

MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

AIR RESOURCES BOARD

ZOOM PLATFORM

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

BYRON SHER AUDITORIUM

1001 I STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, JANUARY 23, 2025

10:02 A.M.

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

J&K COURT REPORTING, LLC

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS:

Liane Randolph, Chair

John Balmes, MD

Hector De La Torre

John Eisenhut

Dean Florez (Remote)

Eric Guerra

Davina Hurt

Gideon Kracov (Remote)

Tania Pacheco-Werner, PhD (Remote)

Cliff Rechtschaffen

Susan Shaheen, PhD

Diane Takvorian

STAFF:

Steve Cliff, PhD, Executive Officer

Courtney Smith, Principal Deputy Executive Officer

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

Chanell Fletcher, Deputy Executive Officer, Environmental Justice

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

Michael Benjamin, Chief, Air Quality Planning and Science Division(AQPSD)

Mark H. Hixson, Staff Air Pollution Specialist, Central Valley Air Quality Planning Section, AQPSD

Vernon Hughes, Assistant Chief, AQPSD

Kelli Johnson, Attorney, Legal Office

Ali Kindred, Manager, Central Valley Air Quality Planning Section, AQPSD

Abigail May, Deputy Counsel

Sylvia Vanderspek, Chief, Air Quality Planning Branch, AQPSD

Daniel Whitney, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

ALSO PRESENT:

Gustavo Aguirre, Jr., Central California Asthma Collaborative

Will Barrett, American Lung Association

Christian Bisher, Central California Environmental Justice Network

Teresa Bui, Pacific Environment

Evan Edgar, Edgar and Associates

Dr. James Enstrom, Scientific Integrity Institute

Dianne Flowers

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

ALSO PRESENT:

Matt Holmes, Holmes & Associates, Valley Improvement
Projects

Greg Hurner, Miller Industries

JR Lemke, Happy Daze RV, California RV Dealers Association

Bill Magavern, Coalition for Clean Air

Clayton Munnings, Elevate Climate

Cynthia Pinto-Cabrera, Central Valley Air Quality
Coalition

Melina Rothen, California RV Dealers Association, ET
Quality RV

Ruben Rodriguez, Central California Environmental Justice
Network

Craig Thomas, The Fire Restoration Group

INDEX

| | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| Call to Order | 1 |
| Opening Remarks | 2 |
| Item 25-1-1 | |
| Chair Randolph | 7 |
| Executive Officer Cliff | 8 |
| Motion | 11 |
| Vote | 11 |
| Item 25-1-2 | |
| Chair Randolph | 12 |
| Executive Officer Cliff | 13 |
| Motion | 14 |
| Vote | 14 |
| Item 25-1-3 | |
| Chair Randolph | 15 |
| Executive Officer Cliff | 16 |
| Motion | 17 |
| Vote | 17 |
| Item 25-1-4 | |
| Chair Randolph | 18 |
| Executive Officer Cliff | 19 |
| Staff Presentation | 21 |
| Craig Thomas | 36 |
| Ruben Rodriguez | 38 |
| Christian Bisher | 40 |
| Dr. James Enstrom | 41 |
| Dianne Flowers | 42 |
| Cynthia Pinto-Cabrera | 43 |
| Gustavo Aguirre, Jr. | 45 |
| Matt Holmes | 46 |
| Board Discussion and Q&A | 47 |
| Motion | 63 |
| Vote | 63 |
| Item 25-1-5 | |
| Chair Randolph | 64 |
| Executive Officer Cliff | 67 |
| RJ. Lemke | 81 |
| Melina Rochin | 82 |
| Evan Edgar | 84 |
| Will Barrett | 86 |

INDEX CONTINUED

| | <u>PAGE</u> |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Item 25-1-5 (continued) | |
| Matt Holmes | 88 |
| Bill Magavern | 90 |
| Clayton Munnings | 91 |
| Board Discussion and Q&A | 92 |
| Open Public Comment | |
| Evan Edgar | 104 |
| Teresa Bui | 106 |
| Greg Hurner | 107 |
| Closing Remarks by Chair Randolph | 109 |
| Closed Session | 114 |
| Adjournment | 114 |
| Reporter's Certificate | 116 |

PROCEEDINGS

1
2 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Good morning. The
3 January 23rd, 2025 public meeting of the California Air
4 Resources Board will come to order.

5 Board clerk will you please call the roll.

6 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dr. Balmes.

7 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here

8 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. De La Torre.

9 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Here.

10 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Eisenhut.

11 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here.

12 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Senator Florez.

13 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here

14 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Assemblymember Garcia?

15 Mr. Guerra.

16 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Guerra here.

17 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ms. Hurt.

18 BOARD MEMBER HURT: Hurt present.

19 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Kracov.

20 BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Here.

21 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

22 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Here.

23 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Supervisor Perez.

24 Mr. Rechtschaffen.

25 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Here.

1 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dr. Shaheen.

2 BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Here.

3 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Senator Stern?

4 Ms. Takvorian?

5 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.

6 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Chair Randolph.

7 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Here.

8 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Madam Chair, we have a
9 quorum. All right. Thank you very. We will first cover
10 our housekeeping items before we get started this morning.

11 We are conducting today's meeting in person as
12 well as offering remote options for public participation
13 both by phone and in Zoom. Anyone who wishes to testify
14 in person should fill out a request-to-speak card
15 available in the foyer outside the Board room. Please
16 turn it into a Board assistant prior to the commencement
17 of the item. If you are participating remotely, you will
18 raise your hand in Zoom or dial star nine if calling in by
19 phone. The clerk will provide further details regarding
20 how public participation will work in just a moment.

21 For safety reasons, please note the emergency
22 exit to the rear of the room through the foyer. In the
23 event of a fire alarm, we are required to evacuate this
24 room immediately and go down the stairs to the lobby and
25 out of the building. When the "All Clear" signal is

1 given, we will return to the auditorium and resume the
2 hearing.

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

11 Interpretation services will be provided today in
12 Spanish for both in-person and Zoom attendees. If you are
13 joining us using Zoom, there is a button labeled
14 "Interpretation" on the Zoom screen. Click on that
15 interpretation button and select Spanish to hear the
16 meeting in Spanish. If you are joining us here in person
17 and would like to listen to the meeting in Spanish, please
18 speak to a Board assistant and they will provide you with
19 further instructions. I want to remind all of our
20 commenters to speak slowly and pause intermittently to
21 allow the interpreters the opportunity to accurately
22 interpret your comments.

23 THE INTERPRETER: Thank you, Chair Randolph.
24 We'll repeat that in Spanish now for the benefit of your
25 Spanish listening audience.

1 (Interpreter translated in Spanish).

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

3 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you so much. I will now
4 ask the Boar clerk to provide more details regarding
5 public participation.

6 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you, Chair Randolph.
7 Good morning, everyone. I'll be providing additional
8 information on public participation for today's meeting.

9 We will first call on in-person commenters who
10 have turned in a request-to-speak card and then I call
11 commenters who are joining us remotely. If you are
12 joining us remotely and wish to make a verbal comment on
13 one of today's Board items or during the open comment
14 period at the end of today's meeting, you will must be
15 using Zoom webinar or calling in by phone. If you are
16 watching the webcast on CAL-SPAN, but you wish to comment
17 remotely, please register for the Zoom webinar or call in.
18 Information for both can be found on the public agenda for
19 today's meeting.

20 To make a verbal comment, we will be using the
21 "Raise Hand" feature in Zoom. If you wish to speak on a
22 Board item, please virtually raise your hand as soon as
23 the item has begun to let us know you wish to speak. If
24 you are using a computer or tablet, there is a "Raise
25 Hand" button. And if you are calling in on the telephone,

1 dial star nine to raise your hand. Even if you previously
2 indicated which item you wished to speak when you
3 registered, you must raise your hand at the beginning of
4 the item to be added to the queue.

5 When the comment period starts, the order of
6 commenters will is determined by who raises their hand
7 first. We will call each commenter by name and will
8 activate each commenter's audio when it is their turn to
9 speak. For those calling in, we will identify you by the
10 last three digits of your phone number and we will
11 announce the next three or so commenters in the queue, so
12 you are ready to testify when we come to you. Please
13 note, your testimony will not appear by video. And for
14 all comments, please state your name for the record before
15 you speak. This is especially important for those calling
16 in by phone.

17 Each commenter will have a time limit of two
18 minutes, although this may change at the Chair's
19 discretion. During public testimony, you will see a timer
20 on the screen. For those calling in by phone, let you
21 know when you have 30 seconds left and when your time is
22 up. And for anyone giving verbal comments today in
23 Spanish, please indicate so at the beginning of your
24 testimony and our interpreter will assist you. During
25 your comment, please follow any instructions the

1 interpreter provides and please note your time will be
2 doubled, if you require Spanish interpretation.

3 To submit written comments, please visit CARB's
4 "Send Us Your Comments" page or look at the public agenda
5 on our webpage for links to submit your comment. Written
6 comments will be accepted on each item until the Chair
7 closes the record for that Board item.

8 And if you experience any technical difficulties,
9 please call (805)772-2715, so that an IT person can
10 assist.

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

12 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. Before we begin
13 today's agenda item, I want to take a moment to
14 acknowledge all of those impacted by the devastating
15 wildfires in Southern California, including our own Board
16 colleague Gideon Kracov and his family who were impacted,
17 and CARB staff who were displaced and who are supporting
18 family who were displaced, and including those who are
19 right now evacuated due to the Hughes fire. And I also
20 want to make sure and thank the amazing first responders
21 from all over California, from other states, from other
22 countries who stepped in to help us during this time.

23 California, as you know, is taking an
24 all-hands-on-deck approach to the response and recovery.
25 And we at CARB have offered support to the South Coast Air

1 Quality Management District who staff are working around
2 the clock on local air monitoring and response efforts.
3 CARB has leveraged its California Smoke Spotter app to
4 provide information on smoke conditions and to help people
5 find clean air centers.

6 Our Smoke Ready California campaign also provides
7 key information on how to stay safe from wildfire smoke.
8 And we were able to quickly pivot to ease restrictions on
9 portable generators to make it easier for manufacturers to
10 meet the increased demand for those generators.

11 Our hearts are with our with colleagues, and
12 friends, and family, and residents in Southern California
13 and we will continue to support the State's response as
14 the rebuilding process gets underway.

15 All right. Turning to our agenda, the first item
16 on the consent calendar, as noted on the public agenda is
17 Item number 25-1-1, a proposed research contract with the
18 University of California at Berkeley titled, "Assessing
19 Health Impacts of Brake and Tire Wear Emissions in
20 Overburdened Communities of the San Joaquin Valley." This
21 contract will be the first study to examine the effects of
22 brake and tire wear emissions on ambient exposures and
23 public health impacts in the San Joaquin Valley.

24 If you are here with us in the room and wish to
25 comment on this item, please fill out a request-to-speak

1 card as soon as possible and submit it to a Board
2 assistant. If you are joining us remotely and wish to
3 comment on this item, please click the raise hand button
4 or dial star nine now. We will call on both in-person and
5 remote commenters when we get to the public comment
6 portion of this item.

7 This item is listed on the agenda to comply with
8 Board approval requirements in Government Code section
9 1091. Board Member Balmes will abstain from the
10 discussion and vote because he is affiliated with the same
11 department at the University of California, Berkeley as
12 the contract's principal investigator.

13 Dr. Cliff, will you please summarize this item.

14 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Chair
15 Randolph. Many overburdened communities in California are
16 exposed to high levels of traffic emissions, including
17 non-tailpipe emissions such as brake and tire wear
18 particles. While CARB's regulations and advances in
19 vehicle technology have reduced tailpipe emissions
20 greatly, non-tailpipe emissions have become a growing
21 percentage of traffic pollution. Most studies of brake
22 and tire wear to date have focused on particle components
23 emitted from the tailpipe rather than community exposure
24 to brake and tire wear -- tire wear particles in ambient
25 air. Existing research on health impacts of brake and

1 tire wear particles, including a study contracted by CARB,
2 has highlighted concerns about potential health impacts
3 but more studies are necessary.

4 This contract is the first to examine brake and
5 tire wear exposures and health impacts in ambient air in
6 the San Joaquin Valley. This contract will help CARB
7 understand the impacts of brake and tire wear emissions on
8 health, particle toxicity, and exposure disparities
9 including impacts in vulnerable communities with high
10 traffic exposures.

11 The investigators will develop advanced exposure
12 models to determine the health risks in these communities,
13 particularly for respiratory, cardiovascular, and birth
14 outcomes. Key contract outcomes will include analysis of
15 exposure levels and health outcomes at the zip code level
16 for smaller scale in the San Joaquin Valley, and
17 comparison of exposures and impacts in overburdened areas
18 to other areas.

19 A technical advisory group of scientific experts
20 and community representatives will provide input to the
21 contract implementation. This group, along with CARB
22 staff, will provide input on the study's design,
23 methodology, and health analysis. The contract team will
24 also plan and conduct community meetings before the study
25 begins and after the results are completed to keep the

1 public informed. The investigators will coordinate with
2 ongoing studies on brake and tire wear, including the
3 Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Studies, or MATES VI, under
4 development at the South Coast Air Quality Management
5 District. MATES VI will monitor brake and tire wear in
6 ambient air and estimate health risks.

7 This proposed contract was reviewed and
8 recommended for approval by the Research Screening
9 Committee.

10 CARB staff recommend that the Board approve
11 funding of the proposed research contract with the
12 University of California, Berkeley entitled, "Assessing
13 Health Impacts of Brake and Tire Wear Emissions in
14 Overburdened communities of the San Joaquin Valley," and
15 \$850,000 is requested to fund this contract.

16 This include -- concludes my summary of the item.
17 Thank you.

18 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

19 Board clerk, are there any commenters signed up
20 to comment on this item.

21 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: No.

22 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right, I will now close the
23 record on this item. Do I have a motion and a second to
24 approve this item and have staff proceed with executing
25 this contract?

1 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'll move the item.
2 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Second.
3 CHAIR RANDOLPH. Board clerk, will you please
4 call the roll.
5 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. De La Torre?
6 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Aye.
7 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Eisenhut?
8 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Aye.
9 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Senator Florez?
10 Senator Florez?
11 Mr. Guerra?
12 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Aye.
13 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ms. Hurt?
14 BOARD MEMBER HURT: Aye.
15 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Kracov?
16 BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes.
17 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?
18 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes.
19 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Supervisor Perez?
20 Mr. Rechtschaffen?
21 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Yes.
22 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dr. Shaheen?
23 BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Aye.
24 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ms. Takvorian?
25 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.

1 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Chair Randolph?

2 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.

3 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Madam Chair, the motion
4 passes.

5 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

6 The next item on the consent calendar, as noted
7 on the public agenda, is Item number 25-1-2, proposed
8 research contract with the University of California,
9 Berkeley titled, "Reducing Exposure With Air Cleaners and
10 Technology, REACT, in At-Risk Communities." If you are
11 here with us in the room and wish to comment on this item,
12 please fill out a request to speak card as soon as
13 possible and submit it to a Board assistant. If you are
14 joining us remotely and wish to comment on this item,
15 please click the "Raise Hand" button or dial star nine
16 now. We will call on both in-person and remote commenters
17 when we get to the public comment portion of this item.

18 This item is listed on the agenda to comply with
19 Board approval requirements in Government Code section
20 1091. Board Member Shaheen will abstain from the
21 discussion and vote, because she is affiliated with the
22 same department at UC Berkeley as the contract's principal
23 investigator. Board Member Balmes will also abstain from
24 the discussion and vote, because he is affiliated with the
25 same department at UC San Francisco, as the lead

1 investigator of a subcontractor in the study.

