many of the recommendations as possible based on the content and structure of the Scoping Plan and alignment with State priorities. This means that the draft Scoping Plan includes approximately five dozen of the EJ Advisory Committee's draft recommendations. And this was in addition to the modeling feedback from the EJ Advisory Committee that we included prior to releasing the draft.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: The overlay of carbon neutrality in our long-term climate planning means we need to redefine our scope of sources and sinks. Carbon neutrality is achieved when emissions sources equal sinks. Up until now, every Scoping Plan has focused on reducing emissions from fossil energy and industrial-focused sources defined in the AB 32 inventory. As we shift to the framework of carbon neutrality, we have expanded the scope to include all sources, which means the emissions from the natural and working lands and all sinks.
The circle shown on this slide represents California's greenhouse gas emissions from AB 32 inventory sources, which we continue to ratchet down through air quality and climate policies.

Natural and working lands can be a net GHG source or sink, as indicated by the plus and minus signs. The State's separate natural and working lands inventory allows us to track the GHG emissions and sequestration on natural and working lands over time.

And the final piece refers to mechanical carbon dioxide removal through direct air capture options.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: We modeled four draft energy and technology scenarios. Two of the scenarios achieve carbon neutrality by 2035 and two by 2045.

The proposed scenario, formerly known as Alternative 3, uses a broad portfolio of existing and emerging fossil fuel alternatives, and includes achievement of Executive Order N-79-20, eliminating internal combustion engines in new vehicle sales and the majority of legacy vehicle fleets.

Alternative 1 most closely aligns with the outcomes and priorities identified by the EJ Advisory Committee. For example, this alternative phases out
fossil fuel and biomass combustion across the economy, and it includes the least engineered carbon removal to achieve carbon neutrality by 2035. This alternative also includes ambitious innovation in electric technology and aggressive consumer adoption trends.

Alternative 2 implements a full suite of technology options, including engineered carbon removal at a rapid pace in order to reduce emissions as much as possible and achieve carbon neutrality by 2035.

Alternative 4 relies on existing and some emerging technologies with slower deployment and consumer acceptance rates. It reflects a higher reliance on carbon dioxide capture and removal technologies to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: The figure on this slide depicts greenhouse gas emissions from the traditional AB 32 GHG inventory sectors. On the far left, you can see a breakdown of GHG emissions for the year 2020. The next four columns depict the emissions remaining in 2045 under the proposed scenario and the three alternatives.

As you can see, all four scenarios achieve drastic emissions reductions, with the most reductions coming from the industrial and transportation sectors.
Despite aggressive measures, there are still leftover GHG emissions in the proposed scenario and the three alternatives. These residual GHG emissions would need to be accounted for through engineered carbon removal. It's important to note that even in Alternative 1, where we phase out all combustion, there are still remaining emissions from short-lived climate pollutants. There is no scenario that gets to zero. This is consistent with other studies.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: For the natural and working lands side, CARB modeled four scenarios for all our natural and working lands types. These scenarios were developed with stakeholder and agency collaboration and reflect varying levels of natural and working lands actions that represent different visions for the future of California's natural and working lands.

The proposed scenario, also formerly known as Alternative 3, strives to balance ambitious levels of action among all the land types to increase restoration and climate resilience. Practices were increased on forests, shrublands, and grasslands to promote carbon stock stability. Practices on other land types were scaled back from the maximums identified in Alternative 1, based on stakeholder and agency feedback to feasible but
still ambitious levels.

Under Alternative 1, the objective was to maximize short-term carbon stocks. For forests, shrublands, and grasslands, this means no management at all to retain carbon stocks in the short-term. For croplands, wetlands, urban forests, defensible space, and deserts, this means the maximum amount of climate beneficial management practices were implemented to increase carbon stocks.

Alternative 2 relied on current commitments and plans, such as the one million acre strategy for -- for forests, shrublands, and grasslands, and existing planned wetland restoration. For those land types that did not have existing State commitments, we scaled acreages to complement the other alternatives.

And Alternative 4 was focused primarily on forest wildfire fuels reduction efforts, with an aggressive level of forest, shrublands, and grasslands management and defensible space establishment to reduce fire risk.

Other land types had reduced levels of practices compared to other alternatives, but were still greater than the BAU acreages.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: The next two slides will walk through the steps staff took to
choose the proposed scenario. For the AB 32 sectors, we screened the scenarios to ensure that they met the goal laid out in Executive Order B-55-18 to achieve carbon neutrality no later than 2045.

Next, staff evaluated the feasibility of the alternatives. Technology readiness and costs are critical for decarbonizing fuels and technology and were examined as part of this feasibility analysis. Consumer adoption of new technology or practices is also critical for this assessment. Are people willing to give up their internal combustion engine vehicles sooner than later?

Even more critical in this transition is building clean energy infrastructure. We know that building new large energy infrastructure in California can take five to 10 years of planning and construction. And so scenarios that rely on larger energy infrastructure buildout on quicker time frames are inherently less feasible.

Allowing for longer implementation timelines also provides greater opportunity to get it right, as well as time to address environmental and community concerns that can arise during a project's entitlement phase. And the longer time frame provides more time for scaling of technology and for costs to come down.

And lastly, we must consider affordability in this feasibility assessment to ensure that the transition
to a carbon neutral future is inclusive and accessible for all Californians. Alternatives 3 and 4 have a longer timeline to reach carbon neutrality, 2045, and performed better than Alternatives 1 and 2 in each of these feasibility categories due to the long ramp-up time available.

With this process, staff then compared Alternatives 3 and 4 with regard to health, economic, and other benefits. As mentioned on an earlier slide, a variety of public health metrics were assessed as well as impacts to employment. In both of these categories, Alternative 3 outperforms Alternative 4. Staff also assessed whether or not the two scenarios achieved the goal of 80 percent GHG reductions by 2050, as well as consistency with other Executive Orders and statutes. Alternative 3 achieved this 2050 target and the ZEV Executive Order. Alternative 4 did not meet either criteria.

With these criteria, we recommend Alternative 3 as the proposed scenario for the draft 2022 Scoping Plan.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: Staff approached the natural and working lands sector using the same general framework. Important consideration was the advancement of strategies identified through State
efforts, such as CNRA's Climate Smart Strategy and the 30x30 Pathways, as well as the resulting natural and working lands co-benefits. These strategies include increasing stable carbon storage, reductions in fuels and wildfires, and the restoration and protection of land and healthy soils, among many others.

Alternatives 3 and 2 were most successful in meeting the largest mix of these natural and working land strategies, whereas Alternative 1 did not reduce fuels or wildfires and Alternative 4 lacked balance between all the natural and working lands strategies.

Feasibility was also closely considered in terms of implementation timelines for the identified strategies and capturing achievable levels of management. Based on staff's evaluation and consultation with other agencies, Alternatives 3 and 2 were determined to be more feasible than Alternatives 1 and 4.

Staff also assessed the economic and public health outcomes resulting from the scenarios. The scenarios were ranked in terms of lowest costs to implement the strategies, least impact on employment, and overall economic metrics, and the highest benefit to public health. Alternative 3 performed the best in meeting these criteria.

Overall, Alternative 3 achieved the best balance
between these considerations and was selected as the proposed scenario for natural and working lands.

---o0o---

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: So this slide just brings it all together by summarizing the proposed scenario for the draft 2022 Scoping Plan, representing both the AB 32 GHG inventory sectors and our natural and working lands.

---o0o---

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: The proposed scenario achieves significant GHG reductions through 2045. The chart on this slide shows total GHG emissions in 2020 compared to expected emissions in future years with implementation of the proposed scenario. The proposed scenario exceeds the SB 32 target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 depicted in the dashed line. The proposed scenario cuts short-lived climate pollutants meeting our SB 1383 targets and continuing reductions in methane and hydrofluorocarbons into mid-century.

---o0o---

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: Achieving these GHG emissions reductions would not be possible without a significant reduction in fossil fuel combustion. In the proposed scenario, fossil fuel combustion declines tremendously by 2045, as shown in the
third and fourth columns. It's also important to understand the electricity sector will be supporting decarbonization efforts across many sectors through electrification, and yet still has reduced GHG emissions in 2045.

Natural gas combustion for electricity in 2045 is a fraction of current levels and would be needed only when renewables are not available. Now, there has been some confusion as to this point, but there is no increase in natural gas produced electricity between now and 2045.

Nearly eliminating fossil fuel combustion also eliminates much of the criteria and toxic air pollution from sources and is responsible for the majority of the health benefits reflected in the proposed scenario.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM:

Electricity demand under the proposed scenario will increase by 68 percent statewide by 2045, because we're proposing to lean heavily on this sector to transition away from fossil fuel. This means a substantial amount of load increase. Moving the world's fifth largest economy with about 40 million residents to electricity means we must ensure an affordable, reliable, and clean electricity grid.

The modeling indicates we will need backup
dispatchable power for when intermittent renewables, such as solar or wind, are not available or when loads exceed the planned forecast. The modeling includes 10 gigawatts of natural gas capacity in 2045 to support the grid, if sufficient renewable power is not available, but only used if needed for reliability.

Opportunities to increase seasonal energy storage capacity or to increase energy efficiency, to bring down overall electricity demand, can both reduce the need for new natural gas capacity.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: As we showed on a previous slide, the proposed scenario, as well as other alternatives all have residual GHG emissions in 2045. These residual emissions come from some remaining combustion emissions, as well as non-combustion emissions like hydrofluorocarbons, methane, and N20. These residual emissions must be accounted for in order to reach the carbon neutrality threshold.

Carbon dioxide removal is the category of options for removing CO2 from ambient air and sequestering it. This is distinct from carbon capture and storage, or CCS, which captures emissions from exhaust gas at industrial processes utilizing fossil fuel. We'll talk more about CCS on the next slide.
There are two types of carbon dioxide removal. There's mechanical and there's nature based. Mechanical carbon dioxide removal includes direct air capture, which uses large fans and a chemical process to remove carbon from the ambient air, as well as bioenergy processes that capture carbon from biomass. The proposed scenario makes use of some mechanical carbon dioxide removal. Nature based solutions refers to CO2 captured by our natural and working lands. Nature-based solutions are effective if the net carbon sequestered by land is greater than the carbon emitted by decaying plants or wildfires.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: Carbon capture and sequestration is distinct from carbon dioxide removal. CCS can be applied to point sources to capture CO2 from exhaust stacks. CCS is not a new technology, but it has not yet been applied to facilities in California. In the proposed scenario, CCS is utilized in a handful of targeted end-uses such as cement plants and refineries, which are difficult to decarbonize without capture technology.

The yellow wedge on this chart illustrates the targeted role of CCS in the proposed scenario. Now, as you can see the bulk of emissions reductions will come from reducing and replacing fossil fuel consumption.
ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM:

Now, let's shift to the natural and working lands sector. These lands play a role in the State's efforts toward carbon neutrality in two different ways. Lands may act as a carbon sink by sequestering more carbon than they emit. And also lands currently hold a substantial amount of carbon in their soils and biomass. We can help our climate goals by reducing the amount of carbon that gets emitted from this large carbon pool.

However, as we go through the next few slides, it's important to remember that carbon is only one aspect of lands that will influence how we set a target for this sector. Lands also provide many other services that humans and nature rely upon to survive, such as biodiversity, clean water, fire risk reduction, food security, public health, recreation, and economic sustainability. In setting a target, we must consider the multiple benefits of natural and working lands and the importance of ecological health and be careful to avoid prioritizing carbon sequestration that might come at the expense of other benefits or create adverse ecological impacts.

--00o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: Staff
used groundbreaking modeling methods to assess how climate and management will affect our ecosystems, and as a result, how we as a state can go about utilizing lands to achieve our climate goals. This modeling effort was used to inform the natural and working lands target in the Scoping Plan.

This slide contains the list of natural and working lands categories that were included in the draft 2022 Scoping Plan. The selection of these land categories for modeling was driven by their contribution to overall statewide carbon stocks, our understanding of the state of the science for modeling them as well as staff resource capacity.

Some land categories are not as well studied and understood as others and so they were not modeled for this draft Scoping Plan. However, staff understands that these other land categories are important and can still provide GHG emissions benefits and other co-benefits.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: Here is the modeled natural and working lands carbon stock change from 2025 to 2045. This slide shows our combined projections of carbon stocks in our forests, shrublands, grasslands, croplands, orchards, urban forests, wetlands and deserts.
Forests, shrublands, and grasslands dominate California's natural and working lands contribution to carbon neutrality, and our current forested biomass on the landscape is at historic highs. This, combined with increasing impacts of climate change on our lands going forward, means that we are predicting a decreasing trend of carbon stocks through 2045.

Despite an overall decreasing trend in carbon stocks going forward, certain land management actions we take can increase carbon sequestration and reduce GHG emissions from the land sector. For example, if we increase our urban forests or deploy more healthy soils practices, we can pull CO2 from the atmosphere and sequester more carbon than if we continue with the business-as-usual approach.

Additionally, actions that improve plant growth and soil health, such as compost applications, can help increase the sequestration rate. It's important to note that lands can be complex systems, both storing carbon through increased sequestration, while also generating emissions from fires, decay, soil, oxidation and fertilizer use. For this Scoping Plan, staff's analysis included both the sequestration and emissions to the extent feasible.

--o0o--
ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: And here are those results on net GHG emission from 2025 to 2045 for natural and working lands. Positive values indicate net sequestration during a particular year, while negative values indicate net emissions that year. As you can see, the rate fluctuates greatly through 2045. The time frame in which we look at overall natural and working land sequestration or emissions is very important and largely determines whether natural and working lands are a carbon sink or a source. The shorter five-year time frame, indicated by the dark blue brackets, contains significant variability in emissions. Staff instead recommends using a longer averaging period to assess the average annual net emissions and sequestration from natural and working lands.

And while we -- while we are recommending averaging natural and working lands across a 20-year period, we recognize that there is no right answer here. We welcome feedback on the time frame we should use for including lands in our carbon neutrality goal and we're seeking to set an annual emissions value for natural and working lands that also reflects the multi-decade time scales needed to see the land management benefits.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: In the
proposed scenario, carbon dioxide removal compensates for the remaining emissions in 2045. The AB 32 inventory sector sources are significantly reduced by 2045, but some residual emissions remain in 2045. And as we just discussed, if we look at natural and working lands net emissions with a 20-year time frame, additional GHG emissions will remain in 2045.

Carbon dioxide removal currently accounts for around one-third of the GHG emissions reductions needed to achieve carbon neutrality and could be reduced if GHG emissions reductions can be achieved more quickly from the AB 32 sectors or if natural and working lands are able to become a net sink of GHG emissions, meaning they absorb and sequester more than they emit.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: All right. Before concluding the presentation, I want to summarize two items that we included in the draft 2022 Scoping Plan.

A number of questions and concerns about safe and reliable deployment of CCS and carbon dioxide removal have been raised by the EJ Advisory Committee and community advocates, so there will be a multi-agency group convened starting this summer to engage with communities to better understand and address their concerns with regard to CCS
and its efficient and safe deployment.

Another key area was included in response to a commitment by Secretary Blumenfeld related to the role of the Cap-and-Trade Program in achieving the 2030 target. Our recent modeling shows the role of Cap-and-Trade in achieving the 2030 target is reduced relative to the 2017 Scoping Plan update modeling, in large part because new legislation increases the contribution of renewable electricity generation and establishes targets for emissions reductions in the cement industry.

In addition, more stringent programs reduced the carbon intensity of liquid fuels and increased the deployments of zero-emission vehicles and the pandemic lowered emissions in ways that were never foreseen during the 2017 Scoping Plan update process.

Even with these complimentary policies reducing emissions, the Cap-and-Trade Program continues to work to reduce emissions and generate proceeds for reinvestment in California. To date, the Cap-and-Trade Program has generated over $20 billion in proceeds and this money is directed toward actions that reduce GHG emissions with 50 percent of the project implemented to date benefiting the state’s disadvantaged and low-income communities.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: We will
be updating the modeling for the proposed scenario including any direction from the Board. And as we consider more ambition for clean technology deployment, we must consider the implications for clean energy supply. For example, if we assume earlier deployment of zero-emission vehicles, we need to build additional wind and solar electricity generation plants even faster than what is currently proposed. Actions that reduce overall energy demand, such as energy efficiency measures, reduce the need for faster deployment of renewable electricity.

Regarding the natural and working lands, management actions can be adjusted. Forests are tremendous contributors to carbon neutrality and the implementation timelines and treated acres affect the overall carbon stocks. Staff also found that accelerating deployment of urban tree canopy, wetland restoration, healthy soils practices, and organic farming deliver increased carbon sequestration and reduced emissions.

However, we need to acknowledge that significant uncertainty exists here, and in addition the State has limited tools to accelerate the deployment of these strategies. And the ability for natural and working lands to contribute to carbon neutrality is also affected by future climate change and natural variability.

--o0o--
ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: All right. We're almost at the end. Just two more slides. So a reminder to the Board and the public that staff completed a Draft Environmental Analysis for this plan. And this Draft EA was released for a 45-day comment period on May 10th. The public comment period will close on June 24th and staff will respond to any timely EA comments we receive and will present those responses to the Board along with the Final EA.

--o0o--

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: Now, during the summer, we will engage in listening sessions around the state to hear perspectives from communities, which will be additive to the community meetings planned by the EJAC. We will also continue to hold public workshops and will share revised modeling assumptions at a public workshop. The Board and EJAC will also meet together in September 2022. After the final Scoping Plan is released in the fall, we will bring it back to the Board with the Final EA for approval before the end of the year.

So this concludes the staff presentation.

I'll now invite Jared Blumenfeld, Secretary of CalEPA, to give his remarks.

CALEPA SECRETARY BLUMENFELD: That was a
blockbuster presentation. So super appreciate that. Good morning, Chair Randolph. Good morning, Board members. My name is Jared Blumenfeld and I'm the Secretary of California's Environmental Protection Agency. And it's an honor to be with you and talk briefly today about this important issue.

Today, as we meet, Sacramento will get to 100 degrees. This year, before fire season even begins, we've had 2,900 fires in the State and we're living through historic drought where water scarcity has become the new normal. And so against that backdrop, I think every single Californian today knows that we're living through a climate emergency, living in a climate emergency. And so what we're doing today takes on additional importance and urgency.

I want to thank the CARB staff for doing an incredible job of putting together what will be the world's first actionable draft of how we get to carbon neutrality. No other advanced economy of our size has undertaken such an effort. And I can say without hesitation and with great provide that CARB is the foremost air and climate regulatory agency in the world today. So there's a lot of attention and focus on what we do here, but there's also enormous amount of pride in the work that has been done to date.
I really want to make sure that what we're focusing on is both the ambition. The world is full of ambition when it comes to climate change. Often, that ambition is not met by climate action and what is important I think today is to really marry those two things. We need to be ambitious, if we are to have a planet that is future -- in the future is capable of human and other habitation.

So when we talk about this, it is not abstract, right? This is not an abstract conversation about numbers, or modeling, or the economy, or future jobs alone. This is about the very future of our planet and whether we can have one that is habitable for human kind.

That is a pretty heady, difficult thing to wrap your arms around. And in a number of the conversations that I've been in in the last few days, it really feels like we don't have an option for failure. And so when we think about that way, that responsibility, a lot of the world is focused on us today. I want to start with the people that -- the community members, the business leaders, the labor groups, the moms, the youth activists, in particular, the environmental justice advocates, the academics, everyone who has come out today, religious leaders, elected officials, thank you for coming. Really appreciate each and every one of you. Thank you for your
energy. Thank you for just really pushing us to do our best. Often, that relationship is going to feel difficult. Often that relationship is going to feel complex. You've spent a huge amount of time.

I particularly want to thank the EJAC members. No one I think who got into this probably realized what it meant to engage in the Scoping Plan. And the more we engage, the more work you need to do, so thank you for taking time out. Many of you, most of you are unpaid. You're doing this, because you care about it. We need your energy. We need your passion and enthusiasm to get this done and we need you to hold us accountable to the plan that is ultimately approved, because this is only as good as the actions that follow it.

Yeah. We're very focused on what this says we should do. But what we should do is only as good as what we do, and that is only going to happen because of each and every one of you. So thank you from the bottom of my heart for doing what you did and coming out today.

Don't forget, it's very hot, so hydrate, even though we don't have a lot of water in the State, use what we do to drink.

I also want to -- Martha Dina's -- I was sitting next to, but all of the CARB Environmental Justice Committee, you guys, as an Advisory Committee, have gone
though a lot. We have not always reached and will probably never reach consensus on everything. But as we heard in the presentation, there are 60 items from your list, which have been merged into the Scoping Plan draft that we have in front of us. I know that's good enough. I know we want to get more and appreciate everyone's attention to thinking about how we do that.

We often read in the newspaper and the International Panel on Climate Change, if you look at their pronouncements over the last 10 years, they kind of like, you know, have gone from very dry science to this is code red for humanity we need to act. And really gratifying that the Scoping Plan and the work that is in front of us reflects the consensus of the IPCC. Not only does it do that, but it really focuses on how we make this transition. That's what the world is looking at.

The first most important thing that California did globally on climate change was to be able to show the world that we can delink carbon emissions from GDP growth. What everyone else is going to look at is how do we hold society together or hold our economy together, while coming up with a plan that radically reduces greenhouse gas emissions and brings us to a place very quickly, where we get to neutrality.

So when implemented, this plan will reduce fossil
fuels by over 90 percent and deliver critical air quality benefits to disadvantaged communities in the near term. In fact, it overshoots our 2030 target of reducing emissions 40 percent below 1990 by six percent. The draft is incredibly ambitious and the chosen scenario will require unprecedented pace of deployment funding. And we've heard this, but this cannot be ignored. And it's one of the things when you get to implementation, which is where we're going to be very soon and offer 2030 targets, we have to be able to get projects in the ground quicker.

When I hear that, you know, offshore wind will take 15 years to permit and deploy, we don't have 15 years. We simply don't. So part of our effort needs to be not only to understand the power of our ambition, but how the hell do we get this done in the context that we currently have. And we need reforms in those areas as much as we do in others.

When we think about the future, often this plan is seen as overly cast in stone. I don't think that is the intent. The intent is that as we get new data and cost-effective technologies that emerge, we can accelerate the target laid out in the plan. That has been the case of every single Scoping Plan so far.

Battery storage is only the most recent example. In 2017 didn't know how effective that technology would
be. Now, it is. That's going to be case moving forward. We simply don't know what we don't know, but we need to adapt, and this plan will allow us to adapt.

One of the first immediate next steps that gives me a lot of hope and is a lot of work for you as a Board is that once the plan is finalized. And you know, we will engage in that process of revisiting regulations, such as the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, so that they take into account all the learnings and the descriptions of where we need to go that are laid out in this Scoping Plan.

So this is a document that is -- I describe it as a roadmap for reducing GHG emissions. And I know it's tempting and I get a lot of these calls at CalEPA to ask this process to address a myriad of other challenges, such as reducing the use of harmful pesticides, even if they don't, as in that case, have a direct relationship to carbon pollution. I would say that watering down the focus of this document will have a negative effect on distracting us from the very real challenge of implementing emissions reductions.

We need to continue to work together. As I said, this is a fight of our generation. This is probably the largest single fight that any generation has ever been asked to undertake. Carbon is woven into every aspect, every facet of our economy. And it isn't an abstraction.
When I think about my two children Marcus and Anya, we often in this movement of optimists started with this premise that we want the world that our children to inherit to be better than the one that we did. That is simply not going to be the case. There's too much carbon baked into the atmosphere already. What we're trying to do is have the best scenario that we possibly can, the least bad scenario for our kids.

And living through the last three years in California the reality that we're currently facing is a difficult one. We need to make sure that we're doing everything humanly possible to move forward to a future that is less difficult, less bad than the one that is projected by science. And so far the science has only been wrong in that what we thought would be 20 years from now in terms of impact is today.

That's the -- the science isn't -- you know, none of the science that we saw, you know, could be wrong, you know, is going to happen in not 50 years, 60 years, now it's happening today what we thought would happen 50 years ago -- 50 years from now. So for me, so much in our society divides us. You only need to look at what's happening in our nation's Supreme Court, what's happening on the streets, what has happened to our society in the last 10 years. People are focusing on what divides us and
I want to make sure in California in 2022 that we focus on the partnership.

We need a partnership to get this plan approved. We need an even stronger partnership with each and every one of you to get this implemented. And this isn't about politics. This isn't about different views. We all share the view that we need to radically reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We all share the view that we need do it in a way that lifts up communities and supports equity. But often, what -- and what we'll hear today often is the issue that divide us. I just hope we can also focus on what's going to bring us together, because there's so many interests from large fossil fuel interests to others that want us to fail, that have economic reasons to tell us to push us to a point of failure.

And so we have a very difficult task. You do as a Board. I want thank each and every one of you for your commitment, and your time, and your energy, and your smarts to get this done, but mostly for your heart and your compassion. This is an incredibly technical issue, but it's also one that's affecting Californians today, each and every day. So I will be a partner with you and all of you, each of you to get this done. But let's think about how we work together in partnership, move this to completion, realize it's a roadmap. It isn't cast in
stone. Realize that it is the most ambitious plan around implementation, and that if we don't focus on implementation and just focus on ambition, we won't achieve the results that future generations need us to. Thank you.

And now I think I get to introduce a great partner and someone who is a global leader on thinking about a community that faces every single day climate change in a way that you wouldn't imagine, but the farm and ag community outside every day. They know how much it rains. They know how hot it gets and they have someone who's pushing them to think about climate change in a very different way and that is Secretary of California Department of Food and Agriculture, the Honorable Karen Ross.

CDFA SECRETARY ROSS: Thank you, Secretary Blumenfeld. It's hard to follow an act like that, so I'm going to bring us back down to earth literally because our business is on the ground. And I want to start by thanking you, Chair Randolph, for welcoming us here today. I know you're going to have a very long day, and I want to be respectful of your time, but I'm passionate about what we do here in California that cannot be easily duplicated in other states or even in other nations, and that is this bountiful, healthy, nutritious food that we produce in
California on a daily basis, because we've been given this
Mediterranean climate that allows us to do nutrient dense
fresh produce, our fruits, our vegetables, where we're the
producers of over two-thirds of that for our entire
nation.

Our tree nuts, which can be castigated as water
users, as all plants are water users, but tree nuts are an
important part of the rapidly growing plant-based protein
diets, in addition to dairy and livestock. We are able to
do that here in California in some of the most efficient
ways possible with progressive farmers who are great
stewards of their lands. We cannot do that without
partners. And our most important partners are our
consumers and our sister agencies with the commitment to
really looking at what is possible, what is feasible, and
what is achievable.

And I just want to thank our CARB staff for doing
something so remarkable, and that is this modeling on
natural and working lands. I am -- like I'm sitting here
being a little bit intimidated, but mostly I am very
excited about the opportunities before us. And that is
what climate is presenting to us, because as Secretary
Blumenfeld said, there is no option to fail. We will not
be able to feed people if agriculture is not a part of
this solution, implementing the practices that we have
available today, let alone knowing that the very important policy signals the ambitious goals that you are setting are the right signals to the marketplace, to scientists, to researchers, to really unleash innovation and technology solutions in addition to really implementing those practices that have been with us from the beginning of time from indigenous peoples on how to care for the land, care for the resources, make sure that we can maintain or biodiversity, all that makes it possible for us to grow the delicious and health food that we do.

So I wanted to say that today, California agriculture our farmers, our ranchers, and our farmworkers are living climate change. The drought has been mentioned. Last year, we fallowed over 285,000 acres. It's estimated in the Central Valley we'll probably fallow over 600,000 acres this year. But the Sacramento Valley it has never had the kind of fallowing that they will see this year. It will not be able to plant 250,000 acres of rice. And just last week in Imperial County, the home of 90 percent of our winter vegetables, and our salads, has been told that they must reduce their water use by 40 percent.

This is climate-induced drought in levels that we've never seen before. But we also, over the last decade, have seen the loss of chill hours that has a
direct impact on the fruit tree productivity that we enjoy in this State. We're seeing warmer nighttime temperatures, that for those of us who came out of the wine sector -- I'm a true confessor here -- that has a direct impact to the quality of our wine groups, but also the ripening process for our tree fruits and all those summer fruits that we enjoy so much.

We are losing out on the opportunities to self-correct on this, because of what is already happening and coming at us much faster than any of us would have ever anticipated.

And last year's loss of that runoff, because of the dry soils, and hotter temperatures, and evapotranspiration are living proof that we can't afford to take our time. We have to work together aggressively to save this agriculture, to protect the lives of our people in our communities, and to really rapidly move towards carbon neutrality. And I know that agriculture can be part of the solution, because of practices that we have already started to implement with incentive programs from a climate change investment fund that have been supplemented the last couple of years with general fund dollars to save agricultural land. Preserving that land to prevent it from being developed on a permanent basis that will usually be to increase vehicle miles traveled is
an important strategy as part of natural and working lands. Making sure that it's never bare is also part of making those lands sequester carbon.

We have invested at the Department of Food and Agriculture an on farm water use efficiency, which also reduces energy use for irrigation practices, and also improves nutrient management practices. We have invested $123 million on over -- let's see here, I want to make sure I get this right -- 168,000 acres that not only have saved the equivalent of 71,000 Olympic pools of water, 47 and a half billion gallons of water that have been saved, but have reduced greenhouse gas emissions on an annual basis by 81,000 metric tons. So this is a multi-benefit way of spending those dollars and allowing us to continue to be productive in food.

We are also the implementer of our Dairy Digester Research Program and our Alternative Manure Management Program. I am the only Cabinet Secretary -- I know, you're jealous Secretary Blumenfeld -- that get to talk -- talk about cow poo and I do it often, because it is nutrient rich. It's not just that valuable milk and all the products that come from milk or dairy, but it also about capturing methane.

I was so proud to be with you Chairman Randolph when we were at COP to be able to be the only place on
earth that had an aggressive 40 percent reduction below 2013 levels of methane. We were the only state to have that goal and the only place on earth that was making the kind of considerable investment in it that we're doing. Our dairy families have stepped up and embraced the technology, whether it's for anaerobic digesters or alternative manure management practices to create more compost, which is very important to our healthy soils program. It's that circular economy that we're really having people embrace and move forward with. And it happens because the State is willing to partner with agriculture in its transition to carbon neutrality. Incentive programs, investment in technical assistance, whether it's cooperative extension or resource conservation districts, we've invested $11 million to make sure that every farmer, regardless of the size of their farm, the crops that they grow, or the language that they speak can learn about our programs and have technical assistants to apply for our programs. We put aside target dollars for those hard-to-reach populations to make sure that no one is left behind in implementing these programs.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you, Secretary Ross, so much for your comments.

CDFA SECRETARY ROSS: I'm sorry. I got too excited and too passionate. I could go on and on. I
didn't every touch on health soils, but the globe is so excited about the work that we're doing and USDA is investing considerable dollars. We look forward to partnering with them. I just wanted to say that this is a challenging goal on working lands like agriculture, because crops change all the time, so it's going to take some time and effort for us to invest in how to monitor, measure, and better quantify in a more precise way. But we look forward to working with everyone here at CARB. And I want to thank the CARB staff for being so inclusive and really the collaborative processes that we all enjoy.

And I really -- some day, I would like to have some great good and talk more about how passionate I am about what we do for California.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you, Secretary Ross.

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: Thank you. Next we'll hear from Alice Reynolds, President of the California Public Utilities Commission.

CPUC PRESIDENT REYNOLDS: Good morning, Chair Randolph and Board members. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak today. I'm Alice Reynolds, President of the California Public Utilities Commission and I am really pleased to join you for this very significant public meeting. I first want to recognize the close
collaboration between the staff at my Commission, and California's other energy agencies, and the Air Resources Board. Many, many people have worked across agencies side by side to get us to this point and I want to acknowledge and commend their efforts.

At the Public Utilities Commission, we recognize that with this Scoping Plan process, California really is shaping the next chapter of policy and initiatives to achieve our aggressive -- aggressive climate goals. And as we do, I am always mindful of the high stakes balancing act of maintaining safe, affordable, reliable, electricity and natural gas service to meet existing demands, even as we ask the electricity system to do more and transition away from natural gas.

The world is watching us as we embark on this next phase. And the energy sector in particular has historically outperformed its goals as the renewable portfolio standard and this -- the Commission's integrated resource plan process have provided the energies -- the engines for doing a lot of that greenhouse gas emission reduction work. And that's really an example of the action that Secretary Blumenfeld mentioned here in California.

The energy sector has also recently shown resilience as exemplified by the rapid escalation of
installed grid scale storage. Over the past two and a half years, we've seen a 20-fold increase from about 200 megawatts up to 4,000 megawatts, all during an international pandemic and despite supply chain challenges.

But the hard work really is yet to come. We need to think about how the energy sector can continue to grow, in fact, double or triple, to meet electrification and decarbonization goals. And we need to focus on what it takes to meet the needs of an evolving grid, especially during the hours when the system must ramp up to replace or massive solar fleet as the sun sets. And we know to do this well, we must closely coordinate with other State agencies and also members of the public, communities across California and stakeholders across the Board.

Part of that collaboration is illustrated in the joint agency report, the SB 100 report, which has already been prepared, which set forth draft -- which set forth pathways for the electricity sector to implement the goal of a hundred percent clean retail energy sales in California.

Additionally, California's integrated resource plan process is where the energy plans of the energy providers are developed and reviewed from a cost, reliability, equity, and implementation feasibility
perspective. That process is ongoing, well underway, and continually moving towards energy portfolios for clean energy.

And finally, I do want to recognize that in the context of all of the work going on here at the Air Resources Board, and all the energy agencies, we are very much focused on affordability of energy services, especially for low income and vulnerable communities. And this is something that we are incredibly focused on. As we pursue equity across -- in access to electric vehicles and electric heat pumps throughout California, we are keenly aware that affordability of electricity is a key element.

With that, I will conclude by expressing my sincere appreciation to the Board for the opportunity to speak today. Thank you very much.

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: Thank you. Next we'll hear from Amanda Hansen, Deputy Secretary of Climate Change at the California Natural Resources Agency.

CNRA DEPUTY SECRETARY HANSEN: Thank you very much. Good morning. I'm Amanda Hansen, Deputy Secretary for Climate Change at the Natural Resources Agency. And I'd like to start by expressing Secretary Crowfoot's regrets for not being able to participate today. He had
to hop on a flight just 30 minutes ago to participate in a set of events on water conservation and drought in Southern California.

I'd also like to congratulate the CARB team for the ambition called for in the draft plan. My remarks are going to focus on parts of the plan that relate to two areas of work the Natural Resources Agency is focused on.

The first is our electricity sector. Electrification is a key tool for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in sectors -- in most of the sectors that the Scoping Plan is evaluating and it's going to be important to consider the increase in demand for electrification combined with extreme and unpredictable weather events, as we continue the transition to an electric grid that is reliable, affordable, and resilient.

In 2020, 59 percent of the state's electricity came from carbon-free resources. There is a lot more to do to get to 100 percent clean energy and carbon neutrality. We really appreciate the comprehensive analysis by the CARB team that supports procurement of a diverse, clean energy portfolio, as well as the signal that we need to aggressively pursue zero carbon electricity, storage, and transmission. In hard to decarbonize sectors such as the transportation sector, we need to do more. The resources agency is happy to see the
draft plan highlight the importance of clean renewable fuels as we work to meet our zero-emission vehicle goals and reduce our reliance on fossil fuel.

The second area of focus is the natural and working lands sector. Very pleased to see the draft plan integrate this sector more than any previous plan, which reflects and reinforce -- reinforces Governor Newsom's nature-based climate solutions agenda, which was outlined in a 2020 Executive Order and includes a number and -- of elements, including our natural and working lands climate-smart strategy, our pathways to achieving 30x30, which is reducing -- or conserving 30 percent of our lands and coastal waters by 2030, and our partnership with California Native American tribes to achieve the State's ambitious climate and conservation goals. As others have pointed out, we know climate change is accelerating faster than anticipated. And like other sectors in the Scoping Plan, our natural and working lands can either support or undermine our efforts to build an equitable, resilient, and carbon neutral future.

I'd like to highlight a few findings from CARB's analysis in this sector in particular, first, climate action on natural and working lands will increase carbon storage, reduce greenhouse gas emission, increase climate resilience, and provide other critical ecosystem and
public health benefits. Second, the aggressive actions called for in this draft will decrease wildfire risk, and improve forest health without substantial carbon loss.

Third, the health cost savings from reduced wildfire smoke emissions alone approximately cover the increased costs of implementation for all natural and working lands management called for in the draft Scoping Plan.

Fourth, shifting this sector from a source of emissions to a sink will take time. It is possible. And the more we do, the better off we are.

Finally, CARB's modeling makes clear that the current scale of implementation does not match the level of the challenge. Achieving the natural and working lands target requires unprecedented levels of climate-smart land management. And the good news is there is a lot we can do to deliver results in this sector. In addition to what is called for in the plan, CARB's modeling was not able to focus on the full carbon sequestration potential this sector holds, particularly in soils, riparian, and coastal areas and it wasn't able to account for the benefits of many climate-smart land management practices identified in our Climate Smart Land Strategy, such as conservation, forest regrowth, riparian restoration, and forest in cities, and soil health in our grasslands and forests.
These and many other regenerative practices have proven carbon benefits and support water function, biodiversity, and ecosystem resilience. Work is already underway to support climate-start land management in California and the Governor and Legislature have committed record funding to do more.

The aggressive Scoping Plan target will help us to accelerate and scale collective action. We're looking forward to working with CARB on a incorporating additional strategies into the final plan and to partnering with the many climate leaders managing lands across California to implement it.

Thank you very much.

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: Thank you. Next, we'll hear from Siva Gunda, Vice Chair of the California Energy Commission.

CEC VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Good morning, Chair Randolph and members of the Board, staff and everyone in attendance. Thank you for the opportunity to join your hearing today. I'm Siva Gunda, Vice Chair of the California Energy Commission. As we all know, California's climate and air quality goals are profoundly ambitions and rightfully so. We applaud CARB for taking on the monumental task of looking across all economic sectors for how we can address the challenge of our
generation and safeguarding the future generations to come.

The California family is diverse and is blessed by an incredible diversity of opinion about how to achieve our goals. And we want to acknowledge the steps taken by CARB to help foster procedural equity in developing the Scoping Plan. We will need to make difficult choices in the coming years and it gives me enormous hope, joy, and pride to see that so many Californians are willing to invest their time and energy to this process. I want to thank each and every one that is present here and that have spent time to help ensure that the Scoping Plan considers the diversity of ideas.

I want to thank CARB staff for the tremendous work put into the Scoping Plan, as well as for creating intentional opportunities for the CEC to be able to weigh in on the strategies and the sectors that CEC has expertise or jurisdiction of.

Interagency coordination is essential in meeting our economy-wide decarbonization. We respect CARB's process in developing the Scoping plan and we look forward to continuing to collaborate and ultimately achieving the goals.

The CEC's focus, of course, is energy. Much of our success in achieving our climate goals is tied to the
energy sector. As a core responsibility of CEC, I would like to emphasize the importance of electric reliability as a core objective of the electric sector. Reliability is essential for the health, safety, and economic well-being of California. Reliability becomes of even greater importance with the level of electrification proposed through the draft Scoping Plan, especially in the face of extended drought, heat, and fire risk to our electric system.

It is also essential in continuing to foster national and global confidence to accelerate change as California demonstrates that we can achieve our climate goals. While CARB develops a broad economy-wide plan, CEC, similar to other agencies, has a statutory role in planning, defining, and implementing a number of strategies and pathways identified in the Scoping Plan.

To state of few building codes which will be critical to building decarbonization: The Clean Transportation Program that looks at investments in accelerating our clean transportation goals; siting infrastructure that is essential for the clean electric system; research and development to drive clean energy innovation; the SB 100 joint agency report to chart the path for clean, reliable, and affordable electric sector.
We currently have an interagency process to implement recommendations from the first SB 100 report, and we preparing for next report due on January 1st, 2025. We request everyone's engagement in shaping the next report. And finally, on forecasting and understanding the demand scenarios moving forward that we will face in the system and how distributed energy resources can support that.

Again, we want to appreciate the work that the CARB staff has put into the Scoping Plan and look forward to continued coordination and collaboration.

In closing, I want to acknowledge the tremendous task we all have at hand. No one entity can do this alone. We will continue to focus on thoughtful planning and implementation. We hope the high level engagement we have seen in the Scoping Plan will continue as we move into continued planning and implementation.

We cannot allow the conversations amongst our collective family to break down and we need all of us to help move this forward together and build the courage, consensus, love, and trust to be able to do so.

Thank you.

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: Thank you. And lastly, we'll hear from Abby Snay, Deputy Secretary for the Future of Work at the Labor and
CLWDA DEPUTY SECRETARY SNAY: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to be here today on behalf of Secretary Palugyai and to be part of such critical, innovative and exciting planning.

Overall the Labor and Workforce Development Agency works on worker training, worker protections, and benefits administration. Our climate focus and portfolio is emerging and growing, and we are eager to work with all of you to address climate change and move to a more equitable economy. In climate workforce, as we think of it, we see three areas of focus with CERF, the Community Economic Resilience Fund, as an overarching economic development strategy and process. CERF is a $600 million ground-up, regional economic planning effort to support recovery and the transition to a carbon neutral economy.

CERF will start with 65 million for 13 regional planning tables that are intended to be inclusive and collaborative. This -- extremely inclusive. This solicitation is out now. We expect grants for the planning phase to be confirmed in the early fall. The planning phases will be followed by project funding for priorities identified in the regional plans and we will solicit soon for a developmental evaluation to learn as we go with CERF.
On the workforce side, we have three distinct priorities. The first is transition support for workers who lose their jobs, as a result of the transition to a more climate resilient and climate neutral economy. The pending budget includes a $40 million fund for oil and gas workers, primarily in Kern County. This fund will leverage other federal dislocated worker funding and will provide support for living expenses and retraining.

Secondly, we see immense training opportunities as the State addresses climate change through mitigation, adaptation strategies, as well as emerging technologies. The jewel in the Labor Agency's crown is the California Workforce Development Board's High Road Training Partnerships and High Road Construction Careers training. And these are workforce efforts that start with good jobs, develop employer and worker partnerships, and work at the intersection of job quality, equity, and climate change.

Existing High Road Training Partnerships include a partnership in Southern California working on zero-emission vehicle manufacturing for buses, planning in Contra Costa around refineries, and the pending budget includes an additional 45 million for High Road Training Partnerships for a low carbon economy.

