MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
AIR RESOURCES BOARD

ZOOM PLATFORM

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

BYRON SHER AUDITORIUM

1001 I STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2023 9:01 A.M.

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

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS:

Liane Randolph, Chair

John Balmes, MD

Hector De La Torre

John Eisenhut

Senator Dean Florez

Eric Guerra

Davina Hurt

Gideon Kracov

Cliff Rechtschaffen

Tania Pacheco-Werner, PhD

Susan Shaheen, PhD

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 & Mobile Source Compliance

Edna Murphy, Deputy Executive Officer, Internal Operations

Rajinder Sahota, Deputy Executive Officer, Climate Change and Research

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF:

Sydney Vergis, PhD, Deputy Executive Officer, Mobile Sources & Incentives

Ellen Peter, Chief Counsel

Peter Christensen, Branch Chief, Innovate Strategies Branch, Mobile Source Control Division (MSCD)

Jason Crow, Manager, Off-Road Agricultural Strategies and Incentives Section, Mobile Source Control Division, MSCD

Shirley R. Edwards, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

Jack Kitowski, Division Chief, MSCD

Lisa Macumber, Branch Chief, Equitable Mobility Incentives Branch, MSCD

Lucina Negrete, Assistant Division Chief, MSCD

Stephanie Parent, Air Pollution Specialist, Alternative Strategies Section, MSCD

Annmarie Rodgers, Branch Chief, Compliance Assistance and Outreach Branch, MSCD

ALSO PRESENT:

Daniel Barad, Union of Concerned Scientists

Manijeh Berenji, MD

Cameron Demetre, First Student, National Express

Evan Edgar, California Compost Coalition

Sean Edgar, Cleanfleets.net

Obed Franco, California Electric Transportation Coalition

Jay Friedland, Zero Motorcycles

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

ALSO PRESENT:

Stacie Fujii, Aptera Motors

Emily Gartenberg, Jobs to Move America

Maya Inigo-Anderson, Communities for a Better Environment

Jennifer Krill, Earthworks

Bill Magavern, Coalition for Clean Air

Kevin Maggay, Navistar

Tim Manzano, Tom's Truck Center

Lisa McGhee, Tom's Truck Center

Laurel Moorhead, Transfer Flow

Jared Naimark, Earthworks

Roman Partida-Lopez, Greenlining Institute

Bret Prebula, Casual Carpool

Hannon Rasool, California Energy Commission

Angela Richards, Monarch Tractor

Erika Romero, California Vanpool Authority

Mariela Ruacho, American Lung Association

Sasan Saadat, Earthjustice

Matt Schrap, Harbor Trucking Association

The Originaldra

Gia Vacin, Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development

Frank Wheeler, Municipal Maintenance Equipment

James Wheeler, Municipal Maintenance Equipment

APPEARANCES CONTINUED ALSO PRESENT: Tim Wheeler, Municipal Maintenance Equipment Charles Williams, Lightning eMotors

Call to Order 1 Roll Call 1 Opening Remarks 2 Item 23-10-17 Chair Randolph 9 Executive Officer Cliff Staff Presentation 10 Hannon Rasool 28 Gia Vacin 29 James Wheeler 32 Tim Wheeler 34 36 Frank Wheeler Angela Richards 37 39 Obed Franco 40 Matt Schrap 42 Evan Edgar Bill Magavern 44 Charles Williams 45 Cameron Demetre 46 Erika Romero 47 Mariela Ruacho 48 50 Daniel Barad 51 The Originaldra Jennifer Krill 53

INDEX

PAGE

55

57

59

Jay Friedland

Kevin Maggay

INDEX CONTINUED PAGE Public Comment Dr. Manijeh Berenji 111 Lisa McGȟee 113 The Originaldra 114 Sean Edgar 116 Closed Session 118 119 Adjournment Reporter's Certificate 120

1

PROCEEDINGS 1 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Good morning. The 2 November 16th, 2023 public meeting of the California Air 3 Resources Board will come to order. Board Clerk, will you please call the roll. 5 BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you. 6 Dr. Balmes? 7 8 Mr. De La Torre? Mr. Eisenhut? 9 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here. 10 BOARD CLERK MOORE: Senator Florez? 11 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here. 12 BOARD CLERK MOORE: Assemblymember Garcia? 13 Mr. Guerra? 14 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Here. 15 16 BOARD CLERK MOORE: Ms. Hurt? BOARD MEMBER HURT: Present. 17 BOARD CLERK MOORE: Mr. Kracov? 18 BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Here. 19 20 BOARD CLERK MOORE: Mr. Rechtschaffen? BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Here. 21 BOARD CLERK MOORE: Dr. Pacheco-Werner? 22 23 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Here. BOARD CLERK MOORE: Mr. Perez? 24 25 Senator Stern?

Dr. Shaheen?

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Here.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Ms. Takvorian?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Supervisor Vargas?

Chair Randolph?

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Here.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Madam Chair, we have a quorum.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. I'm sorry I'm unable to be there today, but I will be participating remotely and Board Member Kracov will assist in the Board room as needed.

So I'm going to start with covering a few housekeeping items before we get started per usual. We are conducting today's meeting in person as well as offering remote options for public participation both by phone and in Zoom.

Anyone who wishes to testify in person should fill out a request to speak card available in the foyer outside the Board room. 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 a moment.

2.2

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

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

Interpretation services will be provided today in Spanish for both in-person and Zoom attendees. 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 speak to a Board assistant and they will provide you with further instructions. I want to remind all of our commenters to speak slowly and pause intermittently to

allow the interpreters the opportunity to accurately interpret your comments.

2.2

THE INTERPRETER: Good morning. We will now provide those instructions for language access in Spanish as well.

(Interpreter translated in Spanish).

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

CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. I will now ask the Board Clerk to provide more details regarding public participation.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you, Chair Randolph.

Good morning, everyone. I will be providing additional information on how public participation will be organized for today's meeting.

We will be calling on in-person commenters first who have turned in a request-to-speak card and then we'll -- we will be calling on 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 item -- or the one Board item or during the open comment period at today's meeting, you must be using Zoom webinar or calling in by telephone. If you are currently watching the webcast on CAL-SPAN, but you wish to comment remotely, please register for the Zoom webinar or call in.

Information for both can be found on the public agenda for today's meeting.

1.3

2.2

To make a verbal comment, we will be using the raise-hand feature in Zoom. If you wish to speak on a Board item, please virtually raise your hand as soon as the item has begun 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 on the telephone, dial star nine to raise your hand. Even if you previously indicated which item you wished to speak on when you registered, you must raise your hand at the beginning of the item, so that you can be added to the queue.

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

When the comment period starts, the order of commenters will be determined by who raises their hand first. We will call each commenter by name and will activate each commenter's audio when it is their turn to speak. For those calling in, we will identify you by the last three digits of your phone number. We will not show

a list of remote commenters, however, we will be announcing the next three or so commenters in the queue, so you are ready to testify and know who is coming next. Please note, you will not appear by video during your testimony. I would also like to remind everyone to please state their name for the record before you speak. This is especially important for those calling in by phone to testify on an item.

1.3

2.2

We will have a time limit for each commenter and we'll begin the comment period with a two-minute time limit, although this could change at the Chair's discretion. During public testimony, you will see a timer on the screen. For those calling in by phone, we will run the timer and let you know when you have 30 seconds left and when your time is up. If you require Spanish interpretation for your comment, your time will be doubled.

If you wish to submit written comments today, please visit CARB's send-us-your-comments page to look at the public agenda on our website -- or look at the public agenda. Written comments will be accepted on each item until the Chair closes the record for that Board item.

If you experience any technical difficulties, please call (805)772-2715, so that an IT person can help you.

Thank you. I'll turn the Chair -- I'll turn the microphone back to the Chair.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. As we begin today's agenda item, I want to take a moment to acknowledge that this Board hearing marks the 25th anniversary of our incentive programs. Twenty-five years ago on November 19th, 1998, the Board approved the Carl Moyer Program, which was the first incentive program focused on turning over our legacy fleet to the cleanest technologies. This program was foundational in allowing CARB to continue to receive billions of dollars in funding for several incentive programs that followed. Today, this Board will hear item number 23-10-1, the proposed fiscal year 2023-24 funding plan for clean transportation incentives - another critical incentive program aimed at supporting zero-emission technologies and investing in disadvantaged communities.

As the clerk noted, if you 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 Clean Transportation Incentives Funding Plan is an important part of CARB's broad portfolio of incentives that complement our planning and regulatory

programs to reduce emissions and increase access to clean transportation.

2.2

This year's investments represent a substantial contribution toward equitable deployment of ZEVs and build on the first two funding cycles of the multi-year ZEV package, which commits just over \$10 billion through fiscal year 2026-27.

The plan also builds on the investments the State has made over the past decade to support wide-scale deployment of ZEVs to meet targets set in Governor Newsom's Executive Order. Expanding access to zero-emission vehicles and zero-emission mobility for priority populations is a key objective of CARB's work, both through the ZEV Equity Task Force and through this funding plan. With zero-emission technologies now widely available, this is an opportune time for California to double down on this objective. Building on last year's investments, staff proposes to commit at least 60 percent of low carbon transportation investments to benefit priority populations, significantly higher than the 35 percent minimum that was set by the Legislature.

I am also pleased to see significant funding going to transportation equity projects that partner with communities to help provide a broader range of transportation choices, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and

help people get around without relying on personal cars.

1.3

2.2

We understand we need system-level change and this plan reinforces the positive direction our transportation agencies are setting toward walkable, bikeable, and transit-rich communities.

Dr. Cliff, will you please introduce the item.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Chair

Randolph.

As we mark the 25th anniversary of the Carl Moyer Program, as a foundational incentive program, it is important to point out that incentive programs are a critical part of CARB's comprehensive strategy to support the acceleration of the introduction of the cleanest technologies into California complementing our regulatory programs.

Those incentives are crucial to support the acceleration of transportation-sector options that help to achieve zero tailpipe emissions with the lowest possible carbon energy sources. This year, the funding plan includes almost \$624 million in incentives that help this effort.

These investments are designed to scale the ZEV market towards sustainability in the key vehicle segments ready for significant ramp-up in commercial deployment. They continue to expand the focus on equity by increasing

access to ZEVs for priority populations and providing emission reductions in the communities most impacted by air pollution. They also provide critical support for communities to redesign and strengthen transportation planning to give people more and better choices beyond just private cars.

Those investments continue to build on commitments from the previous budget cycles while taking steps to shift from broad purchase incentives to more targeted strategies that support lower income consumers and small fleets facing the greatest challenges. We expect this shift to accelerate in the coming years.

We have coordinated closely with the California Energy Commission, California State Transportation Agency, and the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development on the development of this plan. And I want to thank Hannon Rasool of the Energy Commission and Gia Vacin of the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development for joining us today to support the proposed funding plan.

I will now ask Stephanie Parent of the Mobile Source Control Division to begin the staff presentation.

Stephanie

2.2

(Thereupon a slide presentation).

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: Thank you,

Dr. Cliff. Good morning, Chair Randolph and members of the Board.

1.3

2.2

Today, I'll present the proposed fiscal year 2023-24 funding plan for clean transportation incentives, also known as the funding plan, for the Board's consideration.

After some short background information, we'll review staff's recommendations for the funding plan.

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: For a quarter of a century, CARB has established a variety of incentive programs and achieved several major milestones in their development. The first program was the Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program, also known as the Carl Moyer Program, which was launched in 1998 to provide grant funding for cleaner-than-required engines, equipment, and other sources of air pollution. This year marks the 25th anniversary of the program and we are looking forward to a year of celebration.

I'll now focus on the remaining highlighted programs shown on this slide that are related to this year's proposed funding plan.

In 2008, with the passage of Assembly Bill 118, CARB established the Air Quality Improvement Program, also known as AQIP. AQIP aims to reduce smog, diesel

particulate pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions. This year, funding for AQIP was extended to 2035 by Assembly Bill 126. The reauthorization changed the original broad scope of eligible projects by recasting the program to focus on zero-emission heavy-duty projects with a priority for extreme nonattainment areas.

2.2

In 2013, the Legislature appropriated Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funds to CARB creating the Low Carbon Transportation Incentive Program. These investments support the continued reductions of emissions from freight and passenger transportation with an emphasis on supporting priority populations.

Most recently in 2021, the Governor proposed a multi-year \$10 billion investment to reduce transportation emissions through zero-emission technology deployment.

Using the Governor's proposal as the framework, the ZEV package consists of appropriations set by the Legislature each year. The ZEV package aims to equitably develop the ZEV market across all transportation sectors in support of the Governor's Executive Order N-79-20 and the legislatively directed goal of carbon neutrality by 2045.

Partner agencies, such as the California Energy
Commission, the California State Transportation Agency,
and the Governor's Office of Business and Economic
Development also received ZEV package funding for charging

and fueling infrastructure for both light- and heavy-duty ZEVs as well as for consumer education.

2.2

The programs I'll cover today are part of a broader portfolio of funding that CARB administers to improve air quality, enhance community air protection, and reduce greenhouse gases -- I apologize, greenhouse gas emissions. These programs and projects could not be administered without the complementary funding and support from our collaborative partners including federal, State and local agencies, non-governmental and community-based organizations, and community member partners.

Next, I'll discuss intentional benefits of CARB's incentives to priority populations.

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: This year, we are targeting between 60 to 70 percent of funds benefiting priority populations. And for the decade overall, 63 percent of the funds have benefited these populations. Early on, many of the projects funded under the Low Carbon Transportation Program supported seeding and growing the ZEV market across the light-duty, heavy-duty, and off-road sectors.

Our efforts to support priority populations have increased over the past decade as incentive program funding has evolved. We continue to improve upon these

efforts by shifting to a needs-based model and thinking through implementation of our programs to ensure equitable access to funding. We also collaborate with communities and interested parties annually to better serve communities.

1.3

2.2

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: Now, I'll present the proposed fiscal year 2023-24 funding plan for clean transportation incentives.

