

TELECONFERENCE MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

AIR RESOURCES BOARD

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

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
DISTRICT 1
11780 SAN PABLO AVENUE, SUITE D
EL CERRITO, CALIFORNIA

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH COALITION
2727 HOOVER AVENUE, SUITE 202
NATIONAL CITY, CALIFORNIA

1665 DWIGHT STREET
REDLANDS, CALIFORNIA

CONRAD HILTON DUBLIN
EARLSFORT TERRACE
DUBLIN, IRELAND

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 2016
9:03 A.M.

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

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

Senator Dean Florez

Mrs. Barbara Riordan

Supervisor Phil Serna

Professor Daniel Sperling

Ms. Diane Takvorian

STAFF:

Mr. Richard Corey, Executive Officer

Ms. Edie Chang, Deputy Executive Officer

Ms. La Ronda Bowen, Ombudsman

Ms. Christina Morkner-Brown, Assistant Chief Counsel

Ms. Emily Wimberger, Chief Economist

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

Mr. Bob Fletcher, Project Manager, ASD

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

A P P E A R A N C E S C O N T I N U E D

STAFF:

Ms. April Molinelli, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

Ms. Alice Stebbins, Chief, ASD

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Joel Griffith, Project Director III, Department of
General Services

I N D E X

| | PAGE |
|----------------------------------|------|
| Pledge of Allegiance | 1 |
| Roll Call | 1 |
| Opening Remarks by Chair Nichols | 2 |
| Item 16-3-2 | |
| Chair Nichols | 4 |
| Board Discussion and Q&A | 7 |
| Motion | 8 |
| Board Discussion and Q&A | 9 |
| Vote | 41 |
| Public Comment | 42 |
| Adjournment | 42 |
| Reporter's Certificate | 43 |

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning. The March 24th,
3 2016 public meeting of the Air Resources Board will come
4 to order. Before we begin, I want to say a word though
5 about the sound system, because we do have members calling
6 in from locations that were previously noticed. Board
7 members who are calling in on the phones, I would
8 appreciate it if when you're not speaking, you would mute
9 your phones, because we get the background noise, and all
10 of the conversations that you may be having in your office
11 broadcast over the sound system here.

12 So if you can please mute your conversation,
13 except when you want to speak obviously, then we want to
14 hear from you.

15 Okay. At this point then, we will resume our
16 normal order of business, which is to begin with the
17 Pledge after Allegiance. So would everyone please rise.

18 (Thereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was
19 recited in unison.)

20 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Madam Clerk, would you
21 please call the roll.

22 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Dr. Balmes?

23 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.

24 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. De La Torre?

25 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Here.

1 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. Eisenhut?

2 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here.

3 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Senator Florez?

4 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here.

5 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Gioia?

6 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Here.

7 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Mitchell?

8 Mrs. Riordan?

9 BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.

10 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Roberts?

11 Supervisor Serna?

12 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Here.

13 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Dr. Sherriffs?

14 Professor Sperling?

15 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.

16 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Takvorian?

17 Ms. Takvorian?

18 Vice Chair Berg?

19 VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.

20 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Chair Nichols?

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Here.

22 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Madam Chair, we have a

23 quorum.

24 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

25 Can we adjust the sound system, so that those who

1 are calling in can be heard more clearly in the room?

2 Okay. We could barely hear. We could hear, but
3 it was difficult.

4 Okay. So just couple of opening comments. As
5 was noticed in the public agenda, this Board meeting is
6 available by teleconference in El Cerrito, National City,
7 and Redlands, California, and also in Dublin, Ireland,
8 where Mr. De La Torre is currently. I would have to say
9 that the rest of us wish we were there with him, but we
10 haven't yet figured out how to extend our jurisdiction
11 quite that far.

12 So, for today, this is a vote only matter. We
13 are not taking testimony on this item. But because of the
14 far-flung nature, I am going to be calling for a roll call
15 voice vote to make sure that everyone's votes are
16 recorded. And for those calling in from the remote
17 locations, if when you speak you would identify yourself
18 also, just so we're sure to get the record correct. That
19 would be much appreciated.

20 Now, for those who are in the auditorium here, in
21 Sacramento, I need to remind you that there are Emergency
22 exits at the side, and in the back of the room. And in
23 the event of a fire alarm, we're required to evacuate the
24 room immediately and go out of the building, until we hear
25 the all-clear signal when we're allowed to return. And I

1 think that is all for general preliminary comments.

2 (Thereupon interference occurred in the
3 sound system.)

4 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Could you repeat that?

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

6 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Chair Nichols?

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, Supervisor Serna

8 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Sorry for the interruption.

9 I just wanted to state for the record that I was not at
10 the March 17th meeting in Southern California. However, I
11 have had an opportunity to review the transcripts.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Thank you for that.

13 Okay. So as I indicated, we're here today to
14 consider the Board recommending a site for the proposed
15 new motor vehicle and engine emissions testing and
16 research facility in Southern California, otherwise known
17 as a consolidated site. And as we indicated when we were
18 together before, and I know all the Board members have had
19 an opportunity to spend quite a lot of time getting
20 briefed and thinking about these issues, this is a
21 decision that's going to impact ARB's operations, both
22 today and for decades into the future.

23 The staff conducted a thorough evaluation of
24 three sites and determined that two of the sites are
25 suitable for development. These are Pomona Boulevard and

1 Iowa Avenue -- Pomona Boulevard in Pomona, and Riverside,
2 Iowa Avenue sites. And there's a great deal of
3 information that's contained within the staff report, as
4 well as a large volume of supporting documentation
5 regarding the evaluation of those sites.

