MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
AIR RESOURCES BOARD

CALEPA HEADQUARTERS

BYRON SHER AUDITORIUM

SECOND FLOOR

1001 I STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2015
9:13 A.M.

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

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. Mary Nichols, Chair

Ms. Sandra Berg, Vice Chair

Dr. John Balmes

Mr. Hector De La Torre

Supervisor John Gioia

Mr. John Eisenhut

Ms. Judy Mitchell

Mrs. Barbara Riordan

Supervisor Phil Serna

Dr. Alexander Sherriffs

Professor Daniel Sperling

STAFF:

Mr. Richard Corey, Executive Officer

Dr. Alberto Ayala, Deputy Executive Officer

Ms. Edie Chang, Deputy Executive Officer

Mr. Kurt Karperos, Deputy Executive Officer

Ms. Ellen Peter, Chief Counsel

Ms. La Ronda Bowen, Ombudsman

Mr. Matthew Botill, Manager, Climate Investments Policy Section, TTD

Ms. Deidre Cyprian, Space Acquisition Manager, Space Acquisition Unit, Administrative Services Division(ASD)

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF:

Mr. Bob Fletcher, Project Manager, Administrative Services Division

Mr. Mark Fuentes, Assistant Chief, Emissions Compliance, Automotive Regulations and Science Branch

Mr. David Hults, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

Mr. Doug Ito, Assistant Chief, Transportation and Toxics Division

Ms. Shelby Livingston, Chief, Climate Investments Branch, TTD

Ms. Cynthia Marvin, Division Chief, Transportation and Toxics Division

Ms. April Molinelli, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

Ms. Melissa Niederreiter, Air Pollution Specialist, Climate Investments Policy Section, Transportation and Toxics Division(TTD)

Ms. Alice Stebbins, Division Chief, Administrative Services Division

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY:

Mr. Matt Rodriguez, CalEPA Secretary

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Alan Abbs, California Air Pollution Control Officers Association(CAPCOA)

Ms. Gretchen Bennitt, Northern Sierra Air District

Mr. John Benoit, Riverside County Board of Supervisors, South Coast Air Quality Management District

Mr. Michael Boccadoro, Dairy Cares, Agricultural Energy Consumers Association

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

ALSO PRESENT:

- Mr. Matt Bogoshian, REV
- Ms. Allison Chan, Save the Bay
- Ms. Tammy Cronin, Cleaner Air Partnership
- Ms. Anna Ferrera, School Energy Coalition
- Ms. Katie Valenzuela Garcia, Breathe California
- Mr. Larry Greene, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
- Mr. Joel Griffith, Department of General Services
- Ms. Melissa Gutierrez, California ReLeaf
- Ms. Bonnie Holmes-Gen, American Lung Association in California
- Mr. Dave Johnston, El Dorado County Air Quality Management District
- Mr. Ryan Kenny, Clean Energy
- Ms. Julia Levin, Bioenergy Association of California
- Mr. Moises Lopez, City of Riverside
- Mr. Bill Magavern, Coalition for Clean Air
- Ms. Cara Martinson, California State Association of Counties(CSAC)
- Ms. Deborah Moore, Green Schools Initiative
- Ms. Katrina Ortiz, Green Schoolyards America
- Mr. Ian Padilla, Coalition for Adequate School Housing
- Ms. Michelle Passero, The Nature Conservancy
- Ms. Fabiola Perez, Cal Poly Pomona, College of Agriculture
- Mr. Michael Pimentel, California Transit Association

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

ALSO PRESENT:

- Dr. Benjamin Quillian, Cal Poly Pomona
- Mr. Jason Rhine, League of California Cities
- Ms. Christina Romero, Cal Poly Pomona, College of Agriculture
- Mr. Steve Sanders, Institute for Local Government
- Ms. Phoebe Seaton, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability
- Ms. Sylvia Solis Shaw, Advanced Energy Economy
- Ms. Kerri Timmer, Sierra Business Council
- Mr. Scott Tomashefsky, Northern California Power Agency
- Ms. Eileen Tutt, CalETC
- Dr. Barry Wallerstein, South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Mr. V. John White, Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies (CEERT)
- Ms. Liz Whiteley, North American Sustainable Refrigeration Council

INDEX PAGE Roll Call 1 Pledge of Allegiance 1 Opening remarks by Chair Nichols 2 Item 15-10-1Chair Nichols 10 Motion 10 Vote 10 Item 15-10-3Chair Nichols 11 CalEPA Secretary Rodriguez 14 Chair Nichols 16 Executive Officer Corey 18 CalEPA Secretary Rodriguez 19 Staff Presentation 25 Dr. Wallerstein 34 37 Mr. Greene Ms. Bennitt 38 Mr. Johnston 40 Mr. Abbs 40 Mr. Tomashefsky Ms. Whiteley 42 45 Ms. Ortiz 48 Mr. Pimentel 50 Ms. Solis Shaw 52 Mr. Padilla 53 Ms. Gutierrez 55 56 Ms. Moore Ms. Valenzuela Garcia 58 Ms. Timmer 59 Mr. Bogoshian 62 Ms. Seaton 63 Ms. Levin 64 Mr. Magavern 67 Mr. Kenny 69 Ms. Cronin 70 Mr. Sanders 72 Mr. Rhine 75 Ms. Martinson 78 Mr. White 79 Ms. Passero 81 Mr. Boccadoro 84 Ms. Holmes-Gen 86

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D PAGE ITEM 15-10-3(CONTINUED) Ms. Tutt 89 Ms. Ferrera 90 Ms. Chan 93 Board Discussion and Q&A 94 Motion 111 Vote 112 Item 15-10-4Chair Nichols 113 Executive Officer Corey 114 Staff Presentation 115 Riverside County Supervisor Benoit 132 Ms. Romero 137 Ms. Perez 141 Mr. Lopez 142 Dr. Quillian 144 Board Discussion and Q&A 146 Adjournment 155 156 Reporter's Certificate

1

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Bonjour. Bonjour, everybody. 3 Good morning. Welcome to the Air Resources Board meeting of December 17th, 2015. The Board meeting will 4 come to order, and we will begin with the Pledge of 5 6 Allegiance to the flag. 7 Please rise. 8 (Thereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was 9 recited in unison.) 10 CHAIR NICHOLS: The Clerk will please call the roll. 11 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Dr. Balmes? 12 13 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here. 14 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. De La Torre? 15 Mr. Eisenhut? 16 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here. 17 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Gioia? BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Here. 18 19 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Mitchell? 20 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Here. BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mrs. Riordan? 21 BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: 22 Here. 23 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Roberts? 24 Supervisor Serna? 25 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Here.

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Dr. Sherriffs? 1 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: 2 Here. 3 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Professor Sperling? BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: 4 Here. 5 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Vice Chair Berg? 6 VICE CHAIR BERG: Here. 7 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Chair Nichols? 8 CHAIR NICHOLS: Here. 9 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Madam Chair, we have a 10 quorum. 11 CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Thank you. Just a couple of announcements before we get 12 13 started this morning. First of all, we have 14 interpretation services available in Spanish for anyone 15 who requests it. The headsets are available outside the 16 hearing room at the attendant's sign-up table. 17 (Thereupon Spanish translation of the previous 18 announcement was made.) 19 CHAIR NICHOLS: Muchas gracias. 20 Anyone who wishes to testify should fill out a 21 request to speak card. These are also available in the 22 lobby outside the room. We appreciate it if you could 23 please turn in your request cards prior to the beginning

of the presentation on the item, so that the clerk can

prepare a list and we can know how much time we need to

24

25

allocate to the item. We will be enforcing a three minute limit on oral testimony, but, of course, we will read anything that is submitted to us in writing. But if you are planning to speak, we really appreciate it if you can summarize any written remarks, since they will be entered into the record.

We also need to point out for safety purposes the exits at the rear of the room and to the sides of the dais here. In the event of a fire alarm, we are required to evacuate the room immediately and go down the stairs and outside the building until we get the all-clear signal, and then we can return.

Now, I have a couple of things I want to do this morning. First of all, we do have a rather short agenda today, but it's an important one. But it is also our final meeting of the year, and I want to take a moment to share some observations about California's role in the historic climate agreement that was reached in Paris just a few days ago.

But before I get to that, I have an announcement, which in a way really plays into my comments about Paris, because the fact of the matter is that ARB, as an agency, is recognized literally around the world for the quality of the staff and the skills that they have. And they are sought after as consultants, as experts, and recognized,

```
as I said, in many places.
```

And I do think that that has something to do with the fact that the Air Resources Board is a good place to work as well as a place that does important and interesting work as well. But from time to time, people leave ARB, and we want to recognize one of those people who has been called to another assignment, who has been very visible to this Board because of the controversial nature of some of the work that he has done, and frankly because he has done such a terrific job of driving an issue to a successful -- to a successful conclusion. And that would be Erik White. So, Erik, if you're around there, I hope you will come forward.

(Laughter.)

15 CHAIR NICHOLS: As you must.

16 (Laughter.)

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: You still work here for another 18 couple days.

(Laughter.)

20 MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF WHITE: Yes, 21 yes.

CHAIR NICHOLS: So it's really not an option to just, you know, stay in your seat.

Erik has worked in many key programs at the Air Resources Board, but I think we would have to agree that

his crowning achievement has been as the architect of the truck and bus regulation. To call this a challenging assignment would be to understate it. But nevertheless, this has been a far reaching and literally game changing program. No other policy, I think it's safe to say, in the world has achieved the same level of health protection from accelerated pollution reductions. And Erik has steered that policy along through many obstacles and land mines.

The success of the rule today is due in very large part to his leadership and the respect that everyone who works with him and who's been affected by his work has for him.

So our loss is the Placer County Air Pollution
Control District's gain, because Erik is soon going to
take over there as the Air Pollution Control Officer. And
so this is a bitter sweet moment for us, but we are really
happy for Erik, because I think this is a wonderful
opportunity for him. He's ready to take the helm and lead
the way for Placer County. And I know his influence is
going to be felt beyond that as well.

So, at this point, I think we all want to wish him the best and to give any other Board members an opportunity, if they want to, to say a few words, so he can be even more embarrassed.

1 (Laughter.)

2 BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Madam Chairman.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, may I recognize Mrs.

Riordan.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: I would like to make a comment. First of all, to say to Erik we wish you the best, and we are just so sorry to lose you. And I want the audience to know, and anybody who's on the webcast to know, I've been here a long time, and I've know Erik --

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: I've known Erik all those years. And we see him here in the Board room as he is proposing regulations, but what you don't know is his outreach to the regulated community in California. And Erik never refused to come to some of my remote places to work with people who had large pieces of equipment who were just totally devastated by the recession, and then to have a regulation placed on them made it equally -- well, it was just a real problem for many people.

And Erik was so positive, along with his staff, in working with those who were in the -- being regulated. And I can't say enough about that side of Erik and his empathetic ways. And, we do, we wish you the best Erik. Thank you so much for what you've given to the ARB.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

1 Ms. Berg.

VICE CHAIR BERG: I do want to second that.

Thank you very much for your comments Board Member
Riordan, because I also participated directly with Erik on
both the truck and bus and the off-road rule, and also sat
in many meetings before as we're developing the rule and
afterwards, and the follow up went with Erik and team to
other rural counties, even outside of Southern California.
And his interaction with people that were very, very, very
upset with ARB, but no one was ever upset with Erik.

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR BERG: I mean, I was in one meeting where they absolutely were beside themselves, but the owner of a company actually said to Erik, if he had a daughter, he would want Erik as a son-in-law.

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR BERG: True sorry.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: That is a true story. I heard that, that very comment.

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR BERG: That's a true story.

So that is the character that is Erik White. And it has been just an honor and a pleasure to work with you. We've gone through some very tough -- walking into some pretty hostile crowds, and I never felt anything except

that with Erik and his staff that we would represent not only ARB, but the interests of all stakeholders in California. You have an incredible heart. You have an intellect that is -- just blows me away, and also an integrity level. So we will miss you.

I personally will miss not seeing you. But as the old saying goes, you can leave, but we aren't going to let you leave the family, and we really look forward to interacting with you in your new position, and supporting you. And I know CAPCOA is just thrilled to be adding you to their ranks. So congratulations, and all the best.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

2.4

And just in case, there's anybody thinking about it, I happen to know that Erik has a lovely family, so -- (Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Well, I won't try to embarrass Erik anymore. I just want to simply say that you represent the best of CARB. You worked hard to engineer a regulation that was evidence based. You made corrections based on evidence. And as my colleagues have mentioned, you've always been open to stakeholders. I think that's again representing the agency at its best.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, Dr. Balmes.

Supervisor Serna.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you, Chair.

So I do want to certainly add my thanks for Erik's great work here and his -- the legacy he leaves at ARB. But as you know, some of us up here have geographic specific constituencies. And while it's a loss for ARB, it's, quite frankly, a gain for the geography that I have the opportunity to represent. I look forward to working with you in your new capacity.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Great, yes.

Any others?

Hearing none. I think you've probably endured enough, but we would --

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: But we would love to give you the opportunity to say a few words, if you'd like.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF WHITE:
Yeah, I would like -- I did want to say that after 22
years, it's truly been an honor to be able to serve the
citizens of California and bring cleaner air, you know,
just bring so many great programs to the State and see
them successfully implemented. I think the agency is on a
great path. I want to thank the tremendous staff. It's
been a privilege to work with for 22 years. I think it's
what -- as you know, it's what makes this agency so great
and so unique and the premier air quality and climate

agency in the world.

2.4

And it's not without a lot of sadness that I'm leaving such a prestigious organization. And I want to say it's really been an honor to work with the Board all these years. You have been tremendously supportive of the staff and of the programs we've brought to you. I think without that, we would not have achieved the successes that we have.

So I want to thank you all. I look forward to working with you all in the future on many programs. And Supervisor Serna, yes, I am anxious to dig in and help bring the region into attainment and other things here in the Sacramento area. So thank you all very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Now, to resume the regular agenda. We have one consent item, which is the revisions to the California Infrastructure State

Implementation Plan. We have no comments, no requests from Board members to take this item off of consent. So could I have a motion to approve this?

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: So moved.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: I'll second that motion.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Seconded.

All in favor, please say aye?

(Unanimous aye vote.)

(Board Member De La Torre not present.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Any opposed?

Any abstentions?

Okay. Great.

We will then move to the public hearing on cap-and-trade auction proceeds. I know I said I was going to give you a report on Paris, but I see Secretary Rodriguez is here this morning also to talk about the investment plan. And he might like to join me in giving a very brief report on our trip to Paris, because he was part of the California delegation as well.

And I know the audience as well as the Board members have been following events. So I'm not going to recap all of the accomplishments that were achieved there. But I think it's important that we say for the record that the agreement from Paris is one that gives us a very solid foundation to work from on our climate program. And it's really amazingly satisfying to have been there as an American, and as a Californian.

As an American, because without the agreement that President Obama reached with the Premier of China many months ago, there would not have been the basis for the nations to come together, eliminating the historic, you know, failure of Copenhagen. That was really attributed to the fact that the Chinese were seen as

blocking any kind of an agreement. The Chinese were there, and they were working for an agreement.

And then the skill of our negotiators, including the fact that in response to the island nations and their supporters, the United States was able to quickly adjust its position to support a goal of one and a half degrees as the limit for global warming, instead of the two that had been the initial position was a -- just beautifully done, and very, very well received and help to eliminate what might have been an obstacle to reaching an agreement.

So the people who were in the actual negotiating room did a terrific job. They were also in touch with us, both before and during the conference, and gave us opportunities to comment on some key language. And it was very clear throughout the conference that the work of California, the success that we've had, the example that we've been able to create in terms of our embracing of renewable energy technologies and energy efficiency, the work that's been done on motor vehicles and transportation in general, all of those things were part of what gave other nations that might have been reluctant to sign on to something that could be seen as potentially limiting their growth, instead seeing that as a — that this agreement is, in fact, an opportunity, both to address a truly global crisis and to, at the same time, work towards

transforming our economies and growing at the same time.

And California's presence there, led by our Governor, really was important and was recognized, as was the role of some national entities in general, both cities and states and regions, all of which were very visible there, and again acknowledged as being key implementers of this agreement.

So we have much work to do going forward.

Personally, I see the role of ARB, both in the transportation side and also in the monitoring, measuring, verifying piece of this agreement, which is going to be critical in the next couple of years, as if anything, increasing the interests that other countries are going to have in talking to us. And so we're going to have to, you know, do an even better job of deploying our assets carefully. But it was great from that point of view.

It was also great to have a group of legislators with us. We had Leadership of both the Senate and the Assembly who were present as part of the delegation. There were opportunities for all of us to spend some quality time together talking about the programs and the future. But it was also great to see them having some of the opportunity to share in the success of their work as well, because that doesn't always happen. When, you know, they pass laws and then they're turned over to the

administration, the administration gets to -- gets to get the glory or the brickbats depending. But this was an opportunity for our legislators, as well as many representatives of NGOs and businesses to be part of it too.

are doing.

So I'd like to ask you, Secretary Rodriguez, if you'd like to add anything to that before we move on?

