

MEETING  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
AIR RESOURCES BOARD

RIVERSIDE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CHAMBERS  
FIRST FLOOR  
4080 LEMON STREET  
RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 2018

9:11 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

Mr. John Eisenhut

Senator Dean Florez

Assembly Member Eduardo Garcia

Supervisor John Gioia

Senator Ricardo Lara

Ms. Judy Mitchell

Supervisor Phil Serna

Dr. Alex Sherriffs

Professor Daniel Sperling

Ms. Diane Takvorian

STAFF:

Mr. Richard Corey, Executive Officer

Ms. Edie Chang, Deputy Executive Officer

Mr. Kurt Karperos, Deputy Executive Officer

Ms. Ellen Peter, Chief Counsel

Ms. Veronica Eady, Assistant Executive Officer

Ms. La Ronda Bowen, Ombudsman

Ms. Emily Wimberger, Chief Economist

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

STAFF:

Ms. Cari Anderson, Branch Chief, Freight Transportation Branch, Transportation and Toxics Division(TTD)

Ms. Heather Arias, Branch Chief, Community Planning Branch, Office of Community Air Protection(OCAP)

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

Mr. Pippin Brehler, Senior Attorney, Legal Office

Ms. Kirsten Cayabyab, Air Pollution Specialist, South Coast Air Quality Planning Section, AQPSD

Ms. Nicole Dolney, Branch Chief, Transportation Planning Branch, AQPSD

Mr. Rhead Enion, Senior Attorney Legal Office

Ms. Andrea Juarez, Air Pollution Specialist, State Strategy Section, OCAP

Mr. Vernon Hughes, Branch Chief, Community Assessment Branch, OCAP

Mr. Nesamani Kalandiyur, Manager, Transportation Analysis Section, AQPSD

Ms. Karen Magliano, Director OCAP

Ms. Ajay Mangat, Manager, Freight Systems Section, TTD

Ms. Cynthia Marvin, Division Chief, TTD

Mr. Gabriel Monroe, Attorney, Legal Office

Ms. Lezlie Kimura Szeto, Manager, Sustainable Communities Policy and Planning Section, AQPSD

Ms. Heather King, Air Pollution Specialist, Sustainable Communities Policy and Planning Section, AQPSD

Mr. Craig Segall, Assistant Chief Counsel, Legal Office

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

STAFF:

Ms. Carol Sutkus, Manager, South Coast Air Quality Planning Section, AQPSD

Ms. Sylvia Vanderspek, Branch Chief, Air Quality Planning Branch, AQPSD

Ms. Elizabeth Yura, Branch Chief, Freight Activity Branch, TTD

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Alan Abbs, California Air Pollution Control Officers Association

Ms. Estrella Arana, Sierra Club

Dr. Martha Argüella, Physicians for Social Responsibility

Mr. Victor Banuet, Colton High School Eco-Friendly Club

Ms. Alix Bockelman, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Association of Bay Area Governments

Mr. Bo Boylan, Solidia Technologies

Mr. Jack Broadbent Bay Area Air Quality Management District

Ms. Astrid Calderas

Mr. Todd Campbell, Clean Energy

Ms. Ana Carlos, CCAEJ

Ms. Llesenia Cevallos, Environmental Health Coalition

Ms. Elisa Chang, CALPIRG

Mr. Christopher Chavez

Mr. James Corless, Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Mr. Paul Cort, Earthjustice

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

STAFF:

Mr. George Coursier, Sierra Club San Diego

Ms. Nikita Daryanani, Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability

Mr. Harvey Eder, Public Solar Power Coalition

Ms. Demi Espinoza, Safe Routes to School National Partnership

Mr. Steve Figueroa, Inland Empire Latino Coalition

Mr. Juan Flores

Ms. Genevieve Gale, Central Valley Air Quality Coalition

Ms. Shirley Gamble, Watts Clean Air and Energy Committee

Ms. Lillian Garcia, LA Union Hace La Fuerza

Mr. Cristian Garza

Mr. Ruben Garza

Mr. Ricardo Gastelum, CBE

Ms. Esperanza Gonzalez, Environmental Health Coalition

Mr. David Grubb, Sierra Club

Mr. Gabriel Guerrero, CBE

Ms. Lupe Guerrero, CBE

Ms. Katy Gurin, 380 Riverside

Mr. Christian Guzman, CBE

Mr. George Hague

Mr. Kevin Hamilton, Central California Asthma Collaborative

Ms. Michele Hasson, CCAEJ

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

STAFF:

Mr. Allen Hernandez, CCAEJ

Ms. Jennifer Hernandez, The 200

Ms. Lizette Hernandez, Sierra Club

Mr. Miguel Hernandez, CCV

Ms. Bonnie Holmes-Gen, American Lung Association in California

Mr. Hasan Ikhata, Southern California Association of Governments

Mr. Mike Jacob, Pacific Merchant Shipping Association

Dr. Karen Jakpor, American Lung Association

Ms. Asher Jones

Mr. Tom Jordan, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

Ms. Kim Kawada, San Diego Association of Governments

Ms. Graciela Larios, CCAEJ

Mr. Thomas Lawson, California Natural Gas Vehicle Coalition

Mr. Bob Leiter, Stay Cool For Grandkids

Ms. Bryn Linblad, Climate Resolve

Ms. Irma Loyva, CBE

Mr. Humberto Lugo, IVAN Coachella, Comite Civico del Valle

Dr. Joe Lyou, South Coast Air Quality Management District

Ms. Margarita Margano, Environmental Health Coalition

Ms. Carmina Martinez, Environmental Health Coalition

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

STAFF:

Mr. Richard McCaskill, CARB Small Business Opportunity  
Advisory Panel

Mr. Kent Minault

Ms. Amy Mmagu, Cal Chamber

Mr. Edith Moreno, SoCalGas

Mr. Wayne Nastro, South Coast Air Quality Management  
District

Ms. Alli Neri, Climate Action Campaign

Mr. Luis Olmedo, Komite Civico del Valle

Mr. Rodolfo Olivo, CBE

Mr. Brad Poiriez, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management  
District

Ms. Esther Portillo, CCAEJ

Ms. Linda G. Pratt, Stay Cool For Grandkids

Mr. Matt Regan, Bay Area Council

Mr. Kyle Rentschler, Sierra Club

Ms. Ana Reynoso, Environmental Health Coalition

Ms. Alicia Rivera, CBE

Ms. Maha Rizvi, represented Assembly Member Eloise Gomez  
Reyes

Mr. Thomas Rocha, CCAEJ

Mr. Greg Roche, Clean Energy

Mr. Cody Rosenfield, Coalition for Clean Air

Mr. Carter Rubin, Natural Resources Defense Council

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

STAFF:

Mr. Sebastian Sarria, Climate Action Campaign

Mr. Chris Shimoda, California Trucking Association

Ms. Shelly Sullivan, Climate Change Policy Coalition

Ms. Taylor Thomas, EYCEJ

Mr. Bill Tippets, Southwest Wetlands Interpretive Association

Ms. Heather Tomley, Port of Long Beach

Mr. Christian Torres, Comite Civico del Valle

Ms. Ashley Tremonti, City of San Diego

Ms. Stephanie Tsai, California Environmental Justice Alliance

Ms. Andrea Viadurre, CCAEJ

Ms. Bianca Villanueva, California Association of Port Authorities

Ms. Joy Williams, Environmental Health Coalition

Ms. Ella Wise, Climate Plan

Ms. Sophia Wolfram, Climate Action Campaign

Ms. Jenny Xiomara Rosales Aguilar, Queremos Cero Emission

Mr. Andrew Yancey, Golden Door



I N D E X

	PAGE
Call to Order	1
Pledge of Allegiance	1
Roll Call	1
Opening Remarks by Chair Nichols	2
Item 18-2-1	
Chair Nichols	4
Executive Officer Corey	5
Ms. Gamble	7
Mr. Minault	8
Motion	21
Vote	21
Item 18-2-2 & 18-2-3	
Chair Nichols	9
Executive Officer Corey	10
Mr. Eder	13
Ms. Arana	15
Board Discussion and Q&A	16
Motion 18-2-2	21
Vote	21
Motion 18-2-3	22
Vote	22
Item 18-2-4	
Chair Nichols	23
Executive Officer Corey	24
Staff Presentation	26
Board Discussion and Q&A	39
Mr. Ikhmeta	47
Ms. Kawada	52
Ms. Bockelman	57
Mr. Corless	61
Mr. Regan	82
Ms. Holmes-Gen	84
Ms. Tremonti	86
Ms. Reynoso	91
Ms. Cevallos	93
Ms. Margano	95
Ms. Martinez	95
Ms. Gonzalez	96
Ms. Pratt	97
Mr. Leiter	99

I N D E X   C O N T I N U E D

	PAGE
Item 18-2-4(continued)	
Mr. Coursier	103
Mr. Grubb	104
Mr. Rentschler	105
Ms. Wolfram	107
Ms. Neri	109
Mr. Tippets	110
Ms. Wise	112
Mr. Rubin	115
Ms. Lindblad	115
Ms. Espinoza	118
Mr. Yancey	120
Mr. Hamilton	123
Ms. Gale	126
Mr. Figueroa	128
Ms. Hernandez	131
Ms. Gurin	134
Mr. Hague	134
Mr. Eder	136
Ms. Daryanani	138
 Afternoon Session	 142
 Item 18-2-4(continued)	
Board Discussion and Q&A	142
Motion	160
Amendment Motion	161
Vote on Amendment	168
Vote on Resolution	170
 Item 18-2-5 & 18-2-6	
Chair Nichols	170
Executive Officer Corey	172
Staff Presentation	174
Board Discussion and Q&A	206
Ms. Rizvi	211
Dr. Lyou	214
Mr. Jordan	216
Ms. Hasson	218
Dr. Jakpor	221
Ms. Tomley	223
Mr. Rosenfield	224
Mr. Garza	227
Ms. Villanueva	229
Mr. Hamilton	230
Mr. Minault	234

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

	PAGE
Item 18-2-5 & 18-2-6(continued)	
Ms. Portillo	235
Mr. Cort	237
Ms. Williams	240
Mr. Hernandez	242
Ms. Espinoza	246
Mr. Rocha	248
Mr. Carlos	250
Ms. Larios	252
Ms. Viadurre	254
Mr. Hague	256
Mr. Shimoda	259
Mr. Eder	261
Mr. Banuet	263
Ms. Chang	265
Mr. Lawson	268
Ms. Moreno	269
Ms. Hernandez	272
Ms. Thomas	275
Ms. Jones	276
Mr. Campbell	278
Mr. Jacob	282
Mr. Garza	284
Mr. Roche	286
Mr. Lugo	288
Board Discussion and Q&A	290
Item 18-2-7	
Chair Nichols	311
Executive Officer Corey	312
Staff Presentation	313
Mr. Nastri	325
Mr. Broadbent	327
Mr. Jordan	330
Mr. Poiriez	331
Mr. Abbs	333
Board Discussion and Q&A	335
Ms. Williams	338
Ms. Sullivan	339
Ms. Mmagu	341
Mr. Chavez	341
Ms. Gale	343
Mr. Hamilton	345
Mr. Eder	347
Ms. Guerrero	348
Ms. Aguilar	349

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

	PAGE
Item 18-2-7(continued)	
Ms. Guerrero	350
Mr. Gastelum	351
Mr. Olivo	353
Ms. Loyva	353
Dr. Argüello	354
Mr. Hernandez	356
Mr. Olmedo	358
Ms. Garcia	360
Ms. Calderas	361
Mr. Torres	363
Mr. Lugo	364
Mr. McCaskill	365
Ms. Daryanani	367
Mr. Flores	368
Ms. Tsai	370
Ms. Rivera	372
Mr. Guzman	374
Board Discussion and Q&A	376
Public Comment	382
Adjournment	385
Reporter's Certificate	386

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning, everybody. Would  
3 you please take your seats We're about to begin.

4 Will you please take your seats.

5 I guess -- I think people are having a really  
6 good time, but it's time to start the meeting or we could  
7 have a meeting of our own, I guess.

8 All right. It seems that that's what I had to  
9 do. The March 22nd, 2018. Public meeting of California  
10 Air Resources Board will come to order. Thank you all  
11 very much for being here.

12 Before we begin our agenda, we will all please  
13 rise and say the pledge of allegiance to the flag, which  
14 is right here.

15 (Thereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was  
16 recited in unison.)

17 CHAIRPERSON NICHOLS: Would the clerk please call  
18 the roll.

19 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Balmes?

20 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.

21 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. De La Torre?

22 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Here.

23 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. Eisenhut?

24 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here.

25 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator Florez?

1 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here.

2 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Assembly Member Garcia?  
3 Supervisor Gioia?

4 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Here.

5 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator Lara?  
6 Ms. Mitchell?

7 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Here.

8 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mrs. Riordan?  
9 Supervisor Roberts?

10 Supervisor Serna?

11 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Here.

12 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Sherriffs?

13 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Testing. Testing.

14 Here.

15 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Professor Sperling?

16 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.

17 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Ms. Takvorian?

18 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.

19 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Vice Chair Berg?

20 VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.

21 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Chair Nichols?

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Here.

23 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Madam Chair, we have a  
24 quorum.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. A couple of announcements

1 to make before we get started.

2 First of all, I want to let everybody know that  
3 interpretation services will be provided in Spanish for  
4 the discussion items. Headsets are available outside the  
5 hearing room at the attendant's sign-up table, and can be  
6 picked up at any time.

7 Madam translator, would you repeat that, please?

8 (Thereupon interpretation in Spanish.)

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: Gracias.

10 Anyone who wishes to testify should fill out a  
11 request to speak card available in the lobby outside the  
12 Board room. We'd appreciate it if you will turn that into  
13 a Board assistant or to the clerk seated over here at this  
14 table prior to the commencement of the item that you're  
15 wanting to speak on.

16 Also, since items 18-2-5, the update on  
17 implementation of the State strategy for the SIP, and the  
18 South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, and 18-2-6, the  
19 update on concepts for minimizing the community health  
20 impacts from freight facilities are two agenda items that  
21 are closely related, we are going to hear them both  
22 together. So the two items will be combined in the  
23 presentation, and then there will be one comment period  
24 for both items.

25 I want to make sure that speakers are aware that

1 the Board will impose a three minute time limit. We  
2 appreciate it if you give your name when you come up to  
3 the podium and then put your testimony into your own  
4 words. It's easier for us to follow it if you will just  
5 get straight to your main points.

6 We appreciate all the nice things you want to say  
7 about our staff, but you don't have to take up the time  
8 that you want to take up with making other points by  
9 saying good things about them. And you don't need to read  
10 your written statements, if you have one, because it will  
11 be automatically entered into the -- into the record.

12 So with that -- oh, for safety reasons, please  
13 note the emergency exits to the rear of the room. There  
14 are two. In the event of a fire alarm, we're required to  
15 evacuate this room immediately and to go out of the  
16 building. When the all-clear signal is given, we will  
17 return to the hearing room and resume the meeting.

18 Okay. I think that's it for the  
19 pre-announcements.

20 The first item on the agenda was listed as a  
21 consent item, a public meeting to consider the South Coast  
22 Air Quality Management District's on-road heavy-duty  
23 vehicle incentive measure. I need to ask the clerk if any  
24 witnesses signed up to testify on this item.

25 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Madam Chair, we had two



1 people sign up to speak for this item.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Since we have had a  
3 request now then, we need to remove this from the consent  
4 calendar, and follow the normal procedure for a Board  
5 meeting.

6 So, Mr. Corey, would you please summarize this  
7 item.

8 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair.

9 The 2016 State strategy for the State  
10 Implementation Plan was adopted by the Board March 23rd,  
11 2017. The State SIP Strategy contains the State's  
12 emission reduction commitments for the South Coast Air  
13 Quality Management District, including commitments for  
14 meeting the 80 parts per billion 8-hour ozone standard in  
15 2023.

16 While regulations form the basis of the strategy  
17 and are critical to driving the technology development and  
18 deployment of the cleanest technologies into the fleet,  
19 incentive efforts are needed to expand the deployment of  
20 these cleaner technologies in time to meet the federally  
21 mandated air quality standards.

22 Among the proposed measures in the State SIP  
23 Strategy was a commitment to develop the incentive funding  
24 to achieve further emission reductions from on-road  
25 heavy-duty vehicles or the South Coast's incentive

1 measure. This item delivers on that commitment.

2 The South Coast incentive measure supports the  
3 need to expand deployment of the cleanest technologies by  
4 using Carl Moyer Air Quality Standards Attainment Program  
5 funding to accelerate the penetration of near-zero and  
6 zero emission heavy-duty trucks operating in the South  
7 Coast Air Basin and produce emission reductions in 2023.

8 For these emission reductions to be approved by  
9 the U.S. EPA for SIP credit, staff followed U.S. EPA  
10 guidance as it worked with U.S. EPA and district staff to  
11 develop the first-of-its-kind prospective incentive  
12 measure. This effort will serve as a template for CARB  
13 and air districts to take prospective credit in the SIP  
14 for emission reductions from the incentive programs in the  
15 future.

16 This proposal would establish the accounting  
17 framework needed to receive prospective SIP credit for  
18 turning over on-road heavy-duty trucks to cleaner trucks  
19 through existing incentive programs such as Moyer.

20 U.S. EPA guidelines outlined the requirement  
21 states need to meet in order for the emission reductions  
22 from incentive projects to be SIP credible.

23 California already has in place the accounting  
24 framework to receive SIP credit for incentive projects  
25 after the projects have been completed, and the funds

1 expended. The South Coast incentive measure extends that  
2 framework to future projects for incentive programs where  
3 the future funding stream is guaranteed.

4 If approved, the South Coast incentive measure  
5 will be submitted to U.S. EPA for inclusion in the  
6 California SIP.

7 That concludes pie remarks

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Corey. We have  
9 three witnesses who've signed up. We'll start with  
10 Shirley Gamble. Ms. Gamble, would you please come forward  
11 to speak. There you are.

12 Thank you. Just to be clear, everybody, come on  
13 down, and you'll be speaking from the podium here.

14 Thanks.

15 MS. GAMBLE: Good morning.

16 CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning.

17 MS. GAMBLE: My name is Shirley Gamble. I'm here  
18 from the Watts Clean Air and Energy Group. Thank you for  
19 giving me this opportunity.

20 I'm here for two reasons: One to say I hope you  
21 have the courage and the commitment to draft for the no  
22 emi -- zero emission for the drayage trucks. And I just  
23 learned what that words means, so that's the one that --  
24 the trucks that go from city to city, from the port to  
25 the -- to the other cities, so that's one of the reasons.

1           And the other reason I'm here is I'm hoping that  
2 the draft includes we say good jobs, but good jobs to me  
3 mean jobs that can afford a family to support itself.

4           So thank you.

5           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you for coming. Appreciate  
6 that very much.

7           Next is it Kent Minault. I hope I pronounced it  
8 correctly.

9           Hi.

10          MR. MINAULT: Good morning, Board members. My  
11 name is Kent Minault.

12          CHAIR NICHOLS: Minault.

13          MR. MINAULT: That's quite all right.

14          CHAIR NICHOLS: Pronounced the French way.

15          MR. MINAULT: French names are awful difficult.

16          I volunteer with the Sierra Club. And I work as  
17 an adult education teacher. My remarks are neutral,  
18 because I'm perfectly in favor of the incentives, but I'm  
19 concerned about what are called near-zero emission  
20 vehicles.

21          Right now, I'm teaching a class of students  
22 through L.A. Trade Tech to help them pass entrance  
23 examples to union apprenticeship programs. And the unions  
24 that are looking to recruit are the ones like IBEW Local  
25 11, whose members will build the battery electric buses

1 that will be deployed across Southern California in the  
2 next 12 years, as well as building the charging  
3 infrastructure to go with it.

4 Now, we're calling on the Board to show courage  
5 and save lives. As a result of inaction, children are  
6 dying. Now, zero-emission vehicles are the solution. We  
7 ask that you start moving us to a zero-emission truck  
8 rule. What we have now is dirty air and bad jobs. The  
9 only winners are the fossil fuel and goods movement  
10 industries. Workers are stuck in low-paying jobs, while  
11 their families struggle with dirty air. With a clearly  
12 thought out plan to move us to a zero-emission  
13 transportation system, we can promise our children a clean  
14 air future, and their parents decent paying, collectively  
15 bargains jobs.

16 Let's demonstrate the leadership that will get us  
17 to the future we want. Thanks for your attention.

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

19 The third speaker on this item has also asked to  
20 speak on the other 2 items that were on our consent  
21 calendar. And so I am going to pull also items 2 and 3,  
22 the cap on greenhouse gas emissions, and the consideration  
23 of research proposals.

24 And I think what we'll do is ask Mr. Corey to  
25 briefly speak to those items and then we'll let Mr. Eger

1 come -- or Eder pardon me, Eder, come forward and speak on  
2 all of them.

3 Okay.

4 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Madam Chair, before we  
5 move to the next item, I believe we need to vote for this  
6 item?

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Excuse me?

8 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Take a vote for this  
9 item?

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: I'm not understanding.

11 Yes, he also wanted to speak on this item as  
12 well.

13 Oh, well, he has to be allowed to speak before we  
14 can take a vote. Yeah, so I was planning on just doing  
15 them in order, is that all right?

16 Okay.

17 Would you go ahead, please.

18 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair.

19 So the second consent item I'm going to briefly  
20 describe it. CARB staff has proposed amendments to the  
21 Cap-and-Trade Regulation in order to accomplish two goals.  
22 First, CARB staff seeks to clarify existing requirements  
23 related to changes of facility ownership. Specifically,  
24 the proposed amendments clarify that the Cap-and-Trade  
25 Regulation requires a successor entity after change of

1 ownership to be responsible for the outstanding  
2 pre-transfer compliance obligation of the predecessor  
3 covered entity. This clarification is made in light of  
4 ongoing bankruptcy litigation involving a covered entity  
5 in the program.

6 Second, CARB seeks to clarify the regulatory  
7 procedure for establishing the auction reserve price.  
8 Under the existing California regulation, the auction  
9 reserve price in effect for a specific joint auction is  
10 determined as the higher of the annual auction reserve  
11 prices established individually by California and Quebec  
12 after converting the prices to a common currency.

13 California's regulation does not reflect changes  
14 in Ontario's regulation, and does not recognize the  
15 possibility that the joint auction reserve price could be  
16 set by the Ontario auction reserve price.

17 The proposed amendment is necessary to reflect  
18 that Ontario and Quebec use province-specific inflation  
19 rates when setting their annual auction reserve prices.  
20 Without the proposed amendment, in the unlikely event that  
21 Ontario's auction reserve price were higher than both  
22 California and Quebec's, this could prevent CARB executive  
23 officer from certifying the auction result.

24 The proposed amendments do not change the  
25 structure of the program. CARB staff will also continue

1 with the rulemaking process to propose more substantial  
2 modifications to comport with the requirements of AB 398.  
3 That process will conclude after the -- in -- over the  
4 course of this -- this year.

5           And the third consent item concerns research  
6 proposals. The research covered by the research proposals  
7 before you today support the Board's regulatory priorities  
8 related to health, environmental justice, air quality, and  
9 climate change. The proposed projects will support  
10 California's air quality and climate goals by evaluating  
11 the effectiveness of multiple criteria pollutant emission  
12 reduction programs, identifying high emitting vehicles,  
13 measuring brake wear emissions, developing an instrument  
14 to measure toxic metal aerosols, and creating a framework  
15 to measure greenhouse gas emission reductions in zero net  
16 carbon communities.

17           These research projects were presented to you as  
18 concepts in the research plan, and have now been developed  
19 into full proposals. They have been reviewed by CARB's  
20 research screening committee, as well as by other State  
21 agencies and funding organizations to promote coordination  
22 and avoid duplication.

23           The majority of these proposals includes low  
24 overhead rate and leverages the expertise of researchers  
25 within the University of California and California State



1 University systems.

2 And we recommend approval of these proposals.

3 That concludes the summary.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much. Okay. Okay  
5 No. Sorry.

6 Mr. Eder, would you please come forward.

7 MR. EDER: Good morning. My name is Harvey Eder.  
8 I'm speaking for myself and for the Public Solar Power  
9 Coalition. First, I have a process question.

10 Am I getting three minutes on each -- you know,  
11 each of the three items?

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: I think three minutes total, sir.

13 MR. EDER: I protest that, and say that my time  
14 is being cut. I don't know how the Brown Act fits in or  
15 whatever.

16 Anyway, for the district on one again echoing  
17 what the previous two speakers said there should be  
18 zero-emission vehicles, trucks, battery. I incorporate by  
19 reference the February issue of The Economist, the article  
20 on electric vehicles, electric trucks. They're here  
21 today. Anyway, it's cost effective, and whatnot. And  
22 been looking at this and talking to manufacturers.

23 On greenhouse -- okay, first of all, for natural  
24 gas, it's biased. This plan is a fossil fuel natural gas  
25 plant. All the plants for the state have been. Ninety

1 percent of gas is imported into the state. Health and  
2 Safety Code 530002(b) says the legislative intent is to  
3 not use fossil fuels, especially non-renewable imported  
4 into this State. This is not even published in the blue  
5 book, this 53000. And it also includes for a solar  
6 financing secondary mortgage entity. Anyway, this -- this  
7 has been purged. This is 81 from Row Behrity[phonteic].

8           The particulate matter -- they have not looked  
9 at -- talked with Dr. Linda Smith. There needs to be a  
10 study on dirty gas as toxics, looking at formaldehyde  
11 benzene deaths per million has never been done. NOx, SOx,  
12 PM, that's where the body count is at \$9 million per. In  
13 South Coast you say 4,000, that's \$36 billion per year, 10  
14 years. Thirty years to 50 years life of a solar system.  
15 You're talking over a billion to billion -- trillion to a  
16 trillion and a half dollars. Anyway, the research should  
17 be done on natural -- dirty gas as a toxic.

18           Also, there's a lot happening with --  
19 concentrating solar and thermal storage at less cost and  
20 more viability and options that it can perform, including  
21 seasonal storage.

22           I don't see my time thing here is that -- oh,  
23 okay. Well, it looks like I'm out of time. I am -- we  
24 are litigating against you folks and had a tentative  
25 couple days ago in court. And consider this part of

1 settlement discussions. Talk to me.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you. We had one  
3 last late minute sign up from the Sierra Club -- or  
4 someone representing the Sierra Club. Estrella Arana, if  
5 you're here.

6 MS. ARANA: My name is Estrella and I am from San  
7 Bernardino. I'm disappointed that 200 gas trash trucks  
8 are being distributed to disadvantaged communities in the  
9 Inland Empire. We don't need anymore gas. Purchasing  
10 near-zero emission vehicles, natural gas vehicles, is a  
11 half step that will achieve little, if any, environmental  
12 long-term benefits in order to achieve California's  
13 greenhouse gas targets, SB 100. We must push for  
14 completely zero-emission vehicles, especially in areas  
15 with the worst air quality.

16 Thank you.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

18 Okay. I think we agree with you on the drive to  
19 zero-emission vehicles, but that's not specifically  
20 covered in any of the items that we're voting on at the  
21 moment.

22 I think we need to take them up in order. So  
23 let's start with the first one, which is the incentives.  
24 I'm sorry. I didn't -- I'm trying to learn how to use the  
25 system. Okay. Got it.

1           BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: No problem. Thank you.  
2 I'm glad actually we pulled some of the items. I would  
3 like to ask staff and -- in the future, I know this item  
4 on cap and trade is on consent. I'm just wondering, given  
5 the timeframe of the legislation, given the ongoing  
6 conversation in this realm, whether or not we should not  
7 put cap and trade on consent moving forward, and for a  
8 couple of -- couple of reasons.

9           You know, first, from my perspective only, and  
10 maybe staff can delve a little more into this, the  
11 resolution is to inform the Board on what specifically?  
12 So I'm trying to understand what the resolution is  
13 actually trying to accomplish?

14           DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: Sorry. So  
15 Senator Florez, the -- this is actually a regulatory  
16 amendment, and it has two main parts.

17           BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Yes.

18           DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: One piece has to  
19 do with making sure that as companies are going through  
20 bankruptcy that their emission obligations are passed on.  
21 And we think that the regulation is clear on that, but we  
22 wanted to clarify. So that's one piece, and it relates to  
23 a current proceeding that is happening right now.

24           BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay.

25           DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: The second piece

1 was an oversight in the drafting of the regulation when we  
2 linked with Ontario. And currently, if the Ontario floor  
3 price is the one that is -- is the floor price that we  
4 should us, there's no mechanism in the regulation to  
5 choose that. So these are very, very small surgical  
6 changes that, as Mr. Corey said, don't affect the broader  
7 structure of the regulation or the broader regulatory  
8 changes that we are currently workshopping and having  
9 conversations with stakeholders about.

10 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. I appreciate that.  
11 Madam Chair, I don't know if there's, at some point -- you  
12 know, the goal of the Board obviously is to hear the  
13 public, but there's also this other sector called the  
14 legislature that things bubble up over there. So maybe  
15 staff can, on this topic, come back with three items  
16 through the Chair, on the Chair's timing. One is what is  
17 the status of the advisory board. I know the Senate made  
18 an appointment. I know the Assembly has yet to make an  
19 appointment to give us advice as we move through this.

20 So maybe we can get an update checking in with  
21 the speaker on the timing of that. I think that's  
22 important, only because I think it brings this advisory  
23 board -- the purpose of that was to bring a little bit  
24 more into this.

25 The other has to do with the treatment of

1 offsets. LAO did a pretty thorough job of trying to  
2 understand and give some thoughts on this new rule or new  
3 legislation instate/outstate. I'd like to know if, in  
4 some sense, where that's going. Maybe just an update for  
5 the Board, you know, what is instate what is outstate, how  
6 are we thinking about it, how are we communicating with  
7 the public. And, of course, the always -- the always  
8 upfront conversation about oversupply, is there, is there  
9 not? Again LAO opined on that.

10           And I would like to know from staff in this  
11 particular realm, you know, what -- you know, how we are  
12 looking at this issue kind of moving forward. And so I  
13 appreciate that the resolution is very specific. It's  
14 aimed at two items. I definitely will support it. And  
15 that meant -- but I think on a larger scale these three  
16 items continue to brew in the legislature. I think we  
17 should be ahead of it with a Board conversation. And I  
18 think we should, in some sense, have some Board  
19 conversations on those three items: Again oversupply, you  
20 know, some sense of where offsets are, and, of course, the  
21 status of the advisory committee. So that would just be  
22 my comment.

23           Thank you.

24           CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Well, I'm going to take  
25 that as a Board member request of the staff, and --

1 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: However, you'd like to do  
2 it.

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: -- ask the staff to respond.

4 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Yeah, I just wanted to make  
5 sure at this point.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah, absolutely.

7 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Thank you.

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: I think it's a good -- a good  
9 point that it's time for another update on how things are  
10 going with the program and let's try to get that -- let's  
11 try to get that scheduled. I know a little bit about too  
12 much about all of those things, and I -- but I don't want  
13 to start the conversation right now. I know.

14 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: At some point.

15 CHAIR NICHOLS: No, no, it's for you -- for the  
16 Board and for -- and for the public as well. So, yes, we  
17 need to do that.

18 On these two items that are in front of us, I do  
19 want to mention on one of them that it was actually in  
20 response to a legislative issue about our authority to  
21 require a successor company when somebody goes through  
22 bankruptcy to continue to be responsible for the  
23 allowances. And we were asked that question in a hearing.  
24 And some doubt was raised about our position.

25 So we thought it was really important to get that

1 one fixed and clarified right away. So any other Board  
2 members wanted to comment on item number 1? If not, we  
3 can have a resolution.

4 I have a motion.

5 Yes. Sorry.

6 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Hello.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Your yellow light is flashing.

8 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: We need a technical  
9 manual. Thank you. I just wanted to comment on the  
10 public comments in regards to the need to go to zero  
11 emissions. And I ask that question of the staff in  
12 regards to item number 1. And my understanding, I just  
13 want to clarify this, is that there is flexibility in that  
14 incentive program, and that zero-emission trucks -- trash  
15 trucks and drayage trucks could be -- would be eligible as  
16 well. So I just wanted to confirm that, so that while I  
17 know that there was a -- more of a focus on natural gas  
18 vehicles, that there is the ability for the district to  
19 utilize those incentive funds for zero emission. And I  
20 just wanted to get that confirmation.

21 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: That's correct. The  
22 method -- it's a methodology for accounting. It does not  
23 preclude zero at all. It's included.

24 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.

25 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes.



1 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. All right. May I have a  
3 motion then?

4 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So moved.

5 VICE CHAIR BERG: Second.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. All in favor of Item  
7 number 1, the South Coast heavy-duty vehicle incentive  
8 measure, say aye, please?

9 (Unanimous aye vote.)

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed?

11 Any abstentions?

12 Okay. Great.

13 Let's then move to Item number 2, which is the  
14 amendments to the cap and the market-based compliance  
15 mechanism. And again, the only witness we had on that one  
16 was Mr. Eder. I understand his basic issue is around  
17 solar energy, and the need to be moving on solar energy,  
18 which again we agree to, but I think it's probably not  
19 going to affect this particular item. However, I will ask  
20 for a motion and a second here.

21 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: So moved.

22 VICE CHAIR BERG: Second.

23 CHAIR NICHOLS: All in favor, please say aye?

24 (Unanimous aye vote.)

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed?

1 None.

2 And any abstentions?

3 Okay. Great.

4 Then on item number 3, which is the seven  
5 research proposals, no one has addressed those seven  
6 research proposals.

7 I don't know if any Board members have any  
8 comments on them?

9 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I think I have to recuse  
10 myself as a UC employee.

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. All right.

12 Any other?

13 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Likewise also.

14 CHAIR NICHOLS: So, all right, Dr. Sperling as  
15 well. So our two -- our two actual researchers can't vote  
16 on the research proposals, but I guess that's the --  
17 that's the way it is.

18 With those two excepted, I'll ask for a motion  
19 from --

20 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Move approval.

21 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Second.

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Motion and a second. All in  
23 favor please say aye?

24 (Unanimous aye vote.)

25 (Professor Sperling and Dr. Balmes recused.)

1 CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed?

2 None.

3 And the two abstentions. All right. That  
4 concludes the opening items.

5 We are now going to move on to the staff's  
6 proposal for regional greenhouse gas emissions reductions  
7 targets pursuant to Senate Bill 375, the Sustainable  
8 Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008. As we  
9 discussed at our December meeting, SB 375 is an important  
10 component of our State strategy for achieving our climate  
11 goals through more sustainable land use, and  
12 transportation planning.

13 Today, we will vote on a staff proposal for  
14 updated regional targets. This proposal builds upon the  
15 new framework that we discussed back in December. Since  
16 December, there's been a lot of further discussion between  
17 the staff, the MPOs, and members of the public. And I  
18 particularly want to thank the MPO's who staff members  
19 have worked very closely with our staff, as well as those  
20 members of the public who took the time and provided very  
21 substantive feedback on the new approach.

22 This is not simply an update to the numerical  
23 targets. As we know, SB 375 was not intended to simply  
24 lead us to develop better modeling, but also to prompt  
25 changes in land use and transportation policy. This

1 update presents a new framework for SB 375 that brings  
2 greater focus to tracking and monitoring the policies and  
3 investments that are occurring at the regional level.

4 Today, we will take action on what can be  
5 accomplished via SB 375 while recognizing the fact that we  
6 all have more to do. SB 375 is not the final word on what  
7 it's going to take to get to the kinds of land use and  
8 transportation decisions, investments and plans that we  
9 need to make lasting and serious progress on our  
10 greenhouse gas and air quality problems, but it is an  
11 important step in that direction.

12 We have several MPOs that are here to speak  
13 today, and we look forward to hearing from them. But  
14 first we will hear from the staff.

15 Mr. Corey.

16 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair  
17 Nichols. At the December 2017 Board hearing, as you  
18 noted, SB 375 program staff reported on the target update  
19 process to date, and presented initial thoughts on a new  
20 framework for CARB target setting and evaluations of the  
21 MPO strategies.

22 During that discussion, the Board expressed  
23 interest in staff's proposed direction and provided  
24 comments focusing on helping address challenges the MPOs  
25 faced, as well as the importance of setting targets to

1 achieve concrete benefits for communities around the  
2 State.

3           Since presenting at the December hearing, CARB  
4 staff held four public workshops in Fresno, Los Angeles,  
5 Sacramento, and San Diego. Staff also met individually  
6 with staff from many MPOs. These meetings have allowed  
7 staff to refine the approach to this new target paradigm.

8           In addition, staff has begun work to implement  
9 Senate Bill 150 passed in 2017. SB 150, by Senator Allen,  
10 requires CARB to monitor regional greenhouse gas  
11 reductions under SB 375, and report to the legislature  
12 every four years beginning with a report due later this  
13 year.

14           The report must provide data regarding strategies  
15 to meet the targets, a list of best practices, and  
16 challenges faced by regions, including the impacts of  
17 State funding and policies. Today's proposed target  
18 update and staff's work to develop a monitoring program in  
19 response to SB 150 are anticipated to work together to  
20 strengthen the program implementation moving forward.

21           I'll now ask Heather King of the Air Quality  
22 Planning and Science Division to begin the staff  
23 presentation.

24           Heather

25           (Thereupon an overhead presentation was

1           presented as follows.)

2           AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you, Mr.  
3 Corey. Good morning, Chair Nichols and members of the  
4 Board.

5                               --o0o--

6           AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: For today's  
7 presentation on the SB 375 targets, I'll walk you through  
8 staff's current proposal, which includes an updated  
9 framework for how we at CARB approach our role in SB 375.  
10 I'll share some of the stakeholder feedback that we heard  
11 during our most recent series of workshops, and then I'll  
12 talk about what's next for the program. I'll conclude by  
13 summarizing staff's recommendation.

14                               --o0o--

15           AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: We came to you in  
16 December with an informational update on staff's current  
17 thinking on the SB 375 targets. These are, of course, the  
18 per capita greenhouse gas emission reduction targets that  
19 apply to passenger vehicles. At that time, we also  
20 recommended a paradigm shift in how CARB evaluates the  
21 sustainable communities strategies, the SCSs, that are  
22 prepared by the state's metropolitan planning  
23 organizations, the MPOs. And we also talked to you about  
24 how we plan to approach tracking implementation moving  
25 forward.

1           Staff is proposing three key elements as part of  
2 the proposal before you today. The first is to adopt the  
3 proposed higher numeric targets. This is the same  
4 proposal you heard about in December. The second element  
5 would direct staff to work with the MPOs to recognize and  
6 isolate actual progress due to the land-use trans -- and  
7 transportation policies and investments inside each of  
8 their plans.

9           Our goal here is to overcome the effects of  
10 assumptions about fuel price, vehicle fleet efficiency,  
11 economic conditions, and other factors, and focus more  
12 squarely on the efforts that jurisdictions are actually  
13 making from one plan to the next.

14           So in other words, the MPO will be asked to show  
15 us what is the increment of progress achieved through the  
16 strategies in your plans from one plan to the next?

17           The third element of our proposal before you  
18 today will be to direct staff to work with MPOs to  
19 introduce a new additional reporting and data tracking  
20 component to how the MPOs' investments and their project  
21 lists support their commitments to greenhouse gas  
22 reduction.

23           So in other words, what did the MPOs say they  
24 would do, did they do it, and was it effective?

25                           --o0o--

1           AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: For the targets  
2 themselves, this slide summarizes the existing and  
3 proposed 2035 targets for the four largest MPOs in the  
4 state. As we discussed with you in December,  
5 preliminarily SACOG's target is going to be structured as  
6 a pilot. Under this recommendation, SACOG's target is 19  
7 percent with SACOG responsible for developing some  
8 innovative programs to address challenges that are unique  
9 to the SACOG region in its 2020 MTP.

10           If State funding and other commitments that are  
11 necessary to support those programs are not secured, then  
12 SACOG's target would be 18 percent. And James Corless,  
13 Executive Director of SACOG, is here today and can talk  
14 with us more about this project in more detail.

15           If adopted by the Board, the proposed targets  
16 would take effect October 1st, 2018, which is exactly  
17 eight years from when the original targets were  
18 established. CARB is able to set targets for years 2020  
19 and 2035, though not listed on the slide, the 2020 targets  
20 would be brought in line with the existing anticipated  
21 performance of the current SCSs, which we see as a  
22 necessary clean-up step. And as 2020 approaches, it will  
23 become the first milestone reporting year under SB 375 for  
24 implementation.

25                           --o0o--



1 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Here are the  
2 existing and proposed higher targets for the eight San  
3 Joaquin Valley MPOs. These targets would apply to the  
4 third round of SCSs prepared by the valley MPOs.

5 Next slide, please.

6 --o0o--

7 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: And here are the  
8 existing and proposed targets for the six remaining small  
9 MPOs in the State. The proposed new reporting framework  
10 would be phased in to apply to these 6 MPOs for the SCSs  
11 adopted after 2020.

12 Next slide, please.

13 --o0o--

14 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you.

15 This slide shows graphically the aggregated  
16 statewide greenhouse gas reduction benefits of staff's  
17 proposal. From left to right, the existing targets, what  
18 MPOs' adopted plans would achieve in the center, which  
19 outperforms the existing targets, and staff's proposal  
20 shown in the right most bar.

21 As you'll recall from our discussion in December,  
22 there's a gap between what the scoping plan scenario calls  
23 for from this sector, and what the SB 375 Program can  
24 realistically achieve. We did hear from stakeholders who  
25 want SB 375 to be more ambitious. For example, several

1 stakeholders have said that targets should be set at 25  
2 percent right in line with what the scoping plan calls for  
3 from this sector.

4 So why not just make the targets 25 percent?

5 Let's talk about that. SB 375 allows the MPOs to  
6 recommend their targets to CARB, which they have done so.

7 The MPOs' recommendations to CARB were very much  
8 a continuation of what their existing SCSs would more or  
9 less achieve, if they're implemented. And as we describe  
10 in our final staff report, which we published in February,  
11 we do believe that the MPOs can do more. Our proposal is  
12 a push on the MPOs to do more than what they would achieve  
13 on paper today.

14 And I say on paper, because the operative phrase  
15 I keep using on whether the SCS meets the targets is, "if  
16 implemented", if these plans are implemented.

17 Let's all remember that having an SCS is  
18 voluntary. The RTP, the regional transportation plan, is  
19 a federally required action, but having an SCS that hits  
20 the targets as part of the RTP is voluntary.

21 Ms. Mitchell, you asked us, you know, a very good  
22 question and made a good comment in December, very  
23 accurate, that this is really hard, because the local  
24 governments are the ones that implement the land-use piece  
25 of SCS, not the MPO, and it requires them to work

1 together.

2           We've heard from several stakeholders during our  
3 workshops about local land-use policies that can even  
4 create particular implementation challenges with SCS. So  
5 there are real and great challenges with this program.

6           The MPOs have all prepared SCSs that show meeting  
7 their targets on paper, but there are a lot of questions  
8 about whether we'll hit this 18 percent bar in the middle  
9 when 2035 rolls around. And a lot of MPOs have these  
10 questions too.

11           So our proposal before you today aims to take a  
12 major step forward into making this less of a paper  
13 exercise and getting at what we care about, which is  
14 on-the-ground implementation of SB 375.

15           So CARB could most certainly ratchet the targets  
16 all the way up to 25 percent, but what could that actually  
17 look like?

18           One scenario is that we stop getting SCSs. And  
19 in that scenario, we run a risk of going backwards. So,  
20 you know, we have local jurisdictions that are starting to  
21 use the streamlining provisions under SB 375 to build some  
22 desperately needed housing that's affordable, that's  
23 transit oriented, and those projects could be held up in  
24 litigation for years to come.

25           There are disadvantaged communities who are

1 seeking certain pots of State funding to implement some of  
2 the projects that are in today's SCSs. And those  
3 jurisdictions could, in some cases, become effectively  
4 ineligible overnight for that money.

5 And I haven't even brought up yet the new  
6 challenges that are ahead for MPOs, which are total wild  
7 cards, which is deployment of autonomous vehicles and new  
8 mobility services.

9 Depending on how these new modes are deployed,  
10 this could cause vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas  
11 emissions to go up or down. Depending on the policies  
12 that are rolled out with those. So we as the State and  
13 local jurisdictions have to take responsibility for our  
14 own roles in getting to where we need to go as partners  
15 with the MPOs and provide policy direction that serves the  
16 public interest.

17 CARB is fully committed to getting to 25 percent  
18 as a state. The SB 375 targets are one tool to get there,  
19 but it's not the venue to get all the way there, not based  
20 on what we know today, but we do have a path forward to  
21 close this gap, and I'll come back to that.

22 --o0o--

23 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Over the last two  
24 months, as you've heard, we've conducted four workshops  
25 around the state to reach out to more of our stakeholders

1 about how to get more out of SB 375. We had 130  
2 stakeholders attend in person.

3           One question we got, and we continue to get over  
4 the years, is why are we doing this? Why are we doing any  
5 of this? Why do we need to reduce vehicle miles traveled  
6 through land-use change? Won't technology and fuels take  
7 care of this for us? And the answer is simple, we will  
8 not hit our climate goals without it.

9           And reducing VMT can solve problems that electric  
10 vehicles can't. There are so many benefits with this  
11 program. The narrative we heard from our stakeholders  
12 explains the scope well. We've got many stakeholders who  
13 took time out of their schedules to come to our workshops,  
14 who took time to come travel and be with us here today,  
15 who live in overburdened communities. They're  
16 overburdened with pollution, daily stress, high rents, and  
17 a general lack of access.

18           The transportation system isn't working in so  
19 many of our communities. It literally takes a single mom  
20 90 minutes one way by transit to reach her job only 20  
21 miles away. She can't afford a home near her job. She  
22 can't afford to buy an electric car. That's just a false  
23 narrative for so many folks still in our communities in  
24 California.

25           SB 375 was always about providing choices,

1 choices for where to live, choices for how to get around.  
2 And today's proposal seeks to acknowledge the need for  
3 further progress, not only on emissions, but for access to  
4 choices, and providing those choices will lower VMT.

5 --o0o--

6 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: The other major  
7 need we heard in our workshops is this hunger for  
8 increased transparency and accountability in the process.  
9 That is exactly what we're proposing by adding these new  
10 elements to our evaluation process for SCSs moving forward  
11 under SB 375.

12 Historically, CARB has based its determination of  
13 whether an SCS meets the targets on results of travel  
14 demand models, which reflect many confounding factors,  
15 several of which have nothing to do with the MPOs' land  
16 use and transportation strategies, and can even mask the  
17 effects of those strategies, or work against them.

18 So we will still be looking at the modeling.  
19 That will still be a part of the work we do at CARB, but  
20 we're going to start asking the MPOs to report to us the  
21 increment of progress in 2035 directly tied to their land  
22 use and transportation strategies through a plan-over-plan  
23 comparison.

24 In addition, just last year, SB 375 was amended  
25 to add a third piece to CARB's role in SB 375. Until now,

1 we've been limited to setting targets and reviewing SCSs.  
2 But this new piece calls for monitoring SB 375  
3 implementation to date. So as part of this target update,  
4 we're introducing a monitoring component.

5 We'll ask the MPOs to report on how far the  
6 region has come on implementing their SCS, and whether  
7 their strategies worked?

8 So simply put, we're monitoring compliance and  
9 effectiveness, which completes the cycle in CARB's  
10 evaluation process under SB 375.

11 --o0o--

12 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: In addition to  
13 adding the new monitoring component, CARB will be  
14 preparing a report to the legislature on the challenges  
15 faced by the MPOs, and the best practices that exist.  
16 We've collected a lot of challenges and barriers to  
17 further progress under SB 375 through the target update  
18 process. We've been in the collection phase for some time  
19 now.

20 --o0o--

21 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: That serves as  
22 the basis for this list of seven focus areas listed on  
23 this slide. We're organizing around these seven topics:  
24 healthy communities, land use and the struggles with local  
25 control, the affordable housing crisis, access to

1 transportation choices, incentives and the price of  
2 driving, next generation mobility, and the decision-making  
3 process itself as to how the money gets allocated and how  
4 do the projects get selected.

5           We heard in our most recent series of workshops  
6 that these seem to be the right scope of the issues. But  
7 the narrative I shared earlier explains the scope much  
8 better than this slide. This system isn't working for  
9 everybody. The choices of where to live and how to get  
10 around are not equitably distributed.

11           The land value near transit of high quality is so  
12 sky high that the people who rely on transit most cannot  
13 afford to live near it. Transit ridership statewide is  
14 going down, and we only partially understand why. And VMT  
15 per capita, the most important measuring stick of whether  
16 SB 375 is working, is recently starting to head in the  
17 wrong direction.

18           Land use change take time, but we can't take a  
19 wait-and-see approach either. So this is a call to action  
20 to all parties involved that play a role in housing, land  
21 use, and transportation policy to remove barriers, so we  
22 can get to the desired outcomes in these areas. That is  
23 to take the next steps in the scoping plan, to get to 25  
24 percent, and to get the system working for everybody.

25           To do this, we'll need different tools. We'll



1 need stronger tools. We'll need stronger land-use tools  
2 to produce more housing affordable to all income levels.  
3 We'll need pricing tools that promote the public interest  
4 as technology shifts towards new mobility services. And  
5 we'll need to look at how resources get spent in a way  
6 that can help improve the quality of life for those that  
7 are most overburdened.

8 --o0o--

9 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: During the next  
10 several months, we'll take what we learn, we'll extract  
11 out what are the right metrics to track, what are the  
12 actionable items and what are the best practices?

13 This spring we plan to conduct a public process  
14 to solicit input on how we'll update our program  
15 guidelines for evaluating the SCSs. We anticipate having  
16 a draft available this summer, and we plan to finalize  
17 those guidelines prior to when the new targets would take  
18 effect later this year.

19 We've begun conversations and we anticipate  
20 providing MPOs and stakeholders more details very soon on  
21 the new metrics and the reporting we expect under the new  
22 monitoring program. Next, we'll take our recommendations  
23 forward in the SB 375 progress report to the legislature  
24 due September 1st.

25 We'll update you, the Board, prior to your joint

1 meeting with the California Transportation Commission  
2 later this year with some of these action items that could  
3 potentially be brought to the table for those meetings.

4 --o0o--

5 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: A draft  
6 environmental analysis was completed for the proposed  
7 target update, which was released last June. Staff  
8 determined that implementation of the proposed target  
9 update may have potentially significant impacts for -- to  
10 some resource areas. However, those impacts are mostly  
11 related to short-term construction activities.

12 Staff determined that the overarching statewide  
13 benefits of our proposal on greenhouse gas emissions would  
14 be beneficial.

15 The draft EA was released for a 45-day public  
16 comment period, which ended July 28th, 2017. Staff  
17 prepared a final EA and written responses to all comments  
18 received on the draft EA. And we posted those to our  
19 website earlier this month.

20 --o0o--

21 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: As you've heard  
22 today, our recommended proposal to update the SB 375  
23 targets aims to achieve multiple goals, one of which is to  
24 complete a statutory requirement to update the targets  
25 every eight years. CARB may update the target every four

1 years, as conditions change. So your next opportunity to  
2 revise the targets would be in 2022.

3 Staff recommends that the Board approve the  
4 written responses to comments, certify the final EA, make  
5 the required CEQA findings, and Statement of Overriding  
6 Considerations, and approve the proposed target update.

7 Thank you. And staff would be happy to answer  
8 any questions prior to moving to public comment and  
9 discussion.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Thank you very much.

11 Dr. Balmes, just had a brief comment here.

12 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Heather. And I  
13 think I can speak for Supervisor Serna as well, this is  
14 the kind of staff presentation that really engages the  
15 Board. I really want to compliment you, because instead  
16 of just sort of going through reading, you engaged us in,  
17 you know, a thought exercise.

18 And I would just say for future staff  
19 presentations, you know, you set the mark.

20 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you.

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Very good. Thank you. I agree.

22 So I guess this is a question or comment at this  
23 point. One piece that seems to be missing from the  
24 discussion, maybe it's included elsewhere, is the role of  
25 funding. And the -- it gets brought up all the time by

1 the MPOs is, okay, so you've got a plan. Now, where's the  
2 money going to come from to actually implement it?

3 And we now have, as a result of some legislation,  
4 a process at least whereby CARB is going to be meeting on  
5 a regular basis with the California Transportation  
6 Commission, which is the entity that actually gets to  
7 approve where all the money gets spent.

8 And I'm wondering if you can give us, or someone  
9 can give us, a brief update how that's going, and what you  
10 think is likely to come of that process.

11 Maybe, Mr. Corey, you want to take that one?

12 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Sure, Chairman.

13 So, the -- and I think it was AB 79, but it  
14 basically called for twice-a-year meetings with the --  
15 between the Board and the CTC. So I've been working with  
16 the Executive Director of the California Transportation  
17 Committee to get these discussions set. The first one is  
18 set for June. We're working through the logistics.