6 In addition, the Board heard testimony last week
7 from a broad range of representatives of both communities
8 and campuses, and also from elected officials
9 representatives of the universities themselves, city and
10 county personnel, business organizations, our own staff,
11 the Union that represents many of our employees and even a
12 bicycle advocacy group. These commenters presented
13 contrasting views, but they all made compelling cases
14 about where to cite the proposed new facility.

15 The ARB's staff's preference for Pomona presents
16 an important factor for us to consider, and it cannot be
17 taken lightly, because we all know that the heart and soul
18 of any operation is the people who do the work. But in
19 the end, the decision needs to be made to choose a cite
20 that the Board members themselves believe provides the
21 greatest benefits to the State, while exercising our
22 responsibility to be good stewards of State funds.

23 That said, regardless of the decision that we
24 make today, the Board needs to be very active in
25 addressing the concerns of our staff, if the Board selects

1 the Riverside site, our challenges to address staff issues
2 will obviously be important and will need to begin right
3 away.

4 While the Board is not accepting any public
5 testimony, I want to appreciate the time and energy that
6 people took to come and speak to us last week at our
7 hearing in El Monte, and to assure you that your concerns
8 and your comments have been taken into consideration.

9 I think I also -- well, I'll let it go at that.
10 I would note that this is just a step in a long process
11 for completing this project. Moving forward with a
12 recommendation from this Board certainly brings us closer
13 to making the project more of a reality. And we look
14 forward to continuing to work with the Department of
15 General Services and others on the next phase of this
16 vitally important project for the State and for our
17 mission.

18 So, in a moment, I'm going to open this up to my
19 fellow board members. But I do want to take the
20 opportunity to say a few words about my own perspective on
21 this, because I have been thinking about the need for a
22 new facility for Southern California ever since I got back
23 to the Air Resources Board in 2007. And I realized that
24 this is really a tremendous opportunity, which we have
25 been afforded to continue to lead our State and our

1 country, and I would say the world in developing motor
2 vehicle standards, implementing them, and enforcing them,
3 as well as in providing state-of-the-art thinking and
4 science to support this mission.

5 So it's a transition that we will be working
6 through. I personally will be voting for the resolution
7 that will be coming forth in a few minutes, but I want to
8 hear from all the Board members and to give them an
9 opportunity to speak and make sure that everybody's voice
10 is heard.

11 So I would like to start by recognizing Senator
12 Florez.

13 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you, Madam Chair.
14 I'll be brief. Just -- you know, obviously had a great
15 hearing, lots of input. I appreciate the employees at El
16 Monte. There was some very poignant testimony. I thought
17 it was very heartfelt. I think overall I agree with you
18 that as we move in a certain direction today that we ought
19 to make the staff needs and concerns front and center. So
20 I very much appreciate that. And I think I believe we
21 ought to move in a direction that continues to be focused
22 on what is the best transition as we move forward.

23 I would also like to say -- I don't know if --
24 it's on and off.

25 I'd also like to say that I really would like to

1 thank the cities of each of the entities, both Riverside
2 and Pomona, for their testimony last week. And I look
3 forward to hearing other comments from other Board
4 members.

5 Okay. Is this on?

6 Can everybody hear?

7 Okay. Great. I look forward to hearing from
8 other members of the Panel. But, however, Madam Chair, I
9 would like to move that the site known as Riverside Site 2
10 be selected as the location for the Southern California
11 consolidation project.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Did you make a motion?

13 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: I did Madam Chair, let me
14 reread that.

15 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I was being whispered
16 to about the sound system. I apologize.

17 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: And the sound was on and
18 off, so let me say it again. I would like to move that
19 the site known as Riverside Site 2 be selected as the
20 location for the Southern California consolidation
21 project.

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

23 Do I have a second for that motion?

24 VICE CHAIR BERG: And I'll second that motion.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Ms. Berg.

1 Okay. We can now open this then for discussion
2 on the motion. And, at this point, I think in addition to
3 stating their reasoning or asking questions, it would also
4 be appropriate for Board members to articulate
5 instructions that they would like to make sure that the
6 staff hear from us moving forward with the site, because
7 it's clear that there's a lot of work left to be done, a
8 lot of interest on the part of the Board in watching this
9 project as it goes forward to make sure that commitments
10 that were made at the front end are followed through on by
11 our partners in the process. And so I think we can have
12 both of those elements under discussion. And I think I'll
13 start by recognizing Dr. Sperling.

14 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So it is a really tough
15 decision and, you know, clearly the -- you know, I've seen
16 the Riverside site. I've heard others that have seen the
17 Pomona that in many ways the sites are comparable -- not
18 comparable, but equally attractive. And it's really
19 impressive what both campuses have done in providing, you
20 know, really good spaces near the campuses, near areas
21 that are very attractive.

22 When I look at it, I say, okay, what is good --
23 to kind of play off of what Chairwoman Nichols just said,
24 what's good for ARB, what's good for this State, what's
25 good for the country, and even the world? We've seen how

1 important ARB is, for instance, with the VW issue. And,
2 of course, many of the things we do, our OBD work, and a
3 lot of other technical work that's been done really is
4 instrumental internationally as well.

5 So when I look at it, I see that kind of in the
6 most conservative case the two campuses are roughly, you
7 know, comparable. The -- there's the downside of -- you
8 know, Riverside would be a little more problematic --
9 would be more problematic for staff. On the other hand,
10 UC Riverside provides a lot of opportunities to really
11 meet that goal, that mission of providing high value to
12 ARB, the State, and the country.

13 But then I look -- the more I think about it and
14 the more I've talked to people is I just see the
15 potential -- the upside potential is so huge at Riverside.
16 There's so many opportunities to really enhance the ARB
17 labs and the ARB. And it will take work on both sides,
18 both the Riverside campus and ARB to really realize those
19 upside potentials. But to, me they're large.