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: Beginning in April of this year, staff held a robust public process to develop the proposed funding plan. The process included two public workshops to develop the proposed funding plan. Second, responding to community feedback, staff combined work group topics where possible, which resulted in only five workgroup meetings this year. Staff created an online community survey that was available to community members to fill out. We held numerous one-on-one discussions with collaborative partners, including community advocates. And this year, we introduced five evening community meetings to provide an accessible alternative for community members who engage with staff if they could not attend daytime workshops or work groups.

Now, I'll move on to highlights of the proposed funding plan.

1.3

2.2

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: The proposal we're presenting today addresses both short- and long-term needs by focusing limited State dollars in ways that drive ZEV technology development and deployment, supports and complements CARB's regulatory efforts, and looks at the transportation system as a whole and incorporates new technologies and systems in an integrated package. These are complemented by dedicated funds for outreach and engagement and we will continue to strengthen our community outreach and capacity-building efforts in the coming years.

The proposal also supports the ZEV Equity Task

Force, which the Board established earlier this year

through the Advanced Clean Cars II regulations. The task

force brings together equity advocates, automakers, State

government, and other organizations to foster partnerships

for on-the-ground projects, policies, or programs with the

goal of expanding ZEV access. Staff collaborate with and

incorporate some of the task force's recommendations, such

as expanding ZEV investments in disadvantaged and

low-income communities by proposing to offer lower income

Californians incentives for zero-emission motorcycles and

adaptive equipment for eligible consumers who have disabilities.

2.2

Additionally, the proposal expands accessibility and increases affordability and introduces many new policies and efforts to further center incentives on communities that need them the most, including priority populations, and small fleets and owner/operators. The proposal also includes contingency measures and Executive Officer discretion. In the event of unforeseen circumstances, the Executive Officer would have the discretion to modify project allocations.

Before I address the suite of projects informed by these efforts, let's review the State budget that supports them.

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: The 2023
State budget complements and builds upon the past two
budget cycles to support the acceleration of ZEV
deployments, improve air quality, and support an equitable
transition to a cleaner more sustainable future. As I
noted earlier, these appropriations are part of the
Governor's proposed ZEV package that would culminate in
\$10.1 billion of investment by 2027.

Today's presentation will cover the approximately \$624 million in funding as listed on this slide. In

addition to the money covered in this year's funding plan, the Governor's ZEV package proposes an additional \$1.5 billion over the next three years subject to future appropriation.

2.2

About half of this money is for school buses.

This funding will allow CARB to expand upon our key efforts in future funding plans and continue to focus funding in the areas of -- areas of the state that need them the most. And as you'll see in the coming slides, many changes are proposed to help underscore how important an equity focus for these projects has become.

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: And now, for our clean transportation and light-duty equity investments.

The overarching goals for these investments include to: ensure California's light-duty vehicles continue to reduce emissions of air pollutants that harm public health and welfare; support the Advanced Clean Cars II Regulation and the ZEV Equity Task Force; provide zero-emission and clean mobility options tailored to priority population needs; and expand transportation choices and reduce vehicle miles traveled.

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: Before we

cover staff's recommendations, we'll talk about the Clean Vehicle Rebate Project, or CVRP, which, as you may know, recently closed and the project administrator, the Center for Sustainable Energy, or CSE, is reviewing the final applications received.

1.3

2.2

CVRP has been a huge success story. When the project began in 2010, there were only about five plug-in electric vehicle models available for sale. In 2022, that figure grew to over 100 models. And CVRP has served as a framework for other states that have since adopted similar incentive programs. Since the project began, it has provided rebates for the purchase or lease of new ZEVs. To date, \$1.6 billion have been invested with approximately 40 percent of funds benefiting priority populations. In addition, about 533,000 ZEVs have been funded.

CVRP achieved its goal of accelerating the deployment of ZEVs in California and provided highly useful ZEV market information to stakeholders in California and beyond. This project has deployed over 1.6 million ZEVs in California, leading to a market share of just over 25 percent.

As staff wrap-up CVRP, CARB will transition to focus investments on lower income consumers through the Clean Cars 4 All and Financing Assistance projects.

Lastly, this project has supported key CARB regulations, such as the Advanced Clean Cars regulations.

2.2

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: Now, I'll highlight some key areas where CARB's sustainable community-based transportation equity projects have been successful in supporting healthy communities, clean air goals, and growing the green economy in California.

For the consumer purchase incentive category, staff propose to allocate the \$80 million appropriated by the Legislature among the five projects shown on the slide. Clean Cars 4 All will receive \$28 million to support existing air district programs and the soon-to-be launched statewide project. Consistent with the precedent that the Board set last year, the district programs collectively and the statewide project will each receive \$14 million.

Next, staff recommends allocating \$28 million to financing assistance, \$18 million to the California E-Bike Project, \$5 million for Access Clean California, and \$1 million to the California Integrated Travel Project, which CARB partners on with the California State Transportation Agency.

This funding proposal continues to support the State's commitment to providing clean accessible

transportation options in an equitable manner. In addition, staff's proposal also includes funding to support clean mobility investments to promote more sustainable transportation systems in the most impacted communities.

1.3

2.2

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: For the current fiscal year, staff proposes to allocate the \$60 million appropriation to CARB's sustainable transportation and mobility equity projects as follows:

Fifty million dollars will be divided evenly among the equity mobility projects which would allocate over \$16 million for the Clean Mobility Options Voucher Pilot Project, also known as CMO, the Sustainable Transportation Equity Project, also known as STEP, and the Clean Mobility In Schools Project; and \$10 million for planning and capacity building projects.

This funding proposal helps to expand zero-emission and clean mobility options that are tailored to the needs of priority populations while expanding transportation choices and reducing vehicle miles traveled.

And lastly, staff are also recommending a few changes across all of the consumer purchase incentive and sustainable community-based transportation equity

projects, which I'll discuss next.

--000--

2.2

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: This slide highlights some key recommendations across our light-duty equity and clean mobility projects.

As required by the Legislature in the Budget Act of 2022, Clean Cars 4 All and Financing Assistance staff recommend that funding be provided for adaptive equipment to reduce barriers for drivers with disabilities. As requested by community members, staff recommend considering eligibility for zero-emission motorcycles, which also provide a low-cost option for consumers.

To continue to streamline the sustainable community-based transportation equity projects, staff recommends issuing a solicitation to select a single statewide mobility project administrator to oversee the administration of projects and provide technical assistance and support to grantees funded through CMO, STEP, and Clean Mobility in Schools.

Earlier this year, CARB released a joint request for project applications for planning and capacity building, Clean Mobility in Schools, and STEP. Projects selected through this process will be overseen by the new administrator. Further, staff began making process improvements for these projects, including streamlining

project requirements and incorporating project types as closely as possible, while ensuring the unique goals of the projects continue to be prioritized.

1.3

2.2

The solicitation to select a statewide mobility project administrator aims to help communities address the various needs they have in a more simplified fashion.

Now, I'd like to tell you about the heavy-duty investments.

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: Overall, our heavy-duty and off-road equipment investments strive to: continue and expand support for small fleets and disadvantaged communities; expand support for financial assistance and non-financial incentives for zero-emission heavy-duty vehicles and off-road equipment; ensure heavy-duty on- and off-road equipment substantially reduce and ultimately emit no harmful air pollutants; and, continue to support multiple regulatory efforts.

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: This year, CARB's appropriation from the Legislature covers over \$483 million for heavy-duty and off-road equipment investments. Appropriations that have been allocated by the Legislature to specific projects include: \$80 million to support zero-emission drayage trucks through the Clean Truck and

Bus Voucher Project, or HVIP. Funding from previous appropriations remains available for standard HVIP vouchers and set-asides for other vocations and vehicle types. And \$375 million to fund the replacement of old combustion school buses with zero-emission buses.

1.3

2.2

This represents the first portion of the \$1.125 billion that was initially approved last year. CARB retains discretion for Air Quality Improvement Program funding allocations. And as developed through the public process this year, staff recommends splitting the available \$28.6 million equally between the Innovative Small e-Fleets Pilot, or ISEF, and the Clean Off-Road Equipment Voucher Project, or CORE, with \$14.3 million each.

Staff are also recommending some changes across the heavy-duty and equipment projects, which I'll discuss next.

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: CARB's proposed allocations for HVIP, ISEF, and CORE continue to build on previous allocations, and changes for this year will focus on: prioritizing funding for and enhancing the focus on small fleets and priority populations; modifying equipment eligibility to also include buses that transport people commonly used by small businesses, such as day

cares, and retirement homes; evaluating and updating the voucher pricing and equipment eligibility processes, particularly for CORE, to maximize the limited funding available to help more applicants; and, consistent with direction in this year's budget and to help support fleets, staff are delaying implementation of the fleet size limits to provide additional opportunities in this early market.

1.3

2.2

The proposal also plays a key role in supporting the successful implementation of CARB's heavy-duty vehicle and equipment regulations. For example, our incentives help manufacturers generate credits toward meeting the Advanced Clean Trucks Rule. Incentives provide early or extra emission reductions for fleets subject to the Advanced Clean Fleets Rule. And our incentive funds support zero-emission transit options helping California transit agencies to meet the Innovative Clean Transit Regulation.

Additionally, equipment funded through programs like CORE and demonstration and pilot projects support off-road regulations, such as commercial harbor craft and locomotive regulations.

Before I move on to our conclusion and recommendations, I'd like to acknowledge some recent comments we've received from the Legislature and the

public.

1.3

2.2

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: First, I'd like to acknowledge that CARB received recommendations from some members of the Legislature stemming from a 2023 Union of Concerned Scientists and Greenlining Institute study on emissions from pre-2004 vehicles. The study suggests limiting Clean Cars 4 All to pre-2004 model year vehicles among other targeted approaches. Staff is not recommending to make this change today, because Clean Cars 4 All requires project administrators to target high-emitting vehicles. Since January 2021, approximately 70 percent of vehicles retired through the project are pre-2004 vehicles.

CARB is also using a needs-based approach for applications, offering and encouraging alternative mobility options, and adjusting incentive amounts based on changing ZEV market conditions, which align with the other recommendations, included in the study and letter. We will continue to collaborate with our various partners to ensure our projects continue to evolve to meet the needs of communities and the State.

Next, we want to thank the Board for last year's decision to nearly equally split the \$245 million allocation between the statewide CC4A project and district

programs and we used that as the precedent for today's proposal. Currently, all air district programs and the statewide project are fully funded through 2024. In the event of unforeseen circumstances, we are asking the Board to approve the funding plan with the contingency measures that give the Executive Officer discretion to modify allocations, if necessary. Additionally, we have updated the Board resolution and added explicit direction in it that clarifies that funding from the statewide Clean Cars 4 All project may be shifted to a district program if they run out of funding.

2.2

On a different topic, to ensure fleets based in Mexico, but operating in California, have access to HVIP incentives, staff coordinated with the California Secretary of State's office. Cross-border fleets are eligible for HVIP, if they meet all program requirements, including registration with the Secretary of State, and the Department of Motor Vehicles, at least 50 percent of operating mileage in California, and that they were purchased from a participating truck dealer in California.

Lastly, to support high-road or high-quality jobs, CARB requires that participating fleets comply with California labor standards as directed by Assembly Bill 794. We will continue to collaborate with our partners for additional ways we can support quality jobs, including

potential options to encourage manufacturers to demonstrate support for high-road jobs.

2.2

--000--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PARENT: That concludes staff's detailed proposals. I'll now wrap up the presentation with staff's recommendations.

The proposed funding plan continues to support the State's air quality, climate, and equity goals.

Through the transportation incentive programs and projects, the State has invested billions of dollars in transformative change in the mobile sector, and much of that funding has gone or will go to priority populations.

The plan also complements and supports CARB's regulatory programs.

Therefore, staff recommends that the Board approve the proposed fiscal year 2023-24 funding plan for clean transportation incentives. Specifically, the Board would approve staff's recommended funding allocations that were not provided by the Legislature as well as the recommended project changes. Thank you for your attention today.

Now, I'd like to introduce Hannon Rasool from the California Energy Commission and Gia Vacin from the Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development to share a few remarks.

HANNON RASOOL: Good morning. My name is Hannon Rasool and I'm the Director of the Fuels and Transportation Division at the California Energy Commission.

1.3

2.2

I would like to express my support for CARB's fiscal year 23-24 funding plan for clean transportation incentives. And I want to congratulate CARB staff for another thoughtful and equity-focused investment plan. Also, I'm very appreciative of all the collaboration between the Energy Commission and Air Resources Board. The collaboration between multiple agencies, including the Energy Commission, CARB, Public Utility Commission, GO-Biz, CTC, CalTrans, and many others is really one of California's strengths.

There is a lot of work occurring right now on funding vehicles and deploying supporting infrastructure to target apartments and condos, rural communities, trucks and buses, and goods movement. We're putting State and federal funding to work to build out infrastructure including the recent release of the federally funded NEVI program.

The State has been very thoughtful in setting important regulations to improve public health for all Californians and it's backed up with vehicle and infrastructure investments. One example of our extensive

collaboration is our effort for medium-duty and heavy-duty vehicles. CARB's HVIP Program provides important vehicle incentives supporting equity in small businesses. And the Energy Commission's EnergIIZE program works with that to provide zero-emission truck and bus infrastructure with 60 percent of our installations going into disadvantaged and low-income communities.

These programs have been very successful and we're seeing several sites becoming energized and operational throughout the state. That is why California has over 25 percent of new passenger vehicle sales as zero emission and for trucks it was over seven percent in 2022. We're making steady progress towards our zero-emission goals and CARB's investment plan will continue to be a key part of that.

With that, thank you for allowing me to share a few thoughts this morning and I look forward to our continued collaboration.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

GIA VACIN: Great. Good morning. Thank you so much for having me this morning. I'm Gia Vacin. I'm the Deputy Director for Zero-Emission Vehicle Market

Development at GO-Biz. So good morning, Chair Randolph and members of the Board. I'm here to offer my support for the approval of the 2023-24 funding plan for clean

transportation incentives.

