

STATE OF CALIFORNIA / AIR RESOURCES BOARD  
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

BRAWLEY PUBLIC LIBRARY DEL RIO BRANCH  
1501 I STREET, BRAWLEY, CALIFORNIA 92227

APRIL 4, 2016

REPORTED BY: KIMBERLY NOVAK, CSR NO. 13135

1 ATTENDANCE:

2 Sarah Rubin, Institute for Local Government - Facilitator

3

4 Trish Johnson, Air Resources Board

5 Diane Takvorian, Air Resources Board

6 Floyd Vergara, Air Resources Board

7 Stephanie Kato, Air Resources Board

8 Steve Cliff, Air Resources Board

9 Dave Mallory, Air Resources Board

10 Matthew Botill, Air Resources Board

11 Johnnie Raymond, Air Resources Board

12 Senator Dean Florez, Air Resources Board

13

14 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

15 Eleanor Torres, Incredible Edible Community Garden

16 Katie Valenzuela Garcia, Oak Park Neighborhood Association

17 Rey Leon, Valley LEAP

18 Mari Rose Taruc, Asian Pacific Environmental Network

19 Luis Olmedo, Comite Civico Del Valle

20 Monica Wilson, Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives

21 Martha Dina Arguello, Physicians for Social Responsibility

22 Giselle Fong, End Oil

23 Tom Frantz, Association for Irrigated Residents

24 Sekita Grant, The Greenlining Institute

25 Kevin Hamilton, Central California Asthma Collaboration

1 ATTENDANCE CONTINUED:

2

3 Ryan E. Kelley, Imperial County Supervisor, District 4

4 Donnie Wharton, City of Brawley Mayor

5

6 PUBLIC COMMENTS

7 Anita Nicklen

8 John Hernandez

9 Ray Askins

10 Mark Baza

11 Efrain Saldival

12 Rita Galindo

13 Roberto Necochea

14 Jose Velez

15 Kimberly Clark

16

17 INTERPRETERS: Luisa, Erica Rupert

18

19 COURT REPORTER: Kimberly Novak

20

21 SOUND/VIDEO: Antonio Campos, Roy Durantes

22

23 Students from Brawley

24 Community

25

	AGENDA	
		PAGE
1		
2		
3		
4	Welcome and Overview	5
5	Meeting Goals	20
6	Follow-up from 2/15/16 EJAC Meeting	22
7	2030 Target Scoping Plan: Part 1	55
8	2030 Target Scoping Plan: Part 2	91
9	2030 Target Scoping Plan: Part 3	128
10	Public Comment Period	149
11	Lunch Break	158
12	Afternoon Session	159
13	California Climate Investments Presentation	160
14	2030 Target Scoping Plan: Part 4	195
15	2030 Target Scoping Plan: Part 5	235
16	Public Comment Period	251
17	Closing Remarks	256
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

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

BRAWLEY, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, APRIL 4, 2016

8:11 A.M.

-INTRODUCTIONS-

SARAH RUBIN: We're starting a little late, but we do need to get going because we have a big day.

Okay. So we -- good morning, my name is Sarah Rubin, and I am with the Institute for Local Government. The Institute is the nonprofit research and education arm of the League of California Cities, the California State Association of Counties, and the California Special Districts Association, and I'm providing facilitation for you all today.

So we will do some introductions after we have some initial welcomes from our host, Luis.

LUIS OLMEDO: Good morning. Welcome to the City of Brawley and to the County of Imperial, as well as Valley of Imperial. It's an outstanding community. And it is -- I'm really glad to see all the members come out here.

In Imperial yesterday, we had a tour. We started in Brawley, saw a lot of the projects in terms of transportation, some of the visions, and also got to sit with a lot of people from the community, who were giving you your only personal guided tour. That's what I hear.

1 So I think it's very appropriate to be able to have these  
2 more personal conversations. You got to go all the way to  
3 the border, which is great. And I find that really  
4 important, especially because, you know, having to go to  
5 Sacramento.

6 I know in the past a lot of our meetings are in  
7 Sacramento, and I think it's hard, you know, whenever we  
8 talk about the issues and the border, about how we  
9 interact with Mexico and, you know, the issues of  
10 transportation. And I think a lot of times, it gets  
11 overseen, even sometimes overshadowed by San Diego. You  
12 know, most people know where San Diego is. But where is  
13 Imperial? I mean, I've been doing this for 15 years, and  
14 I still remember where I had to kind of tell people, you  
15 know, put it in the map.

16 After a while, honestly, I just say, you know,  
17 "I'm from San Diego." It just made it easier. But, you  
18 know, I mean, I think the whole environmental justice  
19 movement, and I think the -- you know, everything from  
20 AB32 and all these policies that are happening since I've  
21 been working on environmental justice, I think it's  
22 really, you know, kind of piecing it all together. And,  
23 you know, I know it's work that has been happening for  
24 decades and decades, you know, but I'm just happy to be a  
25 part of it for the last 15 years. I'm glad to be a

1 member. You know, I'm very honored to be a member of this  
2 Environmental Justice Advisory Committee with the Air  
3 Resources Board. I want to welcome all of you.

4 I do want to make some mentions here and get the  
5 chance to speak with our -- just looking around the room,  
6 I want to recognize that we do have two board members for  
7 the Air Resources Board, which it really honors us to have  
8 two of you board members, Diane Takvorian and Senator Dean  
9 Florez, the two new ARB Board members, and, you know, just  
10 friends come out here. I think it's great. I've been  
11 trying to get Mary to come out here, but we have the next  
12 best thing, which is Steve.

13 Steve -- where is Steve?

14 STEVE CLIFF: Here.

15 LUIS OLMEDO: Oh, Steve Cliff. So Senior  
16 Advisor of Mary Nichols as your Board Chair of ARB. You  
17 know, in the audience, we also have the City Manager, who  
18 has been very helpful, and her staff. You know, I'm  
19 sure -- you know, it all came together, we pulled it  
20 together thanks to Rosanna Bayon Moore, our City Manager,  
21 and of course with all the support of the -- the -- of the  
22 council.

23 And we have some of the council members here --  
24 so if you just want to stand up -- Norma Jauregui, Council  
25 Member; the Mayor of the City of Brawley, Donnie Wharton;

1 and we also have a County Supervisor, and he'll have the  
2 chance to do a welcome; Ryan Kelly, the Imperial County  
3 Supervisor. And so -- and as well as John Hernandez, who  
4 wears many hats. You met him yesterday. And among them,  
5 you know, he's an IID Consumer Advisor and Senior  
6 Legislator and so on. So I'm sure others will come in.

7 I want to thank my board members who are here,  
8 as well, which is Oscar Suarez, one of the board members  
9 of Comite Civico, and Maria Lizaola. And I'm hoping I  
10 don't forget, of course Martin, who was very kind to give  
11 us a tour throughout the Imperial Valley.

12 So with that, I welcome you. I hope you feel a  
13 warm welcome from everybody so far. Yesterday was a great  
14 dinner, and I thought it was a great opportunity to get  
15 together and get to know each other better.

16 So with that, I'd like to bring in the Mayor and  
17 say a few words, and then followed by our County  
18 Supervisor, Ryan Kelley.

19 MAYOR DONALD WHARTON: Thank you, Luis, and  
20 thank you for that great introduction. I'll keep it  
21 brief. My -- my job here this morning is just make sure  
22 everyone is comfortable and more than welcome for being  
23 here. So we thank you very much for, I think, making a  
24 little history. This is the first meeting in Imperial  
25 County, and you can't get much further south. So welcome

1 here this morning.

2 I had a chance to just shake a few hands before  
3 getting started here this morning, and Senator, next  
4 time -- because I think he drove in -- just give me a  
5 call. I do fly. We can get you in here a little quicker.  
6 You're looking at a little perk of Brawley.

7 But outside of that, we ordered up plenty of  
8 sunshine, so enjoy the day. You've got some very  
9 important work to do, and each and every one of you  
10 Committee Members that take your time for this cause, for  
11 the work you do, we thank you, and it is absolutely our  
12 pleasure here in Brawley. Anything you need, please let  
13 us know.

14 Luis, thank you for hosting and making all this  
15 happen. I know it's a big -- there's a little bit of an  
16 army behind it to make it all happen. But welcome and  
17 enjoy.

18 LUIS OLMEDO: And our District's Ryan Kelley,  
19 Imperial County Supervisor.

20 RYAN KELLEY: Thank you, Luis, for the  
21 invitation to make a formal reception and introduction.  
22 I'm Ryan Kelley. I'm the County Supervisor for  
23 District 4, which is the north end of the Valley, and this  
24 past year, I was the presiding chair for the Board of  
25 Supervisors.

1 I know that I was trying to become a little bit  
2 more acquainted with what the topics were and the AB32  
3 greenhouse gas emissions for 1990 levels by 2020.

4 Within the County of Imperial, we have been --  
5 we've been stressed to have a lot of the information  
6 available. One of the larger contributors is Mexico into  
7 our -- I say airshed, and Luis always corrects me -- it's  
8 air basin. But another marked contributing factor is the  
9 open desert to the west of us, and if we could maybe get  
10 San Diego County to pay for some of the air mitigation in  
11 Imperial County, that would be -- or maybe the Federal  
12 Government, the Bureau of Land Management. We've already  
13 stoked those coals.

14 In addition, the largest potential problem for  
15 air in our valley is the Salton Sea, and so -- well, some  
16 of the things that have taken place in the past year is,  
17 the County of Imperial and the Imperial Irrigation  
18 District settled a lawsuit, a 12-year running lawsuit,  
19 over the validation of the Quantification Settlement  
20 Agreement, which was the water transfer from the Colorado  
21 River and Imperial IID -- Imperial Irrigation District's  
22 allocation. Three hundred thousand acre feet of water  
23 going to urban use in San Diego County and in Coachella  
24 Valley. The full impacts of that will be realized on  
25 December 31st, 2017, when the mitigation of water that

1 were ordered by the State Water Resources Board is in.

2 And if you've been in the Sea, and I hope you  
3 got that on your tour, you can see the receding shoreline  
4 and the exposed playa. Estimates are between 5- and 7,000  
5 acres that are already exposed. The significance to  
6 Imperial County is that most of the elevation on the Sea  
7 is on the south sea, And that's where you are going to see  
8 most of the exposed playa as the years progress.

9 So moving forward, we had a -- on March 18th,  
10 2015, there was a workshop by the State Water Resources  
11 Board, and we made a case that the State of California had  
12 an obligation for mitigation above the water order to --  
13 and \$133 million from the San Diego County Water  
14 Authority, CVW, and Imperial Irrigation District.

15 What's taken place since that time, is the  
16 Governor created a task force made up of CARB, also  
17 Natural Resources Agency, and few other departments within  
18 the Governor's office, and they came back with a  
19 recommendation, and that happened in late summer. An  
20 Assistant Secretary for Salton Sea Policy under the  
21 National Resources Agency was created. And since that  
22 time, we have been having stakeholder groups almost every  
23 month since November, and Assembly Member Garcia passed a  
24 bill, signed by the Governor in early October, AB1095,  
25 which required shovel-ready projects to be identified by

1 March 31st.

2           So our status today is that we have a workshop  
3 scheduled for next Monday here at Palmer Auditorium,  
4 wherein you can hear everything that's taken place to  
5 today, and you'll also be able to hear about all the  
6 shovel-ready projects and what will be priority funding  
7 going out in the short-term. Also, medium-term, what does  
8 the management program look like for the Sea. And then  
9 long-term still has not been decided.

10           There are a lot of concepts out there, but the  
11 reason I bring this to you is because the State Water  
12 Resources Board is also having another workshop, and they  
13 will continue to have these quarterly. So our next  
14 workshop is on the 19th of April, and once again, we will  
15 be advocating a united voice for Imperial County and  
16 Sacramento. But if you have the ability, please attend  
17 April 11th at Palmer Auditorium at 6:00 p.m. It is the  
18 opportunity for the local community to speak here in front  
19 of the people that are going to be advocating for you in  
20 Sacramento.

21           Thank you.

22           LUIS OLMEDO: Thank you, Supervisor Kelly, for  
23 highlighting one of the biggest challenges of our time in  
24 Imperial, Imperial Valley and Salton Sea. It's a huge  
25 task and a huge challenge.

1                   So we have two dignitaries as well here. It's  
2 Senator Dean Florez and Diane Takvorian.

3                   So do you want to say some opening remarks?

4                   SENATOR DEAN FLOREZ: No, thank you.

5                   DIANE TAKVORIAN: I just wanted to thank you,  
6 Luis. I just want to welcome all these wonderful students  
7 who could join us. Do you want to --

8                   LUIS OLMEDO: Absolutely. Oh, yes, I want to  
9 recognize -- well, first of all, Mr. Florez, where you at?  
10 Is he here?

11                   Thank you for engaging the students. He's been  
12 doing this for several years, and I mean, I think it is a  
13 good problem. Having a seating problem is a good problem.  
14 And I'm glad to see the students and, you know, the  
15 leadership of Mr. Florez to his superintendent to the  
16 school and the Board. I know they've been very active  
17 participants in environmental issues and bringing it into  
18 the schools. So thank you for bringing the students and  
19 thank you for caring enough to be a part of this.

20                   DIANE TAKVORIAN: To think that you're a  
21 great -- thank you so much for being here, and that you're  
22 a great reminder of why we're all here. And I just want  
23 to thank Luis and Comite Civico and Brawley, all of you  
24 who are here. I want to say that California doesn't end  
25 in L.A., being from San Diego, so I get it. So we're

1 thrilled to be here today, and I -- I also want to say  
2 that I'm really honored to be in one of the first two  
3 positions for environmental justice with Senator Florez,  
4 and I hope that we can take environmental justice forward.

5 I was privileged to be the co-chair of the  
6 California Environmental Justice Advisory Committee that  
7 issued its recommendations in 2003. So the long arc of  
8 justice, I think is a reminder of that, and I know that  
9 there -- this community is critically important.

10 I also had the honor of being on the first EJAC.  
11 So I want to listen and participate, and I hope that we  
12 can really move environmental justice forward today. So  
13 thanks so much.

14 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

15 Okay. Welcome from ARB, starting with Steve.

16 STEVE CLIFF: Well, thank you. I had the  
17 pleasure of working with EJAC back in 2014 and left the  
18 Air Resources Board for a couple of years, but I am now  
19 proud to be back, and really great to be here to see all  
20 of the EJAC folks that I worked with in 2014, as well as  
21 some of the new members.

22 I want to welcome everybody to the EJAC meeting,  
23 but more importantly, thank you for opening up your  
24 community and allowing us to come in and talk to you here.  
25 It's not often that we get out of Sacramento, but it's

1 very important that we do so, and I think it's just really  
2 great how you guys have opened the community and really  
3 welcomed us in. We had a really nice dinner last night,  
4 and it was really a pleasure to sit and talk with a lot of  
5 the folks from the community, as well as interact with  
6 EJAC members.

7 I have about forty slides I'm going to go  
8 through -- no, I'm kidding. I really do appreciate that  
9 the students are here. I understand we're going to have  
10 about a hundred students throughout the day come through,  
11 so that's really great. As Diane said, this is a good  
12 reminder of why we're all doing this, it's really for the  
13 next generation and generations to come.

14 So I hope that as you watch these discussions  
15 and interact that you'll be able to take that back, and  
16 hopefully you'll have an opportunity, as your careers  
17 progress, to engage your community and carry this sort of  
18 tradition on. I think sustainability is really about  
19 those future generations, and that's really what we're all  
20 about here, so I appreciate that -- that you'll be  
21 listening to this and -- and -- and take that -- that  
22 message back. I'm really proud to see that this is the  
23 kind of engagement that we're getting.

24 So thank you very much, and I look forward to  
25 the discussion.

1 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

2 Floyd, do you want say good morning?

3 FLOYD VERGARA: Good morning. Do I have to  
4 stand up there, too?

5 SARAH RUBIN: No.

6 FLOYD VERGARA: Yeah, thank you. I'm Floyd  
7 Vergara of the Air Resources Board. I'm the Chief of the  
8 Industrial Strategies Division. My group is in charge of  
9 this session of EJAC proceedings, and I'm very happy to be  
10 here. I think you've heard me say before that I am  
11 personally committed to making -- making sure that this  
12 process works for all of you, providing you with  
13 meaningful feedback. And part of that commitment is to  
14 make sure that we're here in the communities that are  
15 being affected, so I'm happy to bring my entire team down  
16 here. Steve had to pay for his own way, because I'm not  
17 paying for him, but yeah, we're -- we're happy to be here  
18 and provide responses to the EJAC's prior comments, and  
19 then, you know, hopefully we'll -- we'll have as  
20 productive or more productive a meeting as we had last  
21 time.

22 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. In the facilitator world we  
23 have this phrase called "going slow to go fast," and all  
24 these welcomes have been fantastic, but we are going to  
25 need to start going fast because you have a huge agenda in

1 front you.

2 So what I'm going to do now is I'm going to go  
3 around for all the EJAC members to introduce themselves.  
4 As you can see, we have different reference materials on  
5 the wall. I'm going to touch on our meeting goals and our  
6 agenda, and then we are going to dive in because we're  
7 already behind on our first agenda item.

8 So let's see, you guys got to introduce  
9 yourselves. Stephanie, I'm going to hand the mic to you,  
10 and then we're just going to go around.

11 STEPHANIE KATO: I'm Stephanie Kato, I'm one of  
12 the lead staff on the Scoping Plan update at Air Resources  
13 Board.

14 KEVIN HAMILTON: Kevin Hamilton, Executive  
15 Director for Central California Asthma Collaborative, from  
16 Fresno.

17 THE REPORTER: Can I have you speak up, please.

18 KEVIN HAMILTON: Wow, that's the first time  
19 that's ever happened.

20 My name is Kevin Hamilton, and I am the CEO of  
21 Central California Asthma Collaborative, and I'm an EJAC  
22 member from Fresno.

23 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

24 SEKITA GRANT: Sekita Grant, legal counsel with  
25 The Greenlining Institute in the Bay Area.

1           TOM FRANTZ: Tom Frantz. I'm president of the  
2 Association of Irritated Residents, which is about air  
3 quality among other things, and I live in Kern County of  
4 the San Joaquin Valley.

5           GISELE FONG: Good morning, everyone. My name  
6 is Gisele Fong, and I come from the port community of  
7 Long Beach, California. We are a community that's very,  
8 very much affected by freight transportation, and I run  
9 End Oil and Communities for Clean Ports.

10           MARTHA ARGUELLO: Good morning. My name is  
11 Martha Dina Arguello. I'm the Executive Director of  
12 Physicians for Social Responsibility of Los Angeles, and  
13 morning traffic was really a pleasure this morning. And  
14 we -- our organization works in a range of issues. We  
15 started as an organization of a land and nuclear  
16 organization, and now we work on planet change, toxic  
17 chemicals, and we do extensive work in South Los Angeles  
18 and in Watts around building healthy communities, land  
19 use, climate change, and toxic chemicals.

20           MONICA WILSON: Morning. I'm Monica Wilson with  
21 Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives. We work  
22 with communities on stopping incineration and lead towards  
23 safer alternatives.