20 It's -- there's so -- and I trust that there's
21 a -- I believe that those upside potentials will be
22 realized because when I talk to the Riverside campus, the
23 community, the leaders there, over and over again, I hear
24 about all the things that they plan to and could do,
25 everything from extension programs for workers,

1 apprenticeship internship programs, hiring new faculty,
2 tailoring their research programs more.

3 And the Riverside is attractive to me, because
4 Riverside is kind of like the ideal campus to be
5 associated with, in the sense that it's not like Caltech
6 that already has its reputation, its high quality
7 research. It's not like UCLA which is a big huge campus.
8 Riverside is a growing campus. It already has a focus on
9 environment, but it's really expanding. And there's a
10 real opportunity there for to create really strong
11 synergies.

12 And so that's what's compelling to me. And you
13 look through the statistics, you know, how much research.
14 Obviously, UC Riverside is far superior as a research
15 campus, but it goes well beyond that. So I've --
16 actually, the more I've thought about it, and the more I
17 talk to -- when I talk to even the university leaders at
18 Pomona, they don't come forward with a lot of these ideas
19 about how to create these synergies with ARB. And we
20 talked to Riverside and they do. It comes just flowing
21 out of them. Everyone we talk to they have how to set up
22 these different programs, how to create these synergies,
23 working with the staff, working in terms of training, in
24 terms of creating a pipeline of employees that are
25 targeted for Riverside for -- excuse me, for the ARB labs.

1 So at the end of the day, we're putting something
2 in place here for many, many decades and something that's
3 really very important to all of us. And so at the end of
4 the day, I've come to feel strongly that Riverside is not
5 only a better choice, a far better choice. And I
6 understand it's going to be a difficult transition. We do
7 want to worry about the morale of the staff and how to
8 transition. But this is a long-term thing, and I think we
9 need to be thinking about that in terms of the greater
10 benefits.

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I'd like to go to the
12 phone so we don't leave them dangling till the last. And
13 I'll try to do this in alphabetical order, if I can. So
14 I'll start with John Balmes. Dr. Balmes.

15 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Hi, Chair Nichols. So I
16 won't be long. I think I outlined a framework for my
17 decision making at the Board meeting last week. I agree
18 that both universities have made -- presented very
19 compelling cases. It's a difficult decision, and I have
20 to say that scientifically the potential synergies with
21 the Riverside atmospheric chemistry and environmental
22 engineering groups with our own laboratory that potential
23 synergy is really great. And going through the points
24 that the staff had in their presentation last week to try
25 to create a world class facility -- I would say maintain

1 the world class facility, because I think we already have
2 that, and push it to either -- even greater heights, and
3 to have an international impact, national/international
4 impact, and to do the best for the State of California
5 that we can, that the Riverside location looks somewhat
6 better than the very good Cal Poly Pomona site.

7 That said, I'm very mindful of the impact on
8 staff. So it's -- like I said last week, it's a hard
9 decision for me, because we already have a world class
10 laboratory, and the Cal Poly proposal is not a bad one. I
11 just think that for the long term, the investment in the
12 Riverside location provides more bang for the buck. And I
13 think as stewards -- good stewards of California taxpayer
14 dollars, that it's the better investment.

15 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

16 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I just would also say, we
17 really have to work hard to try to mitigate the negative
18 impact on staff from a move to Riverside. So I am
19 supportive of whatever we can do to provide help to the
20 staff.

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: So before we leave here this
22 morning, I do want to have a discussion with Mr. Corey
23 about some of the specifics of what the staff will be
24 working on going forward here. But I also feel a need to,
25 before I go to Mr. De La Torre just to make one point,

1 because when we talk about synergies, I want to be clear
2 to everyone, our staff, our stakeholders, the public that
3 we are not becoming a unit of either campus. We are going
4 to be receiving free land to build a free-standing
5 laboratory. And there are opportunities for synergy and
6 they are certainly important to consider, but I think it's
7 also important to understand and to reiterate that Air
8 Resources Board is not giving up its independence or its
9 authority.

10 This is going to be a laboratory that's going to
11 be created and operated by the Air Resources Board to
12 support our mission. So it's a great advantage, not only
13 because we've been given the opportunity to do this with
14 free land, but also to consider ways in which we can
15 enhance and expand our work and our access to research and
16 to students and faculty and so forth. But there shouldn't
17 be any confusion that we're somehow becoming an arm of the
18 university.

19 With that, I will go to Mr. De La Torre.

20 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you. I said a
21 lot last week, and I have a little bit more to say today.
22 I think that staff's -- and again, it's not just our
23 staff. It's DGS and others who have worked on this
24 recommendation based it on knowable facts, and based on
25 those knowable facts, made a recommendation.

1 I appreciate the comments that have been made so
2 far by my colleagues, but many of those things that have
3 been cited are future hypotheticals, not known facts.
4 They are parts of a pitch that was made to us to have this
5 facility located at one or the other place. And so, yes,
6 maybe one of the two campuses is better at their pitch
7 than the other. We're not here to buy a car or a house.
8 We're not dealing with a real estate broker or a car
9 salesman. We are dealing with analysis from our own staff
10 of which would be the better location for our employees.
11 I think the recommendation speaks for itself, that we
12 should go with Cal Poly Pomona.

13 So what are some of the facts that we know? We
14 know that significant numbers of our staff, over 80
15 percent, are going to have to drive further to get to
16 Riverside. So that is increased emissions, that is
17 increased greenhouse gases, and that is increased cap --
18 increased cost for the movement of those employees, if
19 they decide to move out there.

20 That's not a hypothetical. That's not a maybe.
21 That's not possible synergies. That's real.
22 Those -- we're going to have to figure out significant
23 issues with that with each of those points.

