

MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
AIR RESOURCES BOARD

ZOOM PLATFORM

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
BYRON SHER AUDITORIUM
1001 I STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 2026

9:04 A.M.

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

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS:

Lauren Sanchez, Chair

John Balmes, MD

John Eisenhut

Dean Florez (Remote)

Paula Stigler Granados, PhD

Eric Guerra

Lynda Hopkins (Remote)

Patricia Lock Dawson

Tania Pacheco-Werner, PhD (Remote)

Cliff Rechtschaffen

Miguel Santiago

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

Shannon Dilley, Chief Counsel

Chanell Fletcher, Deputy Executive Officer, Equity, Communities and Environmental Justice

Christopher Grundler, Deputy Executive Officer, Mobile Sources and Incentives

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF:

Femi Olaluwoye, Deputy Executive Officer, Southern California Headquarters & Mobile Source Compliance

Rajinder Sahota, Deputy Executive Officer, Climate Change and Research

Michelle Buffington, Division Chief, Mobile Source Control Division(MSCD)

Ariel Fideldy, Chief, Air Quality Planning Branch, Air Quality Planning and Science Division(AQPSD)

Sara Forestieri, Manager, Off-Road Model Development Section, AQPSD

Austin Hicks, Air Pollution Specialist, Air Quality Planning and Science Division, AQPSD

Matt Lakin, Division Chief, AQPSD

Cory Parmer, Manager, Off-Road Diesel Analysis Section, AQPSD

David Quiros, Assistant Division Chief, AQPSD

Steve Weiss, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

ALSO PRESENT:

Cesar Aguirre - Central California Environmental Justice Network

Christian Bisher

Kimberly Burr

Tim Carmichael, California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance (CCEEB)

Steve Douglas, Alliance for Automotive Innovation

Harvey Eder, Public Solar Power Coalition

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

ALSO PRESENT:

Evan Edgar, Refuse Haulers

Sean Edgar, Clean Fleets

Jonathan Kendrick, California Chamber of Commerce

Ryan Kenny, Clean Energy

Joe Kilzer

Michael Lewis, Construction Industry Air Quality Coalition

Benjamin Lu, American Lung Association

Ian MacMillan, Southern Coast Air Quality Management
District

Bill Magavern, Coalition for Clean Air

Nicole Rice, California Renewable Transportation Alliance

Ryan Senneff

Chris Shimoda, Supply Chain Federation

Sarah Taylor, Western States Petroleum Association

Krysta Wanner, Western Propane Gas Association

Gary Wockner, Tell the Dam Truth

INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
Call to Order	1
Roll Call	1
Opening Remarks	2
Item 26-2-1	
Chair Sanchez	7
Executive Officer Cliff	8
Harvey Eder	9
Motion	10
Vote	10
Item 26-2-3	
Chair Sanchez	12
Executive Officer Cliff	12
Ian MacMillan	13
Steve Douglas	15
Harvey Eder	16
Motion	18
Vote	19
Item 26-2-2	
Chair Sanchez	20
Executive Officer Cliff	21
Staff Presentation	22
Kimberly Burr	42
Benjamin Lu	44
Bill Magavern	46
Chris Shimoda	47
Ryan Kenny	49
Evan Edgar	50
Jonathan Kendrick	52
Nicole Rice	54
Joe Kilzer	55
Christian Bisher	57
Krysta Wanner	58
Board Discussion and Q&A	59
Motion	92
Vote	92
Open Public Comment	
Sean Edgar	93
Tim Carmichael	95
Evan Edgar	97

INDEX CONTINUED

	<u>PAGE</u>
Open Public Comment (continued)	
Ryan Kenny	98
Nicole Rice	99
Cesar Aguirre	101
Gary Wockner	103
Sarah Taylor	104
Harvey Eder	106
Christian Bisher	108
Ryan Senneff	109
Michael Lewis	111
Adjournment	113
Reporter's Certificate	114

PROCEEDINGS

1
2 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Good morning. Good morning.
3 Buenos dias. Is that working? We're on.

4 Okay. Good morning. The March 26th, 2 -- public
5 meeting of the California Air Resources Board will come to
6 order. Board Clerk, will you please call the roll.

7 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Dr. Balmes.

8 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.

9 BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Mr. Eisenhut.

10 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here.

11 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Senator Florez.

12 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here.

13 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Councilman Guerra.

14 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Here.

15 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Supervisor Hopkins.

16 BOARD MEMBER HOPKINS: Present.

17 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Assemblymember Jackson.

18 Mayor Lock Dawson.

19 BOARD MEMBER LOCK DAWSON: Here.

20 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

21 Mr. Rechtschaffen.

22 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Here.

23 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Assemblymember Santiago?

24 Dr. Shaheen.

25 BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Here.

1 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Mayor Silva.

2 Senator Stern.

3 Dr. Stigler Granados.

4 BOARD MEMBER STIGLER GRANADOS: Here.

5 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Ms. Takvorian.

6 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.

7 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Chair Sanchez.

8 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Here.

9 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Madam Chair, we have a
10 quorum.

11 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you. Before we get
12 started, I will cover a few housekeeping items. We are
13 conducting today's meeting both in person as well as
14 offering remote options both by phone and via Zoom.

15 Anyone who wishes to testify in person should
16 fill out a request-to-speak card available in the foyer
17 outside the Board room. Please turn it into a Board
18 assistant prior to the commencement of the item. If you
19 are participating remotely, you will raise your hand in
20 Zoom or dial star nine, if calling in by phone. The clerk
21 will provide further details regarding public
22 participation in a moment.

23 For safety reasons, please note the emergency
24 exit to the rear of the room through the foyer. In the
25 vent of a fire alarm, we are required to evacuate this

1 room immediately and go down the stairs to the lobby and
2 out the building. When the "All Clear" signal is given,
3 we will return to the auditorium and resume the hearing.

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

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

24 THE INTERPRETER: Thank you, Madam Chair and
25 Board members.

1 (Interpreter translated in Spanish).

2 THE INTERPRETER: Thank you.

3 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you. I will now ask the
4 Board Clerk to provide more details regarding public
5 participation.

6 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you, Chair Sanchez.
7 Good morning, everyone.

8 I will provide additional information on public
9 participation for today's meeting. We will first call
10 in-person commenters who have turned in a request-to-speak
11 card and then call commenters who are joining us remotely.
12 If you are joining us remotely and wish to make a verbal
13 comment, you must be using Zoom webinar or calling in by
14 phone. If you are watching the webcast but you wish to
15 comment remotely, please register for the Zoom webinar or
16 call in. Information for both can be found on the public
17 agenda for today's meeting.

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

25 When the comment period begins, the order of

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

12 Each commenter will have a time limit of two
13 minutes, although this may change at the Chair's
14 discretion. During public testimony, you will see a timer
15 on the screen. For those calling in by phone, we will let
16 you know when you have 30 seconds left and then when your
17 time is up. For anyone giving verbal comments today in
18 Spanish, please indicate so at the beginning of your
19 testimony and our interpreter will come to assist you.
20 During your comment, please follow any instructions the
21 interpreter provides and please note that your time will
22 be doubled if you require Spanish interpretation.

23 If you have any additional remarks regarding
24 other topics, please sign up to speak during the open
25 public comment period, which will take place at the

1 conclusion of the meeting. To submit written comments,
2 please visit CARB's "Submit and Review Written Comments"
3 section on the public agenda on our webpage for links to
4 submit your comment.

5 Written comments will be accepted until the Chair
6 closes the record. If you experience any technical
7 difficulties, please call (805)772-2715, so an IT person
8 can assist.

9 Thank you. I'll turn the microphone back to
10 Chair Sanchez.

11 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you. Much appreciated.
12 Before we proceed with today's agenda, I'd like to extend
13 a warm welcome to our newest Board member, Mayor David
14 Silva, who was appointed by the Governor earlier this
15 month. Mayor Silva was elected to the Buellton City
16 Council in 2022 before coming -- becoming Mayor in 2024.
17 He has served on the Board of the Santa Barbara County Air
18 Pollution Control District since 2025. He also serves as
19 the Senior Director of Development at UC Santa Barbara
20 helping support philanthropic initiatives at his alma
21 mater. Even though he could not be here today, we would
22 like to extend a warm welcome to Mayor Silva.

23 (Applause).

24 CHAIR SANCHEZ: I would also like to thank my
25 fellow Board members for being here today and for their

1 attention to the issues and the work before us. These
2 last few weeks have shown more than ever that the work we
3 are doing here is being done against the backdrop of a
4 very uncertain world, in large part because of the actions
5 taken by our federal government.

6 However, I believe that the political, legal and
7 market uncertainty caused by the federal government's
8 actions only underscores the urgency of our work here at
9 CARB. It is in moments like these that our integrity of
10 process matters most. The rigor of our staff's work, the
11 engagement of our stakeholders, and the deliberation of
12 this Board are acts of institutional responsibility and
13 proof of our commitment.

14 Through public process, California is
15 demonstrating that we will continue to uphold and fulfill
16 our obligation to protecting public health and safety.
17 Today's agenda is an important next step to address
18 emissions and the reduction gap created by federal
19 backsliding, and I am proud of the work that staff has
20 done in order to bring these items forward for our
21 consideration today.

22 With that said, let's thousand now turn to the
23 items before the Board for today's meeting.

24 The first item on the consent calendar, as noted
25 on the public agenda, is Item 26 -- item number 26-2-1,

1 public meeting to consider the 2026 updates to motor
2 vehicle emissions budgets for the San Joaquin Valley 75
3 parts per billion ozone State Implementation Plan.

4 If you would like to comment on staff's proposal
5 as posted on CARB's website, please raise your hand in
6 Zoom or dial star nine now. When we get to the public
7 comment portion of this item, we will call on in-person
8 commenters first and then move to Zoom.

9 Dr. Cliff, good morning, would you please
10 summarize the item.

11 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Good morning. Thank
12 you Chair Sanchez.

13 The federal Clean Air Act establishes
14 requirements for transportation conformity to link
15 transportation in air quality planning. Conformity is
16 facilitated through motor vehicle emissions budgets
17 established in State Implementation Plans.

18 In March of last year, the Board revised the
19 budgets for the San Joaquin Valley 75 part per billion
20 ozone standard to align with the latest transportation
21 model, EMFAC2021. This revision was necessary to allow
22 the MPOs to meet conformity in their upcoming
23 transportation plans.

24 Unfortunately, following the March revision to
25 the budgets, the federal government took several

1 unwarranted and illegal actions to under -- undermining
2 the emissions reductions accounted for in the revised
3 budgets. In June of last year, the federal administration
4 illegally purported to revoke California's recent Clean
5 Air Act waivers, including those for the Advanced Clean
6 Trucks, and the Heavy-Duty Omnibus rules.

7 In response to these federal actions and to
8 ensure that transportation plans produced by the MPOs in
9 the valley can meet conformity requirements, we are
10 proposing to once again update the budgets for the valley
11 for the 75 ppb ozone standard. The updates to the budgets
12 include the removal of the benefits of the ACT and
13 Heavy-Duty Omnibus regulations.

14 This concludes my summary of the item. Thank
15 you.

16 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you.

17 Board Clerk, have any witnesses signed up to
18 testify on this item?

19 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: We do not have any in-person
20 commenters at this time. We do have one commenter on
21 Zoom. This is the phone number ending in 738.

22 Phone number ending in 738, I have activated your
23 microphone. You may unmute and begin your comment.

24 HARVEY EDER: Hello. Am I being heard.

25 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Yes.

1 HARVEY EDER: Okay. My name is Harvey Eder. I'm
2 the founding director of Public Solar Power Coalition.
3 I'd like to say that there's control issues. As this
4 thing is implemented, who's going to own and control it?
5 It's required by CEQA analysis. That has to be done. And
6 all this that has to be looked at. There is a UN
7 conference coming up next month in 20th and 29th in
8 Colombia. The just transition to solar renewables, that
9 has to be emphasized and be a top priority of your
10 program. Also, if the SIP review in the context of that
11 that you haven't met any State or federal laws for
12 emissions in 50 years.

13 Thank you. Bye. Reserving time.

14 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you for your comment.

15 Chair Sanchez, that concludes commenters for this
16 item.

17 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you. I will now close the
18 record on this agenda item.

19 The Board has before them Resolution number 26-2.
20 Do I have a motion and a second?

21 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: So moved.

22 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Move to approve.

23 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Great. Thank you. Board Clerk,
24 will you please call the roll.

25 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Dr. Balmes?

1 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes.
2 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Mr. Eisenhut?
3 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Yes.
4 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Senator Florez?
5 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez, yes.
6 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Councilman Guerra?
7 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Aye.
8 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Supervisor Hopkins?
9 BOARD MEMBER HOPKINS: Yes.
10 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Mayor Lock Dawson?
11 BOARD MEMBER LOCK DAWSON: Aye.
12 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?
13 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes.
14 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Mr. Rechtschaffen?
15 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Yes.
16 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Dr. Shaheen?
17 BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Aye.
18 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Dr. Stigler Granados?
19 BOARD MEMBER STIGLER GRANADOS: Yes.
20 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Ms. Takvorian?
21 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.
22 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Chair Sanchez?
23 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Yes.
24 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Madam Chair, the motion
25 passes.

1 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you.

2 Moving on, the second item on the consent
3 calendar, as noted on the public agenda, is Item number
4 26-2-3, public hearing to consider the proposal to
5 permanently adopt the Emergency Vehicle Emissions
6 regulations. If you would like to comment on staff's
7 proposal, as posted on CARB's website, please raise your
8 hand in Zoom or dial star nine now. When we get to public
9 comment, we will call on in-person commenters followed by
10 those who have virtually raised their hand.

11 Dr. Cliff, would you please summarize the item.

12 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Chair
13 Sanchez.

14 Staff is proposing to permanently adopt the
15 Emergency Vehicle Emissions regulations that were
16 initially adopted through an emergency rulemaking last
17 fall.

18 In January of last year, U.S. EPA granted
19 California waivers for Omnibus and Advanced Clean Cars II
20 regulations. In June of last year, President Trump signed
21 congressional resolutions that purported to disapprove
22 these waivers, as you heard in the last item.

23 To provide clarity to engine and vehicle
24 manufacturers, CARB introduced the Emergency Vehicle
25 Emissions regulations via an emergency rulemaking last

1 fall with an October 2nd effective date. CARB proposed to
2 readopt the emergency regulations on March 6th of this
3 year, extending the regulations for an additional 90 days.

4 The Emergency Vehicle Emissions regulations'
5 proposal today would make permanent the Emergency Vehicle
6 Emissions regulations from last fall. This would clarify
7 for stakeholders that CARB's pre-Omnibus and Low Emissions
8 Vehicle, or LEV III, criteria pollutant regulations, along
9 with the associated on-board diagnostic requirements for
10 both regulations will remain operative.