CAL/EPA SECRETARY RODRIGUEZ: Well, thank you very much, Mary. No, I think you've really hit the high points quite well. I think that it was very, very gratifying to see the recognition given to California, the work of the Board, the work of the legislature, and certainly the work of the Governor. There is recognition that the UN, and the international level of the work that

But to be candid, I think a large part of the reason that there is recognition being given to those programs is because of California, and because of the work that California is doing.

subnational governments are doing, regional governments

Now, that comes in as a -- sort of, there's a mixed message there. That is the way I think of it. I'm always apprehensive about claiming or self-proclaimed leaders. Yes, we're leading the charge. You really prove through your actions that you're worthy of having a

leadership position.

as a leader, you really need to carry through. And so now, I think it's fair to say that California has been recognized as really one of the leading governments in the world at dealing with climate change. We've got the leading programs in the world to deal with climate change. But now, everybody is watching us. And we need to make sure that we continue to follow through and make these programs successful, that we reduce our greenhouse gas emissions, that we continue to have a strong economy, that we continue to show resilience and creativity and inspire innovation in our businesses and technology sectors.

So in many ways, the easy part is done. We're done with the parties and the receptions. And now, we've got to get back to work and make sure that we continue to have a good story to tell the rest of the world, because everybody is watching. That was really a large part of the message here.

As Mary said, if we're not careful, we could spend the next year or two meeting with delegations from all around the world. Certainly, we've been asked to go many places in the world. And I kept telling people, now let's see, I've got a day job. We need to make sure that we're continuing to make these programs work in

California. But it's gratifying, terribly gratifying, to receive the recognition that California's programs have received. But now, it's an obligation on our part to continue to move forward and really show that these programs can work in the successive phases that we're going to be going through in the days ahead.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

Appreciate that.

And less anybody think that it was all misery, Paris is Paris. It was beautiful.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: We had some wonderful -- some wonderful receptions. And it was just great to see the city lit up, and the local people out, apparently in force, and still enjoying their cafes, and their night life and ordinary life. So it did feel a little strange at first coming into a city that had so recently endured such a horrible -- a horrible tragedy.

But I think, in some ways maybe, that meant that we were even more welcome, because there were so many visitors from abroad, and people who were there because they love Paris.

So all right, let's move on then to the work of the day. This is not exactly tough. It's a pleasant obligation to be in a position of thinking about investing

the funds that come from our Cap-and-Trade Program. It's an opportunity to continue to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while setting the course for projects that also pay long-term dividends as well.

And by the way, this is one of the things that we talked about in many places during the conference, which is not widely recognized. But the fact that California in 2012 passed a law that requires a long-term investment plan to identify priority investments for auction proceeds, and then that we are required to spend a very significant portion of that investment in disadvantaged communities is something that addresses head on an issue that has been divisive in the past in many parts of the world as to whether any type of Cap-and-Trade Program could be something that could also support and not undermine efforts to improve equity as well.

I'm not going to go on at length, because we have a staff presentation on it, but I do want to just underscore the fact that the plan that's here before us today is not an ARB proposal. It's the result of an administration wide effort. And it is an administration document that reflects a multi-agency effort to address the issues that we have identified as being critical to the future success of our climate programs.

So this hearing is designed to provide an

additional opportunity for public input as well as for the Board to comment. But the Board does not take formal action on this item. We do have a procedural resolution in order to reflect the fact that the Board has implemented the legislation that laid out the requirements for this investment plan. But the final document will be put into shape and transmitted to the legislature in January by the Department of Finance.

So Matt Rodriguez is here as Secretary for Environmental Protection, and also Chair of the Climate Action Team. And so we've asked him to make some brief remarks on the plan. And first, however, I'll ask Richard Corey to just say a few words to introduce the item.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thank you Chairman.

ARB continues to assist the Governor's office and Department of Finance as noted in drafting the plan and coordinating with State agencies to seek public input.

The draft investment plan includes funding concepts -
CHAIR NICHOLS: Could you speak a little closer

to the mic. I think your mic may be down too far.

Thanks.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The plan also -- or funding concepts that are critical to help meet our climate goals. The plan also furthers the State

Implementation Plan and sustainable freight measures to reduce regional ozone and fine particles, as well as diesel particulate matter. It supports important new programs identified in the update to the scoping plan as well as the draft short-lived climate pollutants plan, especially measures for methane and fluorinated gases.

The plan also reflects the administration's broader priorities, such as water, waste, and natural resources the may not be covered by ARB, but are critical for achievement of our climate targets. And to be clear, the draft plan describes concepts for investments in a qualitative fashion. Inclusion in the plan does not guarantee funding through the budget process.

For this item, the -- we're first going to hear remarks from, as noted, Secretary Rodriguez on behalf of the Climate Action Team. This will be followed by an ARB staff presentation.

Now, I'd like to introduce Matt Rodriguez, Secretary for Environmental Protection.

Secretary.

CAL/EPA SECRETARY RODRIGUEZ: Well, thank you very much. I will be brief.

When I talk about California's programs, both within the State and around the world, I always note that there are a number of ways to deal with climate change and

to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. You can change your energy sources, you can use your energy more efficiently, you can look at really whether you should be using the energy at all? Shouldn't we be, you know, walking more and using bicycles?

And then I note that being California, we've identified there are a number of paths forward. And so we've decided to take them all. And you really see that reflected, I think, in the programs that have been set out by the Governor. I know that you're familiar with all those programs that --

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

CAL/EPA SECRETARY RODRIGUEZ: -- require a reduction in petroleum use in vehicles by 50 percent by the year 2030, that require an increase -- doubling the energy efficiency of our existing building stock by 2030, 50 percent renewables by the year 2030.

Just looking at, you know, how do we use our agricultural and natural lands more effectively, and how do we deal with short-lived climate pollutants. So all of those are initiatives that have been identified by the Governor as priorities.

--000--

CAL/EPA SECRETARY RODRIGUEZ: And we've got a

number of programs to go ahead and pursue all those initiatives. Now, some of them you can pursue through your traditional command and control or -- and regulations, but we have here a very, very unique opportunity in California, because of our very successful Cap-and-Trade Program, to take some of the funds that have been generated by that program and invest them in additional programs that will also reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

So the legislature, in its wisdom, directed us to come up with an investment plan, so that we would be using that money appropriately, targeting it for policies and programs that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but also provide some other co-benefits as well, increasing renewable energy, reducing the use of fuel, really, as I said, maximizing the use of our agricultural and natural lands.

--000--

CAL/EPA SECRETARY RODRIGUEZ: Also providing job opportunities, and then very, very importantly using some of the fund source to help disadvantaged communities in California.

This has put us in a very, very good position, I think, that -- to continue ahead with all of our programs. And importantly, again, as I discuss our programs with

representatives from around the world, it's always interesting to me when somebody says, well, have you thought of this or have you thought of that or we're thinking of doing this. And I'm in a position to say, yeah, actually we do have a program on that; yes, we are looking at biomass; yes, we are looking at agricultural practices to see what we can do with natural and agricultural lands.

But in order to make sure we're hitting all those high points, in order to make sure that we're moving ahead appropriately, it makes complete sense to have an investment plan that identifies a range of programs where we can be spending our money for the next several years.

To make sure that we've identified the appropriate range of programs and that we are not missing anything, your staff has worked collaboratively with the representatives --

--000--

CAL/EPA SECRETARY RODRIGUEZ: -- from other boards and agencies in California to come up with this investment plan. The investment plan is really a -- well, I've got to be careful, because I know ARB staff has put in a lot of time. So I really want to acknowledge the time and effort that ARB has put into developing this investment plan.

But it's then also been a work that has been shared with representatives from boards and departments, as I said, throughout the State. Again, one of those good stories that I can tell other governments.

They are frequently amazed to hear about the collaborative efforts of the Energy Commission, the PUC, the ARB, CalEPA, the Natural Resources Agency. Not all governments function that way. But through the Climate Action Team and through the work with the ARB staff, we've developed this investment plan that is before you today. It lays out a range of programs that would be worthy of funding in future budgets.

Then, as the Chair identified, this plan will be submitted to the Department of Finance. The Department of Finance will then forward this plan to the legislature, which will be using this plan to identify programs that should be funded in the future.

The program, as noted, has gone through a number of drafts. There were 10 workshops to discuss this particular plan. It was discussed twice at the Climate Action Team to get -- make sure that we were providing an opportunity for input from all the boards and agencies. It touched some piece of the Climate Action Program. And this really represents a collaborative effort to identify programs that we can pursue in the next three years using

the several billion dollars that are being provided annually by the Cap-and-Trade Program to further reduce greenhouse gas emissions, to accomplish some of these other program objectives, such as stimulating economic growth, job opportunities, and as I said, helping disadvantaged communities in California to make sure that everybody is benefiting from the programs we have here to address climate change.

So that's just a very brief report on -- to emphasize the fact that this is a collective effort, and it covers a wide range of programs. Frankly, every program that could be conceived of that we thought of that could really reduce greenhouse gas emissions and accomplish some of these additional goals and objectives that have been established in AB 32 and SB 535.

So I don't know if you've got any questions. I can certainly attempt to answer them.

CHAIR NICHOLS: No, but thank you for being with us. We appreciate that.

CAL/EPA SECRETARY RODRIGUEZ: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you for your leadership on this investment plan.

Mr. Corey.

2.4

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Now, I'll ask Melissa

Niederreiter to give the staff presentation.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Melissa.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was

presented as follows.)

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST NIEDERREITER: Thank you for that introduction, Mr. Corey, and for your testimony Secretary Rodriguez.

Good morning Chair Nichols and members of the Board. We're actually going to start on slide 7.

Secretary Rodriguez did cover most of the items on this slide.

Beginning in 2015, the legislature established continuous appropriations for 60 percent of the available State auction proceeds, included were affordable housing and sustainable community programs, transit and high-speed rail. By establishing continuous appropriations, the legislature and Governor guaranteed funding percentages for future auction proceeds to these programs.

This plan recognizes the important role of these continuous appropriations. However, it focuses on priorities for the remaining 40 percent of auction proceeds that can be appropriated each year by the legislature and Governor during the budget process.

--000--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST NIEDERREITER:

Developing the plan was a collaborative effort and required identifying investment concepts based on legislative direction, the priorities of more than a dozen State agencies and departments, and extensive public input. We also looked at existing State funding strategies to minimize duplication and conducted a gap analysis to identify priority funding areas.

--000--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST NIEDERREITER: In drafting the plan, the administration established four primary investment goals and two cross-cutting approaches for the next investment cycle. First and foremost, the administration is required by statute to invest in programs and projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

State law also requires that 25 percent of California climate investments benefit disadvantaged communities, and that 10 percent of the funds go towards projects located within disadvantaged communities.

The remaining goals focus on providing more opportunities for rural communities by creating program options that respond to their needs. The plan also expands on the description of the critical co-benefits of investment areas, like the opportunity to achieve criteria

and toxic pollutant benefits.

2.4

The first cross-cutting approach supports community-wide transformation through local climate action in disadvantaged communities. For example, a community could propose an integrative project that includes:

Affordable housing near transit; a new or improved transit line and service to collect the affordable housing to areas of employment; zero emission buses, additional bus drivers, and training for its transit system; bicycle and walking paths; and tree planting and subsequent tree maintenance in public areas such as local schools.

The second cross-cutting approach pertains to diversifying financing mechanisms with revolving loan funds and other mechanisms to deliver greater climate benefits statewide.

--000--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST NIEDERREITER: By statute, the administration is required to identify priority investments by sector. Like the 2013 plan, this update looks at three sectors, including sustainable communities and clean transportation, energy efficiency and clean energy, and natural resources and waste diversions.

Integrated local climate action projects in disadvantaged communities, which we discussed in the

previous slide, could include investments in each of these three sectors.

--000--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST NIEDERREITER: As Chair Nichols mention, it is important to note that it is not an ARB document. It's an administrative document and developed by a multitude of State agencies, as represented on this slide, coordinated and staffed by ARB.

--000--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST NIEDERREITER: As staff coordinated a series -- ARB staff coordinated a series of public meetings to solicit input and refine the recommendations in the plan. The administration released multiple public drafts of the document between July and December of this year, and as Secretary Rodriguez mentioned, 10 workshops were held between August and November.

High level representatives from the administering agencies participated in these workshops that helped to lead the public process. The administration also worked with number of individuals and stakeholder groups representing industry, environmental, academic, and environmental justice interests. ARB will continue to work with these stakeholders, including the reconstituted Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, as we move

forward in implementing the program.

The plan before the Board today incorporates public input from this extensive and robust public process.

--000--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST NIEDERREITER:

Stakeholder comments included supporting -support for existing programs, as well as a variety of new
and expanded Investment concepts, like emphasizing rural
community projects, providing opportunities for green
businesses and schools, enhancing jobs and job training
opportunities, providing greater assistance to
disadvantaged communities in accessing funding, and
streamlining the funding process by integrating funding
pots for multiple project types.

The plan includes discussions of these concepts.

And Appendix D characterizes comments from each workshop,
as well as earlier written comments.

--000--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST NIEDERREITER: For the next three slides, the investment recommendations in the plan are identified. For the transportation sector, while significant process has been made through existing efforts to reduce emissions in California through reduced vehicle miles traveled and cleaner engines and fuels, more is

still needed.

In addition to the programs that were given a continuous appropriation, the plan suggests further investments in technologies and strategies that aggressively decarbonize the State's transportation system. From the current programs to expand deployment of passenger zero emission vehicles and provide a robust network of charging and fueling stations, to demonstration projects of advanced heavy-duty technology, these investments support the scoping plan, State Implementation Plan, and sustainable freight efforts.

Also, information technology solutions and efficiency improvements that are such a big focus right now, include initiatives emerging from Professor Sperling's freight initiative think-thank.

--000--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST NIEDERREITER: Reducing energy-sector emissions will require wholesale changes to the State's current electricity and natural gas systems. It will also require better integrating renewables, aligning demand with supply, expanding storage capacity, and increasing energy efficiency. The State has a number of other energy funding sources, like Proposition 39, that are helping to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from schools, but there are a number of strategies that are

well suited for complementary funding from auction proceeds.

The plan highlights the importance of continued funding for weatherization and solar programs for low-income residents of disadvantaged communities; establishing residential wood smoke reduction; and supporting a program to switch commercial refrigeration systems to refrigerants with low global warming potential.

With a focus on the inter-independent relationship between water and energy, the plan also recommends select investments that can reduce greenhouse gas emissions and save water.

--000--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST NIEDERREITER: Natural resources and waste diversion investments have significant potential to reduce climate pollutants and help safeguard California. Opportunities exist to expand and preserve natural resources through efforts to grow and protect carbon stocks on natural and working lands, increase management and restoration, and promote urban forestry and healthy soils practices.

Additionally, by protecting these lands from conversion to more carbon-intensive uses, we can promote infill development that reduces vehicle miles traveled, infrastructure expansion, and associated greenhouse gas

emissions.

For the waste sector, transforming how the State manages organic waste and woody biomass is an important and effective means of reducing methane and black carbon emissions. Treatment of organic waste and woody biomass also provides opportunities to improve soil health and generate renewable energy and fuels.

--000--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST NIEDERREITER: All of the investments discussed in the previous slide will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Many will also provide public health, environmental, economic, and climate adaptation co-benefits. For example, clean transportation projects can reduce the health risk from air pollution in disadvantaged communities, while active transportation helps us to adopt healthier lifestyles and habits.

California residents may receive direct benefits, such as a rebate for an electronic car or energy efficient watt -- washer, a weather-proofed home with a lower energy cost or the potential for a new job and job training for installing solar panels or building high-speed rail.

Both small and large businesses are eligible for California climate investment funds for projects such as: Cleaner more efficient freight or construction equipment, energy efficiency upgrades in low-income rental housing,

forest health and conservation activities, agricultural water energy programs, and infrastructure to process waste diverted from landfills.

To implement these projects, businesses may have -- may also be contracted to perform such services as: design or build affordable housing units, install infrastructure for transit or vehicle charging and fueling, build zero emission equipment, remove dead and dying trees from forests or be the site for new composting facilities.

Investments to restore Delta wetlands to sequester carbon will also improve wildlife habitat, and help protect the State against sea level rise.

--000--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST NIEDERREITER: The proposed staff resolution includes procedural findings for board consideration. Resolution 1549 recognizes and supports the requirements and investments, facilitate the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and further the regulatory purposes of AB 32.

The resolution also states that the Board fulfill its responsibilities in statute for a public process on the development of the plan.

And finally, the resolution supports funding for the identified priority programs to further the regulatory

purposes of AB 32, and help California realize the transformational changes that are vital to meet our long-range goals.

Thank you, and this concludes our staff presentation.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Thank you.

We have a fairly long list of people who've signed up to testify. I think it's -- yes, it's posted up there. And I see that, so far at least, the vast overwhelming majority of people who are speaking are in support of the investment plan. As you know, we are not taking any action today, other than to pass a procedural resolution. So if any of you have been searching for what to give the Board for Christmas, you might consider shortening your comments.

Thank you.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Mr. Wallerstein.

DR. WALLERSTEIN: Good morning, Chairman Nichols members of the board. Dr. Barry Wallerstein the executive officer of the South Coast Air Quality Management District. And the purpose of my comments this morning are really to talk about what happens after today. And so as the staff has just presented to you, what you have is a good overall framework for what will happen with the

proceeds. But the key here really is what is the Governor and what are the legislature going to do on an annual basis in terms of budget allocations.

And as this Board knows, over the next six to nine months, you will be approving multiple plans that are quite significant, the State Implementation Plan, your sustainable freight strategy and so on. And the implementation of those plans, as we all know, is going to require both regulations and a great deal of incentive money.