24 One thing that we learned last week is, in
25 addition to the relocation costs, our employees have

1 bumping rights. Because of the distance -- the additional
2 distance that they are going to have to move, they will
3 now have bumping rights at all State agencies in the Los
4 Angeles area to move and leave CARB. Because there's
5 another opportunity in another agency that they can go
6 work in, they will have better quality of life, because
7 they won't have to commute as far. That's significant.
8 That's real. That's tangible.

9 In terms of diversity, last week we had the
10 presentations. And there was, I think, a few people spoke
11 about the diversity in Riverside. Well, Pomona's economic
12 and ethnic diversity is every bit as much as Riverside.
13 There's not very much difference at all there. We're not
14 talking about Beverly Hills versus Riverside side. We're
15 talking about Pomona versus Riverside, so there is no
16 tangible difference there.

17 And I think we kind of oversold what we were
18 offering. Maybe it was to get that really good deal from
19 one of these universities way back in the beginning when
20 this proposal was put together, but this is, and will
21 continue to be, fundamentally a vehicle lab. Sixty-six
22 percent of our employees at the Haagen-Smit laboratory are
23 directly involved in motor vehicle testing. Another 13
24 percent are not involved in the testing, but are directly
25 involved in the data analysis from the vehicle testing.

1 That's 79 percent of the employees who are doing
2 vehicle -- direct vehicle testing work, another 12 percent
3 are doing enforcement, and nine percent are doing general
4 admin work. There are no non-vehicle related researchers
5 at the Haagen-Smit Laboratory. Let me repeat that. There
6 are no non-vehicle laboratory workers or research workers
7 at El Monte. That is -- that's a fact. That's real.
8 That's what this lab is.

9 I understand about all of the potential research
10 possibilities, but we have those no matter where it is
11 located, because we have those today. We already farm out
12 all of this wonderful research to these fantastic
13 universities we have in the State of California.

14 And as I pointed out as the employees who came up
15 and spoke last week pointed out in terms of how many Cal
16 Poly graduates we have already working for us just in the
17 lab, we have about 50 Cal Poly Pomona employees. They are
18 already producing the kind of workers that we use, not the
19 ones we'd like to use, not the ones that we potentially
20 could use in the future, 20, 30 years down the road, but
21 the ones we already use. That's not going to change.

22 So if I look at this, I appreciate my colleagues
23 being inspired by the possibilities, but we have an
24 obligation to the realities. And the realities are that
25 this is a vehicle lab. It's been in an industrial park in

1 El Monte for decades. And it's going to be in a better
2 place, with better possible possibilities attached to a
3 university in the great State of California, regardless of
4 which we choose. It will be a step up.

5 I believe that fundamentally what this -- what
6 this has turned into is a bias towards UC, and against the
7 Cal State, in this case the Cal Poly campus, which is no
8 regular Cal State campus.

9 I think that we have a recommendation from our
10 staff that tells us which is the better -- not the best,
11 the better, most cost effective choice, and we know, as I
12 said last week, 85 percent of our employees want to move
13 to Pomona. And as I pointed out just right now, the facts
14 are very clear about what this lab is. Unless, we are
15 going to completely restructure CARB to move significant
16 portions of what we do from Sacramento down to Riverside,
17 and maybe we should have that conversation, then we are
18 talking about two different things. We should be talking
19 about this lab moving to the best place for what it does
20 in these next few years, because in the long term,
21 everything can change.

22 So by putting -- making references to things 20,
23 30 years down the road, none of us knows. I'm not going
24 to be on this Board, chances are no one of us is going to
25 be on this Board. Therefore, we should stick with what we

1 know, we should stick with the recommendation that's
2 before us, and we should keep face with our employees who
3 have made their views clear on something that's not
4 outrageous. All they're asking for us to do is to follow
5 staff's recommendation to us, of which is the better site,
6 and that is Cal Poly Pomona.

7 Thank you.

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much, Hector and
9 thank you for all the time that you put in during the
10 earlier stages of this process, where we were out visiting
11 the campuses and meeting with faculty and students, et
12 cetera, as well as your work with the staff.

13 I would like to hear next -- I guess I'm going to
14 trying to be in alphabetical order here, to Mr. Eisenhut.

15 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Thank you, Chair Nichols.
16 I raised last week questions regarding the impact of the
17 site on the potential effectiveness of folks doing their
18 job, specifically with regard to Enforcement Division.
19 And since I raised the issue, and had a chance to become
20 more informed in some of the details the work that the
21 staff had done, I want to report back the results of that
22 conversation.

23 That impact would accrue specifically on
24 enforcement folks, about half of whom already work
25 remotely, either from their homes or from a remote

1 location, and their interaction with the lab is sporadic,
2 maybe every other week or once a month. There are half a
3 dozen, approximately, folks whose daily task includes
4 sampling of fuels and return of those samples back to the
5 lab. It's judged that given the traffic complexities that
6 already exist, that there will need to be some
7 arrangements made, pooling of those samples.

8 And so the impact operationally -- this was not
9 the term that the staff used, but I would say it's a
10 manageable impact, and has a pretty limited impact in
11 terms of the number of employees whose daily task would be
12 affected. So I need to raise the issue and I wanted to
13 share that information.

14 I am -- my decision process. We have a
15 committee, and I haven't heard yet from Barbara, but
16 assuming that she is consistent with her position of last
17 week, the recommendation of the Committee is bifurcated.
18 We have a staff recommendation which is clear. And in
19 that regard, I disagree with my friend Hector. It's our
20 responsibility to study and honor that recommendation, but
21 not necessarily to adopt it. The adoption is our
22 responsibility.

23 Having said that, for a variety of reasons, and
24 including the one I think best just articulated by Hector,
25 I am in opposition to the motion.

1 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. We will now hear from --

2 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Mary? Mary, sorry, we
3 got -- we didn't hear the end of John's testimony -- or
4 his comments.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: John, you want to repeat what you
6 said?