24           LUIS OLMEDO: Luis Olmedo with Komite Civico Del  
25 Valle, and we work on environmental health and

1 environmental justice issues here in Imperial County.

2 MARI ROSE TARUC: Good morning. My name is  
3 Mari Rose Taruc. I was the -- formerly the State  
4 Organizing Director for the Asian Pacific Environmental  
5 Network and currently the CO chair of Filipino/American  
6 Coalition for Environmental Solidarity, and I'm based in  
7 Oakland.

8 REY LEON: Buenos dias. Good morning. My name  
9 is Rey Leon with the Latino Environmental Advancement and  
10 Policy Project out of Fresno. We work with valley  
11 communities to achieve environmental and climate justice  
12 mostly for farm workers. Thank you.

13 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Good morning. My name  
14 is Katie Valenzuela Garcia. I'm with the Oak Park  
15 Neighborhood Association working or working on  
16 anti-indemnification efforts and affordable housing and  
17 clean air in Sacramento.

18 ELEANOR TORRES: Good morning. My name is  
19 Eleanor Torres. I'm with Incredible Edible Community  
20 Gardens from San Bernardino County. We address  
21 agroforestry issues and public health, and we have a  
22 number of community gardens, orchards, and a massive tree  
23 planting program.

24 TRISH JOHNSON: I'm Trish Johnson. I'm the lead  
25 staff for the AB32 Environmental Justice Advisory

1 Committee for the Air Resources Board.

2

3

-MEETING GOALS-

4 SARAH RUBIN: Fantastic. And for those who came  
5 in later, my name is Sarah Rubin. I'm facilitating today.

6 And for all the students, besides being an  
7 elected official or on the board, you can grow up and be a  
8 facilitator. Another job.

9 Okay. So I'm going to go over our meeting  
10 goals. I'm going to walk over here. We've got them up on  
11 the wall.

12 Good morning. Here we are, and hopefully people  
13 picked up copies of the agenda when you walked in, or you  
14 have one.

15 Goal 1: Draft initial scoping plan  
16 recommendations after reports from ARB and EJAC members.

17 Goal 2: Outline and EJAC working time line for  
18 the next three to six months based on ARB updates and EJAC  
19 priorities.

20 Goal 3: Learn about California climate  
21 investments and identify the EJAC's role.

22 And our 4th goal, which I feel like we did so  
23 great yesterday, was learn about the environmental justice  
24 community in Brawley.

25 All righty. So we are just about done with our

1 welcomes. We are going to be diving into follow-up from  
2 the February meeting, and in a moment I'm going to be  
3 turning to Mari Rose to kick off that discussion that  
4 really has to do with the time line.

5 On this back wall, we have the months, and the  
6 content I have up there is the same content that is in  
7 your meeting summary from February. And as we -- as  
8 throughout the day, or towards the end of the day, we can  
9 go back and put up whatever we want on those month lists.

10 Then, we're going to get into the 2030 Scoping  
11 Plan. We've divided it into these chunks. So we've got  
12 Part 1, Economic Analysis, Short-Lived Climate Pollutant  
13 Reduction Strategy, then we'll take a break at 10:00.

14 Because your court reporter --

15 Raise your hand. Want to say hi?

16 THE REPORTER: Hello.

17 SARAH RUBIN: -- is going to need a break, and  
18 so will you all. So if anyone needs to use the restrooms,  
19 they're right out the door, then we will pick back up.

20 Hopefully you have it in front of you.

21 We've got Part 2, Part 3, we will take public  
22 comment at noon, break at 12:15 for lunch. We're going to  
23 pick back up at 1:00 o'clock. We'll have our California  
24 Climate Investments Presentation, then we'll move into  
25 Part 4, 5, and actually, at 3:00 o'clock, I'm going to

1 move us back to the time line in your actions so that  
2 you're clear about what you're doing from here.

3 Does anybody have any questions about today's  
4 agenda? Okay. Fantastic.

5 Mari Rose? Oh, yes, Mari Rose is going to help  
6 out with timekeeping. We were going to rely on this  
7 clock, but it's more fun to have us help each other out.

8 Mari Rose, is your mic on, if you want to take  
9 over?

10

11 -FOLLOW-UP FROM 2/5/16 EJAC MEETING-

12 MARI ROSE TARUC: I think so.

13 So we wanted to start off talking about our  
14 recent meeting with the Chair of the Air Resources Board,  
15 Mary Nichols, and there were -- there was a request to  
16 meet with members of the Environmental Justice Advisory  
17 Committee, so when you hear EJAC, it means the  
18 Environmental Justice Advisory Committee. And so there  
19 were six of us from the committee that were able to meet  
20 with her. We had Luis, Eleanor, Tom, Katie, Martha, and  
21 myself, and Senator Florez also joined us. And the --  
22 Steve was there and Chair Nichols.

23 And we -- I think the meeting was inspired by  
24 two letters that we had written to the ARB staff talking  
25 about how the time line for completing the Scoping Plan

1 was too short for us to truly engage Environmental Justice  
2 Communities in the Scoping Plan, and so that we needed an  
3 extension of that time line to properly bring this  
4 information and solicit the feedback of our community  
5 members to be integrated into the Scoping Plan.

6 We also talked about the letter that we had  
7 written to ARB, that this committee has been under  
8 resourced and understaffed, that the first meetings  
9 were -- were not how we would like to see our meetings,  
10 they were not effective meetings, and that we wanted to  
11 make sure that the staff meet inside ARB to really support  
12 our work in looking at the next 15 years of how we -- how  
13 we plan our greenhouse gas emissions reductions, and that  
14 all those times in between and following up with next  
15 steps from our meetings were -- were addressed.

16 So the meeting was walking through some of that  
17 information, and really, it was an invitation to see  
18 environmental justice communities and the EJAC as partners  
19 in the -- in the implementation of AB32, and so we took it  
20 from there. I think we started to talk about staffing  
21 that we wanted to see, and others can elaborate on that,  
22 as well. And so for those who were there, please feel  
23 free to add.

24 SARAH RUBIN: Anyone -- or Floyd, do you want to  
25 go ahead and share? Anything you have about the time

1 line?

2 FLOYD VERGARA: Okay. Yeah, so --

3 KEVIN HAMILTON: Excuse me. Mari Rose, so what  
4 tangible outcomes did you get from that discussion?

5 MARI ROSE TARUC: We -- we -- Chair Nichols told  
6 us that through Steve, probably, that we would get  
7 communication about next steps around how she would  
8 consider that with her team. So we have not heard word  
9 since that April -- since that March 24th meeting, and we  
10 were hoping that at this meeting that ARB would come with  
11 some follow-up about staffing and time line.

12 KEVIN HAMILTON: So you -- I don't know that  
13 people here know what you mean when you say "time line,"  
14 so could you just briefly talk about what we're asking for  
15 there.

16 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yeah. So we initially  
17 were given a September 2016 time line to complete the  
18 Scoping Plan, which would involve all the climate  
19 investments and basically and extension of programs  
20 through 2030. Really early on, we realized we just didn't  
21 have the data or the staffing support to make informed  
22 decisions to ensure that the policies, as they extend to  
23 2030, really addressed the need, both of California, as  
24 well as specifical communities like Brawley and other EJ  
25 communities across the state.

1           So we asked for additional time so that we could  
2 collect some of that data. There is an OEHHA report  
3 that's scheduled to come out in December that would start  
4 to point to some data that we can use to inform our  
5 discussions and to allow us to do public workshops across  
6 the state to really ground truth and make sure what we  
7 think is happening at the state level is actually what's  
8 happening in the communities.

9           KEVIN HAMILTON: Thank you, because we're  
10 referencing something that I don't think most the people  
11 in the room, other than us, are probably familiar with.

12           SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

13           STEVE CLIFF: Thanks, Mari Rose.

14           So it was a good meeting, and I think a good  
15 discussion. It was the first opportunity for me to hear a  
16 little bit more about the requests, and as a follow-up,  
17 did get the letter that you had sent I think in late  
18 January. And I appreciate you sending that to me. I will  
19 turn it over to Floyd to talk a little bit more about the  
20 time line.

21           With regard to some of the specific requests, as  
22 was noted, we have the court reporter here today. So that  
23 was one specific request, was to make sure that we had  
24 proceedings from the meetings, and that was transcribed so  
25 that there would be the ability to -- to go back and

1 review what was said at the meetings. And so we do have  
2 the court reporter here today.

3 As a follow-up discussion, we are looking at how  
4 we can provide more staffing internally at ARB. That will  
5 be a little bit longer time line to finalize that, because  
6 that would require requests for more resources, and so  
7 that is ongoing work. And hope to have that -- you know,  
8 a more specifically designed approach to how we get more  
9 staffing at ARB in the coming weeks. But that is a -- you  
10 know, that is something that's on the radar, and we  
11 appreciate Senator Florez's help in identifying where  
12 resources can come from to help with that.

13 On the question of providing more support for  
14 the commun- -- committee, staff is actually putting in  
15 place some contracts to help provide some more support for  
16 a technical writer and, as I mentioned, a court reporter,  
17 so that is ongoing work. Of course, it takes a little bit  
18 of time to get some contracts together, but I think there  
19 is a fast track for having that happen. So that's maybe  
20 something that Floyd can talk about a little bit more.

21 And then on the question of the time line for  
22 the Scoping Plan, I understand that the original time  
23 line, what has been proposed is to have a Scoping Plan  
24 finalized by the end of this year. That conflicts with  
25 this OEHHA report that would describe the impacts of AB32

1 on communities. And, you know, so what we're -- what  
2 we're trying to figure out is, is there a way to fast  
3 track that OEHHA report or extend the time line for the  
4 Scoping Plan so that there is sufficient time to evaluate  
5 the findings from that report to make comments and make --  
6 you know, so that EJAC can provide input to the Scoping  
7 Plan based on review of that document.

8           So I have initiated some conversations with  
9 Cal EPA in hoping that we can either bring up the deadline  
10 for that report or, if necessary, push out the Scoping  
11 Plan. As I understand it, there's a challenge in making  
12 the time line for the Scoping Plan extend for another  
13 year, that that's not possible to do, but there's probably  
14 some wiggle room in that final date. And so I don't know  
15 exactly what that is at this point, but, you know, to  
16 extend for some time period beyond December seems like  
17 it's possible.

18           Maybe, Floyd, I can ask you to -- to elaborate a  
19 bit on that.

20           FLOYD VERGARA: Yeah, so -- all right. I  
21 apologize for my froggy voice. I am coming out of a  
22 week-long flu-like thing. Don't worry, I'm not contagious  
23 anymore.

24           So, yeah, with regard to the time line, just to  
25 kind of step back a little bit, as you recall, the

1 original time line called for the EJAC to provide comments  
2 on the draft Scoping Plan sometime in the March, April of  
3 this year time line. You know, obviously, that's already  
4 passed. We heard that comment, and the comment was -- the  
5 concern that was raised by EJAC was that's insufficient  
6 time to provide us time to evaluate it. By the time  
7 the -- the draft Scoping Plan comes out with the economic  
8 environmental impacts analyses, you know, it would be too  
9 late to provide meaningful feedback because that  
10 wouldn't -- you know, it would be set in stone, basically,  
11 as I understood the comment.

12           So we heard that loud and clear. We revised the  
13 time line to provide for a discussion draft to come out in  
14 May, and that discussion draft would contain the Scoping  
15 Plan measures that we're contemplating at that point, and  
16 we'll hear -- and we heard that -- that discussion draft  
17 in May will have the Scoping Plan concepts, and it would  
18 be -- it would go out to -- for public comment without the  
19 impacts analyses. And we heard that loud and clear. That  
20 was the main concern at that point.

21           We understand that the concern still is you'd  
22 like more time to evaluate that, plus the OEHHA report  
23 Steve mentioned, so we are looking at that. We don't have  
24 a -- a final amount of time, that we're still trying to  
25 sort out, you know, the feasibility of accelerating the

1 OEHHA report, plus how much room can be -- how much flex  
2 room is there in the schedule, but we are sorting that out  
3 and we're looking at that. So we should have a response  
4 to you real soon on an exact amount. But like Steve said,  
5 we think that is -- some more extension there beyond  
6 December should be feasible.

7           With regard to the contracts, my staff had put  
8 them together. We are going through that process. As  
9 soon as I'm able to share that, the scoping -- the scope  
10 of work for those contracts, I will share that with the  
11 EJAC members. I do want to get a clear understanding of  
12 the technical assistance that the EJAC members have asked  
13 for. Our interpretation of that is that you need a  
14 technical writer to help you draft up the report and your  
15 recommendations, and I want to understand that -- I want  
16 to make sure that I understand that that's the extent of  
17 the technical assistance, or were we looking for -- you  
18 know, is that the complete nature of the technical  
19 assistance or is there anything else? And I'm happy to  
20 talk to EJAC members to make sure that the contract that  
21 we're drafting would provide that assistance that you are  
22 looking for.

23           And as you can see, we do have a court reporter,  
24 so you won't have to suffer through my staff's note taking  
25 anymore, and I'm sure they are happy to not have to do

1 that. But we will -- we are instituting that, so we heard  
2 that -- that issu- -- that concern loud and clear.

3 I will take any questions on what I just said.

4 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So I'm really pleased  
5 about the court reporter. I was looking again at the  
6 notes from San Bernardino and really bummed that I just  
7 felt like they didn't really capture the essence of  
8 conversation that we had, and the folks who weren't there  
9 and not able to hear it in person missed out on a lot, so  
10 thank you for that.

11 Part of the reason we wanted to bring this up in  
12 front of the full EJAC in this meeting is a bag-leaking  
13 issue. Right? Like, we've been doing a lot of this  
14 outside of your meetings, and it's been leaving out  
15 certain members of the group simply because we don't have  
16 the ability to communicate on a larger scale in between  
17 our meetings. We started bringing this issue in December,  
18 and it's now April. And as we continue this negotiation  
19 process, more and more time is ticking away at our ability  
20 to do our job. Given that it's April and we haven't seen  
21 any write-ups, and right now the charts we've been given  
22 are incredibly sparse, and we don't really even know what  
23 the teams are working on, and hopefully we'll hear more of  
24 that today.

25 This isn't just a matter of the OEHHA report,

1 this is also a matter of the ability to consult the  
2 communities, and the ability to ground truth these  
3 policies, and the ability to do that in a really  
4 meaningful way. And I simply do not believe -- and I  
5 think a lot of people in this room will agree, given the  
6 experience we all have in outreach and in community  
7 organizing -- that that's possible this year. It's just  
8 not possible.

9           So the job we've been tasked under AB32 is  
10 simply not possible. So I wanted to open it up to EJAC  
11 members to talk about next steps. What do we want to do?  
12 We need obviously to put a little bit more pressure on  
13 this time line question, because it seems to just keep  
14 going and going and going. And so I'd like to give this  
15 opportunity for EJAC members to talk about what you think  
16 an appropriate next step on our part might be. Should we  
17 send a letter to the legislature? Should we be sending  
18 more letters to Mary Nichols? Should we be going to more  
19 board meetings and pressing this more? I mean, what  
20 exactly do you all want to see as next steps for the  
21 leadership team to implement or for any staff to rebuild  
22 this community to implement?

23           FLOYD VERGARA: Before the EJAC members chime  
24 in, I would like to add to what I just said.

25           In terms of the time line, the concern that was

1 raised, as you just said, Katie, was the -- you know, the  
2 time that's needed to evaluate these things. So I wanted  
3 to point out that, you know, that since the February  
4 meeting and we revised our time line, we have been very  
5 busy with the EJAC members, holding a number of deep dive  
6 discussions -- I believe there were seven of them -- to  
7 address the concern that was raised, which was to get a  
8 better sense of all these other associated efforts that  
9 are going on, adaptive management, short-lived climate  
10 pollutant, clean power plant, all of those things. So we  
11 provided that. We are happy to take a look at providing  
12 additional follow-up deep dives, because I've heard there  
13 was some -- some interest in follow-up deep dives. So  
14 we're happy to -- to look at having staff provide that, as  
15 well, so I just wanted to get that out there.

16 SARAH RUBIN: This is Sarah. I just need to  
17 interrupt. So we -- I'm getting messages from people  
18 watching the webcast that it's hard to hear and there's a  
19 lot of feedback. So we're trying to troubleshoot. We  
20 really do want folks out there who want to hear what's  
21 happening be able to. So what we're trying to do now is  
22 just make sure that all the microphones are off except for  
23 the person speaking. So I've gone around and turned them  
24 all to mute. So on these, the mute button is on the left,  
25 and it would be red when it's off. So if we can try that,

1 then in a minute or two I'll check in and see how it's  
2 going.

3 Katie, did you want to respond to Floyd, and I'm  
4 wondering if others would like to comment?

5 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yeah, and thank you  
6 for the deep dives that you provided. They've been really  
7 helpful. They've also been really helpful in illuminating  
8 where the blind spots currently are in our state  
9 administration and the program. And ARB staff has been  
10 very open that, look, you're not everywhere --

11 SARAH RUBIN: Slow down. Slow down. Slow it  
12 down for the interpreter.

13 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Sorry.

14 You're not everywhere. You don't know how this  
15 is working in all regions of the state or from all  
16 communities, and that really, this, in our mind, is the  
17 only way to really understand. As much as we appreciate  
18 ARB staff expertise and other agency expertise, we need to  
19 get into the communities and ask them these questions in  
20 really clear and direct terms with enough time to actually  
21 incorporate their feedback into future and final Scoping  
22 Plan drafts.

23 So with that, I'll pass it on.

24 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Remember we have a  
25 translator, so we want give her time to translate.

1 Luis, go ahead.

2 LUIS OLMEDO: Well, first of all, I want to say,  
3 you know, I thought the meeting in Sacramento with the  
4 Chair and Senator Dean was very useful. I think they were  
5 able to get a court reporter. We've been asking for a  
6 court reporter for a long time. We called it a  
7 stenographer, and then ARB interprets it, after speaking  
8 to Steve, talking about a court reporter, similar to the  
9 way ARB has. I mean, yeah, that's -- so I'm really glad  
10 to have that.

11 I know we have professional translation. That's  
12 very useful. I think that in many meetings that I've had  
13 with Cal EPA they've had expert translators. And you have  
14 to have correct translators because not all translators  
15 understand the technical language, so I think that you  
16 have a good team here, Counselor, so I do want to  
17 acknowledge that. I hope that in other areas, they are  
18 going to get the same quality of technical translators.

19 I think that, you know, I appreciate the call  
20 you made, Steve, in regards to trying to clarify what is  
21 exactly the ask. I want so say that I -- that I'm -- I  
22 don't know if it's because of the new ARB board members,  
23 new staff, you know, such as Steve and others, Floyd. I'm  
24 hopeful that some of these things will get resolved.  
25 Obviously, there is an urgency for the time line that has

1    been heard loud and clear.  I still have questions in  
2    terms of how this time line is influenced by market-based  
3    forces.  And I heard some of that before, but I wasn't  
4    very clear.  And whether this meeting is appropriate to  
5    discuss that or not, I want to know more about, you know,  
6    why this time line is so aggressive and where are these  
7    market forces that are driving these -- these deadlines.  
8    And -- and I think they've been made very clear that we're  
9    not going to be able to provide meaningful input.

