MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ZOOM PLATFORM

AIR RESOURCES BOARD

CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA HEADQUARTERS
MARY D. NICHOLS CAMPUS
HAAGEN-SMIT AUDITORIUM
4001 IOWA AVENUE
RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 2023 9:01 A.M.

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

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS:

Liane Randolph, Chair

Sandra Berg, Vice Chair

John Balmes, MD

Hector De La Torre

John Eisenhut

Senator Dean Florez

Davina Hurt

Gideon Kracov

Tania Pacheco-Werner, PhD

Professor Dan Sperling, PhD

Senator Henry Stern

Diane Takvorian

STAFF:

Steve Cliff, PhD, Executive Officer

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

Chanell Fletcher, Deputy Executive Officer, Environmental Justice

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

Edna Murphy, Deputy Executive Officer, Internal Operations

Rajinder Sahota, Deputy Executive Officer, Climate Change and Research

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF:

Ellen Peter, Chief Counsel

Ali Adams, Manager, Central Valley Air Quality Planning Section, Air Quality Planning and Science Division (AQPSD)

Hnin Hnin Aung, PhD, Air Pollution Specialist, Health and Ecosystem Analysis Section, Research Division (RD)

Michael Benjamin, Division Chief, AQPSD

Pippin Brehler, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

Laura Carr, Air Pollution Specialist, Central Valley Air Quality Planning Section, AQPSD

Sonya Collier, PhD, Staff Air Pollution Specialist, Climate Action and Research Planning Section, RD

Ariel Fideldy, Manager, South Coast Air Quality Planning Section, AQPSD

Jessi Fierro, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

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

Vernon Hughes, Assistant Division Chief, AQPSD

Scott King, Air Pollution Specialist, South Coast Air Quality Planning Section, AQPSD

Jeannie Lee, Assistant Chief Counsel, Legal Office

Claudia Nagy, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

Hye-Youn Park, PhD, Manager, Health and Ecosystem Analysis Section, RD

Sarah Pittiglio, PhD, Manager, Climate Action and Research Planning Section, RD

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF:

Elizabeth Scheehle, Division Chief, RD

Sarah Jo Szambelan, Air Pollution Specialist, Executive Office

Sylvia Vanderspek, Chief, Air Quality Planning Branch, AQPSD

ALSO PRESENT:

Teresa Bui, Pacific Environment

Christopher Chavez, Coalition for Clean Air

Janet Dietzkamei

Harvey Eder, Public Solar Power Coalition

Perry Elerts, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability

Ian Faloona, PhD, University of California, Davis

Jonathan Klassen, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

Heather Lieb, University of California, Davis

Adrian Martinez, Earthjustice

Brent Newell, Central Valley Air Quality Coalition

Cynthia Pinto-Cabrera, Central Valley Air Quality Coalition

Brad Poiriez, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District

Mark Rose, National Parks Association Conservation

Jane Sellen, Californians for Pesticide Reform

Robert Yuhnke, Elders Climate Action

INDEX	PAGE
Call to Order	1
Roll Call	1
Opening Remarks	2
Item 23-1-1 Chair Randolph Executive Officer Cliff Janet Dietzkamei Motion Vote	18 19 20 21 21
Item 23-1-2 Chair Randolph Executive Officer Cliff Motion Vote	22 23 25 25
<pre>Item 23-1-3 Chair Randolph Executive Officer Cliff Staff Presentation Dr. Sarah Rees Dr. Ian Faloona Robert Yuhnke Chris Chavez Heather Lieb Adrian Martinez Teresa Bui Board Discussion and Q&A Motion Vote</pre>	26 27 29 48 52 54 56 59 60 62 64 78
Item 23-1-4 Chair Randolph Executive Officer Cliff Staff Presentation Jon Klassen Dr. Ian Faloona Janet Dietzkamei Cynthia Pinto-Cabrera Brent Newell Perry Elerts Robert Yuhnke Jane Sellen	79 80 82 96 99 101 103 105 107 109

INDEX CONTINUED PAGE Item 23-1-4(continued) Mark Rose 113 115 Harvey Eder Board Discussion and Q&A 118 126 Motion 126 Vote Afternoon Session 129 Item 23-1-5 Chair Randolph 129 Executive Officer Cliff 130 Staff Presentation 132 Janet Dietzkamei 151 152 Board Discussion and Q&A 167 Motion 167 Vote Item 23-1-6 Chair Randolph 168 Executive Officer Cliff 171 184 Board Discussion and Q&A 193 Harvey Eder Adjournment 195 Reporter's Certificate 196

PROCEEDINGS 1 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Good morning. 2 The January 26th, 2023 public meeting of the California Air 3 Resources Board will come to order. 4 Clerk, will you please call the roll. 5 BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes. Thank you, Chair. 6 Dr. Balmes? 7 8 BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. De La Torre BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Here. 9 BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr Eisenhut? 10 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here. 11 BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Florez? 12 Assemblymember Garcia? 13 Ms. Hurt? 14 BOARD MEMBER HURT: Present. 15 16 BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Kracov? BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Here. 17 BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Dr. Pacheco-Werner? 18 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Here. 19 20 BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Stern? Professor Sperling? 21 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here. 22 BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Takvorian? 23 BOARD MEMBER VARGAS: Supervisor Vargas? 24 25 Vice Chair Berg?

2

```
VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.
1
2
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair Randolph?
             CHAIR RANDOLPH:
                              Here.
 3
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez here.
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Madam Chair, we have a
 5
    quorum.
 6
7
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez here as well.
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: Oh, perfect. Thank you. Noted.
8
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you.
9
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair, we have quorum
10
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you very much.
11
   Before we launch in today's proceedings, I wanted to take
12
    a few moments to acknowledge a few recent changes to our
1.3
    Board membership. First, it's my pleasure to welcome
14
    Senator Henry Stern who has been appointed by the Senate
15
16
    as an ex officio member of the California Air Resources
17
    Board. Senator Stern represents the 27th Senate District,
    and has worked on climate, clean energy, wildfire
18
19
   preparedness, and other environmental issues during his
20
    time in the Senate. I had the pleasure of working with
   him both when I was at the PUC and here at CARB, and
21
    really happy to welcome him to the Board.
2.2
23
             And I have the duty and honor to announce that
    the terms of two stalwart members of the California Air
24
```

Resources Board have come to an end. As we discussed at

25

the December Board meeting, Supervisor Phil Serna has completed his term on the Board. He was appointed to the Board by Governor Brown in 2013. He's been committed to public service from a young age. In addition to his role on the Sacrament County Board of Supervisors on which he has represented District One since 2010, Board Member Serna has participated in numerous other boards and commission, including the Sacramento First Five Commission, Sacramento Regional Transit, the Sacramento Area Flood Control District, the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, the Sacramento Solid Waste Authority, and the Sacramento Library Authority to name just a few. And we had some time at the December meeting to share our thoughts about Supervisor Serna.

2.2

Barbara Riordan is the longest serving member in the Board's history. As a representative of the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, serving San Bernardino County's high desert area, Board Member Riordan was appointed in February 1991 by governor Pete Wilson and served as Chair from November 1998 to February 1999. She was reappointed in August 2004 by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, and again in 2011 by Governor Edmund G Brown, Jr.

Mrs. Riordan retired from elective office in 1996 after 13 years as a member of the San Bernardino County

Board of Supervisors. Two of those years she served as chairwoman of the Board and four years as a member of the Redlands City Council. During her 30 years of service to the CARB Board and to the public, Board Member Riordan has provided wise counsel and has stepped up to support CARB by serving as Chair when the need arose.

2.2

So I will now hand the mic to Brad Poiriez,

Executive Director of the Mojave Desert Air Quality

Management District who would like to say a few words to recognize Mrs. Riordan's retirement.

MR. POIRIEZ: Good morning. Thank you, Madam Chair, Board members. You took a little bit of my thunder, but not much. I still have plenty to say about Barbara. So it's my honor and privilege to be here to recognize Ms. Riordan for her many, many years of service and dedication to air quality. So if you'd bear with me, I'd like to add a couple more little factoids as well.

So Ms. Riordan was appointed to the San
Bernardino County Board of Supervisors in the 3rd District
in August of 1983 to fill the remaining term of Supervisor
David McKenna. And Barbara has heard this, by the way,
but -- some of these, because we just had the same effort
in front of my Board on Monday.

She was only the third woman in the County's 131 years of history, at that time, to hold the supervisor

office and the first in the 3rd District. As 3rd District Supervisor, Ms. Riordan also served as a Board Member of the San Bernardino County Air Pollution Control District. When the County APCD transitioned by legislative statute to an independent agency, Ms. Riordan was one of the inaugural members of the Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District.

1.3

2.2

After leaving the Board of Supervisors, Ms.

Riordan was selected by the balance of the Mojave Desert

AQMD governing board as a public member, a seat she has

held through reappointments through January of 2023. In

1991, Ms. Riordan was appointed by Governor Pete Wilson,

as was mentioned earlier, to the California Air Resources

Board. Considering her appointment to the Board of

Supervisors in 1983, and continuous service, this

effectively equates to 40 years of commitment to air

quality and the residents of the Mojave Desert Air Quality

Basin. So that's quite the accomplishment.

Ms. Riordan has been a part of virtually every monumental important decision that the Mojave Desert AQMD has done. As recently as Monday, we just approved our ozone SIP as well. So she's had a hand in approving all the SIPs that have ever been submitted and approved for Mojave Desert AQMD.

So I've known -- I've know Ms. Riordan, I don't

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MR. POIRIEZ: So quite a -- quite a long time. From my days back in Imperial County where I was the APCO in Imperial County and also serving on the CAPCOA Board of Director as President. So I came before this Board and Ms. Riordan many times, many times for issues that were quite challenging and she has always served -- I think my Board Chairman said it best, she served with grace. brings a levelheadedness and a calm demeanor to at least our Board meetings. And I think that's appreciated by most of the Board members and myself and my staff especially. She's amazing. She has a very calming effect on not only the people giving presentations, but also anyone that would like to come up and speak on a particular controversial issues. She has a well-balanced approach and she lets her position on the issues be known and why it's important to have that balanced approach. And I've appreciated that very much as the Executive Director.

She's going to be very missed, I think, on my Board and as well as yours. Big shoes to fill. But we are going to miss her and we wish her the very, very best in the next chapter. And I know she won't be quiet. I know she'll still be active and busy and hopefully she's

not going to be a stranger to us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

But Barbara, we do have a plaque for you, another one -- another one up here. Can I give that to you. Would you like to come up here.

(Applause).

MR. POIRIEZ: Do you want me to read it?

MRS. RIORDAN: Thank you, Brad. Thank you.

MR. POIRIEZ: Would you like me to read that?

MRS. RIORDAN: Well, yes, you're going to -- You

read it, because I can't.

(Laughter).

MRS. RIORDAN: I can't hold it out there far enough.

MR. POIRIEZ: You want to hold it.

I'm going to try to read this. It's see-through glass, so it's a little rough. Let's see if I hold it right there. In recognition of Barbara Cram Riordan, representing the Mojave Desert of the California Air Resources Board, 1991 to 2023. Thank you for 32 years of exceptional commitment to protecting air quality in Mojave Desert and the State of California.

MRS. RIORDAN: Thank, Brad. Thank you very much. Thank you.

(Applause)

MRS. RIORDAN: Madam Chair, could I take just a

bit of prerogative and make a few comments?

2.2

I am so pleased to be here today to recognize all of you, particularly the Board members that I have served with, as well as the staff in this wonderful facility. I apologize for not being in person in Sacramento in December, but I had other commitments and I had promised that I would fill those commitments and do Zoom. And Zoom somehow seems to me to be very impersonal. And so that's why I'm here today to express my appreciation to the many Board Chairs that I've worked with over the years, to the many Board members. I can't even count the Board members that I've served with, but -- and they've all been so helpful to me and so thoughtful, and recognizing indeed what small air pollution control districts face or mid-sized air pollution control districts face.

And they're not -- they're -- not all of these rules and regulations that we promulgate over the years are equally able to be enforced by the local districts. People just don't have staff. They don't have the resources to do that. And hopefully I brought that to the Board over the years to remind them that there are a number of us who are in smaller areas that need a little bit more money and staff to be able to do some of the things that we need to do on behalf of air quality.

But most importantly, the reason I wanted to be

here was to say thank you to the staff here at the Air Resources Board and how helpful you have been to me and I wanted to recognize that. You need to understand I'm not a scientist. I'm not an engineer. I have very little background really in air pollution control, but you have been so gracious to give me your time and wise counsel over the years and I appreciate that so much.

2.2

We are so fortunate Madam Chair to have the staff that we have here at the Air Resources Board. And I will never forget, I took a tour the first month I believe that I was appointed to the Board, and I met people who had left graduate school or left college and came to work for the Air Resources Board, and they were still there working on behalf of air quality and air issues throughout California. And I was so impressed that people would stay for their entire careers almost and help people to breathe better and cleaner air here in California. And I think that is a testament to the greatness of the staff that we have. And all of you I know are as appreciative of that fact as I have been over these 30 years.

So I say thank you. I look forward to what you are going to be doing in the next 30 years. But I just want to say thank you and also to recognize this wonderful facility that we are in. It is a pleasure and I'm so pleased to be able to say it's in part of the area that I

represent called the Inland Empire. And so we're -- we, on behalf of this area, just welcome all of you. I wish all of our meetings were here. I love this room.

And so with that, I say goodbye.

(Applause).

1.3

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Would any of our colleagues like to say a few words?

Vice Chair Berg.

WICE CHAIR BERG: Well, for me, this is a mixed emotions day, because I can remember in 2004 as a very wide-eyed and almost what was I thinking I was getting myself into, and it was Barbara Riordan. And at that time, Barbara Patrick, the two Barbaras that absolutely took me under their wing and shepherd me into this position. And it's just been lovely working with Barbara Riordan over the last 18 and a half years for me. But to think 32 years I believe is the time on the Air Resources Board. And that will be a record that will hold for a very, very long time. If you think about all the world record holders, Barbara is going to hold this record probably forever.

And that is a real testament to Barbara, to all the people she served with, as well as the stakeholders. And all the times we sat next to each other and helped each other through various stakeholder concerns, both

communities and industry. When she became Chair -- our Acting Chair, it was often at a time where some -- there was a gap. And that's what Barbara was so good at.

Barbara was so good at being able to step in, fill in, and be that stalwart, that glue that we all counted on.

And so she's a friend, she's a colleague, and I really, really wish you the best, as I know we all do, and can't wait to now just have dinner together and catch up.

So thanks, Barbara.

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Dr. Sperling.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Yeah, I'd like to add to that. You know, Barbara has -- so she's been here obviously the whole time I've been here, and, you know, she's added stability to the Board. She's been the kind of person when we get some of these, you know, tense issues, she brings her wisdom and years of experience, and as Sandy mentioned, she's played a leadership role several times over the history of the Board. So you know, this is really the end of an era. And I think we should be really grateful to Barbara for all the time, and effort, and wisdom that she's brought to it. So thank you so much, Barbara.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Board Member De La Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you, Barbara.

25 The 32 years is impressive. Just -- it's such, you know,

a long period, but when you think that it's 32 out of 55 years of the existence of this organization, it's even more impressive. It is amazing. And the thing that, as a former elected, that amaze -- that truly amazes me is that you were appointed by Pete Wilson. And every Governor since could have removed you and didn't, and that is a testament to your dedication to the mission of this organization. Because no matter what -- which way the pendulum swung, you were here and they wanted you to be here representing these communities, these smaller air districts. So that's what amazes me, because, you know, these -- if you put those governors in a room, they probably couldn't agree on anything --

(Laughter).

2.2

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: -- but they all agreed about you. And that's a really -- a testament to you. And so what I think about with you is how classy you are, always just even-keeled. You know, some of us say goofy things, but you're --

(Laughter).

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: -- you're always just totally even-keeled and classy and your dedication obviously. To be -- to be here for 32 years doing this sometimes very difficult work, taking very tough votes, and you never shirked that. You never ran from it. You

just did it and stuck by it. So, thank you, Barbara.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Board Member Takvorian.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Hi, Barbara. Thank you so much. I -- it seems like yesterday that you welcomed me to the Board. It's almost six years ago now. And I really appreciated the context that you provided for me and the history. And as coming from a district that was not independent until just recently, I think we took a lot of wisdom from the model that you all presented. And also I really appreciated learning more about small districts and all of the challenges, which are sometimes greater than some of the large districts. And I think you taught us well and I really, really appreciated that. And, you know, we're close. We're kind of neighbors, so I appreciated that context as well.

And so thank you so much. You've always been so thoughtful and I always looked forward to your perspective on issues. So I wish you so much good wishes in your -- in your -- good luck in your next adventure, because I think, as someone else said, you will not be quiet I'm sure. And I know that there will be a good adventure and I know you'll continue to serve your community that you care so deeply about. So thank you so much.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: So I've had the pleasure of working with you for the last few years. And as others

have stated, you know, you have been so welcoming to me and hearing your wisdom and your experience. And it amazes me how incredibly hard working you are. All those miles up and down I-5 to come to Sacramento for meetings is quite impressive. And you're always ready to share your wisdom and thoughtfulness on these complex issues we have to deal with. So I will miss you very much on the Board. We will all miss you and we are so grateful for your service to the people of the state of California. So thank you for your work.

(Applause).

2.2

(Standing applause).

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Okay. Now, it's time to shift gears to the housekeeping, so get ready.

We are conducting today's meeting in person as well as offering remote options for public participation both by phone and by Zoom.

Anyone who wishes to testify in person should fill out a request to speak card available in the foyer outside the auditorium. Please turn it into a 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 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 auditorium through the lobby. In the event of a fire alarm, we are required to evacuate this room and immediately exit the building through the front entrance. When the all-clear signal is given, we will return to the auditorium and resume the hearing.

2.2

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

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

2.2

THE INTERPRETER: Back to you, Chair Randolph. Thank you.

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

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you, Chair.

Good morning, everyone. I'm going to provide some additional information on how the public participation will be organized for today's meeting.

We will first be calling on any in-person commenters who have turned in a request to speak cards and then I will be calling on our commenters who are joining us remotely. If you are joining us remotely and wish to make a verbal comment on one of today's Board items, you must be using Zoom webinar or calling in by phone. If you are currently watching the webcast on CAL-SPAN, but you do wish to comment remotely, please make sure to register for the Zoom webinar or call in. Information for both is found on the public agenda for today's meeting.

To make a verbal comment, as the Chair mentioned, 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. And if you are

calling in by phone, dial star nine to raise your hand. Even if you previously indicated which item you wish to speak on when you registered for the webinar, you must regi -- raise your hand at the beginning of the item, so that we can add you to the queue.

2.2

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 one of our translators 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 begins, the order of commenters will be determined by who raises their hand first. We will call on each commenter by name and will activate each commenter's audio when it is your turn to speak. For those calling in by phone, we will identify you by the last three digits of your phone number. We will not be showing a list of remote commenters, however, we will be announcing the next three or so commenters in the queue, so you are ready to testify and know who is coming up next. Please note that you will not appear by video during your testimony. I would like to remind everyone to please state your name clearly for the record before you speak. And this is especially important for those who are calling in by phone.

There will be a time limit for each commenter and we will begin with a comment period of three minutes, although 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 the timer and let you know when you have 30 seconds left and when your time is up. If you do require a Spanish interpretation for your comments, then your time will be doubled.

1.3

2.2

If you wish to submit a written comment today, please visit CARB's send-us-your-comments page or look at the public agenda for our webpage for direct 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 do experience any technical difficulties, please call (805)772-2715, and an IT person can assist you. This number is on the public agenda.

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

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. The first item on the agenda is Item number 23-1-1, proposed 2022 amendments to area designations for State ambient air quality standards. 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 want -- wish to comment, please click the raise hand button or dial star nine now. We'll call on in-person commenters followed by remote commenters when we get to the public comment portion of the item.

2.2

Dr. Cliff, will you please summarize the item.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Chair Randolph. State law requires CARB to annually review and update the area designations for the State air quality standards as appropriate. Therefore, based on a review of 2019 through 2021 air quality data, staff is proposing amendments to existing area designations for ozone and fine particulate matter, or PM2.5

For ozone, staff recommends the Board redesignate Lake Tahoe Air Basin from attainment to nonattainment, and Amador County in the Mountain Counties Air Basin, and Shasta County in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin from nonattainment transitional to nonattainment.

Additionally, staff is recommending that the Board redesignate Tuolumne County in the Mountain Counties Air Basin and Santa Barbara County in the South Central Coast Air Basin from nonattainment to nonattainment transitional.

Finally, for PM2.5, staff recommends the Board redesignate the Sutter and Yuba counties in the Sacramento

Valley Air Basin from attainment to nonattainment.

1.3

2.2

In summary, these changes reflect the current air quality in these areas and staff recommends approval of the proposed changes to the state area designations.

This concludes my summary of the item. Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

We will now hear from members of the public who signed up to speak on this item. Board clerk, do we have commenters?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we do have one person in Zoom who has raised their hand to speak and that is Janet Dietzkamei. Janet, you should be able to unmute and begin your comments.

Dietzkamei. I am a resident of Fresno, California in San Joaquin Valley. And I would like to say that we in the San Joaquin Valley still have the worst PM2.5 and ozone levels in the United States. This is a very, very concerning situation, because thousands of us, myself included, have asthma as a result of breathing this air. We are -- there are a lot of us who also have other respiratory diseases.

But the final thing is every resident in the San Joaquin Valley is physically affected by the air that we

2.1

are breathing here. We are the worst for PM2.5 and ozone in the United States and we are breathing it. Fresno is the fourth -- fifth largest city in California. We have both rural and urban issues here. We have stationary and people -- all of the vehicles, the large trucks, the urban related vehicles, we just have all sorts of contributors to the bad air that we have to breathe.

Please consider the San Joaquin Valley as critical in this subject that we are discussing here, because many thousands of people are suffering from this air. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Chair, that concludes the public commenters.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. I will now close the record on this item. Board members, do you have any questions on this item?

Okay. Seeing none, I -- the Board has before them Resolution number 23-2. Do I have a motion and a second?

VICE CHAIR BERG: So moved.

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Second.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Clerk, will you please call the

23 roll.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

24

25

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes. Dr. Balmes?

