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CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Good morning. The August 25th, 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.

Mr. De La Torre?

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Eisenhut?

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Senator Florez?

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez, here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Assemblymember Garcia?

Ms. Hurt?

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Hurt present.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Kracov?

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Senator Leyva?

Dr. Pacheco-Werner?

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Riordan.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Supervisor Serna?

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Serna here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Professor Sperling?
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ms. Takvorian?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Supervisor Vargas?

BOARD MEMBER VARGAS: Vargas here.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: 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 very much. 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. 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 designated Board assistants prior to the commencement of the item.

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

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

Interpretation services will be provided today in Spanish. If you are joining us using Zoom, there is a button labeled "Interpretation" on the Zoom screen. Click on that interpretation button and select Spanish to hear the meeting in Spanish. If you are joining us here in person and would like to listen to the meeting in Spanish, please notify a Board assistant and they will provide you with further instructions.

I want to remind all of our speakers to speak slowly and pause intermittently to allow the interpreters the opportunity to accurately interpret your comments.

(Interpreter translated in Spanish.)
CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.
I will now ask the Board Clerk to provide more
details on today's procedures.

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

If you joining us remotely and wish to make a
verbal comment on one of the Board items or during the
open comment period at the end of today's meeting, 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 you've previously indicated which item you wish to speak on when you registered, you must raise your hand at the beginning of the item, so that you can be added to the queue and your chance to speak will not be skipped.

If you will be giving your verbal comment in Spanish and require an interpreter's assistance, please indicate so at the beginning of your testimony and our translator will assist you. During 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. We will call each commenter by name and will activate each commenter's audio when it is their turn to speak. For those calling in, we will identify you by the last three digits of your phone number. We will not show a list of remote commenters, however we will be announcing the next three or so commenters in the queue, so that 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 we will begin the comment period with a three minute time limit. This could change at the Chair's discretion. During public testimony, you will see a timer on the screen. And for those calling in by phone, we will run this timer and let you know when you have 30 seconds left and when your time is up. If you require Spanish interpretation for your comment, your time will be doubled.

If you wish to submit 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. Written comments will be accepted on each item until the Chair closes the record for that Board item. If you experience any technical difficulties, please call (805)772-2715, so that an IT person can assist. This number is also noted on the public agenda.

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

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. The first item on today's agenda is item number 22-10-1, the proposed Advanced Clean Cars II regulations. If you are here with us in the room and wish to comment on this item,
please fill out a request-to-speak card as soon as possible and submit it to a Board assistant. If you are joining us remotely and wish to comment on the item, please click the raise hand button or dial star nine now. We will be calling on the in-person commenters first and then the remote commenters when we get to the public comment portion of the item.

This is the second of two hearings on this item. At the first hearing on June 9th, staff presented their original proposal. Following direction from myself and the Board, staff proposed modifications for a 15-day public review and comment period. Today, the Board will consider voting on staff's revised proposal.

A clean transportation sector is essential to protect the health of both our communities and our climate. More stringent mobile source emission controls are necessary to help California achieve federal air quality standards and the State's greenhouse gas targets that will protect public health and mitigate the effects of climate change.

California has long been a leader in the zero emission vehicle, or ZEV, marketplace, pushing for advancement and deployment of ZEV technology for over 30 years. This proposal continues California's leadership in the development of innovative and groundbreaking emission
control programs and advancement of ZEV technologies.

As we heard in June, the proposal will implement Governor Newsom's direction established in Executive Order N-79-20 by driving sales of ZEVs to 100 percent in California by 2035. Given how long conventional vehicles will remain on the road, the proposed regulations also continue to clean up emissions from internal combustion vehicle engines. The Advanced Clean Cars II proposal will also ensure that consumers can successfully replace their traditional combustion vehicles with new or used ZEVs and plug-in hybrids that meet their transportation needs.

As California transitions to zero-emission transportation, it is critical that all Californians are able to access ZEVs. The proposed regulations therefore establish new regulatory incentives to improve access to clean transportation options for lower income households and communities most impacted by pollution.

The true success of the regulation can only be realized through our committed work with automakers and community groups to ensure that ZEVs are affordable and accessible to those residents of front-line communities. California is one of only a handful of jurisdictions to set out a legally binding and enforceable roadmap with
annual requirements showing exactly how we get to zero year by year.

This is a historic moment for California, for our partner states, and for the world as we set forth this path towards a zero-emission future. The Advanced Clean Cars II proposal is the culmination of many years of technical analysis, policy development, and stakeholder engagement. Staff have made many modifications along the way. I appreciate the thoughtful modifications they made to the proposal in the 15-day comment process as well and as they continued to work with stakeholders and consider comments made by the Board in our first meeting on this topic.

Finally, I'd like to take a moment to mark the significance of this occasion. With the phasing out of new sales of internal combustion engine vehicles, this could well be the final set of major criteria pollutant emission standards for new light-duty conventional vehicles. The creation of the California Air Resources Board was rooted in controlling smog-forming emissions from passenger vehicle. We began with the first vehicle emission standards in 1966 and the original Low-Emission Vehicle, or LEV, Regulation was established over 30 years ago, which included aggressive exhaust emission standards for light-duty passenger cars and trucks and the first
requirement for manufacturers to create ZEVs.

Since then, these regulations have undergone numerous amendments, including the original Advanced Clean Cars Regulation package in 2012. If approved, this second and final proposed ACC II Regulation will complete the chapter on this important contribution to the Board's history.

This is a momentous time for the state of California and I look forward to our discussion today.

Mr. Segall, would you please introduce the item?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SEGALL: Thank you, Chair Randolph. As you noted, California has pushed for the advancement and deployment of ZEV technology for over three decade. As a result, automakers have announced electrification plans far beyond what many of us would have imagined just a few years ago.

The industry has rapidly responded to evolving market pressures, consumer demands, and regulatory requirements in California, partner states and around the world. Today, we have the opportunity to accelerate those plans and solidify them into laws.

As you heard in June, staff is also proposing amendments to the Low-Emission Vehicle, or LEV, Regulation, now in its four incarnation. The last internal combustion engine vehicle sold will remain on the
road well past 2035 and a few plug-in hybrids will continue to be sold, hence tighter vehicle emission controls are needed. These amendments tighten standards for a broader array of vehicle operating conditions and help to prevent backsliding of individual vehicle emissions as the fleet contains an ever-increasing volume of ZEVs.

Now, with the growing volume of ZEVs comes a growing need to ensure that these vehicles continue to satisfy the transportation needs of Californians and that these vehicles continue to provide emission benefits over their lifetime. Staff's proposal includes new minimum technical requirements for ZEVs and a suite of ZEV assurance measures that create minimum requirements for warrantee, durability, serviceability, streamline charging, and battery labeling.

At the Board hearing in June, you collectively asked that staff revisit the durability requirement and provide more flexibility in the early years, while continuing its benefit through the vital secondary market. Today, staff will be presenting on this modification.

Staff is also proposing provisions to encourage manufacturers to take actions that improve access to ZEVs for disadvantaged, lower income, and other front-line communities, including by investing in community car share
programs, producing affordable ZEVs, and keeping used vehicles in California to support CARB's complementary equity incentive programs. The Board will also be hearing updates on these proposals, as staff have developed additional ways to encourage automaker use of these equity provisions and we are committed to their success.

These proposed amendments build on decades of expertise and vehicle emission regulations, and are the product of multiple years of technical staff work and stakeholder engagement. As a result of this ongoing collaboration and input, including additional modifications based on your direction in June, staff will now be presenting its final proposal for the Board's consideration. They really are the best in the world. Heartfelt congratulations to this team.

I will now ask Anna Wong of the Sustainable Transportation and Communities Division to begin the staff presentation.

Anna.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

Thank you, Mr. Segall.

Good morning, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. I am so pleased to be presenting staff's final proposal for the Advanced Clean Cars II regulations for
your consideration today.

--o0o--

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:

In this presentation, I will recap -- I will provide a recap of the key components of the Advanced Clean Cars II proposal, a summary of the amendments of from the 15-day changes that we made in response to the Board's direction in June, and the staff recommendation and next steps for this rulemaking.

--o0o--

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:

To recap the process that has brought us here today, staff presented the original ACC II proposal and suggested modifications at the first Board hearing on June 9th. At that public hearing, the Board directed staff to work with stakeholders to take a fresh look at the durability standards for electric range to ensure they are feasible and not unduly costly, as well as to increase the likelihood that manufacturers participate in the environmental justice options.

Staff's proposed modifications were made available for an initial 15-day release -- comment period that commenced on July 12th and closed on July 28th. Staff released a second 15-day notice to add documents relied upon or incorporated by reference to the rulemaking
record on August 8th with a comment period that closed on August 23rd.

--o0o--

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:

As you may recall, the Advanced Clean Cars addresses new passenger vehicles to reduce their emission impacts on climate and air quality with particular benefits of reducing exposure in communities that are already overburdened by air pollution. As we told you in June, this proposal aims to revolutionize the feet -- fleet in the following ways.

First, by tightening the stringency of the Zero-Emission Vehicle, or ZEV, Regulation we'll be maximizing the sale of ZEVs. In addition to the quantity of ZEVs, the quality of ZEVs, both when the vehicle is new and when it is used, will also be key to a growing market. To that end, a suite of provisions that are included to ensure that future ZEVs meet a high-quality baseline in order to consumers confidence that they can replace their combustion vehicles with a ZEV.

Finally, the proposed amendments to the Low-Emission Vehicle Regulation will continue to clean up conventional internal combustion vehicles to reduce exposure to vehicle pollution. Overall, staff's proposal will provide the greatest benefit to front-line
communities nearest to roadways by controlling and then
eliminating tailpipe emissions from new passenger
vehicles.

--o0o--

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:

Briefly, let me walk through the main elements of
staff's proposal. The proposed Low-Emission Vehicle
measures for conventional vehicles with combustion engines
include changes that will require automakers to meet a
stringent fleet average without including ZEVs, meaning
that all remaining combustion vehicles will have to meet
our cleanest standards.

In addition, the proposal includes new standards
that will further reduce tailpipe emissions during
aggressive driving and during cold starts where the
majority of emissions occur, as well as more stringent
evaporative emission standards to require maximum control
of gasoline vapor emissions.

Finally, the proposed regulations will require
better emission control for the large pickups and vans
known as medium-duty vehicles by tightening the fleet
average and aggressive driving standards, and by including
new on-road testing requirements that are aligned with
heavy-duty low NOx standards to ensure robust emission
control under higher load operations such as towing.
STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:

Moving over to the ZEV Regulation. Staff is proposing strong annual new sales requirements for 2026 and subsequent model years. Building on record sales for quarter two in California of 16.5 percent, these percentages keep automakers on a stringent but achievable path to a hundred percent requirement by 2035, not only in California, but also in the states that choose to follow California's regulations, while building in appropriate flexibilities along the way.

In response to public comments calling for 75 percent ZEV sales by 2030, staff did evaluate the additional cost and benefits and found that tighter requirements could add as much as 30 percent to the additional price of new vehicles in the first half of the program, but without providing equivalent emission reductions.

Staff's proposal therefore remains unchanged. In adopt staff's proposal, California will be one of the first and largest vehicle markets to require 100 percent zero-mission vehicles anywhere in the world.

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:

Even with good regulation design, the transition
to a hundred percent will depend on every car buyer embracing zero-emission vehicles, even the most reluctant. For that reason, the proposal also aims to address consumer concerns, helping them replace a gasoline vehicle. ZEVs will need to have more than 150 miles of electric range when the vehicle is new and be designed to retain the majority of that range over 10 years.

In addition to the durability requirements, staff is proposing minimum battery and electric train component warranty requirements that align with the best that industry is currently offering. Unique to our warranty proposal is a requirement for future ZEVs to display the battery state of health to the vehicle owner or to a used car buyer eliminating the uncertainty of the current condition of the battery. This state of health indicator greatly increases the transparency for consumers and also provides critical information relative to warranty eligibility.

To facilitate charging, staff's proposal includes requirements that every ZEV be equipped with a capable charging cord that can charge at Level 1 and Level 2, and requirements to conform with one fast charging inlet standard. The proposed data standardization and disclosure requirements will enable vehicle data to become available on all ZEVs. Along with this data requirement,
staff proposes to require automakers to provide access to independent repair shops to all propulsion related diagnostic and repair information. This will protect consumers' choices on who repairs their vehicle, especially for independent repair shops, where the vast majority of used vehicles are serviced.

--o0o--

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:

Overall, staff's proposal will decrease emissions in all communities, but most of whom live by roadway pollution.

In addition, to strengthen the benefits of the regulation on front-line communities, staff's proposal includes environmental justice values to encourage automaker actions that support the use of ZEVs in lower-income and disadvantaged communities and households.

Option one rewards manufacturers additional vehicle values for each new ZEV or plug-in hybrid sold at a 25 percent discount to qualifying community-based clean mobility programs. Option two increases affordable access to ZEVs and plug-in hybrids by providing an incentive for manufacturers to offer lower priced vehicles in the first years of the regulation when battery costs remain high. And option three aims to increase the supply of off-lease ZEVs and plug-in hybrids to dealerships participating in
CARB's financial assistance programs, meaning Clean Cars 4 All and the Financing Assistance for Lower Income Consumers Project.

The intent of these values is to encourage manufacturers to engage in the equitable transition to ZEVs by partnering with ongoing programs tailored for priority communities and low-income individuals.

--o0o--

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:
The Advanced Clean Cars II regulations are critical to meeting California's public health and climate goals and meeting State and federal air quality standards. Building upon the last 30 years of light-duty regulations, this proposal will result in a reduction of 50 percent in greenhouse gas emissions by 2040 and 25 percent reduction in smog-forming emissions by 2037.

And while the requirements apply to new vehicles, the proposal will benefit used car buyers as well, as it was designed with the idea that ZEVs should be long-lasting with data transparency to ensure consumers in the secondary market know what they are getting. This translates into billions of dollars in avoided health impacts, all while consumers transition into better built ZEVs and spend less money on going where they need to get to go.
It has never been of greater importance to move forward on adoption of such regulations that protect public health and reduce the harmful effects of climate change, all while saving California consumers money.

--o0o--

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:

The next few slides will focus on how staff incorporated the Board's direction from the June 9th hearing. To increase the likelihood that manufacturers participate in environmental justice values, we expanded two of the three options. Staff proposed to extend the timeline for manufacturers to generate vehicle values for community-based clean mobility programs to include the 2024 and 2025 model years. Implementers of community-based clean mobility programs already purchase vehicles based on a community's unique needs and driving patterns, and therefore such a change could provide discounts on individual vehicles earlier than they otherwise would have, delivering benefits that much sooner.

In addition, staff included an additional value to direct those off-lease ZEV and plug-in hybrid delivered to dealers towards financial participants -- financial program participants.

--o0o--
STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:

In addition to expanding opportunities, staff also proposed a -- to link a new flexibility regarding the use of credits earned as part of Advanced Clean Cars I Program with participation in obtaining EJ values. As originally proposed, up to 15 percent of each year's obligation can be fulfilled using ACC I credits that are banked through 2025 model year, and this option still remains.

As an additional option, automakers can instead use a cumulative cap for ACC I credits. The maximum possible cumulative cap is equal in aggregate to the 15 percent annual cap, but can be spread out over five years at the manufacturer's discretion. However, manufacturers could not earn the maximum unless they possess EJ values over multiple years. Otherwise, the default cumulative cap would combine only 10 percent of each year's obligation into a single cap for ACC I credits.

--o0o--

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:

Lastly, as directed by the Board, and in response to stakeholder comments, staff proposed updated durability requirements for ZEVs. This change softens the durability requirement for the first four years of the proposed regulation by ensuring vehicles are designed to retain at
least 70 percent of their certified electric range for ten years.

However, with its reduction, staff is proposing a corresponding change that manufacturers must design for a larger majority of the vehicles in a test group to meet this durability requirement, rather than designing just for the average vehicle to meet this requirement.

These changes are helpful to manufacturers to avoid undue burdens and better align with current durability targets used by most manufacturers that have already committed to battery chemistries for upcoming vehicles. Reducing the requirement for these early model years will also allow additional lead time for manufacturers to incorporate the more stringent 2030 model year requirements into subsequent designs rather than hurriedly incorporate them into redesigns of currently planned products.

--o0o--

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:

In addition to the modified proposal, staff has considered stakeholder feedback on the proposed resolution that is before you today for your consideration and adoption. I want to highlight a few elements of this resolution. Overall, staff has committed to track, analyze, and report back on the development of the ZEV
market and the implementation of the reg -- regulations in
the coming years. This includes closely monitoring value
generation, spending, and banking within the ZEV and LEV
regulations, including the new environmental justice
values.

Also, staff is committed to monitor -- monitoring
where and how ZEVs are making their way into California
households, particularly for disadvantaged and low-income
individuals. Staff will work closely with industry, and
public interest organizations, and environmental justice
and equity advocates to explore ways to further an
equitable transition to a zero-emission future, both in
terms of encouraging manufacturers to increase their
commitments to promoting environmental justice and in
terms of identifying other policies and programmatic
changes the State can undertake to increase access to ZEVs
for low-income and disadvantaged communities.

The last element worth noting is the necessary
ongoing coordination with staff that are working on
heavy-duty low NOx updates and to align where possible and
appropriate for medium-duty combustion engine vehicles
into the future.

--o0o--

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:
In accordance with Cali --
CHAIR RANDOLPH: Anna, our translator has asked you to slow down a little bit.

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG: Oh, I'm so sorry.

(Laughter)

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG: In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA, guidelines, staff prepared a draft Environmental Analysis for the proposed regulations. The draft analysis was released for a 45-day comment period from April 15th to May 31st. Staff prepared a Final Environmental Analysis and written response to all comments received on the Draft Environmental Analysis and posted them on our website.

Despite the potential for adverse environmental impacts associated with the proposed program, the benefits of the proposed actions are significant and outweigh and override the adverse impacts, and therefore are determined to be overriding considerations that warrant approval of the proposed program.

--o0o--

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:

With this action, the Board will accelerate to a fully zero-emission future, which puts into law Governor Newsom's 2020 Executive Order. This is well supported by
the recent -- recently approved California State budget, which boasts $2.7 billion this year and $3.9 billion over three years for investment in ZEV uptake as well as clean mobility options for California's most environmentally and economically burdened communities.

CARB will also continue the implementation of California's ZEV market development strategy and the rollout of infrastructure by partnering with sister agencies, such as the Energy Commission, the Public Utilities Commission, Department of General Services, Department of Motor Vehicles, and the Building Standards Commission. We also look forward to further strengthening our relationship with the Section 177 states, which currently represent nearly 40 percent of the U.S. new vehicle market, as they pursue their own rulemaking to adopt Advanced Clean Cars II over the next two years.

Lastly, the recent passing of Infrastructure Job -- Investment Jobs Act, which is fund -- which is funding electric vehicle infrastructure, and the federal Inflation Reduction Act, which provide both new and used vehicle incentives further supports California's and the Section 177 State actions that we have set for you today for your adoption.

--o0o--

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:

J&K COURT REPORTING, LLC  916.476.3171
Staff recommends that the Board approve Resolution 22-12, and in doing so certify the final Environmental Analysis, including the written responses to environmental comments, make the required CEQA findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopt the proposed modifications presented here today.

--o0o--

STCD ZEV MARKET ADVANCEMENT SECTION MANAGER WONG:

After this hearing, staff will prepare the Final Statement of Reasons, which will respond to public comments received during the open public comment period and during the two public hearings. Then staff will submit the rulemaking to California's Office of Administrative Law this fall for their review and approval.

After that, we will request a waiver from the United States Environmental Protection Agency, to the extent required by the Clean Air Act, and submit these regulations to U.S. EPA for inclusion in the State Implementation Plan to attain the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

This concludes my presentation.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you so much. Okay. We will now hear from the public, who signed up to speak on this item, either by completing a
request to speak card or by raising their hand in Zoom to
speak on the item. As noted, we will be calling the
in-person commenters first and then the Zoom commenters.
Will the Board Clerk please call the first few commenters.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Yes. Thank you.

We currently have 28 in-person commenters who
turned in a request-to-speak card and wish to speak at
this time. We will be showing a list of the next several
commenters on the screen, so you can be prepared to come
to the podium. And I apologize in advance if I
mispronounce your name.

So, Tanya

TANYA DERIVI: Thank you, Chair Randolph and
members of the Board. I'm Tanya DeRivi with WSPA, a trade
organization representing companies in California and four
other western states that provide vital transportation
fuels and other energy supplies. We believe that
Californians should be able to choose a vehicle
technology, including electric vehicles, that best fits
their needs based on availability, affordability, and
personal necessity.

As you prepare to vote to adopt ACC II, I'd like
to focus on three issues highlighted in our May joint
comment letter. First, the proposed ACC II technical
deficient -- deficiencies remain unchanged. The proposal
is not an emissions standard, but rather a technology mandate. As the Ramboll LCA study shows CARB failed to adequately account for the full life cycle emissions resulting from the EV mandate and failed to adequately account for the full life cycle of emission resulting from the EV mandate and did not consider other less costly more viable alternatives.

Neither work electric grid infrastructure impacts or cumulative impacts on mineral resources necessary for the transition to EVs Evaluated. For these reasons, if the proposal were subjected to the type of ESG analysis applied to the private sector, this proposal would likely receive a failing score.

Second, the economic impacts particularly for low- and moderate-income households who will be hit the hardest were not adequately captured in the ISOR, as identified by studies done by Capitol Matrix and Stillwater. Issues such as assumptions about future declining costs of EVs, understated infrastructure buildout, operation and maintenance costs, and upward pressure on the remaining liquid fuels markets have still not be addressed by CARB.

Lastly, the proposed ACC II raised important legal questions that anybody should seriously consider. For example, the ISOR does not fully analyze and minimize
leakage associated with electricity demand, the source of which will be out of state as California struggles to increase its own grid capacity and the increased risk of wildfires.

And despite the acknowledgement of severe economic consequences for labor and businesses, the proposal does not reconcile ACC II with the Constitutionally protected rights of California businesses.

In closing, we continue to recommend a technology neutral, performance based, all-of-the-above approach that allows for innovation and reduces emissions in the transportation sector rather than forcing Californians to become overreliant on just one energy system, electricity. At the very minimum, we would strongly encourage CARB to incorporate enforcement cost-containment mechanisms just as it has done with the Cap-and-Trade and Low Carbon Fueled Standard programs. Incentives help to make policies affordable, a mandate does not. Thank you for your time and opportunity to comment.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ector Olivares.

ECTOR OLIVARES: Good morning. My name is Ector Olivares and I'm from Catholic Charities Diocese of Stockton for the Environmental Justice Program. And I'd
like to thank you for this opportunity to speak to you all. Now, due to historical injustices of redlining and government disinvestment, disadvantaged communities are still recuperating from these repercussions. We, as a community, have failed to provide these areas and these communities the basic rights to clean air, clean water, and affordable housing.

Our organization works with communities in San Joaquin County. These are communities that, according to CalEnviroScreen, have some of the highest exposure to pollution and raise some of the poorest air quality in the state. Their exposure to PM2.5 and diesel emissions directly affect their health and development.

Now, they will be even more burdened by the greenhouse gas reductions measures of ZEVs for all of 2035. We request that CARB ensure that at least 30 percent -- 50 percent of the existing budget allocations for incentives and other EV programs are invested in these front-line communities.

We request that CARB ensures that these incentives are distributed in equitable form by proper vetting process during the application process. The Board has this small opportunity to address past injustices. Please pass this regulation with the modifications that will assist these front-line communities.
Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Michael.

MICHAEL SARAGOSA: Good morning, Madam Chair and Board members. Michael Saragosa on behalf of the Latin Business Association.

You know, we're in a unique position. We've been one of the few business organizations that have supported green policies going forward on -- unfortunately on this, on ACC II, we just can't get there. We have great concern about the 85,000 jobs, the $15 billion being taken out of the economy. We know that large corporations may be able to withstand some of that. Our concern are for all the mom and pop organize -- or businesses that will be affected by this. We represent everybody from street vendors, to, you know, people that have one or two trucks, to small businesses across California. And you know, it's going to be a very big and real struggle for them to be able to, you know, make this transition in the time that's been allotted under this plan.

We also concerns about putting sort of all of our eggs in one basket under electricity. You know, we represent people throughout the state. We know yesterday just in El Dorado County there was a, you know, 80,000 residents that lost power. We're not sure exactly why,
but we know, you know, businesses closed, people had to send folks home. They didn't know how long it was going to be. And that's a real, you know, occurrence that happens quite often with -- whether it's PSPSs or the new type of brownouts that happen for one or two hours. And so as more demand goes on the grid, how are we going to be able to actually, you know, make all of this work. We have, you know, a lot of concerns on that front.

So we think this is too fast, too quick, and we really look for you to look for more realistic alternatives while we all agree that this is the future and where we need to go. We need to do it in a way that's going to be realistic and not hurt most underserved communities in California.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Tanisha. And Heather, Tom, Steve, can you make your way up front.

TANISHA RAJ: Good morning, everybody. My colleague Ector Olivares has voiced our opinions. And I just wanted to say I was voicing my in support for the rule with the resolution.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

HEATHER KAY: Good morning. Heather Kay on
behalf of Si Se Puede. We are here in opposition of these -- this rulemaking effort. We have concerns about disproportionately affecting low income communities and communities of color. We recognize you spent some time looking into options for those communities, but we do not think that they will go far enough. We request that you slow down and think about this plan on behalf of working communities across the Central Valley.

The current plan is unrealistic both in cost and from an infrastructure perspective and we'd ask that you please consider the communities that are the backbone of this state and slow down this aggressive timeline.

Thank you.

TOM CACKETTE: Good morning. I'm here representing the Environmental Defense Fund and its more than three million members nationwide.

Your approval today of the ACC II regulation will once again confirm CARB's global leadership in addressing transportation sector pollution. Your staff has quantified the many environmental and economic benefits of the zero emissions. And EDF has independently confirmed the benefits of ACC, finding it could prevent more than 7,400 premature deaths, and eliminate more than 1.2 billion tons of climate pollution both by 2050, and also save Californians who buy a ZEV in 2035 more than $13,000
over the life of the vehicle compared to a gasoline car. We ask that you adopt this much needed regulation today as proposed.