2 Dr. Cliff, will you please summarize the item.

3 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Chair
4 Randolph.

5 CARB is proposing to enter into \$850,000,
6 two-year contract with Regents of the University of
7 California, Berkeley for the project entitled, "Reducing
8 Exposure With Air Cleaners and Technology, or REACT, in
9 At-Risk Communities." The study will be a collaborative
10 partnership between UC Berkeley, UC San Francisco, and two
11 local environmental justice organizations, Bayview Hunters
12 Point Community Advocates and Brightline Defense.

13 The primary objective of this study will be to
14 investigate the air quality and health impacts of
15 deploying portable air cleaners and air quality sensors at
16 residences in the Bayview Hunters Point community. It is
17 known that when used properly, portable air cleaners are
18 effective in lowering indoor PM2.5 levels. However,
19 little is known about how to maximize the efficacy of
20 these devices. CARB expects to leverage the results to
21 inform communities on best practices to reduce exposures
22 to pollutants in the indoor environment. This contract
23 will provide a better understanding of indoor air quality
24 in impacted communities like Bayview Hunters Point and
25 will further the Board's goals of improving air quality

1 and reducing public health disparities for overburdened
2 communities.

3 This proposed contract was reviewed and
4 recommended for approval by the Research Screening
5 Committee. This concludes my summary of the item. Thank
6 you.

7 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

8 Board clerk, are there any commenters on this
9 item?

10 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: No.

11 CHAIR RANDOLPH: I will now close the record on
12 this agenda item. Do I have a motion and a second to
13 approve this item, and have staffed proceed with executing
14 this contract.

15 BOARD MEMBER HURT: Move approval.

16 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Second.

17 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Board clerk, will
18 you please call the roll.

19 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. De La Torre?

20 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Aye.

21 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Eisenhut?

22 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Yes.

23 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Senator Florez?

24 Senator Florez?

25 Mr. Guerra?

1 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Aye.

2 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ms. Hurt?

3 BOARD MEMBER HURT: Aye.

4 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Kracov?

5 Mr. Kracov

6 BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Sorry about that. Yes.

7 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

8 Dr. Pacheco-Werner?

9 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes.

10 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Supervisor Perez?

11 Mr. Rechtschaffen?

12 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Yes.

13 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ms. Takvorian?

14 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.

15 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Chair Randolph?

16 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.

17 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Madam Chair, the motion
18 passes.

19 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. The next
20 item on the consent calendar, as noted in the public
21 agenda, is Item number 25-1-3, proposed 2024 amendments to
22 area designations for State ambient air quality standards.
23 If you would like to comment on staff's proposal, as
24 posted on CARB's website, please raise your hand in Zoom
25 or dial star nine now. When we get to the public comment

1 portion of this item, we will call on in-person commenters
2 who have submitted a request to speak card followed by
3 those who have virtually raised their hand.

4 Dr. Cliff, would you please summarize size the
5 item.

6 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Chair
7 Randolph.

8 The State law requires CARB to annually review
9 and update the area designations for the State ambient air
10 quality standards as appropriate. Therefore, based on a
11 review of 2021 through 2023 air quality data, staff is
12 proposing amendments to existing area designations for
13 ozone, suspended particulate matter, or PM10, and fine
14 particular matter, or PM2.5.

15 For ozone, staff recommends the Board redesignate
16 Shasta County in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin from
17 nonattainment to nonattainment-transitional.
18 Additionally, for PM10, staff recommends the Board
19 redesignate Nevada, Plumas, and Sierra counties in the
20 Mountain Counties Air Basin from nonattainment to
21 unclassified. Finally, for PM2.5, staff recommends the
22 Board redesignate San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin
23 nonattainment to attainment.

24 In summary, these changes reflect the current air
25 quality in these areas and staff recommends approval of

1 the proposed changes to the State area designations. This
2 concludes my summary of the item.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. Board clerk, have
5 any witnesses signed up to testify on this item?

6 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: No commenters.

7 CHAIR RANDOLPH: I will now close the record on
8 this agenda item. The Board has before them Resolution
9 Number 25-1. Do I have a motion and a second.

10 BOARD MEMBER HURT: Move approval.

11 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Second.

12 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right, Board clerk, will you
13 please call the roll.

14 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dr. Balmes?

15 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes.

16 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. De La Torre?

17 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Aye.

18 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Eisenhut?

19 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Yes.

20 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Guerra?

21 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Aye.

22 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ms. Hurt?

23 BOARD MEMBER HURT: Aye.

24 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Kracov?

25 BOARD MEMBER KRACOV: Yes.

1 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?

2 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes.

3 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez aye.

4 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Florez aye, noted. Thank
5 you.

6 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez aye. You didn't
7 call me in the roll. Thanks.

8 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Supervisor Perez?
9 Mr. Rechtschaffen?

10 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Yes.

11 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dr. Shaheen?

12 BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Aye.

13 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ms. Takvorian?

14 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Aye.

15 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Chair Randolph?

16 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.

17 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Madam Chair, the motion
18 passes.

19 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

20 Okay. The next item on the agenda is item number
21 25-1-4, PM2.5 area designation recommendations for the
22 revised federal annual PM2.5 standard. If you are here
23 with us in the room and wish to comment on this item,
24 please fill out a request-to-speak card as soon as
25 possible and submit it to a Board assistant. If you are

1 joining us remotely and wish to comment on this item,
2 please click the "Raise Hand" button or dial star nine
3 now. We will first call on in-person commenters followed
4 by any remote commenters when we get to the public comment
5 portion of the item.

6 In this item, the Board will consider staff's
7 recommendations for which areas of the state should be
8 classified -- I'm sorry, should be designated
9 non-attainment, attainment, and unclassified for the
10 latest federal annual fine particulate matter standard,
11 the nine microgram per cubic meter standard based on the
12 latest air quality data.

13 When U.S. EPA promulgated this standard last
14 February, it started a one-year clock for states to
15 designate areas and submit them to the EPA for their
16 consideration. Once designations are finalized, the
17 revised standard will initiate a new planning process in
18 addition to the ones already underway for the existing
19 PM2.5 standards.

20 Dr. Cliff, would please introduce the item.

21 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Chair
22 Randolph. In February 2024, EPA strengthened the annual
23 PM2.5 standard from 12 microgram per cubic meter to nine
24 micrograms per cubic meter based on an extensive body of
25 scientific information and consensus of the EPA's Clean

1 Air Scientific Advisory Committee members that the
2 current -- members that the current level was not
3 sufficiently health protective. EPA's review of the PM2.5
4 standard builds on decades of scientific research clearly
5 showing the harmful effects of PM2.5 on human health.
6 States are required to submit designation recommendations
7 and boundaries for nonattainment areas to EPA by February
8 7th of this year.

9 Staff have reviewed the PM2.5 air quality
10 monitoring data from 2021 to 2023, as well as information
11 on the nature of the PM2.5 problem in each recommended
12 region. As you will hear in the presentation, staff are
13 recommending nine non-attainment areas for the nine
14 microgram annual standard. EPA will finalize designations
15 next year based on the 2022 to 2024 air quality data. You
16 will also hear in the presentation key milestones for the
17 designation process, as well as for the State
18 Implementation Plan development process that CARB will
19 undertake in the coming years in partnership with the
20 local air districts responsible for areas designated
21 nonattainment with the new standard.

22 I will now ask Mark Hixson of the Air Quality
23 Planning and Science Division to begin the staff
24 presentation.

25 Mark.

1 (Slide presentation).

2 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON:

3 Thank you, Dr. Cliff. Good morning, Chair
4 Randolph and members of the Board.

5 Today, I'll be presenting on California's
6 designation recommendations for the new federal nine
7 micrograms per cubic meter annual fine particulate, or
8 PM2.5, standard.

9 [SLIDE CHANGE]

10 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: In
11 my presentation, I'll be covering the setting of the new
12 federal PM2.5 standard, how exceptional events play a
13 role, the areas we are recommending designating
14 nonattainment, an overview of the state implementation
15 planning process, and lastly our recommendation for the
16 Board and what happens next related to this new federal
17 PM2.5 standard.

18 [SLIDE CHANGE]

19 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: The
20 United States Environmental Protection Agency, or EPA,
21 sets national ambient air quality standards to levels
22 protective of public health and public welfare. The EPA
23 reviews the standards and underlying scientific and
24 technical information available every five years. PM2.5
25 is harmful since the pollutant can easily get deep into

1 the lungs and even in the blood stream. There are clear
2 health effects associated with exposure to PM2.5,
3 including lung cancer, heart disease, and stroke, which
4 result in hospitalizations and premature deaths.

5 [SLIDE CHANGE]

6 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: The
7 revised PM2.5 standard was finalized on February 7th, 2024
8 at an annual level of nine micrograms per cubic meter.
9 EPA set this value based on an extensive review of
10 underlying scientific evidence showing that the current 12
11 micrograms per cubic meter standard was not sufficiently
12 health protective and a lower standard level would provide
13 increased health protection. This new level would protect
14 millions of Americans from harmful and costly health
15 impacts, from heart attacks, and premature death. Across
16 the nation, EPA determined that the strengthened standard
17 would result in a significant public health benefit that
18 could be as high as \$46 billion in 2032. The standard is
19 set through a robust multi-year public process.

20 Once the standard is finalized, the Clean Air Act
21 establishes a process that states and EPA must follow to
22 designate areas, sets the schedule for state
23 implementation plans, and attainment of the standard. The
24 first step in this process is for states to submit
25 recommendations for areas to be designated as

1 nonattainment, attainment, or unclassifiable within one
2 year of the standard. Since designations are considered a
3 regulatory determination, the impact of exceptional events
4 can be considered.

5 [SLIDE CHANGE]

6 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON:

7 Before I talk about exceptional events in the
8 context of designations, I think it's important to
9 acknowledge the wildfires in Southern California. These
10 events are devastating and have impacted the lives and
11 health of many across the region. We will continue to
12 work closely were other agencies to understand and
13 mitigate people's exposure to smoke and ash from those
14 wildfires.

15 For the purpose of today's Board item,
16 exceptional events such as wildfires can be excluded from
17 the calculation of design value when designating
18 nonattainment areas. However, smoke from wildfire events
19 do remain a part of the air quality records. In EPA's
20 view, wildfires and other exceptional events are not
21 reasonably controllable by State and local agencies. When
22 designating nonattainment areas for the new PM2.5
23 standard, EPA requires a demonstration documenting any
24 days influenced by exceptional events like wildfires that
25 are to be excluded from design value calculations for

1 2023. That means we looked at air quality data for days
2 potentially impacted by wildfires in 2021, 2022, and 2023.
3 We are already reviewing preliminary 2024 air quality data
4 to determine if any additional exceptional events
5 negatively impact the 2024 design value.

6 [SLIDE CHANGE]

7 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: In
8 identifying the proposed nine micrograms per cubic meter
9 nonattainment areas for California, we used the
10 exceptional events process for one area. Siskiyou County
11 was impacted by fires in 2021 and 2022, which made a
12 difference in attaining the standard by impacting the 2023
13 design value. The photo on this slide highlights the
14 significant amount of smoke in the area. Due to the
15 wildfires, the PM2.5 design value was at 11.7 micrograms
16 per cubic meter and is brought below the standard after
17 the exceptional event impacted days are removed. The
18 completed demonstration has gone through public comment
19 period and has already been submitted to EPA ahead of the
20 February 7th deadline. Preliminary air quality data from
21 2024 shows that Siskiyou County will attain the nine
22 micrograms per cubic meter standard without the removal of
23 exceptional events.

24 [SLIDE CHANGE]

25 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: As

1 shown on the map and table on this slide, we are
2 recommending nine areas to be designated nonattainment for
3 the nine Micrograms per cubic meter standard based on air
4 quality data from 2021 through 2023 from regulatory
5 monitors with the remaining areas of California designated
6 either attainment or unclassifiable. Unclassifiable areas
7 would be those areas where there is insufficient
8 regulatory air quality data to determine the attainment
9 status.

10 The values in this table do not reflect the
11 removal of any days impacted by wildfires or other
12 exceptional events. The table lists the proposed
13 nonattainment areas in order of 2023 design value from
14 highest to lowest. Final designations will be based on
15 PM2.5 design values calculated from 2022 through 2024 air
16 quality data. Our preliminary findings from evaluating
17 2024 air quality data shows that Feather River and
18 Sacramento will likely attain the standard as part of the
19 final designations. As a result, we expect seven areas in
20 California to be eventually designated nonattainment of
21 the nine micrograms per cubic meter standard.

22 [SLIDE CHANGE]

23 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: As
24 part of the designation process, the State must also
25 recommend boundaries of proposed nonattainment areas.

1 When determining the boundary for nonattainment areas,
2 EPA's guidance provides a weight-of-evidence approach
3 based on five factors listed here: air quality data,
4 emissions, meteorology, geography or topography, and
5 jurisdictional boundaries. CARB, in consultation with
6 potentially impacted air districts, considered these
7 factors in determining the boundaries. In most cases,
8 existing nonattainment area boundaries were used.

9 However, for a few areas, CARB developed new boundaries.

10 We'll talk about each nonattainment area boundary
11 in the following slides in the order they appeared on the
12 table in the previous slide.

13 [SLIDE CHANGE]

14 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: For
15 each of these maps in the upcoming slides, the
16 nonattainment area boundary is shown in red with the air
17 basin boundaries in blue, county boundaries are a dashed
18 line, red pins are shown for monitors exceeding the
19 standard, blue pins for monitors at or below the standard.
20 We're not showing any monitors here with design value --
21 with invalid design values. In the San Joaquin Valley,
22 the air monitoring site with the highest PM2.5
23 concentration is in Bakersfield and Kern County with a
24 2023 design value of 16.2 micrograms per cubic meter.

25 I'll also highlight that this is a design value

1 covering the years of 2021 through 2023. No exceptional
2 events have been excluded. We are recommending the
3 existing PM2.5 boundary for San Joaquin Valley
4 nonattainment area that was last used in the designations
5 for the previous annual PM2.5 standard be retained for
6 this new standard.

7 [SLIDE CHANGE]

8 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: The
9 Portola nonattainment area within Plumas County sits in an
10 intermountain basin at 4,900 feet elevation surrounded by
11 mountains. The single regulatory air monitor in the City
12 of Portola has a 2023 PM2.5 design value of 14.0
13 micrograms per cubic meter. Similar to the San Joaquin
14 Valley, no exceptional events were excluded. We are
15 recommending to retain the existing nonattainment area
16 boundary established for the previous 12 micrograms per
17 cubic meter annual PM2.5 standard.

18 [SLIDE CHANGE]

19 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: The
20 South Coast Air Basin's highest design value site is 13.1
21 micrograms per cubic meter at the Ontario Route 60 near
22 road air monitor. Near-road monitors are considered
23 microscale due to the influence of pollution from passing
24 trucks and cars and are required for nonattainment areas
25 with populations of more than one million people and on

1 roadways with more than 250,000 passing vehicles. While
2 microscale monitoring sites are normally not applicable to
3 the annual PM2.5 standard, since they are required
4 monitors to assess PM2.5 in a region, they can be used for
5 regulatory determinations, including designations. We are
6 recommending retaining the existing PM2.5 nonattainment
7 area boundary used for the 12 micrograms per cubic meter
8 annual PM2.5 designations.

9 [SLIDE CHANGE]

10 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: As
11 mentioned earlier, preliminary 2024 PM2.5 data shows that
12 the existing Yuba City-Marysville nonattainment area does
13 attain the standard. However, the nonattainment area
14 recommendations we are considering today must be made
15 using 2023 design value data. The single regulatory air
16 monitor in this area has a 2023 design value of 11.2
17 micrograms per cubic meter, which puts it above the nine
18 micrograms per cubic meter standard. CARB will be
19 recommending using the nonattainment area boundary
20 established for the 35 micrograms per cubic meter
21 designations, which contains Sutter County and a portion
22 of Yuba County. If the final 2024 design value ends up
23 being below the nine micrograms per cubic meter standard,
24 EPA should designate Yuba City-Marysville as attainment.