Mr. De La Torre?

2.2.

```
BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE:
                                        Aye.
1
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Eisenhut?
2
             BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Aye.
 3
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Florez?
 4
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez, aye.
 5
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK:
                                     Ms. Hurt?
 6
             BOARD MEMBER HURT: Aye.
7
8
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Kracov?
9
             BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes.
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?
10
             BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes.
11
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Professor Sperling?
12
             BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Aye.
1.3
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Takvorian?
14
             BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Aye.
15
16
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Supervisor Vargas?
             Vice Chair Berg?
17
             VICE CHAIR BERG:
                               Aye.
18
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair Randolph?
19
20
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Madam Chair, the motions
21
2.2
   passes.
23
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.
             The next item on the agenda is Item number
24
25
    23-1-2.
             The Ventura County 2022 Air Quality Management
```

Plan for the 70 ppb 8-hour ozone standard. If you're here in the room with us, please fill out a request-to-speak card. If you are joining us remotely and wish to comment on this item, please push the raise-hand button or dial star nine now. We will call on in-person commenters first then remote commenters.

2.2

Dr. Cliff, will you please summarize the item.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Chair
Randolph. Before you is the Ventura County 2022 Air
Quality Management Plan for the 70 part per billion 8-hour
ozone standard. As the first of three SIPs for the 70 ppb
ozone standard to be brought before this Board today, I
want to emphasize that all of these plans represent the
next building block in our collaborative efforts with the
air districts to meet increasingly health protective ozone
standards. In addition to the three SIPs being heard
today, staff will bring the SIPs for the 70 ppb standard
to the Board over -- will bring SIPs for the 70 ppb
standard to the Board over the coming months, starting
with the Western Mojave Desert SIP in February. The
Mojave plan was just approved within the last few weeks by
the Districts' Boards.

Returning to the item before you now, over the past decade, ozone levels in Ventura County have shown significant improvement in response to reductions in

emissions of oxides of nitrogen and reactive organic gases. Ongoing implementation of current CARB and district control programs, coupled with reductions from new measures included in the 2022 State SIP Strategy, will provide the reductions needed for attainment of the 70 ppb standard in Ventura County by the 2026 attainment deadline.

The Ventura County Air Pollution Control District adopted the 2022 plan on December 13, 2022. CARB staff has concluded that the 2022 plan along with the CARB emission reduction commitment and other elements included in the CARB staff report meets the requirements of the Clean Air Act. Staff recommends that the Board adopt the 2022 plan and State aggregate emission reduction commitment and the planning emissions inventory appended to the CARB staff report and forwarded -- and forward them to the U.S. EPA as a revision to the California SIP.

This concludes my summary of the item.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. We will now hear from members of the public who signed up to speak on this item. Board Clerk, do we have commenters?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: There are no commenters for this item.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. I will now close the

25

```
record on this agenda item.
1
             Are there any questions or comments from Board
2
 3
   members?
             All right. Seeing none, the Board has before
 4
   them Resolution number 23-1. Do I have a motion and a
5
    second?
6
             BOARD MEMBER HURT: Move approval.
7
8
             BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Second.
9
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: Clerk, will you please call the
   roll?
10
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. De La Torre?
11
             BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE:
12
                                        Aye.
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Eisenhut?
1.3
             BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Aye.
14
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Florez?
15
16
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez, aye
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Hurt?
17
             BOARD MEMBER HURT: Aye.
18
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Kracov?
19
20
             BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes.
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?
21
             Professor Sperling?
22
23
             BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Aye.
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Takvorian?
24
25
             BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Aye.
```

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Vice Chair Berg?

2 VICE CHAIR BERG: Aye.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair Randolph?

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Madam Chair, the motion

6 passes.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is Item number 23-1-3, the 2022 Air Quality Management Plan for the 70 parts per billion 8-hour ozone standard in the South Coast Air Basin and Coachella Valley. If you are here with us in the room and wish to comment on this item, please fill out a request to speak card. If you are joining us remotely and wish to comment, please click the raise-hand button or dial star nine now. We will start with in-person commenters first, followed by remote commenters when we get to the public comment portion of this item.

For decades, the South Coast Air Quality
Management District and CARB have been working together to
develop plans that push the limits of technology in order
to clean the air and improve the health of the millions of
Californians who live in the South Coast Air District.
The 2022 Air Quality Management Plan, or 2022 AQMP,
targets emissions reductions from all sources of air
pollution and highlights the importance of additional

future controls on large sources like ships, locomotives, and aircraft that are primarily federally and internationally regulated. The 2022 AQMP is the latest of these continually evolving plans and was developed to meet the newest National Ambient Air Quality Standard for ozone in the South Coast Air Basin and Coachella Valley.

1.3

2.2

Dr. Cliff, would you please introduce the item. EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Chair Randolph.

Staff is pleased to bring before the Board, the South Coast Air Basin and Coachella Valley -- Valley's State Implementation plans for the 70 parts per billion ozone standard.

Historically, the South Coast has had the highest ozone pollution in the nation, due to the warm climate, surrounding mountains, high population, and robust economy. However, even with growth and population in vehicles over the past several decades, ozone levels in the South Coast and Coachella Valley have been significantly reduced due to CARB and the South Coast Air District's ambitious control programs. While we have made great strides lowering ozone, levels in the South Coast and Coachella Valley are still well above the 70 ppb standard.

Last month, the South Coast Air District adopted

their 2022 AQMP. This plan shows that the South Coast will need to reduce NOx emissions by over 80 percent from 2018 levels to attain the 70 ppb standard. In the 2022 AQMP, the District has committed to develop measures on a wide variety of sources under their regulatory control, including driving stationary sources to zero emissions wherever possible.

1.3

2.2

Reductions from direct -- District measures, together with the reductions from measures in the 2022 State SIP Strategy, provide the necessary reductions for attainment in the South Coast and Coachella Valley.

Measures from our State SIP Strategy provide the majority of the reductions to attain the ozone standard and will also greatly reduce pollution within disadvantaged communities.

Before I pass the presentation to staff, I would like to highlight an important difference between this air quality management plan and past ones. Like previous South Coast SIPs, this plan includes actions and emission reductions that will need to be approved by U.S. EPA under the extreme black box provisions of the Act, including with respect to sources primarily under federal or international authority, like aircraft and ships. However, the actions in this plan don't depend on uncertain funding. These actions are wholly and currently

achievable through the federal actions clearly defined in the 2022 State SIP Strategy. Emissions from these primarily federally and internationally regulated sources have grown rapidly and will overwhelm State and District efforts to meet the ozone standard in future years, absent new or strengthened federal controls.

I will now ask Scott King of the Air Quality Planning and Science Division to begin the staff presentation.

Scott.

2.2

(Thereupon a slide presentation).

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you, Dr. Cliff. Good morning, Chair Randolphs -- Randolph and members of the Board. It is my honor to present the South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2022 Air Quality Management Plan, or 2022 AQMP, for the 70 parts per billion ozone standard, along with staff's recommendations for your consideration today.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Before we get into the details of the 2022 AQMP, I'm going to provide some background on the areas and the standard being discussed in the item before you today. As you can see in this slide, the South Coast Air Basin is made up of significant portions of Los Angeles County, San Bernardino

County, Riverside County, and all of Orange County. It is home to almost 17 million residents, which is approximately 40 percent of California's population.

2.2

The Coachella Valley is made up of the Salton Sea Air Basin portion of Riverside County and has a population of approximately 450,000 residents that is expected to almost double by 2035. The South Coast Air Quality Management District is the local air agency that oversees both the South Coast Air Basin and the Coachella Valley.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Over the past 30 years, control programs developed by the district and CARB has significantly reduced ozone concentrations in the South Coast and Coachella Valley. As shown in this slide, between 1990 and 2022, the 8-hour ozone design values have been reduced by nearly 40 percent in the South Coast. And in some areas, such as in the cities of Los Angeles, San -- sorry, Los Angeles, Pasadena, and Glendora, the number of unhealthy ozone days has been reduced by 70 to 90 percent.

However, as you can see here, recent ozone design values have increased somewhat. 2020 was an especially bad year being atypically hot and stagnant resulting in ozone levels in the South Coast that have not occurred in 15 years. 2020 air quality impacts not only the 2020

design value but also 2021 and 2022 design values seen on this graph. However, air quality in 2021 and 2022 was actually significant better and ozone is trending back in the right direction.

2.2

And in the Coachella Valley, design values have been reduced by over 30 percent in the last 30 years. However, to meet the latest health protective ozone standard, there is a tremendous amount of work that needs to be done. So let's talk about the standard we are focusing on today.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: The federal Clean Air Act requires the United States Environmental Protection Agency, or EPA, to set air quality standards and reevaluate these standards every five years to make sure they are as healthy -- health protective as possible based on the latest science. In 2015, EPA reevaluated -- thank you.

In 2015, EPA reevaluated the ozone standard and set it at 70 parts per billion, or ppb. When EPA set the standard, they classified the South Coast Air Basin as extreme, the highest ozone classification, giving the District 20 years to meet the 70 parts per billion standard. Originally, the Coachella Valley was classified as severe. But since ozone in Coachella is mainly due to

being downstream of the South Coast, the District has since determined that Coachella will also need 20 years and additional emission reductions to attain the 70 parts per billion standard.

1.3

2.2

As a result, the AQMP developed by the District includes a request that the Coachella Valley be classified as extreme, meaning that both areas will need to attain the standard in 2037.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: For areas not meeting an ozone standard, the federal Clean Air Act requires that the states develop a State Implementation Plan, or SIP, that demonstrates how the area is going to attain the ozone standard. The Act requires that the SIP contain a number of specific pieces. This slide shows the basic elements of an attainment SIP and how they build upon each other to demonstrate attainment of the standard.

At the base of this process is air quality monitoring, understanding the extent of the ozone problem throughout the area. Next, an accurate accounting of source emissions is necessary to identify the amount of precursor emissions coming from different sources such as cars, trucks, trains, or factories.

The monitoring data and emission inventory are used in an air quality model to predict future ozone

levels and estimate the amount of emissions needed to be reduced to meet the ozone standard.

1.3

2.2

Finally, based on the results of modeling, a SIP must include a control strategy to reduce those emissions from the sources causing the ozone problem. Developing the control strategy requires extensive collaboration with local air districts impacted businesses, health advocates and community members, as well as other stakeholders.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: To meet the Clean Air Act requirements, last month the District adopted the 2022 Air Quality Management Plan, which demonstrates how both the South Coast and Coachella Valley will attain the 70 parts per billion ozone standard in 2037. The AQMP was developed over a three-year period with significant public input and in close coordination with CARB staff. The 2022 AQMP is an aggressive plan that drives zero-emission technology in all sectors to lower air pollution. The 2022 AQMP also includes emission reductions from the 2022 State SIP Strategy approved by this Board last September.

In the State SIP strategy, CARB focused on the drive to zero -- drive to zero, primarily on mobile -- on the mobile side. And for the first time in an AQMP, the District is also focusing on the transition to

zero-emission technologies for stationary sources everywhere feasible.

2.2

In another first, the District shifted to a new screening threshold in the development of their control measures in the 2022 AQMP. The screening threshold in previous AQMPs was based on cost of control technology, while the new threshold is much higher and consists of the monetized health benefits of reducing pollution. The use of this new threshold further emphasizes the District's focus on health by ensuring that additional measures are subject to more rigorous analysis in consideration for inclusion in the 2022 AQMP.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: And while 2022 AQMP and really all ozone SIPs are planning documents required to reduce pollution at a regional level, the control measures in the AQMP from the District and from CARB, as part of the State SIP Strategy, will reduce emissions in many priority communities that are overburdened by emissions from freight source, including trucks and warehouses, trains and railyards, and ships and ports.

As part of the AQMP, the District developed a socioeconomic report that evaluated and identified the cost and total health benefit of the AQMP, including

looking at specific benefits in at-risk communities. Both the District, when developing the AQMP, and CARB, when developing the State strategy, engaged with community members and organizations to pro -- to process -- in the process - sorry - of creating the control measures needed to reduce emissions and meet the ozone standard.

2.2

The Board heard in September about CARB staff's outreach and engagement with developing the CARB measures. In developing the 2022 AQMP, the District had numerous meetings and workshops with active participation by community-based organizations, environmental nonprofit organizations, business, university, and government representatives. This level of public engagement is critical to accomplish the reductions needed to attain the ozone standard in the South Coast.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Now, let's talk about what it will take to meet the 70 part per billion standard in the South Coast. This slide shows the level of emissions — the level of emission reductions of oxide of nitrogen, also known as NOx, needed for the South Coast Air Basin to attain the ozone standard. As demonstrated through air quality modeling, NOx emission — NOx reduction — reductions are the primary driver for ozone reductions in the South Coast and provide the only

feasible path to meet the standard. The bar on the left shows NOx emissions from all sources of air pollution in the South Coast in 2018, a total of 351 tons per day broken down by their source category.

2.2

If we did nothing but rely on already adopted programs, the total NOx emissions in 2037 would go down to 185 tons per day as shown in the second bar.

But to attain the 70 parts per billion standard, modeling in the 2022 AQMP determined that NOx emissions must be reduced to the third bar, or 60 tons per day, an additional 70 percent reduction beyond the baseline level that we would otherwise see in 2037 from programs already in place. To reach the 60 tons per day level, CARB and the District worked together to identify control measures to achieve the needed reduction.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: The next two slides list control measures that the District has committed to pursuing to reach attainment. California law assigns the air districts as the primarily regulatory agency over stationary and area-wide sources of air pollution, while CARB has primary authority to control in-state mobile and consumer products emissions. This slide shows the stationary source measures proposed by the District as part of the recently adopted AQMP. The

District measures encompass all stationary sources of air pollution, ranging from large industrial complexes like energy generating facilities and oil refineries to small but numerous sources, like residential buildings.

1.3

2.2

The District control measures will reduce emissions from residential and commercial appliances, like water heaters, space heaters, and cooking devices by requiring cleaner energy to power these processes. The new district measures for stationary source -- sources accelerate the transition from traditional combustion sources towards zero-emission energy sources, resulting in a 60 percent reduction in NOx emissions between 2018 and 2037.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: This slide lists the District's mobile source control measures. While most of the authorities who regulate mobile sources lies with the State and federal governments, the District has a number of measures that will also reduce emissions from local sources. Some of the key measures on this slide that the District is actively developing are the ones labeled here as facility based measures. The District already approved a very stringent and significant Indirect Source Rule for warehouse and is continuing to work toward implementing additional indirect source rules

for marine ports and intermodal facilities like railyards.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

They are also continuing to use voluntary memorandums of understanding at commercial airports. The District's other strategies to lower emissions for mobile sources include retiring older vehicles, exchange programs for off-road equipment, clean construction policies, and other incentives programs.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: While the District measures provide reductions from sources under their authority, most of the NOx emissions in the South Coast come from sources that are under State and federal authority. The 2020 -- 2022 State SIP Strategy, which was developed to provide control measures and reductions needed to meet the 70 part per billion standard across California will provide 95.7 tons per day of NOx reductions as needed for attainment in the South Coast. This represents over 70 percent of the total reductions from new measures needed for South Coast to attain and builds on significant emission reductions that are being achieved through measures adopted in previous SIPs, and currently being implemented through adopted CARB rules. When the Board adopted the State SIP Strategy, you also approved the commitment to pursue each of the measures listed on the next slide.

--000--

1.3

2.2

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: In the Strategy, CARB committed to pursue an unprecedented variety of new measures to reduce emissions from the sources under our authority. This slide shows the measures from the strategy which are categorized into on- and off-road mobile sources, and other sources that California can regulate, such as consumer products and pesticides.

For on-road mobile sources, the strategy includes a number of measures that will require zero-emission travel both for people and freight. These include the Clean Miles Standard Regulation, the Advanced Clean Fleets Regulation, and the Zero-Emission Truck Measure. The control measures for off-road vehicles and equipment include a broad range of programs that target some of the oldest and dirtiest equipment that remain in use today from sources such as harbor craft, cargo handling equipment, and other off-road equipment. Along with on-road sources and off-road equipment, CARB will achieve additional reductions from new measures for consumer products and appliances.

Finally, and in some ways most importantly, the strategy includes measures to achieve reductions from sources primarily releg -- regulated at the federal and

international level, such as locomotives, ocean-going vessels, and aircraft, which will be needed to meet the ozone standard in the South Coast.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

While CARB and thd District are working to identify all actions within our jurisdiction to remove -- to reduce emissions from these primary -- primarily federal -- federally regulated sources, I want to highlight that we cannot achieve the ozone standard without action at the federal level.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: This graph shows statewide mobile source NOx emissions from 2000 to 2040, with the blue line representing California regulated mobile sources with adopted rules and the gold line represented -- representing primarily federally regulated sources, such as interstate trucks, planes, trains and ships. Emissions from primarily federal sources surpass California sources in 2020, and without more stringent federal requirements will double the contribution of California regulated sources by 2030. Given the increasingly significant contribution of air pollution from these federally regulated sources, federal and international action is critical to attain the 70 parts per billion ozone standard, as well as to support attainment of other federal standards and reduce community

exposure.

2.2

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: In the State Strategy, CARB identified regulatory actions needed to achieve emission reductions from the sources primarily regulated at the federal level. Emission reductions from these sources are necessary for the South Coast and Coachella Valley to attain the 70 part per billion standard. The actions identified for on -- for the on-road sector include a federal low-NOx standard for on-road heavy-duty vehicles, now being proposed as the federal Clean Truck Plan and federal zero-emission on-road heavy-duty vehicle requirements.

In the off-road categories, we are pushing EPA for off-road equipment, Tier 5 compression ignition standards, more stringent national locomotive emission standards, and for the option of more stringent Tier 4 marine standards.

In aviation, we will -- we need to position or continue to advocate to EPA, the International Civil Aviation Organization, and other regulatory agencies for more stringent standards for aircraft engines and the use of cleaner fuels and engines when traveling through California. The measures to control primarily federally regulated sources will also provide health benefits for

disadvantaged communities disproportionately affected by emissions associated with ports, warehouses, and other freight hubs.

2.2

While CARB has defined these measures for EPA, it should be noted that for EPA to approve them in the SIP, they will need to be approved under the advanced technology provision of the Clean Air Act, also referred to as the black box. The black box measures in the 2022 AQMP differ from those of past AQMPs in that in the 2022 State SIP Strategy, these measures are defined and assigned to specific federal actions.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: And while federal actions seem glacial, the State and District continue to pass rules lowering emissions. CARB will get approximately six tons per day of NOx emi -- NOx reductions from measures included in the 2016 State SIP Strategy namely the Advanced Clean Cars II, the TRU Regulation Part 1, and, the Zero-Emission Forklift Rule.

While most of CARB's measures committed to in the 2016 State SIP Strategy have been adopted and their emission -- and their associated emission reductions are reflected in the baseline inventory for the 2022 AQMP, the three measures listed here were not included in the baseline inventory, so their emission reductions will be

included as part of the commitment being considered by the Board today.

1.3

2.2

Two of these measures, the Advanced Clean Cars II and the Transportation Refrigeration Unit Part 1, were adopted by the Board in 2022. And the final one, Zero-Emission Forklift Regulation is planned for the Board -- is planned for Board consideration this year.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Arriving at a legally approvable SIP requires action on the part of the CARB Board that can be broken down into two steps. First, the Board needs to approve a commitment to pursue all feasible measures under CARB's authority. This was accomplished last September when you adopted the 2022 State SIP Strategy.

Second, the Board needs to commit to achieving the aggregate emission reductions from all sources needed to show attainment in a specific region, such as the South Coast, by the designated attainment date.

Today, staff is asking you to take this second step, namely to adopt the commitment to aggregate -- to achieve aggregate emission reductions in our State measures in the South Coast and Coachella Valley by specific dates. I will go into more detail on the District's State and federal commitments in the next

series of slides.

2.2

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: In addition to the State commitment -- commitments I just described, the District has also committed to emission reductions from measures included in their 2022 AQMP. This table provides the commitments from the District in the 2022 AQMP and from State and federal measures in the 2022 State SIP Strategy.

In 2037, the District has committed to achieve 29 tons per day of NOx reductions. CARB measures in the 2022 State SIP Strategy would achieve 44 tons per day of NOx reductions, of which approximately 10 will come from regulations that the Board has already approved that were measures in the 2016 and 2022 State SIP strategies.

And finally, for the sources that are primarily under federal or international authority, quantified measures would prove -- would provide 52 tons per day of NOx reductions. Collectively, these reductions prove -- provide for attainment of the 70 parts per billion standard in the South Coast by 2037. Modeling in the 2022 AQMP also demonstrates that this strategy provides for attainment in the downwind Coachella Valley by 2037 also.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: With these

commitments, the 2022 AQMP demonstrates that the South Coast will attain the 70 parts per billion ozone standard in 2037. This slide provides a detailed breakdown of the categories of emissions and their reductions.

1.3

2.2

The first bar on the left is the 2037 baseline emissions that you saw previously in slide 7, showing the emissions if no new regulations are adopted beyond those currently adopted by CARB and the District. The middle bar shows the remaining emissions in 2037 after the District and CARB measures have been implemented. And the bar on the right represents remaining emissions from sources in the South Coast when all measures, including those assigned to federal and international sources — international sources are implemented.

The third bar, which reflects all the measures in this plan shows that we have identified the emission reductions needed to attain the 70 part per billion standard in the South Coast.

--000--

 $\label{eq:aqpsd} \mbox{AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Oh, 20.} \\ \mbox{Thank you.}$

And while ozone is a regional pollutant, meaning that it typically forms some distance downwind of the emission sources, the District and CARB went to great lengths to verify that the 2022 AQMP was providing air

quality benefits for all communities and improving the health in the priority communities in the South Coast. This slide shows that all six of the AB 617 communities that have been designated thus far in the South Coast will see benefits from the proposed control strategy and will have ozone level -- that will have ozone levels below the 70 part per billion standard by 2037.