Building from this progress, there is more work to be done, as I think you know. For example, there remain uncertainties regarding the degree of vehicle manufacturer utilization in the voluntary equity provisions of this rule. Also, your staff's modeling demonstrates that additional emission reduction programs beyond ACC II will be necessary to achieve net zero passenger vehicle emissions by 2045, the Governor's goal.

Accordingly, we join environmental justice and community groups in asking that you strengthen the resolution to provide increased accountability and transparency through additional staff analysis and reporting, specifically on the effectiveness of the ACC II equity provisions and other opportunities to improve equity, and on opportunities beyond ACC II to further reduce passenger vehicle emissions towards zero in order to meet the air quality and climate goals.

We have provided amended resolution language that we ask you to adopt. And thank you.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Could I just intervene for a second. Acknowledge that Tom Cackette, for those of us -- those of you that haven't been around for a while,
is the guy that headed up the staff that developed all of these policies leading up to today, including the 2021 -- or 2012 greenhouse gas standards, the last change in the ZEV mandate, and much more. So thank you, Tom, for your long service and many contributions.

TOM CACKETTE: Well, thank you. It's an honor to be here for this sort of culmination of the vision that we'll all eventually be able to drive an EV and experience the EV smile.

STEVE DOUGLAS: Thank you very much. Good morning, Chair Randolph, members of the Board. It is a distinct pleasure to be here today.

I'm Steve Douglas, Vice President at the Alliance for Automotive Innovation. We represent car companies that produce about 98 percent of new vehicles that are sold in the U.S., as well as Tier 1 suppliers and technology companies.

This is an historic day. The Advanced Clean Car regulations are the most sweeping transformative regulations in the history of the automobile industry. They will affect -- these regulations will affect a vast swath of the U.S. and they will change the way people have lived, worked, and played for over a century.

In one way, these regulations are the culmination of over three decades of work by automakers and by CARB.
I know I'm dating myself, but many of you may remember that these regulations -- everything you see before you started as a two Senate footnote at the bottom of a small table in the 1990 Low-Emission Vehicle Regulation. I think we probably should have quit while we were ahead, but we made a lot of progress.

I am -- but in another way, this is just the start. I'm confident that the Board will adopt regulations that require a hundred percent ZEV today. And likewise, the industry is fully committed to electrification. We have invested hundreds of billions of dollars or will invest hundreds of billions of dollars. We can build electric vehicles, but can consumers afford them? Can they conveniently fuel them? Is the battery supply chain sufficient? And perhaps most important, do equity communities, low-income communities, have the same access to home charging that -- that the more affluent people buying EVs today do?

In short, the success of this regulation depends on a lot more than this regulation. Today is just the beginning. We're excited to work with the Board, with California, with the staff, with other States, and with other stakeholders.

On behalf of auto innovators and all of our member companies, I want to thank the Board and I
especially want to thank the staff for all of your work.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Amy Lilly.

AMY LILLY: Good morning. My name is Amy Lilly with Mercedes-Benz Research and Development North America. Mercedes-Benz thanks CARB -- the CARB staff for the revisions in the 15-day change notice. I'm not going to go into the details of that, but we're really pleased at what we saw.

We understand the need for challenging standards and we have aggressive plans to sell EVs. In fact, the goal for us is to have a hundred percent of our fleet to be electric by 2030. Just the same, we can foresee some roadblocks that could hinder us from achieving our goals. Therefore, we think it is extremely important for a stakeholder process to move forward that ensures that everything from regulatory requirements to market development is going in the right direction, and if not, to make adjustments, if necessary.

I believe the res -- resolution goes in that direction, but I think it does need to take into consideration some of the market development. While we understand the process is expedited for finalizing this rulemaking, at a minimum, we would appreciate the Board's
support in addressing the following three issues as part of a technical amendment in the near future.

First, we reiterate our request for flexibility under the data standardization requirements. In our previous comments, and as recognized by the Board at the June meeting, the requirement may unnecessarily limit the ability for ZEVs to be sold in this state. We suggest the addition of an option to certify vehicles without earning ZEV credits when they have met assurance measures, other than data standardization. This option would provide an important transition for vehicles launching in the near future. And won't be updated prior to the implementation of the data standardization requirements.

Second, Mercedes-Benz would like to thank CARB for allowing medium-duty vehicles to earn credits in ACC II. However, we believe the medium-duty ZEVs should be allowed to meet a lower medium-duty vehicle specific minimum range. CARB's own data gathered for the Advanced Clean Trucks large entity report reveals that the vast majority of cargo vans like our Mercedes-Benz Sprinter van travel less than a hundred miles per day for last mile package delivery or vocational use.

Lastly, Mercedes-Benz would appreciate the opportunity to continue the work with CARB staff on the medium-duty vehicle PEMS provisions and seek additional
amendments in the future to ensure CARB's regulations properly account for use cases and vehicle capabilities. Thank you again for your leadership and the staff's hard work throughout this process.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Daniel Barad.

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

We urge you to adopt the ACC II rule today and set California and potentially many other states on a path towards a hundred percent zero-emission vehicle sales. Light-duty transportation is responsible for a tenth of the state's smog-forming NOx emissions and more than a quarter of our greenhouse gas emissions.

Transitioning new vehicles in this sector to zero emissions will slow the climate crisis, prevent heart and lung disease, and save lives. Not only are the ZEV targets and the ACC II Rule absolutely necessary, but they are beyond achievable. Already in the first half of 2022, 16 and a half percent of vehicles sold in the state have been either ZEVs or PHEVs.

Further, battery electric vehicles are expected to achieve price parity with ICE vehicles by the middle of
the decade, and incentives in the newly passed Inflation Reduction Act coupled with existing State and federal incentives will drive down the up-front cost of ZEVs even further below combustion vehicles.

Finally, federal and State governments, utilities, and private industries are expected to spend more than $3 billion on passenger vehicle charging infrastructure over just the next five years. This will quell fears of range anxiety which, other than cost, is the largest barrier to ZEV adoption.

Again, we urge the Board to adopt the ACC II Rule today, but we also urge you to recognize that this rule by itself does not do enough to ensure that ZEVs benefit the front-line, overburdened communities that need clean air the most. You should adopt this rule today but also acknowledge that CARB has work to do in the implementation of this rule and in future actions to ensure that the transition to zero-emission, light-duty transportation is swift, equitable, and just.

Thank you and we want to thank the staff for all their work on this rule. Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Laurie Holmes.

LAURIE HOMES: Good morning. Laurie Holmes with Kia Corporation.
Kia is committed to innovation and sustainability and is focused on becoming a leader in popularizing electric vehicles. Kia will invest 25 billion by 2025 in EVs and advance technologies and plans to offer seven EV models in the U.S. by 2027. Between Kia's U.S. headquarters in California and 60 dealerships in the state, Kia is responsible for more than 3,500 jobs across California. Kia appreciates California Air Resources Board working with industry throughout this rulemaking and appreciates the revisions included in the 15-day changes. Kia is committed to the success of EVs and will work hard to meet the zero-emission vehicle standards.

However, CARB's ZEV targets will be extremely challenging. Automakers could have significant difficulties meeting the ZEV targets, given elements outside of the control of industry. These include, but are not limited to, significantly higher material costs, stress supply chain and sourcing, inconsistent consumer incentives, and inadequate charging infrastructure.

Meeting the ZEV targets will require coordinated complementary policies and comprehensive sustained investments by the federal, State, and local governments, and industries outside the auto sector.

Kia strongly encourages California to ensure EV support ecosystem that includes a comprehensive plan to
provide reliable, convenient, and readily available charging infrastructure. A health charging infrastructure is essential to ensure that driving an EV is as convenient as driving today's traditional vehicles.

Kia also strongly supports sustained EV incentives provided year over year that are broad based and non-discriminatory. Kia looks forward to continuing work with California throughout this important transition. Thank you for the opportunity to comment today.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Marcus.

MARCUS GOMEZ: Good morning, CARB Board. My name is Marcus Gomez and I'm Central Region Director for the California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, and I'm also President and CEO of California Clothing Recyclers. It's my business.

CARB's own analysis shows ACC -- ACC II regulations will cost Californians over 85,000 jobs and will reduce personal income by $15 billion. The small businesses and their employees cannot absorb these economic losses. We urge the Board to mitigate the damages these regulations will have on small businesses. ACC II regulations are simply too much too fast for a minority-owned business.

Between the Great Recession, and the pandemic,
and now the record inflation, many of our members are struggling to keep their doors open. We encourage this Board to find a better balance between technology affordability and allow an even playing field. It's hard to compete in a global market when California has rules that no other state and county subjecting their businesses adhere to. This is just an academic debate. It's the livelihood of thousands of Latino-owned businesses and employees.

I just want to say that, you know, my business I'm an international business. And it is hard for me to compete nationwide, you know, with the way minimum wages, between gas prices, fuel prices, all that. This is just adding another expense to my business. I've already had to eliminate one of my vehicles, which was a diesel vehicle, and buy a brand new vehicle which has the DEF system on it. Okay.

I tried to buy a gas vehicle, a gas truck, medium-sized duty truck. They're not available. I don't know how you're going to come up with all these electric medium-sized vehicles when you can't even buy a gas vehicle right now in the time that you -- that you've allotted here.

So I think that California is putting all their eggs in one basket with electricity. I think they need to
diversify. If we're do -- if we go all electric, then that leaves California vulnerable to cyber attacks. Okay. We all know those things -- those are real. And if we get a cyber attack and it -- it's just going to -- it's going to paralyze us is what it's going to do. And then it's going to have a ripple effect, just like right now with the pandemic, the ripple effect that it's had on commerce and everything else.

So that's just all I have to say. Thank you for listening to me.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

JOSEPH MENDELSON: Good morning, Chair Randolph and Board members. My name is Joseph Mendelson. I'm Senior Counsel for Public Policy and Business Development with Tesla. Tesla thanks the Board and staff for the diligence and hard work leading up to today's final and we hope ACC II adoption. From increasing the stringency of the standards to the flexibilities included in other requirements, the proposal is both achievable and pays -- paves the way for California to lead in electrifying the light-duty vector.

We would further emphasize the recent passage of the Inflation Reduction Act and the investment that makes into the entire electric vehicle ecosystem makes this even
more achievable and emphasizes that.

As the draft -- the draft revo -- resolution, excuse me, lays out, it is important also to recognize the historic outcome of today. ACC II puts the state on a pathway to significantly reduce and hopefully eventually eliminate the tailpipe criteria and greenhouse gas pollutants that are so harmful to our public health and welfare, and overburden so many front-line communities.

Tesla is proud to be one of the largest manufacturers in the State and a leader in ZEV technology. Accordingly, Tesla encourages the Board to adopt today the ACC II -- ACC II regulations.

Now, nothing in regulation is ever perfect, as I think we all know. We do encourage the Board to continue to review the proposal, in particular to direct and revisit the requirements on mandating manufacturers to provide charging adapters and cords. We think this mandate increases the cost of the vehicle. It will result in a lot of underutilized equipment and create an unnecessary burden in E-waste. There's a simple solution to this. Manufacturers can certainly be required to provide as an option for purchase at the point of sale this type of equipment, and in doing so will meet the goals that the Board lays out or the staff lays out too for charging, but not force that cost where it's -- where
it's not wanted or unwarranted on the consumer.

    Thank you very much and we appreciate this historic day.

    ALLIS DRUFFEL: Good morning, ARB Board and staff. My name is Alice Druffel and I'm with California Interfaith Power and Light, which works with the California faith community on climate issues. And we represent 300,000 persons of faith. They're all implementing the shared religious values of caring for the common good, loving one's neighbor, and caring for all of creation. I'm also speaking on behalf of the Watts Clean Air and Energy Committee, which California Interfaith Power and Light has been a partner for five years.

The -- excuse me. We are in favor of the ACC II proposal and ask you to vote for it today. This is indeed a big deal in terms of pollution reduction, protecting public health, transitioning to clean energy, and implementing California's goal of 100 percent clean cars and light trucks by 2035.

    The faith community has been witnessing the rapid pace of climate change for more than two decades and its effect on everyone, but especially on those who are already vulnerable due to poverty and historical structural injustice.

    I'm thinking of my friends and colleagues in the
Watts Clean Air and Energy Committee who live on average a decade less than folks in wealthier communities. And the members of the Watts Clean Air and Energy Committee have been extremely active for years on EV education through Earth Day fairs and national Drive Electric Week events.

We do support your yes vote today on the proposal, but we also strongly urge you to accept the recommended edits to the Board Resolution proposed by the California Clean Cars Coalition. These edits will go along way in achieving further reductions from light-duty vehicles, while making affordable EVs especially available to folks in communities that are most impacted by transportation pollution. ACC II, along with strong EV infrastructure efforts like Senate Bill 1482 will make a huge difference.

So thank you to -- so much for your tireless efforts to the Board and to the staff.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Bianca Lopez.

BIANCA LOPEZ: Good morning. My name is Bianca Lopez. I'm co-founder of Valley Improvement Projects and I'm here today representing the Clean Vehicle Improvement Collaborative. Its acronym is CVEC. CVEC was established in 2019 and is come -- is made up of community-based organizations from disadvantaged communities across the
San Joaquin Valley. Today, we're here in support of the Advanced Cleans Cars Regulation proposal. Our EV equity program has been very successful as we've helped California residents in the San Joaquin Valley to educate them about air quality, electric vehicles --

(Emergency Alert System Test)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: We were -- everyone, we were expecting that. That's an emergency alert that's probably on all of your phones. Apologies that that happened during your comment.

BIANCA LOPEZ: This is an emergency, right? Thank you. You can just start it all over. (Laughter)

BIANCA LOPEZ: Should I continue?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Let's give it another couple seconds.

Okay. You can go ahead.

BIANCA LOPEZ: Thank you.

Our EV Equity Program has been very successful as we've helped California residents across the Central Valley to learn more about our air quality, learn about electric vehicles, we've personalized roadmaps to access State and regional incentives to buy electric vehicles that have been very necessary for the people we represent.
We've hosted ride and drive events and advocate for equitable EV infrastructure.

Today, we wear artwork by youth who participated in our art contest that ask the youth to really think about the impacts of electric vehicles in the Central Valley. I wore this shirt today, artwork made by Matthew from San Joaquin County. And I'll show you -- I can share the pictures and more outcomes of that contest if you'd like to see more. Our work has really empowered people in the most disadvantaged communities to demand their right to a meaningful role in improving air quality and other environmental injustices.

We know community-based organizations whose mission is to bridge the gap of opportunity and access to information can help ensure equitable access for many working class Californians that depend on organizations like those that make up CVEC. We urge you to adopt the rule today, but also make -- to make a clear commitment to collaborating with community groups to identify, deploy, and scale projects to make new and used zero-emission vehicles accessible, like our EV equity program does and our grassroots organizations. That is how we can together succeed and promote equity.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you and sorry for the
interruption there.

(Laughter)

ROBERT APODACA: Good morning. My name is Robert Apodaca and I'm here representing the civil rights organization The Two Hundred for Homeownership, which advocates for more homes, less poverty.

We submitted extensive comment outlining the racial, equity, and civil rights issues raised by ACC II. There have been no staff report or other responses to our commence. Access to reliable, affordable passenger vehicle ownership is a civil -- major -- it's a major civil rights issue. The ACC rule ignores the real consequences to real people of banning the source of ongoing, reliable, cost-effective, and low-emission cars that are affordable in the used car market for Californians who cannot afford a $40,000 electric vehicle.

The ACC rule also ignores the fact that consequences are both acute and more racially disparate harm to California working families. For example, families that own a car worth more than $4,650 lose access to key public assistance programs like CalWORKs and food subsidies. There are real consequences of the Air Resources Board that continues to ignore and refuse to respond to.

EV -- electric vehicles play an important role in
the transportation technology of the future. Banning far
less costly, reliable, and ubiquitous vehicles used by the
vast majority of Californians exceeds CARB's legal
authority and it's own moral commitment to ending racial
justice. It remains illegal for CARB to adopt regulations
that cause disparate harms and racial -- to racial
minorities.

The ACC -- the ACC II rule does just that and
must be withdrawn pending the previously promised and not
ignored just transition to reducing reliance on fossil
fuels. There should be no further progress on this
rulemaking until CARB publishes a comprehensive response
to these concerns.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Sarahy

CORINA: Good morning. My name is Corina and
this is my colleague Sarahy. We are with the Madera
Coalition for Community Justice, and ask the Board to pass
the bill with the resolution.

Within the Madera community, there are many
technical, social, and economic barriers to the widespread
adoption of electric vehicles. As you may know, Madera is
known for agriculture, so passing this bill would benefit
the air quality and working conditions of our community
along with breaking the barrier that residents currently face.

SARAHY MORALES: MCCJ asks for you to consider a few points. The current cost of EVs make them unaffordable for a large portion of our population. This rule could help make the transition to clean air vehicles possible for low-income residents, but more needs to be done for those living in disadvantaged communities like ours, where the poverty rate is 19 percent.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Yanni Gonzalez.

YANNI GONZALEZ: Hi, everybody. My name is Yanni Gonzalez and I'm with the Central California Asthma Collaborative, also here as a representative of the Clean Vehicle Empowerment Collaborative. And first of all, I just want to thank the Board and staff for all the work that you've done on this rule. Like I just want to echo what our partners have said already and share a little bit of information about the valley, the things that we're seeing.

Like Bianca mentioned, you know, on our shirts on our backs we're wearing messaging that comes from youth in the valley. People are paying attention, the youth are paying attention. And this is a pivotal day, you know, a
signal to youth that we are looking at their future. And so I think it's important that this rule does pass. You know, the messaging that you're seeing in the front, which says invest in the future, drive electric. This is from a youth in the valley. This is not something we came up with.

The photo in the back that shows the difference between a world with electric with cleaner air, happier lives versus the comparison with, you know, what they're experiencing now with, you know, health issues, dirty air. You know, that is something that came from them. We gave them no direction. We said, you know, here is the contest. It's around electric vehicles. Tell us what you're thinking. And that's exactly what they're thinking. And we saw that time after time with a lot of the entries. So it's really -- this day is really important for us here and, of course, for the youth.

Through our EV Equity Program, we see the demand in the valley for these EVs, but more needs to be done so that folks can access these vehicles and can join the transition to a clean vehicle future. We've done Ride and Drive events. And, you know, there's -- the demand is there. You know, people want to get into these cars.

And so I just wanted to join our partners today, come out here, and encourage the Board to pass this
resolution and continue to work with groups in grassroots roots community-based organizations that are helping folks navigate through these programs to make sure that they can access these vehicles.

Again, my name is Yanni and with the Clean Vehicle Empowerment Collaborative in support of this rule with the Resolution. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Christine Nguyen.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: And I also wanted to make a note for those of us joining us on Zoom, we will be closing the comment queue on Zoom in five minutes. So if you haven't already raised your hand, please go ahead and raise your hand now and we'll close the queue at 10:35.

Thank you.

CHRISTINE NGUYEN: Good morning. My name is Christine Nguyen. And I'm a leverage sustainability fellow from UC Riverside with the American Lung Association. The Lung Association supports the adoption of the ACC II standard today, which sets the floor for zero-emission vehicle sales and makes the critical transition to full ZEV sales by 2035. We appreciate that the proposal has become stronger over the course of the rulemaking and we want to ensure there is equitable distribution of the benefits of this important policy.
This policy is an essential step toward emission reduction that will clean up the air and reduce negative health impacts. As mentioned earlier, I live in Riverside, which ranks as the second worst county for ozone pollution in the United States.

Within just one year of living in the area, I developed a chronic cough that I continue to live with to this day. More bold action, like ACC II, is needed to protect all California communities. The resolution correctly notes that despite decades of progress significant disparities remain in terms of pollution burden. The emphasis on cleaning up the air in overburdened communities must be central to the implementation of this and other CARB rules to follow.

According to the American Lung Association, zeroing in on the Healthy Air Report, the transition to zero-emission transportation, along with electricity resources in the coming decade, California could experience over 15,000 premature deaths avoided, 440,000 asthma attacks avoided, over two million lost work days avoided, and have $169 billion in health benefits.

For all these reasons, the American Lung Association supports the adoption of this rule and the adoption of this rule in other states. We encourage the
Board to ensure proper attention and reporting on the equity provisions and on the overall rule process on emissions as well as policies outside of this rule that can ensure greater benefits.

With that, I thank you for your time and willingness to meet with our team throughout the process.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

DYLAN JAFF: Good morning, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. My name is Dylan Jaff and I'm a Sustainability Policy Analyst at Consumer Reports.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed ACC II rule and thank CARB staff for their work in putting together this proposal. The ACC II rules have the opportunity to encourage the development and adoption of more clean, cost-saving vehicle technologies for consumers, and CR urges the passage of this important rule.

Our analysis finds that based on today's average gas and electricity rates, battery electric vehicle owners in California can save an average of $2,200 in fuel and maintenance costs with an electric car, SUV, or pickup. Additionally, our most recent 2022 survey of California consumer attitudes towards electric vehicles showed that 50 percent of Californians right now either definitely
plan to or would seriously consider getting a plug-in EV as their next vehicle.

California consumers deserve this common sense regulation that will bring clean trans -- more clean transportation options to the market. Additionally, this rule has the opportunity to establish strong consumer protections that will help set the standard for vehicle durability in the ZEV market.

We would like to express our concern with the 15-day changes that will reduce the ZEV range durability from 80 percent to 70 percent certified range for model years yelling '26 to '29, as this change will have adverse impacts on future ZEV adoption, since these provisions are especially critical in achieving consumer confidence in the secondary ZEV market.

As more ZEVs enter the secondary market in coming years, it is imperative that consumers have protections against poorly designed or manufactured batteries that rapidly diminish in capacity or fail early. We do thank CARB for maintaining the 80 percent requirement for model years 2029 and beyond?

Finally, the proposed changes to the equity portion of the rule. We are concerned that this new proposal is too complex to ensure that automakers can be easily held accountable for their role in increasing
access to ZEVs in low-income and disadvantaged communities. For these reasons, we urge CARB to identify and outline alternative strategies to address transportation and climate equity in the light-duty vehicle market, as we understand that amending this rule at this point could result in administrative delays for the implementation of the overall program.

CR supports the resolution language that will provide greater automaker accountability and transparency to the benefits of the proposed equity programs, as well as coordination of future strategies to support participation of the incentives and equity programs.

Again, we'd like to thank CARB and CARB staff for their time and effort to put this rule together and urge the swift adoption of this important rule.

Thank you.

BILL MAGAVERN: There is goes. Good morning. Bill Magavern with the Coalition for Clean Air in support of the proposed rule and of the resolution with the amendments proposed by the Clean Cars Coalition.

California is a beautiful place to live, especially in the summer time. But these days, the summers include smog, soot, extreme heat, drought, and wildfires. And that's why today's action by CARB is such
an essential step in cleaning up our transportation system, which causes about 80 percent of air pollution in California and about 50 percent of greenhouse gas emissions.

These updated standards will mean less pollution coming out of the tailpipes of combustion engines - there hasn't been much talk about that today, but it's important - and an acceleration of the vital deployment of zero-emission vehicles.

It seems like it was only a couple years ago when we were being told that, no, the problem with electric vehicles is consumers don't really want them. And now the problem is that we don't even have enough supply to keep up with demand. So I think we've settled that question of whether people want electric vehicles. And more people that have chance to drive them, the more that demand will go up.

We urge other states and the federal government to follow California's lead in putting ZEVs on the road. At the same time, as you've heard from many other speakers, we must do more to provide clean mobility to all Californians, whether or not they own cars. We need to democratize the electric car and help our low-income communities of color to make the transition to zero-emission transportation.
So how do we do that? Well, first of all, as I mentioned, we proposed some amendments to the resolution. Secondly, we need to complement this crucial regulatory foundation with more and better incentive programs. And we look forward to working with you on the annual funding plan for clean transportation incentives. And we also look forward to election day when California voters have an opportunity to past Prop 30, the Clean Air Initiative, on the ballot this November, which would invest unprecedented amounts of funds in incentives for clean cars, trucks, and buses, as well as bikes, and in the infrastructure to support them with at least half the money flowing to disadvantaged and low-income communities.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Orville Thomas.

ORVILLE THOMAS: Good morning, Board Chair Randolph, Board members, and staff. My name is Orville Thomas and I'm a State Policy Director for CALSTART.

CALSTART supports the adoption of the Advanced Clean Cars II proposed regulation and CARB's continued efforts to address emissions from the transportation sector.

(Emergency Alert System Test)

ORVILLE THOMAS: Oh, I got my alert right now on
this.

(Laughter)

ORVILLE THOMAS: Advanced Clean Cars II will allow California and automakers to come together to push electric car sales and reduce harmful emissions in California communities, especially those most at risk. ACC II alone, however, will not be enough. As the State moves forward we at CALSTART will push for other strong policies like Advanced Clean Fleets, increased investment in clean mobility options, and ensure new funding for EV infrastructure is distributed in equitable and accelerated ways.

Once again, CALSTART does stand in support of the adopted rule and we thank you for your time today.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Gema Gonzalez.

GEMA GONZALEZ: Good morning, everyone. My name is Gema Gonzalez and I'm representing the California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce and Foundation.

On behalf of the California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce, these regulations are a big step backwards for working families and small businesses. ACC II regulations are simply too much, too fast for minority owned businesses to shoulder. Between the Great Recession, then the pandemic, and now record inflation, many of our
members are struggling to keep their doors open.

We urge the Board to mitigate the damage between these regulations will have on small businesses and support the working families in our great state. Good jobs and a healthy economy needs to be part of the environmental justice conversation. Good jobs and economic opportunity are gateways to cleaner local environments. If someone cannot take care of their family or small business, how you can expect them to delve into an -- into an all electric future when it's obvious the State is not positioned to support.

We encourage this Board to find a better way -- a better balance between technology and affordability, and allow an even playing field. Thank you, everyone.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

JEANNINE PEARCE: Good morning, everybody. And I just got my notification. Every time I hear it buzz, I think we're in a climate emergency and it's just going to keep reminding us of that as you guys consider your vote today.

My name is Jeannine Pearce. I spoke in front of you at the June hearing and shared with you my experience as a councilmember and a mother of a daughter who had infant asthma. And so I'm really pleased to be here in front of all of you today and know that we're going to
make history. We're going to make strides today and it's going to impact a lot of people not only in California, but in the nation.