2.2

It probably goes without saying, but I'll say it anyway, that CARB's investments and the associated efforts on implementation are a major contributor in advancing our zero-emission vehicle goals, and particularly when they are intentionally focused within the context of this -- of the broader investment system and also considering where the ZEV market is today as the funding plan does.

Deepening direct positive impacts in priority populations is essential and it's great to see the continued focus on equity as well. Also focusing on funding for heavy-duty trucks and buses makes good sense, particularly where we can make big immediate impacts, like with drayage trucks and school buses in our most polluted areas. Supporting small businesses and creating better mobility options for communities as well as workforce development is also key for a more equitable and inclusive energy transition.

So I want to acknowledge the efforts for the continued partnership between CARB and CEC as well to better align, and synchronize the support for vehicle and infrastructure rollout. This is super important. And I also want to express my appreciation like Hannon for the broader cross-agency collaboration that's -- that just continues to grow over the years.

So it's this system thinking how we can leverage our different strengths that will enable us to meet our zero-emission vehicle and clean mobility targets. And this takes time and effort. We all realize this, but I also think that we know and recognize how meaningful it is.

1.3

2.2

So I just want to -- one more item here. I want to -- the last time we were here that this -- around this same time last year, we were deep in the throes of getting organized to respond to the federal Clean Hydrogen Hubs opportunity. And as you know, the Alliance for Renewable Clean Hydrogen Energy Systems, or ARCHES, was awarded a California hub. Yay. So this is a really big deal. And in the spirit of that kind of systems thinking, we're looking forward to working with CARB and the other agencies to really help enable the ARCHES Program and determine how we can best integrate into that system.

And then related, GO-Biz is also kicking off the development of a hydrogen market development strategy as directed by Governor Newsom. And I just really appreciate the time and contributions that CARB has already made. So, you know, moving the clean transportation market forward is complicated. It has many elements that need to be stood up and supported simultaneously. And doing this is really hard. So thank you to the members of the Board

and the CARB staff for all of your work in balancing these many priorities. Congratulations on a great plan. And I look forward to our continued work together.

CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

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 a raised hand in Zoom.

Board clerks, will you please call the commenters.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you, Chair Randolph. As you mention earlier, I will call in-person commenters first and then we will hear from those who have raised their hands for Zoom. We have 10 commenters who have turned in a request to speak card and wish to speak in person at this time.

We will be showing a list of the next several commenters on the screen, so you can be prepared to come to the podium. The public sign-up closure will be at 10:18. I apologize in advance if I mispronounce your name.

Our first commenter is James Wheeler followed by Tim Wheeler, Frank Wheeler, Andrea Richards, and Obed Franco.

James Wheeler.

JAMES WHEELER: Thank you. Good morning. And

while we're here to speak on a different subject, I do appreciate the work done on the incentives to get us to clean emissions. It is a very important goal. I'm here for Municipal Maintenance Equipment. We're a dealership that supports public fleets and critical infrastructure and emergency equipment. I'm going to bring to your attention a major issue that's progressing rapidly with no resolution. ECF regulated fleets are facing a critical shortage of truck emergency infrastructure vehicles. Examples include street sweepers, sewer cleaning equipment, garbage and refuse trucks, asphalt maintenance and repair, vehicles like that. These trucks are typically in a five to ten year replacement cycle, because uptime is critical. And aged equipment that breaks down and reduces the maintenance interval and creates more problems maintaining infrastructure and also increasing the (inaudible) infrastructure.

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

These vehicles cannot (inaudible) with (inaudible) The clean truck partnership that was negotiated, which allows the OEMs to (inaudible) and allocate credits, those, I think, excellent in intent. Unfortunately, I think a lot of the credits right now are being generated by (inaudible) and Ford and held by the truck manufacturers (inaudible) heavy truck manufacturers are not interested in purchasing more credits nor are they

transparent in how they're allocating credits. It's creating a major issue in this category.

2.2

Right now, effectively, there's no guarantee that in view of it selling zero-emission vehicles will receive credits for ICEs, which are necessary in these critical emergency pieces of equipment at this point because ZEVs are not available yet.

So right now if a dealer doesn't sell enough ZEVs, they can't sell the ICEs that trickle down. We cannot supply our customer these critical pieces. Our customer sin direct fractures. Our customers include Caltrans --

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

Next commenter is Tim Wheeler.

TIME WHEELER: Good morning. My name is Tim Wheeler also representing Municipal Maintenance Equipment. No coincidence here from my bother. We were raised, you know, if you're going to come with issues, you better come with solutions. So, in that spirit, I'm here to address some of the issues he brought up as well as the solutions we think could be viable. Because you know ACF fleets as of -- because of the impending Omnibus Regulation, they'll be subject to EV requirements proposed by your Board, which are necessary, but also stringent and difficult.

First, and we think potentially the most viable solution would be a carve-out to the omnibus regulation that would carve out emergency infrastructure equipment in critical fleets. We believe that a period of potentially two years would allow electric vehicle technology to catch up and potentially allow the ACT adoption and execution to smooth out to an extent where it was viable for the public.

A second solution would potentially be allowing body builders and upfitters access to the credit bank provided through your guys's programs. And this potentially would be a carbon neutral option at this points. Credits only available to OEMs we understand or we expect won't be purchased and that would -- from the lens won't be available for upfitters and body builders in building critical infrastructure vehicles like street sweepers, refuse trucks et cetera.

A third option we believe is if ACT itself would be amended to exempt critical infrastructure fleets from the ZEV ratios allowing them to tap into existing supplies of ICE-compliant engines, but without having to be subject to the ratios necessary by ACT. So we're in it to be a partner in this. We believe in your guys's work. We just want to find a resolution for critical fleets.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Frank Wheeler.

2.2

FRANK WHEELER: Thank you, Board and Chair. I want to, first of all, say I appreciate all the work you've done and your staff has done trying to provide a transition from diesel the current situation we have. The ACF and the ACTs have done that with some minor needs of adjustment.

I believe that dealerships like ours, which is a local California business founded in 1992. Both my sons have taken over the business. I still work in it. My wife still works in it. We have 48 employees, 48 families that are supported in this business through four different locations throughout the state of California. We support Caltrans, city, county, special districts.

Our equipment is put on by body builders outside the state of California. They don't have access to the credits. Those credits are issued by the OEMs. The OEMs have decided that they're going to determine where those credits go. And therefore, of 200 vehicles we have on order right now of various types, we've been told by our body builders we're going to be able to deliver 30 trucks next year. We can't deliver 30 trucks in support of 48 families. So as a company that I started 32 years ago with my wife just the two of us, now supporting 48

families, we will be forced to layoff. We'll be forced to close facilities.

We are a critical infrastructure company and we were designated during COVID as an essential equipment supplier and supporter, because our customers need to have our service parts and our support in order to provide those emergency vehicles. But the solutions that were provided earlier by one of my sons I think would be an opportunity for us to stay in business.

Thank you.

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Andrea[SIC] Richards.

ANGELA RICHARDS: Thank you Chair and Board members for the opportunity to comment today. My name is Angela Richards representing Monarch Tractor, which is an innovative electric tractor company based right here in Livermore, California. We're dedicated to driving a transition to an economically and environmentally sustainable agricultural sector. Our commitment aligns with CARB's vision for a zero-emission transportation future.

Monarch has developed a groundbreaking solution, a fully electric driver-optional smart tractor. This technology combines electrification, automation, and data analysis to empower farmers in reducing their carbon

footprint enhancing field safety and streamlining operations. Our farmer-first approach ensures that every decision is made with the challenges of the farming community in mind. Farms often operate with razor-thin margins, which can sometimes make the higher capital costs for electric tractors and the perceived risk associated with new and unknown technologies like this challenging barriers to overcome.

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

Despite lower operating costs and long-term savings, the CORE program in California has been critical to overcoming these barriers and accelerating adoption of zero-emission equipment in the agricultural sector. The CORE program has been undeniably successful and oversubscribed each year that agriculture has been a This highlights the importance of supporting category. emerging technologies in off-road applications. However, the funding has been reduced for the CORE program this year, which jeopardizes some of this -- some of the accelerated adoption that we've been seeing. And we've seen that agriculture vouchers in the CORE program go mostly towards priority populations. This year, our vouchers have gone more than half to disadvantaged communities and nearly 90 percent more to small business purchasers.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment

today.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Obed Franco.

OBED FRANCO: Good morning. My name is Obed Franco and I'm here representing the California Electric Transportation Coalition, or CalETC. CalETC supports the draft funding plan and CARB shift the focus light incentives on equity and low-income communities to ensure that all Californians are able to participate in and enjoy the benefits of zero-emission vehicles.

We also support Cal-ITP and CARB's plan to integrate Cal-ITP with the EV charging card. A charge card that can be used for EV charging and for public transportation would give card holders meaningful access to clean transportation options and we support expanding this to a statewide program that is available to any income-qualified individuals that do not have access to home charging.

CalETC supports delaying the 50 vehicle fleet size limit for HVIP to 2025. We cannot stress enough that MHD zero-emission truck market is still in a nascent stage. Except for the very largest and well-capitalized fleets, all other fleets currently need financial assistance to help cover the higher up-front cost of ZEVs, the cost of supporting infrastructure, and the technology

risk these fleets are being asked to assume. CalETC is hearing firsthand accounts from our OEM members, trucking as a service companies, and MHC truck dealers that the cost of ZEV trucks have increased significantly and the sales have decreased significantly.

We are in a critical period with the ACT and ACF rules going into effect and sales and purchase requirements ramping up quickly. The market needs sustainable incentives to meet those requirements.

Thank you very much for all your work on the funding plan and we look forward to continuing to work with you on zero-emission transportation.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Matt Schrap.

MATT SCHRAP: After Matt, we will hear from Evan Edgar, Bill Magavern, Charles Williams and Cameron Demetre.

MATT SCHRAP: Hello. Thank you, Board members and staff. Appreciate the opportunity to come and make comment here today. My name is Matt Schrap. I'm the Chief Executive Officer of the Harbor Trucking Association. A little about HTA. We are the nation's largest drayage specific trade organization representing motor carriers doing business here on the west coast with

a particular focus in California.

2.2

First, I'd like to thank staff for acknowledging some of the challenges in removing the fleet size cap and pushing that out to 2025. And really I think that in order to truly facilitate more deployment of especially battery tech -- electric technology, the Board should seriously consider encouraging the Executive Officer to exercise his discretion and move forward with a provision that would allow for the restrictions on fleet size relative to overall purchase requirements, as well as the decreased funding amounts for drayage operators. In order to populate the secondary market, even the largest of the large well capitalized fleets still need incentives to deploy this technology.

If they are able to deploy, test, fund, and then redeploy this technology in the secondary marketplace, this will provide an opportunity for small fleets to truly utilize this equipment, not to say that small fleets shouldn't have the first bite at the apple. But if there is a situation like we've been experiencing where there's a lack of, I guess, interest or maybe not interest but ability to apply for it and deploy these trucks by small fleets, then this should trigger to allow those largest of the large fleets to be able to take advantage of the program again to populate the secondary marketplace.

Furthermore, while we're excited about the zero-emission loan program, and I know staff has been doing a lot of hard work on that, since we see the program be held today, we need to have that in effect sooner than later. Dealerships typically will want an approved financing deal from any sized fleet before they deploy technology even with a grant. Looking forward to further discussion and great work from the staff today.

Thank you.

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Next commenter is Evan Edgar.

EVAN EDGAR: My name is Evan Edgar. California Compost Coalition. We're the guys that take organic waste and make renewable natural gas that's carbon negative. We put it back in our same trucks 30 days later. They're HVIP trucks. They're near zero NOx. It's a great program.

To date, there's \$170 million from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund going to low carbon fuel. You think that you guys would care about greenhouse gas reductions, but we don't see that money for our renewable natural gas. We're carbon negative now. What CARB wants to do is double down on ZEVs. Well, you ought to double your knowledge, because I'm the guy for the last -- since March 2022 have been telling you that life cycle analysis for

ZEVs are about plus 75 grams of CO2 per megajoule. This is based upon the California grid with European studies. And for 18 months, CARB has been not aware. They don't want to know the truth about the Low Carbon Fuel Standard with regards to life cycle assessment for ZEVs and it's embarrassing.

2.2

We had a bill this year, AB 1012 the Quirk-Silva bill that would require CARB to do a life-cycle analysis for ZEVs. You guys don't want to know. The Union of Concerned Scientists opposed this bill. They're concerned about science. The science is plus 75 grams of CO2 per megajoule. CARB staff basically killed the bill in Senate Appropriations with a \$7.1 million price tag and 17 staff to do the low carbon -- to do the life-cycle assessment for ZEVs. I did it with my staff of two and it's about 10,000 bucks using European studies.

So I'm implore upon CARB to fund \$7.1 million dollars and 17 staff to know the truth about ZEVs, heavy-duty vehicles are not zero-emissions when it comes to greenhouse gases. It's a big lie. You are for criteria pollutants, but you are supporting the high carbon choice. Even the EJAC has supported me on this. I stand with EJAC on life-cycle assessments. You guys talk about life-cycle assessments for everything else. Let's do it for heavy-duty ZEV batteries. These are blood

batteries with kids in the Congo and that truth is not being talked about either. Since March 2022, I've been talking about it.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

1.3

2.2

SEAN EDGAR: We can't mine our way out of climate change.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you very much.

Our next commenter is Bill Magavern.

BILL MAGAVERN: Good morning. Bill Magavern with the Coalition for Clean Air. We do support this plan and we urge you to adopt it today. And we thank the staff for all the work that went into it and the public process that they conducted. We amusingly in this funding plan, of course, are much lower than we had in the previous two years, because of the decline of the State's fiscal condition. And we were made going forward to have substantially more investments in the ZEV transition.