2.2

Moscow -- sorry -- Muscoy community in the Inland Empire, where current ozone concentrations are the highest in the South Coast as well as the entire country, is predicted to meet the ozone standard in 2037. Some communities, such as Wilmington, West Long Beach, Carson are predicted to have ozone concentrations well below the 70 part per billion standard in 2037. The District also analyzed the potential health benefits of the measures in the AQMP and found that priority communities in the South Coast will actually see a greater reduction in premature mortality and asthma related emergency visits than non-priority communities in the basin.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: So back to staff's analysis of the AQMP. CARB staff has reviewed the 2022 AQMP and this slide summarizes our analysis of the elements needed to show compliance with Clean Air Act

requirements. The SIP being considered by the Board today includes the required emission -- emissions inventories, assessment of reasonably available control measures, attainment demonstrations, as well as a demonstration of the required annual progress reducing emissions, and related motor vehicle emission budgets, a vehicle miles traveled offset demonstration, and contingency requirements.

1.3

2.2

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: In closing, staff recommends the Board adopt the State commitment to achieve aggregate emission reductions in the South Coast Air Basin and Coachella Valley by 2037, adopt the South Coast 2022 Air Quality Management Plan, adopt the planning emissions inventories, reasonable further progress demonstrations, and vehicle miles traveled offset demonstration included in the CARB staff report, and direct staff to submit the 2022 AQMP and CARB staff report to EPA as revision to the California SIP.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you for your attention and now I would like to invite Dr.

Sarah Rees, the South Coast Air Quality Management

District Deputy Executive Officer for Planning, Rules

Development, and Implementation to provide comments from

the District

1.3

2.2

DR. SARAH REES: Great.

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Dr. Rees.

(Laughter).

DR. SARAH REES: Good morning, Chair Randolph, members of the Board. Thank you for the opportunity to speak this morning. My name is Sarah Rees. I'm the Deputy Executive Officer for Planning at the South Coast AQMD.

We strongly support adoption of this Air Quality Management Plan. This is our most aggressive Air Quality Management Plan to date. It's needed as you can see from staff's report. The amount of emissions reductions required are quite frankly breathtaking and so this is why for the first time we are expressly pivoting towards adoption of zero-emission technologies wherever and where are feasible across all sectors.

The good news is when fully implemented, this Plan is going deliver substantial public health benefits. We will avoid approximately 1,500 premature deaths a year. When we monetize all the health benefits that we expect from this plan, it's going to be in the range of \$19.4 billion a year, so very, very substantial benefits. And as staff mentioned, we do expect to see these benefits across the basin, but particularly for our EJ communities

that are already overburdened by air pollution.

2.2

It's going to be very challenging to get to this plan and to implement it. You know, the amount of emission reductions are very significant. But there's also a few barriers and I want to touch on three points that are going to be critical to the success of this plan. The first is the need for zero-emission infrastructure, the fueling infrastructure. We have issues both on the generation side as well as all the planning and coordination required for the buildout of the infrastructure.

On the generation side, we estimate that power generation needs to approximately double over the period of the plan in order to be able to support all of the zero-emission technology needed. That arguably is the more solvable problem.

The bigger issue, in my opinion, is the buildout, is how do we finance the buildout needed, how do we coordinate amongst all the agencies, both State and local level, that have a piece of this to be able to get the infrastructure in place in a timely manner. So getting the funding present, figuring out the permitting issues et cetera.

The second issue is one that staff highlighted, which is a need for federal action. Frankly, we will not

be able to attain the 2015 ozone standard without federal action and I believe probably the other ozone standards as well.

2.2

In 2037, which is the date we need to be able to attain the standard, the amount of emissions from ocean-going vessels and aircraft alone are going to eat up almost all of the NOx that we can have in the atmosphere and still be able to meet the standard. They'll be simply, despite the best efforts of CARB staff and South Coast, no room to be able to meet that standard unless those choices are addressed. We stand at the ready to continue to work with CARB staff and our efforts in D.C. to get the federal government to pay attention and to Frankly step up and have their regulations keep pace with what California has been able to achieve.

And then the third issue is that of equity and environmental justice. This plan is going to be very challenging and very expensive to implement and it's critical that we do this and make this transition to zero-emission technology in an equitable way that doesn't leave behind our environmental justice communities. One of the ways we think is really important to do that is to design incentive programs in a way that prioritizes funds to EJ communities, recognizes the challenges of low-income areas, and some of the challenges on some of our control

measures addressing residential buildings, for example. If you're majority tenant occupied in an area, how do you overcome that hurdle, how do you get the funds to upgrade the wiring and all the other infrastructure that's needed to support electrification.

And finally, I want to express my gratitude and thanks to CARB staff. I feel like we have a very strong partnership. Their help has been invaluable in getting this Air Quality Management Plan together and across the threshold and also thank them for their partnership with us, and frankly often much needed sense of humor as we battle these very, very challenging and daunting issues, and look forward to continuing our partnership in the future.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you very much. We will now hear from the public who signed up to speak on this item, either by submitting a request to speak card or by raising a hand in Zoom.

Board Clerk, will you please call on the public commenters.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

It looks like we have five people in Zoom with their hands raised. And the first three are Ian Faloona, Robert Yuhnke, and Chris Chavez.

So, Ian, you should be able to unmute and begin.

DR. IAN FALOONA: Thank you very much. My name is Ian Faloona. I'm an atmospheric scientist at the University of California at Davis.

2.2

I would like to present something, but I don't have any access to share screens, so I won't be able to show you any of the data. But to cut to the chase, I believe that your SIP modeling in the plan that was outlined by Mr. Moore is fatally flawed, because it ignores a significant source of nitrogen oxides of the atmosphere, that is those that come from microbes in soil, and particularly in warm dry soils like in the Southern San Joaquin Valley and in the Coachella Valley.

This is a well established mechanism that is completely overlooked by the current modeling that CARB is doing. We have mounting evidence that I would just like to go over. I can't show you visually, but I can tell you the history. In 2015, Oikawa et al. in Nature published results that showed that soil NOx emissions from the Imperial Valley were 10 to 60 times greater than what is commonly model in the chemical transport model.

In 2018, I was involved with a paper that came out in Science by Almaraz et al. and we showed that in the Southern San Joaquin Valley and the Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley, there are large soil source -- sources

of NOx, which is, by the way, a precursor to both ozone and PM2.5. Both of these problems, as you all know, are extremely recalcitrant in these regions of great agricultural activity. That paper came out.

2.2

Then in -- more recently, Shah et al. showed from their modeling of soil sources that in cropland areas of California, approximately 50 percent of the total NOx emissions come from these soils sources and California wide, it's more like 40 percent. This is right in line with what Almaraz et al. estimated, something like 20 to 30 percent coming from these soil sources.

Work I've been doing with David Parrish that was public in Parrish et al. 2017 and is in press right now shows that the ozone trends across decades in much of Southern California indicate that there's an asymptote being approached. There's a floor, which is above the national ambient air quality standards. I would like to show you some of that information, but again, I don't have the visual access, but this shows -- okay. I see that.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ian, I wanted to let you know -- I wanted to let you know that if you -- there's a link here or -- that's shown -- web address that's shown on the screen application/public comments. The docket for this item will be able to receive written comments until the conclusion of public comment. So if you want to go to

that website now, you can submit that, and then the Board members and the public, everyone will be able to see your materials from the webpage.

1.3

2.2

DR. IAN FALOONA: Yeah. I would also just like to point out that I've seen in public comments to these documents other people have raised this issue. And so while I think it's laudable to have these public comments, I think it's -- it's incumbent that you have to acknowledge this. You have to acknowledge this source. It's been ignored for too long --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

DR. IAN FALOONA: -- and the mounting evidence is there.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

All right. Next, we will hear from Robert Yuhnke. After Robert will be Chris Chavez, Heather Lieb, Adrian -- and then Adrian Martinez. If you would like to comment on this item, please raise your hand now. Robert, you should be able to unmute and begin.

ROBERT YUHNKE: Thank you. Chairman Randolph and Board members. My name is Robert Yuhnke. I am currently representing Elders Climate Action. I'm a senior with grandchildren and we're committed to protecting the environment for their future.

We submitted written comments addressing the

challenge that you face in developing rules to achieve the aggregate NOx reductions in the black box and particularly with regard to the reductions that are needed from on-road sources to achieve attainment in the South Coast. You are taking a revolutionary step towards phasing out the operation of internal combustion engines with the draft Clean Fleets Rule, which is one of the primary elements of the commitments that you have taken.

1.3

2.2

That commitment is very important, especially for the protection of the frontline communities along the SR-47, the 710, and the 110 to protect those communities from diesel exhaust from the trucks that are serving the ports. The Clean Fleets Rule would phase out those internal combustion engine vehicles in -- that serve the ports. And that is an important first step in implementing a requirement of the Clean Air Act that I helped write back in 1990.

At that time, I was the senior attorney at Environmental Defense Fund working with Henry Waxman's staff in drafting the Act. And I want you to be clear that the authority that you are relying upon intended that the District and the states have authority to phase out the operation of polluting vehicles. This is a requirement that you are now pursuing for the first time. We're sure that it will be challenged and that comments

that I submitted for the purpose of helping to support the legal basis for those strategies.

But in addition, we urge you to take two other actions. One is that in the development of the Clean Fleets Rule that you direct staff to pursue Alternative 2, which aligns the phaseout deadline for the internal combustion vehicles with the attainment deadline in the Act of 2037, and secondly, that you investigate expanding the scope of the Clean Fleets Rule to ultimately eliminate the operation of all internal combustion medium and heavy-duty vehicles for which there is a zero-emission policy available.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Chris Chavez.

CHRISTOPHER CHAVEZ: Yes. Good morning. This is Chris Chavez, Deputy Policy Director at Coalition for Clean Air. First, I just wanted to note that it sounds like the Spanish translation is getting into the English channel, so you might want to address that.

We recognize the difficult task ahead for the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Not only is South -- the South Coast Air Basin the smoggiest in the region, it also has some of the nation's highest particulate matter levels. While all Southern California

is affected by poor air quality, we can't lose site of the fact that the burden falls heaviest on low-income and disadvantaged communities, many of which were formerly red- and yellow-lined neighborhoods.

1.3

2.2

We remain concerned about the role, however, of speculative black box reductions from future technologies in the AQMP. Prior AQMPs also relied heavily on black box reductions. Yet we are still out of attainment of air quality standards. It's also worth noting that initially, this AQMP was not supposed to rely on such reductions.

We fully agree that U.S. EPA needs to step up to the plate with new standards, rules, and enforcement. We also believe that South Coast AQMD and CARB both need to get every ounce of emission reductions it can get as quickly as possible. This will require the district to get rid of artificially low cost effectiveness thresholds.

Further, the District must pass and begin implementing an Indirect Source Rule for both the ports and railyards this year. Reducing emissions from the ports has been identified as a strategy since at least the 2007 AQMP and the route to the current process span back to 2018.

Meanwhile, there are two proposed railyards, one in the very heart of the Wilmington, Carson, and West Long Beach AB 617 community and another adjacent to the Colton

community. For AB 617, we'd also note that while the District is likely to have its rules updated for the best available retrofit control technology deadline by 20 -- or December 31st, 2023, the actual Implementation of these rules will extend well into the 2030s.

We are also concerned about the availability of State incentive dollars which both AQMD and CARB rely heavily upon. The governor's budget proposal includes billions of dollars in trigger cuts, most of which will come to -- from the medium- and heavy-duty programs of transit and infrastructure. If these cuts come to pass, both the District and CARB will need to rethink of the role of the incentives in its air quality and climate plans. With those comments, I do want to elevate and commend South Coast for the AQMP's provisions on building decarbonization.

While transportation is the largest source of pollution in California, pollution from carbon-intensive buildings, including back-up generators, contributes to our region's poor air quality. We encourage both CARB and the District to pursue building decarbonization control measures, while also assisting equity communities with the transition.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you and thanks for

flagging that for us about the Spanish coming through. We're going to work on that.

Heather, you can unmute and begin.

2.2

HEATHER LIEB: Hi. My name is Heather Lieb. I am a graduate student at UC Davis and I focus on research in the Salton Sea Air Basin. I have four points I want to make today.

So first, I just want to acknowledge thank you so much for your hard work, but the references mentioned in your weight of evidence for the Coachella Valley a lot of them are from studies before 2016, so I don't think that it really reflects any of the recent research, which is mainly to address the current NOx budget, which was actually published in 2012, so it's over a decade old now.

This NOx budget does not acknowledge the contribution of soil NOx, which could be anywhere from 20 to 50 percent based on previous studies. And the reason I bring this up is because the Coachella Valley is NOx limited. So, yes, reducing vehicle emissions will help with the ozone pollution, but not addressing agricultural and lawn management sources from soil NOx emissions and warmer temperatures is going to result in an increase in NOx just due to the microbial process in the soil, and therefore that's going to raise your NOx emissions, which is only going to make it harder to attain the ozone

standard.

1.3

2.2

The reason I mention this is because the region of the Coachella Valley that will most likely face this problem the most are the southern and eastern portions of the Coachella Valley. They have more agriculture in the region, but these regions are also the communities that face the most environmental burdens. They are the low-income communities. A lot of our ag workers -- I work with Lideres Campesinas and Comite Civico del Valle in my research, and so I really just wanted to acknowledge that not addressing agricultural sources and their production, and ozone pollution, and PM pollution in this region is actually an act of environmental justice. So thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Next, we'll hear from Adrian Martinez and then after that, our last speaker will be Teresa Bui.

Adrian, you can unmute and begin.

ADRIAN MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. My name is Adrian Martinez and I'm an attorney with Earthjustice. Earthjustice participated extensively with our partners and clients in the development of the South Coast Air Plan and then also the State Strategy.

I'm here today to recommend that there be

continuing monitored -- monitoring of control measure development. You know, both the California Air Resources Board and the South Coast Air Quality Management District have been ambitious in setting forward many control measures on deadlines in the plan. Sometimes, after the plan approval, everyone takes a breath and sometimes we forget to kind of implement some of the measures.

1.3

2.2

And in this case, it's really important, because for certain measures, there are no emission reduction commitments in the plan, such as the Indirect Source Rules for ports and railyards. And so what the means is sometimes there may be, you know, the agencies achieve their emission reductions and they forget to kind of go back and address certain types of sources. A classic example from the last Air Plan, the 2016 plan, was there was a measure around diesel back-up generators to pursue aggressive reductions, but because of other efforts such as the RECLAIM dismantling, that effort took a back burner.

We're at a stage in our air quality in the region where we can -- we have -- we don't have -- we can't afford to have anything on the back burner. And in fact, we need to, you know, eliminate burners altogether in the region.

We encourage the Air Resources Board to really

roll up their sleeves and work with Dr. Rees and her team on industrial electrification and zero-emission options in that space. There's a lot of boilers, commercial kitchen equipment, and other things in the South Coast that are prime for zero emissions. And so we hope that the ARB will work with the agency staff to make sure that those regulatory efforts move forward quickly so we can get on our path to a zero-emission future.

And then the final thing, you know, I'd encourage some more transparency for both agencies around progress on control measures, perhaps the South Coast website, that can, you know, talk about where they are at the different rule development for the different control measures. Just to create a better way for the public to understand how the plan has been implemented been. It's been sometimes hard to do that, given the length of the plans and how many measures there are. And so some of that work, which I think could be relatively easily done administratively, I think would be helpful from a transparency standpoint.

Thank you for your time and have a good day.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Teresa.

2.2

TERESA BUI: Good morning, Board members. My name is Teresa Bui with Pacific Environment. We are a global NGO with a consultative status with the

International Maritime Organization, which sets global shipping laws. We want to thank staff for their hard work on this plan. However, we have major concerns that the plan do not contain sufficient adopted control measures to provide for the NOx emission reduction. We want to echo Adrian's recommendation to monitor and continue to refine the plan.

2.2

Right now, it lacks developed and immediately actionable plans to put measures into action. Many of the control measures paint in very vague, broad strokes or allude to future rules. And so we need implementation of measures that would get to immediate life-saving benefits.

Right now, last year, the Port of Long Beach saw record shipping traffic and associated toxic pollution. CO2 increased by 87 percent from 2020 and diesel particulate matter jumped up to -- by 77 percent from 2020. And the Port of Long Beach was even worse with a staggering 147 percent jump in diesel PM. And so we really need South Coast to set strong emission targets for the commercial marine port sector. That's in alignment with the 1.5 degree with the Paris alignment.

And so again, we're urging CARB in conjunction with South Coast to -- immediately to set strong emission reduction targets from the marine sector and consider setting clear mandates to allow only Tier 3 main engine

visits to the San Pedro ports by 2025.

2.2

Thank you for your consideration.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Chair, that concludes the comments.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you very much.

Staff, are there any issues raised in the comments you want to address before I close the record on this item?

Okay. Now, we will bring the conversation to the Board.

Board Member Kracov.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Good morning, Chair and everyone. Sorry I couldn't be with you there today in person. I will be there tomorrow.

I represent the South Coast on this Board. And I just wanted to say a couple of quick words kind of repeating what's already been said frankly, which seems to be a very good summary of where we are on this. This is our ozone SIP to try to get into attainment by 2037. And it's true that if you look at the, you know, last 20, 30 years, there's been tremendous accomplishment here in the South Coast with regard to ozone. Yet, the last 12 years, there has really been stagnation. In fact, the ozone levels are ticking up.

Now, there's complicated science on this.

There's complicated atmospheric chemistry, which we had presentations on both from CARB and the South Coast. But the bottom line is that we have a problem with goods movement and ozone emissions, NOx emissions in the South Coast. And to get to where we need to be in 2037, it is an enormous challenge, an 80 percent reduction of -- in our carrying capacity. So, you know, with that, I just wanted to highlight a couple things if I can, Chair.

2.2

You know, the first is that, you know, only about 15 percent of our NOx inventory is from stationary sources, smoke stack sources, which are the typical authority of air districts like ours. And you can only squeeze, you know, so much more NOx emissions out of our stationary source and manufacturing sector. And we're trying to do that in the Plan. The Plan is a zero-emission plan, you know, for things like boilers, furnaces, and building electrification.

And one of the issues that was really -- that got a lot of attention, colleagues, when we approved the Plan, that really was around some of the stationary work was this -- that was mentioned by Mr. King was the raise -- or in the increase in our cost effectiveness threshold. This is a threshold that this -- not necessarily required by law, but something that we've had as guidance to staff in past AQMPs about what measures we were going to analyze

depending on how expensive they were. It was a typical analysis of cost effectiveness, the amount of NOx reductions over how much it's expected to cost.

2.2

In the past AQMP, colleagues, it was set at \$56,000. So if we measure, it was potentially more than that per ton, it was something that there was a sense that we might not pursue. As part of this SIP, however, we've sort of switched a couple important things. The first is we've gone from a typical cost effectiveness threshold to one now that is sort of a benefit cost analysis, that focuses on the benefits of the NOx reductions, public health benefits, et cetera.

And the second big thing there is that we've raised the threshold, colleagues, from \$56,000 by 500 percent to \$325,000. I mean, this is a huge jump and we got to present and get industries in the South Coast to be supportive of it and generally they were, as I'll mention. But the bottom line is, is that this document really does recognize that if we're going to continue to try to reach attainment, and we're going to try to get that extra, you know, drops out of stationary sources, it's going to be extremely expensive for our stationary sources and our manufacturing sector.

The second point then is, you know, what's left?

And it really is the goods movement, it's the remaining 85

percent. And again many of these are sources that the South Coast and the districts do not typically regulate, and that's the challenge that we have for the on-road stuff, the work we're doing here at CARB with trucks is going to make a huge difference. Over time, the projections show that the on-road emissions are really decreasing, but it's the off-road emissions, the federal international regulated emissions that really are the problem. Locomotives, huge problem. Aircraft, ships, as Ms. Bui just mentioned.

2.2

And the South Coast is trying do what we can on that. We are -- have Indirect Source rules in this SIP for railyards, as well as the ports. And colleagues, these have been very difficult to pass, very difficult to fight back, you know, legal challenges on as well. That's one of the reasons why there's not necessarily numeric reductions associated with these. And the other part of it is even with those, we still cannot do it alone. We, at CARB, we at the South Coast absolutely need federal help. I agree with Mr. King without additional assistance from the feds on these kind of sources, we will not reach attainment, you know, period.

And so what does that leave us with? You know, nonattainment penalties, these extremely expensive measures for stationary sources that even if we implement

though, it still won't get us in attainment even if raise, which we've done, our cost effectiveness measure, by 500 percent.

2.2

So we're talking to the federal government. We have a strategy with CARB, talking to Senator Padilla about this trying to explain what kind of draconian impacts nonattainment penalties will have and the measures that are needed on our manufacturing base and economy, if we cannot get help from the federal government on locomotives, ships, and aircraft.

So, you know, trying to speak plainly, that's sort of where we are. That being said, you know, there was broad support, colleagues, for this AQMP at the District, broad support from the Board at the South Coast, broad support from environmental stakeholders which you've heard today, and industry, you know, also, I think, understands the challenges that we face, and generally, I think is supportive of this -- of this AQMP, although they're wary, as we start to implement the rules as part of it, how much it's going to cost. And so that's the challenge that we face.

So I'm supportive today of this AQMP. I want to thank AQMD staff, Dr. Rees and her whole team on this, Mr. King Ariel Fideldy from CARB, who's our sort of district liaison. You know, this document gives CARB and the AQMD,

through the statewide SIP and through the local AQMP, you know, the roadmap on how we're going to try to get to attainment and what it's going to take. And I'm privileged, colleagues, to lean in with all of you on this work, both at this Board, and at AQMD.

Thank you, Chair.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Board Member De La Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you. I'm going to be supportive of this, but -- because it's about South Coast and because we did the SIP back in September. I am frustrated with South Coast with how long it's taken for them to do an Indirect Source Rule for the port complex. You all -- I think I've flashed my show and tell, which is the MATES study where there's been progress made throughout Southern California except one place. very obvious when you see that chart. There's only one purple zone in all of Southern California with the MATES study, which is the carcinogenic effect of air pollution. It is at the port complex, period. And the fact that they got a delay when they did the overall Indirect Source Rule for all of South Coast and left out the worst place in their District was amazing to me. And here we are, two years later and they still don't have one for that area, for the worst polluted area in the South Coast Air

District.

2.2

That has to happen. I can only imagine all of the emissions reductions we would have today if they had gone along -- had been part of the original Indirect Source Rule for the rest of the District.