I want to say how much I appreciate each of you that have met with us, brainstormed with us. I want to say thank you to the staff that has spent countless minutes and hours trying to make sure that outside of the regulation that we are bringing equity and more stringency. Honestly, whether or not it's explicitly said, the goal is to get more cars in California that are zero emission.

We -- I can't say much more than what the community members have already said. We ask you guys to adopt the changed language that was submitted to you this week. I know that we are governing with short timelines and so I thank you for considering them. I trust that you all will do your best to follow the intention of the coalition and the residents that need to have clean cars in their neighborhood as quickly as possible. Really appreciate each of you.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Ruben.

RUBEN ARONIN: I'm taking a deep breath in part as the parent of a son who still needs an inhaler to run a
mile and stresses about that - too many kids that have to use those inhalers, because we grew up in smoggy parts of California - and my daughter who just got her first driver's license driving an electric car. Our next generation is hopefully going to be able to breathe easier thanks to this historic day. Congratulations to all of you.

On behalf the Better World Group at the California Business Alliance for a Clean Economy, I want to thank you for -- and staff for all of your hard work. We've appreciated a 20-plus year collaboration with CARB staff, Board members, other California policy leaders, to support the acceleration of the adoption of zero-emission vehicles.

We and the California Clean Cars Coalition or equity, labor, scientific, consumer health, business, and environmental groups support your adoption of the ACC II Rule, despite some remaining shortcomings, which fortunately you can still redress outside of the regulation.

Just a short time ago some automakers opposed the very idea of California's decades long authority under the Clean Air Act to regulate car pollution. Today it's heartening to see those automakers standing with California and committing to deliver on a hundred percent
ZEV future. And we hope this will be a permanent change. We're grateful to them as well as to the car companies who have stood with California and states across the country who are committed to eliminating tailpipe pollution.

While it's critical to adopt this rule today to give market certainty in California and for the states that will soon follow our lead, we must consider the outcomes of the ACC II Regulate -- Regulation as a floor and not a ceiling. Since the Board met on this rule in June, the federal government has passed historic climate legislation that will provide ten years of new and used ZEV incentives and other investments to accelerate ZEV adoption.

Governor Newsom in the waning weeks of this legislative session urged lawmakers to do even more to address the climate crisis, which a package of policies to complement the historic $54 billion investments into State climate initiatives, including 10 billion in the ZEV marketplace over the five years.

In this vein, we urge you to not only adopt the rule, but to ensure your resolution directs staff to identify strategies to further reduce emissions from the light-duty sector beyond the regulatory requirements that we need to meet our 2030 and our 2045 climate emission reductions.
Furthermore, we greatly appreciate staff and the Chair's support as stated in the resolution to convene stakeholders to establish and scale complementary policies, programs, and investments to address the inequitable access of ZEVs and make ZEVs truly accessible to all working Californians, something we don't feel the current regulation can accomplish as written. We would urge you to consider the modest remaining amendments our coalition has put forward in the resolution. And I want to thank and acknowledge the work of Craig, Jen, Anna, Joshua, the Chair and her team, Daniella and Jamie, and the entire staff to engage with our coalition on concerns. Even though we haven't always been in agreement, I want to acknowledge my colleagues here in the room and across the state who have worked tirelessly to advocate for the strongest most equitable rule possible.

Thank you.

 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Kristian Corby.

LAURA RENGER: Hi. Good morning. I'm not Kristian Corby. I'm Laura Renger filling in for Kristian this morning. I'm the new Executive Director of CalETC. CalETC supports the Advanced Clean Cars II Regulation. These proposed regulations represent an ambitious set of requirements and we appreciate the
tremendous effort that CARB staff has put into proposing the regulation. In order to achieve full electrification of the transportation sector, the State must continue to strengthen and increase the complementary policies and programs. Equity investments must continue to be a priority for both vehicles and infrastructure, including Clean Cars 4 All and the Clean Vehicle Rebate Project.

CalETC supports CARB staff's 15-day modifications to the durability standards and believe the ramped -- ramped approached in the modification will benefit the market for electric cars. We also thank CARB staff and CARB Board for flexibility in allowing the OEMs to generate credits for Class 2b, 3 vehicles in either the Advanced Clean Truck or the ACC II regulations.

We support staff's 15-day modifications to the regulation and believe this flexibility will help electrify this difficult market segment more quickly.

CalETC supports the inclusion of plug-in hybrid electric vehicle technology as the State builds our charging infrastructure and establishes building codes and programs that allow all Californians to access affordable home charging solutions. It will be critical to ensure that hybrid options are available. Plug-in options may be the only viable solution for some single vehicle households with limited access to electricity fueling and/or drivers...
that use their vehicles for heavy work such as hauling or towing.

Finally, charging infrastructure that is accessible and affordable for all Californians is key to a full and equitable transition to zero-emission vehicle technologies. We currently have insufficient charging infrastructure in place to support the EVs on the road today, but we are far behind in building out sufficient infrastructure to support a full and equitable transition to transportation electrification.

Continued funding, building codes that support charging infrastructure, expedited permitting and interconnection timelines, and consumer and stakeholder support will be needed to accelerate the infrastructure buildout.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments today.

DR. DAVID REICHMUTH: Chair Randolph and members of the Board. My name is David Reichmuth and I'm a senior engineer at the Union of Concerned Scientists. On behalf of our over 500,000 supporters, we urge the Board to adopt the Advanced Clean Car II standards. The ACC II standards are one of the most important air and climate pollution regulations to come before this Board.

And as the Chair and Professor Sperling noted,
they are the culmination of decades of ARB action on clean
cars and zero-emission vehicles. Adoption of the ACC II
standards is important not only to ensure cleaner air and
slowing climate change in California, but also for other
states that rely on California to set emission standards
equal to or more stringent than the federal standards.

California needs to continue to show leadership
on protecting health and minimizing climate change damage.
I also ask the Board to accept the recommended edits to
the Board resolution proposed by the California Clean Cars
Coalition, including timely reporting on metrics regarding
equity programs.

Finally, it is important to recognize these
regulations are a floor not a ceiling for action on
slowing climate change and reducing exposure to air
pollution. The Board needs to consider strategies outside
this regulation to achieve further reductions from
light-duty vehicles needed to meet the state's pollution
reduction goals and to target the benefits to reach the
people and communities most impacted by air pollution.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Kathy Harris.

KATHY HARRIS: Good morning. My name is Kathy
Harris and I am a Clean Vehicles and Fuels Advocate for
the Natural Resources Defense Council. Thank you, Chair Randolph and members of the Board and staff for their work on this regulation and for the opportunity to speak today in support of the Advanced Clean Cars II standards.

We are in a climate crisis with an increasing number of fires, droughts, and floods impacting our homes and communities. And a crisis requires immediate action. As transportation is the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in California, ensuring that we accelerate the transition to a zero-emission vehicle future is imperative to prevent the worst effects of climate change from occurring. The Advanced Cleans Cars II standards that you will vote on today are a key part of this transition and I urge the Board to adopt this vital rule.

With increasing investments in vehicle development and charging infrastructure, and a clear desire for these vehicles from consumers, it is clear that these are common sense rules that will help California achieve its climate goals and cement California's global leadership in the transition to a clean cars future.

However, as others have expressed today, it is imperative that communities that have been historically overburdened with transportation pollution are not left behind during the transition to a zero-emission vehicle future and that all Californians are able to realize the
benefits of zero-emission vehicles in the near term.

To achieve an equitable transition to clean transportation, the Board should adopt the amendments to the resolution proposed by the California Clean Cars Coalition, which includes language that directs staff to develop additional complementary policies and measures that will further reduce light-duty vehicle emissions to achieve California's 2045 net zero climate goals and that center and promote equitable access to clean transportation.

My colleague Simon is now going to speak a little bit more about infrastructure and grid reliability standards.

Thank you so much for the time to speak today.

SIMON MUI: Good morning. Simon Mui with Natural Resources Defense Council. I just want to thank the staff, ARB, for their years of work on this standard. It really is accumulation of I think over nearly three decades of history working on zero-emission vehicle standards.

I just wanted to acknowledge the fact that there are some of the opponents broadcasting, polluting the airwaves with some claims and question marks about charging infrastructure in the state. And I thought I might clear the air on the status of charging
infrastructure deployment in California, which is tied to this rule.

NRDC commissioned two consultancies to look at the status of charging infrastructure deployment in California. And I have some good news to share. Atlas Public Policy together with Dean Taylor Consulting looked at the funding for public infrastructure in California. The good news is that there are over 80,000 public and shared charging stations throughout California together with over 700,000 private chargers already deployed. But if you look at the next five years of funding from programs like Low Carbon Fuel Standard, from State public dollars, from federal public dollars, there is already over 3.2 billion in the pipeline to fund the charging infrastructure deployment we need.

That is enough with today's policies to get us to 2027 charging infrastructure needs. With additional funding, we could easily get to 2030, and with continued investments like we're already doing in California, California will be on track to get to the 100 percent charging infrastructure goals.

Of course, that isn't sufficient, right, and we need to continue doing more and more work to make sure that that charging infrastructure is deployed and put forward in the communities that need it the most and that
need that access. More work needs to be done including with CEC in partnership with the Public Utilities Commission, but we are on track, and that's the good news.

The second item I'd like to just clear the air on is the impact on the grid. Folks have raised question marks about the impact on the grid. CEC undertook an extensive study that found that even in 2030 if the charging from EV is managed right, the system impacts would be about one percent addition on the peak load. So that is good news with load management, with policies already in place to help manage that, we are ready to be absorb -- thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

John. And then we'll hear from Mike Williams and Kevin Hamilton.

JOHN KABATECK: Yes. Good morning, Chair Randolph and Board members. Thanks very much for the opportunity to speak. My name is John Kabateck. I am the California State Director of the National Federation of Independent Business. We represent about 15,000 small and independent businesses in California. I want to first thank you and other members of the Board, Member Hurt, and others who have had an open door and staff to listening to us. We work within a larger coalition, as you know, of small an independent and ethnic business owners. Very
concerned about just making sure that there are the best possible outcomes, not just for this, but the Scoping Plans, but today talking about this.

And I think what, you know, you've heard me say before Chair and Board members is a lot about the three Cs, cost, compliance and compass -- capacity to make this work for all Californians. But I think today really making sure, as we're moving forward, that this -- the big focus is on cost. This is something that all Californians can afford, not just small businesses but consumers. And installing charging stations, much contrary to the prior discussion is -- and for our business owners with -- will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars. Plus, we tens of thousands of dollars to maintain every year.

Our focus is not on the longer distance 2035 goal, but it's the approach of starting in 2026 at 35 percent when we're not understanding only about an eight percent. This regulation we believe is only going to divide California even more or we fear that it will between the have and have nots, as we've shared before. Average prices of an EV right now are estimated at about $66,000, up 13 percent from last year.

And I think we want to also be sure we're talking about rural Californians and, you know, who won't be able to adopt this lifestyle as fast as urban California that
might have easier access to public transportation. So, you know, working class Californians need the freedom, we believe, to choose, you know, transportation that of course is healthy, safe, but it's also affordable for them to get to work or to whatever their lifestyle is.

You know, what may work for a CPA or an attorney just may not work as easily or as affordably for a convenience store owner, or a retail owner, or their employees, or their customers. And what works for a construction worker may not be the same for somebody who works from home.

So we all need to ensure that there's a pathway with the ACC II process, but it needs to be successful for all Californians. And so we just ask you to please take that into consideration. We appreciate the open door of talking to you about what this will do and continue to do and working with Judy Nottoli and others like that to make sure this works well. So thank you very much and appreciate that.

Thank you. Have a good day.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Mike Williams.

MIKE WILLIAMS: Good morning, Chair Randolph and Board members. I'm Mike Williams and I'm here on behalf of the IWLA, the International Warehouse Logistics
We have grave concerns regarding the CARB's proposed Advanced Clean Cars II Rule. First, the 2035 goal to ban the sale of all gas vehicles is not only arbitrary, but it's not even based on any market feasibility study to fully consider the effects of the ban. Critical infrastructure that is necessary to fuel and sustain these vehicles must be sufficient to not disrupt the transportation system nor the power grid. And CARB has not provided any evidence that this is achievable or even possible.

In fact, the California Energy Commission recent reliability assessment indicates there may be a five gigawatt shortfall this year. That's enough to power over 3.5 million homes. And the addition of millions of electric vehicles on the road will only tax the electric grid further. The California vehicle fuel tax loss from combustion vehicles will create a budget shortfall and there is no plan to replace those lost revenues. A loss of over 15 billion for critical road infrastructure, it would result in more potholes, more decaying bridges, and overpasses, and more traffic safety concerns leading to more vehicle damage and more crashes.

The will ultimately make driving more expensive and more dangerous for all California drivers. On top of
that, the estimated economic impact created by CARB's ACC II Rule would be devastating for California businesses and consumers. CARB's only estimates show that this regulation will reduce personal income in the state by 15 billion as well as increase the cost of vehicle ownership by an average of just under 6,000 per car per California Department of Finance.

In summary, while the goals of CARB's proposed ACC II Rule are admirable and noble, IWLA cautions against its implementation without sufficient consideration of its dire economic impacts. At the very least, a feasibility study should be undertaken to assess the cost, and tenability of installing the infrastructure necessary to support the amount of EVs by the proposed date of 2035.

Studies should be undertaken to determine the market's availability to produce enough of these vehicles to support the needs of Californians, to assess the capacity of California's electric grid power to support these vehicles, and to estimate the economic costs that would be borne by all Californians if this rule is implemented.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

Kevin.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph a
members of the Board. Kevin Hamilton, co-Executive Director from Central California Asthma Collaborative.

Thank you for having us here today. And I really appreciate all the hard work that staff, and the Board have done, and staff members of the Board as well on this bill. I think -- or bill -- this rule.

This is probably one of the more challenging that I've worked on over the years and I've got a long list. And we end up with what we have, something that I feel I can tentatively support. And the reason for that is the feeling of the folks that I work with in the valley, and you heard some of them today. Their own community-based organizations and the experiences that they have. It's hard to see the equity in this. It really is, the equity piece. And I think everybody has made a good faith effort as they possibly could to get that in there, but it's still very difficult to tease that out.

And so we look to the resolution to -- to fix this problem, if you will, and the commitment to that, and to work forward on this rule and on keeping the accountability strong for this rule, both during the implementation years and prior to those, so we can get a better idea of how the charging infrastructure is rolling out. In case people don't know, starting in January, block grant two will be rolling out. We're part of that
process and part of our work will be Level 3 chargers being installed in disadvantaged communities from inland California all the way north to Sacramento, south to Imperial County.

So indeed we do recognize that there's a dearth of infrastructure, so maybe not as large as people think anymore. But working with the agencies together, people like Electrify America who don't get as much credit as they deserve for the amount of infrastructure they're putting in the ground, Tesla and others, which CEC has made a potential partner in the same project. We feel we will significantly raise the numbers of charging infrastructure, the density of charging infrastructure in communities that need these vehicles all across California.

But it's going to require that we see the vehicles there as well. It will do us no good to create a situation which we've seen, where we have charging infrastructure in communities, but no cars. So that needs to change. And this rule does move the needle in that direction, which is again why I feel CCAC can support this rule at this point.

But I really thank you for working on the resolution and staff. I think the final form, while one of the longest ones I think I've ever read, contains an
awful lot of meat. So as long as we get after that and start eating it -- forgive me for folks who may be it's Impossible Meat, just saying. So let's get after it.

Thank you very much

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

And that concludes the in-person commenters. I will hand it over to Katie for our remote Zoom commenters.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Okay. As Chair Randolph mentioned earlier the sign-ups for Zoom commenters ended at 10:35. We currently have 28 people with their hands raised in Zoom. And so I will be calling out the first few commenters, just so that you have an idea of who's coming up next. And if you are -- if you could just please speak slowly for the court reporter and state your name. Especially if you are calling in on the phone, stating your name before your comment would be great.

The first three commenters are Sarah Somorai, Justin Wilson, Jeff Wuttke.

Sarah, you can unmute and begin.

SARAH SOMORAI: Good morning, Chair Randolph, Board member, and CARB staff. I'm Sarah Somorai representing Hyundai Motor America.

I would like to thank staff for the modifications to the rule, specifically the inclusion of travel credits for hydrogen fuel cell EVs and battery durability updates.
Staff's work with the Environmental Justice Advocates is also laudable and Hyundai will continue to support and participate in these discussions.

Even with these favorable changes, the ZEV sales requirements will continue to be a challenge as we believe current supply chain disruptions and other challenges will have enduring implications well into ACC II implementation. It is critical that key public policies be in place to support these regulations. And relatedly, we ask CARB to support legislation that is technology neutral as it relates to battery and fuel cell electric vehicles. Thank you for your time today.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Next is Justin Wilson. Justin, you can unmute and begin.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'm sorry, Katie. Can -- can we get the volume up. It sounds -- I don't know if it's the volume that's low, but it sounds blurry.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Can we fix that?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: It's maxed on our end.

Is there anything else you can do in the house?

All right. So our volume is maxed. So for those on the phone, if you could just speak up and clearly, that would be great. Thank you.
Okay. Justin, you can go ahead and begin.

JUSTIN WILSON: Thank you. Thank you, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. ChargePoint would like to thank the Board and the staff for their work to develop the proposed ACC II regulations and the opportunity to provide comments today. We'd also like to thank the Board members and staff with whom we've discussed subsection 1962.3 related to the charging cord to be provided as standard equipment for battery electric vehicles beginning in model year 2026. Those discussions with Board member -- Board members and staff have provided an important perspective as well as clarifications to supplement ChargePoint's understand of subsection 1962.3.

We're supportive of the ACC II regulations. We'd also say that, you know, it's a -- it's a big regulation. We've also got related to charging equipment current and upcoming versions of UL standard specifications as well as the National Electrical Code. We look forward to working with the Board, staff, and stakeholders in the coming years to make sure, I believe as the gentleman from Tesla says, that we can achieve the goals of convenient and accessible charging and align all three of these important standards, the CARB, the UL, and the National Electrical Code standards.

Thank you very much for your consideration. We
look forward to continued involvement.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Next, will be Jeff Wuttke. After Jeff, will be

John Shears, Regina Hsu, and Steve Henderson.

Jeff, you can unmute and begin.

JEFF WUTTKE: Good morning, Chair Randolph and

members of the Board. My name is Jeff Wuttke and I am the

California Regulatory Program Lead for Stellantis.

Stellantis is a global automaker formed in early

2021 by the combination of Fiat Chrysler and the Peugeot

Group, whose U.S. product lineup includes Chrysler, Dodge,

Jeep, Ram, Fiat, Alpha Romeo, and Maserati brands.

Stellantis is committed to an electrified future investing

more than $30 billion through 2025. We plan to produce

over 25 new battery electric vehicles models in the U.S.,

representing 50 percent of our nationwide sales by 2030.

We clearly support the goals of the ACC II Regulation,

increasing electrification and lowering criteria

emissions.

Stellantis is committed to doing its part by

making exciting electrified vehicles that consumers want
to buy, but we are also asking for help from government,
energy providers, and other stakeholders to achieve ACC

II's ambitious volume targets with market-transforming
actions, including improving EV affordability with
incentives that provide access to more consumers, creating a readily available public charging infrastructure that lowers consumer anxiety, creating a robust supply chain to provide the needed batteries and EV components, and educating consumers on the benefits of EVs with program like Veloz.

Significant progress on these actions is essential for ensuring the success of the most ambitious California and Section 177 State electrification regulation ever adopted. Stellantis agrees with comments made by the Alliance for Automotive Innovation and encourages the Board to recommend that CARB staff track and annually report on key market metrics, such as vehicle purchase price, numbers of EV chargers in priority communities, EV battery and critical mineral costs, et cetera.

Annual reports will become an important tool for spotting troublesome trends, which could slow the growth of the EV market, so that corrective actions can be taken quickly. Stellantis also appreciates the staff's changes in the 15 notice -- 15-day notice to battery durability and will continue to work with staff as this regulation is finalized.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments today.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. John Shears, you can unmute and begin.

John, are you there?

JOHN SHEARS: Sorry. Zoom difficulties.

Good morning, Chair --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Apologies.

JOHN SHEARS: Good morning, Chair Randolph, members of the Board, and staff. My name is John Shears and I am with CEERT, the Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies.

CEERT again applauds CARB staff's considerable extensive work in developing the proposed ACC II regulatory package and in addressing the two rounds of 15-day changes made since the June 9th hearing. I would like to echo the overall comments made earlier by my colleagues in the California Clean Cars Coalition. I ask that you vote in favor of adopting staff's current revised proposal for the Advanced Clean Cars II Program and that you accept the proposed edits recommended by the California Clean Cars Coalition to the Board resolution, including provisions for biennial reporting on equity programs and a requirement for staff to propose supplementary strategies outside of the regulation to achieve further essential criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas reductions from light-duty vehicles.
These are needed to enhance the provision of long overdue release and justice to those marginalized communities suffering the worst air pollution exposure and that are the most vulnerable to volatile fuel pricing and the impacts of accelerating climate change.

I would like to note that the Section 177 states are not the only jurisdiction that can partner with California in its efforts to building a competitive market for ZEVs. Canada is closely watching this regulatory process, and developments in Europe's efforts to move to zero vehicle emissions by 2035 and is currently actively engaged in the process of developing the design of its own zero-emission vehicles program. Canada, taken together with the Section 177 states, would represent nearly 50 percent of the North American vehicle market.

In closing, I would like to welcome Steven Cliff back from his adventures at NHTSA and congratulate him on his new role as Executive Officer of the Air Forces -- Air Resources Board. I would also like to acknowledge the considerable role that Tom Cackette has played in the earlier development of the earlier incarnation of California's 11 ZEV regulations.

I thank you for the opportunity to comment and I end there. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Regina Hsu, you can unmute and begin.

REGINA HSU: Good morning, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. My name is Regina Hsu and I'm an attorney with Earthjustice. Thank you for the opportunity to comment today. We urge the Board to adopt the Advanced Clean Cars II Regulation, as this rule will achieve a long-standing goal that CARB has worked towards for decades, ending the sale of fossil fuel vehicles in California.

While this is an important milestone critical to improving air quality in California and combating climate change, we're disappointed that CARB failed to be more ambitious in this proposal. The rule lacks the stringency necessary to accelerate the deployment of zero-emission vehicles beyond what automakers are already planning to do and risk California lagging behind, especially as other countries take much bolder action.

The flexibilities in this rule reduce the compliance obligations for an already weak standard. CARB has misses an opportunity to show its commitment to equity as the rule fails to properly incentivize automakers to participate in the equity programs and ensure that all households in California will have meaningful access to affordable zero-emission vehicles.

We support the edits to the adopting resolution
proposed by the California Clean Cars Coalition, because it's clear CARB needs to take further action. CARB must continue to work with stakeholders, including environmental justice advocates to identify and deploy projects to improve accessibility and affordability of ZEVs, and secure agreements from automakers to participate in the equity programs.

We also ask that CARB annually assess the equity impacts of the rule. We urge CARB to not only pass this rule today, but also commit to working with advocates to ensure that this rule delivers the emission reductions we need and benefits all communities in California.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

We're just going to take a short break and work on trying to get the audio from Zoom a little bit louder. And then when we come back we will hear from Steve Henderson, Manny Leon, and Thomas Bradley.

So stay with us. We'll be right back online. So we'll be back online in 10 minutes, so at 11:25.

(Off record: 11:15 a.m.)
(Thereupon a recess was taken.)
(On record: 11:30 a.m.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: All right. Thank
everybody for your patience. So as I mentioned we'll come back and start with Steve Henderson, Manny Leon, and then Thomas Bradley.

Steve, you can unmute and begin.

STEVE HENDERSON: All right. Hopefully, you can hear me. Good morning, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. I'm Steve Henderson, Manager of Regulatory Compliance for Ford Motor Company.

At Ford, combating climate change is a strategic priority. And we're proud of our partnership with California for stronger vehicle CO2 standards forged during a time when climate action was under attack. We're committed to an EV future that includes everyone and we're leading the electrification revolution with over $50 million of investment by 2026.

Turning to the subject at hand, Advanced Clean Cars II is a landmark rule that will define the future landscape of transportation for our nation. Ford supports this rule. And since we provided testimony previously, we'll keep today's comments brief. Ford greatly appreciates the edits made by CARB staff during the 15-day notice period. The battery durability provision is now achievable, while remaining strong, and we look forward to working with CARB on the in-use measurement process to align it with current in-use testing procedures.
The ZEV sales requirements remain very aggressive. And states that adopt the provisions of ACC II will need to adopt the same supportive policies as California if they wish to enjoy similar sales success.

In closing, I would like to reiterate our support for the ACC II Rule and thank the CARB leadership, Board members, and staff for allowing us to provide our input.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Manny Leon, you can unmute and begin.

MANNY LEON: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Board. I'm Manny Leon from the California Alliance for Jobs.

With respects to this agenda item, on behalf of the Alliance and the broader Fix Our Worlds Coalition, while the Coalition supports the path to a cleaner energy future, our concerns as specified in the comment letter we submitted remain. The proposed regulations would establish a significant reduction in transportation infrastructure funding. And additionally, the reduction of this funding would result in terminating thousands of middle class construction careers.

We urge the Board to continue to work on identifying revenue sources that will replace the loss of existing transportation funding sources, if these
regulations are passed today.

Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Thomas Bradley. Thomas you can unmute and begin.

THOMAS BRADLEY: Thank you much. Thanks for the opportunity to speak with you here. My name is Tom Bradley. I'm co-chair of the Strong Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicle Coalition and I'm also faculty in the College of Engineering at Colorado State University.

The Strong PHEV Coalition is a group of 40 industry veterans and was formed three years ago to focus on reinventing PHEVs for longer range and -- and even lower emissions than state of the art. In June, we provided testimony that supported the Advanced Clean Cars II proposal.

We very much appreciate that the Board resolution has been modified to have a report back to the Board every three years on market conditions, on progress, and advancing ZEV -- ZEV adoption, and on progress in meeting the emissions reduction goals. Today, I can express and emphasize our coalition's support of the ACC II regulations as written. But in addition, the Strong PHEV Coalition respectfully asks that the progress review section of the resolution be slightly modified to include discussion of component costs and system cost reductions.
bidirectional charging and consumer protection.