25 [SLIDE CHANGE]

1 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON:

2 Mendocino is a proposed new nonattainment area
3 that has never been designated nonattainment for any
4 federal air quality standards. One regulatory air monitor
5 in the City of Willits exceeds the new standard based on
6 2021 through 2023 air quality data with a design value of
7 11.0 micrograms per cubic meter. This City of Willits is
8 located in the Little Lake Valley Basin at 1,400 feet
9 elevation in the California coastal range surrounded by
10 ridge lines up to 3,000 feet. We worked with the local
11 air district in establishing the proposed new
12 nonattainment area boundary by considering the location of
13 population, sources of air pollution, and topography. We
14 used township range sections to encompass the area. We
15 are not proposing expanding the nonattainment area to all
16 of Mendocino County, because the other PM2.5 regulatory
17 air monitor in Mendocino County in the neighboring city of
18 Ukiah to the southeast attains the standard.

19 [SLIDE CHANGE]

20 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: For
21 Imperial County, a single air -- regulatory air monitor
22 exceeds the nine micrograms per cubic meter PM2.5 standard
23 in Calexico with a design -- with a 2023 design value of
24 10.2 micrograms per cubic meter. The recommended
25 nonattainment area boundary for the new standard, which

1 encompasses only a portion of Imperial County, is
2 consistent with the boundary set for the previous annual
3 PM2.5 standard.

4 [SLIDE CHANGE]

5 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: In
6 Sacramento County, the highest PM2.5 design value is at
7 the Bercut air monitor with a value of 9.9 micrograms per
8 cubic meter represented on this map by the left most red
9 pin symbol. This is a near-roadway monitor representative
10 of a microscale environment and influenced by car and
11 truck emissions near the monitor. A second air monitoring
12 site at Del Paso Manor, shown by the right most red pin
13 symbol, also exceeds the standard. In establishing the
14 nonattainment area boundary for the 24-hour PM2.5
15 standard, EPA included parts of surrounding counties as
16 part of the nonattainment area. For this new standard,
17 the air quality data did not justify including areas
18 outside of Sacramento County.

19 We considered all of the EPA criteria for
20 establishing a nonattainment boundary for the new
21 standard. Monitors in neighboring Yolo and Placer
22 counties attained the standard, as does the Folsom air
23 monitor in the northeast corner of Sacramento County.
24 Meteorological data also indicates the sources impacting
25 the Bercut and Del Paso monitors are within Sacramento

1 County. We are recommending just Sacramento County as the
2 boundary for this nonattainment area. The preliminary
3 2024 design value shows that the proposed new
4 nonattainment area does attain the nine micrograms per
5 cubic meter standard. However, that data has not yet been
6 certified. If the final 2024 design value is below nine
7 micrograms per cubic meter standard, EPA should designate
8 Sacramento County as attainment.

9 [SLIDE CHANGE]

10 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: The
11 highest 2023 design value in San Francisco Bay Area Air
12 Basin is 9.6 micrograms per meter cubed at the San Pablo
13 Air Monitoring site, which is represented by red pin
14 symbol located on the western edge of Contra Costa County.
15 A second air monitoring site at San Jose Jackson Street
16 represented by the red pin symbol in Santa Clara County
17 also exceeds the new standard. We are recommending that
18 the existing 35 micrograms per cubic meter boundary
19 encompassing the air basin is retained for this
20 designation.

21 [SLIDE CHANGE]

22 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON:
23 Staff are recommending San Diego County be
24 designated nonattainment for the new PM2.5 standard based
25 on the 2021 through 2023 air quality data. The Sherman

1 Elementary School air monitoring site is the high site at
2 9.2 micrograms per cubic meter. A second site in El Cajon
3 also exceeds the standard with a value of 9.1 micrograms
4 per cubic meter. Not shown in this map are additional
5 regulatory sites near the border with Mexico. These sites
6 do not yet have enough data to be compared against the
7 standard. However, the Otay Mesa monitor near the border
8 will have a valid design value in 2024 that we believe
9 will exceed the nine micrograms per cubic meter standard.
10 For the new standard, we propose using the county boundary
11 as the nonattainment area boundary since this is
12 consistent with what was used in designations for the
13 8-hour ozone standard.

14 [SLIDE CHANGE]

15 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON:

16 Now, that we have gone through all of our
17 recommendations for the new nonattainment area boundaries,
18 I want to highlight the public process on these
19 recommendations and this new standard in general.

20 Starting in 2023, before the new standard was
21 finalized, CARB staff began meeting with air districts
22 through an ongoing monthly work group to prepare for the
23 new PM2.5 standard. This work group will continue through
24 the SIP development process for the next several years or
25 longer, if needed. CARB staff conducted two public

1 workshops in 2024 on the designations, planning, nature of
2 PM2.5, and emissions inventory updates to support the
3 state implementation plans for this new standard. We
4 released the staff report on the designation
5 recommendations on December 13th, 2024 for public comment.
6 We received public comments from air districts supporting
7 the recommendations as well as comments from some
8 scientists questioning the health basis for the new PM2.5
9 standard. This meeting today serves as another
10 opportunity for public engagement, but it is not the last
11 opportunity for stakeholders to engage on the SIP
12 development process for this new standard.

13 [SLIDE CHANGE]

14 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: We
15 are still at the beginning of the timeline in this SIP
16 development process for attaining the new air quality
17 standard. The significant next -- the next significant
18 milestone is February 7th of this year, when our
19 recommendations for nonattainment area designations are
20 due to EPA. Following that, EPA will send the 120-day
21 letter to share their modifications to our
22 recommendations. Tease modifications include the impact
23 of air quality data from 2024 and EPA's assessment of
24 nonattainment area boundaries.

25 If we disagree with EPA's modifications to our

1 recommendations, we have the option to respond in writing.
2 EPA is required to issue final designations on February
3 6th, 2026. For those areas designated as nonattainment --
4 those areas designated as nonattainment will all be
5 classified as moderate initially and their SIPs will be
6 due 18 months after the designations are effective.

7 The attainment date is the end of the sixth year
8 from the final designations or on December 31st, 2032.
9 Areas unable to attain the nine microgram per cubic meter
10 standard by 2032 will be reclassified to serious
11 nonattainment areas, which will extend the attainment
12 deadline by four years to December 31st 2036.

13 [SLIDE CHANGE]

14 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: The
15 next step after identification and submittal of
16 designation area boundaries to EPA is the development of
17 State Implementation Plans, or SIPs, which will serve as
18 the roadmaps for each of the nonattainment areas to meet
19 the new PM2.5 standard. As mentioned in the public
20 process slide, we have begun discussing the SIP elements
21 with stakeholders. The diagram shows the essential
22 elements of a SIP. Starting at the top with monitoring,
23 we use air quality data both for designations of
24 nonattainment areas, as well as reclassifications,
25 tracking progress, and attainment determinations.

1 To the right, the emission inventories are
2 essential for understanding the sources contributing to
3 air pollution as well as pointing the way to likely
4 control strategies. Modeling, shown on the bottom, is our
5 means to link emission sources to the observed
6 concentrations and understand how effective control
7 strategies are likely to be.

8 Lastly on the left, we have the control
9 strategies that the State and air districts develop along
10 with the federal government to bring an area into
11 attainment. And back to the top, air monitoring data will
12 show us if we meet the standard on time.

13 [SLIDE CHANGE]

14 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: In
15 conclusion, staff recommends the Board direct the
16 Executive Office to forward California's recommendations
17 for nine micrograms per cubic meter PM2.5 designations to
18 EPA consistent with our Clean Air Act obligations. For
19 the next two years, we will have focused engagement with
20 stakeholders and public workshops on the emissions
21 inventories and other elements of the SIP process. EPA
22 will make final designations using 2022 through 2024 air
23 quality data on February 6th, 2026.

24 Lastly, for those areas designated nonattainment,
25 we will bring moderate SIPs to the Board in late 2027

1 laying out the suite of actions needed for each of those
2 areas to meet the nine micrograms per cubic motor PM2.5
3 standard.

4 [SLIDE CHANGE]

5 AQPSD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HIXSON: And
6 that concludes the staff presentation.

7 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. We will
8 now hear from the public who signed up to speak on this
9 item, either by submitting a request-to-speak card or by
10 raising their hand in Zoom. I will ask the Board clerk to
11 call public commenters.

12 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Yes. We currently have one
13 in-person commenter and three remote commenters.

14 So we'll start with Craig Thomas.

15 CRAIG THOMAS: Okay. Thank you to the Chair and
16 members of the Board for this opportunity to speak with
17 you. My name is Craig Thomas, I'm the Director of the
18 Fire Restoration Group in California. We are a small
19 non-profit that work collaboratively together with the
20 California Air Resources Board staff, and air districts,
21 and people supporting fire and the management -- and its
22 management practices on this landscape. And we try to
23 work on this tough stuff together. And we've been, I
24 would argue, very successful in being able to get out of
25 our silos and speak and work with each other.

1 So I want to comment, first of all, and be really
2 clear that that nine microgram per cubic meter piece PM2.5
3 as it relates to the application -- things that we've
4 created, whether that's automotive exhaust in tailpipes,
5 whether it's break and tire fiber, whether it's coal plant
6 emissions, whether it's other forms of incineration that
7 humans have created and constructed with you a hundred
8 percent. And that was our comment letter to federal EPA
9 when we wrote specifically about the new promulgation of
10 the rule, very supportive.

11 My big concern is when we lower that standard,
12 the potential to be triggering more and more monitors in
13 California while we try to do restorative burning and
14 expand beneficial fire in California. That's the big
15 concern. It's a future concern. It's a present concern
16 right now, because that standard is going to be in place,
17 and yet we have State policy, the California Strategic
18 Plan for expanding the use of beneficial fire as part of
19 State California policy helped work on that document for a
20 year. I also served on the National Wildfire Mitigation
21 and Management Commission. Fifty of us in the country
22 spent 10,000 hours together working on 148
23 recommendations --

24 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

25 CRAIG THOMAS: -- under full consensus.

1 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you. That concludes
2 your time.

3 So now we'll --

4 CRAIG THOMAS: I have a paper copy of a
5 recommendation that I want to share with you.

6 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

7 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: So now we'll from our Zoom
8 commenters. That will be Ruben Rodriguez, Christian
9 Bisher, James Enstrom, Dianne Flowers, Cynthia
10 Pinto-Cabrera, Gustavo Aguirre, Jr.

11 So Ruben, I've act -- I have activated your
12 microphone. You should be able to unmute and begin your
13 comment.

14 RUBEN RODRIGUEZ: Can you guys hear me?

15 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Yes, we can.

16 RUBEN RODRIGUEZ: Awesome. Buenas dias. Mi
17 nombre es Ruben Rodriguez with CCEJN, Central California
18 Environmental Justice Network.

19 Given the San Joaquin Valley's ongoing struggle
20 to meet the less stringent 1997 and 2012 PM2.5 standards
21 and the significant challenges in achieving the new 2024
22 standard -- I apologize there -- it is clear that a
23 moderate nonattainment classification will be -- will not
24 be feasible within the required timeline. However, since
25 the San Joaquin Valley has requested extensions for both

1 less stringent 1997 and 2012 PM2.5 standard, it makes
2 logic sense to pursue an initial serious nonattainment
3 classification for the more stringent 2024 PM2.5. The San
4 Joaquin Valley is not only businesses and industry, but
5 people, mother fathers, elders, and all of our relations.

6 Therefore, we strongly urge CARB governing board
7 to request the EPA to reclassify the region as serious
8 nonattainment. For too long, the agency's tasked with
9 protecting the health of the Central Valley residents have
10 failed to do so and the consequences are dire for our
11 children's future. And in that future when asked by the
12 children why did you not protect them, will you be able to
13 justify that you chose the -- your chose to favor industry
14 over the health of the people.

15 Now, it is time for these agencies to do their
16 job with integrity and conscious, to stand with those of
17 the front-line communities facing this environmental
18 crisis. The San Joaquin Valley has always been a key
19 driver in California's economy, yet we are treated as a
20 sacrificial zone. So the real question today is will you
21 participate in the continuing sacrifice by only
22 recommending a moderate nonattainment classification?

23 Thank you.

24 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

25 Christian, I have activated your microphone. You

1 can unmute and begin.

2 CHRISTIAN BISHER: Good morning. My name is
3 Christian Bisher with the Central Environmental Justice
4 Network, and a resident of the San Joaquin Valley. An
5 initial moderate classification is assigned when areas are
6 designated nonattainment. However, I also very strongly
7 urge the Board to add language to the resolution this
8 morning asking the EPA to reclassify the valley as soon as
9 possible to serious nonattainment, which they are legally
10 allowed to do at any time. An immediate reclassification
11 to serious nonattainment would allow the SIP for this new
12 standard to be placed on the same level as existing valley
13 PM2.5 SIPs and eliminate the need for agency staff to
14 spend time creating a moderate nonattainment SIP.

15 This is done when the EPA believes an area cannot
16 practicably attain a moderate area attainment date. Over
17 the -- over 25 years, valley SIPs have reduced annual
18 PM2.5 design values by 8.5 micrograms. And a moderate
19 classification here is saying you believe levels can be
20 reduced an additional 7.2 micrograms, or 85 percent, of
21 what has been done before in just six years.

22 SIP documents submitted to the EPA last year
23 stated the valley doing the very best it could, knowing
24 this new standard was coming, could just barely achieve
25 the 12 microgram standard by the end of 2030. Allowing a

1 moderate classification, an additional three micrograms
2 would need to be reduced in a single year in order to
3 achieve the nine microgram standard by the end of 2031 or
4 2032, as CARB staff just said.

5 We all know the San Joaquin Valley cannot meet
6 this moderate attainment deadline by the new standard
7 date. Please help eliminate unnecessary work on a
8 moderate SIP when the attainment timeline cannot be
9 achieved and ask the EPA to immediately reclassify the San
10 Joaquin Valley as serious nonattainment, in addition to --
11 in an addition to the resolution today.

12 Thank you.

13 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

14 James, I have activated your mic. You should be
15 able to unmute and begin your comment.

16 DR. JAMES ENSTROM: Hello. My name is Dr. James
17 Enstrom. I have over a 50-year career as an
18 epidemiologist spent at UCLA. I am currently President of
19 the Scientific Integrity Institute in Los Angeles. And
20 during the past 20 years, I've submitted comments to both
21 CARB and EPA that there are no PM2.5 deaths in California.
22 And this invalidates the risk-benefit ratio regarding the
23 need for a PM2.5 standard.

24 I've also published documents -- papers that
25 invalidate the original 1997 PM2.5 paper by Pope and the

1 1997 PM2.5 NAAQS. I have submitted numerous comments that
2 are relevant to the improper process that's been followed
3 the past four years to change the standard from 12
4 micrograms per cubic meter to nine. This process is going
5 to be challenged by the new EPA. And there is a serious
6 problem with the measurements also of PM2.5 actual
7 exposure. My monitor now in Los Angeles is reading only
8 one microgram per cubic meter. I believe there's no
9 accurate way of measuring this. Your estimates are just
10 too far off. So this is all going to be challenged very
11 rigorously and very scientifically and I request that you
12 pause this process.

13 Thank you very much.

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

16 DIANNE FLOWERS: Can you hear me now?

17 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: It's very faint, but we can
18 hear you.

19 DIANNE FLOWERS: Hello. How is this, better?

20 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: That's better.