I also wanted to point out related to that, that the Pacific Maritime Shipping Association is shopping a bill in Sacramento to get near zero authority from the Legislature. A, that's forum shopping and you all have heard me say I hate that. B, we don't have the luxury for near zero any more. These numbers speak for themselves and so we have to push for zero. We have to defeat efforts by those who would go around the push that we are making for zero and we need the Air District to really zero in on the Indirect Source Rule for the port complex.

Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Board Member Hurt.

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you. Board Member Kracov, I think summed it up pretty well. And I just want to emphasize the need for federal action really moving beyond pledges and actually doing the work and the measures that are needed.

I just wanted to state I really appreciated how comprehensive this Plan is. And I know as a Bay Area Air Quality Management District representative it's a really

helpful roadmap for what we can do in our own communities. It's a menu of items. So I want to thank everybody that's worked on this plan and worked with the community to make it happen, that includes South Coast, of course, CARB, and all the community members business as well.

2.2

And then lastly, terms matter. A small thing to some and a big thing to others. And I would reconsider us using another term than "black box". Hailing from the Bay Area, I'm aware that a number of tech companies have pledged to remove exclusionary terms like whitelist blacklist, black box, white, master, slave, et cetera. So I would hope that we can reconsider using more inclusive language and not exclusive language

Again, as I said, small to some, but big to others. Thank you, everyone, for working on this.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. Any other -- Vice Chair Berg.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you, Board Member Hurt for bringing up that language. I mean, personally, language does matter. And in my own references, I know when we're comparing something that has a suggestion of good and bad, and black and white is one that comes to mind a lot. And I am personally committed to go to day or night, you know. You're looking for opposites, but not in categories where it does affect others. So I do

appreciate you bringing that up.

2.2

Thank you. I mean, I've lived in the South Coast Air Quality Management District all my life. Of course, now, I'm up here also in Davis, but Southern Cal has always been my home. And I know as a young child when we -- and I lived in Arcadia and couldn't see the mountains, which was just a few miles away. So we do know that this agency and all of our stakeholders, and the innovation, and how we have pushed has made a very significant difference. There's just no question about it.

But as we push to even greater health benefits, one of the things I would -- I would like to see in our presentations and our SIPs, as you did include, and that is the benefits to our communities that are even further behind than other parts of our communities. And I think that that within a -- to incorporate that in SIPs in our presentations to show how we're really closing the gap. There's no question where they were to where we are today. We have made great progress, but there is a gap and we know that.

And those gaps are cumulative impacts. And how are we going to continue to push the cleanest in those neighborhoods first? And so I would like just to highlight that, thank everybody very, very much, and

especially thank Board Member Kracov. I think he did an excellent job in really summarizing everybody's commitment, absolutely the need for the federal government to step up and get to the table, because this is critical for this region, but also giving us a bit of a highlight of the challenges to get there.

So thank you so much.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you. Thank you, Chair. I really appreciate the District and CARB staff's effort at proactively engaging with our federal partners, and particularly our congressional delegation. I think that, you know, the team -- you know, together everyone achieves more. I think that approach is really helpful and I look forward to seeing how in this session, you know, the entirety of our California, you know, delegation can be activated into these causes that really affect all Californians, not just South Coast, not just our extreme nonattainment areas.

I do -- you know, I did appreciate the comments from the public and some from the docket. I do think that, you know, because of the proportion of reductions that are based on our zero-emission transition, as we see the implementation of these measures, it will be important for us to see if any unforeseen delays in implementation

are significantly impacting our attainment. And again, just because at the forefront, you know, we want to see these reductions on paper, but we also want to see the public health benefits that we're getting from these reductions. And so we need to know if those public health benefits are being attained.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I definitely support Board Member Kracov's comments on the federal action piece and Board Member Hurt's comments on the language. I also -- I also -- you know, even though, I am cautious around, you know, the transition and wanting to make sure we get that right, I definitely support Board Member De La Torre's comments on, you know, the need to really be pushing zero at every which turn. And I do think that if we can -- if we can see some of that implementation, if we can -- as Board Member Berg -- Vice Chair Berg mentioned, if the public can see that progress, if we can -- if we can see that progress, you know, I think that will help us also identify those opportunities where there does remain that gap in where we can also in our own respective roles or as private citizens continue to activate our either state or federal delegations to support those communities as well, again with that public goal -- public health goal in mind. Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Oh, Board Member Takvorian. Sorry.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you. Just briefly. I think we've heard a lot and I really appreciate everyone's comments, particularly Board Member Kracov's for the really good summary I think that he gave as the South Coast representative. And thanks to CARB staff and to South Coast for the work that's been done. Ι would just reiterate that I think the port action is critical to take. And Mr. De La Torre's comments about the ISR, we were disappointed not to see the port's in the previous -- in the current ISR. San Diego is considering an ISR now and consider the ports as part of that. South Coast had moved on that, that would have been a good model, and I really encourage there to be collaboration between the District, so that that can occur, and particularly given that -- given the crippled EPA, that we have at the federal level, I believe, the staffing is -capacity is quite sparse, the -- you know, across the Board, and the likely inaction from Congress, I think California has to maximize our efforts, so -- and I believe that's what we're striving to do.

So I'm supportive, but I do think that we have to think outside of the box, which should not be named black. Thank you for those comments as well.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. I have a

couple comments. But before the comments, I just wanted to ask a question around the issue of soil NOx and how you guys see that evolving over time. Did any -- can you share what your thoughts are on that?

1.3

2.2

AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: Yeah, absolutely. This is Michael Benjamin. I'm Chief of the Air Quality Planning and Science Division at CARB.

I'd like to start, first of all, by thanking Ian Faloona and Heather Lieb for their comments. We really respect their scientific expertise in this area. We've been hearing similar comments about the role of soil NOx, also in the San Joaquin Valley and concerns about it there.

We have -- I just want to clarify, first of all, soil NOx is accounted for in the SIP. So it is in the modeling. It is in the plan. On -- the other points about the magnitude of the soil NOx emissions, we are working with academic researchers to better understand that -- the magnitude. We're doing studies and we look forward to working with Mr. Faloona and others on this issue.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you. It sounds like more -- more analysis will be needed going forward. All right. Thank you. Appreciate that.

I just wanted to echo a lot of the comments from

my -- from my fellow Board members. And I particularly appreciated Dr. Rees's summary of the challenges, right, you know, getting that infrastructure to support this transition to zero. Really pleased that the Plan, you know, pushes zero, but we have to recognize that we need that infrastructure in place to support that transition. And, of course, as many of you have said, the importance of federal action and the importance of prioritizing the communities that are hit hardest and most cumulatively first as much as we possibly can.

2.2

So with that, I will ask for a motion to approve. Board Member Kracov, would you like to make a motion.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Sure. I can make that motion. And I just wanted to support the discussion here and Board Member De La Torre's emphasis on the port ISR. It's really been a heck of a process on that. Just FYI, colleagues, and I think you should be aware of this and hold us accountable, but we are trying to bring the Indirect Source Rule for new railyards to the Board sometime in Q3 of this year and we're trying to bring an Indirect Source Rule for the ports sometime to our Board in Q4 of this year or perhaps Q1 of 2024. Those dates have been slipping a little bit, in part because of all the work that was done on the AQMP. But these are among many other things that we're doing, ethylene oxide, rules

78

```
on a notification in oil wells. These are some of the top
1
    priorities for the District. That is the current
2
    timeline, Board Member De La Torre. And I urge you and
3
    all our other colleagues here and all the stakeholders to
 4
    try to keep us at South Coast accountable to these dates,
5
    because without that, without all the other work here,
6
7
    we're are -- attainment is not going to be attainable.
8
             So with that, I'll make the motion to approve
    Item 23-1-3 the 70 part per billion 8-hour ozone standard
9
    for the South Coast Basin and the Coachella Valley.
10
             Thank you, Chair.
11
             BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Second.
12
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: Clerk, will you please call the
13
   roll.
14
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK:
                                    Mr. De La Torre?
15
             BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Aye.
16
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Eisenhut?
17
             BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Aye.
18
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Florez?
19
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez, aye.
20
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Hurt?
21
             BOARD MEMBER HURT: Aye.
2.2
23
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Kracov?
             BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes.
24
25
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?
```

79

```
BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER:
                                          Yes.
1
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Professor Sperling?
2
             BOARD MEMBER SPERLING:
                                      Yes.
 3
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Takvorian?
             BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Aye.
 5
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Vice Chair Berg?
 6
7
             VICE CHAIR BERG:
8
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair Randolph?
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.
9
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Madam Chair, the motion
10
11
   passes
                              All right. Thank you.
             CHAIR RANDOLPH:
12
             The next item on the agenda is item number
13
    23-1-4, public meeting to consider the proposed San
14
    Joaquin Valley 70 parts per billion ozone State
15
16
    Implementation Plan.
             If you are here with us in the room and wish to
17
    comment on this item, fill out a request to speak card as
18
19
    soon as possible and submit it to a Board assistant.
20
    you are joining us remotely and wish to comment, please
    click the raise hand button or dial star nine now.
21
    will call on in-person commenters first followed by remote
2.2
23
    commenters when we get to the public comment portion of
    this item.
24
             This is the third of the three SIPs for the 70
25
```

ppb ozone standard on the agenda today. In this item, we will hear the plan for the San Joaquin Valley to meet the 8-hour ozone standard of 70 parts per billion by the 2037 deadline.

2.2

The plan includes a proposed aggregate commitment in the CARB staff report to achieve emission reductions from the suite of State measures that CARB committed to pursuant -- that CARB committed to pursue as part of the 2022 State SIP Strategy, which CARB adopted last September. Reductions from these measures are now being quantified for the San Joaquin Valley, including the pesticide measure. These emissions reductions and the Plan will improve air quality throughout the valley, including in environmental justice communities that are disproportionately impacted by air pollution.

Dr. Cliff, would you please introduce the item.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Chair

Randolph.

The 2022 Ozone Plan for the valley was developed jointly by CARB and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District to meet Clean Air Act requirements for the 70 ppb ozone standard and to lay the pathway for continued ozone air quality improvement in the valley. Together, District and CARB programs represent some of the nation's most protective air pollution emissions controls.

As you mentioned, Chair Randolph, the 2022 ozone plan includes CARB measures committed to as part of the 2022 State SIP Strategy, which the Board adopted in September. Measures from the 2022 State SIP Strategy will reduce emissions throughout the valley, including in low income and underserved communities.

1.3

2.2

The 2022 Ozone Plan demonstrates that the valley will meet the 70 ppb ozone standard by 2037 with many areas of the valley reaching 70 ppb before that date. Through implementation of the current CARB and District control programs and the 2022 State SIP Strategy measures, I want to highlight that in the past extreme ozone challenge in the valley necessitated the use of the box that we have been discussing with undefined measures to demonstrate attainment of the ozone standards, but in this SIP there is no such box. This means that all measures needed to get to the valley -- get the valley to attainment are identified. This is a significant milestone in the valley's progress towards improving ozone air quality.

In addition, I want to highlight one specific measure which we'll hear more about in the staff presentation, namely the commitment to reduce emissions from the pesticide 1,3-dichloropropene or 1,3-D. In September when the Board adopted the 2022 State SIP

Strategy, it directed staff to come back with a quantified expected emission reductions from the measure being developed by our sister agency, the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, or DPR. Following up on that Board direction, staff have continued to work with DPR and the CARB staff report includes a quantification of the emission reductions from the measure committed to in the 2022 State SIP Strategy.

I will now ask Laura Carr of the Air Quality Planning and Science Division to begin the staff presentation.

Laura

2.2

(Thereupon a slide presentation).

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: Thank you, Dr. Cliff. Good morning, Chair Randolph and Board members. Today, I'll be presenting the final SIP for the day, the 70 parts per billion Ozone State Implementation Plan for the San Joaquin Valley.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: As we heard in the previous presentation, in 2015 the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency strengthened the existing 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard to 70 parts per billion or ppb. In response, EPA designated the San Joaquin Valley as an extreme nonattainment area for

the standard. This means the valley must meet the standard within 20 years in the 2037 ozone season.

2.2

Along with South Coast and Coachella Valley, the San Joaquin Valley is one of just three extreme nonattainment areas in the country for this ozone standard. Developing a plan for attaining the standard is a unique challenge.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District and CARB worked together to jointly develop the 2022 plan for the 2015 8-hour Ozone Standard or the 2022 Ozone Plan. The 2022 Ozone Plan builds on previous planning efforts for ozone and particulate matter and shows attainment of the 70 ppb ozone standard throughout the valley in 2037.

The Plan includes a commitment from CARB for emission reductions from the State SIP Strategy, which are key for the valley to reach attainment. The Plan was adopted by the District governing board in December 2022 and is now in front of you for your consideration. The starting point for each plan is air quality.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: Over the past three decades, ozone air quality has improved in the valley. The graph shows 8-hour ozone design values, which

represent a three-year average of each annual fourth highest ozone value. In the 1990s, ozone levels were between 110 and 120 parts per billion. From those high levels, ozone is now trending downwards in response to significant NOx emission reductions from CARB and District measures, putting the valley on a path to attaining all three 8-hour ozone standards by their respective deadlines, reaching 84 parts per billion by 2023, 75 ppb by 2031, and 70 ppb by 2037.

2.2

In recent years, the prevalence of wildfires during the summer ozone season significantly impacted air quality in the valley. High ozone concentrations were observed at several valley sites on days affected by wildfire. After accounting for data in 2020 and 2021 impacted by fire, the ozone design value in 2022 was 85 ppb, as shown in the blue trend line for adjusted design value.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: Reactive organic gases, or ROG, and oxides of nitrogen, or NOx, are the precursor pollutants which combine to form ozone. In the valley, as well as most parts of California, the key to lowering ozone concentrations and meeting the federal air quality standards is reducing emissions of NOx.

Ongoing implementation of CARB's Mobile Source

Control Strategy continues to drive down NOx emissions and will achieve most of the reductions needed to get the valley to attainment of the 70 ppb ozone standard in 2037.

2.2

From 232.4 tons per day in 2017, the current control program will reduce emissions down to 87.3 tons per day in 2037. However, air quality modeling conducted by CARB for the 2022 Ozone Plan indicates that for the valley to attain the 70 ppb standard in 2037, NOX emissions need to be even lower at 62 tons per day, almost the same level as is needed in the South Coast Air Basin. This means an additional 25.3 tons per day NOx reductions from new control programs are still needed to reach attainment. The Ozone Control Strategy in the 2022 Ozone Plan provides those reductions as I will discuss in the next few slides.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: The strategy to get the valley to attainment of the 70 ppb ozone standard has four main components. As mentioned, a significant fraction of the reductions needed for attainment will come from ongoing implementation of the CARB and District measures that make up the existing control program.

Second, there are three CARB measures from the previous 2016 State SIP Strategy, which achieve reductions

not accounted for in the baseline emissions inventory for the 2022 ozone plan.

2.2

Third, new measures committed to in the 2022

State SIP Strategy adopted by the Board in September provide the remaining emission reductions needed to reach attainment.

And from the District, the 2022 Ozone Plan includes commitments for SIP strengthening and further study measures, which although they do not have emission reductions quantified in this SIP, do reduce emissions and will contribute towards improving air quality.

The 2022 Ozone Plan control strategy does not include advanced technology measures allowed under the extreme area designation. These are control measures that are not yet defined because the specific technologies or controls to achieve the emission reductions are not yet known. The attainment strategy for the valley does not need to rely on these measures, since all of the measures necessary to get the valley to attainment have been identified. This is the first Ozone SIP for the valley that does not need these advanced technology measures, so this is a significant milestone.

The next few slides will provide more detail on the 2016 State SIP Strategy remaining measures, new measures in the 2022 State SIP Strategy, and the District

commitments.

1.3

2.2

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: Although most of the CARB measures committed to in the 2016 State SIP Strategy have been adopted and have their associated emission reductions reflected in the baseline emissions inventory for this plan, there are three exceptions shown here. The Board adopted the Transport Refrigeration Unit Regulation Part 1 in February 2022 and Advanced Clean Cars II in August 2022. By early 2022, the process of developing the inventory for the 70 ppb ozone plan for the San Joaquin Valley and other regions in the state was already underway. Thus, neither adopted regulation has its emission reductions accounted for in the baseline inventory.

The Zero-Emission Forklift Regulation is the only remaining measure from the 2016 State SIP Strategy that the Board has not acted on yet, but action is expected in 2023.

CARB anticipates that these measures will achieve

1.9 tons per day NOx reductions in the valley in 2037 and

1.7 tons per day of reductions in ROG emissions.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: As discussed in the previous Board item, the Board approved

the State measure commitments in the 2022 State SIP Strategy in September following a robust public process to develop the Strategy. Staff presented potential measures at four public workshops and two hearings over a year and a half. Staff met with environmental advocates, community-based organizations, and other stakeholders throughout the process. Measure suggestions from this outreach were added to the Strategy.

2.2

The Strategy is aggressive and drives the pace and scale of CARB rulemakings through the end of the decade. For the San Joaquin Valley, the Strategy includes a commitment to reduce 23.4 tons per day of NOx emissions or 14.6 percent of the reductions needed for the valley to reach attainment.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: Listed here are the measures from the 2022 State SIP Strategy, which provide emission reduction benefits in the San Joaquin Valley. Key measures focus on on- and off-road mobile sources, locomotives, and measures for other sources, including a measure for the pesticide 1,3-dichloropropene, or 1,3-D, which I'll describe in more detail. The inclusion in the Strategy of a measure for 1,3-D was suggested by advocates as part of the strategy development process.

--000--

2.2

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: The 2022
State SIP Strategy includes a measure commitment from the
California Department of Pesticide Regulation, or DPR, for
1,3-D. 1,3-D is a fumigant commonly used to sterilize the
soil prior to planting of certain crops. The 1,3-D
measure is already in the process of becoming a
regulation. The regulation currently under development by
DPR will address cancer and acute risk from the use of
1,3-D by shifting to application methods, which will lower
emissions or use other measures to reduce exposure. The
measure will achieve ROG emission reductions. DPR held a
public meeting just last week on development of this
regulation.

During the public process to develop the 2022 State SIP Strategy, and during the hearing by the Board to adopt the Strategy last September, the public advocated for a stronger pesticide measure. At that hearing, CARB's Board Chair committed to update the 2022 State SIP Strategy by quantifying 1,3-D emission reductions and more clearly stating CARB's authority around pesticides. This update is included in the CARB staff report accompanying the 2022 ozone SIP.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: This table

shows the emission reductions from the 2022 State SIP Strategy measures the Board approved last September in the San Joaquin Valley. By the attainment year of 2037, these new measures will provide an additional 23.4 tons per day of NOx emission reductions and an additional 2.9 tons per day of ROG emission reductions.

1.3

2.2

Significant reductions come from the In-Use Locomotive Regulation at 11.2 tons per day NOx, the Advanced Clean Fleets regulation at 5.9 tons per day NOx, and the Transport Refrigeration Unit Regulation Part 2 at 3.8 tons per day NOx. We can also see the 0.4 tons per day ROG reductions expected from the 1,3-D pesticide measure.

CARB staff will continue developing this ambitious suite of measures bringing them to the CARB Board according to the schedule adopted in September as part of the 2022 State SIP Strategy and implementing them to provide the emission reductions needed for attainment in the valley and throughout the state.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: The next two slides focus on District measures that contribute to ozone air quality improvement. Here we want to highlight eight recently strengthened District rules which achieve NOx reductions. These seven stationary source rules were

committed to as part of the District's 2018 plan for the fine particulate matter standard. And the last rule in the table, open burning, was not part of the 2018 PM2.5 SIP, but was amended by the District as part of developing its agricultural open burning phaseout strategy and has been approved by EPA. Ongoing implementation of these District rules achieves NOx reductions, which will contribute to attainment of the 70 ppb ozone standard.

2.2

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: The 2022
Ozone Plan also includes new measure commitments from the District. While these measures are not needed for attainment and no emission reductions are being committed to, they are expected to provide additional emission reductions.

On the left is a list of regulatory control measures, which the District is providing as SIP strengthening measures, all with action dates in 2023 or 2024. These measures focus on reducing ROG emissions from the oil and gas sector. On the right is a list of stationary and area source measures that the District is flagging for further study, which may yield future emission reductions.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: In the CARB

staff report accompanying the 2022 Ozone SIP, CARB lays out its commitment for emission reductions for the valley. As we heard in the previous presentation, CARB's commitment is two parts. The commitment to pursue measures was adopted in September when the Board adopted the 2022 State SIP Strategy. And today, the Board is considering the aggregate emission reduction commitment for the valley as proposed in the CARB staff report.

1.3

2.2

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: This slide summarizes the aggregate emission reductions that CARB is committing to in 2037 for the valley. The proposed commitment is for 25.3 tons per day of NOx and 4.6 tons per day of ROG. These numbers include the reductions from the three remaining 2016 State SIP Strategy measures, as well as the new 2022 State SIP Strategy measures. This Commitment also includes a subset of emission reductions to come specifically from on-road mobile source measures of 7.5 tons per day NOx and 1.6 tons per day ROG as specified in the CARB staff report to be accounted for as part of transportation conformity.

CARB's current Mobile Source Control Program will also contribute significant reductions bringing the total reductions achieved in 2037 to 159.8 tons per day of NOx and 37.5 tons per day of ROG.

reductions coming from committed measures should be a small proportion of the total reductions needed for attainment. Here, we can see that the aggregate emission reduction commitment represents 15.8 percent of needed NOx reductions and 12.3 percent of needed ROG reductions.

1.3

2.2

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: The ozone control strategy described will lead to attainment of the 70 ppb 8-hour ozone standard in 2037. This slide summarizes the modeling results in the 2022 Ozone Plan and illustrates how ozone is predicted to improve throughout the valley.

Preliminary staff analysis shows that predicted ozone improvements are consistent in disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged communities, with a percent reduction in ozone levels similar in both communities. The left-hand map shows ozone levels in 2018 with most of the valley exceeding 70 parts per billion. From 2018 to 2037, we estimate that CARB and District rules, combined with the new measures described, will achieve over a 70 percent reduction in NOx and about a 10 percent ROG reduction. These emission reductions are predicted to reduce ozone levels to meet the 70 ppb standard by 2037, as shown on the right-hand map. It's important to note that these

maps show ozone concentrations, which include wildfire impacted ozone values. So the attainment demonstration modeling shows that the valley is expected to attain the 70 ppb standard in 2037, even with the inclusion of wildfires.