No one knows what paths we will take to reach 100 percent sales of battery, fuel cell, and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles, so it's wise for CARB to include a diversity of vehicles and technologies, including PHEVs in the proposed ACC II marketplace. PHEVs will be a value to many types of consumers, including low-income drives, late adopters, drivers in rural and cold weather regions, drivers that tow, and those who need back-up power to use vehicles during emergencies.

And we assert the PHEVs will be especially important in the other ZEV states, including Colorado. Recently critical materials and their supply issues have also been in the news. We've looked at this issue and we find that Strong PHEVs use about three times less critical minerals to deliver an electric mile than a long-range PHEV does. And we want to add this to the list of reasons that Strong PHEVs will be an important part of the future fleet.

So I want to thank the Board and staff for their efforts and their collaboration and we want to draw attention to the written comments that have been submitted by this group as detailed inputs to the Board's consideration.

Thank you.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Our next speakers will be Jeremy Hunt, Jimmy and Tom Van Heeke.

Jeremy you can unmute and begin.

JEREMY HUNT: Good morning, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. My name is Jeremy Hunt and I am a policy advisor and analyst at the Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management or NESCAUM. NESCAUM is the regional non-profit association of State air quality agencies in the six New England states, New Jersey, and New York, and has a long history of working with states throughout the country on adopting and implementing California's motor vehicle emission standards.

I'm speaking today in strong support of the proposed Advanced Clean Cars II regulations and urge the Board to adopt the regulations. To date, 17 states have exercised their authority under Section 177 of the Clean Air Act to adopt California's Advanced Clean Cars standards, which has resulted in improved air quality and public health outcomes in our states.

Like California, the Section 177 states have set ambitious greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for 2050 and interim targets by 2030. And across the 177 states, light-duty vehicles are a major contributor to emissions of criteria air pollutants that worsen public health outcomes.
The ACC II regulations, which rapidly increase sales of light-duty vehicles to 100 percent zero-emission vehicles by the 2035 model year and reduce smog-forming emissions from new internal combustion engine vehicles are vital for Section 177 states to achieve their climate and air quality goals. The proposed ZEV assurance measures will lead to the production of high quality electric vehicles, ensure the long lasting emissions benefits of these vehicles, and support the development of a robust used ZEV market, which will help to advance equitable access to clean mobility solutions and corresponding missions reductions in low-income and front-line communities.

In addition, the proposed compliance flexibilities provide automakers with numerous pathways for compliance while Building support needed for Section 177 states to adopt ACC II.

In closing, we thank California for its continued strong leadership to protect the environment and public health from motor vehicle pollution and from putting us on the path to a zero-emissions transportation sector. NESCAUM and the Section 177 states look forward to our ongoing partnership with the State of California.

Thank you for your time and the opportunity to comment on this rulemaking.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

All right. It looks like they lowered their hand. So, Jimmy, if you did still want to speak, please raised your hand in Zoom.

And then Tom Van Heeke. Tom you can go ahead and unmute and begin.

TOM VAN HEEKE: Thank you.

Good morning, members of the Board. My name is Tom Van Heeke. I'm speaking on behalf of Rivian Automotive. Rivian is an independent company headquartered in California where we maintain office locations in Irvine and Palo Alto, as well as customer facing service centers in several cities.

We have approximately 5,000 employees across the State. Rivian's focus is the design, development, manufacture, and distribution of all electric adventure vehicles. Today, this includes our R1T pickup, R1S SUV, and a delivery van for Amazon.

We're also building a network of chargers across the country, including at sites on public lands including Yosemite National Park and the Golden Gate National recreation area.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak today. Development of this rule has been a positive process resulting in a strong regulation befitting California's
role as the global leader in addressing climate change. Achieving 100 percent EV sales by 2035 is critical and we applaud CARB for developing a regulation that fits the moment.

I want to briefly acknowledge and appreciate the revisions made to the proposed rule through the 15-day notice and comment process. The version of the regulation before you now improves upon earlier iterations, in this particular by preserving credit earning optionality for medium-duty ZEVs and moving toward a more practicable battery durability standard. Rivian wishes to thank staff and members of the Board for your thoughtful consideration of these and other issues.

Once again, thank you for your leadership and for charting a course to decarbonize transportation future. Rivian looks forward to continued partnership with CARB, industry, and other stakeholders in advancing the State's complementary policies that will support the success of these regulations.

We're proud to be a part of transforming this industry and we encourage approval of the resolution and adoption of the rules today.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Our next speakers will be Scott Brierley, Christina Marquez, and then a user name...
listed as Linguistica Interpreting.

Scott, you can unmute and begin.

Scott, are you there?

SCOTT BRIERLEY: Hi. Good morning. I'm sorry.

I apologize for that technical issue.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: No problem.

SCOTT BRIERLEY: Can you hear me okay? Okay.

Thank you.

Good morning, Chair Randolph and CARB Board members and staff. Thank you for this opportunity to speak with you. My name is Scott Brierley and I'm the Director of Automotive and Strategic Partnerships at Fermata Energy, a V2X bidirectional charging services company, which has over 10 years of experience of both vehicle to grid and vehicle to building applications.

In June, I provided testimony on the Advanced Clean Cars II proposal and requested that the Board resolution be modified to request a technology review very few years, including on how CARB can help advance bidirectional charging. We sincerely appreciate that the Board resolution has been modified to include a report back to the Board every three years on market conditions, progress in advancing ZEV adoption, and meeting emission reduction goals.

At this time, Fermata Energy respectfully --
respectfully I asks that the resolution be slightly
modified to mention bidirectional charging technology and
the need to accelerate it. California has historically
been a leader in establishing policies that support these
types of emerging technologies and CARB has a unique
opportunity continue in this regard by being a national
leader on accelerating B2X bidirectional charging.

I May of this year, California agencies,
including CARB, utilities, labor organizations, and
technology companies participated in a daylong event
organized by the U.S. Department of Energy to begin
investigating how V2X bidirectional charging technologies
could be accelerated.

As PG&E CEO Patty Poppe highlighted in an
interview with the Los Angeles Times, EVs on the road in
PG&E service territory today have 6,700 megawatts of
capacity, which equates to the capacity of three Diablo
Canyon nuclear power plants. In a recent letter to the
CEC, Fermata Energy estimated that in 2030 Nissan Leafs,
with its demonstrated -- in 2030, Nissan Leafs with its
demonstrated bidirectional capability could provide a
thousand megawatts. CARB, along with other agencies, have
a role to play in accelerating V2X bidirectional charging.

We would like to respectfully repeat our request
for the Board resolution to include direction to staff as
part of the progress review to investigate how CARB can help advance bidirectional charging.

In conclusion, Fermata Energy hopes that our comments are taken under consideration. If we can help CARB with any questions or provide further clarity on the bidirectional charging technologies, let us know. Thank you very much for your time today.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Christina Marquez, you can unmute and begin.

CHRISTINA MARQUEZ: Thank you. Good morning, CARB Board and staff. Christina Marquez on behalf the IBEW 569 and our 3,500 electricians in San Diego and Imperial counties.

We are asking you to vote in favor of adopting the new Advanced Clean Cars II Program. This program will help fight climate change and create -- can create good, green union jobs. A way to do -- to do this is to adopt electric vehicle standards with a requirement that all EV infrastructure be built by licensed C10 electrical contractors and electricians who have the EVITP certification, which is a Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Training Program Certification.

The IBEW has a national challenge to register 10,000 new EVITP certified electricians and is a national and state of California best practice for creating
high-road jobs. In California, there are over 4,000 certified in EVITP. IBEW 569 electricians have been training in the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Training Program since 2013 and are ready to build out the electrical infrastructure to support a growing fleet of pollution-free, gas-free cars.

Using the skilled and trained workforce standards, this will create and protect good long-term careers. Part of what will make these good jobs is requiring workers be paid the prevailing wages. A yes vote today is critical for progress for clean air for all. And coupled with strong labor language, we can create pathways to good middle class green construction careers.

Thank you, staff and Board members, for all your hard work on this.

I yield my time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Next will be the user name listed as Linguistica Interpreting and then after that, we will hear from Dave Patterson, Peter Treydte, and Roman Partida-Lopez.

For this user name, can you please state your name for the record before you begin.

REYNA RODRIGUEZ: Thank you so much. I was unable to rename myself. But good morning, Chair Randolph, members of the Board and all community members
who drove hours to voice the importance of approving the
proposed Advanced Clean Cars II Regulation. My name Reyna
Rodriguez with the Central California Environmental
Justice Network, partner with the Clean Vehicles
Empowerment Collaborative, better known as CVEC from
Visalia, California, which is here in Tulare County.

In order to allow families to be able to afford a
vehicle at a reasonable price tag, it is important that
CARB holds OEMs, or original equipment manufacturers,
accountable for the dealer's actions in regards to extreme
price gouging. We have been seeing in -- and the
insufficient inventory of new standard trim electric
vehicles. Electric vehicles need to be accessible for
all. No family should feel like owning an electric
vehicle is as probably as purchasing a ticket to the moon.
Low- to middle-income families greatly care about our
environment as well, because we are most affected by
pollution as we have identified through studies of places
such as South Fresno area.

We call on our policymakers to hold original
equipment manufacturers accountable for their dealers'
actions on price gouging. Most who have -- most who have
some opposition towards this, it's due to affordability
and the financial burdens, but you can help on this topic
by securing funding to support higher grants for lower-
middle-income consumers and small business owners. You can also establish a focus on making lower price trims a priority in production, and enacting an electric vehicle price gouging prevention act to ensure that California consumers can be part of the solution towards a cleaner, greener California, along with the increased funding supporting grants for low- to middle-income consumers and small business owners, who -- which would make the transition in a much more reasonable opportunity.

We support for consumer protections that make vehicles affordable, sustainable, and reliable for all Californians. We support the approval of Resolution 22-12.

Thank you. I yield my time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: David Patterson, you can unmute and begin.

DAVID PATTERSON: Good morning and thank you for this opportunity to address you. I am David Patterson, the Executive Director of the CHAdeMO in North America. I am speaking on behalf of the 517 CHAdeMO members.

A true global standard, there is nearly 50,000 CHAdeMO chargers in 98 countries, including 2,000 additional installed here last year in North America. CHAdeMO supports the requirements for DC fast charging on all future electric vehicles. However, CHAdeMO strongly
opposes the proposal to mandate CCS1 inlet on these
vehicles. Almost every day, there is a news story about
the U.S. public charging system.

CHAdeMO's -- CARB's own technology review
concluded I quote, "Inoperable stations and public payment
issues continue to be barriers for drivers". The CCS
standard does not address these issues and lacks two
significant functions. Number one, no compatibility
testing of chargers or vehicles. This causes inoperable
stations and frustrated drivers. And two, no
bidirectional charging standard.

In contrast, CHAdeMO incorporates both
third-party certification and bidirectional capability.
Why is this important? In Japan, e-mobility power is
operating at 22,000 station nationwide CHAdeMO charging
network with station uptimes greater than 99 percent. The
main reason for this success is the third-party
certification as required by chat CHAdeMO.

Let's talk about supporting the electrical grid.
In California, there is currently 40,000 used Nissan and
Mitsubishi EVs that are capable of supplying power to the
grid. Recent studies show the monetary benefits for
supporting the grid can offset the cost of EVs, especially
important in disadvantaged and environmental justice
communities.
It's clearly not time to force DC fast charging standardization. Instead, let the pioneering spirit of the EV industry to select the proper DC fast charging solution. Again, we ask you to remove this requirement. If failing to remove this requirement, CHAde -- CHAdeMO at requests the Board to -- resolution to be modified by 2025 to study the advancement of DC fast charging technology, especially bidirectional charging and third-party certification for consumer protection.

We submitted written comments today containing these exact edits. The CHAdeMO Association congratulates the Board and the staff on this historic rulemaking. Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.
Peter Treydte, you can unmute and begin.

PETER TREYDTE: Good morning, Chair Randolph and Board members. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. My name is Peter Treydte and I'm speaking on behalf of the Specialty Equipment Market Association, also known as SEMA.

SEMA is concerned that the proposed regulations will have devastating effects on our industry, on California businesses, on the state's economy, and ironically on the environment. Primarily SEMA believes that Californians should not be directed towards a
specific technology, but rather be allowed to choose the type of vehicle technology that best serves them, acknowledging that any future internal combustion engine vehicles sold in California will meet the most stringent emission standards in the country. This --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Peter, it got cut off there. Can you try unmuting again.

PETER TREYDTE: Yeah. Sorry. I don't know how that happened.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Sorry about that.

PETER TREYDTE: Where did I get cut off?

I'll just start where I started here. SEMA is concerned that the proposed regulations will have devastating effects on our industry, and California businesses, and our state's economy, and ironically even the environment.

Primarily SEMA believes that Californians should not be directed towards a specific technology, but rather be allowed to choose the type of vehicle technology that best serves them, acknowledging that any future internal combustion engine vehicle sold in California will meet the most stringent emission standards in the country.

The sentiment is amplified by the need to set a technology neutral performance standard rather than a technology mandate based on a series of hypotheticals as
currently proposed in the ACC II Regulation. SEMA believes that before this regulation is adopted, further analysis of the full emissions impact of battery electric vehicles should be analyzed and reviewed by CARB to determine if, when factoring in upstream and downstream emissions impacts, battery electric vehicles have less of an emissions impact than internal combustion engine vehicles.

It should be noted that the reference to electric vehicles as zero-emissions vehicles is a misnomer. There is no known technology that eliminates emissions from the manufacturing and charging of an electric vehicle. Internal combustion engines have improved under regulation and will continue to improve in their emissions output.

Additionally, SEMA is concerned about the impacts to California businesses. SEMA member companies, many of which manufacture products compliant with CARB emission standards for internal combustion vehicles, have a significant presence in California, employing thousands of workers across the state. CARB's impact analysis for the ACC II notes that job losses will be in the tens of thousands and economic impacts in the billions because of the mandated shift to so stated zero-emissions vehicles.

Moreover, the speed with which California is moving towards battery electric vehicles does not match
the reliability of California's electric grid, which is expected to supply the power necessary to charge the proposed wave of battery electric vehicles. California's electric grid has numerous challenges, often failing to meet consumer demand now and bringing millions of battery electric vehicles into the marketplace before the power supply is fully developed could prove disastrous.

We respectfully request that you do not approve ACC II and instead continue to allow for a market-driven response to meet California's air quality standards.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: The next speaker will be Roman Partida-Lopez. And then after Roman will be Rasto Brezny, Tom Krazan, and then Jaimie.

Roman, you can unmute and begin.

ROMAN PARTIDA-LOPEZ: Thank you. Madam Chair, Board Members. My name is Roman Partida-Lopez, legal counsel with the Greenlining Institute.

I want to thank CARB staff for all their efforts to get this regulation to the finish line. I know this process wasn't -- was no easy task with so many interested stakeholders. This regulation has a lot to applaud and will put California on the path to meet the State ZEV deployment goals and move us to a fossil free future.

While this rule does have components that will
help improve access and the portability of EVs for low-income households, we're disappointed at the fact that this rule does not do enough to adequately center and prioritize the needs and priorities of low-income and disadvantaged communities.

Over the past year, we provided significant feedback and recommendations on what could have been done to improve equity and the environmental justice provisions, as well as ensure participation certainty from the automakers. These recommendations for the most part are not reflected in this final rule. This rule had an opportunity to be transformative, but unfortunately it only does the bare minimum. This is clear, because at the end of the day, the equity components within this rule, which are basically the EJ provisions, they're limited, voluntarily, and do not provide any certainty that automakers will participate.

We appreciate the attempt to address some of these concerns through the added resolution as a list to address the shortcomings identified. We must do more outside of this regulation to ensure low-income households don't get left behind. We must develop and implement strategies and accountability measures to ensure our low-income and disadvantaged communities benefit from this type of rule and its transition to a zero-emission future.
With that said, we cannot delay this work and we ask you all to approve the regulation as well as the resolution with the recommended edits provided by the California Clean Cars Coalition, which include timely reporting on the EJ credits. We're committed to work closely with all to ensure equitable implementation of this rule and deliver on the State's commitment to prioritize and provide direct and meaningful benefits to those who continue to bear the brunt of air pollution and who are last to benefit from this transition.

We Challenge CARB and its staff to think broader than just what you think is possible to what it is actually needed to deliver for our front-line communities.

Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Rasto, you can unmute and begin.

DR. RASTO BREZNY: Good morning, Chair Randolph, and members of the Board. And thank you for this opportunity to provide supportive comments on the Advanced Clean Cars Rule. I'm Rasto Brezny, the Executive Director for MECA. MECA is a non-profit trade association representing the world's leading suppliers of clean mobility technologies for all mobile sources. Our members have nearly 50 years of experience in commercializing technologies that reduce the environmental impact from
onroad vehicles and non-road equipment.

The light-duty sector has always been the -- lead the way with the cleanest fuels and technology that were later adopted by other mobile applications. And MECA members have invested in research and manufacturing to deploy the technologies that have made combustion engines 99 percent cleaner.

Today, our members are also commercializing battery fuel cell, electric powertrain components, as well as domestic and commercial chargers to meet the goals of this regulation. The diversity of advanced technologies that are being deployed on vehicles today presents both challenges and opportunities for suppliers as they navigate the transition of transportation.

The Advanced Clean Cars II Regulation represents a momentous milestone in over 30 years of California's ZEV Program, as it will see the transition from predominantly combustion cars to electric and fuel cell cars in the future. Suppliers are always the first to invest in technology innovation that is deployed on vehicles 5 to 10 years later.

MECA members have already made investments in jobs and manufacturing for the next generation of electric vehicles technology, based on more efficient, 800 volt electric architecture to deliver longer range and faster...
charging times.

ACC II sets the bar with targets that provide that regulatory certainty needed to continue these investments. We are therefore concerned with the changes to the phaseout of the carryover credits from what was previously proposed, as this may reduce the near-term electric vehicle sales. MECA supports the efforts by CARB and other State agencies to ensure that California's grid and charging infrastructure match the needs of the state's transportation system.

And in closing, we thank your staff for their hard work and dedication to this important rulemaking, and for considering stakeholder comments throughout this regulatory process. Our industry remains committed to working collaboratively on the challenges and opportunities ahead, and in delivering the technologies that advance electric vehicles while also achieving criteria pollutant reductions from the non-electric fleet.

Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Tom Krazan, you can unmute and begin.

TOM KRAZAN: Good morning. My name is Tom Krazan and I am with CADWRA, and that's Californians for Affordable Drinking Water in Rural Areas.

Part of the decision-making that CARB has had in
the recent past has directly affected the groundwater industry, but my comments are really to talk about the future. Obviously, the steps that we're taking with electric vehicles is very important and we do support that.

However, CARB has a unique placement within California, in terms of being an agency. This is probably the biggest alpha agency that affects every other department, and let me be a little more specific. With climate change, air quality, increased temperatures, water and drought have all become important. And it is important for us to take a look at air. But going forward in the future, if CARB decides to eliminate diesel engines in the future, we may lose the opportunity to -- to drill water wells, and let me be specific.

There's approximately 24 million people in California that are dependent on groundwater and there are only 450 domestic water well drilling rigs in the entire State. That is less than a fraction of all the diesel trucks in California. So there's approximately one million heavy diesel trucks and the water well industry for domestic wells only has 450. That is -- that is a zero impact on California air quality.

However, the small group of water well drillers is the only industry allowed to bring water from the
groundwater table to humanity, which is the lifeblood of California. So decision-making in the future is very important to consider what impact CARB will have, especially on the Department of Water Resources and where we're going into the future.

Thank you for what you do, thank you for the clean air that you've provided, and thank you again from a CADWRA, Californians for Affordable Drinking Water in Rural California. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Next speaker will be Jaimie. After Jaimie, we have eight more speakers. And the next few are Hayley Fernandes, Bob Yuhnke, and phone number ending in 639.

Jaimie, you can unmute and begin.

JAMESON DOW: Hi. This is Jameson Dow. I'm a long line -- excuse me, lifelong California resident, EV advocate, and I've had asthma my whole life. I'd like to thank the Board for this measure. And in view of some of the comments today, to thank the Board, particularly for the positive effects it will have on low-income communities. These communities are the most harmed by pollution, which is cleaned up by this regulation. Additional targeted help for low-income communities will be welcome, but this is still beneficial as is.

However, I do have some concerns over the
regulation, for example, the 150-mile minimum for ZEVs. There are use cases for which low ranges work. And building say 300 mile -- three 100-mile cars would be a more efficient allocation of batteries than two 150-mile cars.

Some customers could still benefit from having options for less range, particularly niche applications like local delivery vehicles. Further, you have vehicles like the Arcimoto FUV, the upcoming Meyers Manx 2.0 EV, and even the new USPS delivery vehicles that have 150-mile lower range, but that number is perfectly suitable for these application. So I hope there will be some wiggle room on that minimum requirement.

Next, the allowance for 20 percent plug-in hybrids is really too lax. We should not continue putting gas engines on the road after 2035. Twenty percent is simply too much, even when taking into consideration the rules for minimum plug-in hybrid range. In fact, we shouldn't be putting gas engines on the road after say 2030 or even earlier either.

California could absolutely exceed the 2035 timeline and would perhaps even do so in absence of this regulation. So I hope that the regulation will continue to be strengthened from where it is now. And it's not just me that thinks that, but science, as we are currently
in a climate crisis and we need to work collectively to end that as soon as possible, sooner than ACC II does.

Remember that in this instance, we are not negotiating with automakers, the courts, or any human group. We are negotiating with physics and physics will not budget, no matter how hard industry compliance. Heat-trapping emissions will continue warming the planet no matter how difficult we whine that it is to end them. So let us end them quickly and make this regulation even stronger than it is, as science tells us it needs to be.

I call on the Board to continue to strengthen this regulation and reduce emissions and pollution even further, and even -- and further work to reduce car usage in general and shift people from cars to cleaner transport methods.

Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Hayley, you can unmute and begin.

HAYLEY FERNANDES: Thank you, Chair and members. My name is Hayley Fernandes and I am speaking on behalf of the California Farm Bureau.

We continue to have major concerns with the proposed Advanced Clean Cars II Regulations. A majority of California's farmers and ranchers live in rural communities that have limited access to the infrastructure
required for these vehicles. This proposal will ultimately impact farm employees, small businesses and food prices. Farmers have already committed to addressing statewide air pollution through enrolling in the Truck and Bus Regulation, the FARMER Program, and the Carl Moyer Program. This proposed regulation will add yet another hurdle to these small business owners potentially forcing them out of the state and negatively impacting local communities.

Additionally, the ACC II increases our concerns surrounding California's food security by allowing -- by asking farmers to rely on a grid that is prone to blackouts, public safety, power shutoffs, and power outages. California Farm Bureau asks for you to not leave rural California in the dark and to take a closer review of the effects on rural utility available and capacity. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Bob, you can unmute and begin.

BOB YUHNKE: Thank you, Madam Chair and Board members. My name is Bob Yuhnke. I'm representing Elders Climate Action here today.

You've heard from many speakers today supporting this rule, because of the need to reduce emissions from light-duty vehicles to clean up the air pollution,
particularly in the extreme ozone non-attainment areas for South Coast and the San Joaquin Valley.

CARB proposed to make this rule part of the control strategy for the ozone State Implementation Plan. The ozone attainment is a critical public health goal. Twenty million Americans live in these extreme ozone non-attainment areas and they are bringing up children in atmospheres that are not safe for raising kids. Making this -- these areas safe to raise children is an important public health goal.

The SIP Strategy posted for comment concludes that identified strategies fall 126 tons per day short of the NOx reductions needed for attainment by the Clean Air Act deadline of 2037.

We asked in the written comments submitted in June that you advance the deadline author the 100 percent zero-emission sales to 2030 in order to achieve additional emission reductions for NOx to help attain the ozone standard by 2035. You've chosen not to require these addition -- additional emission reductions from an earlier 100 percent sales deadline of 2030.

Therefore, it is very important that CARB direct staff to develop additional strategies for achieving the reductions needed for attainment by the 2037 Federal Clean Air Act deadline.
We ask particularly that you consider the strategy we outlined in detail in the written comments that we submitted in June that would include a ban on the operation of polluting vehicles after 2035 in order to meet the ozone attainment deadline by 2037. This would complement the sales requirement for new vehicles by making it clear that polluting vehicles would no longer be operated in those areas where extreme ozone threatens public health and the lives and well-being of our citizens. I appreciate the leadership you've provided in adopting this rule and more leadership will be needed to attain the ozone standard by 2037.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Phone number ending in 639 you can unmute and begin and please state your name for the record.

You may need to dial -- oh, it looks like you're unmuted.

JOHN WADE: Hi. Good afternoon. And I appreciate the opportunity to provide comment. I remain a strong supporter of this plan. And I -- oh, I don't know if I said my name John Wade. I continue to remain a strong supporter of this plan. However, I had heard many concerns including my own at the last comment period that I have reviewed the written responses to comments, the
language of the proposal itself, and the statements by the Board members, and I don't feel like they have been adequately addressed in any of those fashions. First, the lack of availability for electric car resources for renters who make up a majority of the City of Los Angeles, the ability to support infrastructure in rural areas. These are more than industry plant concerns. These are real concerns. I searched the documents and their responses, the word "rural" is I don't believe used once in any of the proposals, not is the word "renter" or "rental".

This program, as ambitious as it is, absolutely needs to succeed. And for it to succeed, these kind of considerations must be taken seriously. I recognize that the final vote may well proceed after this comment period, however it is critical that CARB continues to work on this in the implementation with additional rulemakings to address these concerns.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: The final three speakers are Laurel Moorhead, Thomas Becker, and Kiana Valentine.

Laurel, you can unmute and begin.

LAUREL MOORHEAD: Hi. My name is Laurel Moorhead and I am here on behalf of Transfer Flow, Incorporated. Transfer Flow has been in business in Northern California
for 39 years building automotive fuel systems. One thing
I appreciate about -- appreciate about this discussion is
that nobody is arguing the merits of combating climate
change, only the best way to achieve this goal. I keep
hearing CARB staff saying that this is an
all-hands-on-deck moment, yet CARB wants to tie the hands
of our industry from doing our part in achieving
meaningful and lasting change.

I have an advertisement poster that hangs in my
office from when Transfer Flow used to receive grants from
the California Energy Commission's Alternative and
Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technologies Program to convert
commercially available vehicles to run a propane instead
of conventional fuels, which if you know about vehicular
commission -- emissions creates significantly fewer
emissions than gasoline or diesel.