And the staff has highlighted the fact that there is tremendous overlap between the technologies that we need to meet scoping plan requirements and AB 32 and what we also need in regards to having clean air in California throughout the State. And, in fact, to meet the federal clean air standards in South Coast, San Joaquin, Sacramento, to reduce air toxics throughout the State, including the Bay Area, San Diego, and all other portions of the State, we need a tremendous amount of incentive monies.

So my purpose in being here this morning principally is to say after this day, it's very important that you as a Board, you as individual Board members, and my board and others that are involved in this really try and form a chorus that will allow an appropriate amount of

these monies to come back to this Board and to other entities to move forward with the technologies that are necessary to provide for our climate objectives and our local public health objectives relative to clean air.

Lastly, I'd like to mention one other item that I would love to see the Board get more involved in and that relates to the Salton Sea. Salton Sea restoration is critical. The area is an EJ area. It is a rural area. And if it is -- if the Salton Sea problem isn't addressed, we're going to have major public health issues down near the sea.

This year, we've had several violations of the State H2S standard. I don't know that it's violated anywhere else in the State. We've had to put out numerous public health warnings. As more playa is exposed from the sea as the water dwindles, we're going to have dust storms that are going to look like those that this Board has had to deal with with LADWP and others, and there's going to be air toxics exposures.

So I would encourage you to also make that a priority. Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I think the Board will be dealing with that issue. After the first of the year, we're expecting to hear a report on it, but thank you.

MR. GREENE: Good morning. Larry Greene with Sacramento Air District. I want to applaud the staff and all the people that worked on this plan. It's really important. And a couple of areas I'll mentions here are showing how the co-benefits from this are really impacting our air quality and climate work in the Sacramento region.

We're very supportive, of course, of the plan and the -- that you put forth here. We, like Barry, what happens after this time is really important.

Two things I'd highlight. One is the incentives for wood stoves. It's been tremendously effective in Sacramento. I would -- I'm looking very carefully at the weather over the next 10 days out to 26. We're going to have rain. I love that. We're the people who want it to rain on holidays, so we don't have to go out and tell people they can't burn their wood stoves. But if that happens, and we-- next four -- last four days of the month, we're very close to attain the PM 2.5 standard in Sacramento.

And if we get through the end of the year, we will be in attainment for that standard. The key thing there was the wood stove program that our board approved. That impacts the public health, but also attainment across the whole State. And we'll continue to work with the staff here in the legislature as they move forward trying

to get funding for that. Also, in another areas for SEPs and things, if we get funding for those programs.

The second thing is climate adaptation. As all of you know, fire, flood, water are big issues here in Sacramento. Many aspects in this plan have co-benefits and affect that. And we're going to be thinking about those co-benefits and connections as we move forward in our discussions with the legislature, and other people who are going to be allocating funding here.

And lastly, I think that wood stove incentives, I wanted to mention, is a very important rural issue. I think it allows us to put incentive money into rural parts of the State where they will be seeing benefits on the Cap-and-Trade Program that maybe they haven't seen before. And I think that is an excellent strategy and important to our membership in CAPCOA and the other districts around the State. So that will be very helpful to us, if we're able to accomplish that.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Speaking of rural communities, our next speaker Gretchen Bennitt, Northern Sierra Air District.

MS. BENNITT: Good morning, Chair Nichols and the Board -- hold on. So I'm Gretchen Bennitt. I'm with the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District. I'm the

executive director. And our district represents the three rural counties of Plumas, Sierra, and Nevada counties.

Portola in Plumas County was recently designated by the EPA as one of the top five most polluted areas in the United States. It has been determined on an average exceedance day that 87 percent of the PM 2.5 is from residential wood stove emissions. A serious issue in rural areas.

And Portola is typical of many rural mountain communities, communities which rely on cheap and available wood as the primary fuel, and which have strong winter-time inversions which trap the smoke in the breathing zone of residents.

With incentives that could be provided through a wood device change-out program, residents in the rural counties and areas of California could be incentivized to replace their older stoves with a more efficient heating option, and, in turn, decrease climate and toxic pollutants, improve overall public health, and save money on energy bills.

That's all I have.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. We've also got a request, which I'll insert here, from Dave Johnston representing El Dorado County, to speak and then we'll hear from CAPCOA.

Are you here Mr. Johnston?

Yes.

MR. JOHNSTON: Good morning, Madam Chair and Board Members. Dave Johnston, APCO, with El Dorado County Air Quality Management District. I'd just very briefly like to echo what you've heard from Larry Greene and Gretchen Bennitt on the emphasis and the benefits and the efficiency of investing in wood stove replacement incentive programs. El Dorado County has achieved about a \$0.25 per pound emission reduction in CO2 equivalence, so we encourage you to continue to support that.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. We know this is an issue that's of real importance as a health matter also in your communities.

Mr. Abbs.

CAPCOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ABBS: Good morning,
Ms. Chairperson, members of the Board. My name is Alan
Abbs. I'm the Executive Director for the California Air
Pollution Control Officers Association.

First off, I'd like to thank CalEPA staff and the Air Resources Board for a series of workshops they did up in the north State which was pretty rare as part of this process. So they came up to Oroville for a draft workshop in the summer, and then up to Chico just recently as part

of this -- the final process. And so the air districts up in the rural north State appreciate the opportunity to come and speak with Air Resources Board people in person about the plan.

You may have noticed from the list of comments that have been submitted, and in addition I submitted comment letters from the Northern Sonoma Air Pollution Control District today as well as the Butte County AQMD today. You may have noticed in the list of comments that have been submitted over the last month that there's about 10 rural air districts that have submitted positive comments as part of the -- as part of this process, and specifically identified the wood stove change-out program as an area that they're interested in.

It's very rare that some of these rural air districts participate in the process to the extent that they have as part of this second investment plan. And so I think it shows you how important it is for the rural parts of California to be able to do these wood stove change-out programs that can provide quantifiable reductions in not only methane, but also black carbon, which will provide co-benefit reductions, not only in carbon dioxide equivalence but also in particulate matter, which is a particular local health concern for many of these rural areas. And so we would encourage you, to the

extent that you can, to support us as we try to move the wood stove program through this process.

The other thing I'll just mention briefly is we also appreciate that throughout the second investment plan, there's a recognition that air pollution control districts in California have used funding from the State and managed it effectively, and would be good stewards of second investment plan funding in many of the projects that were identified for potential funding. And so we'd also encourage ARB and the State to keep air districts in mind when they're looking for agents to work on these projects and spend the State's money appropriately.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Mr. Tomashefsky.

MR. TOMASHEFSKY: Good morning, Chairman Nichols and Board. Happy to speak today. Today, I just wanted to just briefly talk about the connection between wildfire prevention and actually impact on renewable generation and actually clean generation. We've had experiences this year to -- that we wanted to just share for a minute. And just briefly, Northern California Power Agency is a joint powers agency. We represent about 15 members in northern central California. We have 13 municipal utilities, and one rural cooperative within our membership. We serve about 600,000 Californians.

Generally, we're pleased with the direction of the investment plan. It goes a long way in meeting the objective and providing good recommendations for the State legislature to consider in 2017 for the budget cycle, but we are concerned that not enough emphasis might be placed on critical wild fire prevention practices that protect the generating facilities across the State that are helping the State meet its climate goals, and will continue to have a greater role in that in that regard.

To that point, we've had firsthand experiences about how wildfires actually impact renewable generation. I just wanted to share a couple things. In September, we actually got hit on both ends with the Valley Fire in Lake County which burned 70,000 acres. We had a number of people, employees lose their homes. A number of them were evacuated, but also from the perspective of the generating facilities. There was quite a bit of damage in the geysers area. We were able to get our facilities up and running within about a week. And we ended up losing about a little over 9,000 megawatt hours of generation.

So from that standpoint, it's not a large number. But in context it becomes really important. When you think about the fact that some of our geothermal partners, or at least the neighbors with Calpine have a number of facilities that are still out today. And this is -- it's

going to be several months before they get some of their facilities up, if they ever get them up.

So at this point, what we see is about a reduction of about 100 megawatts of geothermal generation that's occurring because of those fires. And the extent to which that will continue just depends upon how long it takes to get things like cooling towers up and other things like that.

In Calaveras County, we had similar situations with the Butte fire. Although, fortunately in that instance, the wind shifted direction, but we had a 250 megawatt hydroelectric facility that would have been destroyed among other things along the Highway 4 for corridor.

And what happens in that case is you end up with a lot of residual build-up from fire ravaged acreage. And the runoff goes into the reservoirs, and you actually end up reducing the productive capacity of hydroelectric facilities. And you're dealing with a whole bunch of other issues. So this is really important to us.

And basically, these aren't really just examples that are specific to us. These can happen in other areas as well for other utilities across the State. So we've raised these concerns with our partners in the California Joint Utility Group. We've talked about that. We

understand that many of those utilities support the -- or share our concerns, including Los Angeles, the SCAPA members and SMUD as well.

So we're really supporting an appropriate allocation of revenues that really address that issues and to the various agencies and the programs that deal with wildfire protection. So thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Liz Whiteley. And if people would be ready. Yes, you are. That will help also.

MS. WHITELEY: Good morning, Chair Nichols and fellow Board members. My name is Liz Whiteley I am the executive director of the North American Sustainable Refrigeration Council, or NASRC for shorter. I'd like to thank you for hearing our public testimony today. And I'd also like to thank CARB staff for all of their work to help advance the goals of AB 32.

NASRC is an environmental nonprofit committed to lessening the adverse impacts of commercial refrigeration, specifically supermarket refrigeration. Our mission is to help advance natural refrigerants, like CO₂, ammonia, and hydrocarbons. These refrigerants have zero or near zero global warming potential.

Our goal is to help create a more sustainable and climate friendly future for commercial refrigeration and

supermarkets in particular. I'm here today to express my organization's strongest support for using cap-and-trade proceeds to fund a low GWP incentive program for commercial refrigeration. We've submitted comments on the draft investment plan on the previous concept paper and also on the short-lived climate pollutant draft strategy. Those comments all provide data comparisons and contacts for what I'm here to say today, which is that funding a low GWP refrigerant incentive program is one of the smartest most effective climate investments we can make today.

Commercial refrigeration sits at a tipping point right now. We have the HCFC phase-out deadline of 2020 approaching. We have recent HFC use restrictions. And this industry is really at a crossroads, and we can make the right environmental decisions. Unfortunately, though, cost is a major barrier to making those decisions right now.

With the right financial catalyst though,
California can set the stage for how the rest of the
country proceeds. Just as a quick overview, your typical
supermarket uses one of two refrigerants, either R22,
which is an ozone depleting substance that's being phased
out or R404A, which has a global warming potential of
nearly 4,000.

That typical store leaks about 20 percent of its refrigerant charge every year. It also uses about half of its electricity demand to run that leaky system. So when you're talking about almost 1,000 pounds of extremely potent greenhouse gas being emitted every year, that's a serious climate impact.

Extrapolate that across the country, you're talking about more than 35,000 supermarkets. That's not including convenience stores and other smaller retail food establishments. So we're talking about a pretty serious climate impact here.

But the good news is that there are alternatives, transcritical a CO₂, cascade systems, hydrocarbon units, HFO blends that are near drop-ins for existing systems. We have the answers. It's just that cost right now is preventing stores from using those good solutions. The supermarket industry operates on extremely small profit margins, and they really need the help of an incentive program here in California.

So we can drive economies of scale. There's a host of co-benefits that we've identified in our comments. And so I just ask you to please ask the State legislature to financially support this program.

Thank you.

2.4

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

On behalf of Dr. Sherriffs, I'd like to rest your voice at this point. Thank you for your testimony, but it sounded like you were having a hard time.

MS. WHITELEY: A little bit.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Ms. Ortiz. Yes.

MS. ORTIZ: Good morning. I'm Katrina Ortiz with Green Schoolyards America. We're a national nonprofit. Our mission is to inspire and enable communities across the U.S. to enrich their school grounds using them to improve children's well-being while contributing to the ecological resilience of cities. We lead the Living Schoolyard network, which includes 41 participants from 32 organizations across California.

Firstly, I'd like to thank you for including schools in the second draft of the investment plan. And secondly, I'd like to emphasize the potential of K through 12 public schools, since we can't have sustainable communities without sustainable schools.

Public school districts are one of the largest landowners in cities across the U.S. In California, over 10,000 schools serve more than six million pre-K through 12 students each year. Choices made by school districts about how they manage their buildings and grounds profoundly impact their cities and generations of residents across our State.

Most of California's urban school grounds are covered with asphalt and concrete that have very high surface temperatures. Heavily paid campuses contribute directly to urban heat island effect, pollute our water systems and create unhealthy conditions for children.

By removing schoolyard asphalt, planting trees and allowing stormwater to infiltrate on-site, surface temperatures can be decreased, carbon can be sequestered in the soil, and financial savings can be achieved through reduced reliance on municipal water and sewage treatment.

If trees are planted to shade buildings, they can reduce energy use as well. Investing in green infrastructure on school grounds is a way to address climate change equitably, while bringing nature to parts of our cities that lack green space. And the long-term benefits of green schoolyards multiply over time. Not only are they highly visible community hubs, but by incorporating stewardship and environmental education into the physical grounds and curricula, students grow to become adults who care for their environment.

Our future needs citizens who understand complex environmental issues, and can help to find solutions to ongoing problems. Investing in climate change mitigation measures on school grounds will help solve the growing climate change problems we now face, while also preparing

our children to be the environmental leaders of tomorrow.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Mr. Pimentel.

MR. PIMENTEL: Madam Chair and Board members,
Michael Pimentel here on behalf of the California Transit
Association. The Association has long been supportive of
the State's efforts to reduce greenhouse gases and improve
air quality. Our more than 200 transit agency and
business members stand ready with your continued support
to expand efficient and affordable public transportation.

Now, we're encouraged that the second investment plan before you today reaffirms your long health commitment to investing in public transportation as a strategy for decarbonizing the transportation sector, integrating our transportation network, and improving mobility options for all Californians.

With the investment of cap-and-trade auction proceeds made possible through last year's Senate bills 852 and 862, transit agencies across the State have begun an advance key transportation projects and expanded operations that will significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve air quality, while creating good paying jobs, increasing mobility options, and reducing traffic congestion.

And while we remain grateful for these investments, we must continue to stress that funding to decarbonize the transportation sector remains inadequate. So here before you today to respectfully urge you to utilize your tremendous standing with the administration and with the legislature to support dedicating additional cap-and-trade auctions proceeds from the 40 percent that is currently unallocated to public transportation through the existing programs of the transit and intercity rail capital program, Low Carbon Transit Program, and Low Carbon Transportation Program.

2.4

We believe that augmenting existing transit funding is essential to achieving and ultimately sustaining the State's environmental goals for 2050. Finally, and it's a topic I think you guys have heard a bit about from us recently, with the development of the advanced clean transit regulation still ongoing, we support the plan's recommendation to use cap-and-trade auction proceeds to incentivize the adoption of zero and near zero emission transit buses and to facilitate the development of electronic transit vehicles and equipment charging and hydrogen and renewable fueling infrastructure.

We believe that such investments are essential to encouraging the large scale development of cleaner

technologies and necessary for putting into place the regulation that is impending.

Thank you

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Ms. Shaw.

MS. SHAW: Good morning. Silvia Solis Shaw with Advanced Energy Economy. We are a national business association working to make the global energy system more clean, secure, and affordable.

AEE is supportive of this draft of the investment plan, particularly on the provisions relating to the recommendations that emphasize the use of financing mechanisms to maximize and leverage these funds. We believe that these mechanisms will lead to increased deployment of advanced energy projects.

We are also very supportive of the recommendation that the IBank and CLEEN Center house these efforts by the State to coordinate and implement these efforts among the numerous State departments and agencies that are involved.

We would also offer two -- respectfully offer two additional recommendations. We would like to see a more robust increase in the funding for zero emission transportation. We believe that we need a transformative investment if we are going to meet the State's goals of 1.5 million ZEVs on the road by 2025. We would also

recommend greater attention on the water energy greenhouse gas nexus, with a focus on moving and delivering water as well as on carbon intensive water projects. We believe that this is an area that is ripe for significant emissions reductions.

So again, thank you very much for the opportunity to comment, and we look forward to working with the Board, the Department of Finance, and the legislature on maximizing the benefits of this program.

Thank you.

MR. PADILLA: Madam Chair and members of the Board, Ian Padilla with the Coalition for Adequate School Housing. I wanted to thank you today for making some brief comments. Our organization has submitted a letter, so I'm just going to hit a few of the highlights for the sake of brevity.

The Coalition for Adequate School Housing has been around since 1978, and we focus on school facilities. We believe that school facilities are a critical part of the educational process, and we have also been a leader in sustainable green, whatever the current term is for schools.

One of the things that we wanted to point out, of course -- well, let me start with the obvious. Thank you very much for including schools in this -- in your

investment priority. We believe that schools are an excellent partner for reducing greenhouse gases, and so that's why we're so pleased that schools have been included. We did notice in the PowerPoint presentation that schools were referenced a few times, and, of course, we're very pleased about that.

There are 10,000 schools as has been referenced. In California, the scope and scale of schools we think is important here. There are millions of acres of land and rooftops, thousands of athletic fields, parking lots, waste diversion opportunities, transportation issues. So we, schools, play in all three of the major sectors.