1.3

2.2

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: The 2022

Ozone Plan meets the requirements for a State

Implementation Plan under the Clean Air Act. This table summarizes the elements required to be in the SIP. In the left-hand column are listed the SIP elements included in the 2022 Ozone Plan, including the attainment demonstration. Elements in the middle column have already been provided to EPA in previous submittals. And on the right are the two elements which will be submitted in the coming years.

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: While federal measures are not included in the San Joaquin Valley attainment demonstration, I want to highlight the importance of federal action to ozone air quality improvement in the valley. For California to meet air quality standards, it is imperative that the federal government act decisively to reduce emissions from primarily federally regulated sources of air pollution,

including interstate trucks, ships, locomotives, aircraft, and certain categories of off-road equipment. CARB and the San Joaquin Valley Air District are exploring our respective authorities with regard to these sources, but federal action is needed to reduce emissions to improve air quality and accelerate attainment in the valley.

2.2

--000--

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: That brings us to the staff recommendations as laid out in Resolution 23-3. These are as follows:

One, adopt the commitment to achieve aggregate emissions reductions of 25.3 tons per day of NOx and 4.6 tons per day of ROG in the San Joaquin Valley by 2037, including a subset to come specifically from on-road mobile source measures of 7.5 tons per day NOx and 1.6 tons per day ROG, as specified in the CARB staff report; two, adopt the 2022 Ozone Plan; and three, direct the Executive Officer to submit the 2022 Ozone Plan and the aggregate commitment as described in the CARB staff report to EPA as a revision to the California SIP.

That concludes the presentation and I would now like to introduce Jon Klassen, Director of Air Quality Science and Planning at the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District to provide a few comments on the SIP.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Can you say the name again?

AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: Jon Klassen.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Got it.

Okay. Jon, you should be able to unmute.

JON KLASSEN: Thank you. Can you hear me?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, we can.

JON KLASSEN: Great. Thank you so much and thank you, Laura.

Good morning, Chair Randolph, members of the Board. I'm Jon Klassen, Director of Air Quality Science and Planning with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. The District appreciates the opportunity to provide some comments today on the San Joaquin Valley's 2022 Ozone Plan addressing the federal 2015 ozone standard.

Through the development and implementation of numerous attainment plans addressing a variety of federal air quality standards, both the District and CARB have adopted and implemented the most stringent regulatory programs in the nation to significantly reduce emissions across the valley. These efforts have reduced NOx emissions in the region by over 75 percent since 1980, with ongoing reductions expected in the coming years. As

you saw in the CARB staff's presentation, these reductions have brought about significant reductions in ozone concentrations and improvements in the valley in air quality with the valley on the verge of meeting the 84 parts per billion standard, and proving the effectiveness of our collective efforts.

2.2

As with all planning efforts, the District appreciated the close collaboration with CARB staff during the development of the 2022 Ozone Plan and also appreciated all of the public involvement and input provided through a robust public process, which included a number of evening workshops and meetings along the way with interpretation services made available, if needed.

While major progress has been made, we must continue to work together to further reduce air pollution and improve air quality for our residents as expeditiously as possible. To that end, the 2022 Ozone Plan includes a variety of aggressive emissions control strategies, including significant new NOx emissions reductions from the District's recent amendments to a variety of stationary sources rules affecting boilers, steam generators, process heaters, industrial flares, glass melting furnaces, solid fuel boilers and engines.

In addition, the 2022 Ozone Plan includes commitments to reduce VOC emissions through amendments to

a variety of district oil and gas regulations, such as leak and detection and repair and evaluation of crude oil production sumps. These efforts, coupled with CARB's new State SIP Strategy, to reduce emissions from mobile sources, NOx emissions in the valley, are expected to be reduced by another 72 percent through the timeline of this plan.

2.2

In addition to these regulatory programs, the District is committing in the 2022 Ozone Plan to further study the opportunities for additional emissions reductions from a number of sources, including residential and commercial heating, stationary sources of NOx and VOC, energy and climate change programs, and commercial landscaping equipment.

The District looks forward to working with CARB and valley stakeholders as the strategy for this plan is implemented and further emissions reductions are achieved to bring the valley into attainment of the federal 2015 ozone standard.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

We will now hear from the public who signed up to speak on this item. I will ask the Board clerks to call the commenters.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: We currently have seven

people with their hands raised to speak in Zoom. If you would like to comment, please raise your hand in Zoom by using the raised hand icon or dialing star nine if you're calling in by phone. The public comments will conclude -- the sign-ups will conclude at 11:50.

So our first few speakers will be Ian Faloona, Janet Dietzkamei, and Cynthia Pinto-Cabrera.

Ian, you can unmute and begin.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

DR. IAN FALOONA: Hi. Thank you again for hearing me out. My name is Ian Faloona. atmospheric scientist at the University of California at Davis and I've been studying air quality problems in the San Joaquin Valley for almost a decade now. This includes work that we published in Almaraz et al. in Science Advances, which indicated that particularly in the southern San Joaquin Valley, there are large agricultural sources of soil NOx, which comes from application of fertilizer. So it can be organic, synthetic, it doesn't matter. It's the excess nitrogen that's in the soil, which is converted by microbes naturally living in the soil into nitrogen oxides, which are precursors for both ozone and particulate matter. Because of the warm climate in Southern California in general and the dry soils, these emissions are particularly concentrated in regions in this area.

So this is an important point. I realize that the SIP modeling that's been done by CARB does ostensibly have a soil source. However, it's just wildly underestimated as evidenced by several publications that are not referenced in this plan. So I just wanted to point out again, these recent papers -- not even that recent, right? The Almaraz paper is from 2018. There's analysis of ozone done by David Parrish, a colleague of mine, formerly of NOAA, that shows that the ozone trends are indicating that there's some other source that's not currently regulated that is contributing to this large background levels of ozone that you're not going to be able to eliminate through what has been traditionally regulated.

2.2

And I just want to point out that this is actually a point of optimism in a sense, because there --we've heard a lot about how hard it is to wring that sponge out any more to reduce sources traditionally from internal combustion. But there -- in the Almaraz et al. paper, we suggest many reason -- many ways in which fertilizer application and agricultural practices can be implemented to reduce this significant source of NOx through the region. So I implore ARB and the San Joaquin Air Quality Pollution Control District to please study this further. And it -- like I said, it represents

potentially a way to control a large amount of the existing NOx sources and reduce both ozone and PM in the relatively short term.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Janet Dietzkamei, you can unmute and begin.

JANET DIETZKAMEI: Thank you. Good morning, Chair Randolph, and Board members, and staff.

We in the San Joaquin Valley live in a bowl. In addition to pollution generated in our valley, we have some pollutants bleeding in from north and south of us. Other speakers will address the ozone contributing sources. I am addressing what the San Joaquin Valley air does to me and thousands of others breathing the air here.

Air pollution reductions are not yet eliminating air, which causes us disease. Levels above 70 parts per billion cause me to struggle to take air into my lungs. Trying to breathe in elevated ozone is like putting a plastic bag over my mouth and nose. Air will not go into my lungs. Air will not go into my lungs. It causes others in the valley to suffer asthma attacks. Thousands of us in the San Joaquin Valley, including young children with developing lungs, are seriously affected by breathing ozone.

The cost of the health effects of ozone is not figured into costs relative to lowering ozone in our valley. There are medication costs, doctor visit costs, ER costs, sometimes hospital costs. Some here are unable to afford those costs. It is expensive to have asthma and other medical issues due to air pollution. One summer many years ago, I discovered the serious effect ozone has on me, when while walking my dog I began to struggle to breathe, then became light headed, and this developed to so close to passing out while I am out walking my dog. I didn't know the ozone was at high levels and my reaction to ozone at that level. I managed to make it home and take inhalers and lie down. It took me hours to recover.

Now, I do not go out into ozone when levels are in the air monitoring moderate level. I always check air monitors to discover is it safe to go outside. I don't want a reoccurrence of the episode I have just described.

Masks, unless they are gas masks, do not protect us from ozone. Some of our San Joaquin Valley residents are more affected by the locations they live. Reducing ozone in those locations also helps the valley. Unlike PM2.5, ozone is able to more easily affect a larger area. Please help us. Please help us.

Thank you.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Our next speaker will be Cynthia Pinto-Cabrera. After Cynthia will be Brent Newell, Perry Elerts, and Robert Yuhnke.

Cynthia, you can unmute and begin.

1.3

2.2

CYNTHIA PINTO-CABRERA: Hello. Good morning,
Chair Randolph and members of the Board. Cynthia
Pinto-Cabrera, Policy Coordinator with the Central Valley
Air Quality Coalition, or CVAQ.

And today, we're discussing another important opportunity to meet health protective standards here in the valley. And as an asthmatic and valley resident, these plans are extremely important for my family and my community. However, Valley Air and CARB has really missed the opportunity to prioritize environmental justice communities and their concerns.

I'd like to start and say that it was really disappointing to hear that the Valley Air governing board was so adamantly opposed to pesticide commitments. For years, EJ communities have raised concerns about pesticides, raising concerns for their health and their well-being, but have been ignored. So we are -- we are far past ignoring these opportunities. The commitment to reduce the ROG emissions and 1,3-D is definitely a step in the right direction, but we urge CARB to do more and to use the authority -- your existing authority to really

guide DPR in their rule making and ensure that they will implement the most health protective measures without any loopholes or exemptions to major violators.

1.3

2.2

And this level of importance and stringency should also be applied to soil NOx. We had some conversations in the South Coast SIP, but would like to highlight again the concerns in the valley as well and the amount of NOx emissions that could be controlled through better management practice is definitely missed and to proceed without this clear element we feel violates the reasonably available control measure requirements and demonstrates that the Plan doesn't have the most stringent measures available.

And lastly, I'd like to point to the public process that was an -- also an extremely disappointed -- pointing experience with little outreach being done to communities. And I'm not even sure if AB 617 communities were informed about these workshops, which I think is the bare minimum that should be done. An example is the October 27th workshop. Questions weren't fully answered by several advocates. And a workshop that was allocated for an hour and a half only lasted about 30 minutes. This is not an equitable process. There should be some time left over for folks to be -- community residents to be able to join. Not sure if everybody can join after work

long days, things like that.

2.2

And overall the valley is long overdue to meet existing clean air standards and human caused climate change is only increasing our region's challenges. Valley Air and CARB mustn't ignore these opportunities to improve health and well-being to valley residents. We really need CARB to take initiative and provide that guidance for DPR's rulemaking and acknowledge the role of soil NOx and overall promote a more equitable public process in order to really address the disproportionate impacts in EJ communities and help us finally meet our standards.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Next will be Brent. Brent Newell, you should be able to unmute and begin.

BRENT NEWELL: Hello. My name is Brent Newell. I represent the Central Valley Air Quality Coalition. I have three points today. First, the Plan lacks contingency measures required by Section 172(c)(9) of the Act. Second, the Plan lacks a demonstration required by section 110(a)(2)(E) of the Act that must demonstrate and provide reasonable assurances of compliance with Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act. And third, the Plan lacks an accurate and current inventory as required by Section 172(c)(3) of the Act.

The Board should not adopt the proposed resolution, which incorrectly finds that the Plan complies with the Clean Air Act. Rather, the Board has a duty to disapprove the Plan if it finds that the Plan does not comply with the Clean Air Act as required by Health and Safety Code section 41650.

1.3

2.2

So first, the contingency measures are entirely emitted from the Plan. Contingency measures are an essential Plan strategy and provide a back-up when the Plan's primary attainment strategies fail. Every plan for every federal health based ambient air quality standard has failed to attain those standards by their respective deadlines in the San Joaquin Valley. Given that history of failure to attain, the lack of contingency measures in the Plan should not be overlooked or excused by claiming you are waiting for EPA guidance. Instead of doing nothing, you should proceed based on current law. The resolution should be amended to acknowledge that you have not and cannot make a finding that the Plan complies with Section 172(c)(9).

Second, Title 6. EPA's proposed disapproval of the Plan to attain the 2012 annual PM2.5 standard discusses the obligation on CARB to demonstrate compliance with Title 6 in this Plan. Title 6 prohibits recipients of federal financial assistance from engaging in racial

discrimination, which includes disparate impacts resulting from your policies and procedures. This Plan lacks any Title 6 analysis or demonstration and instead acknowledges racial disparities from air pollution. The resolution should be amended to acknowledge that you have not and cannot make a finding that this Plan complies with Section 110(a)(2)(E)

2.2

Finally, soil NOx. The testimony of Professor Faloona supports the need for an updated NOx inventory. The resolution should be amended to commit to submit an updated inventory within 12 months to support an EPA action on this Plan. The resolution should be amended to acknowledge that you have not and cannot make a finding that the Plan complies with Section 172(c)(3).

That's all I have today. Thank you very much. BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Next is Perry Elerts. Perry, you should be able to unmute and begin.

PERRY ELERTS: Good morning, Chair and members of the Board. My name is Perry Elerts, an attorney with Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability.

The SJV 2022 Ozone Plan presents an opportunity to once and for all map out a strategy for how the valley aims to finally reach and maintain a safe ozone level.

Unfortunately, this plan falls short of that goal and

fails to meet many Clean Air Act requirements.

1.3

2.2

For starters, the Plan lacks any contingency measures, as was just discussed, which are required by the Clean Air Act. Given the history of failure to meet any of the ozone or PM standards or to meet multiple Clean Air Act deadlines, it is vital contingency measures are included in this Plan.

Leadership Counsel and others have put forth many potential emission controls that can be used to either more expeditiously meet the 2015 ozone standard or act as contingency measures. For example, we have suggested many ways to further strengthen the ISR Rule. We have also recommended additional pesticide controls with corroboration of DPR, and we've recommended improvements to the Animal Confinement Rule 4570 requiring emission reductions beyond offering an optional menu of controls. Those are just a few examples we and others have highlighted where there's still plenty of room to further emission reductions.

The Plan also does not make any mention of the District's duty to comply with Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act. As the District and CARB is aware when it withdrew the Valley's PM2.5 Plan for failure to regulate ammonia and failure to comply with Title 6, it is a requirement that the District analyze in its SIP how the Plan complies

with Title 6 to ensure the District's actions, including permitting actions, are not intentionally discriminatory or have discriminatory effect based on race, color, or national origin.

Just because we have 15 years to meet the 2015 standard doesn't mean we should wait till the very last year to try to reach attainment. Doing so means valley residents and the valley's environment will only continue to suffer longer.

I thank you for your time.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

So next will be Robert Yuhnke. And then after Robert will be Jane Sellen, Mark Rose, and then a phone number ending in 373. And that's the total number of commenters that I have in Zoom at this time.

So, Robert, you can go ahead and unmute and begin.

ROBERT YUHNKE: Thank you. I previously identified myself this morning, so I'll just pick up from the earlier comment, but this time focused on the Central Valley Plan.

I want to highlight the importance of the Clean Fleets Rule as part of the CARB commitment to meeting the emission reductions needed for attainment in the Central Valley. The Plan shows that the Clean Fleets Rule would

achieve approximately 5.9 tons of reduction of NOx. And that is limited by the fact that the Clean Fleets Rule, as currently designed, would only apply to fleets with more than 50 vehicles from large fleet owners. And according to the inventory developed by staff, that would regulate or phaseout 518,000 medium— and heavy—duty vehicles by 2042 out of a total inventory of 1.8 million medium— and heavy—duty vehicles in the state.

1.3

2.2

So what that says is that this rule is only going to reduce roughly 30 percent of the NOx that is being emitted by medium- and heavy-duty vehicles in the state. That additional 70 percent is open for reductions that could be used to either offset the additional NOx that's coming from soils that has been previously discussed or to offset additional ozone that will result from expanded wildfire. We've seen roughly an 8-fold increase in the area burned by wildfire over the last 20 years in California.

There's every expectation that as we get closer to 15 -- 1.5 degrees centigrade above the baseline for climate warming, that the wildfire problem will accelerate. So past patterns are not predictive of future emissions. And in addition, your plan relies on the Feds to reduce railroad emissions by 11 tons. Well, if you increase the scope of the Clean Fleets Rule to cover all

of the medium- and heavy-duty vehicles in the State by the attainment deadline, you would offset most of all those other sources and including the 11 tons that the Feds might not give you, if they don't take the action that you request on locomotives.

Thank you.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Jane Sellen, you may unmute and begin.

JANE SELLEN: Hi, Chair Randolph, CARB Board, and staff. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I'm Jane Sellen with the statewide coalition Californians for Pesticide Reform. We're a coalition of groups and organizations working to reduce the environmental injustice of pesticide exposure, particularly in the San Joaquin Valley and Central Coast.

On behalf of the coalition, I want to thank CARB for exercising their appropriate authority to set standards for toxic air contaminant emissions in the San Joaquin Valley SIP and for including -- specifically for including a commitment to reduce 1,3-dichloropropene emissions by 2037. Although, we have serious concerns about the Department of Pesticide Regulation's ongoing rulemaking for 1,3-D, we are glad to see CARB and DPR working together on this SIP measure.

As noted in our comment letter, which was signed

by 24 San Joaquin valley groups and coalitions, we believe even more is possible and that CARB must set the overall air quality context within which DPR should regulate. Instead of relying on DPR's conservative estimate, it's based on a flawed draft regulation that excludes farmworkers, eliminates 1,3-D use caps, and is based on the lifetime cancer risk level recommended by the manufacturer Dow over the 14 times more health protective recommendation of CARB and DPR's sister agency OEHHA.

We also want to express our thanks to CARB staff for clarifying in the SIP -- in the draft SIP the shared authority with DPR with regards to pesticides that are classified as toxic air contaminants. State law is clear that it is DPR's job to regulate the use of pesticides, but that CARB retains primary jurisdiction over all toxic air contaminants including pesticides. In practice, that means CARB must set overall pollution standards and DPR's regulation must ensure that the regulated industry can meet them.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and thank you for ensuring the inclusion of this class of air pollution, which CalEPA researchers have found to be one of two pollutants, with the greatest disparity in impact by race and income.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

1.3

2.2

Mark Rose, you can unmute and begin.

MARK ROSE: Good morning, Madam Chair and members of the Board. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

My name is Mark Rose and I'm the Sierra Nevada Program

Manager for National Parks Conservation Association.

After decades of failure in meeting nearly all existing ozone and PM2.5 standards on time, sadly CARB and the Valley Air District have once again brought forward an ozone plan that is all but guaranteed to fail at securing expeditious attainment for valley residents suffering from some of the worst pollution in the country.

Like we've seen time and time again with SIPs for the valley, this Plan is not forward-thinking and is instead heavily reliant on existing measures that have repeatedly come up short in delivering clean air. Nearly all reductions needed to meet attainment are coming from either mobile sources measures CARB has already enacted or plans to enact or from legal dubious aggregate commitments, which we have seen are basically empty promises to come up with a plan later on to reduce emissions.

While we strongly support the mobile source rules that CARB has included in this Plan, far more is needed. Even accounting for future mobile source standards, the

State still needs to achieve over 25 tons per day of NOx reductions and 4.6 tons per day of ROG reductions from aggregate commitments. This oversized commitment accounts for 15 percent of needed NOx reductions and over 12 percent of ROG reductions needed to reach attainment.

2.2

With the Ninth Circuit Court recently ruling against the State for its failure to show that it was capable of meeting similar large aggregate commitments for the valley's 2006 PM2.5 plan, it is frankly dumbfounding while CARB continues to move ahead with plans that rely so heavily on commitments that violate the plain language and intent of the Clean Air Act, but at least CARB is proposing to actually do something new, as opposed to the Valley Air District, which is basically planning to do nothing above and beyond their existing measures for the next 15 years.

Although we do support the small handful of oil and gas leak detection and repair measures the District committed to, the reductions from these measures appear to be so minimal that the Valley Air District didn't even bother to calculate them. The District's Plan also states that they may further study potential new measures for key sources such as commercial and residential heating, stationary source NOx combustion, and stationary VOCs. With 15 minutes -- 15 years until the attainment deadline,

the District must do more to reduce emissions than simply state they'll look into maybe controlling these key sources in the future. Commitments to reduce these sources must be included in this Plan now, in order for them to be federally enforceable. The Valley Air District fails to even promise to study how it can improve upon current measures, such as their outdated ISR measure, or analyze wholly unregulated precursors like soil NOx.

Moreover, as other commenters have pointed out, this Plan is missing key sections required for SIP completeness, including contingency measures, and holistic Title 6 analysis. We ask that you learn from the Valley's long history of past failures and do not approve this Plan until the State addresses the oversized reliance on aggregate commitments, the utter lack of commitments from the Valley Air District, and the missing SIP requirements.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

And our final speaker is a phone number ending in 373. Please state your name for the record before you begin.

HARVEY EDER: Yes. Am I being heard?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes, you are.

HARVEY EDER: Good morning. My name is Harvey

25 | Eder. I'm the founder and director of the Public Solar

Power Coalition that goes back close to 50 years in the state.

2.2

We've litigated on these plans with you all for a long time. We believe that these plans, the Scoping Plan, the '22 plans, like South Coast, et cetera, are illegal. We put in a hundred exhibits in the '16 plan from Department of Energy's SunShot Program, modeled after the Moonshot, that's how we got to the moon in the sixties. And just to bring solar down cost effective with no benefits, tax credits or any of this other stuff. And it was done for all different types of solar for all applications.

In March of '16, we brought these to the South Coast and it came to you all. And we -- it was never studied, never evaluated, no due process, in fact, purging us. We got run out of federal court three years ago by the Federal Marshal and the FBI. We asked for exculpatory evidence, such as getting a copy of the tape from you all, and EPA, and the District, nothing. This is really outrageous. And we are giving you legal notice. And we've been talking to staff and all for the past two weeks. We're going for an emergency stay in the Ninth Circuit under Rule 27-3. Okay. We are going to -- we're getting -- we're actually funding in the budget from EPA and from the State, so that we will do these studies. We

will do this plan. Okay. You can't be trusted. And so that's part of it.

2.2

Also, inequity. We studied 40 years ago the low-income solar equity program with the PUC under Commissioner Grimes, the first black commissioner on the PUC. The myopic definition of environmental justice of just to have less air pollution more like the white communities, the wealthier communities is insufficient and it's a dodge. The real issue is who's going to control it, own it, and make the decision-making?