10                   I also would like to hear at some point of how  
11    we're going to be able to fill in those other requests  
12    that the committee has had.  So I think that you were able  
13    to do that, at least until now, very rapidly for a couple  
14    of requests, and how were the other requests going to be  
15    met.  And I think some of that is already in motion, so if  
16    we can just get a time line that can fit into the overall  
17    plan and give us a confidence that we're going to be able  
18    to have what we need to be able to carry regulations  
19    forward.

20                   SARAH RUBIN:  Okay.  So we'll go to Kevin and  
21    Martha, and then we're going to check in on time because  
22    it's going to be 9:00 o'clock.

23                   KEVIN HAMILTON:  Thanks.  From my perspective,  
24    it seems like a rush to nowhere, so these deep dives are  
25    what we should have been seeing from the very start.  This

1 is the kind of support that EJAC members need. Board  
2 members, when faced with complex issues, we're looking at  
3 the entire Scoping Plan, all facets of it. This is a  
4 multifaceted, complicated plan that in total, of all the  
5 documents, probably comprises 5,000 pages of documents.  
6 To somehow expect those of us who work in the community  
7 and have to continue to work at our jobs every day, to  
8 read all of this and be able to understand it very -- in  
9 that short time line, I think is unreasonable. If we were  
10 board members, we would have staff who would be tasked to  
11 explain it and bring it to us and answer our questions,  
12 highlight areas that we might want to look at first,  
13 review the whole thing with us, and then a short review,  
14 and that's what's going to happen in these deep dives.

15           Each one of the deep dives at our meeting has  
16 been like Chapter 1, so now I'm ready for deep dive  
17 Chapter 2. Now that I've had a chance to internalize and  
18 ask questions on the first one and staff has had a chance  
19 to go back and think about those questions and the  
20 comments that came from the group that attended those, I  
21 think we're ready for that next round at this point. But  
22 what I don't feel ready for is the ability to -- is having  
23 the ability to make an intelligent Scoping Plan  
24 recommendation based on the information that I have right  
25 now. So -- and I believe other committee members feel the

1 same way.

2           So, you know, I don't know why we have this  
3 rush. Again, if there's market forces pushing and nipping  
4 at the heels of the ARB and there's fear somewhere that  
5 somebody else is going to do something that's -- who's on  
6 the opposition to the whole plan and -- and everything  
7 that it means, and if their agenda could potentially  
8 affect our ability to implement a plan like this, we need  
9 to know that. Let's be transparent. Let the community  
10 know, as well, so we can get folks engaged who would be  
11 able to maybe counter those portions.

12           SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Martha?

13           MARTHA ARGUELLO: So I want to echo some of  
14 the -- and I actually have an echo -- some of the things  
15 that folks have said. So I -- I want to speak directly to  
16 Katie, your question, and I think -- and to borrow your  
17 line -- I think we need to go slow to go fast. And we  
18 know certainly the last two EJACs, when you're rushing us,  
19 those key things around the ground truthing and really  
20 helping -- you know, being able to listen to a community  
21 who is telling you where the problems are in the actual  
22 implementation or, you know, what we have to fix. So  
23 without that, this isn't really going to work.

24           And I -- I actually think it's political forces  
25 more than market forces that we need to worry about, and

1 so I think we do need to be good board members. I also  
2 think that we should start meeting at the Governor's  
3 office, because it seems a very long time you keep telling  
4 us you just don't know about the time line, and I just  
5 think that's unacceptable to keep us sort of hanging on  
6 and, again, force us to do work that we don't think is our  
7 best work. And what we're telling you is, we're committed  
8 to giving you our best work, but for that we need your  
9 best work, and we need your commitment, and we need you to  
10 keep your word. And that means giving us an answer. I  
11 think you can find another six months to four months on  
12 this time line.

13           SEKITA GRANT: I want to quickly just double tap  
14 and agree with what's already been said around kind of the  
15 stress on resources and time line, as well as the need for  
16 more transparency. I think it's critical. And I think  
17 that the deep dives have been great. I -- I feel  
18 concerned. I'm new to this -- well, new to this side of  
19 the process. I worked on the Scoping Plan previously for  
20 the State. But very concerned that we're wasting time on  
21 things that, you know, might not be all the way pertinent  
22 to what we end up seeing in that first draft. So I think  
23 getting a first draft is absolutely critical. And, you  
24 know, the deep dives are good, but I just want to make  
25 sure folks around the table have really limited time and

1 resources, and just making sure that we're as focused as  
2 possible on what's relevant for us to be as productive at  
3 the Scoping Plan.

4           And I want to look to our -- I am not a  
5 community organizer, and I want to look to our EJAC  
6 members for us to think about in addition, and I agree  
7 with Martha in terms of talking to the Governor's office,  
8 and I -- I would love to have the ability to talk to other  
9 state agencies that I know have already been thinking  
10 about what's going into the Scoping Plan, because I worked  
11 for one of those state agencies, and there was a lot of  
12 work that was done prior to us getting out into the  
13 communities. So I think it's -- for me, when I was  
14 working with the state, it would have been very helpful to  
15 meet with EJAC members much earlier on. We never met with  
16 them, and then we got a list of recommendations way late  
17 into the process, and it wasn't helpful for us. And  
18 ideally, we would have been meeting in person much earlier  
19 as things were getting developed. I think that's critical  
20 if you're meaningfully going to integrate EJAC  
21 recommendations into the Scoping Plan.

22           And so my point is for us to think about, in  
23 addition to putting pressure on time line and more  
24 resources and having access to staff that's drafting, I  
25 think also us thinking about how -- what is the plan for

1 getting to the communities? Even if we don't have the  
2 content and time line all the way ready, you know, should  
3 we be thinking June, July, August, September, whatever we  
4 have, let's start thinking about what meetings we're going  
5 to have in the communities, and then put pressure on  
6 making sure we have the information we need to present  
7 what we have at those times. But kind of, you know, doing  
8 what we can at the time -- the time frame, but just moving  
9 forward with a community engagement strategy, basically.

10 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you, Sekita.

11 This is Sarah. So I want to check in. It's  
12 9:00 o'clock. We did start this agenda item quite late.  
13 We've got Rey and Eleanor. I want to come to you. But I  
14 am just wanting -- back to the moving slow to going fast,  
15 I want to make sure you have enough time for the  
16 presentations and discussion, and at 3:00 o'clock, our  
17 plan is to revisit the time line and be pointed. And I'm  
18 thinking that during the day, through using the  
19 three-by-five cards or these Post-its, people can rewrite  
20 or think through the specific asks and the specific next  
21 steps, and then we can catalog those at the end.

22 So Rey and then Eleanor, if you could be short,  
23 and then I want to get us moving to our next agenda item.

24 And Floyd, do you want to respond now, or after?

25 FLOYD VERGARA: I can respond after.

1 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Go ahead.

2 REY LEON: Just I think to recognize, but also  
3 to recommend the deep dives were good. Unfortunately, I  
4 was only able to make the -- there was a fake one, and  
5 able to engage with those on the line from staff. And the  
6 thing is, one of the reasons a lot of us have the  
7 expertise that we do is because we're on the ground and  
8 working with the community, and it's quite labor  
9 intensive. So schedules don't always, you know, provide  
10 the ability and the flexibility to -- to partake in, you  
11 know, all the deep dives. So my recommendation would be  
12 that we do a webinar, where we're able to record it, get  
13 some sound, so that when we do miss one, we can go back,  
14 capture it in its essence. Because I think sometimes in  
15 the notes, which may be good, it's a little bit different.  
16 And so that's my recommendation. Thank you.

17 ELEANOR TORRES: Having started coming to these  
18 meetings in December, I've been able to -- you know, just  
19 observing things, and as things continue to be discussed,  
20 having a meeting with Chairman Nichols was something I was  
21 really interested in seeing, and actually really hopeful  
22 about after the meeting. I was looking forward to this  
23 meeting to see what ARB was really going to step up and  
24 do. One of the questions I have is, you've only talked  
25 about one contract you've engaged in or are trying to work

1 on, and that's the trans- -- the stuff that you are doing.  
2 I'm sorry, I'm losing words here.

3 In any case, I'd like to know what are the other  
4 contracts you're looking at doing. But I honestly, as  
5 we're sitting here, I don't see how we can effectively  
6 engage community. And at the heart of it, we really need  
7 to engage community. So anyway, I am a little bit  
8 disappointed and I'd like to see -- understand why there  
9 is such a drag upon the time. What are the issues driving  
10 this? Because if indeed our commitment is first and  
11 foremost to disadvantaged communities, we're doing a huge  
12 disservice as far as allowing this time line to drag.

13 FLOYD VERGARA: Thank you, Eleanor, and for  
14 everyone else's comments. I really appreciate them.

15 Going back to Luis's comments, just to reiterate  
16 the need for the time line, as we talked about it at the  
17 last meeting. So, you know, what we discussed at the last  
18 meeting was the need for the Cap-and-Trade Regulation,  
19 where we're going through this rule-making with  
20 Cap-and-Trade, amendments that would be needed in order to  
21 be in effect before the third compliance period for  
22 Cap-and-Trade. That rule-making needs to be completed and  
23 approved -- assuming OAL approves it -- approved by the  
24 Office of Administrative Law by Fall of next year. So  
25 that would be like the October time frame of next year in

1 order for the provisions of that rule-making to be in  
2 effect, and that would be in effect for the third  
3 compliance period and post 2020.

4           Moving backwards from the October time frame, we  
5 need to look at, okay, so how much time is needed for the  
6 Cap-and-Trade rule-making in order to go to the Board, in  
7 order to go through the 15-day comment period, amendments,  
8 and then going to OAL for approval and filing with the  
9 Secretary of State. Moving backwards from there, we're  
10 looking at Spring, late Spring sort of time frame, for  
11 going back to -- you know, we have these two board hearing  
12 processes. For the Cap-and-Trade rule-making, we're  
13 looking at the second board hearing sometime in late  
14 Spring of next year. So that is the time frame that we're  
15 working off of. Our preference is to complete that  
16 Cap-and-Trade rule-making by that October -- you know, to  
17 have it completed by the October time frame.

18           Now, the reason that's affected by the Scoping  
19 Plan is the Scoping Plan needs to be completed prior to  
20 that Cap-and-Trade Program going to the board, and that's  
21 because the idea is that the Cap-and-Trade rule-making is  
22 supposed to be informed by the Scoping Plan process.  
23 Right? I mean, that is -- you know, those two things are  
24 linked together since Cap-and-Trade is an important part.  
25 And if it's not going be an important part of the Scoping

1 Plan, then that's something we need to understand before  
2 the Cap-and-Trade rule-making is completed.

3 So in order to do that, we need to move  
4 backwards and do the Scoping Plan process. That's why  
5 we're looking at completing it by the end of this year, so  
6 that there's sufficient time to complete the Cap-and-Trade  
7 rule-making. As Steve said, we're looking at that period  
8 between the end of this year and the Cap-and-Trade  
9 rule-making to see what sort of flexibility we have to  
10 move -- you know, to move the end date for the Scoping  
11 Plan process.

12 Now, going back to the -- the deep dive  
13 comments, you know, I just want to reiterate, the deep  
14 dives are there to provide information to the EJAC that  
15 was requested on those programs and efforts that are  
16 related to the Scoping Plan and not necessarily the  
17 Scoping Plan itself. So things like clean power plant,  
18 adaptive management, short-lived climate pollutant, all of  
19 those things that the EJAC felt were needed in order to be  
20 better informed about the Scoping Plan. We could not  
21 discuss the Scoping Plan itself at that point, because we  
22 didn't have a discussion draft at that point.

23 Like we said at the last meeting, we're  
24 proposing to have a discussion draft out in the public by  
25 May, and what you'll hear Stephanie Kato talk about for

1 the rest of today, is basically provide you with a preview  
2 of those measures that we're looking to have in the  
3 Scoping Plan. So we're already accelerating in response  
4 to the EJAC's concerns. We're accelerating the time by  
5 which you would have to actually look at those specific  
6 measures that we're looking to put into the Scoping Plan.  
7 We're doing basically a deep dive on the Scoping Plan  
8 starting today. We will be having further discussions on  
9 that.

10 As I said at the last meeting, we are -- you  
11 know, we are committed to holding, you know, as many EJAC  
12 public meetings as possible to address the key issues that  
13 Katie brought up. I think we talked about up to ten  
14 public meetings. As Rey mentioned, that's very  
15 challenging logistically, but we are committed to doing  
16 that, if needed. And, you know, we're going to start off  
17 with the deep dive on the Scoping Plan today. We fully  
18 expect there will be more discussions that are needed, but  
19 you know, in response to the ques- -- to the concerns you  
20 folks have raised, we are providing that preview today.  
21 And that will be a discus- -- the beginning of that dive  
22 on those specific measures for the Scoping Plan.

23 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So someone give me a time  
24 check. Who's got the time up? 9:10. Okay.

25 Luis, is yours burning? Quick, and then we're

1 going to turn to Stephanie. We're going to go into our  
2 next agenda item so we don't get too far behind. I think  
3 what I want to call out, that everything you just said  
4 Floyd, I think unless you really have it at the tip of  
5 your tongue, it's a lot to just follow, and maybe at the  
6 break, which we need to take at 10:00 o'clock because we  
7 need to give our court reporter a break, maybe you could  
8 do a dive round about these dependencies, or maybe you  
9 guys want to put something else up on the time line we  
10 have on the back wall to help other people visualize on  
11 these dependencies you're talking about.

12 Okay. Luis, we're gonna be real short, because  
13 I really want to move to Stephanie.

14 LUIS OLMEDO: Well, could you just further  
15 explain in terms of the Cap-and-Trade. Is that what I'm  
16 hearing, that we make it important to be part of the  
17 Scoping Plan or not? Can you explain that, what you mean  
18 by that?

19 FLOYD VERGARA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.

20 LUIS OLMEDO: Whether -- the Cap-and-Trade,  
21 whether we make it important or not. Can you just clarify  
22 what -- what you meant by that comment?

23 FLOYD VERGARA: Whether we what?

24 LUIS OLMEDO: You mentioned about the  
25 Cap-and-Trade.

1 FLOYD VERGARA: Uh-huh?

2 LUIS OLMEDO: And you wanted to know now whether  
3 it's going to be an important part --

4 FLOYD VERGARA: No, the Scoping Plan --

5 LUIS OLMEDO: -- or not. And I want to know  
6 how -- how do you make that --

7 FLOYD VERGARA: Okay. Well, the -- the Scoping  
8 Plan is there to identify the measures and programs that  
9 we need to have in place in order to get us to our 2030  
10 GHG target. Right? And, you know, I think we mentioned  
11 in the economic analysis workshop and in other discussions  
12 that we're looking at a couple of scenarios for analysis  
13 for the Scoping Plan. One of which was a specific ask by  
14 the EJAC, which is to look at a world without  
15 Cap-and-Trade. So that is one of the scenarios that we're  
16 looking at for analysis in the Scoping Plan. Right?

17 And what we need to do is complete that part of  
18 the process for the Scoping Plan in order to inform the  
19 Cap-and-Trade rule-making. Because if we need to make  
20 changes to the Cap-and-Trade rule-making, these things  
21 have to work in sequence. Right? Otherwise, it just  
22 doesn't work -- work well. So that's why we're trying  
23 to -- we're trying to work backwards from the  
24 Cap-and-Trade rule-making, and making sure that we give  
25 ourselves enough time to complete the Scope and Plan

1 process so that it does inform the Cap-and-Trade  
2 rule-making.

3 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

4 So Mari Rose, Diane, and then we're going to  
5 move on.

6 MARI ROSE TARUC: All right. I'm going to put  
7 this up on the time line. I -- I think for the discussion  
8 draft, I think this is a process that I can see us being  
9 able to work through, and in terms of dates, we'll have to  
10 figure that out. So I'll read this out.

11 So the deep dives have to be completed,  
12 including all of the sectors, because all the sectors have  
13 not been covered in the deep dives. And then, we  
14 concurrently are presenting initial recommendations. So I  
15 think a bulk of our work today is about those initial  
16 recommendations based on what we know so far, and I know  
17 we need to know more. Then the EJAC work groups need to  
18 come together and refine or continue to develop the  
19 recommendations. We need to talk with the authors. As  
20 Sekita was saying, there are those who are writing the  
21 Scoping Plan now. We need to talk with the sector authors  
22 to be able to explain and -- and walk them through our  
23 recommendations initially, and then the discussion draft  
24 can come out. And then from there, we need workshops.  
25 And not just in Sacramento. We need workshops in the

1 community, at least five that I see. It certainly can be  
2 more. And then, our next -- one of our next EJAC meetings  
3 is capturing what we heard from community feedback about  
4 the discussion draft.

5 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Diane, can I use that?

6 For everybody -- for the EJAC members and for  
7 those of you in the audience, I just want to point out  
8 when Mari Rose is bringing up the deep dives, on this wall  
9 you have all different sectors, and the orange stickies  
10 represent deep dives that have already taken place. Those  
11 are in depth like conference calls or webinars. And the  
12 blue -- what color -- the yellow are planned. So you can  
13 see that there's quite a few where nothing has happened or  
14 planned, and that needs to happen.

15 DIANE TAKVORIAN: Quickly, I just want to say I  
16 appreciate everybody's work around the table. I  
17 appreciate the articulation that's so clear from the EJAC  
18 to the ARB staff. And I definitely am hearing and ARB  
19 staff is hearing that there needs to be an extension in  
20 the time line, and I think everyone is appreciating that.

21 That said, it feels like the basics of a public  
22 meeting that's really core and critical to this process  
23 are just in place at this meeting with interpretation and  
24 the stenographer. So in a lot of ways this is a great  
25 first meeting to really have all of those pieces in place,

1 even though I know other work has been done.

2 I guess selfishly, I don't want to be sitting on  
3 the dais at the ARB and hear the EJAC come forward and say  
4 that you didn't have enough time and that you have deep  
5 problems with the Scoping Plan because of that. So I want  
6 to implore the ARB staff to figure this out and give  
7 concrete changes to the time line right away. And if that  
8 means getting on the phone while we're having these  
9 meetings today with these briefings and having a concrete  
10 answer by the end of today in terms of how the time line  
11 could be changed, that would be ideal, really.

12 And I have to say that in my own conversation  
13 with Cal EPA and OEHHA, I don't think December is moving.  
14 Maybe magic can happen, but it didn't sound like that was  
15 going to happen, so I think we ought to work off of the  
16 assumption that it won't. And if magic happens and that  
17 happens, then great. But in my world, that doesn't happen  
18 very often. So -- so I would just say we should assume  
19 it's not going to happen and that we need time to really  
20 look at that report, because that's something that EJAC  
21 asked for a long time ago and that there have been  
22 repeated requests for from various sectors. So if there's  
23 a way we can get a concrete answer when we return, I just  
24 hate to have the same information at the end of the day as  
25 now.

1                   SEKITA GRANT: Thank you. Senator?

2                   Here, try this one.

3                   SENATOR DEAN FLOREZ: That's okay. I got it.

4 Thank you.

5                   Just to add to my colleague Diane's comments, I  
6 guess what I hear -- maybe starting with Kevin's earlier  
7 frustration I could hear, having known Kevin Hamilton for  
8 a while, the deep dive is what's missing and about a month  
9 or two lag of information, I believe we mentioned in the  
10 meeting with Chairwoman Nichols. It's kind of leading to  
11 this somewhat of a frustrated point, because you all know  
12 that December is the deadline.