21 DIANNE FLOWERS: I am a community member in the
22 harbor area of Los Angeles, Long Beach and I'm very
23 concerned about some of the things the person before me
24 mentioned. I'm asking what is the risk to our California
25 standards from the new administration and the EPA and

1 these sudden changes against regulation and improvement of
2 the public health that are happening and threatening us?
3 Are these standards going to be attacked that we're
4 discussing today? Thank you. Or have they been?

5 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dianne, are you still there?

6 DIANNE FLOWERS: Yes. No. I'm sorry. That --
7 I -- that was my question. What will happen if there
8 are -- if something is coming from Washington to get rid
9 of what EPA said before about moving to nine? Is
10 California going to be able to stay with nine or are they
11 going to do it just to go along with Washington? That's
12 my very serious question for the lives of the people here.
13 That's the end. Thank you.

14 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Okay. Thank -- great.
15 Thank you.

16 Cynthia, I have activated your microphone. You
17 should be able to unmute and begin.

18 CYNTHIA PINTO-CABRERA: Can you all hear me?

19 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Yes, we can.

20 CYNTHIA PINTO-CABRERA: Perfect. Good morning.
21 Cynthia Pinto-Cabrera, Policy Associate with the Central
22 Valley Air Quality Coalition, here today joining to urge
23 the Board to really stand with valley communities and go
24 beyond the staff recommendations for the San Joaquin
25 Valley by recommending that U.S. EPA immediately

1 reclassify the valley as serious nonattainment. The San
2 Joaquin Valley is the most polluted air basin in the
3 nation for fine particles, with a long history of failing
4 to meet standards on time due to weak plans overreliance
5 on incentives, in constant extensions. These failures
6 have real consequences on our health and the impacts stand
7 to get worse from accelerated climate impacts, along with
8 ongoing planning delays and weak enforcement.

9 The 2012 PM2.5 standard extension from 2025 to
10 2030, the additional extension on the 1997 standard are
11 just the latest examples of a lack of urgent action.

12 In the 2024 State of the Air Report, the American
13 Lung Association reported that between 2020 and 2022,
14 Bakersfield had an annual average of 18.8 micrograms for
15 annual PM2.5 concentration, Visalia had an annual average
16 of 18.2 micrograms and the highest day since 2000 of high
17 particle pollution at 35.2 days. The Fresno, Madera,
18 Hanford metropolitan area had an annual average of 17.5
19 micrograms. These concentrations have resulted in over
20 40,000 cases of pediatric asthma, 168,000 cases of adult
21 asthma, 85,000 cases of COPD, and this is just in those
22 three metropolitan areas.

23 It is clear that these plans are falling short of
24 protecting the health of valley residents and therefore we
25 urge the Board to use its authority to go beyond business

1 as usual and demand a stronger plan that brings the
2 attainment deadline closer and ultimately brings relief to
3 valley breathers.

4 Thank you.

5 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

6 So next, we'll hear from Gustavo Aguirre, Jr.,
7 and Matt Holmes. So Gustavo, I have activated your
8 microphone. You should be able to unmute and begin.

9 GUSTAVO AGUIRRE, JR.: Hello. Good morning
10 everyone. Gustavo Aguirre, Jr., resident of Bakersfield,
11 California, and Director of Climate Equity in
12 Environmental Justice with Central California Asthma
13 Collaborative, that as an organization that has seen an
14 exponential growth in our organization due to the asthma
15 education and remediation work that we do. Although, it's
16 great to have our organization expand, it is also very
17 worrisome how much more patients -- how much more younger
18 our patients are becoming in the work that we do in the
19 asthma and the geographical reach that has extended to
20 parts where we were not normally working as an
21 organization. And so that just goes to showcase the
22 worrisome that we have from public health perspective.

23 Again, I am calling as an advocates to ask the
24 Board to recognize, you know, that -- really the
25 limitations and requests EPA to designate the San Joaquin

1 Valley as serious attainment. You know, regarding the
2 other speakers, not to repeat so much, but the 1997, the
3 2012 standards are already on an extension. You know, how
4 much more far out can we compromise, right?

5 And so, I'm just calling to advocate for CARB and
6 the Board members to take the public health of the San
7 Joaquin Valley as serious as other regions and go after
8 the serious nonattainment for the San Joaquin.

9 Thank you so much.

10 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you. Matt Holmes, I
11 have activated your mic. Please unmute and begin.

12 MATT HOLMES: Awesome. Thank you. Yeah, Matt
13 Holmes here with Valley Improvement Projects.

14 I just -- the reason I'm calling the Board to --
15 for the serious nonattainment designation. I think we
16 should take a lead from the Attorney General's office who
17 came out swinging, when we're talking about how do we
18 respond to the federal government. You know, calls for
19 caution under these dynamics assume that we share any
20 values of the federal government at this moment. So,
21 we're reduced to oppositional politics. So I'd encourage
22 an aggressive stance on calling for nonattainment for the
23 San Joaquin Valley.

24 And then as far as our ways of knowing these
25 areas of attainment, you know, we all know that the line

1 was drawn on the map presented by technical staff today,
2 are irrelevant to human bodies and human lungs, especially
3 when we move across them all day long. So, there's
4 really -- the CARB has nothing to lose by being
5 aggressive, but it can lose its credibility as the
6 preeminent public health entity in this country. So I
7 hope for a call for serious nonattainment across the San
8 Joaquin Valley. You know, and if CARB can't lead on this,
9 we're going to continue to end up with the call like we
10 had earlier where people are outright delusional about
11 whether or not there's a PM2.5 problem in this state.

12 I'll settle with that. Thank you.

13 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

14 That concludes the commenters for this item.

15 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. Staff,
16 are there any issues raised in the comments you want to
17 address before I close the record?

18 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: No.

19 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. We will bring it to the
20 Board for discussion. Board members, do you have any
21 questions?

22 Is that Board Member Guerra or Dr. Shaheen?

23 Board Member Guerra.

24 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Thank you, Chair. One, I
25 just -- I wanted to thank the staff in the preparation of

1 this report. And no real questions, but if anything,
2 before this meeting, we had our Sac Metro Air Quality
3 Management District, and the two -- the staff report
4 really highlights, I think, the two things that we face
5 here in the Sacramento Area Basin. One, obviously, with
6 the Bercut monitor, the PM numbers of impact by heavy-duty
7 vehicles, the I-5, 50, 80 corridors in the area where we
8 have communities like Gardenland Northgate, low-income
9 communities who are affected by it and also the Del Paso
10 community that's affected by the industrial, and Business
11 80, and Interstate 80 corridors. So on that point.

12 And then the other piece that both Sacramento
13 faces, along with Feather River as well, is the challenges
14 between both forest fires and then ag burning. And I
15 think the staff report underscores, while it's not a
16 component of this action or whatnot, the -- it underscores
17 that we can't change the geography. We can't change
18 meteorology, or even jurisdictional boundaries, but what
19 we can do is address prevention.

20 And so it's important that I think that, you
21 know, It's probably in the conversation for the next
22 discussion that, you know, biomass utilization to address
23 the issues that we face both in forest fires and also with
24 the challenges with our ag industry, particularly in the
25 north area, that we make sure that we start looking at

1 those investments and prevention to make sure that we can
2 reduce the PM numbers that are affected through wood smoke
3 and -- from Shasta all the way down, and Modoc all the way
4 down to the Sacramento Valley.

5 So with that, I'm willing to support the staff
6 recommendation, Chair, but I wanted to highlight the -- I
7 think that the staff report underscores the need in those
8 two areas as affects the Sacramento Air Basin.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

11 Dr. Balmes.

12 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Chair Randolph.

13 I just wanted to say for the public record how
14 strong the epidemiologic and toxicologic evidence is for
15 the association between ambient PM2.5 and the adverse
16 public health outcomes, the most important one being
17 cardiovascular mortality. The evidence is strong.
18 There's evidence from California. There's evidence from
19 across the U.S. There's evidence from across the world.
20 Hundreds, if not thousands, of studies have supported the
21 association between PM2.5 exposures and adverse health
22 outcomes, especially mortality.

23 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you. I was hoping you
24 would share your expert opinion on that. I appreciate it.

25 Board Member Takvorian.

1 All right, Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

2 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you, Chair.

3 I just wanted to --

4 CHAIR RANDOLPH: We can't hear you.

5 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you, Chair.

6 I want to echo Dr. Balmes' comments on the studies and
7 reiterate that this is definitely a public health issue
8 that is grounded in science. I want to talk a little bit
9 about the San Joaquin Valley just because -- giving
10 attention to our commenters' issues. Just for clarity in
11 terms of our work moving forward on the plans. Talk to me
12 a little bit about what is the difference in terms of how
13 you move forward in your rigor of trying to find
14 reductions in PM2.5 in the San Joaquin Valley in -- with a
15 serious nonattainment versus the nonattainment that you
16 have proposed today.

17 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Yeah, maybe I'll start
18 and then I'll turn it to staff. So it's my understanding
19 that the classifications at the outset are always moderate
20 area. And if we go through the modeling process and
21 determine that by the time that the SIP is due in late
22 2027, that with reasonable controls, we would not meet the
23 attainment deadline of 2032, then it could be appropriate
24 at that point to ask for a designation of serious
25 nonattainment, but we would still have to go through the

1 same process of determining what the conditions would be
2 in 2032, which is the attainment date, with controls that
3 we would be able to put in place.

4 So, staff, please correct me if messed that up.

5 Okay.

6 AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: Dr. Cliff, you did not
7 mess that up.

8 (Laughter).

9 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Dr.
10 Benjamin.

11 AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: I just want to emphasize
12 that this is a very clearly laid out process under the
13 Clean Air Act and by U.S. EPA. All nonattainment areas
14 across the United States must go through this process, so
15 it's not specific to California, and it's designed to
16 provide -- to ensure that whatever SIPs are developed are
17 fair for all stakeholders involved and that we do not
18 overregulate in order to attain the air quality standards.

19 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yeah, that's really
20 helpful in terms of understanding the process. And for
21 me, I think, Chair, as we enter a new year, why things
22 like FARMER and other efforts at the State level are so
23 important in terms of cleaning up the valley's air. So, I
24 look forward to a robust engagement process, where the
25 ideas of some of our speakers are brought to light and

1 where we are able to make sure that all of our plans, as
2 they always have been, are robust, and I have -- I have
3 seen it in the numbers. And I think staff, if you can
4 confirm for the rest of the Board, that there is PM2.5
5 progress being made in the San Joaquin Valley, if you
6 could just confirm that.

7 AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: This is Michael Benjamin,
8 Chief of the Air Quality Planning and Science Division.
9 There is indeed progress being made in improving air
10 quality in the San Joaquin Valley, perhaps not as quickly
11 as we would all like. But as we look at the -- those
12 monitoring sites that no longer attain, we clearly see
13 patterns where the number of sites no longer attaining is
14 decreasing dramatically. We've shared those results with
15 you in previous updates to the Board. We'll be coming
16 back to you this fall with an update on SIP
17 implementation, not just for the San Joaquin Valley, but
18 for South Coast, at which time we can share similar charts
19 that will allow you to see how air quality has improved
20 over time in those parts of California that are most
21 impacted by air pollution.

22 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you.

23 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

24 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you so much.

25 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Board Member Hurt had a

1 follow-up question on that.

2 BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you. I'll try to make
3 it quick without getting a big setup. But as I'm
4 listening to the comments and thinking more about what the
5 future holds and knowing that there has been progress, but
6 then we also have this challenge, at least in the San
7 Francisco Bay Area, with vehicle miles traveled increasing
8 and the concern about how steep the road is to get to
9 attainment, I'm just wondering if we could speak a little
10 bit to maybe the insight or the outlook on achieving
11 attainment in face of increasing vehicle miles traveled
12 and what we have to do to get there for a positive path
13 forward or continued progress rather.

14 AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: Yeah. So we -- as we
15 develop the SIP, we work very closely with colleagues
16 across the agency who are developing other plans, for
17 example, the Scoping Plan. And we think about how can we
18 develop holistic strategies that will help us to attain
19 our climate and air quality mandates. What we're seeing
20 with vehicle miles traveled is even though it is a
21 challenge to reduce vehicle miles traveled, all of our
22 efforts to electrify the fleet is providing significant
23 benefits, and, in fact, it underscores the importance for
24 us to stay the course to continue to electrify and move to
25 zero emissions, such that even if we're not able to

1 perhaps attain our VMT reduction goals, we'll continue to
2 make improvements with air quality.

3 BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you.

4 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you. I had a
5 question following up on the commenter who was talking
6 about beneficial fire and exceptional events. Can you
7 talk a little bit about the interaction? Are we allowed
8 to consider beneficial fire as exceptional events or is
9 that sort of not necessary, given the kind of amount of
10 emissions from beneficial fire?

11 AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: So we have been working
12 very closely with stakeholders. Craig Thomas is a really
13 valuable partner in this process. We have a very close
14 working relationship with him as well as with the land
15 managers and tribal representatives on how can we increase
16 the pace and scale of prescribed burning and cultural
17 burning in California. It's clear from the wildfires that
18 we've been seeing the increase in frequency of wildfires
19 that the path forward is to have more prescribed burning,
20 not less, while at the same time trying to protect public
21 health an exposure to smoke.

22 And so, we have been working very closely on
23 developing tools and approaches, training and
24 collaborative efforts between all of these stakeholder
25 groups for us to try to get as much prescribed fire on the

1 landscape. As was discussed in the staff presentation,
2 there is a process within the SIP for us to exclude the
3 impact of wildfires as well as prescribed fires from
4 attainment determinations. So we're on a parallel path
5 here. We're trying to demonstrate attainment with the
6 standards, while at the same time recognizing that smoke
7 in the air is a serious issue. We have to really address
8 the issues with forest health. We have to ramp up
9 prescribed and cultural burning. And through bills like
10 SB 310 that was recently passed, which will really, I
11 think, facilitate and streamline the permitting process
12 and enable tribes to have a lot more cultural burning
13 across the state, I think we're on the right path.

14 And so I appreciate Craig Thomas and our other
15 partners who have been working so closely with us in this
16 process of trying to balance public health as well as
17 forest health.

18 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you so much. I appreciate
19 that.

20 Board Member Takvorian.

21 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you. Actually, I
22 just -- I had a question that's kind of on the other end
23 of that, which is not about beneficial burning but about
24 wildfires and their utilize -- I understand how they're
25 utilized. They're not utilized in the designations. I'm

1 wondering how they're referenced where those areas that
2 are more prone to wildfires might be utilized in any
3 regulatory processes that we have, because clearly that we
4 know they will continue to happen and we know they will
5 continue to happen in areas like Los Angeles and San
6 Diego, where we already have non-attainment. So I just
7 wondered if you could talk about that a little bit in
8 terms of what we might expect, for instance, when we
9 approach the Scoping Plan and other regulations -- or
10 plans. Sorry, not a regulation.

11 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SAHOTA: Good morning.
12 Deputy Executive Officer Rajinder Sahota. Thank you for
13 that question. And it's a very broad question that is
14 going to have to be addressed on the air quality side and
15 the climate side. In the last Scoping Plan we integrated
16 in wildfire emissions in a more meaningful way, because
17 they are one of the sources of greenhouse gases that need
18 to be balanced when we think about the AB 1279 target for
19 carbon neutrality.