11 This concludes my summary of the item. Thank
12 you.

13 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you.

14 Board clerk, have any witnesses signed up to
15 testify on this item?

16 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Yes. We have two in-person
17 commenters. The first is Ian MacMillan.

18 IAN MACMILLAN: Good morning.

19 My name is Ian MacMillan and I am an Assistant
20 Deputy Executive Officer with the Planning Division at
21 South Coast AQMD. I'm here to comment on these emergency
22 regulations.

23 As you are all aware, our region suffers the
24 worst ozone in the country and some of the worst fine
25 particulate matter, yet we still have, you know, in our

1 great state, 40 percent of our population, actually a
2 little bit more than that. So because of that, you know,
3 we, of course, support these emergency regulations.

4 You know, there's been a lot of changes at the
5 federal level. And we'll hear more about that today,
6 including agency policy shifts and congressional actions.
7 This has certainly complicated CARB's and South Coast
8 AQMD's ability to meet State and federal air quality
9 standards. Today's action reinforces regulations which
10 were previously already approved into the SIP. So this
11 action can provide some added certainty for mobile source
12 regulations.

13 We look forward to continuing to work with CARB
14 staff on mobile source strategies to reduce air pollution,
15 impacting public health. This includes in larger
16 strategies, such as how to attain State and federal air
17 quality standards, but also in more immediate actions,
18 such as those being taken today.

19 South Coast AQMD is one of the very few agencies,
20 besides U.S. EPA and CARB, who have adopted our own
21 regulations that affect mobile sources. This includes
22 multiple Indirect Source Rules, as well as rules on
23 government fleets. These rules all rely on CARB's
24 regulations. So we have a unique interest in maintaining
25 alignment with CARB as it moves forward.

1 Close coordination between our agencies will give
2 each of us the greatest chance of successfully achieving
3 all of our goals to achieve State and federal air quality
4 standards and protect public health. Thank you for the
5 opportunity to comment.

6 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

7 Next, we have Steve Douglas.

8 STEVE DOUGLAS: Good morning, Chair Sanchez,
9 members of the Board. I'm Steve Douglas. On behalf of
10 the Alliance for Automotive Innovation representing the
11 full automotive ecosystem from car companies to startup,
12 to technology companies. We understand and we don't
13 oppose the emergency regulations that are before you
14 today. And the intent of those is to clarify the ACC I
15 and the ACC II pathways that were identified in the August
16 MAC.

17 That MAC also allows manufacturers to certify the
18 U.S. EPA regulations. So we submitted a number of written
19 comments for the record. So I'll just hit a couple of
20 high points. First, automakers remain deeply concerned
21 that the language in the regulations and around it suggest
22 that on the one hand car companies can certify vehicles to
23 the emergency regulations, but on the other hand it might
24 be illegal to do so and they may face enforcement action.
25 This is an untenable position and adds to confusion,

1 rather than providing clarity. The Board should clarify
2 that it is not illegal to follow the regulations that
3 you're about to adopt and that automakers will not face
4 enforcement action when following any of the CARB-approved
5 pathways.

6 Finally, there are a number of technical errors
7 and oversights in the regulations, and by and large, these
8 are minor and we provided detailed written recommendations
9 in our -- in our comments, and -- but there's probably a
10 fair amount of work that the -- that the stakeholders and
11 the staff need to do to clean those up. So just to
12 summarize, we request the Board first clarify the vehicle
13 is certified to emergency regulations will not face
14 enforcement action, and second, direct staff to continue
15 working with stakeholders to correct and clarify the
16 certification pathways.

17 Thank you very much.

18 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

19 Moving to Zoom, we have one Zoom commenter with
20 their hand raised. The same phone number ending in 738.
21 Phone number ending in 738, I have activated your
22 microphone. You may begin.

23 HARVEY EDER: Okay. Good morning. Am I being
24 heard?

25 Hello.

1 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Maybe speak up just a little
2 bit. It's a little muffled.

3 HARVEY EDER: Good morning. Good morning. Am I
4 being heard?

5 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Perfect. Thank you.

6 HARVEY EDER: Okay. My name is -- thank you. My
7 name is Harvey Eder and I'm founder, director of Public
8 Solar Power Coalition. I want to incorporate by reference
9 comments just made on the last item, also in reference to
10 comments referring to SIP by MacMillan.

11 We put in the Solar New Deal for the '16 plan.
12 It was never evaluated. It was the Sunshot program
13 modeled after the Moonshot. And it was from '20 -- '10 to
14 '20 and it made solar cost effective with no tax goodies
15 or anything compared to natural gas and coal. It's taken
16 over the market, et cetera.

17 So what has to be done is this was never
18 evaluated. You're side-tracking it and calling it zero
19 emissions. It's solar. That's the energy for our planet.
20 That's how it works. That's the real. And things have
21 got to change. And on the back end, working with Ian. We
22 tried to get ahold of him for contingency measures for the
23 warehouses. We got all kinds of solar all over several
24 thousands warehouses that was never evaluated. And we
25 tried do this with Lee, head of planning for EPA and it

1 was never evaluated. We -- it's all illegal. And in
2 reference to SIP, that's a very important. Thank you.
3 Enough for now. Bye.

4 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

5 That concludes our public comment for this item.

6 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you to all of our
7 commenters. I will now close the record on this agenda
8 item. However, if it is determined that additional
9 conforming modifications are appropriate, the record will
10 be reopened and a 15-day public notice of availability
11 will be issued. If the record is reopened for a 15-day
12 comment period, the public may submit written comments on
13 the proposed changes, which will be considered and
14 responded to in the Final Statement of Reasons for the
15 regulation.

16 Written or oral comments received after this
17 hearing date, but before a 15-day notice is issued will
18 not be accepted as part of the official record on this
19 agenda item. The Executive Officer may present either
20 regulation to the Board for further consideration, if
21 warranted, and if not, the Executive Officer shall take
22 final action to adopt each regulation after addressing all
23 appropriate conforming modifications.

24 The Board has before them Resolution number 26-3.
25 Do I have a motion and a second.

1 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: So moved.

2 BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Second.

3 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Board Clerk, will you please call
4 the roll.

5 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Dr. Balmes?

6 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes.

7 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Mr. Eisenhut?

8 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Yes.

9 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Senator Florez?

10 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Florez yes.

11 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Councilman Guerra?

12 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Aye.

13 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Supervisor Hopkins?

14 BOARD MEMBER HOPKINS: Yes.

15 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Mayor Lock Dawson?

16 BOARD MEMBER LOCK DAWSON: Aye.

17 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?

18 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes.

19 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Mr. Rechtschaffen?

20 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Yes.

21 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Dr. Shaheen?

22 BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Aye.

23 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Dr. Stigler Granados?

24 BOARD MEMBER STIGLER GRANADOS: Yes.

25 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Ms. Takvorian?

1 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.

2 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Assemblymember Santiago?

3 BOARD MEMBER SANTIAGO: Yes.

4 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Chair Sanchez?

5 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Yes.

6 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Madam Chair, the motion
7 passes.

8 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you.

9 The final item on today's agenda is Item number
10 26-2-2, public meeting to consider criteria pollutant
11 planning efforts.

12 For over 50 years, CARB has exercised our
13 authority under the Clean Air Act to implement mobile
14 source emission control programs that are at least as
15 stringent in the aggregate as federal standards. CARB's
16 mobile source emission control programs, together with the
17 stationary source controls implemented by our district
18 partners have made great strides in reducing air pollution
19 and helping Californians breathe cleaner air. But our
20 programs have been put in jeopardy by federal attacks over
21 the past year.

22 California has been clear that federal actions
23 will not stop us from pursuing cleaner air. Last June,
24 Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-27-25 to reaffirm
25 the State's commitment to zero-emission vehicle deployment

1 and directed CARB to initiate development of next
2 generation requirements for clean cars. In response, CARB
3 developed the ZEV Forward report to the Governor, and we
4 are building on that foundation with the Drive Forward
5 initiative.

6 Last October, this Board heard an informational
7 update on State Implementation Planning efforts that gave
8 the first glimpse of the magnitude of impacts on criteria
9 pollutant emissions and Californians' health that will
10 result from the illegal federal actions.

11 Since then, staff has continued to pursue action
12 to address these harms, including on-road vehicle efforts
13 being developed as a part of Drive Forward and many other
14 initiatives.

15 To be clear, we are not giving up in the face of
16 federal attacks and will continue to use every toll at our
17 disposal to continue our critical work to clean the air.
18 The health and well-being of communities across this state
19 depends on it.

20 Dr. Cliff, would you please introduce the item.

21 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Chair
22 Sanchez. The unprecedented federal attacks on
23 California's environmental protection efforts over the
24 last year threaten the State's ability to meet federal air
25 quality standards, putting public health at risk for

1 millions of Californians, especially those in the most
2 polluted communities.

3 At the October hearing last year, the Board heard
4 a staff report and public feedback on the need for CARB to
5 identify ways to backfill the emission reductions lost due
6 to these federal actions.

7 In response to this public feedback and Board
8 direction, staff have identified and quantified emissions
9 reductions from potential CARB actions that would maintain
10 progress in protecting public health from air pollution.
11 These actions include direct regulations, as well as other
12 potential approaches, including incentive programs and
13 other voluntary measures. Due to the magnitude of the
14 federal actions, CARB must now explore new types of
15 programs and mechanisms to continue our clean air efforts,
16 which are critically vital for the health of all
17 Californians. I will now ask Austin Hicks of the Air
18 Quality Planning and Science Division to begin the staff
19 presentation.

20 Austin.

21 (Slide presentation).

22 AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HICKS: Thank you,
23 Dr. Cliff. Today, I will be presenting on criteria
24 pollutant planning efforts. This item builds on an
25 informational update presented to the Board last October

1 and is in response to damage that federal government has
2 caused to clean air efforts in California.

3 [SLIDE CHANGE]

4 AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HICKS: I will be
5 covering the various reckless federal attacks on
6 California's programs and clean air efforts and an updated
7 estimate of the emission reduction gap resulting from
8 these attacks. Next, CARB's concepts and rulemaking
9 efforts in response to federal actions and the potential
10 associated criteria pollutant emission reductions.
11 Unfortunately, these concepts are not enough and there is
12 a remaining gap in reductions needed to ensure attainment.
13 I will touch on other opportunities for criteria pollutant
14 reductions to chip away at this gap. And finally, we will
15 close with steps moving forward.

16 [SLIDE CHANGE]

17 AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HICKS: As
18 discussed in the State Implementation Plan, or SIP, annual
19 update at the October -- at the October Board meeting,
20 over the last year we've seen reckless attacks by the
21 federal government on CARB's programs, including many of
22 the programs that were included in our recent SIP
23 submittals to U.S. EPA.

24 In anticipation of this, and in response to
25 posturing by the incoming federal -- by the incoming

1 administration, there were some specific actions CARB
2 decided to take at the start of last year. In January
3 2025, because the Biden administration did not act on
4 them, CARB withdrew waivers and authorization requests
5 that were still awaiting action by U.S. EPA. This
6 withdrawal included requests related to drayage and
7 high-priority portions of the Advanced Clean Fleets
8 regulation, the In-Use Locomotive regulation, and a
9 partial withdrawal of the requests related to the
10 Commercial Harbor Craft and Transport Refrigeration Units
11 regulations.

12 In May 2025, Congress passed three
13 unconstitutional and illegal resolutions, which the
14 President signed in June 2025, and which California is
15 challenging. These illegal resolutions purported to
16 disapprove three actions by U.S. EPA waiving federal
17 preemption for CARB's Advanced Clean Cars II, Heavy-Duty
18 Vehicle and Engine Omnibus Low NOx, and Advanced Clean
19 Trucks with the Heavy-Duty Vehicle and Engine Emission
20 Warranty regulations and Maintenance Provisions,
21 Zero-Emission Airport Shuttle, and Zero-Emission
22 Powertrain Certification regulations.

23 More recently, in January 2026, the U.S. EPA
24 finalized partial disapproval for CARB's SIP submission of
25 our Heavy-Duty Inspection and Maintenance Program, also

1 known as Clean Truck Check. While Clean Truck Check does
2 not require a waiver under the Clean Air Act, it must be
3 submitted and approved into the SIP in order for it to be
4 counted in California's SIP emission inventories. I want
5 to emphasize that this partial disapproval does not impact
6 implementation of the regulation and CARB will still
7 enforce, but it does continue to undermine California's
8 ability to credit the emission reductions in our
9 attainment plans and other SIP revisions.

10 [SLIDE CHANGE]

11 AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HICKS: As we
12 show[SIC] you in October, federal attacks have a big
13 impact on emissions in California. We have updated the
14 chart we are showing you today to reflect the most current
15 emission inventories. The bar on the left represents the
16 2018 baseline inventory for mobile source oxides of
17 nitrogen, or NOx. This was the base year for the recent
18 planning efforts. The middle bar shows 2037, the
19 attainment year for the South Coast and San Joaquin Valley
20 under the 70 parts per billion standard, and the large
21 reduction in emissions from CARB's regulations as adopted,
22 especially in the off-road equipment, heavy-duty vehicles,
23 and locomotive source categories.

24 Based on our new emissions inventory, if we add
25 back in the NOx reductions that would be lost due to the

1 federal actions challenging CARB's programs, we see an
2 increase of 165 tons per day in 2037. That is a 42
3 percent increase in mobile source NOx emissions compared
4 to where we would have been with all of the adopted CARB
5 regulations in place. This 165 ton per day increase is
6 larger than the emissions from all of the medium- and
7 heavy-duty trucks and buses operating in California today.

8 In addition to the attacks on our programs, it is
9 important to note the sources primarily regulated by the
10 federal government, shown in teal hues on the chart.
11 These sources have little to no reduction in emissions in
12 recent years and will not by 2037 attainment year. These
13 federal sources progressively account for a larger share
14 of California NOx emissions, as California regulates and
15 reduces emissions from our sources. Even under prior
16 administrators -- administrations, the federal government
17 has adopted new regulations in the last 20 years to reduce
18 emissions under their authority. This problem is now
19 exacerbated by the current federal administration and the
20 reckless endeavors to rollback as many regulations as
21 possible.

22 [SLIDE CHANGE]

23 AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HICKS: Exposure
24 to criteria pollutants directly harms human health. The
25 federal attacks undermine California's proven ability to

1 protect Californians and improve air quality, and will
2 make air quality worse. More Californians will breathe
3 unhealthy air. More Californians will get sick.