19 But more substantively, I think this was really  
20 at the core of the bill, presents an opportunity, for  
21 instance, the conversations of the implementation of the  
22 scoping plan, the implementation of 375, the intersection  
23 of transportation policy and funding. Just as you said  
24 Chair, that the CTC plays a significant role over in terms  
25 of transportation funding and decisions that will be with

1 us for decades, and the opportunity to -- for the Board to  
2 engage with CTC in terms of that decision-making process,  
3 and how it comports with the State's long-term policies,  
4 in terms of air quality, climate policy, and some of the  
5 issues that are raised with 375.

6 So we are working through the agenda now and  
7 really excited. I think it's going to represent really an  
8 exceptional opportunity to put -- pull the pieces together  
9 that really haven't been there substantially so far in  
10 terms of the interaction with CalTrans, CalSTA, CTC.

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: I mean, it hasn't actually  
12 happened yet. Obviously, it's just set for -- but the  
13 fairly near future. But one of the things that I think is  
14 frustrating to everybody who's been involved in this topic  
15 from the environmental or health side is that  
16 transportation projects, as projects, are put into plans,  
17 and they live for decades, not just years.

18 And then they come up for funding, and they've  
19 been on the books for so long, that they end up just  
20 getting funded and going ahead, long after there's any  
21 real desire or need to have those particular projects get  
22 built, or least since they -- you know, they're no longer  
23 a solution to an actual problem, let's put it that way.

24 And so I think maybe there's at least some hope  
25 on the horizon that we may have found a new mechanism that

1 might -- that might help with that problem.

2           Okay. I've got several people who want to speak  
3 starting with Supervisor Gioia.

4           BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Thank you, and thanks to  
5 staff. I'll just second my colleagues comment about the  
6 nature of the presentation.

7           AGP VIDEO: The microphone is not on.

8           BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Is says the mic is on  
9 Can you hear me?

10           Here, we go. All right. There we go. That's  
11 better.

12           So I wanted to ask staff about how we can  
13 include - and I know we're going to hear about this issue  
14 from a number of speakers - greater leverage in our  
15 resolution requiring, encouraging, incentivizing social  
16 equity analysis as part of the development of the SCS. We  
17 have language in the resolution specifically that -- on  
18 page five that acknowledges that -- that this target  
19 approach quote "Is consistent with CARB's environmental  
20 justice policies and does not disproportionately impact  
21 people of any race, culture, or income.

22           And I think we know that as one implements these  
23 plans, there is a great potential in some regions to  
24 impact people who are living in these communities,  
25 especially lower income communities. And I was involved

1 in the development of the first SCS in the Bay Area, Plan  
2 Bay Area. And that issue was discussed frequently. And  
3 there was a lot of thought given to that.

4 I am concerned that all the plans will not have a  
5 robust discussion of that. And I'm not certain that folks  
6 would agree with this statement in the resolution that  
7 this approach does not disproportionately impact people of  
8 any race, culture, or income. It depends how each plan is  
9 developed. And that will vary widely around the state.

10 So I'd like to see us explore the greatest amount  
11 of leverage we have to get a social equity -- a robust  
12 social equity analysis in these plans, which could include  
13 the directors when they come up making a commitment to  
14 doing that or -- and/or including that in the resolution.

15 And so I'd like to hear the staff's thinking on  
16 that, and ultimately to hear comments from the MPOs as you  
17 come up and speak. Because I think it's going to be  
18 approached differently around the state. And I'm not sure  
19 I agree with the finding here that there is not going to  
20 be a disproportionate impact. There is clearly a  
21 potential that some of these plans will -- could.

22 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: Supervisor,  
23 Gioia, Kurt Karperos, CARB staff.

24 We very much agree with you that there is a need  
25 as we move forward with implementation of SB 375, and

1 particularly with the requirements that have been added  
2 under SB 150 for the tracking that we're talking about --

3 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

4 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: -- to fully  
5 evaluate the social equity impacts of the SCSs.

6 This particular finding relates to the  
7 target-setting process.

8 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: No, I realize that.

9 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: Right.

10 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I realize that.

11 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: So in terms  
12 of the finding, from staff's perspective, I think we're  
13 square here. But going forward, as we examine the SCSs, I  
14 think it's absolutely critical that we get a robust set of  
15 metrics and analysis from the MPOs on the social equity  
16 issues.

17 We've started that conversation already with the  
18 MPO directors, and I know that they will be speaking to  
19 that in their prepared remarks. And certainly, we'll take  
20 the direction that you're giving us here, that we -- we  
21 pursue this element of the SB 150 tracking with vigor.

22 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I mean, I know this is an  
23 issue that my -- a number of my colleagues have raised as  
24 well. And so what does it take to ensure that we're  
25 getting a commitment to doing these things?



1           Because I'm not so certain that when folks walk  
2 out of the room, that when push comes to shove, knowing  
3 sort of the discussions that go on in each of the regions  
4 that we -- that we would get those strong metrics.

5           So I'd like to consider how we would put that in  
6 the resolution, and also hear commitments from MPOs, and  
7 any other potential mechanism to enforce that.

8           DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: So I  
9 certainly think it's within the Board's prerogative to add  
10 to the resolution specific direction in terms of the type  
11 of metrics that you want to see when we report back to  
12 you. And as we provide to the legislature through our  
13 reports, the first one being done this summer, as we  
14 listen to the testimony from the MPO directors, I think we  
15 can probably help craft some language that could be added  
16 to the resolution.

17           BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: And maybe as MPO directors  
18 come up, they can give their thoughts on how to achieve  
19 this as well.

20           Okay. Thanks.

21           CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Professor Sperling.

22           BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: I just have a few short  
23 comments, because I want to have a more robust discussion  
24 later. But I first want to repeat what Professor Balmes  
25 said, that was, I thought, the most brilliant, insightful

1 staff presentation I've heard in a very long time. It was  
2 sophisticated, and clearly I agreed with it.

3 (Laughter.)

4 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: You made her blush.

5 (Laughter.)

6 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: But I'm serious. And I  
7 liked the statement this -- there has to be a call to  
8 action. We've been doing this for almost 10 years now.  
9 And frankly, we've not accomplished much, other than we've  
10 created a discourse, which has been positive, and that's  
11 good. But we need -- this is a -- has to be a call to  
12 action now. And I think we start -- we're starting to  
13 appreciate that.

14 And I want to reaffirm what Chair Nichols said is  
15 that focusing on the funding, but I'm not clear -- I've  
16 been one advocating for that a long time. But there is  
17 funding out there through SB 1, through the transportation  
18 programs. And I think the quick comment that was made in  
19 the staff presentation about creating performance metrics  
20 and being able to evaluate it, and those performance  
21 metrics being applied with the CTC and the transportation  
22 funding to actually accomplish the goals we're talking  
23 about. That has not happened, and that would be a great  
24 contribution.

25 And so I'm -- I think we're on the right path,

1 but we need to really up our game. And we can talk about  
2 the details later.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I think it's time then to  
5 turn to our list of witnesses. And we have four MPOs.  
6 I'm not sure if they want to just come in that order or --  
7 is that how you'll do it?

8 MR. IKHRATA: (Nods head.)

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Great, starting with Hasan  
10 Ikh rata from SCAG.

11 MR. IKHRATA: Thank you, Chairwoman, Board  
12 members. Welcome to the SCAG region. This is part of the  
13 SCAG region.

14 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was  
15 presented as follows.)

16 MR. IKHRATA: We need the rain, so I'm not going  
17 to say sorry for the rain, but I'm sure you probably were  
18 expecting different weather here.

19 I'm going to add my voice to some of you, and say  
20 that you have an excellent staff. Richard Corey, Kurt,  
21 all the team has been working with us very closely, very  
22 openly, very honestly. So I couldn't say thank you to  
23 Richard, and Kurt, and the team.

24 We met several times. We talked about what's  
25 happening, where we need to go. A couple of things I want

1 to mention and I want to commit to today. And my  
2 colleagues from San Francisco, Sacramento, and San Diego  
3 will also speak to that.

4           There is -- it's not a secret that per capita  
5 vehicle mile traveled in the nation and in California is  
6 going up. Going in the wrong direction. These are actual  
7 data. You can't hide it. And regardless of how good your  
8 modeling tools are with this trend, it makes you think,  
9 okay, what do we need to do to reverse the trend, and make  
10 these reductions that we need to make under -- under the  
11 law.

12           SCAG in the last couple of weeks have done --  
13 couple of months have done a major transit study. We ask  
14 UCLA researchers to look at why transit ridership is down.  
15 And they came back and frankly it was a bit surprising.  
16 But between 2000 and 2015, the SCAG region added 2.3  
17 million people.

18           The SCAG region also added 2.1 million vehicles,  
19 which is four times the rates of the 1990s. The economy  
20 has never been better, income in the Bay Area up by like  
21 30 percent, up here but not as much. So people are buying  
22 cars.

23           So with all of that, we've been discussing here  
24 how do we reduce per capita greenhouse gas emission? Now,  
25 the transit decline doesn't mean that transit is bad.

1 We're investing heavily in transit in Southern California.  
2 L.A. County just voted \$120 billion to build more transit.

3 But that means we need to look at transit  
4 differently. And like your staff presentation, Heather  
5 indicated we are committing to look at the investment by  
6 mode, including the underserved communities. The  
7 supervisor mentioned -- Supervisor Gioia mentioned social  
8 equity, environmental justice. We actually do that. And  
9 at least at SCAG, we've been used as an example of how to  
10 do environmental justice in the context of planning. And  
11 we'll continue to do that, not just because we want to  
12 comply with SB 375, because I think it's the right thing  
13 to do.

14 So that reporting we commit to you today that  
15 will be done by mode. When it comes to development,  
16 Supervisor Mitchell's mention -- I mean, Board Member  
17 Mitchell mentioned that land-use authority lies with the  
18 cities. That's absolutely true. MPOs have no authorities  
19 over land use.

20 Having said that, I think MPOs, with the help  
21 from ARB and CTC, could bribe the cities to do the right  
22 thing by providing them funding. And I think we have done  
23 that in the past, and it works. I think many cities, if  
24 you incentivize them, they'll be willing to do the right  
25 thing. So we will be reporting in and tracking homes and

1 jobs being developed in underserved communities in high  
2 quality transit areas, and making sure that we're not  
3 driving the original residents out of their homes because  
4 we're doing transit-oriented development. We will commit  
5 to that, and we spoke to your staff about that.

6 The question in front of us is we need to reverse  
7 the trend that's happening right now. I think I'm  
8 supposed to push some buttons here to get --

9 --o0o--

10 MR. IKHRATA: Okay. We are supposed to reverse  
11 the trends that's going in the wrong direction. We're  
12 also supposed to reduce and get to the 25 percent. I  
13 believe we can. And what the approach that your staff  
14 proposing to you is a good one, it is not like us saying  
15 let us go through our modeling exercise, but coming back  
16 to you every year, and saying to you, hear what we did  
17 differently, hear how it's working, and hear how it's  
18 going to lead to us getting that 25 percent.

19 We have to be smart about, you know, the  
20 Professor from -- I call him the Professor from Davis here  
21 just published a book called the *Three Revolutions*. Now,  
22 I would like to think that we're going to look at transit  
23 differently to make it more effective in the context of  
24 the shared, the autonomous, and the electric vehicle  
25 that's coming. Do we have the right ARB policies to guide

1 us through that?

2 I do believe we can reverse the trend that's  
3 happening right now, and we do need clearly to link  
4 funding to that. But also we have to be very open about  
5 the fact that a lot of funding is generated locally and,  
6 specified what kind of projects you're going to have. So  
7 somehow, we need to figure out how we overcome that.

8 And we're committing to you today that we're  
9 going to expand our working with the stakeholders, we're  
10 going to expand the ability to track things, and report to  
11 you in our private -- and look, we might couple of years  
12 into the reporting say, we can't do it. We need to do  
13 something different.

14 I hope we never come to that. I hope we're going  
15 to come to you together with your staff and figure out how  
16 we're going to get there. But we have to do it  
17 differently. You have to do it smartly. We can't just be  
18 throwing money and saying let us do transit and stop.  
19 Transit has to be looked at differently, land use has to  
20 be looked at, funding has to be looked at.

21 And all of that should result in us hopefully  
22 getting to where we want to get, which is 25 percent  
23 reduction.

24 --o0o--

25 MR. IKHRATA: And with that, I'm going to turn it

1 to my colleague from San Diego.

2 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Madam Chair, I didn't quite  
3 hear the details of the social equity metrics, or how you  
4 were developing that. You indicated some -- you indicated  
5 a commitment, but I guess I wanted to hear how you were  
6 incorporating the social equity metrics.

7 MR. IKHRATA: Every plan scenario we run, every  
8 plan scenario we run will have an environmental justice  
9 social equity. Does it impact negatively, proportionately  
10 by ethnicity, by race, by income. So every scenario that  
11 we're going to put in front will have a full evaluation of  
12 the social equity component of the plan.

13 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Okay. Thank you.

14 MS. KAWADA: Good morning. I'm Kim Kawada with  
15 the San Diego Association of Governments, the MPO for the  
16 San Diego County. We have listed here sort of a list of  
17 all the things that strategies -- that the region will be  
18 undertaking to meet the target, and hopefully exceed it,  
19 and go beyond that.

20 If I could characterize it, it's really sort of  
21 in three large categories. One is to plan for  
22 transform -- to look at really transformative solutions,  
23 to plan for them, to pilot and test innovative new  
24 solutions, and then to actually implement them.

25 So on the planning side, the basis of our



1 regional plan has been on urban area transit strategy. We  
2 adopted that with our last plan. And actually investments  
3 really focus on those types of strategies in the urban  
4 area where there's existing infrastructure and existing  
5 population.

6           The other plans we're doing -- that's at the  
7 regional scale. At the local scale what we've uses is the  
8 power of the purse. Our sales tax dollars, our incentive  
9 dollars. The 18 cities in the County of San Diego can now  
10 only compete for those dollars if they have an adopted  
11 Climate Action Plan -- local Climate Action Plan, and  
12 Complete Streets Policy. So that's where we're trying to  
13 drive -- use incentive to drive local infrastructure  
14 investments and plan for clean transportation and clean  
15 energy choices.

16           At the community level, we're piloting things  
17 like mobility hub planning, which is really integrating  
18 all modes, public transit, bike, walking, active  
19 transportation and services. And, for example, we're  
20 working in our -- one of our most vulnerable communities  
21 in the mid-city area to actually try to get one of those  
22 up and running in the next several years.

23           We're also working on things like regional clean  
24 fuel infrastructure, chargers, fueling stations, whatnot  
25 to promote a regional infrastructure to actually help meet

1 the state's goals and our local goals for that. So that's  
2 on the planning side.

3           On the piloting side, we were one of 10 automated  
4 vehicle proving grounds that this -- that the federal  
5 government designated. There's two in California. We're  
6 one of them. And really the promise we see there is to  
7 look at how technology can help really change safety and  
8 mobility options around the region. Now, it's not just  
9 about just sort of new whiz-bang technology, because as  
10 your staff has mentioned, not everyone can afford, you  
11 know, knew Teslas or new Priuses even.

12           So that's something where -- we're looking at the  
13 intersection of technology is also where we can help  
14 support public transit, not detract from public transit.  
15 Can technology provide those last mile solutions? Can we  
16 make public transit even cheaper to operate, that we can  
17 provide more public transit in the region?

18           And then finally, where can -- how can these  
19 strategies, and these investments in these new  
20 technologies really help our most vulnerable communities,  
21 and our aging populations. We're seeing with the aging of  
22 the Baby Boom population the needs to travel to health and  
23 medical services and to meet with -- you know, stay  
24 involved with the community is pressing.

25           Not everyone can afford Uber or Lyft. So we

1 really need to look at how you can transform, you know,  
2 senior and para-transit services, and hopefully use  
3 technology to support that.

4           And finally, what's unique about SANDAG different  
5 from the MPOs is because we have some implementation  
6 authority, we build public transit, we build active  
7 transportation infrastructure. A major part of our  
8 strategy is actually doing just that. We have a \$200  
9 million early action program, where we're building more  
10 than 80 miles of bikeways and urban communities. That's  
11 underway. Our goal is to get those done in the next --  
12 within 10 years. We have an Extensive network and we're  
13 trying to build out our managed lanes, which really  
14 prioritize public transit and HOV modes. And we charge  
15 single-occupant vehicles a fee and reinvest that fee  
16 raised into public transit, so that's another component.

17           And finally, while it's not technically counted  
18 on our ledger, in terms of reducing -- the SB 375 ledger  
19 of reducing vehicles and passenger and light-duty truck  
20 emissions, our region has been sort of at the forefront in  
21 terms of habitat conservation planning.

22           So local sales tax measure dollars are being used  
23 to preserve open space, and preserve -- we've, to date,  
24 preserved, and leveraged enough dollars, and preserved  
25 about 8,600 acres of open space, real critical habitat in

1 the region. And what that does it also directs  
2 development into the urbanized areas.

3 So 8,600, if you -- to get to some sort of scale,  
4 that's about the equivalent of about 10 Central Parks,  
5 which we've done to date, since the sales tax measure was  
6 adopted back in 2004.

7 The next slide --

8 --o0o--

9 MS. KAWADA: -- excuse me, really looks at in  
10 terms of performance monitoring. We do this on a regular  
11 basis. We produce an annual State of the Commute Report,  
12 we do regular performance monitoring of our regional plan.  
13 So you can see here some of the types of metrics.

14 To answer Supervisor Gioia's questions, we do  
15 have with our plan update a set of performance measures  
16 for the plan overall. We've worked with our community  
17 based organization groups, which are 13 community based  
18 organizations from around the region, around the county,  
19 and really worked on a set of meaningful performance  
20 metrics, in terms of social equity, environmental justice,  
21 and Title 6.

22 SO we've worked with those groups to identify  
23 those. We've also done statewide working with our  
24 partners to develop a social equity analysis tool that  
25 could be use statewide.

1 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: And I'm sure my colleague  
2 from San Diego will comment about that, since you're in  
3 San Diego.

4 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: You can count on it.

5 MS. KAWADA: So with that, I'm going to turn it  
6 over to Alix Bockelman from MTC.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I think I'm just going to  
8 let -- ask that each complete their presentations and then  
9 we'll have some discussion and questions. I know  
10 different Board members have different things they'd like  
11 to say about all of this.

12 MS. BOCKELMAN: Good morning, I'm just trying to  
13 get this device to work.

14 Here we go.

15 Good morning, Chair and Board members. My name  
16 is Alix Bockelman. I'm with the Metropolitan  
17 Transportation Commission. And I did want to echo the  
18 appreciation of staff and the Board in working with us on  
19 the target setting recommendations.

20 MTC appreciates the introduction of best  
21 practices into the target-setting recommendations and the  
22 focus on elements of the SCS, where MPOs have more  
23 control, and can take bold steps at the regional level,  
24 and also working in partnership with the State.

25 In terms of how MTC will approach the more

1 ambitious targets in the next round, we will need to  
2 double down on our focused growth development approach.  
3 As discussed in the staff report, this is made more  
4 challenging, given the loss of redevelopment, housing  
5 construction costs, and the very real threat of  
6 displacement.

7           We're in the midst of a major effort to look at  
8 housing crisis in the Bay Area called, CASA, the Committee  
9 to House the Bay Area, to agree at a multi-sector level on  
10 actionable and meaningful changes to address and stem the  
11 tide on the housing crisis.

12           We will also continue to incentivize, through our  
13 One Bay Area Grant, or OBAG, program housing. In the last  
14 two cycles, or 10 years, we have invested \$700 million  
15 supported -- to support the county OBAG program. And that  
16 rewards jurisdictions based on housing and also ensures  
17 that those dollars are invested near -- in priority  
18 development areas or near high quality transit.

19           Our commission has also asked to return back in  
20 the summer to talk to them about more areas where we can  
21 further leverage transportation dollars to link with  
22 housing outcomes.

23           The second area is really the Bay Area will also  
24 have to continue to encourage pricing strategies where  
25 they make sense. This will include a planned 550 mile

1 express lane network, and could include a bridge toll  
2 hike, if the voters approve it this June, as well as  
3 further additional cities rolling out demand-based pricing  
4 concepts, parking pricing.

5           Also, in the third area, the Bay Area must  
6 continue to support robust, innovative, and low-emission  
7 mobility options. This could include ride hailing, car  
8 sharing, and future AV options that reduce emissions. It  
9 could also expand and make more universal bike and car  
10 share programs.

11           Through our climate initiatives program, we will  
12 continue to foster various TDM strategies from  
13 trip-based -- from personalized trip -- sorry. Trip  
14 planning to trip caps in various jurisdictions. And we'll  
15 also continue to accelerate electric vehicle adoption, an  
16 area that MTC has partnered closely with the Bay Area Air  
17 Quality Management District to set ambitious goals, and to  
18 leverage both transportation and air quality dollars  
19 toward vehicle, infrastructure, and education programs.

20           And transit is also an area of plan where we  
21 invest 60 percent of our dollars just to make sure that we  
22 are modernizing and keeping up on transit. And this will  
23 continue to be a major focus area, as well as we invest  
24 significant dollars to expand the transit system, but  
25 we'll also need to continues to invest in this high

1 quality transit and focus very much on the first and last  
2 mile connections as those are very important.

3 --o0o--

4 MS. BOCKELMAN: In terms of performance  
5 monitoring, MTC has long championed performance-based  
6 planning. Performance based analysis is fundamental to  
7 our planning approach with a detailed project assessment  
8 that we do for all of our mega projects.

9 Also, to inform planning and to provide the  
10 public with details on how the region performs in various  
11 areas, we have a real-time performance monitoring system  
12 that we called Vital -- we call Vital Signs. And it tracks  
13 key indicators in the areas of environment, land and  
14 people, equity, economy, and transportation.

15 To Board Member Gioia's comment on social equity,  
16 MTC has several specific performance targets focused on  
17 equity, such as housing affordability, equitable access,  
18 and economic vitality. We conducted a detailed and will  
19 continue to do a detailed and in-depth equity analysis as  
20 part of our plan.

21 And also in this last plan, we also developed an  
22 action plan, because we found that in some of the areas we  
23 were moving off target, in particular on housing  
24 affordability. And that has led to some of our other  
25 initiatives such the CASA initiative I mentioned earlier.



1           Vital Sign also tracks health, housing  
2 affordability, and other real-time indicators related to  
3 social equity.

4           And I'll now it over to James Corless to give you  
5 the SACOG perspective.

6           MR. CORLESS: Well, Thank you, Alix, Chair  
7 Nichols and the Board. Thank you again for having us  
8 here. We just wanted to kind of wrap this up. I was  
9 going to give a couple more slides about SACOG and then  
10 talk a little bit about sort of statewide how we are  
11 enthusiastic about partnering with the State and your  
12 agency and many others.

13                           --o0o--

14           MR. CORLESS: The Sacramento region is considered  
15 one of the big four, but in many ways, we have sort of a  
16 foot in the Central Valley economy and a foot in the Bay  
17 Area economy. We in an interesting in-between place. We  
18 are not participating in the infill, and, affordable and  
19 attached housing boom that's hit the coastal markets.

20           Yet, we have commercial corridors that are  
21 struggling, and retail that's going empty that is the  
22 perfect place to put affordable housing and mixed use  
23 services, and frankly high frequency transit. That's one  
24 of our strategies we're looking at to get to 19 percent.

25           Our public transit numbers are dropping like

1 everybody else's. And the good news is our region and our  
2 board is really open to rethinking how we are providing  
3 service. RT, our main service provider in the county of  
4 Sacramento, is about to embark on a restructuring  
5 analysis, where we have software that is actually open to  
6 the public. And you can change routes and see ridership  
7 and equity in low income and communities of color.

8 But we're also looking at micro transit and  
9 first/last mile solutions. And one program, the staff  
10 mentioned a pilot program that we would love to basically  
11 open source, and be the front yard of the State Capitol,  
12 and try things in experiment.

13 We are ready to try and fail. We have a program  
14 called Civic Lab, which is a nine-month program. We have  
15 nine teams, city, county, staff, transit agencies, where  
16 we're trying solutions. We're going to fund those pilot  
17 projects. We're going to get some of the universities to  
18 come in and evaluate those projects, and we're going to  
19 see if they work or they fail, because the future has  
20 never been more uncertain, and so we want to begin to  
21 embrace that. In terms of monitoring and data, we just  
22 last year released our regional progress report, sort of  
23 getting ahead a little bit on the SB 150, perhaps not as  
24 deep as we'll get into in SB 150 in monitoring.

25 Some of our numbers look good and others do now,

1 and we want to be very honest with both our public, and  
2 you all about where those trends are heading.

3           And then finally just on the SACOG side, I just  
4 want to mention a couple of things of again areas in which  
5 in addition to Civic Lab we're really excited about, but  
6 we're willing to experiment on.

7           The first electrification and EVs. We're  
8 thrilled to have Electrify America investment in the City  
9 of Sacramento. We're taking to our board a bigger green  
10 region framework next month. And we're really looking at  
11 how we can make sure that everybody has access to those  
12 electric vehicles, putting them in public housing  
13 facilities, and making sure that the unbanked have access,  
14 not just to electric vehicles, but we're rolling out  
15 electric bike share this summer as well, and we're going  
16 to be doing a lot of monitoring of that.

17           We have a very unique rural urban connection  
18 strategy program. We have a huge ag area, and we're  
19 making sure that we don't pave over some of the nation's  
20 prime farm land, and that we actually bring back some of  
21 the -- our ability to actually use more of our food  
22 locally, so we're not trucking it to out of state and  
23 trucking it back in. That's a big part of our RUCS  
24 program. And then finally, we've got a lot on data and  
25 zero emissions.

1           Supervisor Gioia, you mentioned the equity  
2 question. And I -- and I want to put at least -- I've  
3 been out of California for 10 years. I've sort of come  
4 back. I worked at MTC for quite awhile. I would just say  
5 to you, I'm -- we are, I think, in a really interesting  
6 and challenging place, which is you're asking us to  
7 predict the future, and we are up to that challenge, but  
8 we also understand that future has never been more  
9 uncertain.

10           And from an equity analysis perspective, we are  
11 absolutely going to run that through our long-range model,  
12 and look at everything we can look at within the model.  
13 But I'm going to tell you I don't think the models are  
14 good for many things. I worry they're not as good for  
15 your equity question.

16           What we would like to do is actually look at  
17 testing and implementation of things on the ground. So,  
18 for instance, in our Civic Lab Program, we're looking at  
19 high school -- low-income high school youth who get summer  
20 internships. The first job they've ever had. They are  
21 showing up late, an hour, two hours late to -- why?  
22 Because they can't take three buses and make it work, and  
23 they're relying on family members for rides. So can we  
24 actually look at a micro transit solution that goes door  
25 to door, multiple kids in one vehicle, and get them to

1 that work site on time?

2 I don't know how we can measure exactly that into  
3 the 20 year plan, but I am more interested in trying to  
4 figure out this access to opportunity question, and how  
5 transportation remains a barrier in the short term, and  
6 testing ideas and solutions that might overcome that. So  
7 that's, I guess, one thought on your equity question.

8 And just finally, I wanted to kind of wrap for  
9 all of the MPOs here, we understand -- your staff again  
10 did an excellent presentation. There is a gap, we get  
11 that, between 19 and 25 percent. We want to help fill  
12 that gap. And we're excited about SB 150 in terms of  
13 performance monitoring and really looking at kind of  
14 testing what works, but we also think that we can't just  
15 be doing these things in isolation.

16 We need more partnerships with universities and  
17 higher education institutions in terms of evaluation. And  
18 we think that statewide, we ought to be leading the charge  
19 as we are on climate change to be looking at and  
20 implementing some of these new forms of autonomous and  
21 shared electric mobility. We ought to be the global  
22 leader in this. And frankly, we're not yet.

23 But we stand ready to work with you, to work with  
24 State agencies to make sure that we can actually  
25 reestablish ourselves as that world leader in these forms

1 of mobility as this disruption only accelerates.

2           So again thank you for your time. I think all  
3 four of us are happy to answer any questions.

4           Thank you, Madam Chair.

5           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I think before we  
6 proceed with the rest of the witnesses list, if there are  
7 really specific targeted questions just for the MPOs on  
8 their presentations, let's do those now.

9           Dr. Balmes.

10           BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes. Thank you, all. I'm  
11 particularly interested in active commuting, active  
12 transport. And I think almost all of you mentioned  
13 something about that.

14           And it's not just reduced vehicle miles traveled  
15 that I'm interested in, but also co-benefits in terms of  
16 health. And there's now modeling -- models available to  
17 do that kind of projection with regard to health benefits  
18 of active transportation, biking, walking. And I'm just  
19 wondering if you -- if any of you have used those models  
20 or are you just looking at reduced vehicle miles traveled?

21           MR. CORLESS: We going to awkwardly look at each  
22 other.

23           (Laughter.)

24           CHAIR NICHOLS: Sure. You can all come up and  
25 just speak briefly. That's fine.

1 MS. BOCKELMAN: Alix Bockelman again, MTC. We  
2 did look at health benefits associated with active  
3 transportation I think using the -- an ITHIM model.

4 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yeah.

5 MS. BOCKELMAN: But I'm not very familiar with  
6 the details of it, we did do that in our last plan.

7 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: That's the kind of thing I  
8 was looking for, yeah.

9 MS. KAWADA: We did not use that model. We're  
10 still -- we're using our AB -- AB ABM model. And so it's  
11 not, I guess, the most ideal, but we are quantifying how  
12 much time is spent -- one of the measures that we're  
13 tracking metrics for our next plan update is tracking the  
14 amount of time spent walking and using active modes. And  
15 I just want to quantify that at least. So when we compare  
16 scenarios, we know which ones do better than others.

17 I would say it is incomplete in this area with  
18 this -- with, you know -- with an ABM model. I don't  
19 think it's perfect, but it's a tool that we have to  
20 measure.

21 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I would just say that the  
22 ITHIM model is actually pretty decent and staff -- CARB  
23 staff are working to make sure that it's well validated  
24 for use in MPO planning.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thanks.

1 Any other quick -- yes, Supervisor Serna.

2 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you, Chair. This  
3 question I posed to any of the executive directors of the  
4 MPOs that are here. I think it's a really important one,  
5 and it goes to the point that was stressed during the  
6 staff report. There's been a lot of advocacy and strong  
7 intent and focus on, well, you know, trying to get to that  
8 25 percent or perhaps even higher reduction of VMT.

9 What are we doing to educate folks that may not,  
10 you know, be steeped in understanding modeling, the  
11 connections between land use and transportation, growth  
12 projections, the stuff that professional land planners and  
13 transportation Experts know very well, but perhaps the  
14 layperson who, you know, really is passionate about  
15 reducing VMT, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions may  
16 not have that sophisticated understanding of that subject  
17 matter. What are we doing to reach out to those groups,  
18 those people to do our best to educate them on the  
19 challenges that we have in just getting to the levels that  
20 we have now?

21 MR. IKHRATA: Well, that's a great questions.  
22 And I think -- I mean, we met with the advocates, the same  
23 one that come and says you need to do 25 percent. This is  
24 the wrong argument to have. This is the wrong approach to  
25 be arguing 19 or 25 or 15.



1           Right now we have a trend that's going in the  
2 wrong direction. How do we make it go in the right  
3 direction? How do we report to you, so you have a comfort  
4 level, you have a call to action that we are going in the  
5 right direction?

6           To that end, how do we do that? We need to do a  
7 lot more public outreach to those advocates. We need to  
8 include them in our planning. We need to talk about, and  
9 be very honest about the trends. I mean, people -- people  
10 says, oh, we need to build transit. And transit is great,  
11 we should build transit, but when you look at the transit  
12 ridership and it's declining, what do you do?

13           You stop listing transit? No, you look at  
14 transit differently. You try to do transit in the context  
15 of how do I make transit convenient for people to compete  
16 with the vehicle? With the rising incomes, with the good  
17 economy, that's a good discussion to have.

18           A lot of it need to take place. And is like we  
19 talked to your staff about, the new approach that Heather  
20 just spoke to you about is about reporting those things.  
21 And, you know, we might come to a point where we come to  
22 you a year or two years from now and say we're still going  
23 in the wrong direction. Then at least that gives you a  
24 chance to say, okay, let us -- let us do it differently.  
25 And for that, we need to educate a lot of the stakeholders

1 and advocates. And we do that through our planning, but  
2 we need to do more of it.

3 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Can I ask a follow-up.  
4 So what -- so I understand and appreciate the expression  
5 of need to do more, but what -- what is the plan? What --  
6 is there a common one for all the big four MPOs? Is --  
7 are there individual plans and process? What has been  
8 done to date to really be transparent and intentional  
9 about - not from a top-down, let me, you know, sit you  
10 down and tell you how it is approach, but doing your best  
11 to distill down the important elements that go into these  
12 types of considerations outside of the elaborate models.

13 MR. CORLESS: Supervisor Serna, honestly, I think  
14 we've spent a lot of time this last 12 months working with  
15 your staff to try to figure out how we can reach the 19  
16 percent targets for the big four. I think SB 150, I  
17 think, should provide a beginning forum for that  
18 discussion on that kind of gap and how we fill up to 25.

19 And so I think we are -- we're willing to commit  
20 to figure that out. I can't say necessarily that we -- we  
21 are worried about going in the wrong direction, if that  
22 wasn't clear from the four of us.

23 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: And I -- and I get that. I  
24 guess what I'm -- maybe I'm not communicating this as well  
25 as I could. I'm -- my concern is really focused on how

1 are we working with the public, so that they understand  
2 outside of the language of professionals --

3 MR. CORLESS: Right.

4 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: -- in the realm of land use  
5 and transportation, the hurdles, and why it's so  
6 challenging just to get to the targets that we have today.

7 MR. CORLESS: A couple of quick thoughts. First  
8 of al, I'm not sure we're doing the best job that we can  
9 do to work with the public to make this meaningful. I was  
10 over in London early -- late last year, where they've  
11 actually translated all of their greenhouse gas emission  
12 stuff into health. I mean, the public understands the  
13 health impacts of all this stuff, and it seems to be more  
14 motivated to work with that. And it's about kids.

15 I mean, you all know this. I don't have to tell  
16 you, number one. And number two, I think that we have a  
17 lot of programs rolling out around shared, shared electric  
18 bike, shared electric vehicles. We have to do our part in  
19 terms of getting folks to understand how to use those  
20 things, working especially in disadvantaged communities.  
21 And then I think, you know, we have other -- we have other  
22 programs that actually are around gamification frankly  
23 to -- for having younger folks get excited about trying  
24 new transportation modes, and so there's a tool, and a  
25 whole suite of strategies. In order to connect this

1 discussion to the general public, I think we have a lot of  
2 work to do.

3 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

5 Yes, go ahead.

6 MS. KAWADA: I can just briefly talk about it  
7 from a -- from a engagement -- community engagement place.  
8 We have used community based organizations. So partnered  
9 and basically hired community based organizations in, you  
10 know, representing kind of, like I said, the most  
11 disadvantaged and vulnerable communities from around the  
12 county.

13 And one of the things they do, they do meet with  
14 us as a staff on a monthly basis with actually Board  
15 members that Chair the Committee. My chair basically is  
16 committed and he's going, as an elected official to listen  
17 to these voices. The charge of the -- we've given them  
18 for the community based organizations is to take the  
19 information that we get, this, you know, very technocratic  
20 kind of language that we speak, and we understand, and  
21 then help us. And they're responsible for translating  
22 that and understanding it enough to take it out to their  
23 communities, and push that information out, and basically  
24 solicit the information back in from their own communities  
25 in their language, in their -- in the ways that are

1 meaningful to them and then bring back -- that back to us.

2           So where we've seen progress in terms of that is  
3 things like we -- we can measure mode share. We can  
4 measure VMT and we're committed to doing that as part of  
5 our metrics for the regional plan, but it wasn't -- those  
6 weren't the only metrics that meant something, because  
7 people -- how do you translate it as someone struggling to  
8 get to work or struggling to get to school? What does VMT  
9 mean to them?

10           It doesn't mean anything to them. They're  
11 looking at how quickly can I get, you know, on any kind  
12 of -- whether it's transit, driving, carpooling, within 30  
13 minutes? Do I have access to food? Do I have access to  
14 health care within 15 minutes. So there -- that's where  
15 we've had meaningful back and forth in dialogue in terms  
16 of what metrics are meaningful to people in our  
17 communities.

18           CHAIR NICHOLS: Question?

19           BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Thank you.

20           Kim, you had mentioned Climate Action Plans from  
21 cities. And I guess one question I have is does every  
22 city have a good Climate Action Plan that helps you do  
23 your work, and how could we better those? Would it be  
24 helpful to have guidance the way we're talking about  
25 developing guidance documents for freight facilities to

1 help communities, to help local governments in this  
2 process?

3 MS. KAWADA: So we've used -- we've had some  
4 cities, even -- so right now, we're getting ready to  
5 release about twenty to thirty million dollars of  
6 competitive funding for local governments to do things  
7 like planning for smart growth, planning for infill  
8 development. And we've done that for a number of years.

9 This year that's different is we're requiring  
10 them to actually have, and we're funding them, but  
11 requiring them to have Climate Action Plans and Complete  
12 Streets policies to be -- in order to compete for funding.

13 To ask whether we need regulation, I'm not quite  
14 there yet. Because even before we have this sort of  
15 incentive stick, if you will, we've had cities on all --  
16 across the spectrum that have done it on their own. So  
17 the City of San Diego, for example, the first, you know,  
18 enforceable, actionable, Climate Action Plan, they've come  
19 up on their own, and other cities have followed suit.

20 We have, you know, the whole spectrum. It's sort  
21 of like with housing you, have the whole spectrum, right?  
22 So I don't know if -- I mean, what I'm hopeful is that I  
23 think if we can do this incentive approach first and to  
24 see, you know, can they achieve certain targets, or  
25 measurable things in mobility, in terms of clean energy,

1 clean choice, because I think we need them to -- and it  
2 needs to -- it needs to boil up from the bottom from  
3 listening to their communities, and see what's really  
4 reasonable and, you know, actionable for them.

5           So I would, I guess, maybe some -- a framework  
6 for it, but I wouldn't say real specific requirements  
7 quite yet, because I think they're still -- they still are  
8 experimenting, and figuring out what works for them in  
9 what areas.

10           BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Yeah, and I was seeing  
11 these documents as guidances, guest -- best practices.  
12 And you've talked about San Diego, what about the other  
13 MPOs? Is this something that's everywhere in the State,  
14 or is...

15           MS. BOCKELMAN: In the MPO --

16           BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Looking for ways to help  
17 you get your job done.

18           MS. BOCKELMAN: Right. In the MTC region I know  
19 a lot of the cities obviously adopt Climate Action Plans.  
20 It's not something that we have required. We've required  
21 other things as -- in terms of when we provide funding,  
22 we've required all the cities to have Complete Streets  
23 adopted policies. We've required every city to have a  
24 housing element adopted. We think that really strengthens  
25 the ability to get SB 375.

1           So this is an area where we probably can partner  
2 better with the cities, because they are doing a lot in  
3 this area with the Climate Action Plans.

4           MR. IKHRATA: And we're the same as San  
5 Francisco. We don't require, but we encourage. You know,  
6 we obviously do the regional housing need assessment. We  
7 ask them to tell us how they're going to zone for all kind  
8 of housing. We -- we have a sustainability program, where  
9 we provide funding for cities to do, but we don't require  
10 it.

11           But, you know, back to the -- how do you -- even  
12 with the local city or the public at large, how do you get  
13 them to understand the world we're talking about?

14           SCAG region is about 19 million people. And when  
15 we hold workshops that we're required to hold for the  
16 regional transportation plan, we're lucky if we have 10  
17 show up.

18           You know, if you ask -- if you ask 100 people now  
19 on the street, how your transportation funding gets done,  
20 you probably get one person to give you an answer.

21           So this is -- I mean, we could feel good about  
22 say we're going to reach people, but this is a language  
23 that very few understand. And we have an obligation to do  
24 the outreach and to encourage cities to do Climate Action  
25 Plan. But frankly, we have to be very clear about what's



1 happening. The trend that we're facing. How the land use  
2 in California lends itself to where we're going.

3 And so but we do -- we do encourage cities to do  
4 Climate Action Plans.

5 MR. CORLESS: Dr. Sherriffs, I don't know how  
6 many of our jurisdictions. I can check on that for you.  
7 I'd imagine a majority do not. And this gets a little bit  
8 back to what Supervisor Serna was saying earlier. Our  
9 jurisdictions, many of them, are struggling economically,  
10 as many cities across the State are. So we've actually  
11 used a Strategic Growth Council grant to provide technical  
12 assistance to do main street revitalization, small  
13 business incubation, and we think there's many climate  
14 benefits to those kinds of things. But the thing that our  
15 jurisdictions want is an economic plan that then ideally  
16 has environmental and equity benefits.

17 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Well -- and again, I was  
18 asking not to burden anybody with more work, but hey, if  
19 this is a useful tool to doing your work, well, then we  
20 ought be thinking about do we promote that, how do we get  
21 it happening, yeah.

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Ms. Mitchell.

23 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you, Madam Chair.  
24 Welcome. Thank you all for coming today and presenting  
25 your ideas to us.

1           A couple of things that I want to touch on and  
2 ask your comment on. When we started this process back in  
3 2008, 2010, the nation was in recession. And so what we  
4 have seen over the last 10 years or so is a nation  
5 recovering. And so part of that is that the unemployment  
6 rate, which was very low back then, is now -- or very high  
7 back then has now become very low, and we have -- most of  
8 our population is employed.

9           We've also seen, as Hasan mentioned, increase in  
10 population, so that we're seeing impacts from a recovering  
11 and thriving economy now. And we're going to have to  
12 address that when we look at what we're doing with this  
13 program.

14           So I'd just like maybe your input on that aspect  
15 of what we are dealing with. It's an un -- it's to some  
16 degree uncertain, but we see ourselves recovering now, and  
17 we have to deal with it now.

18           So, first of all, your comments about that aspect  
19 of what we try to accomplish here.

20           MR. IKHRATA: So I think you, more than anybody,  
21 you sit in the SCAG board. You're familiar with kind of  
22 the discussion. The economy recovered, incomes are  
23 rising, people are buying cars. You know, at one point,  
24 we need to figure out how we have -- it's not the car  
25 versus the transit or versus the bicycle or the walking,

1 it is how you make a transportation system work for  
2 everybody, and how you price it in such a way that it  
3 works for everybody, and how you develop policies that's  
4 really for the revolution that's coming in the near  
5 future.

6           But I can tell you right now, like your staff  
7 very clearly indicated, we're going in the wrong  
8 direction. That should not discourage us, and we said  
9 very clearly, we're going to come back to you in the  
10 interim and report to you about not only what action we  
11 take, but progress we make. And we might come -- I might  
12 stand in front of you or somebody from my agency stand in  
13 front of you a year from now and tell you, you know, we're  
14 trying, but it's not working. We need to do something  
15 else.

16           And we need to factor in these cycles, the  
17 recession, when a lot of people weren't working. When  
18 actually we've seen a decrease in absolute number in  
19 vehicle mile traveled. And in a good economy like now --  
20 and frankly, right now, we do have a lot of questions to  
21 be answered in how we factor these cycles into our work  
22 moving forward.

23           And I think we discussed with Richard and Kurt  
24 and the staff about maybe, in our performance reporting,  
25 to be very specific, the modes, about the social equity,

1 disadvantaged communities, where are the housing getting  
2 built, what did it do to the original residents. And all  
3 of that has to come together in a annual or biannual  
4 reporting, so we can be educated in the cycle's impact.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Come on.

6 MS. BOCKELMAN: Well, I think in the MTC region  
7 we feel this point very acutely. We've added 500,000 jobs  
8 in a time when we've added 60,000 housing units, and that  
9 is a huge problem for us. So some of my comments earlier  
10 really focused on the fact that, you know, we have a  
11 housing crisis. I know California does. We really have  
12 it as well, and we are trying to do everything we can to  
13 figure out how to really get housing built and also do it  
14 in a way that we're not displacing residents. And it is a  
15 real challenge.

16 And so we're trying to bring together all of the  
17 smart minds from all the different sectors, the business  
18 community cares, everybody cares. We've got to do  
19 something very different. So it is a huge challenge.

20 In terms of our transit system, I think while  
21 there may have been pretty big declines in parts of the  
22 state, I mean our rail systems have seen huge increases in  
23 ridership. We may have reach a plateau, because we're at  
24 the point where people -- you know, can't really get on  
25 the system. So we're really trying to continue to invest

1 in core capacity improvements to our transit system.  
2 Ordering new BART cars are kind of rolling in. They need  
3 to roll in faster. New train control system to increase  
4 the frequency through our Transbay Tube by 30 percent.  
5 We're electrifying Caltrain or extending BART to San Jose.  
6 We need all of that.

7           And we are trying to make sure -- I mean, the  
8 dollars in cap and trade and SB 1 are -- can be very  
9 helpful to making sure all these projects stay on track,  
10 which are really important for us to be able to just keep  
11 what we have said that we are doing in our plan.

12           CHAIR NICHOLS: That's an important point. You  
13 have to look more specifically at the different regions.

14           I -- thank you. I think what we should do  
15 actually is take a 10 minute break for the court reporter.  
16 Obviously, we've got a lot of people signed up who want to  
17 speak on this item, but I think this could conclude our  
18 colloquy with the MPOs, and everybody could use a brief  
19 comfort break.

20           So we will break for 10 minutes and be back at  
21 11:10.

22           Thank you.

23           (Off record: 10:59 a.m.)

24           (Thereupon a recess was taken.)

25           (On record: 11:09 a.m.)

1 CHAIR NICHOLS: Our next witness is Matt Regan  
2 from the Bay Area Council. I don't that we've posted the  
3 list of speakers anywhere.

4 MS. JENSEN: Mary, one minute. It will show up  
5 on your screen in one minute.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Can the people in the audience  
7 see the list when it gets posted?

8 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: Yes.

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Okay. Good. Thank you.  
10 Excellent. Okay. So we have 34 witnesses before lunch.

11 I think many people do not have a lengthy  
12 testimony, but if you could try to get it down to two  
13 minutes, that would be terrific and much appreciated.

14 Mr. Regan, hi.

15 MR. REGAN: Chair Nichols, Board members, thank  
16 you for the opportunity to make public comment today. To  
17 be honest, I was expecting to be disappointed by this  
18 hearing. I was expecting to hear a wonkish, navel-gazing  
19 discussion about 19 percent versus 25 percent. And it has  
20 been actually quite different than that.

21 To hear staff make a call for tools -- land use  
22 tools in our to make these plans successful. And Board  
23 Member Sperling to hear him make a call for action rather  
24 than just more plans is very encouraging. And to hear our  
25 MPOs say that, you know, things cannot stay the way they

1 are, that the status quo cannot remain, and we cannot  
2 expect to meet our goals in terms of greenhouse gas  
3 reductions, unless we -- something changes.

4 I should begin by saying I'm here from the Bay  
5 Area Council representing about 300 of the largest  
6 employers in the San Francisco Bay Area. We were the  
7 first business group in California to support AB 32. We  
8 were early supporters of SB 375. I was actually on the  
9 rooftop of that Sacramento parking garage 10 years ago,  
10 when Governor Schwarzenegger signed the bill. I always  
11 find that somewhat of an ironic place to sign this  
12 legislation, but -- and I also sit on ABAG's Regional  
13 Planning Committee, and MTC's Planning Advisory Committee.  
14 So I know way too much about this law than any human being  
15 should.

16 But I also know that, particularly in our region,  
17 it's not working. Alix Bockelman mentioned some  
18 statistics. In 2015 alone, we created 133,000 jobs, and  
19 permitted 16,000 units of housing. That is not  
20 sustainable. And what we need, as has been mentioned, we  
21 need the tools in order for these plans to succeed.

22 Plan Bay Area is a good plan, but it's based on  
23 the premise, on the supposition, on the assumption that  
24 the cities in our region, our 101 cities and our nine  
25 counties have bought into the plan, that they understand

1 that their -- they have a responsibility and a role to  
2 play in reducing VMT, reducing greenhouse gases. But my  
3 experience, spending way too many Tuesday nights, and  
4 planning commissions is that they have not bought into the  
5 plan, and they do not understand that they have a  
6 constructive role to play.

7           And unless this body and others like it bring the  
8 hammer down on noncompliant cities, we cannot ever meet  
9 those goals. So thank you. Looking forward to working  
10 with you in the future on this goal.

11           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

12           MS. HOLMES-GEN: Okay. Good morning, Chair  
13 Nichols and Board members. Bonnie Holmes-Gen, American  
14 Lung Association in California.

15           The Lung Association has been a key partner with  
16 you working toward healthy sustainable communities over  
17 the nine years of the implementation of 375. We still  
18 believe this program has potential for transformative  
19 healthy climate benefits at the state level, local level.  
20 We still have a long way to go, given the need to achieve  
21 the 25 percent GHG reduction, and seven percent VMT  
22 reduction by 2030, and appreciate all the discussion and  
23 recognition of that robust goal that we have, and the  
24 challenges of getting there.

25           Much is at stake. We don't have time to lose in



1 our climb efforts. And stronger targets, together with  
2 strong State and local partnerships, and along with  
3 measurable VMT reduction strategies, more active  
4 transportation, focused investment programs, and health  
5 metrics will not only help clean up the air, but will --  
6 but the increased physical activity and -- will bring us  
7 tremendous public health gains and reduction in chronic  
8 disease rates.

9           And your staff analysis cites the tremendous drop  
10 in chronic illness, early death, drop in cardiovascular  
11 and other diseases that we can achieve from even very  
12 modest increases in physical activity.

13           We submitted a health letter. I have -- had a  
14 copy of it. It's not right here with more than a dozen  
15 health organizations, state and local groups calling on  
16 you for action, underscoring the importance of stronger  
17 regional targets, and the pathway to getting to the 25  
18 percent GHG reduction, asking CARB to be vigilant in  
19 utilizing new funding resources to better assist local and  
20 regional agencies, and communities in getting to these  
21 goals.

22           And we've asked also -- we've asked the Board to  
23 support and elevate ongoing health analysis. And I  
24 appreciate Dr. Balmes bringing this up. I know Dr.  
25 Sherriffs has been very active in this. Several regional

1 planning agencies have begun integrating health into the  
2 planning efforts, and you've heard some of that today.

3           There has been health analysis on a regional  
4 level, MPOs and COGs have hired public health and active  
5 transportation staff, integrated their work with county  
6 health departments, and taken other steps.

7           But there is more to do. We're not at the level  
8 we need to be yet to truly flesh out the health benefits.  
9 We need to do more than regional analysis of health, but  
10 be looking at more the neighborhood, subregional level to  
11 truly flesh out and show these health benefits that will  
12 help excite our communities and cities about what we can  
13 accomplish.

14           And we need to be able to really show the  
15 benefits of innovative projects, like we've been  
16 discussing, widespread bike share, widespread innovative  
17 transportation.

18           We agree with the call to action, and let's focus  
19 on elevating health as we move.

20           Thank you.

21           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

22           MS. TREMONTI: Hello, Chair Nichols and members  
23 of the Board. I am Ashley Tremonti with the City of San  
24 Diego here today to express our support for the targets  
25 set forth in the proposed update to SB 375, and to suggest

1 that the Board consider revisiting these targets on a more  
2 frequent basis, possibly every two to four years.

3           Additionally, we support an increased focus on  
4 performance metrics, including regular reporting and  
5 monitoring of these metrics. The shortfalls associate  
6 with greenhouse gas modeling and calculations can be  
7 lessened by supplementing with analyses of performance  
8 metrics to ensure real progress and success is occurring.

9           The City of San Diego requests that CARB monitor  
10 funding distribution across the state to ensure that these  
11 ambitious targets are being met. However, we need the  
12 financial resources and investment to accomplish them. So  
13 we would like to see a more equitable distribution of  
14 funds, including in the San Diego region.

15           And lastly, I wanted to address Board Member  
16 Sherriffs' comments about a potential regulation with  
17 Climate Action Plans. And I would invite you to come and  
18 talk to the City of San Diego or SANDAG as we are  
19 preparing a regional greenhouse gas framework for Climate  
20 Action Planning, for monitoring, for reporting that I  
21 think would be of interest to the Board.

22           So thank you, and that is all.

23           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

24           BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: And I just want to  
25 clarify. I wasn't asking for a regulation. I was asking

1 if it would be a useful tool, and then how we could  
2 promote that. So I'm glad to hear that you're working on  
3 that.

4 MR. TREMONTI: Yeah, so that's what -- we're  
5 basically trying to develop a useful tool.

6 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Great.

7 MS. TREMONTI: And SANDAG has been coordinating  
8 cities across our region for many months to prepare this  
9 documentation that hopefully our region will follow and  
10 will have a consistent greenhouse gas reporting and  
11 monitoring framework moving forward.