These communities, these laborers, we people, we get it. Piketty, the French economist, Capital in the 21st Century and Capital and Ideology a couple years ago, 60 percent of this country -- two-thirds of this country haven't seen, for the last 40 years, no increase in income or equity. It's (inaudible)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thirty seconds remaining.

HARVEY EDER: -- firsthand. The -- also you're

using the base years of '15 through '17 for your plans and
you purged '20 and '21, and then try to say it was

approved by -- it has not, i.e, Jeff Welling, attorney for

EPA. This stuff is all part of what -- the emergency
stay, we got them to hold of Ninth Circuit and we're going
to proceed. And we want a stipulation to do this. We
don't want to fight you on it. We will fight you and

we're looking to other emergencies, TRO, injunction, and writ.

All right. Let's work together on this and let's do something real instead of something that's going to --

Thank vou.

HARVEY EDER: -- not work --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK:

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair, that concludes the commenters.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

Staff, are there any issues raised in the comments that you want to address before I close the record?

Okay.

1.3

2.2

I will now close the record on this agenda item. Now, will we bring it to the Board for comments and questions.

Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you, Chair.

And thank you so much to CARB staff for working with our

District staff to achieve this ambitious and important

plan. As I told our District Board, I am actually a

walking ozone monitor myself. Nothing affects my asthma

more than ozone. So this Plan is personal to me too. And

I thank our commenters today for raising their issues on

how ozone affects them as well.

I want to give a special gratitude to our environmental justice community for working with CARB, DPR, and District staff to get a DPR commitment to regulate and enforce pesticide -- pesticides included in the State's commitment. I also want to mention that included in our District 2023 legislative platform is a commitment to engage in zero-emission infrastructure --

(11:48 a.m. sound went out.)

2.2

(11:50 a.m. sound came back on.)

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: All right, I think we're good. Go ahead.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. First of all, I just want to make sure that to the extent that the question did not get broadcast, we should probably repeat it and then respond.

AQPSD AIR QUALITY PLANNING BRANCH CHIEF

VANDERSPEK: Okay. Dr. Pacheco-Werner asked if we could address the issues related to Title 6 and contingency measures. So I'm going to -- my name is Sylvia

Vanderspek, and I'm Chief of the Air Quality Planning Branch at the California Air Resources Board and so I'll quickly answer those questions.

So CARB prioritizes environmental justice, incorporating racial equity in conducting meaningful community engagement in its policy and planning efforts

and programs to address a long-standing environmental and health inequities from elevated levels. These connected efforts provide a -- and these interagency efforts will provide additional pathways to address Title 6.

1.3

2.2

In the CARB staff report, we do acknowledge that EPA recently came out and mention that CARB needs to start addressing Title 6. As part of the State SIP Strategy process, we reached out to community members asked them for measures that were included in the Plan. Throughout the process, we had those as public suggestion measures and then we incorporated some of those measures including the pesticide measure in the Plan. Many of the measures that CARB is working on, as you know, you know, impact disproportionate, you know, communities. We're definitely waiting for EPA guidance and we think we have made some steps in addressing these.

We're working internally how to effectively address Title 6 in these Air Quality Management Plans and we're looking forward to working out -- working with the community members to get guidance from them and some appropriate measures to do that.

AQPSD AIR QUALITY PLANNING BRANCH CHIEF

VANDERSPEK: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. And so then on

contingency measures, you know, as you know, the Board just received a memo about contingency measures, about the process that's been going on with the last couple years.

And so we are definitely committed as an agency to provide these contingency measures. I do want to highlight though as CARB is driving emissions down to zero, these opportunities for contingency measures do become fewer and farther between.

1.3

2.2

We are internally looking at ways to meet this requirement, especially with -- in the anticipation of EPA guidance coming out. We have actually met with their headquarters at EPA almost a year ago where, at that time, they let us know that guidance was imminent. So our understanding now it should be coming out fairly shortly, but I can tell you as an agency and as staff we want to meet this requirement. We have a commitment in our resolution that we will continue to work with our federal partners to come up with an approvable contingency measure that not only applies to South Coast and the San Joaquin Valley, but also that can be used for the rest of the State.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you. All right.
Other Board member questions and comments?
Okay. Vice Chair Berg.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you so much. You know,

both San Joaquin Valley and South Coast, it has always been such a struggle meeting these various attainment. And so as we look at -- you know, a couple of commenters did comment that we have yet to attain an ozone level. I didn't think that was correct, so I'd like a -- just some clarification on that.

And secondly though, as we are now bringing pesticides back, because we did have that 1,3 --

CHAIR RANDOLPH: 1,3-D.

2.2

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you -- 1,3-D in a SIP regulation many years ago -- several years ago. And so -- and did we meet that SIP obligation? And now, are we looking to make a measurable impact in reducing it further? And so I'd like just to get your kind of take on that. Thank you.

AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: This is Michael Benjamin. On the ozone question, I think we can think about it in maybe two parts. Ozone air quality is definitely improving in the San Joaquin Valley. I think that's not in question. I think maybe where some of the frustration lies is the pace at which that's happening and have we been meeting the commitments in terms of the timing on that?

So we are seeing very significant improvement in air quality and ozone. And the Plan that we have before

us today is really another step in that direction. And so as staff, we feel very confident that the measures that are in this Plan will provide us -- will get us to attainment in the time that's required by the Clean Air Act.

On --

2.2

VICE CHAIR BERG: Just some translation here.

AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: Yes.

VICE CHAIR BERG: So does that mean we have missed every other benchmark or we -- has there ever been a time where the San Joaquin Valley was in attainment for ozone, since we have had SIPs?

AQPSD AIR QUALITY PLANNING BRANCH CHIEF

VANDERSPEK: I'll go ahead and answer that question. Yes, they have attained the one-hour ozone standard in 2017.

And just a little bit on the -- your other question about DPR and the original SIP target. DPR did meet the requirement that was specified in the '99 -- 1994 SIP on those reductions.

And as far as the 1,3-D Measure, it -- you know it definitely reduces, you know, exposure for that category. There is a lot of other pesticides, but it's about what 10 percent of the emission, Michael?

VICE CHAIR BERG: So an additional 10 percent, but, you know, we are going on 30 years since 1990. And

would you say 19 --

2.2

AQPSD AIR QUALITY PLANNING BRANCH CHIEF VANDERSPEK: It was the 1994 SIP.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Yeah, the 1994 --

AQPSD AIR QUALITY PLANNING BRANCH CHIEF

VANDERSPEK: Right.

VICE CHAIR BERG: -- so we've done one. We reduced it 20 percent. If we had done that in all other air quality areas, we'd have a whole different subject here. We wouldn't have the reductions like we do before. So I'm sure hoping we're going to reduce it more than 10 percent after all this time additionally. So we'll keep working with everybody and thank you for that information.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. The Board has before them --

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Chair Randolph.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Oh, sorry, Dr. Balmes. I didn't see your mic up there.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you and I apologize for being late, but Southwest canceled my flight due to the high winds, so I had fly into LAX and then drive here. So I missed much of the testimony, but I did hear several advocates expressing their concern about asthma and ozone. You know, I've been studying ozone for about 40 years, initially largely related to asthma. And I can confirm

Dr. Pacheco-Werner's comments that people with asthma feel it when ozone levels go high. And while we've made great progress in the San Joaquin Valley in terms of ozone,

I'm -- I've been doing research in ozone since about 1999, and the ozone levels have improved as have other air pollutants.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

There are still, you know, levels that are high enough to cause health problems for people with preexisting disease like asthma. So while I, you know, support the efforts both from the District and CARB to implement this SIP Strategy, I share the frustration about, you know, could we do more? And in particular, with regard to pesticides, while I have to say I'm very pleased that we have the 1,3-dichloropropene piece of this SIP, it's a -- you know, it's a foot in the water -- toe in the water, whatever -- toe in the water, but I think we need to do more. I realize this is an ozone SIP and pesticides are more of a holistic issue with regards to air quality in the San Joaquin Valley, but I guess we use this particular item to emphasize that we need to do more about ambient pesticides.

And the other -- the last comment I would make -- well, it's not the last comment. I just wanted to clarify that we met the 1-hour standard or the Valley met the 1-hour standard. That standard is an old standard. You

```
know, the 80 part per billion -- I mean 8-hour 70 part per billion standard that is currently the EPA NOx is -- you know, it's -- we're a ways from being able to meet that.
```

2.2

And I hope that the measures in this State SIP Strategy for the San Joaquin Valley will get there. It would be nice if we get their faster. And I guess the last comment I would make is given the Board's commitment to environmental justice, I do think we need to do better outreach, as several people suggested, to make sure that the environmental justice community members can be made aware of items like this SIP. You know, it requires us to be active in outreaching to folks. But with that, I am supportive of the State SIP for the San Joaquin Valley.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you, Dr. Balmes.

Any further comments or questions?

Okay. Seeing none, the Board has before them Resolution number 23-3. Do I have a motion to approve?

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Move to approve.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: And a second.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Second.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT Second.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Clerk, would you please call the roll.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Dr. Balmes?

127

1		BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes.
2		BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. De La Torre?
3		BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yes.
4		BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Eisenhut?
5		BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Yes.
6		BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Florez?
7		BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez, aye.
8		BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Hurt?
9		BOARD MEMBER HURT: Aye.
10		BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Kracov?
11		BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes.
12		BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?
13		BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes.
14		BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Professor Sperling?
15		BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Yes.
16		BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Takvorian?
17		BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.
18		BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Vice Chair Berg?
19		VICE CHAIR BERG: Yes.
20		BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair Randolph?
21		CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.
22		BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Madam Chair, the motion
23	passes	
24		CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you very much.
25		We will now take a one-hour lunch break and
	I	

AFTERNOON SESSION

(On record: 1:02 p.m.)

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Welcome back to the California Air Resources Board meeting. The next item on the agenda is Item 23-1-5, the proposed research projects for fiscal year 2023 and 2024.

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 this item, please click the raise hand button or dial star nine now. We will first call on in-person commenters followed by any remote commenters when we get to the public comment portion of this item.

The Research Program supports CARB's work on multiple fronts. It guides CARB's air quality planning efforts, provides the scientific foundation for our regulatory decision making, and supports efforts to meet our climate mitigation targets. The Research Program also serves to further our efforts to improve air quality in the most impacted communities in the state and to support racial equity and social justice goals. Lastly, the program facilitates important collaborations with other research funding organizations. The Research Program is committed to remaining responsive to emerging topics in

order to address CARB's evolving goals and priorities with scientifically rigorous research.

2.2

Today, staff will be recommending Board approval of proposed projects for fiscal year 2023 and 2024, as well as delegation of approval of research contracts to be funded in fiscal years 2023 through 2025.

Dr. Cliff, would you please introduce the item.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Chair Randolph. Today, staff will present the 11 proposed research projects for fiscal year 23-24 and a short health research update. The proposed research projects were developed through a public process, which began in the spring of 2022 with a public solicitation of research concepts and comments. Concepts were prioritized in consultation with CARB staff and stakeholders, advocates, and research partners through individual meetings, and a public meeting on September 14, 2022. The public meeting included a public comment period, an additional informational materials on our website for those unable to attend the meeting.

The project concept prioritization was also guided by the triennial strategic research plan for fiscal years 2021 through 2024, which was approved by the Board on March 25th, 2021. The plan includes a commitment to operationalize racial equity in CARB research. In today's

presentation, staff will summarize current research projects -- current progress towards that goal including changes to the research planning process that increase transparency, how equity is embedded in the process and project implementation, and a description of community driven research roadmap projects currently funded.

2.2

The health update will focus on CARB's expanding health analysis, project, and research studies.

The proposed research projects support CARB's regulatory priorities related to health, environmental justice, air pollution, and climate change. Due to a limited research budget, many of the projects presented today strive to holistically address agency priorities and rely on partnerships in collaboration with other State and federal entities to make our research dollars go further. Staff will be seeking Board approval to develop the proposed budget project concepts into full projects and ask for delegation of contract approval to the executive officer for contracts covering fiscal years 2023 through 2025.

Today, we will be hearing from two research division staff, Dr. Sonya Collier will review the proposed research projects and Dr. Hnin Hnin Aung will be presenting the health research.

I will now ask Dr. Sonya Collier to begin the

staff presentation.

2.2

Dr. Collier.

(Thereupon a slide presentation).

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: Thank you Dr. Cliff. Good afternoon, Chair Randolph and Board members. Today, we'll be -- we will be presenting CARB's proposed research projects for fiscal year 2023 through 2024. The proposed projects were released for public comment on December 16th of 2022.

Next slide, please.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: CARB is seen as a world expert in monitoring, analyzing, and regulating air emissions. This reputation is result of using sound science and up-to-date research to inform our work. The Research Program is key to providing that scientific foundation as envisioned by the Legislature when they created the Board's Research Program in 1971. The Research Program encompasses all aspects of air pollution and plays an important role in meeting the challenges of increasingly stringent federal air quality standards and long-term climate goals and serves as the foundation for effective regulatory decisions.

The Program enables research using leading edge technology and methods in key areas, such as environmental

justice, economics, climate, air quality, and health. The Triennial Strategic Research Plan is an important tool for collaboration and for communicating CARB's research priorities. In the plan, staff compiled information on our past and current research projects and future research priorities. The development of the future research priorities in the plan was also guided by public input. This document aids in our annual research planning process and is an important tool in our outreach efforts.

2.2

--000--

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

We have a variety of projects types. Our extramural research contracts consist of scientifically robust projects that are highly responsive to CARB's priorities and missions. We also fund white paper projects that collect the latest information available on emerging topics, and we fund community-driven research

roadmap projects in response to community concerns. We coordinate with large external research efforts in collaboration with other State and federal agencies to make our research dollars go further. Finally, CARB experts also develop in-house projects leveraging data collected through extramural research and we collect data, develop models, and write highly impactful scientific papers.

2.2

Projects are completed by leading scientists and community researchers in collaboration with community-based organizations, by experts in State, national, and international organizations, and by CARB staff. The research results derived through these various efforts inform CARB programs and help advance our mission to protect public health and the environment.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: As discussed in previous slides, although we create a triennial plan to guide our efforts, each year we go through a research planning process to select new projects for funding. We will now discuss the annual research planning process and highlight the opportunities for public guidance. Our annual research planning process begins each year around April by identifying research project concepts through a public concept and comment

Solicitation. The comments and concepts are reviewed by CARB staff and the top priority project concepts are presented to the public later in the calendar year to get further input on which projects should be funded. We also get input from CARB staff, Board members, and external stakeholders.

2.2

After we have received all project ideas and priori -- prioritize them through internal and external engagement, a final list of proposed projects is presented to the Board for approval. If the Board approves, then project concepts are developed into full projects. In some cases, the projects' requirements are defined by community-driven research roadmaps or white papers. Right now, we are at this stage in the process.

If the Board approves the plan, we release a solicitation for proposals from the Universities of California and California State Universities. In order to increase the transparency of our solicitation award process and foster the development of multi-disciplinary research teams, we hold solicitation meetings and leverage online forums. Proposals are reviewed and winning proposals selected and finalized using multi-division diverse review panels. Once proposals are finalized, the Research Screening Committee, which is composed of various subject matter experts independent of CARB, reviews the

proposal and provides comments. Considering their recommendations, proposals are then developed into contracts.

1.3

2.2

The Executive Officer provides final approval and these projects become active research. During this phase, online progress updates and outreach are done. When appropriate, we establish project advisory committees to provide oversight and direction.

Once projects are finalized, the Research Screening Committee reviews and provide comments and recommendations on the final results and report, which are then shared with the public through seminars and online documents. We have started requiring research contractors to create accessible and clear outreach documents that can be used to share results with the public. At the end of every project, there is a public seminar where the contractors present their research results.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: The previous slide provided an overview of the annual research planning process, which helps us decide which projects to fund each fiscal year. We'd like to now discuss proposed changes to how we engage with the Board on setting research priorities to provide more context for the Board and leverage more funding opportunities. We have a

limited budget and working with other funding sources would allow our budget to go further.

2.2

The first major change we'd like to propose is to bring a five-year strategic research plan to the Board rather than a triennial strategic research plan. Projects take two to three years to deliver results and extending the strategic research plan from three to five years will allow us to summarize more results and inform the next strategic research plan.

The next major change we are proposing is to have a more focused engagement with the Board. Currently, we present individual proposed research projects for Board approval. However, because our time with the Board is limited, we are not able to provide updates on the overall direction of the Research Program or summarize important topics like wildfires, health analysis, or the impact of our work on regulations. We are proposing to reduce our overall meeting frequency from once a year to twice within the five-year strategic research plan cycle, where we will provide more detailed subject-specific updates. As an example of what that might look like, today, we will -- we will be providing a very brief update on our health analysis research.

As part of the annual planning process, CARB will continue to engage with the public to guide project

selection by collecting project concepts and comments from the public and hosting public meetings. Board members will still be given the opportunity to receive briefings on an annual basis. In preparation for each five-year plan, we will hold research symposia summarizing the current state of the research and identifying remaining research gaps.

1.3

2.2

These proposed changes will allow for more holistic, comprehensive, topical Board discussions. It will also increase the flexibility to leverage other funds and encumber funds when they become available. And it will allow for broader stakeholder engagement and more focused and tailored discussions.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: The Research Program is an important part of CARB's work and we are committed to operationalizing racial equity within the program. In response to public comments and input from environmental justice and community advocates, we have started implementing changes to the Research Program, including in the research planning process and the types of projects we fund. We have made changes to our annual research planning process in response to comments we have received to increased transparency, reduced burdens on the public, and have more touchpoints where community members

can provide guidance on project selection.

2.2

As part of this effort, CARB has funded community engagement projects focused on incorporating the voices of concerned community members interested in research on a specific air quality or public health issue occurring in their community. The objective is to create a research roadmap with community members that highlight potential research projects for future funding consideration. For projects that have equity components, we require cultural humility statements and we encourage partnerships in all projects with new researchers, community-based organizations, and community advocates through scoring criteria and project requirements.

These changes have demonstrated that we need to increase internal capacity to provide transparency in our planning process. And all projects that include community engagement require additional resources and solutions, for example translation services for language justice should be guaranteed. In addition, our contracting process potentially limits our ability to have deeper engagement. Creating research roadmap projects has allowed for community engagement to be the main focus of a project.

The Research Program is only at the initial stages of these changes and we are looking forward to leveraging upcoming models and tools that can guide our

efforts. For example, CARB is currently in collaboration with the other boards, departments, and office under the California Environmental Protection Agency to develop a community science model that will be leveraged in the future by all the agencies to organize and fund effective and collaborative community science projects that center community voices, and needs, and build capacity.

1.3

2.2

As you will hear in Executive Officer Cliff's presentation, our research serves a critical role in CARB's overall work to deliver emissions reductions. He will also discuss agency-wide efforts on equity and community engagement that the division will integrate into its work as applicable.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: Now, we would like to update you on the community-driven research roadmap projects that the Research Program has initiated. In order to develop these contracts, we first start by identifying topics, interested communities, and interested partners. A research team consists of Researchers from both the academic and community settings.

In the three projects being described here, a research team is formed from the partnership between a UC or CSU researcher and a community-based organization or member of the community. An important initial step is for

the research team to summarize all information gathered by the community or by the local air district and to include the latest literature results on the topic of focus. The research team must develop a community engagement plan that is achievable and that takes into consideration community capacity and needs. The research team then must collect community input and in collaboration with the community create a research roadmap.

2.2

Ideally, the findings in the roadmap have elements applicable to communities in other parts of the state. Although CARB can't guarantee funding ahead of time, the roadmap is created to drive future research priorities and projects. Future projects based on the roadmap can be used to collect data that is important for community advocacy and the public generally.

So far, we have funded three roadmap projects.

One focused in the Salton Sea that consist of a partnership among community-based organizations, local advocates, and academic institutions. This project facilitated a series of digital community forums and informational sessions focused on health disparities and air quality surrounding the Salton Sea region. Another is focused on air pollution sources of concern and potential mitigation strategies in Imperial Valley. And the newest project is almost ready to be initiated and is focused on

toxic metal emissions in the City of Paramount.

2.2

will now give a brief overview of the 11 research projects we would like to fund in 2023-2024. For this funding year, we anticipate a total budget of \$6.2 million and the list of proposed project concepts covers topics in four major topical categories. Environmental justice and equity are a part of several projects within those categories. In the next slides, I will provide additional background on each of the proposed projects.

--000--

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: The Research Program has funded several important projects that focus on understanding disproportionate exposure to air pollutants experienced in priority communities. Our program will continue to focus on developing tools and metrics needed to understand disproportionate impacts of air pollution and climate on priority communities.

We are proposing to fund a project to continue developing the novel Toxic-metal Aerosol Real-Time

Analysis or TARTA instrument, make it more user-friendly and deploy it in areas of concern. We are also proposing to provide initial funding for a research project that will be responsive to the research roadmap project

described earlier and focused on Imperial valley.

--000--

1.3

2.2

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: Air quality continues to be an important research topic. We will continue to improve our understanding of pollution sources in highly impacted areas. We are proposing to fund three projects including one focused on the San Joaquin Valley that investigates which sources of air pollution will dominate air quality as regulations are implemented. We also propose to fund a project focused on train wheel and brake wear to better understand the potential exposure impacts of locomotives, passenger car, and freight car wheel and brake wear emissions on nearby communities.

Finally, we would like to fund a project to characterize wildland fire emissions, transport, transformation, plume chemistry, and ultimately air quality impacts, including toxicity of smoke, and investigate how pollutant levels change during fires, how gases and particles pollutants measured in the wildland urban interface are different than those directly emitted from fires, and how pollutant levels in the wildland urban interface compare with urban areas.

--000--

RD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST COLLIER: We

are proposing several projects that improve understanding of greenhouse gas emission quantification across the state of California. The first proposed project investigates the real-world emissions of methane from landfills and how we can better estimate statewide emissions. We are also proposing to fund a project that expands our understanding of the industrial sector's contributing to methane emissions in the southern San Joaquin Valley.

2.2

In response to public comment, we are proposing a project that investigates impacts of fumigant use, including fumigant types, application methods, rates, and management practices on emissions of the potent greenhouse gas, N2O from soils.