7 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Did I pull away from the
8 mic. I'm sorry, that I am in opposition to the motion.

9 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Make sure you stay close to
10 the mic.

11 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: I'm in opposition to the
12 motion. Sorry, I had to say that three times.

13 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. We heard you. I think we
14 heard you now.

15 I think actually I was going to call on you next,
16 Supervisor Gioia.

17 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Thank you. And first, let
18 me start by again acknowledging the really heartfelt
19 testimony by the supporters of both Pomona and Riverside.
20 It's clear to me that those committees really think highly
21 of their advantages and the benefits that they would offer
22 to ARB's consolidation efforts, and I appreciate that.

23 I'm not going to be long. I want to also say
24 that it is a difficult decision. I think there's some
25 short-term, medium-term, and long-term issues here at

1 stake.

2 So my final analysis is to think about the
3 long-term implications of the decision. And in that
4 regard, I essentially agree with the comments that have
5 been made by my colleagues who agree with the selection of
6 Riverside. So I will state it that way, because I don't
7 want to repeat the comments that they made. And in saying
8 that, that there really needs to be, I think, a lot of
9 work with employees to understand their needs as this goes
10 forward, so we could assist them and maintain the high
11 quality employees that we've had.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

13 I think it's next -- excuse me?

14 I'm skipping over the maker and seconder of the
15 motion for the moment, and I will turn now to Mrs.
16 Riordan.

17 BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Thank you very much. I
18 have continued and thought about what I heard from the
19 speakers of our last meeting, as well as my opportunities
20 to be able to visit both sites and to hear very personal
21 pleas to locate in either Pomona or Riverside. But as I
22 had said at our last meeting, I feel that the
23 opportunities that are in Riverside for the future, the
24 long-term future of our operation, of our laboratory,
25 clearly, in my opinion, Riverside is the site that I would

1 support.

2 And so, Madam Chair, I would support the motion
3 that is on the floor. And having said that, would
4 recognize clearly that the responsibility for mitigating
5 some of the impact of that choice for our current staff
6 will be our responsibility. And I will pledge myself to
7 do that, along, I'm sure, with everyone else that is
8 supporting this particular motion.

9 And so with that, I will conclude.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

11 Supervisor Serna.

12 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you, Chair Nichols.

13 So as I stated earlier, I was -- I did not have
14 an opportunity to attend in person the hearing last week
15 in El Monte. So I want to preface my comments with the
16 fact that I did do my best to glean from the transcript
17 some of nuanced consideration of this important decision,
18 as it was discussed then.

19 And I certainly have had an opportunity to be
20 briefed by staff, even on the latest developments of the
21 subject.

22 I guess I would start from a place of reflecting
23 on the fact that we have an extraordinary army of staff
24 here that do incredible work on all the subjects that come
25 before this Board, and do very, very detailed analysis to

1 make sure that we are making the most informed decisions
2 we can. And this is -- this is no different for me. I
3 guess what I'm struggling with is I am hearing from the
4 maker of the motion and the seconder and those that are
5 supportive of thus far, and I understand some of the
6 rationale that they've explained here today, and again,
7 I've been able to try and read for myself earlier comments
8 last week in the same vein from those supporters of the
9 Riverside site. But for me I guess I would say that
10 Member De La Torre has really articulated very well the
11 fact that we have some very good facts in front of us that
12 are presented to us no differently than other very
13 detailed facts that staff routinely present this Board
14 again to make informed decisions is it's difficult for me
15 to try and reconcile and interest in looking at the long
16 term, which I certainly appreciate the long term as it
17 relates to the opportunities presented at the Riverside
18 site.

19 But I guess, you know, given the facts that are
20 presented by staff and the fact that I think that because
21 we're talking about the long term, and, for me, that's
22 measured not in years but decades, I've yet to hear a good
23 reason why the Pomona site can't offer the same
24 opportunities? I mean, there's a lot that can happen in
25 the course of decades. There's a lot that can change in

1 terms of curricula that's offered. There's a lot that can
2 be offered at both sites, in terms of grooming a
3 partnership with ARB, a research partnership. And so the
4 argument that we ought to stay focused on the long term,
5 and, in fact, for some perhaps that's what tips them to
6 the site of supporting the motion, I would respectfully
7 say that, for me, that doesn't negate the same opportunity
8 as present for the Pomona site.

9 That combined with what I'm understanding would
10 be a tremendous burden on our staff to consider relocation
11 in many cases, combined with some of the extraordinary
12 differences -- side-by-side differences that have been
13 presented in the staff report and recommendation, most
14 notably for me that nearly 80 percent of staff would have
15 a round trip commute in excess of 90 minutes for the
16 Riverside site is very compelling, and that our employees,
17 if the Riverside site were selected, would incur an
18 additional \$6,400 a year in their annual driving costs.
19 These are very compelling points for me.

20 So if we're looking, as Supervisor Gioia
21 mentioned, at the short, medium, and long term, for me,
22 the short and medium term is -- it's pretty obvious that
23 there would be much less impact, much less disruption for
24 our employees if the Pomona site is selected. And again,
25 I will -- and by again referencing the fact that I don't

1 think that the selection of the Pomona site somehow
2 negates the -- some of the same opportunities that we
3 would have for long-term enhancement of our research
4 capabilities there as opposed to Riverside.

5 And so for these reasons, I will not be able to
6 support the resolution.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. We'll turn now to Ms.
8 Takvorian, if you wish to make any comments. You're not
9 required to, but if you would like to, please do.

10 I thought she was on the line, no?

11 Apparently not. All right. We'll check and
12 we'll move on.

13 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I am on the line. Can
14 you hear me?

15 CHAIR NICHOLS: Oh, there you are. Okay. Good.

16 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Can you hear me?