So again, thank you very much for inclusion. We will continue to support both the investment plan as well as schools inclusion as it goes forward in the budget and legislative process.

I would like to end with a few recommendations. One, we hope that whatever program is developed - we know we've got a long way to go - is that it is simple and streamlined for schools. I think everyone -- all the agencies, everyone, thinks that's important certainly for school -- it's important for schools. Also, some type of a specified grant program for schools, and certainly the involvement of the California Department of Education who seems to have the appropriate experience and background

for this.

2.4

So again, thank you very much. I did want to say that CASH is also a signatory to the Green Schools

Initiative letter, and they have recommendations also which we agree with. So thank you very much for your time.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Thanks for coming.

Ms. Gutierrez.

MS. GUTIERREZ: Good morning. I'm Melissa
Gutierrez with California ReLeaf. We're the umbrella
organization for more than 90 local and regional
nonprofits committed to greening California through urban
forestry. I'm here today to thank the Board for your
continued leadership in addressing climate change and
specifically for reaffirming the value of urban forestry
as a mechanism to reduce greenhouse gases and meet the
needs of our disadvantaged communities.

We're especially gratified that the three-year investment plan acknowledges the value of CalFire's Urban and Community Forestry Program. As noted in the plan, community residents cite the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's urban forestry experts as a model. The GHG reductions and community benefits already being delivered to Californians through investments in this program in 2014 are contributing greatly to the

transformative landscape that will help us meet our shortand long-term climate goals.

Thanks again for all the work you're doing and we look forward to the continued success of this program.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Deborah Moore.

MS. MOORE: Thank you so much, Madam Chairman and members of the Board. My name is Deborah Moore of the Green Schools Initiative. And I'm representing a coalition of 28 organizations that collectively represent more than 1.6 million parents, school board members, facility directors across California and almost all 1,000 school districts in the State.

And we're advocating that K to 12 schools and the education sector are fundamental to achieving California's climate goals. You've heard from some other speakers already that schools have a big environmental footprint, and they also have enormous potential for greenhouse gas reductions, from everything from tree planning and composting to transit, water conservation, solar, and more, especially schools in disadvantaged communities. And there are so many co-benefits, not least of which is to teach the next generation by having schools be community models of sustainability.

So as you've heard from others, thank you so much

and we commend the Air Resources Board for including schools finally in this draft investment plan, because they have been left out in the past. We do have three more recommendations and we have submitted comments in writing, but the three are.

Number one, to add the California Department of Education to the Climate Action Team. It's one of the only statewide agencies you did not see listed as being consulted to provide input. So I think that would be a great step forward.

The second is to create a streamlined and coordinated approach for funding integrated projects at the local level, including for schools, because the barriers are just too high for schools and disadvantaged communities to apply to all these separate programs. And the easiest, from our point of view, is if there was a specific set-aside for sustainable schools.

And the third is we'd like to recommend that you all recognize the educational co-benefits of investing in these kinds of greenhouse gas reduction projects at schools, because that's where 20 percent of California's population is every day at a K to 12 school.

So climate change is a children's issue. The California PTA adopted a resolution this year that recognizes that. They're the most vulnerable to the

impacts of climate a change, in terms of health related illnesses and things, and they're the next generation.

So I have for you some letters signed by third graders - you can see their signatures - and by fourth graders. And also -- and I have some copies, and I gave it to staff, but there are also drawings of what students think that green sustainable schools look like. And this one has compost and flowers coming out of a tailpipe, and a garden and birds and a windmill.

And I'm just going to end by reading what some of this third graders said. They said, "We're getting solar panels at our school. Why are we doing this? Because we want our school to be a school of the future", and, "We understand that you are leaders in helping reduce our State emissions", and, "We hope that you can share your funding with schools so that 6.2 million students just like us can learn how to protect our planet. We want to begin this work together".

So thank you for including schools. The kids are ready to go.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

MS. GARCIA: Good morning. Katie Valenzuela

Garcia with Breathe California. We submitted a letter in

November on behalf of 14 communities based organizations

that work in EJ communities, both here in Sacramento and

across the State. And we continue to plan to inform staff of what we think are emerging opportunities to invest in EJ communities.

For example, urban agriculture is a growing and incredibly culturally relevant process for both carbon sequestration and GHG reduction. And it also has the co-benefits of food access and urban greening. So those are -- that is one potential future opportunity. And we will partner with staff in making sure that they're informed of those strategies as they are developed.

We're also excited to partner with ARB and agency staff to effectively implement these programs and to ensure that the investments actually reach the outcomes that EJ communities have been promised, because that is, of course, as you've mentioned today, of utmost importance.

Thank you.

2.4

CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Thanks for your help in -- throughout the process.

MS. TIMMER: Good morning. It feels really unfair to have to try to follow the words of third graders, but --

(Laughter.)

MS. TIMMER: My name is --

CHAIR NICHOLS: It's really a tough act to

follow.

MS. TIMMER: Yes, no kidding precisely.

My name is Kerri Timmer. I'm the government affairs director for the Sierra Business Council in Truckee. We did submit a more detailed letter, but I would like to highlight a couple of key points today, not least of which is our excitement at having Erik White join the ranks of Sierra activists on air quality and climate. So welcome, Erik.

We support many of the components of the plan, including primarily the increased focus on rural participation, which, as you can imagine, is very important to us, as well as the emphasis on forest management, biomass utilization, and protection against forest conversion, as well as other elements that recognize the need to act immediately and to cross all landscapes to achieve statewide goals.

We are little disappointed however that the plan does not contain more actual direction to that end. Our biggest concern is that regardless of language recognizing the benefits of investing in rural regions, there's not enough effort to prioritize work in these areas. The State will need full participation from communities large and small, urban and rural, adequately served and underserved if it's going to meet its climate goals and

commitments.

Yet, companion plans that could help set priorities, such as the Forest Carbon Action Plan or the Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Strategy remain incomplete, so there's now way to reference them as guidance for investment at this point.

And existing programs like the affordable housing and sustainable communities program still contain disincentives to rural investment. To generate widespread support over time, climate related program will need to provide benefit to all residents. We're afraid that that will not happen robustly enough under the guidance laid out in this plan.

So we ask that you amend the three-year investment plan before transmitting it to the Department of Finance to include more detailed guidance on the following five things:

First, increasing outreach and technical assistance, especially in smaller jurisdictions and rural regions; increasing funding for the Strategic Growth Council's Rural Innovations Project Area Program, as well as other programs that address natural and working lands; third, using funded projects to develop region-wide inventories, quantification methodologies, and benefit accounting that considers co-benefits as well as direct

greenhouse gas reductions; fourth, ways to better identify disadvantaged communities in rural areas, particularly so that they can take more advantage of the residential wood smoke program as an example; and finally, creation of a rural mechanism as an alternative to MPOs for planning, implementing, and aligning greenhouse gas reduction goals in rural regions.

We look forward to continuing to work with the Board and staff, especially related to addressing these rural issues, to ensure that the second investment plan is meaningful to all Californians and achieves the State's post-2020 climate goals.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you for those thoughtful comments, which I think we should also make sure we share with the Strategic Growth Council and others. Thank you.

Mr. Bogoshian, welcome. A Former colleague here.

MR. BOGOSHIAN: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair and Board members. It's great to be back in California.

I work for REV, which is a sustainability service provider, bottom-up, working to meet all the good top-down policies that have happened. And we're making progress from Paris through the President's Climate Action Plan, and, of course, to California's great leadership here, but

we need to meet that with bottom-up activity.

And REV is trying to enable organizations all over California cities, NGOs, businesses of all types to apply sustainability tools and tactics quickly, massively driving down GHG emissions using behavioral scientific tactics and integrated approaches.

We submitted written proposals -- four specific proposals to enable this kind of bottom-up applied sustainability. And we also included proposals to incentivize private capital to come in to invest in those money-making and GHG reducing activities.

So the California Energy Commission just recently came out with its existing buildings Energy Efficiency Action Plan. And in it, they cite behavioral scientific tactics like pure cohort models, and specifically what REV is applying out in the marketplace right now. So service providers really coaching at the organizational level is a key component. And there are elements of that in this draft plan. We encourage more of that and sooner. And thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Phoebe Seaton.

MS. SEATON: Thank you. Good morning. Phoebe Seaton with Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability. Again, thank you all and thanks so much

to staff for the work and also for a lot of openness and engaging in conversation and being responsive to comments. We are pleased with the direction of the investment plan. We thought that it could go a bit further in terms of maximizing benefits, especially to disadvantaged communities in the areas of economic development and public health, et cetera. We look forward to working with CARB and the implementing agencies in taking it that extra mile.

I would especially like to see some investment in planning to really build up the infrastructure of disadvantaged communities, to engage fully in the investment plan in the short and long term direct investments to rural communities that demonstrate a meaningful benefit to those communities. And we are still concerned that some of the investments could have incidental negative benefits on disadvantaged communities.

And we would like to work with CARB and other agencies to make sure that we minimize, mitigate, or eliminate any of those investments. Thank you so much and Happy Holidays.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning.

MS. LEVIN: Good morning, Chairman Nichols and members of the Board, and members of the Air Board staff.

I want to start by just thanking you incredibly,

sincerely, and deeply for your leadership, not just in this investment plan, but in the five pillars of climate change and all the other just extraordinary work that this Board and all your sister agencies are doing. It's really exciting to see. So thank you.

We strongly -- sorry. Julia Levin with the Bioenergy Association of California. We strongly support the draft investment plan, and we're very pleased to see some of the new additions in the plan, and we also have a few recommended changes and additions to the plan.

Above all, we are really excited to see the inclusion of biofuels under the low carbon transportation fund. This is critical to meet the petroleum reduction and sustainable freight strategies for the State.

Biofuels made from organic waste will provide the lowest carbon transportation of any kind. And so this is a really important step forward that we're glad to see in the new draft.

We also strongly support funding for diverted organic waste-to-energy, and dairy waste-to-energy projects. These two are critical to meet the Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Plan, renewable energy, and petroleum reduction goals.

On the diverted organic waste part though, under CalRecycle, we do have a few recommendations. First of

all, it's very important that this funding be technology neutral. It's time to start setting performance criteria, rather than choosing technology winners and losers.

Anaerobic digestion is incredibly important and it is the most common technology used right now for diverted organic waste-to-energy projects, but CalRecycle itself acknowledges that a lot of the organic waste that's currently being landfilled, and that we want to divert away landfills is not suitable for anaerobic digestion.

So it's important that this funding be broader and allow other technologies like gasification that can be used to convert organic waste, the more cellulosic part of the waste stream, forest waste, wood waste, construction debris, orchard prunings, things like that. So we need to broaden the technologies and set performance criteria instead.

Just as importantly, CalRecycle really needs to prioritize diverted organic waste for its highest and best use. And the State of Oregon did a very thorough assessment looking at 26 different studies, and found that not surprisingly, the highest and best use of organic waste -- of diverted organic waste is using it for energy and compost, not one or the other. So we urge CalRecycle to fund projects that do both to achieve the greatest greenhouse gas reductions and other benefits.

Finally, the biggest omission still continues to be forest biomass-to-energy funding. The Governor's emergency order issued in October makes clear that our forests are in a state of emergency. We have tens of millions of dead and dying trees that will be removed pursuant to this order. But if we just pile them up or pile and burn them we're not going to obtain the energy value that we could from that forest fuel that will be removed.

Also, the Placer County Air District did a study finding that if you use that forest biomass for energy in a small gasification facility instead of piling it up and burning it, you can reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 90 percent and reduce other air pollution as well.

So this is a really important funding category that needs to be included. Again, thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. MAGAVERN: Good morning. Bill Magavern with the Coalition for Clean Air. We appreciate the great work done by the staff of ARB and CalEPA and the other agencies, and particularly the very thorough public participation process, which I think really set a standard by holding workshops around the State, mostly in the evening, so that community members had many chances to participate.

In terms of sectors, we know that the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in California is transportation, so we support prioritizing investments in cleaner vehicles, both in the passenger and freight sectors, as well as public transit and active transportation.

We're very happy to see the emphasis on reducing the short-lived climate pollutants, something we've been trying to call attention to for a long time, and in particular, one that has gotten a lot of attention here today, incentives for reducing wood smoke, is something that we very much support.

And as one of the leaders of the SB 535

Coalition, we do want to emphasize the importance of increased investment for most disadvantaged communities, those that have suffered historically from environmental injustice and excessive pollution. And I remind you that CalEPA classifies 25 percent of the population of the State as living in disadvantaged communities. So we think that a minimum of 25 percent of the fund should be invested directly in those communities, with an additional amount for the benefit of those people with particular attention to low-income households.

And we continue to urge the Governor and the legislative leaders to finish the 2015-16 budget process,

and to invest these auction proceeds which are available to help our communities to deliver services and reduce pollution. It's important that this money be invested and not continue to linger in the mysterious budget process in the capital.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Mr. Kerry -- Mr. Kenny, I'm sorry.

MR. KENNY: Good morning, Madam Chair, members of the Board. Just to reiterate what previous comments have been made, we do thank you for your leadership on this. And we are pleased that biofuels and ultra low carbon fuels are included in the investment plan. Of course, we don't have a dollar figure yet, but we do urge significant funding for biofuels, especially renewable and natural gas, as well as alternative fuel vehicles that meet a 0.02 NOx standard, both of which would meet both State statutory requirements and two of the five key climate change pillars, as well as other State goals.

I mention this also in terms of regulatory uncertainty, both industries, the fuel industries as well as the vehicle industries do need to have certainty going forward for a number of years. And having this in place, with significant funding for both, would be very much appreciated by the industries.

1 | Thank you.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. CRONIN: Good morning. My name is Tammy
Cronin. I'm here on behalf of the Cleaner Air
Partnership. We would like to thank the Air Resources
Board and State agencies' staff for their hard work in the open thoughtful process that went into the development of this second investment plan.

The Cleaner Air Partnership, or CAP for short, is a joint project of Breathe California of Sacramento Immigrant Trails, the Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce and Valley Vision. For nearly 30 years, this unique partnership has collaborated with clean air stakeholders representing business, health, environmental, and regulatory interests to find pragmatic solutions for addressing air quality challenges in the greater Sacramento air basin.

Priority areas for CAP investments are public transportation, sustained forest health, and the reduction of wood smoke. We are very pleased to see these funding concepts included in the investment plan, as well as other investments that we support.

A visionary public transit system that reduces traffic congestion and provides enhanced access and mobility options for all members of the community is

imperative to health, economic growth, and improving air quality.

Investments in forest health will help reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire and the associated greenhouse gas and criteria air pollutant emissions.

Protecting the health of forests is not only important for communities near forested areas, but also for the urban areas that rely upon our forests, which provide more than 60 percent of California's fresh water supply. Expanding biomass markets in rural areas can provide local economic development opportunities, as well as help avoid emissions from the open burn of biomass waste.

Effective wood smoke reduction can be achieved through regional air district incentives for replacement of old wood stoves with natural gas or modern cleaner devices. These replacements can provide quantifiable reductions of greenhouse gases and short-lived climate pollutants.

To benefit disadvantaged communities, the CAP supports comprehensive place-based strategies for integrated funding from the various agency programs that achieve greenhouse gas reductions and multiple co-benefits. Project proposals can be facilitated through regional coordination to ensure the needs of disadvantaged

communities are identified through a robust engagement process and achieved at the local level.

Finally, the CAP supports flexible financing option and incentives, including new incentives for waste-to-fuel and ozone depleting refrigerants. CAP also supports continued incentives for energy efficiency, renewable energy, and fleet conversion. These approaches enable businesses to participate in positive efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality. Moreover, these investments will enhance the resiliency of individual businesses, as well as the resilience of the region's economy as a whole. And we would -- look forward to working with the State legislature to champion these investments.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Good morning. Steve Sanders with the Institute for Local Government. I will be followed by my colleagues from the League of California Cities and the California State Association of Counties.

Welcome back to California, Chair Nichols. I think the -- it's true that the Paris agreement opened a new era for us, and that global action will now be beginning in earnest. But the hour is very late, and we must accelerate the pace of implementation if we're going

to have any chance of meeting even the goals that were set in Paris, and that only gets us half way to the place of where we need to be.

So I think California has an outside role to play in this new era. And in many ways, success depends on local action. The State has set some goals, and they're very ambitious. You've provided some tools, and we're talking about some of those today. But the scale of change that is needed requires widespread and voluntary action, and that's a difficult task to achieve.

In many ways, we need to rely on cities and counties to take these various programs that you've developed and weave them together into a fabric that creates a more sustainable community. And cities and counties are really the place where those decisions will get made that will take the most advantage of the policy direction and the resources that you're providing.

You have willing partners in cities and counties to do this. We're distributing an op-ed that appeared in today's Sacramento Bee by the head of the League of Cities and the head of CSAC applauding the work that you are doing and supporting the idea that is included in the investment plan for a integrated local climate action program, a cross-cutting program.

We think that that kind of an approach can

capitalize on the innovation that's happening at the local level, and that that approach will help accelerate and magnify the impacts of the investments that you make now and in the future in making climate action a reality in California.

We can't wait for good ideas to spread. They can do that naturally, but it's too slow. And so the League and CSAC, with the ILG operates the Beacon Program. And the whole purpose of the Beacon Program is to promote innovation, and then to share that innovation among cities and counties.