The third leg of our Climate Workforce Strategy really has to do with procurement. And our colleagues at
the California Workforce Development Board have been working with many of you in State departments to really use State recruitment as a lever to drive job quality and equity tea. Partnerships with the Public Utilities Commission as a good standard -- is a good example. And procurement can be a lever for change in including labor standards, project labor agreements and State contracts, points in competitive bidding for community workforce agreements as an example, or for the use of apprenticeship, and we look forward to working with you on these procurement strategies.

Lastly, we are excited that the budget also includes funding for new leadership for climate workforce within the labor agency. And this leadership position will really be our point person to the state's multiple strategies and plans and to be the voice of workforce and the connection around workforce opportunities and then to connect to your programs within the Labor Agency.

So I will close. Thank you again for the opportunity to be here and thank you for this truly globe-changing work that you are doing.

Thank you.

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: Thank you all for your remarks. So now, I'd like to invite members of the EJAC Advisory Committee to come to the
podium and to speak.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Sorry.

Martha Dina Argüello with Physicians for Social Responsibility and a longtime member of the EJAC. And I wore red in commemoration of the very first vote on the Scoping Plan, because I was wearing red then and I was here then, as were many community members. And I want to thank all the folks who came out. I want to thank my fellow Environmental Justice Advisory Committee members for the tremendous amount of work that we've done to get read for you today.

We will be presenting a series of recommendations in the Scoping Plan sector by sector. We're going to talk about, of course, carbon removal technologies that underpin and already weak Scoping Plan, and then I will -- Jill will come up and talk about indigenous and tribal issues.

And then we're -- in your package, we're actually presenting the better path, because in the words of Angela Johnson-Meszaros, during the first Scoping Plan, there is a better way. And I think the environmental justice community and the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee has been hard at work trying to figure out how to work with CARB and all the other agencies to figure out what is
a better path that gets us to clean air? We live in communities where carbon is the co-pollutant. No facility just emits carbon. We live in communities where it -- there's an extractive economy and we see how that extractive or incumbent economy has been privileged in this Scoping Plan. And we think we could do better and more collectively as CARB, but as a State, to pass -- to get on that path for a just transition, where workers and communities are first.

So we're deeply -- oh, the slide slow. Next slide. I keep forgetting to do that.

---00o--

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Next slide.

---00o--

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: We want to adopt a real zero alternative. Net zero -- these net neutrality goals often hide false solutions or climate dead-ends that continue to rely on the fossil fuel industry, and we need to do better and go further. This plan will not meet those 2030 goals or even our 2045 goals with this net greenhouse gas emissions. The real path for zero -- sorry, I'm trying to read notes and look at the pad.

Next slide.

---00o--

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: And the next slide will be
my partner in crime here, Sharifa. But we are urging CARB to put California on a path to a full coordinated phaseout of fossil fuels with a just transition. Without doing this, our communities who continue to live next to oil drilling sites, refineries, cement plants, our communities from California — throughout California from where I live in Los Angeles, to Wilmington, to the Central Valley, that is where we need to focus our efforts on cleaning the air. Remember, that carbon is the co-pollutant where we live and breathe. It's lung-level pollution. And so our measures have to focus on direct emissions reductions as we figure out the plan for a just transition.

So with that, I'm handing it over to Sharifa.

Get that for you. And let me explain some of the process. We'll be going back between Sharifa and myself, Dr. Catherine Garoupa White, who is on the phone right now. And then we will have a speaker who is an expert on pipeline safety to present and then Jill will present.

Thanks.

That works.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. Actually, would you mind going to the previous slide?

Oh, okay. Never mind. Back to the fourth slide.

Thank you.
SHARIFA TAYLOR: The draft plan has no excuse. The draft plan has no plan to phase out the fossil fuel production that is driving the climate crisis. In the refinery sector, the draft relies on a steep demand-side reduction while ignoring the fact that oil exports from refineries have been increasing. Without a commitment to a plan to manage the decline of refineries in California by 2045, there is no way to meet the State's GHG reduction goals statewide or public health and safety goals in refinery communities, and there is no way for workers and communities to plan for a just and equitable transition.

Next slide, please.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Thank you.

Instead -- instead of a real plan to phase out fossil fuel refining, the proposed scenario includes the most extensive, immediate, and heavy reliance on carbon capture and sequestration, CCS, in refineries, which are the state's largest industrial emitters. This is a dangerous, expensive, and unrealistic protocol to sacrifice low income communities of color.

In moving back the timeline to implement CCS in California, refineries is not a solution. CARB should
only use modeling assumptions that are support by operational data, cost, and deployment timelines. If it does, we know that CCS cannot be used as a GHG reduction strategy in the refinery sector.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

SHARIFA TAYLOR: CCS expansion at California's refineries is dangerous and technically unfeasible, because there isn't enough space.

Could you go back to the slide?

Thank you. That's because I was about to refer to the image on the screen.

(Technical difficulties.)

SHARIFA TAYLOR: We're taking a break.

(Laughter.)

SHARIFA TAYLOR: You want to go back to it while they figure out the PDF thing.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. We're going to take about a five minute break to try to get our PowerPoint working.

(Off record: 10:58 a.m.)

(Thereupon a recess was taken for technical difficulties.)

(On record: 11:16 a.m.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. So we have the PowerPoint ready to go, so we'll be restarting the meeting
momentarily.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Ladies and gentlemen,
could you please take your seats.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you so much.

We are ready to restart.

Thank you, Sharifa.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Thank you, Chair Randolph.

Okay. So just to restart this section. The draft plan has no plan to phase out of the fossil fuel production that is driving the climate crisis. In the refinery sector, the draft relies on a steep demand-side reduction while ignoring the fact that oil exports -- while ignoring the fact that oil exports from refineries have been increasing. Without a commitment to a plan to manage the decline of refineries in California by 2045, there is no way to meet the State's GHG reduction goals statewide or public health and safety goals in refinery communities. There's also no way for workers in communities to plan for a just and equitable transition.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Thanks. Thank you. Instead of a real plan to phase out fossil fuel refining, the proposed scenario includes the most extensive, immediate, and heavy reliance on carbon capture and sequestration,
CCS, in refineries, which are the state's largest industrial emitters. This is a dangerous, expensive, and unrealistic proposal to sacrifice low-income communities of color.

In moving back the timeline to implement CCS in California refineries is not a solution. CARB should only use modeling assumptions that are supported by operational data, cost, and deployment timelines. If it does, we know that CCS cannot be used as a GHG reduction strategy in the refinery sector.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

SHARIFA TAYLOR: This is the slide that started it all.

(Laughter.)

SHARIFA TAYLOR: CCS expansion at California refineries is dangerous and technically unfeasible, because there isn't enough space. So this image is from a Google Earth show, which demonstrates part of the Marathon LA refinery. It shows that refineries are much more complex in dense and in small industries.

And if I you even just visually look at it now, you can tell that there's barely any space just for the vehicles to maneuver around the plant. There are hundreds of massive heaters and boilers and miles of pipe in
between.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Thank you.

The draft Scoping Plan's proposed targets for oil and gas extractions are internally inconsistent. The draft Scoping Plan quotes, "That while the summary table and the draft says oil and gas extraction phaseout operations by 2045, the draft seems to weaken this commitment". This is from page 59 table 2-2, actions for the proposed scenario, AB 32 GHG inventories -- excuse me, inventory sectors.

But we need clarity and certainty from CARB. This draft also says, "To avoid leakage as called for in AB 32 and meet that remaining demand for petroleum fuel, a complete phaseout of oil and gas extraction in refining is not possible by 2045. The draft Scoping Plan assumed the following: One, a phased down in oil and gas extraction by 2045 and refining in line with the reduction in demand for in-state on-road petroleum fuel demand; and two, GHG emissions from the..." -- excuse me, "... from oil and gas extraction could be reduced approximately 85 percent in 2045 from 2020 levels, if extraction decreases in line with in-state finished fuel demand." This quote is from page 78.
SHARIFA TAYLOR: CARB must modify the plan to include an action to phase out oil and gas extraction in-state by 2035. In-state oil extraction provides about a third of crude oil used in California refineries. Oil extraction emits substantial GHGs, including methane, smog precursors and toxic emissions heavily concentrated in EJ communities. This is consistent with local municipal plans -- excuse me plans, such as the County of Los Angeles declaring oil extraction to be incompatible land use this past year.

Additionally, we want to flag that the draft also opens the door to enhanced oil recovery EOR, more extractions and GHGs, which CCS can be used for.
on the draft Scoping Plan. Thank you to community members waiting so patiently to comment on such an important issue. Thank you to my fellow EJAC co-chairs and colleagues who have put in so much work, despite so many constraints, including the ongoing pandemic. It's an honor to co-present today and to recently have been elected as co-chair to replace my colleague Paulina with Center on Race, Poverty, and the environment.

The recommendations before you today represent countless hours invested by EJAC and partners to build consensus on positions on a wide range of complex issues, and to respond to the analysis from the Air Resources Board, which has been a time intensive investment yet essential to our movement building process and really appreciate how much effort my colleagues have put in along with the many unpaid technical experts who have contributed.

What I'm going to cover today on carbon dioxide removal, Cap-and-Trade, and livestock methane is very high level and by no means comprehensive. There are ample opportunities to discuss off-line. Detail is provided in additional comment letters. And we look forward to other ongoing efforts to consult and where possible collaborate.

Relying on such a large amount of carbon dioxide removal is an inherently risky and uncertain strategy that
comes at a huge opportunity cost versus the benefits that we could gain, if we focused on equitable investments in renewable energy and ecological restoration.

Next slide, please.

DR. CATHERINE GAROUPA WHITE: In addition, ramping up direct air capture would require additional energy capacity that the State currently doesn't have, which would either have to come from fossil fuels or renewables. Any increased capacity in energy generation should directly power California's communities and the economy not direct air capture machines.

Next slide, please.

DR. CATHERINE GAROUPA WHITE: The draft Scoping Plan says quote, "Carbon capture and sequestration, or CCS for short, will be a necessary tool to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and mitigate climate change while minimizing leakage". In response, the EJAC has pointed out that point source carbon capture use and storage is not a negative emissions technology, and, in fact, in many cases releases more carbon into the atmosphere than it removes.

As currently practiced, CCUS is net additive releasing into the atmosphere more carbon dioxide than it removes. There is an energy penalty when new natural gas
power plants have to come on line to power CCUS projects, and that produces other harmful environmental impacts. Refineries have multiple point sources and fugitive process emissions as just one example. It's difficult to capture all point source and process emissions resulting in significant reduction in the actual capture rates of these projects. And as just one example, the Shell Quest CCS project in Canada, which was the model used by CARB staff in developing the original 2018 Low Carbon Fuel Standard CCS protocol, boasted of tackling global warming claiming that it demonstrates that carbon capture systems are quote/unquote safe and effective.

However, recent research shows that Quest is, in fact, emitting more than it's capturing. Despite having captured a five million metric tons of carbon across a five-year period, the project has emitted a further 7.5 million tons of climate polluting gases during the same time. Each year Shell's plant has the same carbon footprint as approximately 1.2 million gas powered vehicles. Just 48 percent of the plant's carbon emissions are captured, woefully short of the 90 percent carbon capture rate promised by industry. This rate drops to only 39 percent when including other greenhouse gas emissions from Shell's project.

Next slide, please.
DR. CATHERINE GAROUPA WHITE: So again -- (clears throat) -- excuse me. Again a comparative analysis here where the draft Scoping Plan claims that California's deep sedimentary rock formations, particularly in the Central Valley, represent world class CO2 storage sites that would meet the highest standards with storage capacities of at least 17 billion tons of CO2.

However, the Air Resources Board is targeting the Central Valley with CO2 injection wells and pipelines, and researchers have publicly stated that part of why the Central Valley appears to be a good place for storage is because of existing oil drilling and the information that's been obtained by the oil industry in order to do that drilling, despite a long history of failures including injecting oil wastewater into underground aquifers.

Most CCUS projects in California are currently slated for the central and specifically the San Joaquin Valley, which is the state's historically most polluted region, and a region which the State is again assuming will continue to bear the cost of the State's deferral of real climate action.

Next slide, please.
DR. CATHERINE GAROUPA WHITE: There's ample evidence that carbon capture could lead to significant environmental health and safety hazards. And again, the proposed projects are in some of our most overburdened environmental justice communities. If mitigating climate change is the goal, we have to take impacts on factors such as water, increases in solid waste that also directly affect -- directly affect the climate.

In addition -- sorry, one second.

In addition, the draft Scoping Plan claims that the Central Valley has an ideal geologic substrate for CO2 sequestration. But since the substrate already has many fractures and fissures, the threat of CO2 leakage increases. So this image on the slide is a map of Bakersfield. There is so much extractive infrastructure in the Central Valley with tens of thousands of wells, including numerous that are idle and abandoned. It is no longer geologically sound for injecting CO2 underground.

Black dots on the map represent all of the existing and inactive oil and gas extraction wells. All of these straws poked into the ground are hazards for CO2 leakage that could create carbonic acid in groundwater. The red triangle on the map is one of Chevron's proposed CCS injection/geologic storage sites. This is particularly important as Bakersfield is not only densely
populated, but because of existing oil and gas operations, it is an already immensely overburdened environmental justice community.

Some of you may have heard the story of Satartia, Mississippi, where in 2020 a whole town was hit by an invisible and acutely hazardous levels of CO2 gas from a pipeline rupture. The CO2 pipeline failure resulted in local evacuations and caused almost 50 people to seek medical attention. The impacts of this pipeline failure had a disparate racial impact as all of the victims of CO2 poisoning in Satartia were African American.

Even aside from the corrosion caused by CO2, the pipelines also leak. With current pipelines in Kern County, there have already been multiple methane leaks. Methane is a high potency greenhouse gas. To speak more on this issue, I want to introduce of Bill Caram of the Pipeline Safety Trust to provide a brief overview of these risks. And then I'll have some concluding comments before moving on to the next topic.

BILL CARAM: Thank you. Thank you, Catherine. Thank you, Chair Randolph, members of the Board, CARB staff, and the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee. I appreciate the opportunity to share my thoughts today. My name is Bill Caram. I'm the Executive Director of the
Pipeline Safety Trust. We formed in the aftermath of a 1999 pipeline tragedy in Bellingham, Washington that stole the lives of three boys. And we worked to prevent other families and communities from having to experience the needless grief of those in Bellingham.

Since our founding, we have served as the only national public advocacy organization dedicated to pipeline safety. And as an organization, we have testified before U.S. Congress dozens of times on many pipeline-related topics. I was appointed to the U.S. Department of Transportation - Secretary Pete Buttigieg - to serve on the federal Hazardous Liquids Pipeline Advisory Committee. And I was appointed by Washington's Governor Inslee to serve on the Citizens Community on Pipeline Safety.

Our previous Executive Director was named by President Obama as a champion of change for his work for the Pipeline Safety Trust. And I'm here today to speak about carbon dioxide pipelines.

Virtually any plan that includes carbon capture and sequestration or direct air capture will involve transporting that captured CO2 via pipeline. And as Catherine mentioned, residents of Satartia, Mississippi learned the hard way that they have a CO2 pipeline in their community. When that pipeline ruptured in 2020, the
escaped CO2 caused a harrowing experience for many sending
more than 45 people to the hospital with symptoms of
asphyxiation and some are still recovering from that night
now two years later.

In response to that event, along with the sudden
increase of proposed CO2 pipelines in connection to
various carbon capture and sequestration projects, the
Pipeline Safety Trust commissioned a report from an
independent pipeline safety engineer to identify the
safety risks and regulatory gaps posed by CO2 pipelines.

The report, which was released in March and can
be found on a website, outlined the history of CO2
pipelines and identified a number of unique safety risks
posed by those pipelines, along with corresponding
regulatory gaps.

Congress first asked the federal pipeline safety
agency, PHMSA, to regulate CO2 pipelines in 1988 after a
natural gas release of CO2 from Lake Nyos in Cameroon,
killed every oxygen breathing being within 18 miles,
including 1,700 people. PHMSA responded to that mandate
by tagging on and CO2 to highly volatile liquids
regulations, despite the unique properties and risks of
these pipelines. CO2 pipelines are operated at very high
pressure and releases lead to rapid often violent --
--o0o--
BILL CARAM: -- phase changes. Because CO2 is an asphyxiant and heavier than air, it can stay close to the ground after release and move long distances, often -- often many miles. Traditional methods of determining potential impact areas around hydrocarbon pipelines are inappropriate and insufficient for CO2 -- 2 lines, but that is exactly what the regulations call for.

Denbury, the pipeline operator in Satartia, Mississippi, identified the area around its pipeline that could be impacted by a failure and many of the people hospitalized were outside of that identified area.

Our report also found that CO2 is entirely unregulated if it is transported as a gas or as a liquid. It is only regulated if it is transported as a supercritical fluid. There are no standards as to levels of various contaminants, some -- some of which are very common, corrosive and/or toxic. CO2 acts very differently from hydrocarbons in the pipeline and after a rupture, and the regulations are simply not up to the task of keeping communities safe.

I would also like to point out that the White House Environmental Justice Advisory Council last year listed both CCS and direct air capture as projects that would not benefit a community. A study published just last month by Environmental Science and Technology based
on data from EDF and Colorado State University show the disproportionate burden of pipeline dangers our most vulnerable communities bear. The study found that natural gas pipeline leaks are more prevalent in neighborhoods whose populations are predominantly low income or people of color. And there have been several similar studies with sadly similar conclusions.

I encourage you all to read our report and pay special attention to our summary of findings and regulatory recommendations. I encourage you to click on the link on our page website of the test rupture of a CO2 pipeline, so you can get a sense of a supercritical fluid failure's violent rupture. I encourage you to read Dan Zegart's harrowing article about the CO2 pipeline in Satartia, Mississippi to start to understand the risks these pipelines will pose to our communities. And I ask you to look at ways to close these regulatory gaps before any of California's communities are asked to shoulder the burden of risk these pipelines pose.

Thank you very much.

DR. CATHERINE GAROUPA WHITE: Thank you, Bill, for that presentation. So again, just a high level overview, not a comprehensive assessment of all of the issues and concerns. So a couple of things before we -- I see if the other co-chairs have anything they want to add
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and then we'd segue to the next topic. But thank you, Bill, again for that presentation. And at least personally, I was validated at the last Environmental Justice Advisory Committee meeting in hearing CARB staff make a commitment to revisit and adjust the CDR assumptions based on some of the challenges and questions that environmental justice advocates have raised with decision makers.

The Environmental Justice Advisory Committee last month hosted a webinar specifically to elevate proposed projects and community concerns related to carbon capture use and storage projects. That recording is available and posted on CARB's EJAC resources website. This will also be a major topic of discussion at our EJAC meeting on Monday and Tuesday for those who are interested and available to participate.

And many of our organizations are involved in organizing at the administrative, and regulatory levels, and legislative levels as well beyond the Scoping Plan, because we know that this is just one slice of the issue.

Martha Dina or Sharifa, did you want to add anything before we move on to cap-and-trade?

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Yes. I do want to share a really positive thing. Cities are where things are happening that are incredibly important. Cities are the
places where we're building backstops to bad policies.
So, you know, I want to report that on June 9th, the City
of New Orleans Council passed unanimously a resolution
prohibiting the underground storage of carbon dioxide
facilities for this purpose. No one knows better than
Louisiana and New Orleans what it means to live in
chemical alley, what it means to live with the refineries,
and what it would mean to extend the life of those
facilities for another 150 years. So I want to show an
example of cities that are built on oil that are being
bold. And with that, Sharifa.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Nothing from me.
Go ahead, Dr. Catherine.

DR. CATHERINE GAROUPA WHITE: Thank you. Next slide, please.

---o0o---

DR. CATHERINE GAROUPA WHITE: So specifically on
the role of the Cap-and-Trade Program, I'm one of the
conveners of the Cap-and-Trade Work Group. And yesterday,
we submitted a letter with additional details. So again,
a high level summary here that I would point you to that
letter. We're definitely open to questions and further
conversations.

Many organizations and Environmental Justice
Advisory Committee representatives have been engaged for
many years in discussions around the Cap-and-Trade Program, the associated rulemaking, and again legislative and other related efforts outside of the Scoping Plan process itself.

The Scoping Plan presents a timely opportunity to evaluate the role of the Cap-and-Trade Program and our overall climate program and to explore potential changes to the program, to ensure that climate justice is also realized. First and foremost, the Air Resources Board must prioritize direct emission reduction measures in the Scoping Plan. Cap-and-Trade is not a direct emission reduction measure. It is a market-based mechanism as defined in and authorized by statute. Legislation requiring the prioritization of direct emissions measures should be reflected in the distribution of measures identified in the scenario that's adopted to reach 2030 and subsequent carbon neutral goals and targets.

Direct emission reduction measures include, but are not limited to, the following ideas suggested by EJAC, stronger vehicle standards, accelerated clean energy targets under the Renewable Portfolio Standard, a managed decline off fossil fuel extraction and production, reduction in pesticide use, and investment in whole home retrofits that would decrease fossil fuel and electricity demand over time.
Secondly, CARB should reduce the percentage of reductions expected from the Cap-and-Trade Program. There is no evidence that Cap-and-Trade is driving emission reductions, particularly given the persistently high emissions in some covered sectors and the existence of more direct measures that are much more likely to drive reductions. Furthermore, the carbon market is unpredictable and the need for accelerated emission reductions to meet our 2030 climate targets is real.

Third, CARB should strengthen data reporting to ensure timely tracking of emissions changes. Improved data collection and transparency would better inform decision-making and rule-making processes as we strive to reach our ambitious climate targets while addressing public health concerns through improving air quality.

CARB, as the agency in charge of our State Implementation Plans, cannot afford to keep taking a siloed approach to data collection and interventions that could reduce both greenhouse gases and co-pollutants.

Specifically, in the next Cap-and-Trade rulemaking, CARB should require annual progress updates from covered entities. And that data should be integrated into CARB's pollution mapping tool for public review and to allow visualization on a facility and company-specific scale.
Finally, the Air Resources Board should make scenario assumptions that include key changes to the program to provide greater certainty that Cap-and-Trade will deliver the needed reductions without deepening environmental injustices. These include: number one, eliminating free allowances; number two, eliminating offsets, number three, restricting trading in disadvantaged communities; continuing to accept allowances in lieu of emissions reductions, particularly in communities out of compliance with decades old clean air standards and/or high levels of exposure to toxics should be out of the question; facilities in and directly adjacent to disadvantaged communities; facilities located in communities that are out of compliance with clean air standards; and other overburdened communities should not be allowed -- facilities there should not be allowed to tray allow -- trade allowances or use off-site credits and should instead be required to demonstrate facility level reductions on part with the declining cap.

This would protect the most impacted communities from co-pollutants. And we vigorously reject the notion that AB 617, the Community Air Protection Program, alone can deliver the needed reductions. The program has not proven, after five years through implementation, to generate significant reductions and cannot serve as a
substitute for coordinated State protections for communities, overburdened by air pollution.

Finally, if earlier recommendations are not adopted, we urge the Air Resources Board to consider and adopt the recommendations of the Independent Emissions Market Advisory Committee related to offset availability, raising the allowance price floor, and reducing the supply of new allowances to keep the system as stringent as possible.

I appreciate that Martha Dina Argüello and I were invited to participate in last month's IEMAC meeting. And while we may not be in agreement about the overall role of the Cap-and-Trade Program, generally we are in alignment on the need for robust analysis and program adjustments.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

DR. CATHERINE GAROUPA WHITE: The last topic I'll be covering today is livestock methane. Overall, CARB must include direct regulation of livestock methane as a critical strategy for achieving necessary methane reductions. Digesters do not address enteric emissions, and accumulation of manure creates significant air and water pollution.

Under the proposed scenario, California will not achieve the minimum methane reduction requirements set
forth in SB 1383, which is a 40 percent reduction below 2013 levels by 2030. CARB is currently modeling in the proposed scenario a decline in the State's aggregate herd size, even though the Air Resources Board's own policies incentivize increased herd sizes through lucrative dairy digester and Low Carbon Fuel Standard subsidies. And the Air Resources Board is proposing to scale these up in the proposed scenario.

The draft Scoping Plan recommends building an additional 380 costly dairy digesters by 2030. However, dairy biomethane has a similar environmental impact as fossil fuels when burned. And dairy digesters significantly exacerbate local air and water pollution.

Rather than reducing methane emissions at the source, dairy digesters only capture and commodify livestock methane from manure, perversely incentivizing the creation of methane.

Not only do they favor manure production, but they do nothing to address methane from enteric emissions. CARB will have the legal authority to directly regulate livestock methane starting in 2024. Yet, this option is persistently absent from CARB's discussion on methane and is absent from the draft Scoping Plan and the modeling.

In the revised Scoping Plan, CARB must include direct regulation of livestock methane. The focus in the
Scoping Plan must be on setting regulatory caps on the amount of methane that farms in the industry as a whole are allowed to emit. Although regulated emissions reductions are a standard for other highly emitting sectors, direct reductions are currently absent for the livestock methane sector in the proposed scenario. But CARB must prioritize direct emissions reductions per AB 197.

If the State hopes to attain its short-lived climate pollutant targets set forth in SB 1383 and beyond, CARB must include a strategy to directly regulate livestock methane starting in 2024 and include it as a recommended strategy in the Scoping Plan.

As this is the last section and last slide I’ll be presenting, I wanted to close by saying that overall I think what you’ll hear consistently throughout the day is what the EJAC has been saying from the beginning that we need to say no to false solutions like overrelying on Cap-and-Trade, dairy digesters, and carbon dioxide removal, and instead of expecting our environmental justice communities to be resilient, we should be changing the route causes that have created these circumstances, racism, patriarchy, and settler colonialism.

How we achieve our climate goals matters as much as when we achieve them, and we need a plan for real zero,
not net zero.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment and I will pass it back to Martha Dina.

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Sorry. It's like I'm on Zoom and muted.

(Laughter.)

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Sharifa will be doing the transportation piece and I -- she'll pass it to me to do building decarbonization. Thanks.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: All right. Next slide, please.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Thank you. Next slide, please.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Forty percent of emissions are from transportation. And investing in affordable accessible mass transit is key to achieving our climate goals, reducing vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, and -- excuse me, and an overall more equitable transportation system. At a minimum, 11 percent of all trips should be made on transit by 2035. That would equate to about a 30 percent VMT reduction.

Equally critical is the rapid adoption of zero-emission heavy-duty trucks. EJ communities need clean trucks as soon as possible. Reports show that 2035 is a feasible timeline for a hundred percent ZEV sales for
trucks and drayage trucks at ports can be all ZEV by 2030.

Next slide, please.

---000---

SHARIFA TAYLOR: We wanted to include this slide here about transit justice for California's most transit-dependent residents, because when we think about public transit, a lot of times it's seen as in alternative to driving our personal vehicles, which that in and of itself is a privilege. But for folks who have disabilities, whether that's being blind, or in a wheelchair, or some other type of physical or mental disability, they're reliant upon public transit and services just like paratransit, which paratransit is reliant upon bus routes. And so when bus service decreases, it makes it so that people who may not be able to walk or roll themselves to a transit stop are unable to get reliable access to the services they need via paratransit.

So that's why transportation justice and massifying public transit in California is so important. And so we ask that you work with the transportation agencies in the state in order to help us achieve that goal.

Next slide, please.

---000---
SHARIFA TAYLOR: Here, we just wanted to speak a bit about the electric vehicle infrastructure. So from the draft Scoping Plan, there's a quote on page 150, which says, "Private investment in reliable, affordable, and ubiquitous refueling infrastructure may[SIC] drive the transition as the business case for ZEVs continues to strengthen". Excuse me.

And so in our EJAC recommendation, NF6, CARB must increase accessibility to low-income communities and communities of color to -- excuse me to EV charging infrastructure in key locations that are frequently used. Essentially, the Scoping Plan draft is leaving it up to the market to ensure that EV charging stations are equitably sited in EJ communities, leaving them to be second class citizens when it comes to EV access.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Sixteen percent of transit ridership has increased since September 2022 -- excuse me, 2021 from the launch of the San Diego MTS PRONTO Transit fare card paired with free transit. There's also been success stories with Green Raiteros in Huron, which is a zero-emission transportation ride for rural community residents, where these residents are able to get wherever they need to go using a zero-emission vehicle.
Additionally, the Port of San Diego had a goal for a hundred percent ZEV trucks by 2030. And this is something that was documented in the 2021 Maritime Clean Air Strategy, also known as MCAS. In May 2022, Youth Opportunity Pass pilot program was launched in San Diego County for all youth 18 and under where those youth would be able to ride transit for free. And since May, there has been a 77 percent increase in new unique youth transit riders. So these are just a few success stories where we've been able to increase ridership in ZEVs as well as with public transit.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MARTHA DINA ARGUELLO: Great. Thank you. You're going to be able to see my slides and I'm -- in the interest of time, I just want to give some high level issues around the issue of building decarbonization, which is actually one of the examples where we have actually been able to work with CARB -- the team that's working on building decarb simultaneously as we are part of the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee. And the issue of the decarbonization of buildings from where we sit at the community level sort of came at us as a policy that was already decided -- somebody decided announced it and then those of us who work with affordable housing,
low-income housing, unhoused communities were really concerned with how these policies would impact low-income housing and residents. And so many of us came together, created a coalition, which is the Building Equity and Power Coalition, which is BEEP, and have been able to work with CARB in an example of what co-design can begin to look like and what it looks like beyond the life of the EJAC when we begin to actually implement and rollout the policies.

And so I think that has been for us a bright spot, because, you know, we've been here for -- I've been doing this for 22 years with CARB and all the boards and departments in one way or another. And so this feels different, in the sense of getting listened to. Yes, we have to get loud, but who doesn't like to get loud.

That said, the louder we get, the more listening, and I think we do need more resources to support community engagement. Just last week, we had a community engagement workshop over 150 folks participating. And this is one of the hottest topics. I think people are really interested in it and we want to make sure that we get the multiple benefits of decarbonizing buildings, improving air quality, particularly in low-income communities. We want to make sure that those -- the burdens of implementing those programs do not fall on low- and middle-income
people, and make sure that we figure out enough resources, so there's no -- those up-front costs and many of the problems that we saw with the solar program that we don't recreate those problems.

So I think this model of working deeply with communities and impacted folks, and workers, and others will allow us to have multiple benefits, both the job creation benefits, lower energy costs, and getting rid of fossil fuels within our housing infrastructure, both at homes, public buildings, and other buildings. I'm still very torn about what to do about restaurants. I'm not going to lie.

But I think part of what we're trying to do is figure out what those are, what are those trade-offs, right? When we're at the table, deciding those, we feel different about them. Communities feel different about them. And there's a whole psychological research around locus of control. And having that locus of control is often health protective. And we found that with workers. And that's what we're trying to tell you, right? Informed prior consent is key. Whether you're talking about CCS or you're talking about building decarbonization. Having the most impacted at the table to help inform your decisions means you'll do better policy, and -- and it allows you to see the spectrum of challenges, right?
You can move through the slides, because I'm not even following them.

--o0o--

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: But the data is on there in terms of our recommendations.

Next slide.

--o0o--

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: And again -- oh, back there. Back a little bit.

--o0o--

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: What we're trying to do with buildings and having -- really meeting these assert -- aggressive goals and building in aggressive protections for low-income communities, which is what we're doing at the city level with Los Angeles is building up those through the Climate Emergency Mobilization Office. Through our Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, through a very deliberative process, we are ensuring that we get to the real zero and not overburdening low and middle income folks and actually creating jobs, because we've had a table that was set with labor, with environmental justice, with health folks, and buildings, and others, and we're building that. And we want to bring that model to you at CARB.

Next slide.
MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Because we want -- next slide.

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Did this already. This is incredibly important. A really important part, and I think what you can do in your role as convener is actually create a space that's non-confrontational, that has not happened before, where environmental justice communities and workers can come together to figure out what the transition looks like versus the fossil fuel industry who's pushing solutions that basically say we're going to say we're doing something, but what we're actually doing is delaying -- delaying action. And we've seen what that's gotten us.

I mentioned I've been at this for 22 years and there's folks that have been at it for longer. Delaying action doesn't make the problem better and that's something, you know, the health care industry certainly knows. So we want to make sure that we have job training for contractors, job access for underrepresented local and priority populations. Where I work in South LA, you know, the foster youth program is leading to get -- you know, the prison to school pipeline -- the school to prison pipeline - I wish it were the other way -- what's
happening is those folks come out and they can't get jobs, right, because there's a box on the job application. So that's driving incredibly high unemployment rates. We need to design programs that -- with them in mind that have them being part of solving the problems that exist request communities like air pollution.

So we want to be able to have project labor and community workforce agreements, support job placement pathways, because we've got to support our brothers and sisters in the labor movement through a just transition, and actually stop talking about -- you know, it's not solar jobs. There's not a one-to-one comparison. And we need to do it together, because it's not going to be easy and we need to support them in that transition, so that the jobs that they go into are comparable, living -- thriving wages, right? We can talk about survival wages or we can talk about thriving wages and they're very different things.

Next slide.

--o0o--

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: So again, there is some embedded tensions within the plan. Where will this -- all -- this new energy come from? So they will need -- they will be using combustion indirectly, and so we have to be mindful of making sure that those energy sources are
clean and not making us continue stay on this fossil fuel wheel.

And next slide.

--o0o--

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Am I doing this one?

SHARIFA TAYLOR: No, it's me. So, yeah, this section is about electricity. We know that electrification is one of the major ways we're going to transition away from some more of the harmful industries.

Sorry about that.

So -- okay. Perfect. So the Scoping Plan includes large quantities of electrification across multiple sectors, which means significant growth in electricity demand projected at 80 percent growth by 2045, but as this electricity demand grows, it is critical that the electric sector also get clear in order to avoid intensifying GHG emissions and toxic pollution from gas plants. If we don't set strong electric sector emission targets, this trend will effectively shift pollution from other sectors, such as transportation and buildings to fenceline communities that border gas plants.

Electrification and other sectors must be matched by electric sector decarbonization to comply with SB 100 and to avoid intensifying pollution in EJ communities.

Next slide, please.
SHARIFA TAYLOR: The greenhouse gas emissions limit set by scoping -- excuse me, set by the Scoping Plan determines the emission limits that the CPUC uses in the integrated resource plan proceeding. This submission limit has a direct impact on which resources the utilities and community choice aggregators purchase. But the draft Scoping plan sets a GHG limit -- (inaudible) -- sets a GHG limit of 30 million metric tons in 2045, not the zero -- excuse me, not the zero carbon grid required by SB 100. That law requires that eligible renewable energy resources and zero carbon resources supply a hundred percent of all retail sales of electricity by December 31st, 2045.

The Scoping Plan proposes that the electric sector never reaches zero-emissions, because CARB does not count transmission line losses. However, SB 100 requires a hundred percent of electricity to be carbon free.

The draft Scoping Plan would only have about 80 percent of our electricity as carbon free based on the reasoning that line losses shouldn't be counted in the retail sales definition of SB 100. This isn't a fair accounting of electricity emissions. Consumers pay for line losses in the retail rates. For every customer, a utility procures additional electricity to account for what is lost in delivery over inefficient, long distance
transmission lines. If we are truly to decarbonize electricity generation, we need to make sure that the actual emissions target reaches zero and that transmission line losses are incorporated into the retail sales definition.

Even further, transmission line losses are -- are irrelevant in a future with clean distributed energy. A 2019 report by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, a research arm of the Department of Energy, found that greater use of rooftop solar can reduce the need for new transition lines, displace expensive power plants, and save the energy that is lost when electricity is moved long distance.

There needs to be more focus on transitioning the local clean energy sector to be able to provide high quality union jobs. For solar, this could be done by developing mid-size projects on roof -- on large rooftops and parking lots close to or in population centers in aggregating them to provide sufficient economies of scale for Project Labor Agreements to be developed.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Sorry about that.

This slide describes two issues in the electric sector. A commitment to hydrogen, renewable natural gas,
and gas plants. Those resources are not compatible with our climate and EJ requirements. The Scoping Plan draft reads, "Hydrogen and renewable natural gas must remain options as we transition away fossil fuels." This is on page 156 and 157.

And secondly, "In the near term, fossil fuels generation will continue to play a critical role in grid reliability until other clean, dispatchable alternatives are available and can be deployed". This is on page 158 of the draft.

From the EJAC's expert perspective, these are not the right solutions for the electricity sector. Producing and using gray and blue hydrogen produces more GHG emissions than burning fossil fuels. Renewable natural gas harms Central Valley communities and the environment. There are better ways to strengthen grid reliability and energy resilience including investing in diverse, renewable resources like geothermal and offshore wind, in addition to making big investments in distributed energy resources.

This means investing in energy conservation, energy -- excuse me, energy conservation, energy efficiency, demand response, and local community scale solar -- solar and wind tied to microgrids. These local resources would strengthen grid reliability and resilience
to wildfires and significantly reduce the need for Public Safety Power Shutoffs, which reduces grid reliability.

The last thing we need at this stage is to be investing in new polluting resources particularly fossil fuels. Next slide, please.

---o0o---

SHARIFA TAYLOR: All right. And yet the draft Scoping Plan specifically includes adding 10 gigawatts of new gas plant capacity in addition to maintaining the existing gas leak. New fossil fuel infrastructure runs completely counter to the purpose of this Scoping Plan, in addition to frustrating the purpose of SB 100. The Scoping Plan should specifically exclude any new gas infrastructure. Keeping fossil fuel and combustion generation on the electric system guarantees disproportionate impacts on low income communities and communities of color, such as in the LA and Central Valley areas, where power plants are already located and where air quality is the worst in the nation.

Planning for 10 additional gigawatts of fossil fuel generation, whether for reliability, or ancillary services, or energy exacerbates this injustice. This is already clear based on where gas plants are currently located.

Next slide, please.
SHARIFA TAYLOR: What does this mean for EJ communities?

This chart shows that California's most polluting power plants are already disproportionately located in disadvantaged communities. Without a lower electric sector, emission target, or specific protections, new gas plant capacity is likely to harm EJ communities further. It is much harder to permit entirely new gas plants than it is to expand existing plants. And the PUC recently ordered new procurement -- excuse me, procurement at existing plants. This means that if modeling shows the need for new gas capacity, it will likely come in the form of expansion to existing plants.

Since gas plants are disproportionately sited in disadvantaged communities and communities of color, this means expansion to existing gas plants will increase emissions at the same gas plants that already poison these communities. There is a better way for forward.

Next slide, please.

SHARIFA TAYLOR: A hundred percent clean -- a hundred percent clean reliable energy grid is feasible. There are multiple reports to say this. A very recent report by Energy Innovation and GridLab shows that we can
reach a fully reliable 85 percent clean energy grid by 2030 without any new gas infrastructure, even under high electrification scenarios. The SB 100 study showed that a clean reliable grid was possible even under a no combustion scenario.

A clean renewable grid can meet reliability standards, particularly if you have a diverse mix of renewables. The Energy Innovation report also showed that investing in geothermal and offshore wind, even in small amounts, can significantly decrease the amount of solar needed, and lower dependence on imports and in-state gas.

Additionally, we cannot be talking about the infeasibility and renewability -- excuse me, and renewable buildout, when the draft plan considers building out massive amounts of unproven CCS and direct air capture technology, which has not been deployed at the utilities scale.

Excuse me.

The draft plan is clear that it doesn't include the renewable resources that carbon capture and removal technology would require. It is far more feasible to build diverse renewables than it is to build gas infrastructure, carbon dioxide removal technology, and the renewables needed to power them.

Furthermore, it is the CEC, PUC, and CAISO, who
have the authority, tools, and the targeted expertise to ensure that the lights stay on. This isn't CARB's responsibility. Rather, CARB's responsibility is to chart a course for the medium and long term, not to focus on short-term constraints. And just I guess for us, this image is from the achieving 85 percent -- percent clean electricity by 2030 and California Energy Innovation Policy and Technology Report.

Next slide, please.

---00o---

SHARIFA TAYLOR: In summary, these are the real changes that are needed for the electric sector portion of the Scoping Plan. In order to adopt real zero scenario goals, this would include reducing the electric sector emissions target to zero million metric tons of greenhouse gases by 2035. It would include no new gas capacity, meaning no new gas build and no expansion of existing gas plants. It would require all resource generation to be a hundred percent renewable portfolio standard eligible and zero carbon -- yeah, and zero carbon emissions.

Scale up peak shaving measures, meaning more energy conservation, energy efficiency and demand response measures. This scenario also would include no carbon dioxide removal or carbon capture measures in the electric sector, instead avoiding direct emission from the electric
sector altogether, as well as to begin the phaseout of gas power plants immediately starting in EJ communities and disadvantaged communities.

In order to amend modeling to meet real zero scenario goals, CARB would need to: model realistic increases and availability of beyond-the-meter storage, vehicle-to-grid technologies, and demand-side programs that have been approved by the CPUC; appropriately model the costs of renewable energy versus gas-fired generation and CCS, CDR required to meet neutrality; include line losses in retail sales interpretation of SB 100; model aggregate health impacts from 2022 to 2045 and social costs of co-pollutants on disadvantaged communities.

The draft Scoping Plan's public health impacts analysis included only snapshots of health benefits rather than a more comprehensive analysis. Instead, CARB needs to model the overall health impacts and costs, or savings, for each of the alternatives before determining that the proposed scenario is really the least cost option for electricity.

Next slide, please.

---

SHARIFA TAYLOR: Yeah. So I'm going to talk briefly about public health and economic modeling. So -- oh, I'm saying a lot.
We need transparency around specific modeling inputs in order to have robust public analysis. Economic modeling has been too narrow of a tool to achieve our goals. Current projections about labor and employment are limited to production-oriented industries, particularly the extractive fossil-fuel based incumbent economy. We need a just transition plan with a more comprehensive analysis of labor and employment sectors beyond production jobs. CARB claims that the proposed scenario has the least declining effect on employment and economic growth of all the scenarios considered.

However, the IMPLAN economic model uses the category employment based on the Bureau of Labor statistics and Bureau of Economic Analysis. This category in turn comes from the North American Industry Classification System, NAICS, Industry Classification System, which is a production-oriented economic concept. CARB is focused on preserving the economy -- the -- excuse me, the incumbent economy. In addition to the projected employment and clean energy sectors, we need to think beyond production.