4 As a significant precursor, increases in NOx
5 emissions would result in increases in ozone and secondary
6 fine particulate matter, or PM2.5, levels across the
7 State. Along with these elevated levels, we can expect to
8 see an increase in health-related outcomes for California
9 residents. As shown in the previous slide, NOx emissions
10 for the mobile sources will be about 42 percent higher in
11 2037 than they would have been previously. All of these
12 increases will lead to more than 14,500 additional
13 cardiopulmonary deaths, 5,000 additional hospitalizations
14 for cardiovascular and respiratory illness, 6,700
15 additional emergency room visits, and \$145 billion in
16 associated health costs over the lifetime of the impacted
17 regulations.

18 [SLIDE CHANGE]

19 AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HICKS: Of course,
20 the current federal administration's attacks on clean air
21 and environmental progress are not limited to CARB's
22 programs. This administration is also seeking to rollback
23 or limit numerous federal environmental regulations in
24 unprecedented ways.

25 In February of 2026, U.S. EPA repealed their 2009

1 Greenhouse Gas Endangerment Finding, which served as the
2 regulatory foundation for their ability to regulate
3 greenhouse gas emissions from new motor vehicles and new
4 motor vehicle engines. In accordance with this, U.S. EPA
5 repealed all greenhouse gas emission standards from its
6 regulations for light-, medium- and heavy-duty on-road
7 vehicle and engines. Although, these are greenhouse gas
8 standards, this action will have criteria pollutant
9 impacts and increase NOx emissions due to the impact on
10 electric vehicles sales. U.S. EPA's planned changes to
11 the federal Clean Truck Plan will also impact NOx
12 emissions, but the magnitude will depend on what changes
13 are made.

14 [SLIDE CHANGE]

15 AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HICKS: In
16 addition to rolling back health protective emission
17 regulations, U.S. EPA is also attempting to rollback the
18 PM2.5 ambient air quality standard. U.S. EPA established
19 this standard in 2024 when they lowered the annual PM2.5
20 standard from 12 to 9 micrograms per meter cubed. This
21 was a monumental step forward after the standard had not
22 been lowered since 2012. CARB's analysis has shown that
23 attaining the 9 micrograms per meter cubed standard across
24 California would avoid up to 2,050 early deaths each year.

25 In May 2024, 24 states sued to challenge the

1 standard and requested the court to vacate U.S. EPA's
2 action. In November 2025, as part of this litigation,
3 U.S. EPA filed their own motion for the court to vacate
4 the 9 micrograms per meter cubed standard, rather than
5 undergoing an open public rulemaking process. While the
6 litigation is ongoing, the standard is still in effect,
7 and there are actions both states and U.S. EPA are
8 required to take related to this standard. CARB submitted
9 our recommendations for area designations to U.S. EPA
10 before the February 2025 deadline, and U.S. EPA was
11 required to finalize action to designate areas as
12 nonattainment by February 2026. They failed to meet that
13 obligation.

14 California has joined with other states in filing
15 a notice of intent to sue U.S. EPA for their failure to
16 move forward with these designations.

17 [SLIDE CHANGE]

18 AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HICKS: As we
19 discussed at the October hearing, this barrage of federal
20 attacks on clean air means that plans to meet Federal
21 Clean Air Act requirements that were submitted to U.S. EPA
22 in 2023 and '24 must be revised. Staff continued to work
23 on identifying potential SIP solutions to these issues as
24 they relate to the plans currently before U.S. EPA.

25 Today, the Board adopted a revision to the motor

1 addition to the direct health impacts, the recent federal
2 actions create other types of challenges. They are
3 already causing significant issues in transportation
4 planning across the state. There is the possibility of
5 more issues and uncertainty, as well as potential SIP
6 related sanctions in the coming years.

7 Transportation conformity is the mechanism that
8 ensures California's transportation investments align with
9 SIPs. Because of the loss of expected emission reductions
10 from federal actions, Metropolitan Planning Organizations
11 may not be able to demonstrate transportation conformity
12 for their Regional Transportation Plans and transportation
13 improvement programs. These impacts are already being
14 felt today, as discussed earlier with respect to the San
15 Joaquin Valley.

16 In times with so much uncertainty created by the
17 federal government, transportation conformity requirements
18 result in a precarious situation that CARB and
19 Metropolitan Planning Organizations are constantly
20 monitoring to minimize the disruptions to transportation
21 projects.

22 In addition, sanctions can result from failing to
23 meet SIP requirements. U.S. EPA either disapproving a SIP
24 submittal or determining that the State failed to submit
25 something, as required, could result in emission offset

1 implementing the report's incentive-based recommendations.

2 Building on the foundation established in the ZEV
3 Forward and guided by direction in the Executive Order,
4 CARB launched the Drive Forward initiative, which
5 continues California's commitment to meet both State and
6 national air quality standards, achieving climate and
7 clean air goals, and protecting public health through
8 mobile source control strategies.

9 Since the fall, staff have held a series of
10 workshops for the Drive Forward initiative and beyond to
11 take input on our regulatory strategy for on-road and
12 off-road regulations and, incentives and voluntary
13 programs. CARB is pursuing all regulator and
14 non-regulatory pathways available to us to continue air
15 quality progress in the future.

16 [SLIDE CHANGE]

17 AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HICKS: Building
18 upon these efforts, staff explored a combination of
19 revised and new control measure concepts quantifying the
20 potential emission reductions and the extent to which they
21 can help California overcome the impacts from the adverse
22 federal actions. These next three slides summarize
23 concepts for mobile sources and the building sector that
24 CARB is either actively developing through a public
25 process or could pursue to backfill portions of the

1 Off-road equipment includes land-based off-road
2 diesel engines used in construction agriculture, freight
3 handling, power generation, and industrial operations.
4 The concepts for off-road equipment that staff are
5 exploring are: more stringent criteria pollutant emission
6 limits, addressing issues like low-load and potentially
7 setting standards during idling periods; accelerating
8 development and production of zero-emission off-road
9 equipment and powertrains; and incentives.

10 CARGO handling equipment is any motorized vehicle
11 used to handle cargo or perform routine maintenance
12 activities at California's seaports and intermodal rail
13 yards, such as yard tractors, rubber-tired gantry crane,
14 and container handlers.

15 The concepts for cargo handling equipment that
16 staff are exploring are: requiring the use of
17 zero-emission equipment; voluntary agreements with
18 seaports and intermodal railyards to accelerate the use of
19 zero-emission cargo handle; and incentives.

20 Transport refrigeration units, or TRUs, are
21 refrigeration systems powered by diesel engines that
22 provide temperature control and air flow for goods in
23 trucks, trailers, railcars and shipping containers.

24 The concepts for transport refrigeration units
25 that staff are exploring are requiring the use of zero

1 discussions in the legislative session that could support
2 regulatory opportunities towards reducing the emission
3 reduction gap, including Indirect Source Review, new
4 vehicle emission standards, and reducing small off-road
5 engines, such as lawn mowers.

6 [SLIDE CHANGE]

7 AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HICKS: There
8 maybe less familiarity with Indirect Source Review, so
9 here is some additional information. As an overview, an
10 indirect source can be any facility, building, structure
11 or insulation which attracts or generates mobile source
12 activity that results in emissions. These include
13 warehouses, rail facilities, seaports and airports. A
14 significant amount of air pollution comes from vehicles
15 traveling to and from and operating on-site at these
16 sources. Some local air districts already have Indirect
17 Source Review rules to limit emissions from these
18 facilities.

19 The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control
20 District has rule 9510, Indirect Source Review, in place
21 since 2005. It applies to new development projects by
22 using a menu of compliance options to reduce emissions of
23 NOx and particulate matter.

24 A more recently adopted example of an Indirect
25 Source Review rule is South Coast Air Quality Management

1 District's Rule 2305, Warehouse Indirect Source Rule or
2 WAIRE program. Rule 2305 reduces local and regional
3 criteria pollutant emissions associated with warehouses
4 and the mobile sources attracted to the warehouses in the
5 South Coast Air Basin.

6 South Coast AQMD has also been working for
7 several years with the ports and railyards in their region
8 to pursue reductions through rules and voluntary
9 agreements. Other local air districts, most recently
10 including the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and
11 San Diego County Air Pollution Control District have
12 evaluated direct source review -- Indirect Source Review
13 rules as a potential control measure to support reductions
14 in criteria pollutants and localized air pollution.

15 While air districts continue to explore
16 strategies to reduce emissions including Indirect Source
17 Review, there is an opportunity for CARB to build on air
18 district efforts to obtain significant emission reductions
19 through Indirect Source Review and to help backfill the
20 remaining emission reduction gap.

21 [SLIDE CHANGE]

22 AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HICKS: Staff
23 recommends the Board adopt Resolution 26-4 directing staff
24 to: develop a memo to the Board to provide additional
25 detail, including potential criteria pollutant benefits of

1 potential regulations and other policies that can support
2 attainment of ozone and PM standards; seek opportunities
3 to reduce ozone and PM-forming emissions, especially from
4 the largest contributing sources; authorize Executive
5 Officer to negotiate and enter further memorandum of
6 understanding with off-road air pollution sources for
7 emission reductions; and work with air district to
8 incorporate new measures and/or emission reductions into
9 plans as needed.

10 [SLIDE CHANGE]

11 AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HICKS: Moving
12 forward, CARB will continue to build on the Governor's
13 Executive Order and ZEV and Drive Forward initiatives to
14 advance California's clean vehicle targets. Staff will
15 continue to assess the potential from the identified
16 direct regulations and other opportunities from reducing
17 the gap in NOx reduction caused by federal actions. Staff
18 has been working closely with the air district for months
19 to identify potential SIP solutions to the issues created
20 by the federal actions.

21 As discussed earlier, staff are planning several
22 SIP revisions for the Board consideration over the next
23 year. Despite all the challenges we face, the
24 missions[SIC] of CARB is to protect public health is
25 foremost in our minds. And CARB will continue to use

1 every tool at our disposal to continue our critical work
2 to clean the air, because the health and well-being of all
3 Californians depends on it.

4 [SLIDE CHANGE]

5 AQPSD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST HICKS: This
6 concludes my presentation today. Thank you for your
7 attention.

8 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you, Austin, to you and the
9 AQPSD team for that presentation. Much appreciated. We
10 will now move to members of the public who have spoken --
11 who have signed up to speak on this item. Board Clerk,
12 will you please call the witnesses.

13 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you, Chair Sanchez.
14 We currently have eight in-person commenters who have
15 turned in a request-to-speak card. First is Kimberly
16 Burr.

17 KIMBERLY BURR: Good morning. I want to just
18 thank staff. You guys are incredible and work hard every
19 day to try to, you know, deal with some of the most
20 challenging issues facing us in this time and I can't
21 express how grateful I am to you and how much I admire
22 your day-to-day work really.

23 I only have a short little time here, but I just
24 wanted to say that I support this resolution. I urge the
25 Board to move forward, especially with off-road vehicle

1 emissions problems.

2 And on a related matter, the IPCC has said over
3 and over again that we need to also sequester greenhouse
4 gases. And I guess that kind of goes to your statewide
5 strategy of reducing emissions that we need to sequester
6 in a big way.

7 By way of example in my neck of the woods over on
8 the Russian River, there's a big logging plan proposed.
9 And it just piqued my interest that they say it's going to
10 take 88 years to recoup the lost storage capacity of those
11 trees that they're going to log, which really got my
12 attention, because we do not have 88 years, and a lot of
13 logging and tree removal is going on. So I'm hoping that
14 your emissions inventory model is keeping up with the
15 science on trees and how important they are. They're
16 essential to preventing climate chaos. And they sequester
17 carbon on a grand scale, if they're allowed to grow.

18 We must actually protect trees as much as
19 possible and forests to the greatest extent possible. We
20 must properly weight their importance, which I think is
21 often overlooked, because their forest activities are
22 exempt from some of the modeling that's going on at the
23 state.

24 So I really would love to see staff look that
25 really carefully, look at the new science, the new

1 independent science about the importance of all the trees.

2 Thank you for your time. Thank you, Chair.

3 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you. Just a note that
4 public sign-ups will close in 30 minutes for this item.

5 But next, we have Benjamin Lu.

6 BENJAMIN LU: Good morning, Board.

7 Hello.

8 Good morning, Board. I'm Benjamin Lu with the
9 American Lung Association. Thank you so much for the
10 presentation and to staff for preparing it, and the
11 commitment to continue efforts to the public health and
12 air quality to address gaps caused by federal actions.

13 California's life saving clean air standards have
14 delivered -- have delivered real meaningful health
15 protections for millions of our most vulnerable residents
16 and we support the ongoing effort to protect Californians.

17 The Lung Association is currently co-sponsoring
18 AB 1777 by Assemblymember Garcia to clarify statewide
19 indirect source authority. We encourage the Board to use
20 all tools available to protect health and we see Indirect
21 Source Rules as an important opportunity to address local
22 pollution hotspots and regional air quality.

23 We also encourage the Board to continue to pursue
24 strong and meaningful implementation of Senate Bill 375 to
25 better align land use and transportation planning. The

1 cross-agency coordination to ensure that local, and
2 regional, and State transportation investments continue to
3 move forward, move towards emission reductions and health
4 improvements and remain a key priority for many of our
5 health partners. We look forward to the Board's
6 engagement on this process this year.

7 We also want to flag the importance of the NOx
8 emissions reductions needed through the statewide
9 appliance standards and encourage the Board to realize the
10 benefits of zero-emission technologies in this sector, as
11 well as explore opportunities to reduce emissions through
12 these technologies in the industrial heat sector.

13 We support ongoing efforts to develop and expand
14 and tighten in-use standards from mobile and stationary
15 sources to better identify and correct for excess
16 emissions from combustion sources, both on- and off-road.

17 Finally, in light of the federal government's
18 decision to eliminate health cost analysis from the
19 rulemakings, we will want to applaud CARB's research team
20 for recently expanding healthy analysis and ensuring a
21 fuller understanding of the health toll of pollution. We
22 look forward to engagement with the staff and the Board on
23 these issues in the year to come.

24 Thank you so much.

25 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

1 Bill Magavern

2 BILL MAGAVERN: Good morning. Bill Magavern with
3 Coalition for Clean Air. Your staff report really
4 comprehensively laid out the toll that the Trump
5 administration is taking on our health. You know, we've
6 had Presidents before who were cozy with the fossil fuel
7 industry, but we've never had one as corrupt, as
8 irrational, as reckless and as hostile to the state of
9 California.

10 So the question then is how do we respond? And I
11 think your resolution very appropriately directs the staff
12 to seek every opportunity to reduce ozone and PM-forming
13 emissions. And that's really what's called for. I think
14 right now I know you have a lot of processes to -- that
15 are at the very early stage of developing measures, and
16 we're participating in many of those processes. So the
17 key is now really developing those measures, bringing them
18 to fruition.