The visual that we use for this is kind of a skipping rock. If you think of a skipping rock across the lake, each time it hits, it creates an impact. It moves quickly across and takes that good idea from one place to the next, and the ideas ripple out. And that's exactly what we are trying to do through our program, working directly with cities and counties.

They're the incubators of innovation. It -- as I was preparing for this, I recognized that the local government representatives sitting on this Board represent many of these beacon communities, City of El Cerrito is one of our leading Beacon communities in Supervisor Gioia's district.

And so what we would like to do is to encourage

you to take this concept that you have, make it a reality. It's in the investment plan. We hope that ARB and the administration work with us, work with the League, and work with CSAC to make that a reality in the 2016 budget, so we can get to work and make this partnership an acceleration that we all need coming out of Paris.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. RHINE: Good morning, Madam Chair, members.

Jason Rhine with the League of California Cities. I think

Mr. Sanders did a great job, you know, summarizing the

involvement of local government, how important local

government is and is going to be to the State if we are

going to meet the GHG reduction goals that have been set.

I do want to highlight just a couple things. We have

submitted written comments, so I'm not going to get into

those.

But there are a couple things in the investment plan that I think are really important and worth noting.

One, particularly on pages 28 and 29, where you guys reference the cross-cutting approaches to get disadvantaged communities a bit more involved and have local programs within those communities to assist and to make sure that we get the GHGs that we're seeking. That's a very important thing that I -- that we would like to

see. We certainly would like to see it expanded beyond disadvantaged communities. But certainly starting with those disadvantaged communities is a very good idea, and we're very much in support of that.

Another thing that I would like to highlight, and Julia Levin mentioned earlier, is waste diversion. Waste diversion, I think, is a great example of how the State sets a goal or a mandate and then leaves it up to the local governments in order to implement those programs and to divert that waste from our landfills to recycle the waste. Getting organics out of the landfill is going to be very difficult. And it's going to be difficult for -- in a couple of ways. And in the investment plan, it mentions a very aggressive goal to removing organic waste from our landfills, essentially clear elimination by 2025.

It's going to be very, very difficult, because we have to site the facilities, we have to get them permitted, we have to get through CEQA. We need Air Board permits. We need Water Board permits. And then we have people in our have that may not want to have composting facilities near them or an anaerobic digester. So there are many, many hurdles that we are going to have to overcome in a very short amount of time in order to get the land -- the organics out of our landfills.

And we clearly, you know, need your guys' help

and leadership to work with us, and I think the legislature, to not only identify potential funding - cap-and-trade funding would be obviously a great way - but then also identifying ways for local governments and our ratepayers to kick in in the process. I mean, clearly, we do not think that this is going to be completely funded from, you know, cap-and-trade funds or other State funds that our local ratepayers are going to have to kick-in for this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I just wanted to highlight the difficulty that we're going to have. But, you know, clearly, we are partners, as Steve mentioned, and we want to continue to be partners. And then just one last thing, and it was briefly touched on earlier, you know, next steps. know, the investment plan is great, and you guys did a wonderful job identifying very important programs and projects that need to be funded, big category areas, but the next step clearly is the legislature. And as we all know, they often want to do what they want to do. there's a lot of money left over from last year and we're going to have a lot more money, you know, going in the future. So I think it's going to take folks, you know, like you guys -- and not people like me, because they really don't care what I have to say, but, you know working together to help, you know, spend that money and

to reduce GHGs. And it's going to be very difficult, but we certainly want to be partners in that effort.

So thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Thanks.

MS. MARTINSON: Good morning, Madam Chair, members of the Board, Supervisors. Cara Martinson on behalf of the California State Association of Counties, CSAC. And I won't reiterate the points of my colleagues, but I'd just like to highlight a few things that they said. We do think that there's a much larger role for local governments to play in helping the State meet its climate and energy goals.

And we sincerely thank you for including the concept of the cross-cutting local program in the investment plan. You know, a lot of the creative and innovate work has been done at the local level and percolated up, the PACE Program, Community Choice Aggregation, and other such really innovative programs.

And as Steve mentioned, the Beacon Program provides that best practice structure, and that information sharing network that is really that critical component of a local program. We do think that there is a large role and great need for disadvantaged communities within a local program. But we also see a need in smaller and more rural communities. So we think any local program

should be expanded to include those communities.

And just we'd like to continue the partnership with CARB, with your staff, and with the legislature to help this come to fruition. Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

Mr. White, welcome

MR. WHITE: Madam Chairman, Board members, John White with the Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies. A very interesting day to celebrate and also reflect on both Paris and the work that lies ahead. I wanted to just touch on some things that come to mind when reviewing this document. I realize it's a work in progress, and we have much more work to do, but there's some points I wanted to be sure were in your mind, at least from our thinking on this.

First is, as Dr. Wallerstein mentioned, we need to pay special attention to the needs and opportunities in the Salton Sea, Imperial/Riverside County area. This -- these are disadvantaged communities. There's a huge economic potential for combining economic development from geothermal with the electric vehicle program, ironically enough, because we can extract lithium from the geothermal brine and create a lower GHG footprint from the lithium that goes in our batteries, plus a domestic source, plus a revenue stream for geothermal.

Now, this sounds a little esoteric, and my colleague Jan McFarland, who's a board member and co-founder of CEERT has submitted some comments on behalf of her client Energy Source, but I would just urge a deeper look at this opportunity, because there's some definite synergies, and certainly some needs given where the lithium currently comes from and how limited its supply currently is.

Secondly, with regard to biomass facilities and support, there's a couple of cautions I wanted to Illuminate. First of all, we never got the supply of fuel right with the biomass facilities that we built. We have, in some cases, had an imbalance, partly because we didn't get rid of open burning. This is something that needs to come back. It's time to put an end to open burning and use these biomass facilities for that purpose.

But these facilities have to be properly permitted, have to reduce their emissions. They have some air quality impacts. So we need to keep the fuel supply balance in mind. And this is also true with the new facilities to be sure if we're going to build and support them, that there, in fact, is the right amount of fuel to match the technology capability.

Lastly on methane, I think we need to -- it's passed time to start thinking of methane as an air

pollutant that needs to be permitted and regulated like an air pollutant. The experience that we are having down at Aliso Canyon suggests that we better get going with the infrared monitoring and remote sensing. This is not an acceptable outcome. It's something that should have been prevented. It's something that was missed, and we need to take some attention and some resources for the monitoring of methane.

The other thing is we should recognize while we need to support capital investment incentives like we did with the Moyer Program for facility -- technologies to reduce methane emissions and convert the fuel biomethane. There also needs to be a long-term regulatory strategy.

And I think this is something that the short-lived climate pollutants plan has, but we need to have a combination of incentives and regulations.

Thank you

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I like that last word. Perfect.

All right. Ms. Passero. Yes.

MS. PASSERO: Hi. Thank you. Michelle Passero with The Nature Conservancy. I'll join the chorus of all the previous comments before in thanking ARB staff and the other State agencies for a terrific job in developing this comprehensive plan.

We support it overall, and we especially appreciate the incorporation of natural and working lands. I think it's called natural resources in some parts. It is a critical sector for us to include in our long-term climate goals. And we really need to incorporate the sector, if we do want to meet those long-term ambitions.

We are -- we endorse -- there's a suite of actions there that are numerated for both reducing emissions from natural working lands and also sequestering more carbon. We think these are all great ideas. And we also commend the acknowledgement that these sectors, whether it's natural resources or transportation or energy, have some interconnectedness. And you -- we appreciate the acknowledgement and effort to integrate sectors and enumerate ideas for how to do that.

So I just want to offer two suggestions really to build on what's already there. One for natural and working lands, we recommend conducting a statewide analysis to really more thoroughly assess the greenhouse gas reduction potential of this sector. We've done some preliminary analysis, and are finding that it really is significant.

And you can do this in a way to identify where certain activities or interventions can occur. And by doing this, you can not only identify sort of the range of

reduction potential, but also how you might be able to combine in creating incentives for activities that sequester carbon or reduce emissions and combine that with our other goals around the State, such as safeguarding California for our climate resilience and also our Clean Water Action plan -- or State Water Action Plan. So there's a real opportunity to do that and really look to enhance overall benefits.

The second suggestion really builds on the comments that Cara from CSAC made. And it builds on this notion of integrating the sectors and the good recommendation for local climate action in disadvantaged communities. And we think that if there is room for an adjustment to the plan, it is to have a comparable recommendation for local climate action in other communities, both rural and urban, where we can integrate the really good language that there is in there around green infrastructure and greening the built environment in urban and rural communities, and combining that with other sectors to optimize reductions and also enhance other public benefits.

You could do this at a project scale, and also incorporate it into planning upfront. And so there's an opportunity really to transform how we do our projects and development and advance multiple goals.

1 So thank you.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. BOCCADORO: She was trying to jump the gun.

(Laughter.)

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: Oh.

6 MR. BOCCADORO: Michael Boccadoro.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: No, no, no.

MR. BOCCADORO: Michael Boccadoro on behalf of the Dairy Cares and the Agricultural Energy Consumers Association. We appreciate the opportunity.

We've been working closely with staff, not just on this investment plan, but also on the short-lived climate pollutant plans, and are particularly, you know, thankful that dairy digesters are included in the investment plan. We think that's critical.

Coming out of Paris, there's obviously going to be a focus on short-lived climate pollutants in California and dairy digesters in terms of methane reduction represent a tremendous opportunity.

With that in mind, I think one very straightforward recommendation we can make is that short-lived climate pollutants should receive the same sort of continuous funding that we currently have for transit, for affordable housing, and other high-speed rail

and other projects. It needs that sort of commitment in this State.

The draft short-lived climate pollutants plan that's under consideration and under development by your staff currently also has a very, very significant and ambitious goal for dairy methane reduction. It's going to require several hundred dairy digesters to be built in this State over the course of the next 10 years. And the only way that's going to happen is if there is a significant long-term commitment of funding. The dairy industry is prepared to work with you to make those projects happen, but they cannot and will not happen without significant funding, dedicated funding annually for the next five years minimum and probably 10 years.

It's critical. These projects are expensive. But on the flip side of that, they represent among the best bang for the buck in terms of GHG reduction that can be achieved with the investment of cap-and-trade proceeds. Later today or tomorrow a study is going to be released by Ramboll Environ. It's going to document that these projects can reduce one ton of methane for every \$2 in GGRF funds invested, when you take into consideration the short-lived climate pollutant global warming potential nature of these gases.

These projects also provide tremendous

co-benefits. They not only reduce methane, a potent short-lived climate pollutant as we move and transition from energy production with these facilities to biomethane production for clean transportation fuel, these projects in the San Joaquin Valley have the opportunity to tremendously reduce PM and NOx by replacing diesel use with renewable natural gas.

These benefits can provide significant benefits to disadvantaged communities through the reduction of NOx and PM. And so it's critically important. We've been pushing the State to make a long-term investment of at least \$100 million each of the next five years. That will enable us to build and begin building and meeting the goals that have been set out by the short-lived climate pollutant plan. But without it, it won't happen.

The State spends a lot of time talking about leadership, and we have the opportunity to show the nation and the world how to have a sustainable dairy program, but it won't happen without that investment.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

Hi.

MS. HOLMES-GEN: Hello good afternoon -- morning.
Bonnie Holmes-Gen with the American Lung Association in
California. And I want to, first of all, just thank you,

Chair Nichols, for representing California in our leadership and innovation and sharing so much of our great work in Paris. And we're excited about the agreement.

The American Lung Association supports cap-and-trade investments as a critical tool to promote our climate progress, and integral, as we've heard, and reminded by the air districts to the achievement of our federal clean air standards. I wanted to join the chorus of others to say, you know, we are concerned, especially right now, that the current funds that have been built up are moved out as quickly as possible, and that we don't delay and wait for the next budget year. And we know that we all need to work together with the Legislature and the Governor to make this happen and get those funds out, get health and air quality benefits.

I just wanted to share a couple of key priorities from the Lung Association. We want to make sure that all these investments work to break California's dependence on harmful fossil fuels. And that is a key priority, speeding the transition to zero emission transportation. And we're concerned that we really need to step up our efforts in this area. And this is a key way that we can reduce daily health emergencies linked to our State's pollution problems, largely from transportation. So this included the rapid expansion of zero emission vehicles and

fueling infrastructure, expanding ZEVs in all sectors.

We need to work on passenger freight, off-road.

We need to, of course, work toward our sustainable freight strategy. Zero emission buses are critical to help lead the way toward other heavy-duty electric vehicle options.

And we also want to just mention the importance of assisting in the transition at the city and county level with city and county fleets. It's really important to help promote these partnerships. And I've heard a lot of really good discussion about how cities and counties can work together with you and be climate leaders. And we want to help promote that.

Another key priority is to maximize health -health co-benefits. And we're going to be looking to
support, in every way we can, the short-lived climate
pollutant plan and looking to our projects that are going
to deliver additional health and air quality benefits for
communities. And this is an extremely important focus in
this plan, and making sure that we're improving air
quality for communities near busy roadways and ports and
railyards in areas like the San Joaquin valley, of course,
with so many toxic sources.

And finally, we want to support the new effort in this strategy to focus on wood stove replacement programs.

And that's another area for an important partnership with

the air districts, and the focus on integrated projects and supporting climate action plans at the local level.

So, in summary - eight seconds - we look forward to working with you. And we're especially excited about helping to get the word out about all these great funding opportunities and working with our health partners.

Thanks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

Ms. Tutt

MS. TUTT: Good morning. Eileen Tutt with the California Electric Transportation Coalition. Thank you, Chairman Nichols, members, and staff.

I'm with -- I wanted to say that -- I just wanted to remind everybody that all of our members, not just the vehicle technology providers, truck/bus equipment, all of our members, including the investor-owned utilities and the publicly-owned utilities in California are very, very committed to supporting this plan, and supporting your efforts here today.

I want to say that my Christmas present to you is that I requested that they just let me represent them, rather than all of them coming up today.

(Laughter.)

MS. TUTT: But you can be assured that they 25 are --

So

1 (Laughter.) CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. It was a good choice. 2 3 MS. TUTT: -- behind you 100 percent. We've got 4 your back. I want to say particularly that we appreciate 5 the balance of incentives and regulatory efforts in this 6 The importance of incentives cannot be 7 overestimated. And your support of those incentives has 8 been tremendous. The implementation of the incentive 9 programs by this agency is outstanding. It's a very, very exciting time to be a Californian. Sorry that Erik is 10 11 going to miss out on all the good work that you're going to do. 12 13 CHAIR NICHOLS: He'll be part of it. 14 MS. TUTT: But we're excited to be part of your 15 efforts --16 CHAIR NICHOLS: He'll be part of it. 17 MS. TUTT: -- and really, really proud of 18 California's being recognized in Paris as leaders in the 19 world, and eager to help you continue that leadership.

thank you. CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning, Ms. Ferrera.

MS. FERRERA: Good morning, Chair and members.

Anna Ferrera on behalf of the School Energy Coalition, an organization made up of K-14 schools.

are school districts, consultants, everyone who builds.

And we're especially focused on energy and water projects
for California's students. We do align ourselves with the
remarks of Deborah Moore and Ian Padilla.

We appreciate schools being included in the plan. And we believe we can be a very active part of having projects all over the State. We can measure -- we can easily get the disadvantaged communities numbers for you from our free and reduced meal numbers throughout the State.

I would only add also that, you know, we continue to urge for funding mechanisms, specifically for schools. Because of our unique situation with students, curriculum can be a part of that as you've heard. We have -- and also a very unique opportunity with Proposition 39. It's interesting to me to hear people throw Proposition 39 money around, you know, as if it's a ton of money that schools have to spend on energy efficiency. It's not.

But what it does do, is it allows us to do baseline measurements. It's requiring us to do baseline measurements of our usage for energy and schools as a requirement of funding. It also provides for benchmarking, so we know where we want to go. We're starting a number of lighting and HVAC projects right now. But really to go beyond that, to really attain zero net

energy status is now more attainable than ever. And I think schools are very interested. And while they're focused there, I think this timing is fabulous with the plan. And we only ask that you give us the opportunity to continue the work that schools are already doing.

In addition, the water pieces are also very important, the restrictions. Schools are land rich, as you heard. We also have, you know, the students who -- and the parents who are very concerned about how much water we're using, but we also have to keep students safe and fields and sports facilities in tact along with partnerships we have with local communities to share those facilities as well.

So we would emphasize water and energy for schools, but also looking at some of the other opportunities, everything from transportation, charging stations, the things that Deborah mentioned. And we already have partnerships with agencies such as the Department of Ed. We really appreciate the SPI's letter on -- in support of schools in the plan, and also with the Energy Commission through Prop 39 and DWR through the DROPS program on drought situations.

So again, we look to be partners with you and appreciate the changes that have been made thus far.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Our last witness is Allison Chan. And I'm going to then comment on our schedule here in a minute.

MS. CHAN: Hi. Thanks so much for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Allison Chan, and I manage pollution prevention programs for Save the Bay in Oakland. I'm a relative newcomer to this process, but I'm really excited for the possibilities that it creates.

So I'd like to thank you for the emphasis on green infrastructure and urban greening co-benefits in the investment plan, which not only have the potential to mitigate urban heat islands and sequester carbon, but are also really important strategies for filtering pollutants from stormwater before it flows into waterways.

This is a priority for advocacy groups, municipalities, and agencies throughout the Bay Area, who acknowledge that climate resiliency strategies in our region must include multi-benefit projects that address water quality. So thank you to you and your staff for your work on this plan and for including these elements. And we look forward to working with you, the legislature, other departments and stakeholders in this room to -- as this process moves forward.