Modeling must demonstrate the effects on labor and employment in the regenerative and renewable energy sectors and assess the impact on social infrastructure, for example, employment data for community health workers,
green jobs training, and education. Implementing a
community-driven real zero alternative will need a more
robust social infrastructure that doesn't rely on the
state's meager implementation grants. Therefore, we need
to include the creation of reproductive and regenerative
jobs, including education, care work coordination,
oversight, and maintenance in the modeling projections for
the real zero alternatives.

The Scoping Plan does not model the health and
economic impacts over the same time period. This needs to
happen for an accurate analysis and to enable an
apples-to-apples comparison.

Finally, we would like to know CARB's estimate of
the total aggregate cost of Scenario 3 implementation.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

SHARIFA TAYLOR: The purpose of this slide is to
share how the proposed scenario alternative results in
roughly $1.5 billion less in community health benefits
than Alternative 1, especially because public health has
been touted by the proposed scenario as one of the major
benefits of this plan, when from the graph, you can see
that that's not the case.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--
SHARIFA TAYLOR: And so over to Martha.

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: Thank you. So one of the things that is embedded in this Scoping Plan, and in many ways in our very own economy, in one of the appendices is that this new economy, electric vehicles, this electrification does come with trade-offs. And it will mean an increase in lithium extraction, because it's ubiquitous in our batteries, and our phones, and laptops, and certainly electric vehicles.

And so we're deeply concerned that the -- that we aren't doing the kind of life-cycle assessment and the kind of deep community engagement that I talked about earlier. We'd know that the extraction of lithium, whether it's the brine and it does -- will leach chemicals and contaminate water, takes water allotments from tribes, and farmers, and general populations. It displaces local communities and indigenous people.

Next slide.
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MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: So it's expanding here, as we know. And we know that we're going to need to have -- make sure that communities have a seat at the table. It's something that Luis Olmedo, who is from the community and is part of this lithium committee has been really talking about the need to shake the policies and show that
communities are not left behind. We can't stress enough, and I don't know that we know how to do it as an agency, is this idea of informed prior consent, the power to shape the policies on lithium extraction, and how we balance benefits and burdens for communities.

Lithium extracted beyond California for California's EV exports also sac -- creates EJ sacrifice zones in indigenous communities in the southwest, in the U.S., and the global south. And we're often told that our environmental protections are better, and so we should do it here.

I'm reminded of a tour we did of the Los Angeles oil fields for people from the DRC and from Ecuador and other places, and they're like when I think of LA, this is not what I think about. They don't do this in on country. I can't believe they're doing it in Los Angeles.

So I think we need to balance those trade-offs just, saying that, oh, the people over there, those others, don't regulate as well as ours I think is a misnomer. And you can ask many of the people in this audience who live on the front lines of production, if that's true or not.

So next slide.

--o0o--

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: And with that, I am going
to hand it over to Jill Warne with our -- who is also a
member of the EJAC to talk about natural and working
lands.

JILL SHERMAN WARNE: Thank you.

(Spoke in native language.)

JILL SHERMAN WARNE: My name is Jill Sherman
Warne and I'm a member of the EJAC. And I'm an enrolled
member of the Hoopa tribe. And I use the term enrolled
member on purpose, because what that means is I am dual
citizen of the United States. I'm a citizen of my tribe
and I'm a citizen of the U.S.

And enrollment status is really important,
because that's what gives me special status in terms of
I'm not just an ethnic minority. I am a -- an enrolled
member of a tribe that has a special relationship with the
State and with the federal government.

And I'm here to talk about -- well, I guess,
mostly I should say that I'm disappointed. I was just
recently appointed to the EJAC. And even though, since
the inception of the EJAC was supposed to have a tribal
representative, this is the first time in 2022 that the
EJAC has -- does have a -- well, I wanted to say elected
official. I have just won my election and so I'm also an
elected official of my tribe.

And I'm here to say that this plan has done
little to nothing to engage tribes. And I don't blame
your staff. I blame it on the fact that like other
agencies within the State, they don't know how to work
with tribes. And quite frankly, I don't know that they've
ever asked a tribe how do you want us to work with you?

There are actually several tribes who have a
Tribal Consultation Policy. How that is delivered to the
agency, I don't know. But you will be receiving one from
the Hoopa Tribe shortly. So we do have our own aspects of
how you consult with us.

There are 109 federally recognized tribes in the
State of California. And unfortunately, you probably
can't name 10 of them. There is an additional 40 tribes
that are seeking recognition in the state of California.
Through no fault of their own, they have not been able to
be federally recognized. Anyone can say, oh, I'm -- I'm a
member of this tribe or that tribe and claim ethnicity of
being a tribe, but being an enrolled member has a special
status.

We don't know fully what the impacts are on
tribal lands within the Scoping Plan, because the Scoping
Plan didn't do anything to engage tribes. And, in fact, I
find it disingenuous that the Scoping Plan itself only
mentions tribes about six times - six times in a 280-page
document. When we -- we know that the federal -- federal
lands in the state of California encompass about 47, 48 million acres.

So that's a -- that's a lot of acreage within the state of California that needs -- that the State will have to think about how they're going to involve them in your Scoping Plan, which hasn't been done.

Additionally, there is an executive order that was done by Jerry Brown, B-10-11. And that says that the State agencies are required to give government-to-government consultation with tribes. And they're to work with the Tribal Advisor's Office. There's additionally Newsom's Executive Order N-15-19, which also reiterates the same thing, that engagement with tribes must be done on a government-to-government level.

And that means that, Ms. Randolph, you would probably be the official that would provide a letter to the tribes to say here's our draft Scoping Plan and here is how it might impact you, and why we need your input. Instead, tribes are typically reduced to providing public comment in a public comment forum, which is, in my opinion, inappropriate.

The Scoping Plan does mention that there is -- that there was tribal input received. It's disingenuous, in my opinion, to say that tribal input was received, because they do notate a June meeting of 2021. I was hard
pressed to find any formal comment provided by a tribe on an input of this plan. It's very disappointing. And again, I don't blame your staff and I don't necessarily blame the agency, but quite frankly you simply don't know how to work with tribes.

I came here today wearing the cap. This is my sister's. This was made by my grandmother -- my great grandmother. And it was made for my grandmother. So this cap is quite old. And it takes over a year to gather all of the materials needed to make this cap. This cap, by any standard, is historical and timeless. And when I wear this cap, and I wear my necklaces, I feel like my ancestors are with me, my grandmothers are with me.

I hope that I do them proud and -- in the sense that I still feel like we're fighting for our rights. We're fighting to be recognized. And so I implore upon you that with the EJAC recommendations, the information that we give you of -- in accordance to tribes is really important, but I do need to see that there is more engagement with tribes on a government-to-government basis.

What I would like to know is how CARB plans to follow the law, meaning the Executive Orders that are in place to engage tribes. And I would be happy to work with anyone directly to ensure that that engagement happens
with the 109 federally recognized tribes that exist within California.

I'm also the Executive Director of the Native American Environmental Protection Coalition, and I work with the 28 tribes directly within the State, up and down the State.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

JILL SHERMAN WARNE: I'm really proud to show these pictures. That's me fishing, because I still engage in traditional subsistence fishing. It's an important food item to your people. And that is my son. He has a traditional drum. We're one of the unique tribes. The Hoopa Tribe is a unique tribe in the sense that we have a square drum. His drum is made with a harbor seal that he captured by accident. And rather than let the carcass lay there, as tradition demands that we use everything we catch. We eat everything we kill. And we do that with prayers and honoring that the animal has given its life to us. In the same way, with all of our regalia, when an animal gives their life up to us, we extend that life spiritually by making it into our precious regalia items.

That is -- he's holding a sturgeon that lives in our rivers. And a sturgeon has to live for 15 years before it even becomes able to reproduce. So the larger
the sturgeon, the older it is.

The other picture on the bottom is of our experience with wildfire. Our tribes that are located in rural areas, often the impacts from wildfire are not necessarily by fire itself but by smoke. We had seven HEPA filters in our house running 24/7 because of the wildfire that wasn't on our land, but was about 12 miles away. My father had to be taken to the emergency room, because he thought he was having a heart attack, when, in fact, it was just the smoke was so bad.

We have to live with wildfires. We also have to live with utility outages. We have to -- you know, I have lived in San Diego and I can tell you that living in the urban environment of San Diego, I never experienced a brownout or a power out, only that one time when somebody flipped the switch and everybody went crazy.

But when you live in a rural area within California, because our utilities are often isolated, we go without power for days. And as a result of that, I'm embarrassed to say that because we have medical equipment that needs to be operated and used by my father, we have to power up the old generator -- diesel generator. We have a very large diesel generator. And that's where we're at.

My tribe received a grant to put in eight charging stations about two years ago. They were put in
finished by June of last year. Guess what, there's no power to them. There's no power to those utilities, because they have to replace two transformers in order to power up the chargers.

And those are the issues that we're facing within rural environments, that the utility is not there yet. So this draft plan -- I know I'm getting a little off topic, but unless you involve the utilities and require the utilities to actually do something with their outdated electrical lines, we're never going to reach our goals for 2045. That's reality.

And again, I hope that some day the eight chargers that were paid for by CARB will actually be electrified, maybe next year, so that will be a three-year project. But they're fully built and they're being vandalized, because what are they doing? They're just sitting there doing nothing, not being used at all.

So when we think about tribes, we also -- and the EJAC recommendations specifically to natural and working lands, we do need to think about non-traditional technical input, tribal input, including traditional economic -- ecological knowledge, such as cultural burning. We still need to burn many of our plants for basketry, foods, and medicine. That's a natural part of our ways of managing the lands. And we have to think about the fact that we
need free, and prior, and informed consent. As you know, that comes from the United Nations declaration.

Next slide, please.
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JILL SHERMAN WARNER: We need a real zero alternative, included in the recommendations. And we need to include an ambitious pesticide reduction target. We need to reduce synthetic pesticides by 50 percent by 2030. We need to reduce hazardous pesticides by 75 percent by 2030.

And I am proud to say that many of the tribes engaged in commercial agriculture within the state of California. Guess what? We've already gone organic. And we go organic because we know that what we're doing today is not for ourselves today but for seven generations ahead. I don't do -- I didn't decide to become an elected official of my tribe, because it's something that I wanted to do for me. It's something that I wanted to do for the future generations that are coming. I'm 56 years old. The next generation that's going to lead my tribe into the future has yet to come and they will be becoming. So when we think about this, we as need to think about our future generations.

We need to start with organic phosphates, fumigants, paraquats, and neonicotinoids. I might not be
saying that right. We need to include organic farming in all Scoping Plan scenarios. We need to restructure scenarios to model progressive percentage increase -- increases in the adoption of all proposed agricultural management strategies. Organic agriculture should make up 30 percent of the total agricultural acreage by 2030 or by 80 percent by 2045.

And agriculture is some that's near and dear to me, because guess what? The river -- the Trinity River, which is one of the last wild and scenic rivers within the state of California has its water taken by -- about 80 percent of our water is taken to feed the Sacramento River and act as a cooling agent, so that it could be cool water that's given to the Central Valley.

Tribes are impacted over and over and in this -- in the recommendations, especially in Bakersfield when you're looking at injecting carbon into underground wells or -- we're not even thinking about how it may impact the local tribes there.

So again, I look forward to working with you to provide meaningful engagement with the tribes and government-to-government consultation on this Scoping Plan.

Thank you.

MARTHA DINA ARGÜELLO: And I know I'm standing
between you and many of the communities who came to give public testimony, so I know that this was a lot and I wanted you to breathe for a moment before I finish, so that you would listen to me, but I'm also really concerned about the time and making sure that we have time for community participation.

So really in closing, and I think you have much of the information in my slides, but I do want to loop back to some of our key asks. Plan for full coordinated phaseout of fossil fuels by 2045 and oil extraction by 2035; phaseout oil refining by 2045 and transition to clean renewable zero-emission electricity by 2035; accelerate the scale-up and investments in clean cars, trucks, and mass transit, while addressing the trade-offs such as lithium extraction; and rev up transit for working class Californians mass transit and unique transit opportunities, like the try Raiteros program; minimize reliance on climate policy dead-ends, like carbon capture and storage that extends the life of the State's otherwise different fossil fuel infrastructure.

We need to do this quickly. And again, thank you for all the work. Thank you to the CARB staff, to the Board, to Trish, and to Chanell who's worked with us and that have been patient with us, and to all the community folks who came up who've also been patient with us. I do
want to call -- you know, you have the slides.

This path -- the proposed scenario is not on the right path. We've provided you with a real zero alternative path. And we hope that this time is the charm where we actually work together to get to a real zero, where we're actually working in partnership. So thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Is that the end of the presentation? No. No more other presentations from staff, correct?

ISD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST RAMALINGAM: (Shakes head.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. All right. As noted at the beginning of the meeting, we will be taking a 45-minute lunch break. I will note we have approximately 450 speakers signed up. So we will be -- we will be -- our time limit will be half of our normal time limit. Our normal time limit is three minutes. It will be one and a half minutes. And so when we -- we will take a 45-minute break. We will come back and we will begin the public comment portion of our meeting.

All right.

Thank you.

(Off record: 12:34 p.m.)
(Thereupon a lunch break was taken.)
AFTERNOON SESSION

(On record: 1:29 p.m.)

(Technical difficulties)

TANYA DERIVI: ....for all, because mandates do not. CARB should evaluate how market based approaches can deliver most cost effective emissions reductions than what has been proposed today, ensure that future regulations, including any changes to the Cap-and-Trade program, incentivize investments for CCUS and other carbon reducing technologies, incorporate a requirement for meaningful cost containment mechanisms in future regulations being driven by the Scoping Plan, account accurately for life-cycle emissions, including the production and disposal of electric vehicle batteries, and address concerns with California becoming overly reliant on just one energy system, electricity, to power our economy in a reliable manner that is affordable for all.

Durable policies that encourage not hamper competition and innovation will be the best way to deliver cost-effective emissions reductions for Californians. Our industry's greatest contribution is our capacity to innovate.

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

TANYA DERIVI: Oh, thank you.
JEFFREY CLARY: Good afternoon. I'm Jeffrey Clary, Senior Director for Climate Strategies at the Foundation for California Community Colleges, the non-profit that benefits, supports, and enhances California's community colleges. First, thank you to the Board and to all those who helped bring together this ambitious plan. Today, I wish to express support for the targets in the Scoping Plan to describe the workforce needs implied by those targets and to suggest a framework for thoughtful implementation of climate workforce development.

The Scoping Plan sets ambitious goalposts and fixing these goalposts is absolutely essential right now, as colleges, universities, and industries are making investments to respond to climate change and to climate policy. The Scoping Plan's targets require rapid, broad-based changes in California's workforce. Entire economic sectors such as energy and forestry need thousands of workers with specific skills. And activating the pipeline of new workers into these jobs is a huge challenge that will take time. And right now, there's lots of bottlenecks.

Fortunately, the Governor and Legislature have
recognized the importance of workforce development in their upcoming budget. And the Foundation for California Community Colleges is here to build on robust administrative frameworks and partnerships to bridge the needs and resources of the State and stakeholders across California.

We propose a climate workforce hub built on partnerships and coordinated by the Foundation with two focal areas. Number one, convening and coordinating stakeholders so that we can act with intention and build to where we need to go, and number two, implementing a full life cycle workforce development strategy for careers in climate adaptation and mitigation.

So the Foundation -- thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. And I'll also note, folks can always submit written comments as well.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes. The docket for this item will be open until tomorrow at midnight, June 24th at midnight and you can submit your written comments there. The links for that are on the public agenda.

All right. Go ahead.

DAVID ASTI: Good to go. Good afternoon, Chair, members of the Board and staff, my name is David Asti. And on behalf of Southern California Edison, I want to
thank you for this opportunity to provide comments.

I'll move through these quickly to be respectful of those behind me. First, let me say that SCE strongly supports the proposed scenario. Like SCE's own pathway to 2045, CARB's proposed scenario leverages feasible technologies, such as transportation and building electrification. More importantly, the proposed scenario balances decarbonization with affordability, a key concern, given that achieving carbon neutrality should not negatively impact Californians that have historically been harmed the most by the impacts of climate change.

Secondly, SCE commends CARB for adopting a zero-emission standard new space in water heaters sold in California standard. Building electrification must play an immediate and vital role in the state's decarbonization.

Lastly, SCE stands willing and able to invest in the economy-wide electrification needed to mitigate climate change and meet California's GHG and air quality goals. However, policymakers, IOUs, and other stakeholders must partner to minimize electric rate increases and the State needs to ensure that there is effective coordination amongst State agencies, which is occurring, to allow California to meet its climate goals.

Lastly, I'd just like to say that SCE looks
forward to engaging with summer activities announced by CARB since these will be great opportunities to share and learn from each other's assumptions and methodologies.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. And I will just make an announcement for those that are listening in Zoom, I think there was an audio cut out, but the queue will be closing for sign-ups at 1:40 as the Chair mentioned.

Go ahead.

MANDEEP SAMRA: Good afternoon. My name is Mandeep Samra. I'll be speaking on behalf of the Joint Utilities Group. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and members of the Board.

Today, I want to raise two very important aspects of the Scoping Plan, reliability and affordability. Understanding that the proposed scenario is the best of the four alternatives proposed for energy reliability, affordability, and feasibility, the JUG urges CARB to refine the scenario to keep reliability and affordability top of mind as it aims to provide California with a decarbonization roadmap.

As California utilities, we are experts in the electric industry. Especially as it comes to reliability in helping ensure our customers keep the lights on
requires thoroughly modeling the reliability of future scenarios. Another element of ensuring reliability is to use reasonable assumptions in the amount of resource and transmission buildout.

The economy-wide forecast of the buildout of the necessary resource mix, which includes clean, firm, dispatchable resources is possible by 2045. Electric reliability is essential. Let's be clear. Without reliability, we will not achieve our goals. Thus we urge CARB staff to elevate the necessity for electric reliability when fine-tuning the Scoping Plan by the end of the year to maintain the 2045 as the most feasible timeline.

The JUG is still concerned with the necessary resource and transmission buildout cost, both for energy transition and growing electrification, and how it will put an upward pressure on electricity rates. Although the proposed scenario is the last cost option modeled, it also minimizes job losses, we are still concerned about the jobs that may be lost.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Can you state your name for the record?

MANDEEP SAMRA: Mandeep Samra.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Okay. Thank you.
And then just so you're all aware, the timer will be up here on the screen, so if you need to see the time as you're going, and then there will be that audio signal as well. Next is George Peppas.

Chelsea.

Sylvia Duarte.

Sal Ayala.

SAL AYALA: Good afternoon. My name is Sal Ayala and I'm with the California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce. I'm the Inland Empire region chair and a business owner.

I urge the Board to reconsider the Scoping Plan to ensure the efforts are sustainable with a compromise to the small business diverse communities. Our small businesses are dying in California. While the update is well intentioned, it contains many ill-advised elements that should be removed or substantially corrected before the update is finalized by CARB. The time constraints regarding the due date for comments prevent us from providing thorough expression of our many concerns, but CARB is strongly urged to consider the following basic concerns about the update.

Businesses need to -- certainty to grow, invest in jobs. Yet, every scenario in the Scoping Plan will use facing -- will have us facing an unpredictable and
unreliable electric grid. It seems this Board feels free
to make worse by driving energy and transportation costs
even higher, which is especially hard for those businesses
to shoulder as we face high inflation and energy cost.

In order for -- on our current path, California
electricity costs will increase by as much as 120 percent
by the end of this decade. And by your own analysis,
aspects of this plan will reduce personal income by 15
billion making it even harder to keep our employees
with -- it will cost to much to live here.

Reaching -- please reconsider and go back to the
drawing board. Thank you so much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Sylvia.

And then the next few commenters, if you see your
name on there, if you can come down and stand on one of
these yellow markers so that we're ready to go.

SYLVIA DUARTE: Good afternoon, everyone. My
name is Sylvia Duarte and I serve as the CEO President for
the Antelope Valley Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. The
Antelope Valley Hispanic Chamber of Commerce was
established in 1997 as an organization dedicated to serve
as a vehicle and bridge for Spanish speaking business
owners to participate and assimilate into our American
community, and to ensure interests of our small and
diverse business owners are represented.

Business needs certainty to grow and invest in jobs. Yet, every scenario in the Scoping Plan will have us facing an unpredictable and unreliable electric grid. It seems this Board feels free to make it worse by driving up energy and transportation costs even higher, which is especially hard for small businesses to shoulder as we face high inflation and energy costs.

On our current path, California electricity costs will increase by as much 120 percent by the end of this decade. And by your own analysis, aspects of this plan will reduce personal income by 15 billion, making it even harder to keep our employees, when it will cost them too much to live here.

If someone cannot take care of their family or small business, how can you expect them to delve into an all-electric future when it's obvious the State is not in a position to support that conversion by 2035.

So although we are with you, we believe you need to go back to the drawing board.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Ricardo Villa.

RICARDO VILLA: Good afternoon, CARB Board. My name is Ricardo Villa, President of the San Diego County
Imperial Valley Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. Native Californian and proud of our State's forward thinking, diversity, transparency, and accountability, but we oppose this program -- this Scope and for the following reasons.

First and foremost, of what we know, we've lost 11 businesses in San Diego because of CARB, 17 in LA. They were not provided the proper education, technical assistance or outreach for changing their vehicles.

They lost their businesses. They lost their livelihood. So those companies are going to affect us down the road, because it's going to take away the key thing that makes California unique.

With a weakened economy, hit by COVID, staffing, and a fragile supply, these components are even going to make things more complicated for everybody, especially those in the minority groups and the minority regions. We urge you to take a pause, listen to other options. This has a cost to it and that cost you have not fully assessed because you would have factored in the businesses that we've lost, the communities that we've impacted. And with those things that I've mentioned before, it's going to be even larger.

So I ask you to reconsider again, factor these in, take a pause and reach out again and ask for assistance, guidance, on other options.
Thank you so much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Okay. Thank you.

Mikhael Skvarla. Or I'm sorry, Enrique.

YSIDRO GARCIA: Hi. I'm Ysidro Garcia. I'm representing the LBA. As a small minority business owner, the Scoping Plan does not take into consideration the costs that are required to adhere to these standards. You're forcing me to place my future into the hands of utility companies that don't have no competition or cannot currently keep the lights on when it's too hot or is too windy.

Why do you assume that we'll have the infrastructure in place of an all-electric future, such as -- in a short period? I can tell you the infrastructure will not be in place and is going to fall on the business like mine, my employees, customers, that absorb these costs.

We have record inflation that increases by another eight percent this past month. It shows no signs of slowing. We saw the destructive nature of the Great Recession adding to the Scoping Plan. Costs on top of the inflation will likely create a new recession. It will be disastrous for all Californians. We urge the Board to reject this Scoping Plan and instruct the staff to return to the table and sit down with the working families and
the people who can least support these plans, listen to their concerns. Listening to organizations that are likely white and coastal based does not represent the true face of California.

Thank you. Have a great day.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Enrique.

I'm sorry. Mikhael.

MIKHAEL SKVARLA: Yeah. Mikhael Skvarla here on behalf of the California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance. Our business and labor members stand committed to building the energy systems of the future, delivering low zero and negative carbon energy solutions to all Californians.

California's climate goals paired with carbon neutrality are among the most ambitious and aggressive in the world. This plan calls for fundamental transformation of the way life as we know it is in California. We want to highlight some critical questions for deliberation.

Is the proposed scenario the most cost effective and most technologically feasible? What are the cumulative impacts, including the total societal cost over the next 22 to 23 years? What are the constraints of the modeling exercise and how do these constraints influence the proposed scenario? How will ARB and its agency
partners work together to ensure technology neutrality is allowed within this policy and the subsequent regulations? How will California build the infrastructure necessary at scale to achieve these goals? How will California overcome the regulatory and permitting barriers to achieve this goal in a timely fashion?

As a society, we must carefully allocate our resources to provide essential services to the public. This includes achieving this goal and we need to balance the goal with those costs.

Furthermore, it doesn't matter how ambitious the scenario is if we cannot achieve the buildout.

Thank you and we look forward to following up with comments.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Are you Enrique?
ENRIQUE VELEZ: Yes, ma'am.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Okay. Go ahead.
ENRIQUE VELEZ: Thank you. Good afternoon. I'm Enrique Velez. And on behalf of the Latino -- Latin Business Association, I'd like to convey our opposition to the Scoping Plan, as it will hurt small businesses, especially Latino-owned ones that are still recovering from the COVID disruption. We're still living through this pandemic and the economic downturn -- downturn as is
all too real for the companies' employees that we represent.

Latino businesses were disproportionately affected by the pandemic and were less likely to qualify for government loans. Adding the Scoping Plan costs on top of a likely recession is just going to force more minority-owned businesses to shut their doors and lay off employees.

The Latin Business Association is ready to work with CARB to balance the needs of the community and greening our future. It's disappointing that there was no outreach to ethnic chambers from the CARB staff to discuss how the Scoping Plan will affect communities of color. Only speaking to certain groups does not give a true representation of the ramifications of this Scoping Plan, but rather a whitewashing of its findings. I thank you for the time and may God bless you. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Teresa.

TERESA COOKE: Thank you. Good afternoon.

Teresa Cooke. Pleased to be here on behalf of the California Hydrogen Coalition.

We want to commend the Air Resources Board on a bold plan that includes hydrogen throughout industrial, energy, and transportation sectors. I do, however, caution you about the disconnection that exists between
the transportation demands of the proposals and the build
out of zero-emission vehicle infrastructure. The
availability of hydrogen fueling infrastructure must
proceed vehicle deployment. So let's finish the
development of the light- and medium-duty fueling network,
so automakers can div -- or deploy fuel cell vehicles with
certainty.

Weeks ago General Motors shared that they pulled
back the commercialization -- the commercial release of
their passenger fuel cell vehicle because of the lack of
hydrogen fueling infrastructure in California. Let's not
let that happen again.

As it relates to heavy-duty, we want to thank you
for and give our support to the proposed expansion of the
hydrogen refueling infrastructure credit to heavy-duty
fueling under the LCFS. The hydrogen community is ready
to fight alongside our frontline communities against GHG
and toxic air emissions. And to that end, we look forward
to continuing our work.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Jin Sung.

JIN SUNG: Thank you. Good afternoon, President
Randolph and CARB -- CARB members. My name is Jin Sung.
I'm the National Diversity Coalition's Board Chair. And
our mission really has a lot to do with bringing corporate
social responsibility as a top priority to all
corporations in the nation, and -- in terms of how we have
been engaging ourselves, our three million constituents
across the nation. We are headquartered here in
California and our heart and our insight to bringing some
of the concerns over this proposition is real.

We represent the low-to-moderate income
communities. And how we have been active is in the
California Public Utilities Commission, we are a formal
intervenor representing the low-to-moderate income
communities. This proposal brings a lot of concerns as a
collection for it does not reflect the voices of those
people who are not able to make it here in Sacramento.
I'm formally requesting the Board to not only reconsider
amendment to the added strategy that's much needed to
address some of the concerns for the low-to-moderate
income communities, but with the onset of the pandemic, we
know what has happened. Perhaps what we need to really be
attuned to is the impact of electrification, positive and
negative, to our low income communities.

Corporations currently are focusing on corp --
social responsibility, but ESG when they're focusing on
environmental only, the social and governance element
unbalanced. We would love to see a balanced approached
to --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: That concludes your time.

JIN SUNG: Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Kathy.

FAITH BAUTISTA: Good afternoon, Chairwoman.

Thank you so much for having us here.

I'm Faith Bautista with National Diversity Coalition, a national Asian American coalition. I'm going to continue what Jin Sung is saying. There are so many people that would be affected with this policy. And I'm really encouraging the Board. I know you all care about low-moderate income. You care about poor and very poor. You care about everybody that matters. So I'm really encouraging that every -- all of us should have this outreach in every city that need it the most. Coming here, it takes us the whole day. It's very expensive to come to Sacramento. And there's so many people that will be affected on this policy.

So the scoping of work has to include the people that it will affect the most. So I'm really encouraging that you do an outreach, you go to the churches, you go to the ethnic chambers of commerce, you go to the ethnic supermarkets where this matters the most.

And I also would like to recommend have a survey.
You know, what does this really mean to them, how much will this cost them, and do they even know CARB? Most likely, they don't know what even CARB means and your organ -- this agency. So there's a lot of education. Though there's 40 million population here in California, I would say, you know, the highest of the people only know about what the scope of work would be. So I'm encouraging -- encouraging all of you that before you do any work get the people involved. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

And the next four speakers will be speaking on behalf of a group, so we can change the timer to three minutes. And so first will be Irma.

IRMA LOPEZ LIZARRAGA (through interpreter):

Hello. My name is Irma Lopez. And I am a member of Communities for a Better Environment. I live in the City of Cudahy in Southeast LA. My community has been fighting over the last 20 years, so that the 710 Highway, which is considered a death zone for diesel, is not built out. CARB should include objectives that are stronger to demand that hundred percent of sales of medium- and heavy-duty trucks be zero emissions by the year 2035. In line with their strategy for the mobile sources, the objective for that year is very weak for 2040. So this puts at risk communities that live close to the highways.
and port operations as well as warehouses.

The members and the organizations for a better environment have been involved in this fight against this -- the catastrophic events of these operations at the ports and at the warehouses, and the expansions of highway. CARB has not protected the environmental justice communities, including the ones that live next to port operations and the channels of merchandise like the ones that are next to the 710 highway.

In conclusion, I urge CARB to prioritize the health and safety of communities through more aggressive means in order to safeguard current generations and our future generations that live in the Southeast LA area and in all of California. Thank you.

So I am a witness -- a reliable witness of the pollution and everything that's happening in the area. I have lesions on my skin from the particles -- the pollution that's in the air from where I live. And this is why I'm here. I am raising my voice and I'm fighting for all of those communities that cannot be here in order to safeguard the health of all families in California.

Thank you.

(Appause.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ashley.

Ashley.
ASHLEY PHUTHAMA: Hello. My name is Ashley. I'm a youth intern from Asian Pacific Environmental Network. I have been waiting here all day to speak. I'm the second community speaker after 16 straight industry speakers. Communities should be treated just as well and as heard just as much as industries.

I live in West Contra Costa County my whole life. My parents are refugees from Laos. They moved here to give me and my family a safer life, but it was not as safe as we thought.

Living near the five Bay Area refineries, I've experienced refinery incidents my whole life. A couple years ago in my Freshman year of high school, as I was leaving school, my school would not let us out of the building, and they did not tell us why. After five minutes of staying there, when we got out, we saw smoke everywhere. Everyone was covering their mouth and couldn't breathe. The sky was really foggy. We were stuck in traffic and could not see the road. I thought the air quality was going to get better when I went home, but the smoke got even worse because I was closer to the Phillips 66 Refinery that exploded.

I closed all the doors and windows. I was confused on what happened, but everyone helped my understand it. It was the refinery's fault. I couldn't
imagine how people who were unaware or unable to get access of information felt. I was angry and sad and too afraid to breathe, because every time I would, I would feel nauseous and tired.

Lucky for me, I am young and have a strong Immune system and lungs, but older people with medical conditions and -- do not have these benefits, making it even harder for them to breathe. I don't ever want to feel this way again, but especially I don't want anyone else around me to ever have this experience. I'm here today to call on you to protect our future and make a plan for a full phaseout of fossil fuels by 2045. I've lived in the Bay Area my whole life. It's my home, my community, my family. It should be my safe space. I want to stop Chevron, Phillips 66, and other polluting corporations from polluting my safe place.

(Applause.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: So could we use the ASL for sign for applause, so that people can continue moving for and begin speaking.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Is this next speaker, Debbie?

THE INTERPRETER: So our member will speak in Cantonese. After she finish, I will do an English interpretation for her.
DONG HUA CHEN (DEBBIE): Okay. Hello. My name is Debbie. So I'm the resident of Oakland. I'm here to provide my comments about the CARB plan.

So I have been living in Oakland for nine years, but because of the air pollution in recent years my -- I lost high immunity. I got allergy. And then some of my friends getting worse on asthma. So why not the climate change bring a lot of damage and risk to either healthy people or not healthy people. So me and APEN here represent the voice of hundreds of Asian working class and refugee family. And we really care about pollution in our life. And then we hope that CARB can really make a real plan to reduce emission. And then we wanted to stop oil extraction in 2035 and then shutting down the refinery on 2045, so that we have the opportunity to own a clean future.

Please treat the healthiness of the -- of our community as your first priority, so that -- just once again, we wanted to stop have the fossil fuel extraction on 2035. And then 2045, we're closing the refinery. And then we wanted to have clean and more public transit in our community.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
And the last speaker with the -- for a group that will be three minutes also is going to be Christopher Soriano.

VICE CHAIR BERG: So, ma'am, there is a button on that -- on that table. You could lower, if that makes it more comfortable for them.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. My name is (inaudible). I'm 13 years old and I'm a resident of Oakland, California. I'm speaking on the CARB Scoping Plan for people living with asthma. I'm here today because I want those kids who live out there to have a better future. The reason why I care so much about this issue is because the lives of people are in danger. My life is in danger. Your lives are in danger. You guys don't realize how important a life can be. You guys can't -- are showing us that you don't care about your community. You can't buy a life, but what you can do is save a life. We won't give up on this issue, not right now. If only you had been in our position, if only you would be here with us helping one another to have a better tomorrow.

You should know how dangerous this is. Let me ask you something, do you only care about your profit and the lives of the seven generations? You don't care about those? Because you're basically showing us the exact same
thing you don't, you know that, right?

Treat the world like how you want to be treated.

And I'm going to ask you something. Why should I have this? (Holding up inhaler) Why? Am I supposed to be having this for the rest of my life? Am I supposed to? Why do I have this?

I see kids here. Who knows what health problems they have. Are they going to keep having that? Tell me, yes, no? You should put yourself in our position. If only you guys would have this. And if you have it, then you should know how it feels. People shouldn't be having this and living their whole lives with this.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHRISTOPHER SORIANO: Hey, everybody. My name is Christopher. And I'm just here to tell all of you guys on that stage that we -- you guys are in a power of -- in a position of power where you guys have to listen to us and opinions, my opinion, my fellow youth over here opinions, everyone here in the room opinions, and everyone outside of the building's opinions. You are here to represent us and our future. And it feels like you aren't even respecting and listening to our voice, because we are here today to tell you that our lives matter and that our lives are important.
I am tired and I am mad that I have to spend my
time, that my life is important -- that my life is -- my
life is important.

(Applause.)

CHRISTOPHER SORIANO: I'm here to tell you that
you should listen to our voices, each of the society.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Next will Ariel.

ARIEL McCARTY: Hello. My name is Ariel Bautista
McCarty. I'm here to represent the Asian-American Pacific
Islander community and on behalf of the National Diversity
Coalition.

As a small business owner myself, businesses need
certainty to grow and invest in jobs. Yet, every scenario
in the Scoping Plan will have us facing an unpredictable
and unreliable electric grid. It seems this Board feels
free to make it worse by driving up energy and
transportation costs even higher, which is especially hard
for small businesses like myself to shoulder as we face
high inflation and energy costs. Please go back to the
drawing board. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Bob.

BOB ROSE: Hello. I'm Bob Rose, also here on
behalf of National Diversity Coalition.

We are very concerned about the impact of bad policy and its effect on small businesses, its discriminatory approach. We think it will deepen inequality. Farmers will suffer. The advantaged will suffer. Basically, it's environmental discrimination. Small businesses will get hurt by this.

So what I'm asking, because we all care about the climate, is to make sure that you are looking at this properly from a global perspective with the very best answers and solutions that we can muster as a society.

There are many environmentalists around the world that are far more advanced in addressing issues of global warming than we are. And taking a shot like this is narrow, meaning electric -- forcing electric on everybody. The problem is that you're actually going to be increasing the problem rather than decreasing the problem.

All electric does not dissolve -- does not solve the problem that's in front of us.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Jinky Dolar.

JINKY DOLAR: Good afternoon. My name is Jinky Dolar. I'm here to represent the Asian Pacific American Advocates and also the community.

I urge this Board not to make the California
leader in climate change policy that hurts the low income
community the most. Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Jack Miranda.

JACK MIRANDA: Good afternoon, Board. Pastor
Jack Miranda representing the faith community. God Bless
you. It's daunting -- a daunting task. You hear the zeal
of young people and you hear the impact of business what
it would have on business. And so there's a lot to
consider. And I'm hearing a phrase, go back to the
drawing board. So easy for us to say.

But please consider what you're hearing, all
these distinct voices, these distinct groups, and please
consider the impact it will have on the low-moderate
income community in our -- just the time frame. We're
concerned -- I also volunteer the network of churches and
faith communities that can be your information
distributors. And we would welcome that, that a
knowledgeable constituency is the best one.

And so God bless you. We welcome you. Remember,
the Good Books says zeal without knowledge is not good.
And so I'm hearing a lot of zeal and I hope you can help
us with that knowledge.

God bless.

RICHARD PALAY: Good afternoon, ladies and
gentlemen of CARB. That says Richard Griffen. It actually should be Richard Palay with the National Diversity Council. And I'm here speaking on behalf of the EV program that's going to be imposed on the L, and particularly of LMI, L being low-income community members. I'm speaking on their behalf. I'm the voice of one crying out on behalf of the voice of the many whose voices will not be heard unless someone in an organization like ours comes to speak on their behalf to you.

I want to remind you of the consideration that is needed for those that are in the low and low-income communities. These community members of color will be negatively impacted by the imposition of electronic vehicles. Who's going to pay for those community members to be able to purchase those vehicles. If they can't purchase those vehicles, who's going to pay for them to have to change their lives by buying a bicycle. Who's going to help these community members understand how will I navigate my children to school, myself to the shopping -- to the grocery score, myself to community events, myself to church on Sunday? Who's going to help them navigate that challenge?

So we'd like you to just take the time to reconsider this what you're speaking about and come and hear the voices of the community members. Let's just not
push this forward. I'm here to simply say slow down and let's talk.

    Thank you.

ANDRE CHAPPLE: To the Committee and Chair Lady, Pastor Andre Chapple from the Faith Church, Los Angeles and part of the National Diversity Coalition.

    Great to be a part of something like this. I know you guys have daunting task ahead of you. And it was also great to see so many people represented. But the disappointment that I have is that I can't bring my 100 people all the way up here to Sacramento to share on the agenda that we think works best for us.

    I, too, serve the low, low-income communities, the hard to reach -- the hard to reach communities that literally nobody knows anything that we're talking about today. We need some more transparency is my hope, that maybe we can partner with some of you all, get you all to come down to our communities and explain to them, you know, things like when brought to the Governor how is this going to affect the poor people, and the quote that I saw was that they can use the new bike lanes or the new bus routes. That's sad. That's unfortunate.

    We would like to see this -- every -- if anybody lives in California does not want clean air, they need to go see a medical professional or something. We all want
that. But there has to be a way that we do it that makes sense, that's considerate of the time that it's going to take, that will be effective, because we don't want to be embarrassed in front of the rest of America. Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Alex Anderson.

All right. Then we can go ahead to Magali Torres.

MAGALI TORRES: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Magali Torres and I'm speaking as a resident of Merced County and as a representative of the Merced County Hispanic Chambers of Commerce.

As a recent graduate and as a minority, I want to urge the Board to reconsider how inequitable the Scoping Plan is for rural communities and the underserved communities. People that live in Merced and Tracy are commuting hours to the Bay Area for their work. And if any of these scenarios are chosen, they will not afford to do so, whether they need to plug in or use gas for their fuel.

They do so because they cannot afford to live near where they work. And that will not change given the State of California's current housing market. There are destructive economic consequences of acting fast to be
first. Consumers and industries are being left behind, which slows down the goal of a healthier future. These demands and mandates hold no accountability. There needs to be a diversified plan that doesn't force high cost supplies. The plan is narrowly focused on one technology rather than allowing for the flexibility of other available lower cost carbon options.

These regulations are a big step backwards for the working families and small businesses on behalf of the Merced County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. Policies like this will push people further away from ever being able to afford not to commute hours to work or school. Reaching our climate goals is not a one-way path.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Andre Thompson.

ANDRE THOMPSON: Good afternoon. My name is Andre Thompson. I'm out of Los Angeles, California. And my charter bus company is National Charter, Inc. And I'm also with the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

I'm here today because your regulations and your mandates, as far as charter buses, have -- the finish line has kept moving. First, you ask us to put filters on buses. Then after filters, you ask us to go to the DPF program. And from going to the DPF program, I can attest
that 25 companies in the Los Angeles area alone that had either a combination 66 buses that they had to either sit down or -- and can't sell because of your regulations. You can't sell them in California, so they're worth nothing because of the mandates that you guys have set forth. And then also it goes to now you want us to build a DPF and then from DPF eventually electric.

Buses as it's set now, 500,000. So what do you think an all-electric bus is going to go, a million? People would rather buy homes than put in -- you know, a million dollars into a vehicle. I'm self-employed. I've been fortunate to be able to take over a company from my dad. I've seen it grow and seen it sustained. But you guys are hurting all the minority companies that are here representing that can't or the ones -- the mom and pop with the one bus that couldn't afford the 16 to 18 thousand dollars to put a filter on. Then when they did get the money to put a filter on, you moved the finish line again and now they're out of business.

So I hope you guys do something at least take into consideration what the industry means to all of you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Next is Elaine Borgon, and then the next three that we'll -- we'll call on those then we will go to Zoom for a few.
ELAINE BORGON CONWAY: My name is Elaine Borgon Conway. I'm from Dinuba, California, Central California. I'm here to invite all of you and the Governor to come to Dinuba, bring your bicycles. Let's go from field, to field, to field starting at 4 o'clock in the morning and see how easy it's going to be or to bring a ladder with your bicycles to climb the trees. You're not going to do any work, but you're just going to go from field, to field, to field.

We feed the country and we want to have a green world. I'm bad asthmatic. I have to have oxygen. I -- I want this for my kids. I want to get a new car, but I couldn't afford it. I can't walk to the store. What is good is that we want the best for our coming children and grandchildren. But we can't do this, because this is too much of a hurry. You have to take more time. It's good in a puzzle. It looks good, but separate it, it doesn't make sense, you know.

But if you could come to our town and see that we don't have transportation, we don't have buses to take us anywhere, and we're just out in nowhere. But we are the working back of the United States and other countries with our fruit and vegetables that we give out. So this is not practical for us at all nor can we afford it. If they could afford it, they could live in their car, because
they can't afford anything else.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Sherry.

SHERRY CHAVIRRA: Hello. I'm Sherry Chavirra. I'm Chair for the Dinuba Democratic Club and part of Si Se Puede.