There are some very positive policies that are embedded in this plan. In particular, it's very laudable that the State is now focusing most of the incentives on disadvantaged and low-income communities, where the broad based rebates are really no longer necessary. We actually thought maybe two or three years ago they were no longer necessary. But it's great to see this focus now on equity, because we're not going to be successful with the

ZEV transition if we leave behind our disadvantaged and low-income communities and there is a very real risk of that.

So that means not only vehicle purchase incentives, but also accessing clean mobility without owning a car as a point that I think Chair Randolph made very well earlier. So it's great to see that there is funding here, some mobility options and we want to make sure that that continues, EV car sharing, on-demand transit with zero-emission buses. E-bikes are an excellent mobility option for many people.

When it comes to Clean Cars 4 All, it's good to see that the resolution does address the need to make sure that we keep all the projects funded, so there needs to be flexibility in case some money needs to be moved --

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

BILL MAGAVERN: -- for that to happen. Thank you.

CHAIR RANDOLPH:

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you very much.

Our next commenter is Charles Williams.

CHARLES WILLIAMS: Good morning. Thank you,
Board members for your continued support. My name is
Charles Williams. I represent Lightning eMotors. We
deploy Class 3 to Class 6 electric trucks. We have over

600 vehicles on the road now and have accumulated over 5.5 million miles on the road as well. I'm glad to share most of our deployments have been supported by CARB incentive programs and regulations. However, there is a need for improvement how HVIP funds are collected. We are seeing labor and process costs of 10,000 to 20,000 per vehicle. We work with Tetra Tech. However, there are -- under staff, the redemption and review process is very slow.

Critical feedback from CARB about needed resources can take up to three weeks to receive an update. More direction and clarity about DMV tax receipts redemption and requirements is needed to support our customer fleets with DMV Sacramento. The HVIP manual needs to apply to all vouchers pending approval.

These issues threaten our growth, our financial security, and our ability to leverage programs for California fleets. We request CARB to help simplify and improve the review timeline process for HVIP vouchers.

And lastly, we request that CARB provides payment via ACH.

Thank you very much.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Our next commenter is Cameron Demetre.

CAMERON DEMETRE: Good morning, Board members and staff. Cameron Demetre with Capital Advocacy on behalf of First Student and National Express. Two leading school

and bus contractors that partner with school districts throughout the state.

1.3

2.2

Our two companies alone account for nearly 5,000 school bus units across the state. And school bus contractors like ourselves count for about one-third of the entire State fleet. We appreciate the work that goes into developing the funding plan, but we are still very much concerned that the current funding plan excludes companies like ours and the students we help from accessing critical grants in providing clean mobility for school bus -- school buses, particularly in light of AB 579 requiring all school buses to be zero emission by 2035.

We've raised these concerns with staff numerous times and Board members and hope to continue this work with CARB to find a solution that appropriately accounts for our type of business model and to provide all California students with zero-emission school bus access.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak and to share our concerns today.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Our next commenter is Erika Romero.

ERIKA ROMERO: Good morning, Board members.

24 | Erika Romero on behalf of the California Vanpool

25 Authority, also known as CalVans. Since CalVans was

founded, it's reduced over a billion VMTs across the state serving primarily farm working communities by providing them vanpools that are safe and reliable to get to and from their homes and job sites.

Really in strong support of the funding plan on investments in zero mobility options in general, but here to provide comment on kind of the lack of funding for farmworker vanpools, particularly over the last couple of years. In the fiscal year '16 and '17 and then again in '17 and '18, CARB funded pilot programs to support the hybrid conversions of our 15 passenger vehicles and it hasn't since then. So really just looking to work with the Board and staff moving forward to ensure that farm working communities in particular are not excluded from this transition.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

That concludes our in-person commenters. We will now turn to Zoom. The first five commenters on Zoom are Mariela Ruacho, Daniel Barad, The Originaldra, Jennifer Krill, and Lisa McGhee.

One moment for technical difficulties.

Mariela, I have activated your microphone.

Please unmute and you may begin.

MARIELA RUACHO: Good morning. My name is

Mariela Ruacho from the American Lung Association.

California has the worst air in the nation and the incentives outlined in CARB's funding plan can provide much needed air and health benefits if it targets front-line communities. We support this plan and urge the Board to adopt it.

1.3

2.2

We urge CARB to focus vehicle incentives and mobility programs on low-income and disadvantaged communities that experience the most air polluted -- air pollution in the states. This includes the regional Clean Cars 4 All Program, while CARB waits for next year to launch the statewide program and ensure equity provisions are included in CVRP.

We urge the allocations made -- we support the allocations made to the Clean Mobility Option, Clean Mobility in Schools and the Sustainable Transportation Equity projects, and the E-Bike Program. On medium- and heavy-duty investments, we agree with Coalition for Clean Air on the need to increase the percentages staff focused on equity, DAC projects, and small -- and public fleets for the HVIP and CORE incentives program.

So again, we urge CARB to focus zero-emission vehicle incentives and mobility plans on populations that have experienced the most burden from air pollution and needed health benefits.

Thank you.

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

The next commenter is Daniel Barad. I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

DANIEL BARAD: Good morning, Chair and members. Daniel Barad on behalf Union of Concerned Scientists.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We recommend that the Board approve the plan today and we thank staff for their work and for previewing some of our comments in their presentation. We have a few recommendations on the implementation of the light-duty components of the plan.

First, we urge CARB to prioritize Clean Cars 4
All and Financing Assistance for priority populations who own old cars. We know that pre-2003 gasonline- and diesel-fueled cars make up less than 20 percent of passenger vehicles in the state, but produce the majority of NOx and reactive organic air pollution.

These cars have inequitable health impact as they are also concentrated in disadvantaged communities. CARB should prioritize limited incentive funding to removing these highly polluting vehicles in overburdened communities.

Second, CARB should move incentive programs away from a first-come first-served model to a more targeted

approach. Previous incentive and assistance programs have allocated their limited funds to those who apply first. Instead, CARB should use targeted participation criteria at the start of the program cycle, such as using income limits and disadvantaged community criteria. Then if funding remains at the end of the funding cycle, CARB could consider relaxing program criteria.

Finally, CARB should focus on lending assistance for financial -- financing assistance for lower income consumers projects. Lending assistance could go a long way in helping low-income Californians purchase clean vehicles and would naturally help ensure that benefits reach drivers in need of assistance as lending assistance is of little use to purchasers with wealth or access to credit.

Again, we urge CARB to work to approve the plan today and to work to implement these recommendations for the benefit of communities who are the most impacted by the pollution from on-road vehicles.

Thank you very much.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Our next commenter is The Originaldra.

I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

THE ORIGINALDRA: Thank you. So, you know, I'm

not sure why this is CEQA exempt when, you know, all of the things that you're incentivizing actually cause more pollution and greenhouse gases that you're trying to reduce than they will ever save in their lifetime. And, you know, just in San Francisco we had a bus that, you know, lost power and rolled down a hill.

2.2

There's these lithium batteries can stay under water and still be on fire. The power grid is not able to, you know, produce enough electricity to power all of these vehicles and transportation modes that you are incentivizing. You know just for one of the like Tesla chargers, it's like powering several houses. And if you have several of them like five of them, it's like a whole neighborhood. It's like a thousand houses.

And not only that, but they emit radiation. And we're never talking about that. It's like the whole plan is to, right, get rid of greenhouse gases, but we're carbon-based. Everything living is carbon based and there's no way -- I don't understand why we'd want to put children in a bus that if something happened, they wouldn't would be able to get off the bus and the fire wouldn't even be able to put out. The fire trucks only 500 gallons of water in them. You need tens of thousands of gallons of water to put out one of those lithium batteries. As you can see, if one is under fire and it

won't go out, how long is that going to burn? And then they can recombust.

1.3

2.2

And you're going to be, you know, putting so many people out of business by doing this. And I don't know how you think that we're going to get any kind of imports and exports from fleets when they -- they're not even going to be able to go the distance that they can now. I mean, it's totally going to holistically ruin everybody's life and they don't even understand that. And they think that they believe in this whole lie of the climate changing, but we don't even talk about the chem trails and the spraying of the materials above us.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Our next commenter is Jennifer Krill. I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

JENNIFER KRILL: Can you hear me?
BOARD CLERK MOORE: Yes.

JENNIFER KRILL: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate this. Hello. Chair Randolph and Board members, my name is Jennifer Krill. I'm with Earthworks. We applaud the Air Resources Board for its 25 years of leadership towards a zero emissions future. We also applaud CARB's consistency in looking at global impacts when considering initiatives and policies over the years. My comments

today will focus on supply chain impacts for minerals for ZEV technology. We encourage CARB to implement a screen for funding for all ZEV programs and incentives that encourages responsible mineral sourcing. My organization addresses the adverse impacts from mining and we are a part of broad coalition of over 180 organizations globally advancing the declaration on mining and the energy transition.

2.2

These groups represent mine worker unions, mining experts and front-line indigenous communities who are concerned about the impacts of extracting minerals, such as lithium, cobalt, nickel, and copper for renewable energy technologies.

We do not want to recreate the farm -- the harms of fossil fuel extraction and we want to build a ZEV future that is responsibly sourced. And for that reason, we encourage our transition to renewable energy and transportation to avoid irresponsible mining by, number one, centering the human rights of indigenous front-line communities and workers at mining, recycling, reclamation, and manufacturing for renewable energy and transportation.

Number two, prioritize recycling while minimizing toxicity through low impact circular economy solutions.

Three, ensure best practices with independent third-party auditing.

And four, continue to implement transformative solutions that shift away from private transportation. In conclusion, we encourage CARB to implement a --

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Our next commenter is Kevin Maggay. I will unmute and you may begin.

Kevin.

1.3

2.2

Okay. We'll come back.

Our next commenter is going to be Jay Friedland. I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and begin.

JAY FRIEDLAND: Can you guys hear me?

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Yes.

JAY FRIEDLAND: Okay. Great. Good morning,
Chair Randolph, ARB Board members, and a special thank you
to ARB staff who's been working on this. My name is Jay
Friedland and I'm Vice President of Public Policy for Zero
Motorcycles, which proudly designs and builds
zero-emission motorcycles in California. Zero has shipped
thousands of electric motorcycles to customers in
California and across the world.

Today, I'm actually representing a broad coalition of electric motorcycle manufacturers who strongly support the ARB staff's proposal to include zero-emission motorcycles, or ZEMs, in Clean Cars 4 All

and the Financing Assistance programs of the Clean Transportation Funding Plan. Highway capable ZEMs can significantly impact ARB's goals to both reduce VMT and improve air quality.

2.2

These motorcycles are all freeway capable and can serve more than 75 percent of California commuters.

Hundreds of thousands of motorcycles are sold each year in California often to replace cars for commuting. We think it makes sense to expand incentives on the most affordable type of zero-emissions vehicles to those who need it the most.

In terms of air pollution, these incentives become even more important as ARB considers regulations for motorcycle emissions reductions and the expansion of zero-emission vehicle programs to include electric motorcycles. ARB staff has recently stated that internal combustion motorcycles have become a significant source of mobile source emissions, especially criteria pollutants. Cars have become so much cleaner, while motorcycles now represent an ever expanding source of both on- and off-road mobile emissions.

How can we solve this? First, by setting standards to reduce emissions from ICE motorcycles in similar ways to how ARB has been successful with cars, with the upcoming Board hearing on motorcycle regulations,

including a robust ZEM program, and by helping consumers use purchase incentives such as those in the CC4A and Financing Assistance programs.

Thank you again for your support and for all of your work in this area.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

2.2

The next commenter is Kevin Maggay. I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin. This is also a reminder to -- that our public sign-up closure is -- well public sign-up has now closed

KEVIN MAGGAY: Hi. Can you guys hear me okay?

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Yes, I can hear you.

KEVIN MAGGAY: Hi. My name is Kevin Maggay. I'm with Navistar. Navistar is a leading truck and bus OEM. We produce Class 6 trucks and school buses under the International Truck brand and the IC Bus brand as well.

We currently have zero -- battery electric zero emission trucks and school buses available. First off, thank you for the 25 years of incentives. They've been really impactful in this transition to the zero-emission future. My comments today are specific to school buses.

First, funding from Prop 98 prohibits school bus contractors from receiving funds. Many school districts contract bus services and it's unreasonable that those school districts would be excluded from deploying

zero-emission buses. The air quality benefits to the students should not be determined based on whether or not a school district owns or contracts the buses.

Contractors have been directed to look at other programs like HVIP, but there are still limitations under that program as well. Contractors have different requirements under HVIP. We think that there should be a level playing field, because ultimately it will be the school district and the students that benefit.

There are inconsistencies in the requirements for districts and contractors. For example, contractors are required to purchase 30 buses before becoming eligible for incentives -- 30 electric school buses on their own before becoming eligible for incentives. School districts do not have that requirement. And while contractors are businesses, additional costs will ultimately be passed to the school districts.

Therefore, it makes sense to not punish school districts that happen to contract bus services. Again, the air quality benefits to the students should not be determined based on whether or not a school district owns or contracts the buses.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: All right. The next commenter is Stacie Fujii. I have activated your

microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

2.2

STACIE FUJII: Good morning. My name is Stacie
Fujii and I am head of the Underserved Communities
Initiative at Aptera Motors. We are in California and we
build affordable, light weight, and aerodynamic
three-wheeled vehicles powered by the sun that are able to
handle most daily driving needs completely off the grid.

We launched in late 2019 and have 45,000 plus reservations for customers worldwide. We plan to begin production in 2024 and we need your assistance on driving forward California's incentive for electric vehicles, specifically zero-emission motorcycles. We strongly support the ARB staff efforts to include zero-emission motorcycles in the Clean Cars 4 All and Financing Assistance programs as part of the overall plan for clean transportation initiatives. Signaling the market about the importance of this affordable vehicle class is critical as new models are being added like Aptera. We believe it makes sense to expand incentives on the most affordable type of zero-emission vehicle to those who need it most.