17 You were on mute before. Hi. Go ahead.

18 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Hi. Thank you very
19 much. Sorry about the difficulty with that. I have been
20 able to hear -- I have been able to hear everything that's
21 been said, so thanks so much. I wanted to say that I
22 really appreciate everyone's comments, and appreciate,
23 particularly Mr. De La Torre's comments and his hard work
24 on the Committee. I think very good points have been made
25 regarding the lab, and the enforcement functions. I want

1 to say that I want to reiterate my concerns that I
2 expressed last week about the decision being continued
3 only one week to this meeting, with, for me anyway,
4 virtually no time to talk to staff, or respond, get
5 responses to questions. And that's not staff's fault.
6 It's just the matter of scheduling. It just wasn't enough
7 time. And it certainly wasn't enough time to explore
8 alternatives that I think a number of Board members,
9 including myself, raised at the last meeting.

10 I'm sure that I'm at more of a disadvantage as a
11 new member, but I just want to say that I would have
12 appreciated more time to process some of that and to
13 explore some of the alternatives.

14 But we're here today, and I wanted to say that I
15 really appreciated the staff's work to develop the report,
16 and also particularly the staff testimony, which I thought
17 was compelling and very heartfelt. Staff morale and
18 satisfaction is critically important to me. And I think
19 that if this were a decision that impacted the next five
20 or 10 years, I would be fine with the Pomona site, because
21 I think it would just affect those staff that are
22 currently in place.

23 But it's not a decision for just the next five to
24 10 years, and I think it is multiple decades. And I do
25 believe that the site at UCR, the attributes are more

1 clearly relevant, given the historical relationship
2 CE-CERT, the new medical school, and the fact that the
3 university has been on the edge of cutting -- the cutting
4 edge of air quality research. And I also think that
5 there's a point to be made that Riverside is more of an
6 environmental justice community. And investment in a
7 disadvantaged community, I think is something that we, as
8 a Board, should think about in terms of allocation of
9 State resources.

10 So that is compelling to me, as well as what I
11 think the university's benefits are. This is one of the
12 most transportation emission polluted areas of California.
13 And I think it would be compelling to have the Air
14 Resources Board there. And as a resident of San Diego, I
15 have to say that having most State and other kinds of
16 resources centered in Los Angeles doesn't really speak to
17 Southern California, and doesn't provide access to San
18 Diego, Orange, Imperial Counties. So I think there's that
19 kind of proximity as well.

20 So for those reasons, as well as many that have
21 been cited by fellow Board members, I'm -- I will support
22 the motion. I do hope, however, that we can explore
23 alternatives for staff transition for a period after the
24 facility is built. I've been told that that isn't
25 practical, but I want to -- I hope we can explore whether

1 it's possible to have some of those transitions, so that
2 potentially may have staff in two locations. So I
3 appreciate everyone's consideration and I'll support the
4 motion.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you for those comments.

6 I will now return to the maker and seconder of
7 the motion to see if they have any additional comments
8 that they would like to make, at this time.

9 Ms. Berg, go ahead.

10 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: We're going to twist the
11 Chair's neck.

12 Thank you. Actually, Madam Chair, I'm just
13 anxious to hear your direction and conversation with Mr.
14 Corey in terms of how that might work. So I will hold my
15 comments, if I have any comment at all after that.

16 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thanks. Ms. Berg.

17 VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you. This has been quite
18 a journey. And as I thought about this on my plane ride
19 up this morning, I thought about the fact that it started
20 out with a vision, and the vision from Chair Nichols,
21 really to create an opportunity to catapult ARB's world
22 class intellectual expertise with building an equally
23 impressive world class facility. And over this last week,
24 I, too, have been struggling between the impacts of staff
25 and making this decision.

1 In looking at making change, we do know that our
2 current facility we've outgrown it. It will not take us
3 into the next decade, much less several decades. And so
4 in feeling that discomfort, exchanging the current
5 frustration of not having a world class facility, with the
6 disruption that any change would make, whether it was
7 Pomona or Riverside, understanding that the Riverside site
8 will have more disruption on staff and understanding, too,
9 that we, as decision makers, can appreciate that on paper,
10 but we won't live through that personally, and I'm very
11 mindful of that as I make that decision.

12 To that end, I personally went and visited both
13 sites again last week, and had a long conversation with
14 staff, and I wish I could tell you that that really
15 cleared things up for me. Actually, it just, depending on
16 who I was leaving, made it even more apparent how we had
17 two good choices.

18 After all of that, the tipping point for me is
19 towards the vision, and is towards the possibility. And I
20 will commit myself, along with the other Board members
21 that I have heard from, to help staff, because I will
22 support the resolution for Riverside, and I will be part
23 of the solution to try to find every possible way to not
24 only mitigate, but also to encourage.

25 I go back to my commute this morning. I live in

1 Long Beach and only had to go to the Orange County Airport
2 in bumper-to-bumper traffic wondering if I would make my
3 flight. And maybe this is an opportunity that in 20 or 30
4 years we will address the transportation issues that we
5 have in Southern California that are clearly keeping us
6 gridlocked. And so I will hold on to that as part of our
7 vision as well.

8 So there's no question, if the vote is upheld for
9 Riverside, I personally want to challenge Riverside,
10 because we have a lot of work in front of us, and we
11 expect more than business as usual, and -- both for our
12 employees, for ARB, for the State of California, and of
13 all the UCs, as well as our partners -- to reach out to
14 our partners of our State universities. And I think it's
15 going to be incumbent on UCR to really help us make this a
16 tremendous reality.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much. So I guess
19 it's back to me, and -- unless you want to make a comment.

20 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: No.

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: You're going to wait anyway. So
22 here's the -- here's what I think, at this point. First
23 of all, this is a very major investment on the part of the
24 State of California in Southern California. And it's
25 great to have an opportunity to be part of making that

1 happen.