12 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Thank you.

13 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

14 Sorry, question?

15 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I keep doing that. I  
16 keep wanting your microphone.

17 I just had a question for you.

18 If I might --

19 (Closer to the microphone.)

20 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here we go.

21 I'm just a little bit confused, because my  
22 understanding is that the revelation at the end of last  
23 year in regards to vehicle miles traveled miscalculation  
24 puts the San Diego Climate Plan's ability to reach its  
25 goals at a great risk, that VMT was grossly overestimated

1 in 2010. And as a result, it appeared that there was  
2 great reduction in VMT. We find that to not be true as a  
3 result of SANDAG's Calculations.

4 And my understanding that the city was quite  
5 concerned about that. So how -- how does that square with  
6 your support for the target and what you're going to do  
7 going forward. Maybe you could let us know about that.

8 MS. TREMONTI: Yes. I was not prepared to  
9 respond to that question specifically, and that's a bit of  
10 a loaded answer in response. There was no miscalculation  
11 in 2010 in regards to VMT. We used the best available  
12 data at the time, which was derived from SANDAG modeling  
13 of VMT. Those numbers were subsequently updated, and we  
14 have since updated our inventory to reflect those updated  
15 VMT numbers.

16 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: So are you saying the  
17 City is not worried about meeting its 22 percent of all  
18 commuters' goal of getting them on transit?

19 MS. TREMONTI: Our goal is 50 percent of  
20 commuters by 2035.

21 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Right.

22 MS. TREMONTI: And we are still on track to meet  
23 that goal. We're still developing programs around  
24 increasing the number of mode shift or increasing mode  
25 shift.

1 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'm speaking of the 2020  
2 goal, and the fact that -- so are you saying you're on  
3 track to meet that?

4 MS. TREMONTI: At this time, I'm not really  
5 prepared to go that deep into this. I just wanted to  
6 provide comments on SB 375.

7 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: No, I appreciate that.  
8 I just -- I want to make sure that we're aware of what the  
9 current conditions are. And you are in the best position  
10 to give us that information.

11 MS. TREMONTI: Yeah. So for now, I would  
12 encourage you to look back at our annual report. So each  
13 year we provide updated numbers on where we are in regards  
14 to all of the goals we've set forth in our Climate Action  
15 Plan, transportation included. And if you'd like to have  
16 a more deeper conversation with that, the city would be  
17 happy to talk to you.

18 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah, I know where to  
19 find the city. Thank you very much.

20 MS. TREMONTI: Right.

21 (Laughter.)

22 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thanks for being here.

23 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

24 You don't have to wait. It's not like TSA.

25 (Laughter.)

1 CHAIR NICHOLS: You just come on up.

2 MS. REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you.

3 Can you hear me?

4 Okay. My name is Ana Castro Reynoso. And I'm  
5 here on behalf of over 5,000 members of Environmental  
6 Health Coalition, or EHC. EHC is a 38-year old  
7 environmental justice organization based in San Diego,  
8 California.

9 EHC strongly urges the California Air Resources  
10 Board to require an emission reduction target of 25  
11 percent for the San Diego Association of Governments. The  
12 system SANDAG has built and has worked to maintain is  
13 expensive, car centric, increases toxic pollution, and  
14 contributes to climate change. A 25 percent emission  
15 reduction target would change that.

16 Low income communities of color suffer the most  
17 from SANDAG's focus on freeway expansion. Residents from  
18 disadvantaged communities like Barrio Logan and West  
19 National City rank in the top 10 percent of the most  
20 impacted census tracts for pollution in the entire state,  
21 due, in significant measure, to their proximity to  
22 freeways.

23 San Diego is the eighth largest city in the  
24 country. Yet, it's transportation system lags behind  
25 cities with much smaller populations. As a result, low

1 income communities of color are fronting the impacts of  
2 high levels of pollution, and can only reach 29 percent of  
3 jobs within 90 minutes on public transit.

4           On top of that, SANDAG is not accountable to the  
5 people of San Diego. It has a long history of misleading  
6 San Diego residents. In November of 2014, the California  
7 Court of Appeal held that SANDAG violated CEQA by  
8 approving a defective Environmental Impact Report in  
9 connection with its 2011 Regional Transportation Plan.

10           And this past summer, Voice of San Diego exposed  
11 SANDAG for wrongly projecting revenue from tax measures  
12 during the last election cycle. One thing is clear,  
13 SANDAG is not doing their part as one of the large four  
14 MPOs to achieve a real paradigm shift in San Diego's  
15 transportation planning. We need them to do more.

16           Lumping SANDAG as part of the large four MPOs  
17 provides cover for their mismanagement, and further  
18 silences the community members and stakeholders that are  
19 here today asking for ARB's help.

20           We are asking that based on the community stories  
21 and testimony brought forth today that you ensure SANDAG  
22 is held more accountable with a 25 percent emission  
23 reduction target. These pieces of data and stories of  
24 scandal are not anomalies. They are SANDAG's status quo.

25           CARB staff's proposed target means more of the



1 status quo for San Diego. A 25 percent target is not a  
2 paper exercise. It gives us a more ambitious target to  
3 push for. And finally, the passage of Assembly Bill 805,  
4 or the SANDAG reform bill --

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: You can finish your -- finish  
6 your sentence.

7 MS. REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you -- clearly  
8 demonstrated that we need strong enforcement from CARB to  
9 truly reduce greenhouse gas emissions and serve the  
10 community members that suffer the most from the pollution  
11 plaguing their communities, homes, and lungs.

12 A 25 percent emission reduction target would  
13 truly meet the intended purpose of SB 375, and the CARB  
14 staff's adjustments to target frameworks and SCS  
15 evaluation process.

16 Thank you.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

18 MS. CEVALLOS(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Hello. Good  
19 morning. My name is Llesenia Cevallos and I live in  
20 National City. I'm also a member of the National  
21 Coalition Environmental. I'm here to ask that the ARB  
22 vote for 25 percent emission reduction target for SANDAG.  
23 It is very important to me that we address the inadequate  
24 transportation system in San Diego, because I am concerned  
25 with the health of my children.

1           And I am concerned that we are flooding the  
2 street -- the streets with cars and the freeways and we  
3 are producing more pollution. I have three children and I  
4 am worried about the future that awaits them. The main  
5 issues that I have, the Interstate 5, at only 600 feet  
6 away from my home. The window in my room faces the  
7 freeway. When I open the window, pollution comes in and  
8 marks the walls of my room with a black and sticky  
9 substance.

10           This is quite concerning then, since my children  
11 have breathe this black sticky substance. I also ask  
12 myself how Kimball Elementary, which is also quite near  
13 the freeway. The children in community breathe this each  
14 day when -- whenever they go to school. The Board needs  
15 to ensures that SANDAG complies with the intentions of the  
16 law, and they truly reduce the emissions by 25 percent.

17           We need a firm solution that generates an  
18 efficient and low cost public transport system. We need  
19 your support to have a SANDAG that takes into account the  
20 health of my community and our families. We expect a 25  
21 percent reduction and we want SANDAG to take action to  
22 reach a real reduction. The health and the -- of my  
23 children's lungs are in your hands.

24           Thanks for your time.

25           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

1 MS. MARGANO(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good morning.  
2 My name is Margarita Margano and I live in National City.  
3 I'm a promoter of the Environmental Health Coalition. For  
4 my family and my community, it is important that SANDAG  
5 reduce transportation emissions by 25 percent. The  
6 problem in my community is that SANDAG has not created a  
7 transportation system that takes into account my community  
8 and its needs.

9 I have a son who has asthma, and pollution  
10 damages him a great deal, which causes him -- causes for  
11 his lungs to always be swelled up.

12 The solution is a transportation system that does  
13 not contaminate the communities. And this is only  
14 possible if the Board requires a 25 percent emission  
15 reduction target from SANDAG. The Board needs to ensure  
16 that SANDAG complies with the law and that it actually  
17 reduces pollution emissions.

18 Please demand a 25 percent emission reduction for  
19 SANDAG. Thanks for your time.

20 MS. MARTINEZ(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good morning  
21 to everyone. My name is Carmina Martinez and I live in  
22 Logan Heights. I've been living in this community for 18  
23 years, and I am a mom of three children. It's very  
24 important for me to -- and my family to reduce pollution.

25 I'm here to ask the Board to give priority to the

1 communities that are mostly impacted by these harmful  
2 emissions. The problem in my community is the pollution  
3 produced by the transportation system. SANDAG gives  
4 priority to the freeways. In my personal experience, I  
5 have suffered for eight years of an allergy in my skin  
6 caused by the environment.

7           The proof of this pollution is in our own bodies.  
8 The solution to this problem is to reduce the emissions.  
9 There are contaminants. To really achieve real change,  
10 the Board needs to demand a reduction of emissions of 25  
11 percent. We need your support to have a SANDAG that  
12 supports our communities and our families.

13           Please demand a 25 percent reduction of emissions  
14 for SANDAG. Thank you very much for your time.

15           MS. GONZALEZ (THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good morning.  
16 My name is Esperanza Rosales -- Gonzalez.

17           I'm a resident of the community of City Heights  
18 of San Diego. I'm a promoter of the Environmental Health.  
19 For me, it's really important to have a -- in my community  
20 an efficient transportation system of lower cost, and that  
21 reduces emissions.

22           We need that the Board -- the ARB Board assure us  
23 that SANDAG will achieve this type of transportation  
24 system. The problem in our communities that there is  
25 no -- not enough transportation -- public transportation

1 to travel that -- without taking a long time. It's very  
2 difficult to use the public transportation to be able to  
3 raise your job, go shopping, go to school and other places  
4 in San Diego.

5 We have worked for a long time, many years, in  
6 our community to improve the transportation system. But  
7 we haven't seen enough change. SANDAG doesn't hear the  
8 needs of our communities. The solution is a higher goal  
9 for SANDAG, one that assures that really is inverting in  
10 the more -- the communities are in greater need.

11 As well as my friends and companions, we need the  
12 Board -- the ARB Board to demand lower of emissions of 25  
13 percent for SANDAG.

14 We need your support to have us -- we need your  
15 support to have a SANDAG that takes into account our  
16 marginalized communities and our families.

17 Please demand lowering of the emissions to 25  
18 percent. Thank you very much for your time.

19 MS. PRATT: Honorable Board members, my name is  
20 Linda Giannelli Pratt, and I reside in San Diego,  
21 California. Prior to retirement, I was part of the City  
22 of San Diego's team that developed their Climate Action  
23 Plan. And so I do understand the complexities and the  
24 opportunities inherent in this planning process.

25 I am now on the advisory council for Stay Cool

1 for Grandkids, which is a non-profit organization of  
2 volunteer grandparents, elders, and other citizens in San  
3 Diego region dedicated to preserving a livable community  
4 in the name of those too young to have a voice, our future  
5 generations.

6 We recommend adopting a more ambitious target for  
7 SB 375, specifically 21 to 25 percent GHG reduction by  
8 2035. We believe it is unconscionable for any of us to  
9 leave the burden of mitigating and adapting to dangerous  
10 climate change on the shoulders of young people.

11 According to a recent report, we are handing  
12 young people alive today a bill of up three -- \$535  
13 trillion just to cover the cost of quote "negative  
14 emission technologies" that would be required to remove  
15 atmospheric CO2. And that does not include the cost for  
16 the severe health impacts, food and water scarcity,  
17 irreversible damage to the natural environment, including  
18 wildfires and drought, and untold degradation of life --  
19 of the quality of life for future generations.

20 Intergenerational equity is at the heart of the  
21 lawsuit Juliana versus United States. The 21 plaintiffs,  
22 ranging in age from 10 to 20 years old, state that the  
23 federal government's refusal to take serious action  
24 against climate change unlawfully puts the well-being of  
25 current generations ahead of future generations.

1           And so far, the courts agree, despite attempts by  
2 the Trump administration to have the case dismissed. In  
3 March 2018, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals allowed the  
4 suit to go to trial. This followed an earlier decision in  
5 November of 2017 when the District Court Judge Ann Aiken  
6 sent -- set a judicial precedent ruling that climate  
7 change may pose an unconstitutional burden for younger  
8 generations.

9           We believe that the California Air Resources  
10 Board has the opportunity, and the obligation, to adopt  
11 ambitious greenhouse gas emission targets -- reduction  
12 targets pursuant to SB 375 and to provide guidance to  
13 state, regional, and local governments on how to  
14 effectively implement plans and strategies that will lead  
15 to meeting these targets.

16           There are over nine million children under the  
17 age of 18 living in California today, who are depending on  
18 us, and there is no time to delay. With that in mind, I  
19 will turn the podium over to Bob Leiter who will deliver  
20 our specific recommendations.

21           After more than 30 years in public service, I  
22 still believe that the noblest motive is the public good,  
23 and that should include those future generations.

24           MR. LEITER: Hi. I'm Bob Leiter. I'm a retired  
25 urban planner, living in -- live in Poway, California. So

1 I'm focusing my comments on the San Diego region. And  
2 I'll just mention I've met many of you or worked with many  
3 of you. I was a city planner for the Cities of Escondido  
4 and Chula Vista in San Diego County. Then became the  
5 planning director for SANDAG. And I was the SANDAG  
6 planning director for about seven years, including the  
7 start-up of SB 375 planning.

8           Since -- when I retired from SANDAG, I worked as  
9 a consultant with four other MPOs on their Sustainable  
10 Communities Strategies, and have worked with other public  
11 agencies on plans to promote sustainability, so -- but I'm  
12 speaking as a retired urban planner.

13           And I want to emphasize that the recommendations  
14 that we're making from Stay Cool reflect our understanding  
15 of the long discussions that have been held among the  
16 various staff and elected officials about these targets.

17           And I'll just briefly highlight our  
18 recommendations. We had -- submitted a letter to you  
19 dated March 19th. Our first recommendation is that CARB  
20 should adopt a 2035 GHG emission reduction target for the  
21 San Diego region that is no less than 21 percent, and  
22 preferably up to 25 percent.

23           We understand that CARB and SANDAG staff believe  
24 it would be difficult to replicate the 21 percent GHG  
25 reduction that was shown in SANDAG's most recent Regional



1 Transportation Plan. But we believe that by working  
2 together, CARB and SANDAG staffs would be able to identify  
3 opportunities in the San Diego region to receive GHG  
4 reduction credit for future, what we call, multiple  
5 benefit projects, and also for multi-jurisdictional  
6 projects.

7           And I'll go back to that a little bit more with  
8 my other comments. We also think it's extremely important  
9 for the Air Resources Board to weigh-in on the  
10 implementation of Senate Bill 743, and will -- we can  
11 explain that in a little more detail. But that is a  
12 critical component of the legislation that's been enacted  
13 to help implement SB 375, and we think that's important to  
14 follow through on.

15           So I'll go back to our individual recommendations  
16 with the remaining time available. First of all, we  
17 recommend that the ARB staff work with SANDAG to provide  
18 guidance on the use of multiple benefit plans. And we've  
19 provided a good example of that in our letter. The idea  
20 of complete streets has been well accepted as a way to  
21 reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas  
22 emissions.

23           The idea of Green Streets is that you can design  
24 Complete Streets that also reduce stormwater pollution  
25 runoff, and promote water conservation, and still reduce

1 greenhouse gas emissions. And the advantage of taking  
2 that approach is now you qualify not just for  
3 transportation funds like SB 1 funds, you also qualify for  
4 a number of other State sponsored grant programs. And I  
5 can give you examples of that, but I know that time  
6 doesn't permit that.

7 I would just add that our other recommendations  
8 are that you really take a closer look at multiple  
9 jurisdictional efforts, including city and county Climate  
10 Action Plans. We think there's a lot of opportunity to  
11 more clearly understand the relationship between the  
12 regional targets and the local implementation plans. And  
13 then again, we think SB 743, which is the law that says  
14 that under CEQA now, you focus on vehicle miles traveled  
15 and GHG reductions, rather than on traffic congestion.

16 We think that every city and the County of San  
17 Diego should already be implementing that. And we think  
18 ARB can give a gentle shove to the State agencies, and the  
19 local and regional agencies that are -- that are trying to  
20 figure that out.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Would you wind up, please. I'm  
23 being a little generous here with the timing, because we  
24 shortened it, but we do have a lot of people waiting to  
25 testify.

1           So if you can try to condense your remarks and  
2 get to the bottom line, we would appreciate it.

3           MR. COURSIER: Chair Nichols and Board members,  
4 my name is George Coursier. I'm a volunteer for the  
5 Sierra Club. I'm the Conservation Chair for the East San  
6 Diego group. And I attended the San Diego meeting, which  
7 was outstanding from the CARB staff.

8           My takeaway was that the San Diego meeting was  
9 the targets proposed by the MPOs, and by my own MPO SANDAG  
10 were consistently below the GHG reduction threshold is  
11 required. The very agencies here responsible for reducing  
12 pollution and GHG were willing to fail that mission.

13           This is unacceptable for residents of San Diego,  
14 and it must be unacceptable for CARB as well. Rather than  
15 missing scoping goals and standards, Sierra Club  
16 encourages CARB to make this a turning point, when  
17 required by legislation, and demand a 25 percent reduction  
18 in the pollution of greenhouse gases that the MPO's are  
19 not working with at this time.

20           It's surprising and shocking that my own MPO in  
21 San Diego does not meet these standards and is not willing  
22 to. You know, it's time to stand up for disadvantaged  
23 communities. These are impacted by vehicle pollution.  
24 Stand up for the public transportation, and against trying  
25 to build more freeways near our schools and homes.

1           And the fact that freeways, you know, are so  
2 congested and failing on a daily basis should really be  
3 kind of a bright light to all of us here that this is not  
4 working. And I assure you in San Diego, it is not.

5           Vehicle miles traveled are increasing in  
6 California, and this should be the call to action for the  
7 MPOs for SANDAG to take cars off the road, find public  
8 transit incentives, and remove the vehicles. The present  
9 efforts are failing.

10           Today is the opportunity to break the cycle of  
11 GHG pollution and failed freeways. Please act on the  
12 scoping report gap. And that would demand a 25 percent  
13 GHG reduction. Social equity and environmental justice  
14 are at stake just as much as the GHG requirements. Please  
15 consider your voting impact on the people of California.

16           And thank you so much.

17           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

18           MR. GRUBB: Good morning, Chair Nichols and  
19 Commissioners. My name is David Grubb. I'm  
20 Transportation Chair of the San Diego chapter of the  
21 Sierra Club. My colleagues in the environmental community  
22 have done a wonderful job of presenting the arguments. So  
23 I'll be very brief, and just ask you to please set the  
24 targets for the big four MPOs at 25 percent for all of the  
25 reasons that you've already heard. Thank you.

1           MR. RENTSCHLER: Good morning. My name is Kyle  
2 Rentschler, and I'm a conservation organizer at Sierra  
3 Club San Diego. I'm here, along with our partners at  
4 Climate Action Campaign and Environmental Health  
5 Coalition, to speak in support of higher greenhouse gas  
6 emissions reduction targets in the San Diego region.

7           As you well know, on-road transportation is the  
8 greatest cause of greenhouse gas emissions throughout the  
9 country and throughout California. But it's particularly  
10 high in San Diego, where transportation accounts for 55  
11 percent of our total emissions. Decades of reckless  
12 sprawl development have encouraged reckless freeway  
13 development alongside it. And it is crucial to  
14 acknowledge at this pivotal point in our history that this  
15 is not the time for continued recklessness.

16           And that's really the point of SB 375 to  
17 integrate planning for transportation, land use, and  
18 housing, and to fundamentally reshape our communities to  
19 reduce greenhouse gases and improve quality of life.  
20 Continued recklessness will poison our lungs and drown our  
21 coastline even more than current projects predict.

22           This is also not the time to abide by one-sided  
23 accounts put for by San Diego, especially when that  
24 agency's leadership has demonstrated time and time again  
25 that emissions reductions, public health, and equity are

1 nowhere near the list of their top priorities.

2 I wouldn't chose SANDAG as the governing body  
3 that determines the future of planning and transportation  
4 in San Diego County, but I don't have a choice. So I need  
5 your strong leadership and your oversight to make sure my  
6 region's future is safe and healthy for all communities  
7 and mine and future generations.

8 That's why we need a 25 percent greenhouse gas  
9 reduction in San Diego region. We are behind and we need  
10 to catch up. You're not going to hear it from SANDAG, but  
11 you're hearing it from all of us. And as much as the  
12 region as a whole needs action, health disparities from  
13 poor air quality and lack of access to mobility options  
14 strike hardest in low income communities of color.

15 CARB said despite California's market progress,  
16 greater innovation and effort is needed to avoid the worst  
17 consequences of climate change. That's a statement we can  
18 all get on board with. The people of San Diego live  
19 between and ocean and a desert. We don't want our sea  
20 level, nor our temperatures to rise, but a 19 percent  
21 target is a lazy goal that does not require innovation nor  
22 effort, nor is it enough for the people of San Diego to  
23 avoid the worst consequences of climate change.

24 Thank you for your time.

25 MS. WOLFRAM: Good morning. My name is Sophia

1 Wolfram and I work with Climate Action Campaign, an  
2 advocacy organization that advances policy across the San  
3 Diego region to stop climate change and improve quality of  
4 life, especially through the adoption and implementation  
5 of local Climate Action Plans.

6 While we support a greater focus on tracking and  
7 monitoring, I'm here today to ask this Board to set a 25  
8 percent emissions reduction target for SANDAG, which is  
9 what is needed for the San Diego region simply to catch up  
10 to the rest of the state.

11 This is no time for compromise between the  
12 top-down and bottom-up approaches to target setting cited  
13 in the staff report. We're asking for your leadership to  
14 help wake up our region's leadership, and finally shift  
15 their thinking from tinkering with the status quo to  
16 flipping the script and putting core outcomes first,  
17 equity, public health, and greenhouse gas reduction.

18 The staff report highlights the importance of  
19 additional local and regional action on transportation and  
20 land use. But the fact is in the San Diego region, the  
21 City of San Diego has already set targets far surpassing  
22 those that SANDAG has been willing to commit to.

23 Our cities are working hard to do their fair  
24 share to meet State climate targets, and they need support  
25 from this body to meet those targets.

1 San Diego's legally binding Climate Action Plan  
2 calls for 50 percent of commuters in the urban core  
3 walking, biking, or taking transit by 2035. AB 805,  
4 passed last year, requires that SANDAG seek to harmonize  
5 the upcoming regional transportation plan with local  
6 Climate Action Plans.

7 Yet, members of SANDAG's Board of Directors have  
8 openly stated that they don't believe the RTP should be  
9 consistent with Climate Action Plans, and that reducing  
10 vehicle miles traveled, a core focus of SB 375, is a  
11 irrelevant to climate goals.

12 And it's not just idle comments that demonstrate  
13 SANDAG's indifference. San Diego dedicates a  
14 significantly smaller chunk of its funding to transit than  
15 MPOs elsewhere in the State do. And in RTP after RTP,  
16 SANDAG fails to seriously consider scenarios that would  
17 prioritize transit and infill development over freeway  
18 expansions and sprawl. It has ignored its own urban area  
19 transit strategy, which would maximize transit ridership  
20 and reduce VMT in favor of more of the same.

21 Also, since 2013, the Early Action Program, which  
22 is meant to build out the backbone of the bike system in  
23 the county, has spent \$61 million and completed just four  
24 miles of bike facilities. Our cities need your leadership  
25 to meet the reduction targets, which are aligned to State



1 targets. And our communities need your help to shift the  
2 direction in which our region is headed toward a more  
3 equitable, a healthier, and a safer future.

4 We implore you to set the highest possible  
5 target, 25 percent for the San Diego region. Thank you  
6 for your time.

7 MS. NERI: Good morning. My name is Alli Neri  
8 and I'm a volunteer with Climate Action Campaign.

9 I'm here to echo the call for stronger greenhouse  
10 gas reduction targets for the San Diego region. CARB's  
11 own analysis has found that a 25 percent emission  
12 reduction is needed to be on track to meet the State's  
13 climate targets. California rightly prides itself on  
14 leading the way on environmental policy for the nation.

15 But what kind of precedent would we be setting by  
16 compromising targets that we need to hit to avoid the  
17 worst impacts of climate change, and who's really  
18 benefiting from that compromise?

19 Not us, not our communities, and not future  
20 generations.

21 What SANDAG claims is about lack of revenue and  
22 the VMT rebound effects is in reality about lack of  
23 political will and unwillingness to innovate and apply  
24 bold and creative strategies to advance transit, walking,  
25 and biking, and to shift away from the stereotype of

1 southern California sprawl.

2           We need strong targets to put us back on the  
3 right track. The kind of leadership that's going to solve  
4 the greatest crisis facing humanity is not going to come  
5 from SANDAG, not in 2018 at least.

6           And that's why we're here today. The families  
7 and communities that we work alongside are ready for  
8 change, and we're asking you for your leadership and  
9 support to help us realize the vision of sustainable  
10 communities for the San Diego region.

11           Thank you.

12           MR. TIPPETS: Good morning, Chair and Board.  
13 Bill Tippets, Southwest Wetlands Interpretive Association,  
14 a small organization in southwest corner of the state,  
15 Imperial Beach.

16           Our main interest is conservation and  
17 preservation of wetlands. Southern California has lost 75  
18 percent due to development, and without significant and  
19 rapid reduction of greenhouse gases, we'll lose the other  
20 25 percent. We've got plenty of resources. We can show  
21 you the literature that shows this. We're really  
22 concerned about it.

23           We also support all the recommendations of our  
24 sister environmental, transportation, and social justice  
25 groups that are talking to you. We believe that it's

1 feasible for SANDAG region to achieve at least a 21  
2 percent reduction in GHG, which they have in their current  
3 RTP, and potentially up to 25 percent that would be needed  
4 to close the GHG emissions gap in your own scoping plan.

5           And we believe that SANDAG, working more closely  
6 with the local jurisdictions, can do that through improved  
7 land use and transportation strategies. Another big point  
8 of ours, that there are several reputable transportation  
9 experts have examined SANDAG's approach to scenario  
10 development and land use transportation and trip modeling,  
11 which they believe have either misleading, or incorrect,  
12 or wrong assumptions and approaches.

13           And we've got information and documents that can  
14 show better ways to do transportation planning in San  
15 Diego. The fact that total VMT continues to increase  
16 within SANDAG region, and other places in California,  
17 strongly supports the call for changes in SANDAG's  
18 approaches, and that it must aggressively pursue new  
19 strategies and new technologies.

20           Just as a rational GHG reduction strategy  
21 requires reductions in both total and per capita GHG  
22 emissions, a land use and transportation strategy must  
23 also include required reductions in total and per capita  
24 VMT. It has to do that. It's the only way it's going to  
25 work.

1           And a tighter linkage between SB 375 plan  
2 measures and SB 150 monitoring is absolutely needed. A  
3 lot of the suggestions that the staff presented in this  
4 overview are very good. We completely support them and we  
5 like the idea of separating monitoring from compliance  
6 monitoring, did you do it or not, to effectiveness  
7 monitoring, which is the most important thing. That's  
8 what we really want, reduce greenhouse emissions, and show  
9 that the co-benefits are being produced that the plans  
10 propose.

11           Also, a rapid turn around information system will  
12 allow us to adaptively change the measures we're using,  
13 incorporate our advanced measures that may have been  
14 project -- put down later in the sequencing, and include  
15 and consider new measures that are comparable that could  
16 still be implemented under CEQA. You don't even -- SANDAG  
17 doesn't even have to recirculate the EIR. If they  
18 comparable measures, that would be fine. We think that's  
19 absolutely necessary and possible.

20           Thank you very much.

21           MS. WISE: Hello. My name is my Ella Wise. I'm  
22 the State Policy Associate from Climate Plan, a network of  
23 more than 50 organizations across the state committed to  
24 sustainable and equitable communities.

25           We submitted two letters on SB 150 and 375

1 recently, signed by more than 20 organizations. And I'll  
2 go over a few key points of those. We want to thank so  
3 much our partners from the San Diego region who have a  
4 strong message here today.

5           The key message is the proposed targets are not  
6 enough to meet the goals of SB 32, and we know that. We  
7 want to thank staff for their hard work. We appreciate  
8 working with them. But unfortunately, we all know that  
9 these targets do not go far enough to meet the State's  
10 goals.

11           According to the scoping plan, we need a 25  
12 percent reduction from land use and transportation. The  
13 proposed targets will achieve a 19 percent reduction. The  
14 State has a VMT gap that we need to close as Madam Chair  
15 stated before.

16           So what do we recommend in terms of 375?

17           One, ambitious targets. ARB should adopt more  
18 ambitious targets that require a change from business as  
19 usual. A currently -- the currently adopted plans would  
20 achieve an 18 percent reduction in GHGs. We're proposing  
21 a 19 percent reduction. That's a one percent change. We  
22 can do better, but we'll only do better if we overcome a  
23 fear of failure, and if we set our aims higher.

24           Two, improve trans -- improve transparency. We  
25 appreciate the State's -- staff's proposal to improve

1 transparency. Right now, it's very hard to understand how  
2 these plans will translate to changes on the ground and to  
3 meeting the actual targets.

4           So we recommend that staff go further to improve  
5 transparency. And distill the plans to shift power to the  
6 public and the communities, so that we all know what is  
7 actually in the plans and how those translate to meeting  
8 the targets.

9           Third, accountability. ARB staff is currently  
10 working on SB 150 tracking, and we need to align those  
11 metrics directly with 375, so that we can use those 150  
12 reports to measure the actual reductions compared to the  
13 anticipated reductions.

14           Two more things. We strongly support equity, and  
15 we appreciate that that's been discussed here today. We  
16 need a commitment to social equity analysis, both in the  
17 plans and in the 150 tracking of implementation. So both  
18 in the SCSs and in the metrics.

19           And fifth, prioritizing VMT reduction. We ask  
20 that the Board use the resolution language to make clear  
21 that the main purpose of SB 375 is to reduce VMT and to do  
22 it equitably, and we have proposed specific language in  
23 our letter.

24           Thanks very much.

25           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

1 MR. RUBIN: Good afternoon, Board members, Carter  
2 Rubin, Mobility and Climate Advocate with the Natural  
3 Resources Defense Council. I'm here to echo the comments  
4 from Climate Plan and my colleague Ela. We are part of  
5 that coalition, and sign onto and endorse their comments.  
6 I will briefly put a point of emphasis that it's  
7 unacceptable in this era of climate urgency that we plan  
8 for anything less than what's needed to reach our  
9 greenhouse gas emissions goals.

10 We need to adopt a 25 percent goal and force a  
11 conversation with local agencies and our regional planning  
12 organizations about land use and transportation, and  
13 ensure that our current plans are in alignment with our  
14 climate goals. As the Chair said, we have decades old  
15 highway projects that are still on the books, these zombie  
16 projects, that stumble forward, and that we need to put an  
17 end to in order to reach our climate goals.

18 The 25 percent goal will shine a light on these  
19 bad projects and policies in place, and allow us to  
20 grapple with them in a way that let's us move forward and  
21 reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

22 Thank you.

23 MS. LINDBLAD: Hi. Good afternoon. I'm Bryn  
24 Lindblad, Associate Director of Climate Resolve, a  
25 nonprofit in Los Angeles focused on advancing local

1 solutions to climate change, and also part of the  
2 ClimatePlan Network and signed on to that letter.

3 I don't -- I don't think I need to tell you  
4 members of the Board how critical it is for the health of  
5 our planet that we act with urgency to address our climate  
6 crisis. I think you know that the consequences of  
7 inaction, how scary that future could be that we'd be  
8 leaving for generations.

9 And sort of on a note of inspiration, I think you  
10 also realize that if we're able to figure this out and get  
11 an institutional framework that really works to wean us  
12 off of our bad climate-polluting habits, that the world is  
13 watching, and we can inspire action cross the globe.

14 And I'm afraid -- I hate -- I hate to say it, but  
15 I think the current proposal is really -- it's a kicking  
16 the can down the road kind of move. It's a one percent  
17 increased GHG reductions from what our current plans have  
18 on the books, is essentially a continuation of business as  
19 usual.

20 And our communities deserve better. They deserve  
21 safe access to our streets, as pedestrians, and as  
22 cyclists, as -- in wheelchairs, and transit commutes that  
23 don't take them two hours to get to work.

24 And so I'll speak from experience in the SCAG.  
25 The current RTP SCS in the SCAG region, we're still seeing



1 50 percent of growth outside of transit priority areas. A  
2 lot of that is green field development. There's still  
3 highway capacity expansion happening in there.

4           So when we kind of -- when we say we're doing all  
5 we can do, when 19 percent is as high as we can go, I  
6 don't quite buy it. So I want to mention one new freeway  
7 proposal that's in that plan, the High Desert Corridor  
8 Freeway, you heard earlier of the \$120 billion that L.A.  
9 county is putting into transit, most that is into transit.  
10 \$118 billion worth is doing -- is doing a lot to reduce  
11 daily VMT by 7.8 million, but two billion of that package  
12 is going to this new freeway. It's a sprawl -- it unlocks  
13 sprawl development.

14           And that 2 billion it cuts in half all the VMT  
15 reductions that the rest of that package of investments  
16 would achieve. So it's -- you know, to draw an analogy,  
17 it's like we're trying to air out a smoky room, opening  
18 all these windows, and yet we're fueling the fire that's  
19 in the room.

20           So really support Madam Chair's encouragement  
21 that we need to -- we need to look at some of those zombie  
22 dinosaur highway projects that have been on the books. We  
23 need to not do anymore harm with our transportation  
24 dollars. They really need to be working to help us  
25 address the problem, not perpetuate it.

1           And, you, know I think we really -- we can't  
2 afford to take our current plans as sacrosanct. We need  
3 to call the question and use the performance metrics that  
4 help us do that job.

5           Thank you.

6           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

7           MS. ESPINOZA: Good afternoon. Chair  
8 Nicholas[SIC] and members of the Board. Thank you for the  
9 opportunity to speak at the meeting today. My is Demi  
10 Espinoza. And I'm a policy manager with Safe Routes to  
11 School National Partnership.

12           And my work focuses on enhancing policies to make  
13 walking and biking easier and safer for children and their  
14 families. And I do that in the Inland Empire here and in  
15 Orange County. And we are here today because we believe  
16 that investing in active transportation is one way that  
17 can help us achieve greater GHG reductions.

18           And for that reason, we supported a coalition  
19 letter, facilitated by Climate Plan and other  
20 organizations here today. We are invested in the  
21 implementation of SB 375, but support higher targets. The  
22 proposed 19 percent target does not go far enough to meet  
23 our goals.

24           And I'm concerned that areas within the SCAG  
25 region are not doing enough to meet these goals or we're

1 not addressing our State's VMT gap. Within my region of  
2 Southern California, especially within the Inland Empire  
3 and Orange County, highway expansion projects and sprawl  
4 developments are issues that need to be addressed.

5 For example, we need to consider the removal of  
6 long local highway expansion projects from RTPs, and curb  
7 sprawl development. These types of projects only  
8 contribute to increased VMT, and become barriers to  
9 walking and biking and transit. We can have more  
10 connected communities that do not need to be car  
11 dependent.

12 Investment in active transportation projects and  
13 reducing displacement pressures by doing more equitable,  
14 affordable, infill development are strategies that can  
15 help us reduce emissions.

16 Lastly, we want to use the forthcoming SB 150  
17 report to hold our regions accountable for meeting these  
18 targets. So we recognize that your staff is developing  
19 metrics and report to track SB 375's implementation. So  
20 this is a great opportunity to use these reports to  
21 measure actual -- actual results and get to some of the  
22 issues around social equity consideration that we're  
23 talked about. And so we appreciate those discussions  
24 being implemented in the SB 150 report.

25 And also, you know, we encourage the transparency

1 around this process, around SB 375, to make it more  
2 accessible for community members to understand where these  
3 targets come from, what's really at stake. So the  
4 proposed targets only really require one percent emission  
5 reduction change from what we've already done. We can do  
6 better as a region and as a state.

7 So thank you for your consideration, and work  
8 during this process.

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

10 MR. YANCEY: Honorable Chair, members of the  
11 Board, and staff, my name is Andrew Yancey. I'm an  
12 attorney with Latham and Watkins. I represent the Golden  
13 Door, a world class resort and agricultural operation in  
14 San Diego County. And I also review statewide greenhouse  
15 gas issues for our firm.

16 I'd like to talk to you today about the San Diego  
17 region. I'd just like to note at the beginning when Ms.  
18 Kawada gave her presentation earlier from SANDAG, she  
19 noted one of the things SANDAG is trying to do is promote  
20 development in the urban areas. SANDAG even performed a  
21 stress test last year, which was part of the materials in  
22 your packets today that looked at if they could get  
23 additional GHG reductions out of an even more dense  
24 development model, and determine that the development  
25 plans are already pretty smart in San Diego. And that

1 additional density wouldn't really help much.

2           What they didn't look at was what happens if the  
3 development model switches to more of a sprawl-based  
4 model. Unfortunately, the County of San Diego is  
5 proposing to do just that.

6           Dr. Sherriffs asked earlier about climate action  
7 plans in the SANDAG region. Well, just last month, the  
8 County of San Diego approved a Climate Action Plan that  
9 unfortunately ignores vehicle miles traveled. Instead of  
10 looking to vehicle miles traveled for one of the  
11 mitigation measures for unplanned growth, it allows almost  
12 exclusively on a program to allow offset carbon credits to  
13 be purchased from anywhere in the world.

14           Because the unplanned projects this would apply  
15 to are not within the SANDAG model, the VMT from these  
16 projects would be in addition to what SANDAG has been  
17 looking at. One such project is the Newland Sierra  
18 project, which is expected to come before the Board later  
19 this year, is 2100 homes on a currently rural site located  
20 more than six miles from the end of the transit line in  
21 Escondido. It would increase VMT.

22           Now there is a school of thought that VMT  
23 shouldn't matter. Vehicle technology improvements will  
24 make VMT obsolete. Supervisor Ron Roberts, who's a CARB  
25 Board member, who you all know well, is a proponent of

1 this approach. He has, in public presentations, called  
2 VMT a political model, a pathetic metric and a stupid  
3 metric. Unfortunately, he's not here today to discuss  
4 this. I'm sure you've heard his impassioned case before.

5 And, you know, maybe Supervisor Roberts is right,  
6 maybe Supervisor Roberts is wrong. I don't know the  
7 answer to this question. I'm not a technical expert. But  
8 I think the State policy is pretty clear.

9 Miss King pointed out in her staff presentation  
10 earlier that vehicle technology improvements are not going  
11 to get us to the 2035 targets. Reductions in vehicle  
12 miles traveled is an absolutely necessary component of  
13 meeting those targets. There is a more detailed  
14 description of that in staff's written response to  
15 comments. It's also in the scoping plan, and OPR's SB 743  
16 guidance.

17 So what we're looking at right now in the SANDAG  
18 region is a tragedy of the commons. The county is playing  
19 by its own rules and ignoring VMT.

20 I'll wrap-up quickly, Madam Chair.

21 This leaves the cities holding the bag and having  
22 to do more to be able to meet the VMT reduction models.  
23 And Chair Nichols asked earlier about funding. That's  
24 going to create a funding issue where new sprawl growth is  
25 going to be competing for highway dollars that could have

1 gone to transit otherwise.

2           So I just wanted to leave you with a thought  
3 about the call to action that we've heard about today.  
4 It's not just about the targets being approved, it's about  
5 the implementation. And I understand that CARB doesn't  
6 have land-use jurisdiction. I understand that CARB cannot  
7 and should not be reviewing every development proposal and  
8 plan in the state.

9           And when you have a situation like San Diego  
10 County that is clearly implementing a policy that ignores  
11 VMT, perhaps some direct guidance would be necessary to  
12 make sure is that there's a level playing field for the  
13 developers in the county and the cities, and for all the  
14 members of the MPO there to make sure that everyone one is  
15 playing by the same rules to meet the targets.

16           Thank you.

17           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

18           MR. HAMILTON: Good morning, members of the  
19 Board, Madam Chair. My name is Kevin Hamilton. I'm with  
20 Central California Asthma Collaborative. First, I want  
21 to -- a shout out to Dr. Sherriffs and his idea of  
22 providing this Climate Action Plan for cities for their  
23 land-use planning, something that focuses at R1, R3, C and  
24 industrial level development outside of traditional  
25 freight facilities, similar to the freight handbook, I

1 think would be tremendously useful for cities as they move  
2 forward with their planning, and helping them integrate  
3 that planning more effectively with transportation  
4 agencies.

5           But that's not what I came here to talk about  
6 today. My concern is the way that the Board has addressed  
7 the target setting in the San Joaquin Valley. I notice we  
8 have the first four MPOs in the room today, but we lack  
9 the fifth and sixth, which, of course, is Fresno County  
10 and Kern County.

11           In fact, the City of Fresno is actually larger  
12 than the City of Sacramento. I don't know if you knew  
13 that, but by about 40,000 people. And there's around --  
14 as of 2020, we expect over a million people in Fresno  
15 County. This is a large place. This is a lot of people.  
16 The people are severely lacking a constructed  
17 transportation system, though it's not for lack of trying.

18           In Fresno, the COG there is moving forward with  
19 some pretty adventurous stuff, building solar islands in  
20 the incorporate cities, that the solar arcs that allow the  
21 public to charge for free in their electric vehicles  
22 really pushing hard to bring test drive events, and get  
23 the people engaged in EV technology.

24           And, in fact, if you look at the statistics,  
25 Fresno county is the largest adopter of EV vehicles in the



1 State, which is how it got added to the Volkswagen  
2 settlement, as the fifth green city -- or sixth green  
3 city, I forget which.

4           So we believe strongly that this Board needs to,  
5 instead of treating the San Joaquin valley as -- from just  
6 my perspective, my feeling, a poor relative who just can't  
7 quite step up to the plate here, and isn't ready, they  
8 are, in fact, ready. They are fully capable. They  
9 definitely have money. Though you wouldn't see it on the  
10 face of it, it's there.

11           And, in fact, they understand this technology  
12 very well and the way this system works. To not challenge  
13 them to the same targets you do the other large MPOs is a  
14 terrible disservice to the citizens of our communities.

15           Health consequences in the Valley from climate  
16 and air pollutants are tremendous. We have some of the  
17 highest rates in -- of asthma for instance in California,  
18 and some of the highest in the nation, especially in  
19 children who have been diagnosed with it during their  
20 childhood.

21           It's incredible that we've seen this rate jump  
22 over the last 20 years so high. We have high rates of  
23 heart disease. We have high rates of stroke. Our ERs are  
24 overflowing. And a lot of that is very well corresponding  
25 with the levels of these pollutants in our atmosphere from

1 mobile sources. So we real need your help there, and we  
2 need you to tell our folks step up. So don't back off on  
3 us. Push hard.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

6 MS. GALE: Good morning, Board Members. My name  
7 is Genevieve Gale. I'm a Policy Associate with the  
8 Central Valley Air Quality Coalition, or CVAQ.

9 I'd like to stray from the norm. I'm not going  
10 to offer any policy recommendations, but rather tell you a  
11 short story, a true story.

12 This story begins last year. The Fresno County  
13 of gov -- Council of Governments, or FCOG, conducted a  
14 robust public survey to solicit input on preferred land  
15 use and transportation scenarios in the county. FCOG  
16 hosted or participated in over 32 community meetings, and  
17 also circulated an on-line petition. This survey resulted  
18 in almost 1500 responses. And demographics mirror the  
19 county's demographics pretty well.

20 The preferred scenario by the public was Scenario  
21 B. It focused on transit-oriented development, high  
22 quality transit options, walkable and bikeable streets,  
23 and compact and mixed-use development. So that's Scenario  
24 B as in bike.

25 The least desired scenario was Scenario C. And

1 this moved investment away from active transportation and  
2 towards highway-widening projects and road enhancements.  
3 So that's Scenario C as in car.

4           When the scenarios were evaluated, Scenario B  
5 ranked highest for GHG and VMT reductions. It offered  
6 more transit rides, more bike rides, more walks, and it  
7 ranked lowest for premature deaths.

8           Scenario C trailed in all respects. It offered  
9 less transit, and less bike rides, and less walks, and it  
10 had just a one percent lower reduction in GHGs. You can  
11 think about what your preferred scenario is.

12           In the end Scenario C was chosen. And the  
13 argument was that all scenarios met CARB's GHG reduction  
14 targets for the region. So while Scenario B outperformed  
15 and was the public's number one choice, it wasn't  
16 necessary, because the status quo was good enough.

17           So the people of Fresno County will see more  
18 investment in our freeways and roadways, and it will be  
19 easier to drive a car. It will not be easier to bike, it  
20 will not be easier to walk, it won't be easier to breathe.

21           So like I said, I won't give you any policy  
22 recommendations, but the moral of the story, I'll leave  
23 that up to you to decide. But I can't help but wonder, if  
24 we had just a one percent higher target, what our future  
25 would look like.

1 Than you.

2 MR. FIGUEROA: Steve Figueroa. I'm with the 200  
3 also locally with the Inland Empire Latino Coalition.

4 I'd like to echo what the supervisor said earlier  
5 on, basically what I heard is, the unintended consequences  
6 of your policy making or decisions that impact our  
7 community. Especially, in the area of housing, I'm sorry,  
8 if you build your housing in your urban neighborhoods, we  
9 can't afford to live in them. It's too expensive. It's  
10 unrealistic.

11 How many of you came here through public  
12 transportation?

13 No, because you can afford your own cars, right?

14 Nobody took the bus, right? And nobody came on  
15 metro, right? So let's walk what we talk. How many of  
16 you would tell the Governor to take his 12 -- his \$100  
17 billion bullet train to put that toward electric cars,  
18 right? And that would do more to reduce the greenhouse  
19 effects than anything you can propose, anything you can  
20 propose, right?

21 So how many of you would tell every Senator and  
22 Assemblyman that they could only drive electric vehicles  
23 or use public utilities going back and forth? You gotta  
24 walk what you talk.

25 But you see because the decisions you make impact

1 the businesses I advocate for, or the families with  
2 children with disabilities who don't take public  
3 transportation, because, quite frankly, it's not  
4 comfortable, it doesn't work, and that's why the buses are  
5 empty. You can't even fix the current system to make it  
6 usable for those who need it.

7           That's what needs to be worked on. That's what  
8 needs to be worked on. How -- you know, when CEQA is used  
9 to create red-lining districts in our neighborhoods, to  
10 say guess what, not in my backyard, because we're going to  
11 use CEQA to say we don't want any brown people, or black  
12 people, or low income people in our neighborhood. You  
13 guys have the tools. They're going to use what you  
14 develop here to discriminate against us.

15           And it's happening. It happens in Moreno Valley  
16 all the time, the neighboring city here. And, doctor, I  
17 understand. I'm a chronic heart failure. I have an ICD.  
18 I have COPD.

19           But the bottom line is I want my children also to  
20 afford a house and to get a house. So we have to balance  
21 that. And nobody knows more than somebody who advocates  
22 for families with children with disabilities who refuse to  
23 take public transportation because it's so inconvenient.  
24 How many of you would sit next to a homeless man who uses  
25 public transportation for his home and housing nowadays.

1 Okay. Stays on there, smells like urine. I'm not  
2 criticizing, because I work -- I work with the homeless.  
3 I do all that, okay.

4 How many of you can stomach that with your  
5 disabled child all day who's having a seizure, who's going  
6 to the restroom on himself and the bus or transportation  
7 won't stop in between. You've got to be realistic in your  
8 outreach toward the communities.

9 I heard earlier, nobody from MPO came on public  
10 transportation. They don't walk what they talk. Nobody  
11 from any of the MPOs discuss how it impacts the disabled  
12 or those who don't have access to whatever you're  
13 developing.

14 I noticed you gave lots of people 10 minutes  
15 here, because we were timing it. So what we're asking,  
16 one, is walk what you talk. He had a great idea, the  
17 CEQA study that you did was inadequate. Reach out to the  
18 Hispanic chambers, to the black chambers. You'll fill  
19 up -- you'll fill up your places, because they're looking  
20 for supply-side diversity contracts to help you do what  
21 you got to do, but there's no outreach from CARB to  
22 minority organizations.

23 And I can say that, because I'm a member of LULAC  
24 locally, the Hispanic Chamber for the State, and you guys  
25 have never come to us. You've never been to one

1 convention. You've never been to one function that we've  
2 put on. Okay. Nobody. I think Dean was there when I was  
3 with MAPA, Mexican American Political Association, but  
4 that's about it.

5           Okay. So walk what you talk. Use public  
6 transportation to see what we go through and why we don't  
7 take it, because you guys are developing the criteria, so  
8 you should live by what you develop. Thank you.

9           MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. I'm  
10 Jennifer Hernandez. I'm at the law of firm of Holland and  
11 Knight, and I represent The 200. I was here in December,  
12 and presented you with a fairly long and quite detailed  
13 comment letter objecting to parts of the scoping plan that  
14 expand CEQA, that try to restrict people's access to use a  
15 vehicle to do basic needs, including get to and from work.

16           That letter remains outstanding, and I want to  
17 restate the content of that letter for the purposes of  
18 today.

19           But I'm here to support the staff recommendation.  
20 We support the staff recommendation. Just let that minute  
21 pause.

22           (Laughter.)

23           MS. HERNANDEZ: But here -- but here that your  
24 environmental analysis was a complete absolute failure.  
25 You claim a few maybe construction impacts. Everyone of

1 these MPOs has had to a Program EIR that chronicles the  
2 adverse -- significant adverse impacts of increasing  
3 density. I'm not saying that's the wrong thing. There's  
4 trade-offs. But I am saying your staff has punted again  
5 under the California Environmental Quality Act.

6 If you guys want to increase the targets from 18  
7 to 19 percent, then all of those significant unavoidable  
8 impacts identified in the EIRs done by your MPOs are all  
9 worse.

10 And SCAG alone has 30 of them, significant  
11 unavoidable impacts that are going to be more significant.  
12 And then I want to pick up on Supervisor Gioia's comments  
13 on disparate impacts. You have not, you have never,  
14 looked at the impacts of this program on working families.  
15 Most families work. In this county, most families that  
16 work are Hispanic. They do not have a college education.  
17 They get paid when they show up at work. They don't have  
18 a keyboard economy job at Starbucks.

19 By restricting mobility, by increasing fuel  
20 costs, by increasing the cost that people have to pay  
21 every day to heat and cool their house, by making housing  
22 more expensive with net zero what? What we understand is  
23 that your organization thinks that somehow you're going to  
24 materialize from thin air 10 -- 10 million tons of  
25 greenhouse gas reductions from VMT, in the absence of any



1 evidence whatsoever that that's remotely possible.

2           The only comprehensive study that was ever done  
3 on this topic was done by UC Berkeley, Carol Galante and  
4 Ethan Elkind. And they claim that the VMT reduction from  
5 this whole scheme would result in 1.67 million metric tons  
6 of GHG per year, not 10, 1.67.

7           And that's 1.67 at what cost? The end of  
8 homeownership. Well, guess what, minorities have lost all  
9 homeownership that they gained after years, decades of  
10 civil rights progress.

11           Global greenhouse gas reduction does not equate  
12 to an end to home ownership. It does not equate to  
13 denying people the right to drive to and from in cleaner  
14 cars. In the sixties, we had dirty cars. We've reduced  
15 tailpipe emissions 99 percent, because we thought about it  
16 for criteria pollutants.

17           We reduced CO2 by 60 percent, without thinking  
18 about it. Let's think about it and let's make those cars  
19 cleaner. But we spent -- Gil Cedillo spent how many  
20 years? A decade trying to get undocumented immigrants a  
21 legal driver's license, so they could exercise their right  
22 to work and take their kids to school.

23           The attack on mobility is an attack on  
24 minorities. And your analysis, your environmental  
25 analysis, your economic analysis of that issue fails.

1 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Your time is up.

2 MS. HERNANDEZ: But we support the staff report.

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: Your time is up.

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thanks. I think I was the only  
5 person to actually be cut off.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: I don't think so, because I  
8 counted a couple of others.

9 Ms. Gurin.

10 MR. GURIN: Hello. My name is Katy Gurin. And  
11 I'm on the steering committee of 350 Riverside. I also  
12 collaborate with San Diego 350. So I'm here basically to  
13 echo a lot of the statements that have been made regarding  
14 the emissions target. I support a 25 percent reduction in  
15 emissions. SANDAG -- for SANDAG.

16 SANDAG has long ignored community pleas for a  
17 strong transportation system that meets the needs of  
18 underserved communities. Instead, SANDAG has favored an  
19 expensive toxic and car-centric approach.

20 SANDAG's adamant adherence to emission to an 18  
21 or 19 percent emissions reduction target that so clearly  
22 absolves them of any really changes should be rejected.

23 Thank you very much.

24 MR. HAGUE: Hello. George Hague, volunteer with  
25 the Sierra Club. Glad you're here in this building with

1 the supervisors above you who many times make decisions  
2 that are counter to what should be happening.