13                   I guess the question, Floyd, really, is can we  
14 eke out six months, four months out of that? And if we  
15 can, and if it's possible, I'd like to get back to I think  
16 probably the -- the most important point made, at least  
17 what I'm hearing, was by Sekita that said, you know, from  
18 a community engagement perspective, what's our four-month  
19 plan? What's our six-month plan? Because 12 months isn't  
20 going to happen.

21                   So if it is six or four months, what kinds of  
22 things from ARB do you need, as Diane just said, to make  
23 this like super, super, hyped-out effective? And I would  
24 say that if you're waiting for another meeting maybe next  
25 month to discuss this, we're -- we can just say that it's

1 not going to work. So I would say, even if the committee  
2 has to get together in the next ten days, I would suggest  
3 that you get together, that ARB have the right staff, and  
4 you come -- I think really -- I think Mari put up, you  
5 know, five workshops or something. It sounds more like  
6 ten is kind of the right number. And you need resources,  
7 you need staff time, you need organization, you need  
8 money, you need outreach in order to make any of those  
9 effective.

10 So I think -- but to do that, I think as Sekita  
11 said, what's the plan? You know, what's the community  
12 engagement plan for a four-month ramp up, and what's the  
13 community plan for six months, would be preferable, and I  
14 get that. But how many of these can we really do? And I  
15 agree with Diane. I think I hear the time line for  
16 Cap-and-Trade is still going to stay at December to keep  
17 everything on time, but I'm also very sensitive in hearing  
18 the frustration that if you would have had the deep dive  
19 in December or maybe earlier, we'd be well along in the  
20 process.

21 So I would say that at some point in this  
22 planning session that you really lay out how many  
23 workshops you are going to need in a four-month period and  
24 see if that's even doable, and then allowing the staff to  
25 come up with a very, very concise, powerful way to give

1 you the information you need at each of those workshops.

2 I think Rey is correct. At some point, all of  
3 those workshops need to be taped. All of those workshops  
4 need to be put in a webinar format. All of those need to  
5 be online and available for any community to access, both  
6 in English and in Spanish and in other languages. Because  
7 that's what's going to allow you to scale this up in a  
8 much quicker way for those who can't get to the four, ten,  
9 or however many workshops you're going to have. So I  
10 would say that we also have to count that in as well,  
11 because if not, we're just going to be talking to each  
12 other in this echo chamber.

13 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

14 Okay. Rey, I see you have your card up, but it  
15 is 9:20. Your first meeting goal up on the wall is to get  
16 out recommendations. If we do not move towards pulling  
17 the recommendations out of you, you will not meet your  
18 goals. So I'm wondering if you can hold on and we can  
19 move on.

20 REY LEON: I just wanted to say that it would be  
21 great to be able to --

22 SARAH RUBIN: No, I'm going to give you the  
23 microphone.

24 REY LEON: -- to be able to have and to see this  
25 type of environment. You know, I would like to see, you

1 know, say, one of the deep dives happen perhaps in Huron  
2 and different communities that are the most impacted, so  
3 that the opportunity is not just to get online, but to be  
4 present and participate. You know, keeping it a little  
5 bit more real, you know.

6 SARAH RUBIN: Great idea.

7 All right. Stephanie.

8 So everyone, we are on agenda item listed as  
9 Number 3, 2030 Target Scoping Plan: Part 1. Stephanie is  
10 going to kick us off with an overview, we're going to turn  
11 to Trish for Economic Analysis, Short-Lived Climate  
12 Pollutant Reduction Strategy, and then we're going to be  
13 coming to you EJAC members to start sharing your suggested  
14 recommendations.

15 MARI ROSE TARUC: Just logistically, Sarah, do  
16 we have a projection? What's going to need to happen?

17 SARAH RUBIN: We do not. We're going to have to  
18 record people, and I can do charting, but the projector  
19 isn't working.

20 ROY DORANTES: Well, we have a Plan B. We've  
21 got a portable projector and a laptop, and as soon as you  
22 take a break, we're going to run it in the middle and set  
23 it up for you guys.

24 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So we're going to take --  
25 let's hear the -- the presentation, and then let's take

1 our break early so they can set up, and then we'll do the  
2 recommendations.

3 Does anybody object to that?

4 Okay. Great.

5

6 - 2030 TARGET SCOPING PLAN: PART 1 -

7 STEPHANIE KATO: So I was going to just give an  
8 update to you all on what staff has been working on  
9 lately. We are not as far along on the modeling for the  
10 Scoping Plan as we thought we'd be actually at this point.  
11 You know, we've had a number of public workshops. The  
12 most recent one was kind of like -- was like a deep dive.  
13 It was on a natural working lands at the end of last  
14 month. Something that we're working on for later this  
15 month is hopefully a similar format workshop for energy in  
16 the Bay Area and transportation and land use for the  
17 Southern California area.

18 We -- there's -- there's three core staff,  
19 myself and two others, that are working on Scoping Plan  
20 measures. I'm responsible for green buildings, water and  
21 waste sectors, and the other two for the other areas. We  
22 have about 25 different State agencies participating on  
23 these interagency working groups, so the handouts that you  
24 did get are kind of a -- were prepared by us, but they're  
25 intended to kind of give you an inventory of the various

1 measures, both existing, newly adopted, and some of the  
2 concepts that we've been discussing in order to get us to  
3 the 40 percent reduction target.

4           Because we're not that far along with the  
5 modeling, the interagency discussions have really just  
6 been focused around getting a good vision for each of the  
7 sectors, and then in making sure we have all the measures  
8 accounted for. So this meeting today is actually very  
9 timely to help us with that process, so if EJAC, you know,  
10 could weigh in on the suite of measures that are there.  
11 If you have any ideas on the measures that we haven't  
12 already been talking about, this is just a great kickoff  
13 for that to make sure your interests actually become part  
14 of the modeling scenarios.

15           And that's one of the things we want to do is,  
16 we only have the bandwidth to actually, you know, model a  
17 few scenarios, so if we could get your feedback on if we  
18 were to build those scenarios, what would they look like?  
19 You know, what components would be a part of it? Where  
20 are the areas that are of the most concern to you? That's  
21 really what we're trying to get.

22           I also wanted to mention that we've been having  
23 conversations with the California Air Pollution Control  
24 Officers Association. In past Scoping Plans, local action  
25 has been mentioned as a key component of getting to our

1 targets. I guess in past Scoping Plans, though, a lot of  
2 the information has kind of just been put in an appendix,  
3 and I think folks were unclear about what to do with that.  
4 One of the things we're talking about is although we have,  
5 you know, State-level measures, we'd like to use the  
6 Scoping Plan as an opportunity to identify some core local  
7 actions for each of the sectors and under each of the  
8 measures that could be put forth in order to actually get  
9 us to our goals. And those could actually be, you know,  
10 more at the kind of City Ordinance level, or they could  
11 actually be kind of a list of best practices for  
12 individual projects that we'd be looking at to shore up  
13 the State measures and get us to our goals.

14 So that's kind of the -- the overview I wanted  
15 to give you folks leading into the more specific sector  
16 discussions we're going to have later, just to get you  
17 into it, so you know what we've been talking about and see  
18 if you have any questions about that.

19 TRISH JOHNSON: Thank you, Stephanie. This is  
20 Trish, and I was just going to add a little bit to what  
21 you had to say, especially with regards to the economic  
22 analysis.

23 I'm aware that there was a request from the EJAC  
24 to see draft economic models at this meeting. And like  
25 Stephanie characterized, we're actually not to that point

1 quite yet. This meeting actually is going to affect --  
2 the State agencies right now are developing the package of  
3 policies that would be submitted for the economic  
4 modeling, and Stephanie today is going to go over each of  
5 the different sectors in the Scoping Plan, and what we'd  
6 like to hear from the committee is, you know, your  
7 thoughts about those different actions and whether they  
8 are, you know, on the right track to meet the 2030 target  
9 or if they need to be made more stringent.

10           There was also an ask from the EJAC to have an  
11 economic reviewer with expertise in economics as they  
12 affect disadvantaged communities and air quality impacts.  
13 Specifically, a few names were provided, Manuel Pastor  
14 from USC or Jim Sadd from Occidental. We have had a deep  
15 dive on the Scoping Plan Economic Analysis with our Chief  
16 Economist, Emily Wimberger. In addition, she did have a  
17 specific conference call with a few members to talk about  
18 the request that was made in February at the EJAC meeting  
19 for a Southern California Economic Reviewer.

20           Since she was just recently provided these  
21 names, we will be working with her and will provide you  
22 feedback as soon as possible whether we can get one of  
23 these reviewers added to the panel of reviewers with the  
24 economic analysis, or if -- it kind of depends. I know  
25 that she knows these reviewers really well, and so I'd

1 have to find out if she's had any discussions with them  
2 and where they stand on this.

3 KEVIN HAMILTON: So I'd like to see Jonathan  
4 London added to that group so that we have that expertise  
5 on the Valley and economic issues. Thank you.

6 DIANE TAKVORIAN: So Stephanie, when you talked  
7 about meeting with the Air Pollution Control Officers, are  
8 you also meeting with some of cities that adopted a plan  
9 of action plan to get their -- what ordinance -- what  
10 plans have been put forward and any ordinances, any best  
11 practices? I don't think it's all held in the air  
12 pollution districts.

13 STEPHANIE KATO: Specifically, CAPCOA had  
14 approached us. We haven't yet reached out to the specific  
15 local entities. I know they're a part of those  
16 discussions. I've kind of -- we've been relying somewhat  
17 on, you know, OPR and some of the other State agencies to  
18 kind of bring forth, you know, those perspectives, but,  
19 you know, certainly that -- that is an area we could work  
20 on, especially as we start doing the workshops in the  
21 regions. You know, on the specific sectors, I think  
22 that's probably a -- you know, a very good idea of that  
23 role, to reach out to those local entities to having them  
24 as part of that -- those workshops.

25 DIANE TAKVORIAN: I think it's a good idea. I

1 mean, our Air Pollution Control District had virtually no  
2 part of the Climate Action Plan that was adopted by the  
3 City of San Diego in December, so -- and I know -- and two  
4 of us just had a Climate Action Plan for four years. So  
5 it's -- those -- and they -- again, there wasn't that  
6 involvement. So I think it would be great if there was  
7 and there would be more expertise, both from the State as  
8 well as from the local agencies.

9           STEPHANIE KATO: Are there certain agencies that  
10 are a conglomeration that would represent some of those  
11 individual locals, or is it -- is it best to -- if we're  
12 going to have a workshop in a certain region, then just  
13 contact those -- those specific --

14           DIANE TAKVORIAN: Probably. I think I was  
15 thinking about when you were talking about pulling  
16 together like best practices and ordinances or plans that  
17 have been put forward. I don't know of a collaborative  
18 that they have. There may be one.

19           SARAH RUBIN: All right. So Katie, and then I'm  
20 going to check in and move us towards our break.

21           KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So in general, for the  
22 Scoping Plan, one of the questions I'd really like to see  
23 each agency answer -- well, I have three.

24                   First is how is there -- how are the  
25 recommendations this time different than 2014 and why?

1 And specifically, you know, when you read the 2014 Scoping  
2 Plan, it's a lot of justification, even in the policy  
3 decision, but there isn't a lot of breakdown of the data.  
4 So I'd really like to specifically know what data those  
5 agencies have on the programs that they're recommending,  
6 and what's it's telling them specifically about EJ  
7 communities, and I'd also be really interested in a  
8 breakdown of the data that they don't have.

9 I was really struck in the energy paper from  
10 2014, they say, Oh, we saw this constant reduction between  
11 2008 and 2011, but we don't really know if that was due to  
12 change in consumer demand or our policies and programs  
13 that we adopted. And like those types of gaps, I'd really  
14 like to identify, because one of my objectives today --

15 SARAH RUBIN: A little slower.

16 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Sorry. Sorry. I do  
17 the -- I had some extra expresso today.

18 Because one of my objectives for this Scoping  
19 Plan is to identify data and metrics. That we can use  
20 data that we want to see the agencies start collecting  
21 that we can use to check in every couple of years to make  
22 sure that the programs are meeting their targets. And so  
23 for each agency, I'd like to see a breakdown of the data  
24 that they will collect, the metrics that they will install  
25 for their programs, and how we can check in starting in

1 2020 on that, and that will give them three years  
2 potentially to start collecting that data, so that we can  
3 check right at 2020, and then every two years after that,  
4 where are you at in your metrics, what are you seeing as  
5 far as shifts and demand, and do we need to make  
6 adjustments to the policies that we're assuming that you  
7 will carry forward.

8           STEPHANIE KATO: We've definitely been talking  
9 about the presence of data gaps, you know, in these  
10 interagency group discussions, and we did realize that  
11 this Scoping Plan, if it doesn't have all those answers,  
12 then it can at least highlight some of those gaps, and  
13 that would call out, you know, the need to actually --  
14 between this Scoping Plan and the next update in five  
15 years to see if we can close that gap.

16           SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Is your thing still --  
17 okay. I'd like to move us towards a 15-minute break.  
18 Before we take a break, I want to reiterate what's  
19 happening, which is we're hearing an initial presentation  
20 on these different sectors from ARB. We are wanting folks  
21 from the EJAC who have comments or questions or who were  
22 part of the deep dives to add in, and then the idea is  
23 we're going to be going around and calling out suggested  
24 recommendations. And we're getting the projector out  
25 because Trish is going to type the recommendations

1 realtime so that everyone can see them, and if you want to  
2 adjust them or edit them or combine them, we can do that.

3 Does anyone have any questions before we move to  
4 a break?

5 All right. Let's come back at 9:47. See you at  
6 9:47.

7 (Recess.)

8 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. We're going to get started  
9 again. If everyone could please sit down.

10 Okay. We are back from our break. I know the  
11 breaks always feel very short. And it looks like we lost  
12 our students, but I know more students are going to be  
13 coming back, another group.

14 I just want to give another shout out to members  
15 of the public, folks from the community who are here. We  
16 are so grateful. Very, very excited to hear from you.  
17 The public comment period is scheduled for noon. And if  
18 you want to jot something down or just talk, we definitely  
19 are keen to hear what you have to say and what you want to  
20 share. I know from planning these meetings, we're always  
21 interested in involving and hearing from the public as  
22 much as possible, and I just want to give my personal  
23 apology that because our meeting is so packed with  
24 content, we don't have maybe as much wiggle room for more  
25 of a workshop-style feel with members of the public. But

1 I think that's something we're all excited to be exploring  
2 going forward.

3 So where we left off, as you remember -- I put  
4 it down here for now -- hearing from ARB, hearing from  
5 EJAC members, pulling out recommendations. We're going to  
6 turn it over to Trish for some content presentation.

7 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Because one of our  
8 goals was to have the recommendations, as we give them, up  
9 like on a screen, I want to make sure that the three I  
10 just gave didn't get -- could get posted up there. I  
11 mean, they're posted there, but there's --

12 SARAH RUBIN: I have --

13 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: No, you missed the one  
14 about like I want there to be metrics in the Scoping Plan  
15 that we check in on starting in 2020 to allow for  
16 adjustments.

17 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So let's pull up a Word  
18 document right now and type these.

19 Okay. Katie, would you mind restating it, and  
20 then we'll also have it -- a recommendation for the  
21 record.

22 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So my recommendation  
23 for the general Scoping Plan is that every sector has  
24 established data and metrics that they will start  
25 collecting now that can start to be evaluated in 2020.

1           These are more questions for the draft, but I  
2     have the recommendation, as well.

3           So Trish, just to be clear, that last one is not  
4     a question, that is a formal request that there be  
5     indicators and metrics identified, and that tracking  
6     begins now and our first check-in is in 2020.

7           TRISH JOHNSON: So do I delete this last part?

8           KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yeah.

9           MARI ROSE TARUC: Maybe Trish should do a  
10    section of questions and a section of recommendations --

11          THE REPORTER: I can't hear you, if you want  
12    this on the record.

13          SARAH RUBIN: She's saying make the  
14    recommendations separate from the questions.

15          TRISH JOHNSON: I could maybe do a table,  
16    questions on the left, recommendations on the right.

17          MARI ROSE TARUC: No --

18          SARAH RUBIN: Well, if you could just to do a  
19    hard return after the word "recommendation."

20          MARI ROSE TARUC: Yeah, it's going to start to  
21    be -- become a long list, and so be prepared to --

22          SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So now your presentation on  
23    SLCP.

24          TRISH JOHNSON: Okay. On the agenda, we have a  
25    few minutes dedicated to the Short-Lived Climate Pollutant

1 Strategy that ARB is currently developing. The schedule  
2 that that strategy is on is that this month, we will  
3 release a proposed strategy and hold a public workshop to  
4 detail what's included in that proposed strategy. In May,  
5 we intend to present the proposed strategy to the Board  
6 with the development of a final strategy, including  
7 responses to the environmental assessment in Fall of this  
8 year.

9 This information was presented to a few of the  
10 EJAC members as part of one of the deep dives for the  
11 Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Strategy -- excuse me  
12 Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Reduction Strategy. As a  
13 result of that, one member that participated in the  
14 meeting, Tom Frantz, an EJAC member, did provide a request  
15 to make an immediate recommendation to the Air Resources  
16 Board for incorporation in that proposed strategy. So for  
17 this discussion, I'm going to turn it over to Tom to talk  
18 us through what he's written here, and then get the other  
19 committee members to weigh in.

20 TOM FRANTZ: Tom Frantz here. As you may or may  
21 not know, in the Southern San Joaquin Valley, we have  
22 massive factory dairies up and down the San Joaquin  
23 Valley, and they came in the mid '90s, kind of an  
24 invasion. But it's a massive environmental justice issue  
25 because of the air pollution and water pollution they

1 cause, and now we're finding that the global warming  
2 pollution from these dairies is also massive, and it's  
3 along the lines of from 5 percent to 13 or 15 percent of  
4 the total greenhouse gases in the state, depending on  
5 which climate warming potential numbers you apply to  
6 methane. Because if -- given the state is using different  
7 numbers at different times, it's very confusing that, you  
8 know, methane is more effective at forcing global warming  
9 than CO2, and it's a short-lived climate pollutant, and  
10 sometimes you see that it's 25 times more than CO2,  
11 sometimes you see it's 80- -- 84 times more. But anyway,  
12 it's massive what dairies contribute.

13 So in lining with reducing short-lived climate  
14 pollutants to meet a goal in 2030 of 40 percent below, you  
15 know, 1990 levels, dairies -- the dairy industry and the  
16 people in that industry must do their part. They have to  
17 do their part. And there would be potentially big  
18 co-benefits for our communities that live near these  
19 dairies.

20 And so I'm asking today for the committee to  
21 actually recommend that short-lived climate pollutants  
22 have mandated reductions in this plan that's being written  
23 as we sit here, this plan that will be up for approval in  
24 May. And so the draft -- we're asking that the draft plan  
25 include mandated reductions for all of these short-lived

1 climate pollutants, and dairies will become a part of  
2 that. And then the program, of course, has to be made of  
3 how you're going to do this. Are you going to bring  
4 industrial-size dairies that emit more than 25,000, what  
5 is it, pounds per year or tons per year? Are they going  
6 to be under Cap-and-Trade? I don't think so. But you  
7 have programs like the low carbon fuel standard, where  
8 among fuels, they trade credits back and forth. So you  
9 could have a program like that for dairies specifically.