The most current State statistics indicate over 39 million people live in California. Our State has 13.1 million households and over 14.2 million registered vehicles. There are also many -- also millions of other gas powered machines that are used daily throughout the state. Those staggering numbers are the reason Californians experience rolling blackouts every year in the heat of the summer.

We live in Tulare County. I -- with Elaine that just spoke, and there's many people who have swamp coolers still and coolers. And we've already had two blackouts, okay -- or brownouts and blackouts. So what's going to happen when we have all these electric-powered cars.

Okay. Simply put, the State electric grid cannot generate enough electric power to sustain our enormous demand currently in these summers and we aren't even to July yet.

So the question is, if the grid does not provide enough electrical power now, what will happen when California switches to electric-powered vehicles and other...
electric-driven equipment that will constantly need charging? That is why more time is needed to transform to the grid, perhaps 10 to 15 to 20 years. Till then, no sense is -- in talking about Scoping Plan and driving around electric cars and riding bicycles to work in 108 degrees. Thank you for your time.

    Thank you. And I believe Kristen is not here, so Estella.

ESTELLA KESSLER: Good afternoon, Board. My name is Estella Kessler. I'm from Selma, California, representing Si Se Puede. Selma is in the heart of the Central Valley.

    A popular piece of advice states that you don't cutoff your nose to get rid of a pimple on your nose. That means do not overreact when pressing problems can be solved in a sensible manner. That applies to the Scoping Plan. We want clean air, not policies that will eliminate over 85,000 jobs in our state. We need clean air, not loss of over $22 billion to the state's economy.

    The goal is clean air, but we still need to fix bad roads and old infrastructure that will not be fixed, if billions of dollars are wasted on thoughtless policies. CARB's highly paid staff should be capable of finding sensible ways to give us clean air and not hurt California's economy in doing it.
And my question to you, why aren't these hearings being held throughout the State? Because when I speak to people in my area, they have not heard of this. They have -- they don't have a clue what your recommendation is. Not until it comes to them in front of them, that's when they'll realize, hey, how come we didn't know about this. So my recommendation is you take the advice of Elaine and go down to the Central Valley and ride a bike.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: All right. And now we will transition to some commenters from Zoom.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

And the first five speakers that I will be calling on in Zoom are Alex Kizer, Nora Brown, Theo Pahos, Will Barrett, and Stuart Waldeman[SIC]. And I apologize in advance if I mispronounce your name.

So Alex, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you can begin.

ALEX KIZER: Thank you. My name is Alex Kizer. I'm the Senior Vice President for Research at the Energy Futures Initiative, a clean energy think tank founded by Ernest Moniz former U.S. Secretary of Energy.

California is a global leader in clean energy and what happens there matters for the rest of the country and
the world. In 2019, we published a report that identified 33 technologies needed to meet California's near-term climate goals, led by energy efficiency, fuel switching, and carbon capture and sequestration. California will need additional solutions such as carbon dioxide removal, lithium recycling, and clean hydrogen to reach net zero. Deep decarbonization depends on a lot of options.

In 2020, we coauthored a report with Stanford University on the policy needs for CCS, as we see CCS as one of the most valuable decarbonization solutions for the country and especially for the state. CCS addresses difficult to abate emissions in multiple sectors in California. And using a CCS hub model minimizes its geographic footprint, supports local air quality concerns, and regional economic benefits. Our study found that CCS can rapidly and cost effectively help California remove up to 15 percent of its emissions in the near term.

To make this happen, California needs to make long-term commitments to CCS removing barriers to investability. State permitting could be improved to include clearer timelines and appointing a lead agency. It's really important that some of these early projects be supported, so they can show how CCS projects should be designed, built, and paid for.

Thank you so much for your time, and your work,
and we hope to see California's leadership continue to
grow.

Thanks.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Can we -- I'm going to interrupt
the cadence of speakers for a moment, because Senator
Leyva needs to leave and wanted to say a few words before
she has to get back to her duties.

SENATOR LEYVA: Thank you very much Madam Chair
and Board members for accommodating my little bit of a
crazy schedule. First, I just want to say thank you to
everyone. I want to say thank you to CARB staff. I know
how hard you've worked on this. I know you've had many
conversations with myself and our colleagues. I want to
say thank you to the EJAC folks because they have -- we've
had many meetings with myself and my staff. But I mostly
want to say thank you to everyone who traveled up here,
especially I see people from CCAEJ, which is in my
district, and also from the Inland Empire. I know it's
six and a half hour drive or an hour and 10 minute flight.
So thank you for being able to be here today.

When I was elected in 2014, the very first thing
I did in January of 2015 was go on something called the
toxic tour put on by CCAEJ. And that helped me develop my
love for the environment. We started in Pomona, went out
to San Bernardino, and we went through every community in my district that was being disadvantaged because of pollution. I think that was transformative for me and has certainly helped me define the work that I've done in the eight years in the Senate.

The Scoping Plan, I know we have a little time and I think there -- there's more that we can do. I would really like to see us review, and I've shared this with the staff already, carbon capture storage. I'm really worried that that's something that's untested. It's going to take a very long time to get it up and running, and I'm not sure it's going to get us what when we need.

And gas fire plants, I'm very worried that we are asking to build 10 more gigawatts of new natural gas generating capacity. I just -- I know we have to make sure the grid is reliable. We've heard a lot of people talk about that, but I really worry that we are just postponing a bigger problem, so I'd like us to take a look at that.

I'd also like us to take a look at a more robust transportation sector and those targets. We know that the transportation sector, big rigs, remains the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in California. We did, on this Board just last year, authorize SB 210, a bill I did to make sure that our big trucks have to have a smog
check just like the rest of us do. I've authored legislation to make sure that small- and medium-sized companies can transfer -- transfer over from gas-powered and diesel-powered trucks to -- to electric vehicles. So I would like to see us look at that and maybe -- I just want us to be bold. I just feel that if we -- we've set our target high, even if we fall a little bit short, we're still going to achieve what we need to achieve for the citizens of California.

And I would just ask one thing of all of the community members here. In 2016, SB 1000. That's an environmental justice plan that every city has to do in their plan -- their general plan every 10 years. Every single one of you can participate in that. Go to your city council meetings make sure that your city council has an environmental justice plan. That alone will make a huge difference in the state of California.

Madam Chair, I thank you for letting me express some of my concerns. And thank you to the Board members. I know everyone has put a ton of time in, to staff, and especially to everyone who traveled here today to make their voices heard.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Okay. Nora, you can unmute
NORA BROWN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the Board. I'm Nora Cohen Brown. I'm the Head of Market Development and Policy at Charm Industrial. Charm is a California based company working to provide innovative solutions to tackle the growing threat of climate change. Charm and many other climate innovators are pioneering a host of new technologies to permanently remove carbon from the atmosphere. We very much appreciate the recognition in the scoping plan that carbon removal technologies will need to play a part in California's efforts to achieve carbon neutrality. Global experts have made it clear that carbon removal technologies will be necessary to achieve climate stabilization.

Charm technology converts waste biomass like forest and agricultural waste that would otherwise burn or rot and release CO2, methane, and air pollution into the atmosphere into a carbon dense bio-oil that can be permanently and safely sequestered. The kinds of solutions that Charm has developed can also play a key role in supporting California's biomass and forest waste management goals, wildfire and forest resilience actions, and air quality goals.

As a California based company, we're invested in
helping the State to continue to be a climate leader by putting in place policies that pave the way for innovative technologies and solutions to support climate action. Policies that support emerging carbon negative technologies will ensure continued investment, job creation and economic growth for California. We appreciate the extensive work that has gone into developing the Scoping Plan update, and look forward to working with you as you lead California forward on the path to carbon neutrality. Thank you so much.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you. Theo, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

Theo, are you there?

Okay. Go to Will. I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

WILL BARRETT: Thank you. This is Will Barrett with the American Lung Association. I want to first thank you all for your ongoing on this effort. Many in the health and medical community, we've weighed in on this in past plans calling for a more robust health analysis to inform the mix of measures needed to achieve 2030 climate standards, while generating the most near-term health benefits. We do acknowledge that health analysis has improved over time but it remains a limited snapshot of
the health benefits far into the future. By providing limited information on health benefits only in 2045, we do feel like we're losing sight of the near-term benefits and strong actions versus those 2045 carbon neutrality goals. The staff presentation noted the potential for thousands of additional lives saved due to more active transportation, but those benefits aren't captured in the monetized health outcomes. Again, this gives us a limited view. I want to call for also a greater focus on earlier direct emission reduction policies to bolster local health, air quality, and equity benefits, and note our concerns over unknown levels of carbon trading and carbon capture technology for fossil fuel production that risks to delay action in local air pollution cleanup along with the assumed need for investment in additional fossil fuel infrastructure.

The last thing I wanted to note is on VMT issues. Just yesterday, we saw yet another important bill on this topic stall. And as we've called for in the Mobile Source Strategy, the SIP, and the Scoping Plan, California Scoping Plan really should lay out trackable accountability measures to ensure State policies and investments truly align with climate, health, and equity goals the State has.

So with that, I'll just say thank you and look
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

I'm going to try Theo one more time. Theo, I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and you can begin.

Okay. Let's go to Stuart. Stuart, I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

STUART WALDMAN: All right. Thank you very much. Stuart Waldman. I'm President of the Valley Industry and Commerce Association in the San Fernando Valley portion of Los Angeles representing an area of two million people.

There must be a better way to meet emissions goals that doesn't cater only to those living near the coast who don't really need air conditioning to survive blistering summers, those that drive Teslas with chargers in their four car garages, and can afford to live close to work and easily pay higher energy costs.

The San Fernando Valley is a valley that is very hot during the summer. We need to focus on lowering the cost of electricity for the average household and small businesses in California, not increasing those costs.

California families electric costs will increase by as much as 120 percent by 2030. And so many families are already behind on their utility bills as it is.

CARB needs to go back to the drawing board. The
Scoping Plan is not benefiting California's working families who help drive our economy.

(Chanting in the auditorium)

STUART WALDMAN: California's current poverty crisis is partially driven by transportation and energy costs. There are destructive economic consequences of acting fast just to be first.

Consumers and industries are being left behind, which slows down the goal of a healthier future.

(Inaudible) stands the mandates hold no accountability when --

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you, Stuart. That finishes your time.

(Chanting in the auditorium)

STUART WALDMAN: Excuse me, did I just get -- did I just get interrupted?

(Chanting in the auditorium)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. We're going to take a break from the meeting.

(Off record: 2:35 p.m.)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record: 2:40 p.m.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: We were doing Zoom. We're just going to finish and then we'll go back to in the room.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Okay. We're going to pick
back up on Zoom. The first few commenters will be Miles Heller, Steve Barrow, Jeanne Merrill, and Julia Levin.

Miles, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

MILES HELLER: Yes. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph, Board members. Miles Heller from Air Products, the only U.S. based global industrial gas company and largest producer of hydrogen globally, producing hydrogen for over 60 years and deploying hydrogen transportation for over 30 years, including California. We really appreciate staff's efforts in developing this draft Scoping Plan, especially the extensive and collaborative process to date. We are supportive of the draft Scoping Plan. Believe it recognizes the substantive role that hydrogen can play in the energy transition.

The Scoping Plan development is just one step in this important energy transition and we encourage California's support for market creation and sustained policy support that enabled private industry to make long-term investment decisions.

Energy transition policy should be technology agnostic and focused on achieving emission outcomes. In terms of transportation, this means keeping battery, fuel cell technologies on equal footing in decarbonization and investment dollars allocated, and avoid assuming certain
solutions when other compelling ones are emerging like
green ammonia to decarbonize shipping.

This is what CARB has always done,
performance-based climate policies and they have been
effective. For hydrogen focus on a carbon-intensity
metric instead of colors or other definitions that will
let innovation flourish and the market respond to achieve
decarbonization. The LCFS is a successful example and we
urge CARB to strengthen the program, enable heavy-duty
hydrogen refueling infrastructure credits. Thanks for
allowing me to provide this feedback and we look forward
to working with you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Steve, I have activated your microphone. Please
unmute and begin.

STEVE BARROWS: Thank you, Chair Randolph and
Board members for the opportunity to speak today. My name
is Stephen Barrows and I'm the general counsel and head of
policy at Prometheus Fuels. Prometheus is a California
based company that uses direct air capture technology and
renewable energy like solar and wind to manufacture zero
net carbon and zero carbon CARB hydrogen and drop
unsustainable aviation fuel, gasoline, and diesel fuel.

Our suite of fuels is also known as electrofuels.
The only inputs to our fuel production process are air and
renewable electricity, and the only outputs are fuel and oxygen. More information about our company is available at PrometheusFuels.com.

Regarding direct air capture technology, the Scoping Plan focuses mostly on carbon removal and sequestration. The Scoping Plan can do more to highlight the benefits of carbon utilization. Burying CO2 underground has no economic value and cannot lead to a broader consumption -- broader consumer adoption of renewable fuel over fossil fuel. Rather, the Prometheus model of utilizing the captured CO2 to create a cost competitive alternative to fossil fuel can lead to a broader consumer adoption of a fossil alternative.

For example, a 2021 techno-economic analysis -- techno-economic analysis and life-cycle assessment of the Prometheus process done by Ramboll shows that our energy efficiency is high with a carbon intensity score close to zero and conservatively estimates that our cost to capture carbon is $36 per ton. The Ramboll report also confirmed the maturity of Prometheus's technology and it's ability to deliver carbon neutral fuel at a price that competes with legacy fossil fuels.

Beyond that, Prometheus manufacturing would help California reach the greenhouse gas reductions it is looking to achieve. Prometheus reiterates its support for
CARB's work to consider the solutions identified in the Scoping plan. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Okay. Jeanne, I've activated your microphone.

Please unmute and begin

--o0o--

JEANNE MERRILL: Thank you, Chair Randolph and Board members. Jeanne Merrill with the California Climate and Agriculture Network, a coalition of organic and sustainable agriculture organizations.

Under the proposed natural and working lands climate scenario, only 10 percent of California cropland will be reached with climate-smart agricultural practices by 2045. This lack of ambition in the draft Scoping Plan leaves little -- leaves too many farmers and ranchers vulnerable to climate change.

Under the proposed scenario, 700,000 acres of farmland will be permanently lost, most to urban sprawl development. Under the proposed scenario across landscape types, we see little ambition in the proposed mix of conservation, management and restoration activities to ensure that our natural and working lands our forests, our farms, our wetlands and more are carbon sinks and reduce overall greenhouse gas emissions and are not net sources of emissions.
We request that CARB increase the ambition of the natural and work land scenarios and redo some of the modeling to inform that final plan. We also request that CARB convene a scientific advisory committee this year made up of university researchers and others in the field knowledgeable of -- about climate change and natural and working lands science and practice review new modeling, review more ambition policy pathways and advise State agencies on implementation.

We cannot underestimate the urgency to go beyond the draft Scoping Plan scenarios. Finally, we align our comments with those calling for greater ambition overall in the Scoping Plan. To avoid catastrophe, we must push up our plans and put aside untested technologies.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you. And then we're actually going to go back to Stuart. I will have Chris put 30 seconds back on the clock. And, Stuart, I am -- I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

STUART WALDMAN: All right. Thank you. And I'd like to point out that the children that decided to interrupt that in a democracy, we let both sides speak. These bans and mandates hod no accountability. (Applause.)

STUART WALDMAN: There needs to be a diversified
plan that doesn't force high cost supplies. The plan is narrowly focused on one technology rather than allowing for the flexibility of other available lower cost carbon options.

Small businesses are still in the process of recovery from COVID disruptions that included unexpected shutdowns and chain disruption of inflation of goods. To meet the goals of the Scoping Plan, policymakers need to set a realistic time frame for small business.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Okay. We're going to go back to the in-person commenter at this time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: All right. So we'll put the names up here on the screen as well. And so if the next few -- if you see your name, if you can come down just for efficiency sake. First will be George.

GEORGE PEPPAS: Is it okay if I wipe this down? It didn't really seem like it was the best hygiene of those people. So let me take care of this. So --

(Jeering)

(Booing)

GEORGE PEPPAS: Excuse me. I have the dais.

Thank you.
(Jeering)
(Booing)

GEORGE PEPPAS: Thank you, Madam Chairman -- Chairwoman, Board members. My name is George Peppas and I'm the CEO and President of the San Juan Capistrano Chamber of Commerce.

(Jeering)
(Booing)

GEORGE PEPPAS: I think pretty much what we just saw and what we're dealing with with this group that you just saw come through, I think that kind of sums up this whole hearing. Everyone of you guys almost started laughing. You guys thought it was funny. We did not. We are actually here. We did the correct procedure by putting ourself on the list. I think it's just inappropriate the way guys you are running this. And I thought this was a serious meeting. I flew up here from San Diego County and Orange County to be a part of this.

And I would like to address the fact that they -- the gas taxes that are used to maintain roads will be lost. And pushing regressive of taxes on miles traveled will be hurt -- hurt family, low-income communities, and middle class workers. We have one of the largest populations in San Joaquin Capistrano is Hispanics. They cannot afford any electric vehicles at this moment. I
don't know how we can be able to be able to move forward with this procedure of what you guys are wanting to do of getting rid of all emissions by 2037.

I think that, you know, if you just drive on the streets here in Sacramento -- I haven't been up here. It's the first time. And I think there's people laying everywhere. I don't really know how they're going to be able to afford a vehicle. I don't understand how we can even afford to feed them let alone house them. I think we should work on the problems that we physically and personally see every single day, and figure out what to do, and move forward with the health and wellness aspect. And in return, we build the grid, we make the grid a lot better with -- we green the buildings, and we look toward to a brighter future. And I apologize that you guys allowed this to go the way it did.

So thank you.

(Jeering)

VICE CHAIR BERG: Ladies and gentlemen, we are not going to have screaming in this room, okay? We're going to be respectful, please.

Thank you.

CHELSEA PEPPAS: Thank you.

Good afternoon. My name is Chelsea Peppas and I'm here speaking as a concerned taxpayer and community
member out of San Juan Capistrano, California.

While the update is well intentioned and it contains many -- it -- however, it contains many ill-advised elements that should be removed or substantially corrected before it is finalized by CARB.

I am a charge nurse from Southern California that serves a wide array of socioeconomic patients from extremely wealthy to those that come across the border with only the clothes on their back. Many of the families and patients lack transportation to get to and from our hospital. They have no funds to buy expensive hospital cafeteria food or the ability to even pay the bills for their hospital stay. These are the families that will be great impacted by this scoping plan.

My widowed 92-year year old grandmother lives in LA County alone in a house and every year she and millions of others are subject to rolling blackouts and power shutoffs typically during the hottest part of the day. California doesn't have adequate energy supply or the proper infrastructure to add more pressure to our electric grid. We are constantly being told to turn off the AC and use less energy to not overwhelm the current electrical grid, meanwhile simultaneously being told to trade in our gas cars for electric vehicles.

Environmental acti -- activists like to claim
that they city speak for us, but they don't. Please reconsider. These unrealistic climate policies will only further hurt the communities that I serve.

Thank you for your time, as I did it appropriately.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Next is Prachi.

PRACHI KOHLI: Good afternoon. My name is Prachi Kohli from the National Diversity Coalition.

I believe that little consideration has been given for the low income communities and the diverse communities in California, and the small businesses, and -- in the Scoping Plan that will need more cost effective alternatives to follow the mandates. We need responsible, reasonable and affordable options to the -- to be added to the Scoping Plan. And we must focus on lowering the cost of electricity for the average household and the small business in California, as most of the communities which are low income are already in the housing crisis.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Ari.

ARI EISENSTADT: Hi, folks. My name is Ari Eisenstadt. My pronouns are he/him/his. And I know many of you and thank you so much for your time today. I do
just want to make a quick comment. This is not the
comment that I was going to make prior, but to address the
necessity of what you just saw, which is the fact that
these folks flew or drove hundreds of miles to get here
and did absolutely everything right, absolutely everything
right to make space to talk today. Submitted comment
cards as soon as they possibly could and there's
absolutely no way that so many people from industry got
here before they did. It's extremely clear that people --

(Applause.)

ARI EISENSTADT: -- were already lined up to
speak. It's extremely clear and it's unacceptable. We
did absolutely everything right. And there are not two
side to this issue. I want to make that -- that -- that
really clear. There are not two opinions that need to be
balanced. There is the voices of community members who
are being poisoned every single day by the decisions that
CARB makes and then there are people who are trying to
line their pockets. These are not -- this is not a
two-sided issue.

(Applause.)

ARI EISENSTADT: There is no balance to be
discovered. There is no compromise to be made. On one
side we have the utilities, and we have fossil fuel
companies, and we have industry who are trying to make
more money and on the other side, we have people who are 
trying to stay alive. The values are not the same and we 
need to prioritize the people who flew here or drove here 
for hundreds of miles because their lives are on the line. 

Thank you.

(Appplause.)


NEENA MOHAN: Good afternoon, members of the 
Board and Staff. My name is Neena Mohan with the 
California Environmental Justice Alliance.

And, yeah, I want to echo the comments that my 
colleague Ari just made and really appreciate and 
acknowledge all of the residents from Ventura, South 
Fontana, Richmond, Kern County, San Diego, Fresno, Eastern 
Coachella Valley, and the many more environmental justice 
communities that have come out here today. Over 150 
people came out today, because we know that no matter our 
zip code, our age, our family's country of origin, that we 
all have a right to clean air, to clean water, and to a 
livable future.

But akin to previous Scoping plans, CARB has yet 
again not delivered these real climate solutions and the 
draft that we're discussing on the table today gives 
handouts to the oil and gas industry and continues to 
treat EJ communities like sacrifice zones. And it's a
plan that threatens directing billions of dollars towards risky carbon capture technology and other dead ends, like dairy biogas and dirty hydrogen, as my colleagues on the EJAC so clearly presented to you all earlier.

I just want to make clear that the Board has a choice between two Californias. There's the California where there's 600,000 miles of CO2 pipelines flowing through EJ communities and worsening air quality for residents, and there's the California where all of our families can breathe clean air, can take accessible transportation, bike to work, be with their families, where children don't have to play next to oil wells or to power plants.

And I invite you today, as you listen to the comments, to think about which California you want. And I implore you to make the right decision and to make environmental justice real in California.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

(Cheering)

(Applause)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Alexis.

And then if you see your name on the screen, if the next few speakers can come stand on the yellow tape, that will help us expedite the transition.
ALEXIS SUTTERMAN: Hi, CARB Board members and staff. My name is Alexis and I'm here as a resident of Sacramento to urge CARB to adopt a more ambitious and just Scoping Plan. I, along with my colleagues, know that there have been a lot of feelings in the room, because this issue is a life or death issue for a lot of the communities we represent. And so I do want to qualify the fact that people are bringing in, you know, their lived experience and the fact that they have been polluted for centuries due to legacies of disinvestment, neglect and systemic racism.

I'm speaking today, because we're in a climate emergency and the future of our planet and very existence relies on how our leaders show up for us to date. Climate change impacts all of us, but as I mentioned, due to legacies of systemic racism and neglect, it has hit working class communities of color first and worst. CARB, you have the opportunity and you have Frankly the responsibility to be protecting the public and not industry interest -- interests.

We're here to ask CARB -- for CARB's California Scoping Plan, because it's a chance to set course for California toward a clean regenerative and zero-emission future. Yet, the draft proposal by CARB has been a huge disappointment and a failure to all of us. Without
drastic changes, it will perpetuate grave harms and continue a dark legacy of environmental racism. CARB Board and staff, you have a chance to set the course right and our communities deserve that.

First, I want to mention that CARB should phase out sales of new gas appliances by 2030 and ensure a full decommissioning of the gas distribution system by 2045 in a way that is just.

Second, CARB should exclude reliance on alternative fuels that worsen pollution. That means ensuring that role of hydrogen -- hydrogen is limited and that truly green. And finally, CARB should ensure that carbon capture and storage is not --

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

ALEXIS SUTTERMAN: -- utilized for several purposes in which there are cleaner options. Thank you so much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Nora Penaflor.

(Applause)

(Cheering)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Nora.

Okay. Jesse Gonzales.

JESSE GONZALES: Good afternoon. My name is Jesse Gonzales and I'm with the community organization Si
Se Puede out of the Fresno area.

Anyone who's every played on a sports team or has been a part of any team knows the importance of working together to achieve a team goal. To be successful and to win, everyone has to contribute to the team. In a way, all of us who live here in the great State of California, we are a team. We follow the same laws, pay taxes in the same manner, enjoy its many positives, and we do our part to make our state the best it can be.

So why are some people not being team players? Why are they overlooking members of the team who are not as prosperous and lucky as them? Why do they want the Scoping Plan implemented as is and as soon as possible? Don't they know that the lower income Californians struggle and are unable to comply with the policies of the Scoping Plan? How do they expect our air to be clean, if not everything is on the table to go along with the program?

Not everyone has the money to buy an electric car or other gas-powered machines that will be replaced by electric equipment. We need common sense. In doing a survey on the westside of the Central Valley last week, a retired farmworker when informed about the possible use of bikes by farmworkers to go to work said, its (Spoke in Spanish). Translation, that is idiotic, and whoever
thought of that idea is an idiot that doesn't know what he's talking about.

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

JESSE GONZALES: Bottom line, we need common sense and inclusion in this Scoping Plan --

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

JESSE GONZALES: -- in order to achieve clean air.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Next is Michael Garcia.

MICHAEL GARCIA: Good afternoon. Thanks for having me. I'm from Central California, Selma, California.

How can we -- how can anyone think of adopting a clean air policy that according to CARB's own analysis will have a negative impact of billions of dollars to California's economy. And I have a five-year -- and I have a five-year old little girl and I want better air for her, and her generation, and for her quality of life. But you know what else has to do with her quality of life, if I have a job or not. And so let's not approve a policy in which the cure is worse than the illness. We need to find a better way.

Thank you.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Douglas Kessler.

DOUGLAS KESSLER: My name is Doug Kessler. I'm the Executive Director of Si Se Puede Central Valley.

After your last meeting, which many of us testified or attempted to testify, it became apparent that the Board doesn't have a sense of all of the Central Valley. So we went out during the week and did surveys. We surveyed over 100 men, women, young adults, students from Bakersfield, Fresno, Salinas Valley, places like rural communities, Biola, Huron, Selma, Sanger, Del Rey, Kerman, Dinuba, Kingsburg, and Hanford.

We interviewed people of different economic and social backgrounds. We interviewed farmworkers. We did it in Spanish and Arabic. And the results -- the results were one person had heard of the Air Board and its plan, and he happened to be an elected official. Two of the hundred of people that we did said they would be able to afford the plan, buying a car or working unnecessary -- electric cars zero changes; 63 percent believed that they would lose their job income; 74 percent said they would be forced to be -- would be homeless, move, or drop out of school; 99 percent of the people said that they had no idea what the Scoping Plan was, had never seen it, and then said had no idea.
We ask that you do more education, provide bilingual materials.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. John.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Can I just say thank you, sir for bringing that information. You know, that's good data, even if it's anecdotal and I just wanted to thank you for that.

DOUGLAS KESSLER: I have a little more, but...

(Applause)

JON COSTANTINO: Hi. Good afternoon. My name is Jon Costantino and I'm here on behalf of several biofuel and feedstock clients that are doing their part to lower the carbon intensity of California's fuels today. And the policies that this Board has instituted, Cap-and-Trade and Low Carbon Fuel Standard are working.

Renewable fuels, renewable feedstocks, energy efficiency, they are coming to California for now and through 2045. I do want to mention that there is one error in the Scoping Plan that can be corrected. There is a CCS project that is up and running, and it's permitted, it's built, and it's sequestering carbon, and it will be soon coming to ARB for a pathway.

In-state RNG, cellulosic ethanol, renewable-powered feedstocks are all doing what
Cap-and-Trade and LCFS asked them to do. And the investment signal should remain in the Scoping Plan. So I just wanted to highlight that things are progressing as asked, and that investment signal from those projects need to continue.

Thank you.

TANISHA RAJ: Thank you, Chair and Board. My name is Tanisha Raj. I'm with the Catholic Charities of Stockton. Today, I speak on behalf of many from individuals to communities from small businesses to vast industries and corporations, to farmers, from little kids with asthma to adults and elderly living with respiratory aids after their life-long battle of respiratory and pulmonary diseases.

We are still trying to recuperate from the historical injustices of redlining and its repercussions. From competing for grants and funding to fighting for just policies, from fighting for just and safe accessible environment for all to fighting for clean air, clean water, affordable housing and food.

So I ask why? Why are we still fighting for clean and healthy environment? Poor air quality does not stay in the superficial boundaries set recognized by CalEnviroScreen. It travels beyond and affects the affluent neighborhoods and communities as well. So why
should -- why is this fight -- why are we fighting to begin with?

Why is it difficult for the large industries and corps to be compassionate for our communities, especially the low-income, displaced, and disadvantaged communities when their labor force comes from these communities? Why is it difficult for large industries and corps to understand that they're not immune from the adverse effects of the environmental issues.

When nature strikes, it strikes all. It's not going to differentiate between the rich and the poor, the healthy and the unhealthy --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
TANISHA RAJ: -- the educated and uneducated.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. That concludes your time.
TANISHA RAJ: Okay. Thank you, guys.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Jonathan Pruitt.
JONATHAN PRUITT: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph, board members, staff, and the public. My name is Jonathan Pruitt. I'm here on behalf of the environmental justice communities in Stockton.
I want to first thank CARB staff and EJAC for working hard on this pressing issue. Currently, I'm a master's of public health student and I'm part of the
Sustainable Leadership Council for the school. Me being the unofficial rep from California, sometimes I'm really asked about what is the work that California has done. And it's really given me a sense of pride of what we've done.

Now, with this 2022 Scoping Plan, I'm not really sure about that pride. The push for carbon capture technology is concerning with not enough research put into the long-term solution. Cap -- carbon capture technology, similar to Cap-and-Trade, enables big polluters to continue to pollute. It's a Band-Aid to the actual problem. And marginalized communities will bear the burden of this plan. Enough with the leniency. It's time for direct action.

Here's a quote from a Stockton resident I wanted to share. "I keep hearing that South Stockton residents are resilient -- resilient to the many factors that impact port communities, but being resilient is tiring. Being resilient while our home is engulfed by warehouses and pollution is tiring. I shouldn't have to be resilient against the poor air quality or poor water quality when there are agencies that make sure to get this thing fixed. Governmental agencies need to do their job to protect my health, my family's health, my community's health".

Thank you.
(Applause.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ector.

ECTOR OLIVARES: Thank you. My name is Ector Olivares. And I'm the Environmental Justice Program Manager for Catholic Charities Diocese of Stockton. And as a religious organization obviously, Catholics, a tenet of Catholic social teaching is caring for God's creation. Care for the earth is a requirement of the Catholic faith. We are called to protect the planet, living our faith and relationship with all of God's creation. Our environmental challenges have fundamental moral and ethical dimensions that cannot be ignored. I would like to read a quote from Pope Francis from his homily at his 2015 inauguration.

"The vocation of being protectors however is not just something involving us Christians alone. It also has a prior dimension which is simply human involving everyone. It means protecting all creation, the beauty of the created world, as the Book of Genesis tells us, and as Saint Francis of Fran Assisi showed us. It means respecting each of God's creatures and respecting the environment in which we live. Please, I would like to ask all those who have positions of responsibility in economic, political, and social life and all men and women of goodwill, let us be protectors of nature, protectors of
one another, and of the environment", unquote.

Though the CARB scoping plan is inadequate in addressing climate change. It is unambitious and lacks the true revolutionary vision that Californians need. California needs to phase out fossil fuels with the elimination of oil and gas extraction by 2035.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Thank you. That concludes your time.

ECTOR OLIVARES: Californians deserve it. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: John Blue.

(Appause)

JOHN BLUE: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph, and members of the Board. My name is John Blue. And I'm here today on behalf of IETA, an international business organization of over 200 members committed to ambitious climate action through market-based mechanisms.

We appreciate the vast amount of work this plan represents and the difficulty in finding a path through competing interests and concerns. An efficient least cost path to carbon neutrality is critical for two reasons, the cost of decarbonization tend to be regressive falling on those who can least afford to pay them. And California's greater impact in the fight against climate change is creating a replicable blueprint for decarbonization that
other jurisdictions can follow.

If our plan isn't focused on efficiency and minimizing the cost of the transition, then it won't be followed by others. IETA believes the most efficient and effective way to achieve carbon neutrality would be to increase the role of an even more ambitious Cap-and-Trade Program with caps declining to net zero by 2045.

The State should ensure programs are also aligned to maximize the benefits to residents. The program can be a workhorse for reductions. We look forward to working with CARB staff and all interested parties to further enhance the Cap-and-Trade Program in future rulemakings.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

All right. We're going to turn it back to Zoom.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you. So the next few remote speakers will be Theo Pahos, Julia Levin, Rebecca Baskins, Jayne Parker, Taylor Roschen, and Daniel Barad.

So Theo, I have activated your microphone.

Please unmute and begin.

THEO PAHOS: Madam Chair, members of the California Air Resources Board. Theo Pahos representing the California Pipe Trades Council, 45,000 members strong in California.

We appreciate all of the work that you've done
and the difficult choices before you. While we generally support the pathway you have chose, we have a couple of things that we need to point out.

First of all for decarbonization goals. Though we understand the role of decarbonization, we believe 2026 for new construction is too soon, given that the CEC has identified the state could be anywhere between 7,500 and 10,000 megawatts short through 2027. Because of extreme planning factors such as heat, fires, disruption of supply line, we don't believe that you should subject new homeowners to those type of reliability concerns.

Additionally, we'd like to point out that while we do support CCUS, we believe that the electric sector should have been identified for CCUS applications. And with a robust CCUS plan on the electric sector, perhaps the 10 gigawatts of new natural gas generation would not be necessary.

Lastly, while we appreciate the nod towards hydrogen, we also believe that it should be identified for specific applications for California to reach its carbon neutrality goals. Thank you very much for our opportunity to participate. And again, we thank you for your hard work.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Julia, I have activated your microphone. Please
JULIA LEVIN: Julia Levin, Bioenergy Association of California. We strongly support the proposed alternative, because it keeps all non-fossil fuel based decarbonization solutions on the table, including bioenergy with carbon capture and storage, and renewable hydrogen. As Chair Randolph said, we're going to need all options to tackle the urgent crisis that is climate change. We do however recommend four changes to the final plan to ensure that it meets the requirements of State law. First, while the plan states that reducing short-lived climate pollutant emissions is one of the most urgent things we can do to address climate change, the recommended policies and other measures in the plan are quite light. We are not on track to meet our short-lived climate pollutant reduction requirements and we need more actionable recommendations in the plan.

Second, while we strongly support the transition to zero-emission vehicles, that is going to be a slow transition that could take a decade or two or even more. And we need carbon negative biofuels, including biomethane, in the meantime, so that we can get diesel off the road as fast as possible.

Third, we're very happy and support the new focus on natural and working lands. But the draft seriously
underestimates the amount of forest biomass and agricultural waste that will be available in contradiction to numerous peer-reviewed studies.

And finally, the section on black carbon states categorically that emissions from the forest sector are not human caused. That doesn't make sense, and especially since CAL FIRE says that 90 percent of all fires are caused by human beings. This needs to be corrected.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Rebecca, I have activated your microphone.

Please unmute and begin.

REBECCA BASKINS: Good afternoon, Chair and Board members. Rebecca Baskins on behalf of the California Advanced Biofuels Alliance. And we will also align our comments with those from the Clean Fuels Alliance that you'll hear later today.

First, I would like to applaud Rajinder and the team on the completion of the draft and thank Richard Corey for his leadership over the past decade, especially in regards to the LCFS. CABA is the trade association for biodiesel and renewable diesel. And our fuels have helped California achieve its carbon red -- carbon reduction goals and will continue to do so in those hard-to-electrify sectors.
We were pleased to see the recommendation of Scenario 3 in the draft Scoping Plan, as it recognizes the need for many different fossil fuel alternatives. With that, we also ask that you as a Board direct staff to immediately reinitiate the LCFS rulemaking after the Scoping Plan is adopted to ensure stronger pre- and post-2030 targets. Our fuel are ready and available today and we can meet the alternative diesel needs of the state. We have submitted written comments that dive further into our position and we look forward to continuing working with staff and CARB as we move forward with the Scoping Plan.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

JAYNE PARKER: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, Chair and Board members. My name is Jayne Parker speaking on behalf of PG&E. PG&E is appreciative of all the work that CARB has put into this draft Scoping Plan update and we're supportive of CARB's preferred scenario, Alternative 3. We believe it establishes the right framework for carbon neutrality in California and is aligned with PG&E's Climate Strategy Report, which we leased earlier this month.
While we agree with staff that 2035 is unrealistic and excessively costly, PG&E would like to recommend that CARB can develop a carbon neutral by 2040 scenario for comparison, which could help address stakeholder concerns about timing by demonstrating where some additional cost-effective decarbonization efforts may or may not be feasible.

We expand on this further in our written comments including PG&E's goal to proactively prepare the grid to support three million EVs by 2030.

Finally, we want to highlight the importance of zonal or whole home electrification efforts. As households move away from using natural gas, those remaining on the natural gas system will pay an increasingly larger share of systemwide costs, which could further widen the affordability gap between households. PG&E believes a statewide effort is necessary to decarbonize the natural grid -- national gas grid to ensure affordability for all Californians.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Taylor, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

TAYLOR ROSCHEN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members. Taylor Roschen with the California Farm Bureau.
We present over half of all the state's farms and ranches, including over 20,000 small farms.

With respect to the natural and working lands component of the draft, we appreciate the Board's considerations of the challenges to implement long-term management practices during times of market volatility, input shortage, drought and wildfire. We need to continue to pursue incentive-based reduction efforts that are proven successful and critical for programs like Digesters, Manure Management, Healthy Soils, and FARMER.

We also ask the Board to employ a fully accessible tracking standard to not only or include State-incentivized projects, but also include those projects conducted with federal and personal investments. We're concerned about the State dictating a 20 percent increase in organic acreage. These systems are only sustainable if there's a financial benefit. And as we cannot force consumers to buy California grown, let alone organic agriculture, we're concerned the 20 percent goal will lead to oversupply and increased production costs without a return on that investment.

We'd also like to see more ambitious goal setting for ag land conservation from 6,000 to 60,000 acres per year. That keeps pace with ag land loss and for forest management with greater reliance on planned grazing,
logging, and forest thinning.

With respect to energy and zero-emission transportation including on- and off-farm ag equipment and vehicles, we implore the Board to be conscientious of the impacts on food security, costs to rural ratepayers, unaffordable and unavailable technologies, and issues with grid capacity and reliability.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

And after Daniel, we will hear from Michael Wara, Maritza Garcia, Emily Turkel, Jorge Daniel Taillant, and Katelyn Roedner.

So Taylor, I have activated your microphone.

Please unmute and begin.

TAYLOR ROSCHEN: I actually just testified.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Oh. Sorry about that.

Okay. Daniel. I have activated your microphone.

Please unmute and begin.

DANIEL BARAD: Good afternoon, Chair and members of the Board. Daniel Barad on behalf of Sierra Club California and our 500,000 members and supporters throughout the state.

The path to carbon neutrality in the draft Scoping Plan would depend on nearly 100 million metric
tons of carbon removal in 2045. And this is calculated after large-scale deployment of carbon capture and storage. Not only is this risky to rely so heavily on carbon capture and removal, but these technologies do not deliver criteria emission co-benefits that replacing sources of pollution with zero-emission technologies do. CARB must chart a path towards carbon neutrality that prioritizes near-term direct emission reductions.

Briefly shifting to transportation, we urge the Board to adopt a final Scoping Plan that at minimum aligns with the light- and heavy-duty ZEV sales targets in the Mobile Source Strategy. Rather than relying on this comprehensive analysis on how California can meet air quality standards and climate goals in the transportation sector, the Scoping Plan aligns with the current ACC II and ACF proposals.

California's Climate Plan should be based on the analyses -- analyses of what the State must do to slow the climate crisis. And these analyses should then inform rulemakings. This draft appears to have this process backwards. Climate change is worsening every day and millions of Californians continue to breathe the most unhealthy air in the country. California must adopt a Scoping Plan that meets this critical moment.

Thank you very much.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.
Michael Wara, I have activated your microphone.
Please unmute and begin.

MICHAEL WARA: Good afternoon. My name is Michael Wara. I direct the Climate and Energy Policy Program at Stanford's Woods Institute for the Environment. And I'm commenting on behalf of myself and others at Stanford in a personal capacity today.

I want to make a few -- a few brief points that we will expand on in our written comments. In particular, the preferred scenario relies on technologies that are emerging and where there's still significant technical, economic, and time frame risk of deployment. And we would urge the Board to think about how to incorporate uncertainty along those time frames into their analysis. In particular, the Scoping Plan specifies quite precisely the costs of CDR in 2045 to the nearest dollar. While we believe there's still significant uncertainty in those costs and that that uncertainty needs to be built into evaluation of costs and benefits of the different planning scenarios.

In addition, we urge the Board to consider the relationship more closely between the proposed phasedown of refining capacity and the implied costs of CCS, because CCS installed on refineries, if they phase down, if the
fine -- refinery capacity phased down, won't be used for the full useful life, as is assumed typically in those cost calculations.

Thanks very much and we'll submit written comments that expand on these issues.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Martiza, I have activated your microphone.

Please unmute and begin.

MARITZA GARCIA: Hello. My name is Maritza Garcia. And I'm with the Environmental Health Coalition as well as a resident of Logan Heights here in San Diego. I love my neighborhood, but it is no secret that living in Logan means living in a large amount of pollution. We have the port and industry as our neighbors and a freeway that cuts right through our community. This exposure does horrible things to the health of our members. In my own family, I've had to witness my mother suffer from sinus problems and undergo two surgeries with no permanent fix. And my grandpa passed away from lung cancer.

It has been decades of this struggle and if we don't make changes now, I truly fear for my daughter's future. I have seen the push for more people to drive electric vehicles to commute, but the solution does not work for everyone. Many in my neighborhood don't have the
means to get a vehicle, let along an electric one, and rely on public transportation to commute. That's how I would get around to school and work since high school. It has never been an efficient trip. The wait time for transit is too long and unreliable. There were many times when I would get to my destination late, because the bus didn't come at the right time or the trolley broke down causing a delay.