In terms of air pollution, these incentives become even more important as ARB considers regulations from motorcycle emissions, reduction, and expansion of ZEV programs to include electric motorcycles. The State of

California has ambitious goals for both air quality improvement and GHG reduction, and we believe setting standards to reduce emissions from motorcycles in similar ways to how ARB has been successful with cars and to accelerate the shift to zero-emission motorcycle technology using appropriate incentives (inaudible) in CC4A and Financing Assistance programs.

Thank you so much

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Next commenter is Roman Partida-Lopez. I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

ROMAN PARTIDA-LOPEZ: Thank you. Good morning, Madam Chair, Board Members. My name is Roman Partida-Lopez with the Greenlining Institute. First off, I want to thank staff for all their hard work in putting together this funding plan and for the process that they developed this year to receive feedback on a one-on-one basis, but then also the public process to engage others, especially the evening community meetings where folks that generally may not be able to participate were able to participate.

I just wanted to flag that the Charge Ahead

Campaign submitted a letter a couple weeks ago as well as earlier today that was addressed with 15 other

organizations in support of the approval and adoption of the funding plan. Within the letter, there are multiple areas where we have additional comments that we hope to work with staff after the approval process, but one item that I do want to highlight during this time that I feel needs -- continuous to need more discussion.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And immediate attention is the 1099 tax form issue within the Clean Cars 4 All Program. For those that are not familiar with that issue, two air -several air -- two air districts - now I believe it's only one - continue to provide a 1099 form that impact lower income households when it comes time to reporting their taxes and then potentially impacting what programs they qualify for. This has been an ongoing issue that hasn't It was said would be resolved by now and been resolved. We haven't seen a resolution. And with new -- a new program in San Diego starting up soon and the statewide Clean Cars 4 All as well coming up, we would like to have this issue resolved, so that we don't provide and continue to provide unintentional burdens to low-income households who participate in State programs by accessing these State incentives.

Thank you for your time.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you. Our next commenter is Brett Prebula. I have activated your

microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

2.2

BRETT PREBULA: Thank you, Board members and staff. Brett Prebula representing Casual Carpool. We are an app that is trying to change, revolutionize, a kind of test of time method of carpooling to work and entertainment. Our app really offers a new take on a very old process that was really in need of innovation. Think about, instead of meeting in a park and ride, we partner with businesses throughout the state of California that are essentially sponsors and you collectively get together at a coffee shop or a local bakery to pick up and go. And it's a way for us to provide a level of equity in mobility.

You know, I think many people use, you know, Lyft and Uber, but the cost of that is really prohibitive.

This is really a low cost way to provide a service that many people are still trying to do today in a very analog way.

In addition, when you're picked up at that spot, you now have a kind of built-in social network that people are either working in your area, frankly could be working in your company and you just didn't know, and really provides an enhanced social component to it, along with the technical aspects of the service delivery.

We really are looking at ongoing enhancements to

improve the technology. The great thing is we can use the existing automobile stock with our partners as we evolve. We can provide enhancements for -- on the app and with our partners about those that are doing the service through zero-emission vehicles. And so there is a variety of ways that this could go, but it really, I think, could be a new way of looking at commuting for work and entertainment. I think it's important that the funding plan allows for flexibility of these innovative apps to be able to be funded to help support our initiative moving forward, and again really to provide an equity in mobility for people along with enhanced technology.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

1.3

2.2

Our next commenter is Jared Naimark. I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

JARED NAIMARK: Hello, Chair Randolph and Board members. My name is Jared Naimark. I'm the California organizer with Earthworks. And I'm calling in because I'm part of a coalition of environmental and labor groups that believes there's more we can do to center workers, communities, and environmental justice within CARB's taxpayer funded programs.

In particular, the Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Program, HVIP, has spurred major

transformation within the bus and truck industry. And we believe that with some key changes, HVIP can lead the adoption of zero-emission vehicles while also raising the bar on job quality and environmental protection. So our coalition has put forward a policy proposal called the California Jobs and Environment Plan. This proposal works within HVIP to improve job quality for the workers who build eligible vehicles and also to promote socially and environmentally sustainable manufacturing practices. We urge you to adopt our proposal as part of the implementation of this funding plan.

2.2

And as my colleague commented earlier, demand for minerals being used in electric vehicle batteries is expected to skyrocket. However, we work with communities around the world who are impacted by environmental destruction and human rights abuses from the mining industry. CARB has an historic opportunity to ensure that this transition to electric vehicles is a truly just transition by requiring responsible mineral sourcing and supply chain due diligence across its programs. We believe HVIP will be an excellent starting point and we look forward to a broader conversation about responsible mineral sourcing with the Board and staff.

Thank you very much for your time.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Our next commenter is Maya Inigo-Anderson. I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

1.3

2.2

MAYA INIGO-ANDERSON: Thank you, Madam Chair and Board members. My name is Maya Inigo-Anderson and I'm with Communities for a Better Environment and the Charge Ahead Coalition. Overall, Charge Ahead supports the funding plan and appreciates the staff's extensive work on this. We would like to raise a number of points with future funding plans in mind. Please bear with me if there's a little bit of repetition, but these points are important. We commend CARB's increased focus on low-income consumers. However, we would like to see CARB continue to develop more targeted strategies for reaching priority populations, such as prioritizing funding for low-income consumers before opening programs up to other applicants as others have stated.

We appreciate the extensive investments in mobility -- in the mobility programs and focus on small fleets starting in 2025.

We would further like to ask CARB for a swift resolution to the 1099 tax form issue. Special populations may experience potential negative impacts when receiving a 1099 form, such as losing access to means-tested programs. We further recommend that grant

programs provide resources for grantees in advance, which would create greater opportunity for small CBOs and CBOs in low income communities, and communities of color. We commend CARB staff for expressing a commitment to increasing language access and translation services during the CARB funding plan community meetings, which is a need that has been particularly expressed by some of our members at Communities for a Better Environment. And we also appreciate CARB's commitment to evening time community meetings, which is allowed for increased community participation. Overall, we urge the Board to support the funding plan. Thank you.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

1.3

2.2

Our next commenter is Emily Gartenberg. I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

EMILY GARTENBERG: Good morning, Board members and members of staff. My name is Emily Gartenberg with Jobs to Move America. And I'm part of a coalition of environmental and labor groups that is calling on CARB to continue its legacy of leadership by improving policies related to labor, mining, and environmental policies within HVIP. We must do more to ensure that the workers who are powering the shift to zero-emission vehicles and the communities who are being impacted by mineral mining

and extraction aren't being left behind in our conversations and policies. As you know, HVIP provides millions of dollars in incentive funding, but without consideration of the job quality for the people who are manufacturing these vehicles or the sourcing of materials.

2.2

The lack of policy focus in these areas is impeding us from a truly just transition. This is a problem we can solve together. Our coalition's proposal, California Jobs and Environment Plan works within the HVIP funding model to incentivize high-quality jobs and stronger environmental and mining standards within the zero-emission truck and bus industry.

This year's funding plan currently includes modifications to HVIP related to fleet size, vehicle-to-grade capability, and more. It also focuses on expanding access to disadvantaged and low-income communities. These are all very important changes and we believe that the California Jobs and Environment Plan complements these changes by focusing on a currently overlooked area, the pay and benefits that the workers themselves receive to manufacture eligible vehicles and the environmental repercussions for communities facing extraction.

As you consider the funding plan, we urge you to also include a focus on zero-emission transit vehicles and

workers and their families. CARB is setting the standard for the emerging zero-emission vehicle industry. We urge you to incorporate our proposal into the funding plan and into the implementation procedures.

Thank you so much.

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Our next commenter is Tim Manzano. I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

TIM MANZANO: Thank you, everyone. My name is Tim Manzano. I work for Tom's Truck Center in Orange County, Los Angeles. We're a commercial trucker dealer that provides ZEV trucks from Class 3, actually light weight, all the way up to Class 8.

Kind -- I'm just going to go ahead and speak frankly here. The voucher processing -- well, actually, the processing of vouchers has been incredibly frustrating for us. I -- you know, we're getting really fatigued with a lot of the changing rules, requirements, sometimes with vouchers that are in process, but the one thing that really concerns me and I know it concerns a lot of our other dealers is the amount of time that it takes for redemption.

We're -- as a dealer, we're in a unique position where we have to deliver that vehicle. We have to pay

that vehicle off and then we are sitting on that capital out, if you will, waiting for that redemption to get paid. These lag -- this lag in time can be over two months. And I can't speak highly enough about a \$288,000 voucher times say 15, 20 trucks in a month, that's an extreme amount of capital that is sitting out there on the books for an extreme amount of time. There's very little visibility there for us and we get, you know, responses that they're in review. So that's 7 to 14 -- 7 to 14 days redemption time, we really need help there, guys. We really need help. I appreciate you guys looking into this and appreciate this time that you've given me to be able to share that.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Our next commenter is Sasan Saadat. I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

SASAN SAADAT: Thank you so much. Yeah, Sasan with Earthjustice. I want to thank staff first on their dedication to outreach and working collaboratively with all the stakeholders in this plan. And we definitely support adoption of the funding plan. And we know in no uncertain terms that the State's climate and air quality crises cannot be resolved without a wholesale transition

to zero emissions. And we know that while transformative regulations do the heavy lifting of that transition, strategic investment is essential to ensure that we manage the transition to maximize justice. So the priority population allocations continue to be essential.

2.2

With funding levels reduced, it makes good sense to focus funding in areas that achieve multiple wins, so maximizing access to mobility, maximizing air pollution benefit, reducing VMT, and driving social and ecological improvements in the supply chain. So we strongly support the focus on school buses and we're also pleased to see the labor standards added to HVIP. And we would echo Earthworks' recommendation to also explore adding battery supply chain standards to HVIP to incent more responsible sourcing.

Finally, it must be acknowledged that the funding for zero-emissions has now shrunk and it is not adequate to the needs. So we urge CARB to take a hard look at more consistent funding streams, like the four billion in annual funding from Low Carbon Fuel Standard, which continues to divert over 70 percent of its credits to polluting fuels favored by the oil and gas industry.

I'll just stress one ask here, hopefully the least controversial from those. Add credit multipliers for transit and school buses to recognize their VMT

reduction. Earthjustice submitted comments explaining how we can leverage LCFS to maximize zero-emission investment that reduces VMT and increases mobility for low-income communities and those comments were echoed with support from BART and LA Metro.

We thank you again for your hard work, staff, and outreach to all of our communities, and we look forward to working with you and the Board --

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

1.3

2.2

Our next commenter is Laurel Moorhead. After Laurel, our last Lisa McGhee.

Laurel, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

LAUREL MOORHEAD: Hello. My name is Laurel Moorhead and I'm here on behalf of Transfer Flow.

Transfer Flow has been in business in beautiful Northern California for 40 years manufacturing high quality fuel systems and creating high-paying local jobs benefiting the local economy. Thank you, CARB staff, for allowing me the opportunity to comment. I'd like to echo the comments made by Edgar and Associates.

While the urgency to act is real and unquestionable, CARB's technology-forcing mandates use unreasonable flawed assumptions to support rules that do not result in emission reductions. The limiting

perspective to only narrowly focus on tailpipe emissions, while ignoring life-cycle emissions is an abuse of discretion and devastating to the economy.

2.2

If CARB wants to pass rules that stand up to litigation, they will listen to stakeholders who have spent decades in the industry and allow the ramp up of all near-zero technologies. Just Monday, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce asked a D.C. circuit court judge to rescind CARB's Clean Air Act waiver because of CARB's abuse of discretion. CARB could avoid these types of pushback by working with instead of against stakeholders.

Solutions cannot simply be willed into immediate existence by policymakers. Because CARB staff consistently ignores public input from people who have spent decades working in the industry, these ridiculous technology-forcing mandates are destined to fail. It would be horrible if CARB lost their Clean Air Act waiver because CARB staff was too arrogant to admit that maybe people who have been in the industry their whole lives might know better than the pencil pushers behind the desk.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to comment and I hope at some point, CARB staff will come to their senses and listen to stakeholders who are offering proven solutions instead of some pie-in-the-sky impossible all electric future.

Thank you and have a good day.

1.3

2.2

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Our final commenter is Lisa McGhee. Lisa, I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

If you are having trouble, you can maybe press star six, if you're calling in.

Okay. It looks like we lost Lisa, so that concludes our commenters both in Zoom and in person.

Mr. Kracov, I will turn the microphone back to you.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes. Thank you too all the public commenters. I will now close the record on this agenda item. But I guess before we do, staff are there any issues raised in the comments that you want to address?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Yes. Thank you, Board Member Kracov. I'd like Annmarie Rodgers to address the question about school bus and Prop 98.

MSCD COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE AND OUTREACH BRANCH CHIEF RODGERS: Thank you. As -- in consultation with Legal, we have interpreted SB 114 and the Prop 98 fund disbursement to clearly state that the funds are for zero-emission school buses that are owned by school district, actually local education agencies. We have

committed to go back to Legal and further investigate if there are any flexibilities, but that is the interpretation that we have now.

But the school bus providers, the contractors are eligible under HVIP, under public fleets. So there is no bulk order purchase requirement or reduced voucher amount, so that is an option.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Thank you very much.

Anything else, Dr. Cliff?

1.3

2.2

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: No, that's it. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Okay. So we'll close the record now.

Board members, do you have any questions on this item, the 23-24 funding plan for clean transportation initiatives incentives?

Let me also jus say we have Cliff Rechtschaffen here, the first time he joined us on the dais. It's terrific to see you and we're really pleased to have you as a member of this Board. We'll look forward to working with you.

So with that, we'll open it up to Board members. The folks that are in the room, the Board members with me, just raise your mics. And I'll know to call on you and then we'll go to the Board members that are there remote.

So we'll start to the right. Cliff Rechtschaffen. Okay.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Thank you, Gideon.