10 But we're not recommending how you do this right  
11 now, but that the reductions must be mandated. And -- and  
12 the history of this, dairy digesters were a offset for the  
13 early Cap-and-Trade entities, and it totally failed. No  
14 dairies are volunteering to take some money and build a  
15 digester, unless it's, you know, a massive amount of  
16 money. You know, if you give a dairy a million dollars,  
17 they might put in a digester and all the claiming  
18 facilities so they can make pipeline ready gas, but three  
19 years later, they'll probably shut it down because it's  
20 not working for them.

21 Anyway, the voluntary -- we've seen that the  
22 voluntary method doesn't work, so we're asking for  
23 mandated reduction. Maybe legislation will come along  
24 this year that also mandates that, but CARB has the  
25 authority already to make these programs. CARB proved its

1 authority in court, low carbon fuel standard. They could  
2 do the same with this if they mandate something and  
3 there's a lawsuit. We think it should be mandated. So if  
4 there's any questions from anyone else.

5 This is specific to dairies, but it's also --  
6 the implication is all short-lived climate pollutant  
7 reduction should be mandated.

8 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you, Tom.

9 So I just want to remind you all that your  
10 decision-making process is you seek consensus. And for  
11 the members in front of you, you should have some red,  
12 yellow, green cards, and then if you don't have consensus  
13 on an issue after striving for it, this can move to a  
14 majority vote of a quorum. So we obviously want to take  
15 questions and comments, but Tom has asked that the group  
16 look to make a decision, so I'm giving you a heads up that  
17 I'm going to ask you for a quick temperature take. Red is  
18 you can't live with it, green is you're supportive of it,  
19 and yellow would be you have some concern. Okay?

20 So we're going to go to Sekita, and then I would  
21 like to do a super quick temperature check, and then those  
22 with red or yellow, I would come to you for comment. Red,  
23 yellow, green. Red, I can't live with the proposal, I'm  
24 voting against it. Green is I'm supportive. And yellow  
25 is you have some kind of concern.

1           REY LEON: Honestly, the red and the green look  
2 exactly alike to me.

3           SARAH RUBIN: Oh, okay. So we need to write on  
4 yours "red" and "green."

5           MARI ROSE TARUC: I'll help him.

6           SARAH RUBIN: No, sincerely, I've had  
7 sight-impaired folks, and we always make accommodation.

8           Okay. Go ahead.

9           SEKITA GRANT: I want to quickly thank you, Tom,  
10 for the explanation and for bringing this up. I would be  
11 supportive of having that in the Scoping Plan. As Tom  
12 alluded to, there is legislation on this, as well. It's  
13 going to be highly political, and ideally we have  
14 something in the Scoping Plan that has strong mandates,  
15 really relying on data and research that's come out of the  
16 Air Resources Board itself as a result of SB605.

17           And the only thing that I would add is, if  
18 there's an opportunity to, within this language, embed a  
19 mandate around community participation and even approval  
20 on the implementation side, I think what goes into the  
21 Scoping Plan and legislation and other documents is really  
22 great, and then, you know, implementation becomes really  
23 critical. So I do believe that there's mandating language  
24 within the Scoping Plan that requires community approval,  
25 or at least engagement consultation, as the State is

1 looking at how to actually effect and implement the  
2 requirement.

3 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

4 Could I get a very quick -- with the proposal in  
5 its original form, can people please hold up their red,  
6 yellow or green card. I want to get a sense of where the  
7 room is with Tom's proposal, in its original form,  
8 mandating a 40 percent methane reduction from dairies by  
9 the year 2030. Okay. Thank you.

10 Okay. Luis? Oh, I'm sorry, Rey.

11 REY LEON: Thank you.

12 You know, I think Tom makes an excellent point,  
13 and that is applicable to a lot of the industries in the  
14 San Joaquin Valley for sure and other ones in the State of  
15 California. I've been working on air quality issues, air  
16 quality policy since 2003, and former Senator Dean Florez  
17 could also, I think, speak to this, but you know, what --  
18 what we observed is that when you make regulations  
19 voluntary, it's basically not going to happen. You know,  
20 so I think we -- it would be good to put together a  
21 laundry list of all the regulations that are -- or  
22 policies that are -- that are standards that are voluntary  
23 that have to do with the impact of climate change, because  
24 I think we've gone past that period of providing option to  
25 not participate. I think it's critical that everybody

1 participate, we've just got to figure out, you know, what  
2 that means in terms of time line and -- and other details.  
3 But we should put together a list of existing voluntary  
4 measures that are out there that really should no longer  
5 be voluntary. Thank you.

6 That's my recommendation for the list, actually.

7 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So for the reporter, court  
8 reporter, or tran- -- fancy name, note taker, I want to  
9 make sure we got that one.

10 Okay. So let's go to Kevin, Luis, Monica.

11 KEVIN HAMILTON: I think Monica was first, and  
12 then Luis.

13 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Monica, Luis, Kevin.

14 MONICA WILSON: Thanks. I have a question for  
15 our process, which is that I wanted to put forward another  
16 or second recommendation regarding SLCP, and I wanted to  
17 know do I need to make that now or --

18 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, what?

19 MONICA WILSON: Regarding the short-lived  
20 climate pollutants, the same document. So I just need to  
21 know do I make that now, or do we wait until after this is  
22 wrapped up?

23 KEVIN HAMILTON: Is this related to methane or  
24 to something else?

25 MONICA WILSON: It's related, but I think it

1 would be a separate recommendation.

2 SARAH RUBIN: I think -- why don't we try to put  
3 this to bed, and then come back to you.

4 MONICA WILSON: Thanks.

5 LUIS OLMEDO: For my own clarification, the  
6 major distinction between a CAFO and a dairy? What is --  
7 what is it that we're looking at different in a CAFO and a  
8 dairy?

9 TOM FRANTZ: It's more related to size. But the  
10 regulation under the air quality rules, they are regulated  
11 as stationary sources, that are defined as major sources  
12 and minor sources according to how much pollutants they  
13 actually emit. So it depends on what you are talking  
14 about. Some we have some dairies that are major  
15 industrial polluters over that 25,000 limit, as other  
16 industrial sources, and others are very small. Others  
17 have pasture fed cows that virtually become -- the dairy  
18 is actually a carbon sink, if everything is done properly.

19 LUIS OLMEDO: So the major source that you are  
20 looking at is based on the actual -- the confinement and  
21 the feeding process and the emissions of the actual --

22 TOM FRANTZ: Yeah, the whole industry as a whole  
23 needs to reduce, and smaller dairies can do their part. I  
24 understand there has to be a whole protocol set up and a  
25 way of measuring some of these things, but if you just

1 look at the dairy digester itself only, you're just going  
2 to get a small fraction of the total methane emissions  
3 that are out there from the dairy.

4           And if that's the only thing you incentivize,  
5 then all the other things that dairies could be doing that  
6 are very valuable in other ways, as well, they won't do  
7 any of that other stuff. But if you have a mandate, then  
8 dairies have an incentive to look for the -- all these  
9 different things they could be doing to reduce these  
10 gases. And some of them could actually earn credits by  
11 doing a lot more than others, even the small ones.

12           LUIS OLMEDO: So the reason I ask is because I'm  
13 more familiar with CAFOs here. And I think at one point  
14 in time, we did have a major industry here from dairy,  
15 so --

16           KEVIN HAMILTON: So Luis, like -- like Tom says,  
17 it's about the number of milking cows on the dairy. So --  
18 which interestingly enough, is not all the cows on the  
19 dairy. They have non-milking cows on the dairy, too,  
20 heifers, calves, older cows that are out of cycle for the  
21 milking. They don't have to count these as the number of  
22 cows on the dairy.

23           This has been clearly defined by ARB. There is  
24 large animal operations and smaller animal operations in  
25 three different categories. I can't remember the hundreds

1 and thousands of cows where the numbers fall out. But  
2 it's really -- and what -- what I just want to see happen  
3 here in this document, is I want to be sure that we  
4 capture this idea that we frame as con- -- the dairy  
5 people know it as conservation management practices. And  
6 it's important that we are clear about what -- which of  
7 those practices actually lead to reductions in emissions  
8 on the dairy, and which are simply normal everyday  
9 activities that may or may not lead to reductions on the  
10 dairy.

11           And they -- we know now very well exactly where  
12 the targets are on a dairy. There's areas called free  
13 stalls. If you drive north of here and you see the dairy  
14 operation that's got solar panels on it about ten miles  
15 north, you will see that the solar panels are covering  
16 what's called the free stall area, which are corrals where  
17 the cows come to wander around in. And there is a  
18 practice for how you maintain those and should really  
19 reduce the emissions from those, and, in fact, reverse it  
20 and they can become carbon sinks.

21           The dairy, as Tom points out, a well-managed  
22 dairy can actually become a jewel for the carbon folks.  
23 But there is nothing in the state that requires that  
24 they -- they implement those kinds of management  
25 practices. So if this doesn't take that on, we'll see

1 business as usual. What happened with the local air  
2 districts calling them stationary sources, they would give  
3 them menus of 15 different things they could choose for  
4 conservation management practices, some things as silly as  
5 just locking their gates. So this is more focused to PM  
6 than it is to CAFO.

7 LUIS OLMEDO: I just want to -- again, what is  
8 the major distinction between a dairy and a CAFO, and why  
9 would the CAFOs also benefit from these measures?

10 KEVIN HAMILTON: They will benefit from these  
11 measures.

12 LUIS OLMEDO: So what would be --

13 KEVIN HAMILTON: Keep in mind, you're talking  
14 about a concentra- -- it's a concentrated animal feed  
15 operation, so now you're talking about potentially  
16 chickens, you're talking about potentially pigs, you're  
17 talking about turkeys exactly. The numbers get much  
18 higher when you get into turkeys. You're talking about  
19 like 50,000 turkeys to reach that CAFO level. There's --  
20 I can't remember how many pigs, but it's an incredible  
21 amount. But it should apply to all of them.

22 The biggest problem we have -- we don't have a  
23 huge turkey problem as far as the of number of turkey  
24 ranches we have. We don't have a huge hog problem as far  
25 as the number of hogs we have. But what we have a problem

1 with is the number of dairies we have. In the South  
2 Valley, as the dairies moved out of Los Angeles, we have a  
3 problem with 20- and 30,000 cow dairies broken up into  
4 10,000 cow segments, but really contain 15- to 17,000 cows  
5 apiece. These are huge. We have more cows in the Valley  
6 than there are people, and there's almost 4 million people  
7 in the Valley. So that's why it's a concern to us.

8 Sorry.

9 LUIS OLMEDO: So would it be out of place to  
10 say --

11 KEVIN HAMILTON: It's C-A-F-O.

12 LUIS OLMEDO: -- why not say dairy and CAFOs?

13 KEVIN HAMILTON: The rule would -- the rule  
14 would apply to all of them.

15 SARAH RUBIN: So we need to do one person at a  
16 time, and my question is, everyone here, including me,  
17 might not know what a CAFO is.

18 KEVIN HAMILTON: I said concentrated animal feed  
19 operation.

20 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. I didn't hear you. Okay.  
21 Thank you.

22 KEVIN HAMILTON: Sure.

23 SARAH RUBIN: Luis, I didn't hear the last thing  
24 you said.

25 LUIS OLMEDO: My question is why not further

1 define it -- okay. Right. Exactly. So just further  
2 define dairies, CAFOs. Add the additional language to it  
3 is what I'm recommending.

4 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Senator?

5 SENATOR DEAN FLOREZ: Thanks, Tom. Tom and I  
6 have frequent e-mail exchanges on -- on the topic, so my  
7 question simply is on what you are voting, mandated  
8 40 percent methane reduction from dairies by the year  
9 2030. Knowing that Lara has a bill in that could actually  
10 do this, and that would obviously give CARB some reason to  
11 now kind of put regs around.

12 I think -- are you voting on CARB doing this  
13 outside of the legislative purview, is my number one  
14 question? And number two is, I would just say, because  
15 I've been involved in this for like a thousand years, as  
16 Tom knows, when you do mandate a dairy or -- I'm not going  
17 to use CAFO for now, I'm just going use dairies because  
18 those are very, very large -- here is my concern and just  
19 to think about, and that is, if you mandate, then some  
20 dairies will make this a business. And if they make it a  
21 business, then you are actually going to find more stuff  
22 coming into the Valley in order to make that business  
23 effective. Meaning, beyond what the dairy is producing  
24 itself. And in some cases, you might find folks trucking  
25 in stuff in order to make some of this stuff workable.

1           So my question is always one, if we're going to  
2 do this, could we cap somehow that it be somewhat local,  
3 Tom? I don't know. I mean, in other words, if every  
4 dairy is going to be taking care of their stuff, I think  
5 that's a positive. You're pulling stuff out of the  
6 Valley. But if their -- if you're mandating something  
7 that has to pencil out and the dairy is so small it  
8 actually has to bring stuff in, then that's actually  
9 bringing more stuff to communities that live around  
10 dairies, whether they use McFarland, or you use Schaffner,  
11 or you use some of these communities, I'm just worried  
12 about the fact that, you know, we're not kind of looking  
13 at that consequence, as well. Because if you do have a  
14 digester, you've got to make it economic, and my worry is  
15 that things will come in, not -- it won't just take care  
16 of the things around.

17           I don't know if you guys -- I probably thought  
18 about that a million times. I just wondered.

19           TOM FRANTZ: I think the idea here is that  
20 dairies will not have this huge incentive to do digesters  
21 if they're mandated to make reductions. But see, perhaps  
22 that happening at a huge dairy, I can see it happening  
23 right now. That's the problem. See, right now with  
24 the -- we're going to talk about the low carbon fuel  
25 standard. They get a huge credit for collecting methane

1 and selling it for transportation fuel, and that gives  
2 them an incentive to bring in material to put into their  
3 lagoon from L.A. to make methane. Maybe become -- they  
4 start making more money making methane than they do making  
5 milk, producing milk. That's the situation right now. So  
6 by making it a mandate to reduce, the small dairy isn't  
7 going to build a big digester. A small dairy can do  
8 numerous other things, like dry-scraping of manure daily  
9 and composting, and perhaps bringing in some local wood  
10 chips from the almond industry to make a fine compost  
11 product. That's -- I don't think they're gonna -- a dairy  
12 will bring wood chips in from L.A. to make compost. It  
13 just doesn't make sense to me.

14 But there's many options besides a dairy  
15 digester that a mandate would bring into play, and those  
16 options are really nice synergies with the local farming  
17 community around in this area.

18 SARAH RUBIN: This is Sarah. I have a question,  
19 and I'm going to be calling for us to do our vote through  
20 consensus, and then we absolutely have to move on. We're  
21 starting to get too far behind in our agenda, and it's  
22 going to become a problem very quickly.

23 So we have new language that Trish is putting in  
24 that incorporates Sekita's additions. And my question to  
25 you all, hearing what Senator Florez raised about a

1 potential cap, it seems to me you could do this  
2 recommendation now, and then if at another time, through  
3 additional discussion, you want to adjust this, say add in  
4 that kind of language because after additional discussion  
5 at a different time, then you could do that. So I thought  
6 I would just raise that, that you all can adjust your  
7 recommendations in the future, if you want. Okay. But  
8 for the sake of moving on, I think we see if the folks are  
9 behind us.

10 KEVIN HAMILTON: I have just one --

11 SARAH RUBIN: Yeah.

12 KEVIN HAMILTON: -- quick comment to Dean's  
13 point, which is a very good one.

14 SARAH RUBIN: Into the mic.

15 KEVIN HAMILTON: Into the mic. Thank you.

16 That all additional ancillary missions -- sorry,  
17 all additional ancillary emissions generated --

18 SARAH RUBIN: Wait, I'm sorry. Where should she  
19 type?

20 KEVIN HAMILTON: Right where she's typing.

21 SARAH RUBIN: Right. But at the end of the word  
22 "mandate"?

23 KEVIN HAMILTON: No.

24 SARAH RUBIN: Oh, no, down here. Okay.

25 KEVIN HAMILTON: That's fine.

1 All additional ancillary emissions generated  
2 through achieving this goal must be mitigated.

3 SARAH RUBIN: Do you want this part of the  
4 decision?

5 KEVIN HAMILTON: Yeah.

6 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Then it needs to be up  
7 here, Trish.

8 TRISH JOHNSON: I'll just move it.

9 KEVIN HAMILTON: So in other words, everything  
10 that Dean illustrated so well, and I hope Tom recognizes  
11 that --

12 SARAH RUBIN: Sorry, we need help --

13 KEVIN HAMILTON: -- that we actually see, as a  
14 dairy is starting to build up the capacity to generate  
15 this energy --

16 SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

17 KEVIN HAMILTON: -- quote, unquote, it starts  
18 leading to impacts on the community surrounding it with  
19 increased truck trips, as just a simple example.

20 SARAH RUBIN: So let's get the words that you  
21 all want to vote on.

22 "All additional ancillary emissions generated  
23 through" --

24 KEVIN HAMILTON: -- "achieving" --

25 SARAH RUBIN: -- "this goal" --

1 KEVIN HAMILTON: -- "must be mitigated."

2 SARAH RUBIN: -- "must be mitigated."

3 KEVIN HAMILTON: So we know those might happen  
4 in the construction process and the setup process, but it  
5 all needs to be mitigated. And if it's going to be a  
6 long-term insult to the community or generation of some  
7 kind of emission, whether it's a short-lived climate  
8 pollutant, or greenhouse gas, or in our case criteria  
9 pollutant, as well, it needs to be mitigated.

10 SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

11 KEVIN HAMILTON: Which may mean they can't do it  
12 at all, because there's no mitigation.

13 SARAH RUBIN: So here is the question on the  
14 table for you all to hold up your cards.

15 The EJAC, you all, would make a recommendation  
16 to CARB to mandate a 40 percent methane reduction from  
17 dairies and CAFOs by the year 2030, and will require  
18 community consultation and approval of the implementation  
19 plan for the 40 percent methane mandate: All additional  
20 ancillary emissions gathered through achieving this goal  
21 must be mitigated.

22 Can you move them up.

23 TRISH JOHNSON: Yes.

24 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So cards here. Red,  
25 yellow, green. Okay. So we have a consensus support

1 here. Thank you.

2 So we are going to move on. I'm going to push  
3 you to go a little faster.

4 Sekita?

5 SEKITA GRANT: Just a quick -- quick response to  
6 Dean's comment about that Senator Lara has Bill 1383 right  
7 now that provides percentage reduction requirements for  
8 short-lived climate pollutants, including F gases that  
9 they -- and black carbon. And I think -- I think if we  
10 move forward with the recommendation here as well,  
11 that's -- I don't want to use any expletives, but that's  
12 going to be political nightmare. I think it strengthen --  
13 it strengthens kind of our chances of getting this through  
14 if it's -- if it comes through in the Scoping Plan, as  
15 well, but ideally that legislation passes and it's  
16 complimentary to what we're doing.