This is why mass transit is a key solution to the climate crisis -- sorry -- is a -- yeah, to the climate crisis. It's better for the climate and creates more access to opportunity for working families. CARB can be a leader in making a transportation system that works for everyone as soon and possible. We need and deserve clean and mass transportation by 2035.

I also want to note that I understand that Mr. Stuart might have felt disrespected for being disrupted, but that's the same disrespect we feel every single day that we're not included in these conversations.

So thank for your time.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Emily, I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

EMILY TURKEL: Thank you. This is Emily Turkel speaking on behalf of Calpine Corporation, the largest
produce of electricity from geothermal power and operators
of the largest fleet of natural gas plants in California.
Calpine would like to thank CARB staff for the numerous
workshops walking through the plan and the Environmental
Justice Advisory Committee for hosting transparent
meetings on their thought process.

Ultimately, the draft Scoping Plan is great
achievement balancing each sector of one of the world's
largest economies. While Calpine appreciates the
recognition of the need to retain all gas resources to
maintain affordability and reliability, we continue to
hold concerns about the modeling of carbon capture and
storage retrofits. The deployment of direct air capture
in the modeling and the lack of CCS in the electric sector
is because the cost of CCS for electricity were never
directly compared against the cost of direct air capture
for those same emissions. Nonetheless, Calpine is
encouraged by the recognition in the Scoping Plan that
quote, "CCS can support clean dispatchable power for
reliability needs", I end quote.

Ultimately, if Calpine is expected to maintain a
gas fleet into 2045, there is no reason to bar the
decarbonization of that fleet, especially since Calpine
has already spent millions and received funding from the
Department of Energy to do so. Greater acknowledgement of
the role of CCS in decarbonizing the electricity sector would ensure the Scoping Plan meaningfully engages with the climate, affordability, and reliability crises.

Thank you for this time.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Jorge, I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

JORGE DANIEL TAILLANT: Jorge Daniel Taillant speaking on behalf of the Center for Human Rights and the Environment and IGSD.

The IPCC tells us that our GHG emission reduction targets are off. We are on the very of surpassing 1.5 C of warming and triggering irreversible climate tipping points from which we will no recover.

The first message to CARB is that the marker in the sand is now 2030. It's not 2045. It's not even 2035. Governor Newsom recently correctly identified that we have undervalued the importance of reducing climate super pollutants. Decarbonization, although important, is simply not enough.

The second message is that we must more aggressively reduce methane, 86 times more severe for climate than CO2; more aggressively reduce HFC refrigerants, hundreds to thousands of times more polluting; and more aggressively reduce black carbon
emissions, which impact health, melt glaciers, and in turn lead to sea level rise and weather -- severe weather events.

The third message is that we must cease allowing GHG emissions justified through offsets that we carefully reconsider reliance on carbon capture and storage technologies where emission reduction numbers simply don't add up.

The fourth message is that we can more effectively reduce super pollutants, while concurrently tackling environmental justice, improving public health and advancing energy efficiency, raising the economies of low-income households, and improving the quality life of those that need it most.

The world needs the most aggressive, the most far reaching, and the most effective California Scoping Plan ever. And in the words of Secretary Blumenfeld today, we do not have an option for failure. CARB, we need you. Let's do even more.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Katelyn, I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

KATELYN ROEDNER SUTTER: Good afternoon. Thank you. I'm Katelyn Roedner Sutter with Environmental
Defense Fund. I appreciate the opportunity to provide comments and I'd also like to recognize the significant amount of work from staff, consultants, and EJAC that has gone into getting us to this point.

EDF will submit detailed written comments, but the bottom line is that the fourth coming revised draft Scoping Plan will need to lean even more into near-term emission reductions. We certainly agree that California needs to plan for net zero no later than 2045, but we need to also maximize emission reductions in this decade and ensure that California meets the 2030 greenhouse gas goal.

There's significant opportunities in the Scoping Plan to increase climate ambition before 2030, including clearly planning for zero carbon electricity generation, 100 percent, no later than 2045 alongside ambitious interim targets. And this also means achieving zero -- 100 percent zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicle sales by 2035. Both of these measures have significant public health and climate benefits that can be realized almost immediately and represent opportunities for greater near-term ambition in this plan.

We also agree that, you know, emerging strategies like hydrogen, carbon capture, and CDR will likely be necessary to achieve a stable climate. But we're very concerned that this draft plan is relying too heavily on
these strategies without considering their impact.

Thank you very much for your time.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

We'll turn it back to the in-person commenters now.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: All right. Thank you.

That commenters are shown here. And then if the next few want to come and make their way down just for time's sake, that would be great.

Sara, go ahead.

SARA FITZSIMON: Hi, Chair Randolph and Board members, and also CARB staff that has been working very hard on this draft Scoping Plan. My name is Sara Fitzsimon. I'm the Policy Director at the California Hydrogen Business Council.

We are very supportive of the proposed Scenario number 3 that's been put forward, but we do think that with the use of clean hydrogen, we can meet a lot of these decarbonization and air quality goals sooner. So two places that I want to really highlight are the transportation and the energy sectors. So for transportation, I'm just going to piggyback on the comments of Teresa Cooke earlier from the California Hydrogen Coalition, who so brilliantly talked about the infrastructure needs of the fuel cell electric vehicle
market. That is something, as a fuel cell electric
vehicle driver myself, would be very important for the
expansion of this technology, particularly in the
communities that are deeply impacted by NOx and black
carbon emissions.

Alongside that, I do want to emphasize the
heavy-duty sector does need a target of fueling stations.
Right now, there is no actual target in California for
heavy-duty fuel cell electric vehicles or ZEV. And so
we'd really appreciate a 200 heavy-duty station goal be
incorporated in the plans going forward.

And as it relates to the energy sector, we do
believe clean hydrogen could be included far better in the
Scoping Plan as it is now. There is specifically a place
where it talks about energy storage. And hydrogen has
been developing in such a way that there are so many
mechanisms in which storage can be used with hydrogen, and
then be used for seasonal, and then long-term dispatchable
resources later on when our wind and our solar sources are
not operating or are not nearly as productive.

So we do hope that hydrogen is included better in
the storage section as a medium -- oh, dear, that was
quick.

(Laughter.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
SARA FITZSIMON: Dang it. Okay. Thank you.

Thanks for your work.

(Laughter.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Shayne.

SHAYNE PETKIEWICZ: Good afternoon. My name is Shayne Petkiewicz. I'm with Anaergia. We're a California based company based out of San Diego. And we develop organics recycling infrastructure that allows cities to divert organics from landfills and we convert it into renewable energy and fertilizer.

I really wanted to appreciate -- express my appreciation for the ambitious -- ambitious goals that staff has proposed in this climate Scoping Plan. I really wanted to highlight in particular, the role and the importance of mitigating the short-lived climate pollutant emissions, in particular methane from landfills, one of the leading source of emissions in the state, particularly when it comes to the short-lived climate pollutants.

Right now, we have SB 1383, a monumental goal and a law that is spurring the diversion of 20 million tons of organics out of landfills in the state of California. We have cities that are developing organics recycling programs. We have waste water plants that are interested in being outlets for these organics to produce renewable energy and fertilizer. The key challenge that we're
facing right now is the lack of infrastructure.

California needs a 150 anaerobic digesters and compost facilities in the state produced to be able to be an outlet for the organics. And I ask you CARB staff and the Board to be able to develop those market signals to develop that infrastructure. In particular, I would ask that you have for a -- as a formal amendment to the Scoping Plan that you update the landfill capture rate. That will help incentivize and give credit due to the diversion of organics from landfills and it will bring in the $4 billion in jobs and infrastructure that's necessary.

Thank you for your time. I appreciate your work, and look forward to working together.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

ALICIA VALENZUELA: Thank you, Chair, Board, and the public. My name is Alicia Valenzuela. I'm a teacher. I'm an artist. I'm a story teller. And I wanted to share a short story that's very close to home. My parents are immigrants. They came from Mexico and they're both contractors, so they work in the sign industry. And this industry involves traveling across the area. They limit their region to about 200 miles and they drive trucks. These are not passenger vehicles. These are medium-duty
trucks.

And my dad came to me and he's like, hey, I can't renew my tags. What can I do? And there's no grants available for these types of vehicles. They don't qualify as heavy-duty trucks, so I was stuck. I felt like, Dad, I can't help you. Let me look into it. Let me see what I could do.

And as a teacher, I come to my students posing them challenges so we could work through the solutions. But I'm -- I'm coming to you as -- as an agency to consider the businesses that fall through the cracks, the people who don't have a voice, because they're really busy surviving putting good on the table. And they want to do what's right, but the equipment is not available. They don't have the capital to invest. It's $300,000 to replace one truck. And so far, what they're doing is using passenger vehicles and renting. And the big companies make all the money.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Tyrone[SIC].

TYSON BAGLEY: Tyson, yeah.

Good afternoon, Board members. My name is Tyson Bagley. I'm the President of United Steel Workers Local 326. I've been an employee at the facility for nine years and very proud to be a representative of both Phillips 66,
the USW, and the oil and gas industry. We are currently in the process of converting the Rodeo facility from a traditional refinery that refines petroleum. Instead, we are now going to be producing renewable fuels from waste products, such as fats, oils, and greases. This is all driven from your guys' past Scoping Plans and policies.

This innovative project will make Contra Costa County and the state of California one of the world leaders in clean energy. I want to be crystal clear that this project and conversion is what a just transition should look like for the front-line essential employees who work and man these facilities.

One of the greatest barriers to converting these facilities into this renewable production has been and continues to be around permitting. We need regulatory certainty in order to ensure that we can make these projects a reality from your guys' Scoping Plans and policies of the past.

Therefore, on behalf of the members of USW Local 326, we ask that this Board continue to send a strong message through the Scoping Plan about the large contribution that this project can make from both an environmental perspective and in terms of living wage careers. It's good for the environment. It's good for the people that work there. Thank you for the time and
allowing me the opportunity to speak with you today.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Michael.

MICHAEL SARGOSA: Good afternoon, Chair. Michael Sargosa from the Vice Mayor City of Placerville. I want to thank you for taking all of our comments today. I would just say we're lucky. We have two charging stations in the City of Placerville now, which we had none a couple of years ago. However, the charging stations are essentially people that are coming from the Bay Area that drive through our town that go to their second houses in South Lake Tahoe or in Lake Tahoe. So it's still really a -- the have and have nots. My area certainly doesn't have the capacity yet to have, you know, a lot of our citizens have EVs to be able to plug into those.

And, you know, the other thing that's a little infuriating is we're really captured by PG&E in Placerville in a lot of the same areas. If it's too hot, our power goes out. If it's too windy, our power goes out. We have to live with that. Our businesses have to live with that. You know, we understand when it's winter and there's a big storm, we're used to that and we can do it. But when it's too hot, and it's too windy, or there's no wind, but it still goes out, that's very infuriating. And having to move to an all-electric future this fast just puts us at even more at risk.
So we're talking about a felonious company, PG&E that's, been, you know, wrongful death suits against them. And we have to put all of our -- all of our progress and our city's future into their hands.

So I would say we need more time and please give us more options as well. So thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Jeff.

JEFF PARDINI: Hi. Jeff Pardini Hills Flat Lumber Company. We celebrated 100 years in business in California last year. We have two stores. I just want to let you know, I have used solar on both our businesses. One of our stores has a 145 kW system, which is enough to power the entire business for the entire year. We did that in 2003. And our Grass Valley store has solar and geothermal, so I do have some experience with geothermal too. I'll just run through a few statistics with you.

A high efficiency HVAC system would have been $380,000, a geothermal system was about $900,000. It made sense, because it would save us about $4,000 a month in electricity, so about $48,000 a year, 10-year payback. An HVAC system has about a 12-year life. Geothermal system has about a 20-year life and then you just have to replace pumps and stuff.

We have had some challenges with the geosystem.
We've probably spent about $25,000 a year with the HVAC companies having them repair or replace parts of the gee system. So it's not all it's cracked up to be. I still would do it. It's still saving us some money. I just thought I'd bring that, because I've heard a lot of people throwing out geo -- is that it?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

JEFF PARDINI: Okay.

BOARD CLERK PARDINI: Joe Thompson.

JOE THOMPSON: Good afternoon. First off, I'd like to thank all of you that are actually looking up and listening to us as we speak. That's really important to us that takes time out of our day to come out here and talk about these issues that are very important to us.

I'm just going to say some things very quick. The first one is someone mentioned businesses that fall through the crack. That's definitely mine. Not only is my restaurant gone through a heck of a time the last two years dealing with the pandemic, but now we're looking at a new -- a new set of rules that we'll have to play by when this all comes into effect, new equipment, new other things that will basically take our restaurant prices and probably quadruple them from where they are. We're not even doing well right now. And as a matter of fact, my restaurant hasn't even reopened yet. We just got the
So there are a lot of small businesses. There's been talk from both sides that this plan isn't exactly where it needs to be yet. And if you have both sides saying that this isn't the right spot, I think it may be time to look at it and see what can be changed.

Rolling blackouts for 20 years. I mean, what's going to change in 20 years from now? We're all using all the plugs in here right now to plug in our phones, plug in our computers, plug in all those kind of things. Where are all these cars going to get charged at. How is all this going to happen?

I'm also going to be a grandfather hopefully in the next few years, and I really hope my grandkids get a clean environment. But what I'm reading is not the way it's going to get there and my family, which is middle to lower income, cannot pay for this or support this.

So thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

WILL McCLURE: Good afternoon, Madam Chair, Board members. I'm Will McClure the Small Business Director of the California Black Chamber of Commerce and thank you for your time.

Almost 50 percent of American households earn
less than $50,000 a year. In California, you'd have to earn $144,000 annually to afford a medium priced home. So while we afford or understand these numbers, when you look at small businesses that we represent and assist, 40 percent of small businesses are suffering from COVID and in danger of closing. In addition to that, only about 96 percent of small businesses that we serve have zero employees and about 60 percent of them do this as a side job not as their main job.

While we can call the circumstances around the proposals that are being pushed forward unintended consequences, whether they're intended or unintended consequences, the pain is the same. So what we want to emphasize is to ask you to consider both those intended and unintended consequences that you make your decision, and take a look at us holistically, not just the people that are fortunate to live in good homes and in good communities, but in all the people that represent our wonderful State.

Thank you for your time

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Marta.

MARTA GONZALEZ: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and everybody here and all the people --

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Pull the -- pull the mic down.
MARTA GONZALEZ: I'm short. Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you for coming out. I know everybody had to drive a long ways and we appreciate that, because this is so important.

I come from a very small rural area. And the stark reality is that the implementation of this Scoping Plan is not correct at this time. The time frame is not there. I live in an area where there's lots of farmworkers. We are the people who put the food on the table for you and for everyone, and many other places also.

Now, the stark reality is that they believe to have a harder time to live and to put food on the table. They can -- they can't even afford to buy a car, a regular car, much less an electric car, okay? So we can't afford the incentives or anything else that is being offered to many people.

So we're asking you to go back to the drawing board and take a look, just like that gentleman said before me or the one before, that if both sides are saying there's something wrong here, there is something wrong here. You need to look at it again. You need to take a longer time frame, please. Maybe even send out something so that other people know, a little simple flier that can go out to schools, so the kids can take home to their
parents, and they can ask them questions about what they think about what is happening in California with all that is trying to happen to make California green. We all want go green --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

MARTA GONZALEZ: -- but the thing is we cannot afford to. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Next is Tony.

TONY LEON: Good afternoon. Tony Leon.

Well, electricity is said to be a way to achieve clean air over California. It is not cheap and it will only get more expensive. A gloomy forecast of what to expect by 2030 indicates that bundled residential rates will jump by 40 percent according to PG&E, by 20 percent according to Southern California Edison, and by a whopping 70 percent according to San Diego Gas and Electric.

Since it is advocating that California go electric within the next five to 10 years or so, the Scoping Plan must find a way to transform our electrical grid so it can provide an adequate supply of electrical energy and prices all Californians can afford. We must clean our air, yes, but we must do it in a practical manner while not bankrupting our lower income population.

Thank you.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

John.

JOHN KABATECK: Hi there. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and Board member. My name is John Kabateck. I am the eye California State Director of the National Federation of Independent Business. We represent about 14,000 small businesses across California, 350,000 nationwide.

I'm here today to ask the Board to please consider the three Cs as you're going about deliberating this Scoping Plan, Cost, Compliance, and Capacity. You know, make no mistake, small business owners do believe in the importance and the benefit of creating cleaner, and greener, and healthier, not just small businesses but communities. According to recent NFIB surveys, 45 percent of main street employers take measures to make their businesses, their workplaces more energy efficient. But also in that same survey, the small business owners ranked soaring energy costs as the number one concern, second only -- number two concern, second only to soaring health care costs.

We just want to be sure that the Scoping Plan and any air or energy policy for that matter reflects principles that will work well for all Californians, one that addresses cost, so they can afford it. They already
hit with inflation and so many other impacts on an average small business, one addressing compliance so that there's reasonable process and timelines for small businesses and Californians to comply, and then one that addresses capacity. As we are looking at we are one wildfire, or one blackout, or one hot summer away from the capacity of our grid. So it's go to be a capacity. We all want a better tomorrow. We want to make sure that everybody, small businesses and everyone has certainty and hope. So think about that please as you're going about it.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Mark Skvarla

MARK SKVARLA: Chair and Board members, my name is Mark Skvarla. I am the CEO of GPS specialty construction located in North Highlands. We are a manufacturing contract. We employ 13 skilled women and men. Our success in manufacturing requires a steady uninterrupted flow of energy. The Governor's office has issued warnings that our electrical grid lacks sufficient capacity to keep the lights on this summer. When the power goes out, we shut down losing time on financially binding deadlines and hours of unproductive wages.

This hurts our competitiveness these in a market that has increasingly driven down margins. I hear that
the Scoping Plan, absent a plan to address the necessary infrastructure needs and costs to ratepayers will only create more headwinds for small businesses like GPS.

In developing a plan to decarbonization, it is imperative to provide energy security through diverse sources of energy, including hydrogen, solar, wind, decarbonized liquid fuels, and even nuclear.

Our economy runs on the benefits and productivity of small businesses. Please keep the employees and small business owners in the forefront of each and every one of your decisions.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Virgil.

VIRGIL WELCH: Good afternoon, Madam Chair, members of the Board. Virgil Welch with the California Carbon Capture Coalition. I want to start by recognizing the tremendous amount of work and analysis that has gone into this plan from both the staff as well as all the stakeholders that have participated in this process. This morning, the Chair mentioned that to be successful to achieve our climate goals, we are going to need deep decarbonization across virtually every economic sector of this state. And it is clear that in order to be successful, any reasonable scenario, as shown in this
plan, is going to require carbon capture technologies. These findings are consistent with the leading global experts. IPPC[SIC], Internation Energy Agency, have all concluded CCS is going to be necessary to achieve our climate goals. We have a number of industries across a number of sectors in this State that right now can start to deploy these technologies as we start to ratchet down emissions. We cannot afford to limit our application where it is appropriate. Of course, CCS is going to be held to the same standard as any other carbon reducing technology.

And I was very pleased to hear this morning that as we're looking forward to thinking about refining the plan, we're going to be evaluating the role that CCS can play. It's clearly going to be an important part of our efforts in California.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Carolle Mendez.

CAROLLE MENDEZ: Good afternoon, Board members. My name is Carolle Mendez and I'm the head of the USW Local 326 and Women of Steel Chairwoman, and the Chairperson of the Phillips 66 Black Employee Network.

I've been an employee at the Rodeo facility for 33 years. I'm very proud to be a representative of
Phillips 66 and the USW. The facility is being converted from a traditional refinery and instead will produce renewable fuels from waste products that would have been landfilled and instead can now be used to produce renewable fuel.

The project will reduce our carbon footprint and help to improve air quality and provide clean renewable fuel supporting approximately 500 union-led construction jobs, totaling approximately four million work hours and employing roughly 650 renewable energy jobs from my local, as well as my bothers and sisters in the building trades.

I want to congratulate the Board for having a section of this Scoping Plan draft dedicated to local permitting. There is an important statement here in the draft that I'd like to quote and emphasize, because it is important to keep in mind. The draft Scoping Plan states, "It is important to recognize that we will need to build new energy production distribution infrastructure, and repurpose existing ones, for clean technology and energy."

Let's make sure that local governments are aligning with the State's goals and that local government representatives not only support this very important statement in their words, but also this their actions".

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

John Hoffman.

JOHN HOFFMAN: Thank you, Board. John Hoffman.

I'm here from Sacramento. If I may, as I've mentioned previously at another meeting here, every person in this room wants clean air. I'd suggest everyone in California wants clean air. Most people in the world want clean air, though some would put food and clean and water as a priority.

My primary -- primary concern for all of you is what if? What if PG&E cannot provide enough power? What if SoCal Edison cannot provide enough power by 2035? Right now, right now, on the websites, there are almost 10,000 people in California without power. That's per PG&E and SoCal Edison's website right now.

And also, SoCal Edison forecasts having scheduled outages for over 62,000 people today. Senator Leyva mentioned a little while ago about a 10 gig -- 10 gigawatt gas plant that's being built. With CEQA and EIRs, protests and lawsuits, permitting and buildings, how long do you think it will take for that to come on line?

My guess is over 10 years.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Caelin Macintosh.

CAELIN MACINTOSH: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph
and members of the Board. My name is Caelin and I'm speaking on behalf of Clean Air Task Force. Clean Air Task Force is a global nonprofit working to safeguard against the worst impacts of climate change through the adoption of low carbon energy technologies. Carbon capture removal and storage technologies provide permanent mitigation solutions to address California's CO2 emissions and can be used in tandem with traditional mitigation efforts.

CATF supports the inclusion of these technologies in the Scoping Plan. While the Plan is ambitious, CATF believes that it strikes the right balance between engineered carbon removal and natural solutions in order to meet carbon neutrality. As CARB notes, air quality is extremely important. We know that the flue gas, as many industrial plants include sulfur dioxides, nitrous oxides and particulate matter. Carbon capture systems can significantly reduce these pollutants, if designed correctly.

On methane, just a few quick notes. CARB should avoid relying on carb -- on capture from landfills and agriculture, instead require direct elimination, look for contingent measures to slash methane in other sectors, prioritize green and food waste removal from landfills and move for tighter emission standards at landfills, and
four, set a goal of limiting methane in the oil and gas sector by 2030.

Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

MARY SOLECKI: Good afternoon. My name is Mary Solecki. I'm speaking on behalf of world energy. Congratulations on a draft Scoping Plan that is both highly ambitious and still shows demonstrable economic impacts. World Energy is a global supplier of biofuels, including a sustainable aviation fuel and renewable diesel facility in Paramount, California. This facility is currently being converted to the world's most advanced renewable fuel facility with completion in late 2024.

We've had the pleasure of hosting a few of you at the facility for tours and would really welcome the rest of the CARB Board members to come take a tour any time you would like.

A few specific comments on the draft Plan are:

Number one, the proposal within the plan to accelerate the LCFS targets is urgently needed. LCFS values are trading at low prices indicating the success to date of the program and that CARB can be even more aggressive with its targets.

Number two, there is further opportunity to reduce GHGs from the transportation sector within the
selected scenario. World Energy alone will be producing hundreds of millions of gallons of renewable fuel within the next five years. In addition to other announced projects, our industry is clearly capable of delivering further emission reduction beyond what’s modeled. We recommend the PATHWAYS data be updated accordingly.

Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Sarah.

SARAH TAHERI: Good afternoon. I am Sarah Taheri with San Diego Gas and electric. Thank you first to the Board, to staff, to the consultants and to everyone that's put so much hard work into this plan. I wanted to provide some comments today in support of the State's GHG emission goals and the work that we are all doing collectively to meet them.

SDG&E recently published a pathway to net zero, the first economy-wide decarbonization analysis to incorporate the industry standard for electric system reliability through 2045. We know the path to carbon neutrality by 2045 is a steep one, but we stand ready to help support our customers through that transition.

We'd like to urge CARB to consider a few points as you finalize the Scoping Plan. First, the Scoping Plan focus on the 2045 decarbonization timeline is appropriate
and aligns with the State's ambitious policies. We know it will take a multi-industry transformative push to get there and note that given costs and technical constraints, this decarbonization timeline is the most feasible.

Second, electric reliability is critical for successful decarbonization. You've heard this from several people today, but I want to echo this and really stress that without reliable electricity, we will not achieve the progress we need in decarbonizing the transportation and building sectors.

Third, solutions must prioritize equity and affordability. Decarbonization is going to be costly. We need a variety of tools to address this, including rate reforms, in addition to well-designed and publicly funded equity programs and policies.

Lastly, please consider technology inclusivity --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

SARAH TAHERI: -- and ensure that you're looking at low carbon fuels and CCS.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: That concludes your time.

Thank you.

SARAH TAHERI: Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Nancy Roberts?

Greg Spooner.

GREG SPOONER: Good afternoon. My name is Greg
Spooner and I'm an organizer with Extinction Rebellion and Scientist Rebellion.

All four scenarios of the Scoping Plan rely on CO2 Removal, or CDR. CARB's emphasis on CDR is worrisome. Alternative 3 relies on CDR of around 80 million tons CO2 equivalent a year by 2045 and only reduces emissions by 80 percent. While alternative number one reduces emissions by more than 90 percent. The technologies to achieve that much CDR include BACT, DAC, and CCS. Let's briefly consider them. The best DAC success story is the Orca facility in Iceland. It managed to capture 4,000 tons per year in a demonstration project. Alternative 3 would require us to achieve 20,000 times this amount. The largest BACT success story is an ADM plant in Illinois that captured around a half a million tons per year. We would need 160 times this amount to reach the Alternative 3 CDR requirements.

As environmental researchers at Lancaster University have written DACs is a quote, "Largely imaginary technology with poorly understood impacts and resource demands", closed quote. CCS, on the other hand, has been successfully demonstrated. But even in the best examples achieve only a megaton of CO2 equivalent per year. CCS also uses a tremendous amount of water.

Is it wise for our plan to rely on energy, water,
and land resource intensive technologies?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Daniel

GREG SPOONER: Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Daniel Larham.

DANIEL LARHAM: Members of the Board and staff,

I'm a theater professor at Saint Mary's College of California and a volunteer with Extinction Rebellion San Francisco Bay. The fact that people like those assembled in this room are mobilizing themselves and showing up in contexts like this is a testament to the widespread recognition that what we do over the next handful of years will be decisive for the fate of life on earth. So this is it? It's this Scoping plan and it's true. It's true.

This Scoping Plan and not the next one or the one after that will bend our trajectory toward a livable future or guarantee California's complicity in climate breakdown and the societal collapse that will inevitably follow from it. These are the stakes. They really are.

And I know that tensions have run high in this room over the past few hours, but none of us here, none of us wants to see what climate driven social collapse looks like. So I urge you, I plead with you to aim California's sites on more ambitious targets phasing out fossil fuel extraction by 2035 and oil refining by 2045 and achieving a clean electric grid by 2035.
I urge you to incorporate the recommendations of the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee and to resist the magical thinking represented by reliance on carbon capture technologies. I invite you, the members of the Board and staff to look into your heart of hearts and ask yourself on this -- ask yourself honestly, if you believe that the targets and timeline in the proposed scenario in the Scoping Plan as it currently exists, if implemented in the macrocosm around the world, would be enough to stave off climate breakdown? If not, what game of bad faith are we playing with ourselves?

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Heidi Harmon.

(Applause.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ameen Khan.

AMEEN KHAN: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and Board members. My name is Ameen Khan and on behalf of California Environmental Voters, formerly the California League of Conservation Voters, I'd like to thank CARB for your efforts in development of the draft Scoping Plan and for the opportunity to provide public comments.

In the five years since the adoption of the previous Scoping Plan, the calamitous impacts of climate change in California, drought, wildfires, extreme heat and
pollution, have only become more evident and widespread and dire. The 2022 Scoping Plan update is a critical opportunity for our state to lay out an ambitious roadmap on how we're going to reverse course on the deepening climate crisis and meet important climate targets so we sooner achieve a carbon neutral future.

We are disappointed in the draft Scoping Plan, because it fails to accelerate either our 2030 or our 2045 climate targets. It's simply not good enough to meet the urgency of the climate crisis and a desperate need for bolder actions. We ask that CARB improve -- improve the Scoping Plan in the following ways.

First, a full and coordinated phaseout of fossil fuels by 2045. We must end all extraction by 2035, phaseout all refining by 2045, phaseout gas powered power plants by 2035 and eliminate gas appliances by 2030.

Second, minimize reliance on carbon capture and storage and other climate dead-ends that are proven costly and potentially harmful to already overburdened frontline communities. Instead, the Scoping Plan should rely on proven renewable and clean energy technologies that increase investments in ecosystem restoration.

Third, more robust transportation sector targets. Transition to 100 percent zero-emission vehicles by 2035 and lower the amount of -- thank you.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Lynne.

Phoebe Rogers.

PHOEBE ROGERS: Hello. My name is Phoebe Rogers representing the Placer County Air Pollution Control District. We thank the Board for its effort on the draft and for the opportunity to provide comments.

As one of the most heavily forested counties in the State, we are very encouraged to see that CARB has recognized the importance of forest health and management and its impact on wildfire reductions and improvements in public health.

For our first suggestion, we'd like to request that the body of research on the health impacts of black carbon from wildfire found on page 95 through 98 of Appendix 1 be included in the main health impacts summary of the plan on pages 14 through 15 of Appendix 1. As the threat of wildfire increases in our state, we believe it's important to expand education and understanding of these impacts and that they are considered in the larger context of health impacts in the plan.

Second, we'd like to emphasize the need for CARB to consider and expand research on the impacts of forest-related black carbon emissions on climate change. Black carbon has significant climate forcing potential and
as we learn more about the crucial role that managed fire plays in healthy ecosystems, it becomes important to avoid open pile burning and to use the correct biomass management tools to reduce air quality hazards in California.

And finally, we strongly recommend a public workshop be held to focus on the biomass mobilization section of Appendix 1. Specifically, we recommend a careful analysis of the usefulness of the C-BREC model in making regional waste disposal decisions. We applaud the Board for tackling this issue and believe more work should be done to strengthen this model before the plan is finalized. Thank you for your research and your effort and we look forward to working with you more.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

AUSTIN AVERY: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph, attending Board members, and CARB staff. So my name is Austin Avery and I'm with Turlock Irrigation District.

So TID is here this afternoon to echo support for CARB staff's selection of Alternative 3 as the proposed carbon reduction scenario for the 2022 Scoping Plan update. Upon review of Alternatives 1 and 2, TID is concerned about the high cost and reliability constraints that these two pathways would represent for the state's
electricity sector.

TID already is having difficult contracting for new renewable developments and this supply chain induced shortfall will continue for the foreseeable future. Setting a GHG-free goal of 2035 will be extremely costly and next to impossible, when considering that TID will be competing with all the other utilities for these scarce renewable resources. Should either Alt 1 or 2 be selected, the high cost associated with implementation of either scenario will end up being passed on to our ratepayers posing a challenge to affordability, particularly for those in disadvantaged and frontline communities.

Likewise, the low growth that we see contemplated in the analysis for Alts 1 and 2 would pose a significant reliability challenge for TID that serves as a balancing authority area here in California that must balance supply and demand, while also providing reserve -- reserve capacity to maintain reliability.

For these reasons, TID supports CARB staff's selection of Alt 3 as the proposed carbon reduction scenario for the 2022 Scoping Plan update.

Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Madam Chair, I just wanted acknowledge Turlock Irrigation District for doing
something that we should have done a long time ago. The solar panel canopies over the canals is just a common sense thing that we should have done a long time ago. It creates clean energy, limits osmosis -- or the evaporation of the water. It's just a great idea and I want to acknowledge that you're the first to do it the state of California.

Thank you.

AUSTIN AVERY: Thank you very much.

(Applause)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Sarah.

SARAH DESLAURIERS: All right. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and the Board members, as well as CARB staff. My name is Sarah Deslauriers and I serve as the Climate Change Program Manager for the California Association of Sanitation Agencies, the members of which represent over 90 percent of sewered population of the State of California. And as envi -- are a partner of environmental stewards, our members perform critical and essential public service of cleaning wastewater to protect public -- or public health and the environment while advancing Community resilience through recovery of renewable resources. And we're talking today about non-fossil fuel biogas and biosolids.

We fully support helping the state achieve carbon
neutrality by 2045, while maintaining services vital to
human life and environmental justice. Anaerobic digestion
is a key component of wastewater solid treatment producing
a renewable non-fossil fuel biogas to produce renewable
energy and heat to sustain wastewater treatment plant
operations, transportation fuels for heavy-duty essential
fleet vehicles, and for pipeline injection. However, no
single use is sufficient for all non-fossil fuel biogas
produced now or in the future with Senate Bill 1383
implementation, since there are regulatory limitations on
each, which are detailed in our comment letter.

As written, the proposed Scoping Plan update
programs and supporting regulations are threatening all
uses of renewable non-fossil fuel biogas, which will
continue to be produced as we all flush our toilets. And
as a natural part of wastewater treatment, it will have to
be wasted in the absence of alternatives reducing
wastewater treatment plant resilience.

We ask CARB's Board members to direct staff to
work with the wastewater sector to maintain multi-pathways
for renewable fossil -- non-fossil fueled biogas use and
incorporate these pathways in the Scoping Plan update.

Thank you and we'll submit our comments tomorrow.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Emily.
EMILY McCabe: Good afternoon. My name is Emily McCabe. I'm an intern with Environment California and I'm a student at UC Berkeley. I'm originally from a rural community in Northern California. And in 2018 the Camp Fire burned down the town of Paradise 15 minutes away from my home. The fire set records for the number of buildings destroyed and people killed by a wildfire.

Four years later, my community has not fully recovered. People are still haunted by the devastation that this fire caused. Climate disasters like this are not far off in the future. They're already happening in our State. Each year it seems like the fire season starts earlier and lasts longer. We have to get to a hundred percent renewable energy as fast as possible to prevent more climate disasters. We need California to lead the way on accelerate the timeline to a hundred percent clean energy.

This involves the full phaseout of the fossil fuels that pollute California's most vulnerable communities by 2045. Environment California is calling for a Scoping Plan that ensures we get to a hundred percent clean energy as soon as possible. Our state is burning and we need you to act. Thank you for your work and allowing public comment today.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. All right,
we're going to turn it back over to Lindsay for Zoom.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

The next few commenters in Zoom will be Nicole Rice, Alison Torres, Pete Montgomery, Karla Monsivais, and Sarah Aird.

Nicole, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you begin.

NICOLE RICE: Thank you. Good afternoon. Nicole Rice, President of the California Natural Gas Vehicle Coalition.

To borrow a phrase from a previous commenter, the implementation of this ambitious plan hinges on our ability to successfully navigate the what-ifs. And it's in that spirit that I offering the following comments.

First, we support the concept outlines in the proposed Scenario number 3 for all the reasons identified this morning in the staff's presentation.

However, we urge the Board to not forget about the near term. We've heard a lot today that infrastructure buildout and grid reliability to support the economy-wide electrification will take considerable time. Yet, this initial draft lacks a comprehensive strategy to capture near-term reductions starting today.

No urgency exists in the draft to replace older, higher emitting diesel trucks as quickly and as soon as
possible. CARB can pursue a strategy under the proposed scenario that prioritizes the rapid phaseout of diesel trucks by including language in the plan that not only allows for but directly encourages the deployment of the cleanest technology available, like low-NOx trucks operated on renewable fuels to achieve near-term emission reductions.

We have submitted a more expansive comments in writing and we look forward to continuing working with the staff and the Board on these recommendations.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Alison, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

ALISON TORRES: Hi. Good afternoon, Madam Chair and Board members. My name is Alison Torres with the Eastern Municipal Water District. EMWD is a water, wastewater, and recycled water agency located in the South Coast Air Basin and serves more than 827,000 people. EMWD supports the comments made by SCAP -- or will be made by SCAP and the comments made by CASA and strongly urge the Board to read the CASA comment letters on this topic.

Water delivery and treatment and wastewater treatment are necessary functions that are vital to human
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life and must operate at all times. The importance of maintaining these critical services, as the state pursues carbon neutrality, is not addressed in the draft Scoping Plan update, but it should be.

Our sector strives to reduce dependence on the grid by diversifying our energy sources. This includes the beneficial use of wastewater non-fossil fuel biogas, which in turn reduces the use of fossil fuels.

Wastewater biogas is a renewable, sustainable, non-fossil fuel that will be generated as long as toilets are flushed. Relying on a single pathway, such as pipeline injection for the non-fossil -- the use of non-fossil fuel biogas will not work for all critical service agencies in the wastewater sector throughout the state. We ask CARB Board members to direct staff to work with the wastewater sector to maintain multiple pathways for renewable non-fossil fuel biogas use and incorporate these pathways into the Scoping Plan update.

The inclusion of multiple pathways is critical for ensuring the reliability and resilience of our critical services. Thank you and we look forward to working with CARB staff.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Pete, I've activated your microphone. Please
unmute and begin.

PETE MONTGOMERY: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and Board members. Pete Montgomery representing Clean Energy Systems, a San Joaquin Valley based clean energy company developing a suite of bioenergy CCS projects. We strongly support CARB's inclusion of carbon dioxide removal and CCS in the draft Scoping Plan.

CES projects use waste biomass that is currently either open field burned or burned in wildfires in idle biomass plants that have been retrofitted with CES's zero-emission gasification and capture technology with no criteria pollutants or carbon emissions, producing either zero carbon electricity or hydrogen for California's transportation network.

This zero-emission technology is not theoretical in a lab or unproven as some have claimed. We've been operating this technology in Kern County for years, as Board member Florez could attest to who's visited the site. By supporting projects like our carbon negative energy projects, the Board demonstrates that its climate policies can also deliver significant air quality and economic benefits for disadvantaged communities.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Karla, I've activated your microphone. Please
unmute and begin.

KARLA MONSIVAIS: My name is Karla Monsivais and I have been a resident of Barrio Logan for the past nine years. There are many issues concerning the immense pollution affecting my community. Barrio Logan is disproportionately affected by the toxins and pollutants with no help from the city to reduce the health inequities we've experienced. Many of my neighbors, including family members have respiratory health issues such as asthma, due to a lack of funding to counterbalance the damage that has been going on for far too long. We need investments to a clean and affordable mass transit now.

Public transit is convenient for my community, but we need solutions to increase efficiency and availability. Before the pandemic began, I would ride the trolley Monday through Friday to San Diego State University, but the trolley didn't always arrive on time and waiting times increased in the evening. If it missed your stop, you would have to wait half an hour or more for the next trolley to arrive. I often felt unsafe. San Diego has provided transit aid by passing the 10 Transit Lifelines, such as youth passes, faster frequency of buses, as well as 24-hour system.

Solutions like this would benefit Californians if the State followed the plans. We need clean air and
dependable mass transit. CARB can be a leader in making a transportation system that works for everyone as soon as possible. We need all-electric buses with 10 minute frequency by 2030 and more investments in mass transportation by 2035.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

After Sarah, we're going to hear from Greg Kester, Rebecca O'Brien, John Schaefer, Dominic Lucero, and Kathleen Kilpatrick.

Sarah, I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

SARAH AIRD: My name is Sarah Aird and I'm with the statewide coalition Californians for Pesticide Reform. First, I'd like to thank CARB staff and the Board for incorporating into the Scoping Plan for the first time ever the goals of increasing organic farming and decreasing agricultural pesticide use. Having said that, we need more ambitious goals. The draft Scoping Plan has not recognized the full contributions of agricultural pesticides to carbon dioxide and even more potent greenhouse gas emissions, nor has it fully taken into account pesticide's detrimental impacts on the ability of the soil to sequester carbon and conserve water, nor has the plan fully identified the health impacts especially to
1 communities of color of current agricultural pesticide
2 use, nor has it considered how heavy pesticide use props
3 up monocrop farming that prioritizes long distance export
4 of Californian's food needs.

5 The climate health, environmental justice, and
6 water crises are interrelated and greenhouse gas sources,
7 such as pesticides that are contributing to all these
8 crises should be fully incorporated into the Scoping Plan
9 with truly ambitious targets. We have six asks.

10 First, the Scoping Plan should adopt a goal that
11 30 percent of all agricultural lands be organically farmed
12 by 2030. The current goal of 20 percent organic by 2045
13 is insufficient and essentially just keeps pace with
14 business-as-usual growth.

15 Second, California should follow the European
16 Union's example and adopt a target reducing agricultural
17 pesticide use by 50 percent by 2030.

18 Third, the Scoping Plan should call for direct
19 State incentives and increase technical assistance to help
20 farmers move toward ecological farming practices and
21 organic Farming.

22 Fourth, any reference to herbicide or other
23 pesticide use as a Climate Smart Strategy in the Scoping
24 Plan must be removed.

25 Fifth, we call for additional research on the
disparate impacts of pesticide use.

And sixth, and finally, all language in the Scoping Plan that implies that Climate Smart Agriculture --

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

SARAH AIRD: -- practices will somehow automatically result in --

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Greg.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Just make sure you cut them off next time.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Greg, I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

GREG KESTER: Hello. My name is Greg Kester and I'm with CASA. We respectively urge CARB Board members to direct staff to work with the wastewater sector to ensure biosolids are included in the natural and working lands component of the Scoping Plan and to maintain multiple pathways for our wastewater derived non-fossil fuel biogas and incorporate them into the Scoping Plan.

Biosolids, produced as an integral part of the wastewater treatment process, can help meet all of the objectives of the Healthy Soils and Natural and Working Lands initiatives. Biosolids increase soil organic carbon, sequester carbon long term, improve soil health,
avoid fossil fuel intense inorganic fertilizer, reduce the
need for irrigation, provide drought resistance, and
increase crop yields. Yet, there is no mention of
biosolids in the draft Scoping Plan, which is a
significant omission.

As SB 1383 is implemented, recycling of biosolids
via land application is recognized as the best beneficial
means to manage this vital renewable resource. In
addition, biosolids can be used to reclaim fire damaged
land, improve water quality in impact areas, and lower the
potential severity of future fires.

Others will speak to the need for flexibility to
beneficial utilize our biogas, but please note that
despite SB 1440, pipeline injection is practically limited
by Cal/OSHA requirements to 10,000 pounds and does not
work for all agencies.

Thank you very much and we look forward to
working with staff moving forward.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair, did you want to
make an announcement?

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Okay. Rebecca, I've
activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

REBECCA O'BRIEN: Thank you. Good afternoon.