I was sitting in another CARB meeting recently
when a farmer asked a CARB representative how she was
supposed to install a Tesla charging station in the middle
of her corn field. The answer is it's not a practical
solution.

Although electric vehicles certainly are an
important part of the future, they are incapable of
meeting all the needs people need to sustain our modern
life styles. When CARB doesn't recognize this, they run
the risk of undermining the effectiveness of this regulation. It is disturbing that farmers that are using anaerobic digestion to create their own low-NOx, carbon-negative fuels from agricultural waste would no longer be allowed to power their equipment using their own home grown fuels. CARB's response was that those farmers should be required to put their renewable natural gas into the pipeline. But permits to do so cost tens of thousands of dollars, making that solution prohibitive.

How can transporting the renewable natural gas made on a farm to a power plant turning it into electricity and then transporting that electricity back to the farm to charge the farm equipment, create less emissions than the farmers powering their equipment directly from their own locally created fuels? Requiring those farmers to put their renewable natural gas into the pipeline is not logistically viable.

Transfer Flow would like to echo the concerns of MECA as well as SEMA, and that all near-zero technologies need to have a place in the movement to reduce California vehicular emissions. Just a month ago the Washington Post published an article about how Volkswagen has recently invented a new carbon negative fuel. So CARB's technology bias is banning technologies that haven't even been invented yet.
It is important that CARB staff get this right and that needs to include low-NOx, carbon-negative biofuels as part of California's vehicular future. Allowing biofuels reduces the pressure on infrastructure buildup and encourages both consumers to adopt near-zero technologies of their choice as well as allows flexibility of 177 states that may not have the same infrastructure resources as California does.

In closing, Transfer Flow respectfully requests that the Board reject the ACC II Regulation until the rule can address the technology biases that threaten to undermine the effectiveness of the regulation.

Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thomas, you can unmute and begin.

THOMAS BECKER: Thank you. Tom Becker.

First off, I'd like to say that staff refused to analyze alternatives to this regulation. Specifically, staff refused to analyze an alternative for reducing VMT in this state to reduce emissions. The reason why staff didn't analyze that is because staff knows that VMT will achieve even greater reductions in emissions than this regulation, but they don't want to jeopardize their pet project.

It's unlawful to ban ICE technology in this
state, because ICE technology is necessary to power our vehicles using renewable liquid fuels. The very first speaker you had, the lady said that this isn't an emissions standard, it's a technology ban. You are banning a technology in favor of your preferred technology. That's illegal. It's absolutely illegal and I don't think it's going to fly.

Number -- another thing, vehicle owners will repair and maintain their old ICE vehicles instead of buying your brand new electric vehicles. Guys like me, mechanics, we will become rich by maintaining and repairing people's old vehicles, because they won't buy electric cars and electric trucks. So go ahead and make my day, make me a millionaire. Jesus.

Dealers, you're going to crush the new car market, but dealers -- used car dealers can bring cars in from other states and sell them here in California. Fifty states emission cars will be legal to sell in California. So instead of buying electric cars, people will buy used cars, gasoline cars, brought in from other states. You ever thought of that, because that's going to happen.

Battery failures in electric vehicles are very common. And guess what, these people are not going to honor their battery warranties. They don't honor them now. You could have a battery failure in these electric...
vehicles that will cost 20, 30, 40 thousand dollars and they don't honor the warranties, because they blame the person operating the vehicle for the failure. So when you say you're going to have warranty periods, that's garbage, because they will get out of the warranty period by claiming it's the fault of the operator.

Finally, on YouTube, you can go and watch videos of people showing how useless electric vehicles are. Some -- a very intuitive guy took two Ford trucks, electric and a gas truck, ran them by sides -- side by side, the electric Ford truck miserably failed. In fact, it was so dangerous, they almost had an accident. That's how much -- and I'm going to show that video to everybody who says electric vehicles work.

Thank you very much for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Next will be Kiana Valentine and then Jeanna Murphy.

Kiana, you an unmute and begin.

KIANA VALENTINE: Thank you. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. Again, Kiana Valentine on behalf of Transportation California today, an organization that represents the transportation industry and workforce that builds, repairs, maintains California's statewide multi-modal transportation system.

We're pleased to be in strong support of the
State's efforts to reduce vehicle emissions, especially those from light-duty passenger cars, trucks, and SUVs, which the Advanced Cleans Cars II rulemaking seeks to accomplish. At the same time, the proposed rulemaking will have drastic negative impacts to transportation funding and the State's ability to build, repair, and maintain our multi-modal transportation system. And that's what I would like to focus my comments on today.

We believe that CARB's economic analysis of the proposed rule underestimates the impacts to State and local transportation funding, which already quantifies a cumulative reduction in fuel excise tax revenues to the States and locals to the tune of 31.1 billion between 2026 and 2024. California's fuel excise tax revenue is allocated nearly exclusively to maintaining and improving local streets, and roads, and State highways, including active transportation improvements, sidewalks, bike lanes, et cetera. And these needs will continue to be acute even with a fleet increasingly compromised of zero emission vehicles.

The State highway system is already facing a significant funding gap. The most recent analysis of the States highway system management plan identified a 10-year unmet funding need of $61.9 billion. That includes expansion needs to equip the State highway system, where
appropriate, with bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, mitigation for potential sea level rise, et cetera.

Similarly, local governments are facing significant transportation funding shortfalls. The most recent assessment of that system identified 64 billion in unmet needs. And I'd like to point out that it is where the local system primarily facilitates active transportation and transit modes of transportation. So those needs in that system is a critical component for transportation going forward.

While offsetting revenue increases are identified in the economic analysis from vehicle registration and license fees and energy resource fee and vehicle sales tax, these funding streams are not dedicated to transportation infrastructure, so therefore don't actually offset some of the losses anticipated by the regulation. I know I'm running short on time, so let me close by saying we are supportive of the State's efforts today, but urge CARB to take a leadership role in helping the State of California develop a workable, realistic, and implementable plan to replace the gas tax with an alternative mechanism.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Our final speaker will be Jeanna Murphy. You can unmute and begin.
JEANNA MURPHY: Good morning. My name is Jeanna Murphy. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the Advanced Clean Cars II proposed regulation. I'm requesting today that the Board take additional time to consider and provide a sufficient written response to technical information that has been previously provided by written comments.

This information, which includes cost-benefit analyses and overall feasibility conducted by outside consultants, deserves a more meaningful evaluation and a response from CARB prior to final decision. This information analyses have direct implications to the proposed rules' impacts on disadvantaged front-line communities, infrastructure development, energy security, as well as supply chain management.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you very much. Okay. Assuming that there's no specific issues staff needs to address, I will now close the record on this item. However if it is determined that additional, sufficiently-related, substantial modifications are appropriate, the record will be reopened and a 15-day Notice of Public Availability will be issued. If the record is reopened for a 15-day comment period, the public may submit written comments on the proposed changes, which
will be considered and responded to in the Final Statement of Reasons for the regulation.

Written or oral comments received after this hearing date, but before a 15-day notice is issued will not be accepted as part of the official record on this agenda item. The Executive Officer may present the regulation to the Board for further consideration, if warranted, and if not, the Executive Officer shall take final action necessary to adopt the regulation.

Okay. So thank you very much for all of the public comment. I will turn it over to my colleagues in just a moment, but I wanted to address some of the concerns that advocates made around modifying the resolution to add some additional language. And I really appreciate the incredible amount of work that the coalition put in working with our staff and communicating with the Board members, and really, you know, taking a deep dive into this important critical goal of trying to get vehicles into communities as quickly as possible.

I do have a few concerns with the suggestions, because I will note that a lot of language was added to the resolution to ensure that there's going to be a lot of follow up. There's going to be annual reporting on compliance by the manufacturers, including annual information on the use of credits. There will be
triennial reporting on deployment of zero-emission vehicles in low-income communities. And I'm concerned that if we make that more frequent, that we will not have sufficient new data that will really inform that reporting and it will be very time-consuming for staff. So I think if we consider that there will be annual reporting and then the triennial reporting on how things are rolling out, I think that will be adequate.

And most importantly, I do really appreciate staff's addition of a timeline on following up on some of the brainstorming ideas that we've had about working with automakers working with community organizations, and really trying to develop some new strategies. And so I really appreciate that the resolution kind of lays out a timeline to make that happen.

And the last thing I would note, as I also have concerns about setting up a separate sort of light-duty strategy -- emissions reduction strategy separate from all of the other planning work that we do, separate from the State Implementation Plan, separate from the Scoping Plan, separate from the Mobile Source Strategy, all of which are called out in the resolution as really important pillars of our planning work. And also, we will have the funding plan coming to us later this year that will orient the incentive funding that we have towards more lower income
and middle income residents. And I think that's going to be a really important strategy for the Board to consider.

So I do have some concerns. I'll be interested to hear what -- what my colleagues think about that. But I do want to make sure that we are striking the right balance between staying informed on what's happening, adjusting as necessary, but also recognizing that it will take time to roll out these strategies, and it will be -- even the resolution as written will have some significant responsibilities for staff and a lot of time to do this work.

So that was sort of my -- those were my initial thoughts. I'm very excited about the -- this regulation and the opportunity to make some real fundamental change. And so looking forward to the discussion. And let me check my Zoom screen to see if I have any colleagues on Zoom yet.

Not yet.

Okay. Who would like to speak here in the room?

Dr. Sperling.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Kind of my traditional roll with this rule that I've followed for many decades. And so in that sense, in the historical sense, to build on what Chair Randolph said earlier, I'm going to go even further. I'm going to say this is the most important and
most transformative action that CARB has ever taken. And I was working through all the different -- you know, the 2012 standards, the low-emission vehicle in 1990, Cap-and-Trade, this is the most transformative. And it has global implications. So the staff I think has done just a superb job in working through all the details. You know, when you're doing something so important and so big, you better get it right and I think they've really gotten it right. They've tweaked it, made some adjustments along the way.

I think -- you know, there is no such thing as perfect, and -- because who knows what perfection is. We won't know that for another 20 years. But I think they've done just superb job. And that -- and I know there were many concerns, but you know, the staff is monitoring. They're monitoring everything that happens. They're going to be on top of changes that happen with the industry, happen in -- with the EJ community. And so, you know, I defer to others if we're going to put in any small changes in the resolution, but I think this is something that staff is really on top of.

So having said that, as many said, it's going to be very hard getting to a hundred percent. You know, as some say, you can't just wave your wand and you can't just adopt the regulation. People actually have to buy them
and use them. And so I'll tell you just a tiny anecdote. So this morning, I was on Fox News and I talked about this program, you know, just kind of the way that -- you know, describing it. Well, within minutes, I got a torrent of hate mail. You know, kind of the nicest thing they said was I was a friggin idiot.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Some people said I hear enough good things that it's good for me to hear that as well.

But you know, it just highlights that -- you know, because this is not just for California. This goes beyond it, but even in California, we're going to get a lot of pushback. And there's going to be people, you know, that have legitimate reasons and concerns about how do they accommodate it, and there's going to be others that are just politically ideologically opposed. So we're -- this is going to be a continuing challenge. You know, we're not done today, I guess, is the real -- the real message. And we're going to have to keep at this to make sure with the infrastructure, with the incentives, and so on.

Just some very quick comments. The staff emphasized the air quality and climate benefits. And just in passing, they said consumers would save money. Well, I
think we need to elevate that point, because this is good not just for the environment but this is good for the economy. Consumers are going to save money. The economy is going to benefit from it. It won't happen right away. Consumers don't necessarily make decisions based on what we call the total cost of ownership and that's why we need incentives for a long time. But the reality is this is really important for -- from an economic perspective as well as environmental.

And I also support the 15-day changes that the staff did. I think that, you know, they -- they enhanced the incentives for automakers to provide vehicles in disadvantaged communities. They provided flexibility for the 177 states. You know, if -- as I said last time, my biggest concern with this is how this is adopted and pursued in the other states. I think as -- as the auto industry folks said, you know, we can do this. We'll pull the off in California. There will be challenges, but in other states, it's going to be a bigger challenge.

So providing that -- some increased flexibility I think is really important and keeping -- and the changes that were made to keep the cost down in the near term dealing with the warranties I think is a good near-term strategy.

So I'm all happy. I feel good. We've done a
great job. Staff has done a great job. This is really
historical as many have said and in ways that, you know,
we're going to look back on this day and say how amazing
it was what we -- what we pulled off. So kudos to
everyone.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes. Thank you,
Chair. As I sit here while my infant sleeps in another
room and I have a toddler, I think about the great clean
air impacts of this regulation that will have on them and
on all of our future generation. And I'm so excited and
grateful to all of those who have worked so hard to get us
to this vote today.

I think as a Latina from the Central Valley, I am
personally committed to ensuring equitable transition to
cleaner cars in the community that are traditionally left
behind, those communities of color and rural communities.
At the forefront of my priority is ensuring our State
agencies work together to make this work for all
Californians and really thank the Governor and the
legislature who continue to ensure the funds are available
for programs that help small businesses in low income and
rural area residents to be able to afford these vehicles
at the forefront and not just as an afterthought of this
regulation.

I do think that we have important challenges ahead that we will continue to tackle. And I think to those who raise opposition because of the grid and technology challenges today, know that we continue to evaluate those and that's at the core of the feasibility that we are looking at. It is at the core of how we will evaluate this before it goes into effect, when it goes into effect and onward. We will not set up Californians to fail. We will not set up the other states who want to follow this regulation to fail.

I think that in doing this, I also want staff to continue to evaluate before the regulation is implemented how much our charging cord requirements will impact cost and really the cost benefit in terms of the emissions, reductions, and the affordability and accessibility benefits to having these requirements versus not.

I do think that I really want to thank all of those that have worked on the equity provisions included in this regulation and in the 15-day changes. And I think that as we continue to have further conversations as the Chair pointed out later this year in terms of funding programs, but also as other State agencies continue to look at how we all work together to implement this, there will be lots of opportunity to close these gaps that were
raised by many people here today. And particularly those
talking about the small business and rural communities, I
think that those opportunities will lie within our agency,
but also within our partner agencies who in the first
hearing have equally committed to making this regulation
successful.

So thank you to all who attended today and who
spoke, and thank you to staff for getting us to this
point. Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

Board Member Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Chair.
Good to see you Tania and congratulations. I'd
love to see the baby.

(Laughter)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Is that acceptable?
So maybe we'll make that happen.

So I just wanted to thank everyone who here today
and who's been here over these many decades. Thank you,
Dr. Sperling. I think that you gave us a bit of a history
lessen. I appreciate that as always. And I don't think
there's any disagreement that this is a historic moment,
that this regulation is going to reduce air pollution,
it's going to reduce climate pollution, and it really
represents CARB's wheelhouse, which is what I heard you
saying. So we should be really proud, those of us who are standing on the shoulders of those who came before us to really set the stage for this moment.

I want to thank staff for their incredible work, for taking my phone calls, for taking everybody else's phone calls, for having endless meetings. I heard Anna you saying so I'm so glad to be here today.

(Laughter)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I think that's -- we all feel that way. Thank you for working on alternatives. I think that we asked a lot of tough questions at the last June Board meeting. I feel like we got a lot of good answers. And I want to thank the stakeholders, especially the Clean Cars Coalition and the other NGOs who came forward and made proposals, a lot of which helped to change the rule in certain ways. And I think given the good news about overcompliance, about manufacturing modifications by the manufacturers, the enthusiasm shown for ZEVs by consumers, I still feel that we're being a little cautious about our goals.

But that said, after all of these meetings with staff and stakeholders, I have been convinced that this is where we are at this moment to maintain our partnerships with stakeholders and manufacturers, as well as with the 177 states. So -- so I think -- I think that we've --
we've done what we can in the rule. But what's really
exciting to me is that that's not the end of the story,
that equity is the challenge now that's been expressed
both by supporters and detractors of the rule.

We have the opportunity I think to flip the
script now. I really don't want a lot of what was talked
about here that this is going to cause economic hardship,
that this is going to put small businesses out of
business. As the daughter of a small business owner, I
would not want to see that happen or to any of the folks
in our communities. So now is the time that we have to
really get it done.

And so I -- I think that for the first time, this
huge burden of vehicles on residents of impacted
communities that don't actually own those vehicles do --
the burden is really because of the proximity to
warehouses, to freeways, fuel distribution centers, that
now we can do more. And it's not going to get done inside
the rule, it's going to get done outside of the rule. In
the programs that we're developing, some that the Chair
just mentioned, I think are really important that we put
our -- our focus there, because honestly the 15-day
changes while I think are good, they do not and perhaps
they cannot guarantee the direct benefits to the
Californians that are most impacted in disadvantaged
communities.

    So I appreciate the multiple acknowledgments in the resolution about the need to go beyond the rule, but I'd like to make that a little bit tighter. And I'd like to make that a little bit more focused, so that we really get it done, because now is the time that we really need to move on the implementation of the rule adjacent measures that we can push forward.

    So one of the specific changes I wanted to suggest is in -- on page 20 it says that starting no later than July 1, 2023 to develop, and where appropriate by July 1, 2025 to begin implement strategies, I'd like to change that to starting no later than January 1, 2023 and where appropriate by July 1, 2024, so that we move quickly to bring folks together. And I'd like to hear more, Chair, about your concern about setting up a separate group, but I don't know how else it's going to get done, because I felt like in all those other spaces, it's really busy. They have huge things on their plate and I kind of think it's going to take that focus for that group or focus group to come together.

    And one of the reasons why is because I feel that while the regulation doesn't go into effect until 2026, that there's going to be a bunch of used secondary market vehicles that are going to be on -- on the market as
people prepare to buy these new cars. And we need to convince people to buy the used ZEVs and not the old fossil fuel cars, which is what I'm afraid will happen. So I really think we need to get going faster, so that's -- that's one suggested change that I'd like to make.

And I would like to have a discussion about why a biannual report on the equity measures can't work, because honestly I feel like staff's been really honest about the fact that they don't know whether these equity measures, these EJ measures are going to work. It's new. And I appreciate the creativity, but we really don't know what's going to happen with them. So I would like to have that be biannual. And those are the two recommendations that I would make.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: I'll just note to be clear, I wasn't -- I think there should be a group working on the equity goals outside of the regulation. My only concern was the advocates had proposed language around coming up with light duty -- additional light-duty emissions reductions, you know, in the light-duty sector. And I just didn't see why we would want to do that separate from all of our other work. But I 100 percent agree that we need to sort of convene a group and start working on other strategies to get vehicles out into communities.

And so I would love staff to provide, if it's
okay with my colleagues before I call on you, your thoughts on changing the timeline and your thoughts on triennial versus biennial reporting.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SEGALL: Sure. I'll turn to Jen Gress on this in just a second, but for a high result. Starting sooner, I think January is just fine. I do think that we want more time to develop a really substantive report. So, 2024 would be more challenging.

Jen, anything you want to add on the reporting frequency point?

STCD CHIEF GRESS: As Craig said, I think it makes sense to move up to January 1, 2023, the start of the work. In terms of the biennial reporting, the one thing I want to emphasize is that every year annually we'll be producing a report that talks about compliance of the ZEV reg, including the general use of the EJ values. So that will be on our website every year.

The report we're talking about in terms of biennial and triennial is really this deeper dive analysis. And it's more about where are ZEVs across the state? Are they actually in disadvantaged and low-income communities? That is a -- is a deep analysis. It -- it may not change that much year to year. And I think as long as we are seeing how the EJ values are actually being used annually, that will give us enough information in
terms of how the reg is actually working and we won't get, you know, that much more information within a two-year period, in terms of where cars are actually located across the state.

And, you know, it is a lot of work to do that analysis and we're going to make sure that the work we're putting toward -- putting to do that is actually generating meaningful results.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: No, I appreciate that.

So when would the first report come out?

STCD CHIEF GRESS: So I believe the first one would be -- I'd have to -- it looks like it would be after the 2026 model year. The end of the reporting for that -- that the OEMs do is in September 2027. Then we would do our work after that. So, you know, probably early 2028 in order to actually have an analysis.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: So that's what I'm kind of worried about. I just feel like it's -- then we're facing down 2030, and we're facing down 2035, so it doesn't give us a whole lot of time to make changes. So I wonder if -- you say here that -- well, I'm not sure if you say it in this one, but where you say at least trienn -- triennially, so it could be, if I'm reading that correctly, that it could be more frequent. And could that be something that the group that we're convening talks
DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SEGALL: Yes. I think the way to approach this is if there's something big happening, we obviously would not sit on that for a year. So, in essence, as this group keeps talking and thinking, if there's something that we need to come back to the Board with sooner, of course, we would.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Board Member Hurt had a follow-up question.

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Yeah. I did actually. Thank you. So we're talking about the EJ values and credits. And I appreciate that in-depth analysis requirement, but I'm thinking a little bit more about the deployment and wondering when it comes to an equity lens whether we can just provide raw data annually, so that the community can make their own decisions and understanding and figure out within their own organizations how to deploy incentives where things need to be.

And I feel like we do that in Clean Cars For All and other programs. Is there a way that we can do that alongside that annual reporting that we do for EJ credits and values.

STCD CHIEF GRESS: I think in terms of the incentives, it's data that we have, you know, pretty readily. The issue is not every cary buyer actually takes
advantage of an incentive and we need additional data
sources to tell a more complete story about where vehicles
are located. That's the part that's a little bit more
time-consuming. But if you -- so, I mean, it's really
just a matter of how much information you think we'll get
every two years relative to the amount of work it will
take. Can we do it every single -- every two years? We
can do it. How much infor -- new information will it tell
us? And I think our judgment is we probably won't get
that much more information if we do it every two years,
and for the amount of time we would get.

BOARD MEMBER HURT: But every year we will get
numbers of deployment?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SEGALL: Right.

BOARD MEMBER HURT: So that is information that's
been official for the community.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SEGALL: Right. So in
the annual reports, there is quite a lot that comes out.
There are obviously a few things there, CBI and the like
that you don't share publicly. But I think there would be
continued data sharing more regularly. And one thing to
calibrate this is I think part of the conversation we
probably -- I mean, literally we say start in January that
we're talking to everyone all the time, is figuring out,
well, what are the data points that make people feel more
comfortable, more aware that are useful. And this is obviously, you know, a hundred percent commitment to make sure we get out as much as we can, whenever we can.

BOARD MEMBER HURT. Okay. I think -- I think it will go a long way for further trust in the community and we've heard it here the concern for people being left behind. And any information or metric we can give, even annual if it's raw data, not like a deep analysis of where deployment is, I think we can do that annually.

Thank you for interrupting.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SEGALL: Yea, it runs both ways. It's really important to hear from communities what they're learning and how we can learn from them.

No, I was just saying that it runs both ways. It will be really important to hear what communities are learning, so not just us sharing things with them, but vice versa.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Vice Chair Berg had a follow-up question.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Just an observation. You know, when we talk about this reporting, it's very, very important that we all get on the same page on where the data is coming from and what are the baselines. I often feel like we're talking past each other, because in our own minds we have a different concept of what the data is
showing or not showing. And I can tell you from the California Clean Fuel Reward, we track sales, but the inventory that we get, there is a marginal difference. And so as we're tracking sales, it's really important that these cars are registered in the state of California and stay in the state of California.

And so there's some real nuances to benchmarking. And I think it also would be really, really helpful for our equity partners to help define what is year-over-year success, because this is going to be an ongoing transformation for all Californians. And I absolutely think we have a remarkable opportunity to make sure that we are impacting everybody in a very beneficial way. But what's the definition of success, so we have something to measure against, and how are we doing? And we need to partner with the OEMs. This is not their sole responsibility. So thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. So I'm going to kind of summarize where I think we are at this point before I call on the rest of my colleagues that have their hands up.

(Laughter)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: So it sounds like July -- I'm sorry, January 1st, 2023 to begin the work. It sounds like we clearly want to make sure that our annual reporting provides as much raw data as is sort of
accessible on that annual basis. We are still comfortable with the deeper dive being triennial, but with, you know, continued conversation as part of the group that's going to be working on this as to whether there's opportunities for more information or analyses that could be shared at a shorter timeline, is that right? Is that where landed on that?

(Yeses)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. So I think that's good. So then I'm going to go ahead and call on the rest of my colleagues, see what other issues folks have.

Mrs. Riordan, I think you were next.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Thank you. This is very special for me, because of my tenure on this Board I have watched its infancy move to today, and that's rather exciting. And I look out at Tom Cackette and say thank you for giving us the groundwork to work and to the staff of today, you are incredible, and the work that you've done, and the thoughtfulness that you've given to this. And then to those of you who were listening to some of the testimony of -- of the manufacturers, I think it's just incredible the investments that are being made for us in California and hopefully the United States as a whole. That's just incredible.

You know, we're talking billions not millions,
billions. And I think we are going to be extraordinarily successful in this effort. The one caution I have to all of you is infrastructure. I am convinced that if this is to be successful, infrastructure is absolutely critical, and it will affect you in very different ways. There are parts of California that are without the infrastructure that's going to be needed for this program, particularly the rural areas. They -- they just don't have that infrastructure and we need to make it available for them.

The other part is there may be a great deal of money in the pipeline, but it has to be implemented. It doesn't do us any good to have money in a pipeline. The acqui -- you know, the emphasis today is to get infrastructure going, but if we continue to find ourselves behind the eight ball, a lot of people won't invest in an electric vehicle unless they can be assured that the infrastructure is there to keep it charged, to keep it going.

So that is my caution. And I know as we have divided a responsibility here, Madam Chair, for that implementation of infrastructure and concentration, that that's going to be a very important program and I hope we keep that on the forefront, because I think infrastructure again is the key to making the whole program very successful.
And I appreciated your emphasis, Madam Chair, on the reporting and the understanding. And I certainly support what you have said in terms of understanding where we are on the reporting. And I'm just curious, while I was sitting here thinking about, okay, how do we know where these vehicles are, is the DMV in partnership with us, do they have the ability to identify where these vehicles are registered? And if they can produce that kind of information for us, that could be very helpful. I mean, you know, they certainly have information. Now, can they separate out electric vehicles from fossil fuel? Well, there is your information. You'll know exactly where these vehicles are. And that will answer the question are they in the right communities as we look forward, and for somebody like myself, are they in the rural communities that I'm most concerned about. So I think that would be a great partnership that we can work on with the DMV.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SEGALL: Mrs. Riordan, we'll explore that. I'll just note that DMV data has a bunch of legal protections around it and can be challenging. So we have reporting in the core reg to make sure we know as much as we know, but it's an interesting lead we can look into.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Yeah. And we need to
explain to them what we need and maybe they can work that information for us, so that it's pretty easy to decipher and good partnership.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SEGALL: Yeah. We will discover what is possible as ever.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: All right.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: And, Madam Chair, with that I've concluded.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

The next person is Supervisor Vargas.