17 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

18 Okay. So Trish, did you want to present any  
19 information before we move to recommendations on this  
20 piece? And we're going to start with Monica once we're  
21 taking recommendations. Anything else you want to say?

22 TRISH JOHNSON: I don't believe so, no.

23 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So let's pull up our sheet  
24 with just the recommendations, our Word document, and  
25 Monica, we're going to take yours.

1           MARI ROSE TARUC: And just to time check, how  
2 much time for finishing out the recommendations for the  
3 overall Part 1 section?

4           SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Ten minutes. We have ten  
5 minutes.

6           MARI ROSE TARUC: And so right now, we're just  
7 looking for recommendations to be written up, initial  
8 recommendations.

9           MONICA WILSON: Related to the short-lived  
10 climate pollution; right?

11          MARI ROSE TARUC: The whole thing. The whole --  
12 overall short-lived climate pollutants, economic analysis.

13          SARAH RUBIN: Correct. The three bullets on  
14 your Part 1. Overview -- the whole thing, which is what  
15 Katie was speaking to, economic analysis, short-lived  
16 climate pollutants, and I think starting with that,  
17 Monica, is great.

18          MONICA WILSON: Great. All right. Well, just  
19 to preface this, no one will be surprised to hear this is  
20 about waste and solutions there, and as ARB has  
21 acknowledged, this is really a time for an aggressive  
22 approach to prevent greenhouse gases from the waste  
23 sector. And I also want to preface this by saying that  
24 the short-lived climate pollutant strategy currently  
25 includes some really important language, and I am hoping

1 that we can emphasize that language, the importance of  
2 keeping that language, and actually strengthening it a  
3 bit.

4           So this is about the -- the -- with the draft  
5 language that prohibits the disposal of food waste into  
6 landfills. And it would be a really big shift across the  
7 State of California, keeping food waste all the way from  
8 the waste collected, either harvested or not harvested on  
9 farms, then once it's harvested, keeping that out of  
10 landfills, making sure that that material, while it's --  
11 when it's edible, that because it's not pretty enough, it  
12 doesn't end up in a landfill, it actually goes to people,  
13 if it's still edible. And if it's compostable and not  
14 edible, that it gets composted. So I just want to  
15 emphasis that that's a really important part of what's in  
16 the current plan, and anything else that's really relevant  
17 is how recycle estimates that if we use that material to  
18 make compost, we could create 14,000 new jobs in the  
19 state. So that's a really -- I think on the economic  
20 side, a really big factor.

21           So my recommendation would be that -- that EJAC  
22 support the draft short-lived climate pollutant strategy  
23 focused on prohibiting the disposal of organics, and that  
24 that be expanded to explicitly prohibit the disposal --

25           SARAH RUBIN: I'm sorry --

1                   MONICA WILSON:  Sorry.

2                   SARAH RUBIN:  -- let's stop.  Let's make sure  
3  Trish is getting this.

4                   MONICA WILSON:  All right.  Let me just say one  
5  other thing real quickly.  In Europe, European policy has  
6  prohibited the disposal -- and done the same thing, of  
7  food waste to landfills.  What's happened then, some of  
8  that material has gone to compost; a lot of it has gone to  
9  new incinerators.  So what happens then, you get more air  
10  pollution.  You're not just burning food waste, it's  
11  plastics and lots of other things.  So my recommendation  
12  is going to be that we -- that the short-lived climate  
13  pollution strategy specifically say no disposal to  
14  landfills or incinerators.

15                  SARAH RUBIN:  Okay.  So did you get that?

16                  TRISH JOHNSON:  Can you say it one more time?

17                  MONICA WILSON:  Okay.  Specifically say no  
18  disposal of food waste to landfills or incinerators.

19                  SARAH RUBIN:  Okay.

20                  KEVIN HAMILTON:  And what would be the al- --  
21  what would be the "instead" part of that?

22                  MONICA WILSON:  The -- well, there -- this is  
23  already part of it, the first portion, the short-lived  
24  climate pollutant strategy currently says no disposal of  
25  food waste to landfills, so my recommendation is to be

1 that they add incinerators explicitly, and also that  
2 ARB -- this is already -- it came up during the natural  
3 working lands discussion, but I think it's really  
4 pertinent here. If the State be exploring the synergies  
5 for methane reductions from dairies, for example. Because  
6 we've got compostable material, woody biomass --

7 SARAH RUBIN: Should she start a new one?

8 MONICA WILSON: I think it would be expanded to  
9 say "and explore synergies with methane reductions from  
10 dairies, and then management of organic waste like wood  
11 waste."

12 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Mari Rose, and then do you  
13 guys have -- Kevin -- Senator, do you have  
14 recommendations?

15 SENATOR DEAN FLOREZ: No.

16 SARAH RUBIN: All right. Mari Rose.

17 MARI ROSE TARUC: All right. I was part of the  
18 deep dives for the economic review, and in that economic  
19 review, we were given -- finally given, just that team of  
20 EJAC members, the emissions report from 2008 to 2013. And  
21 the biggest conclusion that I made from that chart, seeing  
22 the data, is that overall facilities, polluting  
23 facilities, over -- from 2011 to 2013, so looking at that  
24 since the Cap-and-Trade program started in 2012, overall  
25 facilities have increased 13 million metric tons of

1 pollution. So not a decrease, but an increase. And the  
2 electricity and the fuel sectors have increased 11 million  
3 metric tons in that three-year period. So we are not  
4 meeting our reduction targets to date, just based on that  
5 set of data.

6 So to me, there has to be a more aggressive --  
7 so a recommendation is a more aggressive emissions  
8 reduction plan, and to particularly target the oil and gas  
9 sector to reduce their emissions. So I want to see  
10 scenarios to target the biggest emissions sectors to --

11 SARAH RUBIN: Hold on. To reduce emissions --

12 MARI ROSE TARUC: So that's -- that's one.

13 I think with the economic analysis, I want to --  
14 I want to recommend that the models that they look at  
15 include -- so they're obviously going to do a market in  
16 Cap-and-Trade model, I want to see a scenario on a carbon  
17 tax, a scenario on just straight up regulation --

18 SARAH RUBIN: Slow down. Let's get the first  
19 one.

20 MARI ROSE TARUC: Regulation, and then a cap and  
21 dividend.

22 SARAH RUBIN: Mari Rose, will you help her with  
23 the --

24 MARI ROSE TARUC: I can type these up for you  
25 and send it to you, Trish, just capture initial things

1     there.  I don't want to slow us down.

2                   It could be fee and dividends, cap or fee and  
3     dividends.

4                   A lot of what we heard from the economists  
5     inside ARB is cost containment, cost containment for  
6     polluting industries, and so what I want to see is an  
7     expansion.  So a recommendation is to expand the  
8     definition of economy to include the cost to the public,  
9     whether those are health costs or social costs.  And the  
10    U.S. EPA actually has a social cost of carbon calculator,  
11    so there are tools out there to use to expand the cost of  
12    climate change and its impacts and its effects to the  
13    public, and I want to see that included in the analysis.

14                  And I think -- last one for now.  I think  
15    outside of -- outside of specific policies, we need to  
16    have a public engagement and -- and culture shift in  
17    California that includes education of our communities.  
18    The public communications and -- and the partnership of  
19    environmental justice communities is key to making sure we  
20    achieve these reductions.

21                  SARAH RUBIN:  Thank you.  Okay.  I'm going to  
22    ask everybody in the room to please stand up.  Everyone.  
23    Unless you can't stand up.  And I'm going to ask one of  
24    our new group of students to tell us what grade they're in  
25    and the name of their school.

1                   STUDENT: Brawley Union High School.

2                   SARAH RUBIN: Here's today's students. Hi.  
3 We're glad you're here.

4                   Okay. We are going to move to our next agenda.  
5 You can sit down. Great job, EJAC. Good job standing up.  
6 You get a gold star. Anyone in the room who wants a  
7 snack, go grab it.

8                   So as a reminder, it is 10:30. We are taking  
9 public comment at noon, and we are taking our lunch break  
10 at 12:15. Right now, we're just 15 minutes behind. We're  
11 on Agenda Item 5, 10:15, 2030 Target Scoping Plan: Part  
12 2, Transportation.

13                   If everybody wants to look on the wall that's to  
14 my left, you'll see the EJAC members who are signed up to  
15 be part of the transportation sector, and you can see that  
16 three deep dives already happened and that two are  
17 planned. Stephanie, you ready for me to turn to you?

18                   Okay. So as a reminder -- we have it right  
19 here -- we're going to hear from ARB, we're going to want  
20 to hear from the EJAC members that were at those deep  
21 dives, and then Trish is going to capture the  
22 recommendations.

23

24                   - 2030 TARGET SCOPING PLAN: PART 2 -

25                   STEPHANIE KATO: So for this sector, what we've

1 been working on, basically we're planning to subsume all  
2 of the current plans that are going on right now in terms  
3 of measures, and that would include the Mobile Source SIP  
4 Strategy, which is using data from our revision model,  
5 assisting -- strategy, advanced clean cars --

6 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't understand  
7 you. Can you repeat that?

8 STEPHANIE KATO: Sure. So for -- for this  
9 sector, for transportation sector Scoping Plan, our base  
10 assumption is to incorporate plans that are, you know,  
11 ongoing now or already in place. Those include advanced  
12 clean car regulations, our sustainable freight strategy  
13 which is going on right now, our Mobile Source SIP  
14 strategy which is also going on right now, our low carbon  
15 fuel standard, which has been adopted, and so that's  
16 what -- we've been working with E3 consumer pathways model  
17 on making sure that pathways does reflect those base  
18 assumptions in those strategies, because pathways is very  
19 detailed on the energy and fuel and on vehicle stock, on  
20 components, and so they've been making sure that they  
21 incorporated data from the energy commission models and  
22 from our own models to make sure that there's consistency  
23 across what's going on now and what -- the Scoping Plan.

24 Some of the newer strategies that are reflected,  
25 our SB350, and that's actually focusing a lot more on

1 transportation electrification, so we are talking about  
2 scenarios that would, you know, push -- push that. If you  
3 remember from the Scoping Plan kickoff meeting, basically  
4 the strategy that's being built around the sector is kind  
5 of like a four-legged stool, so we've got the vehicle  
6 technologies, which are moving towards, you know, plug-in  
7 hybrids and electrification. We're moving towards, on the  
8 fuel side, low carbon fuel standard or, you know, low  
9 carbon intensity fuels, renewable biogas, things like  
10 that.

11           The other critical piece that we're trying to  
12 include here is the whole idea of land use, you know, more  
13 emphasis towards infill developments, smart growth,  
14 incorporating SB375. So our internal SB375 people are  
15 also working with the pathways folks to incorporate the  
16 NPO targets into the modeling work that's going to go on  
17 for our Scoping Plan.

18           And so I think what we're interested to hear  
19 from you all is whether or not some of these core  
20 strategies that are outlined on this table are inclusive.  
21 We'd like to know about some of the -- the details that  
22 you'd see, that you you'd like to see in the scenarios in  
23 terms of whether certain scenarios should just focus on  
24 electrification, if you see a role of NG in some of these  
25 scenarios.

1           Also, we're looking at a scenario that would  
2 include Cap-and Trade and not Cap-and-Trade. So if  
3 Cap-and-Trade is removed from that scenario, then I think  
4 the assumption is that we're going to need to ratchet down  
5 an individual program area. So do you have any ideas in  
6 terms of, you know, moving forward farther with some of  
7 the regulations that are already in place, or are there  
8 other areas that aren't included here on this list that if  
9 we can look at pursuing further measures.

10           Also, going forward with the implementation, if  
11 you have ideas about whether measures should start as  
12 regulations, or there needs to be some type of phasing  
13 period, or certain strategies really should be more  
14 incentive based. So those are just -- that's just a  
15 flavor of the discussions we've having, and I really hope  
16 to hear some specific recommendations from this group.

17           SARAH RUBIN: Great. So we're ready. Who's got  
18 recommendations, or who wants to see -- all right. Katie,  
19 you're ready.

20           KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: I was up late last  
21 night doing homework --

22           SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

23           KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Oh, no, this is  
24 better.

25           So we know -- so I'm going to focus mostly on

1 SB375, specifically the Sustainable Communities  
2 Strategies. We know, like in Sacramento, for instance, we  
3 just adopted our new strategy, and before ARB's even  
4 approved it, the local governments are already moving  
5 forward with it all, and I thought would go outside of the  
6 projected growth areas for our Sustainable Communities  
7 Strategy. So clearly that incentive program isn't really  
8 working all that well. And I've heard similar stories  
9 from Kern County, where I'm from, where the council of  
10 government has actually given GHG reduction credit for  
11 lower than expected population growth, when there were no  
12 actual changes in land use patterns or transportation  
13 investments. And if that's what we're trying to  
14 incentivize, my recommendations --

15 Just to give Trish a few.

16 So I would like to see the Sustainable  
17 Communities Strategies or SCSs be based on land use and  
18 transportation changes.

19 Further, I would like to see increased  
20 enforcement on how implementation matches the plan, either  
21 from ARB or SGC, and wherever else they think that's  
22 appropriate.

23 I would like to strengthen the transit planning  
24 components of SCSs.

25 And finally, I'd like to prioritize the

1 investments from SCSs in environmental justice  
2 communities.

3 So like Sacramento, all of the projects that are  
4 getting funded are in our urban corridors, the  
5 transportation corridors, and not in the neighborhoods  
6 that need the most investment. Thank you.

7 SARAH RUBIN: All right.

8 KEVIN HAMILTON: So with regard to -- to  
9 transportation, specifically, there was some  
10 recommendations made from 2014 and some modifications that  
11 I think need to happen. One of the things that is in the  
12 old plan was the idea of preserving and investing in  
13 current transit services as being important. I disagree.  
14 I think while that needs to be included, that we need to  
15 focus on expanding transit services to provide  
16 neighborhood level access. We need to use different  
17 vehicle sizes and types and modalities to reach  
18 community -- economies of scale that ensure these are  
19 sustainable.

20 You want me to say that again?

21 TRISH JOHNSON: Yeah. Expanding transit  
22 services --

23 KEVIN HAMILTON: Expanding transit services to  
24 provide neighborhood level access. Use different vehicle  
25 sizes and types to reach economies of scale that ensure

1 sustainability.

2 MARI ROSE TARUC: I think he said to reach  
3 economies of scale.

4 KEVIN HAMILTON: Yes. Reach, yes. I actually  
5 said to ensure. I'm sorry. And that's economies, plural.

6 TRISH JOHNSON: Okay.

7 KEVIN HAMILTON: Next, I want to more clearly  
8 ensure that we clearly define what we mean by  
9 infrastructure. After meeting with transportation people,  
10 I worry that infrastructure will become more highways,  
11 freeways, and support for more highways and freeways,  
12 basically, knowing that they view everything as needing  
13 more concrete to solve the problem.

14 So we want to be sure that the infrastructure  
15 includes support for this new vehicle type that we're  
16 going to develop or that we're -- we already have and we'd  
17 like to see expanded. That infrastructure needs to reach  
18 down again into the neighborhoods. You're going to hear  
19 me saying this a lot, because that's what I'm afraid of,  
20 is we're already installing infrastructure at large  
21 corporations around the communities and -- and other  
22 public places. The idea that these neighborhoods and  
23 these small areas that we work with, and even in our  
24 larger cities could have access to those is ludicrous. It  
25 certainly isn't going to help them to step into an

1 electric vehicle. It certainly isn't going to help them  
2 get to work every day.

3 So if we can't reach them with mass transit, we  
4 need to be able to invest in their infrastructure. In  
5 other words, their home, their neighborhood, to make sure  
6 that it has the capacity to embrace this new technology.

7 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Do you have another  
8 one?

9 KEVIN HAMILTON: Yes, but I'm waiting.

10 SENATOR DEAN FLOREZ: Kevin, are you specifying  
11 the technology, or are you talking about specifically  
12 electric vehicles?

13 KEVIN HAMILTON: Yes, I'm specifically speaking  
14 not just to electric vehicles, but also natural gas, CNG.

15 Again, there's no infrastructure in any of our  
16 communities that's readily accessible to support any of  
17 this. So again, going back to a higher level,  
18 infrastructure at this point often means new fueling  
19 stations, new roads, and running high voltage electricity,  
20 high amp, carrying electricity into big commercial centers  
21 where these charging stations are located. But that's not  
22 what we need. People can't go there, charge their car and  
23 go to work. That's just not going to work for them. They  
24 need to be able to access this at home. Or if it's CNG,  
25 then they need to be able to go to the same gas station

1 they get gasoline at and get CNG instead. So that's a big  
2 infrastructure expansion. But it's the level we need to  
3 go to to reach communities, especially again at the  
4 neighborhood level, which is where people are working  
5 from, their neighborhoods, their homes.

6 So moving on -- sorry. I do -- I do want to  
7 include in that the idea of improving the existing transit  
8 resources, such as bus stops. The majority of the bus  
9 stops in the communities we see don't even have covers on  
10 them. We've got bus stops where the bus comes through  
11 twice a day, maybe three times a day out in the rural  
12 areas, and it's a bench sitting under the sun. You know,  
13 and the Transportation Department says they just don't  
14 have the money to be able to put up covers, and they could  
15 have solar covers. We've seen exactly on tour yesterday  
16 what they could have. So that -- that needs to happen in  
17 those communities. There needs to be an inventory  
18 assessment, and COGS all have these inventory assessments  
19 already. No one needs to go out and do them again. They  
20 know where all of these assets are. So it's a matter of,  
21 again, that interagency cooperation, that interagency  
22 communication needs to happen.

23 So sorry, one -- one more here. It's very  
24 simple. There is a suggestion to financially support  
25 transit operations and restoration of transit services and

1 routes that have been dropped, and I agree with that. But  
2 I would add "and expansion of services where lacking."

3 That goes on -- right there, yeah. And Sarah  
4 right -- right. "And expansion of services where  
5 lacking." Expansion versus expand. Okay. There we go.  
6 "Where lacking." That would be w-h-e-r-e, l-a-c-k-i-n-g.  
7 W-h-e-r-e, sorry, where lacking. Perfect. That's fine.

8 SARAH RUBIN: Great. Thank you.

9 Okay. Rey, Luis, Sekita, we're going to do a  
10 time check, Gisele.

11 REY LEON: Okay. I don't know if later we'll be  
12 sharing the data regarding the freight deep dive where we  
13 were talking about the trucks that were passing through  
14 the Valley. And I just think that it's -- it would be  
15 really important for us to learn which trucks were -- were  
16 just bypassing the Valley, the amount of them, which ones  
17 are doing business in the Valley, and to get a better  
18 understanding also of, you know, how to -- you know,  
19 what -- what could we do about that, you know. The other  
20 thing is with the -- trying to remember -- but with the --

21 You know what, let me come back to that.

22 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Yeah, so the more we can be  
23 pointed in getting up these recommendations, kind of  
24 knocking them out, the kind of quicker we can go into  
25 discussions.