3 The same thing with Riverside County  
4 Transportation Commission. I'm glad I saw the focus areas  
5 that were presented at the very beginning. But when I  
6 read SB 375 when it first came out, the word farmland was  
7 in there, ag was in there. And I do not see that being  
8 represented hardly anywhere in the past 10 years.

9 In Riverside County, it continually disappears.  
10 Why? Because the majority of the supervisors support leap  
11 frog development actually developing brand new cities.

12 RCTC, Riverside County Transportation Commission,  
13 likewise seems to support these new cities. And a good  
14 example of this is the Villages of Lakeview that was  
15 approved earlier this year by a majority of the Riverside  
16 County Board of Supervisors, where they have 9,000 or  
17 8,750 units next to San Jacinto Wildlife Area, leap frog  
18 development in the middle of ag in between the cities of  
19 Perris and the cities of San Jacinto, an RTCC[SIC] just a  
20 year or two prior to that facilitates this by building a  
21 or approving a almost \$2 billion expansion of the Ramona  
22 expressway, turning it into the Mid County Parkway, 16  
23 lanes, plowing through the city of Perris, eliminating 400  
24 people's homes and businesses, causing people around that  
25 to suck in the pollution that will result from the Mid

1 County Parkway.

2           This continues in our area, where we expand and  
3 build new cities, build new roads, and destroy  
4 agricultural lands in the meantime. Something hopefully  
5 these incentives that somebody mentioned can be done with  
6 our county -- get our county to work with our cities to  
7 place homes closer to existing urban areas, instead of in  
8 the middle of nowhere, where it would be appreciated.

9           The city -- the county is also thinking about a  
10 project called Paradise Valley at the southern border of  
11 Joshua Tree National Park, another 8,000 homes. Agreed  
12 we're in a housing crisis, but why build new cities in the  
13 middle of basically nowhere, where people have to drive to  
14 look for jobs?

15           It's a problem that no one in this county is  
16 trying to resolve, and building new roads to get there.

17           I thank you very much.

18           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

19           MR. EDER: Good afternoon. I'm Harvey Eder with  
20 the Public Solar Power Coalition and I'm here to talk  
21 about this 25 percent reduction based on 2005 by 2035 and  
22 AB 7 -- 375 versus -- excuse me, SB -- SB 350 that  
23 requires by 2030 a 40 percent reduction from 1990 levels,  
24 which was about 400 parts per million CO2 equivalent than.  
25 So we're down to about 250 these numbers are off. The

1 greenhouse gas numbers, the real numbers in the '16 plan a  
2 year ago I came and talked to you about this. There's  
3 been a 30 percent -- on the chapter 10, pages two and  
4 three written by Dr. Aaron Katzenstein that now runs the  
5 laboratory for South Coast.

6           There's been a 30 percent increase in methane  
7 over the last 12 years. And that these numbers come out  
8 to right now about 750 parts per million CO2 equivalent  
9 now, right here in river city, not by 2050 by 2100. And  
10 that all of -- all of -- the t difference is like 500  
11 parts per million going back to the 350 requirements,  
12 which you folks have to enforce the law.

13           And all of the Climate Action Plans and  
14 everything else deriving from this are off and wrong. We  
15 have to use the best science, the best evidence. We're  
16 involved in litigation. We brought this up on August 12th  
17 of '16. We submitted these numbers working with Dr.  
18 Katzenstein, and there was no evaluation from the  
19 district, no evaluation from CARB. It was just purged,  
20 and that's part of our litigation now.

21           Also, worked on the first social equity low  
22 income -- there was a low income solar equity program. I  
23 worked as a consultant to the PUC in 1980 and '81 under  
24 Leonard Grimes in the first solar proceeding. We got a 10  
25 percent mark out for low income, and increased that in the

1 future. Also litigated again to Rose Bird's court and got  
2 her vote, and so Breiner did not vote against to look at  
3 all models of public solar, not just using the  
4 industry-owned utilities to finance it. There is a  
5 question of equity, low-income subsidizing, upper income  
6 solar, and also of antitrust.

7 And that's still an issue now. Extending the  
8 monopolies into a non-monopoly area, this is illegal and  
9 cannot be allowed to continue. And in terms of social  
10 equity, we've worked on this in the past. And we also  
11 support and housing with the homeless program, whatever.  
12 We need to have rent-to-own and other programs like that,  
13 that includes solar and transportation, heating and  
14 cooling and distributed heating and cooling as well.

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Eder.

17 Last witness.

18 MS. DARYANANI: Hello. My name is Nikita  
19 Daryanani with Leadership Counsel for Justice and  
20 Accountability. We work with low-income communities of  
21 color throughout the San Joaquin Valley, and work with  
22 five value MPOs on their RTP SCS updates.

23 I'd like to echo the comments made by Climate  
24 Plan earlier, as well as those made by CVAQ and CCAC, and  
25 highlight the need for greater transparency, so residents

1 can see tangible results and actually experienced the  
2 co-benefits that come with access to transit and active  
3 transportation.

4           The current modeling approaches do not clearly  
5 translate into on-the-ground improvements, and changes.  
6 And greater clarity around modeling assumptions will allow  
7 residents and advocates to better assess their region's  
8 progress in achieving our emission reduction goals.

9           I urge ARB to encourage MPOs to move beyond the  
10 status quo and front-load projects that benefit  
11 disadvantaged communities. We want to see projects that  
12 result in greater connectivity to and from essential  
13 services, especially for rural communities. And land-use  
14 planning that limits the sprawl development we continue to  
15 see in the valley, and prioritize infill development in  
16 existing communities.

17           I think there are still plenty of opportunities  
18 for alternative modes of transit, and vanpooling in rural  
19 communities that agencies must be more proactive in  
20 seeking. Many agencies in the valley are also still very  
21 reluctant to study social equity and transportation  
22 inequity, leaving so many communities out and ignoring  
23 decades of historical neglect.

24           More ambitious and stronger regional reduction  
25 goals will help us achieve our State's ambitious climate

1 goals, and encourage the valley to reduce emissions by  
2 implementing more stringent, equitable, and innovative  
3 land use and transportation policies and programs.

4           Again, we need to move far beyond the status quo  
5 to combat climate change, and advance social, economic and  
6 environmental justice.

7           Thank you.

8           CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. That concludes the  
9 list of witnesses who've signed up to speak on this item.  
10 I'm now going to quickly turn to the staff -- I'm going to  
11 close the record for this item, and just make it clear  
12 that any written or oral comments received after the  
13 comment period is closed will not be part of the official  
14 record on this item.

15           I would like to ask if the staff wants to respond  
16 to any of the comments at this time?

17           AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: We did receive  
18 some comments on our environmental analysis, and we would  
19 like the opportunity to respond, but we will need a little  
20 bit of time to prepare that response, so we could have  
21 that ready to go after lunch, if we wanted to conduct the  
22 vote at that time, so we can have the opportunity to  
23 respond. But if the Board has any further discussion, you  
24 could --

25           CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, we certainly would like a



1 response.

2 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Yes.

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: So I think that's the better part  
4 of valor. So why don't we do that. It's a good time to  
5 take the lunch break. But we are on a tight schedule  
6 today, because we have two more items today, one of which  
7 has quite a lot of witnesses who've signed up to speak on  
8 it. Although, it isn't action item, it's still important.

9 So let's try to be back here, I want to say, 45  
10 minutes, but let's just make it 1:30, and be -- we will  
11 resume at 1:30 then.

12 Thank you.

13 (Off record: 12:39 p.m.)

14 (Thereupon a lunch break was taken.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1                   A F T E R N O O N   S E S S I O N

2                   (On record: 1:36 p.m.)

3                   CHAIR NICHOLS: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome  
4 back to the meeting. We are ready to resume our  
5 discussion on the SB 375 numbers, and the updates on GHG  
6 targets. And so I'd like to move now to Board discussion,  
7 and then we will -- hello. Oh. Okay. I'd like to move  
8 to Board discussion, and then when we're done with that,  
9 we will ask the staff to respond to comments, close the  
10 record again, and then proceed.

11                   So before I do that, I would like to call on  
12 Board Member Sperling. I asked Dan to summarize some of  
13 what we heard and help put it in context to frame the  
14 discussion here.

15                   So Professor Sperling.

16                   BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Well, thank you very  
17 much. You know, I listened to the discussion this  
18 morning, and there were a lot of very frustrated people.  
19 And I have to say that includes me also very frustrated.

20                   On the one hand, to deal with that frustration, I  
21 think CARB needs to take more responsibility and more  
22 leadership. And that means dealing, for instance, on  
23 this -- on the money issue with the California  
24 Transportation Commission. And we have that. We're  
25 moving in that direction, which is good.

1           We need to be -- hold the MPOs more accountable  
2 in terms of specific actions and with performance metrics.  
3 We are moving in that direction, which is really good.  
4 And we can do more. We can do things like having clearing  
5 houses of information, so that we can provide more  
6 assistance, in fact, provide technical assistance to the  
7 local governments and the community-based organizations  
8 and the NGOs.

9           There's a lot more we can do, but at the end of  
10 the day most of the responsibility is not CARB's. Most of  
11 the responsibility is not the MPOs in making progress and  
12 reducing VMT. Setting aggressive targets, it's  
13 appropriate, but way too many people are way too focused  
14 on whether it's 18 or 19 or 25 percent. And I have to  
15 say, having been a modeler and worked with all of the  
16 transportation modelers, they're very clever, they're very  
17 effective. If you want a different number, they can come  
18 up with a different number. And as Chair Nichols said, we  
19 need to move away from focusing on the modeling and moving  
20 towards action.

21           So at the end of the day, the key responsibility  
22 really is -- I know a lot of people don't want to hear  
23 this, but it really is at the local level. And I'm going  
24 to give examples of that in a moment. And we heard all of  
25 this testimony this morning about from different groups

1 testifying that they're -- about their -- the focus needs  
2 to be on all these changes. But I'm going to say that the  
3 focus needs to be much more so on local decision making.

4           They need -- we need the MPOs, and the cities,  
5 the local governments, the counties to be much more  
6 focused on what are -- exactly are the strategies and  
7 priorities for moving forward?

8           And I'll -- you know, just as a little digression  
9 on that. There was a discussion about transit. You know,  
10 pouring a lot of money into transit is not the answer. It  
11 might be part of it, if we do it in a clever way. But  
12 transit -- we're putting money into transit and ridership  
13 is going down. And even worse than that, transit really  
14 only accounts for a little over one percent of the  
15 passenger travel -- passenger miles traveled in  
16 California. It's not serving a large role, except in some  
17 very specific corridors and for a few people. And it's  
18 not serving low-income communities very well.

19           We can do a lot better, and we should do a lot  
20 better. But just putting more money into transit is not  
21 going to accomplish that by itself.

22           So here are the four strategies that I think I'd  
23 like to see articulated better by the MPOs, and by all of  
24 us. And this could be -- you know, this is my take on it  
25 having worked from both a research perspective and a

1 policy regulatory perspective for many years.

2           So number one is what I call pooling. What that  
3 really means is increasing the utilization, the load  
4 factors, and all of our vehicles. And that means, you  
5 know, more carpooling, that means more of the Lyft Line,  
6 uberPOOL, not the conventional Lyft and Uber Services  
7 where there's just one passenger, but the pooling  
8 services.

9           It means the microtransit services, like Via. It  
10 means conventional transit as well, and figuring out how  
11 to increase the ridership and the utilization. And that  
12 will be one of the most effective ways of reducing VMT.  
13 And I would emphasize this is a local challenge, not  
14 totally, but mostly. This is -- means coming up with ways  
15 of incentivizing the pooling, figuring out working with  
16 transit how you do the first/last mile, where they partner  
17 with some of these other companies, private providers, or  
18 maybe even get into the business themselves in some cases.

19           It means increasing the utilization of bus and  
20 rail, where it works well, and not -- and getting away  
21 from supporting it or funding it where it does not work so  
22 well. There's other ways of doing that.

23           The overall strategy may be that to use and  
24 thinking about this overall is what we need to do is  
25 reduce VMT, but increase passenger miles traveled. And

1 that responds to a lot of the concerns here. And what  
2 that means is provide more services to people. And it can  
3 be -- it has to be in unconventional ways.

4 We sink a huge amount of money into transit. And  
5 as we've heard the ridership is going down, so we've got  
6 to get creative and innovative about it. But we can do --  
7 and so if we do that, we can increase the passenger miles  
8 traveled. That means providing more accessibility for low  
9 income disadvantaged communities, elderly people, a lot of  
10 people, young people as well.

11 Okay. So that was number one, the pooling, and  
12 that's -- and that is a local -- mostly a local issue.

13 Number two is housing. That's a real crisis in  
14 this State that everyone understands and acknowledges.  
15 And that is also mostly a local issue, whether you call it  
16 transit-oriented development, or whatever you want, but  
17 it's somehow dealing with that housing crisis, so that  
18 people are not moving way -- long distances away to get  
19 cheap housing increasing their VMT.

20 Number three, this is also local, and that is  
21 creating the incentives and disincentives for everything  
22 I've just talked about. And that means the -- dealing  
23 with reducing the sprawl, the transit-oriented  
24 development, the pooling. You know, one little example of  
25 that is that airports for instance. Most airports put a

1 tax on the Lyft and Uber, but they do it per ride. They  
2 should change it to do -- to reduce it for the vehicles  
3 that have multiple riders, and increase it for the ones  
4 that have a single passenger, as just, you know, one  
5 simple example.

6           And the fourth one is one for CARB and is more of  
7 a statewide priority and responsibility. And that is we  
8 do need to restructure the transportation funding. The SB  
9 1 money that -- there's a lot of that SB 1 money, other  
10 transportation funding, the cap-and-trade funds. We need  
11 to restructure it in a way that it rewards cities and  
12 counties that are implementing the kinds of strategies and  
13 projects that do result in less VMT and more PMT, as I  
14 said a moment ago.

15           And so at the end of the day, you know, I think a  
16 lot of the people in the audience have to think about this  
17 as partners in this. This is not -- you can't just point  
18 at a CARB or even the MPOs. Most of these decisions are  
19 at the local level. And CARB should play a strong  
20 partnership role in that. And in a lot of ways that --  
21 you know, including the funding and including performance  
22 metrics and so on.

23           But at the end of the day, you know, it's the  
24 responsibility of all of us. And a lot of the local  
25 community-based organizations and NGOs have a big

1 responsibility in this. And I know there's frustration,  
2 tried hard, sometimes it's failed, but that is the way the  
3 change -- most of the change is going to happen, if we're  
4 really going to be successful.

5 Thanks for letting me do that speech.

6 (Laughter.)

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

8 Ms. Takvorian.

9 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you. Thank you  
10 very much.

11 So I just wanted to start by thanking all of the  
12 community members who were here today from throughout the  
13 state of California and who testified today. Clearly,  
14 there is a strong appetite for more ambitious targets and  
15 for CARB intervention.

16 And this is the question before us today, and  
17 this is the question that we must focus on and respond to,  
18 the strategies for how to achieve those targets do need to  
19 be develop at the local level. And MPOs have a  
20 responsibility to advance the kinds of strategies that Dr.  
21 Sperling just talked about. And CARB needs to set the  
22 appropriate targets to make those to create that incentive  
23 to have it happen.

24 I'm going to focus my comments for now on San  
25 Diego, because San Diego environmental justice, and



1 environmental community groups, and community residents  
2 have been advocating for decades for SANDAG to move  
3 towards true VMT, and transparency, and GHG reduction.  
4 And San Diego's interest in this issue are clearly very  
5 high. I think they comprised at least over 50 percent of  
6 the -- of the testimony that we heard this morning.

7           So I want to also thank staff for the important  
8 changes that you're recommending that would be  
9 incorporated in the performance objectives that would  
10 include transparency, accountability, all of that is very  
11 good.

12           What I'm disappointed about is, I feel, staff's  
13 presentation was not responsive to the San Diego  
14 community -- community's call for increased targets. And,  
15 in fact, there was initially no meeting in San Diego  
16 planned. That there had to be a request made, even though  
17 San Diego representatives were the only ones that were  
18 here at the December meeting. That was disappointing.

19           And we did appreciate that staff did come forward  
20 and held a really productive meeting in San Diego, and we  
21 really appreciated that.

22           So we appreciated that the MPOs are satisfied  
23 with the cooperation that they have felt, but I didn't  
24 hear that sentiment from most of the folks who testified  
25 today or from the impacted communities. So we need to be

1 clear that the report and the recommendations are  
2 obviously not universally supported.

3 I'm concerned about some of what I heard, which I  
4 think are a little bit worst case scenarios. I think we  
5 have to challenge and incentivize the MPOs. The  
6 communities are really ready to step up and work for this.  
7 This is about the lives of their families. And the worst  
8 case scenarios are happening right now in the asthma rates  
9 that -- in some of our communities that are three times  
10 that of the county average. That's the worst case  
11 scenario that a child is limited in their lives, and  
12 aren't able to achieve what is a rightful, healthy,  
13 quality of life. So the worst case is happening now, and  
14 we have this opportunity to really change it.

15 SANDAG's problems are legendary, frankly. It's  
16 unfortunate. I don't like being the representative from  
17 San Diego that has to say that, but they've been well  
18 articulated by public comment here and in previous  
19 hearings.

20 There were incorrect VMT calculations, inaccurate  
21 revenue and expenditure projections. And as a result, our  
22 Measure A was rejected by San Diego voters in 2016. So we  
23 don't have those sales tax dollars to utilize. So it's  
24 true that there is a lack of funding or as much funding as  
25 we would like to have.

1           We are, as a result of all of this disarray that  
2 has been really building over the last several decades, a  
3 very unusual and significant step was taken when AB 805  
4 was signed into law in 2017. That bill, by Assembly Woman  
5 Lorena Gonzalez Fletcher actually reorganized SANDAG in  
6 very significant ways.

7           State of California stepped up to require a  
8 course correction for San Diego. And among the changes is  
9 there's an establishment of an audit committee to oversee  
10 the revenue and expenditures and metrics that San Diego is  
11 using, so we hopefully can get ourselves on the right  
12 track, so we know what the data is and how we can move  
13 forward.

14           There's a reorganization of the transportation  
15 committee to focus on VMT reduction and prioritization of  
16 transit. And there's a specific incorporation of  
17 disadvantaged communities as defined by CalEnviroScreen in  
18 State law that has to be incorporated into the Regional  
19 Transportation Plan. And I think this relates to the  
20 social equity analysis that Supervisor Gioia was talking  
21 about.

22           SANDAG's model doesn't include a cumulative  
23 impacts approach as CalEnviroScreen does, so it tends to  
24 skew the communities that are identified as most impacted.

25           So SANDAG's target probably should be 25 percent

1 as many people have asked. It's clearly needed, but I'm  
2 going to recommend 21 percent that we amend the resolution  
3 to change it to 21 percent. I think it's justified by  
4 CARB's own report that was put out in June. The February  
5 report really did not provide clear evidence or a  
6 metric-based rationale for the change.

7 San Diego is the only -- or SANDAG is the only  
8 one of the big 4 MPOs that did not propose a higher  
9 target -- target higher than their anticipated 2015 SCS  
10 target.

11 And so therefore I'm going to make an  
12 amendment -- a motion for an amendment that would call for  
13 SANDAG's target to be changed to a 21 percent emission  
14 reduction target by 2035. And I would like to move that  
15 that be incorporated into the resolution.

16 CHAIR NICHOLS: I think we need to put the motion  
17 forward first, so then you can propose the amendment to  
18 it. I think that's how we need to do it.

19 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. So do you want to  
20 come back to me when we're --

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah.

22 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay.

23 CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, let's just have whatever  
24 more discussion there is, understanding that you intend to  
25 make that amendment.

1 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: So we'll move on.

3 Any others?

4 Supervisor Gioia is next.

5 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I just wanted to add a  
6 little bit to my colleague Dan Sperling's comment. I do  
7 think local action is important. But let me just qualify  
8 that a little bit. I assume when you say local action,  
9 we're mostly referring to local regional action, because  
10 there's really no way that these issues are going to get  
11 resolved city by city, county by county. I don't think  
12 there's the -- frankly, in some cases, the political will.  
13 There's a lot of -- and I say this, having been in local  
14 government for like 30 years, that there's just -- these  
15 big issues just won't get solved in each individual  
16 jurisdiction. So I take it by local action, you're  
17 referring sort of the MPOs, the regional action.

18 I do think the frustration that we heard is that  
19 different regions of the state are going to have less  
20 rigorous plans than other regions of the state, and the  
21 frustration that there may not be a similar approach  
22 statewide. And that's where our ability to set some, I  
23 don't want to say minimum standards, but to set as much  
24 guidance as possible to get more quality around the state  
25 in how these plans are approached.

1           Like I honestly believe the Bay Area's plan is  
2 more robust than SANDAG's plan, for example. And this is  
3 not meant to try to criticize any part of the state. But  
4 I think we can play a role in trying to incentivize and  
5 support the regional actions to be as strong as possible.

6           I don't have -- I wish I could have more faith  
7 that local government can step up to solve all of these  
8 issues. I think there is a value to statewide standards,  
9 and statewide incentives.

10           So that's just -- just maybe to amend your  
11 comments a bit, and see how we can achieve that in our  
12 resolution.

13           CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Mr. Florez. Senator  
14 Florez.

15           BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you. Trying to  
16 figure out the system here. Well, I would just say first  
17 and foremost, I agree with John Gioia, and, of course, my  
18 colleague from the EJ community.

19           I think the value of this is not only being  
20 engaged in the game, but getting dialogue. And I just  
21 want to take the Board back to a moment in Fresno, where  
22 we had a pause, and we had an opportunity to pull people  
23 to the table. And that was time well spent. I think it  
24 was getting folks to dialogue, to shoot towards maybe the  
25 higher goal. And us being engaged in this, I think, was

1 very much of a positive.

2 So I would support Ms. Takvorian's motion when it  
3 does come up.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Great.

5 I think we're now actually ready to get to that  
6 point. So we have a Resolution 18-12.

7 Do I have a motion and a second?

8 CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: Excuse me, Chair Nichols.

9 I think the staff wanted to do a CEQA response.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: I was told that I was supposed to  
11 reopen the record after that happened.

12 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: I apologize,  
13 Chair Nichols, if I was unclear. Reopen the record just  
14 before the vote.

15 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. All right.

16 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: So right now.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: I appreciate this carefully  
18 nuanced legal advice that I am receiving here.

19 (Laughter.)

20 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. All right. Before we  
21 act to put forward the resolution, let's hear from the  
22 staff in response to the comments then.

23 ATTORNEY MONROE: Chair Nichols, this is Gabriel  
24 Monroe an attorney for the SB 375 program. We're going to  
25 start with some responses to some comments that raised

1 some questions of economic analysis related to the current  
2 proposal. And then we're going to come back to staff for  
3 some supplemental responses to the environmental analysis.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

5 CHIEF ECONOMIST WIMBERGER: Chair Nichols, hello.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, you're hiding behind your  
7 screen.

8 CHIEF ECONOMIST WIMBERGER: I'm hiding behind a  
9 very large monitor, sorry.

10 This is Emily Wimberger. Staff heard comments on  
11 potential economically regressive consequences of the SB  
12 375 targets. In addition to ongoing staff work and  
13 whatever that the Board directs staff to do, it is  
14 important to note that staff have, in fact, carefully  
15 considered these issues. Specifically, the SB 375 staff  
16 report refers to the economic analysis for the updated  
17 scoping plan, which the Board approved in December.

18 The scoping plan update recognizes the role that  
19 reducing growth in VMT plays in supporting other important  
20 public health, equity, economic and conservation goals.

21 The modeling for the scoping plan was conducted  
22 using two Models, E3's PATHWAYS Model and REMI, a  
23 macroeconomic model that was run internally by ARB, and it  
24 used cost and emission reductions estimated from the  
25 PATHWAYS Model.



1           The PATHWAYS Model includes inputs for vehicle  
2 stock VMT and vehicle efficiency. And these were derived  
3 from the VISION Model, which draws from EMFAC 2014, with  
4 VMT updated to reflect adopted RTPs and SCSs. The  
5 economic analysis in the scoping plan includes the  
6 incremental costs between the reference or  
7 business-as-usual case, and the scoping plan scenario.

8           The inputs between the reference scenario and the  
9 scoping plan include changes in VMT and stock that come  
10 from the VISION Model.

11           The REMI Model is then used to estimate the  
12 impact of the scoping plan on the California economy,  
13 California employment, and personal income. And we use  
14 personal income as a proxy to estimate the impact on  
15 households. The estimated impact to households in 2030  
16 from -- of the scoping plan implementation is estimated at  
17 \$115 to \$280.

18           The economic analysis also includes an assessment  
19 of the impact of the scoping plan by region, as well as  
20 comparing the impact on disadvantaged communities relative  
21 to other census tracts.

22           The results show that there is not a discernible  
23 difference between the impact to disadvantaged communities  
24 relative to the overall regional in which they are  
25 located. In other words, the modeling which staff has

1 conducted does not show a disproportionate economic impact  
2 to disadvantaged communities. On the contrary, we  
3 anticipate that SB 375 and the scoping plan in general  
4 will support more equitable access to housing and  
5 transportation. Staff is also supportive of continued  
6 work to develop metrics and tools in this area.

7 Lastly, staff did quantify and monetize the  
8 avoided health impacts associated with implementing the  
9 scoping plan, which includes SB 375. The analysis shows  
10 that there are health benefits, including avoided  
11 premature mortality, avoided hospitalizations, and avoided  
12 ER visits due to implementing the scoping plan.

13 These health benefits are estimated to range from  
14 1.2 to 1.8 billion dollars in 2030, and these estimates do  
15 not include any benefits associated with increases and  
16 active transportation, which may be substantial.

17 Thanks.

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Any questions on  
19 that?

20 Then let's move on to the responses to the CEQA  
21 comments.

22 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you. We  
23 did receive comments claiming generally that our CEQA  
24 analysis was inadequate. We respond that generally our  
25 CEQA analysis, including the draft and final environmental

1 analyses and related processes, were legally adequate, and  
2 analyzed all reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts  
3 at a programmatic level appropriate to this high level  
4 target-setting proposal.

5           We also received a comment that the environmental  
6 analysis should have considered detailed impacts from  
7 development across the state. Staff responds that the  
8 environmental analysis prepared for the target update --  
9 this target update proceeding is necessarily programmatic  
10 in nature since CARB's action involves setting regional  
11 greenhouse gas reduction targets.

12           Staff has reviewed the environmental impacts  
13 resulting from regional planning agencies' actions, as  
14 disclosed in their planning level environmental documents,  
15 and prepared our final EA in a manner that discloses those  
16 impacts as an appropriate level of specificity for the  
17 high level planning action provided before you today.

18           The regional planning agencies have discretion as  
19 to how to incorporate those targets into their planning  
20 level documents, which will include their own CEQA  
21 analysis as appropriate. Individual development projects  
22 will also be subject to even more specific CEQA review  
23 requirements when specific development projects are  
24 proposed.

25           The commenter is essentially asking for multiple

1 levels of duplicative CEQA review that is not required at  
2 this high level planning stage.

3 A commenter also referenced her separate comments  
4 on the scoping plan update proceeding in December 2017.  
5 Staff responds that the scoping plan update proceeding was  
6 a separate proceeding, not under consideration today, with  
7 its own environmental analysis. Responses to the  
8 commenter's scoping plan comments were prepared and  
9 approved prior to the scoping plan update approval.  
10 Staff's responses to those comments, which the Board has  
11 already reviewed and approved, are incorporated by  
12 reference here.

13 We also heard a comment that CARB failed to  
14 consider impacts to population and housing. Another  
15 commenter raised impacts of the program on agriculture  
16 generally, though it is not clear that this was intended  
17 as a CEQA comment. In any event, staff responds that it  
18 did consider those potential impacts as set forth in  
19 chapter 4 of the final EA.

20 CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Thank you.

21 At that point, I think we do close the record.  
22 And let's -- let's bring forward the resolution. We have  
23 a motion and a second.

24 And now we can consider amendments.

25 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I was moving the staff

1 recommendation with the amendment.

2 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Second.

3 CHAIR NICHOLS: I see. Well, I think that's  
4 fine. We needed a second to your amendment, I think.

5 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Second.

6 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I think we had one.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: And you had that from Mr. Florez.  
8 Okay. That's great.

9 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: And I have some  
10 whereases to go with it, which I can read or I can  
11 dispense with that just -- whatever your pleasure is.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, you could go ahead and do  
13 that. I wanted to add one more amendment, which is very  
14 simply to incorporate the comments that -- the responses  
15 to the comments that we've just heard from staff as part  
16 of the resolution that we'll be voting on as well, so it's  
17 clear that they are part of the resolution. If you want  
18 to add.

19 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Sure. Thank you.

20 So whereas the San Diego Association Of  
21 Governments is undergoing implementation of Assembly Bill  
22 805, and according to Section 7 of Article 11 under  
23 chapter 4 - thank you - of Division 11 of the Public  
24 Utilities Code; whereas SANDAG is the only MPO in the  
25 state organizational structure that also mandates its

1 prioritization of transit and requires that SANDAG's  
2 regional comprehensive.

3 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: You're going to have  
4 to start over again, because he can't hear you.

5 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'm sorry. You want me  
6 to start from the beginning?

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Or you could just give him the  
8 language. I think if it's substantially what we discussed  
9 before --

10 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: It is. That's why I was  
11 asking if you wanted me to read it.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: I see. I'm sorry. We're not  
13 used to actually proceeding with this amount of formality.  
14 So I think we're all just kind of improvising here. I  
15 think it's acceptable if we all understand that what  
16 you're doing is changing number to 21 from what was  
17 proposed by the staff, that that's the proposal. We don't  
18 have to --

19 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: For San Diego. Yes,  
20 that's right.

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Only for San Diego.

22 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: It just references in  
23 the whereases the changing environment that AB 805  
24 presents.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

1 Dr. Balmes.

2 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I just want to be clear,  
3 only for San Diego?

4 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: That's my motion.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: That is the motion

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. That's it.

7 Any other -- are we all set?

8 Okay. In that case, I think we're prepared to  
9 vote at this point.

10 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Do we vote on that --  
11 those changes or are we just voting --

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, the two changes are the  
13 responses to comments and the movement to 21, yes. I  
14 thought the correct procedure -- I may need help here --  
15 was to vote on the amendment separately first and decide  
16 whether we were going to agree to the amendment, and then  
17 vote on the resolution. Okay.

18 I see heads nodding.

19 ATTORNEY MONROE: Sorry, Chair Nichols and Board  
20 members, if you do -- it's Gabriel Monroe over here. If  
21 you do approve this increase in the target for SANDAG, we  
22 would have an additional bit of language that we would  
23 like to suggest that you include in the resolution along  
24 with that, that I can read in now or if you want to  
25 discuss it and vote on it first, I can read it in later.

1 CHAIR NICHOLS: I think you'd better give it to  
2 us now.

3 ATTORNEY MONROE: Okay. So it would be  
4 another -- it would be language that would say, "Be it  
5 further resolved the increased targets are within the  
6 scope of the existing draft and final EAs would not  
7 present any new or substantially increased significant  
8 impacts not already analyzed in the final EA, and would  
9 not present any of the scenarios set forth in section  
10 15088.5(a) of the CEQA guidelines requiring recirculation  
11 of final EA.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. So the change in staff's  
13 view does not necessitate any further analysis, which I  
14 think we would want to -- we would want to know that. So  
15 let's proceed.

16 VICE CHAIR BERG: Could I -- could I just ask a  
17 point of clarification?

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: Um-hmm.

19 VICE CHAIR BERG: Because I'm really  
20 uncomfortable with the fact that we're singling out one  
21 MPO. We also had someone ask us to increase Fresno, but  
22 they're, you know -- I'm uncomfortable as to since San  
23 Diego is at 19 percent as the other large MPOs, they  
24 started out at 13 and went to 19, I believe. And it's not  
25 that I disagree with my fellow Board member, it's just I



1 don't feel very qualified to make a decision strictly on  
2 one MPO.

3           And so, Diane, maybe if you could help me as to  
4 why we would increase San Diego and not increase the other  
5 three MPOs, not that I'm advocating that, because I think  
6 there's great challenge here. And I also agree with  
7 Professor Sperling. We can pick a number and how the  
8 modeling turns out is that really going to give us more  
9 action?

10           And so I want to be supportive. I agree with  
11 what we need to do here on SB 375, but I just need to  
12 express my concern to make sure that we're moving forward  
13 in a way that we expect to.

14           BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Ms. Berg. I  
15 appreciate the question, and I wanted to speak  
16 specifically about San Diego, because that's the region  
17 that I know the best. And it seems to me that because of  
18 the unprecedented State action that was taken in 2017 with  
19 the adoption of AB 805, which amends the Health and Safety  
20 Code and -- amends the Health and Safety Code related to  
21 the operation of SANDAG. It changes the organizational  
22 structure. It applies new responsibilities to SANDAG to  
23 be more focused on transit, to actually incorporate  
24 disadvantaged communities in -- in their planning.

25           And in their planning specifically of transit, it

1 also sets up a new audit committee that holds them more  
2 accountable because there's been problems in the past.

3           Those are some of the reasons why, in addition to  
4 what you've heard as inaction moving towards reducing VMT,  
5 that we think it's appropriate, I think it's appropriate,  
6 that their target be increased. So that's the rationale  
7 that I'm presenting to all of you for consideration.

8           VICE CHAIR BERG: So, and I would -- I understand  
9 they were one of the lowest ones at 13 percent. And  
10 they've come out now to meet the others, where they were  
11 at 15, 16, and another also 13 to 19. So you don't feel  
12 that going those extra, you know three, four percent up to  
13 the 19 doesn't meet your criteria, you think it should go  
14 even more?

15           BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Well, I share Dr.  
16 Sperling and your, I think, and probably other people's  
17 concerns about metrics and about how these things have  
18 been calculated. The best we can do -- and that's why I  
19 think staff's approach is really a good one, that we're  
20 going to improve metrics, that we're going to focus on it,  
21 that we're going to have a common set of metrics and ways  
22 that we measure this progress going forward, and that's  
23 desperately needed, because we've been off in San Diego.

24           But what we can focus on is that, for instance,  
25 SCAG and Bay Area are spending tens of millions more. I

1 think some 50 percent more in transportation dollars and  
2 transit dollars than SANDAG is spending per capita.

3 So we've got evidence that the performance just  
4 isn't at the same level as well. So I think that, coupled  
5 with the new structuring that's happening, and the new  
6 eyes on their performance from both CARB, as well as from  
7 the State are reasons for them to perform more.

8 VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you for helping me.

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah, I think that Ms. Takvorian  
10 has provided a good basis for distinguishing San Diego  
11 from other parts of the state, which also had people here  
12 to advocate for higher numbers, but I'm not going to  
13 support the resolution anyway, the amendment, because I  
14 feel that we've heard enough to know that these numbers  
15 are largely symbolic. And therefore, to symbolically go  
16 after San Diego because of the -- what have been found to  
17 be deficiencies in their program in the past, when we  
18 haven't really had that engagement with them before now is  
19 like the ARB just coming with a -- you know, from out  
20 of -- out of nowhere in effect and giving them a higher  
21 number without having given them an opportunity to justify  
22 why they're already being asked to do a lot more than  
23 they've already been asked to do before.

24 I have to admit I feel a little -- although, he's  
25 not here. It's not -- you know, he can't speak for

1 himself, but it does bother me a little bit that the  
2 representative of San Diego who is on this Board isn't  
3 here to speak on this issue. So I feel somewhat troubled  
4 about that as well.

5 Any other comments on the amendment?

6 If not, I think we'll have the clerk call the  
7 roll please on the amendment -- on the amendment, yes.

8 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Balmes?

9 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: No. Excuse me. No.

10 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. De La Torre?

11 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: No.

12 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. Eisenhut?

13 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: No.

14 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator Florez?

15 BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Aye.

16 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Assembly Member Garcia?  
17 Supervisor Gioia?

18 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yes.

19 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator -- oh, I'm  
20 sorry. Ms. Mitchell?

21 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: No.

22 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mrs. Riordan?  
23 Supervisor Serna?

24 BOARD MEMBER SERNA: No.

25 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Sherriffs?

1 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: No.

2 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Professor Sperling?

3 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: No.

4 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Ms. Takvorian?

5 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.

6 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Vice Chair Berg?

7 VICE CHAIR BERG: No.

8 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Chair Nichols?

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: No.

10 BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Yes votes win, the  
11 motion passes -- or, I'm sorry, the motion does not pass,  
12 10 to 2.

13 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. All right. We'll now  
14 move to the main motion

15 Three yeses.

16 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Metrics.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: You've got to count every vote  
18 you get. This is important. All right.

19 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: Chair  
20 Nichols?

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

22 DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: I apologize  
23 again for the procedural issues. Your amendment about  
24 incorporating the response to comments.

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Do we need a separate vote?

1           DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: You still  
2 need to dispense with that.

3           CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, I think we can dispense with  
4 a separate vote on that, unless anybody wants to call for  
5 a separate vote on that.

6           Hearing none -- nobody suggest that. Let us move  
7 to the resolution as amended. And I think we can probably  
8 do that without going through a roll call vote.

9           All those in favor please say aye?

10          (Unanimous aye vote.)

11          CHAIR NICHOLS: All those opposed?

12          Abstentions?

13          Thank you. It passes.

14          So thank you, everybody. This was a good  
15 discussion, and very good hearing. Really appreciated the  
16 participation of the -- all of the people who came in to  
17 try to help us.

18          We now need to shift the cast of players at the  
19 table. We're moving on to three different, but very  
20 related items. An update on the progress of the State  
21 strategy for our State Implementation Plan, and the South  
22 Coast Air Quality Management Plan, an informational update  
23 on concepts for minimizing the community health impacts  
24 from freight facilities, and an update on implementation  
25 of Assembly Bill 617, the Community Air Protection

1 Program.

2 We'll hear the first two items together as I  
3 mentioned this morning, and then follow up with the update  
4 on the Community Air Protection Program. We've organized  
5 these three items today, put them all in one day, because  
6 they encompass a range of programs currently in place as  
7 well as new actions to clean up the air, both in the Los  
8 Angeles region and in communities across the state that  
9 continue to be impacted by air pollution.

10 So we'll hear from staff about the work being  
11 done to implement the SIP, since it was approved last  
12 March in this place actually. And we'll hear about the  
13 multiple regulatory programs to clean up ships and trucks,  
14 cargo handling equipment, and refrigerated trailer units  
15 and other contributors to the air pollution that  
16 communities near ports, railyards, and distribution  
17 centers are disproportionately exposed to.

18 The update on 617 will outline the progress that  
19 we're making in consulting with communities around the  
20 state and trying to assure that we develop programs that  
21 really slash emissions, both toxic and smog causing  
22 emissions, with specific directed programs developed for,  
23 by, and with those community members.

24 The schedule that the staff has laid out for this  
25 multi-pronged attack is an aggressive one. It's not too

1 aggressive. It is -- it's needed in order to deliver on  
2 the promise of the legislation, as well as on the need  
3 that is out there.

4 I want to underline that a major driver in our  
5 approach is that we want to accelerate the movement to  
6 zero emissions, freight hauling, and freight handling  
7 technologies. Electrifying the equipment that is now  
8 pumping smog-forming emissions and toxic diesel soot into  
9 the air in and around the most impacted communities is  
10 really at the heart of this effort.

11 So we'll start with the staff's presentations on  
12 the SIP and the freight. And then we'll perhaps take a  
13 break before we hear again from the public. I'm not sure  
14 that we actually need that. But if we do, we can take it.

15 Then we'll hear the staff's presentation on 617,  
16 which has its own separate opportunity for comment. So  
17 there will be a break before 617.

18 But none of these items is an item that the Board  
19 is required to vote on. Obviously, we're -- our attention  
20 and our input are being solicited by the staff, so we  
21 should be prepared to engage, but we're not actually  
22 taking a vote on any of these items today.

23 So, Mr. Corey, would you begin, please?

24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair  
25 Nichols.



1           So last March, as you noted, the Board adopted  
2 the State SIP Strategy in South Coast AQMP, and directed  
3 staff to provide an annual status report on progress made  
4 during the implementation phase. The State SIP Strategy  
5 describes CARB's measures and commitment to achieve the  
6 mobile source and consumer product emission reductions  
7 over the next 15 years, and was a critical component of  
8 the South Coast AQMP.

9           Both CARB and district staff have begun  
10 implementation of the plans, both rulemaking and  
11 incentives, to deploy cleaner technologies. Staff's  
12 briefing will identify the metrics we're using to ensure  
13 we're on track to get the needed emission reductions.  
14 Underscoring a link between the SIP and freight actions,  
15 the SIP includes commitments to develop 13 new measures to  
16 reduce freight emissions.

17           Since March of last year, CARB staff have been  
18 working closely with the South Coast District, community  
19 groups, and industry to develop additional concepts for  
20 reducing community health impacts from freight facilities.  
21 Today, staff will present those ideas and describe the  
22 path forward.

23           Kirsten Cayabyab will provide the first staff  
24 presentation on the SIP Strategy and South Coast Air  
25 Quality Management Plan, followed by Ajay Mangat, who will

1 cover the freight update.

2 Kirsten.

3 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was  
4 presented as follows.)

5 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: Thank you,  
6 Mr. Corey. Good morning, Chair Nichols and members of the  
7 Board. Today's presentation is a combined update on the  
8 implementation of the State SIP Strategy and South Coast  
9 AQMP, and concepts to minimize the community health  
10 impacts from large freight facilities.

11 --o0o--

12 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: Before we  
13 jump into these items however, I'd like to take a moment  
14 to delve a bit more deeply into what Chair Nichols was  
15 just speaking about. CARB has multiple complementary  
16 goals that we are moving towards, including attaining our  
17 regional air quality targets and climate goals, reducing  
18 near-source risk, and most recently the push for community  
19 level programs under the auspices of the efforts of AB  
20 617.

21 It's clear that there's a lot of overlap, both in  
22 terms of sources and pollutants, and the types of  
23 technologies we need to achieve our targets. Over the  
24 last few years, CARB staff has been engaged in a  
25 coordinated planning process that informs the development

1 of a single Mobile Source Strategy to meet these multiple  
2 goals.

3 This type of planning process is essential to  
4 address the interplay between pollutants and sources, and  
5 to enable consideration of the benefits of different  
6 technologies and energy sources. That's because actions  
7 deploy near -- excuse me, to deploy zero-emission and  
8 cleaner combustion technologies is essential to transform  
9 the mobile sector to meet our multiple goals.

10 Over the last year, what we've heard from the  
11 Board and community members has further underscored the  
12 need for a comprehensive transformation to cleaner vehicle  
13 technologies, fuels and energy sources.

14 That's also in part why after this joint SIP  
15 freight item, you'll be hearing an update on  
16 implementation of AB 617, the Community Air Protection  
17 Program.

18 In fact, throughout this afternoon's  
19 presentations, CARB staff will be discussing proposed  
20 actions that in common this genesis; they have been  
21 developed to support our push towards a more sustainable  
22 transportation system in California.

23 --o0o--

24 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: As you may  
25 recall, we were back here in Riverside last March when the

1 Board approved the State SIP Strategy and South Coast  
2 AQMP. There was significant community input, and Board  
3 discussion last March, about the importance of reducing  
4 health risk from freight operations, so the Board directed  
5 us to provide annual status reports on progress in  
6 implementing the strategy, and also gave us direction on  
7 reducing risk from large freight facilities, which you  
8 will hear more about in the second half of this  
9 presentation.

10 I'll begin by providing an update on staff's  
11 efforts to implement the State SIP Strategy. I'll also  
12 touch upon the South Coast Air District's efforts to  
13 implement their local Air Quality Management Plan, or  
14 AQMP, as our two agencies are partners in ensuring the  
15 region achieves its clean air targets. The two plans work  
16 synergistically towards this goal.

17 I will then transition to my colleague Jay for an  
18 update on concepts to minimize the community health  
19 impacts from large freight facilities. And at the end of  
20 our joint presentation, we will open it up for public  
21 comment on both items.

22 --o0o--

23 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: Jumping right  
24 in to the update on the State SIP Strategy.

25 --o0o--

1 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: I'd like to  
2 remind the Board what they adopted last March. This was a  
3 two-part commitment. The first was a commitment to  
4 achieve specific emission reductions from mobile sources  
5 by the required attainment date. And the second  
6 commitment was to take action on a new suite of measures,  
7 according to a designated schedule, which you see here on  
8 the left of the slide.

9 Board members, a more legible version of this is  
10 in your packet, and for the public it's out on the table  
11 outside this auditorium.

12 This table is an excerpt from the State SIP  
13 Strategy document that was approved last year. And it  
14 really shows the suite of new measures that were  
15 introduced in the State SIP Strategy, which call for  
16 actions to transform the State's mobile sectors, ensuring  
17 that the vehicles and engines used to move people and  
18 freight throughout the State are the cleanest available.

19 CARB's mobile source control programs have  
20 achieved tremendous success in cleaning up the mobile  
21 fleet throughout the years. Ongoing implementation of the  
22 current control program will continue to provide  
23 substantial reductions through 2031, providing a  
24 significant downpayment on the needed emission reductions.

25 To ensure that these reductions are fully

1 realized, staff continues to engage in efforts to ensure  
2 that we are effectively implementing the regulations that  
3 the Board has already adopted, for example ensuring full  
4 implementation of the truck and bus regulation.

5 Building upon these emission reductions, the new  
6 SIP measures call for actions to transform the  
7 technologies and fuels we use, the design of our  
8 communities, and the way we move people and freight  
9 throughout the state. The new measures also play a  
10 substantial role in reducing NOx emissions in the South  
11 Coast Air Basin.

12 The SIP measures include 14 new regulatory  
13 measures to introduce the cleanest technologies across all  
14 mobile source categories, including the logistics sector.  
15 These regulation controls are complemented by the  
16 remaining SIP measures, which are designed to accelerate  
17 the deployment and penetration of advanced technologies  
18 through incentives and other programmatic approaches.

19 Funding pilot and demonstration projects will  
20 continue to advance cleaner technologies in other sectors,  
21 while supporting the identification of future regulatory  
22 efforts. At the same time, other actions will ensure that  
23 the in-use fleet continues to operate as cleanly as  
24 possible.

25 --o0o--

1 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: Last March,  
2 in response to public comment, the Board told us to come  
3 back with proposed metrics for tracking progress and  
4 implementing the State SIP Strategy. There was also  
5 significant discussion about the need for expeditious  
6 regulatory action, and close tracking to ensure that we're  
7 getting the funds we need to accelerate turnover to the  
8 cleanest technologies.

9 To be responsive to this direction, we're  
10 proposing metrics in three major areas: rule development;  
11 advanced technology deployment; and emission reductions  
12 achieved.

13 In the subsequent slides, I'll walk through these  
14 metrics and provide a brief update on the implementation  
15 status for each.

16 --o0o--

17 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: The first  
18 area for which we are proposing metrics is rule  
19 developments. This is intended to track progress in  
20 developing and bringing to the Board the 14 regulatory  
21 measures identified in the State SIP Strategy. We're  
22 tracking progress through two metrics, which are shown on  
23 the left of this slide.

24 The first is staff initiation of the regulatory  
25 development process. Initiation of that process at CARB

1 is considered to have begun when public workshops are  
2 held, a stakeholder working group is convened, or when a  
3 staff report is released, whichever comes first.

4 The second metric is ensuring that we bring those  
5 regulatory measures to the Board for action by the dates  
6 committed to on the schedule for the SIP measures.

7 We're making great progress. As you can see on  
8 the right side of this slide, we've currently initiated  
9 developments of 11 of the 14 regulatory measures. And two  
10 of these have already been approved by the Board. Beyond  
11 regulatory approaches, we've also been working to develop  
12 the needed programmatic framework for the reductions that  
13 will be coming from accelerated turnover to the cleanest  
14 energy technologies.

15 You approved, earlier this morning, the South  
16 Coast heavy-duty vehicle incentive measure, which will  
17 utilize Carl Moyer Program incentive funds to replace and  
18 repower older on-road heavy-duty vehicles with  
19 approximately 1,300 low-NOx trucks.

20 CARB staff has worked closely with the South  
21 Coast Air Quality Management District staff on the  
22 development of this measure to ensure it meets U.S. EPA  
23 requirements to achieve SIP credit.

24 --o0o--

25 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: Reducing



1 emissions from on-road trucks and buses is a cornerstone  
2 of the strategy, due to their significant contribution to  
3 NOx emissions in the region. The strategy calls for  
4 low-NOx trucks that are effectively 90 percent cleaner  
5 than today's standards. And with targeted introduction of  
6 zero-emission technologies in heavy-duty applications that  
7 are well suited to the early adoption of zero-emission  
8 technologies.

9           At the same time, to ensure that the in-use fleet  
10 continues to operate as cleanly as possible, includes a  
11 measure to adjust in-use emissions. As I mentioned  
12 earlier, the two regulatory measures have been approved by  
13 the Board. This includes the innovative technology  
14 certification flexibility regulation, which enables early  
15 deployment of the next generation of truck and bus  
16 technologies. And last month, the Board approved the  
17 California phase 2 GHG regulations for medium- and  
18 heavy-duty vehicles.

19           Development has also begun on five other  
20 heavy-duty measures which you see listed here. CARB staff  
21 began regulatory development efforts on more stringent  
22 heavy-duty low-NOx emission standards in 2016. Currently,  
23 CARB's optional low-NOx standards are paving the way for  
24 these more stringent emission standards, with  
25 certification of two commercially available heavy-duty

1 engines to the optional NOx standards occurring last year.

2 An additional engine size is expected within the  
3 next several years. CARB staff is also developing  
4 regulatory amendments to lower in-use emissions  
5 performance levels and to improve detection of potentially  
6 high emitting trucks in use and in buses and to develop a  
7 comprehensive vehicle inspection and maintenance program  
8 for heave-duty vehicles.

9 The strategy also calls for targeted introduction  
10 of zero-emission technologies and heavy-duty applications,  
11 where zero emission technologies are currently available  
12 and feasible, such as transit vehicles, airport shuttle  
13 buses and last-mile delivery trucks.

14 Actions to promote zero emission in this -- in  
15 these applications are important to foster further  
16 technology development so they become suitable for broader  
17 use in the future.

18 --o0o--

19 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: The strategy  
20 calls for similar actions to reduce emissions from  
21 off-road sources, with a focus on more stringent emission  
22 standards for new engines, complemented by targeted  
23 deployment of ZEV technologies and smaller equipment  
24 types, such as forklifts, airport ground support  
25 equipment, and small off-road equipment, such as lawn and



1 cleaner technologies to markets.

2           Due to the magnitude of emission reductions  
3 needed, however, additional strategies, which includes  
4 funding mechanisms, are also necessary to accelerate the  
5 transition of the mobile fleets to these advanced  
6 technologies.

7           While regulatory measures are anticipated to  
8 deliver approximately 70 percent of the mobile source  
9 emission reductions needed, funding to expand the  
10 deployment of the cleanest zero emission, and near-zero  
11 emission technologies will achieve the remaining increment  
12 of necessary reductions.

13           The South Coast AQMD has estimated the sustained  
14 funding levels of approximately \$1 billion per year  
15 through 2031 will be needed to support the necessary scale  
16 of technology transformation.

17           For this area, we are proposing metrics that are  
18 track incentives secured, the number of the pieces of  
19 equipment and the engines turned over, and any new  
20 regulatory actions or emission reduction control  
21 strategies that are identified throughout the  
22 implementation process.

23           In the 12 months since the strategy was approved,  
24 there has been a substantial first year allocation of over  
25 a billion dollars of incentive funds statewide.

1 Additionally, discussion over the last year has identified  
2 additional potential actions to reduce emissions from the  
3 freight and goods movement sector, which my colleague will  
4 speak about in more detail in the latter half of this  
5 presentation.

6 --o0o--

7 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: The slide  
8 provides a snapshot of those incentive funding pools  
9 received over the last year. The important takeaway from  
10 this slide is that CARB is operating a number of incentive  
11 programs, including those that are funded through the  
12 approximately \$1 billion approved by the legislature for  
13 the fiscal year 2017-2018 budget that I mentioned earlier.

14 Together with the Volkswagen settlement funds and  
15 remaining funds from Prop 1B, these programs collectively  
16 represent over \$1.5 billion in grants available to reduce  
17 emissions from on- and off-road vehicles and equipment  
18 statewide.

19 Again, this at the statewide level. And while we  
20 are appreciative of having received such significant  
21 funding this year, it is important to remember that this  
22 scale of reductions needed in the South Coast called for  
23 approximately levels of funding in the ballpark of \$1  
24 billion annually sustained over the years of the strategy.

25 --o0o--

1           AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: The third  
2 area for which we are proposing metrics is tracking the  
3 emission reductions achieved. This metric is intended to  
4 track the pace of emission reductions achieved relative to  
5 the emission reductions that we projected when we adopted  
6 the strategy.