And thank you for the nice welcome. I have a question and a comment. Can someone clearly (inaudible) funding for an increase. (Inaudible). 2017 if it's sunk (inaudible)

MACUMBER: Yes. Thank you very much. So we have funded vanpool programs in the past. One of the challenges that we've been up against is that the technology has not yet been available to support the needs that the farmworkers have for transporting multiple people, equipment that they need, but we are continuing to work with manufacturers. And that absolutely is something that we can continue to consider for funding in the future.

BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Thank you. That's something that' (inaudible) continued focus. (Inaudible) strong focus on their own equity (inaudible) communities (inaudible) this is just (inaudible) investment in clean transportation. (Inaudible) to see (inaudible).

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Thank you, Cliff. Great to have your comments.

We'll go to Dr. Shaheen.

BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Thank you. So I just wanted to start by thanking the staff for all their hard

work on this proposal. It's very clear a lot of thought went into this. I really appreciate that and also really appreciate the process and the thought that went into getting public feedback. And I appreciate all the comments that were submitted prior to the meeting today on the docket, as well as in-person comments today.

2.2

So my comments and questions fall into two categories. The first is the clean transportation incentives. The first thing I'd like to speak to is the E-Bike program and really be very excited to see this. I'm glad that we're up to 18 million. One of the questions I have for you all on this is the importance of looking at supportive and safe infrastructure for these bikes and if you've given any thought to that or a collaboration with Caltrans and locals on this issue.

MACUMBER: Great. Thank you for the questions. Lisa
Macumber, Mobile Source Control Division. Yes, we have.
In developing the Electric Bike Incentive Project, we have
been collaborating with and talking with various local
agencies. We've talked a little bit with Caltrans. We
also are working with CHP who is in the process of
developing an educational campaign around how to use
proper e-bike infrastructure and safety mechanisms when
folks are in bikes all down the street.

The funding in particular for this E-Bike Program though is primarily for the bikes. We have included a component that would allow consumers to purchase safety equipment, but it doesn't really fund the infrastructure pieces that you're talking to. So coordination is important and that is something that we're doing as we roll the program out.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: I really appreciate that Lisa. And there were some comments on the docket about just the importance of e-bikes. And if we get can this program accelerated right into the EV mode, if we can, that would be wonderful.

My next comment relates to the CMO and the STEP Program. I'm really delighted, as I shared with you in my briefing, to see ongoing support there. This is an area I'm deeply familiar with and I think we really need to have a long-game strategy here and an extremely strategic approach moving forward.

I was really delighted to see that there's focus on streamlining this access to the funding of the program through one single RFP mechanism. I believe that's what the solicitation was referring to. There were several comments today, but also in the docket about a targeted needs-based approach. And so I'm really curious about how that's interpreted by staff. I know that's complicated,

but there's limited funds. So how do we target and prioritize those funds that are coming in particularly when we know that these types of programs can really move the needle in terms of being a VMT and GHG reduction, but they can also move the needle in terms of disadvantaged communities.

2.2

emphasizing enough sustainable business model strategy or coming to grips with the fact that a long-term subsidy may be needed and characterizing exactly what that gap is, as we move forward with these programs? I know this is a lot. Lisa, I see you writing it down, but really would love to hear your thoughts on this and also make myself available to staff as you move forward on this one.

MSCD EQUITABLE MOBILITY INCENTIVES BRANCH CHIEF MACUMBER: Yeah, absolutely. Thank you for the comments. Lisa Macumber, Mobile Source Control Division.

So kind of two main takeaways there on the targeted needs-based approach on the long-term sustainability. First, regarding the targeted needs-based approach, so we are just beginning to kind of embark on a more targeted approach to our vehicle purchase incentive programs. And we'll be doing that when the statewide Clean Cars 4 All and Financing Assistance Program launches by setting various different kind of levels that notch

down. We have kind of a system setup in which the consumer that meets the lowest possible level in a disadvantaged community, very low income level, when they come in the program, they kind of are prioritized against the person that isn't in a disadvantaged community. So their application would be handled first.

2.2

Taking that same type of very (inaudible) to the mobility side is a little more challenging, because when we're funding things in the mobility space, what we're doing is we're looking at each individually -- each individual community and what those communities needs are. And it's really hard to identify how you would use that same type of method. And so one of the things that staff have committed to doing is this next year really talking more with the stakeholders about what that could look like in the mobility space.

Right now, we work really hard to help communities develop projects. And the funding that you're approving today for planning and capacity building will really, really let us do that. And we'll be able to really sit down with the communities that have a vision or an idea and help them plan, help them think ahead towards how they could build the best possible project doing -- getting through permitting processes, really those -- the hard planning processes that often are a barrier to

communities for these projects. But then, to answer the sustainability question, really get them thinking about what type of service that they can provide and how it can be funded long term with some State investment now and then maybe other types of investments or would it need continued State investment.

2.2

So our hope, through planning and capacity building, is to really be able to help the communities get started and then get the funding and bring the projects really full circle. But that needs-based approach to how we fund that, it's different than what we're looking at in the purchase incentive side, so that's going to take just a little bit more thought.

BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Thank you. It seems you've given a lot of thought to that and I really appreciate it. I would like to just underscore, as you get those proposals in or you develop that solicitation, make sure you are ensuring that you're getting the data, because that's how we're going to know whether or not there's a cost effectiveness proposal here with respect to what we're getting in terms of VMT GHG reduction, accessibility metrics, et cetera. And sometimes that's a major problem when we give out this, I've found, over the years plus on (inaudible) eligibility.

I'd like to move to the heavy-duty allocation

component. Really delighted to have some opportunities to speak to some stakeholders who are very interested in the CORE agricultural funds. They're doing great work. And I really want to express my strong support for this program. I know the funds have been cut, but really want to get it on the record that I'd love to see more funding in this category. I know that's not in CARB's purview per say, but would just love to hear a comment on what happened with the funding between last year and this year's proposal.

MSCD INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES BRANCH CHIEF CHRISTENSEN: Yes, thank you. Peter Christensen.

2.2

Last year, CARB was fortunate to receive a significant appropriation from the Legislature for heavy-duty funding. And that actually allowed the Board to allocate \$273 million to CORE, which is helping to fund 11 different off-road equipment categories that are moving in the zero-emission space. Unfortunately, this year, we did not receive an appropriation from that allocation of funding. The only thing that we have to work with this year is the much smaller incentives that are available, much larger -- smaller funding that's available through the AQIP Program, the Air Quality Improvement Program.

So we're recommending half of that funding to continue supporting CORE. It's only \$14.3 million and we

know that that doesn't meet all of the demand out there, but we think it's important to continue supporting those investments as much as we can. Also recognizing that CORE is unique in our portfolio. It's very simple. It's very streamlined for the applicants, does not require scrappage. However, we do have other funding programs in our portfolio that can help with this, including the Carl Moyer Program and the FARMER Program.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Thank you so much for the follow up on that, Peter.

And my last comment relates to the high-quality jobs piece in the HVIP. So we've heard a lot from stakeholders today about responsible mining and high-quality jobs. Just wanted to hear a bit from staff about you're take on the California Jobs and Environment Plan that was presented to us.

MSCD INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES BRANCH CHIEF
CHRISTENSEN: Yeah. Peter Christensen again. This -great question. We've met with Jobs to Move America and
other stakeholders that helped to provide a very detailed
recommendation to us in the comment letter and definitely
appreciate that, really moving it toward a proposal that
encourages high-road jobs within these programs. As the
Board knows, we're currently implementing the labor
requirements under AB 794, which ensures that all of the

applicants that are receiving funding for our truck programs for short-haul trucks and for drayage trucks are complying with State labor standards. So that's an important thing that we kicked off this last year and we're continuing to implement that.

1.3

2.2

In terms of the particular implementation mechanics around the recommendations, I think we do still have a little bit of work to do on that. A couple of things to note. One is that the structure -- the implementation structure that's recommended is adjusting the voucher amount in HVIP. That voucher amount is actually tied to the incremental cost to help us encourage purchase decisions on the part of fleets. The incentive does not go to manufacturers. So we're looking at what kind of implementation mechanisms might be effective in motivating manufacturers that may not actually be the incentive amount. There may be other things that we can look at and we're certainly open to continuing to work on those -- on those issues.

I'll note that one of the things that we need to keep an eye as we look for these opportunities is staffing resources. Clearly with a program like HVIP, it's great news that we have so many models of zero-emission trucks and buses on the road in California, close to 150 right now. So when we think about how we would implement a

requirement that looks at high-road jobs criteria for each one of those models and maybe even the suppliers that provide components to those vehicles, it can become, you know, a significant staff intensive effort. So it's something that we're definitely interested in and continuing to work on, but we do have a little bit of work left to do on that.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Okay. Thank you so much.

I really again appreciate all the hard work of the staff.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Thank you, Dr. Shaheen.

Dean Florez.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you. It's been such a long time, I forgot to turn the mic on. I'm always used to Zooms now. Well, first and foremost, thank you to the staff. Very much appreciate the work. I think my question revolved around a slide that was put up. I think slide 16. You don't have to throw it back up, so I'll just paraphrase. You know, it says shift the CC4A funding from statewide projects to the district program. So I guess from a district level perspective, they are also very oversubscribed. Staffing levels for them -- for this shift, have we checked into that. Does that look appropriate and is there enough money in some sense to clawback, if indeed some of these programs need -- really get hyper-driven? Just a question on just that level I

think is my first.

2.2

The second would be the CalVans Program I'd like to stay thank you to that. That's been a very successful program in the Central Valley. I know the expansion revolves around clean vehicles. And I just want to thank staff for continuing putting that forward. Hopefully, the legislature itself, along with some of our colleagues, will be able to figure out a way to put more funds into a program I think that's very, very successful. So -- and I'm very happy that we continue to move that along, even in our own agenda.

And the cross-border thing is super important. I think that's a big, big issue that CARB is leading on and I hope to continue to see that front and center. I know Diane isn't here today or maybe she's listening via online, but it feels like that's one of the most important programs to look at as well.

So I guess that's my question, capacity at the district level. What can someone tell me about it? Does it look fine, everybody look good, checked in with Wayne and some of the other folks, South Coast, here -- Alberto here in Sacramento just getting a sense of that.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thanks, Senator Florez. I'll start and then staff should fill in. So first, I'll just say the proposal is to split 50/50 between the

statewide and the district programs with the idea that we could, if necessary, move money from that statewide program in targeted ways to address the issues. The program at the district level has been fully funded and it's been successful. So we actually, at this point, don't believe that it's going to be necessary to move additional funds. But the proposal would allow for that flexibility.

In terms of how well the District programs are run, we're hearing great success obviously. Staffing is an issue that all of us are concerned about, but I don't think that we have any particular issues or concerns that need to be addressed. So generally speaking, we're -- we think that the proposal that we have in front of you is going to be appropriate to make sure that the Clean Cars 4 All Program is successful.

And staff, please add anything to that about specific issues with districts, if appropriate.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Thank you.

Mr. Eisenhut.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Thank you, Gideon.

First, I need to acknowledge that I do and will support this action. I have a couple comment, questions. The first surrounding the school bus. The school bus is split between private and public receipt of the school bus

funding. And I acknowledge the limitations on funding what is probably a third of the school bus -- a third of the school bus fleets in the state and that those are probably funded through HVIP and are not going to be funded through the action of this -- through this action.

2.2

So I'm -- my comments are that whatever we can do to facilitate access to those funds by those private fleets I think are -- I would encourage, in part because it's my belief - I haven't seen data - that those fleets tend to be more rural and more -- and smaller, and that -- in that small rural districts don't run their own fleets, contract out. And I think this disadvantages those communities that we're intending to help. So whatever we can do to facilitate that funding through parallel programs, I just want to encourage that.

Second -- that's more comment than a question.

Second, also a comment, in partial preparation for this meeting, I spent a little bit of time looking at the websites and at access for Clean Cars 4 All and the Clean Vehicle Rebate Program, and the -- acknowledging my own strong limitations in terms of web searching, I found -- and without getting into the weeds, I found them to be not as user friendly as I would have hoped. And I notice with interest that the -- that part of this program includes some funding for mobility administration.

What I made up, as I heard that, was that part of their responsibility would be to enhance access for folks. And specifically what I make up here is that in Clean Cars 4 All, which could involve a private transaction, without the assistance of a dealership or a salesperson, and that I want to make this as accessible as we can make it.

2.2

So those are my comments. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Thank you, Mr. Eisenhut. We'll go to the Board members who are participating remotely. We'll start with Diane Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Member
Kracov. And thank you for leading us today. I wanted to
just say that I appreciate the exceptional staff work and
the extensive public outreach that's been done. I think
this is a really very exceptional funding plan and one
that I'm really excited to support. I particularly
appreciate the priority populations focus, I think it
really demonstrates the clear commitment at every level of
government and supports -- We haven't talked about the
fact that I think it supports the goals of nearly every
617 community and the goals in just about every CERP that
we have heard and approved. So I think we should note
that it's really helping to move those programs forward in
a significant way.

The focus on transportation equity, really

addresses our Scoping Plan goal of reducing VMT by 25 percent below 2019 levels by 2030 and by 30 percent by 2045. And as we all know, these targets demonstrate a greater urgency to reduce VMT. And as we learned a couple of weeks ago as we were discussing with our partners, CTC and the HCD meeting, we still have State funding that's going to VMT increasing projects.

2.2

And so I really appreciate the focus on VMT reduction in this funding plan and I think that innovations like the combined transit payment card will really help to really advance transit use. So I know we're doing what we can and I look forward to helping to encourage our partners to do more.

On the heavy-duty side, the equity focus is really important, our focus in disadvantaged communities, the independent operators and small fleets focus and appreciate Senator Florez's comment on the cross-border trucks. It is very important in the San Diego Tijuana region. We're -- I think the exploration of opportunities for incentives and staff's attention to this really complex and critical issue in our region is really laudable and I appreciate very much that -- the allowance of cross-border trucks getting the incentives, if they meet the criteria that you described, such as registration with the Secretary of State. And I really want to just

shout-out right now to the staff who have come multiple times to our region to really work through this difficult transition for cross-border trucks. More than a million trucks cross at the Otay Mesa border every year, as you know. And this is going -- this is a huge issue and one that I think we're addressing really appropriately.