Supervisor Vargas, are you there?

Okay. I will come back to you.

The next is Board Member Hurt.

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you, Chair.

So two words come to mind with this regulation, and that is strategically ambitious. It's an important step forward to achieve our clean air goals, and emission reduction, and accelerate the clean energy transition that we really need for our communities and the climate. I recently read a speech of the 44th President that aptly stated that we cannot condemn our children and their children to a future that is beyond their repair, not when we have the means, the technological innovation and the scientific imagination, to begin the work of repairing it
right now. And this regulation is the repair we need.

After countless meetings with the various stakeholders, the auto industry, and the community, it's clear that we have the proper technological foothold to make a difference in light-duty vehicles to reach what I heard from everyone is our collective goal to clean air and a better environment. And Governor Newsom has led the state along with the Legislature just with the same optimism that we can do this today, we've been working on it for decades, and the time is now.

And I just want to reiterate that in all my meetings, no one said we couldn't get this done, that it was impossible. They just said it was challenging. And so let's meet the challenge together.

I'm further heartened statements that, you know, this is solvable. And I think we have no choice but to move forward, but thoughtfully, so that we can prompt the market and further prompt behavioral changes and continue to protect and transition our jobs and our economy.

I want to also thank the staff, as others have said, and all the stakeholders for really digging deep and working together to perfect this rule. I think since my time on the Board, this has been the first time where I've heard everyone say this is a rule that should move forward in its form. So kudos to the team to get most of the
community and everybody to that place.

I also want to thank Gress, McCarthy, and Cunningham for taking my call yesterday as it related to technical challenges. I think it's going to be really imperative that we continue to evaluate those standards. There were some concerns from different stakeholders. I think we cleared some of these concerns up, but I'm sure there will be more as we get into this regulation and the practical aspects of it.

And I also just want to uplift that in order for this to really work, it's going to need to be affordable, convenient, and accessible. And I think what you've heard today that everybody is committed to doing their best and their part to make sure that those qualities as it relates to zero-emission vehicles will be a reality.

I do want to challenge the car makers, and I see some faces out in the audience, that they also need to find ways and actions, not just words, to partner with community organizations in these communities. So that's a friendly challenge, but I think together we can meet what this future calls of us.

And then someone I think said earlier, like a little anecdote, I was at the Petersen, I think, Museum, yeah, in LA with my daughter earlier this summer. And it's just really amazing to see the distribution of old
cars, you know, your old Model T all the way to the latest and greatest today. And it just reminded me of the vast technological changes that have occurred over the decades. And the combustion engine has endured for a hundred years, right? But like the way of the steam engine, it's time for it to phase out. And it's necessary and it's the technological advancement I think we all want to see for a better world.

I do want to acknowledge that there are really some sobering aspects though to this regulation that I'm confident we can navigate. There is going to be that short-term demand as this becomes more mainstream and our long-term ambition to tackle other vehicles. I do hear the challenges around charging infrastructure. I'm thinking always about consumer protection, and durability, warranty, and as well as the supply chain issues. But there are also challenges in inaction, and in fact, grave challenges when it comes to climate change and poor health that we know shortens the life due to the air quality that we breathe. So I think we've got to move forward, folks. We've got to do what we can and dig in with infrastructure and other means.

And when I think of the infrastructure topic, I think of the history of roadways. And we started maximizing construction post-war. All the roadways were
not in place when we did mass distribution of cars. And I think as it relates to charging infrastructure, it would scale with time and demand. And I think we're all determined to push us forward in that direction, and so I feel good about that.

Lastly, I think someone said earlier I am committed as well to working with all of you to ensure deployment in our communities, front-line communities, incentives in places that really need them, communities of color. I think and believe that we can get their together. And I'm glad to hear that the staff will follow the deployment of ZEVs, but we have really got to follow that closely. And I am glad to hear that we will annually try to figure out some way to create raw data for communities to help themselves and for us to help them as well along the way.

And so I think all in all, this is -- this is great news this regulation for California, the United States, and the world, and I'm glad to be a part of it.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Okay. I'm going to go back to Supervisor Vargas, who was trying to speak, but we couldn't hear her. So Supervisor Vargas, are you ready?

We show you as muted. Can you hit unmute?
Okay. You're unmuted, so you should -- we should be able to hear you.

We're not -- we're not hearing you yet. Oh, she just went away.

Okay. I'm going to call on Board Member De La Torre who's the next on my list and then we will back to Supervisor Vargas again.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you. First of all, I have a little show and tell.

(Laughter).

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So imagine my surprise, I've seen this this morning. This is obviously not this morning, because today it's right on I Street. But for the last couple weeks, this truck has been parked outside of the Capitol running, or maybe has a generator, I don't know, polluting while talking about the Western States Petroleum Association's concern about pollution.

Wow. Wow. Wow. Wow. I really appreciate all of the well-selected factoids that they have projected on the side of this truck, but that's not at all concerned about the environment to have a truck out there running all day long, for weeks on end for what? It doesn't work, FYI, in terms of your PR strategies. So I'll just leave that up there while I'm talking.

(Laughter)
CHAIR RANDOLPH: But those fact, like I don't want them up on the screen, because I'm not sure they're true.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yeah. Yeah. There it is. It's a pretty picture, the Capitol part, not the rest of it.

So related to that too, there was a couple of folks who mentioned that this isn't standard space. It absolutely is. Zero emission is a standard, period. So to those that are trying to obfuscate. Zero emission is a standard, and that is the standard that we are adopting here today.

I want to talk a little bit about the marketplace, the broader marketplace, and then I'll -- I'll bring it back to California.

Denmark, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Netherlands, Norway, Scotland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, all have ZEV mandates coming up between 2030 and 2040. We are right in the middle of the international trend. And some of you may say, well, Iceland has 300,000 people. Yes, they do, but we also have the United Kingdom, number five economy in the world. Well, they'd be six if they allowed us to be counted. But UK is fifth economy in the world, France number seven economy in the world, Canada number nine economy in the world, they all have mandates as well.
And so Japan has an EV and hybrid mandate by 2035. India has a governmental ZEV mandate, meaning all government vehicles will have to be ZEV by 2030. So -- and China, the country doesn't have a mandate, but there are provinces, very large provinces in China, that do have a ZEV mandate in the same time rate -- time frame as we have in these other countries. This is the world market. This is where things are going. So California is not out of step. We may be out of step with Texas and Mississippi, but we are not out of step with the world market. And frankly, I'd much rather be with them than those two, and some others of their ilk. So we are absolutely on the right path in terms of the marketplace and this market transformation that is taking place.

Board Member Hurt was talking about our roadways and that infrastructure. As late as the 1930s and 40s, in many places in America, you got your gasoline in a can at a roadside store. There --

VICE CHAIR BERG: A 55-gallon barrel.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: There were no gas stations, less than a hundred years ago. And somehow, the car grew, and was sold, and became successful, and no one was complaining about the lack of infrastructure then. We are way ahead of that transition in 2022 in California and we're going to keep pushing the bar, not just with this
regulation, but other things that are taking place.

The ZEV alliance, we have Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington, and Vermont all are committed as we are to follow along this. We heard from NESCAUM earlier during this meeting.

In terms of sales in California, 2016 and I've said this before, 3.3 percent of all cars sales were ZEV, 2017, 4.3 percent, 2018, 6.98 percent, 2019, 6.8 percent, so about the same, 2020, 7.8 percent, slightly higher, but about the same, and then a big jump in 2021 to 12.4 percent. First quarter this year, 16.3 percent of all car sales in California, new car sales were ZEVs. And second quarter -- I said that first quarter number in June. We now have the second quarter number, 16.6 percent. Holding steady and growing. The pattern is clear of where this is headed.

So again, in terms of the marketplace, in terms of this market transformation that is taking place, it is happening. What we're doing here today is nudging it along. It is showing that this is the path where California is headed and those other states that follow us.

In terms of the cost of the vehicle itself, in 2021, U.S. Department of Energy did a maintenance analysis
comparing internal combustion engines to zero-emission engines. They determined $0.04 per mile cheaper for ZEVs. And that doesn't sound like a lot, except when you add it up over the life of the car, it's $8,000 cheaper for a ZEV compared to an internal combustion engine. So that mechanic guy who called earlier, sorry, I think the people are going to figure out they don't want to spend that $8,000 coming to you when they can get a ZEV that is going to be cheaper for them.

Also, U.S. Department of Energy in 2020, a different administration did a fuel analysis and determined that over 15 years a ZEV was $14,500 cheaper in operating in -- driving a ZEV compared to an internal combustion engine. That's over $22,000 savings over the life of a ZEV versus an internal combustion engine. So when people are saying this is too expensive, saving $22,000 over the life of a care is too expensive. That -- that's a different kind of math than the one I'm used to.

In terms of incentives, so getting into the vehicles, we have CVRP, which is one thousand to seven thousand dollars per vehicle. We have Clean Cars 4 All, which was mentioned that's up to $9,500 per vehicle. And Clean Cars 4 All also includes used vehicles, which I'm always pushing for here at the secondary market, and some of my colleagues have as well, for those low-income
communities. The budget and it's still being negotiated right now, but we're talking close to $200 million in this year's budget for Clean Cars 4 All in that ballpark. That's going to go to those communities that we're talking about today.

They will get that. And if the Bay Area AQMD and South Coast AQMD could get rid of that form 1099 requirement, we could get it even to -- even more people's hands in the community that we're talking about.

And then on top of that, this is an added bonus, we didn't even know this was happening when we here in June, the IRA, the --

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Inflation Reduction Act.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: -- Infrastructure --

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Inflation Reduction --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Inflation Reduction Act. Thank you. See, you forgot it. I forget it. It's a dumb name, but --

(Laughter)

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: -- the result is good, $7,500 credit for new vehicles -- EVs in -- from D.C. and 4,000 for used vehicles. They have never done used vehicles from D.C., and they've done it now. So you can -- you can pile those on top of the California incentives and really get a reduction in the price.
Some people were complaining about the cost of electric vehicles -- new electric vehicles. Price parity is coming. And that -- this is the one part of staff's work that I disagree on. I think you were too conservative on price parity. It's coming sooner than what you estimated in your analysis. I understand why you did it, but other sources, and I've been checking with other people 2030 at the latest is what they're saying. And some are saying it's as soon as 2025. COVID and the supply chain issues may impact that a little, but between 2025 and 2030 is -- it's going to happen, price parity.

And you cannot just fixate on lithium ion. There are other battery technologies out there. There are other battery technologies that are being involved -- developed. Who knows, maybe fuel cells drop in price and that becomes a more competitive light-duty vehicle option. So zero-emission options are going to be available at price parity with internal combustion engines sooner rather than later, certainly in the time of this regulation. And at that point, it becomes a one-to-one match. Actually, it's better for ZEVs, for the reasons I cited earlier. They're cheaper to operate, cheaper to own.

So this -- this is good stuff. This is market transformation. It's CARB again putting itself out there way ahead of the rest of the United States except for the
Section 177 states. And it really sets a marker for the world market that -- that parts of the U.S. in the game along with all those countries that I started with.

Thank you to staff for your work on this. I know you've -- you've been putting out fires all over the place for months and months. And we've really come to a good place. And I think back to 2012 when we voted on the joint standards with the Obama Administration, where we didn't know -- we did not know where this battery thing was going to go. We just took a leap of faith and we've been way ahead of the curve on all of our estimates from then to this point today.

And now we're going to take another leap of faith, and I know -- because of that, I know we're going to outperform on these standards as well.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Supervisor Vargas.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Supervisor Vargas, you may have to press star six to unmute.

It doesn't look like you've unmuted. Can you try hitting star six.

BOARD MEMBER VARGAS: Can you hear me now?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER VARGAS: All right. I think you can
hear me now.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER VARGAS: Oh, my goodness. Thanks.

My apologies to all of you. Thank you, Chair Randolph and thank you (inaudible). I just wanted to make sure that I acknowledged that obviously this is a very important phase to advance clean air in the long term, absolutely (inaudible) -- long-term impact it's going to have on our -- on our communities. But I wanted to mention that communities that is really important for us and our binational community that really suffers from some of the worst air quality in traffic (inaudible) in the country.

And so I wanted to just emphasize that today's action is critical for the well-being, not only of the residents across -- you know, in my district and around the border, but (inaudible) climate change. I really believe that this is a bold move. It's going to once again put California apart and commit us to support programs to ensure EVs and charging infrastructure is affordable and available for all Californians.

I really do appreciate your leadership and staff's continuing efforts to develop this space for advancing equity. I really appreciate all the comments and the recommendations that you were able to advise just a couple minutes ago, so that way we may ensure that
environmental justice advocates and manufacturers are also part of that.

Like my colleagues on the Board, it is -- I'm really interested in making sure that we get this technology into our communities of color, our front-line communities sooner. So I really do support the recommendations -- the recommendations that were made by my other colleagues as well.

We have a lot of work to do with leadership to advance the secondary market sales to ensure that our residents in our communities are able to compete for the used car market for its EVs, which is why I'm also really appreciative of the Biden administration's infusion of its -- for buying used EVs reading.

So we will continue and work to promote EV participation. I also want to make sure that we're really discussing, and I think we've mentioned it already, to support the organizations doing the work on the ground in our communities. And I'm looking forward to the updated report and the progress that my colleagues also mentioned, so -- again, it's -- to say that I think this is (inaudible) today. And I thank you and I appreciate the Governor setting the target of all of our (inaudible), and remember that our State (inaudible) are all also supporting our work.
Thank you, very much Chair.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Okay. Board Member Eisenhut is next.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: There. Thank you, Chair.

I've struggled. I've heard the comments of my colleagues, historic, transformative, market transformative, strategic, and I've been looking through my thesaurus to see if I can do better.

(Laughter)

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: And so far without success.

(Laughter)

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: So I will -- I will embrace the comments of my colleagues each and all, Dr. Sperling and his emphasis on the -- on the historic transformation nature of our work, Barbara on her cautionary note about not outdistancing the infrastructure, and Ms. Takvorian in -- in her comments about I think timing of our review and the cycle of the review. And I'd like to -- well, let me digress. I make it abundantly clear I'm very much in favor of this. I am personally privileged to be a part of the group that seems to be headed toward an adoption of this action. And I'm -- it's something that I, at some point, will be able to share with my grandchildren when they want to know what
part I have taken in making their lives potentially different. And it's a privilege to be able to be here.

I'm -- I would respectfully change the Chair's description of comfortable with the three-year cycle of the report to accepting of the three-year cycle. And I'm not going to propose. I would not propose that we change that cycle, but I -- I think we could do it outside of a -- an amendment to -- because -- because the language allows for more frequent than three years, but I would specifically request a more -- a report that's earlier than the one that was described that possibly stretched into 2027. And I'd like to begin that three-years cycle earlier, rather than later. I think it contains a critical information to our review of the collaborative nature of this work. And I'd like to see that report sooner. I'm not going to -- I'll just leave it at that. I'd like to see that report sooner, so those -- those are my comments, Chair.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Can I follow up on that? I mean, is there -- is there an opportunity to perhaps maybe do the first one a little sooner and then kind of start that three-year cycle?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SEGALL: Well, it's fundamental just a question of depth and quality of analysis versus timing, you know, which is what we're
balancing. And I guess what I'd suggest -- you know, understanding that folks both really want to know how we're doing, but also that we need some time to discover how we're doing, is that this be a conversation with the basic advisory group we're putting together. There's nothing in the resolution that stops us from coming back more quickly.

But one thing I'm just aware of is we want to come back with useful information that folks can either organize on or think about and I don't want to short circuit that either. So I think we'll -- we will learn this and I totally hear the interest in making sure we track this really closely, which I'm very committed to. It's just we want to discover what we're learning and report it in a thoughtful way.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Great. So basically kind of one of the key first topics of that group what we'll start no later than January 1st will be at least an initial baseline report and the timing for that.

Okay. Dr. Balmes is next.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Chair Randolph and I'll try to be brief, since my colleagues who've spoken previously have said most of what I wanted to say. But I have to go back to something that Dr. Sperling mentioned early on and a -- I don't know if Tom Cackette
is still in the audience, but now that I'm one of the more senior Board members, I do really appreciate the staff's work all these years that I've been on the board to get to this point. And I particularly want to give a shout-out to Tom for his leadership in that regard.

I also tried to consult my thesaurus about the language to properly frame and contextualize this regulation and I decided not to go for a superlative, but to say that this is the appropriate response to the climate emergency. So I'll start with that.

We have to do this for all the reasons that my colleagues have mentioned, but I want to add one more, which some of the testimony today pointed out, especially people with asthma or who had kids with asthma, there is a public health dimension to this historic regulation, and staff has projected that at least 1,300 lives would be saved, over a thousand health care utilization for respiratory and cardiovascular outcomes. And I think that's conservative. We're really going to have a major reduction in internal combustion engine generated PM2.5, in addition to other pollutants. So that -- and it's especially important for the low-income communities of color, the front-line communities that my colleagues have spoken about.

So in addition to all the environmental and
economic reasons for this regulation, there's a public health dimension that I wanted to emphasize as well. And finally, I want to thank all stakeholders for their participation in helping to craft this regulation, and especially to recognize the hard work of staff. And I'm very supportive of both the regulation and the monitoring of the environmental justice values component that we've discussed.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Supervisor Serna.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you, Chair.

And I too will attempt to be brief here. Dr. Balmes ended with rightful thanks to everyone involved and I'll start there, and, of course, shower my gratitude upon our fine capable staff for not just the immediate work that has transpired to get the resolution in front of us today and the regulation in shape, but as has been mentioned, over several years and that's why, in part, today is, as has been mentioned, a very historic -- very historic moment. So thanks to staff, thanks to everyone that provided testimony today and certainly back in June.

You know, I guess where I want to kind of start the substantive comments here is that I think it's incumbent upon us to acknowledge at a moment like this
that our responsibility is more than just leaving tea
leaves on the rim of a cup. And what I mean by that is
that when we are going to be expected to take bold action
in the form of regulation and rulemaking, especially
subsequent to a very clear directive vis-à-vis an
executive order or orders plural, you know, we need to be
bold in how we go about thinking carefully about
implementing what is in those orders. And I think that's
what we have achieved here today.

And for those that testified today, you know,
there was -- there was a common theme amongst some, and
that common theme was too fast, too soon. And I would
just encourage those that have expressed that particular
concern to think about how the market and the OEMs have
already responded to much of what CARB has been leading
worldwide again in the -- in the space of advancing
zero-emission vehicles and attempting to influence the
market, so that market share continues to increase.

You know, while others were consulting their
thesaurus waiting to speak, I was -- I was consulting
Google. And I was just very curious. I Googled some OEMs
to see what popped up as kind of the first bit of
marketing rhetoric that they -- they offer. So when I
looked up General Motors, the first thing I see is, "The
Electric Future is Here. When I Googled Toyota, it
said -- they said, "Building an Electrified Future Today". And when I looked up Audi, the first thing that comes up is, "Progress is Electric".

So I think, if nothing else, when you look at the response that the OEMs have already taken and will continue to take, based on the fact that the technology is, and has -- and continues to just grow very fast in terms of dealing with range anxiety, and, you know, we have -- there are certain models today that actually have better range than their -- their internal combustion counterparts. And then, of course, as has been mentioned, the cost of ownership being as competitive as it is for ZEVs. I think we're well on our way, and have been.

Yes, today marks a very, you know, seminal point in the continuum of how we influence the market in the right way, but I think there's a lot of momentum that's already there. And so I just wanted to offer that, Madam Chair, specifically for those who may, you know, continue to have some -- some concern about the swiftness of this regulation and the fact that, you know, 2035 is going to come sooner than we think.

But I am very confident that with, again the thoughtfulness that's gone into this, especially with regards to the intersection with our environmental justice goals, that this can be something that we all look back
upon as, you know, a critical moment in time to -- to be
proud of and be proud of for all the right reasons for
doing our part to address climate change and public
health. And that is in large part, you know, the
principle part of our mission. And so I'm very proud, as
my colleagues have mentioned, of being a small part of it
today.

So thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. Okay. That was a
very enthusiastic thank you to Supervisor Serna.

Okay. Senator Florez.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you. It's hard to
speak after everyone has made the most amazing comments,
but I will say I also, as Dr. Balmes has pointed out, you
know, point to the historic nature of today. I think John
Eisenhut was correct. I think everyone should take a
screenshot at some point. This is absolutely historic.
And the reason for that is I think it's pretty clear that
climate change is the single most important generational
challenge that we are facing today. And I think this
Board is taking it head on. Clearly, the vote today is a
generational shift in the way we think, in the way we
operate, in the way we survive in the world.

And I can tell you as a past legislator and I'll
point both Connie and to Hector, the one thing you learn
in the Legislature is you really don't mess with people's cars. So I think tomorrow I'm expecting to see some headlines calling our action extreme. I think a lot of folks will look at this as impossible. Most will ask the question whether or not the Board, and California, and this Governor have gone too far.

But if you put it in the context of what climate change is and the impact of automobiles and the ability to change the course, at the end of the day, we have polluting cars whose exhaust is threatening people's health, its -- their well-being. It -- they get that it's from point A to B. And on the other hand we have clean cars that will now get us to the same location in a clean carbon-free way.

It seems like the choice for the Board and the action that we're taking today is pretty clear. I think we're opting on the side of clean air, better health, commitment. You're hearing from everyone to work to make the transition the way it can and should be. Obviously, as Barbara mentioned, there's lots of issues about range anxiety. There's the whole issue about convenience, always built into this. And I do really feel -- you know, I also did a little looking into as Hector did.

You know, it amazes me that if you look at the arguments back in the early 1900s when the automobile was
created, you know, it was kind of called the horseless age. And those horseless carriages, you know, the amount of ridicule and the amount of really bad reaction to those who even thought about this was very similar to I think what a lot of Board members, the Governor, and others are going to get tomorrow, and that is, you know, some skepticism, because in some sense people are happy with the way their polluting cars operate today. They've been used to it probably for the last hundred years.

Today's action sets an absolutely new course, but it's built, as Hector said, on an infrastructure that did -- was not really created, if you will. I think once people see the convenience of charging from home, the fact that they're not going to have to search for a gas station with gas prices that are astronomical. The fact that they're not going to put in fuel that is poisoning all of us, it feels to me that the vote today really is going to set this course in a way that, you know, is -- it's -- it's history.

So I just am very happy to be associated with today's vote. I clearly feel like if you look at the first automobile that was created, I think it took 19 years to get 15 million cars from the time that we had one car from 1908 to 1927 up and running. I think just looking at trajectory of EVs, the amount of marketing by
the manufacturers, you just had watch to the Super Bowl to know that everyone is turning the corner on this, including the auto manufacturers. I mean we have 13 years and we are already at an almost more amazing trajectory than the gas powered poisoning machine that we're now hopefully going to displace in California.

And I do think we will lead other states and I do think we will lead the world. I'm absolutely proud to be associated with that. And Madam Chair, I hope that -- that you see on your new venture as the Chair of our Board congratulations. I think this is something we can all look at and be proud of. We will weather this storm just like we did on the horseless carriages. But just as they did at that point in time, I think we're going to be able to look and see that we really stood on the side of public health, climate change, and we really built on the operational success of technology that we are also used to and also quickly.

So thank you, Board. I look forward to my aye vote. Probably one of the better aye votes I'm ever going to take and I'm really looking forward to moving forward. The hard work is ahead as has been mentioned. Got a lot of checking in to do, a lot of data, got a lot of infrastructure to build. We've got to have enough energy to make all of this work. But I think it does start with
our Board's action today to point in the direction of reducing the amount of climate change problems that we have in this world. And thank you so much for allowing me to say a few words.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Senator Leyva.

SENATOR LEYVA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Wow, what an exciting day. Sorry I'm a little late. We had a floor session this morning. I want to say that I think Dr. Balmes was a hundred percent correct that the action that we are talking is appropriate and it's what we should be doing. And I really want to echo all of the words of all of my fellow Board members and what they have said. And then I also want to say that change is hard. And, you know, when we go to the gas station and we put gas in our car, even when we know it's not good for the environment, certainly for myself representing the 20th Senate District, where we have more smog and bad air days than almost any place else in the Senate, it's what we know. So we're going to have to get used to a new normal, but it's an exciting day. It's an exiting day that we get to all be a part of this. It's been an honor for me to get to be on the Board and be a part of this.

I want to say thank you to staff. Thank you for letting me call you with my crazy questions and making
sure I understand the process and what we're doing. We couldn't have done it without you. And I want to say to the public and everybody listening, we know that change will be hard, but we also know that this is the absolute right thing to do. But this has been a very thoughtful process with lots of public comment.

And I always like to say that when we reach any kind of a deal, if anyone ever -- if we all walk away a little bit happy and a little bit unhappy, then we've probably reached the right balance. And I think that's where we are today.

Everyone won't think it's perfect, but as Dr. Balmes said it is appropriate and it's what we should do. And I hope as we move forward, we are always mindful of our underserved communities, and folks who will have a harder time purchasing an electric vehicle, but you know what, I have no doubt that we can do all of that. So great work everyone. It is an exciting day and I'm honored to get to be a part.

Thank you Madam Chair.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Vice Chair Berg.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Well, thank you very much, Chair. You know, it has just been so inspiring listening to all of my colleagues. And I, too, echo all the comments. And there's no question that you have a Board
that is very committed. We are not going into this blind. We absolutely understand the upsides and the challenges. And so, staff, congratulations. We're in it with you. And, Madam Chair, it's yours.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you so much. And all of my colleagues were so eloquent. So I'm not going to repeat what they said. This is a historic day and I'm really pleased to be here with all of you to take this step.