So thanks very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. All right. We're

going to finish up this item and then take about a 10-minute break in order to both give the court reporter a break and also to include some people for the next item. So I just wanted to let people know in case they were planning.

But I believe that we will finish with that staff presentation on the lab and the discussion by about 1:00 o'clock. And so we won't be taking a lunch break. That would be -- I think that's everybody's preference, given the time of year and all the other demands on their time.

So I think it's -- we've finished with the public testimony. It's time for Board members, if they have any questions or comments, starting down on the end with Supervisor Serna.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you, Chair Nichols.

First, let me express my thanks to our fine staff for all the great work that they've done to prepare the revised draft investment plan for our consideration today, and for the public's. And I also want to thank all the individuals representing various organizations that testified here today.

I specifically want to call out the effort to hold numerous public workshops. I think the outreach effort for this was extraordinary as was expressed by Bill Magavern and others. So I think there's a special thanks

there that's well deserved.

The revised investment plan does make mention, appropriately so I think, of -- it cites the fact that the scoping plan -- the 2016 scoping plan is going to be very crucial for a number of reasons, many of which were mentioned here today. And I think it's worth mentioning that we have a newly constituted EJAC. And I think moving forward that that organization, that committee is going to be very instrumental in future investments. I just want to make mention of that this morning.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Yes, Supervisor Gioia.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Thanks again to everyone who really participated across all the agencies. So I just had a couple thoughts or suggestions. I think there's some good new provisions regarding increasing outreach to disadvantaged communities and increasing outreach in rural communities. And specifically under disadvantaged communities, it talks about hiring a contractor. That's great.

But I think under both sections, you out to make reference to work with local government, to work with cities, counties, and school districts as part of that outreach. It's not just about working with the contractor. Those of us who are in local government

understand the best way often to do outreach, it gets them invested in this. So I think you should specifically call out cities, counties, school districts, local government as part of who you'll working with and do outreach in local communities for both rural and disadvantaged.

Then under the co-benefits section on page four, where it talks about to the max -- to the extent feasible to maximize co-benefits. I know we talk about that all the time, but it seems more meaningful to say that we also want to or at least include some statement that in disbursing these funds we want agencies to encourage and incentivize maximizing co-benefits, not just -- I mean, current extent -- to the maximum extent feasible is great. It just doesn't sound as assertive as encouraging and incentivizing the maximization of co-benefits, so how you capture that concept.

And just finally, I know that we have the separate document, which is the funding guidelines defining what it means to benefit a disadvantaged community, and you link to that. So I know a lot -- some of the questions that have come up from speakers really are also addressed in that other document, which really is much more detailed and specific about what it means to benefit a disadvantaged community. And we had a lot of great input into that. So appreciate that.

And I'll just close with the thought, I agree with the speakers who said we really need to all work with the legislature to make sure that the funding is all allocated, because that's -- there can be the plan, but ultimately the following through with the allocation. And so I just wanted to second that thought. So thanks.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Ms. Berg.

VICE CHAIR BERG: I, too, want to thank everybody, especially the stakeholders that have put in numerous hours and times and thoughts as to -- for staff, but staff you've done an incredible job and thank you very much for that.

I also want to second anything that we can do to help after the fact and to assure that the funding is understood, and whatever we can do to help the legislature and get this money into the hands of these projects. I'm on board and happy to help.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Great comments.

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Thank you.

And again, it's a recognition of staff's work that there are all these S's on the testimony. So clearly, a lot of great work and has been mentioned the engagement of the public in the workshops has been really tremendous and important and not always easy to achieve.

So well done.

Just a couple of things. One, over and over, the themes of methane and wood management, which are obviously so important, and are things that have been talked about in the past, but good they're now coming into the fore.

And another neglected -- we've talked about being more inclusive, in terms of being sure that schools are included. Well, I'm also thinking health institutions are a huge, in a sense, missed opportunity. And they're certainly -- in the rural communities, you think what are the major employers? Well, maybe government, certainly the schools, and also the health institutions, the local hospitals, the local rural health clinic operations and so on.

So it's something that we've neglected, but certainly can be engaged and could be a very important partner in many of these things. Maybe that follows more under the sustainable communities, but --

CHAIR NICHOLS: There are many ways to organize some of these ideas. And I think the schools coalition has done a good job of mobilizing and pointing out the different ways in which schools can benefit from these programs. I think we could do a sort of a cross-sectoral discussion to a number of different entities and hospitals. And health institutions are a good example of

that, where there are different pots of funding out there that need to be accessed. And one of the things that I know staff not only here but elsewhere in the Government is thinking about is how to do a better job of consolidating, coordinating, and not confusing people about those opportunities.

I think we all share that goal. Not always easy to make it transparent, but that clearly is something we have to work on, but it's a good comment.

Others in this direction?

I will face the opposite direction and start from the outside in, if anybody has comments they want to make.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: I just had -- I would like some clarification from staff. I was struck by the commenters regarding adding the State Department of Education to the --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Oh, to the Climate Action Team?

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: -- Climate Action Team.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Sure. Does anybody want to address how the Climate Action Team is actually structured? My understanding is that it was done initially via statute, yeah.

Ms. Chang, do you want to --

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: Originally, that was done by statute. And I think in later years -- and I

was actually looking to see if CalEPA is still here. The Climate Action Team is actually convened by the Secretary of the Environmental Protection Agency. And they have included other agencies in the meetings, so that we have a more coordinated effort across the entire administration. So CalEPA was here when that was discussed and that's something we can talk about with them.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Other commenters?

Mr. De La Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I appreciate the city and county folks who came and spoke. I think being able to work with cities and counties with local government and school districts is very important in two ways. One, it's -- they tend to be a little more sophisticated in getting projects done. They do things in their facilities with their vehicles, et cetera all the time. And so being able to swap things out or improve them or change them, they know the process. They're used to deadlines with outside funding, et cetera.

So you can get stuff done through these governmental entities relatively quickly like within a fiscal year, which is very important for us to show the results of what we're trying to do.

Secondly, in many lower income communities, the

101

```
1
    heavily impacted communities, these entities, these
    government agencies, whether it's the schools or local
 2
 3
    government are a big player, because there's not a lot of
 4
    heavy economic activity going on in some of these
5
    communities. Some of the biggest employers tend to be the
6
    schools or the city or county government in some of these
7
    communities.
                  So you're getting -- you're getting a quick
    bang for your buck, and you're getting it in the places
8
9
    where we need it. And so I want to continue to push that
10
    within our plans, with the administration, with the
11
    Governor's office and Finance, and with the legislature,
12
    because I really think that's an opportunity for us in
13
    this fiscal year to really push some of these projects out
14
    into these communities quickly.
15
```

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

16 Ms. Miller.

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

17 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Mitchell.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Mitchell, excuse me. I looked straight at you. Sorry.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: There is a Judy Miller too, I think.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I apologize.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: She's a newscaster.

CHAIR NICHOLS: It begins with an M.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you. There's

several points that I want to touch on here. One of the sectors that was mentioned was the waste management sector. And this is a sector that sort of crosses over into a number of other areas that are important, waste to energy, so we get into the energy segment of this; biofuels; and agricultural lands come into play here.

We had one of our speakers talk about dairy digesters. The need for the infrastructure for dairy digesters, as well as other kinds of waste diversion infrastructure. And so a lot of money could be spent just in that infrastructure to accomplish what is laid out here in this plan.

Along those lines, I think we can also look at financing. It was mentioned in the plan, I believe it was on page 29, there was some talk about financing mechanisms and the efficiency of financing. Dairy digesters and waste diversion is one area where I think you could use financing mechanisms. There should be private capital somewhere in that mix, because there's a way to make money off of these kinds of projects.

So I think leveraging these kinds of projects with financing, loans, private investment for that kind of infrastructure would be important in actually implementing what we're laying out here, and how we can get it done.

Clean transportation is really close to my heart.

It's really important, I think. It's one of the most important things that we're doing in the Air Resources

Board. I think there needs to be some emphasis on heavy-duty sectors, class 7, class 8 kinds of trucks and vehicles. The technology on that needs to be further developed. And I would like to see our funding, you know, for that be ongoing.

The other thing that's really important is the rebates for CVRP. And we have a new program this year, the EFMP Plus-Up Program, which is very successful in the areas where it's being implemented. So I would like to emphasize how important that program is, and that we work on making sure that keeps going.

A lot of the programs that are going to be implemented have co-benefits. And one of the co-benefits would be not just reducing greenhouse gas -- gases, but also reducing the toxics in the pollution. And many of the things that we're doing can combine to reach both of those objectives.

But the other objectives that are mentioned and called out are the stimulation of the economy, that can happen along with this, and aid to our disadvantaged communities. Both Hector and John have mentioned the role of local government in what we do here. That can't be overemphasized. They are really a good tool for outreach.

And they are the entities that are going to be implementing the sustainable communities strategies. So using them for that outreach. And reaching also to disadvantaged communities, that is a direct line for local government to reach those communities that are -- that we're trying to reach in our programs.

So CSAC, the League of Cities, the Beacon

Program, the Institute for Local Government, all of those,
and schools as well, are good partners for us to be using
as we implement some of the programs here.

Thank you.

2.4

on.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: We've heard from the presentation and some of the testimony about all these great programs. And actually people proposed some new programs, even including some of my fellow Board members. And there -- you know, they're all good -- they're all good intentioned. Many of them have huge potential benefits. But at the risk of being the skunk at the party -- (Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: A role that you hesitate to take

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: He relishes it.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: -- I have a few concerns.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Let me just start out by saying kind of the words I've heard and not -- and more importantly, not heard. I haven't heard words about leveraging, scaling, opportunities, rational, economic analysis, cost effectiveness, science based. I haven't -- I don't -- barely heard any of those words through all the testimony, all the presentation.

I heard the word innovation a little bit. And I would point out that in Paris, one of the biggest themes of all was innovation -- and, of course, technology innovation that we heard a little bit about here. I did hear the word performance -- using performance criteria in one testimony.

This troubles me, because this is a lot of money, and it's going to be expanding. And I really think that while it's called an investment plan, I think the word strategic also is another word I barely heard. And I think as we go forward, we want to make sure that we are investing this money in a, strategic, science-based, rational cost effective way.

And I -- I know I'm being naive. I know the history of this. But as we go forward, I guess I'd make a plea that we try to move a little in the direction of some of these concepts that I was just bringing up. Because at

the end of the day, if we're going to achieve 40 percent reduction in greenhouse gases, 80 percent reduction, we need some major transformations. We need some major innovation, and we've got a lot of funding as Secretary Rodriguez talked about. You know, this is a great opportunity.

So I want to make sure -- you know, we certainly want to respond. There's lots of goals we want to respond to. And, you know, in government, we have lots of competing constituencies. But I just leave it with that general plea, that, you know, we really pay attention to doing this right in the long time -- term, and not just handing out a lot of money to all the different constituencies out there that want money for good causes usually.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: At the risk of being tainted by Professor Sperling's skunkiness, I have to -(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: -- agree with him about having strategic planning being part of this. I realize that the staff and the Climate Action Team and CalEPA have, in fact, tried to capture strategy in the investment plan. But I agree that most of the testimony didn't

involve that kind of thinking, so I agree with Dr. Sperling.

2.4

I have a few other comments, mostly in agreement with other members of the Board who have already expressed these ideas, but I do think it's worth emphasizing. I was struck by the -- one witness's testimony about disadvantaged communities need assistance in taking up the opportunities that are available from the investment plan. And so I support what Supervisor Gioia, I guess, Supervisor Serna as well, Mr. De La Torre, Ms. Mitchell said about working with local governments of disadvantaged communities. And I think we need to reach out and help them take advantage of opportunities.

And I also agree with several comments about use of forest waste for energy. As somebody who spent a lot of my career studying the health effects of wood smoke, whether those are in homes of folks in the developing world or from forest fires wildland fires in our State, we do have to deal with the forest waste issue, and I don't think we should just let it pile up. So I think that being smart about how we approach forest waste for energy conversion, for example, is an important and strategic way for us to go forward.

And again, I wanted to support what has been said about waste -- organic waste diversion for energy and

greenhouse gas reduction, and the appropriate investments in infrastructure to make that more real.

And finally, I really want to endorse what Ms. Mitchell said about in part of the strategic thinking, co-benefits -- health co-benefits always have to be considered.

My last comment was just, in general, I'd like to wish the best for CARB staff in this holiday season. I'm really proud to be a member of your Board and you guys do great work.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. I think we can all endorse that comment.

You know, I have been known to tease my fellow Board member about his comments at times, but I want to also associate myself with Dr. Sperling's remarks. And I want to actually do it in a somewhat more concrete way by turning our attention to the resolution.

And while we're actually looking at the resolution that is before us, I would like to comment that I believe that if this money in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund were under the control of the Air Resources Board, the document that you see before you might look somewhat different. And that's not to say that there's blame to be cast elsewhere. It is, as you correctly identified, the result of the fact that the funding that

now is available to the State through the GGRF, and as a result of our Cap-and-Trade Program is the first new source of funding for many starved programs within the State that do have relevance and benefit in the direction that we're trying to go.

So there's nothing that's addressed in this plan that is not appropriate and there's nothing in it that doesn't have some, in some cases many, co-benefits associated with it.

But in -- there are two things that I think are missing. One is the recognition, this is only one source of funding in a very large State budget. And when you talk about leveraging, it would be really great if we were using the kind of thinking that we're applying to this program to look at our expenditures for many other parts of the State budget in a more strategic way. I think we could all -- we could all wish for that.

And secondly, I would say that it is a work-in-progress. The investment plan, although it should provide some general guidance, isn't a budget. It isn't even close to a budget. And when you look at what's actually in the budget that the legislature is, in fact, considering right now, there are elements of it that I think go further in the direction of what you are suggesting and others that perhaps don't, but that's where

the real battle takes place.

Nonetheless, I think that this is a document that could be improved from my perspective. It isn't -- it isn't all that it could be. And I think it should be looked at as an opportunity maybe on a continuing basis to sort of refine some of everybody's thinking about how the State is taking on the big challenges of dealing with global climate change and dealing with local priorities at the same time.

So having said that, I would skip all the resolution -- all the whereas language, which talks about all the importance of this stuff and sort of move on to the whereases. And it seems to me that within the whereases and in the further resolveds in particular, there are some opportunities at a minimum for us to pass the document along with our concurrence that it met the procedural requirements and, you know, good work went into it without having to specifically endorse expenditures that are contained in the plan.

You know, I think it's appropriate at a minimum if you were for the back-up, you know, to question whether we really want to support the funding for these programs as opposed to other programs, not because we're opposed to those programs, but because we might like to see them consolidated or potentially some other things done. Maybe

we want to, you know, to reserve some judgment on some of those things, because actually, in a sense, nobody cares, because this is a document, as I said, that has a lift of its own. But to the extent that the ARB is putting its imprimatur on it, I think it's appropriate for us to ask for some of the things that Ms. Mitchell and you and Dr. Balmes and others have suggested, you know, be included.

So since we probably don't have time to work that owl out, and we certainly don't have time to, you know, revise the document, I would just send it along and say, you know, we've looked at it, good work went into it, and, you know, we'll continue to work on this, or something to that effect.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: How about we do have one further be it resolved one that just adds in some of the words that I mentioned that be it resolved that we look forward to investment plan taking into account strategic considerations and scientific and economic considerations, that it be leveraging, that it be, you know, investments that can scale, that are cost effective, you know, some mix of those words.

CHAIR NICHOLS: If you would like to move that, I think there's others who would second it. I see a nod here to my left. So, yes, absolutely.

Staff, can you add a be it further resolved that

112

```
1
   reflects the need for the investment plan to be updated
    and to be implemented in ways that reflect strategic
 2
 3
    thinking and looking at the cost effectiveness and the
 4
    scientific benefits of various programs, is that something
5
    that you can do?
6
             EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: We certainly can.
                                                           I
7
    think the message came clear and consistent across the
8
    Board, yes.
9
             CHAIR NICHOLS:
                             Yeah. Okay.
10
             BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: And hopefully someone
11
   will read it somewhere.
             CHAIR NICHOLS: Someone will read it somewhere, I
12
13
    think so.
14
             (Laughter.)
15
             CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Any other?
16
             If not, that's a motion to approve the resolution
17
    as amended?
18
             And seconded by?
19
             BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I'll second.
20
             CHAIR NICHOLS: Dr. Balmes.
             All in favor, please signify by saying aye?
21
22
             (Unanimous aye vote.)
23
             CHAIR NICHOLS: Any opposition?
24
             Any abstentions?
25
             Seeing none. Thank you very much all who
```

participated. And we will be in recess until 12:00. We'll come back at noon. Thanks, everybody.

(Off record: 11:43 AM)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record: 12:07 PM)

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right, ladies and gentlemen. We're going to reconvene the Board meeting here. We're all enjoying the break, but it's time to move on to our last item of the day, which is an update to the Board on the project to -- on the project to rebuild and replace our motor vehicle engine testing and research operations into a new facility, and where we are on the preliminary site evaluation.

And this is a project which I think many people know is very dear to my heart, both as a Southern Californian and as somebody who is constantly being reminded of the importance that this laboratory has for our overall operations as the foundation of our technical excellence.