2 To my colleagues who don't come from the region,
3 I feel a little bit like I'm in the decision making that
4 sometimes the local officials are on a land-use decision,
5 you know, looking at the traffic impacts, looking at the
6 jobs impacts, looking at other kind of synergies in the
7 community. And frankly, it was the advantages of
8 Riverside more as a community which came together to make
9 the very strong presentation and commitments that they did
10 that swayed me more than the benefits of the university.
11 Not that I'm unmindful of, you know, the benefits of being
12 with the University of California, but that we had our
13 former Board Member Ron Loveridge who I see is in the
14 audience today, who spent so many years both as Mayor and
15 as a South Coast Board member working on air quality
16 issues, the reality that Riverside is the epicenter
17 historically of the air in California, not a distinction
18 that I'm sure they wish to be reminded of, but it is a
19 part of the reality, and that the community, as a whole,
20 is a place that has done so much to try and address its
21 own problems as well makes this an appealing opportunity
22 to be a strategic partner for Riverside in this effort.

23 Clearly, however, the success of ARB's motor
24 vehicle program is a direct result of the work that's done
25 at the Haagen-Smit Laboratory. And while observing that

1 we have many graduates of UC Riverside and Cal Poly, I
2 don't think either one of them is going to stop sending us
3 very fine graduates or providing opportunities to work
4 with.

5 So I think we have to recognize that a move is
6 going to have a serious impact on our programs from the
7 moment we start seriously working on it. And we have to
8 make sure that whatever we're doing in furtherance of this
9 project does not jeopardize our hard earned respect and
10 our reputation with the industries that we regulate or
11 cost us in any way that we can possibly avoid the
12 retention of our expert staff, because they are at the
13 core of our work.

14 I have a list of ideas and suggestions, which I
15 have -- which actually are in writing. I'm just going to
16 read them, because I think it's important for everybody to
17 hear, but I assure you that I will give it to Richard to
18 have in writing as well, because I think they could become
19 part of our direction to the Executive Officer as part of
20 our action here today.

21 So clearly, we've heard that we need to move
22 quickly on assuring our employees that we're hearing them,
23 and that we're going to work with them as they consider
24 their options for moving, flexible schedules,
25 tele-working, working non-standard hours, mobile work

1 stations. All of those are issues that they all have
2 challenges, but they all are things that we have to give
3 serious consideration to, given the horrific traffic that
4 we already deal with. But now that we're thinking about
5 the move, it becomes very timely to start working on them
6 now.

7 The transportation options needs of our current
8 employees, what we can do as citizens of Southern
9 California to be working with the transit agencies, but
10 also to be working with our employees, in terms of helping
11 to overcome additional costs of commuting for them is
12 going to have to be a part of the consideration here, as
13 well as the possibility for the enforcement and field
14 staff to be able to work, not only from home, as many of
15 them do, but also to be able to have access to vehicles
16 there, and whether there could be courier options, as Mr.
17 Eisenhut mentioned, for fuels and samples and so forth.

18 We already do this between our heavy-duty testing
19 facility and the main laboratory. We have a shuttle going
20 back and forth with samples. It's not ideal, but given
21 the challenges of getting around, it's -- it may be that
22 we should be doing more of that on a regular basis.

23 Looking at reimbursable expenses in connection
24 with relocating, as well as temporary living expenses and
25 moving, options for reimbursing relocation for staff that

1 are not covered by the professional engineers in
2 California government contract, because that unit has
3 authorization to receive relocation costs, but the others
4 do not. So we're going to have to figure out what we do
5 for the non-represented employees as well.

6 Looking to our new partners with the University
7 of California as well as the City and County of Riverside
8 to look at what the amenities are. We heard mention of
9 many of these things at the hearing, but we have to try to
10 put meat on the bones in terms of help and attention for
11 relocation of spousal jobs, the amenities that Chancellor
12 Wilcox mentioned in his handout that included access to
13 child care facilities, adjunct faculty positions. I mean,
14 these are all things that are hypothetical now. And
15 obviously it depends on individuals and their interests
16 and choices, but we need to start figuring out how we're
17 going to make those things real opportunities, as Ms. Berg
18 has stated before.

19 We know that employees are, in some cases,
20 apprehensive about moving from their relatively safe area
21 where they are comfortable now to the big City of
22 Riverside. And there may be some issues there about
23 security. And I think also looking ahead, as has been
24 mentioned before, this move is going to take place in
25 roughly five years. Not everybody will make the move,

1 either because they were already planning to retire or
2 because their career choices focus them in other areas.

3 But in every instance, we need to be enhancing
4 our succession planning, recruiting, things that have come
5 up really through the ARB staff surveys. And again, using
6 ARB staff as a focus group to help develop these ideas as
7 was done during the earlier stages of this process is
8 going to be very important, I think.

9 I also want to say, and I've aye already been
10 contacted by the Chamber of Commerce in Riverside offering
11 to do this, but plans to acquaint the staff early with
12 opportunities that exist for them in the Riverside area,
13 including schools, housing, et cetera, entertainment
14 opportunities and so forth, we should really be starting
15 that soon, even if we're not going to be moving right
16 away, just so people have a better idea of what their
17 future opportunities might be.

18 Lastly, in order that this not just languish, I
19 want to say staff reporting back within 60 days about what
20 they've done to implement these suggestions, and to put
21 together a real plan for transition. I expect we're going
22 to want to be hearing at least quarterly reports on the
23 progress of this project anyhow, given its importance to
24 ARB.

25 But I think on this particular issue of outreach

1 to the employees, mobilizing whatever staff resources we
2 need from Sacramento to assist in this effort, as well as
3 seeking additional resources, if you need them, as part of
4 the budget process to not just do designing and building,
5 but also to look at the employee side of this, those are
6 all going to be important concerns.