19 And again, the staff presentation really laid out
20 a lot of the options. I'll just emphasize a few of them.
21 When it comes to light-duty, we do need to, for the first
22 time, have standard for the non-exhaust emissions that are
23 a growing proportion of our inventory, and to finally make
24 some progress on reducing vehicle miles traveled. When it
25 comes to heavy-duty, as we push forward with zero-emission

1 trucks, we need to also have the combustion trucks that
2 are being sold, be the cleanest that are available, and we
3 need to be retiring the dirtiest and oldest of the diesel
4 trucks, and enforce the Clean Truck Check regulation to
5 require inspection and maintenance. The off-road sectors
6 badly in need of addressing. And CARB, and the
7 Legislature, and the districts need to all get together to
8 address the indirect sources of pollution.

9 Thank you.

10 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

11 Chris Shimoda.

12 CHRIS SHIMODA: Good morning, Madam Chair and
13 members. Chris Shimoda on behalf of the Supply Chain
14 Federation.

15 To pull a quote from CARB's 2022 SIP, "During the
16 1960's there were as many as 186 smog alerts in a single
17 year. Today, alerts have been eliminated due to
18 improvements in air quality." Now, I have not been coming
19 to this Board since the 1960s. I believe that Dr. Balmes
20 is the only Board member left since I started my career at
21 CARB, but --

22 (Laughter).

23 CHRIS SHIMODA: -- I do want to recognize that
24 this is a testament to the incredible progress on air
25 quality that has been achieved through the collective

1 efforts of this body, air districts, and regulated
2 industries and a long-standing framework of setting and
3 meeting reasonable technical -- technologically achievable
4 mobile and stationary source emission standards.

5 The Supply Chain Federation's members and our
6 other industry partners look forward to working with CARB
7 as it considers new emission standards, incentives,
8 creative partnerships to continue progress towards federal
9 attainment goals. You may hear voices calling for the
10 Board to depart from this decades old proven framework to
11 adopt novel approaches such as Indirect Source Rules,
12 otherwise known as ISRs.

13 ISRs have already been proven effect --
14 ineffective as SIP measures with the Biden
15 administration's EPA, not the Trump administration's EPA,
16 declining to grant any SIP creditable emission reductions
17 to the South Coast AQMD's WAIRE Program despite costing
18 regulated entities over half a billion dollars a year.

19 SCF will soon publish an update to our Ramboll
20 authored study of the WAIRE Program detailing how that
21 rule has cost more than anticipated while delivering no
22 measurable benefit to the region's attainment.

23 In short, we would like to caution the Board
24 against departing from what has worked, which is working
25 with industry to adopt reasonable, achievable emission

1 standards in favor of reinventing the regulatory wheel so
2 to speak with ineffective measures like ISRs.

3 I want to thank you for the opportunity to
4 comment and we look forward to working with the Board and
5 staff moving forward.

6 Thank you.

7 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

8 Ryan Kenny.

9 RYAN KENNY: Hi. Good morning, Chair Sanchez and
10 members of the Board. My name is Ryan Kenny with Clean
11 Energy. And I just wanted to deliver one message, it's
12 that we want to help. My company and our affiliated
13 industries want to help reduce NOx.

14 Staff has done a great job, I think, expressing
15 the problem well, California's poor air quality, the
16 potential impact from the federal regulations of 175 tons
17 per day of NOx by 2037, the challenge of meeting the
18 federal attainment, the possibility of losing 75
19 million -- \$75 billion in federal transportation funding
20 because of federal attainment -- or not meeting it, and,
21 of course, the impact on disadvantaged communities.

22 We also heard today that there was a gap of 91
23 tons per day of NOx by 2037 that CARB needs to close. And
24 that brings me to our solution. And then goals were
25 documented, but the means continue in the heavy-duty

1 transportation space to focus on heavy-duty ZEVs. And
2 that's more of a longer term horizon. Our industries
3 really would like CARB to focus also on the near-term and
4 intermediate term to include the cleanest combustion
5 engines that meet, you know, 50 milligrams, if not 35
6 milligrams in 2027, as the cleanest combustion trucks.

7 We saw at the first stakeholder meeting of Drive
8 Forward back in December that there was the possibility
9 that low-NOx trucks may be incentivized within that
10 framework. But yesterday's Drive Forward made no mention
11 of low-NOx trucks being incentivized going forward. We're
12 very concerned about any sort of policy shift where
13 low-NOx trucks are no longer a consideration. We've
14 invested in technologies to substantially reduce NOx, but
15 we're not inclusive in those policies at the moment. Our
16 stations, our fuels, our trucks are ready now, and we just
17 need a regulatory signal that the cleanest combustion
18 trucks will be included. More of "and solution", "near
19 zero and zero", not just an "or". We want to help. It's
20 just urgent to get the cleanest combustion trucks on the
21 road now. Thank you.

22 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you. Evan Edgar

23 EVAN EDGAR: Chair and Board members, my ne is
24 Evan Edgar. I'm the engineer for the public and private
25 refuse fleet industry. We were early adopters since 2000.

1 We're getting off diesel, getting off landfills, taking
2 those SB 30 -- 1383 organics and making renewable natural
3 gas with near zero NOx engines.

4 There's about 16,000 in the refuse fleet. And
5 we've been Driving Forward for -- since 2000 with our
6 carbon intensity about minus 100 with near-zero NOx trucks
7 with significant reductions. And by 2030, we are driving
8 forward to have 90 percent of our fleet on RNG with
9 near-zero NOx.

10 When ACF was adopted, it attacked this program.
11 This is a circular economy carbon negative program that is
12 in California based upon landfill waste. But instead, we
13 had to keep our older diesel fleet longer. It broke our
14 circular economy. We stopped rolling out our near-zero
15 NOx trucks. We stopped making carbon-negative fuel with
16 anaerobic digestion. The greenhouse gas was minus 100.
17 And with the ZEV/BEV program, it will be plus 15.

18 So with ACF, it backfired for the refuse
19 industry. ZEV is driving backwards. Meanwhile, with
20 Advanced Clean Fleet, you guys are leaking greenhouse gas
21 emissions onto others around the world. You're not
22 supposed to be leaking that. You're leaking criteria
23 pollutants on people of color communities around the
24 world.

25 BEV manufacturing is mining rare minerals around

1 the world, leaking those NOxes, leaking all those criteria
2 pollutants onto people of color communities from the Congo
3 to Jakarta. I can go on from Canada. An Amnesty
4 International's about it. I provided that to you for the
5 last three years, but with deaf ears.

6 So where is environmental justice for all? What
7 CARB should be doing is studying the NOx leakage onto the
8 people of colored communities around the world. Where is
9 environmental justice for all?

10 Not here.

11 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

12 Jonathan Kendrick.

13 JONATHAN KENDRICK: Good morning, Chair Sanchez
14 and members of the Board. Jon Kendrick from the
15 California Chamber of Commerce.

16 Californians are already struggling with the cost
17 of groceries, consumer goods, and every other -- other
18 everyday essential. I'd like you to -- when you're
19 considering the options that are before you, put cost
20 effectiveness at the heart of that consideration, because
21 this is really truly your agency presents front-door
22 affordability issues for all Californians.

23 In this specific context talking about we've
24 heard discussion of a statewide ISR, this matters because
25 an ISR has to be carefully tailored to avoid imposing

1 excessive costs for little or no environmental benefit.
2 The reason that the authority rightfully rests with the
3 local air districts is that California's air quality
4 challenges are not uniform. Each region is distinct in
5 terms of geography, economy, emission sources, attainment
6 status.

7 The Port of Long Beach is a very different port
8 than the Port of Stockton. A warehouse in San Bernardino
9 has very different characteristics from a warehouse in
10 North Coast. Indirect Source Rules by their nature need
11 to reflect local geography and economic conditions,
12 infrastructure constraints, attainment status. That's why
13 these programs are developed, if at all, at the local air
14 district level where regulators routinely balance these
15 factors for their own district.

16 A statewide framework risks imposing uniform
17 requirements across very different regions and facilities.
18 It becomes a blunt instrument that drives costs and
19 ignores the complexity of each of these geographic
20 regions. The result could be unnecessary cost. When and
21 ISR is not properly tailored to local conditions,
22 facilities are forced into measures that don't fit their
23 operational profile or perhaps they default to paying a
24 mitigation fee that functions as a surcharge on the supply
25 chain.

1 If an ISR effectively operates as an
2 electrification mandate, it ignores real-world
3 constraints. In many regions, grid capacity is strained
4 and interconnection timelines are measured in years, not
5 months. So I urge you to consider these factors.

6 Thank you.

7 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

8 Last in-person commenter is Nicole Rice.

9 NICOLE RICE: Good morning, Madam Chair, members.
10 Nicole Rice, California Renewable Transportation Alliance.
11 And I'm here to point out once again that we are missing a
12 golden opportunity to be able to reduce emissions today,
13 keep California's progress moving forward, as we're
14 dealing with the challenges that are coming from the
15 federal government.

16 As the speaker from Clean Energy pointed out,
17 during yesterday's workshop for the Drive Forward
18 initiative incentive programs, we didn't hear anything
19 about the use of low-NOx combustion trucks that were
20 enabled by this Board to come to market to decarbonize
21 heavy-duty and other combustion trucks and to displace
22 diesel on our road to continue our goals moving forward.

23 And in today's presentation, that was very
24 thoughtfully put together by staff, but also did not
25 include for medium- and heavy-duty trucks any mention of

1 using the technology that was enabled by this Board's
2 regulatory framework under Omnibus to deal with near-term
3 emission reductions and the displacement of diesel today.

4 We heard the stats. We heard the numbers. This
5 is an urgent crisis. We have made promises to front-line
6 communities and we need to continue progress on our goals.
7 Anything that we're contemplating today, including ISR
8 statewide authority is going to take some time. But
9 meanwhile, the progress in air quality improvements is
10 being lost. We know that low-NOx trucks are not the
11 State's a long-term strategy, but it is a strategy that
12 can meet the moment today.

13 So we urge the Board to direct staff to include
14 low-NOx trucks into your interim Drive Forward strategy,
15 accelerate their rapid adoption through incentive dollars,
16 affirm policy directions that encourage the replacement of
17 diesel and the use of clean combustion.

18 Thank you.

19 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

20 Moving to Zoom, our first Zoom commenter is Joe
21 Kilzer. I have activated your microphone, Joe, and you
22 may unmute and begin your comment.

23 Joe Kilzer.

24 JOE KILZER: Hi. Good morning. Good morning.

25 Can you hear me?

1 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Yes, we can hear you. You
2 can begin. Thank you.

3 JOE KILZER: Okay. First of all, my name is Joe
4 Kilzer. I'm a retired chief operator in a local refinery,
5 and I want to thank you all for your hard work and the
6 obstacles that are up against you in this state of time.

7 The one thing I wanted to bring up is I moved to
8 Riverside County like three years ago, and I've noticed on
9 this FasTrak, it's economically disproportionate. I'm
10 seeing the FasTrak just moving along and the high price of
11 getting on the FasTrak of seeing like five miles like \$14.
12 So economically, if you can't -- maybe I want to eat
13 instead of spend that \$14 on FasTrak.

14 So you get a line of cars going 0 to 25 miles an
15 hour, which is probably the worst speed you can go for
16 hydrocarbon emissions of the tailpipe. And also, we all
17 know that 10 years is probably the maximum of a catalytic
18 converter.

19 So I would like to -- you all just to look at
20 this disproportionate economic FasTrak. It seems like
21 there's like a -- you know, you're in traffic, then the
22 other side is like moving freely, which is less
23 hydrocarbons coming out the tailpipe for the ozone layer.
24 And I'd just like you all to look at this disproportionate
25 economics. It's not fair.

1 So that's what I have to say and I thank you
2 again. And just to leave how things have changed, I heard
3 the other day in -- President Carter wanted to have 20
4 percent solar power by the year 2000 in this day and time.
5 So just we're kind of behind times and I appreciate your
6 hard work and thank you.

7 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

8 Next, we have a phone number in 738. Phone
9 number in 738, I have activated your microphone. You may
10 unmute and begin.

11 Phone number in 738, I have activated your
12 microphone and you may begin.

13 Okay. Moving to the next commenter, we have
14 Christian Bisher. Christian, I have unmuted your
15 microphone. You may begin.

16 CHRISTIAN BISHER: Hi. Good morning. Thank you.
17 My name is Christian Bisher and I live in the San Joaquin
18 Valley.

19 I just wanted to add that for this item, the
20 proposed resolution and meeting presentation still hadn't
21 been uploaded to the agenda on your website. As a member
22 of the public, if I can't review something and research it
23 in advance, then I really can't make an informed comment.
24 So in the future, if you could just be a little more
25 diligent looking at that. And then if the material is not

1 going to be ready, potentially move the item to the next
2 meeting, so that the public has opportunities to engage.

3 Thanks.

4 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

5 Next, we have Krysta Wanner. I apologize if I
6 mispronounce your name. Krysta, I have activated your
7 microphone and you may unmute. Thank you.

8 KRYSTA WANNER: Thank you. Krysta Wanner with
9 the Western Propane Gas Association. I also had in my
10 notes for comment the previous speaker about not having
11 items posted in advance to the public, but going with this
12 comment.

13 California is in the midst of an affordability
14 crisis, so now is not the time to be expanding CARB's
15 regulatory reach through Indirect Source Rules. Such
16 action would increase cost of living for Californians and
17 would not actually produce CARB's desired effect of
18 significantly reduced emissions as demonstrated at the
19 local air district level of other attempted ISRs.

20 A statewide ISR would only increase compliance
21 costs for affected parties, double regulating some of
22 these sources. Current creative mobile and stationary
23 source control methods have already drastically cut
24 emissions and continue to do so. Therefore, CARB should
25 focus on what has been proven effective without further

1 burdening Californians.

2 Thank you.

3 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

4 Phone number in 738. 738 are you able to unmute
5 and begin?

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

8 Okay. Chair Sanchez, that concludes our comments
9 for this item.

10 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you very much to all of the
11 members of the public, who weighed in on this item.

12 Staff, are there any issues that were raised that
13 you'd like to address?

14 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: No, Chair. Thank you.

15 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you. I will now close the
16 record on this agenda item.

17 Board members, turning to you all, comments,
18 questions, please raise your microphone.

19 Oh, please, Dr. Shaheen, over to you.

20 BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Thank you, Chair and thank
21 you to the CARB team for the very thoughtful, yet sobering
22 presentation. This update makes it clear that we are no
23 longer operating in a stable regulatory environment.
24 Federal actions are not just slowing progress, they're
25 actively increasing emissions and forcing the State to

1 rethink its pathway to attainment.