If I hadn't known it before, I think the recent activity with respect to Volkswagen has brought that home in really stark relief as the world literally wants to come out and take pictures at the El Monte lab. And while I am very proud of our people and of the work that they did, showing off the El Monte lab is not necessarily a

source of the greatest excitement, when you realize that all of this work happens in a place, which is overcrowded and not energy efficient, and not nearly as pleasant a place to work as you would think for our people. So with that, I think I should turn it over to Mr. Corey.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Madam Chair, if I may?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: I was involved in the subcommittee on this issue many months ago, and found a need to recuse myself from the subcommittee. And although there is no legal conflict of interest for me to continue here at this Board level on the issue, out of an abundance of caution, I will recuse myself from the item in order to avoid any appearance of conflict of interest.

So I wish you all Happy Holidays. I will leave the dais and leave the meeting at this time, and wish you all a good holiday season.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

Mr. Corey, would you introduce the item, please? EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I will. Thanks, Chair Nichols.

I'm pleased to report that significant progress has been made on ARB's proposed Southern California consolidation project, since the project was included in

the Governor's budget for fiscal year '15-'16. Since July, staff, with the assistance of the Department of General Services, represented here with us at the table, has been evaluating sites in Riverside and Pomona, and staff is performing a complete and open evaluation of the sites and their respective surrounding areas. We're confident our efforts will be provide a site that is conducive to a quality work environment while offering various opportunities for program staff and visitors. In addition, we believe that the facility will provide a unique opportunity for university collaboration.

Deidre Cyprian, Space Acquisition Manager, will now provide the staff presentation.

Deidre.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Thank you,
Richard. Good morning.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Your microphone is not on.

20 SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Okay. Thank
21 you.

Thank you, Richard. Good afternoon, Chair

Nichols and members of the Board. In today's

presentation, I will provide you with an update on our

efforts to evaluate potential sites for ARB's new

emissions testing and research facility in Southern California.

--000--

2.4

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Here are the topics that I will cover today.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The following slides provide some background that will help put the site evaluations in perspective.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The Southern California operations are the cornerstone of ARB's mobile source program. With the focus on emissions testing and research, these operations have supported virtually every mobile source action that ARB has implemented.

In the future, the Southern California facilities will be critical to the development of the State

Implementation Plan, the scoping plan, and the sustainable freight initiative. With upgraded testing capabilities, we will be able to provide the technical data and engineering solutions necessary to meet our existing and future air quality and climate change mandates. Some of the key programs are listed on this slide.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Our

operations are currently located at the State-owned Haagen-Smit Laboratory and five adjacent leased facilities in El Monte. The Haagen-Smit Laboratory opened in 1971 and was designed to support 40 staff. Today, there are about 400 staff with 90 percent of these staff associated with testing and research activities.

ARB also operates a limited heavy-duty test facility at the Metropolitan Transit Authority in Los Angeles. These operations are conducted under an MOU with MTA. In total, ARB occupies approximately 135,000 square feet of office and laboratory space in Southern California.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Existing Southern California facilities are now stretched beyond their capacity --

CHAIR NICHOLS: May I ask that you move the mic even a little closer. Sorry.

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: No problem.

Is this better?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, it is. Thanks.

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Okay. The existing Southern California facilities are now stretched beyond their capacity, cannot support ARB's existing and future testing needs, do not provide adequate

infrastructure to expand or upgrade equipment, and are not energy efficient. Therefore, ARB is proposing to relocate and consolidate existing operations in a proposed new emissions testing and research facility.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The goals for the project are listed on this slide and establish the overall framework for not only site selection, but construction and operation of the proposed new facility.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: In designing, constructing, and operating the facility, ARB will seek to establish a model for sustainable laboratories by pursuing the highest level of LEED certification as well as zero net energy. Due to the nature of testing operations, this will be a challenge. However, pursuing these goals is consistent with ARB's mission on climate change, as well as the Governor's initiatives for green buildings.

I will now present few facts about the proposed new facility.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: ARB worked with an outside consultant to complete a feasibility study for the new facility. The study concluded that a facility size of approximately 299,000 square feet is necessary to

meet ARB's needs. The site requirements are approximately 14 to 17 acres, and the total project cost is estimated at \$366 million.

Additional land may be necessary to support ZNE. If all goes well, ARB would take occupancy in 2020.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The study was the basis for this year's approved budget proposal. In the budget, ARB was authorized \$0.2 million for evaluating sites, and \$5.7 million for developing design guidelines and performance criteria that are used to select the team that will design and build the facility.

For the fiscal year '17-'18 budget year, ARB will need to submit another budget proposal for the balance of the funds needed for the project.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: ARB staff plans on releasing a staff report in January that presents the staff's recommendations. The Board will consider the staff's recommendations in February. If appropriate, the Board will approve a resolution that sets forth the Board's recommendations for a site, and then forward the recommendations to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee for review.

After review, and any appropriate updates, ARB

will then forward the recommendation to DGS who will then complete the process of acquiring the site.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Siting is typically the lengthiest element of these types of projects and is critical to the overall schedule. Any delays in the sight selection process can result in increased construction costs. In addition, from a program perspective, we are anxious to move the project forward as expeditiously as possible to meeting our testing needs.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Since the budget was approved, we have been working with DGS to evaluate various sites.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: To provide a common framework for this evaluation, ARB and DGS developed a site evaluation matrix that included a number of different attributes. We are using this matrix to evaluate the three sites shown on this slide.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide lists examples of some of the general attribute categories we are using. As you can see, the categories include legal, technical, environmental, transportation and

circulation, neighborhood characteristics, and the potential for site-specific LEED points. We will present the results of this analysis in the January report.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: We are also considering other factors. This includes the requirement that the 14 to 17 acres be available at no cost. Other considerations include the ability to move quickly, the potential availability of additional land for zero net energy or future expansion, access to campus resources, and the potential for ARB/university collaborations.

These collaborations are win-win propositions that benefit both ARB and the affected university. The following slides highlight examples of potential collaborations.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: General program collaborations are not specific to any educational program. As you can see, there is a wide variety of potential opportunities. Relative to the last bullet, ARB does plan on establishing a broad intellectual partnership that will help govern both the design and use of the new facility. This intellectual partnership will involve national and international experts in the field of engine and vehicle emissions, testing, and research.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide provides examples of potential program collaborations specific to educational programs. Opportunities in this areas would be developed based on the needs of ARB and the affected university.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: I will now present information specific to the three proposed sites.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide shows an overall view of the three potential sites and the existing ARB facilities. The proposed Pomona site is approximately 17 miles from the existing facilities. The Riverside sites are approximately 45 miles from the existing facilities.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Here is a closer view of the two Riverside sites. The technology court site is located about three miles from the main university campus and about four miles from downtown Riverside. The Iowa site is located less than one mile from the main campus and about two miles from downtown Riverside. The two sites are approximately three miles apart.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The first Riverside site that we evaluated is located about one half mile from the university's Center for Environmental Research and Technology. CE-CERT has long been a partner with ARB on emissions testing and air pollution research.

The technology court site is located in University Research Park and involves light industrial and warehousing.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The acreage available at this site is about 19 acres and is a combination of public and private land. The county owns about seven and a half acres, and has indicated that they would acquire the private land to make up the needed acreage. They have also indicated a willingness to acquire additional land, if needed.

The site is adjacent to the 1,100-acre Box Spring Mountain Reserve. Other nearby site attributes include a new metro station, a new housing development under construction about one mile from the site, and a grocery store in the planning stage. The county also indicated that they expect the opening of the metro station and the addition of our facility would spur additional mixed-use development near the site, but there are no specific plans

available at this time.

2

3

1

--000--

appears to have sufficient acreage available to support

the project, as well as acreage necessary to support ZNE.

It is a very low traffic area and has easy access to the

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This site

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

freeways. As mentioned previously, it is near CE-CERT, and that would facilitate collaboration on ARB research contracts. The site does have very limited access to restaurants transit and diverse uses. The site may have slightly increased construction costs due to the uneven topography of the site, and the elongated nature of the property makes it a little bit more difficult for design purposes. Now, let's take a look at the second Riverside site.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: As you can see on this slide, the site is bordered by agricultural property owned by UCR and by retail and shopping. The Marriott Hotel is located about half a block from the northwest point of the property.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The Iowa Avenue site consists of about 18 acres. The land is part of a 100-acre parcel that is planned for campus

development. The university has indicated that they would consider further discussion on additional land to support ZNE, but has not committed any specific property at this time.

The land is likely designated as prime agricultural land and is currently being used as a part of UCR's agricultural research program. The university has indicated that any ongoing research would be relocated, if ARB recommends this site.

The flat and rectangular site allows flexibility in project design. The site also has good freeway access and site access, although Iowa Avenue would need to be widened.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The Iowa site has access to retail and restaurants. It is also close to transit. In addition to buses along University Avenue, the downtown metro station is about two and a half miles away and has more options for metro than the Hunter Park station near the other site.

As mentioned before, the site is located less than one mile from the main campus. ARB and DGS have initiated detailed investigation of this site, including environmental and other assessments. There are residences located within 1,000 feet of the property boundary.

However, neither ARB nor DGS expects to find any attributes that would make the site unworkable.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: There are several general considerations associated with locating the facility in Riverside. The coordinated support from Riverside representatives is impressive and would likely help the project stay on track. There is also reasonable access to campus amenities, such as the student recreation center, the child development center, campus restaurants and the performing arts center.

The university has a diverse academic program with a research focus on many areas of interest to ARB. For example, the university now has an accredited medical school. These programs lead to ample opportunity for collaboration.

The South Coast Air Quality Management District has committed \$1 million to CE-CERT should ARB decide to locate in Riverside. The endowment would be used to develop an air quality and climate research training program that would benefit ARB and South Coast AQMD staff.

In general, Riverside has access to affordable housing. However, there would be a significant increase in commute distance for the existing ARB staff. We are currently conducting a detailed evaluation of the impact

on our employees, including driving time and distance as well as the availability for transit. The distance from the existing El Monte facilities to a Riverside site would also likely trigger additional costs for -- to ARB for relocations expenses for employees that move to Riverside.

In addition, access to the site would likely be more difficult for the general public and conversely more difficult for ARB staff to travel to meet with stakeholders in Southern California. They are also conducting an analysis of these impacts.

Now, let's look at the Pomona site.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The Pomona site is located on agricultural land referred to as Spadra Farms. This land is currently used in the College of Agriculture's Educational Program. It is a little less than a mile from the center of the Cal Poly Pomona campus. The Cities of Pomona and Walnut are located about three and one half miles from the site. The City of Diamond Bar is located about one and one half miles from the site.

The now closed Lanterman Development Center is located just south of the property.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide shows the area surrounding the Innovation Village II site.

The retail and shopping areas are located less than one half mile away and a Starbucks is planned on the corner of Pomona Boulevard and Temple. At the south side of the property, there are heavily used railroad tracks. These tracks would be less than 1,000 feet from the south side of the site.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The Pomona site consists of about 17 acres. The university has indicated that they would consider further discussions on additional land to support ZNE, but has not committed any specific property at this time. The land is part of 165-acre parcel that is planned for a mix of agricultural and commercial developmental.

The flat and relatively rectangular site allows flexibility in the project design. In addition, the university has expressed interest in working with us to site a new retail complex adjacent to the corner of State Street and Pomona. We will continue to work with the university to explore the feasibility of this option. In general, there is good freeway and site access, but there is heavy traffic on Temple Avenue during rush hours.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The Innovation Village Site has access to many diverse uses,

including retail and restaurants. It is also close to transit. In addition to buses along West Temple Avenue and South Campus Drive, there are two Metrolink stations within about five miles of the site.

The site is located less than one mile from the main campus and is a 10 minute drive from the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Nearby, there is also the Spadra Landfill and some residences that are within 1,000 feet of the property boundary.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: There are several general considerations associated with locating the facility in Pomona. The university is supportive of the project as are community business leaders and elected officials. As a tenant of Innovation Village, ARB employees would have access to many of the same benefits and privileges afforded to faculty and staff. Some of these privileges require user fees, such as access to the Bronco Fitness Center, the children's center, and any performing arts.

Cal Poly does not have the same breadth of research focus as does UCR. However, we believe that there are still many opportunities for collaboration, including with the agriculture and engineering programs.

The average housing cost in Pomona appear to be

slightly higher than Riverside. Housing costs in nearby
Walnut and Diamond Bar appear to be significantly higher.
Interestingly, both Riverside and Pomona have lower
housing costs than El Monte.

2.4

For the Pomona site, there would be minimal impacts on commute distances for the existing ARB staff. As I mentioned before, we are currently conducting a detailed evaluation of the specific impact on our employees, both from the impact on driving time and distance, as well as the availability of transit. Because the Pomona site is only 17 miles from the El Monte facility, ARB would not be responsible for paying any relocation costs.

In addition, it is likely that access to the site would be less difficult for the general public and conversely less difficult for ARB staff to travel to meet with stakeholders in Southern California. We are also conducting an analysis of these impacts and will provide our results in the January report.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Now for the summary.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: ARB is considering all three sites. Each has its own pros and

cons. We will continue to work with the Pomona and Riverside representatives to assess the sites. We again expect to release our staff report in mid-January for public review. The Board is tentatively scheduled to consider the report at the February Board meeting. Should the Board approve recommendations, ARB is then required to submit these recommendations to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee for review. After addressing any comments, ARB would transmit the recommendations to DGS for final site acquisition.

--000--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: That concludes my presentation, and we would be happy to answer any questions

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you. Before we go further, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the representatives of both Riverside and Pomona who have made really extraordinary efforts to help us to evaluate the potential sites, and to think through the opportunities that are presented there. I know we'll be hearing from some people associated with both of these potential sites.

But even before we hear from them, I just want to say that we have been afforded not only the courtesy, but a lot of thinking and really had an opportunity to explore

and expand our own views of what the potential for this new site will mean for us. And so I'm very grateful for that.

I also want to recognize the efforts of Mr. Joel Griffith who's present at the staff table here, who is the project director for the Department of General Services and for his staff's efforts on this as well. This has been a real partnership, and we're very grateful for all of their support.

So thank you.

Okay. Let's then -- are there Board members who'd would like to say anything before we begin?

All right. Why don't we just turn to those who've traveled to be with us then. And we'll begin with John Benoit of Riverside County, and a member of the South Coast Air District Board. Welcome.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISOR BENOIT: Thank you very much, Chair Nichols members, fellow supervisors. My former colleague stepped out of the room, but all my friends.

I'm pleased to be here today representing
Riverside County. I'm Riverside County Supervisor John
Benoit. And I'm here to emphasize again just how proud
and excited we would be to be the host of CARB's new
facilities in our beautiful inviting and well prepared

region in the Inland Empire. We very much appreciate the open, detailed, and transparent process that has now been undertaken to allow us to demonstrate what we have to offer, and as well as to allow you to make a good choice, and it's been a good process.

Regarding that decision, I'm, of course, hopelessly biased --

(Laughter.)

RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISOR BENOIT: -- towards Riverside and UCR.

CHAIR NICHOLS: You should be.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISOR BENOIT: This would clearly be an ideal new home for CARB's Southern California consolidation. And I'd like to just briefly highlight a couple of points and the obvious reasons.

One is the cost. The land is already owned by UCR. The newest Iowa location, which I this has kind of become the focus, is an ideal flat. It has, I think, an 80-year old orchard on it that's no longer being utilized for that purpose. It could be easily relocated, or those efforts would be carried on elsewhere.

As far as LEED process, our site, our location, our city is extremely well prepared to help you make your goal of Platinum LEED for this facility, a very worthy goal, given your mission.

Partnership with UCR and South Coast Air Quality Management District, I've got to tell you that I was very anxious to work with Mr. Wallerstein. I'm thankful my board concluded that this relationship, which we've had with CE-CERT for years and the College of Air Quality, even before that, is huge. This is a full-blown research university that has been focused on air quality for five or six decades.

And then come up with the idea -- and I credit
Mr. Wallerstein. I appreciate his help. I appreciate my
board's support that we would even further emphasize that
with a million dollar endowment to create a specific
school on air quality. It's going to be a huge potential.

I see many opportunities for AQMD -- I'm sorry, CARB employees to teach at the school, to go to the school to further their educational goals that are directly related to your mission right there on campus. This new location is basically on campus. I was surprised to learn it's not actually on the campus, but it's very close to the existing major campus, and only a few miles away from the CE-CERT operation, which is just down the street from the first location.

So the location has those amenities plus a couple of good hotels for -- I've been a State employee. I know what the ranges are. And the Courtyard Marriott and the

Hampton Inn are close by, restaurants, banks, credit unions. And I want to point out that there are two existing Starbucks very close by.

(Laughter.)

RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISOR BENOIT: So we do have a wide range of housing available. Our housing prices are among the most competitive in Southern California still. The cost savings, as I've mentioned, because of the proximity of CE-CERT and the potential dual use of some of those facilities, employment opportunities, utility service and water rates. We have a city-owned utility that will make that process very favorable.

Joining me here today, as I conclude, is our Riverside County Assistant CEO, Rob Field from EDA, Brian Nestande our Deputy CEO for legislative affairs. You'll hearing from Mr. Perez from the City of Riverside. Any of us would be pleased to answer any questions you or the staff may have.

But to summarize we'd love to be your neighbors.