20 So, the focus still has to remain on reducing the
21 combustion of fossil fuels and com -- and the use of
22 combustion technologies in general everywhere that we have
23 these nonattainment areas and everywhere else possible.
24 The wildfires are going to be unpredictable. We didn't
25 know even when the Scoping Plan was first done in 2008

1 that the pace and scale of these fires would be this fast
2 and this catastrophic. And so we're all trying to pivot
3 to understand what are the implications, what is the new
4 data that's going to be coming in from the fires in
5 Southern California in addition to the data that we have,
6 that it can help us understand changes in terms of that
7 urban, rural boundary for development, understand what
8 kind of HVAC systems, other kinds of ceiling systems need
9 to be in place in homes. And then there's just going to
10 be a whole, you know, effort to go back and understand
11 what could -- what lessons were learned and what we need
12 to carry forward. So there is no single answer, because
13 it touches so many parts of public health and economics of
14 the state, and affordability.

15 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I appreciate that. No,
16 I know it's a big question and there's a lot on all of our
17 minds right now. We're trying to figure out how to
18 integrate what's happening and what we know. And I think
19 you all are doing a really good job of that. I guess I
20 just -- do you think then we would see more of that --
21 those analyses or those predictive analyses be
22 incorporated into some of the health analyses that we do
23 as well, particularly like with the Scoping Plan and
24 others.

25 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER SAHOTA: So we've seen a

1 wealth of information coming out on the economic of public
2 health impacts of the wildfires that we've already seen
3 and we're going to continue to get that data. We're going
4 to continue to incorporate it to make the case that we
5 need to be more sustainably managing these resources and
6 here's the cost if we don't manage these resources. I
7 think a big consideration is going to be how do we make
8 sure that we fund the work that needs to happen to manage
9 these resources, because it's not just State Lands, it's
10 also a federal land issue. And then it's also private
11 lands in the State. So there's multiple stakeholders that
12 have a lot of -- a lot ownership of these working lands
13 and actual landscapes.

14 So I think the challenge will be recognizing the
15 scale of the issue and how it's just going to continue to
16 get worse for probably the next few decades based on some
17 of the modeling that came out of the Scoping Plan and how
18 do we pivot to make sure the resources are there and we're
19 able to manage prescribed burn, cultural burns, and also
20 any thinning that needs to happen.

21 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you. I really
22 appreciate your response. I would also add local
23 government land, because that is everywhere and often
24 there aren't the resources to manage those lands and
25 they're right on top of residential communities, so -- as

1 you know.

2 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

3 Okay. The board has before them Resolution
4 Number -- oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Eisenhut. Go ahead.

5 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: I'd like to offer first a
6 comment and then a question. I want to offer my support
7 to the comments made by Mr. Benjamin with regard to
8 preemptive burning as a -- and the tension between us
9 preemptive burning and -- forest health and public health.
10 And as a -- as a forest dweller, I'm aware that generally
11 preemptive burning is conducted on calm non-windy days
12 when the smoke lingers and it's terribly annoying, but
13 it's also I believe a better option than the fear of an
14 August or September conflagration. So I appreciate your
15 comments.

16 I'd like to -- one of our commenters earlier
17 asked a question that is somewhat hypothetical, but in --
18 I believe increasingly real, and that is the -- what is
19 our expectation? Are we prepared to address the issue of
20 where U.S. EPA is headed or is this too premature for that
21 conversation?

22 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Well, we're certainly
23 aware that the new administration has flagged several
24 issues for U.S. EPA to evaluate and present
25 recommendations. So I think we're following that closely

1 and we'll, you know, develop our response as we understand
2 more. So it is a bit premature at this point. We
3 certainly recognize that there's the possibility of a
4 number of actions including that on -- you know, on air
5 quality standards that could be on the table for
6 consideration.

7 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Board Member Guerra.

8 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Thank you, Chair. Mr.
9 Benjamin and Ms. Rajinder prompted both a comment and a
10 question here. One, I think or -- the voters passed Prop
11 4 and there was some money set aside there for forest tree
12 mass. And I don't know how we -- how this agency or this
13 Board has engaged yet on that process. But at least when
14 I looked at the preliminary budget proposal, there wasn't
15 any significant or large amount of money as what was
16 proposed in Prop 4 for the issue of forestry management.
17 I saw some in the Tahoe Conservancy, some in the
18 Department of Conservation, but not at the -- at the
19 magnitude that was presented to voters.

20 So I think, one, from an air quality standpoint,
21 I think we need to be, I think, vocal about the need to
22 have that money released sooner than later, particularly
23 the \$50 million for biomass utilization, because as Mr.
24 Benjamin said that we don't have a choice. We have to
25 balance out the ag burning and the fire burning at the

1 same time.

2 So, one, I hate to sound like a broken record,
3 but I mean those are our options. And so if we don't have
4 that new technology that gives us a viable alternative to
5 that, then I think we're still exposing smoke to people,
6 period. And whether it's in the calculations or not, the
7 smoke is still exposing folks.

8 Now, on the concern that I have here and maybe
9 this -- if there isn't an answer today. One thing we've
10 experienced in the Sacramento Valley is a higher increase
11 in the amount of disease amongst the rice. And so need to
12 burn that is going to be probably more apparent this time
13 around. So where does the calculation affect our
14 attainment in that scenario and is there an exemption for
15 that? And if there isn't, then how does that -- how do
16 the -- how do the air districts that -- there's about nine
17 of them that are affected through that area.

18 AQPSD CHIEF BENJAMIN: Yes. This is Michael
19 Benjamin. So back in the nineties actually, one of the
20 first parts of California where it was determined for
21 public health reasons that we needed to phase out or
22 significantly reduce ag burning was in the Sacramento
23 Valley, where every fall there was widespread burning of
24 rice straw after the harvest, resulted in very significant
25 public health impacts, and it was decided at that time to

1 phase out almost completely rice straw burning. It was
2 widely supported. There was State funding provided for
3 alternatives for both growers and to encourage markets for
4 rice straw. And that phaseout of rice straw burning has
5 continued to the present day. It's resulted in dramatic
6 improvements in air quality in the Sacramento region and
7 all of the surrounding counties. And I would say it's one
8 of the successes from an air quality perspective.

9 What we've been seeing with the phaseout of ag
10 burning in the San Joaquin Valley is the similar sort of
11 challenges of how do we continue to provide tools for
12 growers to be able to mitigate disease. There is a --
13 within the San Joaquin Valley ag burn phaseout, a -- an
14 option for those fields where it's been demonstrated there
15 is disease that burning can occur. And so there is an
16 avenue within the current process by which growers on a
17 very limited basis can burn fields where there's evidence
18 of disease.

19 So I think again this is an example of where we
20 have tried to balance the needs of the growers as well as
21 public health and people exposed to smoke. So I think
22 that's something that can be addressed through the current
23 process.

24 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Okay. Very good. And to
25 that point, you know, again if there's disease, then

1 that's the option that we have. But as we're -- when that
2 is occurring and we have on top of that the normal process
3 of ag burning, I guess that get -- it underscores again
4 the need for really prevention on new technology to look
5 at our -- at that amount of fuel that's out there. So
6 thank you, Chair.

7 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. The
8 Board has before them Resolution number 25-2. Do I have a
9 motion and a second.

10 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: So moved.

11 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Second.

12 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Board clerk, please call the
13 role

14 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dr. Balmes?

15 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes.

16 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. De La Torre?

17 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yes.

18 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Eisenhut?

19 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Yes.

20 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Senator Florez?

21 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez aye.

22 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Guerra?

23 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Guerra aye.

24 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ms. Hurt?

25 BOARD MEMBER HURT: Aye.

1 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Kracov?

2 Dr. Pacheco-Werner?

3 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes.

4 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Rechtschaffen?

5 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Yes.

6 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Dr. Shaheen?

7 BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Aye.

8 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Ms. Takvorian?

9 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.

10 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Chair Randolph?

11 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Yes.

12 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Madam Chair, the motion
13 passes.

14 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right, thank you.

15 Okay. The last item on the agenda is item number
16 21-1-5[SIC], a report on the California Air Resources
17 Board's program priorities for 2025. If you are here with
18 us in the room and wish to comment on this item, please
19 fill out a request-to-speak card as soon as possible and
20 submit it to a Board assistant.

21 If you are joining us remotely and wish to
22 comment on this item, please click the "Raise Hand" button
23 or dial star nine now. We will first call on in-person
24 commenters followed by any remote commenters when we get
25 to the public comment portion of this item.

1 For many years, it has been a practice for the
2 Executive Officer to make a presentation to the Board each
3 January outlining the priorities for the agency for the
4 coming year. As we enter 2025, the work of the California
5 Air Resources Board has never been more critical. The
6 impacts of climate change are accelerating with extreme
7 weather, wildfires, and air quality challenges becoming
8 more of a day-to-day reality for residents.

9 Cleaning the air and taking action on climate
10 change are not just environmental imperatives, they are
11 essential to protecting public health, fostering economic
12 resilience, and ensuring a sustainable future for all
13 Californians. CARB remains steadfast in its mission to
14 address these challenges through innovative policies,
15 technological advancements, and a commitment to equity,
16 ensure that all communities, especially those most
17 vulnerable and most impacted, benefit from our efforts.

18 Our climate and clean air policies can also help
19 address affordability challenges, by reducing health care
20 costs, lowering the total cost of vehicle ownership, and
21 fostering the growth of new industries and jobs. We
22 remain committed to working with our partner agencies and
23 the Legislature to help identify ways to make this
24 transition affordable and accessible to all Californians.

25 As we continue to work toward our climate and air

1 quality goals, we stand ready to collaborate with all of
2 our stakeholders and partners, including with the new
3 federal administration. I'm hopeful that we can find some
4 common ground in supporting the innovation, job creation,
5 and economic growth that come with a clean energy economy.
6 By working together, we can continue to position both
7 California and the United States as global leaders in the
8 clean technology space.

9 But we recognize and we are determined that if
10 and when challenged, CARB will vigorously defend
11 California's authority to set standards necessary to
12 protect the public health and well-being of our
13 communities. The right to breathe clean air is not a
14 political or a partisan issue and climate change is
15 impacting communities everywhere, in California, across
16 the country, and around the world. We will not compromise
17 on our commitment to safeguarding the air we breathe and
18 confronting the climate crisis head on.

19 While I recognize the uncertainty that comes with
20 administration change, one thing is certain, CARB will
21 continue to make progress on California's significant air
22 pollution challenges. We will continue our critical work
23 to address climate change and implement the key policies
24 that we need to tackle both of these issues.

25 As the fifth largest economy in the State, we

1 will not cede California's position as a national and
2 world leader in building a clean energy economy. CARB is
3 ready to continue its legacy of effective action to
4 protect public health and the environment. Dr. Cliff, I
5 will turn it over to you for this item.

6 (Slide presentation).

7 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Chair
8 Randolph. And I want to thank, in particular, Dr. Qian
9 Mitloehner for the help in putting this presentation
10 together, as well as the entire CARB team for all the hard
11 work that they have done to set me up for this
12 presentation.

13 And, yes, as you allude to, we do anticipate that
14 in -- if we can go to the next slide, please --

15 [SLIDE CHANGE]

16 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: -- in 2025, we bring
17 unique challenges as CARB continues to drive towards
18 progress fulfilling its mission.

19 Today, I'm going to start by addressing two
20 specific areas of challenge head on, the transition in
21 federal administration and the impact of California's
22 budget challenges.

23 And sorry, I jumped ahead one slide, but that's
24 okay. We'll stay on this slide.

25 It is no secret that the new federal

1 administration has previously attacked California's
2 programs to protect public health and the climate and has
3 stated its intention to continue its effort to rollback
4 our programs and authority. In light of this, last
5 Monday, CARB withdrew the remaining requests before the
6 U.S. EPA for waivers and authorizations to enforce key
7 California transportation regulations. And while we're
8 disappointed that the U.S. EPA was unable to act on all
9 the requests before them in time, we knew that keeping
10 pending requests before the new federal administration
11 would create undue uncertainty. I will talk more about
12 our path forward in light of these withdrawals a bit
13 later, but know that we will be considering additional
14 alternative courses of action, particularly those that can
15 be carried out under State authority that will allow
16 California to continue reducing pollution and protecting
17 the health of its residents.

18 As we enter this new federal administration, we
19 do so with eyes wide open. Having gained experience from
20 Trump's you first term, that equips us for what lies
21 ahead. During the first Trump administration, we engaged
22 in estimated 25 litigation cases related to federal
23 actions aimed at defending our actions and authorities.
24 As a result, a key priority for CARB this year will be to
25 hold our ground, defending our authority under the Clean

1 Air Act. Our legal team is closely tracking court cases
2 and preparing to respond proactively to defend against
3 attacks to undermine our authority.

4 Another challenge we face in 2025 is something
5 shared by departments across State governments, which is
6 the realities of California's budget challenges. Last
7 year's enacted budget includes reductions to all State
8 department budgets, including the elimination of
9 vacancies, and an almost eight percent reduction in State
10 operational budgets, which includes contracts,
11 procurements, and other types of operational expenditures.
12 With these cuts, timelines for certain activities will
13 have to be extended and there will be certain activities
14 we can no longer support.

15 CARB has weathered budgetary challenges before
16 and we know it will be critical for our organization to be
17 disciplined in how we spend our increasingly limited
18 resources, prioritizing our most impactful efforts.

19 [SLIDE CHANGE]

20 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Amidst the challenges
21 we face in 2025, CARB remains steadfast in our mission to
22 address California's air pollution problems and lead
23 effective climate action. As a part of that commitment,
24 CARB will continue our efforts to address historical
25 inequities and deliver tangible benefits to communities

1 disproportionately impacted by air pollution and climate
2 change. This includes using tools we have developed, such
3 as the Racial Equity Lens and Community Engagement model,
4 to inform decision-making, effectively engage with
5 impacted communities, and to ensure those impacted by
6 structural racial inequities are meaningfully involved in
7 the creation and implementation of CARB's work.

8 To continue to make progress towards that
9 mission, CARB will be focusing on implementing key
10 existing programs while also developing new programs and
11 regulations. Together, these efforts will deliver
12 meaningful results to improve air quality, address climate
13 change, and pave the way for a more sustainable and
14 inclusive future.

15 [SLIDE CHANGE]

16 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Before highlighting key
17 programmatic priorities for 2025, I want to take a minute
18 to recognize the foundational support that makes these
19 initiatives possible. Behind every priority outlined in
20 this presentation lies an iceberg under the water, the
21 dedicated administrative staff who helps support the human
22 resources, the fiscal resources, and the information
23 services of a 2,000 person organization. Their work
24 underpins not only the priorities we highlight in this
25 presentation, but every aspect of what we do.

1 With that, let's turn to a few existing efforts
2 that will remain key priorities in 2025.

3 [SLIDE CHANGE]

4 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: First, is our
5 California Climate Investments Program. Last year,
6 California Climate Investments celebrated a decade of
7 progress, with more than \$11 billion of Cap-and-Trade
8 auction proceeds invested throughout the state. More than
9 75 percent of those investments are providing direct
10 benefits to disadvantaged communities and low-income
11 communities and households.

12 In 2025, the California Climate Investments will
13 continue collaborating with 27 State agencies across the
14 more than 110 programs supporting projects in clean
15 energy, affordable housing, public transit, short-lived
16 climate pollutants, and nature-based solutions.

17 Through this collaboration with administering
18 agencies, the team plans to continue to prioritize efforts
19 to help ensure benefits reach the most disadvantaged and
20 low-income communities, and households, including
21 increasing access for tribes and unincorporated
22 communities. The team will also be focusing on uplifting
23 economic opportunities and climate resilience efforts
24 throughout the portfolio by supporting high quality jobs,
25 enhancing affordability, and assessing climate risks and

1 adaptation benefits.

2 [SLIDE CHANGE]

3 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Another key priority in
4 2025 is continuing to support the Community Air Protection
5 Program. Through collaboration between air districts and
6 CARB, we are seeing real and meaningful reduction in
7 emissions and exposures to air pollution in California's
8 most disadvantaged communities. Nineteen selected
9 communities representing over four million people - a
10 quarter of the population identified as disadvantaged
11 under CalEnviroScreen 4.0 - are working to develop or
12 implement CARB-approved Community Emission Reduction
13 Programs.