This is Rebecca O'Brien with True North Renewable Energy.
As we also provided in our written comments, we agree that we must do more to cut potent short-lived climate pollutant emissions, especially methane. And we encourage you to take additional steps to do so, especially from landfills and organic waste management.

Just for background, our company develops, build's, and operates large scale regional high solids anaerobic digestion facilities, where we repurpose and reuse organic resources like food and green material diverted from landfills and we generate both renewable natural gas and compost. It is really our goal to help decarbonize sectors of the economy and to meet California's climate goals.

Based on the language -- (coughing) -- excuse me -- currently included in the draft Scoping Plan, we encourage you to highlight even further the benefits associated with anaerobic digestion and advance proposals to rapidly increase development of those new facilities.

We support many of the proposals in the strategies for achieving success in the waste sector and we'd advocate for additional items in the final plan. Really mainly, we want to ensure that there's expanded markets for products from diverted organics, with the recognition of the co-benefits of energy production from anaerobic digestion and we really want to ensure that
investments in infrastructure are made within the next 12
to 18 months.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Were you ready, Chair?

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes. So we need to take about a
10-minute break to give the court reporter some time to
take a break. Also, we have -- we still have quite a lot
of public commenters. And so, at this point, our plan is
to go ahead and stay and hear all the public comment and
Board discussion will need to start in the morning at 8:30
our -- for the second day of our board meeting. So if any
of you have already commented and are waiting to listen to
the discussion, we will be webcasting it tomorrow like we
do with all of our -- our meetings, but if we are not able
to finish -- we want the Board discussion to be robust and
thorough. And if we wait to do all the public comment and
then do the Board discussion, I don't think it would do
justice to this important issue.

So we are going to take a 10-minute break and
then we're going to go back to public comment.

Thank you.

(Off record: 4:23 p.m.)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record: 4:36 p.m.)
CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. I think we're ready to get back. Okay. We're going back into session to continue our public comment. Board members, please take your seats. Mr. De La Torre, Dr. Sperling, please take your seats.

Okay. Clerks, I'll turn it back over to you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you. We're going to pick back up with the Zoom commenters that I announced previously. So we'll hear next from John Schaefer, Dominic Lucero, and Kathleen Kilpatrick.

John, I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

JOHN SCHAEFER: Thank you, Chair Randolph and Board members. I'm John Schaefer, retired engineer now with 350.org. I worked most of my career in energy. None of staff's alternatives in the Scoping plan is aggressive enough to save us from this climate crisis. For the next crucial decade, a stronger Cap-and-Trade offers the best chance for our grandchildren's future. But as it's currently structured, it is inadequate.

To fix Cap-and-Trade, I have four points. One, there are too many existing allowances and they should be canceled or repurchased.

Two, the minimum level for oxygen prices should be tied to historic values of climate damage as the best
approximation to social cost of carbon. No matter which
damages or which years, damages far exceed the current
Cap-and-Trade price.

Three, carbon capture and sequestration promises
to be a fossil fuel boondoggle, particularly direct air
capture, but its economics show why the carbon price
should be higher. Projected CCS costs are around $900 a
ton, but the Cap-and-Trade price only $22. On the basis,
Cap-and-Trade's price should be 40 times higher.

Four, reviews should be annual.

Other climate goals will be easier to attain with
a high enough carbon price. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Dominic, I've activate your microphone. Please
unmute and begin.

DOMINIC LUCERO: Thank you, Board members. My
name is Dominic Lucero. I represent the International
Brotherhood of Boilermakers. I serve as an Executive
Board Member, Chair of the New Endeavors Research and
Development Committee, or NERD, for short, and most
importantly, I work as a full-time apprenticeship
instructor. I am in full support of these technologies.
I'm a self-proclaimed nerd and have been immersed in these
technologies when they were considered tin foil hat stuff.

I support the direction that CARB is going but I
cannot support the draft Scope. How can we be sure that private companies that will build California's new infrastructure will not hire low-skilled, short-term workers with no real future. Our Californians at work in organized labor often live in disadvantaged communities and will be left behind if organized trades are not written into the framework of this plan.

There is no real mention of a highly skilled workforce as in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. Why is there no mention of apprenticeship programs as in the proposed California Senate Bill 18 on green hydrogen. Our California organized trades provide higher education for working class people with no college debt and a long-time career, not a one-time job.

The public often thinks that boilermakers can just be retrained to install solar panels for close to minimum wage. Many of us have spent a life time to learn our craft. The workers for solar companies often come to our apprenticeship programs looking for a better future and protection from these companies. We are the educated, hard working, highly skilled Californians that have been building our infrastructure throughout our state's history. We want to help and support, but we must be unmistakably included in the plans moving forward towards a just and equitable future.
Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Kathleen, I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and you can begin.

KATHLEEN KILPATRICK: Hello. My name is Kathleen Kilpatrick. I live in Watsonville. I work with several environmental groups. I appreciated today's increases focus on natural and working lands, but the plan still overlooks the risks and needs in rural agricultural communities like mine.

The public health's analysis in particular reflects this. For example, rural communities are the most impacted by drought and fire. The may have limited access to proposed solutions by occupation, income, and location. We have high percentages of people of color and children and the elderly. The San Joaquin Valley had some of the worst air quality in the State, in spite of relatively low population density, not just from wind transportation industry, VOCs, nitrates, tillage, methane from agriculture.

To have food security we require an agricultural system that's diverse, decentralized, and rebuilds soils. Let's not brag about feeding the world until all Californians have access to healthy, justly grown food, including those who do grow it.
Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.
I'll now turn it back over to the in-person commenters.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
All right. First, we have Anne-Marie.

ANNE-MARIE OTEY: Good afternoon. This is Anne-Marie Otey representing 140,000 members of 48 building trades unions in Los Angeles and Orange counties. I appreciate very much your patience and attention to all of these issues.

We fought long and hard to bring a skilled union workforce to California refineries to improve safety and create good jobs. And we will hold the same standard for all the jobs created by this climate plan, but we are concerned about the overreach of all the alternatives in the Scoping Plan and the abandonment of the oil and gas industry.

We support expansion of carbon capture transitioning pipelines to use by the hydrogen industry as well as building new pipelines, repurposing current oil and gas refineries for hydrogen, wind and solar power, nuclear power, and continuing oil and gas extraction and refining in California.

We also urge you and our lawmakers to expedite
building all of this essential infrastructure with a union workforce, as my brother from the boilermakers just said.

We are an industrial society. We need to support the production of energy at an industrial level. We can balance this by building more mass transit and denser multi-family housing, helping the economy and in turn allowing the flourishing of the natural green areas that all the alternatives call for and which we very strongly support.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Scott Starr.

SCOTT STARR: Good afternoon, Scott Starr with California Steel Industries. And my question for you today is this, what can ARB do to avoid leakage among companies that rely on high heat intensity for their production processes, where such a company is using the best available control technology and still facing an increasing and unknown cost of Cap-and-Trade carbon credits. My company is -- is one of those companies. We're a major employer in the Inland Empire, about 900 excellent jobs, 300 customers, most in California, and proud of our no layoffs for 38 years.

We do use a lot of heat. We buy slabs. We heat them to 2400 degrees and roll them into sheet for
construction end uses. As such, we are one of SoCal Gas's largest customers. And like one of SoCal Edison's largest customers paying $30 million for electricity, which is double what we could do in Arizona or any of the western states bordering California.

We've survived in California by reducing GHG emissions per ton by leading the nation's steel industry in the reduction of criteria pollution -- pollutants, such as NOx. And that puts us at the forefront of environmental technology for burners in the steel industry.

We've evaluated electrification and the use of hydrogen. At our scale, it doesn't work for us at this time. So my question is, once again, if we're an industry leader in emission control processes, how can ARB develop programs within Cap-and-Trade for heat and sensitive industries such as CSI, so that we can comply and still survive and thrive in California. We appreciate the time to comment. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Neil.


The RFA supports the Scoping Plan's goal of carbon neutrality by 2045 and agrees with the emphases on
reduction in petroleum fuels, a portfolio approach to solutions, carbon removal, and ensuring equality and affordability. Today, U.S. ethanol production on average reduces GHG emissions by 50 percent compared to gasoline with the trajectory and commitments to be net zero before 2050, and higher ethanol blends lower criteria pollutants.

Liquid fuels will be consumed for decades to come in California. In addition to the electrification of the light-duty fleet, the Scoping Plan should send stronger policy and market signals for the production of low to zero carbon liquid fuels and we must act now.

Higher blends of low to zero carbon ethanol in the current and future gasoline pool represent the quickest and most affordable path for greater GHG and petroleum reductions from the light-duty fleet. E85 in California today is selling at a price over $2 a gallon less than regular gasoline. Securing this low-cost option for California consumers is valuable in meeting equity and environmental goals.

We suggest that the fuels section of the Scoping Plan expand to specifically recognize the GHG, criteria pollutant, and cost advantages of ethanol and other biofuels. Without a clear and strong low to zero carbon liquid fuels component, alongside aggressive electrification, California will not achieve carbon
neutrality by 2045.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Veronica.

VERONICA PARDO: Yes. Hi. Good afternoon.

Veronica Pardo -- excuse me poor handwriting -- Resource Recovery Coalition of California, here in support of the Scoping Plan that addresses the need to reduce methane emissions and more specifically shift our organic waste out of our landfills into appropriate organic waste management facilities.

Under the strategies for achieving success, the Scoping Plan states the need to maximize existing infrastructure and expands it with strategies including compost, anaerobic digestion, and co-digestion at waste water treatment plants. It calls for the expansion of markets for products made from organic waste, and the need to invest in the infrastructure to support growth in organic recycling capacity, among other recommendations.

And we support these strategies and recognize the need to ultimately direct biomethane to the hardest to decarbonize sectors. And at this time, we know that the near-term strategy is to use this gas in our heavy-duty vehicles and to plan a long-term strategy of use.

Can -- Californians will continue to make waste
and this material must be managed per the Scoping Plan strategy. To that end, we kindly request that the Board direct staff to harmonize the Scoping Plan with our Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Strategy and our zero-emission vehicle goals. And we must have strong signals that we are going to continue to invest in organic waste diversion facilities and achieve a circular economy for the waste we create.

   Thank you so much

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Tatanka.

Gaurav.

Katherine.

KATHERINE LARSON: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and Board members. My name is Katherine Larson and I'm with the Southern California Public Power Authority. We represent 12 publicly owned electric utilities in Southern California serving over five million people. I'm here today to express support for the direction that the draft Scoping Plan is going, but to urge CARB to address some key gaps in the analysis when the final plan is released, namely regarding grid reliability and electricity affordability ability.

   The grid's transformation has unlocked many new opportunities to decarbonize other
sectors. But there are also new challenges that we plan to meet a hundred percent clean electricity and accommodate major new load increases.

These challenges aren't insurmountable, but they'll require time, and resources, and coordination, and likely some emerging technologies to resolve. We have to ensure the path to carbon neutrality does not compromise the reliable, affordable clean energy that will be needed to power the homes, vehicles, and buildings in our state.

If we stumble on this, there could be significant consequences for our ability to meet our goals and serve as a model for other jurisdictions as well as for the Californians who will increasingly rely on electricity in all aspects of their daily lives.

We believe the proposed scenario is the most feasible pathway, because it provides time to build out clean energy resources and transmission and recognizes all options must remain on the table. With that said, we still need to see analysis of reliability, greater impacts, and electricity affordability impacts. And we urge CARB to incorporate this -- address this in the final Scoping Plan. Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Jack.

JACK LUCERO FLECK: Good afternoon, Board members
Jack Fleck, 350 Bay Area.

Thank you for having in with us this afternoon. It's been a long day. Really appreciate that. And we did submit comments, but I want to say -- I just want to underscore three points that I have to ask both the Board members and the staff, which is, number one, please respect the EJAC recommendations. Great presentation this morning. They had a lot of good ideas. Please -- and we appreciate all the work they did going to all these hearings, webinars, et cetera for many, many months.

Number two, the models you've presented are not transparent. We can't see the calculations. There's no way for us to really do an evaluation with those models, unless we can really get at the actual math that was done. And number three, you're not making it. You're not going to make 40 percent reduction by 2030 with the way things are going right now. Now, how do we know that? Well, we can't tell because the model says you're going to make it. And you heard Secretary Blumenfeld today say, well, you're actually going to overshoot it by six percent. But he's just looking at the numbers that CARB is throwing out.

There's no explanation for where those numbers came from. And when we do the math, please look at our comments. We did the math. We did the arithmetic. It's
not hard. If you look at transportation, five million EVs is a small percentage of the 30 million cars out there. You're not going to get 40 percent reduction with only five million EVs. You're not going to get 40 percent reduction with only 12 percent VMT reduction. So how are you going to get 40 percent reduction?

We have some suggestions and we think that it can be done and we think that CARB staff even agrees that it can be done. We'd like you to do it.

Thanks.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ariella.
Veronica.
Jane.

JANE SELLEN: Chair Randolph, Board members, and CARB staff, thank you for the opportunity to comment. Jane Sellen, co-director of Californians for Pesticide Reform and also want to note that my co-director Angel Garcia who's on the EJAC, and two community members were here to comment, but they had to leave to make the long trip back to Tulare.

I want to thank you for the inclusion in the draft plan of agricultural pesticides as part of the climate problem and or organic agriculture as part of the solution. I particularly want to acknowledge the CARB Board members who've joined us in advocating and leading
on this. It's taken years to achieve even this
acknowledgement in the plan and we consider it a step
forward, if not yet a win.

We strenuously disagree that inclusion of action
on pesticides would water down this climate plan. As
Amanda Hansen noted the role of natural and working lands
and their potential sequestration benefits continue to be
insufficiently researched, measured, modeled or
understood.

The time to be bold is thousand. Acknowledgement
of industrial agriculture's role is not enough. We also
need ambitious targets for adoption of organic ag and for
reduction of hazardous pesticide use. The draft target of
20 percent organic by 2045 is inadequate. It's projected
that this target, despite the serious obstacles faced by
growers to transitioning to organic will be achieved
through market forces alone with no help from the State.

If no action is needed to achieve the target, it
doesn't belong in the plan.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Sara.

SARA THEISS: Yes. Hi. And thank you to the
staff and all of you for paying so much attention and
spending so much time on this. My name is Sara Theiss. I
live in Richmond, California. I work with Fossil Free California. And I'm just strongly supporting the EJAC response to the Scoping Plan. I just want to add two points.

One is that somebody talked about how California has and remains a leader in the environmental area and climate, but I do want to point out that our proposed plan for 2045 relies way too heavily on CDR. We're at almost 20 percent, you know, to pick up the last bit that needs to be taken care of, whereas I think that Washington is at five percent and New York is maybe 10 percent of something -- or something. So I think that needs to -- we need to increase our ambition in that, if we want to remain a leader.

And then next, just -- this is for -- just carbon trade. I'm not an expert in this but Cap-and-Trade is not a reliable way to lower emissions. It's been around for awhile. It hasn't been working. My understanding is that the companies -- the fossil fuel companies, et cetera have banked enough permits that basically would allow them to pollute to undue a lot of what, you know, the goals -- if we reach the goals, they could pollute with these permits. So I just think it's very complicated to do. I know it's difficult, but it just can't be relied upon at this point when we have so few years left.
Thank you so much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Jan.

JAN WARREN: Hi. My name is Jan Warren. I live in Walnut Creek and I Chair the Interfaith Climate Action Network of Contra Costa County. The ask today is to increase incentives for methods we know will reduce emissions. As a person of faith, I ask you to observe what the creative force teaches us about healing and protecting health.

The Poor People's Campaign believes in lifting the voices from the bottom and that means they speak first. And today, almost two hours were used up when all these people came to be heard by this -- by this Board.

Use the knowledge of indigenous residents, the real live generational experiences of people in impacted communities. They are the profits of today. Ask where is the money coming from, who benefits, and who harmed?

Biofuels are taking up an increasingly large share of major U.S. crops. Roughly two-fifths of American corn and soybean crops now end up burned in engines. The biodiesel share of soy has increased from 21 percent in 2010 to 40 percent in 21 -- 2021-2022. The 90 percent capture rate assumed in CARB's modeling has no basis in current technological experience at refineries.
David Clegern -- forgive the pronunciation. I'm out already. Oh, man.

(Laughter.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Bonnie Lockhard.

BONNIE LOCKHARD: Hi. My name is Bonnie Lockhard. I'm a member of the American Federation of Musicians and one of 138 rank-and-file unionists who signed a comment letter demanding that CARB revise your plan to address the concerns of labor, but right now I'm speaking as an individual.

I'm going to say we have to get real. The -- we must reduce fossil fuel production and consumption. And we can't produce consumption without reducing production. Let's be real, there's no path except the reduction of -- of carb -- fossil fuels.

I also share the fears that have been voiced here today by low-income people, by people in -- saying that this is going to cause enormous economic disruption. That's true. That's true. And I'm particularly concerned about that, because the plan that you put forward, as the EJ people have pointed out, is an insufficient economic model. There is not sufficient economic model in this and that makes many people fear what must be done.

We have to protect those people and make those fears go away, because we have real solutions. And
luckily, there is a plan with real solutions and that is the California Climate Jobs Plan. This is an elaborate real model of an economic path forward commissioned by USW, one of the unions that represents most of the fossil workers in this State.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

BONNIE LOCKHARD: Please look at our comment letter.

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

BONNIE LOCKHARD: Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Randy.

RANDY BEKENDAM: Good afternoon, Board. I'm Randy Bekendam, the Executive Director of the Southern California Agricultural Land Foundation. I'm also a regenerative farmer. I operate Amy's Farm with my daughter Amy. It's a family farm. We've made a complete transition to regenerative farming over the last few years.

The fastest way to draw down legacy carbon is through regenerative farming. We have to convert our industrial farming methods to regenerative farming. Check out the website of The Carbon Underground for more information on that.

An innovative thing with regenerative farming is
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you can employ agrivoltaics. Do research on that. You can grow food under solar panels and produce electricity at the same time as you're producing food. So that's another thing for the future that I don't think maybe you've looked at.

The other thing I want to address is warehouses on farmland. Across the street from Amy's Farm, the City of Ontario is converting 600 acres to warehouses. My issue isn't so much the pollution of warehouses as is paving over prime farmland. This is happening all around the nation, especially by Amazon. And it's insanity. We don't have that much prime farmland.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

AUGIE VENEZIA: My name is Augie Venezia and I'm here on behalf of Fairfax Lumber. The company was originally founded in 1912 and today we are 100 percent employee owners. I'm here to voice -- I'm an employee and my job is to take care of our business on behalf of our employee owners.

I'm here to voice my confusion over the plan to decarbonize from fossil fuels to renewable electrical energy. You are too narrowly focused to achieve this
goal. First, the State doesn't have the infrastructure to
distribute the increase in electricity needed to take the
place of propane, gasoline, diesel, and natural gas. And
we are facing massive increases in the cost of electricity
due to this increasing demand. The net result will be
more and more energy poverty as more citizens slip into
the ranks of the poor.

This being said, more and more citizens and
businesses are leaving the state and leaving behind
massive debt due to the poor fiscal mismanagement of our
cities, counties, the State, school districts and State
colleges. Bottom line is you need small businesses. If
we disappear there won't be a cleaner future, because the
State won't be able to afford it.

Concerns have been made carbon capture, carbon
sequestration, clean water, clean air, and food supply. I
highly recommend you watch the documentary kiss the
ground.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

The next speaker I believe is a duplicate. So
then we'll go to Gary Hughes.

GARY HUGHES: Hello, Chair, members of the Board.
My name is Gary Hughes. I work with the international
organization Biofuelwatch. And I've had some comments
that I've been editing incessantly for quite some time.

I will flag really quickly that we're very concerned about the exaggerated benefits of bioenergy as described in the Scoping Plan and we think that needs, you know, quite a bit of revision.

But I really kind of just want to speak off the cuff and, you know, say that what I recognize happening here today with all the tension and the polarization is really it's an outcome of kicking the can down the road, which is what the agency has been doing since 2006 unfortunately.

And I think we're only going to see the tensions worsen unless the agency really does step up to protect communities, protect the environment, and to, you know, essentially stop working behind closed doors with polluting industry. I mean, we've done the Public Record Act requests. We've gotten the information. We've seen the emails. We know what goes on behind closed doors.

But if the agency doesn't do something to address these, you know, inequities in the political process, the tensions, as we've seen here today, are only going to get worse and worse. So it's really time to stop kicking the can down the road and it's time to make some real action happen through the authorities that you have.

So thanks for your time
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. And I apologize, I think I skipped over Jose.

Jose Castillo, are you here?

Okay.

Abby.

ABBY YOUNG: Okay. Thank you. Abby Young with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. And I'm just going to jump right in.

Alternative 1 is appropriately aggressive in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, incorporates much -- you know, the most -- most of the recommendations from the EJAC and most directly reduces pollution and overburdened communities.

I wish that I could recommend which elements of Alternative 1 could be incorporated into the preferred scenario, but I can't, because the analysis that determined that Alternative 1 is economically infeasible was not sufficiently detailed or transparent in order to make -- to really figure that out, so we really recommend that there is a more transparent justification for why Alternative 1 and its elements were considered infeasible.

Second, we're concerned that the extensive attention the plan gives to carbon capture, and storage, and carbon dioxide removal. While we acknowledge that there is a role for CCS and CDR, we strongly recommend
that the unknowns and uncertainties be discussed transparently. And that if these strategies are used, that they avoid capital investments that extend the lifetime of highly polluting industrial sources that are so often located in overburdened communities.

So with these suggestions, we think the proposed scenario could include more direct greenhouse gas emission reductions and that benefit the health and well-being of all Californians.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

ANNIE KORUGA: I'm here to tell you that all proposals before you today don't -- distinctly staff's Plan 3, are rather inadequate as serious plans to address California's climate crisis. There are numerous problems with all of the proposals. And for time's sake, I'll just go over one.

The part of Plan 3, which proposes building 10 gigawatts of new natural gas capacity. We need more renewables, not more dirty fuel. I know this personally. When PG&E's San Bruno natural gas pipeline exploded, I lived nearby. We thought a bomb had gone off or an airplane had crashed. We saw fire hundreds of feet in the air for days.

I want to make it clear that if that -- that
explosion had happened literally two miles down the road, I would not be here before you today. I would be dead and my house would have exploded. Those are the stakes that we're considering right now. Not one more Californian should have their house blown up by natural gas. No Californian should see forests around them disappear due to clear cutting. Carbon capture and storage is inefficacious. Burning our forests for biomass is a bad idea. You know all of these things.

This is supposed to be a climate plan, not a rubber stamp to continue our worsen the status quo. The root causes of this climate crisis must be addressed, so our great State can achieve real zero-emissions. If we don't, guess what, literally nothing matters. No house, no business, no nothing. It is literally game over.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

(Applause.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Igor.

IGOR TREGUB: Good evening, Madam Chair and members. I'm delivering these comments on behalf of the California Solar and Storage association, which represents over 700 members and 65,000 workers in distributed solar and storage. We are very proud that our Golden State leads the nation in distributed generation.
Since 2006, our members have installed over 1.3 million solar projects totaling over 12 gigawatts of installed capacity, equivalent to getting four million cars off the road for a year or shutting down 20 large gas-fired power plants. Nearly two-thirds of the distributed solar being adopted in recent years has been in 14 working and middle class neighborhoods.

And over the past decade, our members have built out among the highest amount of solar capacity for multi-family housing in the communities most unfortunately impacted by pollution, such as Fresno, Riverside, and San Bernardino.

CARB's objective to meet GHG targets in the electricity sector is more likely to succeed if the contributions of DER are meaningfully evaluated. Rather than retaining and building new fossil fuel, infrastructure, the Plan should aggressively pursue additional renewable energy and storage technologies and other demand reductions. There's simply no need for an additional 10 gigawatts of fossil fuel built, when the same capacity and more can be provided in the form of democratized, reliable, and 100 percent renewable clean energy.

This is a viable solution that is ready right now. Let's get to work. Thank you.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.  

Floyd.  

(Applause)  

FLOYD VERGARA: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph, Board -- and Board members. I'm Floyd Vergara with the Clean Fuels Alliance America. We're the U.S. trade association for the biodiesel, renewable diesel, and sustainable aviation fuel industries.  

I'd first like to congratulate the CARB team, Jarinder, Matt, and all of the highly capable staff and the stakeholders who worked to put this together under very challenging conditions.  

Together, with the California Advanced Biofuels Alliance, we submitted a comment letter in support of staff's recommended Alternative 3 with some enhancements that we noted in our previous comments. I won't read that to you, but I will highlight a couple of points that we raised.  

Alternative 3 provides an all-of-the-above pathway for both electrification and other existing and emerging low carbon technologies. This is especially important for environmental justice, since it helps you achieve the deepest and the quickest pollutant reductions in the most difficult to electrify transportation sectors, heavy-duty on- and off-road, marine, rail, and aviation.
I want to echo the earlier comments about needing a strong signal from you all with respect to the clean fuels industry. So to that end, three asks. One is adopt the Scoping Plan update quickly. Two is reinitiate the low carbon fuel standard right after that. And then three, strengthen the LCFS including doubling down on the pre- and post-2030 targets, updating the lifecycle science behind the LCF -- LCFS, and then incorporating lessons learned from the past several years.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Juan Flores.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Juan Flores couldn't be here. He had to leave. So he -- we're going to have to take residents from Pixley to speak instead.

MARIA AREVALO(through interpreter): God afternoon. I formally turned in a letter in the name of the defenders of the Central Valley for air and clean water. My name is Maria Arevalo and I live in Pixley. I've lived there since 1967. I represent the community of Pixley and what we're worried about is the air quality, especially the dairies. There are 18 dairies around Pixley. They are less than five miles away and there is a digester. The residents suffer the impacts from the dairies. They suffer from headaches, from allergies,
asthma, nose bleeds, and pulmonary deficiency.

We want to ask the State to stop giving loans to the ranchers and the dairies, so that they can create more cows and to expand to make methane gas. Pixley invites all of the Board members to come see us and to come see what we're going through in our community, especially our children during recess. With so much pollution and especially when it's really hot, you can really smell the manure there. And we are all worried for the children's health. We're older and our time is coming up, but it is sad to think about our children and what future they have.

What were -- will their health be like in the future? They could be our future leaders like you are here. Thank you and Good bless you all.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Can you confirm if these -- this letter was submitted in the docket.

MARIA AREVALO: Si. Si.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Okay.

Okay. Thank you.

(Applause.)

ZOLBOO NAMKHAIDORJ: Good afternoon. Jasmin isn't here and I'll be speaking for her.

My name is Zolboo Namkhaidorj and I'm with Communities for a Better Environment speaking on the Scoping Plan.
I would like to think that you've all been called into public service and be in these positions of power, because you actually care about people and because you want to change the world for the better. This is your chance to do just that.

Chair Randolph, you told me that these decisions are really hard. And to tell you the truth, I don't care, because historically politicians and corporations hand in hand have no problem neglecting and sacrificing the health and well being of black, brown, indigenous communities of color.

Environmental justice communities refuse to be the dumping ground and do not deserve to be sacrifice zones so that every can -- everything can stay the same. Clearly, this isn't working, to the point the zero-emission vehicles will negatively impact poor communities. The highway routes with dirty diesel trucks and thousands of cars traveling through communities every day already negatively impact poor communities that don't have the privilege to be here today to advocate for their health.

So you can choose to make an inconsiderate harmful and dangerous decision that has dire, not to mention, expensive consequences for the State, but especially for everyday working class people that make you
look like another business-as-usual politician that cares about getting ahead or you can choose to make a considerate, sensible, and the obvious decision that gives help and inspires your fellow peers, and young people, and working class communities and environmental justice communities who have been fighting for their lives --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

ZOLBOO NAMKHAIDORJ: -- and their communities to not be looked onto as disposable for the sake of capitalism.

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

ZOLBOO NAMKHAIDORJ: Thank you.

(Applause)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Sofia

ANA GONZALES: Good Evening. Sofia had to leave, so I'm taking her place.

Happy Thursday CARB Board, CARB staff, community and stakeholders. My name is Ana Gonzales and I am first a mom of two teenagers, a community member of an overburdened city who is amongst the worst air quality county in the nation, San Bernardino County. I am also the Executive Director for the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice, an organization that represents hundreds of frontline community members in both Riverside
and San Bernardino County. I am here today to speak on
the CARB Scoping Plan, because we can do better.

We talk about intent -- intentionality and how we
come together to combat climate crisis. And as my girl
Kimberly Ellis says, California doesn't follow the trend.
We set the trend. Here, we have an opportunity to do that
and be the model for the rest of the country. We are
making history here and our decisions today will send a
message to our future generations we need more aggressive
Scoping Plan period. We need a full phase out of fossil
fuels by 2045. We need to phase out gas plants not expand
them.

My neighboring city of Colton has three gas
plants -- three gas plants, and many studies have shown
cancer clusters near them. We need to transition to a
hundred percent zero-emission vehicle vehicles by 2035 and
it be done justly, inclusively, and equitably. Minimize
reliance on CCS, because those are not a real solution.
Our communities are dying. Our planet is dying.

Zero-emissions equals zero health impacts. We
are not collateral --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: That concludes your time.
ANA GONZALES: -- for economic Development.
Thank you.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Kim Do.
(Applause)

KYLE HEISKALA: Hello. I'm Kyle Heiskala with Environmental Health Coalition.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Sorry. The next speaker was Kim do.

KYLE HEISKALA: Oh, sorry.

(Laughter)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: You'll be next though.

KIM DO: Chair Randolph, esteemed members of the Board, thank you for your time here today. I'm Kim DO, Director of Finance for White Energy. I'm here to voice White Energy's support of the inclusion of carbon capture in the 2022 Scoping Plan.

Since the adoption of the CCS protocol, White Energy has invested millions of dollars of R&D and thousands of man hours. The Scoping Plan lays out a means for ethanol biorefineries to produce zero or negative carbon fuels while maintaining sustainable food and fuel supplies.

Ethanol carbon capture projects, such as the DOE and ADM's Decatur, Illinois project has shown that technology is mature and commercially scalable for ethanol. If California were the source, it's 1.5 billion gallons of ethanol from facilities, such as that of ADM with CCS, than it would support 4.3 million metric tons of
CO2 sequestration a year or the equivalent of 932,000 cars, or 197 million trees, a forest twice the size of Sacramento.

Finally, thanks to CCS -- California's leadership in CCS, the ethanol industry is poised to deploy CCS across the board, which would lead to upwards of 43 million metric tons of CO2 captured a year.

Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Okay. Kyle.

KYLE HEISKALA: Hi. I'm Kyle Heiskala with Environmental Health Coalition. Many of our community members and transit advocates have been waiting eight hours on Zoom to comment and they want to add their voices as well. And so we ask you, Board, please prioritize mass transit and clean trucks in this plan. CARB's own latest SB 150 report acknowledges that we are driving more and not on track to meet our transportation goals.

The big problem we face of 40 percent of GHG is coming from transportation. And in San Diego, 70 percent of jobs are not accessible by transit. Diesel trucks are concentrated in EJ communities and this plan's economic modeling is flawed, relying on expensive, unrealistic, and false solutions like the retirement of all combustion vehicles by 2035 in Alternative 1.
But the good news is we have real solutions. We need, by 2030, all drayage trucks and transit buses to be electric. By 2035, 11 percent of all trips can be done on transit by reducing VMT by up to 30 percent. All truck sales could be electric by 2035 and CARB must do a cost comparison between transit investments and ZEVs. We can't afford to gamble on unproven technologies. In San Diego, youth opportunity passes have launched, giving a 77 increase in unique transit riders. And transit will work if we fund it, so we ask you for your support today for more mass transit and zero-emission heavy-duty vehicles in this plan.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Kyle Krueger.
Andrew Meredith.
Marjaneh.

MARJANEH MOINI: Hi. My name is Marjaneh Moini. I'm a physician and member of American Public Health Association and on the Board of Physicians for Social Responsibility.

I have taken care of cancer patients in Contra Costa county and polluted communities near refineries for more than 20 years. We're submitting a letter that in just over one week was signed by more than 300 health
professionals and 20 health organizations asking you to
protect public health in frontline communities by
prioritizing direct emissions reductions. Health
professionals are alarmed because climate change is a
public health crisis. They're alarmed because oil and gas
industry is a major driver of climate change, but also is
associated with many health -- public health -- public
health harms.

We're alarmed because the Scoping Plan's reliance
on loopholes like carbon capture and sequestration and
unrealistic expectations from direct air captures put us
on the wrong path. CCS creates public health hazards at
every step of the way, capture, transport, and storage.
The idea that these public health hazards could be
regulated is not rooted in real life experience of our
frontline communities, who live in regulatory failures
every day.

CO2, odorless, colorless, deadly asphyxiant that
is heavier than air and can spread for miles in case of
illegal pipeline -- pipeline rupture is being treated as a
commodity.

We're asking the Board, CTA, and the Governor to
prioritize public health.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
(Applause)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Timothy Jefferies.

TIMOTHY JEFFERIES: Good evening. Chair Randolph and Board -- CARB staff, Rajinder, thank you for the time.

So two things, energy and transportation. It was just -- had been said before I think I like the number 27, Andre Thompson from the Faith Chapel who said that no one in his community even heard of it, you know. I think -- it was almost they never even heard of -- never heard of CARB. They haven't even heard of these mission -- these issues and that CARB, these -- this Scoping Plan that CARB has to save that community. They don't even know who they are and what that community does. And I'd imagine there's communities across the state that have just met the same way these poor communities that this plan is supposed to protect. It's not going to even know this is supposed to protect them, because no one has reached out to them, which is what I want to say, that we should be speaking with those communities. I believe that someone said it earlier that -- I'm going to be repeating a lot of things people said, but that nobody likes it, so take it back.

It doesn't mean that CARB staff that you didn't do -- you didn't do a great job on it. You did good work here. It was worthy of bringing back to the public here, but you're missing things. You didn't talk to the people.
I think that -- and as far as energy is concerned we don't want to limit it. Why look at just only one source. I mean, it should be -- biofuel should be there, hydro, renewable hydrogen, CCS. It should all be there to get us faster where we want to go, as soon as we need to be there.

And whatever that timeline is going to be, as soon as we can get there, the technology puts us there. As long as we're not limiting how we get there and hurting the communities that we say we're supposed to protect to get there, I think we're all on the same page we want to get there to clean energy.

So with that, I say we're going to oppose it as it -- as it stands unless amended. And go do some good work, because I know you can.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. All right, we're going to go back to Zoom.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: All right. Thank you. The next few commenters in Zoom will be Margarita Moreno, Frank Harris, George Peridas, David Rothbart, Patrick Griffith, and James Leach.

So Margarita, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

I see you've unmuted. Go ahead and begin.
It looks like you've muted yourself. If you could unmute Margarita and begin. Okay.

Can we have an interpreter.

(Interpreter communicated in Spanish)

MONSERRAT HERNANDEZ (through interpreter): My name is Monserrat Hernandez. Margarita had to step out, because she had to go to work. I'm going to read her testimony.

(Interpreter communicated in Spanish)

THE INTERPRETER: I can't hear.

MONSERRAT HERNANDEZ (through interpreter): Good morning. My name is Margarita Moreno. I live in National City and I'm with Environmental Health Coalition. I am interested in the plan that the CARB is working on and I would like for you to prioritize investment in public transport. I ask for more accessible rates, that buses pass by more frequently, because people would use public transport more with this instead of their cars.

I have three children that go to school and depend on public transport in order to continue with their goals of graduating from school. We also want to ask that diesel trucks are reduced because these pollute a lot and they destroy our health, as well as our family's health. We need clean air now and not in 20 years from now. And we hope that by 2035, there are no more sales of diesel
trucks, because we don't want our communities to have polluted air and respiratory illnesses.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Okay. Frank, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

Frank Harris.

Okay. Let's go to George. George, I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

GEORGE PERIDAS: Chair Randolph, members of the Board. My name is George Peridas and I'm an engineer at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. Our job is to help solve hard problems, pursue sound science, and help California achieve its climate goals. We do not stand to gain from any approach that CARB pursues. I commend staff for explicitly recognizing for the first time in any Scoping Plan that California cannot meet its climate goals without carbon capture or removal and storage.

This conclusion is in line with the overwhelming majority of analyses for California and beyond. A lot has been said of these technologies. Some of it hopeful false promises to prolong business as usual, and some of it plainly factually incorrect criticisms rooted in ideology rather than science.

For over two years at the lab -- over two decades at the lab, we have had a front row seat in every step of
the development and testing of these technologies and we've seen them work with our own eyes. Today, we can reliably capture CO2 from large sources in the atmosphere putting away the bulk of life-cycle emissions underground. We can move that CO2 by rail, barge, truck, or pipeline, and we can safely return it thousands of feet underground for permanent storage in the same kinds of rocks that held the carbon in the first place.

The track record of these technologies is overwhelmingly positive. A handful or fewer of glitches or incidents as well as lessons from past regulatory failures in oil and gas have resulted in modern regulations that place an unprecedented level of scrutiny on the practice. We commend CARB for including strategies for success in carbon capture removal and storage in the draft plan and urge its Board -- broad utility beyond petroleum refining also be explored and included in the final plan.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

David, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

DAVID ROTHBART: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and Board members. I'm David Rothbart and I represent the Southern California Alliance of Publicly Owned Treatment
Works, or SCAP. SCAP represents over 80 public wastewater agencies in Southern California and our members provide wastewater treatment for approximately 20 million people. Many of our members are located in the South Coast air basin and have concerns about ozone attainment. The Governor's Executive Order established a goal to achieve carbon neutrality by no later than 2045 and to be consistent with State and federal law.

Unfortunately, the draft Scoping Plan fails to address how mandated emission reductions will be achieved to comply with the 1997 8-hour ozone standard in 2023, as required by federal law. The Scoping Plan needs to provide mobile source emission reductions using all available options to achieve federal air quality standards by the attainment deadline. Without such a plan, California will be in violation of the Clean Air Act and be subject to stringent enforcement actions, and achieving clean air in sensitive communities will be delayed by years, if not decades.

In conclusion, SCAP supports CASA's comments and respectfully requests that the Board direct staff to work with the wastewater sector to maintain multiple pathways for renewable, no fossil fuel biogas use and to incorporate these pathways into the Scoping Plan.

Thank you very much for your consideration.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Patrick, I have activated your microphone.

Please unmute and begin.

PATRICK GRIFFITH: Thank you. Good afternoon. I'm Patrick Griffith with the Orange County Sanitation Districts or OC San. OC San provides wastewater services for roughly 2.6 million people in Orange County. OC San operates two wastewater resource recovery facilities. These facilities serve a unique role in the management of community sourced organic waste. By providing essential wastewater treatment services vital to public health, OC San sustainably converts organic solids into renewable, non-fossil, low carbon intensity biogas.

In the spirit of SB 1383 facilities like OC San are best positioned to produce renewable power from community source waste, if given adequate flexibility to match this non-fossil fuel source with appropriate technologies. For example, when wastewater resource recovery plants meet internal power needs from non-fossil biogas, it reduces demand from the grid, lowers greenhouse gas emissions, and strengthens system resiliency. Like our CASA partners, we ask CARB to maintain multiple pathways to ensure the highest and best use of this community-based renewable, non-fossil fuel biogas, and to work these pathways into the scoping plan update.
Please engage with CASA to ensure a successful outcome.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

After James, we'll hear from Catherine Dodd, Jackie Zipkin, Carlos Gutierrez, and Joe Lubas.

James, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you can begin.

JAMES LEACH: Thank you very much, Chair Randolph and Board members. My name is Jim Leach. I'm representing the Santa Margarita Water District. We belong to the California Association of Sanitation Agencies in connection with the wastewater treatment portion of our service to some 200,000 customers in South Orange County.

Our concern today is that there is no mention of establishing or existing long-term beneficial uses of renewable wastewater non-fossil fuel biogas in the draft Scoping Plan update and regulations. This biogas will be generated whether we flush our toilets, collect our sewage or treat our wastewater. As the provider of wastewater collection and treatment, the district is responsible for the managing and elimination of the health and environmental hazards that sewage can pose in a reliable and cost effective manner.
Handled properly, it's a resource that can contribute to the self-sufficiency and resiliency of essential public service. At our main treatment plant, we're putting renewable wastewater derived non-fossil fuel biogas to beneficial use by capturing it and using it to generate electricity on-site. We're also piloting a gasification of solids to produce additional energy and reduce the volume of biosolids going to the landfill.

Regrettably, there is a clear disconnect that remains between the draft Scoping Plan update to achieve carbon neutrality, the regulations and federal legal requirements to achieve nitrogen oxides and ozone reductions. We ask CARB board members to direct staff to work with the wastewater sector to maintain multiple pathways for renewable non-fossil fuel biogas use and incorporate these pathways into the Scoping Plan update.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Catherine, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you begin.

DR. CATHERINE DODD: This is Catherine Dodd. I'm a registered nurse and I'm representing Sonoma, Safe Ag Safe Schools, and Families Advocating for Chemical and Toxics Safety. I first want to just finish the two points
that were not finished by Jane Sellen and Sarah Aird, and that is that we want to remove all implications in the Scoping Plan that climate-smart agriculture practices, including in the modeling, which would -- or will inherently in -- result in pesticide reductions. That's not -- climate-smart practices are not -- when adopted in isolation do not guarantee pesticide decreases.

We also want to insist that there are direct incentives to farmers to reduce pesticides use, especially smaller BIPOC farmers.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of the incredible Native American woman who spoke last in the EJAC section, as well as many of the other comments that have been made. The -- we agree with the Californians for Pesticide Reform recommendations that we need to reduce, in general, synthetic pesticide use by 2030 and accelerate -- and accelerate organic farming. The Scoping Plan could be stronger in that. I testified at each one of the workshops and I've sat through a lot of committee hearings and hope this is reflected in the plan.

Thank you for your time and energy.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Jackie, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

JACKIE ZIPKIN: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph
and members of the Board. My name is Jackie Zipkin and I'm the general manager of the East Bay Dischargers Authority, or EBDA. EBDA is a public joint powers agency that sustainable manages the wastewater discharge of one million residents and businesses in Alameda County for the protection of public health and the San Francisco Bay.

We support CASA's comments and request that the Board direct staff to work collaboratively with the wastewater sector to incorporate solutions in the Scoping Plan update that facilitate resilient wastewater treatment in service of environmental justice.

As you've heard from other commenters, wastewater facilities perform an essential public service. For decades, wastewater professionals have been working to make wastewater treatment more sustainable and resilient. A core component of this evolution is the ability to generate renewable biogas, a sustainable fuel that allows us to generate renewable power or fuel vehicles.