And we think Riverside is a perfect place for CARB's

future. We hope you agree.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much. I didn't press the buzzer on you, because we have a special rule for supervisors and other elected officials, but I do want to remind you --

136

```
1
             RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISOR BENOIT: We have
 2
    several of those too.
 3
             (Laughter.)
             CHAIR NICHOLS: We do have --
 4
5
             RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISOR BENOIT: But thank
6
   you very much.
7
             BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Madam Chair?
8
             CHAIR NICHOLS: -- a three minute limit. Yes,
9
    questions.
10
             BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Those of us in countyland,
11
    of course, know John and his role with the California
    State Association of Counties. And, John, you left out
12
13
    one really important asset that will help swing this base
14
   player over here, and that is that you are the home --
15
   your county is the home to Fender Guitar.
16
             RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISOR BENOIT: Oh, yes we
17
          Thank you.
    are.
18
             (Laughter.)
19
             BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: So I think Phil should know
20
    that.
             RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISOR BENOIT: Fender has
21
22
    offered us and we've provided many Fender instruments.
23
    Not that that would have any impact here --
2.4
             (Laughter.)
25
             RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISOR BENOIT: -- but they
```

137

1 are available. 2 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I know your colleague gets 3 Steve Miller down there now and then. RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISOR BENOIT: The Steve 4 5 Miller Band, yes absolutely, a very good group. We have a lot of assets and we look forward to 6 7 having you. CHAIR NICHOLS: All of these comments are going 8 9 to be stricken from the record. 10 Thank you. 11 (Laughter.) RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISOR BENOIT: Thank you, 12 13 Madam Chair. 14 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Well, if we do go to 15 Riverside, can Steve Miller do a sort of welcoming --16 (Laughter.) 17 RIVERSIDE COUNTY SUPERVISOR BENOIT: Count on it. CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Thank you. That's 18 19 great. 20 All right. Christina Romero. MS. ROMERO: Well, that's a hard act to follow 21 22 right there, so...

(Laughter.)

23

MS. ROMERO: Hi, Chair Nichols and the members of

25 | the Board. My name is Christina Romero, and I'm a

graduate student at the college of agriculture and would like to provide you with information on the great need for college graduates in the field of agriculture, and some background about our program.

This USDA has stated by 2050 we will need at least 600,000 new farmers to be able to feed the world. Last year, only 1,200 people went into farming. With the average age of the American farmer now at 58.7 years old, for every farmer under 25, there are five who are over 75.

This year the USDA stated that there will -there is a need for 58,000 college graduates in
agriculture every year. Yet, the universities are only
generating 35,000 In our program at Cal Poly Pomona, all
of the students in the plant science and ag science
programs who use Spadra Farms have an average of two job
offers when they graduate. With those -- those with
irrigation backgrounds have an average of six.

In addition, we have seen a 20 percent increase each year for the last three years in applications to the plant science, ag science, ag education, and ag business management programs. Our animal science program is already impacted with only a 10 percent acceptance rate.

We are the only four year college in agriculture in the southern part of the State, which contains many of the highest agriculture value counties in the nation, and

the only four year college with an urban and community ag program.

As part of the urban and community ag program, we also have an organic farm on Spadra that we are planning to increase in the size now that has a program which -- as the program, which is enrolling more students.

We will also be generating organic feed and fodder for organic animals and egg production. The organic farming operation alone utilizes about 30 acres of farm land once planted out with feed and fodder. Most importantly, the local surrounding communities benefit immensely from Cal Poly Pomona farm store, which sells our locally grown produce, and the access to agriculture, animals, and horses that community and children would not otherwise have.

We host over 5,000 K through 12 students a year for field trips to learn about agriculture, gardening, and animals. Each October, we host a pumpkin festival, which attracts over 80,000 people.

We realize that your plans do not include to build out all of Spadra Farm, but your project is a cornerstone to the development of the entire property.

December 2nd, President Coley announced she made the decision to develop 80 acres of Spadra to accommodate the ARB and its needs, such as solar panels and

ammenities. She states she would allow the College of Ag to continue to farm 70 acres for the next five years. As you can imagine, this is not an acceptable alternative for our students or our program.

We encourage you as an agency protecting the environment to consider what will be lost if your facility is located on an educational farm. It is where we learn to feed our population with the minimum impact on the environment. We will no longer have the facilities to learn what we need to take care of agriculture into the next generation.

So we invite the Air Resource Board to Cal Poly Pomona, just not on our farm land. At this juncture, without a more collaborative partnership or plan, the student body officially opposes any development on our farm land.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: John, did you ask her to

come?

2.4

CHAIR NICHOLS: Question or comment?

Sorry?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Oh, okay. Sorry. Thank you.

Fabiola Perez.

MR. PEREZ: Good afternoon, Chair Nichols and

Board members. Thank you for providing us the opportunity to speak to you today. My name is Fabiola Perez. And we are students from the College of Agriculture at Cal Poly Pomona. We are here today to provide you with information about the impact that building the new CARB facility at Cal Poly Pomona will have on the students and the programs from the College of Agriculture. The location that has been proposed for building your facility is on our educational land Spadra Farm, which we have used as an important part of our education for the last 50 years.

This property is used by our plant science majors, our agriculture science, agriculture education majors, students in urban agriculture, pest management, agronomy, soil science, horticulture, irrigation science, as well as students in regenerative studies program as a laboratory space that is irreplaceable on campus.

It is on this property that we learn how to grow crops using fewer pesticide applications, utilizing biological control, minimizing water use for crop production, utilizing newer and efficient technologies for transplanting crops for locally ground vegetables, and we control soil erosion an agricultural water runoff.

It is also on this property that we grow produce for our on-campus food service, so we can meet our 20 percent locally grown requirement. It is on this property

where students with no background in agriculture learn how to farm, or many students like myself, a first generation hispanic college student and a daughter of farm workers have the chance to make a career in agriculture at a higher -- at a level of greater opportunity than my parents had.

And I hereby oppose any development on Spadra Farm without a more collaborative partnership.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

We have next Moises Lopez from the City of Riverside.

MR. LOPEZ: Good morning, Madam Chair and members of the Board. My name is Moises Lopez. I'm the intergovernmental relations officer for the City of Riverside speaking here on behalf of our entire city. The decision before you this morning and in the coming months will have a huge effect on the ARB's ability to continue its incredibly important work.

And equally important, your decision will also have a very significant impact on the community in which ARB makes its next home. But I'm here this morning -- or, excuse me, this afternoon now, to -- very happy to discuss with you why this city is such a great fit for the Air Resources Board.

We know that Riverside is a great fit for you to thrive as an agency. Your new home in our city will put you in great company in the middle of thriving community and immediately adjacent to UC Riverside, one of the top research universities in the country and indeed the world.

UC Riverside is an integral part of our city and would play a similar role for the ARB. Its faculty, students, its research laboratories, its centers of excellence all offer a wealth of knowledge and a deep pool of potential collaborators for you.

Alongside of them in our city and our region stand the California Baptist University, La Sierra University, California State University at San Bernardino, and the Riverside Community College District all centers of higher education and research that are ready in terms of their willingness to partner with the ARB.

And as you heard from Supervisor Benoit, the County of Riverside, the greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce, and UC Riverside are also ready to partner with the ARB, and not just to work with you, but to welcome you into our community. It's this kind of partnership that embodies who are and why we feel Riverside is a great choice for the ARB.

Our historic downtown, our Fox Performing Arts
Center, where Steve Miller -- I'm sure we can work on

having him there.

(Laughter.)

MR. LOPEZ: Our beautiful neighborhoods, our parks and our recreation centers, our local schools and the four colleges and universities that I just mentioned. These are the things that make Riverside a great community. Our city, along with our partners, look forward to partnering with the ARB to ensure that your agency's employees know how much we look forward to welcoming them into our community, and to make them feel at home in the City of Riverside. So thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you so much. And we have indeed been warmly welcomed in Riverside when the Board came out there.

Dr. Benjamin Quillian from Cal Poly Pomona. Good afternoon.

DR. QUILLIAN: Thank you very much.

My name is Benjamin Quillian, acting vice president for administrative affairs and chief financial officer at Cal Poly Pomona.

On behalf of Cal Poly Pomona, I want to reaffirm our commitment to establishing a partnership with this Board. We believe there are tremendous opportunities for innovation, research, learning and advancement for your organization and for Cal Poly Pomona.

I might also mention that our campus is located only five miles from the offices of the South Coast Air Quality Management District, which will help facilitate coordination between the Board and the District.

We believe the proposed campus site will meet your needs in three respects. First, the amount of acreage available on our campus will provide the capacity to addressee evolving program needs for at least the next 30 years and ensure that existing programs are achieving intended emissions reductions and other benefits. Second, the land designation is appropriate for this type of development project. And finally, there will be no cost to the State for this land.

Beyond meeting your basic needs, I think it's important for you to know also that environmental sustainability is a hallmark of our university. We are working to become completely carbon neutral by 2030. We have several LEED certified buildings and have been honored by many organizations for our green efforts.

Last year, for example, we received a Gold Star's rating from the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education. As you know, there is a group of students and some faculty members within our College of Agriculture who have expressed concerns about the use of ag land for other purposes.

But let me be clear about two points. First, there are different perspectives within the College of Agriculture about how ag land should be used.

Second, all of the students support the Air Resources Board locating on our campus. And I should also point out that the School of Ag uses 500 acres of campus property.

We are excited by the shared opportunities for education and research as it relates to engineering, the sciences, and agriculture. And finally, we're proud to have the support of the California State University Chancellor Timothy White, State leaders, and the entire Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

Cal Poly Pomona is a university with the right experience and incredible opportunities. And we all hope that we can be partners on this journey.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

Thanks also to Dr. Coley who has been very helpful in responding to questions and following up with us as well.

So we are blessed with choices, good choices, but we have more work to do. The staff has more work to do before they can come back to us with a recommendation. I understand you're hoping to be ready shortly after the

147

```
1
    first of the year?
             ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION PROJECT MANAGER
 2
3
              Yes.
                     Our plan is to release a staff report in
 4
    mid-January that would have the staff's recommendations in
5
    it, and the analysis that we've been doing over the last
6
    six months.
                 That would be out for a 30-day public
7
    comment, and then you folks would consider it at your
8
    Board meeting in February.
9
             CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Any questions at this
10
   point?
11
             Yes, Dr. Sperling. We're not coming to Davis.
12
             (Laughter.)
13
             BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Funny thing.
14
             CHAIR NICHOLS: This is a Southern California
15
    facility.
16
             BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN:
                                    Davis.
17
             BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Funny thing, you said
18
    that.
19
             (Laughter.)
20
             BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: But, as someone familiar
   with universities --
21
22
             (Laughter.)
23
             BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: -- you know, clearly
24
    CE-CERT has the strong graduate program in air quality
```

engineering, but universities have the opportunity to --

25

you know, to make changes. And this is a five-year lead time, so I would think that one could negotiate -- I mean, one could negotiate with Cal Poly Pomona to recruit -- to make a commitment to recruit new faculty members in the air quality engineering area. And, I mean, that would show evidence of good faith, because, in fact, the synergies are really important, you know, in terms of student training, and so on. And so just a thought.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, my understanding is that we actually do currently do some research with Cal Poly Pomona, is that not correct?

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: That's not correct actually.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Oh.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION PROJECT MANAGER

FLETCHER: I don't think we have -- we used to have

contracts -- Cal Poly used to run the Cal -- the Hornet

found -- not the Hornet Foundation, but the student

contracts for many years, so that was millions of dollars,

but that has not been done --

CHAIR NICHOLS: I know we have recruited form there graduates for our employee base. So we do have some active proponents of this site working on our staff at the moment. I want to say a word about that in a minute, but I want to make sure we have a chance to have Board members

ask any questions.

Ms. Riordan.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Well, thank you. This is a request of staff. But just to those of you who came today, thank you very much, because I know you're all very interested in the outcome of this quest for a new site.

One of the things that I am interested in, staff, which I wasn't -- I clearly understood the transit issues from the first site in Riverside that was proposed, because we physically were there and we saw it. But I'd like to have you, if you wouldn't mind, to go over again, not here today, but maybe for the Board, when you actually submit your next analysis, a very clear analysis of the transit to the second Riverside site, as well as let's go back to the Pomona site as well.

I just want to be real clear on what is needed and what can happen, and if there is input from either group that is here today, from either Riverside or Cal Poly, to that transit issue. I think we would welcome any information that you have, or any future development, because sometimes transit is thinking. They plan ahead as you know way far in advance. So I think we want to also be very clear about what are the plans for transit to these two particular sites. If you could get that please, I would be very grateful, because I think that's very

important, not only for our staff, but also for anybody who might be doing business with us or having some sort of, you know, interaction with us. And so if you -- if you would collect that, I would be very pleased.

And I would just tell you that I've learned something today. I live, as you well know, not far from either of these sites, quite frankly. Never did I know about this guitar business.

(Laughter.)

2.4

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: I had no idea. I'm going to go home with a pearl of wisdom that I've never had before, and I do appreciate that. Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Who said that this wasn't an opportunity for learning.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Other questions or comments?

Mr. De La Torre, you served with Mrs. Riordan on the subcommittee that I'd ask to help with this process.

Do you have any additional thoughts?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Well, other than we're dealing with two completely different proposals than what we started with --

CHAIR NICHOLS: That's true.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: -- in that meeting

that we had. As I was telling some folks before, we started with two plan A's and now we're dealing with two plan B's. You know, I want to see the comparison of the two as they exist now. I have a good sense of what each of them are, but I do want to see the relative merits and de-merits of each of the proposals as they are today. And I think we need to take that time to do that.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah, I agree. I agree.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: They clearly both have been listening and have been responsive, but that means the proposals have changed.

Ms. Berg.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you. And thank you, staff. This is a very exciting program. And I was able to participate in the very beginning. I did attend the early visits. These are two very impressive institutions, and I'm glad I'm not going to be involved in the toin coss{SIC} as we get down, because it is two very exciting opportunities.

I really did want to thank both of the students from the College of Agriculture. You came a far way to come up here and make your presentation, and I want to personally thank you for that. I have seen your site, and it is impressive the things that are going on there.

I think it's important that if we do select Cal Poly Pomona, we want to be very good neighbors. And so I would invite you to be vocal, but trust the process. And in trusting that process, things open up sometimes that we don't actually see right now. And so I would just invite you to that, and thank you very much for coming up.

And with that, good luck staff. This is a really, really hard decision. UCR, what an impressive institution. There are so many great things. I also will add to your learning, Barbara. As Ellis Paint provides the coatings that go on many of the Fender guitars.

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR BERG: So --

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Well, that is really interesting.

VICE CHAIR BERG: -- you know, I will just add to that. But also on Cal Poly Pomona, the paint industry has a program at Cal Poly Pomona. And we have been involved with Cal Poly Pomona for decades. It is one -- it is the only paint coatings course in the Southern California area. The other one is at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. That's actually a graduate class. These are the only polymer coating courses west of the Rockies.

So I -- you know, it would be like choosing between two wonderful children. So good luck.

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, let me just add, first of all, a word of appreciation to the students who have participated actively in this process. They came to talk to us when we visited the site, not these two individuals, but others that are part of their group. And clearly, they care passionately about their school and about their education. And the fact that so many of them are first generation college attendees speaks very, very well to what the institution is providing.

It's also, I think, worth saying that we are building a facility for the long term. As has been pointed out, five years to opening time is optimistic, but I think it's realistic. And I hope it could be sooner, but I'm willing to live with that, if that's what it takes.

But what that means is that during the period that this facility is going to be alive and a vibrant contributor to the program, a whole new generation of people will be coming to work for the Air Resources Board. And so while in no way minimizing the intense feelings of our current employees, we need to also be focusing on the people who are to come.

Having said that, I have been made aware that

we've been doing a lot of presenting and consulting. Bob has done many briefings, and there's been a lot of information shared with the staff in El Monte about the process. But I know that there are people who feel that they would like to have more direct explicit input to us. And I'm hesitant to recommend a poll, because I think those things are too easy to manipulate or misinterpret. It's very hard to have a poll that speaks to everybody.

But I would like to ask the staff if you could formally open up a process whereby employees could make their views on this known. Perhaps, a special place on our website, on our intranet site, where people could file their comments and views with the assurance then that they would be made available to the Board members, so that we can hear from people about their views on this.

And I will leave it to you to determine exactly how to do, but I do think it's important that we make an extra effort to reach out from the Board itself on this.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chairman. That's understood, and we will pull a plan together and get that going.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Well, with that, thank you for all your good work so far. Thanks to those who have participated. And we'll be eagerly awaiting the staff report in mid-January.

```
If there are no other speakers -- did anyone sign
 1
 2
    up for general public comment?
 3
             BOARD CLERK JENSEN: (Shakes head.)
 4
             CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Then I think we are
 5
    in fact ready to adjourn.
             Happy Holidays to all, and we'll see you in
 6
 7
    January.
             (Thereupon the Air Resources Board meeting
 8
9
             adjourned at 1:00 PM)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand
3	Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:
4	That I am a disinterested person herein; that the
5	foregoing California Air Resources Board meeting was
6	reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified
7	Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and was
8	thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by
9	computer-assisted transcription;
10	I further certify that I am not of counsel or
11	attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any
12	way interested in the outcome of said meeting.
13	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
14	this 30th day of December, 2015.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	famin M
20	
21	
22	JAMES F. PETERS, CSR
23	Certified Shorthand Reporter
24	License No. 10063

25