1                   So Luis?

2                   LUIS OLMEDO: So I missed the first one. I  
3 stepped outside for a minute, and I'm not sure if this was  
4 mentioned, but I want to say that a holistic approach for  
5 transit options to rectify DAC histories of inequity --

6                   THE REPORTER: Of the what?

7                   LUIS OLMEDO: Holistic approaches for transit  
8 options to rectify DAC histories of inequity, shared  
9 mobility for disadvantaged communities. DACs,  
10 disadvantaged communities. Also, shared mobility, and I'm  
11 still trying to figure out how to word this, but look at  
12 mobility in a regional way when on the -- when -- I need a  
13 little more thinking about that, but there are many  
14 communities in California that are in the outer edges of  
15 metropolitan areas, and we have a very distinct, a very  
16 unique challenge here with -- you know, all my fellow  
17 board members and others from ARB got to see yesterday  
18 there's a political line that divides us, but yet we have  
19 this inflow daily of large amounts of population vehicles  
20 moving in because they are still working. Although  
21 there's a lot of great work that's been done, there's a  
22 lot more. And I think that's goes back to my first  
23 thought about holistic approach, but also how do we go  
24 beyond that when you have a political line? And no matter  
25 what you do, if you ignore that political line, you would

1 still have a disadvantage. So that's what I need to  
2 figure out, the right words.

3 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So Luis, would you  
4 maybe accept, Luis, like equitable regional planning and  
5 investments for transportation? Like is that maybe a good  
6 way to think about it, in terms of like the Sustainable  
7 Communities Strategy and Metropolitan Transportation Plans  
8 that the region does, we want to focus on access and  
9 equity ensured mobility?

10 LUIS OLMEDO: That's great language. You're  
11 still -- you're still not getting beyond the challenges of  
12 California and Baja California. That's where I need some  
13 help on the language.

14 SARAH RUBIN: Perfect. Thank you.

15 Okay. We're going to go to Rey, Sekita, Gisele,  
16 Tom -- who else has theirs up? And when we -- we have  
17 about 20 more minutes for this agenda item.

18 And students, I'm warning you that in between  
19 this agenda item and the next agenda item, when we stand  
20 up, I'm going to ask a couple of you to share something  
21 that you think is either interesting or boring about this  
22 meeting. Okay? So get your thinking caps on.

23 Here we go.

24 REY LEON: All right. Now I'm ready. Thank  
25 you, Luis. You touched on part of the point that I wanted

1 to make. We've been working on a -- we've got a program  
2 called Green Raiteros. It's a rural ride-sharing program  
3 that is based on the existing culture of the raiteros in  
4 the community, which are mostly farm workers and rural.  
5 In our case, that take -- raiteros take people from the  
6 rural towns of Huron and Avenal and other communities to  
7 Fresno and Madera to the Children's Hospital. Mostly it's  
8 related to medical.

9 But we submitted a couple years ago, and I might  
10 as well tell that -- but the reality is that, you know,  
11 small towns like Huron can't compete against like big  
12 towns like Fresno. Big towns like Fresno can't complete  
13 against big cities like Los Angeles or San Diego, you  
14 know. And -- and so, you know, that makes me think about,  
15 you know, equity in terms of investment. There's a lot of  
16 great ideas, and I think we're putting down some really  
17 great recommendations, but at the end of the day, if we're  
18 not able to allow the similar-sized communities to compete  
19 with each other, you know, I think we're -- we're doing a  
20 lack of service to a great deal of the communities that  
21 are disadvantaged and may never get the resources they  
22 require after being overlooked for so many decades.

23 And so -- so just a regional equity investment.  
24 We need to figure that out. I know there's two -- two  
25 policies that are currently at the legislature, you know,

1 to identify mid-size or, you know, whatever, and I haven't  
2 really read the language of them, but perhaps we could put  
3 together some language that -- that we could recommend to  
4 them and set up something more solid in our Scoping Plan  
5 recommendations to make that happen.

6 Another one -- you know, and I speak from really  
7 the effort and the struggle to try to make it happen and  
8 the poorer cities in the state, at least as the statistic  
9 shares it, which is my hometown of Huron, 6,000 population  
10 (Spanish) and close to a hundred percent (Spanish),  
11 Latino. But we've been working to try to put in what we  
12 call -- well, I mentioned it yesterday, multi-moral  
13 culturally relevant rescue and refuge, aka una plaza.  
14 Right? Where the -- the regional and the local transit  
15 goes through, a space where multi-generations are able to  
16 hang out, come together. It's about social cohesion,  
17 which is heated in respect to climate resiliency. Right?  
18 So some of the old school models of planning that our, you  
19 know, communities are very familiar with, especially our  
20 old schoolers, the braceros (Spanish) --

21 THE REPORTER: I have no idea what he just said.

22 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Okay.

23 REY LEON: -- to make that happen. Right?

24 SARAH RUBIN: You know what, you're going too  
25 fast and she can't --

1 REY LEON: Oh, I'm pulling a Katie. I'm pulling  
2 a Katie.

3 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Do you have a  
4 recommendation you want to --

5 REY LEON: So let me finish that. So -- so the  
6 recommendation in that respect is also, you know, looking  
7 at -- at those plans, those developments that are also,  
8 you know, in these communities, and I think the regional  
9 equity kind of comes -- Disculpe, I'm excited.

10 SARAH RUBIN: Plans/developments --

11 REY LEON: But -- so if we could get these type  
12 of models funded and developed in the communities, where  
13 they could be similar to the one that we seen yesterday,  
14 but they could also be -- but separate from the grit. You  
15 know, so then they're emergency islands. There's a  
16 blackout that goes out, everybody could go there, charge  
17 up their phone, call who they're going to call, maybe  
18 there was an earthquake, maybe -- you know, the climate  
19 changing and the times are changing, and the land is  
20 responding in ways aren't always, you know, appreciable to  
21 our quality of life.

22 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Sekita?

23 SEKITA GRANT: Okay. So I have sev- -- these  
24 are awesome. I'm really excited to see all of these ideas  
25 coming together. I have a few to add.

1 I would like to add -- where's Kevin? He left.  
2 He stepped out -- a friendly amendment to one of his  
3 recommendations. He talked about using a different  
4 mobility types to ensure sustainability in economies of  
5 scale. I think it was up higher, but I would love to add  
6 in addition to ensuring sustainability to economies of  
7 scale, also ensuring accessibility to -- so I'm proposing  
8 an amendment to one of your recommendations around using  
9 different vehicle sizes and types to ensure economies of  
10 scale and ensure sustainability, and I recommend that we  
11 also include ensuring accessibility to the disadvantaged  
12 communities in addition to that.

13 KEVIN HAMILTON: Absolutely.

14 SEKITA GRANT: Okay. A couple more. And I --  
15 this really goes to what Rey was talk- -- actually,  
16 everybody who's spoke, and Katie coming in, as well, and  
17 Luis.

18 Having community driven mobility needs  
19 assessments that inform equitable investments,  
20 regulations, and implementation strategies.

21 So if you are talking about the need for more  
22 proper shade for bus stops or supporting programs like  
23 Green Raiteros, or the una plasa for people to come chill  
24 at, whatever it is that kind of plays in to one creating  
25 more sustainable communities, but you're coming up with

1 ideas and programs and projects that are from the  
2 community. It's not folks coming from outside to say this  
3 is how -- you know, everybody should have an electric  
4 vehicle, or everybody should be in public transit, because  
5 that might not work for the community.

6 Assessments -- inform equitable investments, not  
7 assessments. Investments, regulation and implementation  
8 strategies.

9 And one -- yeah, thank you.

10 A couple other ones. One is this broad concept  
11 of increasing access to clean mobility options. And this  
12 is something we'll talk about a little bit in our deep  
13 dive that's happening with the 350 studies, but how do we  
14 increase access to these technologies? Whatever it is,  
15 whatever is -- you know, with the right form of mobility  
16 for the community, whether it's trackable, walkable,  
17 electric vehicles, how do you increase access to  
18 technologies, particularly if their upfront costs are  
19 really high, particularly if the business model is not yet  
20 in those communities? How do we get the technologies  
21 there?

22 Another thing is thinking about -- I want to  
23 definitely support Luis mentioning shared mobility. He's  
24 already talked about that, but two more things.

25 Just transition for communities, individuals,

1 and small businesses reliant on fossil fuel based  
2 transportation. And that is to say, as we're moving from  
3 this fossil fuel based economy to a clean energy economy,  
4 making sure that we're not burdening communities,  
5 disadvantaged communities, underserved communities, you  
6 know, whatever the term being used, but that we are  
7 providing pathways into the clean energy economy through  
8 jobs, through investments, through technology access.

9           And then the final thing is around research. So  
10 how do we infuse environmental justice consideration and  
11 equity in the pre-policy -- and this is broadly through  
12 the Scoping Plan -- pre-policy research? There's a lot  
13 that goes into when staff starts drafting a Scoping Plan.  
14 There's a lot of research that starts years before that --  
15 you know, the Energy Commission does, Air Resources Board,  
16 they're, you know, using consultants like E3, and  
17 UC Berkeley and UC Davis to do studies on what the future  
18 of our transportation and our energy systems should look  
19 like. And those studies do not have EJ at the table. And  
20 they're starting to, but we need to, I think, vocalize the  
21 need for that. Because a lot of what's getting pulled  
22 into the Scoping Plan is starting from conversations that  
23 we don't even see. So I think it's important to have that  
24 as a recommendation here.

25           SARAH RUBIN: Gisele. Thank you.

1                   KEVIN HAMILTON: Can you go down a little,  
2 Trish, because I saw something on the bottom that I was  
3 looking at recommending.

4                   Oh, see, so I didn't mean -- second line down  
5 from the top now, this wasn't specific to just communities  
6 near Fresno and the San Joaquin Valley. This is for --  
7 for, by the way, 75 percent of California, the 25 percent  
8 that's not in L.A. or San Diego or in the Bay Area.

9                   SARAH RUBIN: Great. Gisele.

10                  GISELE FONG: So first, I have a process  
11 question. So I thought that we were doing the deep dive  
12 kind of processing, so I have actually a comment about the  
13 deep dives and maybe suggestions on it, but then I also  
14 some have recommendations. So one thing --

15                  SARAH RUBIN: So just process wise, so your  
16 comments on the deep dives, or anyone's, those get  
17 captured in the notes, and then once you switch to  
18 recommendations, she's capturing the recommendations on  
19 the screen. That's the distinction.

20                  GISELE FONG: Okay. So one thing about the deep  
21 dives is that we had a deep dive on sustainable freight  
22 strategy, and we also had a deep dive, sort of a cursory  
23 one, on SB350. So what would be really helpful for me as  
24 an EJAC member, would be to get a clearer sense of how  
25 those different parallel efforts are intersecting with the

1 Scoping Plan. Because there's so many different pockets  
2 and different, you know, pieces of this work, that it  
3 would be very helpful for me to understand, you know,  
4 where those different puzzle pieces fit in. So that's one  
5 thing.

6           And I think secondly, just -- you know, we  
7 recognize that the draft Scoping Plan is not out yet, but  
8 for me as an EJAC member, there -- it was helpful as an  
9 overview. It was -- I -- I have so many more questions,  
10 though, you know, really echoing exactly what the EJAC  
11 members have said. You know, how are -- how is this all  
12 going? You know, what are the metrics? What is the data  
13 that we're, you know, using to evaluate the efforts. So  
14 that would be really helpful. And I hope -- hopefully  
15 that will come in round two, but just as a general  
16 feedback on the deep dives that it was helpful as an  
17 overview, not so helpful as getting into the -- what would  
18 help me as an EJAC member evaluate and to make deeper  
19 recommendations. Okay. So that's that.

20           So I just wanted to -- in terms of  
21 recommendations, I really wanted to lift up the work of  
22 the California Cleaner Freight Coalition, because in terms  
23 of the work on sustainable freight strategies and the  
24 intense work that has gone on, that this is our -- for us  
25 on EJAC. And there's many of us on the EJAC who are part

1 of the California Cleaner Freight Coalition. The work is  
2 already being done here. Right? And -- and we can  
3 actually learn a lot from the recommendations that are  
4 being shaken. Certainly, it would be up for a discussion  
5 for us as EJAC members to consider those, but I really  
6 wanted to make that known to us as EJAC members, that  
7 there are white papers out there, you know, there -- and  
8 what I'm going to do right now to lift up some of the  
9 recommendations that come actually directly from the --  
10 the California Cleaner Freight Coalition.

11 And I know that the CCFC has been meeting with  
12 ARB monthly, and so one of the questions that I have for  
13 ARB is how actually that continuous relationship with the  
14 Cleaner Freight Coalition is being responded to, or how --  
15 how that is actually being used to shape Scoping Plan  
16 recommendations? So that -- I would like some feedback on  
17 that.

18 But let me just kind of list out a few things  
19 for EJAC consideration on the recommendations around  
20 freight transportation. And I think that it's very, very  
21 parallel with the types of thoughts on moving towards  
22 cleaner personal transportation or public transportation,  
23 and that we're focusing on first freight transportation  
24 here, that the goal, obviously, is to work towards zero  
25 emissions.

1           And some of the -- for those of us that live in  
2 ports and its communities understand how difficult it is  
3 for those -- for us to actually get to zero emissions  
4 based off of the difficulties in clear market signals and  
5 operationalizing within a larger scale. And so some of  
6 the recommendations would be to emphasize technology  
7 forcing regulations so that we can give clearer market  
8 signal for manufacturers and operators. And I think that  
9 it's also, you know, really understanding that there  
10 are -- there's a whole kind of pipeline of technology, as  
11 many of us know within the room, and to really think about  
12 what are those near-term wins, so that those of us that  
13 look and can clearly see, for example, port operations,  
14 which are the ones that are the near-term wins so that we  
15 can actually start creating the stronger pipelines, market  
16 pipelines for those technologies that are farther out.

17           And then, you know, just kind of tagging onto  
18 Kevin's comment earlier about infrastructure, I mean, the  
19 same thing is true of defining, you know, how can be  
20 better strengthen infrastructure for zero emissions  
21 freight transportation; right? And so I'm not -- so  
22 thinking about fueling stations and thinking about battery  
23 refueling stations and so forth within the whole corridor  
24 of the freight operations. So I just wanted to put a  
25 caveat there for infrastructure, but specifically on

1 freight.

2 I'm almost done.

3 And then I think just lastly, just to tag on the  
4 community participation, I mean, that should be kind of a  
5 overall, you know, for every single piece of the work that  
6 we do to make sure that we are ground truthing and the --  
7 it's happening and to really listen to the communities.

8 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. I'm hoping to wrap up  
9 this agenda item in about seven minutes. So we've got  
10 Tom, we've got Kevin, and we've got Rey, and so if  
11 everybody is pretty quick, then we will get ready to move  
12 on, and then we'll be heading towards lunchtime.

13 Go ahead.

14 TOM FRANTZ: I had my own deep dive, private  
15 deep dive with part of staff on the low carbon fuel  
16 standard, so that's to lower the carbon intensity of  
17 transportation fuels by 10 percent by 2020.

18 So one rec- -- one strong recommendation,  
19 because they're easily making that target. And one thing  
20 the low carbon fuel standard is, if you provide gasoline  
21 or diesel, your carbon intensity is about 100, so you get  
22 that down to 90 by buying credits for the people that are  
23 making electric chargers available to the community. And  
24 they have a carbon intensity down to about 33. So buying  
25 credits from them allows you to say your fuel is down at

1 10 percent less. So we have to go way beyond that, so  
2 we're recommending, I'd say, a 25 percent, to go from 10  
3 to 25 percent, but it should be 30 percent.

4 Right now, they're lowering the target by about  
5 two percentage points a year, and if we do that from 2030  
6 to 20- -- from 2020 to 2030, we should be able to get  
7 another 20 points off of that to go from 10 percent  
8 currently to 30 percent for the low carbon fuel standard.  
9 That's the first recommendation. Increase that target  
10 now, so everybody knows it's coming in 2020. They have to  
11 start incrementally going at about the same rate they're  
12 going right now, quite frankly, in reducing that. And  
13 we'll get a lot of electric chargers built with the  
14 credits that are generated.

15 Secondly, you have to do -- it's unique to  
16 the -- kind of unique to the low carbon fuel standard, you  
17 have to do a life cycle assessment of each type of fuel,  
18 meaning a well to wheels, what all goes into producing  
19 that fuel, including land use changes. But one thing --  
20 we recommended this many years ago, the very first time  
21 the EJAC was meeting, that they look at if you make fuel  
22 out of food, how does that affect food prices around the  
23 world? That has never been analyzed by CARB or included  
24 one bit in this low carbon life cycle assessment. But  
25 there's a huge impact on food prices or basic grain

1 commodity prices around the world when the U.S. grows so  
2 much corn to make into ethanol. So that needs to be  
3 included in the life cycle assessment, and the economists  
4 can figure that out.

5           And then finally, the -- I talked to you about  
6 how gasoline and diesel is at 100 in carbon intensity and  
7 electric charging stations at like 33. If you are a dairy  
8 right now that builds a digester, you get to have that --  
9 and if that gas you collect goes to a transportation fuel,  
10 you get a carbon intensity rating of negative 307. And  
11 there's no life cycle assessment of what went into making  
12 that methane, and that's not right. The dairy is so  
13 totally unsustainable in its use of cheap fossil fuel,  
14 that to say now that they have this waste product that  
15 they can sell for a million dollars with no analysis of  
16 how that waste product became a transportation fuel in the  
17 first place -- it shouldn't even have been produced, that  
18 methane, yet now that they do it in a very unsustainable  
19 way, now they get a huge carbon credit for it. There's  
20 got to be a better analysis of that. And if we mandate  
21 methane reductions from dairies, this problem goes away,  
22 but quite frankly, it's a real injustice to subsidize a  
23 dairy right now for collecting a little bit of their waste  
24 gas and allow them to be paid literally thousands and  
25 thousands of hundreds of thousands of dollars from the

1 gasoline companies so that they can meet the low carbon  
2 fuel standard. It's in my paper.

3 TRISH JOHNSON: Yeah, I'm just going to copy  
4 them over. For Number 1, you're changing 10 to what  
5 percentage?

6 TOM FRANTZ: Instead of 25, it should be 30.

7 TRISH JOHNSON: Oh, I see.

8 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So we're going to go to  
9 Kevin, Rey, Sekita, and we have to wrap up. We're getting  
10 a little too behind. We're really on a two minutes left  
11 moment.

12 KEVIN HAMILTON: I'll be really quick.

13 So I just wanted to support Sekita's  
14 recommendation for the -- sorry, Gisele's recommendation.  
15 For those of us who've been working on sustainable freight  
16 for seems like all our lives sometimes, but certainly for  
17 the last five years constructively and creating and  
18 submitting to ARB a vision for a sustainable freight  
19 system in California. It does embrace pretty much  
20 everything that was discussed today, including the life  
21 cycle discussion and the fuels and the batteries and the  
22 vehicles themselves.

23 If you don't have it, I'm happy to send it to  
24 Trish so that -- I've got it right here. I'm happy to  
25 e-mail it to Trish right now so that it can be sent out to

1 folks. I think I did the best that I could, and I know  
2 others did as well, to circulate it around at the time.  
3 When the sustainable freight workshop was held at ARB, out  
4 of 15 commenters, 13 were from CC- -- from CCFC, and so we  
5 are leading the discussion on this issue around  
6 sustainable freight. So essentially, for this group, I  
7 would ask that you review that document and see if it  
8 meets your needs and make any amendments that you think  
9 you would add to it.