I just wanted to take a moment to thank the staff. And I -- you know we're used to thanking the staff that's here right in front of us, and seeing your faces, and being excited to see you, and happy to contribute. But I also wanted to thank the staff that's not here in the Board room. There were over 40 staff people who worked on this incredibly complex regulatory package on everything from the battery durability requirements to providing legal advice on CEQA, legal analysis on other issues to provide information and advice round our incentive programs and how they interact with this, to work on our -- on-board diagnostic amendments, to work on economic modeling and other modeling needed for the regulation, working on fuel cell issues, you know, because this is -- it's not just electric vehicles, it's also fuel cell vehicles -- analysis of health benefits, analysis of
the emissions reductions we're going to see, analysis of the battery labeling and the recycling issues, the durability issues, in-use testing and warranty issues, an incredibly complicated package.

And I'm just -- I just really want to thank all of the hard work that went into building this package, and working with the stakeholders, and putting together something that is world changing.

So with that, I am going to turn to the Board member who was here the -- for the first zero-emission vehicle requirement and ask her to make a motion to approve the resolution, Mrs. Riordan.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Madam Chair, it is my pleasure to move the staff recommendation of approving Resolution 22-12.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Is there a second?

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Second.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Second.

(Laughter)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. There is a second. Board clerk, will you please call the roll.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Can we -- can I ask if the maker of the motion and the second would include the changes to the dates that were agreed to.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Oh, yes, the January 1st --
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.
CHAIR RANDOLPH: -- 2023 date for the --
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Sorry.
CHAIR RANDOLPH: -- beginning. Yes. No, that is included.
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you.
CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dr. Balmes?
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: A very enthusiastic yes.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. De La Torre?
BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Aye.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Eisenhut?
BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Aye.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Senator Florez?
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Aye.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ms. Hurt?
BOARD MEMBER HURT: Hurt, aye.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Kracov?
BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?
BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mrs. Riordan?
BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Aye.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Supervisor Serna?
BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Serna, aye.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Professor Sperling?
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Sperling, super aye.
(Laughter)
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ms. Takvorian?
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Takvorian, aye.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Supervisor Vargas?
Vice Chair Berg?
VICE CHAIR BERG: Berg, aye.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Chair Randolph?
CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Madam Chair, the motion passes.
CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right, yay.
(Applause)
BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Mazel tov. Mazel tov.
CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. All right. Now, I have to get back to the order of the meeting. Sorry.
Yes. We are about to take a break, but I just want to make sure that I make it clear that we are adjourning until 4 p.m., at which time we will consider the AB 617 Community Emissions Reduction Plan for the South Los Angeles community. So thank you all for coming. Thank you for your work on this regulation. And for those of you who will be at the 617 item, we'll see you at 4 p.m.
Thank you very much.

(Off record: 1:45 p.m.)

(Thereupon a lunch break was taken.)
AFTERNOON SESSION

(On record: 4:02 p.m.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. We are back -- come back from our break, so please come to order.

For those of us who are just joining us, I would like to go over the housekeeping items that we mentioned at the start of this morning's meeting.

Anyone who wishes to testify on a Board item in person must fill out a request to speak card available in the foyer and turn it into the designated Board assistant prior to the commencement of the item. If you are participating remotely, you will raise your hand in Zoom or dial star nine, if you're 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 left of the elevator and out of the building. When the all-clear signal is given, we will return to the hearing room 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 by phone.

Interpretation services will be provided today in Spanish. If you are join us using Zoom, there is a button labeled "Interpretation" on the Zoom screen. Click on that interpretation button and select Spanish to hear the meeting in Spanish. If you are joining us here in person and would like to listen to the meeting in Spanish, please notify a Board assistant and they will provide you with further instructions.

I want to remind all of our speakers to speak slowly and pause intermittently to allow the interpreters the opportunity to accurately interpret your comments.

(Interpreter translated in Spanish.)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: I will now ask the Board clerk to provide more detail on today’s procedures.

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

If you are joining us remotely and wish to make a verbal comment on one of the Board items or during the open comment period at the end of today's meeting, 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 you've previously indicated which item you wish to speak on when you registered, you must raise your hand at the beginning of the item, so that you can be added to the queue and your chance to speak will not be skipped.

If you will be giving your verbal comment in Spanish and require an interpreter's assistance, please indicate so at the beginning of your testimony and our translator will assist you. During 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. We will call each commenter by name and will activate each commenter's audio when it is their turn to speak. For those calling in, we will identify you by the last three digits of your phone number. We will not show a list of remote commenters, however, we will be announcing the next three or so commenters in the queue, so that 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 we will begin the comment period with a three minute time limit. This could change at the Chair's discretion. For those calling in by phone, we will run the timer and let you know when you have 30 seconds left and then when your time is up. If you require Spanish 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. Written comments will be
accepted on each item until the Chair closes the record
for that Board item.

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

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

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

The second and final item on today's agenda is
Item number 22-10-2, Assembly Bill 617 Community Air
Protection Program, Community Emissions Reduction Plan, or
CERP, for the South Los Angeles community.

If you are here with us in Zoom and -- I'm sorry.
If you are here with us in the room and wish to comment on
the item, please fill out a request to speak card as soon
as possible. If you are joining us remotely and wish to
comment on this item, please click the raise hand button
or dial star nine now. We will be calling on the
in-person commenters first followed by the remote
commenters when we get to the public comment portion of
this item.

Assembly Bill 617 established a first-of-its-kind
air quality program that works to advance equity and
environmental justice by focusing attention and resources on communities most burdened by poor air quality. The California Air Resources Board created the Community Air Protection Program to coordinate implementation. Since 2018, CARB has accepted 17 communities into the program. For four years, we've worked closely with air districts, other governmental agencies, community partners, and affected industry.

We have come to better understand the challenges facing California's most overburdened communities and we continue to learn. We are committed to working together toward more effective and equitable implementation of this program.

In 2020, this Board selected the South Los Angeles community for community air monitoring and to develop a community emissions reduction plan. The South LA community area is approximately 64 square miles and is home to over 900,000 people. The air quality challenges faced and prioritized by this community include mobile sources, auto body shops, general industrial facilities, metal processing facilities, and the oil and gas industry.

Since January 2021, the District has been working with the South Los Angeles community steering committee and three co-lead organizations, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Los Angeles, Strategic Concepts in...
Organizing and Policy Education, and Watts Clean Air and Energy Committee to develop strategies to improve the air quality for everyone in South LA. Of note, these organizations received community air grants in year one and year two of the program, and their partnership under the grant built support for the selection of South LA.

By a unanimous vote, the South Coast Air Quality Management District governing Board adopted the final CERP for the South Los Angeles community in June 2022. We are excited to consider South LA's community emissions reduction plan today as it is the first of the three communities selected in 2020 to have completed a plan. Moreover, as you will hear from the staff report, the plan reflects a wide range of strategies to address community identified priorities.

Because the heart of the community air protection program is focused on communities, we tend to structure these Board items a little differently. We'll first hear from a South Los Angeles co-lead, then the South Coast Air Quality Management District, and finally from CARB staff regarding the CERP. After the presentation, we will take public testimony, and the Board will vote on whether to approve the community emissions reduction plan for the South Los Angeles community.

Ms. Fletcher, would you please introduce the
item?

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Thank you, Chair Randolph. In my role as Deputy Executive Officer for Environmental Justice, I oversee CARB's Environmental Justice, Racial Equity, and Community Protection programs. In that role, I have come to appreciate the value of AB 617 in catalyzing organizational change. Effective implementation of AB 617 requires coordination across multiple divisions within CARB. And it requires us to rethink our traditional methods of engagement. Just as critically, AB 617 requires true partnership between air districts, CARB, and communities.

In addition to hearing from South Coast AQMD, and a community co-lead, you will hear from staff about the significant level of engagement that guided the concurrent development of the South LA emissions reduction plan and air monitoring plan. Of note, the South LA community is the first South Coast AB 617 community that relied on a formal community co-led model.

South Los Angeles suffers from poor air quality due to mobile sources, stationary sources emitting VOCs and toxic metals, and oil and gas production. We recognize that these communities also experience pollution from the sources that are primarily regulated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, including exhaust from
out-of-state trucks moving through the community.

CARB and community members have pressed U.S. EPA for strong federal truck rules, which we hope will become final later this year, along with other federal action on emissions from ships and planes. We want to keep working together to support strong action at all levels of government to reduce emissions.

I will now ask Terry Allen of the Office of Community Air Protection to introduce the community lead.

Terry.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: Thank you, Chanell. Good afternoon Board members. In addition to hearing from one of the South Los Angeles co-leads, you will also hear from South Coast AQMD as well. Today, we have Paula Torrado Plazas, Manager of Health and Environment Program with Physicians for Social Responsibility, Los Angeles, Uyen-Uyen Vo, Manager of Community Emission Reduction Programs at South Coast Air Quality Management District, and Kathryn Higgins, Director of Community Air Programs at the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

Now, I'll turn it over to Paula with PSR.

Paula.

PAULA TORRADO PLAZAS: Thank you, Terry.
Good afternoon, everyone. Good afternoon, California Air Resources Board, members, and everyone in the audience. As Terry mentioned, my name is Paula Torrado and I am the Manager of Health and Environment Programs at Physicians for Social Responsibility and have been representative of the co-leads at the -- of the AB 617 South LA community steering committee.

We would like to thank that you for the opportunity to address you today in the -- on behalf of the AB 617 South LA community co-leads that are PSR-LA, SCOPE, Watts Clean Air, and the South Coast AQMD.

But first and foremost, the co-leads want to acknowledge and express gratitude to CARB Board members, the CARB staff for their support from the onset of the South LA community being selected as an AB 617 official community and the staff for providing technical support and guidance. I also want to recognize and acknowledge the tremendous work that was done by the community co-leads and the South Coast AQMD AB 617 South LA team to develop the -- both the CERP and the CAMP. It has been a hard process and we want to thank the South Coast AQMD staff for their hard work, commitment, and for working towards developing a more trusting relationship with the co-leads and for trying to listen to us and prioritizing what the community wanted.
We are happy with the fact that our just transition chapter made it to the CERP and that South LA CERP actions are moving forward, such is the process, to amend and review Rule 1148.2 that will ensure all oil injection wells are included in the notification system.

Next slide, please.

PAULA TORRADO PLAZAS: So I wanted to -- to start with the background of the community of South Los Angeles, the traditional land of the Tongva and Gabrielino peoples original landowners of the LA Basin, which is now home to a historic black and brown community and low-income community that has faced many historical social injustices battles.

And the South LA community today faces multiple synergistic and cumulative stressors that -- and hazardous exposures that when combined with existing vulnerability lead to very difficult adverse health consequences as shown in the CalEnviroScreen map here.

Environmental factors -- next slide, please.

PAULA TORRADO PLAZAS: Environmental factors that contribute to poor health conditions include the presence of four freeways, clusters of industrial sources of
pollution, legacy contaminants, and currently operating oil and gas extraction. In addition, current monitoring efforts provide a quite incomplete picture of the state of air quality, in part because there are no regulatory grade air monitors located in South Central Los Angeles. There are -- one in Korea Town and the other one is in Compton. And we believe that having more regulatory grade monitors in South Los Angeles could help bridge that data gap.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

PAULA TORRADO PLAZAS: So in terms of the AB 617 Program in the South LA community selection. So after many years of advocacy and groundbreaking work at the local level, building the community capacity, on February 25th, 2021, the community of South Los Angeles was officially selected as an AB 617 community. And as mentioned, this major success would have not been possible without the report of our SCLA-PUSH Project, or our South Central Los Angeles Project to understand sources of air pollution and health impacts. Quite a mouthful, but long -- for short SCLA-PUSH which started in 2018 -- in 2019 as part of our AB 617 community air grants. And that was also done in collaboration with our long-time community partners SCOPE and Watts Clean Air.

Next slide, please.
PAULA TORRADO PLAZAS: So the project aimed at building the capacity of South LA organizations and community residents to better understand the state of air quality and health in their community, to engage in air monitoring, and data analyses, and data collection, ground truthing through our air quality academy. And all of that with the goal to advance community driven solutions in air quality policy and through the AB 617 Program.

So our strong partnerships in South LA are rooted in our commitment and principles to environmental justice and achieving social justice and the strong community engagement we have led together with the co-leads in South LA have led -- led to the co-leads and our SCLA-PUSH air quality ambassadors to the development of the AB 617 co-leadership model, which also brought many of our committed and trained residents to become part of this -- the community steering committee.

So the community co-leadership model. So we are in full support of approving the South LA community emissions reduction plan and the community air monitoring plan to achieve the goals of AB 617 in a way that truly reflects a community-driven approach to addressing localized emissions and achieving tangible improvements in health and air quality with the hope that the CERP
implementation phases guided by the co-leads leadership and community voices and experiences and that the CERP actions implementation is only strengthened through the process.

Next slide, please.
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PAULA TORRADO PLAZAS: So the co-lead organizations, again PSR-LA, SCOPE, and Watts Clean Air collective have a track -- a track record of success of over 20 years of experience in working in South LA organizing, building relationships, and advocating for solutions for the ongoing health threats linked to environmental justice issues in the community. So the co-leadership model demonstrates not just that this part of the work around AB 617, but a history -- a long history of decades of work in the South LA community. And the co-leadership model demonstrates that relationship and was developed to ensure that the process for identifying air quality priorities and emissions reductions strategies was grounded in the community, but also did come -- this came with some challenges and lessons learned.

So next slide, please.
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PAULA TORRADO PLAZAS: So some challenges. A major barrier to achieving meaningful community engagement
through the AB 61 south -- AB 617 process was the time constraints due to the fast-paced timeline for the development and approval of the -- both the CERP and the CAMP, the continued impacts of the pandemic and community engagement, Zoom fatigue, onboarding a facilitator later in the process, the path that South Coast AQMD took to reground the process, which was very meaningful, and purposeful, and needed, among other factors that contributed to a delayed CERP and CAMP development for South LA.

And since February 2021, the co-leaders have been working on a weekly basis with the South Coast AQMD, AB 617 team, and conducting community outreach and serving as a strategy partner to provide guidance to the AB 617 community steering committee.

Also, the AB 617 work has come at the expense of stretching our community-based organization's capacity and overwhelmed staff, as we're rushing -- rushing to complete a CERP and a CAMP by the AB 617 deadline. Studying the AB 617 process, it was challenging. Due to the limited resources and expensive commitment required, it was hard to get South LA voices heard. And we saw how there was a lack of our people at the mic. And while the AB 617 was not perfect, it did give us an opportunity to focus our energy to build capacity and organize the community.
However, there is no doubt that more resources are needed for communities to be effectively engaged in the process. In addition to these barriers, other barriers are the process transparency, data access -- accessibility, and the co-leads on balance decision-making ability due to limited capacity.

All of these barriers also created opportunities to develop lessons learned for us to step off our community leadership and digital community engagement tools -- next slide, please --

--o0o--

PAULA TORRADO PLAZAS: -- and to pivot around time and capacity constraints by leveraging existing resources, for example through our SCLA-PUSH project, and through our organizing models and expertise to get the strongest CERP version possible for South LA.

Many of the barriers that we faced through the CERP development and the CAMP development were turned into important lessons learned that led us to stronger understanding of how to leverage the program to get the best out of it, including strengthening relationships, partnerships with the District, getting to problem solving, and having a more inclusive working relationship with the goal of amplifying South LA voices in the CERP.

From the outset of the AB 617 implementation in
South LA, we have learned the importance of meaningful community engagement initiatives, when addressing community needs and developing solutions. As co-leaders, we have stepped up for the South LA community to ensure this equitable representation, transparency, and accountability in the program implementation. But for that, we definitely need stronger popular education, strengthening trust, and we need the ability to build different and unique relationships with the community and the District, both separately and collectively.

We have also learned that transparency, open dialogue, and accountability are key to ensure all co-leaders, including South Coast AQMD are heard and their input is equitably -- equitably reflected in the decision-making process.

None of the -- nonetheless, that cannot happen without first building trust and strengthening relationships between the co-leaders and the Air District.

Next slide, please.
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PAULA TORRADO PLAZAS: So we still want to emphasize that the current South LA CERP in its implementation needs to be strengthened in terms of achieving quantifiable emissions reductions and it needs serious commitment towards implementing our just
transition pilot projects and needs to include more proactive approaches to reducing emissions with the goal of attaining the Clean Air Act standards and beyond and protecting the health of South LA residents.

Based on the community insights gathered through AB 617 the steering committee and the economic and health burdens that South LA residents and workers experience daily, it is clear that to achieve air quality improvements, we must combine a number of strategies and approaches that aim at achieving both health equity and economic justice. One of these approaches is developing and implementing just transition strategies that promote best available control technology process changes and innovations that focus at achieving clean production. The South LA CERP development and implementation is key for addressing all of these air pollution burdens and achieving a just transition, as outlined by this model.

Next slide, please.
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PAULA TORRADO PLAZAS: So in conclusion, the South Los Angeles community is a vibrant community where community residents and organizations are hungry for transformative change that can reverse the impacts of legacy environmental racism in decision making. A key demand from our communities is a community where residents
can live, work, play, pray, and thrive individually and collectively. The AB 617 community process to develop this CERP offers an opportunity to address the pervasiveness of industrial pollution from the perspective of public health by tapping into the creativity and innovation that exists in the area. The AB 617 South LA co-leads believe that a just transition for facilities of concern cannot occur without building trust and strong partnership agreements.

In order to achieve that, South LA communities must forge a relationship with the regulated community that is based on trust and achieving a common goal, healthier communities for all.

Lastly, we support the approval of CERP and hope that its implementation is guided by the lessons learned, a more trusting an engaged relationship between the co-leads and the Air District, and is centered in intentionally implementing the CERP actions in a way that truly reflects the priorities of our community. We want serious commitment towards funding resources allocated to implementing our just transition projects and emissions reduction actions as outlined in the CERP.

We thank you for your time and commitment to improving the air and health of our community and are looking forward to the next phase of implementation. We
are hopeful that we collectively can achieve a vision for a healthier and stronger South LA.

Thank you for your time.

--o0o--

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: We have our next speakers too. I just wanted to make the request from our interpreters that we speak as slow and clear just for their sake. Thank you.

And then Terry back to you.

OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: Next up, we have Uyen-Uyen Vo with the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

UYEN-UYN VO: Hi. Good morning. Sorry. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and CARB Board members.

Next slide, please.
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UYEN-UYN VO: My name is Uyen-Uyen Vo and I am a part of South Coast AQMD's Community Air Program. Today, I will be giving a brief overview of the South Los Angeles CERP. The South Los Angeles community boundary that Chair Randolph mentioned includes four cities and about 20 different neighborhoods. And then Additionally at the end of this -- the conclusion of my presentation, Kathryn Higgins will be giving some program highlights on South Coast AQMD's AB 617 Program.
UYEN-UYEN VO: So South Coast --
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Uyen-Uyen, can I ask you to speak a little slower for the interpreter.
UYEN-UYEN VO: Oh, yes. Sorry.
BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: I'm sorry. Thank you.
UYEN-UYEN VO: So South Los Angeles is South Coast AQMD's sixth AB 617 community and our only year three community.

Next slide, please.
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UYEN-UYEN VO: So first, I wanted to kind of provide a little bit of background on the unique circumstances surrounding the development of the South Los Angeles CERP. As touched on by Paula, our CERP development did begin in March 2021 during the pandemic, so the entire process has been virtual minus two in-person meet and greets.

And then as mentioned by Chair Randolph and Ms. Chanell, another unique point about this community is it used a community co-lead model, which is the first community to do that at South Coast AQMD. So I just wanted to once again mention Paula and Martha from PSR-LA, Gina from SCOPE, and Ms. Linda and Ms. Jackie from Watts
Clean Air. And then, of course, we have our CSC members who are a very integral part of our CERP development. So this is a very -- was a very community-driven process. Our CSC is composed of 48 members with two alternatives and 57 percent of our members are South Los Angeles residents.

Once again, South Coast AQMD truly recognizes and appreciates the efforts and dedication of all the work that has been put in to collaborate on developing this CERP. So we just wanted to thank everyone and we understand that it was done through the challenges of the pandemic on top of just the hard work that was put in just for CERP development overall.

Next slide, please.
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UYEN-UYEN VO: So based on emissions data and the community's data experience with air pollution, the South Los Angeles CSC identified five air quality priorities and the CERP lays out 37 goals and 73 actions to reduce emissions exposure and increase monitoring to address these five air quality priorities.

Next slide, please.
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UYEN-UYEN VO: So four of the five air quality priorities include a commitment to rule development. I
did want to highlight one of the rules for this CERP. It's under general industrial facilities. There is a commitment to Rule 1102, which will consider establishing a new standard which would reflect zero-emissions technologies for any new dry-cleaning systems. With respect to incentives, all five of the air quality priorities include commitments to incentivizing funding opportunities for cleaner technologies.

For example, for mobile sources, incentive funds for cleaner mobile - excuse me - source technologies, such as lower -- lower emitting trucks and buses, and also, of course, electric vehicles. Other funding opportunities mentioned in this CERP include school air filtration systems, paints, coatings, and cleaners that are used at some of our auto body shops, and incorporating best management practices at facilities such as metal processing and our oil and gas facilities.

Next slide, please.

UYEN-UYEN VO: So as depicted here, all five of the air quality priorities also have an enforcement strategy. For instance, at -- for auto body shops, there is a commitment to door-to-door focused enforcement. And this will -- this includes auto body shops and potential auto body shops. And this will ensure that facilities are
properly classified and also will verify compliance with all applicable rules and regulations.

Additional enforcement through the CERP includes at construction sites and of specific South Coast, AQMD, and CARB rules and regulations such as those for dry cleaners and chrome platers. Four of the five air quality priorities include an air monitoring component. And this is mainly driven through the community air monitoring plan. And through that plan, it utilizes several monitoring strategies, such as mobile and fixed monitoring, which we hope to supplement with the use of air quality sensors.

Next slide, please.
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UYEN-UYEN VO: Our last two strategies include public information and outreach and collaboration. And all five air quality priorities have both of these strategies included. So for public outreach and information, this will include distributing materials and conducting trainings and workshops. For collaboration, South Coast AQMD together with CARB will work with other agencies, local businesses, and community-based organizations to implement the actions in this CERP, provide outreach, and then also coordinate agency referrals.
UYEN-UYEN VO: So implementation of this CERP will achieve emission reductions. It is estimated through our process that nitrogen oxides, NOx, will be reduced 193 tons per year in 2026 and 320 -- I'm sorry, 300 tons per year in 2031. For diesel particulate matter, DPM, 2.3 and 3.89 tons per year in 2026 and 2031 respectively.

Next slide, please.

UYEN-UYEN VO: That concludes the South Los Angeles portion of the presentation. Next will be Kathryn Higgins.

KATHRYN HIGGINS: Thank you, Uyen-Uyen. And good afternoon, Chair Randolph, Board members, and everyone in attendance this afternoon. I'm Kathryn Higgins, Director of Community Air Programs for South Los Angeles -- for the South Coast AQMD. In addition to supporting your staff's recommendation for consideration of the South LA CERP, thank you for the opportunity to just take a few minutes to share a broader perspective of some of our program highlights across all of our AB 617 communities.

Next slide.
KATHRYN HIGGINS: So certainly almost three years of information is a lot to condense into just a couple of slides, but this provides sort of a bird's-eye view of key program milestones. What's captured here is more or less a snapshot of comprehensive program highlights from 2019 through this past June in key areas such as CERP implementation, incentive fund distribution and emissions reductions to date, community steering committee leadership models that we have in place and progress in uplifting community voices.

Without a doubt, we have challenging work ahead, but the lessons learned as Uyen-Uyen and -- both Paula and Uyen-Uyen just commented on, and accomplishments in these areas are examples of program wins and successes that are worth noting. Some of the highlights include truck idling sweeps, which is an enforcement element included in each of our CERPs, since truck emissions is a top concern across our communities.

From our focused enforcement activities jointly with CARB, we've conducted over 4,000 truck idling inspections. Air monitoring strategies are also guided by CSC-identified facilities of concern. So continuous mobile air monitoring is in place across our communities, either conducted directly by our monitoring team or through collaborative partnerships. Our governing board's
adoption of Rule 2305, the warehouse Indirect Source Rule, and progress towards proposal Rule 2306, which is the rail yard Indirect Source Rule, those both also significant towards emission reductions.

Relative to funding and emissions reductions, around $133 million in cap incentive funds have been distributed for mobile source and community-directed projects. NOx, PM, and VOC emission reductions were estimated respectively at 505, 17.9, and 27 tons per year from cumulative CERP strategy implementation.

Also, an additional -- additional NOx reductions of up to 1,460 tons per year are expected from Rule 1109.1 implementation. As for co-lead or CSC leadership models, our six communities are very unique, each of them having identified specific air quality concerns that are unique to their experiences, but also in their governance and use of leadership models. So utilizing the co-lead model in South Los Angeles, for example, we worked in close collaboration with our community co-leads to jointly -- or co-select a facilitator who's not only assisted in ensuring that our CSC meetings run smoothly, but also she gets the gold star for successfully facilitating the relationship between our co-leads and agency staff.

Finally, the manner in which we gauge -- engage with CSC members has shifted over -- over time. That has
definitely evolved, in that we are more in listening mode and actively seeking ways to prioritize community voices and community expertise.

Next slide.
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KATHRYN HIGGINS: So as we all know and can attest to, AB 617 is a very complex program with many challenges and intersections, not only related to air pollution, but also with regard to race, community traumas, resource impacts, and now we can add a global pandemic to the list of challenges.

However, we are very much focused on integrating lesson learned and looking forward to creating what we consider transformational and certainly sustainable ways to reduce air pollution emissions, exposures, and to improve public health in all communities, but especially those that are most highly impacted. We see opportunities to interact more equitably and transparent. We've had discussions with CARB staff about the need to brand the program for visual recognition of AB 617 funded tools, equipment, and projects. Another opportunity is to co-collaborate with CSC members to develop sort of a cross-CSC communications platform, if you will. And lastly, to support transparency of our efforts and those of the other air districts, we are committed to improve
reporting of program accomplishments by developing more user-friendly, visually-appealing tools that report both quantitative and qualitative program updates to community members.

So with that, that concludes my overview of our program. That's my allotted time. And I'd like to thank you for giving me this time to share program accomplishments and, of course, to support CARB staff in recommending your consideration of the South Los Angeles CERP. And I believe Terry will continue on with this item and presenting staff's recommendation.

Thank you.
(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: Thank you, Kathryn.