2 Even with current and proposed regulations, a
3 large emission gap remains. According to slide 14 of the
4 presentation, by 2037, CARB still faces a substantial NOx
5 reduction gap, estimated at approximately 91 tons per day.
6 We're not just closing an emission gap anymore, we have to
7 backfill lost reductions.

8 Even if we fully implement the current suite of
9 vehicle and equipment regulations, we still face a
10 substantial shortfall. That raises an important question
11 about how far technology-based standards alone can take
12 us, particularly on the timeline that we're facing. This
13 leads me to conclude that the next phase of air quality
14 policy is not just about cleaner vehicles, it's about
15 managing the system in which the vehicles operate.

16 In that context, I would like to focus on the
17 Indirect Source Review, or ISR. I appreciate a lot of the
18 comments about ISR from the testimony received today.
19 This is an area I spend a lot of time thinking about and I
20 do have a few questions for the CARB team on this.

21 So ISR stands out as one of the few tools that we
22 have in our toolbox to directly address activity-related
23 emissions, freight movement, warehouse operations, and
24 broader logistics of this system, as have been noted by
25 many of the members of the public. But for ISR to be

1 effective at the state level, we need to be very clear
2 about the analytical information and foundation upon which
3 it's built.

4 So my first of two questions is can the CARB team
5 quantify the emission reduction potential from a statewide
6 ISR program? Do we have the necessary facility-level data
7 to do so and the modeling tools to support that analysis?

8 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Dr. Shaheen.
9 Absolutely, we could quantify that. I will say that we're
10 in very early stages of understanding what the potential
11 from an Indirect Source Review rule would look like, but
12 we have information and modeling tools at least to make
13 kind of an initial assessment of what the potential from
14 such a measure could be, in part having worked with our
15 air district partners, especial those who have already
16 promulgated such rules.

17 BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Thank you. I'm not
18 surprised we're equipped with the scientists to do that
19 work. And it's going to be very, very important that we
20 get the analysis right. Just as important to the
21 quantification and the modeling tools is the design of
22 ISR. If we don't get the design right, ISR risks
23 redistributing the emissions rather than reducing them.
24 And I believe we heard that from a member of the public.

25 So my next question is, is how do we

1 restructure -- or structure ISR so that it drives real
2 reductions without simply shifting activity and emissions
3 from one region to another? This could have substantial
4 equity effects. So I'd love to hear what the staff have
5 to say about this particular question.

6 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Maybe I'll start and
7 then see if staff want to add more. I would just say that
8 certainly that's one of the considerations that we would
9 want to look at and to understand. One of the concerns we
10 have heard from ISRs occurring in specific regions is that
11 it can exacerbate that sort of shift.

12 And so, there have been calls for statewide ISR
13 potentially to avoid that. It would be an important
14 consideration and certainly I would expect that if this
15 Board is interested, that would be the direction that
16 would be provided to the staff in developing any future
17 ISR to the extent that CARB were to do so.

18 BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Yeah. I think -- I think
19 we've got to get the analysis right and be very careful,
20 particularly as we move to more of a statewide program.
21 Analysis at the regional level is different, as we heard
22 from a member of the public. That is indeed true. And it
23 sounds like you're aware of this and very cognizant of it,
24 alongside its potential equity effects. So thank you so
25 much.

1 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you for those comments and
2 questions, Dr. Shaheen.

3 Board Member Takvorian.

4 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Chair and
5 thanks to Dr. Shaheen for those comments. Appreciate
6 that. And I want to follow up on the ISR conversation in
7 just a minute. I want to first thank the staff for a
8 really robust, and deliberate, and vigilant and dedicated
9 report. I think it was really well done and I really
10 appreciate your dedication to protecting the health of
11 every Californian. So, congratulations for that.

12 He's not here, but I want to thank Dr. Balmes for
13 dedicating his life -- his public life, his career life to
14 protecting public health, and especially respiratory
15 disease. And I'm thankful for his tenure on the Board.
16 And I'm struck, as I'm sure he is, by the stunning data
17 that you presented on slides 4 and 5 indicating the 42
18 percent increase in NOx and the some 14,500 deaths that
19 would occur as a result of that, and the many
20 hospitalizations, as well as the rollback on the PM2.5
21 standard, which we know is going to really impact all of
22 California, and especially those communities that are
23 already very impacted by PM.

24 And I think these are not shockingly new that
25 would happen, but they're stunning. And we're all living

1 in communities -- many of us are living in communities
2 that are highly impacted. So we're looking at the faces
3 of children who are going to be the recipients of these
4 impacts. And I don't think we can forget that, as we
5 think about what comes next. So I really appreciate your
6 diligence in laying the foundation for us to do that.

7 You know, you're a lot of the same folks that
8 helped us make progress over these many years to regulate
9 the key sources of NOx and PM. And I appreciate that
10 you're looking at new options for us to move forward on,
11 especially related to heavy-duty and medium-duty
12 manufacturers, and the incentives that we can move
13 forward, as well as retiring older vehicles, which we have
14 talked about for many, many years. So making that happen,
15 I think is critically important.

16 Let me just say that I really also appreciated
17 your reference to the internationally regulated sources
18 and wanted to just say that we learned a lot about the
19 progress that's being made in the -- in the European Union
20 when CARB joined Pacific Environment and many of the ports
21 of California to learn about the efforts that are
22 happening in Europe. And I appreciate the Governor's
23 recent efforts, I think this week, to collaborate with the
24 European Union to forge a sustainable future, and --
25 especially given the refusal of -- the outright refusal of

1 the federal government to even participate in these
2 discussions. So California is stepping in. CARB is
3 stepping this and it's exactly where we need to go.

4 In regards to the issue of ISR, I think it's very
5 much a critical tool that we need to help us continue on
6 this path and to help close that gap that we're seeing now
7 in regards to NOx and PM reductions. And there's no
8 question that warehouses, distribution centers, and ports
9 are clearly a significant source of pollution -- this type
10 of pollution, as demonstrated by CARB's own assessments
11 and localized assessments of cancer risk and respiratory
12 disease risk.

13 And I do agree that we need to work in
14 partnership with local districts. If I understand it
15 correctly, and perhaps this gets to the question that
16 builds on Dr. Shaheen's question, there -- as I understand
17 it, the local rules really start with very rigorous
18 emission inventories, and very rigorous reports that come
19 from -- come from the industries that are potentially
20 being regulated.

21 So I wanted to just ask staff to confirm that and
22 say that that would be in partnership with our
23 districts -- our partner districts. That would be the way
24 that we would proceed, so that we would have really
25 important and accurate data in order to move forward.

1 Thank you.

2 AQPSD CHIEF LAKIN: Good morning, Board Member
3 Takvorian. My name is Matt Lakin. We've met obviously.
4 I'm the Division Chief for the Air Quality Planning and
5 Science Division. I just want to confirm that absolutely,
6 yes, like all our regulatory rulemakings for, you know,
7 our direct regulations or Indirect Source Review, we would
8 base it on the best available data and science. We have a
9 huge team of emissions inventory staff who are doing
10 exactly, as you say, using the best available emissions
11 factors and activity information. And most importantly,
12 as you noted, we would work very closely with the air
13 districts and who are a huge source of information, but
14 also we want to be well-coordinated with them in their
15 efforts, if we were, you know, to consider any type of
16 regulatory rulemaking, including future ISR.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you, Board Member
19 Takvorian. On to Zoom. Dr. Pacheco-Werner, the floor is
20 yours.

21 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you, Chair
22 and thank you to the staff for this presentation and the
23 ambition and the work you've already laid down for these
24 next steps. I know that my past two colleagues, Board
25 members, have talked about the science and the tools

1 available, but I also have a question about kind of like
2 the values leading into this process. I know that when we
3 were developing ACF and ACC II, we were definitely looking
4 to be technology forward and thinking about how to drive
5 technology as well through our processes. Is that also
6 part of the spirit of in which we're approaching this ISR?
7 And I -- and before you answer, I ask because I guess as a
8 follow-up question, you know, if we are sort of technology
9 forcing in our values going into this, are we, as part of
10 the tools and data that we're looking at, are we looking
11 at the current readiness as it stands today for any new
12 technologies in these kind of indirect sources?

13 Now, this is not because I oppose technology
14 going forward and technology. I think that it's amazing,
15 even in the last year, as the federal administration has
16 tried their best to set us back, my neighborhood is
17 transformed. I see the delivery trucks running on ZEVs.
18 I see more electric cars in my neighborhood than I ever
19 have before. I see solar panels on nearly every house
20 now, where five years ago that was a rarity. And so, I am
21 excited and I also really think that as part of the
22 engagement process, for us as Board members, but also the
23 public, I do think it's important to understand where
24 we're at in terms of the thinking behind what will be --
25 how we'll be evaluating the data that we see in front of

1 us in terms of what is available, what works now, what
2 doesn't work.

3 And finally, I want to end with a comment of, you
4 know, last -- earlier this month, CARB Board staff and
5 Board members were gracious enough to come down to the San
6 Joaquin Valley and see a lot of the work that's being done
7 in the valley to address these issues of -- that we're
8 faced with. And while not everything is SIP creditable,
9 as a public health scientist, it is important to say that
10 incentives do produce real emission reductions. And they
11 have immediate public health benefits. And I do think
12 that that's an important aspect of all of the things that
13 as we're going to look forward to all of our criteria
14 pollutant issues that, you know, in the San Joaquin
15 Valley, we have made progress both through regulation and
16 through incentives. And I think highlighting the former
17 program earlier this month was a testament of that, that
18 when you switch over a tractor and crush the old less --
19 more polluting one, there's an immediate health benefit,
20 but there's also an immediate emissions reduction too.

21 And so I do think that there is a fine balance
22 for us between SIP creditable options as well as those
23 non-SIP creditable options that we know will have a real
24 effect on the ground.

25 Thank you.

1 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Dr.
2 Pacheco-Werner. So maybe I'll back up for just a second
3 and explain the difference between what we're trying to do
4 here from a planning perspective and what we would do in a
5 rulemaking. And from planning perspective, we're taking
6 the best available data, using the best available tools.
7 Those will include inventories of the types of equipment
8 and vehicles that operate on the road, where they're
9 located, how much they drive. We pull in those data from
10 registrations. We get on-the-ground information about
11 where vehicles drive, how much they drive, and we have a
12 good understanding of the emissions profile from those
13 vehicles both from in situ measurements, we do roadside
14 work, we also have research to better understand
15 deterioration in those engines, and we also are looking at
16 things like off-road sources. And in addition, we have
17 registration requirements here at CARB for many of those
18 vehicles.

19 So all of that sort of input would go into our
20 modeling. That helps us develop an inventory of where the
21 emissions occur, and then we can better understand the
22 potential for emission reductions associated with
23 different types of policy interventions that we might
24 implement.

25 That -- it's a little bit different than what

1 would happen in an actual rulemaking, where we would
2 develop a team, we would start looking at that, engaging
3 with stakeholders and doing the economic analysis, the
4 public health analysis, and then bringing forward an
5 actual regulation, which then would quantify the
6 reductions associated with each regulation.

7 And I sort of explain all this, because I don't
8 want to leave the impression that we have an ISR team
9 already starting this rulemaking. We do not. This is,
10 you know, a conceptual sort of planning discussion that is
11 happening. We're looking for feedback from the Board, if
12 this is something that we should continue to kind of push
13 and look at. That could result in an actual team that
14 might start to work on a regulation.

15 So all that said, to answer the more specific
16 question, certainly when we're thinking about the planning
17 exercise, we are pushing the technology. We are saying
18 this is going to drive an outcome of more zero-emission
19 vehicles, both on-road and off-road.

20 And in that, we're going to have to think about
21 complementary policies to ensure that there's the right
22 kind of infrastructure to help support that new
23 technology. And that's not just us, that would certainly
24 be CARB, but working with our partners at the Energy
25 Commission, the Public Utilities Commission, and the

1 Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development,
2 among many others.

3 So, this is a whole-of-government type of
4 approach. We start to think about what's possible, then
5 what's necessary, you know, work across the administration
6 and with the Legislature to ultimately determine, you
7 know, what we can put in place as a regulation.

8 All of that would take quite a bit of time for an
9 ISR. So this is not a near-term type thing, but it -- the
10 question has arisen about that as a type of tool and
11 whether that's a proper tool for CARB to start to
12 investigate more and use as part of our future efforts to
13 reduce air pollution.

14 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you for that, Dr. Cliff.
15 Board Member Santiago.

16 BOARD MEMBER SANTIAGO: Yeah. Thank you, Madam
17 Chair. And, Dr. Cliff, thank you for making the
18 difference and the distinction between planning and
19 rulemaking. And while I've had some experience in
20 creating statewide policy, I also know the deficits of
21 creating statewide policy while not taking into
22 consideration local economic needs. And, you know,
23 sometimes the word "economics" is a big word that where
24 jobs get lost. And so I want to be able to say something
25 to that nature as well.

1 I'd like to echo some of the comments, but I
2 won't repeat some of the comments. But I think it's
3 really important as a cautionary rule when we're moving
4 forward in planning, one of those tools in the toolkit
5 ought to be whether we take into consideration what it
6 might mean. And I'm not saying that it will, but if, in
7 fact, it devastates a certain economic pillar in a
8 particular area, what could be done to mitigate that. And
9 what I mean by that is something -- sometimes you reach
10 for the stars and, you know, blow through the atmosphere,
11 so to speak, as opposed to maybe taking the cautious step
12 getting us there, so that there's a -- there's a
13 transition that allows us to get there, while saving a
14 local economy.

15 And I -- you know, I say this while at the
16 same -- in the same breath I say -- I say that I share the
17 goals of cleaning the environment, making sure that we
18 have healthy air and we pollute the least amount as
19 possible, absolutely. But I think one of the cautionary
20 things about making a statewide policy, having been
21 involved in those, is that there may be a legitimate
22 reasons why pause and take a second look at a local area,
23 and it may not be meet a hundred percent standard, but it
24 may be necessary to preserve -- to preserve an economy at
25 the local area.

1 And that's just really the cautionary, I guess,
2 footprint I'd like to put on this to be able to say, hey,
3 if we're going to think about do this, and it sounds to me
4 like, you know, some -- there's some space here that
5 already says we are, or we wouldn't be having this
6 conversation. But if we are going to move down this
7 particular path, we should consider all things available
8 in front of us and all economic footprints, and whether
9 something could be done to mitigate that. And I think
10 that that would make a better statewide policy than a
11 blanket policy that doesn't take that into consideration.
12 So, thank you.