Next, we will present on our health research. I will now pass the mic over to Dr. Hnin Hnin Aung, who will give an overview of our health analysis research program, our proposed health projects and will wrap up our presentation.

--000--

RD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST AUNG: Thank you, Dr. Collier. We will now provide an update on pro -- on the progress in addressing the Board Resolution that directed CARB staff to provide a more comprehensive evaluation of the health benefits of both air quality and climate action. In response to the Board's direction, we have

been working on developing new methodologies to assess health impacts, including developing new qualitative and quantitative approaches, inclusion of additional health endpoints, assessing health impacts in priority communities, quantifying additional pollutants, and evaluating and communicating greenhouse gas reduction benefits.

1.3

2.2

--000--

RD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST AUNG: This slide describes our initial work of developing new health endpoints for analysis of Board rules and programs. In this initial phase of projects, we have updated and incorporated several new health endpoints for PM2.5 into our health analysis in response to recent research and Board direction. We updated three health endpoints and have added eight new endpoints. As a result, staff are using 12 health endpoints to evaluate air quality benefits instead of the four we have used in the past.

The new and updated endpoints are described in our public bulletin released in November 2022 on our health analysis methodology website. These include cardiovascular endpoints in red such as hospital admissions, ED visits, and acute myocardial infarction, also known as heart attack. Also, we have respiratory endpoints in yellow, such as hospital admission, ED

visits, asthma onset and symptoms, and lung cancer incidence. We also have neurological endpoints in blue, which are Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease, and a nonspecific endpoint such as work loss days. Two of these new health endpoints, asthma onset and asthma symptoms, provide information about children's health effects. We will continue to update and edit health endpoints going forward as we complete additional research.

2.2

These endpoints are important as they are necessary to more comprehensively quantify benefits from regulations and plans. These were incorporated into the Scoping Plan analysis, and we expect you -- we will begin to see -- you will begin to see these quantified benefits in regulations this year.

--000--

RD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST AUNG: Another key aspect of our expanding health analysis project is to conduct research, support -- that supports the continued development of new or updated health endpoints and deepens our understanding of the health impacts of pollution in California, including criteria pollutants and air toxics. This table is an overview of several research projects that are either completed or underway. These studies will be incorporated into our new health endpoints for

regulatory analysis in the future, if appropriate.

2.2

For example, we are investigating birth outcomes and neurodegenerative diseases in which we will be looking at air pollution effects on preterm birth, low birth weight, autism, and Alzheimer's and Parkinson's diseases. For the children's health and neurodevelopment project, we will look at air pollution effects on neurodevelopmental milestones, attention, and standardized test scores.

Additionally, we are looking at air pollution effects on lost work days and metabolic illnesses such as diabetes, and the impact of freight pollution on respiratory symptoms such as asthma medication use, respiratory symptoms, and ED visits.

We are also identifying and establishing a dashboard to track various health indicators in vulnerable and impacted communities, including AB 617 communities in the Improved Assessment and Tracking of Health Indicators Project. As you can see, we are focusing on our research, both on better understanding the impacts of PM2.5 and other criteria pollutants and going beyond these pollutants to see if we can quantify health effects of air toxics also.

--000--

RD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST AUNG: In addition, our new research has more focus on community health

issues. We are focusing in this slide on three ways we have been increasing our community focus. For instance, multiple research projects are examining air pollution related health impacts by racial and ethnic subgroups. This means we are investigating ways to go beyond our current analysis that looks at the State average health impacts. Some examples are the health impacts and health indicators projects that we discussed on the previous slide. Analyzing health effects in subgroups will allow us to understand how to best reflect the impacts on air pollution on the most impacted populations in the state.

2.2

The second way we are increasing community health focus is to include paid community collaborators in research. For example, in our wildfire smoke health effects projects researcher will quantify the health impacts of short-term exposure to wildfire smoke and they will work with communities for a new California Education Fund and the Central California Asthma Collaborative to collect community input on health effects and disseminate results.

Another way we are increasing health focus in projects is to require mechanisms for community advice and input. One example is our building decarbonization projects that includes a community advisory committee to provide input on research methods to instigate impacts of

building decarbonization among priority populations.

1.3

2.2

In summary, staff is moving forward on research to support expanded health analysis while incorporating new ways to understand community health issues. We plan to provide more information on ways we are updating our health analysis and adding health endpoints in the future.

--000--

RD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST AUNG: Now, I will present the health research projects proposed for 2023. These projects focus on improving health analysis and understanding the nexus of health and climate change impacts. The first proposed health project focuses on health impacts and benefits of land management strategies and investigate how we can better support land management practices to reduce wildfire with improved quantification of health impacts from reduced exposure to wildfire smoke.

The second proposed project focuses on combined impacts of multiple climate change stressors on health, taking into account environmental justice, racial equity, and social vulnerability factors. Combined impacts could include, for example, heat, air pollution, and wildfire.

Finally, we are proposing a project on health and economic benefits of cancer risk reduction, specifically investigating how CARB can expand current health analysis methodologies to quantify the health and economic benefits

of cancer risk reduction in addition to other benefits of reducing exposure to air toxics including diesel.

2.2

--000--

RD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST AUNG: As Dr. Collier described earlier, the research planning process relies on the priorities delineated in the triennial research strategic research plan. Based on the current plan, we still have research gaps remaining that will guide projects selected over the next few years until we create and present the next five-year plan.

--000--

approves the proposed project for year -- fiscal year 23-24, staff would develop full project scopes and include them in a proposal solicitation. We are required by the Health and Safety Code to look for expertise in the UC and CSU systems first. We are releasing the solicitation on -- an online platform called Empower Innovation, which will facilitate the development of partnerships between UC and CSU researchers and non-academic researchers and community partners. We are also holding a solicitation meeting in April in order to provide guidance on these, particularly for researchers who have not worked with CARB previously. Future solicitation meetings may be held if additional funding becomes available.

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

2.2

--000--

RD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST AUNG: Staff are recommending that vote approve Resolution 23-5, which includes the proposed research projects for planning year 2023-2024 and that they delegate authority to the Executive Officer to approve contracts and future projects for both fiscal year 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

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

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you very much, Dr. Aung and Dr. Collier.

It is now time to hear from the public who signed up to speak on this item. Clerk, do we have commenters.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: It looks like we have one person with their hand raised in Zoom and that's Janet Dietzkamei. Janet, you can unmute and begin.

JANET DIETZKAMEI: Thank you. This is something that I have felt should have been done a long time ago, expanded health analysis. Those of us who have pollution sickness I feel like we're just kind of dismissed in the

discussions. And hopefully, the information gathered regarding expanded health analysis of pollution sickness will help bring to the forefront the thousands of people in this state that are suffering from pollution sickness.

I appreciate this study. I thank you for this study. And I hope this study helps in our work towards improving California air, and especially San Joaquin Valley air.

Thank you.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you.

Chair, that concludes the commenters.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. I will close the record on this agenda item and bring it to the Board for comments or questions.

Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you, Chair, and, you know, thank you so much. I really want to give a special recognition to this Division for being so responsive to community feedback to get us to where we are with this list of studies. I think -- I think that's wonderful. I have a couple of points and maybe, you know, if there's -- if any of them warrant responses, I'd love to hear from you.

I do think that it's important that we're incorporating equity in the -- in the next phase of this

discussion. And I wonder, you know, if there are -- at this point, if there's any warrant of any concrete next timelines or things that we're thinking about to -- around that particular point of discussion. And I also think that there are some very, very important proposed projects here having to do with monitoring. I hope that we can also work with districts to maximize the data and monitoring that they are already doing, especially opportunities to use any community air grant monitoring that has -- that has already been used. I know that the community members have expressed the need for -- to have that -- more analysis of that data. And I definitely see how maybe there's an opportunity for this -- for some of these proposed projects to do just that.

2.2

You know, I have to say that with -- I think our investment in the research plan outlined here has the great potential to have effects not only within our own rulemaking, but outside of our walls too. You know, I think we can find opportunities to bring this amazing work already done. The first -- the first one really being the endpoints -- the new health endpoints to bodies like CAPCOA to see how air districts can be using this information in real-time as well. As we -- as we saw just today, you know, the next steps for many of our air districts, you know, are complex. And I think any other

information that they can include in their analysis is important.

So I do hope to see some of that -- that collaboration and see how we can support them in having more robust analyses themselves as well, as well as the importance, I think, of reporting back. And I know that, you know, we have -- we have very precious and limited resources in this Division. And I think that part of the -- part of what we could prob -- a way to maximize that may be in our solicitations to really have that reporting back really be embedded in the -- our selected, you know, researchers that, you know, we actually, you know, have them go out into their own communities where they are conducting this work to report back as well. And so I hope to see some of that. And I just, you know -- these -- this list is phenomenal and I can't wait to see the results.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Board Member Hurt.

BOARD MEMBER HURT: I'll echo the comments of the hard work that's been put into this and a really amazing list. I just have a few questions. And one of my first questions is how is racial equity lens applied in the evaluation of the project priorities? I think the public

would be really curious to hear that. I know we have said and stated racial ethic subgroups is an expectation, but is there a requirement that all projects really apply that racial equity lens, since we know that our most impacted are low-income and minorities.

1.3

2.2

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SAHOTA: Board Member Hurt, this is Rajinder Sahota, the Deputy Executive Officer for Climate Change and Research and I'd be Happy to respond to that question.

So the equity lens, the REAL equity lens program, there's one that's being formally developed at CARB that Deputy Executive Officer Chanell Fletcher is leading. And I know the teams have been collaborating on the types of questions and the types of -- lens-specific types of details that should be included or that could be included in the research projects. But that real effort, the formal process, is not completed yet, so we're just collaborating with the staff in Executive Officer Fletcher's[SIC] team to integrate as much as we can right now.

But I also want to be very transparent that there are going to be some types of projects that will lend themselves substantially to the questions that the REAL framework will have. And there are going to be some other questions that won't lend themselves to those kinds of

reviews. For example, when we look at something that's more technical, for example, the satellite data -- the methane satellite data, that's going to be data that comes in that we then have to apply across different agencies and then understand what the emissions are at the ground, engage with communities to talk about what their symptoms are, what might be impacting them, the sources that they're exposed to.

1.3

2.2

Whereas, some of the work that staff is doing, such as the work in Imperial Valley is very community driven. And so they are themselves expressing their lens, and their questions, and their views about what they want to see. And so there's going to be a spectrum of how much of the community and lens for REAL is going to be applied across the different project types. What you saw today was a substantial increase in the types of projects that staff is looking at. We historically have a budget of about \$4 million and I'm happy to see that we were able to get about 2.2 million more.

The goal is to continue to leverage as much of the resources as we have internally, but also leverage relationships with other academics and other institutions, so that we can continue to integrate more of that community work and community lens on health analyses into our own work here.

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you. I think it's really important and I'm glad to hear that we're continuing to build in this racial equity lens. And I think it's really important when I think about the reduction of black maternal mortality, chronic illness that underlies that. I think we can all be a part of the solutions by having important research projects coming out of our shop.

1.3

2.2

My other question is how do we determine what health endpoints we focus on. In other words, hypertension is not on the list. You know, how are we determining out of the many chronic illnesses which ones when it comes to PM2.5 we want to focus upon?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SAHOTA: So Board Member Hurt, this again is one of those areas where we are leveraging work that's being done outside of ARB. There are many manifestations of health impacts that can potentially be looked at in terms of air pollution or other kinds of impacts and environmental stressors out there including socioeconomic stressors.

But what we traditionally do is go back to U.S. EPA and look at some of the work that's been done at the federal level, where there's a wealth of information and research that's available, and then use some of their guidelines for how to incorporate those health endpoints

into our own work.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

We went from four to a substantially increased number and we used that increased number as part of the scoping plan last year. The goal is to not only continue to use about a dozen or so new ones and updated ones for every rule and regulation that we move forward, but also do some of the research like presented -- such as presented here today to help feed into some of the work at U.S. EPA, collaborate with other academics, and continue to add to that list of health endpoints. It really comes down to the resources, the amount of data, and the progress that's been made where we can pick up some of that work, use in its readily available form or do a little bit more investment of our own through our Research Program or through academic institutions, and then integrate it back into some of the analyses we do for the rules and regulations here.

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you. I look forward through -- of us doing more investment through our own shop, because we all know there's really a lack of that data and information in the places that you listed. But I am very happy to see the direction that we're pointed and thank all of you for all the hard work in getting us in that direction.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SAHOTA: Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Dr. Balmes.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Chair Randolph.

First of all, I want to salute the Research

Division. Elizabeth Scheehle and Bonnie Holmes-Gen have
reached out to me on a regular basis about the types of
health studies that they wish to do, and I appreciate
that. I think it's been a mutually informative dialogue
that we plan on continuing. I think we're already trying
to set up the next meeting.

members. I agree with Dr. Pacheco-Werner that similar to what I said about outreach with regard to the San Joaquin Valley SIP, I think we really have to work hard to get the results of our research projects back out to the affected communities. You know, there's already a reporting back process -- there's a reporting process -- public reporting process every successfully concluded research project. There's a -- I think it's called the Chair's seminar or whatever. But those aren't attended -- they're attended by other scientists and maybe policymakers, but not by the community.

So I think it's, as Dr. Pacheco-Werner knows very well, it's, you know, important principle that a -- that participants in the study or affected communities that are involved in a study should be informed of the results.

And I think that, you know, we have good intentions in that regard, but we have to work at it, and -- but I also recognize that that strains resources, so there's a balance between the outreach that we can do and our resources, but we should actually try more. And it fits with the direction that the Board -- the agency is going in terms of trying to both involve the communities with designing research that's relevant to them, but also we then have to get the results back to the community.

1.3

2.2

And Vice Mayor Hurt made some good comments about the outcome -- the health outcomes that we look at. And, you know, I've tried to provide advice to the Research Division, but I welcome collaborating with other Board members in that regard. I can funnel good ideas from other folks.

You know, with that said, I think that the Research Division is trying to make the research that the agency is funding with its limited resources. That's something to remember. We -- this is like a pittance in terms of academic research funding. They're trying to make it relevant to health -- public health, but climate change mitigation, transportation policies. And I applaud the Division's efforts to continue that search for relevance and for making the research responsive to community needs.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

Senator Stern.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

SENATOR STERN: Thanks, Chair Randolph. And it's good to be with you all. These are my -- I wish my first remarks as your new ex officio from the Senate were in person, but I'll be there in a few hours, wind cooperating.

I just want to say briefly at the outset too, I did have a chance to watch the morning proceedings on the SIP process. And just for the record, I want to state that I did support the item and the approval and did want to echo the frustrations of those down south on the timing of Indirect Source Rules as well as the -- express some concern about legislative efforts to undercut the Air Board and South Coast work on that front. And I'll be vigilantly hunting for those efforts. And I also want to pledge my support in the federal piece of the puzzle. just wanted to put that note in the record since I missed that comment period that I am ready and willing to go with you all to Senator Padilla's office and everywhere else to get some cooperation and some leadership from the Biden Administration to help us through here.

My brief comment on this research item was just, you know, a note of enthusiasm about the quality of the work and this new process, and do agree in terms of size,

you've always punched above your weight for a very, very modest budget here. And with even these modest increases, they are doing much more than a normal agency would do, but that's what CARB does.

2.2

I would -- just two things to note. In terms of opportunities for leverage even in the near term, last year's budget was quite good and the research budget was expanded. UC right now is administering about \$100 million program statewide on the future climate research. And so in addition to foundation partners and others, I think there's a good opportunity to perhaps leverage that open solicitation and try to get some near-term work product done or some collaborative work done here. I'm especially interested in the gap noted in terms of what's going to be important to look to the future of the Scoping Plan where do we want more work done?

And, in particular, I'm curious whether there's an opportunity to start thinking about what an investment roadmap could look like or a sort of needs assessment to identify not just sort of from that more rigid cost-benefit analysis that we'll see in -- through the CEQA process on something like the Scoping Plan, but something a lot more functional and operational where we could actually understand the scope of need to accomplish our ambitious goals and to think about the mix of direct

regulations and private sector investments, as well as sort of public investments. I'm thinking about the IRA and maybe the Air Board that may be a combination of multiple agencies, but I do think we're eager to move forward and start to chart that out in sort of identifiable sectoral investment opportunities. Even if they far outstrip the current resources, I think it's helpful for people to understand that context.

2.2

So I did want to note that on the gap -- or the future work. And then just a -- the other brief note was just to agree with Dr. Balmes about that idea of sort of being community facing. And I just want to offer the idea that perhaps in those topical presentations as you're doing your sort of more regular Board updates, that you could put a community facing component on those too. So even if you're not fully done with the work or it's got a little longer lead time, perhaps those topical presentations can be a little more polished and, you know, digestible also for public consumption as well, and sort of give some interim updates. So that might be an opportunity for you all to continue to sort of be public facing, drive the conversation, elicit more interest and support from outside folks, and hopefully help.

So anyway, those are my first two cents. I apologize in advance for all the future, yeah, deep dives,

but I'm really excited to get into details with you all and hopefully see you in a few.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SAHOTA: Thank you, Senator Stern.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right.

1.3

2.2

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SAHOTA: Welcome to ARB. Chair Randolph, may I just respond to the UC \$100 million, because I'm excited to share a couple of areas on that front. We are looking at least --

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Sure. Go ahead.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SAHOTA: Thank you. So we are looking at least three specific efforts to partner with the different UCs. One of them is a broader effort related to the Scoping Plan implementation that has space to put in the types of questions that you raised about the relationship of incentives, private, public investment, and federal action versus State action, and then also specifically on IRA.

There's also a specific contract to continue to look at how to best quantify the societal costs of carbon. We did some of that work -- updated work for the last Scoping Plan, and so that effort is going to be pushed forward again as part of the grant process by the UCs by UC Santa Barbara.

And then this brings me to another effort pushed

forward by UC Davis ITS related to the transportation sector. So the UCs have been contacting us directly specifically on that \$100 million, because they have been tracking the Scoping Plan and they are also monitoring what needs are out there and what conversations are happening. And they also want to make sure that the work they do is going to be informing and actionable when we go to try and achieve those reductions that we looked at in that Scoping Plan. So I'm happy to report back on that point.

SENATOR STERN: Thank you for that. Very encouraging.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. I have a quick question and a comment. I'll do the comment first, which is as I said last year when this item came up, I really cannot express how much I appreciate the way the Research Division really jumped right in to prioritize racial equity and to prioritize working with community. I mean it is truly impressive sort of that you all took that opportunity and just ran with it, so I very much appreciate that. Things like the community-driven research roadmap is just so forward-thinking and such a huge opportunity and I can't express my appreciation more.

The second question I have is just a really basic question for Elizabeth, which is can you tell me a little

bit more about the Toxic-metal Aerosol Real Time Analysis instrument?

(Laughter).

1.3

2.2

RESEARCH DIVISION CHIEF SCHEEHLE: I can try.

Thank you for that question, Chair Randolph. So we've been working with the UCs on an instrument that can real-time -- look in real-time at toxic measurements.

It's still in sort of a laboratory experimental phase.

And so this would be expanding that, seeing how it works actually out in a community, and if it works, and next steps for that. So it would really be taking something we've been working on on an experimental phase and trying to make it something that can be used as a monitoring tool on a more regular basis.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. So it's really just sort of looking at what's there in the air in real-time at a community level?

RESEARCH DIVISION CHIEF SCHEEHLE: And it's limited in -- and you can't measure everything, so there are limitations to what sort of toxics you could look at. And I can follow-up with more details about what exactly we can and can't look at, because I don't have the specifics in front of me right now. But yeah, so it would be going out and seeing what you can look at in the community in real-time and if that works actually out in

167

```
the real world versus in an experimental setting.
1
             BOARD MEMBER BALMES: And if I might, if that is
2
    successful, that would be a major improvement under the
3
    current situation.
 4
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. That sounds great.
5
             Okay. Thank you so much.
 6
             Any other questions or comments?
7
8
             All right. And so we have Resolution number 23-5
9
   before us. Do I have a motion?
             BOARD MEMBER HURT: Move approval.
10
             BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Second.
11
             CHAIR RANDOLPH: Clerk, will you please call the
12
   role.
1.3
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Dr. Balmes?
14
             BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes.
15
16
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. De La Torre?
             BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Aye.
17
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Eisenhut?
18
             BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Aye.
19
20
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Senator Florez?
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez, aye.
21
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Hurt?
2.2
23
             BOARD MEMBER HURT: Aye.
             BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Mr. Kracov?
24
             BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes.
25
```

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Ms. Takvorian?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Aye.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Vice Chair Berg?

VICE CHAIR BERG: Aye.

2.2

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Chair Randolph?

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Madam Chair, the motion passes.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you so much.

Okay. The last item on the agenda today is item number 23-1-6, a report on the California Air Resources Board program priorities for 2023. If you are here with us in the room and wish to comment, please fill out a request to speak card and submit it to the Board assistant. If you are joining us remotely and wish to comment, please click the raise-hand button or dial star nine now. We call on in-person commenters first followed by remote commenters.

So when I think about all that CARB and the State of California have accomplished over the last year, I am proud to say that we have made real progress towards ending the harmful combustion of fossil fuels and protecting health in communities across the state. This

progress is born from our tremendous staff work, a lot of which you have heard about today, and Board actions across our programs. I want to emphasize three important milestones from 2022.

2.2

We passed our Advanced Clean Cars II Regulation, creating an enforceable pathway to 100 percent zero-emission car sales by 2035 and strong consumer assurances for new technology. We adopted the State Clean Air Implementation Strategy, to map out how to meet stringent federal air quality standards in 2037 and protect our most vulnerable communities from dangerous levels of air pollution.

And most recently, we approved the 2022 Scoping Plan, our fourth Scoping Plan update and the most ambitious to date. It sets out the actions needed to achieve carbon neutrality and reduce anthropogenic emissions 85 percent from 1990 levels by 2045, prioritizing reductions in the communities most affected by pollution.

In all of these efforts, we prioritized addressing environmental justice and advancing racial equity. For each of these milestones, we worked with communities to uplift their concerns by collaboratively developing solutions to ensure more equitable outcomes for all Californians.