7 So I have this all down in writing. You do, too,
8 I think. So I don't have to ask you to recite it all back
9 to me, but I think I would appreciate some comments from
10 you, Mr. Corey.

11 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thank you, Chair.
12 And the theme that came through, and is coming through
13 loud and clear from the Board, is the respect of the and
14 appreciation of the extraordinary staff, I mean, that is
15 crystal clear. And you all know it's the life-blood of
16 the effectiveness of this organization. I heard, you
17 know, significant concerns about the need to mitigate and
18 really minimize disruption. And you called out, Chair,
19 just a few examples, in terms of the impact and
20 opportunities, options for dealing with the transportation
21 the -- the very real transportation issue. I mean, I
22 won't sugarcoat it. It's an issue we're going to have to
23 deal with and take head on and work through.

24 The relocation related issues, the comment that
25 was made about enforcement and how we can effectively

1 continue to operate that element of the program, which may
2 mean some additional satellite related activities. And
3 looking at exploring flexible work schedules, that's
4 something that we're going to need to look at as well.

5 But to kind of -- to get to the heart of the
6 point that you just made, which was although breaking
7 ground is still a few years out, there's a lot to do. And
8 although occupancy is targeted for 2020, we'll get to work
9 on this now. And the way we're going to do this is go
10 right back to the amazing team that we have, sit down with
11 them, and their creativity, as well as that of this Board,
12 Riverside, and a range of other partners, in terms of
13 walking through each of these issues, calling them out,
14 and really beginning to dive in in terms of what are our
15 opportunities, what are the options, what the trade-offs,
16 and develop a plan.

17 And, Chair, we'll report back in 60 days the
18 progress on that plan. And as you requested, because I'll
19 need, as the Executive Officer of this organization,
20 continued interaction and assistance from this Board, as
21 issues are identified, as also as opportunities. You'll
22 get quarterly reports, how's it going, are the problems,
23 are there issues, areas where I need help or the team
24 needs help.

25 I'll also be reaching out very quickly to

1 Riverside and UCR and following up on Chancellor Wilcox's
2 commitment last -- at last week's Board hearing in terms
3 of number of opportunities that were on the table to fully
4 explore those and work with them, because I think that's
5 part of the overall strategy.

6 So at this point, providing, you know, the
7 direction as I understand it going, it's going to be get
8 to work, get to work with the team, get to work on an
9 overall timetable while we're working on the facility plan
10 as well.

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Just as a practical
12 matter, once this Board votes, our recommendation, along
13 with all the other materials, are due to the Joint
14 Legislative Budget Committee. That's our next step in
15 this process, correct?

16 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: It's correct. It's
17 actually is submitted to Department of Finance, Department
18 of Finance will transmit it to the Joint Legislative
19 Budget Committee, which will have 30 days to provide
20 comments. We'll be responding to those comments. If
21 there's any issues, I'll be reporting back to the Board on
22 that as well. And then the next stop would be back to
23 Department of General Services to begin the site prep and
24 associated transfer -- land transfer.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Do we have any additional

1 comments before we proceed to a roll call?

2 Mr. Corey.

3 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Chair, I wanted to add,
4 my colleagues here pointed out two additional areas that
5 we will need to follow up on as well. In terms of the
6 follow up on the site, it will include a full CEQA
7 evaluation. And we also want to work with Riverside and
8 the commitment in terms of zero net energy and how that
9 could potentially factor into the project.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, the need to acquire
11 sufficient land, so that we can actually generate our own
12 electricity on site is one of the factors that we've been
13 looking at.

14 All right. Seeing no additional --

15 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yes. This is --

16 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, excuse me?

17 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yes, this is Hector.

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: Hector, yes, go ahead.

19 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: One more data point as
20 this moves forward, which is I'm sure we are going to be
21 losing employees, I'd like to have a running count of how
22 much employees we lose who, in their exit interviews or in
23 other ways, let us know that they are leaving because of
24 this move.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: You know, I'm sure we can keep

1 track of what's going on with our staffing in El Monte.
2 You are perhaps deliberately doing your best to send a
3 message. I would like to say that I hope that that is not
4 the way it's heard, because I realize, having met with the
5 employees, with the group, including the leaders of the
6 laboratory day before yesterday, that while their
7 feelings, you know, ranged from concern to, in a few
8 cases, support, but in many, many cases opposition to the
9 decision, that, you know, our job is to reach out to them
10 and talk to them about the Board's thinking.

11 And I think driving a wedge between the staff and
12 the Board is the opposite of what we should be trying to
13 do. But we will certainly be keeping track of what's
14 going on with employment in El Monte, and, you know,
15 you'll have access to that information, absolutely.

16 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Madam Clerk, would
18 you please call the roll.

19 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Dr. Balmes?

20 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Aye.

21 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. De La Torre?

22 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: No.

23 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. Eisenhut?

24 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: No.

25 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Senator Florez?

1 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Aye.

2 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Gioia?

3 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Aye.

4 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mrs. Riordan?

5 BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Aye.

6 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Serna?

7 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: No.

8 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Professor Sperling?

9 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Aye.

10 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Takvorian?

11 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Aye.

12 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Vice Chair Berg?

13 VICE CHAIR BERG: Aye.

14 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Chair Nichols?

15 CHAIR NICHOLS: Aye.

16 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: The motion passes 8 to 3.

17 Thank you, and thanks to all for an extremely
18 cordial and high level discussion.

19 And we'll now move on to the next stages. And I
20 think -- did anyone sign up for general public comment?

21 BOARD CLERK JENSEN: (Shakes head.)

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Then we can be adjourned.

23 All right.

24 (Thereupon the Air Resources Board
25 adjourned at 11:15 a.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E O F R E P O R T E R

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

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 24th day of March, 2016.

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