14 As of May 2024, over \$550 million of community
15 air protection incentives have been invested statewide.
16 Of these funds, over \$215 million dollars have funded more
17 than 4,500 projects within those 19 communities.

18 For 2025, this program is expected to reach
19 several milestones. Later this spring, staff will bring
20 to the Board a slate of candidates for the AB 617
21 Consultation Group, award close to \$16 million in
22 community air grants to community-based organization and
23 tribes, and launch a peer-to-peer learning series. This
24 summer, the Board will hear a report on the Program's
25 annual progress. And later this year, the staff will also

1 update the Community Air Protection Incentive Program
2 guidelines and continue to support the statewide mobile
3 monitoring initiative in consistently nominated
4 communities.

5 [SLIDE CHANGE]

6 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Next, I want to
7 highlight our transportation and off-road efforts. The
8 transportation sector remains the largest source of air
9 pollution in California, making continued progress in this
10 area central to CARB's mission. We have received several
11 long-awaited waivers and authorizations from U.S. EPA
12 granting CARB authority to enforce key regulations. At
13 the end of 24 and early 2025, CARB received six waivers
14 and authorizations granting CARB authority to enforce
15 regulatory packages that will drive significant pollution
16 reductions in passenger car and heavy-duty vehicles.

17 Of note, the federal waiver for the Advanced
18 Clean Cars II Regulation allows California to fully
19 implement and enforce requirements that would move the
20 State towards 100 percent sales of zero-emission vehicles
21 by 2035. This year is noteworthy for ACC II, because
22 manufacturers will produce and sell the first set of
23 vehicles that meet those requirements. In addition, this
24 year, CARB staff will bring proposed amendments to the
25 Board for consideration to clarify certain provisions

1 related to ZEV certification and to continue CARB's
2 progress in supporting the ZEV market with new consumer
3 focused assurance measures.

4 CARB will begin to continue -- sorry. CARB will
5 continue implementing and enforcing these six regulatory
6 packages, which will also include the Heavy-Duty Omnibus
7 Regulation that will drastically reduce smog-forming
8 emissions, particulate matter, and nitrogen oxides from
9 heavy-duty vehicles, as well as requirements for cleaner
10 off-road engines -- small off-road engines, like lawn
11 mowers and leaf blowers, off-road vehicles, and the
12 authorized portions affecting commercial harbor craft and
13 refrigerated trucks.

14 As I mentioned previously, last week, we withdrew
15 the remaining authorization requests before U.S. EPA,
16 including the Advanced Clean Fleet Regulation and the
17 In-Use Locomotive regulatory package. For both of those
18 regulations, CARB is evaluating next steps. For ACF, CARB
19 is not enforcing the parts that require federal
20 authorization, such as the parts -- the portions that
21 apply to high priority and drayage fleets. However, not
22 all elements of the ACF Regulation require a federal
23 waiver or authorization, such as the State and local
24 government fleets requirements, which CARB will be
25 implementing and enforcing.

1 We remain committed to achieving the goals laid
2 out in the Governor's 2020 Executive Order establishing a
3 goal that 100 percent of medium- and heavy-duty vehicles
4 in the State be zero emission by 2045 where reasonable,
5 and by 2035 for drayage trucks. We will evaluate the next
6 steps to continue driving toward this goal. At the same
7 time, we have the Advanced Clean Trucks Regulation, which
8 received a waiver in 2023 as well as the Clean Truck
9 Partnership, which is an agreement made by the nation's
10 manufacturers to reach 100 percent zero-emission sales by
11 2036, both of which are critical tools to help us reach
12 the Governor's goals.

13 [SLIDE CHANGE]

14 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Now, let's transition
15 to a -- to new initiatives and regulations CARB will be
16 prioritizing in 2025.

17 [SLIDE CHANGE]

18 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Short-lived climate
19 pollutants, like methane, are powerful climate pollutants
20 with global warming potential that is -- that are tens to
21 thousands of times greater than that of carbon dioxide.
22 In 2025, CARB will take additional efforts to slash their
23 emissions, including updating the landfill regulations and
24 progressing the methane satellite data project.

25 Decomposition of organic waste at landfills emits

1 methane and makes landfills the second largest source of
2 methane emissions in California. Under the early action
3 Landfill Methane Regulation of 2010, California landfill
4 operators are required to install and operate gas
5 collection systems at landfills to capture and use
6 fugitive methane. This year, staff will propose
7 regulatory updates to the regulation to improve emissions
8 monitoring, leverage more recent technology developments,
9 improve has collection systems operation, and improve
10 administration of this regulation.

11 CARB is also leveraging innovative technology
12 through the methane satellite data project, which uses
13 advanced remote sensing to detect large methane leaks in
14 California and globally. One philanthropically funded
15 satellite was launched in August of last year and CARB
16 anticipates awarding a \$95 million contract in the coming
17 months for additional data. With this unprecedented
18 information, CARB will start notifying operators in 2025
19 so swift action can be taken to address identified leaks.
20 To support this effort, CARB has amended its Oil and Gas
21 Methane Regulation to require oil and gas facility
22 operators to act promptly upon notification of methane
23 plumes. And we are also exploring similar provisions as
24 part of the landfill methane regulation amendments. In
25 addition, CARB plans to release a \$5 million community

1 grant program solicitation to engage communities in
2 interpreting and responding to plumes detected in their
3 areas.

4 [SLIDE CHANGE]

5 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Another priority for
6 2025 is focused on updating planning targets to reduce the
7 need for vehicle travel. SB 375 requires California's
8 Metropolitan Planning Organization regions to develop
9 Sustainable Communities Strategies aimed at reducing
10 greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicle travel to
11 help achieve the State's climate goals. To guide these
12 strategies, CARB sets a GHG reduced -- reduction target
13 for MPO regions, which must be updated at least every
14 eight years. The current target update process is
15 underway and must be completed by next year. To support
16 this, staff will host a second statewide public workshop
17 in the second quarter and plans to release a draft report
18 with target recommendations for public review and comment
19 in the third quarter of this year.

20 [SLIDE CHANGE]

21 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: This year, we also plan
22 to support several efforts to advance climate action. We
23 are prepared to support the administration and Legislature
24 as they consider extending the Cap-and-Trade Program
25 beyond 2030 to achieve carbon neutrality. We will also be

1 conducting rulemaking activities to support carbon
2 capture, utilization and storage, as well as corporate GHG
3 emissions reporting and corporate climate financial risk
4 disclosure, as required by SB 905, SB 253, and SB 261,
5 respectively. The State's leadership in these areas is
6 critical to attract funding for innovation and
7 technologies needed to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045
8 and to provide public transparency on how large
9 corporations are responding to the science of climate
10 change and acting to do their part to reduce GHG
11 emissions.

12 Over the coming months, staff will be holding
13 workshops on the implementation of these bills through
14 rulemakings and welcome broad participation.

15 [SLIDE CHANGE]

16 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Ensuring affordable and
17 equitable access to transportation fuels will also be a
18 key priority for 2045 -- 2025. And late last year, CARB
19 received a letter from Governor Newsom asking the agency
20 to prioritize the multi-media evaluation of E15, which is
21 a statutory requirement for CARB and other CalEPA
22 departments to evaluate potential air, soil, water, and
23 other impacts when considering whether to modify
24 regulations allowing ethanol use in California gasoline to
25 increase from 10 percent by volume to 15 percent.

1 The Governor's proposed budget includes needed
2 resources to support this effort. In addition, this year,
3 we will continue to coordinate with the California Energy
4 Commission to engage the public through community meetings
5 and ongoing discussions with a legislatively created
6 working group on the development of the Transportation
7 Fuels Transition Plan required by SBx-1.

8 [SLIDE CHANGE]

9 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Looking ahead to 2025,
10 we face an array of unprecedented challenges, but these
11 obstacles will not deter us. As Barack Obama once said,
12 "You don't choose the time, the time chooses you." This
13 year, CARB and California have been chosen to stand at the
14 forefront to defend clean air, science-based public health
15 protections, and climate efforts against what we expect
16 will be a concerted federal assault. That is the part we
17 must play. To meet these challenges, 2025 is going to
18 require a level of discipline from us to stand our ground
19 and remain focused on the core activities and programs
20 that deliver tangible results in improving air quality and
21 combating climate change.

22 It will also demand resilience from all of us to
23 adapt to an evolving landscape and the creativity to
24 explore new innovative approaches, something that CARB
25 does very well. This is an effort that spans across the

1 entire organization, every division, every team, and every
2 one of you will play a critical role in ensuring CARB
3 remains a beacon for Environmental leadership.

4 I am grateful to all of the almost 2,000 staff
5 for their hard work and dedication, and look forward to
6 rising to the challenges of 2025 together. And in
7 closing, we'd like to share a short video that highlights
8 the transformative power of the community air protection
9 as told by the Portside -- the members of the Portside
10 Steering Committee, bringing to life the impact of our
11 work and the stories of the communities that we serve.

12 (Thereupon a video was played.)

13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you for sharing
14 that video and I want to thank the participants, the CARB
15 team who helped put that together, and of course our work
16 with the air districts and especially the communities
17 involved in help making these stories. Really inspiring
18 and appreciate that. That concludes my item.

19 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you so much.
20 Okay. We are going to hear from the public who signed up
21 to speak on this item by submitting a request-to-speak
22 card or by raising their hand in Zoom. And I will ask the
23 Board clerks to begin calling the public commenters.

24 BOARD CLERK LEVRINI: Madam Chair, we have four
25 in-person commenters. We will start with RJ Lemke.

1 RJ LEMKE: Good afternoon. My name is RJ Lemke
2 and I'm representing Happy Daze RVs, which is my family's
3 business. It's proudly served California for 50 years, as
4 well as the California RV Dealers Association. Here to
5 voice my strong concerns about the inclusion of motorhomes
6 in the Advanced Clean Air and the Omnibus regulations.

7 While I support California's mission to reduce
8 emissions, grouping motorhomes with semi-trucks and heavy
9 equipment is unfair and impractical. Motorhomes are
10 recreational vehicles, not commercial workhorses. They
11 are used seasonally or intermittently averaging fewer than
12 2,000 miles a year, which makes their emissions impacts
13 negligible at best. Applying these regulations to
14 motorhomes does little to achieve clean air goals while
15 creating significant burdens for both consumers and the RV
16 industry.

17 Additionally, California recently dropped its
18 regulations phasing out diesel trucks and requiring
19 cleaner locomotives measures, which would have far -- had
20 a far greater impact on emissions. It's hard to
21 understand why motorhomes, which make up a tiny fraction
22 of emissions are still being targeted while much larger
23 sources are being abandoned. The economic implications
24 are also troubling. The RV industry generates generally
25 around 500 million annually in California supporting local

1 businesses, jobs, tourism. Overregulation risks pushing
2 customers out of the state to buy, harming local dealers,
3 reducing tax revenue, and threatening the viability of our
4 industry. These policies could drive costs up, pricing
5 many families out of RV ownership.

6 I urge the Board to exclude motorhomes from the
7 ACT and Omnibus frameworks. Let's focus on sectors with
8 greater potential for emissions reductions, and protect
9 small businesses and consumers while still advancing
10 California's environmental goals.

11 Thank you.

12 BOARD CLERK LEVRINI: Thank you.

13 Melina Rochin.

14 MELINA ROCHIN: My name is Melina Rochin, Board
15 member of Cal RVDA and COO of ET Quality RV, a
16 family-owned business that has proudly served our
17 community for over three decades. I want to highlight
18 some critical considerations regarding the practicality
19 and unintended consequences of the ACT Regulation on the
20 RV industry and working class families. One major
21 challenge is a significant difference in utility between a
22 full tank of gas on a truck hauling a trailer and a full
23 charge on electric truck. The range and convenience
24 offered by gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles make
25 weekend camping trips and long distance RV travel feasible

1 for our -- for families. Current, electric truck models,
2 even at full charge cannot match the range or refueling
3 speed of traditional vehicles creating logistical
4 challenges for RV owners.

5 This limitation disproportionately affects
6 working class families. The increased cost associated
7 with transitioning to electric RVs coupled with a lack of
8 charging infrastructure risk pricing these families out of
9 recreational travel altogether. As a result, the economic
10 impact on our industry could be devastating.
11 Additionally, it is important to contextualize the
12 emissions produced by RVs and the trucks that tow them.
13 These vehicles are not used daily. Their emissions are a
14 fraction of those generated by other sectors.

15 Meanwhile, California's wildfires emit far More
16 greenhouse gases and harmful particulates than the entire
17 RV sector. In 2020 alone, wildfires in California
18 released more than a hundred million metric tons of CO2,
19 an amount that dwarf's the emissions of RVs and towing
20 vehicles. Addressing wildfire emissions by investing in
21 forest management and the fire prevention strategies would
22 have a far greater impact on air quality and climate goals
23 and targeting niche market like RVs

24 We believe CARB should focus on comprehensive
25 solutions that address these broader issues, while

1 supporting the transition to cleaner technologies. Given
2 the minimal emissions contribution of RVs and their unique
3 usage patterns, we strongly urge CARB to consider
4 excluding RVs from the ACT Regulation altogether. This
5 approach would prevent unnecessary economic burdens on
6 families and small businesses, while allowing the
7 family -- the industry to pursue cleaner technologies at a
8 realistic pace.

9 BOARD CLERK LEVRINI: Thank you.

10 MELINA ROCHIN: Thank you for your time.

11 BOARD CLERK LEVRINI: Evan Edgar.

12 EVAN EDGAR: Hello, Board members. My name is
13 Evan Edgar. I'm the engineer for the refuse industry.
14 There are 16,000 public and private refuse fleets in
15 California, half are public, half are private. The other
16 half are on RNG with a carbon negative intensity of minus
17 119. The other half are on renewable diesel question.

18 We are the early adopters. We are the clean
19 technology with near zero NOx. We are the carbon negative
20 folks that make our own energy with anaerobic digestion.
21 We create jobs today, not tomorrow. And we're going to
22 lose those jobs maybe. We are the circular economy of
23 today and we're being penalized as being early adopters.
24 Plus, as part of the CalEPA report, we are the most cost
25 effective solution for climate change as the development

1 of anaerobic digestion facilities.

2 In February 2023, when you guys adopted the
3 Advanced Clean Fleets rules, the resolution to talk about
4 the future of biomethane, to quote -- to quote the Board
5 resolution, you were going to prioritize policies
6 discussions related to SB 1440 recommendations,
7 discussions how to transition biomethane into the
8 hard-to-decarbonize communities. That workshop was never
9 held. I've been up here for two years trying to get that
10 workshop held. We don't make biomethane for
11 hard-to-decarbonize communities that are late to the game.
12 We're early adopters since 2020. From South San Francisco
13 to the Inland Empire, we are making carbon negative fuel
14 today.

15 And the future of biomethane is that a lot of our
16 facilities are not on -- not on a PUC pipeline. The
17 public sector under the Advanced Clean Fleet Rule also the
18 wastewater guys. And they really worked hard to get this
19 workshop about what is the future of biomethane when
20 you're not on a PUC pipeline. We don't make fuel for the
21 tomato processing plant in Modesto. We make fuel for our
22 own fleet that's carbon negative with zero NOx.