Adding additional organic to pro -- to our process to meet the State's climate goals under SB 1383 is a natural outgrowth of this evolution, but its success depends on having outlets for that biogas. Pipeline injection and hydrogen are worthy goals, but trying to funnel all biogas in those directions is not only impractical, it misses an opportunity.
We've heard a lot from environmental justice advocates today highlighting the need for restorative action for overburdened communities. One of the fastest and most effective ways to reduce emissions in disadvantaged communities without adding any greenhouse gases to the environment is to transition away from fossil fuels to renewable biogas fueled trucks. We urge you to leave this and other options open.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank -- Thank you.

Okay. Carlos, I have activated your microphone.

Please unmute and begin.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Good evening, Chair and members of the Board, Carlos Gutierrez on behalf of the California Dairies, Inc., and its more than 300 family owned and operated member dairies.

California dairies are leading the world in sustainability. Farmers have worked hard to reduce the environmental footprint of livestock by increasing farming efficiency and feed crock yields, improving animal care comfort, nutrition, and implementing the latest sustainable planet-smart practices.

Dairy farms are willing to go above and beyond to partner with the State to achieve these ambitious climate goals and believe that the incentive-based reduction
efforts are working and it's critical that we stay that course.

Funding will also be critical both AMMP and DDRDP to move forward and meet that State's goals. Simply put, the State's goals cannot be met without adjusters. Any additional funding and incentives should focus on the identification of enteric methane solutions and making them commercially available. I would also like to State that adding numbers -- large numbers of additional small pasture-based operations is not a solution. For example, pasture-based dairies along the north coast of California provide an important niche organic market. So widespread adoption is not economically or environmentally feasible.

It is also important to notes that our dairies are not corporate or industrial. They are family owned and operated and have been passed down through generations.

With that, I would just like to thank you, your staff for your continued work on the draft Scoping Plan and we look forward to working with you as this moves forward.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Joe, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you can begin.
JOE LUBAS: Hello. My name is Joe Lubas. I am with Associated Builders and Contractors Northern California Chapter, that's ABC NorCal for short. Our more than 500 members consist of small to large contractors, subcontractors, suppliers, and associates of all trades. ABC NorCal is also committed to training a skilled workforce and we have more than 300 apprentices trained each year.

CARB acknowledges that local government's complimentary authority to restrict greenhouse emissions through -- GHG, through adoption of Reach Codes. Variable and ambitious local Reach Codes result in confusion for industry and may result in building standards being adopted too early without adequate product to support them. The proposed timelines to transition to zero-emission appliances are already aggressive. And by supporting local Reach Code adoption through development of voluntary model building standards such as CALGreen, ordinances adopted even before CARB's proposed dates further exacerbates the problem for the industry.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Then I apologize. We skipped over Andrew Meredith earlier from the in-person commenters. So Andrew go ahead.
ANDREW MEREDITH: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board. Andrew Meredith, the President of the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California, here on behalf of our nearly 500,000 members here in California, including 73,000 registered apprentices, about 70 percent of whom identify as people of color. We appreciate the efforts of staff as it relates to this Scoping plan. We know this has been a long and tedious process, certainly highlighted by some of the antics that you have seen today. This is definitely something that's motivating people to comment and be engaged. We appreciate those efforts.

We don't believe that the proposed plan though embraces all available methods to dealing with climate change in California. Therefore, we must respectfully oppose. We believe that California is not ready for full electrification on the timelines that you all have set forth. Massive generation needs are going to be required by the State of California to meet these goals that we are simply not building today and we haven't been building for decades.

We must embrace all available technologies to deal with this crisis facing humanity. That includes mechanized carbon capture. It includes hydrogen of all colors, pump storage, geothermal, and all available
technologies like offshore and onshore wind. Look no further than water infrastructure in California to look at what a all in on one technology approach does. We invested in the 1970s in a water system designed to capture snowmelt that is not falling in California today. Because we weren't investing in things like rain water recharge, rain water capture, storm diversions, we are dealing with a water crisis. We do not want to be dealing with an energy crisis in the future. I thank you all for your efforts and we respectfully oppose.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Okay. I'm going to turn it back to the Zoom commenters. So next we'll hear from Ryan Kenny, Brittany Benesi, Kristi Shaw, Nancy Cruz, and Danielle Diele.

So Ryan Kenny, I have activated your microphone. Please unmut and you can begin.

RYAN KENNY: Great. Thank you. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. My name is Ryan Kenny with Clean Energy. We're the nation's largest provider of renewable natural gas transportation fuel working to decarbonize heavy-duty transportation. I do want to thank the staff and stakeholders for their time today.

We do support much on the fuel side with -- with
the Scoping Plan. We join our industry colleagues in doing so. We support Alternative Scenario number 3, as well as the focus on needing to reduce short-lived climate pollutants and also continued methane reductions from dairy and livestock operations, as well as landfills.

We do see some need to get better clarity on the use of biomethane especially within the LCFS. We know that that process is underway very soon, but we also are concerned about the end use. And the draft Scoping Plan does mention hard-to-decarbonize sectors, such as marine, aviation, and locomotives, but not heavy-duty transportation.

The Scoping Plan also does not include a near-term focus. And we do believe it should be an option, an alternative included to use low-NOx engines operating on renewable fuels. It's also important to note that the renewable natural gas has a carbon intensity of negative 33.36. And that is not prominent in the end use for heavy-duty transportation in the Scoping Plan.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Brittany, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

BRITTANY BENESI: Thank you, Chair Randolph, members, and staff for the opportunity to provide

The ASPCA respectfully urges the Board to recognize the nexus between climate resilience, community health, and animal welfare within our agriculture sector. It is with a deep appreciation for the complexities of this issue that we highlight the draft's recognition of the role that decreasing overall animal populations must play in the path to climate-smart agriculture. We encourage the Board to pair this with a transition to more pasture-based systems and prescribed grazing, which are also recognized in the draft as important tools for increasing soil carbon sequestration.

Support for this two-pronged approach of incentivizing and accelerating the growth of higher welfare and pasture-based farming in California will not only result in reduced emissions and enhanced climate resilience, but will increase food safety and strengthen public health. We want to emphasize how vital it is that California support its farmers and ranchers as part of this -- as the State embarks on this strategy.

Additionally, we respectfully urge reconsideration of the priority placed on digesters as a methane reduction tool and biomethane gas as a renewable energy source. As noted in the draft, and emphasize by
EJAC, California will not reach its methane reduction targets through improved manure management alone. Incentivizing the development of new anaerobic digesters incentivizes increased consultation and growth of CAFOs increasing source pollution and placing disproportionate public health risks on those communities.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

KRISTI SHAW: Thank you, Chair and Board members for the opportunity to provide comments. I'm Kristi Shaw, Director of Environmental and Regulatory Compliance AgLand Renewables. AgLand is a strong supporter of ARB's efforts (inaudible) by 2045. AgLand converts organic poultry litter into renewable natural gas and the organic controlled release fertilizer, which reduces potent nitrous oxide emissions, where leading policies, such as the Scoping plan and specific ARB program, such as LCFS are a driver of economic development and job creation.

We commend ARB for the inclusion of nitrous oxide emissions as a serious climate threat within the Scoping Plan. ARB's inclusion of nitrous oxide sets a global precedent to increase the focus in climate plans, policies, and actions around the globe.
As ARB moves forward to finalize the plan, a specific suggestion that would provide substantial nitrous oxide emission reductions is for the final version of the plan to identify the LCFS program as a tool to drive nitrous oxide emission reductions via low carbon transportation fuels. In addition, please consider climate-smart agricultural practices to improve farming efficiency and sustainability in the natural and working lands section on croplands, specifically consider including controlled release organic fertilizers, which reduce off-gassing of potent nitrous oxide emissions, as well as reduced nitrate groundwater pollution as a possible strategy.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Nancy, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you can begin.

NANCY CRUZ: (Spoke in Spanish)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Okay. One moment.

(Interpreter communicated in Spanish)

NANCY CRUZ (through interpreter): My name is Nancy Cruz. I'm from San Diego. And I'm going to Alicia Sanchez comments who couldn't be here today.

Good morning. My name is Alicia Sanchez and I'm a resident of National City. I'm a member of ABC 17[SIC]
THE INTERPRETER: ABC 17 -- or excuse me, AB 617.

Interpreter clarification. Thank you.

NANCY CRUZ (through interpreter): My community and I need more -- need more buses which are cleaner and of course run more frequently in our area. It's not right to wait 20 whole years to have clean transportation and clean air. I depend on public transportation every day to go to my job and to do my shopping. We need California to invest more in public transfer -- transport by 2035, making fares cheaper, more accessible, and have run times be more frequent for our community. In fact, we feel that that would improve the number of those who choose to use public transport in California.

We've also tried for years to have diesel trucks removed from our roads. We do so, because they contaminate the air in our community. They pass right next to our schools and right through our residential roads. We would love to see 100 percent electrified vehicles by 2030. And pollution is a tremendous problem that affects not just our health but our vulnerable communities.

And that's why we beg you, please listen to our requests. We believe everybody deserves clean air and a brighter future.
Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

After Danielle, we will hear from Harry Lamba, Armando Marono, Suite 202, Ernesto Arevalo, and Sandy Naranjo.

So Danielle, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you can begin.

DANIELLE DIELE: Good afternoon. My name is Danielle Diele with the Agricultural Council of California. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Ag Council represents 15,000 farmers across the state from small farmer-owned businesses to some of the world's best known brands. Although, there are many items to comment on, given the time, I will highlight the following.

First, funding for both digesters and alternative manure management practices is crucial going forward to meet the State's goals. These incentive-based reduction efforts on California family dairy farms work. Simply put, without digesters, the State cannot meet its goals. Lastly on this point, additional funding should be put in place to focus on enteric solutions in making them commercially -- commercially available. Whether it is methane reduction or climate-smart ag programs, a voluntary incentive based approach must be used.

Secondly Ag Council -- Ag Council supports
continued funding of Cap-and-Trade Program as the program solidifies California as a global leader on climate issues. Cap-and-Trade funds critical carbon sequestration efforts on working lands, including the Healthy Soils Program. Cap-and-Trade also improves air quality in our most vulnerable communities through the Food Production Investment Program and the FARMER Program.

Lastly, for all communities, but especially rural communities, grid stability, rising utility costs, equipment availability, and the compliance timeline will present huge Challenges in achieving a goal towards a zero-emission vehicle future. We want to support and emphasize the need for CARB to deliver on its planned strategies -- strategy to incentivize the transition to zero-emission vehicles.

Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Harry, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you can begin.

Harry Lamba.

Okay. Let's go to Armando Marono. Armando, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

ARMANDO MARONO: Hi. I will be reading a comment from a community member who waited seven hours, but had to leave. So this is Elizabeth Chavez' testimony.
Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Elizabeth Chavez and I've been living in Rowland Heights for 11 years. As a transit commuter for six years, I rely on public transportation for school, work, running errands, etcetera. There are so many other folks in my neighborhood who also heavily rely on public transit. Personally, I am not in the financial position to own a car, especially with the cost of insurance, loan payments, permits and more.

We need a fast -- we need fast and frequent electric buses, hence that -- I rode on one -- I road on one and was very pleased with the ride. There were no loud noises when I got off. There were no big clouds of smoke trailing behind.

Our community is asking for public transit funding, so that they can be more frequency, to make the buses more dependable and not have to take so much time out of our day to get to your destination. Most of my destinations take at least 30 minutes to almost an hour each way, and that's not including waiting for the bus, trolley -- riding the bus or trolley, sometimes walking to the next bus trolley stop, then walking to your Destination.

The area my family and I live here in San Diego also has a high cancer risk level due to many sources of
I'm going to wrap it up and get to the ask. We need clean buses to -- that run every 10 minutes, because there are bus routes that drive by houses, apartments, and we don't want to contribute to more pollution. Our health is at stake here. If we want to encourage more people to use transit, we first need to invest in mass transit. CARB can be a leader and double how many people use transit by 2035.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Suite number 202. I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

Okay. Let's move to Ernesto. I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

ERNESTO AREVALO: Good afternoon. My name is Ernesto Arevalo, calling from Ohlone territory in East Oakland, also with CBE. I'm calling in today, because it is important that we set a plan to phase out refineries by 2045. Just in these past two years, Chevron and Richmond have spilled oil into the bay, received 182 notices of violation in 2020, and received 146 in 2021.

Even with existing regulations, policies, and laws, it is taking too long for agencies to coordinate and hold Chevron accountable for past and current harms. We
have to establish ability for agencies to create a plan now, so we can be better prepared to protect frontline communities health and wealth through future transitions, because already transitions are happening in Contra Costa County resulting in job losses.

Carbon capture and sequestration is a climate dead end. That does not address the impacts of refinery closures down the line or the existing need to drastically decrease direct emissions. We need to take strong measures, include phasing out all oil extraction in California by 2035, not granting any more new extraction permits, and we need a just transition that will result in a hundred percent zero-emission truck sales by 2035, increased transit, and provide just transition funding for workers to well paid union jobs.

Growing up near industrial trucking routes in East Oakland, I have asthma. There are times this year when I feared I would take this last breath. And I stayed this long, because I want to live just like everyone else that stopped this process earlier to remind you what is on (inaudible), our lives.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Okay. After Sandy, we will hear from Kathy Kerridge, Katie Donahue-Duran, Robert Apodaca, and Cynthia
Babich.

Sandy, I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

SANDY NARANJO: Greetings, Chair Randolph and members of the California Air Resources Board. My name is Sandy Naranjo and I'd like to speak on the record for my dual roles as the -- as a proud appointed Port Commissioner representing the City of National City for the Port of San Diego and policy advocate for ClimatePlan.

For far too long, communities of color have suffered the brunt of toxic pollution. That is why I am so proud that at the Port of San Diego we adopted the Maritime Clean Air Strategy, also known as MCAS, which outlined strategies centered on promoting health equity for all, which includes the adoption of the 100 percent ZEV role for trucks by 2030.

At the Port, we are ready to move beyond statewide targets and prepare HR transition plans with benchmarks to get us there. It is disappointed to see that the draft Scoping Plan proposes a delay of the phaseout of trucks until 2040 and there's a lack of call for retirement of trucks before the end of their useful life.

Knowing the transportation sector is the largest source of GHG emissions and harmful local air pollution,
we must reduce our VMT by 30 percent in 2035 to promote
the urgent need to decarbonize our transportation sector
and protect our community's health harmed by
transportation pollution.

A 30 percent reduction of VMT in 2035 will
accelerate investments needed to help implement goals
outlined in our California Action Plan for Transportation
Infrastructure, CAPTI. With time working against us on
attacking the climate crisis, I urge you to adopt an
ambitious and aggressive Scoping Plan with recommendations
made by the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee.
These recommendations will complement the Port of San
Diego's MCAS and our statewide transportation plan, CAPTI,
by singling crucial strategies that move us into
implementation.

The current draft Scoping Plan will only
(inaudible) and leave our communities of color to continue
to suffer from constant exposure. Again, I urge your--
understand. I don't know if it's the volume or maybe we could ask folks to slow down just a little bit. I know they're trying to get in the timeframe, but it's hard to understand. I know we wall want to hear everything that people have to say

    BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: We can turn up the room audio a bit.

    BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. Thank you so much.

    BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Okay. Kathy, I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

    KATHY KERRIDGE: Thank you. I'm Kathy Kerridge. I live in Benicia, California, a refiner community. And I'm a member of 350 Bay Area Action.

    Just sitting here at my desk waiting to be heard, there were two fires in my area and there is one up in Vacaville. I looked out, the air -- the whole sunshine was a weird yellow color and there's a big cloud over our house of smoke.

    We need to act fast. It's not even July and we're having fires all over the place. Climate change is upon us. We need to move as aggressively as we can to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions, otherwise we're going to be nearing tipping points. I agree with much of what the environmental justice community said. We need to make
sure that we are using real solutions, that we're not promoting CCS, unless it works. We don't want false solutions. We don't want pipelines shipping dangerous gases.

I also am a little mystified by all the small business owners who think this is going to cost them money. They may need help initially, but ultimately rooftop solar, battery storage, and electric vehicles save you money. And we have a lot of local businesses in our community, or some anyway that have realized this and are saving quite a bit.

The disruption from climate change is going to be much worse than any disruption from CARB's Scoping plans. Please move aggressively.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Katie, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you can begin.

KATIE DONAHUE-DURAN: Good afternoon. Katie Donahue-Duran, Public Affairs Manager with Neste. Neste appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft Scoping Plan. Neste is in the business of combating climate change by developing solutions for the hard to decarbonize heavy transportation sector. We are the world's largest producer of renewable diesel and
sustainable aviation fuel refined from waste and residues. We've often been the largest supplier of renewable diesel in California during the years the LCFS has been in effect and we are proud to have been an essential and reliable partner to you in achieving California’s climate goals to date.

We are here to support and to urge your continued support for a strong LCFS program as a primary method for reducing emissions in the heavy-duty transportation sector. The LCFS program is working for the heavy-duty transportation sector. It is scalable, adapts for new technologies, avoids economic shocks, particularly for small business fleets, reduces pollutant emissions, and has become a model for other jurisdictions.

It is poised to deliver additional GHG and criteria pollutant emission reductions in the near term. The LCFS Program deserves its place as an anchor for the Scoping Plan, one to be supported and expanded by increasing targets and including aviation, rail, and maritime transport, and considering other potential applications like backup generators.

Other jurisdictions are already making improvements to their programs and California needs to keep up. Neste is making significant investments to help the State, cities, and our customers combat climate change.
and create a healthier planet for our children. We look forward to continuing to work with you to do that.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Robert, I've activated your microphone. Please unmute and you can begin.

Robert Apodaca. Okay. Let's try -- I see you've unmuted, Robert. Go ahead.

ROBERT APODACA: Good afternoon. Robert Apodaca, Executive Director of the 200 for Homeownership. Our mission is more homes, less poverty. Spoiler alert. The draft Scoping Plan will worsen our state housing and poverty crisis and worsen racial segregation and the wealth gap. The Bay Area is more segregated today than it was when Dr. King was assassinated.

The draft Scoping Plan includes a statewide housing prescription that conflicts with local -- local general plan housing elements required under the Regional Housing Needs Assessment laws. Housing production goals will not be achieved and again the house crisis will get worse.

The draft Scoping Plan demands that new housing be built only in high frequency public transit corridors. The new construction will displace families by freeways, and essential worker families and even median income
families cannot afford the rent or purchase condominiums. Even the draft Scoping Plan admits that VMT regulations are not working and yet the draft Scoping Plan is increasing the reduction of vehicle miles traveled. More wishful thinking. The draft Scoping Plan will deprive our families of affordable low-emission cars needed to get to work and to take care of families. There are no provisions to subsidize poor families or to purchase an electric vehicle.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

After Cynthia, we will hear from Genevieve Anasalem and then we will turn it back to the in-person commenters.

Cynthia, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you begin.

CYNTHIA BABICH: Thank you. My name is Cynthia Babich and I'm Director of the Del Amo Action Committee. And I'm also the coordinator for the Los Angeles Environmental Justice Network.

I do not support Option 3 that the CARB staff presented today. I do support the recommendations of my EJ colleagues on the Advisory Board and thank them for their hard work and advocacy on our behalf. When I hear Jill Sherman Warne speak for the very important
underrepresented -- underrepresented and underserved population, they must be heard. Rushing along without the benefit of their voice is wrong. Government-to-government conversations with tribes around these issues must be robust and begin now, along with EJ Advisory Committee recommendations.

The Mother Earth is dying. With her, we will die, the human race. Our most overburdened polluted areas are suffering. The writing is on the wall. We cannot continue down our current path. Industry and business's position is misguided. There are no jobs on a dead planet. Life is precious. Our youth are precious and needs protecting.

Act now to work on changes to the plan based on the thoughtful outline provided by the EJ Advisory Committee. Act now before it's too late. Thank you for your time and for listening.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.
Genevieve. I've activated your microphone.
Please unmute and you can begin.

GENEVIEVE ANASALEM: Hello. My name is Genevieve Anasalem. I'm behalf on behalf of the Central California Environmental Justice Network.
I found many people see the climate crisis as the primary issue to solve and see the right to breathe clean
air and drink clean water as secondary issues. I urge a reframing. I urge everyone to see the problems forced upon environmental justice communities not as secondary issues, but as the inciting events. The true reasons behind the climate crisis, because it's not just methane gas from dairies that's the problem. It's industrial scale animal feed lots that pollute our air, water, and climate. And it's not just carbon from smokestacks that's the problem. It's dirty fossil-fueled polluters next to our homes and schools that's the problem. We cannot look at our climate issues in a vacuum, as this leads to false climate solutions that continue to treat EJ communities as sacrifices zones.

Like CCS, carbon capture and storage is more of the same, heavy industrial technology promoted largely by fossil fuel companies that pollutes the air and risks the lives of EJ communities. This is not climate justice. This is not a strategy you want to export to other communities.

A quick note on the Lawrence Livermore Lab comments, the LA Times came out with an article today that found the lab's research was funded by a group with ties that stands to benefit from CCS.

But in conclusion, CCS is an attempt to shortcut the hard work we need to do, sustainable organic farming,
deindustrialization of animal husbandry, aligning the Low Carbon Fuel Standard with our air and equity goals, because it's not climate and then justice. It's climate justice. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Okay. Now, we're going to go to an in-person commenter.

Theodore.

Kinehstan.

KINEHSTAN SARA LEWIS: (Spoke in native language)

I am 16 years old. I am enrolled and descended form the Hoopa Valley Tribe located in Northern California. I am here to represent my people. I am here to remember all of my people from the past, to present, to the future. Today, I have the chance to be heard, so I hope you truly hear me. I hope you truly hear all of us.

For as a 16 year old girl, I shouldn't have to worry about my home's future, my culture's future, my children's future. I shouldn't have to be worrying about losing our ancestral land, because some people don't know how to take care of their surroundings correctly. I don't think you people understand the fear that even the youth have of losing our land once again. Indigenous land in California is definitely being targeted as one of the most exceptional spots to pollution by the State of California.
We have a chance to change that for our future's sake. So I ask that to help change our current situation by planning to direct the State of California to stop pollution at the source, and keep fossil fuel in the ground, where it belongs. You have the responsibility to make our -- you have the responsibility to make a change for our home for the better. Please take this opportunity to do so. The time is now.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

And then the next speaker is Thomas. And for the timer, he'll be doing three minutes. He's speaking on behalf of a group of five.

THOMAS JOSEPH: My name is Thomas Joseph. I'm also Hoopa Valley Tribal member. And I am the carbon pricing educator for Indigenous Environmental Network.

The Board has bo -- has boasted about its consultation with California indigenous peoples. There are no tribes here today, either because they didn't get invited or refused the invitation. Both the reasons show a lack of free prior informed consent, which the United Nations has declared under the rights of indigenous peoples, which California has stated they would oblige with.

....is the bare minimum, the floor. California
should not be setting a standard -- California should be setting a higher standard and leave the minimal actions to countries with dictators. This lie about the Board can't be any further from the truth. And this lie sets a foundation for the credibility of the Scoping Plan. The information given this morning is no more than gaslighting the climate crisis, which we in Indian country are already experiencing, extreme heat waves, low snowpack, and wildfires have already caused havoc in our communities leading to the loss of traditional foods, threatening our ways of being.

An example, the ability to have our ceremonies in a balanced relationship with our lands and waters. This climate crisis is even threatening life today. This will only get worse. Indigenous peoples of California seen firsthand the desecration of our ancestral lands by the Colonial State of California and its extractive and polluting industries.

This state has assumed its jurisdiction on the backs of slaughter of the first nations peoples who have co-managed these lands since time immemorial, co-managed with nature herself. And this is a reciprocal relationship. It has always been vital for think sustainable community to thrive for thousands and thousands of years, like we have. And this baby nation in
its infancy can only dream of that.

These indigenous peoples knew and know the importance of a reciprocal relationship with our Mother Earth and Father Sky. These traditional ecological knowledge is still alive today in our communities. The world is now looking towards our communities for real climate solutions, but these teachings can be extracted like you have with our resources and our bodies. The world wants this balance, which can only be led by indigenous peoples of the globe. The world must understand decolonization, matriation, reconciliation.

This includes land back, and, of course, this also includes water back, and ceremonial items back that are locked up in universities and museums. Indigenous -- indigenous management of these lands will not benefit the most vulnerable people, it will benefit Californians and the humans across the globe as they implement real resolve for climate change and stop the commodification of our Mother Earth.

Now, is the opportunity CARB has to change the destructive legacy by revising the 2022 draft Scoping Plan to stop the release of fossil fuel emissions at source and end carbon neutrality mechanisms that prop up industry scams like carbon capture, technofixes, carbon trading, offsets, hydrogen and bioengineering. These are not real
solutions that will address the climate change at scale and we will all experience the wrath of climate chaos. Our Mother Earth will rebalance herself with or without us.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

(Applause)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: James Wong.

Theo.

And if you see your name on here, go ahead and start making your way to the front.

Dolce?

Jasmine.

JASMINE CUNNINGHAM: I'm a little tired. I'm sure you guys are too. Why don't we just like take a second, take a deep breath, maybe ten seconds, just relax.

Do you guys feel a little bit better?

We can't do that in my community. If you do that outside my house, it's toxic. If you do that outside my kid's school, that is toxic. Hi. My name is Jasmine Cunningham and I live in the City of Fontana. It is a trucking and logistics hub in Southern California. I'm a forensic accountant by trade. And most importantly, I'm a mother of two. I have a five year old and a three year old. My five year old will be graduating high school in 2035. She'll be a sensitive receptor for the entirety of
that time. I'd like you guys to understand that. In 2035, that's when these kids are breathing the most and they are sensitive receptors.

The air quality affects my children, because they are hurting now. Our air is not clean today and we have failed my children already, so we need to step up and make real changes. My kids think I'm a super hero. And as a parent, I am. I have to protect them from so many things, like food shortages become creative dinners, and fuel prices become walking distance to the park and activities at home. I have to make it work. I have to be their super hero, their super mom.

Your super power is up there is you can protect us, the community.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Amparo.

AMPARO MUÑOZ MIRAMONTES: My name is Amparo Miramontes and I too am from Fontana and I brought visual aids. This is my 13 year old Renee Miramontes. And this is my 9 year old Lucas Orion Miramontes.

The reason I brought pillows and pillow cases is because you have no idea how much blood I clean up off of them. You can see blood spots on all of our pillows, because they go to sleep after riding their bikes or
playing with their dogs with nose bleeds, because our
PM2.5 levels are in the 40s. On a great day, they're in
the 20s, maybe 15. You can go outside for a few hours.
And why? Why is it that bad? We have logistical
hubs and we have oceans of warehouses we could put solar
panels on, but we don't, because there's this myth.
There's this myth that we can't forward it, because of
reliability. Reliability is profitability. I'm sure not
everyone knows, but utilities make money on how many
assets they put in. What's why they want 33 more fossil
fueled plants, so they can depreciate those plants over
time and make their money back. We pay for the
reliability. We pay for the maintenance of all of the
fossil fueled infrastructure. Not them, we do. Stop
allowing them to do this to our children.
I literally bought pillows of my kids, because I
don't know -- I don't know if I'm going to wake up one day
and they can't breathe anymore. I have no idea. I sleep
next to them sometimes to wake up them up if they start
choking on their blood. So please do the right thing.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Arleigh -- I'm sorry,
Caroline.
ARLEIGH HITCHCOCK: I'm not Caroline. I'm
Arleigh, is that okay?
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yep, go ahead.
ARLEIGH HITCHCOCK: Oop. Dropped an earring.

Hi. My name is Arleigh Hitchcock. I was born in Long Beach, California, but I live currently in Alaska with -- and I work with Fairbanks Climate Action Coalition. And I'm here today because CARB's compliance offset program that impacts not just California but Alaska and the world.

Carbon offsetting is a false solution that this Board should not be backing. The carbon offset market has existed for over 20 years now and emissions have only gone up during that time. There are 12 Alaskan corporations, including native corporations that California companies have been buying offsets from. Members of these native corporations and being told that they are receiving money because they trees on their land, but aren't being told how long these deals are or how these deals impact land use. These deals have little transparency and takes management of land away from Alaska natives without prior informed consent the opposite of land back.

Carbon offsetting does not compensate for the carbon pollution created by these companies. They are not saving these lands from the same amount of pollution. Market measures are not going to save us, because the market made this problem. It is a tiny Band-Aid on a gaping wound. What we need is a massive shift away from
What I'm hearing today is a false dichotomy of options between a livable plan and people's livelihood. The government has the power and this country has the money for a just transition. Let's make the polluters pay for it. Polluting industries should not benefit from climate policies, communities should.

CARB should hold these companies to actually lower their emissions and not continue to buying into false solutions like carbon offsetting, Cap-and-Trade, green hydrogen, and LNG.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Jason Pfeifle.
Graham.
Kayla.
Oh, you're Graham. Sorry.
REED ADDIS: No, I'm Kayla.
Hi. Chair and members, Reed Addis on behalf of Kayla. We both work with CR&R Environmental Services. (Clears throat) -- excuse me. They're a company based in Southern California focused on both waste and recycling activities. They have one of the largest anaerobic digesters in Northern America -- North America rather. And part of that is because they've been able to partner with the State in developing those facilities to address
our SB 1383 goals.

We are therefore very interested in the Scoping Plan or especially around the short-lived climate pollutants elements. We, in particular, like three pieces of that work, one, related to food waste, two, related to facility expansion and development, and three, the support for market development in the future. These are critical pieces to helping the State address it's short-lived climate pollutants and allows the Scoping Plan to provide real guidance and leadership our industry going forward.

However, I would lie say the one place that we would like some further clarification and that is to make sure that the Scoping Plan is very clear about how SB 1383 can be promoted and harmonized as well with electrification in the transportation sector.

At a minimum, there's some confusion and potential conflicts between how the State is addressing both of those plans. We think the Scoping Plan is a perfect place to create that clarity, so that we know we can continue to invest in SB 1383 grant -- gas and use that in our vehicle fleets.

Thank you very much for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Erin Rodriguez.

Lilia Beceril.
Antonio.

(Interpreter communicating with speaker.)

LILIA BECERIL (through interpreter): Good afternoon, members of the Board. Thank you for waiting for us. And we've come here from very far so that you can hear us. We've come from three hours away and we've been here waiting for eight hours to get your attention. We come from the County of Fresno. And what worries us the most is the pollutants that surround us where we live in our homes. We live in the AB 617 area where the pollutants from all of the heavy vehicles are killing us.

We have close in our area this company that came from Amazon. They were just a few trucks. They were just regular vans that we have larger trucks that transport furniture. I would like for you to consider our households, that even though we are poor, we also pay taxes.

My father passed away approximately six years ago. His lungs basically dried up because of the consequences of the pollution. My mother died of cancer. How many more deaths do you need to consider the families that are left behind? We have children here that are present that suffer from asthma. The other women before me said that they are the future, and they are the future, and so we have to take care of them. Let's not give these
companies anymore opportunities or chances, these companies that are killing us with so many pollutants. They have the money to pay for all of this pollution and we don't have the money to pay for any of the medication. Let's think about our families. Please put yourself in our situation. We ask that you please take us into consideration.

Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. And that was Lilia, correct?

Okay.

Antonio.

(Applause)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So the next couple of speakers are also in this group and they have their own order.

ARACELI SANABRIA (through interpreter): Good afternoon. My name is Araceli Sanabria. We belong to a group called Families in Action. And we come with Leadership Counsel. We are from Fresno from District 5 and we live in Southeast Fresno, where we're surrounded by factories, factories that pollute -- that highly pollute our environment, with all of the trucks that come and go on a daily basis. Also, in the area where we live and where we live on the streets a lot of the young guys, a
lot of the young people will do donuts. They use the streets to do that. And there is dark smoke that will remain for a long time and it smells really bad.

Also, in the morning when we wake up, the smell in the air it's very unpleasant, because of the factories that are around us. I hope that you take into consideration our voices, because I don't think that you're taking our voices into consideration and I think regardless of whether one is rich or poor. We all have the right to have clean air.

Because of this bad environment, my oldest daughter has asthma. And the other three have severe allergies, which is about to turn into asthma. I have to take medication to keep my allergies under control as well. And I don't want to have to keep doing this, because -- because of my age and everything, everything is getting more complicated and I don't want to have to keep doing this.

So I ask you that you end pollution urgently. We want more trees, green areas in our district --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Thank you.

That concludes your time.

ARACELI SANABRIA(through interpreter): -- and no more factories.

Thank you.
(Applause.)

KIMBERLY BECERIL: My name is Kimberly and this is (inaudible). And in this speech we'll be talking about how many chemicals are always destroying our -- our environment and possibly the entire world if we continue like this.

For example, (inaudible) has asthma. It affects it in multiple ways. She can't run as others normally. Plus, from (inaudible) experience, she can't breathe properly and can't catch her breath, not just from her perspective but many other people around the world. Asthma is caused by unhealthy chemicals spreading around. Example, smoke, dust, and many more.

We decided to give this speech today because we felt like this topic has to go around and people need to realize how much it affects us humans with or without asthma. But my question is, if you guys can help us seeing the air pollution, then make it better place.

Thank you.

(Applause)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Maria.

THE INTERPRETER: Chair Randolph, this comment will be in Spanish.

MARIA GASCO (through interpreter): Good afternoon. My name is Maria Gasco. We are here from
Fresno, California. We belong to Families in Action, along with the organization consejo de liderazgo.

We're here to ask you to help us please with the contamination in our area. My little one, the daughter who was here just a few moments ago, she's had asthma since she was four years old. They have to be hospitalized every time air pollution is bad or air quality is bad, sometimes for up to three days at a time. We're here ask you please to help us with the pollution in our area and please help us fix our environment. Please get rid of anything, any type of -- any type of warehouse, business that contaminates our air, and please impose stricter laws, so that those who are contaminating and polluting our air can do it so easily. Please enforce stricter rules on them.

And as Fresno residents, we would love you please take in consideration our needs and our family. We would love to see our children be healthy and not hospitalized quite as often.

Thank you so much.

(Applause)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Cecilia.

CECILIA ALVARADO (through interpreter): Hello. Good afternoon. My name is Cecilia Alvarado. Thank you so much for your (inaudible) or listening to hearing us
out, listening to your (inaudible). I live in an area
affected by AB 617, south of Fresno. And we're here to
let you know that. We also need you, your help. We need
your help (inaudible). Just like you like to be treated
well, we also want to be treated well.

And I'm here to let you know that the area south
of Fresno has a quality of life -- a quality of life
that's very low. We live surrounded by trash and trash,
pollution, and we're here looking -- seeking solutions,
and we hope that you will support us. Just as you're
supporting other projects, please support us to those of
us who live in South Fresno respect your -- we deserve
your respect and we deserve to be valued.

We also pay our taxes. We also count. We are
also people. We need our health to improve. Lately, I
was diagnosed with allergies. And that's horrible. No
one wants to live like that. You have the power. You can
help us. People shouldn't be getting sick. Big business
make money and cost us our health and that's not right.
Thank you.

(Applause)

ESTHER RAMIREZ: Good afternoon or evening. My
name is Esther Ramirez. I'm from Cantua Creek, a rural
community in Fresno County. Members of our community
struggle with vehicle access for their needs. We want to
be a part of a mission -- of an emission-free future. Our community believes in electric cars to help address our immediate transportation access, but we need you to hold polluters accountable and ensure the reduced emissions, specifically in San Joaquin Valley.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK:

LESLIE MARTINEZ: Hi. My name is Leslie Martinez. I'm with Leadership Counsel. I'm going to be speaking on behalf of a resident from Planada who could not be here today. Planada is in Merced County.

My name is David Rodriguez. I reside in Planada, California, which is in Merced County and considered part of the Central Valley. My family moved here in 1960 and I started first grade the same year.

Planada is surrounded by agriculture land and crops. The population is close to 5,000 and the community consists of 98 percent Latinos. While growing up in Planada, we never had any problems with dairy odors. Since the arrival of Hillcrest Dairy, with their 3,000 units, or cows, our community has endured the stench and has complained to our town hall meetings, as well to our Supervisor, who at the time was John Pedrozo. And that is a connecting story as well.

In 2012, the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution
Control Board granted Hillcrest Dairy at PTO with 8,000 cows. After the PTO -- after the permit expired, the dairy was out of compliance with Merced County. A group of Planada residents, including myself attended meetings to complain, but to no avail. The Board granted the dairy access to 8 -- to have 8,000 cows. According to the EPA, 2,000 cows generate more 2,400 pounds of manure daily. The USDA estimates that manure from 200 milking cows produce as much nitrogen as sewage from a community of 5,000 to 10,000 people.

Average drinking water per cow is 23.6 gallons per day. Long story short, people in Planada are really tired of dairies and the dairy digester program LC -- LCFS will continue to perpetuate larger dairies, larger expansions.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Shayda.

SHAYDA AZAMIAN: Thank you. Thank you for your time today and opportunity to comment on this -- on this draft.

Our youth and community members, our commenters today see it the clearest and said it the best. The draft plan is many value decisions wrapped up in one. And sadly, in many cases, we see profits and false industry stability prioritized over human life and community
experience. I'm concerned that this plan is not plausible. With such reliance on emissions displacement from unjust and dubious CCS technologies, with the threat of BECCS reopening biomass plants in the San Joaquin Valley that were already shutdown because communities decided that biomass has no future in their home.

We've submitted comments alongside organizations here which outline a strong start that many strategies CARB should be considering instead. As one example in rural California, it is not logical nor is it scientific that California could achieve its methane reduction targets by allowing livestock methane to go unregulated and uncapped.

But CARB's primary proposed strategy of dealing with livestock methane, dairy digesters, and the production of biomethane are highly polluting to local air and water, in no way address enteric methane emissions, and actually incentivize increased enteric methane emissions. Direct regulation is a sensible policy for ensuring we achieve the livestock methane emissions reductions we know we severely need at this point.

Finally, I ask that this Board understand that feasibility is a policy choice here, but our communities never decided that the environmental racism --

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

Next, we will have Juliette Beck.

ELIZABETH SENA: Good evening. My name is Elizabeth Sena and I will be speaking on behalf of Juliette Beck.

Good evening, Chair, Board members, staff and communities. My name is Elizabeth Sena and I'm with CCAEJ as well as South Fontana Concerned Citizens Coalition. But most importantly, I'm here representing my two daughters back home in Fontana.

I'm here because I believe that a concern without action is just a complaint. But today, myself and hundreds of others took action. I look to change the level of impact to the Scoping plan, a plan that very few people know about, and even less are able to provide input on.

The Scoping Plan essentially creates a solution based on theory, whereas my family and I will be living the suggested solution in practice, even though the plan has a huge consequence for EJ communities like mine.

I reviewed the public health portion of the Scoping Plan and was alarmed when I read that children are more susceptible to environmental pollution because of their ongoing development of their nervous, immune, digestive, and respiratory systems. Since children's
heart rates and respiratory rates are faster than adults, their heart and lungs are being damaged at a higher rate as they're developing.

I encourage you to create a plan as if your own families lived in the communities being negatively impacted. I would ask that you think of your mother, your sister, and even your niece living next to the new gas plants being discussed. The guidelines are set out to -- that you set out to improve down to negatively impact communities like mine, which are currently being hit hard with influx of thousands of warehouses and increased truck traffic.

When you go back to the drawing board, I encourage you to remember there's always room for improvement and we should always select people over profit.

Thank you. Good night.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Marian.

Sam.

C.J.

Halimah.

Jessica Tovan.

Kevin Abernathy.

KEVIN ABERNATHY: Good evening, Chair Randolph,
members of the Board. My name is Kevin Abernathy. I'm the General Manager for Mile Producers Council and also the Vice Chair of Dairy Cares.

California dairy families are very appreciative of the comments from Jared and Karen this morning. And I say that in context from the standpoint that the partnership and the progress that the California Dairy industry has made is one of the most unique success stories that I've had the pleasure of working with the dairy producers in California to help accomplish.

Separating the facts from the falsehoods that we've heard here today, some -- sometimes it's almost outrageous. California dairy families made a commitment to 1383. The current graphs that we have as part of your incentive programs and reductions, there is nothing that even comes remotely close to the success story of methane emissions that are real, quantifiable, and permanent. They're gone.

As we -- as we move for -- as we move closer to climate neutrality, staying this course is going to be one of the key success stories that we can tell the world, and especially the rest of the country as the current administration is moving more and more into agriculture as a solution.

Thank you for your time.
MICHAEL BOCCADORO: Chair Randolph. Michael Boccadoro on behalf of Dairy Cares. Governor Newsom said it very well recently when he said we don't deal in ideology. We deal in reality when it comes to climate change. And he is correct. This is an immense undertaking and we must approach this with real solutions.

California's dairy sector and our dedicated farm families have worked with CARB and CDFA since the passage of 1383. We developed a realistic five point comprehensive strategy, efficiency involving, producing more milk with fewer cows. And one thing I can guarantee you is there will be fewer cows in this state going forward. We've lost a lot of dairies. We're going to lose more and we're seeing a trend of reduced number of cows in the state.

Methane avoidance is a big piece, but digesters are the centerpiece. They're achieving 90 percent of the reductions. I tried to get a chart off your own website passed out that shows dairy methane is by far the leading investment the State is making.

Enteric is the other piece. We heard today that digesters don't reduce enteric emissions. Absolutely true. That's why we're working on feed additives. CDFA just approved one. We hope to implement them quickly.

Two things I can tell you that don't work.
Seventy years ago we had 20,000 dairies in California, small ones, pasture based. Today, we have 1,200. We'll be lucky to have a thousand by 2030. We're not going back 70 years to pasture based dairies. Not going to happen. Thank you. I guess I'll leave it there.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Marlen Garcia.

MARLEN GARCIA: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and mem -- and Board members. I'm Marlen Garcia and a resident of the City of Fontana, which is located in the Inland Empire area of Southern California.

I am here today to address concerns of the current draft of the Scoping plan. As proven by members of EJAC, the very same committee that representatives of the Scoping Plan have claimed to work with, the decarbonization technologies proposed in the plan do not reduce emissions, but instead release more.

Additionally, the current draft and techniques target decarbonization in manners that worsen the environmental inequities that many of us experience today. It is vital to the safety and survival of me and my community members to reorient our decarbonization methods to initiatives that replace and shut down current large industrial emitters.