13 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you, Board Member Santiago.
14 Board Member Rechtschaffen.

15 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Thank you. I want
16 to echo board member Takvorian's salute to Dr. Balmes for
17 his long career protecting air quality. And his expertise
18 is needed more than ever. I didn't realize he was on the
19 Board in the 1960s till now --

20 (Laughter).

21 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: -- but he's been
22 doing it for a very long time.

23 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I didn't either.

24 (Laughter).

25 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: I want to thank the

1 staff for its excellent cogent presentation and also Bill
2 Magavern came up with a great phrase I'm going to use, but
3 I didn't capture all the adjectives, corrupt, irrational,
4 reckless, and there's a fourth one. So I'm just going to
5 say just CIRI or CIR, whatever to refer to the Trump
6 administration going forward.

7 So thank you for that. What's the fourth one?

8 BILL MAGAVERN: Hostile.

9 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Hostile. Okay.

10 That's not -- that doesn't make for a good acronym though,
11 so maybe we have to come --

12 (Laughter).

13 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: I had a couple of
14 quick follow-up questions. On ISR, I fully appreciate
15 what you said, Dr. Cliff, that we're in -- very much in
16 the early stages, and there's a lot more to be done. And
17 I -- you're asking for feedback, I agree with what my
18 colleague said, it's a very important tool. And since
19 we're so hamstrung by the federal government we need to
20 explore all these new strategies.

21 One question that's come up is whether or not the
22 reductions under ISR are creditable toward our SIP
23 compliance. Could you address that question?

24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Sure. Thank you, Board
25 Member Rechtschaffen. I think that the answer to that so

1 far has been that it's been challenging to include ISR as
2 creditable under the SIP, at least that's our
3 understanding so far. I wouldn't say that it's impossible
4 to do so. We, you know, haven't developed one or worked
5 with U.S. EPA on that, so that's, you know, something we
6 would certainly like to explore.

7 More broadly though, I think, what's important to
8 understand is that while the State Implementation Plans
9 are incredibly important for determining whether we are
10 meeting federal air quality requirements and making
11 progress towards those, and there are very specific
12 accounting rules for how you demonstrate that, that
13 emission reductions that occur from regulations, even if
14 they aren't credited in the SIP, would still provide
15 benefits to California breathers, and with regard to the
16 SIP, could still help us meet attainment.

17 So even if not credited, the fact that it would
18 reduce actual air pollution, which is evaluated through
19 ambient air monitoring, that will help us show reasonable
20 further progress and drive emissions down, such that
21 achieving attainment, which is the actual goal of the SIP,
22 is still possible.

23 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Thank you. And I
24 appreciate what Dr. Pacheco-Werner said about this very
25 topic just a couple comment ago.

1 Could you also address -- we heard some
2 commenters talk about the absence of mention or incentives
3 for low-NOx engines in the Drive Forward presentation
4 yesterday in our thinking more broadly. Could you address
5 our staff's thinking on this question?

6 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Can -- I'm sorry. I
7 think I'm not fully understanding the context of the
8 question, if you could repeat.

9 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: The comments we
10 heard from clean energy and others saying that yesterday,
11 we're not -- we're not looking at the low-NOx emissions as
12 part of our overall strategy in Drive Forward, the
13 presentation yesterday. We're just -- we're overly
14 focused on ZEV technology.

15 MSCD CHIEF BUFFINGTON: Hi. Michelle Buffington
16 Chief of the Mobile Source Control Division.

17 Yesterday, we held a workshop to talk about our
18 Heavy-Duty Incentive programs focused solely on our air
19 quality improvement program dollars. And during that
20 presentation, staff proposed for the funding to go to a --
21 to a particular program that we operate the CORE program.

22 It was the first workshop we're working together
23 to put the funding plan proposal together to bring to the
24 Board. And so while there may not have been specific
25 dollars pulled out for natural gas out of the AQIP pot of

1 funding. We did have an open public forum where everybody
2 was allowed to bring their comments and ideas to the
3 table.

4 And so, we have now the opportunity to digest
5 that feedback and consider other alternatives, if we deem
6 them necessary. We do want to make sure that the limited
7 dollars that we have in the AQIP, the Air Quality
8 Improvement Program, are getting as many reductions as we
9 can to help support and fill some of the gap that we're
10 seeing in the -- in the SIP process.

11 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Thank you. I have
12 one last question. Could you just give a little more
13 detail about something you mentioned in the slide about
14 future concepts to reduce medium- and heavy-duty vehicle
15 emissions which is retiring vehicles after they're useful
16 emissions, which is retiring vehicles after their useful
17 life, consistent with SB 1. Could you give a little more
18 flesh on the bones of what that might entail?

19 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Yes. So you're
20 referring to under Senate Bill 1, there's a provision that
21 the Legislature included that defined what useful life for
22 heavy-duty trucks is. And I'll try and summarize and
23 hopefully I get this correct. It is 13 years -- the first
24 of 13 years or 800,000 miles, but no later than 18 years
25 for a heavy-duty vehicle on the road. And because the

1 Legislature defined that that is the expected useful life
2 of a heavy-duty vehicle on the road, conceptually one
3 could consider an approach which would ensure that at the
4 end of useful life, those trucks would no longer be
5 operable on California's roads.

6 Again, this is, you know, early-stage thinking,
7 part of our Drive Forward discussions to better understand
8 the potential for the types of programs that could reduce
9 emissions, especially from those sources which have the
10 largest amount of criteria pollutant emissions impacting
11 public health.

12 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Thank you.

13 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you, Board member
14 Rechtschaffen.

15 Councilman, the floor is.

16 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Thank you. Thank you very
17 much, Chair. Appreciate this. I also will salute our
18 esteemed doctor here, Dr. Balmes. I appreciate his work.

19 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I haven't left yet.

20 (Laughter).

21 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Imagine what happens if you
22 did. We'd have to have a hearing just for that.

23 No. First, I want to speak to -- from the
24 perspective have a local air district and in my point of
25 view here, that the role of this Board is to assist an aid

1 in the local efforts. And particularly when it comes to
2 ISR, I do think that this is where I've mentioned before,
3 you have, you know, retail air quality and wholesale air
4 quality, and the benefits of local air districts being
5 to -- being able to identify and work with their industry
6 partners to meet those goals. And I think if we had a
7 wholesale air quality approach, I think it might -- it
8 could make it difficult to execute and balance the issues
9 that I think Board Member Santiago had mentioned before
10 here.

11 What I would say is that the role of the Board as
12 we move forward in this is identifying blind spots at the
13 local level or weak points in strategies at the local
14 level to aid in the local effort approach to address --
15 you know, address where their efforts are. So -- and to
16 also recognize how we can assist municipalities in
17 addressing the severe financial challenges.

18 As I see it, you know, with these illegal federal
19 attacks on our public health, and also the -- depending on
20 who you ask, the multi-billion dollar State budget
21 shortfall, there's very little support that's going to be
22 coming from the federal level and from the State level for
23 municipalities. So, we need to help and support
24 municipalities in a way that they can make any type of
25 significant and incremental approach. And that's where I

1 do believe that allowing the locals to figure out how they
2 can -- where they can move to a ZEV model, but where
3 the -- even in the infrastructure side, just trying to
4 get, you know, transformers or substations built has been
5 a challenging here in Sacramento. And I'm very proud that
6 we've reached federal air quality attainment, but to --
7 but the fact still exists that even our municipal corp
8 yards haven't been able to move as quickly as they can,
9 because of supply and just cost of issues.

10 So being able to have low-NOx option, while
11 we're, you know, fighting the federal government and
12 hoping that the Legislature can find some significant
13 resources are going to allow municipalities to achieve our
14 no low -- our lower stand -- our lower air quality numbers
15 on NOx and PM.

16 So, to me, I think that's -- those are some key
17 things that we need to understand kind of where each of
18 our roles are. So I'm speaking as a -- as a rep from a
19 local air district, every little impact, if we can get the
20 dirtiest vehicle off. Even if it's a cleaner one, it's
21 better than having that other one sit on -- in that corps
22 yard and being used. Rather than -- and then hopefully,
23 as we plan, because many times when we're looking at our -
24 I'll stop using the alphabet soup - the MYOB, the
25 multi-year operating budget, for a city, you know, when

1 they put a capital improvement project plan together, this
2 is a multi-year plan. And if we're expecting that we're
3 going to completely go into a -- address and issue where
4 even if it's -- if it's a -- whether it's a warehouse, or
5 a city, or other entity, that they have to get the
6 equipment, we're talking years of impacts to communities.

7 So, I'd like to make sure that we allow the
8 localities to identify which way they can address
9 immediate impacts. And yes, we have to have a long-term
10 vision, a very long -- strong long-term vision, but we
11 have to take every action we can that is an impact today
12 for someone breathing today. So thank you, Chair.

13 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you, Councilman, for those
14 remarks and that perspective. Dr. Balmes, the floor is
15 yours. And before I give you the microphone, let me just
16 add my gratitude and appreciation for your years of
17 ongoing service to this Board and to all Californians.

18 (Laughter).

19 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you. And I guess I
20 should thank Chris Shimoda for getting me all these
21 compliments. I'll keep my comments short, since I'm here
22 at the end, and I've appreciated all my fellow Board
23 members' comments. I agree with almost all of them. And
24 I want Councilmember Guerra to set -- to tell him that I
25 appreciate where he's coming in terms of the budget

1 demands right now that are hard to meet for local
2 municipalities.

3 And I also appreciate Board Member Santiago's
4 concern that we have to be careful when we're talking
5 about statewide regulation, but I want to take up Dr.
6 Cliff's question about whether Board members think we
7 should be looking at a statewide ISR. And I definitely
8 think we should be looking at that.

9 But the process of developing a statewide ISR
10 would have to take the economic impacts under
11 consideration and all the complications that would -- a
12 statewide ISR would involve, both at the State and local
13 levels, and -- but I do think it's a tool we should look
14 at, in terms of going forward.

15 Even if it doesn't give us SIP benefits, as Dr.
16 Cliff said just recently, and really Dr. Pacheco-Werner,
17 more or less said, if it -- if it improves air quality,
18 I'm for it -- considering it, you know.

19 So I guess I'll stop there just -- but I think
20 that the quantification of the benefits in terms of air
21 quality and public health would come from a full
22 consideration of the ISR. So I support conceptually
23 looking at it.

24 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you, Dr. Balmes.

25 Supervisor Hopkins on Zoom, the floor is yours.

1 BOARD MEMBER HOPKINS: Thank you. I just wanted
2 to note that wearing my other hat as Chair of the Bay Area
3 Air District, that the Air District did establish a formal
4 support position for AB 1777, which, if I have my ABs and
5 SBs straight today, is the legislation introduced to
6 support CARB's authority to regulate indirect sources.

7 In the Bay Area, we've actually received
8 substantial advocacy in support, you know, from the
9 community in support of ISR and we are planning on moving
10 forward with our own rule focused on warehouses. And as a
11 Board, we have also, you know, established an appreciation
12 and support for a statewide approach that could kind of
13 mitigate that problem of having a patchwork of different
14 regulations throughout the state of California.

15 So I look forward to seeing how AB 1777
16 progresses, and I would support considering and moving
17 forward with a statewide approach, if CARB is granted that
18 authority.

19 Like a lot of my colleagues have said, I'm very
20 supportive of incentives. I've seen firsthand how
21 effective they can be, especially in the ag industry
22 around us, which is an industry that has a substantial
23 inventory of off-road engines. So I really appreciate
24 that being included as a strategy, as well as the MOU
25 strategy, which as I understand it would require mutual

1 agreement and support among the parties.

2 I think that we're all cognizant of the need to
3 address affordability, while also moving forward with
4 pursuit of our clean air goals. And I think if we can
5 partner with industry, with incentives and proactive
6 mutual agreements, we'll be able to move forward quickly
7 and with enhanced certainty. I think it was Board Member
8 Rechtschaffen that noted the, you know, current hostility
9 and litigious nature of the federal administration, and
10 one thing, right, about incentives and that kind of
11 proactive work, is that we can move forward without those
12 concerns.

13 And so just a couple quick questions. I just --
14 just to confirm, I assume the intent of the MOUs would be
15 to proactively partner with industry to achieve our goals
16 and find common ground. And then in terms of the
17 direction to staff for a memo in the future, is that we've
18 had kind of the slide with the blue space and the white
19 space, right? And I'm assuming that the memo would really
20 at how do we address that white space and what could all
21 of the potential regulatory strategies grant us in terms
22 of emission reductions. So we'd be able to look at things
23 like ISR, like Tier 5 and other regulatory processes, as
24 well as incentives and MOUs to try to figure out how to
25 close that delta, is that correct?

1 AQPSD CHIEF LAKIN: I'll hand the second one
2 first. Hello, Supervisor Hopkins. This is Matt Lakin
3 again. Just in terms of the blue space and the white
4 space, you know, absolutely, if the Board directs us, we
5 would look to evaluate, articulate, and quantify
6 strategies, including, at the Board's direction, if you
7 want to consider ISR, to help fill up that gap. I will
8 caution our preliminary look at this, it will be
9 difficult. We might not be able to fill completely the
10 gap, so -- but, you know, we will strive to do so and
11 we're going to further articulate our progress to fill
12 that gap. We would also welcome the opportunity to
13 further clarify what went into the 74 tons per day in the
14 blue part as well, so we could do that as part of the
15 report.

16 And I'll turn it back to Steve.

17 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Yeah. Thank you,
18 Supervisor Hopkins. Would you mind repeating the first
19 part of the question.

20 BOARD MEMBER HOPKINS: Oh, just sort of a little
21 more information about MOUs, which as I understand are
22 really mutual agreements, right, between parties. So it's
23 sort of voluntarily entered into. And I just was looking
24 for a little more information about what you had
25 envisioned on that, just kind of confirming that my

1 assessment and assumption is correct.

2 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Yeah. Thank you. This
3 really is, at this point, something that we are just
4 trying to take advantage of every potential opportunity to
5 make progress on a -- any sort of voluntary reductions. I
6 will -- you know, I will note, for example, as part of
7 settling litigation with the railroads last year, we
8 agreed to coordinate more on meetings going forward. So
9 we have been working with the American Association of
10 Railroads, BNSF and UP on future opportunities to reduce
11 emissions.

12 So those are the types of things that we have in
13 mind that potentially could result in some sort of
14 voluntary agreement. But at this point, we don't have
15 anything specific that's been laid out that, you know,
16 we're -- that we're anticipating would necessarily be the
17 type of agreement to put forward. So we still need to
18 work on that. You know, in the past, of course, we have
19 worked with auto companies, we worked with other
20 manufacturers, those have, you know, have had varying
21 degrees of success over the past several years. And for
22 us, it's really just no stone unturned. We're trying to
23 find every possible opportunity to continue to reduce
24 emissions and voluntary agreements are part of those.