23 So I stand here asking you to prioritize that for
24 2025, seeing that two years later, you guys haven't held
25 that workshop. So, please hold that workshop. And the

1 RNG forever people, we want RNG forever. Thank you very
2 much.

3 BOARD CLERK LEVRINI: Thank you.

4 Will Barrett.

5 WILL BARRETT: Good afternoon. I'm Will Barrett
6 with the American Lung Association. Really happy to be
7 here to start the year with you. Certainly, CARB's
8 leadership and innovative approach to clean air policies
9 are critical to meeting healthy air standards, for
10 addressing health equity concerns, as well as pushing
11 towards a healthier climate.

12 Certainly, the lack of waiver approval across the
13 Board is very concerning, as Dr. Cliff noted, especially
14 on the locomotive and Advanced Clean Fleets fronts. We
15 see this as a clear need for CARB to fully embrace and
16 fully implement all existing policies and really look at
17 all authorities that California has to clean up the air.
18 A key example of this is really the need for addressing
19 these SIP gaps for NOx tons looking at our legacy fleets,
20 whether -- you know, across the Board, looking at in-use
21 testing and more frequent intervals for all in-use testing
22 opportunities to really identify high emitters earlier.
23 We see that in the Heavy-Duty Inspection and Maintenance
24 Program that has just kicked off successfully.

25 We know that that's going to increase testing

1 interviews down the road and that will save hundreds more
2 lives in the base of massive health benefits of that
3 program. So just in-use testing and legacy fleets is a
4 key point I want to make.

5 Also, in the presentation, really encouraged to
6 see the focus on opportunities to reduce time stuck in
7 traffic, traffic -- vehicle miles traveled reductions that
8 are critically needed to meet our clean air standards, to
9 meet our climate standards. And this week, 65
10 organizations across California, through the Climate Plan
11 Network, wrote a letter to all California State agencies,
12 CARB included, as well as the transportation agencies to
13 really put a fine point on this that we need to make more
14 urgent and rapid progress on VMT reduction, on meeting our
15 SB 375 vision that California has had, but has so far not
16 materialized, to build healthier communities, and more
17 efficient and more affordable mobility options for all
18 Californians.

19 So with those two things, I just wanted to kind
20 of kick off a few, you know, areas where we think that our
21 shared mission of public health protection really can
22 advance even under these -- the current circumstances
23 we're in. So keep up the good fight and thank you very
24 much.

25 BOARD CLERK LEVRINI: Thank you. We will now

1 move into Zoom.

2 Matt Holmes, I have activated your mic. You may
3 unmute and begin.

4 MATT HOLMES: Awesome. Thanks so much. I want
5 to start by thanking Executive Officer Cliff for that
6 update on programs. I want to echo your call for drawing
7 a protective circle around the Office of Community Air
8 Protection, despite the many growing pains in this process
9 that we've all been through. It's absolutely enabled
10 meaningful change and how many of our communities relate
11 to the state. And Office of Air Community -- Community
12 Air Protection has only grown CARB's credibility under its
13 current chief.

14 I also want to express my gratitude for -- that
15 the remote sensing methane satellite is finally getting
16 its regulatory debut. Some of you may remember that the
17 authorization of these funds were really dead in the water
18 until impacted communities reversed our positions on. And
19 that was on the condition that the data would be
20 meaningfully available in real-time to our methane
21 polluted communities. Real-time access is easier than
22 withholding it. That's the good news. Real-time enables
23 pragmatic emergency response strategies in the communities
24 and it also helps us to control for really a lot of bad
25 actor local agencies that are really uninterested in

1 helping with this problem. It's a serious problem and it
2 really -- it's a problem that should be really escalated
3 within the Scoping Plan.

4 I just want to see -- you know, knowing that the
5 delay was frustrating for many of us, the work never stops
6 and the extra clock has afforded us the opportunity to
7 develop our academic and philanthropic partnership to
8 ensure that the original conditions on this funding
9 instrument are observed.

10 So I want to close encouraging the Board members
11 that they have all the authority necessary to unilaterally
12 direct this funding to communities that are most burdened.
13 The -- you know, the Department's finance ritual around --
14 were certainly outdated competitive grant making framework
15 continue to admit bad actors into the monitoring
16 enforcement space, which only further marginalizes
17 impacted communities.

18 And I want close by thanking Board Member Kracov
19 for really diligently helping us stay on top of this
20 issue. I know it hasn't been ease. This is something
21 that we can really help lead the country and lead the
22 nation on, so long as we keep the right people in the
23 center of this conversation. Thank you so much.

24 BOARD CLERK LEVRINI: Thank you.

25 Bill Magavern, I have activated your mic. You

1 may unmute and begin.

2 BILL MAGAVERN: Thank you very much. Bill
3 Magavern with the Coalition for Clean Air. Appreciate the
4 presentation and the video, and really want to thank Dr.
5 Cliff for leading off his list of 2025 priorities with the
6 landfill methane issue. The existing rule on landfill
7 methane emissions is too weak and outdated and we need to
8 take advantage of technology that exists now to do a
9 better job of detecting leaks and also set a tighter
10 standard, so that we can better control this short-lived
11 climate pollutant that CARB has been addressing through a
12 number of measures, and which the Legislature recognized
13 in SB 1383.

14 We now have two giant holes in our plans to
15 reduce diesel emissions in California because of EPA's
16 failure to approve the Locomotive and Advanced Clean
17 Fleets rules. And I want to echo Will Barrett's comments
18 that we can partly fill those holes. Nothing will do it
19 on its own, but we need to focus on retiring the oldest
20 diesel trucks and expedite that rulemaking that is in your
21 SIP plans, and also have more frequent in-use testing to
22 catch more of the excess emissions.

23 I also urge you to move forward on the rulemaking
24 processes, which have started now in the early stages,
25 reduce emissions from ocean-going vessels, and also from

1 airport ground operations.

2 I look forward to working with you on all of
3 these processes and many more in the coming year.

4 Thank you.

5 BOARD CLERK LEVRINI: Thank you.

6 Clayton Munnings, I have activated your mic. You
7 may unmute and begin.

8 CLAYTON MUNNINGS: Yeah. Thank you. Clayton
9 Munnings with Elevate Climate speaking in my own capacity.
10 So CARB's update to its Cap-and-Trade Program has suffered
11 a number of delays, which is casting uncertainty over the
12 market, having three negative consequences. First, the
13 uncertainty over regulation delays climate action. Taking
14 climate action is important, not only to reduce the number
15 of additional wildfires, but also to ensure we hit our
16 State greenhouse gas goals given that we know wildfires
17 emit greenhouse gas emissions.

18 The update on the Cap-and-Trade Program is poised
19 to remove one billion allowances from the market, thereby
20 reducing one billion tons of additional greenhouse gas
21 emissions through 2045. It would do so as cost
22 effectively as possible, thereby eliminating concerns
23 regarding the portability and the existing regulation has
24 provisions to attack -- to protect electricity ratepayers.

25 Second, certainty over the regulation raises

1 climate-friendly investments into California. Investors
2 look at the allowance price to decide if climate-friendly
3 investments are profitable or not. And volatility around
4 that price raises additional climate-friendly investments.

5 And third, uncertainty over the rulemaking
6 weakens allowance prices, which has led to lower auction
7 revenue. This is important because of Dr. Cliff's
8 statements regarding the Climate Change Investments
9 Program, which relies on Cap-and-Trade revenues. It's
10 also important, given some of Governor Newsom's plans to
11 use Cap-and-Trade revenues to backfill either the budget
12 or backfill subsidies that Trump may rollback.

13 So in conclusion, I urge CARB to release the
14 update to its Cap-and-Trade Program, also known as the
15 Initial Statement of Reasons, or ISOR, as soon as is
16 feasible.

17 Thank you.

18 BOARD CLERK LEVRINI: Thank you.

19 And this concludes our commenters for this item.

20 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you. This is
21 an informational item, so there's no need to close the
22 record. So I will open it up to Board members for
23 questions or comments. I did have a question on the
24 comments around RVs. Could you talk a little bit about
25 how ACT and Omnibus affect RVs.

1 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Yes, Chair. Thank you.
2 Really appreciate the commenters coming today. I'll just
3 note that it's actually when we do these updates, I don't
4 remember ever having public comment on the EO update
5 previously, so I feel pretty special.

6 (Laughter).

7 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Noting that, the
8 comments regarding RVs, we really empathize with the
9 industry and we have heard concerns related to RVs
10 repeatedly. I will note that this Board took really
11 important action last fall to help improve and streamline
12 the implementation of the Advanced Clean Trucks
13 Regulation. We also have been working really closely with
14 the manufacturers regarding how they implement the Omnibus
15 and Advanced Clean Trucks regulations. You'll member that
16 we sent a memo last year kind of detailing our analysis
17 there.

18 We really believe that Advanced Clean Trucks
19 should not have any constraints on the RV industry. And
20 we actually have on our website a myth versus fact sheet
21 that's been posted that kind of goes through this. We do
22 know that now manufacturers are actually taking advantage
23 of provisions in the regulations that allow them to
24 purchase credits, and noting that there are sufficient
25 credits to comply with the Advanced Clean Trucks

1 Regulation for at least two years that are already in the
2 marketplace. So there should be absolutely no
3 constraints.

4 In addition, there's no reason that, in fact, RVs
5 should be chosen as the first out-the-gate type of vehicle
6 that would be targeted by the regulation. The regulation
7 has very modest implementation expectations. As I
8 mentioned, we already have more credits than are necessary
9 for a couple of years of implementation. So, there are a
10 lot of opportunities to electrify certain parts of the
11 market. And we have been working with the manufacturers
12 to target those first.

13 We understand that manufacturers, in some cases,
14 would prefer that for every type of industry that they
15 electrify and that it ensures that they're always in
16 compliance, but the regulation does not require that. So,
17 as I mentioned, we are seeing certain manufacturers take
18 advantage of the credit provisions. And then noting that
19 in addition, the amendments that the Board took action on
20 last year would allow manufacturers, including secondary
21 manufacturers, such as those that make RVs, to take
22 advantage of purchasing credits.

23 So if ultimately that becomes a constraint on the
24 marketplace, that they could purchase credits and then
25 hand those off to OEMs in lieu of actually buying

1 electrified product, if those are not yet available in the
2 segments that they serve.

3 CHAIR RANDOLPH: So to be clear, the rule allows
4 manufacturers to continue bringing those engines to market
5 in California, given the flexibilities in their compliance
6 strategies, right? There's no like category that says you
7 have to electrify RVs. You can sort of decide your
8 strategy in terms of compliance and which engines you
9 choose to bring into the state, is that correct?

10 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: That's right. It's
11 completely flexible. It's based on the total sales of
12 vehicles. Some percentage of those increasing annually
13 will need to be zero emissions. That's how the regulation
14 works. So it doesn't specifically target any particular
15 sector. And that's why there are more credits than are
16 necessary, because many sectors are starting to electrify,
17 and especially those that are in that kind of medium-duty
18 category, delivery trucks, and some other work trucks that
19 are already being electrified.

20 So those are the -- those are the categories that
21 are being targeted first. In some cases what we're
22 hearing, and this is part of what's the concerns that were
23 brought today, that manufacturers have said we would
24 prefer to have every single vehicle type we sell meet that
25 percentage. And if there is no electrified product in

1 that category, that's where the constraint comes in.
2 That's not a requirement of the regulation. And we do
3 think that opening up that credit market to a broader
4 class of manufacturers will allow RV manufacturers to buy
5 credits to comply or the original equipment manufacturers
6 can then start taking advantage of the credit provisions
7 in the regulation, as well as electrifying those trucks
8 that make sense first.

9 CHAIR RANDOLPH: So could I ask staff to do one
10 more round of conversations with the manufacturers, given
11 the changes we made in October, and just sort of, you
12 know, remind them again of these flexibilities and get
13 some information from them about how they are reacting to
14 the October changes.

15 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Yes, absolutely. And
16 I'll just note those changes aren't technically in effect
17 yet. Of course, you guys did agree to the regulation and
18 approved that. We're still going through the process to
19 finalize that through the -- through the Office of
20 Administrative Law. We expect that to be completely
21 updated later this year. But those provisions will be in
22 effect in the coming months, but we will -- we will do
23 that next round of conversations.

24 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Great. Thank you.
25 Okay. Dr. Shaheen.

1 BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Thanks so much. And Dr.
2 Cliff, thank you so much for the update. I wanted to hone
3 in on the really important conversation about VMT, which
4 has been raised several times. So I know we've got I
5 think a very important action in summer of 2026 associated
6 with the SB 375 updates. And I as recall from our
7 November briefing, the Board got together and we heard a
8 lot about the SCSs, the targets, the role of, I think,
9 streamlining guidance around methodologies and methods
10 that there might be some inconsistencies.

11 So I was curious do we have ongoing
12 communications with the MPOs at present in advance of the
13 2025 workshop? You know, ultimately, where I'm going with
14 all of this is we've got to get the data right, the
15 methods right, but we also need to get to implementation
16 to get the VMT down to get GHGs down.

17 And I know there's been a call for action to get
18 more towards implementation. But I think we've got to
19 address both, right, is how do we -- how do we get to
20 actions that are really going to count and prioritize them
21 as part of this process, but also get to a place where we
22 better data, better methods, more consistency in how the
23 reporting is done. I know it was a lot, but thank you.

24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Yeah. Thank you, Dr.
25 Shaheen. So to your question, yes, we do have an ongoing

1 dialogue with MPOs. And we also include other State
2 agencies, the California Transportation Commission and
3 Caltrans in those conversations. And there have been --
4 there's dialogue both at my level and at Chanell's level,
5 as well as staff level conversations that are ongoing. So
6 we are trying to work with MPOs, making sure that we both
7 understand the concerns in how they report information to
8 us and how we account for reductions to meet the targets
9 that have been set by this Board, as well as continuing to
10 update our reporting requirement.

11 So under SB 150, we do have to -- we do have to
12 provide a report annually on the progress towards
13 implementing the targets and we're continuing to refine
14 that. We have a dashboard online that has a lot of
15 information that's available to ensure accountability
16 there. The challenge is as MPOs are continuing to
17 implement SCSs, we also need to work on updating those
18 targets for the future.

19 And so we're kind of doing both simultaneously.
20 We're -- they're in various phases of developing
21 Sustainable Communities Strategies. We're developing new
22 targets and then each of the MPOs that has submitted those
23 SCSs we're evaluating. And so we're kind of on this
24 constant cycle of update, evaluate, and then make progress
25 moving forward.

1 Unfortunately, I think our SB 150 reports have
2 shown that we're not making the progress that we expected.
3 Certainly during the pandemic, vehicle miles travel
4 reduced, but the report continues to show that we're not
5 making the progress that is necessary to achieve our
6 climate objectives. And that will be ever more important,
7 especially in the face of what we expect to be rollbacks
8 in the federal administration support of our priorities,
9 including not only the waivers and authorizations, but the
10 potential for impacts to incentives for zero-emission
11 vehicles.

12 So we're watching all of that very closely, and,
13 of course, working closely with MPOs and other
14 stakeholders to try and advance our objective and our
15 mandate to reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions in the
16 regions.

17 BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Thank you. Thank you for
18 that. And I'd just like to underscore again how important
19 that is. The VMT is not on track and that's a fact. And
20 we really need to work together and I think get action and
21 implementation out there, including reinforcing the role
22 of public transit and reducing VMT.

23 Thanks.

24 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

25 Board Member De La Torre.

1 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you. Mine are
2 just two things that I want to highlight. It's not a
3 question or anything.

4 One is the heavy-duty trucks and the transition
5 to zero-emission trucks. I want to be clear that our
6 commitment in that regard, the transition to zero-emission
7 trucks, is unabated. There was one thing that isn't going
8 to happen, at least partially, as Steve mentioned. We
9 will continue to do ACF for government fleets. So that
10 piece is still there, but we still have, in terms of
11 incentives and regulations, and this is not an exhaustive
12 list, we have at the State level greenhouse gas reduction
13 funds, Carl Moyer funds. The California Energy Commission
14 has funds for this transition, whether for the trucks
15 themselves or for the infrastructure. We have LCFS
16 credits. So all of that remains and the commitment
17 remains, but it isn't just us.