In terms of my hometown, Fontana, and my neighboring Inland Empire communities, getting this plan
to target the main polluters will bring countless benefits without risking the livelihood of other communities. In the Inland Empire as in many places, there are concerns that targeting our main polluters are industrial -- are industrial warehouses will harm our economy and our labor force. That is not true. Economic scholars from the University of California, Los Angeles have found the workers of warehouses and other industrial polluters in the IE face economic instability.

There are other more renewable, economic, and sustainable jobs, and opportunities to provide to our communities. I urge you to reconsider the current Scoping Plan.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Shari Lynne.

Jacob Mohr.

Amanda Millstein.

Ben.

BEN HAKU: Hello. It's been a good 12 hours. I'm Ben Haku, Board members. I'm a lifelong resident of Fontana. And as you've heard from my other neighbors, we are at the epicenter of a horrible warehouse takeover, I guess. We have this silvery gossamer that hangs over our city, our entire empire, and it gets so harsh sometimes
that when the sun is setting, the sky gets this really shiny silvery tone to it. And if you're sensitive enough, you kind of get snow blind. It's disgusting. And the only place I've ever seen it is at home. We were leaving this morning on the plane and as the plane was ascending into the sky, you could see the blanket over the empire. And it really, really made me think about this meeting, this is -- this conference, because I've never actually seen that blanket from that position and it was disgusting. We have refineries in the city over -- you know, in Colton. We have tons of -- we have thousands of trucks daily. It's disgusting. We really, really need to focus on fixing this and getting to zero emissions as soon as possible, because we have no time to wait. Climate change is here.

Thank you.

(Applause)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

All right, Sheila.

Cory.

Susie.

SUSIE BERLIN: Good afternoon. My name is Susie Berlin and I'm speaking on half of the Northern California Power Agency, whose members are publicly owned utilities, and the Golden State Power Cooperative who represent the
state's rural electric cooperatives. POUs and co-ops are not for profit community owned utilities that provide electricity at cost to their customers. NCPA and GSPC utilities appreciate the work done by CARB and by the EJAC and support the State's environmental objectives and we're committed to doing our part in that effort.

However, we urge CARB to address two key shortcomings in the draft Scoping Plan, reliability of the electricity grid and affordability of electricity. First, the electric grid must be reliable. We appreciate the widespread recognition this morning from the agency leaders about the importance for reliability. However, as proposed, the preferred scenario did not do enough to ensure reliability and we respectfully disagree with those that say CARB's role is not to ensure electricity reliability. Without reliability, the Scoping Plan cannot be a successful plan.

Accelerating the target to anything earlier than 2045 is not feasible and presents a significant risk to grid reliability. Second, electricity rates must be affordable. The cost of electrification and decarbonization will result in electricity rate increases borne by utility customers. Accelerating the decarbonization target date will only increase energy costs, further exacerbating the affordability crisis that
the CPUC has already identified. It is not tenable or feasible for electricity customers to bear this cost.

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

SUSIE BERLIN: Thank you.

O. Nicolas.
Che.
Charley.
William.
Ivan.
Olivia.
Maria.
Anaya.
Philip.
Luis.
John.
Teresa.
Dejonae.
Oh, sorry.

JOHN WHITE: Thank you, Madam Chair and Board members. I'm John White with Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies. This -- it's been a long day. There's lots of information to absorb. I want to make a couple of points that I think are significant and worth
First of all, we need much more transparency on the modeling assumptions and the emission assumptions. Our inventories are -- often it takes two years to find out what the actual emissions are, and the modeling is often wrong. Emissions are higher than the models assume, actual emissions. Gas plants are running up and down, lots of starts and stops. So we need to understand where we're starting from and be realistic.

Second, the E3 RESOLVE modeling is deeply flawed and inconsistent with other modeling that's been done, particularly at the California Energy Commission with their starting point analysis, which builds off of other issues that need to be considered in the modeling. The key difference with the E3 model is that it's a capacity expansion model, not a production cost model, so it's relatively indifferent to the price of natural gas.

I have a chart I forget to bring with me that compares that falling costs of solar, and wind, and storage with the spiking cost in natural gas. So the idea that's Scenario 3 is less costly than accelerated clean energy is not true and it's -- and it's a very important change to make.

Third, we need a realistic and detailed plan for 2030. After 2030, there's eight pages in the Scoping
Plan. We need a much more detailed plan, because 40 percent is a statutory requirement and yet, there's very little guidance there. And then third, I think you need to take a look at the LCFS.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

JOHN WHITE: -- for the (inaudible)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Next speaker is Teresa.

And Dejonae.

Kat Ramios.

Evelyn.

Francis.

FRANCIS MACIAS: Good evening. My name is Francis Macias. I was born and raised in Fresno, California, and spent my summers in Dinuba, California. These places are already impacted by pollution, high asthma rates, and extreme heat waves.

There are scientists that estimate that without the rapid reduction of carbon emissions by 20 -- by 50 percent by 2030, that by 2050 our home will become unlivable. They estimate that a sizable portion of the globe will become so hot that people will be committing suicide by the millions. I don't know about you guys, but that to me is terrifying.

I urge you to reconsider your climate Scoping
Plan and begin the rapid reduction of fossil fuels immediately.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Lambert.

Laura.

LAURA ROSENBERGER HAIDER: The Greyhound bus was three and a half hours late and the 12 midnight bus was full.

Let's see, so greenhouse emissions need to decrease 40 percent of by 2030. Give more incentives and require all electric appliances and heat pumps for new buildings and homes, and when replacements or renovations are done, replace gas power with wind power, and solar power battery storage using -- and also green hydrogen power plants using water electrolysis.

The problem with gas plants is the need for Aliso Canyon natural gas storage, which is on an earthquake fault and it could be damaged by and earthquake and create an explosion eight times worse than what happened in 2015 and that put uranium in people's hair.

All right. Natural gas -- all right, Blade Energy Partners report on the root causes of Aliso Canyon disaster found out that Aliso Canyon storage wells had numerous casing leaks. Forty percent of the gas storage
wells they reviewed has casing failure an average of two per well. And also, in California, there's a large number of home gas heaters that leak methane from the pipe near the meter. And all cities had Higher rates of methane leakage.

Researchers from the Laboratory of Climate and Environmental Sciences in France over two years found more than 1,800 large bursts of methane worldwide, including the U.S. often releasing several tons of methane per hour, from a satellite. And then also in 2020 Plum borough, outside Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where oil waste water classified as hazardous radioactive waste was ejected into sand (inaudible) --

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

LAURA ROSENBERGER HAIDER: -- noticed the color and taste of their water change.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Chair, now, we'll transition to -- that concludes our in-person commenters, so we will transition back to Zoom.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Okay. So the next few commenters in Zoom are going to be Daniel Chandler, Julia May, Michael Carroll, Ruth Ivory-More.

Daniel, I've activated your microphone. Please
unmute and begin.

DANIEL CHANDLER: Good evening, Board members. Thank you for this opportunity. I'm Daniel Chandler representing 350 Humboldt climate action group.

What the Board decides about this Scoping Plan could be a tipping point in leading the way for developed countries to take 1.5 degrees Celsius seriously. The draft plan is well done, but Alternative 3 is the wrong choice. It should be a modified Alternative 1. Here's why. The IPCC has determined that the carbon budget we have left, if we want to meet that 1.5 Celsius goal, is only 11 years from now. So all our efforts should be on 2030 rather than 2045.

The most important thing we can do to slow warming is to eliminate high global warming potential gases, namely methane and HFCs. And the plan is very inadequate on that.

Alternative 1 was not chosen primarily because of the higher up-front cost, but analyses published in Nature and by the IPCC show that reducing fossil air pollution has health benefits that immediately makes up more -- makes -- more than make up for the cost of decarbonization.

We also support the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee proposals on specific sector issues.
Thank you very much. Inspire the world.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Julia, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you can begin.

JULIA MAY: Julia May, Senior Scientist, Communities for a Better Environment.

Your staff stated refineries are difficult to decarbonize. In fact, they're impossible to decarbonize. California refineries are not small. Many take up thousands of acres with statewide hundreds of massive heaters and boilers, each one as big as a house, each burning millions of BTUs per hour of fossil fuels. Only a small portion of CO2 can be captured at refineries, which are not, in any way, comparable to the small CCS systems.

CCS can't address thousands of fugitive leaks, explosion hazards, nor carcinogens either. Meanwhile, California refineries are allowed to export gasoline and diesel out of the state and country and plan to do more of that. So nothing in the plan requires any refinery phaseout. In fact, CCS encourages long-term refining and greenwashing.

Earlier statements about carbon capture's necessity for climate goals has nothing to do with adding refinery CCS. Global findings instead show it's necessary to take carbon out of the air, because there's so much in
it now, we're in code red for climate. That's completely
different from putting highly subsidized, poorly
operating, dangerous, and currently unavailable CCS on oil
refineries to allow them to continue polluting.

We're not asking for much, just add an action to
Table 2.2 to start next year on a plan to phase out
refineries by 2045 with a just transition fund for oil
wells.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.
Michael, I've activated your microphone. Please
unmute and begin.

MICHAEL CARROLL: Thank you. Michael Carroll
with Latham and Watkins, LLP. And I'm speaking on behalf
of the California Coalition for Climate Ambition, which is
a broad-based coalition of Cap-and-Trade stakeholders
including both covered entities and financial investors.

My comments this evening are directed at the
discussion of the Cap-and-Trade Program in the draft
Scoping Plan and want to make three points specifically.
The first is how effective the Cap-and-Trade Program has
been to date. The Cap-and-Trade Program's design allows
for predictable and stable decline in emissions, such that
even the most ambitious emission reduction targets can be
achieved. It's the most cost effective way to reduce
emissions, which translates to lower cost to consumers of goods and services supplied by compliance entities. To date, the Cap-and-Trade Program has generated over $20 billion to be put to work reducing GHG emissions, strengthening the California economy, and improving public health.

The second point is the role the Cap-and-Trade Program plays in advancing environmental justice. In 2021 alone more than $1 billion in funding was directed to projects benefiting disadvantaged communities and low-income communities and households. According to a recent report by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, facilities subject to the Cap-and-Trade program has reduced emissions of co-pollutants. These emission reductions have major health benefits, including a reduction of premature pollution and related deaths. The greatest beneficiaries of reduced emissions from facilities are those in communities of color.

And finally, the third point is the need for certainty. Increased certainty regarding the Cap-and-Trade Program will drive further capital investments in California including physical projects that reduce carbon emissions. Examples of ways to increase certainly would be to support using Cap-and-Trade beyond...
2030 preferably in workhorse role and clarifying any future rulemakings.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

MICHAEL CARROLL: Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: That concludes your time. Our next speaker will be Ruth Ivory-Moore. You may unmute and begin.

Ruth, are you there?

RUTH IVORY-MOORE: I just had a problem unmuting.

Hi. Ruth Ivory-Moore representing the Global CCS Institute, a national think tank dedicated to (inaudible) the deployment of CCS, vital technology to (inaudible) institute all unparalleled expertise across all aspects of CCS deployment.

My comments focus on CCS misinformation. For more -- we will submit more in-depth written comments later.

The Institute applauds the -- CARB's recognition that acceleration of stable CCS deployment is critical for reaching carbon neutrality. All the components of CCS chain deploy proven technology that have been used for decades in commercial steel. Bases on the Institute's internal estimation, around 300 million tons of CCS have been captured and injected underground around the world in different ways.
CCS is safe, transported in the U.S. with zero fatalities over a 50-year history. The cost is declining. The IPCC found that on average 130 percent more expensive the -- to reach global climate goals without the use of CCS. CCS is a necessarily tool to decarbonize sectors. The IPC[SIC] and IEA both agree that CCS is the only option for decarbonizing several non-energy sectors such as cement, steel, chemical, and fertilizer production.

In closing, CCS is critical. We must deploy it. CCS is a proven technology. The cause for deployment is declining. CO2 is safe. We must dispel misinformation and rely on the size and evidence advised for operating facilities. (Inaudible) depend on what we do.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

RUTH IVORY-MOORE: Community engagement is a must. Thank you.

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

Our next speakers will be Sydney Chamberlin, Lisa Danz, and Baani.

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

SYDNEY CHAMBERLIN: Thank you. Good evening, Chair Randolph, members of the Board, and CARB staff. My name is Sydney Chamberlin and I'm with The Nature
Conservancy. We'd like to extend our thanks to you and your staff for your work on this draft plan, which is an important first step in creating a climate future where Californians can not only survive, but also thrive. The Nature Conservancy is pleased to see that CARB has included in its draft plan for the very first time extensive modeling and scenario development for the natural and working lands sector.

This is the first and only time any government in the U.S. has worked to include the sector in its climate planning to this degree and its critical for climate action, not only because of the carbon benefits our natural and working lands offer, but also because of the many other services they provide. Without ambitious action now, we risk losing these many benefits.

In light of this, it's critical that the final plan more clearly articulate how this sector can contribute to emissions reductions, including through its proposed target and how this target compares to a business-as-usual scenario.

The narrative in this plan should make clear that the target presented seeks to balance the carbon tradeoffs that arise from the near-term action that is needed to improve ecosystem health now and that will foster longer term beneficial outcomes for our lands.
Additionally, in terms of modeling for this sector, though the plan proposes some ambitious actions for some of California's landscapes, there's also room for continued refinement. We recommend that CARB continue to work with stakeholders to update the modeling in the plan prior to its adoption at the end of the year.

We also recommend that within the next year, CARB convene a group of experts for the natural and working lands sector to review these updates and help identify pathways for implementation. We appreciate the opportunity to comment and we'll be sharing more detailed recommendations in writing.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Lisa Danz, you may unmute and begin.

LISA DANZ: Hello and thank you. My name is Lisa Danz. I live on a unceded Ohlone land in the area now known as Fremont, California.

I want to appreciate the hard work of the Board, staff, and the EJAC. We all share the same goal of achieving a livable future. To that end, I do believe the plan needs to be stronger. You've said a lot about protecting environmental justice communities. If you're really committed to that, then you'll implement the changes that they've demanded.
A key area of concern is carbon capture and storage and carbon dioxide removal. Chair Randolph said this morning that we need an all-hands on deck approach. Now, that is true. The IPCC has said that the deployment of CDR to counterbalance hard-to-abate residual emissions is unavoidable if net zero CO2 or greenhouse gas emissions are to be achieved.

However, the key point here is that CDR is inevitable in addition to doing all that we possibly can to abate emissions. A true all-of-the-above approach would maximally reduce emissions as Alternative 1 proposes.

I'd also like to talk quickly about transit, the imbalance between public funds that are invested in roads versus mass transit is part of what keeps us relying on cars. We need to reverse that trend and make the corresponding land-use decisions that support mass transit, such as a higher density housing and limiting urban sprawl.

California is in a unique position of being a wealthy state with high political will for climate action. We have to lead.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Next is Baani. I've activated your microphone.
You can unmute and begin.

BAANI BEHNIWAL: Hi. Thank you, Chair Randolph, members, and agency staff. My name is Baani Behniwal with The Climate Center. First and foremost, we appreciate the immense effort that went into the draft of this Scoping Plan but is far less ambitious than the science calls for in order to secure a stable climate. We must reach carbon neutrality by at least 2035 not 2045.

While we are happy to see the inclusion of natural and working lands in the Scoping Plan, if fails to realize the immense potential of sequestration in this sector, which is backed up by numerous peer-reviewed studies. It has been found that California's working and urban lands alone have the potential to sequester over 100 million metric tons of carbon every year.

The Scoping Plan, however, grossly undervalues these solutions that are not only proven and scalable, but provide a whole host of ecological and economic co-benefits. Instead, we are disappointed to see the heavy reliance on CCS technologies that allow the state to continue burning fossil fuels, while ignoring the needs of communities that have been made to bear the brunt of the pollution we see today.

For these reasons, we urge the agency to assemble a Science Advisory Committee to reevaluate the findings.
from the natural and working lands sector. Before finalizing the Scoping Plan. In addition, the Scoping Plan as it does -- as it is does not take advantage of the economic opportunities in the clean energy sector, especially now that it is cheaper to build large scale renewable energy projects than it is to operate existing fossil fuel plants.

Widespread deployment of distributed energy resources at the local level must also be considered as a strategy to meet our collective goals, (inaudible) reduction, community resiliency, and equity.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speakers will be Bill La Marr, Time Carmichael, Andrea Cao, and Andrew Westgate.

Bill, I will activate your microphone. You can unmute and begin.

BILL LA MARR: Good afternoon, Board members. I'm Bill La Marr. I'm the Executive Director of the California Alliance of Small Business Associations representing 14,000 businesses throughout the state.

A number of speakers have urged you to be more aggressive in eliminating the causes of global warming. They point accusatory figures at industries that enabled us to live up to our name sake, the Golden State, but no
one thought to mention the three main factors that contribute to unhealthy levels of pollution, which are the activities of over 39 million people, a mountainous terrain that traps pollution, and a warm climate that helps form ozone and other pollutants, and only one of those is within your purview to mitigate.

California needs a Scoping Plan that is thoughtful, affordable, reliable, and equitable. We don't need more businesses moving their headquarters and entire operations out of state. Your current plan might reduce ozone levels to some degree, but it's certain to drive up prices, eliminate consumer choices over where we can live, the kind of cars we can drive, how we can cook our food, and how we can run our businesses.

Alliance members want to work with your staff on a plan that embraces carbon removal with technologies that reduce emissions without requiring us to abandon all energy sources other than electric.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Tim, you can unmute and begin.

TIM CARMICHAEL: Good evening, Board members.

Can you hear me?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can.

TIM CARMICHAEL: Hi. So Tim Carmichael speaking
on behalf of SoCalGas. Thank you very much for your stamina today. We also greatly appreciate the time and effort the CARB staff have put into this plan. SoCalGas is one of California's leading energy infrastructure companies, and we strongly support the State's greenhouse gas emission reduction goals.

I want to make three points related to the plan. Given the scale of transformation this Scoping Plan envisions between now and 2045, California must use all the tools available, including low carbon fuels like hydrogen and renewable natural gas for electricity generation and for transportation; continuation of programs that are working, such as the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, such as Cap-and-Trade, and public incentive funding; and new efforts such as carbon capture utilization and sequestration.

We strongly agree with the comments made by CARB staff, CEC Vice Chair Gunda, and CalEPA Secretary Blumenfeld. California cannot achieve our climate and clean energy goals if we can't figure out how to site, permit, and build clean energy and clean transportation infrastructure more quickly. As the EJ representatives accurately pointed out, community members have to be engaged in that process.

Finally, the industrial sector is an important
part of the California economy, our workforce, and decarbonization strategy. Many in that sector are keen to transition to low carbon fuels and technologies. We recommend that CARB establish an industrial --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

TIM CARMICHAEL: -- clean fuel standard to implement a decreasing --

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

Next, will be Andrea Cao. Andrea you can unmute and begin.

ANDREA CAO: Hello, Chair Randolph, members of the Board, and staff. My name is Andrea Cao, Public Policy Manager for the California Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce and we represent over 600,000 Asian American and Pacific Islander owned businesses in the state of California.

We believe this plan creates major inequities because of the lack of affordability and increased utility rates across the state. By their own modeling, the Scoping Plan will lead to at least 80,000 job losses and $18 billion in taxpayer costs. Our organization encourages this Board to find a better balance between technology and affordability, rather than push mandates that take the choice away from Californians and add extra
burdens on the thousands of AAPI-owned businesses we represent.

The Scoping Plan clearly only focuses on one technology, electrification, which has proven to be costly and less reliable.

Thank you for your time today.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Okay. Our next speaker will be Andrew Westgate. After Andrew will be Todd Campbell, Anthony Budicin, and then a phone number ending in 175, and then Alicia Rivera.

So Andrew, you can unmute and begin.

ANDREW WESTGATE: Thank you. Andrew Westgate for Clear Sky Advisers. Clear Sky is an investment manager focusing on sustainability and climate-related investments, including allowances in the Cap-and-Trade Program.

We believe Cap-and-Trade plays an indispensable role in achieving California's ambitious climate goals and urges the Board to protect and expand that role. Cap-and-Trade has a broader reach than any other climate program in California and imposes steep emission reductions on 80 percent of the state's economy efficiently through market forces. It also brings additional investor capital to the state and has generated $10.5 billion for the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund to
support additional climate and environmental justice programs.

California Cap-and-Trade has been an influential model nationally and globally and is widely considered one of the best run emissions trading systems in the world.

We respectfully -- respectfully offer three suggestions for the Board to consider. First, support extension of the program through 2045, preferably in a central role. Second, provide greater transparency and clarity regarding the timing and scope of future rulemakings. Third, continue to support the participation of investors and other market participants in the program.

Thank you and good evening.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you so much.
Todd Campbell, you can unmute and begin.

TODD CAMPBELL: Can you hear me?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can.

TODD CAMPBELL: Great. First of all, I want to thank every Board member who has suffered throughout the entire day listening to many of us. And it is an honor and a privilege to be able to comment on, you know, this plan and for you to like, you know, take our input.

I just want to remind everybody that, you know, we are all, despite like what various stakeholders want to pit us against, we're all in this together. We all want
to move to zero-emission technology. And what I'm very proud about with our industry is that we can move towards zero-emission. What I think is really important for everyone to understand is we need performance metrics when it comes to the Scoping Plan. We need to be able to have competition. We need to be able to embrace the ability to compete against one another. And I think that's how we achieve carbon neutrality in 2045, if not sooner.

So my bottom line to you is I appreciate the hard work that staff has put together. We support the Scoping Plan that has been pulled together. We also would like to encourage you to --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
TODD CAMPBELL: -- embrace near-term emission reduction solutions sooner --
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. That concludes your time.
TODD CAMPBELL: -- with low-NOx (inaudible)
Thank you.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Next is Anthony Budicin. You can unmute and begin.
ANTHONY BUDICIN: Hello. My name is Anthony Budicin. I work for Western Municipal Water District, a public agency who serves nearly one million people across 527 square miles in western Riverside County located in
Southern California. We provide wastewater, drinking water, and recycled water services. Western operates two wastewater treatment facilities with participation and conveyance to a third wastewater treatment facility. Renewable biogas produced from the wastewater treatment plant processes is an energy source that, if not utilized, would be wasted.

This energy source will be produced no matter what, because we all need to flush our toilets, generating wastewater that must be treated which then produces biogas. Western asks CARB Board members to direct staff to work with the wastewater sector to maintain multiple pathways for biogas use and incorporate these pathways into the Scoping Plan update.

We also support SCAP and CASA's comments today and ask the Board to consider CASA's written detailed comments they will by submit. Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

All right. Next, we will have a phone number ending in 175. I will ask that you state your name for the record before you begin and then I will announce when you have 30 seconds left and when your time is up.

You should have a prompt to unmute.

STEVEN ROSENBLUM: Hello. My name is a Steven Rosenblum. Can you hear me?
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can.

STEVEN ROSENBLUM: Okay. Yeah. I'm a resident of Palo Alto. And I represent 350 Silicon Valley, which has 5,000 members in the San Francisco Bay Area and we will be submitting detailed comments on the Scoping Plan. I'd like to first thank Secretary Jared Blumenfeld for his inspirational speech at the beginning and to thank the EJAC members for their trenching criticism of the plan.

They covered most of the deficiencies that we will be talking about. According to the IPCC AR6 report, we have -- we must take action on the climate emergency immediately. If our State is burning down during fire season, we don't argue over the cost of the fire equipment and manpower to put out the blaze. But this is exactly what the 2022 Scoping Plan does by emphasizing economic feasibility over the economic -- over the climate necessity of fighting disaster.

Chair Randolph's optimistic view of the efficacy of the Scoping Plan is unjustified. Firstly, the plan does not follow AB 32's requirement that California achieve the maximum technologically feasible emissions reductions using the most cost effective methods.

Secondly, the draft plan will not keep global temperatures close to what scientists say will avoid catastrophe.
Thirdly, the plan only aims for an 80 percent reduction in emissions by 2045.

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

STEVEN ROSENBLUM: Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Next will be Alicia Rivera. You may unmute and begin.

ALICIA RIVERA: My name is Alicia Rivera. I'm a Wilmington community organizer with Communities for a Better Environment, CBE.

Wilmington has the highest concentration of oil refineries on the west coast. I urge you to add a plan to begin phaseout of oil refineries. An analysis by the South Coast Air Quality Management District recently found that without a transition to zero-emission non-carbon energy for both industry and transportation, we cannot meet Clean Air Act health standards. This means we need a broad phaseout of fossil fuels in the region.

At the same time, you're considering a plan to address climate change and greenhouse gases. They come mostly from the same industries and transportation sources that cause smoke. We can't solve smoke or climate change without phasing out fossil fuels including oil refineries, which directly pollute and which make the gasoline and diesel. These are all connected.
This draft Scoping Plan doesn't include any plan to start a phaseout of refineries. It chose to do CCS as the only method to reduce greenhouse, despite this project being non-existent at refineries and without any precedent for its viability. They are only being used at CCS refinery projects around the globe. This is continuing experimentation such as the failed Cap-and-Trade and the failed reclaim that made frontline communities into sacrifice zones.

Please start a plan for refineries now.

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

Our next speakers will be Victoria Rodriguez, Chuck Mills, Matt Haynie, and then Sasan Saadat.

And so, Victoria, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute and begin.

VICTORIA RODRIGUEZ: Good evening, Chair Randolph and CARB Board members. My name is Victoria Rodriguez and I'm here on behalf of WM, previously Waste Management, to speak in support of the 2022 draft Scoping Plan.

We appreciate the efforts the CARB Board staff put into the draft and we are supportive of the proposed scenario overall. WM would like to highlight a few points for the Board to consider when considering the final Scoping Plan. We strongly feel that the timeline for
carbon neutrality must aim for no earlier than 2045 as recommended in the proposed scenario to provide time for California to build out infrastructure and ensure that the necessary technology to make this transition is widely available.

We are very supportive of displacing fossil fuels and replacing them with renewable low carbon fuels as we move to carbon neutrality. With such a large need for renewable fuels to use during this transition, WM would like to emphasize that stricter regulation on dairy methane projects within programs like the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, which have been extremely successful, would be catastrophic to the this transition.

Finally, industry needs more clarity on SB 1383 implementation and WM would strongly recommend that CARB, in consultation with CalRecycle, take a look at the feasibility of SB 1383 implementation as the regulations are currently written. In order to incentivize the scale of additional landfill and dairy RNG projects called for in the draft, CARB must continue to engage in robust stakeholder discussions on SB1383 compliance.

WM would again like to thank the CARB staff for their hard work on the draft and we would welcome the opportunity to meet with CARB staff to discuss these important issues. We're happy to be a resources in any
Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Chuck, you can unmute and begin.

CHUCK MILLS: Thank you. Good evening, Chuck Mills. I'm a Senior Grants Administration for TreePeople. I want to acknowledge the time and effort staff have put into evaluating the role or natural and working lands in the draft to 2022 Scoping Plan and urge CARB to return to the proverbial drawing board on this subject. When CARB released its 2017 Scoping plan and encouraged Californians to look to the future and alluded to statewide emission projections that would support natural and working lands achieving statewide way goals of at least 15 to 20 million metric tons carbon equivalent emissions sequestered and avoided by 2030.

The question is what happened? For example, the 2022 draft plan notes 600,000 metric tons carbon equivalent and net sequestration may be possible from increases in urban forestry by 2030. However, the state's 2018 forest carbon plan cited peer reviewed data that asserts the amount of carbon dioxide sequestered by urban forests was estimated to be almost two million metric tons of carbon per year and another 0.4 million metric tons of carbon per year avoided due to modeled reductions in
billed energy use.

Therefore, the draft Scoping Plan projects a 75 percent reduction in annual sequestration rates from urban forests in comparison, while receiving a 20 percent increase above business-as-usual investments. Consequently, I want to align TreePeople with Ms. Merrill's and Ms. Chamberlin's call for CARB to convene a Scientific Advisory Group composed of external experts in modeling for the NWL sector and aim for more ambitious targets.

Finally, I want to commend the tremendous work of the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, which has consistently been a voice for underserved communities throughout this process.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Matt Haynie.

MATT HAYNIE: Good evening, Chair Randolph, Board members, Board staff. My name is Matt Haynie and I'm with POET, the world's largest producer of plant-based biofuels. Thank you to the Board and staff for your hard work on this plan and for the opportunity to provide oral comments.

Today, I'd like to emphasize a few points about the importance of biofuels in meeting California's climate
goals. And POET strongly supports the State's efforts to lower carbon emissions and address climate change. Biofuels, including plant-based bioethanol present and immediate opportunity to reduce the carbon intensity of California's transportation sector.

Recent research shows that the carbon intensity of bioethanol is 46 percent lower than gasoline. In addition, an increased bioethanol blend reduced tailpipe emissions of key pollutants which can improve air quality in vulnerable communities across California.

To that end, we strongly encourage CARB to make increased bioethanol blends part of the ClimatePlan. More -- most immediately, California can join almost every other jurisdiction in the country by allowing the sale of gasoline blended with 15 percent bioethanol known as E15. That change would be a significant step towards lowering the carbon intensity for the liquid fuel vehicles that make up the current fleet and that will continue to be on the road for many years.

POET also encourages CARB -- encourages CARB to consider options in the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to incentivize practices that lower the carbon intensity of renewable fuel production. For example, we encourage CARB to adopt incentives for farmers who use climate-smart production practices and technology, such as improved
fertilizer use that reduces nitrogen emissions. These incentives could further reduce the carbon intensity of biofuels and serve as the model for carbon reductions in other industries and states.

Thank you again for your work. POET stands ready to help support this critical effort.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. Our next speaker is Sasan Saadat. And then after Sasan will be Catalina, Hari -- or Catalina Gonzalez, Hari Lamba and Jon Ullman.

And Sasan, you can unmute and begin.

SASAN SAADAT: Thank you so much. Sasan with Earthjustice. Thank you so much Board members for staying so long and listening and to all the advocates who turned out to speak, and, you know, stayed on the whole time. I just want to call attention to a couple problems. I think the comments have already been really effective.

But I want to highlight Gavin Newsom's words, a direct quote from his letter to you all to CARB saying that we must do everything possible to accelerate our climate targets and increase the pace of action to transition to a low carbon future after the Dixie Fire. So does this plan accelerate any of our targets? No. Does it increase the speed of any of our actions to meet those targets? Also, no. And because existing actions
aren't enough to hit our current targets, we rely on the myth that a hundred-fold increase -- sorry, 1000-fold increase in global direct air capture capacity could be achieved in California. Yet, we dismiss the idea that we could triple the pace of California's own solar production.

I really think -- and another thing I need to hit before we move on, comments that were made by Daniel Barad of the Sierra Club. The Mobile Source Strategy needs to be the minimum for the transportation targets. There's actually graphics that CARB has showing arrows pointing from the Mobile Source Strategy to the Scoping Plan saying it's supposed to be the input. And it was the input for Alternative 3 in October. And then that got redlined out sometime in January to align more with the rulemaking process. The rulemakings should not be governing our scientific modeling, so please at a minimum correct those.

Thank you so much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Okay. Next, Catalina Gonzalez. You can unmute and begin.

CATALINA GONZALEZ: Hi, Board. This is Catalina Gonzalez on behalf of the Center for Progressive Reform who is a Research and advocacy organization working across the country to support just climate solutions. We want to
thank CARB leadership and staff for all the work that has gone into the Scoping Plan. We also recognize the incredible work of the EJ Advisory Committee in representing marginalized communities and providing their priorities in their recommendations reflected in the plan. We want to -- we would like to -- we just want to highlight areas where the Scoping Plan could be significantly improved, and we will elaborate these in on comments specific to sectors that we'll submit after this meeting.

We just want to -- I wanted to emphasize something that Chair Blumenfeld mentioned this morning, which is that implementation is going to be very critical to this plan. We feel that the Scoping Plan doesn't sufficiently or with enough detail discuss implementation. And we think that some of the regulations, some of the direction that is going to guide implementation could be strengthened in the plan. So we look forward to providing those recommendations.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Hari, you can unmute and begin.

Hari, are you there?

HARI LAMBA: Hello. Can you hear me?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can.
HARI LAMBA: Yes. This is Hari Lamba. I'm the author of a book called Brighter Climate Futures, which has a dictated plan for zero-emissions plan for California that basically relies on eliminating fossil fuels and getting to -- and using green hydrogen for the remaining uses. I would like to request the CARB Board to consider quantitative reductions in fossil fuels and replacement of fossil fuels in the energy sector and transportation industry and so forth directly, so that we can achieve those emissions reductions.

One point I'd like to leave you with is only two percent of the land area when I look at utility scale systems, only two percent of California's land areas with solar panels can generate all of our energy. So I would urge CARB to be more aggressive in terms of green hydrogen. If green hydrogen can be a good storage medium, then when the sun is not shining and the wind is not blowing, we can have green hydrogen in commercial quantities that can run our grid very reliably. And plus, we should have maybe, you know, 10 million acres of forested land added. Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Next, will be Jon Ullman. You can unmute and begin.

JONATHAN ULLMAN: Hi. My name is Jon Ullman.
I'm the Director of the Sierra Club, Ventura Chapter of Sierra -- Ventura Chapter. I just wanted to say, it's remarkable how the oil and gas industry has mobilized to create this -- this new technology that is going to save the day for their fossil fuel technology. It's like nothing I've ever seen in a short amount of time. So I congratulate all of you. But I think the thing we need to realize is that oil and gas is the problem and burning it is the problem. So the question is, is your plan realistic or is it just part of this new wave of oil and gas startup con -- startup ideas that are basically some kind of grift.

And I'm -- I'm just going to say right now that we have experience in Ventura with a -- with a compressor station that they want to build -- SoCal gas wants to build right across from an elementary school in a mostly Latino area. And they're -- they're not stopping for anything. And one of the reasons they're saying they need to do this is because they would like to increase natural gas into areas of Santa Barbara County and San Luis Obispo county.

Anyway, I encourage you to rethink this because --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. That concludes your time.
JONATHAN ULLMAN: Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: All right. Our next speakers will be Magali Sanchez, and then a username name listed as Suite 202, Paulina Torres, Frank Harris, and Dave Shukla.

Magali, you can unmute and begin.

MAGALI SANCHEZ-HALL: Yes. Hi, everyone. Good afternoon. Good evening. They said that the last ones will be the first. So thank you again for -- I've been here since 9 a.m. And I really, really love the presentation from both groups and the PowerPoint.

I just wanted -- I have a -- I have a request for the Board to consider. And let me just explain who I am. My name is Magali Sanchez-Hall. I'm a resident of Wilmington and I am a member of the CBE And CFASE, which are two environmental justice organizations in our community. I also am founder of EMERGE, which is an environmental and social justice movement.

And one of the things is that what I notice is that the modeling and the scenarios do not include the phasing out of fossil fuel. And I would recommend highly, since I am a public policy -- I hold a master's degree in public policy from Luskin School of Public Affairs, and I understand that you have to consider every option available and scenario. When you do modeling as well, you
have to consider every -- every thing that you can
actually come to the best option, right?

So I am asking you, and if you can, and I would
like to see this in the -- in the Scoping Plan is also to
consider the phasing out of fossil fuel and what would be
scenario. And I think that's when they mentioned that
they -- that we cannot achieve zero-emissions. I think if
you consider that scenario with that modeling, you will
achieve zero emissions.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

The next is the account listed as Suite 202. You
should have a prompt to unmute and please state your name
for the record before you begin.

CAROLINA MARTINEZ: Thank you I'm sorry for the
confusion. Good afternoon. I am Carolina Martinez with
the Environmental Health Coalition. And this is message
on behalf of Roddy Jerome from City Heights in San Diego.
He was on a call, but had to step out.

Roddy shared that in order to breathe better
within the City of San Diego, if he's visiting Barrio
Logan around the port area, City Heights, and downtown, he
needs to bring and use his inhaler or else he has
difficulty breathing, even in San Ysidro. He's asking
CARB to include a plan to phase out all refineries by 2045
and more action towards mass transit, increase service frequency, 24-hour service, and trolley expansion. Roddy explains that carbon capturing is not realistic and is very expensive.

Here's another story from another member that had to step out too. Ashley Valentin Gonzalez was born and raised in Logan Heights in San Diego. Has been riding public transit all her life. Transportation is essential to her community. In Barrio Logan, gentrification is happening, costs are rising. Transit takes away those people had to worry about, but transit is not dependable. Sometimes she spends money on expensive Uber rides, so she loves public transportation, because it allows her to explore the city and the community with other riders. But when the system doesn't work, it's stressful and it discourages people from using it. CARB needs to invest more in mass transit, so that we can double how many people are riding transit by 2035.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

All right. Next, we will hear from Paulina Torres. And Paulina, you can unmute and begin.

Just a moment, I'm trying to give you permission to speak and it's not quite allowing me to. One moment.

Okay. You should be able to unmute now
PAULINA TORRES: Hi. Can you hear me now?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can hear you.

PAULINA TORRES: Okay. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. My name is Paulina Torres, attorney with the Natural Resources Defense Council. And first, I'd like to thank CARB staff and particularly the EJAC for their tireless advocacy on this draft.

As you may know, prior to joining NRDC, I had the privilege of serving on the EJAC and personally share my deep disappointment that this draft ignored so many of the concerns raised by the EJAC from the start of this process. I'd like to point out four overarching deficiencies in the draft. First, the draft fails to outline a strategy to reach California statutorily required 2030 targets while focusing on carbon neutrality by 2045.

While NRDC can appreciate the value and need in planning for long-term climate goals, this has come at the expense of planning for actions now to meet our near-term goal of 2030.

Second, the draft still assumes Cap-and-Trade will close a sizable emissions gap without any meaningful discussion or analysis.

Third, the draft fails to identify actionable
steps to increase the pace of reductions in line with our
GHG targets. Even the column of actions under staff's
proposed scenario merely lists a suite of goals rather
than actual actions. This coupled with a statement in the
draft, and I quote, "This plan is fundamentally based on
hope, highlights the need for actual and concrete
strategies".

Lastly, the draft relies too heavily on carbon
capture awe technologies. And we urge CARB to approach
with caution as these technologies are too costly and
unproven to rely on at this time.

Thank you for your consideration of these
comments.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Okay. Next is Frank Harris. You can unmute and
begin.

FRANK HARRIS: Okay. Very good. Thank you very
much and I am sorry that I missed the opportunity earlier.
My phone died just before you called me.

My name, as you said, is Frank Harris. I'm
speaking on behalf of the California Municipal Utilities
Association, an organization of non-profit, local
government agencies that provide essential public services
including electricity, water, and wastewater services
throughout California.
CMUA agrees that the proposed scenario is the best of the four alternatives for SBU, in terms of energy reliability and affordability. As others have said, electricity reliability and affordability are essential for California to achieve its environmental goal to maintain consumer support for the State's electrification goals. The electric service must remain reliable and affordable. To this end, CMUA encourages CARB to continue to prioritize electricity reliability and affordability.

CMUA's member agencies are also concerned about the continued economic or workplace opportunities provided in California. Many of California's POUs and public water and wastewater agencies serve low-income and disadvantaged communities. We're concerned about the significant loss of jobs forecast as a result of the various scenarios.

For example, Alternative 1 forecasted to cost 385,000 jobs in 2035. Alternative 2 is forecast to cost 270,000 jobs in 2035. Both numbers exceed California's business-as-usual forecast job growth for that year.

CMUA asks CARB to provide more granular data regarding economic and job impacts of model's alternative. It's important -- thank you very much and we'll submit written comments.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

So our final two speakers are Dave Shukla and
then Melissa Traugh. Dave, you can unmute and begin.

DAVE SHUKLA: Hello. Can you hear me?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can.

DAVE SHUKLA: Thank you. Hello. My name is Dave Shukla. And I'm from Long Beach. I was with you in-person until I had to catch my flight back home, where I am now. I'm -- for the past 25 years, since I was 17 years old in 1997, I've been the electricity ratepayer on record at my home, 6333 East Eliot Street located directly across the street from the Alamitos Generating Station 690 North Studebaker Road in Long Beach.

This is a natural gas peaker literally in my backyard. And -- so the 2022 CARB Scoping Plan affects me and my family and our future quite directly and uniquely. The plan, which proposes increasing this form of dirty polluting gas-fired generation by up to 10 gigawatts and also relying for the outputs on disproven and highly energy resource intensive CCS -- CCUS technology, is entirely the wrong direction for the state of California.

And I'll have to give you some specifics in written comment. But I'd like to take this opportunity to not only thank you and the EJAC specifically for the work, but to call on the CARB Board and staff to fully commit the best available science in its modeling, and assumptions, and scenarios, commit to SB 100 and other
legislative implementation with direct emissions reduction and environmental performance impacted standards, and commit to the high DER scenarios in the public process with the Energy Commission, and finally, a full phaseout of all fossil fuel-based generation distribution by 2030.

Thank you so much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our final speaker is Melissa Traugh.

Melissa, you can unmute and begin.

MELISSA TRAUGH: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. My name is Melissa Traugh and I'm here today representing the Central Valley Business Federation, or BizFed, a grassroots alliance of over 75 businesses and organizations representing 30,000 diverse employers and over 400,000 employees in the Central Valley.

At BizFed, we believe that a thriving economy will help solve many of our areas' challenges. We want to express our concern today for the proposed policies that will increase already rising costs for gas, food, and things that we need every single day. In the coming months, you will consider the scenarios and included rules that will limit consumer choice by banning the purchase of traditional cars.

By cars -- CARB's own admission the 2035 ban does
not reflect a market feasibility study, which really means it will further hurt families and businesses to make ends meet. These regulations will hurt the families and businesses that we represent in the pocketbook. We will lose 85,000 jobs that put food on the table every day. Employment and jobs will be affected and the economic output will be stifled when so many are already struggling financially.

The real-life impacts one everyday people will be detrimental, especially to those people in the Central Valley employed by the energy and agricultural industries. We ask that you consider these everyday people and urge you to balance our climate goals with the continually growing cost-of-living nightmare families and businesses are fighting every day.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
And Chair, that concludes the comments with hands before the cutoff this afternoon.
Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you very much. We will now be closing the record on this agenda item for this Board hearing. Tomorrow morning at 8:30, the Board will reconvene and discuss this agenda item.

The official comment period for the environmental
review for this item closes tomorrow at the end of the
day, June 24th, 2022. So written comments can be provided
up until midnight tomorrow.

So with that, we will adjourn till 8:30 tomorrow
morning.

(Thereupon the Air Resources Board meeting
adjourned at 7:51 p.m.)
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