Next slide.
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OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: As you heard from Paula, Uyen-Uyen, and Kathryn, the South Los Angeles community has a long history of environmental challenges, including disproportionate exposure to poor air quality. The South Los Angeles community made up of multiple neighborhoods and cities. Approximately 904,000 people live within community's border of Latinos making up 68 percent of the population and African Americans making
up 26 percent of the population.

The state of California as a whole is 39 percent Latino and 5.5 percent African American. The population as a percentage compared to the state has more people under 10 years old as well as more people between the ages of 10 and 65.

The South Los Angeles community steering committee, as you heard, prioritized five sources of concern, mobile sources, auto body shops, general industrial facilities, metal processing facilities, and the oil and gas industry.

--o0o--

OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: The reason we are presenting this slide is just to give perspective on how large the South Los Angeles community is. Also, we wanted to highlight just how much effort has been focused on this area through this program.

--o0o--

OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: At the end of the CERP development process, CARB traditionally holds a workshop to get feedback from the community about the development process in order to inform CARB staff report. This year, CARB staff made a decision to have one-on-one conversations with community steering committee members as a way of soliciting feedback. The reason the staff chose
this method was due to observing a lack of attendance at CSC meetings towards the end of the process, and because in previous years, CARB workshops and other communities have not always achieved a high level of engagement.

The common themes across the one-on-one interviews were the necessity for CERP development to be community driven, how challenging it is to work within a compressed timeline, the necessity of emission reductions that are quantifiable, permanent and enforceable, and needing to require zero-emission equipment and fleets for industrial operations.

---o0o---

OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: Let's talk about the key strengths of the community emission reduction plan. The first key strength was the community engagement that took place during the development of the plan. The level of engagement was maximized through the use of co-leads, a facilitator, and online tools. I'd like to acknowledge the massive effort that South -- that staff at South Coast AQMD, the co-leads, and the facilitators engaged in to produce the plan.

For the South Los Angeles community, the South Coast AQMD opted to use a co-leadership model to develop the plan. And I know they were mentioned earlier by Uyen-Uyen, but I just want to uplift the co-leads again,
Martha and Paula with Physicians for Social
Responsibility, Los Angeles, Gina Charusombat with SCOPE,
and Ms. Linda Cleveland and Jacquelyn Badejo with Watts
Clean Air and Energy Committee. Facilitation was provided
by La Mikia Castillo Diana Sarabia-Briseño with Castillo
Consulting Partners.

South Coast also used an inclusive process to
select a facilitator through input on the scope of work
and joint interviews that included the co-leads. In
addition to using online tools such as Google Forms and
Jamboard, there were also breakout sessions and virtual
office hours scheduled for community members in order to
provide more time for community members to engage with Air
District staff and co-leads. All these efforts helped
further engagement within a virtual setting.

Another strength of the plan is the diverse set
of actions that are used to reduce emissions and exposures
to harmful air pollutants. The plan includes actions that
rely on enhanced enforcement rule development, incentives,
collaboration, monitoring and outreach, all of which were
informed by input received through the robust community
engagement process.

--o0o--

OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: As
expected, mobile sources are a major concern for the South
Los Angeles community. In addition to relying on actions from CARB, the District is also taking the lead on efforts to reduce mobile source emissions.

---

OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: I'd like to highlight specific CARB actions that are in the plan. CARB is the lead for actions that address three sources of concern that the community identified. Those sources are mobile sources of course, but also metal processing facilities in the oil and gas industry.

In addition to the actions shown on the slide, CARB will also provide information on chrome plating Air Toxics Control Measure and conduct compliance inspections of trucks and buses.

---

OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: The processes and practices that guided the development of the plan represent a big step forward in terms of community engagement and the wide variety of actions to obtain emissions and exposure reductions for flood community priorities.

There are two areas where the plan could be strengthened and one recommendation about continued engagement to strengthen implementation. The plan can be strengthened by continuing to refine strategies and
ensuring continued collaboration, and the process can be strengthened by considering the use of work teams.

--o0o--

OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: A common theme throughout CERP development across all communities is that one year is not enough time to develop a CERP and detailed strategies. During one-on-one conversations with CSC members, we learned that it was important that CERP actions were followed through. South Coast AQMD, the community co-leads, and the community steering committee should continue to work to refine these details during implementation of the plan and ensured these details are provided in annual progress reports.
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OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: The CERP looks towards agency collaboration as a cornerstone to achieve emissions and exposure reduction. Many relationships exist amongst agencies already. However, there's still details about these collaborations that need expanding upon. It is important to ensure that collaborations will continue not just during implementation but, if necessary, beyond.

Furthermore, the consideration of memorandums of understanding should also be considered. One theme that came up during one-on-one conversations with CSC members
was a lack of clarity in CARB's role. Facilitating collaboration between the community, South Coast AQMD, and other State agencies is a role that CARB can fulfill to help clarify CARB's role.
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OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: The idea of work teams or subcommittees is not new in AB 617 communities. Due to the dwindling participation in the South LA CSC, the District and co-leads should consider work teams to allow subgroups to focus on priorities for implementation.

The Enforcement Division at CARB is currently in the process of setting up at a work team for enforcement for South Los Angeles to specifically focus on oil and gas issues that community members would like resolved.

--o0o--

OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: Staff recommends that the Board approve the South Los Angeles Community Emission Reduction Plan and direct CARB staff, the Air District, the community co-leads, and the community steering committee to work together to strengthen implementation. Additionally, staff recommends that the Board direct the air district to include progress updates on identified actions and annual reports that will expand upon the details that are currently lacking in the
That concludes my presentation.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you very much. We will now hear from members of the public who signed up to speak on this item, either by submitting a request to speak card, or a raised hand in Zoom. I will ask the Board clerk to call the public commenters.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you. We have one person who has turned in a request to speak card. Allis Druffel.

I guess Allis is not here in the room.

So we'll turn it over --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: We have -- year, we have three in Zoom. All right. So the three commenters that we have with their hands raised are Jacquelyn Badejo and Agustin Cabrera, and Linda Cleveland.

So Jacquelyn, you would be able to unmute and begin your comment.

Jacquelyn, are you there?

JACQUELYN BADEJO: Yes. Now, I'm able to unmute. Good afternoon, CARB Board and everyone. I'm so happy to hear this presentation. Just outside of maybe what Paula Torrado mentioned in her presentation, I'm just happy because I feel it's a great opportunity being that, you know, we did go through some organizational changing
things when it comes to the AQMD side. And I just want to thank CARB for being supportive as we figured everything out.

I feel that everything is on the right track and I know that during the implementation phase of this CERP, that we'll be able to look at everything from a whole of government perspective, which is something that I believe is very important and will help frame -- properly frame all the work we do moving toward. So thank you all for your great work.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Agustin, you can unmute and begin.

AGUSTIN CABRERA: Hello. Good afternoon. My name is Agustin Cabrera. I am here on behalf of SCOPE, one of the community co-leads. And I just want to underscore the points made by my colleague Paula and really uplift the reality that a lot of our community members and South LA residents face every day. The reality of decades of disinvestment, neighborhood oil drilling, and just lack of resources that they have to live healthy and thriving lives.

And for this reason, we want to just show our support of the adoption and the passing of South LA CERP and support CARB's approval, but we want to make sure that the South LA CERP will be approved and prioritized the
following: the phasing out of chemical usage and industrial operations and incentive use of least harmful alternatives, and safer clean technologies that will protect health; also, provide access to incentives implementation of cleaner energy technologies; require implementation of business's, industry's best practices to reduce emissions, such as emissions entrapment technologies; and finally, provide readily available and timely enforcement data, including public notification of new permits, updated emissions reports, and inspection information to the community.

Lastly and finally, just South LA needs strong enforceable actions that will result in better air quality and quality of life in our communities. We thank you for the opportunity to present on our experience and thank you so much for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Next will be Linda Cleveland. And then after Linda will be Hugo Garcia.

Linda, you can unmute and begin.

LINDA CLEVELAND: Good afternoon, CARB Board members. And thank you for giving us this time and space to come and speak on supporting the AB 7 steering committee's CERP plan.

This is a long-time coming. It's given the
community an opportunity to participate an actual program that will reduce the carbon that's -- and the pollution that's in our communities, that it's -- will give us the opportunity to try and do something to improve the health conditions for our babies that are located throughout the South Los Angeles area. We have a high percentage of asthma and other respiratory illnesses that affect our kids, that affect their learn. It affects just the time that they could even spend in school trying to learn.

I am a senior and my family has been in the community for more than 50 years. And this is the first opportunity that I've had personally to contribute to a plan that will help make things better for our community. And I'm just so in favor of you guys approving this plan and working with AQMD and CARB in order to make life better for the children that are located in South Los Angeles.

Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Hugo.

HUGO GARCIA: Good afternoon. Thank you, CARB Board members for the opportunity to express some of the sentiments of the South Central LA community. My name is Hugo Garcia, Environmental Justice Coordinator from Esperanza Community Housing, serving South Central LA. I
have firsthand experience with the South Central LA AB 617 community steering committee as a community partner.

Because of our personal experience in coordinating with residents for the People Not Pozos Campaign for Environmental Justice in University Park Community. And I worked with the STAND LA coalition to end neighborhood drilling. We understand that communities of color have disproportionately borne the brunt of poor air quality for many decades. And, of course, this needs to end. South Central LA communities need to breathe cleaner air as other communities do.

Esperanza stands in support of South LA CERP and support the California -- or CARB Board approval. We want the CERP to be implemented in a way that enforceable emissions reductions in South Central LA will be prioritized. We want health protections for the sake of our communities. We want to hold agencies accountable while Implementing the CERP and we want to ensure that the actions during implementation result in improvements. We want to see -- to achieve tangible, measurable, and enforceable emissions reductions in South Central LA, and the CERP must include the implementation of community-driven strategies, best available control technologies, best available retrofit control technology, and businesses' and industry's best practices with
continuous monitoring and community-led enforcement plans.

Thank you so much for giving us the opportunity to express our feelings.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

And the last speaker is Erica Blyther. You can unmute and begin.

ERICA BLYThER: Hello. Can you hear me?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: It's a little bit quiet. Can you try that again?

ERICA BLYThER: Oh, yes. Sure. You can hear me, correct?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes. Yeah.

ERICA BLYThER: Okay. Thank you so much. My name is Erica Blyther. I'm with the Office of Petroleum and Natural Gas in the City of Los Angeles. And I'd like to urge the approval of the community air monitoring plan and I look forward to working with CARB's oil and gas work group. Thank you so much.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Chair, that concludes the public comment

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right.

(Voice echoing in auditorium)

(Laughter)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: The voice.

Okay. Board member Kracov.
BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Hi. Good afternoon, Chair.

So sorry, colleagues and staff, that I couldn't be with you today or the folks from the South LA 617 community. I'm moving my son David into college today.

So on the one hand I'm -- it's bitter sweet doing that. On the other hand, it's -- I'm on a real high here from the epic, you know, monumental staff work, and work product that we did in the ACC II item. Just a gigantic kudos to everyone. And, of course, so much work has gone into this item too. I want to thank Ms. Higgins from South coast, Mr. Allen, and I think there was another presenter from South Coast that I missed just running around here at Loyola Marymount this afternoon.

But, you know, I know a lot of work went into this CERP. A big applause though for everyone, the co-leads, the community, CARB, and AQMD for doing this. Let's be honest, you know, during a pandemic, it's been very difficult, but we've got it done. And I think there's -- folks are broadly supportive of it and excited to see it get to work. I want to, you know, call out Martha Argüello and Paula Torrado from PSR, and Gina from SCOPE, and, you know, the mother/daughter duo for environmental justice Linda and Jacquelyn from the Watts Committee.

I know folks are very excited about this plan,
particularly as Paula Torrado mentioned, the just transition chapter. There are measures in there, funding for dry cleaners, there's the oil and gas drilling work, Rule 1148.2 on notification that is really moving through right now, and I know that our AQMD staff are really interested in getting that done.

So I'm supportive of this. I thank you for the opportunity to speak on it. Now, I think the work starts. It's sort of, I don't know, I think the end of the beginning, I guess. But now we have to really get to implementation, really look at those annual reports, colleagues, and make sure that the work is being done, and, in general, you know, focus on AB 617 and making sure the program ends up fulfilling that, and that it can be all that we -- that we hope it to be. So thank you for letting me say those words, Chair and colleagues. I miss you all today.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: I keep -- I keep jumping the gun. Okay. Thank you so much, Board Member Kracov. Any other Board member comments on this item?

Oh, sorry. Board Member De La Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you and thank you to the community for being involved. Thank you to staff for watching over this. Thank you to Supervisor Holly Mitchell and Congresswomen Karen Bass who have been...
checking in on this with me regularly. And I've been connecting them to staff.

I want to note two things, one, that this is a really big area. It's the biggest we've done. This is supposed to be kind of a neighborhood targeted thing, and this area is really, really big. It's multiple neighborhoods combined.

And secondly, this is the fourth 617 community in the immediate vicinity East LA, Southeast LA where I live, South LA, this one, and then Wilmington/Long Beach down to the south. They are almost contiguous and that is a sign of how bad the pollution is in those communities and how much they're facing. They're slightly different in terms of the challenges that they're facing. But obviously, they are all worthy of this process and getting all the mitigation, all of the regulation, all of the enforcement that we can bring to bear, all the incentives that we can bring to bear on these four communities. So I'm very supportive of this and want to see us start to deliver on those reductions that are promised under AB 617.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Chair Randolph. I wanted to wait till Mr. Kracov and Mr. De La Torre who
have more local stake in this particular CERP from South LA, but I wanted to congratulate the co-leads and the South Coast for, I think, incorporating lessons learned from previous AB 617 CERP programs in the South Coast. I think that there was more community engagement, more sharing of leadership this time around. And I really want to compliment all parties involved in creating the CERP for that work. I mean, it's not perfect, but I don't want perfect to be the enemy of the good.

And I think that Paula's and Uyen-Uyen's presentations showed where there's been a good collaboration and then areas where more collaboration needs to happen. And I especially appreciated Terry's comments about where CARB needs to do its part to further the implementation of this CERP.

But all in all, I'm very pleased and optimistic that this CERP is going to make a difference in this community, which, as has been pointed out by all speakers, has a long history of a disproportionate burden of air pollution and consequent health disparities. So kudos and I'm happy to support this CERP.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. Okay.

Vice Chair Berg.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you so much. And I do also -- John, thank you for your comments. You really
teed it up well for me. I would really like to follow up
with a question both to South Coast Air Quality Management
District and CARB staff as we really heard the
presentations as well as the public testimony. There was
very clear expectations set. And I heard phaseout
industrial sources, enforcement of community priorities,
accountability to our agencies, tangible reductions, the
community involvement, both continued leadership and
working with our agencies, best available control
technologies. And we know part of South Central. I've
been part of the south -- the Southern California
landscape for a long time, and certainly in Boyle Heights,
and have spent some time in the South Central area.
There's a lot of small- and medium-sized businesses there.

And so if the Air District and CARB can just take
a bit of time to talk about how we're going to keep these
community priorities front and center, how are we going to
measure. I was really taken back in my briefing as to the
amount of pollution and how hard we have to work to get
those reductions down. So walk us through kind of your
thinking about how we are going to meet these expectations
in this CERP.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Would it make sense for Kathryn
Higgins to answer that question first?

KATHRYN HIGGINS: Yes. Trying to unmute. Thank
you. And thank you for that, Dr. Berg. As with each of our communities, the CERP is going to be -- the adopted CERP will be the guiding path, if you will for all of the strategies, those that Uyen-Uyen covered and cumulatively, you know, the various strategies, whether they are enforcement, the incentives, air monitoring, all of them will collectively, you know, and comprehensively allow us to, through implementation, achieve those reductions. We have metrics in place. In the CERP, there are time lines that commit us to when, on a quarterly basis, we are to rollout those actions. And they are supported by outreach activities as well, you know, in order to get the information out, because as you are aware, outreach and community involvement, especially when it comes to communities identifying locations where there are -- there's a need for monitoring. And that connection -- connected with our enforcement will then help us to identify gaps in rules that are not being complied with. And so all of that collectively will allow us to ensure that the reductions occur.

There are rule actions in place. We have, for this community in particular, made sure to involve CSC members in our rulemaking activities. I'd say more so than even our prior five communities, as we have learned from prior lessons. We have subcommittees or working team
meetings that also are designed to facilitate community members being involved and being present to help hold us accountable. But I can assure you that our Executive Officer, everyone throughout our entire agency, every capacity from our engineering team, monitoring, enforcement, across the board it is taking a collective effort, lots of collaboration internally and with the community, to get -- to implement the CERP.

So we also capture updates in our annual reports, as Board Member Kracov alluded to. That is the time when our board and CARB's board can look at the progress that's being made. As you know, your staff has in place through the blueprint October 1st deadline for annual reports to be submitted. That is right around the corner. That's another opportunity just to check, and to monitor, and confirm what we've done and the progress that's been made. There are challenges along the way. We all mentioned COVID being in place. That has been a little bit of a deterrence in some places.

But in -- in times when there are challenges, we are actively communicating with the CSC members about alternatives or delays, but nonetheless, we are committed and dedicated to moving forward and being transparent in -- where we are making accomplishments, but also where there might be, you know, hiccups along the way or delays.
VICE CHAIR BERG: Great. Thank you so much, Kathryn.

Well, before I get off, I would like to say very, very impressed at my briefing. Congratulations to the community. It was the most detailed briefing I've had on a CERP. And it was very impressive the degree of the community presentations today. My only regret I'll say as a Board member, and certainly it speaks again to this -- to our new reality that we're in is that we weren't able to come down and actually do a tour. That said, I was part of a tour earlier this year that did hit part of the community. And we look forward to being able to make up maybe that tour at another time.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you, Vice Chair Berg.

Any -- Board Member Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Chair.

Thanks to everyone. I just wanted to really express huge congratulations and thanks to the community and the environmental justice organizations who participated, and particularly to the co-leads. I think it's a great model for other CSCs to follow, and seems like it's really -- the air districts can really learn a lot, the community can learn a lot from this model. And I think it's -- it's really important.

The strategies I think, as Vice Chair Berg has
pointed out, are Ambitious and diverse. There's every kind of pollution. I'm a native of LA as well and so I understand and have long known South Central. So every rule, every kind of pollution exists there. And so there -- you know, there's just -- it's hard to get relief, but I think that one of the concerns I have -- I totally support the CERP, but I wanted to hear perhaps from any of the co-leads how you're going to get continued participation, because I think that's really challenging and I know we're experiencing that in the portside communities in San Diego, you know, because once -- it's been a big push to get the CERP done. And then it's a really long slog to try to get the rules done that are going to move this forward.

So anyway, any thoughts, because I think this is pretty smart and wise group that can advise the rest of us. Any thoughts you might have about that, but otherwise congratulations and huge gratitude to all of you.

OCAP DIRECTOR REYES: If we could go ahead and respond to the previous question and then turn to the co-leads. All right.

OCAP AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST ALLEN: Yeah, just responding to the previous question. You know, it's an 11-year commitment for this community, keeping the community front and center. I think the engagement is the
key piece. I meet with the co-leads bi-weekly. The co-leads meet with South Coast and myself and a few other CARB staff weekly, so we're constantly meeting, constantly talking, constantly refining. And I think that's going to be the key to keeping the community at the front and center is just to continue to engage on that time period.

As far as ensuring reductions, I think we'll look to South Coast and information they provide us in their annual reports to make sure that what we said we were going to do was actually happening through the numbers, and if it's not then adjusting at that time to make sure that we can meet the promises that we committed to.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: And I think Paula from the co-- one of the co-leads is going to speak to Board Member Takvorian's question.

PAULA TORRADO PLAZAS: Yeah. Thank you so much, Board member and -- for that question. I think, as Terry said -- well, as I mentioned in my presentation, the three organizations that are co-leading this effort have a track record of successful organizing and building coalitions and work in South LA. And I think tapping into that transformative engagement that these organizations have created in South LA will be really important for the continued engagement and ensure the continued engagement of communities in the CSC -- in the CERP implementation.
And in addition the co-leads are also reflecting on where to focus our energy and where to focus community members' energy, according to what's most of -- what's of most importance to the community, because we recognize that, again as I mentioned in the presentation, the challenges of high expectations, lot of work and limited resources and capacity. So assessing that from the beginning, we're developing a scope of work that sort of reflects that, in terms of where we want to put our energy for engaging the community, for outreaching -- for conducting outreach and tapping into our organizing resources.

And in addition, we definitely want to expand our community outreach to the communities that are lacking representation in the CSC currently, including Lynwood and other areas of South LA, and leveraging lots of relationships that we have in South LA, for example, the South LA Building Healthy Communities, the South LA BHC that was funded through the California Endowment.

So there -- there are several way -- several -- several ways that we are hoping to continue to maintain engagement, with that nuance that we know that this is going to be -- continue to be a lot of work and a lot of commitment. So we want to be mindful of how we engage the community members in this effort in a way that is -- that
is effective and meaningful.

So I hope that answered your question, but I think with PSR-LA, SCOPE, and also Esperanza, and Watts Clean Air, we covered a large part of the outreach in South LA.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Hello. I see how that happens.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Paula. I think the -- you all are an amazing team. And if anyone can get it done, you all can, so -- so congratulations. And, yeah, that -- we have complete faith in you and I think we just have to really work at how we're going to ensure that the organizations continue to get resources. I know resources are an issue, but we need to really make sure that we're allocating those resources on the ground where you all are. So thank you so much.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Board Member Eisenhut.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Thank you, Chair. This is more of a -- of a 617 question than a question that's specific to this community. But I observe that -- that this -- this report is probably the most cohesive and coordinated collaborative report that I've seen from a 617 community. And I believe that it's in part due to the strength of the community -- community, and in part due to
our increasing sophistication as collaborators. And my --
I believe that we have a continuing responsibility to
those 617 communities that we've already established and
perhaps established with a lower level of expertise than
we currently possess. And I think it's our responsibility
to work on a continuous basis with those communities.

My question is do we have that ability? Are
those -- is the situation now embedded where that's not a
practical approach? It's kind of an open-ended question
and it's designed to be. So I'm interested in our -- in
our thoughts and whether it's today or whether it's at a
subsequent 617 meeting is deemed more appropriate, the
question is still out there.

Thank you.

OCAP DIRECTOR REYES: Deldi Reyes, Director of
the Office of Community Air Protection. Thank you, Board
Member Eisenhut. That is very provocative question and
one that we're -- we grapple with. It really goes to the
heart of our role in OCAP and also at each individual air
district, which is we must learn from our initial
experiences and apply them both going forward, but also in
the communities we already have made commitments to.

As Terry said, it's an 11-year commitment. And
even just within any one air district, we have learned
what works, what works better, and what doesn't work at
all. And we do need to go back and make sure we're applying that same lens to all of the communities.

For example, you heard that participation towards the tail end of this process started to dwindle. Not only was their COVID, but it was -- it was a long process and that is not uncommon. And so that is, in part, why we recommended the use of the work teams. We have found in other air districts that using subcommittees has really galvanized the community steering committees. It helps folks narrow down the things they really care about. And it's -- it's actually become very powerful in terms of organizing the work and is another example of community co-leadership.

That's something we want to see in all of the 617 communities in the South Coast Air District. And we intend to work with and support South Coast Air District in doing that. But just as Board Member Takvorian said, that takes resources. We must find ways to bring more modest amounts, for example, of grant funds to the CSCs in order to support that engagement. Particularly if implementation dollars to air districts continue to stay flat, how can an air district decide that they can no longer bring on new communities, because they have very little implementation funds and yet we have -- we all of us have the challenge of supporting the continued
engagement.

Okay. It's quite a dilemma, but it's one that we intend to focus on in the update to our blueprint and in the reimagining of the program that we're working on now.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. Okay.

I think that's it for Board comments.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: I just wanted to --

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Chair, It's Board Member Kracov. I guess it was a Uyen-Uyen Vo's presentation from the South Coast that I missed there. So I want to just give a shout-out congratulations to her and all the staff that worked on this CERP.

Sorry for omission. Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. Thank you.

I just wanted to just uplift how impressed I was by the -- the just transition piece of this plan. I mean, this is a really important issue that the state is going to need to be grappling with in the coming years. And the fact that -- that this CSC really kind of took it on and gave it some deep thought, and analysis. And, you know, looking for opportunities to make progress there, I thought was really important. So I was pleased to see that as part of the plan.

If there are no further comments, I will ask for
a motion on this from perhaps Board Member Kracov from South Coast.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: You must like my background music today, Chair. I don't have the resolution in hand, but I certainly would be happy to move approval of the community emission reduction plan for the South LA community from the South Coast, if that's the appropriate motion, Chair.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Perfect

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: And I would be happy to second it.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: I second the motion, Madam Chair.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. We have a motion. We have a second. Board Clerk will you please call the roll.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Yes.

Dr. Balmes?

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. De La Torre?

Mr. Eisenhut?

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Yes.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Senator Florez?

(Laughter)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Can you call Mr. De La Torre again?
BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Sure. Mr. De La Torre?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Aye.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Senator Florez?

Ms. Hurt?

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Aye.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Kracov?

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?

Mrs. Riordan?

BOARD MEMBER RIOR DAN: Aye.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Supervisor Serna?

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Serna, aye.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Professor Sperling?

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Aye.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ms. Takvorian?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Takvorian, aye.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Supervisor Vargas?

Vice Chair Berg?

VICE CHAIR BERG: Berg, aye.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Chair Randolph?

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.

BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Madam Chair, the motion passes.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you very much and congratulations to the community steering committee,
and to staff at CARB, and to South Coast Air Quality Management District.

(Applause)

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. We will now move to open comment for those who wish to provide a comment regarding an item of interest within the jurisdiction of the Board that's not on today's agenda. The Board will call on those who have either submitted a request-to-speak card or who have joined us remotely through clicking the raise hand button or dialing star nine.

Clerk, will you please call the commenters.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: It looks like we just have one person in Zoom with their hand raised. Linda Cleveland, you can unmute and begin.

Linda, were you hoping to make a comment for open comment?

All right. It doesn't look like you've unmuted.

All right. I don't think that she's there.

That was the only commenter that we had.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. All right. So that brings our Board meeting to a close and we will see you at our next CARB Board meeting.

Thank you all and we are adjourned.

(Thereupon the Air Resources Board meeting adjourned at 5:24 p.m.)
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