7           As I mentioned earlier, ongoing implementation of  
8 the current control program will continue to play an  
9 important role in providing emission reductions fro  
10 attainment. So staff is currently engaged in tracking  
11 efforts to ensure we are realizing the emission reductions  
12 from our existing suite of control programs.

13 Concurrently, we are developing and bringing to the Board  
14 the new regulations and actions identified in the State  
15 SIP Strategy.

16           We knew when we developed the strategy that the  
17 focus in the initial years would be in developing and  
18 proposing to the Board the regulatory and programmatic  
19 measures we need to achieve the emission reductions  
20 anticipated in the later years of the strategy. And  
21 that's been borne out.

22           Staff has been engaged in outreach and  
23 development efforts to ensure that we get the process  
24 right and we'll be back before the Board frequently over  
25 the course of this year and the next few years to propose



1                   --o0o--

2                   AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: The remaining  
3 portion of my presentation touches upon the implementation  
4 efforts that our partners at the South Coast Air District  
5 have undertaken in the past year to implement the AQMP.

6                   As part of the direction to staff last March, the  
7 Board asked that we report back on progress that the South  
8 Coast Air District has made in meeting their AQMP  
9 commitments. This slide highlights the three most  
10 significant commitments in the AQMP: to sunset the  
11 RECLAIM program and reinstate BARCT level controls to  
12 secure the funding necessary for incentives critical to  
13 achieve -- accelerating the deployment of cleaner  
14 technologies and to work on developing facility based  
15 mobile measures to provide the benefits at both the  
16 regional and community level.

17                   --o0o--

18                   AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: The South  
19 Coast District has made tremendous progress in the  
20 transition of the RECLAIM Program towards a BARCT level  
21 command and control regulatory structure. A significant  
22 first step was taken in 2016 with the removal of the  
23 excess credits still available in the system from  
24 shut-down facilities.

25                   In 2018, the district has taken several



1 additional actions, including preventing new facilities  
2 from entering the program, freezing credits of existing  
3 facilities, and a release of the draft transition plan  
4 earlier this month, which establishes the guiding  
5 principles for all RECLAIM facilities to leave the  
6 program.

7           In addition, the district is also developing new  
8 rules and amending existing rules to ensure that there are  
9 established BARCT-level landing rules in place to control  
10 emissions from these facilities as the RECLAIM program is  
11 sunsetted.

12           This year, the district is developing  
13 source-specific BARCT rules for RECLAIM equipment and  
14 industry-specific BARCT rules for refineries and  
15 electrical generating units, or EGUs.

16                           --o0o--

17           AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: As the Board  
18 is well aware, funding for incentives is critical for the  
19 South Coast to attain the ozone standard. The South  
20 Coast, along with CARB, is working in different areas to  
21 secure this funding. The district has identified a number  
22 of new sources that will contribute to meeting their goal.  
23 The district's voluntarily incentive program will provide  
24 over \$60 million for new cleaner technologies, and AB 134  
25 will provide the district with over \$100 million to lower

1 emissions from mobile sources.

2           And while the exact amount of funding from the  
3 Volkswagen settlement for the South Coast is not certain,  
4 that amount is expected to be substantial.

5                           --o0o--

6           AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: And finally,  
7 the district has been working on facility-based measures.  
8 Last spring, the South Coast governing board directed  
9 district staff to work with facilities on voluntary  
10 measures, and if necessary, to begin development of  
11 regulatory measures, including industrial source rules, or  
12 ISR.

13           The South Coast board also directed the district  
14 staff to report back in one year on the progress made, and  
15 unless sufficient actions have been identified, to  
16 initiate rule developments. Over the last year, the  
17 district has had held 17 working group meetings in which  
18 CARB staff has participated.

19           As shown in this slide, district staff are  
20 proposing five different facility-based measures, and is  
21 recommending a suite of approaches, including MOUs, or  
22 memorandums of understanding, and Clean Air Action Plans,  
23 in addition to regulatory measures, such as fleet  
24 requirements for vehicles servicing these facilities.

25           The district board will consider staff's

1 recommendation to move forward on this approach early next  
2 month.

3           And with that, I'd like to turn it over to my  
4 colleague for his update on concepts to reduce the health  
5 impacts from large freight facilities.

6           Ajay.

7           AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

8           Thank you, Kirsten.

9           Good afternoon, Chair Nichol and members of the  
10 Board.

11                           --o0o--

12           AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

13           This presentation is a report back on staff's  
14 evaluation of concepts to reduce community health impacts  
15 from large freight facilities, including recommendations  
16 for additional CARB actions.

17                           --o0o--

18           AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

19           In the early 2000s, CARB set targets to cut  
20 emissions of toxic diesel particulate matter and the  
21 associated cancer risks statewide. The resulting  
22 regulatory agenda covered virtually all diesel vehicles  
23 and equipment under CARB's control, including the fuels,  
24 trucks, ships, harbor craft, transport refrigeration  
25 units, or TRUs, and other equipment used to move cargo.

1           We have made significant progress in reducing  
2 diesel PM through these regulations together with large  
3 scale private investments and public incentives. But more  
4 recent health science emphasizes the need to do more to  
5 protect children and other vulnerable residents living  
6 near large freight facilities.

7           In recent years, much of the discussion before  
8 the Board has been about further reducing NOx emissions  
9 from freight equipment as part of the -- as part of the  
10 SIP Strategy. Our conversation today focuses on the  
11 impacts of this equipment on communities near freight  
12 facilities using the potential cancer risk from exposure  
13 to diesel PM as the primary metric.

14           But staff's evaluation of potential emission  
15 reduction strategies considers all pollutants to meet  
16 local, regional and global needs.

17           In its 2015 *Sustainable Freight: Pathways to*  
18 *Zero and Near-Zero Emissions* document, CARB recognized the  
19 importance of setting a goal for freight of zero emissions  
20 everywhere feasible, and near zero-emissions with  
21 renewable fuels everywhere else.

22                           --o0o--

23           AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT: A  
24 year ago, the Board directed staff to come back today with  
25 concepts for an indirect source review, or ISR, rule, and

1 alternatives to reduce pollution from large freight  
2 facilities. These include seaports, railyards, warehouses  
3 and distribution centers.

4           The message was loud and clear. Do more to  
5 lessen the health impacts for communities living next to  
6 large freight facilities.

7           This report describes our evaluation and  
8 conclusion of the most effective CARB -- effective actions  
9 CARB can take to achieve that objective. We begin with  
10 the bottom line.

11                           --o0o--

12           AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT: In  
13 the coming years, CARB is already committed to develop and  
14 consider a dozen new measures to reduce freight pollution  
15 shown in blue below the timeline.

16           In response to the Board's direction, we  
17 identified nine additional CARB is to reduce emissions and  
18 community exposure to freight pollution. Five are  
19 regulatory. These additional actions are shown in green  
20 above the timeline.

21           We expect to deliver these new actions for Board  
22 consideration over the next five years. We appreciate the  
23 need to move as quickly as possible to address the health  
24 impacts near freight facilities. This schedule considers  
25 several factors.

1           The push to zero emission operations will require  
2 successful regulations to address complex infrastructure  
3 issues. There must be a strong record for Board decision  
4 making, including thorough environmental and economic  
5 analyses to meet statutory requirements, and address  
6 stakeholder concerns, and the contribution to community  
7 health risk. We've provided advanced written materials  
8 with detail on each action, and I'll cover the highlights  
9 in this presentation.

10                           --o0o--

11           AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT: We  
12 began our work last year to evaluate ISR and other  
13 concepts by identifying the outcomes crucial to success.  
14 And viable concept would need to be effective in  
15 delivering real-world benefits for communities with a high  
16 degree of certainty that the concept could be implemented  
17 to achieve emission reductions. Of course, the concept  
18 would also need to be feasible for industry to comply with  
19 and the agencies to enforce.

20                           --o0o--

21           AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:  
22           Then we began consulting with our air district  
23 and State agency partners, impacted communities,  
24 environmental advocates, seaports, the freight industry,  
25 and other stakeholders.

1                   --o0o--

2           AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

3           Staff co-hosted five community roundtable  
4 discussions with local advocacy groups to hear from  
5 residents of freight-impacted communities.

6           Residents provided a wealth of information during  
7 these meetings and we've posted detailed summaries of the  
8 community meetings on our webpage.

9                   --o0o--

10          AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

11          Our initial evaluation focused on facility-based  
12 approaches. These concepts consider the facility as a  
13 whole, and include all of the mobile vehicles and  
14 equipment serving the facility.

15          CARB has some experience with these types of  
16 facility-based actions. For example, an enforceable  
17 agreement that quantified and reduced diesel PM emissions  
18 at major railyards, CEQA comment letters that recommend  
19 how projects can minimize risk to nearby communities, and  
20 \$150 million in incentives for zero and near-zero emission  
21 freight facilities project funded by the cap-and-trade  
22 auction proceeds.

23          When we looked at the potential regulatory  
24 approaches, we considered legal authority, the scope of  
25 impact, and enforceability. An indirect source review

1 rule, or ISR, is one type of facility based approach, but  
2 not the only kind. The air districts have the strongest  
3 authority to pursue ISR rules in California. The blue  
4 area on this slide highlights a few pros and cons of  
5 potential facility-based regulatory actions.

6 --o0o--

7 AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

8 Some people assume that an ISR -- an ISR rule can  
9 only mean a cap on facility emissions. But there is an  
10 endless variety of concepts for design. This slide shows  
11 just a handful. The San Joaquin valley Air District  
12 adopted the first ISR rule in California in 2005 that  
13 requires builders and operators to use clean equipment  
14 during construction and operation of new development or  
15 pay a mitigation fee.

16 Other examples might include an emissions target  
17 for a facility per unit of cargo to encourage efficiency,  
18 or a requirement to use a certain percentage of  
19 zero-emission equipment on site.

20 The South Coast Air District is exploring ISR  
21 concepts that include requiring facility plans, like the  
22 Clean Air Action Plan, developed by the Ports of Long  
23 Beach and Los Angeles. And the district staff is also  
24 considering a voluntary certification program for truck  
25 fleets cleaner than required by CARB's Truck and Bus Rule.



1           This coupled with a facility requirement for  
2 warehouses and distribution centers to use these cleaner  
3 truck fleets.

4                               --o0o--

5           AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

6           Staff also considered our more traditional  
7 approach based on reducing pollution from specific types  
8 of equipment, which we've referred to as "sectors" here.

9           Most mobile source regulations utilize a sector  
10 based approach, including those established by CARB, U.S.  
11 EPA, and international bodies. Approaches that set an  
12 emissions or performance standard for the manufacturer or  
13 owner of specific equipment are typically more  
14 straightforward -- more straightforward to implement and  
15 enforce than a facility approach.

16           But there are drawbacks too, because  
17 zero-emission operation requires infrastructure that may  
18 not always be in the control of the operator. For  
19 example, the operators of ships at berth, or TRUs, capable  
20 of plugging into the electric grid and turning off their  
21 diesel engines are dependent on the availability of a  
22 connection.

23           The next four slides take a closer look at the  
24 types of freight facilities that the Board identified as  
25 priorities. CARB staff performed screening-level health

1 analyses to assess the relative contribution from each  
2 sector at, for example, freight facilities.

3 We wanted to gain an understanding of which  
4 sectors operating at these facilities have the greatest  
5 impact on health risk in nearby communities. We analyzed  
6 2016 and 2023 when most existing CARB diesel regulations  
7 are fully implemented.

8 --o0o--

9 AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

10 Our first example facility is a very large  
11 seaport dominated by containerized cargo activity. The  
12 left bar shows the contribution of each sector to the  
13 average near-source cancer risk in adjacent communities.

14 In this case, the average near-source risk  
15 considers the cancer risk in community locations between  
16 the edge of the port property extending to about one mile  
17 inland. As always, when considering exposure to air  
18 pollution, the proximity of the emission source to people  
19 matters a lot.

20 For this analysis, we quantified and modeled  
21 diesel PM emissions out to 40 nautical miles offshore for  
22 ships and harbor craft, out to three miles from the port  
23 boundary for trucks and locomotives, and on site for cargo  
24 equipment that operates a marine terminals.

25 In 2016, working from the bottom to the top



1 black stripes, followed by drayage trucks, and cargo  
2 handling equipment.

3 --o0o--

4 AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

5 We also evaluated the emissions from freight  
6 activity associated with a one million square foot  
7 distribution center. Trucks are the biggest contributor  
8 in 2016, but their relative contribution declines  
9 significantly by 2023 after the Truck and Bus Rule is  
10 fully implemented.

11 Then on-site diesel equipment becomes the biggest  
12 contributor to cancer risk. Note that much of the  
13 equipment at distribution centers is already powered by  
14 electricity or propane to reduce worker exposure indoors.

15 --o0o--

16 AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

17 For cold storage warehouse, the near-source  
18 cancer risk in both 2016 and 2023 is dominated by  
19 emissions from diesel transport refrigeration units, with  
20 very small contributions from trucks.

21 CARB's existing TRU rule is expected to reduce  
22 emissions by half by 2023 through cleaner diesel engines  
23 and particulate filters.

24 --o0o--

25 AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

1           Staff's analysis considered legal and practical  
2 issues, input from community advocates and industry, and  
3 which sectors are driving the near-source health risk. We  
4 reached these conclusions.

5           The most effective approach for CARB to achieve  
6 significant, enforceable emission reductions from freight  
7 is to regulate both the equipment and the facilities. The  
8 focus is on transitioning to zero emission, supplemented  
9 with near-zero emission technologies.

10           CARB can use its mobile source authority to  
11 require equipment owners and operators to transition to  
12 zero emissions. And CARB can also use its toxics  
13 authority to require owners and operators of certain  
14 freight facilities to make charging or fueling  
15 infrastructure available to equipment operators, and to  
16 ensure that only compliant equipment is allowed on-site.

17           CARB can prioritize rulemaking, based on  
18 community risk to achieve that greatest health benefits  
19 first, and CARB can continue to work in close coordination  
20 with the South Coast Air District, and any other districts  
21 considering new ISR rules to weave in the state and local  
22 regulations together

23           This is important to maximize their  
24 effectiveness.

25           Let's now turn to the nine new actions that CARB

1 staff will undertake for freight.

2 Each slide highlights the proposed action and  
3 lists some of the considerations that must be evaluated  
4 and addressed in the public process during development.

5 --o0o--

6 AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

7 We'll start with drayage trucks serving ports and  
8 railyards.

9 CARB's existing rule and port initiatives  
10 transform the drayage truck fleet from the dirtiest to the  
11 cleanest in the state. The next step is to move to zero  
12 emission operations everywhere possible.

13 First, staff will advocate for drayage truck  
14 rates at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach that  
15 provide clear market and financial advantages to zero and  
16 near-zero emission truck trips.

17 Second, staff will develop a statewide rule for  
18 drayage trucks to direct transition to zero emission  
19 operations.

20 The many technology demonstration projects  
21 underway will provide valuable information on performance  
22 and costs for the regulation.

23 --o0o--

24 AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

25 CARB is implementing existing rules that require

1 diesel PM controls for harbor craft and cargo handling  
2 equipment. For harbor craft, the next step is for CARB  
3 staff to develop lower emission standards for both new and  
4 in-use vessels. We expect this effort to focus on cleaner  
5 combustion and hybrid systems.

6 For the cargo handle equipment used at ports and  
7 railyards transitioning to zero emission -- zero emissions  
8 requires substantial planning and investments in the  
9 associated charging or fueling infrastructure. It also  
10 raises the prospect that marine terminal operators might  
11 choose to automate some operations concurrently, which  
12 would impact labor.

13 Staff is proposing to develop the harbor craft  
14 regulation first, because the sector offers the  
15 opportunity to achieve greater reductions in toxic diesel  
16 PM and NOx emissions than cargo handling equipment.

17 --o0o--

18 AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

19 The federal Clean Air Act preempts California  
20 from setting emission standards for the newer  
21 remanufactured locomotives that generate most of the  
22 emissions and health risk from rail operations.

23 CARB staff is proposing to focus on two areas  
24 where we have authority. First, a new regulation that  
25 would limit idling of all combustion-powered vehicles and





1 centers. CARB is forming anew team to respond to this  
2 priority.

3 --o0o--

4 AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

5 This table lists the nine additional actions that  
6 we've described to reduce the impact of freight pollution  
7 in communities. This is beyond the dozen freight  
8 commitments currently in the SIP.

9 Given the importance of freight, we will provide  
10 an annual update to the Board describing our progress, as  
11 well as highlighting any issues and changes that need to  
12 be considered.

13 --o0o--

14 AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

15 The nine additional actions are a part of a suite  
16 of approaches that comprise CARB's path forward to reduce  
17 emissions from freight facilities, and lower the health  
18 impacts in nearby communities.

19 New regulations that require equipment owners and  
20 facility operators to participate in the transition to  
21 zero emissions, support for any district's facility-based  
22 measures and port initiatives, stricter federal standards  
23 for trucks and locomotives, and international standards  
24 for ships, incentives that support the transition to zero  
25 emissions operations through grants and other means. All

1 of these actions will work together to protect communities  
2 near freight facilities, and support the goals of the  
3 Community Air Protection Program established under AB 617.

4 Thank you for your attention and we welcome any  
5 questions or comments that you may have.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks. It's obviously a  
7 complicated agenda, but I know that there is also a lot of  
8 people here wanting to urge us to do more and to do it  
9 faster and so forth. So I think we really ought to hear  
10 from them, but if there are any questions at this point.  
11 I don't see any.

12 Oh, I do. Sorry. Dr. Sperling.

13 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Just to try to  
14 understand, it is complicated. There's a slide -- the  
15 second set of slides, 13, that was on distribution  
16 centers. It shows that in 2023 trucks play -- have almost  
17 no impact. And it's all on-site equipment.

18 And I heard a -- I thought I heard that rules had  
19 already been adopted to deal with the -- no, that's not  
20 it. I think it's 30 according to your -- we have a  
21 different set of numbers here.

22 Yeah, that's it. So it shows that trucks have  
23 almost no role in warehouses and distribution centers in  
24 2023. And it's almost all on-site equipment. And I  
25 thought I heard a comment that rules had already been

1 adopted on on-site equipment.

2           And then on slide 34, there was a reference to  
3 new CARB rules to transition cargo handling equipment to  
4 zero emission. Can you explain -- I mean, this is really  
5 important, because it's kind of the key -- one of the key  
6 strategies and key problems here.

7           Am I understanding this right?

8           TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:

9           Yes, professor Sperling. This is Cynthia Marvin.  
10 If you look at slide -- the slide on distribution center  
11 risk. We do see that dramatic improvement -- that  
12 dramatic reduction in trucks. The reason that you don't  
13 see a noticeable change in the on-site equipment, that  
14 equipment is regulated under our off-road equipment  
15 regulations. Most of the benefits have already been  
16 implemented by 2016.

17           So you see relatively consistent emissions  
18 between 2016 and 2023. The equipment that operates at  
19 warehouse and distribution centers is not covered under  
20 our Cargo Handling Equipment Rule, which is specific to  
21 ports and railyards.

22           But there are commitments in the SIP to look at  
23 zero-emission operations for off-road equipment, which  
24 would certainly consider some of the equipment that would  
25 operate at a distribution center. There's also the SIP

1 commitment to look at zero-emission forklifts.

2           So both of these things will help address some of  
3 the equipment that's operating at those facilities.

4           BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So to the extent we're  
5 worried about warehouses and distribution centers, that's  
6 what we should be focusing on it sounds like, that  
7 on-site, equipment, right?

8           TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:

9           Relatively, yes. But, of course, we're concerned  
10 about all of it. The other thing is that these analyses  
11 are a snapshot of what's happening on site at the  
12 facility. It doesn't include the additional emissions and  
13 exposure that happens as those trucks travel to and from  
14 the facility. So the impacts on the community from trucks  
15 would be larger than what you see as this narrower view of  
16 just the impacts from what's happening at that facility  
17 itself.

18           BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So when you say on-site  
19 truck, you draw a boundary -- you know, maybe a quarter  
20 mile or something like that, is that what that means?

21           TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:

22           In this particular case, this is only the truck  
23 operations on the physical property of the facility.

24           BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Okay. Thank you.

25           TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:

1           So the -- the answer is always is we care about  
2 all of it.

3           BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Thank you.

4           BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I had a question. I had a  
5 comment.

6           CHAIR NICHOLS: Another question, yes.

7           BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: So I just wanted to amplify  
8 one thing. In the presentation, you state that local air  
9 districts have the strongest authority to develop ISR  
10 rules. I'm already hearing there may be some push-back to  
11 that.

12           So I'd like to understand, I know we'll discuss  
13 this more later, what conversations you've had with local  
14 air districts on this, and what you've heard from local  
15 air districts?

16           ASSISTANT CHIEF COUNSEL SEGALL: Sure. I'll take  
17 that one, Supervisor. This is Craig Segall.

18           We've spoken with several of the districts,  
19 including South Coast and Bay Area, met with Greg Nudd, I  
20 believe, at Bay Area recently and discussed these issues  
21 with him. It seemed like a positive step forward there  
22 with some subtleties that I ma happy to talk through with  
23 you. South Coast has also posted a public memo on their  
24 authority affirming it recently.

25           BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: A public memo on their

1 website?

2 ASSISTANT CHIEF COUNSEL SEGALL: Yes, that's  
3 correct.

4 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: There's already comments on  
5 it.

6 ASSISTANT CHIEF COUNSEL SEGALL: That's my  
7 understanding and we can get you a copy as well.

8 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yeah, if you can send it,  
9 that would be great.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Dr. Sherriffs.

11 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Thank you. A couple --  
12 a couple questions about freight. I've always wanted to  
13 drive a locomotive.

14 (Laughter.)

15 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: But to share my  
16 ignorance and why they won't let me in the cab obviously.

17 You know, the locomotives by the bar graphs are a  
18 huge contribution to the intermodal rail yard cancer risk.  
19 And I'm looking at the next steps slide and railyard  
20 idling and non-preemptive locomotives are pretty far out.  
21 And, you know, I'm ignorant, how hard is it to turn off a  
22 locomotive and then turn it back on? I'm wondering how we  
23 move that up.

24 It doesn't sound like it needs a lot of new  
25 technology to -- but I don't know.

1 TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:

2 I wish things were that simple. Part of the  
3 complexity on this particular issue is that there are  
4 federal regulations already that affect the same  
5 locomotives. There are some regulations that require  
6 certain safety and testing. And so it's always a bit  
7 challenging to determine what is necessary, i.e. federally  
8 mandated idling and what is unnecessary idling, which is  
9 the piece that we can tackle.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Let's go to our witnesses  
11 then. Have we got the list projected here yet?

12 It will be in a moment.

13 Okay. So now you can see where you are in the  
14 line, and beginning with our first Ms. Rizvi. Please come  
15 to the podium here, yeah. Hi.

16 MS. RIZVI: Good afternoon. My name is Maha  
17 Rizvi. And I am here representing Assembly Member Eloise  
18 Gomez Reyes. And I'm here reading her letter.

19 "Dear, Chair Nichols and members of the Board.  
20 In February of last year, I wrote a letter to South Coast  
21 Air Quality Management District(SCAQMD), regarding the  
22 review of its air quality management plan. In it, I  
23 stated, 'Although we understand the need to collaborate  
24 with stakeholders around what may be done voluntarily, we  
25 cannot delay action'.

1           "Further, I made clear that need of emissions  
2 reductions standards that improve the quality of life for  
3 residents across California, ultimately actions by the  
4 SCAQMD has stalled. I have been heartened by the Air  
5 Resources Board(ARB) and staff activity, and along with  
6 advocates, thank you for work being done to prioritize  
7 addressing pollution from freight facilities.

8           "There is a lot to like regarding the proposed  
9 regulation for drayage trucks, cargo handling equipment,  
10 and enforcement action, which includes a new freight  
11 handbook. However, there is still much work that needs to  
12 be done, and it is imperative that we speed up Board  
13 action and engage meaningfully in and discussions around  
14 more stringent regulations.

15           "Specifically, I am disappointed that contrary to  
16 my previous letter, local air districts still seem to be  
17 focused almost exclusively on an incentive-based approach  
18 to clean up freight. This is not to say that incentives  
19 should not be part of the equation.

20           "During my time in the legislature, I have  
21 successfully advocated for hundreds of millions in  
22 investments into our State's most successful medium- and  
23 heavy-duty vehicle programs. However, in order to get  
24 where the State desires to go, involve markets, and  
25 protect our most vulnerable communities, regulations such



1 as Indirect Source Rule must be taken seriously.

2 "Given the current lack of action, ARB must take  
3 the lead. Although, I am mindful that regulations cannot  
4 be crafted overnight, we cannot further delay regulation  
5 that of those around zero-emission cargo handling  
6 equipment proposed to be completed by 2022, especially  
7 since they were expected this year. Taking swift action  
8 to address the number one source of transportation-related  
9 pop -- pollution in California, it must be one of the  
10 Board's top priorities.

11 "I recommend in order to accelerate the timeline  
12 for freight regulation, ARB temporarily redirect staff to  
13 reflect their prioritization.

14 "I often state that my constituents are usually  
15 sold a false narrative that they can have either clean air  
16 or good jobs, but not both. It is our..." --

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Go ahead.

18 MS. RIZVI: Okay. "It is our responsibility as  
19 government to help evolve the economy to protect  
20 communities like mine who want both environmental quality  
21 and economic prosperity. I look forward to working with  
22 advocates, the Board, and SCAQMD to enact solutions that  
23 enforce this ideal.

24 "Sincerely, Eloise Gomez Reyes. Assembly Member,  
25 47th District".

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

3 Good afternoon.

4 DR. LYOU: Good afternoon. We're really close  
5 here. My name is misspelled, but that's okay. A lot of  
6 people do that.

7 (Laughter.)

8 DR. LYOU: I'm Joe Lyou. I am the Governor's  
9 appointee to the South Coast AQMD Governing Board and have  
10 been for the past 10 years. And Chair Nichols, I don't  
11 know if you remember, but we went through confirmation  
12 together 10 years ago.

13 Oh, yes. Actually, Dr. Balmes you were there  
14 too. And she was cool as a cucumber, like no problem.  
15 Walk in the park, and I was nervous as all get out and go.

16 But anyway, it's been 10 years. I've been asked  
17 by my counsel to let everybody know that I'm speaking on  
18 behalf of myself, not on behalf of the governing board.  
19 As you might know, that our governing board hasn't really  
20 taken a position on what staff is -- your staff is  
21 proposing here, and also hasn't come to conclusion about  
22 what we're going to do about our indirect source rules or  
23 not.

24 And I'll get to that in a little bit. But I want  
25 to remind you of a couple of things that are of key

1 importance. Forty-five percent NOx emission reductions by  
2 2023, and that's above and beyond what we've already  
3 adopted. So that's what we have to do in order to attain  
4 our most pressing criteria pollutant standard on time for  
5 the Clean Air Act. And so the reminder is really that we  
6 have a long way to go, and we have a very short time to do  
7 it.

8           Secondly, the Governor issued his Sustainable  
9 Freight Action Plan not that long ago. And within that  
10 action plan was an analysis provided by your staff that  
11 the Governor signed off on that showed that the  
12 consequences of the freight industry operations in  
13 California were an estimated 2,200 premature deaths per  
14 year, at a cost of \$20 billion annually.

15           So there are serious public health consequences,  
16 and serious economic consequences of not -- of delaying  
17 action and not acting quickly. So the recommendation, as  
18 Chair Nichols said, do more sooner if you can at all  
19 possibilities.

20           When I attended workshops on this issue, your  
21 staff indicated to us that they had to make some choices  
22 about doing things sequentially instead of simultaneously  
23 when it came to rulemaking. I'm encouraging you, please  
24 provide them the resources to do the rulemaking  
25 simultaneously, so that the rules can come to you sooner

1 rather than later.

2           And lastly, we -- I want to remind you that when  
3 the South Coast AQMD adopted its Air Quality Management  
4 Plan, we made a commitment to assist you in this process  
5 of dealing with mobile sources. Now, I need to be careful  
6 here, because we have an open thing -- open hearing  
7 process going on at South Coast. And as Mayor Pro Tem  
8 Mitchell and I are both in the room, we have to be careful  
9 about Brown Act issues, but I think that the staff  
10 presentation on what South Coast is proposing to do and  
11 what South Coast may actually end up doing, maybe two  
12 different things.

13           We need you to do everything you can. So I can  
14 answer some questions perhaps, but we need to be a little  
15 careful on what we say.

16           Okay. Thank you.

17           CHAIR NICHOLS: Understood.

18           Thank you.

19           MR. JORDAN: Good afternoon, Chair Nichols,  
20 members of the Board. I'm Tom Jordan with the San Joaquin  
21 Valley Air District. I'm here today to speak in support  
22 of ARB going forward with an aggressive mobile source  
23 statewide strategy. In particular, the efforts to get  
24 early implementation of the optional low-NOx standard and  
25 zero emission equipment throughout the state.

1           We are the other part of the State that needs  
2 substantial NOx emission reductions. And as most of you  
3 recall, our challenge is similar in scope to South Coast.  
4 The pollutant that's driving our issue right now is  
5 particulates rather than ozone. We still have an ozone  
6 challenge, but particulates the more pressing of the two  
7 issues.

8           The reason that's important is the timeframe with  
9 which we have to get to attainment is very short. Whereas  
10 you're looking in the 2030s for ozone, we're looking in  
11 the mid-2020s for particulate matter.

12           You guys will probably also remember that your  
13 Board directed your staff to work with us on looking for  
14 everything that both the State and the locals could do to  
15 attain that standard as quickly as possible. We're very  
16 near to -- my understanding is the modeling is very close  
17 to being finalized, demonstrating attainment. We have  
18 gone back to our rules and looked for everything we can do  
19 to tighten up on our sources. And the State has done the  
20 same on the mobile source.

21           But like South Coast, the only way we're going to  
22 get there is with an aggressive program to clean up  
23 heavy-duty equipment. And so we're fully supportive of  
24 that.

25           The discussion of the Indirect Source Rule and

1 warehouse and distribution facilities, it was mentioned  
2 we've had a rule for 10 years, which is correct. And  
3 we've seen a lot of benefits from that in cleaning up  
4 truck fleets. We actually had to go back and modify our  
5 rule this last year, because there was a -- kind of some  
6 land-use issues where some of the industrial facilities  
7 didn't fall under ISR. But we've tightened that up to  
8 make sure those facilities are now part of the rule as  
9 well.

10 But once again, we're fully supportive of the  
11 State pushing forward for reductions from heavy duty.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

13 I hesitate to do this, because we're getting to  
14 the point in the day when everybody has reasons why they  
15 would like to go first, but we had a special request of  
16 the clerk earlier on behalf of Michele Hasson, who is  
17 number 13 on the list and is the person who's going to be  
18 presenting a letter, I believe, on behalf of the CCAEJ.  
19 So if you would go head, Michele.

20 MS. HASSON: Thank you, Chair Nichols. I very  
21 much appreciate the switch up in procedure. Very much  
22 appreciated.

23 I not only will present a little bit about the  
24 letter, but more than anything I really want to talk about  
25 two things that aren't in the letter, time and

1 accountability. Today, I come humbly before you trying to  
2 represent 13 community members that could not speak today,  
3 because we were misinformed about time. We had a call  
4 with staff three days ago and were told that we should be  
5 able to expect our community to testify at 11:00. It's  
6 now 3:00, and I don't think our community would have made  
7 it. They have lives. They had to go, and they stayed all  
8 day. They stayed until 1:30 and wanted the opportunity to  
9 engage with this process. And because of time, they  
10 weren't able to. And who can we hold accountable? I  
11 understand how difficult staff's job is. I would never  
12 question that.

13           But there needs to be a level of accountability  
14 to ensure that community -- when community reaches out to  
15 staff to say we want to coordinate, we want to work with  
16 you, please don't misrepresent the times, because it  
17 really limits 12 people that are from this community that  
18 couldn't speak today, and I come on their behalf.

19           Another thing, I really want to highlight about  
20 time, we have no more time. We need regulations. We  
21 don't need actions telling us that regulations will be on  
22 the books. We need regulations now.

23           We can't -- ARB is one of the primary regulatory  
24 agencies and enforcement agencies in the state, and you  
25 cannot enforce rules that are -- that take three years to

1 make. We need rules at the end of this year at the very  
2 least, because our communities are suffering.

3           And I know that's hard. I know it's hard, but it  
4 is so hard to have a child with asthma. It is so hard to  
5 take your day off and sit here all day with your small  
6 children while they are sick just because you want to  
7 speak, and you want to tell this Board how urgent it is,  
8 and you can't because of time.

9           We don't have time anymore. We also don't have  
10 time to not -- to be falling between the cracks of  
11 accountability and authority. Last year, you stood before  
12 us and said that in one year we would review the South  
13 Coast Air Quality Management District's plan for an  
14 Indirect Source Rule. And here we are, and we have  
15 nothing.

16           We have a Board that is poised to refuse to admit  
17 that staff's recommendations are valid and logical. They  
18 will not even start on a rulemaking process. We need you  
19 to hold them accountable. What is it -- we would like ARB  
20 to come back and tell us what can you do to hold our South  
21 Coast Air Quality Management District accountable, when  
22 they will not take the time to even start rulemaking.

23           So on behalf of the community that can't be here  
24 and the time that I have been allotted, I thank you all.  
25 And I request please give our community the time to speak,



1 and please hold yourselves accountable to the supreme  
2 honor that you have to make rules and enforce them.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. We will stay here  
7 until we've heard from everybody. And I do apologize if  
8 there was a miscommunication about when this item was  
9 going to be called.

10 Thank you.

11 DR. JAKPOR: Thank you. My name is Dr. Karen  
12 Jakpor. I'm here to speak with you today as a physician  
13 volunteer with the American Lung Association's Doctors for  
14 Climate Health Campaign. I'm both a physician and a  
15 patient here in Riverside. I've been admitted to the  
16 hospital or the emergency room so many times, I've lost  
17 track because of asthma. And I even had to give up my  
18 medical practice because of asthma.

19 My friends in American Lung Association sometimes  
20 say I'm like the canary in the coal mine because my  
21 breathing goes up and down daily depending on the air  
22 quality conditions.

23 My daughter is unable to play outdoors 100 days  
24 per year, because I can't supervise her outside on  
25 unhealthful air days. Along with our coalition partners

1 here today, the American Lung Association supports the  
2 Board's efforts to move forward with strong regulations  
3 for cleaning up railyards, trucks at warehouses, port  
4 equipment, and ships. Our major concerns is with the time  
5 it will take to adopt and implement these rules and  
6 deliver on the critical health benefits we know we need.

7           We need certainty that there will be staff  
8 resources available to create the clean air rules. We  
9 need certainty that the ARB will have local partners in  
10 directly reducing pollution from freight facilities  
11 throughout the State.

12           We need certainty that we will see relief come as  
13 quickly possible from pollution hot spots that contribute  
14 to asthma, heart attacks, cancers, and premature births  
15 and deaths.

16           We need certainty that we can move beyond clean  
17 air grant discussions to strong rules and enforceable  
18 actions that deliver real lasting relief. Zero-emission  
19 solutions are the key to this certainty. And strong  
20 actions by the Board are needed to drive these benefits as  
21 quickly as possible.

22           The public health risk analysis highlights that  
23 we need to move forward with a broad suite of measures as  
24 quickly as possible to reduce health risks. As a resident  
25 affected by warehouse scene industry, I welcome the

1 creation of the freight hub enforcement team to the  
2 ongoing discussion of how we can move more quickly to cut  
3 pollution across the freight industry.

4 I need your support to be able to breathe and  
5 you'll have our support in getting us there.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

8 (Applause.)

9 MS. TOMLEY: Good afternoon. I'm Heather Tomley,  
10 Environmental Planning Director for the Port of Long  
11 Beach. I first want to thank the Air Resources Board  
12 staff for their long working relationship with the port.  
13 Through an approach of early voluntary action at the port  
14 supported by statewide source control regulations, and the  
15 monumental efforts of our industry partners, our port's  
16 emission's inventory has shown significant emission  
17 reductions in a little over a decade.

18 We recognize there's more work to be done. So to  
19 build on this progress, the boards for the two ports  
20 recently approved the third iteration to our Clean Air  
21 Action Plan setting forth aggressive goals to move to zero  
22 emissions.

23 Achieving these goals will be a huge challenge  
24 and will require all of us to continue to work together  
25 collaboratively. We're very appreciative of the grant

1 funding support by the Air Resources Board over the years  
2 to help support these efforts. Funding for early action  
3 to accelerate vehicle turnover to install electrical  
4 infrastructure and to demonstrate emerging technologies  
5 has been a critical component to achieve these emission  
6 reductions and will continue to be a critical component  
7 into the future.

8 We look forward to continued cooperation with  
9 your agency and other stakeholders as we work to  
10 demonstrate these new cleaner technologies to evaluate  
11 their feasibility, and to identify the remaining  
12 challenges for drop -- broad deployment, including  
13 operational capability, infrastructure availability and  
14 economic factors.

15 These studies and demonstrations need to play  
16 out, and will be a critical component to help inform our  
17 approach and to ensure we can be successful into the long  
18 term. We support the prioritization identified for ARB  
19 actions, and we look forward to continuing to work with  
20 your staff through the details on development of new  
21 strategies to reduce emissions from freight sources, and  
22 advancing our shared goals for clean air.

23 Thank you.

24 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

25 MR. ROSENFELD: Thank you, Board members. I'm

1 Cody Rosenfield with the Coalition for Clean Air. First,  
2 I'm going to very quickly thank the staff and the Board  
3 for working so hard at trying to regulate these freight  
4 facilities.

5           The Coalition for Clean Air supports the freight  
6 facility measures and regulations proposed, but asks that  
7 the Board consider further stronger regulations and  
8 allocating more resources to accelerate the rulemaking and  
9 implementation timelines.

10           Last March, this Board directed staff to report  
11 back on concepts for an ISR regarding these facilities.  
12 The Board direction recognized that the State  
13 Implementation Plan with its overreliance on voluntary and  
14 unfunded incentive measures would not be adequate to  
15 achieve the emissions reductions necessary to bring the  
16 State into attainment with federal clean air standards.

17           Since that meeting a year ago, it's become very  
18 clear that air districts lack the will to adopt ISRs for  
19 freight facilities. Voluntary- and incentive-based  
20 programs must be balanced with enforceable regulations  
21 that drive innovation and investment in clean  
22 technologies.

23           We continue to believe that facility-based  
24 emission limits are necessary to protecting community  
25 health, and we urge CARB to work with the air districts to

1 see that those limits are adopted.

2           Meanwhile, infrastructure projects that bring  
3 more freight vehicles to highways and communities are  
4 being approved, and more warehouse are being built every  
5 day in Southern California. This growing problem  
6 necessitates a faster timeline than proposed by CARB staff  
7 for many of the regulations and measures.

8           In light of the failure of air districts to make  
9 headway on effective ISRs, CARB should pursue direct  
10 technology controls on trucks, trains, ships, and  
11 equipment as proposed by staff. We support transition to  
12 zero-emission engines wherever the technology exists. And  
13 for vehicle and equipment, where there is no viable  
14 alternative, we support near-zero technology paired with  
15 low carbon renewable fuels.

16           We support moving forward expeditiously with  
17 rulemakings on drayage trucks commercial harbor craft,  
18 cargo handling equipment, locomotives, and railyard  
19 equipment, as well as with infrastructure requirements for  
20 these facilities.

21           We understand that staff will need additional  
22 resources to -- in order to begin the rulemaking process  
23 for all these measures simultaneously rather than one at a  
24 time. CARB must allocate further staff to tackle this  
25 problem and protect communities that continue to be harmed

1 by the freight industry. Delaying these timelines not  
2 only postpones the transition to cleaner vehicles and  
3 cleaner air, but sets a precedent that CARB deadlines are  
4 fluid at a time when there's more urgency than ever,  
5 especially if there's any hope to reach attainment with  
6 state and federal clean air standards.

7 We believe the proposed measures and regulations  
8 are a good starts, but should only be the first step  
9 toward reining in emissions from these sources. The Board  
10 should consider stronger direct controls going forward and  
11 provide the staff necessary to fast track these rules.

12 The Coalition for Clean Air remains supportive of  
13 the freight handbook that will give other agencies tools  
14 to tackle this problem on the ground.

15 Thank you for your time and consideration.

16 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

17 MR. GARZA: Good evening, Board of Supervisors.  
18 My name is Cristian Garza. I'm a volunteer at Sierra Club  
19 and youth council member of the air quality management  
20 district.

21 I am born in Mecca, California. It's a small  
22 farmworkers town. Literally, you go 10 feet to the right  
23 of the end road, farm; 10 feet to the right, farm. It's  
24 about a mile and half -- a mile and a half long. Small  
25 little town, right?

1 I have a dying sea, 10 miles back the Salton Sea.  
2 I have helicopters that fly by and pour pesticides on all  
3 the fields that are, what, five feet away from my  
4 school -- my elementary schools. And what I'm trying to  
5 get at here is that you don't need to know that the air is  
6 bad. You can see the dust. You walk outside, you can see  
7 the smog.

8 I -- I'm personally -- I'm tired of waiting for  
9 tests. We know that the air is bad. We know it's not  
10 good for us. We know there's toxins in the air, all these  
11 particulate matter. And I'm here to ask for action. I  
12 was born with asthma. Two years ago, I had an asthma  
13 attack that resulted in a collapsed lung. I actually  
14 almost nearly died, because of my collapsed lung.

15 The doctor told me if I -- if I did not get there  
16 10 minutes before I got there, I would have died. My  
17 whole lung would have collapsed. In that moment, I  
18 realized it was that much more serious for me. And I am  
19 just -- I was the lucky one. I am one of hundreds of  
20 thousands of kids in my valley that are -- we're allowed.  
21 I had the chance to live a second time. And I'm grateful  
22 for that. That's why I'm here, because for the ones that  
23 could not make it that day. I'm here because I got a  
24 second chance.

25 And I'm here because I don't want to go through



1 that again. I don't want to see my mom have to see her  
2 child go through that again. I don't want to see any  
3 other parent have to see their child go through that  
4 again. It's terrifying. So I'm here saying stop with the  
5 tests. You know, we have the data. We have the  
6 information. I've done a lot -- I go through all the  
7 logistics work. I go to the meetings. I know it's a big  
8 process, but we need action by the end of this year. Some  
9 plan, something in the works or our community is going to  
10 slowly die off.

11 And I love this place. I every -- I love my  
12 community. I love my valley, and I don't want to see that  
13 happen. So for my valley, my people, and my community,  
14 you, I wish more action by the end of the year.

15 Thank you for your time.

16 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

17 Bianca.

18 (Applause.)

19 MS. VILLANUEVA: Good afternoon, Chair Nichols,  
20 members of the Board. My name is Bianca Villanueva. And  
21 I am here to read a statement on behalf of CAPA.

22 On behalf of the California Association of Port  
23 Authorities, CAPA, which is comprised of the state's 11  
24 publicly-owned ports, we are pleased to submit the  
25 following brief comments regarding the informational

1 update on concepts to minimize the community health  
2 impacts from freight facilities.

3 CAPA sincerely appreciates the efforts of CARB  
4 staff to work with all stakeholders. We thank you for  
5 maintaining an open dialogue with our ports and with the  
6 freight industry. Ports share the same goals to reduce  
7 impacts from port operations, but we may take different  
8 approaches to get there.

9 We strongly believe that a robust study,  
10 including a careful examination of potential cargo  
11 diversion and related job loss must be undertaken as  
12 additional efforts are considered. This study should also  
13 include a thorough analysis of potential emissions  
14 leakage. Cargo, diverted to ports in other states and  
15 nations, and then trucked into California could  
16 significantly increase local emissions and greenhouse gas  
17 concerns.

18 CAPA believes that the imposition of a statewide  
19 Indirect Source Rule for freight facilities is  
20 unnecessary. Thank you.

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

22 MR. HAMILTON: Good afternoon now. Kevin  
23 Hamilton, Central California Asthma Collaborative, and  
24 also a member of the California Clean Freight Coalition.  
25 And I believe you have our letter already submitted to you

1 on that, so I'm not going to belabor that point.

2           Instead, I'm going to express my concerns with  
3 this plan and the timelines it expresses, and the changes  
4 that have been made or the proposals that have been made  
5 around them. The San Joaquin Valley can't wait for this.  
6 Your timelines are stretched out way too long now.

7           A year ago, we stood right here in this spot and  
8 I stood right here at this podium, and I watched Mr. De La  
9 Torre put a resolution in effect that this Board adopted  
10 to commit to this process and to move it forward  
11 expeditiously.

12           And the goal was by now we would have some  
13 kind -- at least a commitment and some draft rules ready  
14 to go or regulations that we could look at. That's what I  
15 took away from it. And I'm not seeing those. I'm excited  
16 about the plans for the things that I'm seeing. This  
17 freight handbook, great thing. We've been working on that  
18 with staff. I really think it's a beautiful thing coming  
19 forward. I'm not excited about the fact that it's now in  
20 two different chapters with one coming much later than the  
21 others.

22           But I want to be very specific. So we need the  
23 mobile source reductions in the San Joaquin Valley in  
24 order for you to honor your commitment to us for our SIP  
25 to work. It's as simple as that. When I look at dates

1 for trucks for lower use performance level multiple regs,  
2 and I see a date that drifts between 2018 and '24, '24 is  
3 not going to cut it for us. We need all these things by  
4 2021.

5           Okay. If we can't get them by then, we can't  
6 start getting clean enough air to meet our SIP commitment,  
7 which means you don't meet your SIP commitments. So  
8 without them, we lose. Advance Clean Trucks Regulation  
9 last mile delivery, those trucks are all over our region.  
10 We know that 80 percent of these trucks -- the trucks in  
11 our valley belong to us. They originate in the valley and  
12 they end in the valley. They are last mile trucks. They  
13 are drayage trucks.

14           I'm very concerned about the freight handbook.  
15 We have a number of areas in the valley that are being  
16 considered for inland port status, already in South Kern,  
17 Merced is moving forward with this idea. I expect Fresno  
18 to be not far behind. If they're an inland port, you  
19 should treat them as ports.

20           They should have the same assets and incentives  
21 that ports have, because they have all the same stuff,  
22 other than a few ships and a crane. But everything else  
23 on that site is looking pretty much the same. And we need  
24 those same incentives in the valley.

25           Not only that, we don't have the ocean wind

1 coming in every afternoon changing the tide and taking the  
2 pollution back out with it occasionally or the Santa Ana  
3 winds coming through twice a year. Not that people aren't  
4 suffering under the pollution in between that, don't get  
5 me wrong. We don't have anything like that in the valley.

6           Instead, we have stagnation events. I mean, you  
7 haven't lived, till you've lived through a stagnation  
8 event. Over between Christmas and New Year's, we had one,  
9 where particulate matter PM2.5 hit 156 mics one day.  
10 That's incredible. That's higher than the pollution --  
11 particulate pollution in Beijing China. I mean, this is  
12 crazy.

13           So we need your help, and we need it now, because  
14 the valley is also growing. This freight transport is  
15 growing. You're running out of space down here. So where  
16 is it dumping over into? The other place where there's  
17 land. We got your used cows last time, so now we're  
18 getting -- and I'm really worried about your used port  
19 equipment.

20           If we're not designated a port, where are you  
21 going to put all that used stuff that you change over for  
22 zero equipment down there. I'm very concerned about that,  
23 and I hope you understand it.

24           So as you look down this list, please think of  
25 the numbers 2021, and direct staff appropriately and give

1 them the resources they need in order to accomplish that,  
2 and we'll help you advocate with the industry to do that.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Mr. Minault.

7 MR. MINAULT: Thank you. Thank you, Board. Kent  
8 Minault from the Sierra Club.

9 I want to thank staff for the very detailed and  
10 well thought out report that they just made. And I liked  
11 a lot of what I heard, but I have a concern. I heard  
12 staff say that the principle of the report was deploy  
13 zero-emission vehicles wherever feasible, zero-emission  
14 everywhere else.

15 My concern is what do you mean feasible?

16 I mean, I just made a quick calculation between  
17 the ports in San Pedro and Long Beach to the center of the  
18 logistics industry in Fontana is about 70 miles. Right  
19 now, you've got battery electric tractor -- or truck  
20 tractors that can make that trip on one charge, so that's  
21 feasible, right? I didn't hear any detail about those  
22 kind of things in the report. And I'm interested in that.

23 And here's the fine point of it, community health  
24 impacts from freight hauling will not be seriously reduced  
25 by so-called near-zero vehicles. Rather, those impacts

1 will be moved from communities near warehouses to  
2 communities near fracking sites and gas storage facilities  
3 like Aliso Canyon.

4 Now, before I made the point that zero-emission  
5 battery electrics are key to serious job growth, when you  
6 implement incentives and regulations, you must distinguish  
7 clearly between zero-zero and real zero and seriously  
8 prioritize the zero.

9 And finally, would you explain to all of us,  
10 please, what happened to the \$23.6 million this Board gave  
11 to South Coast Air Quality Management District in 2016,  
12 specifically for battery-powered trucks? Please tell us  
13 what happened to that money. Thank you so much.

14 (Applause.)

15 MS. PORTILLO: Hi, Board members. My name is  
16 Esther Portillo. I'm with the Center for Community Action  
17 and Environmental Justice.

18 First of all, I would like to say that our  
19 community members and our organization felt really  
20 disrespected that due to the fact that the -- you  
21 prolonged this meeting. I came here at about 8:58 a.m.,  
22 and when I walked into the -- to this room, everybody was  
23 chit chatting. And I was actually really surprised that  
24 this Board wasn't meeting as soon as 9:00 a.m.

25 Our community members are used to coming to city

1 call -- sorry, city hall meetings, they go to planning  
2 commission meetings, some of our community members here  
3 we're at a planning commission meeting to 10:00 o'clock on  
4 Tuesday night. So they're used to attending these type of  
5 meetings. But unfortunately, 20 or so were not able to  
6 stay. Actually one of our community members who has  
7 children with asthma had -- just had to leave about 15  
8 minutes ago, because she just couldn't stay anymore. She  
9 had to go back to her family. So I really think that as  
10 we proceed, we really have to respect the time of  
11 community.

12 I want to say that in the Inland region,  
13 currently, we have about -- about 1.2 billion square feet  
14 of warehousing. And SCAG just released some data that  
15 shows that they will need that two -- that the commerce  
16 and everything will need two billion more square feet of  
17 housing. So that means that in the next couple of years,  
18 we're going to need -- there's going to be three billion  
19 square feet of housing, and -- I'm sorry of warehousing.

20 And we already see this. We go to meetings, city  
21 council meeting, planning commission meetings where  
22 they're discussing and approving projects of a four  
23 million square foot warehouse. And they're estimating  
24 thousands of trucks coming to this warehouse. The draft  
25 EIRs are stating this.



1           This is not something that we've come up -- are  
2 projecting. This is in the Draft EIR. So we see this  
3 tidal wave of warehouses, tidal wave of trucks that are  
4 going to be coming into our communities. And the -- every  
5 year these warehouses get closer to our schools, closer to  
6 our neighborhoods. There's actually a -- really, I think  
7 it's 700,000 square feet of warehousing across the street  
8 from an elementary school.

9           I mean -- and it's just outrageous how this  
10 freight industry and the logistics industry really  
11 disrespect our community.

12           So what we're asking for is for protection. We  
13 need protection from this tidal wave of warehousing, this  
14 tidal wave of diesel trucks. And someone has to step up,  
15 because our cities, our local jurisdictions are not  
16 stepping up. There's developers that are coming into our  
17 cities, they're buying off our city council members,  
18 they're buying off our planning commissioners.

19           So someone has to take the next step to protect  
20 our health and to really regulate and enforce some laws on  
21 these -- on this industries.

22           Thank you very much.

23           CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Thank you.

24           (Applause.)

25           MR. CORT: Hi there. I am not Adrian Martinez.

1 My name is Paul Cort. I am also with Earthjustice.

2 First, I want to say that we definitely support  
3 the new proposals to address freight. But as you've heard  
4 from many folks, there's still much more that needs to be  
5 done. I think there were three issues that were not  
6 addressed in the staff's proposal, three questions that  
7 you need to be asking and getting answers to.

8 First, why is staff delaying regulatory actions?  
9 In the SIP presentation, they presented a metric that said  
10 they would measure progress against the various deadlines,  
11 but there was no analysis, no showing of how those  
12 deadlines are being met. The Board resolution adopted  
13 last year called for cargo handling equipment rule by  
14 2019. Staff has decided that 2020, 2022 is better.

15 Staff has also proposed to push back the at-berth  
16 ship regulations, the Clean Transit Rule was supposed to  
17 be adopted last year, and we still have no proposal. And  
18 we can see, those of us working on it, that the clean  
19 truck rule is nowhere near on target to finished this year  
20 as promised.