I want to ask a couple questions. I'll just ask them all and then ask for your responses on them. I really appreciate what I think is an intention to shift, as you described on this target, to a needs-based approach. And I think I heard the explanation about it for light-duty but not for heavy-duty. So I wanted to make sure that either if I didn't hear it, forgive me for that, but if you could talk more about that, I'd appreciate it.

I also would appreciate any clarification that you have on the 1099 issue that Roman Partida-Lopez from Greenlining mentioned. I think it's a critical issue and one that I'd like to learn more about. And then obviously the concerns raised about mining and the impacts on extraction communities, I'd like to learn more about any actions we're either taking or exploring for either this funding plan or ones in the future. So those are my questions.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

MSCD INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES BRANCH CHIEF
CHRISTENSEN: Thank you, Board Member Takvorian. Peter
Christensen and I'll start us off today. First, thank you
for your question on how the heavy-duty program is
shifting toward meeting the needs of small fleets and a
focus on equity. I think one of the things that's notable
in the funding plan this year is that we're recommending
some changes to HVIP that really incorporate some of the
initial lessons learned from the Innovative Small e-Fleets
Pilot Project. And really the first one is that we're
shifting the direct purchases from ISEF and we're moving
those into HVIP.

2.2

And I know I just threw a bunch of acronyms around, but what that really means is that we're making it easier for small fleets to purchase zero-emission trucks with a much higher incentive amount, because we know that small fleets have additional financial challenges, not only in the purchase price, but also in finding financing, and just understanding the landscape of new technologies.

In addition to the incentives part of it, I think one of the things that is important to note, and thank you Board Member Takvorian for your support in this area, but we kicked off our Cal Fleet Advisor this year -- and that's a -- that's a really, I think, innovative approach to providing one-on-one support for small fleets, small

business owners, small business truckers to help them individually in understanding what the incentives are that are available, understanding the technologies and the different options in the market that might meet their needs in terms of the kind of work that they do and their duty cycles and things like that, and then bringing it all together, incorporating infrastructure of the vehicle and incentives all into one comprehensive package. So I think quite a bit of work on shifting that focus in HVIP in our heavy-duty program to support the needs of small fleets and owner/operators.

2.2

Quick -- just a quick comment on some of the battery things that we've heard today. There's been quite a bit of activity supporting specifically the battery recycling market that I thought I'd just touch on. It's in part driven by the fact that if you think about the cost components of a zero-emission vehicle, much of that cost is driven by the batteries. In terms of policy -- so it's driven by the batteries, so there's an incentive for manufacturers. There's an incentive to look at recycling as a way to help to mitigate some of those costs.

And then in terms of policy, CalEPA prepared a comprehensive report to the Legislature in 2022 on policy recommendations for battery recycling and that was an effort that was driven by AB 2832. And then this year, SB

615 was a proposed bill in the Legislature. It didn't pass this year, but might be brought back in the next session. It would require automotive batteries to be recycled or reused. And there are other developments that are happening in the industry too. Obviously, new businesses are supporting that recycling effort in collecting used batteries and making those available at locations here in the U.S., leveraging some of the lessons learned from Europe and China.

2.2

So quite a few things happening in that space and something that we'll continue to keep an eye on.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: And I can address the 1099 issue, Board Member Takvorian. So last year, we heard a lot about concerns related to 1099s and we have been successful in certain air districts in not having those air districts issue 1099s to recipients of Clean Cars 4 All funding (inaudible).

And so the concerns that were raised by air districts, we wanted to address head on. What we did is we embarked on a conversation with the Attorney General's office and lots of conversations internally. And ultimately what was decided is that we would hire outside counsel, expert tax counsel, to look at this issue. They advised us and as part of that helped us prepare a private letter ruling request to the Internal Revenue Service.

That request went in a little more than six months ago and it's our understanding that the IRS typically provides these private letter rulings within six months of the request.

2.2

So we expect any day now to get back -- get that feedback from the Internal Revenue Service. I will say that without revealing too much, we're very encouraged by the discussions that we've had to date and we expect this to be a positive outcome. And as long as we can get that outcome prior to the time frame when 1099s must be issued, which is by the end of January, then we can hopefully put this issue to bed.

So we have worked very hard to get this resolved. And I appreciate the Board's consideration and support in getting this through. So we're very hopeful and hope that this will not be an issue in the next several weeks.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: That's great. Thank you so much. I really appreciate it. And thank you, Peter, for your responses as well.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Thank you for that. And on the 1099 issue, if we do hear something, please do let the Board members know, okay?

We'll next go on Zoom to Board Member Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you, Board

Member Kracov. Thank you to all the commenters and everyone who has participated in the engagement that has led up to this resolution that we now see before us and just a huge thank you to staff. I really appreciate how this spending plan has evolved, just even in my short time on the Board, when it comes to process and flexibility across the programs to ensure the maximum benefit.

1.3

2.2

I appreciate the comments about the opportunities for improvement of HVIP for small businesses and I look forward to more outreach for small fleet operators, especially those whose English is not their first language. I support the ongoing focus on the reduction of VMTs in the strategy to those incentives. And I appreciate staff's efforts to clarify the 1099 issue.

I do want to continue to express concern about the legislative guidance to move away from plug-in hybrid in the CVRP Program. There is more data that we have now that we didn't a few years ago about the real problems from an infrastructure level to the OEMs pulling back from their target goals of EV manufacturing, which will no doubt impact the long-term pricing decreases we originally thought we would see in the timeline that we thought we would see.

I know that California ia already a lead adopter, but just putting the lens of the disadvantaged community

and how we achieve mass adoption to truly achieve an equitable transition, there continues to be the need for flexibility. While I know the ZEV Infrastructure Task Force is hard at work, as we've heard some of the folks on it today, some of those fixes in the most disadvantaged communities are not going to be ready by the time of that phaseout. I hope that we can have a fix now, rather than a fix once we have seen a negative impact happen in the uptake of clean air vehicles for those who would most benefit from the emission reductions in their neighborhoods.

And I do want to say that, you know, I'm excited about the Innovative Small Electric-Fleet Program moving into the new category. And I also wonder if there's flexibility across programs once this gets launched to allow for more CORE funding if that program is underspent? Does that flexibility exist now or will there need to be additional consideration?

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Does someone want to speak to that CORE issue?

MSCD INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES BRANCH CHIEF
CHRISTENSEN: Peter Christensen. Yeah. In terms of CORE
funding, we expect that with the recommendation this year
for 14 -- just over \$14 million, that that allocation is

going to go very, very quickly. So we're in a position and we're ready in the event that in the next legislative cycle that there's additional funding that's allocated to allow us to provide additional funding in this space. And we -- we're hopeful that that's -- that that's the case.

And in terms of, you know, implementing the relatively small allocation this year, again \$273 million last year and \$14 million this year, we know it's going to go quickly. The demand is there, but we'll be prepared. And, you know, in the event that additional funding comes, we'll be ready -- ready for it right away.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: And regarding the hybrid electric vehicles, my understanding that -- is that that was legislation.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Okay. Just wanted to confirm that you understood that. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yeah. Yes. And that's a -- you know, that's -- that legislative guidance and I'm hoping that there's -- there can be updated resolution on that front.

Thank you.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Thank you, Board member.

Last, we'll come back to the room here and go to

Board Member De La Torre. But before we do, to those of you that haven't read it, there's just a wonderful profile of Hector in the LA Times. This is from October 27th, entitled, "From the State Assembly to the California Air Resources Board, Hector De La Torre Makes His Mark." It's really the truth and we're just so proud to read that article. And for those you that haven't, I encourage you to do so. So we'll swing over to you to again make another mark, Hector De La Torre.

2.2

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you. It was a very good piece. And although I do take exception to my gait slowing. I don't even know what the hell that means. But thank you.

In terms of this spending plan, three things. On school buses, I agree with my colleagues who are speaking. I understand the Prop 98 issue, but it seems to me that it's the service that matters and the school district that matters, not how they provided for those kids. Because, and as I talked to staff, I've talked to some school bus operators on the transition to zero emission to battery electric, in this case, school buses. And there are two things that I never thought of. Obviously, we thought of the pollution part of it and the kids breathing the fumes, because those are not very well insulated.

But there are two additional things that have

happened with EV buses. One, they're quieter, so the kids are better behaved, because the bus driver can hear what's going on behind them. Completely happenstance, right? We never thought of that, but it's happening out there. And the school bus drivers are saying, they want to drive the electric ones, because the kids are quieter. That's a good thing.

1.3

2.2

And then second, for special needs kids especially, the difference in the noise that agitates them, or many of them, to the quiet bus has been tremendous in terms of the impact on them showing up to school calmer and ready to learn as opposed to agitated and worked up because of the stress of the bus ride, and the noise, et cetera.

So, you know, I never would have thought -- we never discussed that. We never anticipated it, but we're getting these additional benefits. And so very, very supportive of what staff is doing on the school buses. And again, we just want to make sure that everyone can benefit from it.

Second on the 1099, Dr. Cliff and I have been working on this for quite a while. I've been talking to my colleagues in some of the air districts that were handing out those 1099s. And it is absolutely bad policy, and even though I'm not a lawyer like some of my

colleagues, bad law. There is a public benefit to having these folks get these vehicles. And so I expect that we will keep on it -- keep working with the federal government. Right now, there is only one air district, South Coast, that is doing it. And we need to get them to change it, whether it's on their own or with federal intervention, but we absolutely need to make sure that these incentives are available and that there is no penalty afterwards on the recipient.

1.3

2.2

It just really, really hurts our low-income folks who would want to do this transition. They're not going to do it, when they've got a tax bill that is bigger than their normal tax bill at the end of the year.

So last, but not least, we -- I really appreciate the adjustment to the resolution. We had this discussion in my briefing. I really believe that we are about to have a similar uptick with used car -- EV car sales like we had with new car sales just a couple years ago and continues to grow, 27 percent last quarter of new car sales were EVs. It is happening on that side.

I expect now that we have this spending new cars being sold, we're going to have used cars coming on line in two, three years. And that's going to grow, so that availability is going to make it more attractive for low-income, moderate income folks to buy a used car.

That's how the normal car market works. Some people buy new, others by used, only used.

2.2

And so if that is happening, then clearly the district programs, which are the bigger share, are going to potentially need additional dollars. And so I appreciate the change to allow flexibility for the director to change or shift funds from the State program to the district programs.

CVAP Financial Assistance Program, you know, I don't -- I just don't think that program has been at a certain level for a while. Even if we promote it more, I don't see that growing significantly. So I think that the shift, if it is needed, will be between the statewide program and the district programs.

I would say though that we need to have some transparency on where we stand between these three programs at any given time. And so, you know, if there is a need to shift that we're very clear and transparent about why we need to shift at that time.

So that -- those are my comments. Very supportive of the whole package. We're in -- we're in kind of limbo as we transition here, right? We have pushed these policies. And for those folks who spoke out and said that, you know, we're being sued over this, we get sued on everything, so that's not really indicative of

anything. We get sued all the time about everything we do, so -- and fortunately we have great lawyers who defend us and win -- and great scientists, yes. As I've said many times here, our science is going to kick your science's ass. And so we take that. We have good policy and good law, and we're able to do these wonderful things.

So thank you very much.

1.3

2.2

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{BOARD}}$$ MEMBER KRACOV: Thank you very much for that, Hector.

So before I'll ask for a motion and a second, just a couple things from my perspective. Very pleased by the emphasis on the drayage fleets in this proposal. As we all know, drayage is coming first in Advanced Clean Fleets. It's extremely important that we do it right kicking off in 2024 for compliance for the drayage fleets, and coming from the South Coast, the San Pedro ports. And what happens out there is just so important that we do that right with CARB, with our partners at CEC and the utilities all the way down to the ports.

We've even had Matt Schrap from the Harbor
Trucking Association come today. He put on a tie, which
was quite unusual.

(Laughter).

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: He had a comment, if I can just get staff to respond to this, basically concerned

that perhaps some of the smaller fleets are not going to access the funding and the numbers that we are hoping for, and that we can maybe lift the funding restrictions, including the amounts and the purchase requirements for large fleets and open that up, that the small fleets don't come as we expect. Do you have a response to that, staff?

2.2

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: So I'll just -- I'm going to ask Peter to respond, but I'll just say that my understanding is that actually this program has been very successful and there's been a lot of interest. So the premise that it's undersubscribed is not quite accurate. But Peter, if you could address that directly, please.

MSCD INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES BRANCH CHIEF
CHRISTENSEN: Thank you, Dr. Cliff. Yes, the Board last
year in the funding plan of course recognized the
importance of small fleets. And I would just say that
looking at what we've seen over the last year, your
direction has had the desired impact. We talked about
ISEF a little bit today already. Great example of
incentives that support small fleets, both for direct
purchases as well as more innovative models like trucks as
a service and others.

In fact, looking at the -- at the stats on how things have changed over the last couple of years, two years ago in HVIP, we had roughly 12 percent of our

applications were from small fleets, this year about 40 percent, so a really significant change in that shift to supporting small fleets. The policy direction is having the desired impact.

2.2

And yeah, we've heard the term undersubscribed. It doesn't really apply to HVIP. HVIP is meant to be -to have funding continuously available, not having stops
and starts. That's particularly important for small
fleets. Small fleets owner/operators do not have the
flexibility to time a purchase when there's funding
available. When they need a truck, they need a truck. So
it's really important that we have that funding
continuously available for small fleets.

So I think it's just important that we continue to -- continue on that policy direction and make sure that we're -- that we're supporting small fleets through our incentives like HVIP and ISEF.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Terrific. And I know how important getting drayage right is to our Board and to the staff. And whatever we can do in the South Coast to assist that, again as ACF starts to kick in next year for that sector.