18 At the local level, we have air district funds.
19 We have port funds. Even transportation agencies, local
20 transportation agencies have funds for either the trucks,
21 or the infrastructure, or both. So all of that is
22 unabated. It will continue. Absolutely.

23 On the regulatory side, we have the Advanced
24 Clean Trucks rule, which is a thing. It has not changed
25 in any way, shape, or form. In fact, we have all of the

1 manufacturers signed on to an agreement to that effect,
2 regardless of regulatory actions.

3 We have the Truck and Bus rules for emissions,
4 which are getting lower, and lower, and lower, to the
5 point where zero emission is a better path for a lot of
6 folks than continuing with the diesel. We have our
7 Heavy-Duty Truck Smog Check Program that is really
8 starting to pick up steam. And we have -- oh, I mentioned
9 ACT, government fleets, so -- and there's others are.
10 These are -- this is just a sampling of our commitment
11 that is not changing in any way, shape, or form. And we
12 will continue to move towards the Governor's goal that he
13 laid out in 2020, prior to ACF, that we will transition to
14 zero-emission truck new truck sales by 2035 for drayage
15 and 2045 for all. And I know there's a date in between
16 too that I don't remember what it -- what category we're
17 doing in between. But all of that is still moving ahead
18 and absolutely a priority for me personally and I know for
19 my colleagues on the Board.

20 The second is a follow-up to our conversation in
21 November. I want to keep this in front of staff and I
22 know there's still discussions going on, but Clean Cars 4
23 All. What we -- what I didn't know in November, I know
24 now, is that there are only two of the five air districts
25 that are short of money, San Joaquin has run out already

1 and Bay Area is about to run out any day now. So those
2 two are the ones that need the help, not all five in this
3 fiscal year. And so that's just, you know, again putting
4 that forward to make sure that we're working on that
5 solution as well.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

8 Board Member Guerra.

9 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Thank you, Chair. Very
10 briefly, again I want to echo the concern that Board
11 Member De La Torre mentioned, and we had a very, you know,
12 I guess lively discussion last time, but here we are again
13 on that point, where we have, you know, two air districts
14 in a position where on a very successful program, where
15 the public and those that are involved know how to access
16 it. That reliability, is essential to make sure that we
17 keep going. And I wouldn't want to be in our region here
18 in our air district area to find us in that same
19 situation.

20 So I think this needs to be responded to this
21 year in making sure that those districts have the funding
22 and support for the Clean Cars 4 All Program. So I'll
23 leave it at that and a lot of work ahead.

24 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

25 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yeah. Thank you.

1 I think that I definitely just wanted to start on this
2 that I really feel like our priorities are very, very
3 sound, and -- for this year and I look forward to working
4 with staff to making sure that those are accomplished and
5 risen to the front of other priorities at the State and
6 federal level as well. One of the things -- and then in
7 particular, the continued commitment to community
8 engagement, because I think that that yields better
9 results for everybody in terms of our trying to prioritize
10 the most impactful efforts.

11 I think to that effect, I do also want to echo
12 that we need to keep in mind the resolution and continuity
13 around Clean Cars 4 All and ensure that those entities
14 don't have to roll in and out, because that also creates
15 larger confusion and lessens the potential impact of these
16 programs when they have to start and stop. So I want to
17 continue to emphasize moving forward on that end as well.
18 Thank you so much.

19 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

20 Well, thank you very much for that presentation
21 and appreciate all the work that went into the
22 presentation and the video.

23 And since we don't need to take a vote on this
24 item, we can move on to open public comment.

25 BOARD CLERK LEVRINI: Thank you. We currently

1 have one in-person Commenter.

2 Evan Edgar.

3 EVAN EDGAR: Good afternoon, Board members. My
4 name is Evan Edgar. One word, "leakage". Two words,
5 "blood batteries". I'll be talking about those.

6 I've been promoting the European battery
7 directive for the last three years when the European Union
8 adopted it. And since that time there's been really no
9 movement. There are three aspects to the European battery
10 directive: one is supply chain due diligence, verified
11 carbon intensity and recycling. On the recycling bills,
12 SB 615, the Governor vetoed that. So apparently it's okay
13 to throw ZEV batteries into the landfills because there's
14 no recycling law.

15 Number two, SB 1018 Quirk bill had to have a
16 verified third party for the carbon intensity of
17 manufacturing and charging ZEV batteries. That bill was
18 killed by CARB staff in Committee, because it cost too
19 much to know the truth. Even the Union of Concerned
20 Scientists opposed it, because nobody wants to know the
21 truth about zero-emission vehicle batteries, because
22 they're not zero. The carbon intensity is plus 20, as
23 provided by Ricardo that works in the European Union
24 implementing the European battery directive. California
25 should follow that. And number three the biggest one is

1 supply chain due diligence.

2 It has to do with a Scoping plan with minimizing
3 leakage. Where we call it zero-emissions in California,
4 we're leaking our emissions for criteria pollutants and
5 greenhouse gases onto other people, from the plains of
6 Argentina with lithium dust to the kids slave labor cobalt
7 in the Congo, they are mining artisanal minerals to do
8 blood batteries.

9 EJAC supports this. I've been in front of
10 Environmental Justice for three years. They support the
11 three initiatives. I've been in front of you for three
12 years talking about this, zero input, for zero emissions
13 about leakage. The Scoping Plan says to minimize leakage.
14 You're encouraging leakage. Where is environmental
15 justice for all? Not just free cars in Fresno, but what
16 about the rest of the world.

17 BOARD CLERK LEVRINI: Thank you.

18 EVAN EDGAR: Who killed the carbon negative
19 fleet?

20 BOARD CLERK LEVRINI: Thank you.

21 We will now move to our Zoom commenters starting
22 with Teresa Bui. I have activated your mic. You may
23 unmute and begin.

24 TERESA BUI: Great. Thank you so much. Hi.
25 This is Teresa Bui with Pacific Environment. Happy new

1 year to all and thanks for the opportunity to comment.
2 This is actually on the previous item, the 2025
3 priorities. I had my hand raised, but had some internet
4 outage.

5 Thank you to Steve for sharing CARB's 2025
6 priorities. Now, that EPA approved the majority of the
7 harbor craft rule, we want to continue working with you
8 all on robust implementation and enforcement. And we view
9 that the LCFS is -- plays a critical role. And we would
10 live for CARB to provide more explicit information on how
11 hydrogen dispensers can get credit under the harbor craft.

12 And then in terms of the LCFS is an important
13 role in transitioning fleets and new vessels into new
14 fueling pathways and infrastructure, and so I want to --
15 you know, we're grateful to CARB for its commitment to
16 adding marine fuels for the next round. And I want to
17 make sure that it's as robust as possible and not allow
18 for false solutions like liquefied natural gas.

19 I also want to echo Bill Magavern's comments on
20 the ocean-going vessel rulemaking. We are so pleased that
21 you guys are tackling the biggest emission source at the
22 ports. Given that we are seeing record wildfires and
23 attacks on environmental protection at the federal level,
24 State leadership is needed more -- now more than ever.
25 And so for the in-transit rule, we want to work with you

1 all to accelerate the rulemaking, so that port communities
2 can breathe cleaner air earlier and to make it as robust
3 as possible. We are standing by and looking forward to
4 working with you.

5 Thank you so much.

6 BOARD CLERK LEVRINI: Thank you.

7 Greg Hurner, I have activated your mic. You may
8 unmute and begin.

9 GREG HURNER: Hi. This is Greg Hurner on behalf
10 of Miller Industries. And they wanted me to provide an
11 update on product availability for tow trucks. We
12 provided this update to staff yesterday.

13 I didn't talk on the last item, because this is
14 not about moving forward. Miller has worked with four
15 different manufacturers to try and develop a zero-emission
16 tow truck, but there are no options that meet the
17 legislative mandates and the requirements of the
18 California Highway Patrol to operate those on the road.

19 Of note, we purchased from nearly all
20 manufacturers. So this isn't about a particular
21 manufacturer. But with the changes you approved and the
22 discretionary enforcement, we were supposed to be -- we
23 were supposed to be able to see an increase in chassis
24 available. At this point in 2025, we -- the known
25 allocations are less than half of 2024 or about 10 percent

1 of what we would have in a normal year. Class 8 is worse.

2 The lack of availability is so severe right now
3 that we had to get a customer to give up a truck, so that
4 we could move it to someone that they needed to fill --
5 fulfill a contract with the freeway service patrol.

6 Board members, this is when the shortage of
7 chassis starts to impact the safety of the motoring public
8 and first responders. When we can't get newer, safer,
9 lower emission trucks on the road, it's going to impact
10 all of those services. And recall, UC Berkeley has found
11 that the freeway service patrol actually reduces emissions
12 and saves motorists money.

13 As I mentioned, we talked to staff yesterday to
14 give them this update open. We hopefully that we can find
15 a resolution we went through many topics and I'm happy to
16 go through many of those, but we really need to find a
17 solution quickly, because there is no optimism and people
18 are starting to try to figure out what they're going to
19 do, as far as jobs in California.

20 BOARD CLERK LEVRINI: Thank you.

21 And that concludes our open commenters.

22 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.

23 I wanted to take a moment to make a retirement
24 announcement. After 16 years as CARB's Chief Counsel, and
25 an extraordinary 48 years practicing law, Ellen Peter has

1 decided to retire at the end of February. Ellen has been
2 a wonderful, hard working, amazing leader who made a
3 significant and historic contribution to CARB and its
4 mission that we have spent so much time talking about
5 today.

6 She's been instrumental in our enforcement and
7 legal efforts, working on cases that have absolutely
8 shaped environmental and regulatory policy in California.
9 She has mentored many amazing attorneys and has helped
10 build a strong legal team within our agency and a strong
11 enforcement team as well. Ellen's dedication, steadfast
12 determination and strength have been invaluable to the
13 State of California's emissions reduction efforts, and she
14 will leave behind a very hard-to-fill space here at CARB.

15 And so I wanted to make sure and congratulate
16 Ellen on her amazing career, begin many -- several months
17 of thanks for her service and congratulations to the State
18 of California and celebrations of her amazing work, and
19 wish her well in her incredibly well-deserved retirement.

20 I personally am so fortunate to have been able to
21 work with you here at CARB for the last four years and you
22 will be very, very, very missed.

23 So thank you.

24 (Applause).

25 CHAIR RANDOLPH: And if there are any other Board

1 members who's like to say a few words, please do.

2 I knew Cliff would want to say something.

3 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Well, I -- thank
4 you. I've known and had the pleasure of working with
5 Ellen for over 20 years, previously at the California
6 Attorney General's office. And she is a incredibly
7 tenacious, pragmatic, collaborative, and super effective
8 advocate and a pleasure to work with. And having
9 experienced a trauma of too hostile previous
10 administrations under President -- the first -- second
11 President Bush and President Trump last time around, I
12 can't imagine how we're going to get through this third
13 trauma without you, but best of luck. You've more than
14 served your time for the -- for CARB and the people of
15 California.

16 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Dr. Balmes.

17 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Well, as the longest
18 serving Board member, I actually started before you.

19 (Laughter).

20 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: But it's always been a
21 pleasure to work with you, both because you're always nice
22 and congenial, and always give very direct advice,
23 whenever I, you know, am about to screw up. So I
24 appreciate that. And you definitely will be missed and we
25 wish you the best in your retirement. Continue to enjoy

1 life.

2 CHAIR RANDOLPH: Member Takvorian.

3 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Well, if it were
4 possible, I'd make a motion to deny this request for --

5 (Laughter).

6 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: But --

7 CHAIR RANDOLPH: I tried.

8 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes, I know. I just
9 want to express my huge appreciation and I really have
10 enjoyed getting to know you as a CARB member for the last
11 six years. And -- but I met you as an environmental
12 justice advocate, and just want to say on behalf -- well,
13 on behalf of myself, but I believe that many in the -- in
14 the movement really feel strongly that you were an open
15 ear and someone who really fought on behalf of our
16 communities, and really fought for environmental justice
17 long before it was a popular phrase. So I really
18 appreciate that and all your service in all the different
19 places that you've been in the State of California,
20 including, of course, CARB. So good luck and I hope you
21 enjoy birds, and lots of travel, and lots of fun.

22 Thank you, Ellen.

23 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

24 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yeah. Thank you,
25 Chair. Ellen, I'm so sorry I can't be there in person and

1 I'm also not sorry to not share this cold I have with you.

2 But I just wanted to say that I -- for those in
3 the room and those listening, I mean, what a true servant.
4 Ellen has been, in your time in legal services, which if
5 anyone knows anything about legal services, it truly takes
6 a servants heart to start your career in that space. And
7 so, I have seen what you've done here at CARB and have
8 actually been privileged enough to be part of your
9 mentorship. So I can only imagine how well you've
10 mentored your staff, and know that they are ready to take
11 the baton. And I am glad that you are now in this next
12 place in your life to really enjoy life and I know that
13 you'll be rooting for us. And I am sure that you are
14 still going to get called on and answered. And I know you
15 will pick up the phone, because that's you, but also feel
16 free to put it on silent every now and then too.

17 Just thank you so much for all that you've done
18 for Californians and through your legal services work as
19 well. For those that needed that representation the most,
20 what a brilliant career. And I am so -- I know that you
21 are such a great mentor and that we are in good hands.

22 Thank you.

23 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you so much,
24 Ellen. I know you will have an amazing retirement. You
25 and Dan will be able to spend more time together and you

1 will be, you know, off to New York, I'm sure, on an even
2 more frequent basis to see your daughter. So we will miss
3 you. And as Dr. Pacheco-Werner mentioned, we'll probably
4 be hanging onto your ankles via your cell phone, "Ellen,
5 Ellen, Ellen."

6 So thank you for your service on behalf of the
7 people of California.

8 CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: Great. Thank you, Liane.
9 And thanks for all the kind words from all of you and both
10 here and just this morning. I really, really appreciate
11 it. I want to acknowledge my husband who's here. Liane
12 referenced Dan who's been a supporter of me working for so
13 many years and continuing for all these hours, and would
14 joke on those Volkswagen things, what's our percentage
15 cut, you know, here? And we would --

16 (Laughter).

17 CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: What the lawyers do, what's
18 your percentage. So any event. Not any. But anyway, I
19 wanted to just say for the past five decades, CARB has
20 done some amazing things to improve public health, address
21 climate change, and just keeps ongoing. And I've just had
22 the -- I really appreciate the opportunity to spend these
23 last years with you to help move that forward. And as
24 Steve set out already, we have a lot of -- you have, we
25 all, have a lot of challenges in front of us, but I think

1 that with this very committed Board and this very
2 outstanding staff that we'll get there. And so just once
3 again thanks very much for the kind words, and thanks for
4 the support from me in this position.

5 (Applause).

6 (Standing applause.)

7 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Pursuant to our
8 publish agenda, the Board will now break for closed
9 session and then we'll reconvene after closed session to
10 adjourn the meeting.

11 Thank you.

12 (Off record: 12:47 p.m.)

13 (Thereupon the meeting recessed
14 into closed session.)

15 (Thereupon the meeting reconvened
16 open session.)

17 (On record: 2:34 p.m.)

18 CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Please come to
19 record. The Board met in closed session and no action was
20 taken by the Board.

21 The January 23rd, 2025 CARB Board meeting is now
22 adjourned. Thank you.

23 (Thereupon the California Air Resources Board
24 meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.)

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

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

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 3rd day of February, 2025.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "James F. Peters". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "James" and last name "Peters" clearly legible.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 10063