21 If freight is to be a priority, resources must be  
22 shifted to make this happen. Now, we understand the  
23 arguments for a strong record to support some of these  
24 rules. But four years to develop that record, that's not  
25 about developing a record. That's about delaying the

1 start of that regulatory rulemaking process.

2           Second, if the freight strategy is to rely on  
3 local districts to adopt an Indirect Source Review rule,  
4 what is ARB's plan to make the districts adopt those  
5 rules?

6           This Board adopted Resolution 17-7, in part  
7 because the State Air Plan lacked specific action. I  
8 think Mr. Eisenhut referred to it as faith-based planning  
9 at the time.

10           Staff have concluded that ARB will not pursue its  
11 ISR rule, and will support local ISR rules, but they  
12 presented no plan for how those ISR rules will come into  
13 effect. Now, ARB may not want to specify what local air  
14 districts must and must not adopt, but ARB has the  
15 ultimate authority to reject plans that fail to meet air  
16 quality standards. And so if that's the sort of action  
17 that's being left off the table, ARB is within its  
18 jurisdiction to say, no, go back and try again.

19           Third, we heard that staff was going to report  
20 back on the metrics of incentives. Are we finding those  
21 incentives dollars that were assumed in the plans? Staff  
22 gave you no answer. The answer is no, we have not found  
23 the money that these plans assumed would be there to make  
24 all these voluntary actions possible.

25           South Coast needs a billion dollars a year

1 through 2031. Staff have identified a billion dollars  
2 statewide. And they have not done the analysis to show  
3 that the dollars that they have found fund the voluntary  
4 turnover of vehicles that all these plans assume.

5 If they're going to present metrics, they need to  
6 show you that this plan is not on target.

7 Thank you.

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks, Mr. Cort.

9 (Applause.)

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Joy Williams I guess is next.

11 MS. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon. I'm Joy Williams  
12 from Environmental Health Coalition in the San Diego  
13 Tijuana region.

14 We agree with the comments on staffing and  
15 timelines made by other residents of other communities  
16 impacted by freight. Reducing the health risk from  
17 freight is important in San Diego also. The Barrio Logan  
18 and Logan Heights areas, for example, are in the top 5  
19 percent statewide on the CalEnviroScreen diesel  
20 particulate matter indicator. And we have children's  
21 asthma hospitalization rates three times the average for  
22 the region.

23 We strongly support new regulations that will  
24 require electrification of the freight industry. In the  
25 case of the 10th Avenue terminal in San Diego, the port is

1 committed to voluntary replacement of 26 pieces of  
2 cargo-handling equipment on a set schedule. And they've  
3 agreed to do that regardless of whether the increases in  
4 cargo throughput materialize or not. So that's a positive  
5 direction, and we're happy to see that.

6           However, those 26 pieces of cargo handling  
7 equipment only represent 22 percent of the total of what  
8 they have now. And that obviously would need to increase,  
9 if they get more cargo. So we believe regulations are  
10 needed to ensure that all the cargo handling equipment is  
11 replaced with zero-emission equipment.

12           Likewise, there's a number of port tenants who  
13 have gotten grants to -- to get a handful of drayage  
14 trucks that are zero emissions. But the large majority of  
15 drayage trucks are not zero-emission vehicles. No  
16 commitments have been made on harbor craft and we support  
17 an early timeline for moving this forward.

18           We continue to believe that facility caps are  
19 needed also, such as could be required under an Indirect  
20 Source Rule. Again, using the 10th Avenue terminal as an  
21 example, the mitigations for the expansion project itself  
22 have reduced the cancer risk to below 10 per million for  
23 that project.

24           However, the risk from the terminal as a whole is  
25 higher and there's another cargo terminal and a cruise

1 terminal that also generate freight-related health  
2 hazards.

3           We have urged the port to adopt facility-wide air  
4 quality and health goals, but they have not done so. So  
5 we support the freight handbook and we continue to  
6 appreciate that staff commented on the CEQA analysis for  
7 that terminal expansion, but we're still looking for  
8 enforceable facility standards.

9           Thank you.

10           MR. HERNANDEZ: Hello, Board. My name is Allen  
11 Hernandez. I am with CCAEJ. I'd like to start by  
12 expressing some very deep disappointment. We had 13  
13 community members come here this morning. They're really  
14 affected by the pollution, the trucks, the warehouses, the  
15 LNG tanks, everything going on in the community. They  
16 really wanted to share that testimony today. They  
17 couldn't. They had to go back home. Responsibilities.  
18 It's hard coming out on a Thursday at 9:00 a.m. So they  
19 stayed as long as they could, but ultimately they had to  
20 leave. So I'm very, you know, crestfallen over that,  
21 because they have a testimony I think everyone here needed  
22 to hear.

23           So I'll try my best to try to capture some of the  
24 sentiment going on. I'll share a little bit of myself. I  
25 grew up in Fontana. I'm a homeowner in Fontana now. And

1 on the south part of Fontana, they are building warehouses  
2 like crazy. They are, you know, taking over homes. It's  
3 kind of like an industrial gentrification. Like, really,  
4 there are -- there are full intact houses behind green  
5 construction fencing where people used to live.

6           They' putting this in residential neighborhoods,  
7 next to high schools. There's -- there's going to be a  
8 couple warehouses that are going to go up next to three  
9 high schools. Bloomington High School, Citrus High  
10 School, Jurupa Hills High School, and a middle school Ruth  
11 O. Harris. And there's nothing being done about it. What  
12 we would like to see is if you could use your power to put  
13 some pressure on the South Coast AQMD to start adopting an  
14 Indirect Source Rule for our communities, please.

15           Right now, these trucks are just running wild.  
16 They're coming in through our neighborhoods. My little  
17 niece, who's six years old lives right in the middle of  
18 what's becoming this new warehouse corridor in South  
19 Fontana, in Bloomington. She was diagnosed with  
20 respiratory problems at about nine months old and was  
21 finally told she had asthma at four years old.

22           So we have to regulate her running around, her  
23 being outside, which is really hard to do with six-year  
24 old. It's really something you don't want to do to a  
25 six-year old. You don't want to say, hey, like, stop

1 running around, don't be a child, right? You have to  
2 think about your health. This is a lot of the reality for  
3 a lot of our community in the region.

4           So what we're asking for is, you know, we need to  
5 see more action. We need to see it a lot quicker. And we  
6 need to see this Board really put a lot of pressure on our  
7 local AQMD to start doing something to mitigate some of  
8 this work to try to get us to zero emissions, because we  
9 are out of compliance. I mean, we are, you know, dying  
10 dead -- like daily. I think right now the stat is 15  
11 people die a day in our basin due to the bad air quality.

12           We really need to stop that. And I think one of  
13 the ways to start addressing that is really start focusing  
14 on an Indirect Source Rule.

15           So thank you very much.

16           (Applause.)

17           CHAIR NICHOLS: I just want to make sure that you  
18 all understand that we are here because we're presenting  
19 work that is being done or which is intended to be done by  
20 ARB. And we're also here to listen to what people have to  
21 say about that, and we respect and care about your views,  
22 and we'll be talking more about how we can respond.

23           But I don't want it to be thought that we just  
24 shuffled the hearings around. The Board was here at 9:00  
25 o'clock. We had a quorum. I had a hard time getting



1 everybody into their seats. And it was the audience that  
2 was not in their seats, not the Board members, and we  
3 ended up starting a few minutes, about 9:10 a.m.

4           So if there was confusion about when this item  
5 was going to happen, again, I would apologize about that.  
6 Although, I understand that information was conveyed to at  
7 least some representatives of the groups that are here now  
8 explaining that this wouldn't happen. This couldn't come  
9 up until afternoon, because we had another meeting that  
10 also involved a lot of community people, where we had to  
11 actually vote on something for regulatory purposes that  
12 started earlier.

13           So there was Absolutely no intent to delay, to  
14 inconvenience people. We don't ever want to do that. We  
15 wouldn't be here if that was our intent. So just please  
16 know that we're going to continue. We'll stay here as  
17 long as you want to and as long as we can, until they  
18 throw us out of the building to make sure that everybody  
19 gets heard.

20           So I just wanted to convey that. Otherwise,  
21 you're being great. It's fine to applaud. You're all  
22 doing it very politely, and that's really nice.

23           Thank you.

24           Okay. Next Penny Newman, I believe?

25           Is Penny still here?

1           No, she's not here. Okay.

2           Demi Espinoza.

3           MS. ESPINOZA: Hi. Good afternoon. Thank you  
4 for the opportunity to speak again today. Again, my name  
5 is Demi Espinoza. And I'm from Safe Routes to School  
6 National Partnership. I do most of my work in the Inland  
7 Empire, and I've been -- I'm a resident of Riverside,  
8 California. And, you know, I am here today because I'm  
9 concerned about the growing development of warehouses and  
10 freight facilities near schools and residents.

11           And when I grew up, it -- the picture looked a  
12 lot different. And I'm concerned about how a lot of the  
13 warehouses are being approved. And through our coalition  
14 work with environmental justice organizations, we've  
15 witnessed the policy struggle between freight warehouse  
16 expansion at the expense of children's health.

17           And the environmental justice and freight  
18 communities are carrying the burden of the struggle and  
19 paying the price for poorly regulated warehouse  
20 industries. So, for example, in the City of Fontana, we  
21 have witnessed warehouse expansions be approved through  
22 overriding considerations left and right.

23           Despite being in dangerous proximity to schools  
24 and residents who are already carrying the burden of a  
25 90th percentile CalEnviroScreen profile are low income and

1 disproportionately represent communities of color.

2           Furthermore, the project that I'm speaking of was  
3 documented to be inconsistent with the South Coast Air  
4 Quality Management Plan, inconsistent with CARB's  
5 recommendation for buffers between sensitive receptors and  
6 distribution centers, inconsistent with RTP S -- RTP SCS,  
7 and ultimately jeopardizes our region's ability to meet  
8 GHG reduction goals and SB 375.

9           And we elevate this example to demonstrate that  
10 we need to do -- we need to have more air quality  
11 accountability and cooperation from local, regional, and  
12 State agencies. The air quality management district needs  
13 to adopt an Indirect Source Rule to ensure accountability  
14 from logistic centers emitting harmful pollutants so close  
15 to schools.

16           CARB should not continue to approve air plans  
17 until the staff recommendations are integrated into the  
18 plan, and this rulemaking process for Indirect Source  
19 Rules is implemented.

20           I appreciate your consideration of these  
21 comments, and want to support the comments of local  
22 residents who were here today who may not have had the  
23 chance to speak, and environmental justice organizations  
24 who are here today. We hope and urge that you continue to  
25 work with regional/local agencies, but especially working

1 with community members to eliminate not minimize impacts  
2 from freight.

3 Thank you again.

4 (Applause.)

5 MS. PORTILLO: So Erika Flores and Jessica  
6 Rodriguez, Eduardo Galvani, they are three of the  
7 community members that had to leave. So Thomas Rocha will  
8 take their place.

9 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Welcome.

10 MR. ROCHA: Good afternoon, Chair Nichols, Vice  
11 Chair Berg, Board members, staff members, Senator Florez  
12 and Senator Lara. My name is Thomas Rocha. I'm from  
13 Bloomington, co-founder of the Concerned Neighbors of  
14 Bloomington. And as you can see by my shirt, Bloomington  
15 lives do matter.

16 Don't you just love this rain outside? That's  
17 God's way of cleaning the air, I guess another way of  
18 cleaning the air.

19 You know, Blooming is an incorporated area, a  
20 community of color. We live next to the 10 Freeway next  
21 to railroad yards. Some say we have two strikes against  
22 us. We love our community, and don't want to be forced to  
23 move out. But we are on the verge of being overtaken by  
24 warehouses, and these diesel-polluting trucks.

25 We are a strong community, and we are not afraid

1 to stand up to unscrupulous realtors or roofless  
2 developers. I have a job where I work 40 hours a week --  
3 40 plus hours a week to support my family. And I took off  
4 today because I thought it was very important for me and  
5 my family and my community to talk to you guys, and I  
6 waited all day. And I'm also here to speak on the 12  
7 people -- I'll be their voice for the people that had to  
8 leave earlier.

9 I have a full-time job though. That is to  
10 protect my wife, my children, my grandchildren, and now  
11 what has become protection of my community. You guys are  
12 very strong -- a very, very strong agency. You, too, have  
13 a job. Your job and responsibility is to protect our air,  
14 and protect the public from the harmful effects of air  
15 pollution and to ensure that we have a safe quality of  
16 life.

17 Here, in California, we're known as leaders. We  
18 are asking you to do your job and lead and protect our  
19 environment. It's time for you to stop making  
20 recommendations. It's time to close the loopholes. No  
21 more gray areas. It's time to start making regulations,  
22 have stricter standards, and stand up to corporations and  
23 be proactive instead of reactive, before it's too late.

24 It's a sad day in today's society when we let  
25 developers of warehouses build less than 70 next to homes.

1 Seventy feet, picture that. Everybody has a kid, or a  
2 grandchild that's been in little league. Home to first  
3 base is 60 feet. Can you imagine that behind your house?

4 Or less than 200 feet from an elementary school,  
5 or across the street from our little league parks. That's  
6 what's happening to now -- today.

7 When we walk away from these hearings today,  
8 let's put in place standards and regulations, let's make a  
9 regulation to keep warehouses and these diesel polluting  
10 trucks a minimum of 1,500 feet from our homes, schools,  
11 playgrounds. You guys cannot sit and be silent anymore.

12 Martin Luther King once said, there comes a time  
13 when silence becomes betrayal. Our lives begin to end the  
14 day we become silent about things that matter.

15 Thank you and God bless you.

16 (Applause.)

17 MS. CARLOS: Hello. My name is Ana Carlos, and  
18 I'm taking the place of Jessica Rodriguez someone who had  
19 to leave. I had a long letter written. I practiced it  
20 yesterday, but I'm just going to speak from the heart.  
21 I'm tired. I've been here all day. But I just want to  
22 speak fro the heart.

23 I live in Bloomington. It's a beautiful rural  
24 community. We do have the railyard, right, running right  
25 through the middle of our town. We have the 10 Freeway

1 running right through the middle of town. And now, we  
2 have a lot of proposed warehouses. And if they were more  
3 strategically placed, I'd be okay with that, you know, in  
4 the commercial industrial zones.

5 But what's happening is they are coming right  
6 into the middle of our neighborhoods in zones that are  
7 zoned for homes and right next to schools. And that's  
8 where I have the problem. I feel that this agency --  
9 well, actually, I was looking at your website, and I said,  
10 you know -- well, before I looked at the website, I said,  
11 wow, there has to be someone that can help us. This is an  
12 environmental injustice. There has to be an agency that  
13 can help us with cleaner air in our neighborhood.

14 And there I found CARB. And basically, one of  
15 your priorities should be environmental justice. And  
16 what's happening in Bloomington is an environmental  
17 injustice, because we are a poorer community, a community  
18 of color, they are targeting us. They're coming into us  
19 because we're easy targets. We already have the railyard.  
20 We already have trucks going in and out. And now they --  
21 to put warehouses in the middle of our neighborhoods,  
22 that's going to be a big health hazard for us.

23 We cannot just stand there. And I'm proposing  
24 something that seems very easy to me. I don't know how  
25 hard this would be, but I'm proposing that you implement

1 or enforce a rule that states no warehouses next to homes  
2 or schools, at least 1,500 feet away from homes or  
3 schools. That's -- that seems easy to me. That seems  
4 possible to me.

5 We have to set a standard, so that they don't  
6 keep coming in, because it -- they come up really quick.  
7 We can't wait a year for this. There already have been a  
8 law proposed, passed, and there's just more to come.  
9 They're overtaking our neighborhood, and we can't have  
10 this. There has to be a regulation that we can do a rule  
11 that states that they cannot come within a homes or  
12 warehouses, so I urge you to please protect the community.  
13 Like I said, our children deserve it. I'm a teacher. I  
14 see the warehouses coming right next to the schools and I  
15 just -- I can't even imagine this. So thank you very  
16 much.

17 (Applause.)

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

19 MS. LARIOS: I'll take the spot of Eduardo  
20 Galvani. I know him so we're good. We're good.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MS. LARIOS: I'm actually Graciela Larios with  
23 CCAEK, Center for Community Action and Environmental  
24 Justice. I'm a community organizer that. And like  
25 fellows like Eduardo Galvani that -- you know, I'm here



1 representing them. He couldn't take off another time from  
2 work. And you know people like Gene Proctor, who has  
3 bronchitis today. He lives in Mira Loma village where  
4 he -- they just, you know, approved another warehouse.  
5 They're looking into approving a truck stop. They got 800  
6 trucks going up and down, north and south of the street  
7 right adjacent to his community in one hour.

8           This man has bronchitis. His granddaughter has  
9 asthma. I mean, I'm here for those people that couldn't  
10 make it here today. And especially those people that  
11 always have to be there for their families, and couldn't  
12 make it to daily meetings. And I guess one of their main  
13 requests is no more meetings, no more studies, no more  
14 time.

15           We need the rules now. We need the regulations  
16 now. Zero emissions now. And the time, we don't got it  
17 anymore, especially their children who, like our executive  
18 director just said, they can't play. They can't be kids.  
19 And for us to tell them that it -- it is ironic for them  
20 to go outside and play, because it is unhealthy, that's  
21 ironic. And I said that ironic - and I said that wrong.  
22 Sorry. But that's ironic for them to go outside and play,  
23 because it's healthy for them. That is ironic for us to  
24 tell them that it's unhealthy for them.

25           So please protect us. Be a good leadership and

1 we depend on you, because local officials they take too  
2 much time. We need you. Thank you.

3 (Applause.)

4 MS. VIADURRE: Hi. My name is Andrea Viadurre.  
5 I grew up in San Bernardino and Riverside counties. I  
6 wanted to come up here today and give you my personal and  
7 direct experience as a resident in these environmental  
8 justice communities.

9 Now, I'll also try to share the stories of some  
10 of the people that won't be here, because of how  
11 inaccessible this meeting is to a lot of working class  
12 people. So I'll try and share some of their stories and  
13 then my experience.

14 Moving on. I'm not sure how familiar -- familiar  
15 you are with this region, so I want you guys to imagine  
16 like our lives here. I want you to imagine what it's like  
17 growing up with your loved ones or your little ones and  
18 teaching them how to walk or teaching them how to ride a  
19 bike, and imagine having to do that at a park where  
20 there's a freight always driving by there.

21 I want you to imagine at an intersection where  
22 you're walking with your grandma or your grandpa, right,  
23 and there's these trucks passing all the time, right in  
24 front of you. We can't simply just turn them off, so they  
25 stop idling, correct? Like, they stop there. There's

1 traffic.

2 I want you to also imagine the local high schools  
3 that are literally getting engulfed by distribution  
4 warehouses around them, particularly the one in Fontana,  
5 who now has warehouse neighbors on the side of it. So  
6 instead of attracting new families and children, they're  
7 attracting warehouse neighbors.

8 I want you to -- and maybe many of you have ran  
9 track or cross-country. Imagine this high school's team.  
10 Instead of running a track or running around their  
11 community and up hills, they run adjacent to these trucks  
12 that are driving around them. They're -- the trucks have  
13 a street and the kids don't even have a sidewalk sometimes  
14 to run on.

15 Just imagine that picture. These are the  
16 communities. That. We're talking about.

17 I want you to think about the homes that are here  
18 with the families who only wish to see their children grow  
19 up safe and healthy, but instead they battle against  
20 developers and cities who forcibly displace them, or they  
21 built giant warehouses right outside their kitchen window.  
22 It's -- instead of seeing the mountains outside, which is  
23 something I think people here are used to and like,  
24 instead now they are seeing these really gian White  
25 buildings, right?

1 I want you to continue to imagine our freeways  
2 and what our freeways look like, the ones where the good  
3 movements go back and forth, the ones that we live right  
4 next to. I want you to think about being stuck in  
5 traffic, and you have to put your windows down, right?  
6 What are you doing? You're stuck in traffic with all of  
7 these trucks around you and you're breathing in this air.

8 I want you to imagine the truck drivers who also  
9 are stuck with their trucks, right? And it gets hot in  
10 there. And what do they do? They put down the windows  
11 and they're choking on this air. We cannot keep living  
12 like this.

13 Zero-emission technology exists, and it must be  
14 required. And I hope that a lot of you become advocates  
15 for that. We're looking at you to do your job and protect  
16 our lives because we literally depend on it.

17 We've beared this brunt for far too long, and I  
18 ask you how much longer will we have to endure this?

19 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks. Your time is up.

20 Okay.

21 (Applause.)

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Mr. Hague.

23 MR. HAGUE: Hello again. George Hague, volunteer  
24 for the Sierra Club. Live in Moreno Valley, where they  
25 approved the 40 million square foot world logistic center

1 with this 14,000 daily truck trips, where the city council  
2 has been, is currently in place thanks to over a million  
3 dollars of donations from the developer.

4           We need your help. We cannot rely on local  
5 agencies and decision makers. We need you to step forward  
6 to protect the people. Moreno Valley selected a truck  
7 route going past three elementary schools. I mean, it's  
8 crazy, and yet this is happening again and again.

9           The warehouses in Moreno Valley are not going to  
10 be covered with solar. Every warehouse should be covered  
11 with solar. If you talk to some developers, they say they  
12 haven't even made their roof able to hold solar panels.  
13 You need to require all warehouses to at least to have the  
14 capacity to hold the weight of solar panels, and ideally  
15 be solar ready, but they're not.

16           The World Logistics Center is right across the  
17 street. I mean, there's going to be houses, and that wall  
18 will be an 80-foot building right across where people are  
19 living. In fact, within the World Logistics Center, this  
20 wonderful city council that owes its allegiance, at least  
21 a majority owes the allegiance to the developer, actually  
22 enclosed many homes inside of the development, and said  
23 you can't even change anything in your house because  
24 you're now part of this specific plan. These are  
25 individual homeowners, and yet they were encapsulized

1 inside of this development, and they're still there.

2           Some have now finally run away because they  
3 realize their future is bleak, but there are still  
4 homeowners that are forced to be within this specific  
5 plan, and they can't do anything to upgrade their home,  
6 because they've been forced into this situation.

7           Ideally, we will have solar on these roofs, and  
8 these trucks and these yard equipments will run on  
9 sunshine. And that should be your goal is to have all of  
10 these vehicles running on sunshine. And in Southern  
11 California, it's crime that they are not, and that you're  
12 not requiring such.

13           Warehousing, they're selling it as a job for  
14 people. They're saying we're going to bring you jobs, and  
15 economic benefit. What's really going to happen is, as  
16 you know, these are all being automated. They're being  
17 automated to the point that the city of Moreno Valley is  
18 covering all of their available land with warehousing, or  
19 at least much of it, and they're going to turn around and  
20 all these people who were promised jobs are going to have  
21 to be hitting the freeway to find jobs somewhere else,  
22 because all of the land was taken up by a business or an  
23 entity that is automated.

24           I want to point out one more thing I couldn't say  
25 before, on the other entity. If you allow for

1 electrification of vehicles, you're not solving the  
2 problem of farmland, because you're still going to impact  
3 farmland with electric vehicles.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: I'm sorry, could you just say  
6 that again. I don't -- excuse me, I didn't understand  
7 what you just said.

8 MR. HAGUE: On the previous time I spoke, I ran  
9 out of time. This time I going to say what I wanted to  
10 say on electric vehicles.

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

12 MR. HAGUE: If you use them as a solution to SB  
13 375, you're still going to be impacting farmland.

14 CHAIR NICHOLS: I see. I understand.

15 MR. HAGUE: It's not a solution to that part of  
16 SB 375.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: I understand. Thank you.

18 MR. SHIMODA: Good afternoon, Chairman Nichols.  
19 Chris Shimoda with the California Trucking Association.  
20 Thank you, Board members, for the opportunity to speak  
21 today on this item. As today's staff presentation  
22 demonstrated, trucks with modern emission controls  
23 virtually eliminate diesel particulate matter.

24 Since 2008, as this Board is well aware of, our  
25 members have spent millions to comply with ARB

1 regulations, which require all trucks to be outfitted with  
2 diesel particulate filters, selective catalytic reduction  
3 by the year 2023.

4           Last year, thanks in large part to the leadership  
5 of the Senator, we were successful in making sure the  
6 trucks that do not comply with your regulations are not  
7 registered by the California DMV, which is going to make a  
8 huge difference. This year, we plan on taking on  
9 high-emitting glider kits that some rollbacks from the  
10 federal government have allowed. We want to make sure  
11 those don't enter the state.

12           Still, truckers operating compliant trucks and  
13 TRUs face an unlevel playing field, even 10 years after  
14 we've adopted these rules. I received unfortunate news  
15 last week that a CTA board member, an ag hauler from  
16 Fresno County is going to be leaving trucking. And one of  
17 the two reasons he gave us is he is losing business to  
18 non-compliant competitors.

19           So with that in mind, I know a lot of today's  
20 item is about the future. But for the here and now, I  
21 urge this Board to continue to prioritize enforcement in  
22 getting everybody to play by the same set of rules.

23           We look forward to working with staff on their  
24 recommendations in this area on the freight hub  
25 enforcement piece, and will continue to work with staff to



1 implement the other new and proposed measures.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. EDER: Hello again. I'm Harvey Eder speaking  
4 for myself, and for the Public Solar Power Coalition.

5 We're involved with litigation with you and the  
6 district. And we spoke with you a year ago and should be  
7 solar -- immediate total solar conversion. We put this in  
8 response to the '91 plan with the district, in '92, and  
9 filed two cases, including in that went back to when we  
10 had the red car in L.A., and it was torn out, and there  
11 was -- incorporated into the record is there a 60-minute  
12 program? I said they ripped them out of 40, 50 cities.  
13 And there was litigation. There was \$1 fine. This is bad  
14 stuff.

15 Also, we knew about greenhouse gases back in the  
16 late 1890s, early 1800s, a guy named Svante Arrhenius,  
17 second winner of the Nobel prize wrote on this. And this  
18 is when we were trying to decide what fuels to use for  
19 vehicles. And we had this knowledge. He's no slouch. He  
20 actually, for 20, 30 years, ran the Nobel organization.

21 Anyway, so -- and, you know, 40 years ago, the  
22 oil companies knew about this. And they did some study,  
23 and then they went into the deniers.

24 And the stuff I brought up before about what  
25 we're -- actually, right, it's like 700 -- 800 parts per

1 million CO2 equivalent now. I mean, if -- we know this.  
2 We have the facts. We have the evidence.

3           And to not act on this and denying it is doing  
4 what Trump and the climate deniers are doing in D.C.,  
5 except it's worse, because we know this stuff is going on,  
6 and we're not dealing with the real situation. And  
7 that's -- that's what we've got to deal with.

8           So we litigated. Then we litigated on the '12  
9 plan and on the recent plan. We went to the judge a  
10 couple days ago. He said, well, there's law and policy.  
11 He said to me I'm talking a lot. I said, well, look,  
12 we've got de León and -- you know, 50 percent by 2030, and  
13 he wished he'd done 100. Now, there's Senate Bill 1  
14 they're looking by '45, 100 percent.

15           But that's just for electric. That's not getting  
16 into heating and cooling and other processes. And also,  
17 we've got to do environmental impact of what  
18 electrification is on our bodies. Electromagnetics and  
19 whatnot, the impact, and also for hydrogen fuel cell  
20 electric vehicles.

21           Talk some more later. Thank you.

22           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

23           MR. BANUET: Hello?

24           CHAIR NICHOLS: Sorry, just not for you. Another  
25 comment. Just for the audience as a whole, we have one

1 more item on our Board agenda for today, which is related,  
2 but which we took separately. It is the report on  
3 implementation of AB 617, that Community Air Protection  
4 Program. And apparently, according to the Board clerk, we  
5 are sort of getting requests to speak kind of dribbling in  
6 on that, one by one or whatever. I would like to ask that  
7 we close off the list of people who are testifying on that  
8 item like in the next five minutes. If you're going to  
9 speak on that item, let us know, so we can organize the  
10 list, and then maybe also think about how we can use the  
11 time most efficiently.

12           Sorry. Go ahead.

13           MR. BANUET: That's okay. Thank you so much.  
14 I'm here on behalf of Colton and the Colton High School  
15 Eco-Friendly Club, as well as the high school. Two of the  
16 other members Judy Mendoza and Richard Oluyole could not  
17 make it, because they had to leave early. They were here  
18 earlier, but because other responsibilities they had to  
19 leave.

20           I thank you for taking this time, and I'd like to  
21 thank everyone who came here today, because this is super  
22 important. And I don't know, I really love the idea of  
23 everyday people coming and addressing their concerns.

24           Now, the concern I have really goes to the local  
25 level at my school, which is Colton High School. We have

1 trains passing by every day, highways filled and  
2 congested, and air pollution rampant. And really it's a  
3 shame to see that so many people in my own school have to  
4 go through this every day, and deal with this bad air  
5 pollution.

6 I, myself, deal with asthma and my mother deals  
7 with asthma and bronchitis to an even worse extent. And  
8 my mother has to deal with this even more so, because  
9 she's always on the road trying to just to commute to her  
10 job. And the pollution in the air has gotten worse and  
11 worse over the years. And as time goes on, the climate  
12 itself has been changing and making things even worse.  
13 And I see other companies and corporations moving in on  
14 warehouses into my own area, which is also worrying.

15 So I just wanted to bring these own concerns that  
16 I had to everyone in this forefront. And just try to  
17 exemplify how important it is, and especially to students  
18 at my own school. Students at my own school are outraged  
19 that they have to deal with such poor control and  
20 pollution. And it's a real shame.

21 But I see a lot of progress is going to be made  
22 in the coming years. All I ask is that we try to go and  
23 make these regulations and decisions faster and even  
24 stronger, and to be rougher about the way we approach  
25 things, because things need to be done as quick as

1 possible. Thank you for this time. It means a lot. Have  
2 a great day.

3 (Applause.)

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

5 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Excuse me.

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: Victor.

7 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Excuse me, Victor.

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: Come back.

9 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Just a quick question.

10 So your high school, Colton High School, is it  
11 located next to a warehouse or several warehouses or is it  
12 next to a busy --

13 MR. BANUET: No, it's next to a busy highway and  
14 train.

15 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Highway. I just wanted to  
16 be clear, yeah.

17 MR. BANUET: And the warehouses are more further  
18 down.

19 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Okay. I just wanted to  
20 clarify. Thank you.

21 MR. BANUET: Thank you so much.

22 MS. CHANG: Sorry, I'm a little sick. Hello,  
23 everybody. My name is Elisa and I'm a third-year transfer  
24 student here at UCR. And I'm also part of an awesome  
25 organization here on campus called CALPIRG students.

1           We basically a statewide student advocacy group  
2 that works to organize college students around public  
3 interest issues. And one of the things that we also do is  
4 we train and empower students to make real social change  
5 happen. The students that are out here with me right now  
6 in the middle of finals week, they're all out here because  
7 we care about these issues.

8           And Southern California has been my home for the  
9 past 12 years. Riverside has been my home for the last 5.  
10 And this is where I hope to build family in the future as  
11 well. And over the years, I've seen the development of  
12 warehouses, the increase in traffic, the increase in  
13 trucks, in highways on my way as I'm driving to school.

14           And the school that I transferred from was Moreno  
15 Valley College, a campus and community that have become  
16 like a home to me. And so the effects of these facilities  
17 are especial prominent in Moreno Valley because I'm not  
18 sure if guys are aware, but about two years ago the City  
19 of Moreno Valley passed an agreement to build these mega  
20 warehouses into the city.

21           And warehouses means trucks, which means  
22 emissions, which means poor air quality. And they say  
23 these are going to bring like great job opportunities to  
24 the people. But the thing is these are low quality jobs  
25 with low pay and bad shifts.

1           And many of my friends that have had to rely on  
2 these warehouse jobs, these jobs of poor condition, they  
3 don't like it. And as students, it is our priority to  
4 voice our concerns for clean air, so that we can focus on  
5 our studies and our education, because this isn't the  
6 future that we want.

7           With CALPIRG student's, we've been able to  
8 organize grass root movements collecting over 20,000  
9 petitions -- student petitions statewide in support of  
10 clean energy. We've also generated student leader  
11 sign-ons, faculty sign-ons, been to Sacramento to lobby  
12 for these bills that we support, like Senate Bill 100, a  
13 bill that's supposed to get California to commit to fully  
14 renewable energy by 2045.

15           And we've also been trying to encourage our own  
16 UC campuses to commit to 100 percent renewable energy,  
17 because as higher institutions we can lead the way. And  
18 as students, we're at the heart of these grass root  
19 movements, and always will be. And that's why we're here  
20 today.

21           We want to voice our concerns to government  
22 agencies and have them listen to us, because we're your  
23 constituents, and we care about these issues regarding the  
24 future of our environment. And we're students, and we're  
25 doing everything that we can.

1           So we urge the California Air Resources Board to  
2 prioritize clean energy and to implement strong  
3 environmental policies in order to build a clean and  
4 sustainable future.

5           Thank you.

6           (Applause.)

7           MR. LAWSON: Good afternoon, Chair Nichols and  
8 Board members. My name is Thomas Lawson with the  
9 California Natural Gas Vehicle Coalition. We submitted  
10 written comments, so I'm not going to repeat those. I did  
11 want to talk a little bit about the 11.9 liter. I was  
12 just in Sacramento yesterday talking about fleets and  
13 goods movement, and the need to focus on those. So this  
14 conversation is timely.

15           Most of you know, that the Cummins Westport 11.9  
16 liter ultra low NOx engine is now certified.  
17 Manufacturers are working really hard right now on merging  
18 those chassis and that OBD wiring to get the new engine  
19 ready to go. We expect to have a debut at the ACT Expo in  
20 Long Beach in May. So that's going to be exciting. We  
21 think it's important and it's going to play a vital role  
22 in allowing the folks that work in and around these  
23 freight facilities to clean up the air.

24           I also wanted to point out that incentives  
25 matter, and sometimes there's an opportunity to do



1 something that doesn't necessarily require money. That's  
2 why we're working with Assembly Member Frazier on AB 2601,  
3 which provides a weight exemption for alternative fuel  
4 vehicles near zero and zero emissions. And that allows  
5 folks that are carrying goods movement to be on par with  
6 what they're carrying, and not lose any load because of  
7 the alternative fuel systems.

8           So we -- you know, we want to just show that's an  
9 opportunity to think a little bit outside the box on  
10 incentives.

11           I think lastly what I'll say is -- and it's  
12 important, since we here in Riverside, last year, and UC  
13 Riverside and Southwest Research Facility did some in-use  
14 emission tests on the 8.9 liter, which is kind of the baby  
15 brother of the 11.9 liter. And that engine actually  
16 was -- the standard was 0.02, but it was rated a 0.01. So  
17 it was 99 percent reduction from the 2020 -- the 2010  
18 standard. And we think that's a very, very important.

19           I think the other part of that testing would show  
20 that the diesel engines were actually five to nine times  
21 dirtier than the current standard.

22           So we are excited to work with staff and the  
23 Board on these measures, and we look forward to working  
24 with you on those. And thank you for the time to talk  
25 today.

1 MS. MORENO: Good afternoon. I'm clearly not  
2 Kevin Maggay. That's actually my co-worker. He had to  
3 leave and pick up his children. But anyway, my name is  
4 Edith Moreno, and I'm here representing Southern  
5 California Gas Company. Anyway I start -- I want to start  
6 off by saying that SoCalGas does support the effort to  
7 reduce emissions from freight facilities, but we do have a  
8 little -- some concerns with some of the concepts that  
9 have been presented.

10 We did provide a comment letter, and that goes  
11 into a little bit more detail. But we do oppose the  
12 proposed rules, because they are -- we feel that their  
13 technology mandates for technologies that currently don't  
14 exist. It's not practical to develop regulations that  
15 require undeveloped technology.

16 Instead, we feel that CARB should develop  
17 performance standards that are based on best available  
18 technologies.

19 Also, in one of CARB's freight facility concept  
20 workshops, staff cited that the quote unquote, "Timing and  
21 certainty of implementation as a consideration in  
22 developing the concepts". However, battery-electric  
23 technologies are still being tested, therefore there's  
24 absolutely no certainty on the timing that the  
25 technologies will become available, and what emissions

1 reductions can be achieved.

2           With that -- with that said, low NOx engines and  
3 renewable natural gas are available today that can achieve  
4 near-zero emissions for NOx, and depending on the source,  
5 RNG, or renewable natural gas, can have carbon intensities  
6 that are even lower than electricity at a fraction of the  
7 cost.

8           So thank you for your time. I know it's been a  
9 long day and we've all been here. So have a good evening.

10           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

11           It has been a long day, but it's going to get  
12 longer. And because of that, I think we need to take a  
13 little break, comfort break of about 10 minutes, and we  
14 will get back not later than 10 minutes from now, so 25 of  
15 5:00.

16           Thanks.

17           (Off record: 4:25 p.m.)

18           (Thereupon a recess was taken.)

19           (On record: 4:37 p.m.)

20           CHAIR NICHOLS: We will resume, and I have my mic  
21 on.

22           Okay. Back to the hearing process. We just  
23 heard from Taylor Thomas, right. Now, it's Lizette  
24 Hernandez.

25           Hello.

1 I have my mic on supposedly. I'm waiting for our  
2 next witness here.

3 Hi, Lizette.

4 Someone will help you.

5 MS. HERNANDEZ: I turned it on.

6 AGP VIDEO: Test, test.

7 MS. HERNANDEZ: All right. Great.

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

9 MS. HERNANDEZ: All right. I'm already wearing a  
10 lot of hats today.

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: We like your hats.

12 MS. HERNANDEZ: I've been -- thank you so much.

13 CHAIR NICHOLS: Go Dodgers.

14 MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. I'm actually an  
15 organizer with the Sierra Club. I did drive a set of  
16 folks from Los Angeles here. We woke up really early, so  
17 we're a little bit tired as well.

18 And I just want to say that the Sierra Club will  
19 mobilize about 80 folks today to today's hearing. We've  
20 also been mobilizing to hearings here at CARB and at AQMD  
21 for a good number of years, sometimes up to 100 people  
22 talking about the AQMP, talking about how -- like in  
23 communities like ours -- I live in South Central L.A., and  
24 I organize -- help organize the Watts Clean Air and Energy  
25 Committee.

1           In that community of Watts, we have a life  
2           expectancy of 10 years less than the rest of L.A. The  
3           asthma in Los Angeles County for African-American children  
4           under the age of 17 is 25 percent. So basically, about 1  
5           in 4 African-American children have asthma, whereas other  
6           children have less than half of that in terms of the  
7           propensity to have asthma.

8           My son has asthma as well. He's a black/brown  
9           child. I have had him testify at several hearings. He  
10          has had to be put on breathing machines. And I'm not sure  
11          if Board members here or in the AQMD -- you know, it seems  
12          like we don't understand the -- what we feel is a delay, a  
13          stalling. You know, we hear of studies. We hear of  
14          plans.

15          However, we don't see the outcomes driving the  
16          conversations. And so we would like for you to make  
17          decisions that are based -- that are outcome based that  
18          affect or improve the equity and justice for our  
19          communities, you know -- and just addressing the fact  
20          that, you know, all of these trucks, for example, go  
21          through our communities from the ports all the way through  
22          our communities into the Inland Valley.

23          And I really value, and many of the communities  
24          that are represented from L.A., value the testimony from  
25          the Inland Valley and the ECUV. We've learned a lot from

1 the volunteers, and all the people that have spoken over  
2 all these years about the conditions that they face.

3 Many times they can't testify because they're  
4 sick, their lungs have collapsed. I mean, we've had high  
5 school or college kids have to drop out, or stop going to  
6 school because they have medical issues. And one thing  
7 that we do know is that many of the Board members - I  
8 don't about here, but on other boards, you know - don't  
9 live in our same communities. We've met that, you know,  
10 using the CalEnviroScreens. You know, a lot of you live  
11 in the hills, live in the beaches. You don't live in the  
12 communities that we live. You don't understand what it's  
13 like to breathe dirty air day-in day-out it seems like.

14 At least that's how it feels. Because if you  
15 did, you would know and you would have the urgency that we  
16 do.

17 We also understand that the AQMD is currently  
18 looking at the Indirect Source Rule. And unfortunately,  
19 instead of creating a plan or a rule on that issues, they  
20 are looking to tax us to be able to implement that. So  
21 you're telling us that they're willing to tax diapers,  
22 they're willing to tax school books, they're willing to  
23 tax, you know, shoes for our kids, but they're not willing  
24 to tax the warehouses that pollute our communities.

25 And we think that that is incredibly egregious

1 and immoral. And we've been incredibly patient for the  
2 last few years. And we implore you to take immediate  
3 action that will result in outcomes that we feel are  
4 tangible in our community.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

6 MS. HERNANDEZ: Otherwise, you leave us no  
7 option, but to take the power back.

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. You got the red light.

9 MS. THOMAS: Good afternoon, Board members and  
10 staff. My name is Taylor Thomas. I'm a resident of Long  
11 Beach, and -- okay. I'm a resident of Long Beach and I'm  
12 with East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice  
13 representing the communities of East L.A., Commerce,  
14 Southeast L.A., and Long Beach.

15 And I would usually be before you asking for  
16 something, but today I don't want to ask. I want to  
17 demand. So I'm demanding that you uphold your  
18 responsibility to protect public health. Mitigation and  
19 incentives don't cut it. We need rules such as ISR.  
20 Regulations don't kill jobs, industries just shift as  
21 society progresses.

22 There's a reason we're not hunting whales any  
23 more to harvest their oil, to burn in our lamps. We've  
24 moved beyond that, and it is time to move forward again.

25 The notion that zero-emission technology is not

1 ready or available is a red herring. All of us know that  
2 when policies are passed, they may take a while to  
3 implement. We're in a marathon for the health of our  
4 communities and the environment. We're crawling when we  
5 should be running. It's time to pass the baton and get us  
6 across the finish line.

7 Combustion technologies and voluntary measures  
8 are not solutions. We need immediate and direct mandates.  
9 We need zero emissions now, and we need the rules that  
10 have been proposed by staff to today to not have the  
11 implementation -- excuse me -- dates pushed back.

12 Thank you.

13 MS. JONES: Hello. My name is Asher Jones, and  
14 I'm from Riverside. I'm a 19-year old, 19-year resident,  
15 and I'm currently 24 years old.

16 I'm here to stand with the Sierra Club and other  
17 environmental justice organizations in saying that we need  
18 logical, effective, and timely regulations on clean and  
19 sustainable modes of transportation. We don't need  
20 incentives for polluters acting -- acting under the  
21 exchange of carbon credits. We need regulation -- we need  
22 regulations and accountability measures, such as the  
23 Indirect Source Rule now.

24 Our communities are on the front lines when  
25 talking about zero-emission trucks and cleaning up the



1 pollution in and around freight facilities. If companies  
2 that pollute are able to continue to pollute, more people  
3 will die. These same communities need sustainable green  
4 jobs and zero-emission infrastructure.

5           This Board has the power to stimulate this  
6 conversation and implement that. I am a student at  
7 Riverside City College -- Riverside Community College, and  
8 we need training for these jobs in all fields, so the  
9 future has a future, as highly skilled candidates hoping  
10 to enter viable employment opportunities.

11           I skipped class - let me say that again, I  
12 skipped class, a class that I need to pass to graduate  
13 this June and transfer, because it is important for me to  
14 know about what impacts me and my community here in  
15 Riverside.

16           As a body who votes on resolutions that directly  
17 affects community, it is imperative that you understand  
18 what is at stake, if you do not take the strongest stand  
19 in order to protect community. Fifteen people die per  
20 day. In the 70s, it was 200 people per day.

21           We, as a collective body, who care about the  
22 environment and community need to make sure that we don't  
23 go back to these days. So therefore, I urge you in the  
24 strongest way possible do your job and do the strongest  
25 regulations, not incentives to these polluters who are

1 harming community and don't care about the babies on the  
2 respirators or the children who have to stay home when  
3 there's smog alerts.

4 Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Chair, members of the Board,  
7 my name is Todd Campbell. I represent Clean Energy. And  
8 I'm going to give you guys a little love. I want to give  
9 Cynthia Marvin and her staff some kudos for doing a really  
10 great job of going up and down the state and finding out  
11 what the community needs were to come to you today and  
12 present what -- you know, their findings. And I just want  
13 to give them a little tap on the back and thank you. And  
14 I want to thank each of you for serving on this Board.

15 This Board is a pretty tough board and you guys  
16 are doing strong leadership. So I just wanted to kind of  
17 give you that too. I know what it takes to sit on dais.  
18 It's not an easy job. And so thank you for spending your  
19 entire day with us.

20 Clean Energy is very supportive of all the  
21 efforts to minimize or eliminate emissions from freight  
22 operations. And we have been a proud clean air partner  
23 with the Air Resources Board, the South Coast Air Quality  
24 Management District, and the San Pedro Bay Ports.

25 If we want to reduce emissions immediately in

1 communities that have and continue to suffer from freight  
2 operations, we need all the advanced clean technology  
3 tools in our toolbox. We can achieve this by sending a  
4 clear policy signal that both zero and near-zero  
5 strategies are needed to combat freight pollution over the  
6 next decade and beyond.

7           We support the important work that ARB staff is  
8 doing on freight operations. We also believe it would be  
9 prudent to immediately consider performance based approach  
10 that would allow us to achieve deep emissions reductions  
11 from freight sources now rather than pursue a future  
12 technology mandate of zero-emission strategies that needs  
13 to be demonstrated, commercialized, or achieve greater  
14 economies of scale to become affordable.

15           It would be a fine that the performance based  
16 approach ultimately graduates to a zero-emission endpoint.  
17 But adopting a zero emission mandate without strong policy  
18 support for a near zero-emission truck adoption today,  
19 does not provide the certainty required to have near-zero  
20 emission strategies back-up any of the unfor -- unforeseen  
21 short falls of zero emission technologies in the  
22 heavy-duty space.

23           In short, a ZEV mandate for drayage trucks may  
24 subject communities to many more years of high-risk air  
25 pollution and further delay meaningful action.

1           We are also concerned about the economics  
2 required to support a heavy-duty ZEV mandate, given the  
3 state of the technology and the logistics that would be  
4 need -- required to be -- deploy the technology. The  
5 current expense of heavy-duty ZEV demonstration is roughly  
6 three times the cost of near-zero commercial-ready trucks,  
7 while the emissions performance between the two strategies  
8 is practically equivalent for NOx emissions.

9           The vehicle cost, of course, does not take into  
10 consideration facility upgrades, charging and power supply  
11 logistics that all can add significant unforeseen costs  
12 and implementation delays to those fleets operating the  
13 equipment.

14           Our ability to get to freight emissions right now  
15 will be critical for both the South Coast Air Quality  
16 Management District and the San Joaquin Valley. Both of  
17 these regions are currently the only two extreme  
18 nonattainment zones in our nation.

19           In fact, the SIP and the air quality management  
20 plans for these regions call for a need to turnover  
21 hundreds of thousands of Class 4 to Class 8 trucks to near  
22 zero levels to reach attainment by 2023 and 2031. Now,  
23 that SB 1 limits ARB's ability to impact fleet turnovers,  
24 this rulemaking should start now and must be inclusive of  
25 near-zero technologies that are demonstrated and

1 commercialized.

2           We therefore ask you to direct staff to take a  
3 more comprehensive, inclusive approach for both ZEV and  
4 near-zero technologies with strong policies that  
5 demonstrate support for both strategies. A performance  
6 based approach that ultimately gets us to zero-emission  
7 transportation is ideal -- is the ideal approach --

8           CHAIR NICHOLS: Todd.

9           MR. CAMPBELL: -- as it would deliver --

10          CHAIR NICHOLS: Todd, I called other people, I've  
11 got to call you on time.

12          MR. CAMPBELL: I was just -- it was the last --  
13 last -- I was finishing the last sentence.

14          CHAIR NICHOLS: I know, but it's a very long last  
15 sentence.

16          (Laughter.)

17          MR. CAMPBELL: No, it's just -- it's just  
18 literally the last sentence. I was just going to say --

19          CHAIR NICHOLS: It has no period has and many  
20 clauses.

21          MR. CAMPBELL: But I think a performance-based  
22 approach would be ideal.

23          Thank you.

24          (Laughter.)

25          CHAIR NICHOLS: I understand your point. Thank

1 you.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

4 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

5 All right. Mr. Jacob, hi.

6 MR. JACOB: Thank you, Madam Chairman, Board.

7 Mike Jacob with Pacific Merchant Shipping Association. We  
8 represent ocean carriers and marine terminal operators.  
9 And in the interests of time, I'll also speak for my  
10 colleague, Thomas Jelenic, following me on both items on  
11 the SIP and the freight facility update briefly. And we  
12 submitted some extensive comments as well.

13 So we appreciate the opportunity to do that, to  
14 work with Board members, senior executive staff, and with  
15 the freight division. All very helpful and we appreciate  
16 all of your time. We do have some concerns moving forward  
17 with respect to the SIP action on at-berth amendments.

18 We are participating in that process. We support  
19 the amendment process that's outlined in the SIP. We do  
20 want to improve the existing rules with respect to  
21 implementation and compliance by the Board early enough to  
22 help us facilitate our next compliance deadline, which is  
23 an 80 percent emissions reductions for ships plugged in  
24 out of the fleets that are applicable cruise ships,  
25 container ships, refrigerator ships to get to 80 percent

1 by 2020.

2           That will probably require -- we're very  
3 confident it will require some amendments. We would like  
4 to see those amendments approved on an expedited basis.  
5 And, if necessary, they should be advanced independently  
6 of whether or not additional vessel fleets and types are  
7 added under the Mobile Source Strategy compliance start  
8 target date of 2022, which is outlined in the plan.

9           We do have some additional issues and concerns  
10 with respect to the cargo handling equipment regulation.  
11 You've heard from some people about that today. Most  
12 notably, I'd like to point out what the staff said and  
13 what we all know.

14           The transformation of the ports is not a simple  
15 rule amendment. We already have a rule. We have a best  
16 available control technology rule for cargo-handling  
17 equipment at the ports. We've achieved 91 percent  
18 emissions reductions in our DPM at the Port of L.A.,  
19 according to the last emissions reduction. That's a good  
20 story.

21           We want to transition to zero. That is going to  
22 take transformational change. That is not a simple  
23 regulation. It's not just a new fuel. It's not just  
24 putting on a new filter. It's not just talking about the  
25 next emissions standard. It requires substantial

1 infrastructure investment and new technology introduction.  
2 That will take time.

3 We're committed to working with staff on doing  
4 that. Our concerns are that you move forward in a way,  
5 which you foreclose options, you pick technology paths,  
6 which are not feasible. You make commitments to  
7 infrastructure paths, which are excessively expensive and  
8 not financeable over time. It's exceptionally complex.

9 So we very much look forward to working with the  
10 staff on moving forward with that. But again, I think  
11 we've really appreciated the opportunity over this past  
12 year to have a discussion about it, to look forward about  
13 all of the challenges and complexities that come forward.  
14 We've been in the legislature asking for incentives to  
15 transfer -- transform ourselves to zero emissions.

16 We were here in December at your Board meeting  
17 asking for the opportunity to participate in our -- in the  
18 incentive plans. And so we very much appreciate the  
19 opportunity to continue to look forward on this very  
20 complex and challenging issue. Thank you.

21 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

22 MR. GARZA: Hi. My name is -- that was pretty  
23 loud.

24 (Laughter.)

25 CHAIR NICHOLS: You're close to the mic. It's



1 great.

2 MR. GARZA: Yeah, I am. It's the second time  
3 being up here. I was here last career.

4 Hi. My name is Ruben pronouns are he, him, his.  
5 I guess I'll start off already.

6 Well, I'm from a small town named Mecca. I'm  
7 here today to emphasize that CARB go for zero not  
8 near-zero emissions plan. The intent to move away from  
9 fossil fuels is a respectable decision and should be  
10 commended, except when you plan to replace it with another  
11 pollutant.

12 It's counterproductive to continue to pollute our  
13 cities while effectively making our communities' members  
14 sick. These same community members are often either  
15 people of color, folks in lower income areas or both, such  
16 as myself.

17 To disregard the fact that we do have the  
18 technology to root out this problem shows a lack of  
19 consider -- lack of concern for these same communities in  
20 favor of earning a profit.

21 We can't breathe money. We just can't. Now, I  
22 ask that the Air Resources Board skip right over the  
23 natural gas and change to go straight to electrification.  
24 The burden is not yours to endure alone to make this  
25 change. We are all responsible, AQMD, community, and

1 yourselves.

2           We have a duty to protect our families, friends,  
3 and even our neighbors. Stop informing us about what the  
4 community already knows. Stop these researches because  
5 leaders don't make excuses, they make improvements, so  
6 make one today.

7           Thank you.

8           (Applause.)