And lastly, I want to thank the other Board members, like Dr. Shaheen, Diane Takvorian that picked up a little bit on the comments from Earthworks and Jobs to

Move America. I don't need to hear more on that, but I am interested both in some of the jobs piece, sourcing, supply chain, due diligence, follow-up on the Lithium Ion Task Force recommendations. I do think it's a market mover. CARB does have the ability to send some signals, both on the sustainable mining, on the backend on recycling, and also on the jobs piece, and look forward to continued discussions with those stakeholders, and appreciate the things that you said here today, Peter.

2.2

So I also want to thank the staff, really from left all the way to the right and Syd Vergis up in front and our whole executive team. It's just such a great team working on the funding plan, working on these incentive issues for our agency. Just whenever we've got a question, you folks are totally on top of it and really if you look at this document or the appendices, the heavy-duty strategy, all the work that's put in the technology side, and the incentive side, it's really so impressive. I really speak for all the Board and the confidence that we have in this team on this Board. And I think it's exemplified in the document and all of the work that's gone into today.

So thank you for that. With that, the Board has before them Resolution number 23-23, including the edits that were published I believe today with regard to the

```
Executive Officer discretion. And assuming that Steve
1
    does not object to that additional discretion vested in
2
    him, is there a motion and a second on Resolution number
3
    23-23.
 4
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: So moved.
5
             BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Is there a second?
 6
             BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Second.
7
8
             BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Dr. Shaheen seconds this
9
    one.
             So clerk, if you would please call the roll.
10
             BOARD CLERK MOORE: Yes, I'm going to call all
11
   Board members, because we had some coming in and out
12
    remotely.
1.3
             So Dr. Balmes?
14
             Mr. De La Torre?
15
16
             BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Aye.
             BOARD CLERK MOORE:
                                  Mr. Eisenhut?
17
             BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT:
                                      Aye.
18
             BOARD CLERK MOORE: Senator Florez?
19
20
             BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Aye.
             BOARD CLERK MOORE: Mr. Guerra?
21
             Ms. Hurt?
2.2
```

BOARD MEMBER HURT: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Mr. Kracov?

23

24

25

```
BOARD CLERK MOORE: Mr. Rechtschaffen?
1
             BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Yes.
2
             BOARD CLERK MOORE: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?
 3
             BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes.
             BOARD CLERK MOORE: Mr. Perez?
 5
             Dr. Shaheen?
 6
7
             BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN:
8
             BOARD CLERK MOORE: Ms. Takvorian?
             BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN:
                                      Yes.
9
             BOARD CLERK MOORE: Supervisor Vargas?
10
             Chair Randolph?
11
             The motion passes.
12
             BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Terrific. So the motion
13
             Thank you to all the staff and all the Board
14
   members for this.
15
16
             Before we move to open public comment, I
   understand Dr. Cliff would like to offer special
17
    recognition to one of our long-standing partners in
18
    connection with the work they're doing on these programs.
19
20
    So I'll turn it over now to you, Dr. Cliff.
             EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Yes. Thank you, Board
21
   Member Kracov. As you heard today, the Clean Vehicle
2.2
23
    Rebate Project, or CVRP, recently closed. I'd like to
   take a few moments to express our gratitude to the Center
24
25
    for Sustainable Energy, known as CSE, for implementing and
```

administering CVRP for nearly 14 years on behalf of CARB.

I'd like to present a commemorative Executive Order to

Larry Goldenhersh, the President of CSE, as a token of our appreciation.

1.3

2.2

Commemorative Executive Order M2-23-001 reads,
"Pursuant to the establishment of the Clean Vehicle Rebate
Project, CVRP, in 2010 and administered by the Center for
Sustainable Energy, CSE, on behalf the California Air
Resources Board with the goal of increasing zero-emission
vehicle adoption in California;

"Whereas, CVRP provided rebates to consumers and public fleets that purchased plug-in hybrid vehicles, battery electric vehicles, hydrogen fuel cell vehicles, Neighborhood Electric Vehicles, and zero-emission motorcycles;

"Whereas, CVRP also offered increased rebates to lower income consumers statewide to reduce the financial burden of adopting a newer technology and encourage lower income consumers to choose zero emissions.

"Whereas, CSE served as CARB's partner in the program's development, implementation, and continuous adaptation since 2010;

"Whereas, CARB finds that:

"CVRP successfully invested over \$1.6 billion in clean light-duty vehicles for individuals, businesses, and

fleets since 2010. Of that amount, CVRP invested over 430 million in Assembly Bill 1550 Priority Communities.

2.2

"CVRP successfully established and nurtured a number of partnerships with community-based organizations, community leaders, and environmental justice organizations to develop innovative approaches to reach community members and provide information about the rebate and related EV incentive programs;

"CVRP conducted over 6,000 outreach events, test drives, presentations, and training for community members and dealerships regarding the rebate's importance;

"CVRP served as a model for other states that have since adopted similar incentive programs;

"CVRP achieved its goal of accelerating the deployment of zero-emission passenger vehicles in California and provided highly useful EV market information to stakeholders in California and beyond;

"Now, therefore be it resolved, that CSE's administration of CVRP was critical to making the program one of the largest clean vehicle purchase incentive programs by providing rebates for over 520,000 clean vehicles statewide;

"Be it further resolved, that CARB recognizes CSE for the decade-long successful implementation of CVRP;

"Be it further resolved that CARB extends its

appreciation to the many CVRP applicants who made an impactful community choice to invest in a climate resilient future for California.

"Be it further resolved, that CARB extends its appreciation to the many partners of CVRP who have helped create impactful opportunities to reach community members most in need of CVRP;

"Be it further resolved that CARB acknowledges that the success of CVRP would not be possible without the team of over 100 hard working staff, past and present, who have worked on CVRP (rebate processing specialists, outreach coordinators, equity specialists, research analysts, and dealership coordinators to name a few) to provide support to the many applicants and rebate recipients of CVRP, as well as the partners and stakeholders involved"

Mr. Goldenhersh on behalf of CARB, we greatly appreciate the incredible work your team has done for CVRP.

(Applause).

MR. GOLDENHERSH: Thank you very much.

(Applause).

EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Okay. Back to you, Mr.

24 Kracov.

1.3

2.2

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Thanks, again for your

service to the State and to the Board.

2.2

Okay. Colleagues, we are going to move to open comment for those who wish to provide a comment regarding an item of interest within the jurisdiction of the Board that is not on today's agenda. The clerk will call on those who have submitted a request to speak card. And if you're joining us remotely and wish to comment, please click the raise hand button or dial star nine now.

And if we can have the clerk please call on those who have raised their hand or signed up to speak, if any.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Yes. We currently have four with their hands raised in Zoom.

Our first commenter is Manijeh Berenji. I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

MANIJEH BERENJI: Oh, hello. Can you hear me?
BOARD CLERK MOORE: Yes.

DR. MANIJEH BERENJI: Excellent. Thank you so much.

My name is Manijeh Berenji. I'm an occupational and environmental medicine physician at VA Long Beach Health Care System. And I'm also a Health Sciences clinical assistant professor at UC Irvine. I am also a member of Climate Health Now. Thank you so much for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed fiscal

year 2023-2024 funding plan for clean transportation incentives.

1.3

2.2

I wanted to share a case that I recently evaluated here at the VA Long Beach. I actually treat veterans and I take care of their environmental exposures. I want to talk about Martin. He's a 45-year old longshoreman and marine veteran who works at the Port of Long Beach and he lives in Wilmington near the Marathon Oil Refinery. He has recently developed worsening allergies, which have not been well controlled despite the best efforts from his primary care team. He's had a long-standing history of asthma and he has had more exacerbations in the last few years, and he also has underlying cardiovascular disease, which makes him more sensitive to heat-related issues. He's had a number of heat related events in the last year as well.

I wanted to highlight this particular case because this provides the urgency. We urge CARB to not just build upon last year's 70 percent of funding to be invested in priority populations, but that these investments in programs are intentionally targeted at those with the most barriers to adoption. The recent Low Carbon Fuel Standard 2023 amendment Standardized Regulatory Impact Assessment reinforced the need to not just prioritize priority populations, but intentionally

target investments to those that continue to face the biggest barriers to adoption.

1.3

2.2

It is imperative that CARB act with urgency and intentionality to avoid the identified and direct burdens outlined in the report. We appreciate CARB also setting investment targets. We request that CARB develop a strategy, informed by a public process, that outlines the activities that we'll employ through --

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Our commenter is Lisa McGhee.

I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

LISA McGHEE: Hi. Yes. My name is Lisa McGhee and I'm with Tom's Truck Center, and apologize. I wanted to actually speak on 23-10-1, but nonetheless appreciate the vote from the staff today and the Board's work on this effort. We really appreciate the program as it relates to being more equitable and supportive towards the small fleets. There is a lot to do for the small fleets and I just want to encourage the continued innovation to modify the small fleet definition to align it with the fleet size, such as in ISEF, at 20 trucks, and include more funding towards short-term rentals and leases. This allows these fleets to participate and not have to incur any investments up front.

In addition, I want to address the issues that we're experiencing, which hopefully we can have consideration as we move forward for redemption of payments in these programs. There's a number of vouchers that have gone through this process. We've got at least 6,582 vouchers, but only 62 percent -- or 62 percent of these, which is 4,000, are actually unredeemed today.

1.3

2.2

We're one of those dealers that sit at that end of delivering vehicles after we've submitted vouchers and awarded, but we're waiting well over 90 days for payment and that continues to climb. This creates a burden and a hardship on the dealership in the whole process of how we can manage to carry the amount of vouchers that we're submitting on our books. So I'd like to just address. This is not simple or supportive, and the actual IM has a timeline for seven to 10 days.

So I'd love to continue to make sure that we fix the issues that can impact true voucher accelerated adoption. Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Our next commenter is The Originaldra. I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

THE ORIGINALDRA: Yes. I'm a little bit concerned with all of the, you know, things that we are

doing to save the planet, that there's so many people outside of like our state, right, that aren't doing it.

So I'm just wondering when we could talk about doing some kind of like bubble over the state. I don't know if like a biodome type of thing. And then we could also think about going into each county and then you would want to go into each like city, so that you can keep everybody contained.

2.2

And then I was thinking because, you know, we're all individually doing different things to, you know, save the planet, and it's not really equitable that, you know, some people are producing more clean air than others, so perhaps our own bubble we could do. And then, you know, if somebody is, you know, producing more like the bubble we'll grow, so you'll be able to tell who exactly is, you know, producing more of these greenhouse gases. And then, you know, we can find a way to mitigate that. I don't know if like popping the bobble and then making them having to get another one.

But, you know, it just almost seems pointless to be doing all of these things when the clean air that we're, you know, producing is going to just be like blowing into other states or like across, you know, the ocean, or something like that, or countries, you know. And so I just really think that we need to figure out how

we're going mitigate that, because otherwise I mean it seems kind of wasteful to do all these things if it's not going to make a difference.

2.2

So I don't know if we want to talk to NASA or, you know, somebody who creates bubbles, and, you know, just look into that, because I'm sure there's enough money to do that for each of us individually. I mean, we could use that to incentivize people as well, like maybe you can, you know, offer some kind of really neat, you know, sci-fi adventure going on within the bubble, that will make them want to do it. So I don't know just some thoughts. Thank you, guys.

BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

Our next Commenter is Sean Edgar. I have activated your microphone. Please unmute and you may begin.

SEAN EDGAR: Hi. Good morning. How is my volume?

BOARD CLERK MOORE: We can hear you,

SEAN EDGAR: Great. Thank you. This is Sean Edgar. I'm the director of cleanfleets.net based in Sacramento.

I just wanted to highlight for a moment here what I believe will be a pending problem toward the end of the career with the Clean Truck Check Reporting System and fee

payment. And Ms. Takvorian mentioned the one million international trucks. Those are required to be registered by the end of the year in the Clean Truck Check database as well as other interstate an in-state fleets, many of those operated by small fleet operators, including one-truck operators that don't have a lot of technical expertise or savvy.

1.3

2.2

So just a brief list of issues with the Clean Truck Check database. We're currently experiencing -- you know, we have about 45 days until end of the year for over 75,000 fleets to report into this brand new system and, you know, would affect north of about a million and a half trucks and also affect about, you know, over \$40 million of revenue to ARB in fee payment. So the current problems that we're experiencing is the service system apparently has some timeout problems. So it took about three days this week to establish a single user account.

Our firm functions as a -- similar to a DMV registration service, where we do that on behalf Fortune 500 companies and other fleets. And we're experiencing server downtime. Staff was helpful to suggest that we try that again after hours and that we use Google Chrome as a browser, but essentially it took three days to establish one account. Our firm is responsible to do over 200 of those accounts and -- new accounts. And it's very

doubtful we're going to meet the end-of-the-year deadline with the current problems with server access.

The second issue will be data availability. In the workshop phase for this regulation, staff painted a picture that trucker's data and DMV data would be put into a system where fleet owners would just simply need to validate data and that doesn't seem to be the case, because it seems to be hand cranking one by one over a -- BOARD CLERK MOORE: Thank you.

That concludes our commenters for open comment. I'll turn the microphone back to President Chair Gideon Kracov.

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Great. Very good.

We'll now break for closed session, as indicated in the public notice for today's meeting, approximately 45 minutes. After closed session, the Board will reconvene to adjourn this meeting. We'll now go into closed session.

(Off record: 11:48 a.m.)

(Thereupon the meeting recessed

into closed session.)

(Thereupon the meeting reconvened

open session.)

1.3

2.2

(On record: 12:36 p.m.)

BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Please come to order. We

met in closed session and no action was taken by the Board. Therefore, the November 16th, 2023, California Air Resources Board Meeting is now adjourned. We are not meeting in December. Thank you. (Thereupon the Air Resources Board meeting adjourned at 12:37 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 2nd day of December, 2023.

James & Path

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 10063