These actions usher in our next era of equitable clean air and climate policy. We are looking at a technology and economic transformation that moves us once and for all away from fossil fuel combustion with a focus on addressing the needs of the people and communities most burdened by pollution.

1.3

2.2

This commitment to air quality, a healthy climate, environmental justice, and racial equity is bolstered by significant investments that California has dedicated to climate change over the next several years. And through these and other actions, California continues to lead the nation and the world on climate and clean air policy.

This year, we have the opportunity to continue to live -- to deliver on the progress we've made to map out a clean air and carbon neutral future. We have the chance to assess and ensure that the many programs that span our agency align with our unprecedented plans and directives, including our Board resolution on social justice and racial equity. We will need to leave no stone unturned in looking for ways to ensure alignment of our programs with these principles. It will require the rigorous, consistent, equity-focused work we know we can deliver at CARB.

We also know we need to work with a wide range of

partners, not only within the Administration, but with stakeholders in our communities, industry, and the academic community, as well as with our federal partners. This is absolutely an all-hands-on-deck effort now and throughout the years to come.

2.2

So with that, I'm pleased to turn things over to Dr. Steven Cliff for an overview of what this year holds for CARB and the people of the state of California.

(Thereupon a slide presentation).

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Chair Randolph. Really appreciate that.

I'm glad to have the chance to look ahead to discuss with you CARB's priorities for the coming year. I feel a little guilty taking what would maybe normally be a staff presentation during a Board meeting and taking the spotlight here for a few minutes.

To start the conversation, I'll present some high level priorities for 2023, including the actions that will come before you, CARB's key efforts to implement clean air and climate policy and our internal efforts to make CARB a rewarding place to work for all employees. Throughout, I'll discuss our plans to integrate Environmental justice and racial equity into all we do.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Let's begin with

process -- progress made through Board action.

--000--

1.3

2.2

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Last fall, the Board heard important initial discussions on two regulations, the Advanced Clean Fleets Rule and the In-Use Locomotive Regulation. Staff continue to refine both under your direction and with stakeholder input and you will have the chance to hear these again later this year. Many other regulations will come before you this year as well, each going through their own public process with the goal of helping to protect communities and reach our air quality and climate targets.

--000--

year in planning for our most ambitious clean air and climate plans to date. This year, the Board will consider actions to ensure our programs align with them. The Board just approved, as you all observed, three State Implementation Plans, or SIPs, to meet the U.S. EPA's 70 ppb ozone standard, and will consider more regional SIPs later this year. These SIPs drive the pace and ambition of our rulemaking calendar, which is especially important for low-income and front-line communities that are disproportionately exposed not just to smog but also diesel exhaust and other toxic air pollutants.

We'll also consider actions to ensure alignment with the 2022 Scoping Plan to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045 and drastically reduce emissions across every sector of the economy, while, also prioritizing equitable economic growth and community health.

2.2

This year, we will also reimagine how to support more communities through an update to the Community Air Protection Blueprint, the program's guiding plan.

Alongside recent directives from the Governor and the Legislature, the unprecedented scope and ambition of these plans will usher in an era of investment, implementation, and engagement with communities. CARB staff will be reviewing, updating, and developing new regulations and programs to align these plans -- with these plans and the Board will have a chance to hear and act on those updates.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: In 2023, CARB will devote substantial effort to on-the-ground implementation. This will include administering our programs with new sources of revenue, ongoing and enhanced research, testing, and enforcement, meaningfully engaging with communities to advance racial equity and environmental justice, and working with federal, State, and local government partners.

--000--

2.2

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Given the State deficit, we have anticipated cuts to some of CARB's incentive programs in the Governor's recent budget proposal. While the \$10 billion zero-emission vehicle package from last year was trimmed to about 8.9 billion dollars this year, we will still see substantial investments in drayage trucks, transit buses, and our projects to support low-income consumers and our innovative clean mobility projects developed and implemented by communities to fit their needs.

Some of our other programs will see greater cuts, but triggers in the proposed budget will fully restore them if general fund health improves. We will continue to work with the administration until the budget is finalized this June.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: We will also continue to prioritize community-scale and community-focused investments. For example, investment through AB 617 is beginning to payoff. Ten of the 17 selected communities are either in their third or fourth year of implementation. And next month, staff will recommend to the Board the inclusion of two more communities.

Through our Community Air Grants Program, a

funding stream dedicated to projects identified by community organizations and tribes, CARB has supported 95 projects statewide with another \$10 million in funding available now. This year, CARB will look for ways support more communities through this program.

2.2

In addition, the 2022-23 funding plan for clean transportation incentives, developed across CARB and in partnership with several community stakeholders, calls for spending billions to benefit priority population. It includes funding for zero-emission medium— and heavy—duty vehicles operating in our most polluted communities, and for community—led efforts to create walkable, bikeable, transit—friendly places for all.

--000--

passed Resolution 20-33, "A Commitment to Racial Equity and Social Justice". Presented to the Board last May -- presented to the Board last May, its implementation remains a priority in 2023. We are building our capacity to more meaningfully involve and engage communities in our programs, policies, and regulation. CARB will work directly with communities to co-develop community engagement guidance and curriculum, which will serve as a resource for all staff and will continually refine -- be refined over time.

We are also developing our racial equity assessment lens that you heard a bit about earlier, REAL, which is a set of questions for staff to use as they design programs and develop policies and regulations.

This tool will help us operationalize racial equity across all that we do. We will continue to refine it internally and externally and pilot its use this year.

2.2

Our model of change requires long-term commitment to racial equity, transparency, and accountability, including through annual Board updates, the next of which will be in April.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: CARB's work to define, measure, and ensure emission reductions spans hundreds of specialized staff every day. As seen in the images across the slide, meeting our clean air and climate goals means that we need to continue to ask and answer our most pressing research questions, as well as sample, measure, inspect, and test emissions in a variety of settings and from a variety of sources. Our staff will continue this important work in 2023 as well.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: We are pushing the envelope and finding innovative ways to efficiently identify our biggest emitters with large-scale

technologies.

2.2

For example, through a competitive process, we're currently looking to work with a satellite operator to monitor and detect large methane emitters, which have an outsized impact on climate. With a sizable \$100 million in funding, we will aim to launch roughly eight satellites by 2025. This will augment two philanthropically funded satellites that we expect to launch later this year. Data generated by satellites and other large-scale methods can be fed back into research, improve our understanding of emission sources, and can support our regulatory implementation and enforcement activities. We'll also use funding from this project to engage communities.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Residents of our communities have a unique ability to inform CARB's monitoring and enforcement efforts. As a tool for the community and pictured here, CARB received \$30 million to collect air quality data from across the sate using mobile air monitors. These data will be shared with local communities to increase understanding of community exposure to the pollutants and facilitate focused community and agency action to reduce emissions.

In 2023, we will continue to refine our community-based enforcement efforts from prioritizing

community-identified concerns to focusing enforcement within disadvantaged and AB 617 communities, and supporting community-based environmental projects with a portion of -- with a portion of enforcement penalties.

1.3

2.2

--000--

air and climate goals, we rely on federal partners to address sources primarily under their jurisdiction and that uniquely affect the most vulnerable Californians. We will continue to push for swift recognition of our unique authority under the federal Clean Air Act. We will continue to urge our federal partners to align their emission standards with our own and to establish decisive plans and actions to address emissions from primarily federally regulated ocean-going vessels, locomotives, and interstate trucks.

Large federally owned fleets, such as postal trucks, present another important opportunity for the federal government to choose health protective zero-emission technologies and become a signal of zero-emissions transportation visible to all Americans.

The U.S. EPA's recent proposal to follow the science and lower the PM2.5 standard only emphasizes the need for the federal government to do their part.

Lastly, we will continue to engage with federal

partners as they design and administer Inflation Reduction Act programs and funds totaling hundreds of billions of dollars. We will urge aligning with existing State efforts, prioritizing funding for regions with severe air pollution, and to benefit front-line communities.

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Successful climate and clean air implementation will require close coordination with other State agencies and the private sector across every sector of California's economy. Together, our part -- our actions must align and support the goals and actions identified in our latest SIP and Scoping Plan to implement the climate package adopted last year, including beginning work on SB 905, SB 1757, and other directives from the Legislature.

While collaboration with sister agencies across all sectors is critical, this is particularly true in the case of infrastructure. To get to carbon neutrality by 2045, it is essential that this decade we transition away from fossil energy systems, increase access to raw materials, and accelerate the buildout of new electricity transmission and distribution infrastructure.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Similarly, we will rely on local governments that have responsibility and

authority over the built environment, land use, and transportation networks, and the provision of local services. They have unique authority to cite, permit, and support the transition and buildout of clean energy infrastructure and vehicle chargers, decarbonize buildings, and align land use and transportation systems to reduce vehicle miles traveled. As with statewide collaboration, local actions across all sectors must support the goals and actions identified in the SIP and the Scoping Plan for California to reach its climate and clean air quality targets.

2.2

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: This year, we are prioritizing internal coordination across all CARB divisions that play a role in reducing emissions from stationary sources. We aim to better support air districts who are key partners with whom we implement clean air programs throughout the state. And we also plan to work closely with communities and CAPCOA to ensure the progress in this area and to advance equity and environmental justice.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: This year, we'll reimagine the community air protection blueprint, the program's guiding document. The People's Blueprint was

drafted in 2020 to capture, in their own words, the experiences and lessons learned of the environmental justice representatives from the AB 617 Consultation Group. This year's Blueprint update will be significantly informed by the People's Blueprint. It will also incorporate lessons learned from all program stakeholders, including air district partners who co-implement the program.

2.2

--000--

that all of the pioneering work here presented so far relies on CARB's organizational capacity, our internal resources, staff, its culture, and organizational health. Embedded in the Governor's 2023 budget proposal, CARB's operating budget for the next fiscal year included 13 budget change proposals requesting 118.5 new positions, and 51 and a half million dollars to support both statewide program implementation and CARB's growing internal portfolio of IT projects.

Over the last year, our administrative services division experienced an abundance of staff turnover. Our focus in 2023 is getting staffed up. ASD acquired LinkedIn and other recruitment tools to expand our outreach and improve our hiring and retention process across the agency. In the process, we'll prioritize

creating an inclusive climate within CARB and supporting our essential personnel that despite significant vacancies continue to underpin CARB's mission.

2.2

CARB's many new programs and upcoming regulations and program expansions also require significant operational support, from the development of new systems, to ensuring processes are in place, to collect, distribute and track funding and data. In the Office of Information Services, we are expanding our IT governance processes, looking for opportunities to streamline and automate processes and to pilot new technologies to make everyday work more efficient and effective.

Through these steps, we aim to bolster employee satisfaction and retention and maintain our commitment to ensuring CARB is a rewarding place to work for all employees.

--000--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: In addition, CARB seeks to normalize conversations and action to advance racial equity, organize around such efforts, and operationalize them across the agency. Two initiatives will forward this work in 2023:

The Diversity and Racial Equity Task Force, known as DaRE, is moving into its third year and continues to attract growing participation. DaRE will continue to

offer employees implicit bias training, a shared language on racial equity, diversity, inclusion, and belonging, ten heritage month celebrations, and a 90-day challenge to learn and talk about racial equity alongside peers.

2.2

CalEPA's Advancing Racial Equity training will continue for all staff and is mandatory for CARB management and executives. It plays an essential role in creating shared understanding of institutional and structural racism, governance -- government's role in both, and why we must lead with race and be champions of racial equity.

We have heard from staff that these activities have significant personal impact and have helped shape CARB's work, including in our SB 150 report, the Advanced Clean Cars II Regulation, and much more.

--000--

draw our attention to where we are meeting now. Here in the Riverside -- here in Riverside at CARB's Mary D.

Nichols campus, this space encompasses both CARB's decades of progress and signals our capacity to make lasting change in 2023 and beyond. This is the largest designed and built zero net energy facility in the nation. The facility and CARB's cutting-edge research and testing on an array of vehicles and equipment and consumer products

is already attracting visitors from around the world. And we're just getting started. Later this year, our Riverside facility will come completely online marking another milestone along our mission-critical path to address the existential threat of climate change and ensure healthy air for all Californians.

Before I close, I just want to say thank you for the staff that helped prepare this presentation. Sarah Jo is sitting here behind me and also Margaret Sanchez who helped, as well as the entire team who helped prepare me for this presentation. So with that, thank you for your attention and I look forward to the discussion.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

DO we have any public commenters on this item?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: No, Chair, there are no commenters.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Any comments or questions from members of the Board?

I just realized I don't have my Zoom screen up.

Okay. Any questions for comments?

1.3

2.2

Board Member Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'm not sure I wanted to start, but I will.

(Laughter).

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you. Thank you,

Dr. Cliff. I really appreciate the far-reaching nature of the plan that you're laying out and your vision. know that it's reflective of the experience that you had previously with CARB as well as your openness to the changes that have been made since your return. really want to speak to the importance of what you said in regards to the incorporation of racial equity across everything that this agency does. That's a sea change from when I know 20 years ago I started relating to this organization and then was privileged to come on the Board. I really believe that incorporating it into our regulatory work and internally especially has been an enormous change. And I know we have a long distance to go, but I do believe that everyone on this Board and in the staff So thank you for your leadership and are very sincere. thank you to everyone else on the staff who have really helped to push that forward and raised voices where they needed to be a little louder than perhaps we're used to. So I really appreciate that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I did want to mention on the Blueprint on the Community Air Protection Blueprint, I mean you talked about a lot, but let's talk about that for just a second. I think we all know that the AB 617 had an undistinguished really inception. It wasn't the way we would like to have started programs. It was -- but it did serve to draw very

focused attention on the communities that need it the most, I believe.

2.2

And so while many of us were concerned about how it started, we believe that it's landed in a place that really focuses on those communities that need that attention. And I've watched firsthand and we've all witnessed the community emission reduction plans that have come forward from communities that -- where there's true community participation, I believe, and strong engagement from impacted residents. These are far-reaching and very aspirational plans, but they lack authority to ensure that they are -- that they're implemented and that they're complied with. So I appreciate that the blueprint revisions are moving forward and that they'll be informed by the People's Blueprint.

I think it's going to take another sea change with the blueprints in order for those to be real. I mean, we have multiple examples across 617 communities, if you will. I'm going to call them environmental justice communities. I don't -- nobody knows what a 617 community is except the people in this room, but that, you know, these have given people a whole lot of hope that there really can be changes in the community. And when we then hear back in communities that, well, they really aren't -- there really isn't the authority to do much with them.

The District can't require that these things happen or CARB can't require that those things happen. I think it is -- we're making a bit of a false promise. So I know that that's a lot, but I think it's important that we really address that as the Blueprint comes back.

2.2

And I thought if you had thoughts about that, I know it's a big topic, I'd love to hear that. It's going to be important that when we talk about reducing, for instance, diesel particulate matter by 50 to 80 percent in one community, that -- and all of the strategies that we're talking about to do that, that we have some teeth in that, so that we can truly make that happen.

So I want to continue to work in that and be sure that we really can make good on the promises that I think everyone is very sincere about in this organization.

So that would -- those would be my comments. And any thoughts you have, I'd really appreciate it.

Member Takvorian. I will -- I will -- I will say just two things. One, the regulation that you'll hear tomorrow is something that we, you know, heard as part of the community engagement that was a concern in communities.

And so CARB is prioritizing its own work to respond. And while that's not enough to do everything that's in those plans, it is a start for us.

The plans also help us organize our conversations. And I'll give you just one example of that. There's a project in the San Joaquin Valley that's a transportation project that community voices have raised as a concern to us. And using the 617 process as sort of an organizing framework for us in CARB has allowed us to have conversations with our other sister agencies, in particular Caltrans, about this project, and engage them in ways that we wouldn't necessarily previously have been able to do. So we learn of things that, through this community engagement, that then we can raise to others. It's not a perfect process, but, you know, there is more work to do.

2.2

I'd also give space if Deputy Executive Officer
Fletcher wanted to add any comments there. I believe that
Deldi is out today taking some much needed time off, but
Chanell if you're -- if you're on and would like to say
any more, I'd be glad to give space.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER FLETCHER: Thank you,

Steve, so much. And so apologies that I can't be there in

person I'm sick yet again, so did not want to get anyone

else sick.

I guess the best method there of not getting sick is not having kids under five. So that's a pro tip for anybody that wants to hear it.

I think that what Executive Officer Cliff said makes a ton of sense. And so I think, Diane, I know we've had conversations about this. Some of the things that I would also want to bring up is that we've been doing a lot of work to leverage, I think, what are in the CERPs and really think about what does that look like in terms of actual teeth. And I'll bring up the example that we've been doing a lot of actually community-driven enforcement efforts.

2.2

So you're talking in Stockton, right, and we're working with like Little Manila Rising, we're working with CVAQ and we're really focusing on, well, how do we kind of drive some of those enforcement efforts, how are they driven by community? And that's why we have partnerships, and I think that 617 has really brought to forefront. I think Steve already mentioned the example with Caltrans. And again, it's really communities using, I think, the 617 process and those levers that are in place to start to get to what we want to see in terms of the projects and what's going to actually benefit on the ground.

And so I do think that when we're looking at the blueprint and we're talking about the update to it, what we're -- what we're trying to do, right, is leverage what we've already been doing, particularly I think I would say, in both, I think, the enforcement space, the

commitments around hex chrome. So as Steve pointed out, you'll hear tomorrow and you'll actually see the community that mentioned this in their CERP, this is actually going to be addressing those kind of what's -- what was in the CERPs, which is huge, right? There's also, I think, oil and gas coming up, right, with the Methane Task Force.

2.2

So there's a number of things that are actually, I think that we're realizing that we need to do a better job of communicating how 617 is actually driving those processes, and really getting us to some actual real teeth in terms of seeing changes for communities. That's part of what we want to see in that blueprint update, communicating how those are connected while we're also leveraging what we have in place to kind of expand the benefits of 617 beyond those selected communities, so that we're reaching more across the state.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Well, I just want to thank you both. Thanks, Chanell, and I hope you feel better.

I think -- I really do agree that you're making a really important point, which is something that as a Board member I've noticed that I also hear as community members make the point that CARB is so much more responsive. And so I think what you're describing is the very concrete ways, like in rules, that CARB can respond to some of

the concerns that have been raised as part of the 617 process. I would agree with that. And I think in other areas as well just having more resources from CARB for all kinds of different projects that came up during the 617 process of the CERPs, because they were so far-reaching, and they -- from parks, and school filtration projects, the research projects I think are impacted by it.

So I don't want to say that I don't see that. I think it's when we look at what the goals are that were set in the CERPs and the difficulty people have about thinking about how those are going to get achieved. But it's important to point out that it's not a straight line by a lot.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you so much.

Okay. Any other questions or comments from Board members?

All right.

VICE CHAIR BERG: We did have one person pop up online if you want. Not -- public comment, if you want to do it.

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: You want to take the hand?

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes. However, Board Member

Kracov just raised his hand so let's do that and then

we'll take the comment.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

I'm sorry I'm off video here just to end the day. But,
you know, my head is spinning from the amount of work and
the vision for the agency and all the things that we have
ahead of us. I mean, what an incredible presentation of
work, you know, in furtherance of our mission. I thought
we had a big year last year with ACC II, and Scoping Plan,
and the funding plan, and the all other things that we did
back to back there in the second half, but the work just
continues.

So I want to thank you, Dr. Cliff, and staff.

And I think anybody listening to this is going to be inspired and committed to the work that we have ahead. So thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you.

All right. So we will hear our public comment. The Clerk can call the comment and then I think that's...

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Okay. So it looks like we have a phone number ending in 373. You should be able to unmute and begin.

HARVEY EDER: Hello. Am I being heard?

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Yes.

HARVEY EDER: Hello. Okay. Is this on public comments or is it public comments on what was just being

discussed?

1.3

2.2

CHAIR RANDOLPH: This is public comment on what was just being discussed.

HARVEY EDER: Okay. Well, my name is Harvey

Eder. And I'm speaking for myself and for the Public

Solar Power Coalition that's been around fore more than 40 years.

Plan for South Coast, you know, working with Dr. Burke and -- a hundred exhibits from the SunShot Program from the Department of Energy. It was made after the Moonshot back in the sixties. And, you know, that was just trashed. No due diligence. Nothing was -- we put it -- we put in eight reports from March of '16. The draft plan for South Coast came out in late June, actually early July.

In August, we addressed that and they said there'd been an Adrian -- Aaron Katzenstein wrote the section. He's head of research for us now. All right. So he said there'd been a 30 percent increase in methane, okay? We used those numbers. We had an article from National Geographic on the cover. The arctic is melting, all right. This is all put in there. We (inaudible) the shift to EPA and they wanted to give it back to us. This guy Ombarski[phonetic], he wouldn't send us a copy. This

is pretty outrageous, okay?

2.2

So we -- the 26th -- the 12th of August we wrote on that and we said that actually you didn't -- looking at CO2 equivalence and was coming out of methane that they had a 10 time increase in 10 years of nitrous oxide.

That's 30 times global warming potential. And there's the methane and everything else coming out.

Okay. We had 780 and plus or minus maybe 40, 50, but that's what it was, you know, eight years ago, all right? And that could have been very low. Now, you're not using CO2 equivalent. Nobody is. We're talking about -- this is in the open. We've got to deal with it. We've got to be in the real. And our plans and what we're addressing is not just from '16 that's -- that should be going on now that we've got to redo and then we need them for the new plans, the Scoping Plans, going into the future. But the 617 plans, they're all -- the local plans for growth, generally plans are all subsidiaries --

BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thirty seconds remaining.

HARVEY EDER: -- to the plan. The controlling plan is the Solar New Deal, based on the SunShot from Department of Energy. And we've controlled market. IAE says the 290 given watts that were putting, 85 percent solar and wind, but 60 percent of that two years ago was owned by fossil fuel companies. We've got to stop it

internationally. We've got to stop it right here in River City right now. Enough is enough. How much time do I have? BOARD CLERK ESTABROOK: Thank you. CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you. All right. With that, the January 26th Board meeting is now adjourned. The Board will reconvene tomorrow, Friday, January 27th at 8:30 a.m. for the remaining agenda item for this month. Thank you all for your participation. (Thereupon the Air Resources Board meeting adjourned at 2:34 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 3rd day of February, 2023.

fames & atte

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 10063