9           MR. ROCHE: Good afternoon, Board members and  
10 staff. And by the way, thank you very much for your  
11 service. This is a very tough job, so thank you for that.

12           My name is Greg Roche. I'm with Clean Energy,  
13 and I work out of an office in Carson, California, and  
14 spend most of my time around the Ports of L.A. and Long  
15 Beach. What I do is I work directly with truck owners.  
16 This could be anybody from an independent contractor that  
17 owns one truck to a fleet that owns several trucks. What  
18 I do is I help them transition from their old truck they  
19 have today to a clean near-zero truck.

20           Now, I've heard the passionate, well-intended  
21 advocacy to you today to go with clean zero-emission  
22 trucks and bypass near-zero altogether. And what I  
23 suggest is that this really should be cleantech against  
24 status quo versus cleantech versus cleantech.

25           Because one thing I've learned from working with

1 the owners of trucks, there's a great interest in  
2 upgrading trucks to clean trucks. They need two things,  
3 they need funding. They need incentive money to  
4 transition. They also need choices, because this is not a  
5 one glove fits all industry. It's a diverse industry.  
6 It's diverse in its operations, its applications. It's  
7 diverse in its business models and its ownership.

8           They need technology choices so they can make a  
9 decision what is the best way for them to continue their  
10 operations, contribute to the economy, provide jobs, and  
11 still deliver emission reductions.

12           This is really a case of don't let the perfect be  
13 the enemy of the very, very, very good, because the  
14 near-zero technology accomplishes 100 percent reduction of  
15 diesel particulate matter, 99 percent of reduction of NOx  
16 compared to in-use diesel trucks, is far, far, far quieter  
17 than a diesel truck, and they run on renewable energy,  
18 while at the same time manufactured by companies like  
19 Kenworth, Peterbilt, Freightliner, Volvo, and Mack, so  
20 they can be rapidly scaled to achieve rapid emission  
21 reductions today.

22           So my -- my message is I urge the Board and the  
23 staff to prioritize early emission reductions,  
24 incentivize, develop rules that prioritize deployment of  
25 near-zero trucks, so that emission reductions can be

1 accomplished quickly.

2 Thank you very much.

3 MR. LUGO: Hi. Good afternoon, members of the  
4 Board. Just like my colleagues I was here last year on  
5 March 23rd, I think it was. A year ago exactly.

6 So I just have some comments that I want to make.  
7 You know -- so I'll just start my comments.

8 While some local agencies have demonstrated  
9 leadership in tackling the freight pollution, we cannot  
10 rely on these local efforts to advance mandatory programs  
11 to clean up the industry. CARB needs to go further,  
12 specifically when it comes to directing local air  
13 districts to use their authority to regulate freight  
14 operations.

15 Ample evidence demonstrate that freight  
16 activities continue to create unacceptable impacts in  
17 communities around freight facilities and along freight  
18 corridors.

19 Sierra's efforts to regulate freight activities  
20 that are required to meet basic health based air quality  
21 standards and to curb greenhouse gas emissions. While we  
22 are pleased to see additional regulations proposed such as  
23 Zero-Emission Drayage Truck Rule, staff has offered a  
24 phased-in approach rulemaking that would delay necessary  
25 regulatory actions well into the future.

1           While we understand that regulations cannot be  
2 crafted overnight, the freight pollution crisis that  
3 continues to plague communities requires CARB to allocate  
4 significant staff to protecting communities harmed by  
5 freight. In the meantime, there is no actual plan to  
6 achieve the emission reductions necessary to meet any of  
7 the national ambient air quality standards for ozone.

8           There is much more work -- much more work needs  
9 to be done, because diesel pollution continues to burn in  
10 environmental justice communities that are impacted by the  
11 freight industry. CARB needs to create a plan and focus  
12 on environmental justice communities throughout  
13 California.

14           Example, at the California Mexico port of entry,  
15 it lacks enforcement from CARB or any warehouses located  
16 within 80 miles from the border, that includes the  
17 Coachella Valley. The trucks with good movements bound to  
18 Mexico have no regulation measures in California, and are  
19 spewing large amounts of diesel pollution into our  
20 communities. I have seen trucks in California just make  
21 it across the border and break down as soon as it crossed  
22 the border.

23           So the system is failing. CARB is failing us in  
24 these enforcement activities at the border, because we see  
25 trucks just barely working just to make it across the

1 border.

2           One more thing I wanted to add, our community air  
3 monitoring network, which might be part of the next item  
4 on the Agenda, AB 617, have identified trends in air  
5 pollution, where regulatory monitors have not. CARB has  
6 developed measures, regulations, and programs that will  
7 entirely eliminate emissions.

8           Thank you.

9           (Applause.)

10          CHAIR NICHOLS: Where is Albert Prestholt?

11          Mr. Prestholt, are you here?

12          Anybody know him?

13          Is that you, sir, standing up in the back?

14          No, I guess not.

15          Okay. If that is the end of our list, then we're  
16 going to close off this hearing. It is an informational  
17 item only, so there's no record to be closed officially.  
18 Although, we will be keeping a record of everything that  
19 was said here.

20          It's getting late in the day. I think a lot of  
21 us probably have a lot of things that we'd like to say.  
22 I'd like to say a couple myself, and then I'll turn it  
23 over to my fellow Board members.

24          So I do remember very clearly when we were here a  
25 year ago. And I remember particularly many of the same

1 people who testified here today actually were here then to  
2 express their concerns about the South Coast plan. Some  
3 of them were focused on the indirect source review issue  
4 in particular, others had other concerns. This question  
5 about zero versus near-zero has just gotten more intense  
6 as the time has gone on. I want to reflect on just those  
7 two items. And there are other things that we've  
8 certainly heard about too.

9           So on the issue of indirect source review,  
10 anybody who has worked with me over the years knows that I  
11 hate to be told that I don't have the legal authority to  
12 do something, if I think it's the right thing to do.

13           And I have looked at this issue inside and out,  
14 and I'm pretty well convinced that the authority to adopt  
15 an Indirect Source Review rule lies with the districts,  
16 and must be exercised by them. There may be alternative  
17 ways to get to the same result, but we haven't found  
18 anything that's as clear and as direct as that kind of a  
19 review would be.

20           It fits within the authorities that local  
21 agencies and, of course, local land-use authorities have.  
22 And this proliferation of warehouses. I do live in  
23 Southern California, even though I don't live in the most  
24 impacted area, but it's pretty obvious what's going on,  
25 and it's not gone unnoticed. It's a really serious

1 problem.

2           So we are watching very closely what's going on  
3 at the South Coast District. We're not predicting that  
4 they will do the right thing or the wrong thing. We're  
5 just hoping that they will do the right thing. And if for  
6 some reason they don't, then we will have to take action.  
7 That is our responsibility.

8           (Applause.)

9           CHAIR NICHOLS: So I want to be clear about that.

10           The other piece is on issues where we're talking  
11 about setting standards or putting together fleet turnover  
12 programs, spending money from the variety of different  
13 sources, whether it's cap and trade, or money that comes  
14 from other funds like fines and penalties, we have been  
15 pretty far out in terms of pushing for the zero emission  
16 vehicles, because we believe it's our responsibility to  
17 incentivize and push for the best technologies.

18           This program -- this air quality program, I know  
19 if you're, you know, under the age of 50, you're not going  
20 to be all that sympathetic to this. But back in the  
21 seventies we were being told that the things we wanted to  
22 do to clean up the air required new technology, which  
23 didn't exist, that all the low-hanging fruit had already  
24 been, you know, taken, and anything we were trying to do  
25 was going to be too expensive and would take too long.



1           And we persevered. And I think we made some  
2 incredible progress, but it was certainly not enough  
3 progress. And we all know that there's a lot more that  
4 needs to be done in Southern California in the valley to  
5 achieve healthy air.

6           So we have to keep our eye on the prize. The  
7 question is how quickly can we get there? How do we send  
8 the strongest possible signal so that investors and  
9 inventors, people who need to go out to raise the money to  
10 build factories to build the cleanest vehicles have the --  
11 something that they can point to that shows that they are  
12 going to have a market for these things and will see that  
13 that's -- that we're firm on that, and yet, at the same  
14 time, doesn't push it out so long that we're not getting  
15 benefits that we could be getting today.

16           So that's the dilemma. I hate this term  
17 near-zero. You know, if you had a choice, would you  
18 really prefer near-zero rather than zero? No, of course,  
19 not. You know, it does -- it's terrible.

20           So nevertheless, if it's better than what we have  
21 now, and you could make significant progress without  
22 sacrificing the longer term approach, would you try to do  
23 it? Well, it depends. It depends on how much it costs.  
24 It depends on whether it's real, et cetera.

25           So this is what we deal with as a regulatory

1 agency. This is our job is to try to figure this out, but  
2 we hear the people who have spoken to us loud and clear  
3 that you want us to be pushing towards zero. And I just  
4 want to say we heard you.

5 So with that, I have several other Board members  
6 who have signed up to speak here, and I'll just go in  
7 order starting with Supervisor Gioia.

8 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: We'll figure these mics out.

9 (Laughter.)

10 BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I appreciate the discussion  
11 on Indirect Source Review. I know that's been a really  
12 key strategy. And the concern I have is, you know, we  
13 all -- the communities around the state have the same  
14 right to the same level of clean air. And the concern  
15 right now is as local air districts look at this issue,  
16 and it's acknowledged that local air districts have the  
17 strongest legal authority to develop ISR rules, you may  
18 have a hot spot in one part of the state where an ISR rule  
19 is in effect and improves air quality. You may have a  
20 similar type of hot spot somewhere else in the state in  
21 another air district, where there are no ISR rules, and  
22 therefore there's worse air quality.

23 So I think we need to figure that out, and  
24 whether it's eventually having greater authority here at  
25 ARB. It would have to be probably maybe seeking some

1 statutory authority for some statewide ISR rule, because I  
2 think we just have to be aware that some air districts are  
3 going to step forward and be more aggressive than others.

4           So I think we should talk about that, and what's  
5 the best path forward to make sure that we have consistent  
6 standards around the state, because you could argue there  
7 will -- there will be even businesses that will argue  
8 they're at a competitive disadvantage if they're held to  
9 one standard in one part of the state and another standard  
10 in another part of the state.

11           And frankly, community residents are  
12 disadvantaged by having different air quality in different  
13 parts of the state next to similar types of facilities.  
14 So I'd like to understand how we can address that.

15           And I would argue for greater authority here at  
16 CARB and some greater level of guidance, direction with  
17 regard to local air districts and open for discussion on  
18 that.

19           CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Supervisor Serna.

20           BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you, Chair. Let me  
21 start by saying thank you to all the people that stayed  
22 with us for as long as you did and expressing the patients  
23 that you have to forfeit a good part of your day, whether  
24 it was forfeiting class or work, and understanding  
25 hopefully that, as the Chair mentioned earlier, this was

1 by no means intentional. And it actually happens quite  
2 frequently that we'll see a bigger turnout of people to  
3 speak on items prior to an important one like this. Other  
4 items are no less important to this Board, I assure you.  
5 But I, nonetheless, wanted to start the -- start my  
6 comments with expressing gratitude for your patience.

7           One of the things that I heard consistently from  
8 a number of speakers was concern about really a land-use  
9 matter that, as far as I'm -- as far as I know is --  
10 really lies outside of the jurisdiction of this Board, and  
11 it has to do with the proximity of schools and residential  
12 areas to warehouses.

13           And hearing some of the testimony about life  
14 experience living and being educated next to warehouses  
15 and distribution centers with a great deal of truck  
16 traffic especially is very disconcerting. What I'd like  
17 to suggest, as we begin to take the concepts that have  
18 been presented to us today and I suspect will be further  
19 vetted, is that we take into consideration how we might  
20 build a more robust connection with the Governor's Office  
21 of Planning and Research to begin to feed some of the  
22 information that we are gleaning from the testimony from  
23 hearings like this, to think carefully about the  
24 appropriate agencies that do govern land-use matters,  
25 namely local agencies cities and counties, who by way of

1 OPR's guidelines do take into consideration much of what  
2 comes out of that particular State agency.

3           So I think it's really important not to lose site  
4 of that subject, as peripheral as it may be to kind of the  
5 main event here, which is kind of this debate about ISR or  
6 not. I think it's one that ought not to be lost on us.

7           So I'd just like to offer that up as some  
8 constructive feedback, as we move forward.

9           Thank you.

10          CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Dr. Balmes.

11          BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Well, my comments follow  
12 nicely from Supervisor Serna's. I, too, want to extend my  
13 thanks to all those from the community -- from multiple  
14 communities that came here to testify today. And I'm  
15 sorry that many didn't get the chance.

16           I'm the public health member of the Board. I'm a  
17 physician studies the health effects of air pollution, and  
18 I take environmental justice very seriously. And I give a  
19 talk -- I give multiple talks where I actually have photos  
20 of warehouses in the Inland Empire, and busy roads and  
21 then railyards with, you know, people's homes adjacent to  
22 these facilities, so I know exactly what you're talking  
23 about.

24           I haven't experienced it in terms of living near  
25 these facilities, but I -- I do know what you're talking

1 about. And I just want to say that I, in those same  
2 talks, say that people shouldn't have homes that are  
3 adjacent -- immediately adjacent to either busy roads with  
4 lots of truck traffic or warehouses, which are basically  
5 truck farms. And I think I heard somebody say 500 -- or  
6 1500 feet. That's 500 meters. That's usually what I  
7 recommend as a minimum in terms of a buffer.

8           Why are busy -- why are schools -- public schools  
9 next to busy roads? Because the land is cheaper.

10           So, yes, I totally agree that that's not really  
11 acceptable, but I also -- not being a lawyer, I also agree  
12 with Supervisor Serna that we probably don't have the  
13 jurisdiction to mandate that. One of the witnesses said  
14 you've got to act now to do this. I don't think we have  
15 the authority. We recommend actually that people don't  
16 live closer than 500 meters, 500 yards, whatever, from  
17 busy roads. Yeah, but we can't mandate that.

18           So I wanted to say that I hear you. I strongly  
19 agree that it's not healthy to be close to those  
20 facilities with lots of truck traffic, and I think we have  
21 to work. It's a -- you know, there's a call to action  
22 here. So we need to work with other agencies, and I think  
23 it's mostly at the local level. We can push for such  
24 action, but that's all we can do, I think. Sorry to say.

25           CHAIR NICHOLS: Senator Lara.

1           SENATOR LARA: Thank you. Microphone, working?  
2 It's this one.

3           Is that working?

4           Oh, perfect, yeah. Call here and the microphone  
5 is this one.

6           BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right, right, right, right.

7           SENATOR LARA: Thank you. I want to just take a  
8 moment to thank the community who was here earlier as  
9 well, and really recognize that we've made tremendous  
10 progress already, in terms of the -- even in the last 10  
11 years when it comes to freight and air quality.

12           The clean truck initiatives, in my previous  
13 legislation of SB 1204, and the funding that we are  
14 pursuing from the GGRF fund, I think will also accelerate  
15 the use of zero-emission trucks. And that's zero. I  
16 think we've also sent a very strong message to the rest of  
17 the world in terms of investments and market signals with  
18 this latest budget that we had last year, where I don't  
19 think anybody else on this planet or in any jurisdiction  
20 have invested close to a billion dollars, that's a billion  
21 dollars, in ports.

22           And this is a major investment, and will result  
23 in further advancements I think in air quality for years  
24 to come. And I also want to just bring up a piece that I  
25 want to note, and want to thank the ARB staff for

1 consid -- the considerations of the cargo handling sector  
2 with our labor community. And I think it's important that  
3 we keep the consequences for jobs at the port in mind as  
4 we proceed. And our goal should be a sustainable port  
5 system of course, as part of the sustainable freight  
6 system that includes our workforce and our workers. The  
7 workers at the port have been critical to its -- to the  
8 port success, and is definitely an economic juggernaut for  
9 our State and our region.

10           And these workers also live in our communities,  
11 so they also will benefit from the clean air and the work  
12 that we're doing here today. And so for staff, I would  
13 just recommend as we continue to tease out the details of  
14 this plan which is to strongly urge that we continue to be  
15 thoughtful in not fall under the false choice of jobs and  
16 clean air, like the Assemblywoman Reyes talked about  
17 earlier in her letter.

18           We can make the investments to achieve the clean  
19 air and protect these jobs. This means we definitely keep  
20 an eye on the sources of largest emissions and prioritize  
21 that immediately, which are, as we all know and continue  
22 to talk about our truck emissions, and the warehouse  
23 emissions, where we can incentivize continued progress.

24           These trucks move throughout the freight network.  
25 And so keeping our eye on how we -- how we do when trying



1 to achieve the highest emission reductions will really, I  
2 think, continue us on the pathway to improve our air  
3 quality throughout the freight network, and will bring the  
4 most benefits to our community immediately.

5 And then have those further discussions as we  
6 continue to look at what other sources and other targets  
7 we use to clean our air in the port and transportation  
8 corridors throughout the State.

9 Thank you

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Thanks.

11 Mr. De La Torre.

12 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you.

13 On the AQMD issue, I was the one who made the  
14 motion last year, so I think I should address that. I  
15 think Chair Nichols did a -- she said exactly the right  
16 thing, which is we cannot preempt any action by the AQMD.  
17 It's their task. They're going to do whatever they're  
18 going to do, and then we'll see what we do in response to  
19 that.

20 It's -- that's the proper way to do it. As the  
21 person who kind of started this ball rolling, I  
22 acknowledge that. I accept it. It's the right way to go.

23 In the meantime though, what we are doing here  
24 today -- we're not taking action, but we're acknowledging  
25 what's happening, we are taking nine measures on freight

1 and goods movement, which is incredible -- an incredible  
2 workload to be doing in the three main areas that we know  
3 have this significant emissions and cancer risk: cold  
4 storage warehouse, railyards and seaports.

5 I, in meetings and discussions, have been  
6 clamoring for railyards, because in my for former assembly  
7 district, we had -- we have a railyard that obviously  
8 impacts neighboring communities. And in my time on the  
9 Air Resources Board, we have yet to take action with  
10 regard to railyards. That's part of this package. And so  
11 to me, that's incredibly important.

12 And then the other two, clearly, if the emissions  
13 are coming from there, and the cancer risk is coming from  
14 there, we need to prioritize that. And that's exactly  
15 what we are doing with this package.

16 So I'm very supportive of the direction we're  
17 going in. I always want to be more aggressive. And any  
18 opportunity we get, as we go along this path, we will try  
19 to be more aggressive. I've got some ideas that I've  
20 shared with staff about how we can do that. There are  
21 models in other states. There are things that are being  
22 done in other states that maybe we can take, not expecting  
23 that this administration -- not our administration, the  
24 other one in Washington --

25 (Laughter.)

1 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: -- will accept it.  
2 But, you know, other states have it, so why can't we? And  
3 I think that is a -- that's not a legal analysis, but I  
4 think the courts would probably be okay with us copying  
5 other states.

6 So with that, thank you very much staff. This is  
7 a wonderful, wonderful start. And we're going to be, you  
8 know, keeping your feet to the fire to follow through on  
9 all of this. Thank you.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Ms. Takvorian followed by  
11 Professor Sperling. Oh did you -- I don't see -- your  
12 name did not come up. Did you try to --

13 BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Push harder.

14 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: I pushed it a couple  
15 times today and it never came up. Did it not come on.

16 CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, go ahead. We'll give you a  
17 free pass here.

18 (Laughter.)

19 CHAIR NICHOLS: You made it. You're there.  
20 Okay.

21 Diane, was -- were you --

22 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Ms. Mitchell is going to  
23 go now and then I'll go after her. How about that.

24 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. All right. Great.

25 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you.

1 (Laughter.)

2 BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: So I, first of all, I  
3 want to say thank you to all the people that came today.  
4 You're -- I wanted you to know that your health is at the  
5 very top of our list. To provide you with the best air  
6 quality is our mission, and that's why we do this work.

7 Secondly, I want to say that I am the  
8 representative here on this Board from the South Coast Air  
9 Quality Management District. And so all the things that I  
10 hear from you are heartfelt and make me want to work  
11 harder to get to the goals that we're trying to reach.

12 The Air Quality Management Plan that came before  
13 this Board last year had a lot of different parts to it.  
14 The -- we're working pretty diligently on the stationary  
15 source reductions that are in that plan. And what we're  
16 here today and looking at today was the Indirect Source  
17 Rules that were included in that plan.

18 And at the -- last year, which was one year ago,  
19 we said we could come back here at this time this year and  
20 review what had been -- what we were doing and where we  
21 were with it. So the Indirect Source Rules came before  
22 our board, the first draft of those, just in the last  
23 month's meeting. And they have not been decided on. They  
24 are in process. We will continue to be working on those.

25 I think there are real possibilities to look at

1 the railroads and the railroad idling -- railyards and  
2 idling situations under Indirect Source. And I think the  
3 warehouses are a possibility also, but I will say that a  
4 lot of what we heard today on the warehouses are land-use  
5 issues. And I urge you to go to those people responsible  
6 for land use, that would be your board of supervisors,  
7 your city council people, and bring your concerns to them.  
8 There are state resources as well that we may look at if  
9 we find those people abrogate their responsibilities.

10 I want to also thank the ARB staff and the AQMD  
11 staff, because they have been collaborating extensively on  
12 what is -- on these rules, and on what happens in the  
13 South Coast District. CARB has the regulatory authority  
14 over all mobile sources. That's direct authority.

15 And when we look at Indirect Source Rules, one  
16 thing we are trying to get to is control of some of the  
17 mobile sources that go to and from these facilities.

18 So that authority for Indirect Source Rules falls  
19 pretty definitely within the jurisdiction and the  
20 authority of our local district, and -- but I don't  
21 believe we've seen any districts exercise that authority  
22 except San Joaquin Valley. And so this is bit of an  
23 experiment as we move forward in this direction.

24 I'm wondering as I listened to what people were  
25 saying today, if this Board might consider accelerating

1 some of the rules on mobile sources that are in the yard  
2 hustling trucks at the ports. And then we heard that  
3 there will be equipment in the warehouse yards that in the  
4 future are going to be the main source of emissions.

5 Trucks also, but I'm going to get to that in a  
6 minute. So if there's possibility to accelerate to  
7 zero-emission equipment used in warehouse yards, and some  
8 of the trip equipment used in cargo handling functions, I  
9 would have our -- I would like our staff to look into  
10 that.

11 When it comes to trucks, because we would like to  
12 go to zero emission immediately. I mean, all of us would  
13 like to be there, but it's just not there yet. We are  
14 seeing that development. And someone asked about the  
15 \$23.6 million that was given out last year. That money  
16 was combined with money from other sources to add up to  
17 \$40 million. And it was spent on five electric BYD  
18 trucks, a Peterbilt truck, a Volvo truck and a Kenworth  
19 truck, all of which had different combinations, hybrids,  
20 natural gas, and battery electric to get to cleaner  
21 emission trucks.

22 So your money is getting spent in the development  
23 of that technology, and we will continue to work to get to  
24 the cleanest zero-emission technology that is possible.  
25 Right now, the South Coast District needs to reduce its

1 NOx emissions by 45 percent by 2023.

2           And we have now in certified and commercialized a  
3 low-NOx truck that gets 99 percent reductions, a very high  
4 reduction, in NOx emissions. That's available now. It's  
5 on the streets. You can buy it. You can use it. And we  
6 see in our district, that would be the intermediate step  
7 while we wait for zero emission to be -- trucks to be  
8 perfected and on the street and commercialized.

9           So that is the reasoning behind getting down to  
10 low NOx and what we call near zero. Yes, our Chairman is  
11 right, we would much prefer to get to all zero, but that's  
12 not on the street and available and commercialized yet in  
13 a way where the truck driver out there or the fleet owner  
14 out there can go buy one and put it out on the street.

15           So we're working toward that end goal. It's very  
16 important to all of us sitting up here, and to the local  
17 air districts wherever they may be in the state.

18           I think that's all I wanted to say.

19           Thank you.

20           CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Then we -- I think you --  
21 you'll do your time, or your seat there, your place in the  
22 queue.

23           BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. Thank you.

24           So I wanted to add my gratitude to everyone who's  
25 been here all day. I know it's a long day. And my

1 apologies to those who had to leave and weren't able to  
2 have their voices be heard. And I think that we'll all  
3 try to do better in terms of time management for the  
4 future.

5 In regards to this matter, I wanted to say for  
6 the direct regulations that are being proposed, both the  
7 ones that have been in the -- in the works and those that  
8 are new, that I strongly support those for the drayage  
9 trucks, the cargo handling equipment, the locomotives, the  
10 harbor craft, and the increased emphasis on enforcement,  
11 as well as the new freight handbook, all of those are  
12 good. And I think that everyone from communities that are  
13 impacted by these activities welcomes them.

14 The problem is the pace of the development. And  
15 I think my question to staff would be how can the timeline  
16 be improved? Is there -- is there a way that we can move  
17 resources around? Is there a way that we can get to some  
18 of these -- some of the actions that we need to take on  
19 these regulations more quickly? And so I'd like to get a  
20 response on that.

21 On the ISR, we were here a year ago. I  
22 co-authored the amendment and felt strongly that this was  
23 something that really needs to be in places. And I think  
24 the testimony that we heard today is evidence of that.  
25 The difference between a direct regulation that assumes



1 that a facility is there, that operations are there, and  
2 that they need to be regulated. A truck needs to be  
3 regulated. The cargo-handling equipment. That's all good  
4 to make it as clean as it can be, but it presumes that the  
5 facility is there.

6 With ISR, there could be the inclusion of a  
7 holistic analysis of that facility, and whether or not  
8 it's located in the right place. And I understand the  
9 intersection with land use, but I think that we can begin  
10 to explore that.

11 We can do that. We have a land-use guidance  
12 manual that could be updated, and that could be considered  
13 for regulation, that we would make those buffers  
14 requirements. I heard that from the public today. I'd  
15 like to ask that that get put into the hopper again, so  
16 that we could look at that.

17 And I think also the EJ element that is required  
18 now as part of the general plans could be incorporated and  
19 we could look at that. I know that everyone on this Board  
20 wants to get to not have these bad land-use decisions  
21 being made. And I know that everyone that has talked to  
22 us about it has been to their local authorities.

23 I don't think -- with all due respect, I don't  
24 think anybody is confused about where to go. So I think  
25 this Board really needs to exercise its voice to say to

1 those local authorities to add our voice to the community  
2 voices to say this is not acceptable, because of the  
3 impact on public health.

4           So I'd like us to explore other ways. ISR is  
5 one. The buffers are another with the land-use guidance  
6 to make that not only our voice, but our authority as  
7 well.

8           Thank you.

9           CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Professor Sperling.

10          BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: I will be very short. I  
11 promise.

12          So I hold the transportation seat on the Board  
13 and I'm a professor. So I just want to make a plea that  
14 we be analytical and smart about how we address these very  
15 real problems and figure out what the problems really are.  
16 So if the problem at the warehouses are, as the data seems  
17 to be suggesting, is the equipment in the warehouses and  
18 on site, then let's deal with the equipment on site, and  
19 maybe we don't need a cap or a ISR. Maybe there's a  
20 better way of doing it.

21          And if the problem is trucks in neighborhoods,  
22 where it's not a pollution problem, but a noise and  
23 disturbance problem, then let's get the trucks out of  
24 there, and out of those streets, and out of those  
25 neighborhoods. So just a plea for science, and to note

1 that there actually are a lot of manufacturers, and a lot  
2 of fleets that are making a lot of investment in  
3 zero-emission technology. And we should be sending them  
4 pretty clear signals how to continue to make those  
5 investments to bring that technology to bear.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. We have no further  
8 comments from the Board, at least nobody has pressed their  
9 button. So I think we bring this item to a conclusion.  
10 Probably everybody wants to stand up and stretch at least  
11 for a minute, because we have one more item that we want  
12 to get through before we break for the evening.

13 If you're here to talk about that, which is the  
14 refrigerants rule, then stick around. Otherwise -- sorry,  
15 617.

16 (Laughter.)

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Refrigerants is tomorrow. Sorry.  
18 Sorry. It has been a long day. Yes, it's -- I'm sorry.  
19 It's 617 -- it's the update on 617. If you want to hear  
20 about 617, stick around. Otherwise, go home. Thank you.

21 (Off record: 5:35 p.m.)

22 (Thereupon a recess was taken.)

23 (On record: 5:43 p.m.)

24 CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. We're down to the  
25 true -- the true hard core here. 617. Magic numbers.

1           So let's begin. This is also an informational  
2 update on implementation of the AB 16[SIC] Community Air  
3 Protection Program.

4           Last month, we celebrated 50 years of actions  
5 that have helped make California a healthier place to  
6 work, live and play. However, as we know, many  
7 communities still suffer greater impacts than others. The  
8 Community Air Protection Program will play a critical role  
9 in reducing community level exposure to air pollution,  
10 providing a specific focus on disadvantaged communities  
11 that require special attention and expedited -- special  
12 attention and expedited action.

13           Okay. So, Mr. Corey, would you please begin this  
14 item.

15           EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, chair.

16           The focus of this program, as you noted, is on  
17 community action to achieve additional emission reductions  
18 in the most impacted communities. It's appropriate this  
19 item falls the SIP and freight discussions as those  
20 programs form a foundation upon which additional community  
21 focused actions will build. The program includes a number  
22 of specific elements, including emission reduction  
23 strategies that work together to improve public health and  
24 communities that bear the greatest burdens.

25           AB 617 sets out an ambitious schedule. CARB must

1 sell -- or rather set the overall program framework as  
2 well as identify an initial set of communities for  
3 deployment of community air monitoring plans, end  
4 development of community emission reduction programs by  
5 October 1st of this year.

6 To meet these requirements, staff has been  
7 conducting extensive outreach and is developing a program  
8 framework for Board consideration in September.

9 Last month, staff released a concept paper  
10 outlining a initial proposal for the framework elements  
11 along with the process for community members and air  
12 districts to submit recommendations for priority  
13 communities.

14 Today, staff will provide you an update on  
15 progress since last October, and planned efforts going  
16 forward. I'll now ask Andrea Juarez of our Office of  
17 Community Air Protection to give the staff presentation.

18 Andrea.

19 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was  
20 presented as follows.)

21 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: Thank you.

22 I was going to say good afternoon, but I might as  
23 well say good evening at this point.

24 As introduce by Mr. Corey, for the last item of  
25 the day, we'll be providing an update on development of

1 the Community Air Protection Program, and our progress  
2 since last October.

3           This program is about achieving new reductions  
4 and cleaner air in disadvantaged communities. Many  
5 factors have contributed to the air pollution burdens in  
6 these communities, including proximity to multiple sources  
7 and regional land-use planning, which is under the  
8 jurisdiction of other agencies. This makes the solutions  
9 more challenging and we'll need to be looking at new ways  
10 to engage with these other agencies.

11           Building the program will take time as we develop  
12 new community-level solutions, and provide greater equity  
13 in cleaner benefits. We'll be learning from initial  
14 efforts as we continue to expand and integrate this  
15 additional community focus into all our planning programs.

16                           --o0o--

17           AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: As a quick  
18 refresher, the program includes a number of elements to  
19 focus actions within these communities: These are  
20 community emissions reduction programs and additional  
21 controls on industrial facilities; community level air  
22 quality monitoring that supports actions to reduce  
23 emissions and exposure; enhanced requirements for the  
24 reporting of emissions data to improve transparency and  
25 tracking progress; and increased penalty provisions for







1           AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: We are  
2 therefore working on setting up additional opportunities  
3 to have discussions with community groups over the next  
4 few months. We want to understand impacted communities,  
5 and we know that hearing directly from communities is  
6 critical.

7           So last month a number of local community-based  
8 organizations in Southern California took us on a tour of  
9 their communities. This gave us a chance to see, hear and  
10 smell firsthand what community members experience every  
11 day, and better understand the types of actions that will  
12 be needed.

13           We are working on additional visits and  
14 conversations with communities throughout the state to  
15 continue to enhance ways that community residents can be  
16 active participants in the program.

17                           --o0o--

18           AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: We've also been  
19 busy over the last six months working on program  
20 implementation, including the four documents shown here.  
21 These include our proposed process for identifying  
22 communities and initial concepts for different elements of  
23 the program.

24           While we are still in the early stages of  
25 developing the program, the concept paper is the mechanism

1 to seek advice and spark discussion. It includes  
2 approaches for statewide strategies and criteria for the  
3 Community Emissions Reduction and Air Monitoring Programs.

4 Feedback on the concept paper will guide a draft  
5 program framework, which is scheduled for release in May.  
6 We've also been moving forward on the initial funding  
7 appropriated by the legislature. Earlier this month, we  
8 released a solicitation for grants to community-based  
9 organizations to support their participation in the  
10 program. These proposals will be due mid-April.

11 And just last week, staff released a proposed  
12 supplement to the Carl Moyer Program guidelines to better  
13 support the types of incentive projects that can provide  
14 immediate benefits in communities. The Board will be  
15 considering the proposed guideline changes next month.

16 --o0o--

17 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: So what is it  
18 that we have been hearing and discussing?

19 This slide highlights five key themes that have  
20 been brought to our attention. First, we've had a lot of  
21 discussion about how initial communities will be selected.  
22 Community members have also expressed the urgency of  
23 immediate actions to reduce emissions and exposure, and  
24 conducting air monitoring that has a clear connection to  
25 supporting subsequent action.

1           There has also been a great deal of interest in  
2 identifying and tracking health indicators related to air  
3 pollution. And finally, the importance of community  
4 partnerships in implementing the program. And I'll talk a  
5 little more about each of those over the next few slides.

6                           --o0o--

7           AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: One of the  
8 first steps is to identify and prioritize communities with  
9 the highest air pollution burdens. So we are requesting  
10 recommendations from not just the air districts, but also  
11 the communities. So we can reflect their local knowledge  
12 and experience.

13           Then, we'll be reviewing and compiling those  
14 recommendations for Board consideration in September. As  
15 we begin this new program, we anticipate recommending a  
16 smaller set of first-year communities where we have a  
17 solid technical foundation for identifying strategies and  
18 community-based organizations that can be strong partners.

19           Selecting communities in the first year that  
20 reflect a variety of sources can help in developing models  
21 for other communities with similar challenges.

22           We are also required to come back to the Board  
23 each year with additional recommendations, so you'll be  
24 seeing us again. And we plan to establish a list of  
25 communities for future years, which we will update

1 annually with new data and recommendations.

2 --o0o--

3 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: Once the  
4 communities are identified, the key focus is expediting  
5 action to reduce emissions and exposure. Many factors  
6 contribute to the pollution burdens experienced by these  
7 communities. And the Community Emission Reduction  
8 Programs will need to include multiple strategies to  
9 successfully tackle the air pollution challenge.

10 This will include:

11 New regulations that reduce community-level  
12 impacts coupled with strong enforcement; incentive  
13 programs to accelerate deployment of the cleanest  
14 technologies and foster technology innovation; mitigation  
15 measures to reduce exposure; and ways to engage on  
16 land-use planning.

17 --o0o--

18 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: Over the next  
19 few months, we'll be outlining strategies and defining  
20 clear direction for development of the Community Emissions  
21 Reduction Program. This slide highlights the key  
22 implementation principles that are critical to delivering  
23 knew reductions, incorporating community voices, and  
24 providing accountability.

25 The first is requirements for near-term actions,

1 such as focused enforcement, targeted incentive funding,  
2 and mitigation measures to provide immediate reductions.  
3 The second is a core regulatory focus through new  
4 rulemaking commitments by both CARB and the local air  
5 districts.

6 As you heard in the last item, CARB staff will be  
7 working on a significant number of regulations over the  
8 next few years including new measures to address the  
9 community level risk associated with the freight sector.

10 These strategies will include a focus on the  
11 transition to zero-emission technologies that are critical  
12 for impacted communities, but also support regional  
13 attainment and climate programs. We will be identifying  
14 additional CARB actions for other types of sources that  
15 impact communities, and air districts must expedite the  
16 retrofit of pollution controls at industrial facilities.

17 We are also looking at ways we can work with  
18 other agencies that have authority on land-use and  
19 transportation planning. And this includes informing  
20 local land use and transportation planning decisions  
21 through continued CEQA review, identifying best practices  
22 and tools, and bringing these agencies into community  
23 discussions.

24 And finally, ongoing community engagement,  
25 regular reports and metrics for tracking progress will be

1 essential in making sure that we see real improvements.

2 --o0o--

3 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: Community air  
4 monitoring is another program element with a specific  
5 focus on collecting data to support actions to reduce  
6 emissions and exposure. These actions can range from:  
7 identifying contributing sources, supporting enforcement  
8 actions, tracking progress, or informing daily activities  
9 to reduce exposure.

10 In each case, the appropriate methods and  
11 equipment must be tied to the action they are designed to  
12 support. We'll be developing criteria and guidance to  
13 ensure well-designed monitoring programs and actionable  
14 data. This data must also be transparent and accessible,  
15 and we'll be working with air districts and community  
16 groups to provide a variety of ways to access, interpret  
17 and act on data.

18 --o0o--

19 AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: All of the  
20 elements I've just been discussing are designed to improve  
21 public health by reducing exposure to air pollution.  
22 Tracking and effectiveness of the program will need to  
23 take many forms. We are considering metrics for actions  
24 taken the amount of emissions reduced, and, of course,  
25 improvements in air quality.

1           Now, while reductions in air pollution are  
2 strongly linked to improved public health, there are also  
3 many determinants of health in disadvantaged communities.  
4 These factors can include poverty levels and access to  
5 health care. And there are often gaps in data available  
6 at the community level. This is an important issue, but  
7 also a challenging one.

8           We're discussing with health professionals the  
9 types of data collection and research that will be needed  
10 over the longer term to track public health improvements,  
11 and better understand their relationship to reductions in  
12 air pollution.

13                           --o0o--

14           AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: The last major  
15 theme is the importance of community participation in  
16 implementing the program. We've heard the need for  
17 authentic community voices, as well as finding ways to  
18 bring agencies together to be a part of the solution.

19           These community partnerships are a core principle  
20 to make sure we are working together to provide clean air.  
21 We are proposing community steering committees to provide  
22 a venue for sharing information on community issues, and  
23 ensuring meaningful involvement in the planning and  
24 decision-making process for both the emissions reduction  
25 and monitoring programs.

1           We know there are a number of different models  
2 and approaches for community participation, and we're  
3 seeking recommendations on committee structures and roles.

4                   --o0o--

5           AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: To wrap-up, I  
6 want to touch briefly on the timeline over the next six  
7 months as we still have a lot to do in a short amount of  
8 time.

9           As discussed earlier, we'll be providing our  
10 recommendations for our first-year communities in  
11 September, and we are asking air districts to provide an  
12 initial list of communities at the end of April, with  
13 final recommendations based on continued outreach with  
14 communities at the end of July.

15           In September, the Board will also consider the  
16 overall planning framework. Our concept paper is an  
17 initial document to guide that framework. We expect to  
18 release an initial draft of the framework in May and a  
19 revised draft in August. We'll also continue to keep the  
20 Board updated throughout the process and look forward to  
21 today's discussion.

22           That concludes our presentation. But first, I'd  
23 like to invite some of our district partners to come up  
24 and provide a few remarks.

25           Wayne Nastri, executive officer for the Couth



1 Coast Air Quality Management District; Jack Broadbent,  
2 Chief Executive Officer, Air Pollution Control Officer for  
3 the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Tom Jordan,  
4 Senior Policy Advisor for the San Joaquin Valley Air  
5 Pollution Control District; and Alan Abbs, Executive  
6 Director for the California Air Pollution Control  
7 Officers' Association.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. NASTRI: Good evening, Madam Chair.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Good evening.

11 MR. NASTRI: We APCOs like to roll together.

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: I see.

13 (Laughter.)

14 CHAIR NICHOLS: Need the protection, do you?

15 MR. NASTRI: That's right.

16 We're also very pleased to have Brad Poiriez from  
17 Mojave Air District with as well.

18 So thank you. It has been a crazy last several  
19 months. When we think about the fact that 617 was just  
20 authorized, signed last year, and all of the work that has  
21 gone on during these last several months it's really quite  
22 amazing.

23 So we've been working very diligently to reduce  
24 the impacts in our communities from toxics -- from toxics  
25 exposure, toxic measures, and we've done it through a

1 number of different programs. We've done it through a  
2 multiple air toxics emissions study. We've done it  
3 through our toxics hot spots. We've done it through our  
4 localized air monitoring programs, very similar to what  
5 we've done in Paramount and Compton through our extended  
6 enforcement outreach efforts, as well as was discussed  
7 previously.

8           And through it all, we're working very closely  
9 with ARB staff. I think it's extremely important to  
10 highlight the fact that the coordination the  
11 communication, and really the support that we've been able  
12 to provide for one another is really a very positive  
13 aspect. I think in the two communities that we've had  
14 meetings in Los Angeles County, there's always been  
15 questions that one agency or the other was able the  
16 answer. There's been a tremendous amount of interest in  
17 the technical assistance grants that are being offered to  
18 the communities and having a better understanding of  
19 what's involved in having each other's staffs present  
20 really allows us to answer all of the questions as we move  
21 forward.

22           We at the South Coast are also continuing to work  
23 very diligently on dismantling our RECLAIM program. And  
24 as you heard the -- bringing BARCT rules is something that  
25 requires an intense effort for a program that's been in

1 existence for decades. And we're bringing many of the  
2 rules to our governing board this year.

3           So our staff has been working diligently on the  
4 development of these rules, working on the outreach in the  
5 communities, working on trying to make sure that we engage  
6 the communities. And as you've heard, there have been a  
7 number of different methods in how we actually do that.  
8 You know we've had programs, meetings where we've had  
9 people come up to an open mic, and we solicit input. And  
10 we've had breakout sessions.

11           And so we've learned a lot of different things.  
12 And we have more meetings coming up. In fact, next week,  
13 we'll be here in Riverside. And in the coming weeks after  
14 that, we'll be in San Bernardino and Orange County.

15           So we continue to work diligently on these  
16 programs. We intend to meet all of the deadlines, and  
17 we're going to continue to make sure that we're working  
18 with you and with the legislature to ensure that we have  
19 the funding to continue these programs.

20           Thank you.

21           MR. BROADBENT: Good evening, Madam Chair,  
22 members of the Board. Jack Broadbent with the Bay Area.

23           First, I just want to thank you all for allowing  
24 us to be here to talk to you about our efforts in  
25 implementing 617.

1           As we discussed I think at our -- the last time  
2 you all heard this, we see 617 as really a new paradigm  
3 with regard to air quality management. In the sense that  
4 we're going to be talking about -- and really trying to  
5 understand and address public exposure. And I think  
6 that's -- we at least at the Bay Area are very excited  
7 about that.

8           We're moving forward very aggressively to  
9 implement 617. We had our first fairly comprehensive  
10 meeting with the communities at night in January, late  
11 January, where there was a considerable amount of public  
12 interest provided. And we're now in the process of  
13 setting up the individual community meetings in each of  
14 the different communities around the Bay Area.

15           For example, tomorrow we have a site tour of  
16 Vallejo, and next week we have a fairly big meeting in San  
17 Leandro.

18           And so we think that just in the Bay Area, we  
19 think we're probably looking at least about a dozen  
20 different communities that will be addressed over the next  
21 several years with West Oakland and Richmond being in the  
22 first year where we need to address.

23           So one thing that Mr. Nastri said, and I just  
24 want to echo, I think the partnership with your staff,  
25 Madam Chair, has been excellent. It's been just

1 phenomenal the amount of communication, and partnership,  
2 and we really -- I just want to commend your staff for  
3 working with us.

4           Just a couple of issues that are clearly, though  
5 I just want to highlight for you just at the outset of  
6 this effort that I just want to bring to your attention.  
7 One has to do with capacity building. This is going to be  
8 a -- this is going to be an important issue for both  
9 ourselves, as well as CARB to address, in the sense that  
10 there's a lot of communities out there we're going to need  
11 to really get in and develop the extensive monitoring  
12 network.

13           And yet, there's not necessarily the structure.  
14 There's not the community groups and organizers that are  
15 there. So you all have a \$5 million grant out for to help  
16 in that regard. And we at the Bay Area are stepping up  
17 also to provide some of our resources for that capacity  
18 building as well.

19           Another issue is communication. A lot of folks  
20 as we go and sit down and talk to them, they're only  
21 hearing about this for the first time. And there's just a  
22 whole conversation we have to have as to who is the Bay  
23 Area Air Quality Management District and who is the  
24 California Air Resources Board.

25           So we understand that there's a -- there's a kind

1 of a learning curve there with a lot of communities. And  
2 finally, as Mr. Nastri indicated, resources are going to  
3 be critical moving forward. We at the Bay Area have  
4 already gone to hire and put in place a number of staff.  
5 We've hired eight staff just to -- for 617 implementation.

6 And so there's going to be a strong need for  
7 ongoing resources to implement this important piece of  
8 legislation.

9 So thank you, Madam Chair. And let me hand it  
10 over to Mr. Jordan.

11 MR. JORDAN: Well, good evening. As with  
12 everybody else, we've been very busy trying to get this  
13 thing going in the valley. Over the last two months,  
14 we've had about 10 meetings on the topics, ranging from  
15 joint meetings with ARB staff to meetings about our  
16 incentive programs and how to get those early action  
17 dollars out.

18 Admittedly, most of those have been kind of your  
19 standard workshop formats at our board room, and we want  
20 to make sure that we're actually getting out to the  
21 communities. We've written just recently many grants with  
22 three community-based organizations in the valley to set  
23 up meetings in the communities around the San Joaquin  
24 Valley to get out and talk to everyone about this program,  
25 opportunities for the early action dollars and the like.

1           Also, getting information out, we've set up a  
2 webpage with everything 617 related and the Valley  
3 available on there, be it events, be it dollars, be it  
4 mapping tools. We've come up with some ideas mapping  
5 ideas as far as identifying communities. Also, getting  
6 information out. We've set up a web page with everything  
7 617 related in the valley available on there be it  
8 even'ts, be it resource -- dollars be it mapping tools.

9           We've come up with some ideas -- mapping ideas as  
10 far as identifying communities that we've made available  
11 to the public to get input on communities that we think  
12 should be in the initial round for 617.

13           And then as Jack Broadbent mentioned, we've  
14 actually went to our board recently and there were 30  
15 positions authorized between our grant programs and 617,  
16 as well as a significant enhancement of our monitoring  
17 capacity to do mobile monitoring throughout the valley.

18           But with that is the realization that when you  
19 staff up, you need that ongoing -- those ongoing  
20 resources. And we realize part of that will be from local  
21 resources, but we think there's a State role to play in  
22 that as well, as we continue forward year after year for  
23 617.

24           Thank you.

25           MR. POIRIEZ: Good evening, Brad Poiriez, Mojave

1 Desert AQMD and also Antelope Valley. So before you have  
2 the wide spectrum, you have the large air districts, the  
3 medium districts, and I'm also the Executive Director over  
4 the staff at Antelope Valley as well, which is a rural  
5 district.

6           And I guess what we've done from the medium-size  
7 in my particular agency is we've linked a lot of the  
8 materials that staff at ARB has provided on their website  
9 to our website. We're trying to get the message  
10 consistently out there what CARB is trying to get out to  
11 the state. We want to do the same.

12           I felt it was important for me to first educate  
13 my own Board members. And Ms. Riordan is one of my Board  
14 members. So we agendized this item and we had a -- quite  
15 the robust discussion on it. So I thought that was very  
16 important to have my elected officials understand what our  
17 mandated requirements were under the 617 legislation.

18           And we also are doing our public outreach, and we  
19 are having our meeting. I think our next meeting is next  
20 week that we'll be having in Victorville.

21           But I think the dollars are very important as  
22 you're going to hear from everyone that comes up here  
23 probably to make sure that we can implement this to the  
24 best possible way to make sure that this legislation is  
25 successful.



1           And that holds true, especially for some of the  
2 really small air districts, as well as us medium  
3 districts, not just the large urban areas. And our  
4 colleagues -- and my colleagues here in CAPCOA we try --  
5 we strive very hard to be consistent in our messaging, and  
6 also work collaboratively to get the message across. And  
7 we want to be a partner with the Air Resources Board and  
8 make sure this is successful.

9           So thank you.

10          CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

11          CAPCOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ABBS: Good evening.

12 Alan Abbs with the California Air Pollution Control  
13 Officers Association. I guess it's my job to try to say  
14 the things that haven't yet been said. And I'll start off  
15 by thanking the Board and thanking Richard Corey for an  
16 excellent hire he made in having Karen Magliano lead the  
17 staff. And I mean her leadership in this and the staff  
18 under her that have been working with her have made this  
19 process a lot easier than it could have been with a  
20 different person in place. And she's been a great person  
21 to work with. And this program is better because of it.  
22 So I'd like to say that for starters.

23           When staff gave the update about where we are  
24 right now, six months ago the ink was still drying on this  
25 bill. And when the Board heard the presentation, we were

1 trying to figure out, you know, really what -- what we  
2 were going to have to do by October of this year.

3           And in six months, we've accomplished a lot. And  
4 behind the scenes from what you've seen tonight and the  
5 documents that have been prepared, and many of you have  
6 seen as part of this, as staff has mentioned, we've had  
7 these consultation group meetings, which are picking up  
8 again next week. We have -- we've had executive level  
9 meetings with some of the large air districts, with the  
10 air pollution control officers at large.

11           Many of these requirements in 617, the BARCT, the  
12 emissions inventory, the monitoring programs all have  
13 separate work groups with CARB staff, and with air  
14 district staff. And then even at the CAPCOA level, we  
15 have a series of committee meetings where 617 is prominent  
16 among the individual air districts when they get together  
17 and talk about issues, to the point where sometimes I have  
18 to tell these committees, no, you've got to talk about  
19 something other than 617. There's other things that we  
20 have to work on as well.

21           And so I just want to reassure everyone that the  
22 air districts take this work seriously. We've been  
23 engaged in it. We know that there's a lot at stake. We  
24 know that there's a lot of work to be done to make the  
25 first deadline in October, and then future deadlines as

1 they come up. And I'm just here to tell you that we're  
2 ready to -- we're going to continue to do this, and we  
3 look forward to doing this with CARB staff.

4 Thanks.

5 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. There you are, the five  
6 amigos.

7 (Laughter.)

8 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Okay. I'm going to call  
9 to on -- we were just going to go straight to the large  
10 list of witnesses that we have here. But I want to ask  
11 Dr. Balmes who's been acting as a kind of a special  
12 liaison on the health issues to say a few words here.

13 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes. As was mentioned by  
14 staff, I volunteered, and am happy to be chair of the AB  
15 617 Consultation Group, which includes representatives,  
16 about 25, from community organizations, larger  
17 environmental health advocacy groups, all of the five  
18 amigos -- well, I should say three of the -- four of the  
19 amigos actually that just spoke, but I appreciate that  
20 Mojave and Antelope Valley where present today.

21 And it also includes some of the people you'll  
22 hear from later as witnesses, Kevin Hamilton from San  
23 Joaquin, Martha Argüello, Luis Olmedo. I'm probably  
24 leaving out some other people that might be in the  
25 audience, but it's been -- we've only had one meeting, but

1 I think we already covered a lot of ground in that one  
2 meeting, because the initial effort from staff was mostly  
3 to focus on the community air quality monitoring network,  
4 and then the community action plan to reduce emissions  
5 sort of based on the data from the community air quality  
6 monitoring.

7 But we found out from legislative staff that were  
8 present at that first meeting that health is really  
9 where -- was the intent of the legislation. And I want to  
10 just say that while I totally support that as a public  
11 health practitioner, specifically related to air pollution  
12 health effects, and as I've already mentioned today, very  
13 much concerned about health disparities related to  
14 excessive exposure to air pollution in our disadvantaged  
15 communities, getting to the health metrics linking that up  
16 with the rest of what we're doing with AB 617 is a heavy  
17 left.

18 The first part is a heavy lift, but getting to  
19 health metrics is a heavier lift. And I say that as an  
20 experienced air pollution health effects researchers. We  
21 don't have data in this state at the community level to  
22 link the efforts of the community monitoring network and  
23 emission reductions plans. We don't have the health data  
24 to actually assess how well the rest of the program is  
25 working.

1           And I was pleased to hear some interest from  
2 Senator Lara when I talked to him about this about trying  
3 to help get funding for the CDPH as a super -- supervisor  
4 of increased resources for the community -- excuse me, the  
5 county health departments to help get more granular data  
6 at the community level with regard to appropriate health  
7 metrics.

8           And I just want to say I'm not talking about more  
9 research about air pollution and health effects. I'm  
10 talking about, and I don't need statistical significance  
11 at the community level, but we need to be able to see  
12 trends over time and appropriate health metrics.

13           What those health -- appropriate health metrics  
14 will be, needs further work. But I both want to say that  
15 I'm very happy with the effort we've done so far. As Mr.  
16 Broadbent said this is a paradigm shift that, you know,  
17 the rest of the country really will be looking to us to  
18 see if we can make this work. So it's very important  
19 work, but we need to do it right.