25 BOARD MEMBER HOPKINS: That sounds like a great

1 approach and I really appreciate it. Thank you so much
2 for the information.

3 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you. And I also
4 just wanted to add, in terms of ISR regarding CARB's
5 authority, this is -- you know, it's very clear that the
6 State has authority under the federal Clean Air Act to
7 establish Indirect Source Review rules. CARB has never
8 exercised that. We have never, you know, done a full
9 evaluation or developed any type of rulemaking, but we
10 know that air districts have. So, in case, that wasn't
11 parent that, you know, there's -- you know, of course,
12 there is legislation, which I won't comment on that would
13 affirm that position. But I just wanted to make it clear
14 that under federal law, the State does have authority to
15 establish ISRs

16 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you, Supervisor Hopkins.
17 Mayor Lock Dawson over to you.

18 BOARD MEMBER LOCK DAWSON: Thank you, Board[SIC]
19 Sanchez. And I just want to wear my municipal hat as well
20 as my South Coast AQMD hat and agree with Councilmember
21 Guerra on both budget and attainment issues. You know,
22 the City of Riverside has invested substantially in
23 renewable natural gas from our waste stream. We did that
24 based on, you know, previous trajectory of low-emission
25 vehicle guidelines and trying to reach attainment. And I

1 think it's got to be an all-of-the-above strategy until we
2 can sort of sort things out at the federal level, but also
3 get a little closer to our attainment goals and it is also
4 a budgetary problem for us.

5 Secondly, I wanted to just -- I was meeting with
6 some constituents in my area the other day that were
7 lamenting the fact that there's so little products out
8 there to satisfy their zero-emission vehicle use for
9 fleets, and particularly in the heavy-duty pickup truck
10 space. And I happen to bring some fliers for a company
11 that's based out of my city. They are the world's first
12 and only all electric heavy-duty pickup truck
13 manufacturer.

14 They're rolling off the line right now. The City
15 of Riverside is purchasing I think 20 of these vehicles
16 for our fleet. They're called Voltu. That's the name of
17 the company. I'm just putting in a plug for them, but
18 also letting folks know there is a product out there to
19 achieve that goal of getting their zero-emission trucks in
20 their fleets.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you, Mayor Lock Dawson, and
23 appreciate the real-life example and proof point.

24 Any other comments from -- yes, Board Member
25 Eisenhut over to you.

1 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Thank you. To be clear,
2 I support this action. As Bill Magavern and others have
3 said, this is a situation that requires every opportunity
4 for reduction, light-duty, heavy-duty, off-road. I have,
5 in the past, been hesitant about promoting or even
6 substantially exploring alt -- other fuels, such as
7 natural gas, viewing it as a -- more of a transitional
8 implementation. And for the -- I need to withdraw that
9 hesitation, because I think every option needs to be on
10 the table for exploration. So I just wanted to make that
11 clear from my own personal position.

12 And I do have a question. Dr. Cliff has already
13 appropriately staked out the timing issue, but I am --
14 I'll respectfully ask if he has a sense of timing when
15 this may return to the Board and introduce the possibility
16 that it might return to the Board in segments, rather than
17 as a whole, if that's the -- that's the manner that the
18 research develops. So those are my questions for you.

19 EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Thank you, Board Member
20 Eisenhut. Regarding Indirect Source Review rules, best
21 guess would be several years, you know, a typical
22 regulation for CARB is in the two- to five-year
23 development to get to the Board sort of time frame. So I
24 don't imagine that this would be any different. Again, we
25 don't actually have a team yet working on such a thing.

1 So, you know, we would have to develop that, start to do
2 the research, and, you know, that sort of have inevitably
3 would take a little bit longer as a result.

4 With regard to the other regulations that were
5 part of the bar that we, you know, feel like we
6 potentially could fill in. Those are already underway.
7 So, they -- for example, in the Drive Forward context,
8 staff have been working with both the heavy- and
9 medium-duty manufacturers and stakeholders on potential
10 new regulations there, as well as on the light-duty. And
11 then, of course, there is a budget proposal for \$200
12 million for a light-duty vehicle incentive.

13 So those things are already in progress. My
14 expectation, for example, for the light-duty vehicle rules
15 is that we would have a proposal out by the end of this
16 year, for Board consideration sometime next year. So just
17 to give you a sense of that.

18 Can I just add with regard to this question over
19 low NOx, it's come up quite a bit. In the federal context
20 starting next year, the federal requirements for medium-
21 and heavy-duty trucks is a 35 microgram -- sorry -- yes,
22 35 microgram standard and that was consistent with what we
23 had proposed for our Omnibus standard. So federally, we
24 imagine that trucks are going to meet that more stringent
25 standard next year, absent any changes that the feds may

1 make in their regulations, which, you know, potentially
2 they will.

3 In California, we have -- we have established
4 what in the -- in the finalization of the regulation this
5 morning, the emergency vehicle regulations, that the 200
6 milligram standard is in force, but we are also certifying
7 if -- you know, voluntarily to those lower requirements.

8 So to the extent that there are technologies that
9 are certified to lower emission standards, that could be a
10 real opportunity to continue to reduce emissions. And
11 we're absolutely interested in that. So, for example, if
12 natural gas trucks were still certifying to that lower
13 emissions standard, the difference between that 200
14 milligram and the 35 milligram could represent a
15 significant real-world reduction. So that is, you know,
16 certainly something that we're continuing to evaluate and
17 trying better understand. And, you know, to the extent
18 that there are opportunities to encourage that, we would
19 certainly be interested in exploring.

20 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you, Board Member Eisenhut.

21 Thank you.

22 Any additional comments, reflections?

23 No. With that, great. The -- we will move --
24 the Board has before them Resolution number 26-4. Do I
25 have a motion and a second?

1 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: So moved.

2 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Second.

3 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Board Clerk, would you please
4 call the roll.

5 BOAR CLERK FRENCH: Dr. Balmes?

6 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes.

7 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Mr. Eisenhut?

8 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Yes.

9 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Senator Florez?
10 Councilman Guerra?

11 BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Aye.

12 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Supervisor Hopkins?

13 BOARD MEMBER HOPKINS: Yes.

14 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Mayor Lock Dawson?

15 BOARD MEMBER LOCK DAWSON: Aye.

16 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Dr. Pacheco-Werner?

17 BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Yes.

18 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Mr. Rechtschaffen?

19 BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Yes.

20 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Assemblymember Santiago?

21 BOARD MEMBER SANTIAGO: Yes.

22 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Dr. Shaheen?

23 BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Aye.

24 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Dr. Stigler Granados?

25 BOARD MEMBER STIGLER GRANADOS: Yes.

1 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Ms. Takvorian?

2 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.

3 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Chair Sanchez?

4 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Yes.

5 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Madam Chair, the motion
6 passes.

7 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you. Thank you, everyone

8 We will now move to open comment. For those who
9 wish to provide a comment regarding an item of interest
10 within the jurisdiction of the Board that is not on
11 today's agenda. The Clerk will call on those who have
12 submitted a request to speak card. And if you are joining
13 us remotely and wish to comment, please click the "raise
14 hand" button or dial star nine now.

15 Will the Board Clerk please call on any
16 commenters that have requested to speak?

17 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you, Chair.

18 Starting with in-person commenters for open
19 comment. First, we have Sean Edgar.

20 SEAN EDGAR: Good morning, mayors,
21 councilmembers, and supervisors of the Board. I have a
22 public budget buster alert and compliance problem that I'd
23 like to address this morning.

24 The Board's attention and intervention is needed
25 immediately to publish the legal authority your staff

1 claims to force ZEV purchases on the privately owned
2 contractors that contract with public agencies. This
3 appears to me to be an underground regulation that would
4 reverse what you the Board voted unanimously last
5 September to repeal the high priority section of the ACF
6 regulation.

7 Allow me to break this down with the goal of
8 prompt dialogue and action on this matter. The reason for
9 urgency relates to guidance that was emailed last week by
10 your ZEV fleet staff. That comes just days before the
11 April 1 annual certification for State and local
12 governments, SLG fleets. Under the March 17th email from
13 your staff, local governments must do three things. They
14 remain responsible, which they never were to begin with.
15 They must include vehicles used under contract when
16 determining compliance, which they've never had to do.
17 And while the private fleet is itself not the regulated
18 entity, the government agency must account for the
19 emissions and vehicle types used under contract, and may
20 impose contractual requirements to ensure regulatory
21 compliance.

22 None of these requirements is contained in the
23 SLG portion of the ACF that was approved by your Board.
24 Well over 25,000 privately owned heavy-duty vehicles are
25 contracted annually by public agencies, including State

1 agencies. Nowhere in the past five years of public record
2 in the -- has the required analysis been done, nor the
3 public been informed of the impacts of this requirement.

4 Furthermore, none of the hundreds of public
5 agencies or private contractors that might team serves is
6 aware of the staff interpretation. I serve on the Drive
7 Forward effort as a panelist for the outreach section, and
8 there was no announcement at our most recent March 16th
9 public meeting nor any prior meeting about this urgent
10 matter affecting April 1 compliance.

11 Absent immediate and clear direction from the
12 Board, next week there will be hundreds of State and local
13 agencies out of compliance and subject to enforcement
14 penalties. Private contractor fleets that the Board has
15 agreed to exempt would now be subject to what is
16 effectively an underground regulation. Your attention and
17 clear written guidance to the regulated public is
18 required.

19 Thank you.

20 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

21 Next is Tim Carmichael.

22 TIM CARMICHAEL: Good morning, Chair Sanchez
23 members of the Board. Time Carmichael with CCEEB. Let me
24 add a little more context to what you just heard. The
25 Advanced Clean Fleets State and local government portion

1 came to you in the fall. You delegated to Executive
2 Officer to wrap up some minor amendments and do 15-day
3 changes. We've heard those 15-day changes could come as
4 early as next week. We submitted a request for
5 clarification to the staff in January. We received a
6 response last Friday, which does -- which said, as Mr.
7 Edgar just indicated, that under the staff's
8 interpretation of that rule -- or that developing
9 regulation, any privately contracted vehicles and fleets
10 to a State or local government would be subject to the
11 requirements. The local government would be responsible
12 for the emissions. The local government would be
13 responsible for ensuring through their contracting that
14 those contracted fleets meet the zero-emission
15 requirements.

16 That was never discussed in front of you. I do
17 not believe any of you were briefed on it. It definitely
18 was not discussed with many of the key stakeholders. And
19 our membership includes both the agencies that are subject
20 to the rule and expecting to comply with their own
21 vehicles, as well as many other private fleets that could
22 be caught in this net. Think of refuse hauling. Think of
23 public works. Think of tree trimming. Think of
24 telecommunications. This is a dramatic increase in the
25 scope of what was presented to you. There's a process

1 concern, but there's also the dramatic cost implications.

2 One of our members told us that the vehicle that
3 they use for refuse today versus a ZEV alternative it
4 would be double the cost with the associated
5 infrastructure. So very significant. We're raising the
6 red flag today, because this item is not scheduled to come
7 back to you as a Board.

8 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

9 Evan Edgar.

10 EVAN EDGAR: Chair, Board members. My name is
11 Evan Edgar. I'm an engineer for public and private refuse
12 haulers and biomethane developers.

13 CARB posted the 2026 CI values for the California
14 average grid electricity used for transportation fuel last
15 week. The CI is 65.07 grams of CO2 per megajoule. It's
16 not zero. Your grid won't be zero maybe till 2045. The
17 EER, the Energy Economy Ratio, for heavy-duty BEVs is 5.0.
18 That means that carbon intensity for BEVs are about 13.
19 That's carbon positive, not zero.

20 Plus it shows the manufacturing of BEVs is plus
21 5. I provided a study for you on that. A couple years
22 ago that was disregarded. So together, the heavy-duty
23 BEVs are plus 18. They're not net zero greenhouse gases.
24 The truth is that ZEVs are not net zero greenhouse gases
25 and your staff confuses the public with that.

1 The reality is the heavy-duty near-zero NOx
2 trucks what use biomethane RNG from 1383 west -- waste
3 we're minus a hundred today. We're minus a hundred today,
4 delivering NOx benefits today. However, it is not being
5 recognized. You guys are driving backwards with the
6 refuse fleet by disarming us of our RNG and the near-zero
7 NOx trucks for expensive battery-electric trucks that are
8 not affordable. The Cap-and-Trade Program should be
9 funding these greenhouse gas programs with low-NOx trucks,
10 because we are delivering both at the same time.

11 So the ACF Rule is carbon positive, and
12 expensive, and the local government can't handle it. So
13 when we need to do is keep the RNG forever for both public
14 and private fleets. And meanwhile, the European battery
15 directive for supply chain of BEV rare minerals should be
16 enforced. I was here last month talking about that the
17 European Union did on recycling batteries, the carbon
18 intensity of batteries, and the supply chain.

19 These blood batteries are on our hands.
20 Environmental justice for all.

21 PAULINA TORRES: All

22 CHAIR SANCHEZ:

23 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

24 Next is Ryan Kenny.

25 RYAN KENNY: Hi. Good morning, Chair Sanchez,

1 members of the Board. I wanted to just echo what the
2 previous speakers have expressed. My company, Clean
3 Energy, includes customers who buy -- refuse customers who
4 purchase and use renewable natural gas are already using
5 the cleaner fuel. And what this modification would do is
6 require municipalities to extend their ZEV requirements to
7 their contracts with private fleets. And this would
8 require all municipalities to renegotiate those contracts,
9 and that includes, as a previous speaker mentioned,
10 refuse, street cleaning, et cetera.

11 Many of these fleets already run on clean fuels
12 and will certainly add significant cost to the
13 municipalities and the residents who pay for those
14 services. And, of course, we're in a affordability
15 climate and crisis at this point. And this would just add
16 to that and compound those robs. So again, echoing what
17 the previous speakers mentioned, we are very concerned
18 about this gong forward.

19 Thank you.

20 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

21 Nicole Rice.

22 NICOLE RICE: Still Good morning, madam Chair,
23 members. Nicole Rice California Renewable Transportation
24 Alliance. Again, I just want to align myself with the
25 comments that have been made by the previous speakers. We

1 are very concerned about the process of this and not
2 having gotten forward notice of this potential change that
3 come about. We are also concerned about how it could
4 impact us specifically, refuse fleets, and what the Board
5 has heard continuously at Board meetings about the
6 circular economy and the effectiveness of that economy for
7 that industry.