20           And I think on the health side, we need a lot  
21 more work. So I just want to thank everybody so far for  
22 their efforts. I totally agree with the kudos that Ms.  
23 Magliano has just gotten. I support that completely. And  
24 I also appreciate Veronica Eady's efforts to help us reach  
25 out to the communities.

1           As I've said in the past, this agency hasn't been  
2 that good at reaching out to communities. We're trying  
3 really hard now, and I appreciate all the efforts that Ms.  
4 Eady is bringing to this. And I definitely appreciate  
5 what the district representatives have said in terms of  
6 trying to work with us on this really important effort.

7           CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

8           We're going to go to the list now. And I am  
9 going to arbitrarily say that we're going to give  
10 everybody two minutes, because it's late in the day and I  
11 think people can say what they need to say in two minutes.  
12 So let's get started.

13          Joy Williams.

14          MS. WILLIAMS: Good evening. I'm Joy Williams  
15 with Environmental Health Coalition and the California  
16 Environmental Justice Alliance.

17          We urge ARB to take a strong leadership role in  
18 implementation of 617 to ensure the outcomes that our  
19 communities urgently need. In regard to the statewide  
20 strategy, it's essential that ARB develops a strategy that  
21 lists the strongest possibly emission reduction measures  
22 for all types of sources, prioritizing those that have  
23 direct emission reductions and zero-emissions  
24 technologies; sets clear aggressive goals and timelines to  
25 meet, based on health-based metrics - and I hear that

1 that's difficult, but that's where we think it needs to be  
2 measured; requires air districts to prioritize community  
3 input in developing the community emission reduction  
4 plans; and prioritize the measures that communities want  
5 and support; provides clear directives to develop new  
6 local regulations as needed; and clearly lays out a  
7 process for ARB to step in if air districts do not comply.

8 ARB's statewide strategy should provide a minimum  
9 baseline set of criteria for all air districts and  
10 community emission reduction plans to meet and exceed, not  
11 preempting or preventing stronger proactive local action.

12 Regarding BACT and TBACT, we need a clear and  
13 stringent definition that is applied consistently  
14 statewide. The standard should include the concept of  
15 maximum achievable reductions, but may also need to  
16 incorporate non-technology concepts, such as limitations  
17 on operations. The standard should be geared to a health  
18 metric, rather than to cost effectiveness.

19 In the San Diego region, we have community air  
20 quality hazards from both mobile and stationary sources,  
21 and we'll be looking tot the 617 process for support on  
22 land-use issues, such as a required truck route, as well  
23 as direct emission source regulations and an Indirect  
24 Source Rule for facilities that generate truck traffic  
25 within our residential communities.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

3 MS. SULLIVAN: Good evening, Madam Chair and  
4 Board, and ARB staff members. My name is Shelly Sullivan.  
5 I'm here representing the Climate Change Policy Coalition.  
6 And we just wanted to let you know that we support several  
7 of ARB's guiding principles in the concept paper,  
8 including those pertaining to the need for clear metrics  
9 to track progress, a strong science-based foundation to  
10 support identification of communities with the greatest  
11 commun -- cumulative exposure burden, and ensuring  
12 scientifically sound evaluations of community air quality.

13 One exception that is repeated throughout the  
14 concept paper is ARB's -- ARB's emphasis on the deployment  
15 of zero-emission technologies. ARB's principles should  
16 not endorse one particular technology or classes of  
17 technologies. And ARB should not presume that  
18 zero-emission technologies will be the most effective path  
19 to achieving AB 16[SIC] objectives in all cases.

20 ARB requires consideration of cost effective  
21 emission reduction measures reflecting the reality -- in  
22 reflecting that reality is the ARB, the districts,  
23 regulated entities and communities are working with  
24 limited resources. For these reasons, the concept paper  
25 should promote an overarching goal of deploying the most



1 cost effective emission reduction technologies to maximize  
2 the benefit per dollar invested in any given community.

3 We're going to be submitting additional comments  
4 later, but those are our top line goals. So thank you  
5 very much.

6 MS. MMAGU: Good evening, Madam Chair, Board  
7 members. Amy Mmagu on behalf of the California Chamber of  
8 Commerce. First of all, thank you all for your hard work  
9 that you've done on this. We look forward to remaining  
10 constructive participants in this process moving forward.

11 One issue that I do want to raise which may not  
12 be directly your issue, but it is an issue that is really  
13 a significant impact on the ability to implement the  
14 program is the fact that local air districts do need  
15 funding to be able to develop and carry-out the programs  
16 at a local level.

17 Currently, the State budget isn't allocating them  
18 the funds necessary to do that. And as representing  
19 members within those communities and stationary sources in  
20 those communities, we are concerned with the ability for  
21 those air districts to be able to properly implement the  
22 programs.

23 So I wanted to raise that concern, and once again  
24 we remain committed to working with you in the future.  
25 Thank you.

1 MR. CHAVEZ: Hi. Chris Chavez with the Coalition  
2 for Clean Air. The Coalition for Clean Air supports the  
3 broad overall goals and strategies of CARB's initial plans  
4 for AB 617. Developing pollution reduction strategies  
5 tailored to meet the needs of our most impacted  
6 communities is an important and needed evolution in  
7 California's climate and air quality policies.

8 The concept paper rightfully recognizes that  
9 community air protection should build upon and complement  
10 existing efforts with an integrated approach and to  
11 reducing cumulative impacts at the community level.

12 The workshops hosted by CARB and South Coast AQMD  
13 have shown that the suggested metrics for identifying AB  
14 617 communities largely aligns with community wants. One  
15 where there could be more overlap is on the area of health  
16 outcomes.

17 While health conditions are difficult to  
18 attribute directly to pollution, health emergencies, such  
19 as asthma hospitalizations are scientifically linked to  
20 air quality and air pollution. Ensuring that community  
21 engagement and leadership in local community emission  
22 strategies is a must. Communities must have a hand in  
23 implementing the program and feel invested in it.

24 There's been some discussion about defining  
25 communities beyond just focusing on specific neighborhoods

1 and cities. In some cases, this might be appropriate,  
2 particularly communities impacted by freight corridors and  
3 the ports and so on. However, we must make sure that  
4 we're taking this locally rather than regionally.

5 The requirement for the best available retrofit  
6 control technology must be implemented so that it requires  
7 actual equipment upgrades to reduce emissions rather than  
8 paper compliance. And short-term emission strategies  
9 can't just focus on mitigation.

10 Filters, buffers and vegetation might be helpful  
11 in reducing exposure pollution, but they do not reduce  
12 emissions.

13 Similarly larger mitigation strategies such as  
14 developing alternative truck routes and relocating  
15 facility entrances must not merely relocate harmful  
16 emissions to other areas, rather the focus must remain on  
17 reducing emissions. And thank you for your time.

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

19 MS. GALE: Good evening, everyone. Genevieve  
20 Gale, Central Valley Air Quality Coalition.

21 (Timer sounded.)

22 (Laughter.).

23 CHAIR NICHOLS: That was just a reset.

24 MS. GALE: AB 617 is exciting. It's new. It's  
25 sexy. However, I worry that it is somewhat distracting us

1 from some unfinished work that we have in the San Joaquin  
2 Valley. So I am actually hijacking my own comments today  
3 to remind all of us that the San Joaquin Valley has yet to  
4 officially come into compliance for a PM standard that was  
5 set in 1997. And we have yet to submit a plan for a  
6 standard that was set in 2006. And that's not even to  
7 mention the 2012 standard.

8 So we've had decades to clean the air in the San  
9 Joaquin Valley. And this past holiday season, as Kevin  
10 explained, we saw one of the worst spikes in particle  
11 pollution that we've had in years. Dr. Sherriffs, you  
12 probably were there. It was scary.

13 So thanks to the Board's action in 20 -- October  
14 2016, we've all been diligently working on an integrated  
15 PM plan. However, it's been 18 months, and CARB and the  
16 district have yet to produce a plan that brings us into  
17 attainment.

18 So like I said, AB 617 is exciting. It's the new  
19 girl on the block. And hopefully, it will bring near-term  
20 benefits to communities across the State.

21 However, I don't want this Board to forget about  
22 a plan that has the potential to bring clean air to over  
23 four million people in the San Joaquin Valley.

24 So I'll end by saying go forth with ambitious 617  
25 goals. We support you and your staff, and I support the

1 comments made by CCA, CCAC, Leadership Counsel, CRPE,  
2 CEJA. But also after this meeting, perhaps ask your staff  
3 what more we can do to finalize a plan for the valley.

4 Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 CHAIR NICHOLS: I think some clapping might be  
7 good actually just to get some energy going here.

8 MR. HAMILTON: It was awesome. That was -- I  
9 feel ashamed that I'm not just saying that, so that's --

10 (Laughter.)

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, you can just incorporate --

12 MR. HAMILTON: -- so right on target.

13 So with regard to 617 --

14 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: You're pretty awesome too.

15 MR. HAMILTON: -- though, I -- Kevin Hamilton,  
16 Central California Asthma Collaborative. Thank you.

17 I do want to say and give Compliments to the  
18 staff here, particularly the folks sitting here who have  
19 done yeoman's work in traveling across this state over the  
20 last few months since early fall conducting so many  
21 community meetings and listening sessions, which should  
22 set a pattern hopefully going forward for this Board and  
23 its staff, and how they address all of the issues before  
24 them.

25 There were some weaknesses there that we think

1 could be addressed. The ability to be able to get  
2 community members to these meetings. I was laughingly  
3 referred to as the van driver on a regular basis, but it's  
4 serious. I mean, the facts is that the community that  
5 we're trying to hear from has a lot of barriers to  
6 engaging on these issues, not the least of which is  
7 transportation.

8           So there are some areas of our State, which are  
9 pretty transportation rich, but our region is not. Our  
10 public transportation systems are weak and ineffective,  
11 and our families are poor. And traveling in the dark  
12 across the area on a bus with four children is just not  
13 going to cut it as a general rule.

14           So we in community-based organizations do the  
15 best we can to address that and support it, and ensure  
16 that those voices are heard. But we feel that they're  
17 best heard if those people can show up for themselves and  
18 speak for themselves. I'm always cautious and concerned  
19 when I -- I'm referred to as speaking for the community,  
20 because they have their own voices and they need to be  
21 heard.

22           This process has the chance to really do some  
23 work that a lot of us have been pulling for for quite a  
24 number of years, and that's characterize emissions and  
25 exposures to community folks at the community level. We

1 all understand that air pollution has been regulated at a  
2 regional level. And that's the legal way that it's done.  
3 That's what the statutes say, but we have this opportunity  
4 to move forward, and find out a better -- better  
5 information and be able to better protect our community's  
6 health.

7 So we'll be here cheering you on making sure that  
8 that happens and keeping our foot where it belongs when it  
9 needs to be, so thank you.

10 CHAIR NICHOLS: Macy Westbrook? Here, not here?  
11 Not here -- with the American Lung Association?  
12 Harvey Eder.

13 MR. EDER: Hello. I'm Harvey Eder for myself and  
14 the Public Solar Power Coalition. This is great that this  
15 is happening. It has to be worked with a solar conversion  
16 program for different areas in the state. We're trying to  
17 amend our complaints with litigation that we've got with  
18 you folks. And one thing is I think I mentioned the judge  
19 said there's -- there's law and policy -- well, there's  
20 laws of nature, and laws of humans. And we're breaking a  
21 lot of the laws of nature. And we've got to adjust our  
22 human laws and policy and laws is where you folks come in.

23 There is technology forcing, in the Supreme Court  
24 case on coatings versus the air district, South Coast. In  
25 2012, the Supreme court said that BARCT is technology

1 forcing, that means that isn't cost effective absolutely  
2 right now and will be in one or three or five years.  
3 That's what shall be done. So this is very important.

4           There's the world -- the whole state to retrofit.  
5 And so we were involved also in litigation talking about  
6 BARCT, and BACT, and ACT alternative control technologies,  
7 and control technology guidelines. EPA has been  
8 negligent. It's been 20, 30 years ago. The most recent  
9 about 10 years ago. I'm looking at solar and cost  
10 effectiveness, but this is typical.

11           CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I know two minutes goes  
12 fast.

13           All right. Corie Goldman.

14           Lupe Guerrero?

15           MS. GUERRERO(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good evening.  
16 My name is Lupe Guerrero. This is the first time that I  
17 come to a meeting like this. And I realize that there is  
18 a lot of important people here, many people that have  
19 degrees that they have been to advocate for their  
20 communities. I represent the City of Huntington Park and  
21 the communities of the South Side, Southeast -- Southwest  
22 of the L.A.

23           I don't have a degree as many of the people that  
24 have been addressing here, like doctorate degrees or being  
25 a teacher, but my title is to be wife, mother, grandmother



1 and great grandmother. And on behalf of the family that I  
2 have, I would like to request to have clean air, zero  
3 emissions.

4 And this is what I want to say that I wish my  
5 voice, this voice could listen. And I'm going to continue  
6 to fight for my community my family.

7 Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 MS. AGUILAR (THROUGH INTERPRETER): Almost good  
10 evening. My name is Jenny Xiomara Rosales Aguila. I am  
11 proud to be -- to have the opportunity to be here. I know  
12 that it's been a long wait. Thank you for the time that  
13 you have been spending here also. And thank you for the  
14 good work that you all take part here.

15 I come here to speak on behalf of Huntington  
16 Park, and CBE is the organization that I represent. I  
17 have suffered as a person. My family has been stricken by  
18 cancer, by asthma, but I'm here mostly for my community,  
19 my neighbors. Some of them are not here anymore, they  
20 have gone to a better life. Because of the bad quality of  
21 the environment. The bad air that we have endured for  
22 years.

23 So for that reason, I'm asking you, I'm begging  
24 you to think for those -- on behalf of those communities  
25 that have suffered for many years. We know that we have

1 better automobiles with zero emissions. We'll have better  
2 quality of life. AB 617 has good opportunities, but we  
3 have to take into account that the number of cars, the  
4 many cars that are going through our communities and are  
5 affecting our lives.

6 For those families, for those communities, for  
7 our beloved ones, I ask you -- we are asking you to have  
8 zero emissions, please.

9 Thank you very much.

10 (Applause.)

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Who is next here?

12 Gabriel, yes.

13 MR. GUERRERO: Okay. I can speak English a  
14 little.

15 CHAIR NICHOLS: You speak English. It's up to  
16 you, whatever you like.

17 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I'll just do it.

18 MR. GUERRERO: No, that's fine. Yeah, my name is  
19 Gabriel Guerrero. And I've been living for 45 years on  
20 the southeast cities, which is Maywood, Huntington Park,  
21 Walnut Park, and South Gate. Actually, I belong to CEJA  
22 and also CBE, and I'm glad to be serving these  
23 organizations.

24 I'm a volunteer. Okay. The reason I'm here  
25 today is there's so many things around -- happening around

1 my city. I'm surrounded by freeways. I'm right on the  
2 middle of 710, 105, and I got 5 on the north. And then on  
3 the west, I have 110.

4 So, yes, I'm the husband of this lady, she just  
5 spoke just a few minutes ago. And I'm also a father, and  
6 I'm a grandfather, and son. I've got a great, great  
7 daughters. And I'm so worried about life of my kids. I  
8 would like to see my kids grow up. I would like to be  
9 maybe 85, 90 years old. And I would like to see my babies  
10 to be 15 years.

11 And in order to do that, we need clean air. We  
12 got a lot of contamination around our cities. So urge you  
13 guys do your best you can. Okay. And 617 is really good  
14 for us. She is the sexy lady walking on the street.  
15 That's what the other girl says. Okay, right.

16 So thank you very much. I really appreciate it  
17 for your time.

18 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

19 (Applause.)

20 CHAIR NICHOLS: Mr. Gastelum.

21 MR. GASTELUM(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good evening,  
22 everyone. I'm Ricardo Gastelum. And I'm a CBE organizer.  
23 My point is that we want zero emissions. We have already  
24 too many rules. We have too many policies, but some of  
25 them are violated by the people that work in the

1 governments. We have companies in our area that work  
2 without any permit -- any permits.

3 They expand without any permission. My question  
4 is where are the inspectors? If I do something illegally  
5 in my house, they come and tear it down. How come those  
6 companies continue to operate? We have also -- we need  
7 also solutions at the port, not only with cars. Those  
8 ships are coming in are contaminating and polluting our  
9 beaches. We cannot go to the beach.

10 We want rules that affect them. Some of those  
11 ships come and they bring their containers with them. We  
12 don't know what they bring in terms of pollution. We  
13 invite you to go and swim on the beach. The sign says do  
14 not swim, so why do we need the beach?

15 Airports, rules for the airplanes also.  
16 Sometimes when they are landing, they have to release  
17 the --

18 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Fuel.

19 MR. GASTELUM(THROUGH INTERPRETER): -- fuel -  
20 thank you - because they need to land.

21 There are no policies affecting those. Where are  
22 the workers that are checking the are and checking the  
23 land. The hospitals are full. They are up to the reams  
24 with people seek people. If I go to the hospital, it will  
25 take me 24 hours to take -- to be taken care of. Besides,

1 it will take me, it will cost me a thousand or 900  
2 dollars.

3 We need quality inspectors that work for the  
4 people. And if they don't work, we've got to fire them.  
5 We need people that work there that like the people.  
6 Otherwise our youth are not going to stay. We have just  
7 some years, but the youth -- our youth, our kids and  
8 grandkids they are coming up. What kind of planet are we  
9 going to leave to them?

10 Sea water is polluted. We cannot go fishing  
11 because it's polluted.

12 Thank you very much. I leave it in your hands.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. OLIVO(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good night --  
15 Good evening. My name is Rodolfo Olivo. I come here to  
16 request and demand for you to work for clean air, and also  
17 air that is free from toxics -- toxins for all the  
18 community. We want you to act fast for a better future  
19 for all the generations, both the kids as well as to all  
20 of us.

21 Thank you.

22 (Applause.)

23 MS. LOVYA(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good evening.  
24 My name is Irma Lovya. I'm here advocating for my  
25 children, because I believe they need to be at school.

1 That's why they are not here with me. Two have problems.  
2 One has a heart problem. He was studying at Long Beach.  
3 Now, he's now in a different school studying.

4 I have another son who is 18 years old. I have  
5 lots of trouble with him, because I didn't know that  
6 what -- the trouble that he had with learning and his  
7 learning abilities is because of the environment. I live  
8 in Long Beach and doctors tell me that maybe is -- this is  
9 because of food, because the food is -- because the earth  
10 and the land is still polluted.

11 That's why I'm here on behalf of my community  
12 also, and on behalf of my kids. I don't want you to say  
13 when I live here is, oh, poor lady. I know that it is in  
14 your hands, and that's why I'm here. I'm here in support  
15 of my children, and I want them to study with that  
16 aptitude that the disabled person has and -- and because  
17 my son is handicapped that's why I couldn't bring it,  
18 because he believes -- I believe that he deserves to  
19 study.

20 I know that all of this is in hands. Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MS. ARGÜELLO: Good afternoon. Hopefully, I can  
23 be linear, because I'm a little bit tired.

24 My name is Martha Argüello. I'm the Executive  
25 Director of Physicians for Social Responsibility. I'm

1 also the Co-Chair of Standing Together Against  
2 Neighborhood Drilling, and a member of CEJA.

3           And physicians for social responsibility as an  
4 organization of health professionals, nurses, and  
5 physicians is dedicated to this idea of preventing harm to  
6 human health and the environment. And we've been very  
7 much pushing this idea of using health metrics. So we  
8 hope to work with you because we know it's difficult.

9           We hope that what comes out of this is something  
10 that the environmental justice and the public health  
11 community have wanted a long -- for a long time, and  
12 actually real-time Environmental Health Tracking Program,  
13 increasing the numbers of illnesses that are actually  
14 reportable, so we can start tracking that.

15           And so we hope to partner with you to move health  
16 departments and move the legislature to begin to  
17 understand the importance of actually collecting some of  
18 that data. Without that data, we can't actually tell  
19 people we're reducing cancer risk, which is what one of  
20 the metrics for this bill should be.

21           We can't tell communities we're reducing  
22 respiratory risk or reproductive health risk, unless we do  
23 that. And that's what communities are demanding. Whether  
24 you live next to an oil well, you live next to an oil  
25 well, you live next to an agricultural field, or you live

1 next to the ports, people are demanding relief and a  
2 decrease in the health symptoms.

3           And so we have a public health emergency. We  
4 cannot wait. There is enough data to act. Certainly, you  
5 know, just a few -- a week ago, the L.A. County health  
6 department released a report looking at urban drilling and  
7 said we know that this is a public health threat, and that  
8 proximity and density matters, and we shouldn't be  
9 carrying out these practices next to where people live.  
10 It is unhealthy.

11           We should be moving toward health-based decision  
12 making. That's really what would prevent harm, and  
13 actually begin to force us to do that technology-forcing  
14 regulations that will get us an economy that's benign by  
15 design, and it looks at things from cradle to cradle.

16           And -- okay. And we should make sure that  
17 monitoring -- I'm going to just say the last thing, that  
18 if we're going to put monitoring equipment in the hands of  
19 community, it should be -- we should be honest that what  
20 we monitor, you can take action on, because we don't want  
21 to raise false expectations of communities, and again  
22 disappoint them.

23           And we hope a strong implementation of 617 and  
24 that you don't forget 197 as well. Thanks.

25           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.



1 (Applause.)

2 MR. HERNANDEZ: Hi. Good evening, members of the  
3 Board. It's been a long day, but we're still here. I'm  
4 grateful. Thank you for your time. Actually, I wanted to  
5 be home earlier because I have T-ball game today happening  
6 right now. And I'm there for the children, you know,  
7 which is basically what we're here for to speak out the  
8 voice that they don't have just yet.

9 And I think that AB 617 should be implemented all  
10 the way. And there should be something that we should  
11 take advantage of, reach out to the communities, make the  
12 offer that the grant is here, and also build capacity to  
13 our communities work this. Community science raise  
14 monitors. And everything that we could put back and bring  
15 back to the community for their benefit.

16 One of the major cases that we have affecting --  
17 I'm from Brawley from Comite Civico.

18 I'm sorry. I didn't introduce myself. I'm  
19 Miguel Hernandez, by the way.

20 So our major issues that we have, among other  
21 stuff, will be the Salton Sea and its wind dust that we  
22 get over there. You may be aware that it contains  
23 pollutants, such as selenium, arsenic, all that stuff from  
24 pesticides. So, I mean, having those monitors or that air  
25 quality monitoring available to our community, especially

1 around that area or the southern part that gets affected  
2 the most, they -- it will be something that -- to make the  
3 community aware of what they're facing, what they're  
4 breathing, and for them to take action or be part of those  
5 meetings, and so they can speak out the word too and be  
6 heard, because I'm not the word for the community. They  
7 also have a voice, but I'm here for them, representing  
8 them.

9           And especially the children that I care the most.  
10 And I think we should put AB 617 to its maximum effort.  
11 And thank you. Appreciate your time.

12           (Applause.)

13           MR. OLMEDO: Good evening, Madam Chair and  
14 members of the Board. I'll try to stick to the two  
15 minutes. And I'm just going to read real fast through my  
16 comments.

17           So AB 617 is critical to improving public health  
18 in the environment in rural areas of California. It's  
19 particularly important that Imperial Valley where fine  
20 particulate matter from fugitive dust, agricultural  
21 burning is prevalent -- that is prevalent.

22           Also, toxic emissions from the Salton Sea, as you  
23 heard, continues to recede and endangers our local  
24 residents. I know that for a lot of you, especially those  
25 who live here in the Los Angeles area or closer to the

1 Ports of L.A., we have a large port of entry as well. And  
2 also these trucks end up in our community. So it's  
3 important to also see those types of strategies of where  
4 we can work across districts.

5 Some of those conversations are already  
6 happening, so we hope to see that we have some projects  
7 and ideas and solutions that -- you know across districts.

8 Among the many benefits at AB 617, it promotes  
9 the self-determination of my community by putting data in  
10 the hands of residents. The IVAN network, for example,  
11 provides a glimpse into the promise of AB 617. IVAN has  
12 over 40 monitors cited according to criteria developed by  
13 residents in collaboration with scientists, public health,  
14 and agencies like California Air Resources Board and local  
15 air districts.

16 Residents can also access real-time data, and  
17 change their behavior outdoors based on the air quality.  
18 IVAN has built local community capacity. Educated  
19 residents input health into our own hands to help. We can  
20 also now push for zero emission solutions in rural areas,  
21 which are often overlooked. AB 617 will also provide  
22 metrics to track emissions, reductions, and health  
23 outcomes that's what we're hoping. When co-locating with  
24 State monitors, we can also ensure that monitors are  
25 accurate, and doing their job.

1           A couple of items that I wanted to also do.  
2 Performance measures are going to be very important,  
3 providing as much possible. You've heard time and time  
4 again that it -- even though that -- to the best of the  
5 interests of the air districts, they may not all apply at  
6 the same time.

7           Well, finally, I'll skip some of these. I'll  
8 have time to submit public comments, I'm Pretty throughout  
9 the whole process. But I do want to say that, first of  
10 all, I want to thank Dr. Balmes for his leadership in  
11 consultation group.

12           Thank you, Dr. Balmes.

13           So we're looking forward to working with CARB,  
14 Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, South  
15 Coast Air Quality Management District, CAPCOA, to reduce  
16 emissions in the Imperial Valley. Thank you very much.

17           (Applause.)

18           MS. GARCIA: Good evening, Madam Chair, members  
19 of the Board, and Assembly Member Garcia. My name is  
20 Lilian Garcia. I represent La Union Hace La Fuerza, a  
21 community based organization focused on environmental  
22 justice in the Coachella Valley.

23           I'd like to share some critical concerns  
24 regarding the air quality in my community. Due to the  
25 close proximity to the Salton Sea, my community has been

1 exposed to high concentrations of particle pollution. It  
2 is critical for Assembly Bill 617 to implement change in  
3 my community for the well-being of all residents in order  
4 to comply with State and federal regulations.

5 I ask the Board the following: The Coachella  
6 Valley needs community monitors that provide real-time  
7 data. Assembly Bill 617 can make this happen. The  
8 Coachella Valley needs a transparent community selection  
9 criteria, and we need meaningful engagement in this  
10 process Assembly Bill 617.

11 Finally, no community meeting should happen on  
12 behalf of OCAP without community and environmental justice  
13 partners.

14 I just want to kind of share a personal  
15 experience. A few years ago, I drove through 14 states in  
16 the Country of Mexico. Before I left, I had bronchitis.  
17 I arrived over there. I stayed out there for four months.  
18 When I came back home to the Coachella Valley, I was out  
19 here maybe three or four days, and I got sick again.

20 So my question is, you know, what's difference?  
21 I drove through 14 states in the Country of Mexico, and I  
22 come back home and I get sick again. So I thought Mexico  
23 was a third world.

24 And so thank you for your time.

25 (Applause.)

1 MS. CALDERAS: Hello. Good evening. I'm Astrid  
2 Calderas, and I'm from the Imperial County. I have been  
3 doing data analysis for over two and a half years -  
4 actually a little bit more - for both community IVAN and  
5 regulatory networks.

6 In addition to agricultural burning analysis, I  
7 have also compared PM levels from both networks. Two  
8 years ago, I had found several sensitive discrepancies  
9 with regulatory monitors through the data analysis.  
10 Perhaps I'm hoping that even if it's going to take a lot  
11 of time, once AB 617 starts operating, and collecting  
12 community data, these type of situations will be resolved.

13 An important point through the analysis is the  
14 fact that IVAN Air has been providing consistent PM10 and  
15 PM2.5 data from the 40 low-cost monitors deployed  
16 throughout the county, regardless of the harsh  
17 environmental conditions for almost three years. I see  
18 that both networks, regulatory and community, can  
19 complement very well with each other.

20 Before the deployment of IVAN Air, residents had  
21 to rely on data from the five regulatory monitors, some of  
22 them -- well, this is all from 13 to 29 or even more miles  
23 away from their homes.

24 Now, they feel more confident because now they  
25 have real-time data from community monitored network. And

1 I am really looking forward to contribute with AB 617  
2 implementation. And thank you for your time.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. TORRES: Hi. My name is Christian Torres,  
5 part of Comite Civico Del Valle. I'll try to keep this  
6 brief, as everybody has had a long day.

7 I see AB 617 as a great first step now in  
8 fighting particulate matter and other pollutants. I hope  
9 that it's a great resource for battling air pollution, in  
10 disadvantaged communities that really need help, because  
11 they don't have their own resources.

12 I hope that AB 617 and especially the Community  
13 Air Grant Program can help expand and implement air  
14 monitoring programs in communities, because they really  
15 want it. I'm the air monitoring technician for CCB. And  
16 I've seen firsthand what people want and what they demand.  
17 They see hope in air monitoring, because it's information  
18 that they can have and use to fight for legislation, push  
19 for regulation, and everything that they want for -- not  
20 just for themselves, but for future generations.

21 As we've heard before from my colleagues, IVAN  
22 Air is shining example, because of their -- our 40 air  
23 monitoring networks. The network is expanding. There are  
24 partnerships that want to be develop. And I hope that AB  
25 617 gives us a chance to push this network, not just to

1 the State of California, maybe the whole U.S. eventually,  
2 and we can see how the communities can arm themselves with  
3 information, and fight for their own rights in cleaning up  
4 their air, and not -- let's not just keep it at the air.

5           Maybe one day it will expand and the whole  
6 environment will be free of pollutants.

7           Thank you.

8           (Applause.)

9           MR. LUGO: Hi. Good evening again. Humberto  
10 Lugo with Comite Civico Del Valle, in the eastern  
11 Coachella Valley.

12           As you heard from my colleagues here, you know,  
13 we've -- we have a community air monitoring network, IVAN  
14 Air, that most of you are a familiar with by now. IVAN  
15 Air was able to identify trends in air pollution where  
16 regulatory monitors sometimes were capturing some of these  
17 levels. You know, and all their monitoring networks is  
18 validated against federal reference monitors or federal  
19 equivalent monitoring.

20           Now, to clean up this air pollution, we must  
21 start looking at governmental monitors, because government  
22 has allowed pollution exceedance for way too long from  
23 meeting any air quality standard.

24           It would be great -- you know, a lot of  
25 communities are at different places for AB 617. Some are



1 focused more on emission reductions, some are ready for  
2 community air monitoring networks. But I think as a goal  
3 together, we can all get -- get to where want to get.

4           So it would be great if we could just remove the  
5 pollution, not have to deal with it and have one  
6 revolutionary change. And while some of us work towards  
7 these goals, others of us can try another course of  
8 action, whether it's emission reductions, or it's  
9 community monitoring to have this data available for the  
10 communities. Because when science is used effectively and  
11 when done honestly, it can get us good results such as  
12 IVANAir.org.

13           And there is still value moving the dial in small  
14 amounts. So CARB should set clear strict benchmarks and  
15 timelines for all community emission reduction plans.  
16 This would constitute a consistent statewide minimum  
17 baseline that all plans must meet and exceed and adopt the  
18 strongest possible measures from the statewide strategy by  
19 prioritizing zero emissions.

20           Thank you.

21           (Applause.)

22           MR. McCASKILL: Good evening, Chair Nichols, Vice  
23 Chair Berg, and Board members. My name is Richard  
24 McCaskill. I am a resident of San Diego, California, a  
25 small business owner. And I am the co-chair of your Small

1 Business Opportunity Advisory Panel.

2 Today, I'm speaking to wearing all those hats.  
3 And I want to impress upon you that the word "community"  
4 cannot be separated from the concept of small business.  
5 Small business owners tend to live near their businesses.  
6 We live in disadvantaged communities often. And our  
7 families breathe community air that we live and work in.

8 Unlike most of our neighbors, we are also direct  
9 consumers of the rules and policies at ARB and other  
10 regula -- regulators pass into law. And those rules and  
11 policies differently affect our ability -- or directly  
12 affect our ability to succeed in our businesses.

13 Yet, most of us do not know how to engage with  
14 you in a moment like this. So I appreciate the ARB, the  
15 Air Resources Board, for establishing a Small Business  
16 Owners Panel to engage policy at this level. It's really  
17 important.

18 Through this engagement, I was encouraged to  
19 attend the program that I want to speak to you about right  
20 now. The program is your AB 617. A community meeting was  
21 held in San Diego, which I had an opportunity to attend,  
22 our local -- a local resident had a concern about trucks  
23 detouring through her residential street in order to get  
24 to the freeway on-ramp more quickly.

25 Because I live in the area, and my business is

1 not far away, I knew the area, her street, and the issue  
2 with the trucks, and I was able to share a couple  
3 solutions that could be implemented.

4 She was very happy to receive them. As I was  
5 happy to be helpful. I appreciate the warm welcome also  
6 from Board Member Ms. Diane Takvorian. I appreciate you.

7 It was very great to see you there. And I  
8 appreciate you allowing me to come and observe and be  
9 involved.

10 When you bring small business to the table for a  
11 community meeting, you help to think about the rule and  
12 the policy. You'll get more creative thinking when you  
13 want to achieve a more equitable outcome, both  
14 environmentally and economically. I encourage you to go  
15 out of your way to ask small business owners for their  
16 ideas. We have a tremendous impact on the impact that  
17 communities try to make for a cleaner environment.

18 And so when you think of a community, think of  
19 small business. We know the neighborhood. Our  
20 communities need us, and we are very inventive thinkers.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Thanks for  
23 summarizing. We have your letter also.

24 MS. DARYANANI: Hello. My name is Nikita  
25 Daryanani with Leadership Counsel for Justice and

1 Accountability. We work with communities throughout the  
2 San Joaquin Valley and Eastern Coachella Valley. We're a  
3 member of the California Environmental Justice Alliance  
4 and share the same concerns as our partner CVAQ and CCAC  
5 mentioned as well. We believe that in order for residents  
6 to meaningfully engage in this process, it must be made  
7 more accessible and transparent. So input from community  
8 meetings and workshops must be documented and made  
9 publicly available, and CARB must also provide responses  
10 to this input.

11 Many of the communities we work with live in  
12 neighborhoods with industrial facilities, or a  
13 distribution center. So reduction plans must effectively  
14 promote equitable land-use planning and policies, so that  
15 jurisdictions do not continue to cite and permit polluting  
16 facilities in the backyards of low-income people of color.

17 When we held a community meeting on 6/17 in the  
18 City of Fresno, one resident said, and I'm paraphrasing,  
19 we come to all of these community meetings and public  
20 meetings and, workshops, make all of these comments, and  
21 our air is still awful to breathe.

22 So this frustration with the current system is  
23 not uncommon. So it's imperative that this program leads  
24 to actual emission reductions and reduction plans that are  
25 enforced with a stringent timeline, so that we're not just

1 creating plans to be shelved.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. FLORES: Good evening, Madam Chair, Board  
4 members. Let me take a really good look, because once I  
5 start talking, then my field of vision is just right here.

6 (Laughter.)

7 MR. FLORES: My name is Juan Florez. I'm with  
8 the Center on Race, Poverty and the Environment.

9 Jose Ruby came with me today from Kern County.  
10 We're representing communities from Delano, Shafter,  
11 Arvin, Bakersfield.

12 We support monitoring, but you already have  
13 enough information to be able to begin immediately to  
14 clean up the pollution with your State strategy, part of  
15 the Community Air Protection Program.

16 The State strategy should include early action or  
17 immediate strategies for CARB and the air district to,  
18 one, establish buffer zones and setbacks. The CCSD report  
19 recommends that the State develop policies such as the  
20 same space surface setbacks to protect public health by  
21 limiting exposure to harmful pollutants.

22 Scientific literature supports at least a 2500  
23 feet setback between the surface locations of the wells  
24 and tanks within an oil and gas site, and sensitive  
25 receptors, such as schools, parks, clinics, hospitals,

1 churches, long-term health care facilities or residences.

2 CARB concept paper for the Community Air  
3 Protection Program says that the early action strategies  
4 for immediate pollution reduction could include tools such  
5 as appropriate setbacks.

6 Number two, limit production from oil and gas  
7 operations. The CCSD report found that even with emission  
8 control technologies, local pollution still increases as  
9 oil and gas production increases. Emission control  
10 technologies will not be effective unless oil and gas  
11 production also stops increasing.

12 Three, implement all the recommendations from the  
13 CCSD report. The CCSD report includes all the  
14 recommendations between -- within CARB and the air  
15 district authority under AB 617.

16 Thank you so much.

17 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MS. TSAI: Hi. Good evening. I'm Stephanie Tsai  
20 with CEJA, the California Environmental Justice Alliance.

21 As you know, you've heard from many of our  
22 members here today throughout this long day. We are a  
23 statewide coalition of grass roots community based  
24 organizations working to advance environmental justice in  
25 State policy. Our members work across California and in

1 low-income communities and communities of color that are  
2 disporporationely burdened by air pollution and suffer  
3 from the severe negative health impacts.

4 I want to take this opportunity to remind you all  
5 of a story I shared the last time we were here actually,  
6 right here, talking about AB 617 in October.

7 So it's a story of Kim a Thomas Rocha who were  
8 earlier -- here earlier today. They live in Bloomington  
9 just a few miles away from here. The Rochas live 1000  
10 feet from a high school, and they already have two massive  
11 warehouses in their neighborhood.

12 They're fighting against a propose third one that  
13 would be just 70 feet from their back fence. That's 7-0,  
14 70 feet. This means that there are thousands of  
15 heavy-duty diesel drayage trucks in their neighborhoods  
16 every day.

17 They've seen their neighbors, especially the kids  
18 and the elderly struggle with asthma, other respiratory  
19 illnesses, and cancers. The Rochas have stood with their  
20 neighbors here before you today to advocate for your  
21 support of an Indirect Source Rule in this area.

22 I urge you -- you know, there are many, many  
23 stories like this, and I just want to highlight this one,  
24 because it's so close by, and, of course, you heard it  
25 earlier today. And I urge you to keep them in mind, as we

1 move forward with the implementation of AB 617.

2 I also want to remind you of your mission as a  
3 State agency. So the Air Resources Board, as you well  
4 know, is charged with protecting the public from the  
5 harmful effects of air pollution and developing programs  
6 and actions to fight climate change.

7 These are goals that we support and we share in  
8 common. We really want to work together with you all to  
9 effectively carry them out and provide relief in the form  
10 of clean air in our communities. We know you've heard  
11 from us and other communities about the urgent actions we  
12 need, and we want to emphasize that this process is not  
13 starting from scratch.

14 Again, as you've heard, the pollution sources in  
15 our communities are well known and documented, as are the  
16 solutions, so we don't want the process to delay action.

17 We -- as you know, we submitted many pages of  
18 comments, so we have plenty of recommendations and are  
19 looking forward to continuing the conversation.

20 Thanks.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. RIVERA: Good evening. My name is Alicia  
23 Rivera. I'm a Wilmington community organizer for  
24 Communities for a Better Environment. And other members  
25 have come from Wilmington. We battled the rain this



1 morning. It took us about four hours. We have started  
2 from about 6:00 in the morning. We were afraid that you  
3 were going to switch the agenda perhaps, and that we might  
4 miss the 617 issue.

5 But anyway, so we are still here. And so are  
6 you, and we appreciate it and everyone else. It's -- you  
7 know, I have to say that I have some notes here, but  
8 everyone is asking you to please and pleading, pleading,  
9 pleading to please, you know, hear or our concerns. We do  
10 this all the time throughout the year, and the air doesn't  
11 seem to improve very much.

12 Why?

13 It's because our regulators are not really having  
14 a very strong stand against the polluters. And the  
15 polluters are always the ones who end up with the best  
16 system, which they write themselves in cap and trade.

17 We're talking about 617 as if this is going to be  
18 the panacea. You can make it a panacea or we're going to  
19 be here in five years still saying that nothing has been  
20 done. How long are our communities going to be studied?  
21 Wilmington has been studied over and over again. Yet,  
22 people keep falling dead through -- you know, with cancer.  
23 The kids are missing school, because they can't breathe.  
24 They have to go to emergency room when they turn blue.

25 You know, the parents ride the whole way there

1 and they have to take them to the emergency room. It  
2 doesn't seem to be getting any better? Why?

3 And that is because you need to take a strong  
4 stand, and you need to do it now, because you have enough  
5 data already, you know. And you can move on from here.  
6 You know what is needed in each community that has spoken  
7 here today. You have enough information. You just need  
8 to get it going.

9 617 -- AB 617 going to be the panacea that every  
10 other project before this has been, and hasn't been.  
11 Anyway -- also, you know --

12 CHAIR NICHOLS: Ma'am.

13 MS. RIVERA: -- stop allowing expansion like the  
14 Tesoro one.

15 CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

16 MS. RIVERA: You need to give a mandate to the  
17 local regulators.

18 Thank you.

19 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

20 (Applause.)

21 Guzman I just wanted to give you some more  
22 perspective on Wilmington, which is where I live. So  
23 Wilmington is a neighborhood of Los Angeles. And it's  
24 interesting because I live in an apartment complex on the  
25 corner of the Pacific Coast Highway, which sees a lot of

1 traffic, and the 110 Freeway, which goes to the Port of  
2 Los Angeles.

3           And L.A. Metro services our area, and they like  
4 to claim this is the nation's largest clean air fleet.  
5 But Wilmington and Long Beach get some of the only lines  
6 that have the diesel buses still. And it's really a  
7 shame, because the 344 line, which goes to the more  
8 affluent and less diverse area right next to Wilmington,  
9 they get the natural gas bus. It's really -- it's a  
10 shame.

11           But, you know, this 617 I think it's a -- I read  
12 some of the grant kind of guidelines. And I think you  
13 should really emphasize -- I don't know who's going to  
14 actually do the judging, but I think you should emphasize  
15 the emission reduction programs, community-led community  
16 air protection efforts, and the best available retrofit  
17 control technologies implementation. I think those would  
18 be best to get some funding.

19           We also live next to the refineries, of course.  
20 And just last -- this past week, I witnessed a flare.  
21 And, of course, it kind of fed into the conspiracy that  
22 they always tend to flare when it's raining. It was like  
23 I actually saw the smoke first. I was at the library, and  
24 I see this smoke, and I thought there was a huge fire.

25           And I looked to the right, and the flare was

1 going on. And it went on for about two or -- right, I  
2 think about two minutes. And then I called the South  
3 Quality Air -- you know the AQMD. He calls me back up and  
4 he says, oh, it's routine. I didn't see anything when I  
5 drove by. And they told me that they're just kind of  
6 doing what they have to do to routine maintenance.

7 But, you know, we'd really like to see a  
8 reduction in that too.

9 Thanks.

10 (Applause.)

11 CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

12 Mr. Guzman was the last speaker who signed up to  
13 speak on this item. It was an informational item. And we  
14 got a lot of information. Most of it I take as saying get  
15 on with the job, so I think that's good advice for us to  
16 take to hear to get on with the job

17 Any Board member wish to make any last comments  
18 on this item?

19 We have possibility to do that.

20 So I think we have our Assembly Member here.  
21 Perhaps you'd like to say a few words.

22 ASSEMBLY MEMBER GARCIA: Testing. Testing.

23 CHAIR NICHOLS: Have you got your --

24 BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: You have to push the  
25 button on the other side.

1 ASSEMBLY MEMBER GARCIA: Use my outdoor voice.

2 CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

3 ASSEMBLY MEMBER GARCIA: Thank you, Madam Chair  
4 and colleagues. You know, AB 617, I'm going to start off  
5 with the last comments about it being the panacea, the  
6 end-all meet all.

7 And quite frankly, I hope it's not disappointing  
8 that I say this, but it is not. It is a tool, one of many  
9 tools for us to meet our overall emission reduction goals,  
10 and identifying what's happening in very specific  
11 locations, geographic areas of the State of California  
12 that perhaps many of you who are here today have felt that  
13 have been overlooked for a long time.

14 Speaking as one of the authors of the bill, I  
15 think the goal here was to get to these communities that  
16 have been overwhelmingly disproportionately impacted by  
17 air quality issues and direct sources emission, and other  
18 pollutant criterias, that are affecting the public health  
19 and well-being of Californians.

20 Public health aspect of this is extremely  
21 important, at the center of our objectives, but reducing  
22 emissions is just as important. It was mentioned, you  
23 know, metrics. I think there are some things that we can  
24 do, in terms of seeking data from our public health  
25 departments as it relates to hospitalization visits

1 related to respiratory problems and things of that sort.  
2 And I don't know if that would require legislation, or is  
3 that something that we can directly ask some of our public  
4 health partners and support them with the resources to  
5 provide that information. But I think there are some  
6 things that we can do to begin tying in the public health  
7 component to this.

8 I want to just, you know, highlight that there  
9 are other policies and programs here at ARB are going to  
10 be extremely important that go back to AB 32, SB 32, 197  
11 was mentioned earlier, that we will have to continue to  
12 carry out. And so as much of an important piece of policy  
13 AB 617 is, and the implementation that's taken place --  
14 and I have to commend the team here at ARB for the work  
15 that's been done in such a very short period of time to  
16 actually carry forward a lot of the community  
17 conversations that have taken place, and now at a point  
18 where we're implementing things.

19 I was sharing with the Chair earlier that as a  
20 kid I used to drive out to Riverside. And we always  
21 assumed that Riverside was just a place that was always  
22 filled with overcast. That it was a place that the sun  
23 didn't really come out a whole lot, because there were  
24 clouds everywhere.

25 I didn't grow up in Riverside. I grew up in the

1 Coachella Valley, but that was our perception of this area  
2 of Riverside. And for those who grew up in Los Angeles, I  
3 would imagine that very similar visualization of what the  
4 air looked like. And so I think it's important that we  
5 stop and recognize that there have been tremendous strides  
6 in improving the quality of the air in this particular  
7 region.

8           And without a doubt a tremendous amount of work  
9 that needs to be done. I appreciate those who have come  
10 out from Imperial County, Coachella Valley, and have  
11 highlighted the important problems that exist that need  
12 the additional attention, Salton Sea, the ag related air  
13 quality circumstances, and the list goes on and on as it  
14 was mentioned.

15           And that's important. These are parts of the  
16 state that I think for many years, tying it back to my  
17 comment, have felt that they've been overlooked,  
18 underrepresented, or for that matter even underinvested.

19           And so I think we're moving in a good direction.  
20 And I appreciate the air districts that are here that  
21 although during the moment of deliberation on the public  
22 policy there were some concerns, it seems to be that we're  
23 now moving in a direction that we need to be, which is the  
24 implementation and making it a point to be as inclusive as  
25 we can with the community residents that are directly

1 impacted by inaction.

2           So I want to thank again the team here at ARB for  
3 the work that you're doing. Without question, those of  
4 you who have come out from the Imperial Coachella Valley  
5 and other parts of the state.

6           (Thereupon Assembly Member Garcia  
7 spoke in Spanish.)

8           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

9           I can't resist pointing out to the audience, if  
10 you are not familiar with the way our legislature works,  
11 that the fact that we have an elected member of the  
12 Assembly who sits in Sacramento and easily could be  
13 spending his time up there, and has the right to hold  
14 hearings and get us to all come to him, the fact that he's  
15 come out here and participates with our Board, and is  
16 overseeing the work that we're doing on behalf of the  
17 legislature is a very remarkable thing. I want to thank  
18 you for that. Thank you for being here, and for your  
19 comments.

20           So we have one more person. Ms. Takvorian you  
21 have your light on here.

22           BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Just really quickly  
23 thank you Assembly Member for your leadership on this, and  
24 today and previously. I just wanted to note that I wanted  
25 to appreciate the staff for the evolution of the program



1 since the last update, and since the update before that.  
2 I think the emphasis on action is really very clear and  
3 recognizing that each community is different. Some  
4 problems have been well documented, as I think Alicia was  
5 saying. And action is needed. In others, the monitoring  
6 is clearly critical to developing a good strategy.

7           And I also wanted to observe that this program  
8 provides the opportunity to bring together a lot of the  
9 key concepts that we've been discussing today, and that  
10 are high priorities for the agency is. I think Indirect  
11 Source Review is a component that could be included here.  
12 And I'm hoping that it becomes an element of the community  
13 action plans that would be either required or would  
14 elevate the district and the community's ability to move  
15 forward with incentives and other benefits.

16           So I think it's a place for us to include that.  
17 I think again the land-use guidance is critical. I  
18 appreciated Stephanie's raising of the Rocha story and  
19 that's true for so many others in this community and  
20 others. We'd have to address this land-use issue because  
21 it's really an air pollution and public health issue. So  
22 I hope we're able to do that through these plans.

23           And the last thing I think it relates in part to  
24 something that Assembly Member Garcia said, is -- and to  
25 the public health standards, asthma reporting is not

1 mandatory in the State of California, and probably should  
2 be, and would give us a set of data almost immediately  
3 that the health providers collect, and that is available.

4           So it's something that we -- would allow us to  
5 know a whole lot more. I know it's not that simple, but I  
6 think it's one of those things we could reach for. So  
7 that would require legislation, if anyone was so inclined.

8           Thank you.

9           CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Seeing no other Board  
10 members who wish to speak at this point, I'm going to  
11 close this item.

12           However we're not quite done, because we are  
13 required to hold an open comment for anyone who wants to  
14 speak on a matter that was not covered by one of our  
15 noticed agenda items.

16           And we have two requests for comment. The first  
17 is from Bo Boylan.

18           So you got two minutes, Mr. Boylan.

19           (Laughter.)

20           CHAIR NICHOLS: And we have your written  
21 material.

22           MR. BOYLAN: Great. Thank you, Madam Chair,  
23 Madam Vice Chair, Board members. I'm going to just skip  
24 the slides, and just talk.

25           I flew all the way from Charlotte, North Carolina

1 to be with you tonight. So I get the man miles award, or  
2 the person miles award I suppose, to introduce Solidia  
3 Technologies, my company, in the hope that our brief  
4 interaction tonight might stimulate interest on behalf of  
5 the Board, to have a more detailed conversation about how  
6 our technologies might be able to support your very  
7 ambitious and necessary goals for greenhouse gas emission  
8 reductions.

9           Solidia is a cement technology, concrete  
10 technology company. We have a cement technology that  
11 enables cement producers to produce a low carbon, low  
12 energy, non-hydraulic cement. We have a technology that  
13 enables concrete producers to take waste stream CO2 and  
14 cure their products.

15           CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I am going to refer  
16 you to Edie Chang. Ms. Chang who is the Deputy Executive  
17 Officer is in charge of our climate programs and she will  
18 follow up with you.

19           MR. BOYLAN: So I've --

20           CHAIR NICHOLS: You've accomplished your goal.

21           MR. BOYLAN: I accomplished my goal.

22           CHAIR NICHOLS: You accomplished your goal,  
23 because someone is going --

24           MR. BOYLAN: All right I'm going to fly back to  
25 North Carolina. Thank you for your service and your time

1           Good night.

2           CHAIR NICHOLS:   Okay.   Thank you.

3           And we have one final commenter who is known to  
4 all of us Harvey Eder.   Mr. Eder this is your final word  
5 of the evening, and you are the final speaker of the  
6 evening.

7           MR. EDER:   Hi there.   I'm Harvey Eder speaking  
8 for myself and for the Pubic Solar Power Coalition.

9           The CARB uses 7500 premature deaths per year in  
10 California.   In 10 years -- and that number is disputed  
11 and low.   It could be off by orders of magnitude at least  
12 factors.   In 10 years that's 75,000 deaths.   In 50, 60  
13 years, which is a short life, that's about 400,000 deaths  
14 or one percent of the population, over living in  
15 California for 50 years will die from the air pollution.

16           That's not very good numbers for an advanced  
17 industrial society that purports to be a leader in  
18 environment and whatnot to the world.   We could do better.

19           And immediate total solar conversion is what's  
20 needed.   The science tells us that with climate change,  
21 and toxins, and criteria emissions and whatnot.   In a  
22 litigation with you, we've been negotiating in settlement  
23 through February and whatnot.   And then we're trying to  
24 get discovery and amended complaints and whatnot.

25           Anyway, there's things going on.   One thing that

1 was happening is that -- I wasn't happy about that, there  
2 was -- on the second of this month, although we'd  
3 exchanged documents, they said there were no points to the  
4 demur -- there was an eight point demurrer and a motion to  
5 quash service.

6           Anyway. I said, look, you got State court, State  
7 law, the California Clean Air Act, AB 892 is suppose to do  
8 a report every three years. The report is due this year.

9           And anyway, that's undisputed by Noah Krasner --  
10 Golden-Krasner a justice, that there's at least that and  
11 hopefully everything to litigate.

12           Thank you.

13           CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

14           And that I think is the end of this meeting. I  
15 want to remind everybody that tomorrow morning we resume  
16 here at 8:30 a.m. So be here. We will start promptly.

17           Thank you.

18           (Thereupon the Air Resources Board meeting  
19 recessed at 7:34 p.m.)

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 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 6th day of April, 2018.



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