8 I would also submit that there are other
9 contracted entities that are running our renewable fuels
10 that are out there, that are getting the emission
11 reductions that California and others have, you know,
12 charged this technology and this fuel to do for years.
13 And so moving forward with a proposal like this could
14 disrupt that effectiveness, could result in higher costs,
15 not only for the companies but also for the municipalities
16 and the residents that they serve. And it honestly would
17 be a needless change in a segment of the industry that is
18 providing emission reductions that this Board and others
19 want to see during this time frame.

20 So we just urge the Board to take a look at this,
21 and to consider our concerns, and to consider a better
22 alternative than moving forward with this particular
23 provision.

24 Thank you.

25 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

1 Now, moving to Zoom for open comment. Our first
2 Zoom commenter is Cesar A. Cesar, I have activated your
3 microphone. You may unmute and begin.

4 CESAR AGUIRRE: Hi. Thank you so much. I am
5 with the Central California Environmental Justice Network.
6 And would also like to mention another opportunity to
7 fight against the federal slipping that's leading to worse
8 air quality, especially here in California. One of those
9 things is sliding back on OOOOc updates, which pertains to
10 the California Oil and Gas Rule or the Methane Rule. This
11 is something that CARB put out a presentation and gave
12 updates to us in a presentation August 2024 with a whole
13 plan of how they were going to update, draft and proceed
14 to implement the COGR, or California Oil and Gas Rule
15 updated early this year.

16 That did not happen because of the federal
17 government, but this is something that California could
18 very easily move forward with, something that CARB has
19 plans to move forward with, and something that
20 environmental justice communities and environmental groups
21 both support. This comes with getting rid of exemptions
22 at the wellhead, several components with oil and gas
23 facilities, as well as infrastructure that leaks a lot and
24 has stacking exemptions from CARB currently in the Oil and
25 Gas Rule like tanks.

1 So I would like to encourage and thank CARB for
2 the progress that they have made, but also urge them to
3 act faster, seeing as information and data sets like
4 Carbon Mapper have California leaks from oil and gas
5 sector being beat out by only one or two other countries
6 in the whole world. If California was a country, we would
7 be number three in leaks across the whole world for
8 methane leaks from the oil and gas sector and visible from
9 space. And part of that is because of the exemptions that
10 exist in the state, like the heavy oil exemption that
11 needs to be addressed and should be gotten rid of in the
12 updates to 0000c in the California Oil and Gas Rule.

13 I'm hoping that CARB also stood against the
14 federal government in making comments to the Bureau of
15 Land Management against the land grab for selling our
16 public lands for the use of oil extraction, and I would
17 like to extend an invitation to any of the CARB Board
18 members to meet with us one on one, so that I can give you
19 more information on the California Oil and Gas Rule.

20 Thank you.

21 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you. We have six more
22 commenters on Zoom with their hand raised. Open comment
23 sign-ups will close at 11:39 a.m.

24 The next Commenter is Gary Wockner followed by a
25 Sarah Taylor, and then a phone number ending in 738.

1 Gary, I have unmuted your microphone and you may
2 begin.

3 GARY WOCKNER: Thank you. Hello, CARB Board
4 members and staff. My name is Gary Wockner and I direct
5 an environmental organization named Tell the Dam Truth
6 based in Ventura. First, I want to thank you for your
7 work and for your service to the people of California.
8 Second, I want to especially thank you for being a
9 national and global leader in the fight against climate
10 change. California is truly a bright spot taking climate
11 action leading the world and many people are watching.

12 Yesterday, my organization, along with a
13 coalition of environmental and indigenous groups submitted
14 a legal petition to CARB asking the agency to initiate a
15 rulemaking process to add dam and reservoir facilities to
16 CARB's mandatory greenhouse gas reporting regulation. The
17 32-page petition contains significant legal and technical
18 arguments for why CARB should initiate the rulemaking. In
19 addition, one of the supplemental attachments to the
20 petition created by our science team estimates that
21 California's 368 biggest reservoirs cause at least 5.3
22 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent to be
23 emitted each year. That's the same amount of emissions
24 from approximately 1.2 million gas-powered vehicles driven
25 on California's roads in one year. These are real

1 numbers.

2 We look forward to engaging with CARB staff and
3 board to answer any questions you might have about our
4 petition and to working closely with CARB through a
5 rulemaking process. We are happy to meet with any of you
6 at any time in person or in Zoom to discuss the petition.
7 Thank you again for your service to the people of
8 California.

9 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you. Next, we have
10 Sarah Taylor. Sarah, I have activated your microphone.
11 You may unmute and begin.

12 SARAH TAYLOR: Thank you.

13 Good morning, Madam Chair and CARB Board members.
14 My name is Sarah Taylor. I am here on behalf of the
15 Western States Petroleum Association commenting on Consent
16 item 26-2-3. WSPA submitted written comments opposing
17 both CARB's original adoption of the Emergency Vehicle
18 Emissions Regulation and the proposed 90-day extension. I
19 understand the comment period for this item has closed,
20 but we previously saw on the docket that written comments
21 could be submitted until 3 p.m. today.

22 This speaks to some of the procedural
23 irregularities we have seen with this item. For example,
24 CARB posted a notice postponing this action on November
25 7th 2025, three days before the original comment period

1 was set to close on November 10. Since the bulk of
2 comments are submitted at the end of comment periods, the
3 timing of the postponement notice suppressed public
4 participation from commenters who reasonably believed they
5 would have another opportunity.

6 Now, in the notice for this hearing, CARB asserts
7 that comments submitted outside the original period would
8 be considered untimely. CARB's irregular approach
9 dissuaded stakeholders from submitting comments during the
10 original period. Second, CARB's CEQA analysis is
11 deficient as highlighted in multiple comment letters
12 submitted during the fall of 2025 public comment period.
13 CARB claims the emergency regulations and efforts to
14 permanently adopt them are exempt from CEQA under the
15 "Common Sense" exemption and the Class 7 and Class 8
16 categorical exemptions. These exemptions do not apply and
17 CARB has not met its burden to invoke them.

18 CARB's environmental analysis finding emissions
19 reductions is both flawed and conclusory, failing to
20 provide underlying data, emissions modeling or
21 differentiation by vehicle class. CARB has not met the
22 demanding certainty showing required by the Common Sense
23 exemption, nor can it rely on the categorical exemptions
24 where its actions lessen environmental protections.

25 For these reasons, WSPA urges the Board to reject

1 staff's proposal to permanently adopt the emergency
2 vehicle emissions regulations, and instead direct staff to
3 comply with CEQA. And as I noted, we did believe we had a
4 little more time to submit written comments, but we have
5 submitted those to the clerk as well.

6 Thank you so much for your time. We appreciate
7 the opportunity to comment.

8 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

9 Next, we have a phone number ending in 738. You
10 can use star nine to unmute your microphone. I have
11 activated your microphone but once again is star nine.
12 You may unmute and begin.

13 HARVEY EDER: Hello. Am I being heard.

14 Hello.

15 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Yes, it's a little muffled.

16 HARVEY EDER: Okay. It's better than nothing. I
17 got -- the last two times I got nothing and they've cut me
18 off twice in the last hour. This retaliation against
19 truth telling that's against the law, State and federal,
20 okay?

21 My name is Harvey Eder. I'm founder, director of
22 PSPC, Public Solar Power Coalition. I've been doing this
23 for over 50 years. I want to incorporate by reference all
24 of our activities in the state. Forty years we've been
25 going to the Air District and you all. And we're

1 consultants to the PUC on -- in '81 and '82, the Low
2 Income Solar Equity Program. Commissioner (inaudible) at
3 PUC, and it was not annualized. We put in the '16 plan,
4 the Solar New Deal, based on the Sunshot Program, based on
5 Moonshot. That's how we got to the moon under Kennedy.
6 Musk wouldn't be up there on Mars if it wasn't for that.
7 Okay?

8 So we put in a hundred exhibits in the '16 plan.
9 That plan is illegal. It was never evaluated. It was a
10 request of Dr. Burke, who managed (inaudible) for five
11 years. Also at the administrative committee meeting on if
12 8th of February in '19, this was addressed. And we said
13 it in, you know, the Supreme court case in '12, it's
14 technology forcing. It was the air district case. They
15 won it. And it applies to solar. We brought this up.
16 This meeting has been purged. It's not online. We
17 announced these lies and said it was getting up. We tried
18 to get copies of it through information through the State
19 asking legal for advice. This is outrageous. It's
20 frigging outrageous.

21 Okay. There's a UN conference coming up next
22 month in Colombia the 28th and 29th. There's 24 countries
23 about a just transition to solar renewables. There's a
24 need for us to step up and to organize, because we're out.
25 The cost benefit analysis does not include the real that

1 there's a million to a million and a half deaths a year in
2 this country, according to Lancet, 10 years ago, Dr.
3 Picarus (phonetic), okay? That -- you're not doing
4 cost-benefit analysis with externalities. This has
5 personally affected me. When I was nine, I had pneumonia
6 and pleurisy. And now I've got heart failure. A million
7 people die a year plus over 55. It's outrageous and only
8 a quarter million from heart -- from lung stuff.

9 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you. Your comment has
10 concluded.

11 Thank you.

12 Next, we have Christian Bisher. Christian, I
13 have unmute your microphone. You may begin.

14 CHRISTIAN BISHER: Good morning. My name is
15 Christian Bisher. I live in the San Joaquin Valley. I am
16 aware you will not agree with this statement, but I
17 believe Trump and his administration would support
18 everything the San Joaquin Valley has recently submitted
19 to you: A five-year attainment deadline extension for the
20 2012 PM2.5 standard, a one-year extension for the 1997
21 PM2.5 standard that the court later determined was
22 illegal; the 1997 ozone contingency measures submission
23 that included a Smog Check measure that only provided two
24 percent of the recommended emission reductions. And then
25 the Air District and CARB said no other contingency

1 measures were possible from any source.

2 In Kern County oil and gas emissions flow freely,
3 given the plethora of exemptions and enforcement
4 loopholes. Beneficial COGR updates have stalled. And the
5 Stationary Source Permitting Program operates unchecked,
6 that CARB would endorse and post the recent stationary
7 source review memo is a testament to how little you have
8 actually looked into their work.

9 Sit in on a San Joaquin Valley governing Board
10 meeting, a citizen advisory committee, and their industry
11 and ag led Environmental Justice Advisory Group and
12 listen. Trump's views are at home in all of these places.
13 And the people of the San Joaquin Valley are paying for it
14 with their health.

15 The next time something comes to you from the San
16 Joaquin Valley Air District, ask yourself what would Trump
17 do? If he would support it, please take a look closer and
18 see if there's something that should be improved.

19 Thank you.

20 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

21 Next, we have Ryan Senneff. I apologize, if I
22 mispronounced your name, Ryan. But I have unmuted your
23 microphone and you may begin.

24 RYAN SENNEFF: That's quite all right. My name
25 is Ryan Senneff and I'm here to ask this Board's support

1 for Assembly Bill 2647. For too long, the reliability of
2 our grid has been subsidized by the health of red-lined
3 communities. Gas-fired peaker plants, the most polluting
4 of our infrastructure, partially hurting these
5 neighborhoods, by triggering smog and respiratory issues.

6 By enabling advanced nuclear reactors, we can
7 provide massive 24/7 baseload power necessary to
8 permanently retire these plants. We could finally replace
9 toxic combustion with clean carbon-free energy right where
10 it's needed the most.

11 As we scale Advanced Clean Cars and Truck
12 mandates, the power gap is our greatest hurdle. We need
13 an abundant always on energy to charge millions of
14 passenger EVs, trucks and expanding public transportation
15 systems. AB 2647, which is California (inaudible) from
16 industrial commuter to the regional rail line, the power
17 is there. It's affordable, a hundred percent clean.

18 Finally, this bill is a catalyst for cheap green
19 hydrogen. By utilizing high temperature thermal energy
20 from advanced reactors, we can produce hydrogen at the
21 scale required to decarbonize long-haul trucking and heavy
22 manufacturing. These are the sectors that batteries
23 cannot reach. And AB 2647 provides the missing link for
24 their total decarbonization. AB 2647 is about air
25 quality, grid resilience, and meeting our 2045 mandates

1 with the technical reality. I respectfully urge this
2 Board to support this path forward.

3 Thank you.

4 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

5 Next, we have Michael Lewis. Michael, I have
6 activated your microphone. You may unmute and begin.

7 MICHAEL LEWIS: Thank you. This is Mike Lewis
8 and I'm the -- with the Construction Industry Air Quality
9 Coalition. And I wanted to echo the comments of a couple
10 previous speakers, and express our surprise and sort of
11 disappointment at the staff's new guidance, which they've
12 established to include private fleet emissions in the
13 fleet calculations for State and local government fleets
14 under the ACF, or what remains of that regulation.

15 This is a new interpretation. I think it's
16 authority that you don't have, because you didn't get a
17 waiver. For this to have been done by email in response
18 to a question that somebody asked without any involvement
19 on the part of the stakeholders or the private fleet
20 owners, I think is very disappointing at least. This was
21 something that was never reviewed as part of the
22 establishment of that regulation. There was no
23 consideration, no evaluation, no cost analysis done of
24 that -- of the impacts of that kind of a -- of a change in
25 interpretation.

1 I think this looks to me to be an underground
2 regulation under the Office of Administrative Law's
3 requirements and I should be concerned about that. It
4 looks to me also like you're trying to do an end run
5 around U.S. EPA's authority because they didn't grant you
6 a waiver to do this.

7 And finally, this looks a little bit -- smacks a
8 little bit like an Indirect Source Rule where you're
9 trying to make somebody responsible for somebody else's
10 emissions. It's a strategy that doesn't work and it's --
11 the Legislature ought to take a keen interest in how
12 you're going about this, given the fact that they're
13 looking to provide you with some authority in that area in
14 the first place.

15 I think -- I think you need to take a step back
16 from this and invite the stakeholders in and have a real
17 discussion about what the impacts of this regulation -- or
18 this interpretation is and -- before you move forward with
19 something that -- this dramatic.

20 Thank you.

21 BOARD CLERK FRENCH: Thank you.

22 Madam Chair, that concludes public testimony for
23 open comment.

24 CHAIR SANCHEZ: Thank you very much. Thank you
25 to all of our commenters who joined us today. I know

1 staff is committed to working through many of the issues
2 that were raised, both with industry and also with the
3 community groups. So thank you all. We look forward to
4 that ongoing work.

5 And just another note of gratitude to my fellow
6 Board members for their work today and our unwavering
7 commitment to the public health of Californians. And with
8 that, the March 26th meeting of the California Air
9 Resources Board is now adjourned.

10 Thank you.

11 (Thereupon the California Air Resources Board
12 meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