10 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So for the notes, Kevin is  
11 going to e-mail the document, ARB will distribute it, and  
12 the request is for all members to review it and comment.

13 All right. Rey, and then we're going to wrap up  
14 this agenda item after Sekita.

15 REY LEON: I just want to remind the -- all the  
16 colleagues that at the last meeting in San Bernardino, we  
17 spoke to the strain that would connect with all of these,  
18 which was workforce jobs and economic development. So,  
19 you know, just keeping that in mind in regards to, say, in  
20 this case, the transportation and land use, you know, how  
21 is it that we can incentivize through GGFR to ensure that  
22 local communities actually -- you know, also benefiting  
23 economically; right? And the people are actually getting  
24 a employed from the local community, as well.

25 Because at the end of the day, I think -- well,

1 and additional incentive would be to, you know -- there's  
2 a lot of our communities that lack not just  
3 infrastructure, but critical resources. My home town has  
4 not had a pharmacy forever. We submitted it to Strategic  
5 Growth Council to do a veteran and affordable housing unit  
6 that will be two stories mixed use with a pharmacy. For  
7 the first time ever, we're going to have a pharmacy,  
8 hopefully, if it gets accepted.

9           So, you know, just, you know, identifying those  
10 type of situations where, you know, these disadvantaged  
11 communities have been lacking, you know, whatever resource  
12 for such a long time, and this is an opportunity to  
13 basically provide a solution to more than one problem.

14           Thank you.

15           SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

16           Okay. So after Sekita, we're going to be  
17 switching to our next agenda item, but I'm going to remind  
18 you all that before we do that, I'm going to again ask  
19 folks to stand up to give us a little wiggle break, and  
20 students, I'm coming to you. We're going to ask a couple  
21 of you if you'd be willing to share in Spanish, so we hear  
22 some comments from you all in Spanish. Luis is going to  
23 translate. And then we're going to move on to our next  
24 segment before lunch. And at 12:00 o'clock we're going to  
25 ask for public comment. 12:15 is lunch.

1           Sekita.

2           SEKITA GRANT: Okay. I have three -- three  
3 comments. The first is around the sustainable freight  
4 deep dive. I think one of the reactions I had was there  
5 is -- you know, there's three goals or 2030 targets,  
6 improve system efficiency by 25 percent by 2030, deploy  
7 over a hundred thousand freight vehicles capable of zero  
8 emission, and fostering economic growth. And for the last  
9 two, I think it's critical that when we put out these  
10 policy documents, that there is a -- there's specific  
11 language identifying how we're going to -- we're going to  
12 achieve this particularly in disadvantaged communities and  
13 local areas.

14           So you have an overarching goal of, say,  
15 reaching a hundred thousand freight vehicles capable of  
16 zero emission. How are you getting those vehicles into  
17 disadvantaged communities? What is the plan or goal or  
18 target there? And to raise a point around jobs and other  
19 cobenefit. Not even cobenefits, when you have a goal  
20 around fostering economic growth, what does that look  
21 like? What is the goal specifically within low income  
22 areas and disadvantaged communities?

23           The second piece, I just want to touch on the  
24 second deep dive or overview that was had around 350  
25 studies. So right now, one of -- one of the priorities

1 identified was -- or I identified. I don't know if  
2 anybody else agreed with me yet -- but really increasing  
3 access to these technologies, these mobility options  
4 within low-moderate income communities and disadvantaged  
5 communities. The 350 studies are looking exactly at that.  
6 They're looking at what are the barriers to getting more  
7 public -- permanent public transportation,  
8 neighborhood-based public transportation within  
9 disadvantaged communities, more electric vehicles, all of  
10 these things, what are the barriers or what are the  
11 solutions to overcoming those barriers? And ideally, the  
12 solutions are coming from the communities.

13 So really encouraging folks to feel free to  
14 reach out to me, but if you have any ideas on how or why  
15 your communities are not receiving the -- those clean  
16 mobility options that you know exist, feel free -- you  
17 know, I can put you in contact with the right person or  
18 you can reach out to me, but this is really important for  
19 us to be engaged in that. And this is also a call that  
20 the Scoping Plan should connect to those studies. There  
21 should be -- there should be reference or even integration  
22 of the recommendations made in the 350 studies within the  
23 Scoping Plan.

24 SARAH RUBIN: Sekita, what's the time line for  
25 the 350 studies right now? Sorry.

1                   SEKITA GRANT: January 1st, 2017.

2                   And then the last thing that I really wanted to  
3 have more of a robust discussion, but I know we don't have  
4 time, to have prog- -- how do we -- the process,  
5 basically, how do you strengthen the process to ensure  
6 that we're meeting these recommendations?

7                   So in preparing for this, I looked at our  
8 2014 -- EJACs 2014 recommendations. It's very difficult  
9 to tell what has been done, what has not been done. I  
10 think this gets a lot to Katie's points around metrics.  
11 And so I really wanted to hear recommendations, and folks  
12 can -- maybe we can have a follow-up discussion on this,  
13 about how we make -- all these recommendations we're  
14 putting down, how do they make -- ensure that there's  
15 transparency, there's follow-up, and there's -- there's  
16 metrics there? And the three things that I recommended  
17 are having quantifiable metrics embedded within all of our  
18 recommendations. So that's in part for us to do. Perhaps  
19 that's something a consultant can help with if CARB is  
20 looking at what the scope is for a consultant.

21                   MARI ROSE TARUC: Should Trish be writing this  
22 down?

23                   SARAH RUBIN: It's on her paper. It's on Page 2  
24 of her handout.

25                   SEKITA GRANT: Yeah.

1                   MARI ROSE TARUC: Are we going to include it in  
2 the recommendations?

3                   SEKITA GRANT: Trish, the top of the page was --  
4 the bottom is the new stuff.

5                   KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Oh, so that last of  
6 recommendations was for our recommendations. Just  
7 clarifying, because I read your thing, and I didn't -- I  
8 wasn't clear that those last three recommendations were  
9 for our recommendations, not just for the broad Scoping  
10 Plan recommendations. So for each thing we recommend, you  
11 want a quantifiable metric and detailing that.

12                  SEKITA GRANT: It was intended to be just for  
13 transportation, but I think you're bringing up a good  
14 point that it could be valuable for -- for overall.

15                  So anyways, those are the three. Having  
16 accountable agencies, and maybe even EJAC members who are  
17 accountable for a certain recommendation. And I say that  
18 to also, along with that, understanding how the nonprofit  
19 world works, there needs to be, you know, money for that,  
20 whether it's with -- from the State or outside. There  
21 needs to be fundraising to ensure that, you know, if the  
22 EJAC is able -- ideally, the EJAC continues and is  
23 monitoring progress throughout. This is what happens with  
24 the SB535 Coalition. There should be something equivalent  
25 on the EJAC side.

1           And then the final thing is just reporting  
2 requirements of fault, meaning how are we checking in.  
3 And having worked for the State, a lot of reports can be  
4 very draining of resources, so maybe that's not the right  
5 method or we can work around that, but at least meetings  
6 and check-ins.

7           SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

8           So Trish, I'm sorry if you already did this,  
9 because it is, as we all know, challenging. Did you copy  
10 those recommendations to the top where Katie's questions  
11 were at the very top of the document?

12           Okay. Thank you.

13           Okay. If everyone wants to -- oh, wait, do I --  
14 have I missed anyone? Are these table tents down?

15           Luis?

16           LUIS OLMEDO: I just have a follow-up on Sekita.

17           You've got quantifiable metrics, if you can  
18 explain that a bit more. And the reason I ask is because  
19 whenever we talk about rural communities, the numbers  
20 don't always add up, and so it's -- I just want  
21 clarification of what you mean by quantifiable metrics,  
22 and how that doesn't create a disadvantage for rural  
23 communities, because we're seeing it in the housing, for  
24 example. We're seeing it in other areas where the numbers  
25 just don't play out, you know. And it's leading rural

1 communities outside of a competitive process when it comes  
2 to -- when it gets to an investment purpose.

3           SEKITA GRANT: Yeah. And I think to your -- to  
4 your question, I think that's a great point, and Mari Rose  
5 and I were just talking briefly about how we're defining  
6 costs and benefits, so this -- these definitions should be  
7 coming from this group. And so I think what happens with  
8 rural communities, there's -- you are dealing with metrics  
9 that were designed for L.A., not necessarily for your  
10 community. So that, I think, is a critical point, and you  
11 could even have metrics that are based on job review or  
12 based on size of the community, or something like that.  
13 But ideally, those metrics are coming from -- from this  
14 group.

15           SARAH RUBIN: Diane?

16           THE REPORTER: I can't hear you.

17           SARAH RUBIN: We're adding quantifiable metrics,  
18 community driven quantifiable metrics with geographic  
19 consideration.

20           Diane, Martha, and then we are wrapping up this  
21 agenda item.

22           DIANE TAKVORIAN: I just wanted to ask -- I  
23 think Katie may have said this in the beginning, but I'm  
24 not completely sure, and I wonder if there's a question  
25 that can be asked for information about the conflicts that

1 are created as a result of meeting freight requirements  
2 and how those conflict with sustainable transportation  
3 recommendations, because that seems to happen on the  
4 ground every day. So I thought Katie said that, or  
5 something like that, but I'm not sure. So if that could  
6 get added -- you didn't?

7 So the question is, how are the requirements  
8 related to goods movement and freight frustrating or  
9 conflicting with sustainable transportation requirements  
10 and/or the recommendations that I'm hearing that are  
11 coming up here? Does that make sense?

12 SARAH RUBIN: So for the record, that's a  
13 follow-up item.

14 DIANE TAKVORIAN: Well, it's a question.

15 SARAH RUBIN: It's a question that I think,  
16 given time limits, will need follow-up.

17 Let's come to Martha.

18 MARTHA ARGUELLO: And it's related to my  
19 question, which is clear I did not do enough homework.

20 These all -- all of these actions will have  
21 consequences. And I don't like calling them unintended,  
22 because sometimes I think they're very well -- they're  
23 intended. So these metrics around displacement  
24 indemnification are going to be really difficult, and we  
25 have to figure those out. And those are going to be

1 really different in urban ar- -- urban, suburban, and  
2 rural areas. So this question of -- I don't know how to  
3 phrase it, so I'm struggling because it's related to what  
4 Diane was saying. Some of our actions on the ground, some  
5 of the policies have real consequences on the ground, so,  
6 you know, how long -- how much longer do we want to use  
7 natural gas in our transportation? You know, what are the  
8 drivers of -- of us having that cheap gas?

9 I'm sorry I don't have a recommendation.

10 SARAH RUBIN: That's okay. Thank you. Great  
11 job.

12 I think we should give Trish a round of applause  
13 because it's hard to have your notes be on screen. Thank  
14 you Trish for your perseverance.

15 Okay. It's stand up and stretch moment before  
16 we move to our last agenda item before lunch. Everyone  
17 up, up, up. Wave to the ceiling.

18 Okay. If we could hear from one or two  
19 students, whatever you prefer, in English or Spanish,  
20 what -- something that was interesting for you about this  
21 meeting or boring. Someone's got to do it, or we'll never  
22 go to lunch. Say your name.

23 STUDENT ALBERTO LOPEZ: My name is Alberto  
24 Lopez, and I've never been to these type of meetings, but  
25 it's actually interesting hearing you guys talk about

1    how -- you guys throw out ideas, and it's interesting how  
2    the ideas you throw, it helps actually our environment,  
3    and you guys are trying just to better us, you know. It's  
4    interesting for me, and I just want to thank you guys for  
5    doing what you guys do.

6                SARAH RUBIN: Very cool. Great. Okay. One  
7    more person. One more person. One more. Someone's got  
8    to do it.

9                STUDENT: (Translated from Spanish.) I just  
10   wanted to thank everybody for what they're doing. It's  
11   very interesting to see there are people that are worried  
12   about our environment, and I'm very grateful to be able to  
13   be present in a meeting like this.

14               SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Did I have one last hand,  
15   because we're so happy you're here. Did one of you want  
16   to say something? You don't have to. You don't have to.  
17   You want to?

18               STUDENT: (Translated from Spanish.) It's very  
19   interesting for me to hear about transportation issues  
20   because I commute a lot to Calexico, so I can actually see  
21   the changes when I commute. And that's all. Thank you so  
22   much for all you are doing for us.

23               SARAH RUBIN: Okay. We've got one quick comment  
24   from Luis. Grab a water, if you want, and then we'll get  
25   started again in a moment.

1           LUIS OLMEDO: So I just wanted to make a couple  
2 of quick mentions. I wanted to recognize that we do have  
3 some members of Comites Air Quality Monitoring Program, so  
4 we have Anita, and we have Ray, and we have John. They're  
5 members of -- advisory members of our air monitoring  
6 program. And I want to recognize that we have members of  
7 Una Sola Fuerza (phonetic), which are from the Coachella  
8 Valley, so we have representation from the Coachella  
9 Valley, as well.

10           SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So Stephanie, you're going  
11 to be back up, if folks want to find their seats. We have  
12 one last item. At noon, we are going to take public  
13 comment. At 12:15, lunch.

14

15           - 2030 TARGET SCOPING PLAN: PART 3 -

16           STEPHANIE KATO: So the next paper, which is  
17 basically similar format to the transportation one, covers  
18 energy, water and green buildings. Clearly, we went to  
19 water and green buildings to get energy because of the  
20 synergies and connections there. As far as energy goes,  
21 the main new measure driving reductions there is Senate  
22 Bill 350. You know, we're continuing on with a 33 percent  
23 RPS at 2020, but SB350 moves us to 50 percent by 2030, I  
24 guess at a minimum, and also requires us to look at  
25 doubling energy efficiency and electricity and natural gas

1 uses by that same time frame. So those are some of the  
2 core, you know, new measures that we're -- we're using to  
3 push green house gas reductions in this sector.

4           Clearly, we're going to keep relying on our  
5 existing building compliance codes and make progress in  
6 those areas. Also, you know, some of our more locally  
7 driven programs, like the building solar roofs program.  
8 And we also have our SB1122 bioenergy feed-in tariff, so  
9 that's trying to get more bioenergy in certain classes to  
10 deal with waste from dairies and food waste and forest  
11 waste.

12           And as far as the water sector discussions go,  
13 those have pointed out that basically the GHG emissions  
14 from that sector are coming from the energy needed to  
15 treat, to move water, so that group has been discussing  
16 basically building off the set of recommendations from the  
17 original Scoping Plan and also the 2014 update. So it  
18 would be looking at what more we could do on the water  
19 conservation front, more use of recycled or gray water,  
20 looking at SB350's doubling energy efficiency and applying  
21 that to the water sector, so looking at how we pump, could  
22 we make the equipment more efficient, looking at  
23 collecting, you know, water from urban runoff, and using  
24 that to better infiltrate into our ground water resources.

25           And one of the other main components that's

1 being driven by the short-lived climate pollutant strategy  
2 for water sector is that to look at ways to better capture  
3 methane that's being generated during the anaerobic  
4 digestion of waste at those plants.

5           And as far as the green building sector goes,  
6 the energy efficiency mandates are driving a lot of that,  
7 but green buildings, because it looks beyond just energy,  
8 it's looking at buildings in a more integrated manner,  
9 looking at the effects of the built environment, so we're  
10 looking at things we can do to improve transportation  
11 around buildings, you know, how people commute to work,  
12 commute to different business areas, we're looking at  
13 better handling of waste at buildings, use of green  
14 materials or lower carbon intensity materials in  
15 buildings.

16           We also talked a bit about green roofs, although  
17 that has brought about some issues with water use, and so  
18 more recent discussions have been involved around use of  
19 pool roofs, which is, you know, light gleaning or  
20 reflective materials to reduce urban heat island effects.

21           Long-term goals we're talking about are to look  
22 beyond just the current zero net energy goals established  
23 by the POC and CEC, and to, by 2050, enter transition to  
24 this more idea of zero carbon buildings. So that's  
25 another one that we see there as a concept.

1           And one of the things that, you know, we're  
2 interested in hearing from this group is, is we've got  
3 these large overarching goals, but how do -- how do you  
4 see them being implemented, you know, at the local level?  
5 So with like the 50 percent RPS, do you see that more  
6 being utility-scale renewables, are we talking about, you  
7 know, large solar and wind farms and, you know, the land  
8 use required around that, or are we talking about a lot  
9 more maybe renewable distributed generation?

10           There's a lot of conversation right now about  
11 how to move away from natural gas use in buildings, how do  
12 we reduce the greenhouse gases from heating water and that  
13 type of thing, so do we move towards electrification on  
14 that front, or do you see biogas applications on that  
15 front? So that's -- that's the nature of some of the  
16 conversations we've been having about what are the  
17 specifics, and those specifics can be built into some of  
18 scenarios that we're working on, and you can see the  
19 resulting GHG impacts and cost effects with -- with the  
20 choices being made.

21           So we're going to hear from this group about  
22 their specific recommendations and whether or not we've  
23 captured a lot of the major actions going forward in these  
24 sectors.

25           SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

1           So I would suggest we just circle around. We  
2 can start with Kevin.

3           KEVIN HAMILTON: Start on other side.

4           SARAH RUBIN: Other side. All right. Want to  
5 start? Katie, start us off.

6           KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Sure.

7           SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

8           KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: I'm starting all the  
9 fun, but I'll take that.

10           So two questions I have for this is, you know,  
11 looking at the 2014 report, there wasn't -- it didn't seem  
12 like folks were able to disaggregate how much of a  
13 percentage of change in the energy sector was due to  
14 consumer demand or due to program and regulatory changes.  
15 And so I'd really like to see that analysis done, if not  
16 for this Scoping Plan, then for the 2020 check-in point  
17 that I'm talking about.

18           My second question is about the percentage of  
19 building stock impacted. You give a lot of numbers, but  
20 I'd like to know what that represents as far as percentage  
21 of building stock that's transitioned and where those  
22 buildings are generally located. Specifically, I'm  
23 interested in how many -- what percentage of the buildings  
24 that have been transitioned are located in environmental  
25 justice communities. The same thing for the green

1 buildings.

2           And then finally, the point you made about  
3 asking about implementation barriers, a big barrier has  
4 been roof quality for eligible households, especially for  
5 solar panels. Secondary would obviously be incentives for  
6 multi-family owners to transition, since a lot of the  
7 financial benefit goes to the tenants. We're not seeing  
8 any shift in the apartments, where most of our lower  
9 income folks are living.

10           And the final key fact is the electrical  
11 upgrades that need to happen in houses. I know we were  
12 talking about this yesterday, but a lot of these buildings  
13 have really old electrical systems that can't support  
14 either solar or EVs, even if we put them -- get them to  
15 people for free, they wouldn't be able to charge them at  
16 their homes, and that's a big barrier.

17           So I'd like to see those considerations  
18 included, both how we make our funding available for roof  
19 and other building and electrical upgrades that need to  
20 happen to ensure access.

21           SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

22           ELEANOR TORRES: Well, just a few observations.  
23 In terms of the green roofs, for instance, I just want to  
24 address green roofs for a moment, that those don't really  
25 work in Southern California, not just because of the water

1 issue. Green roofs are something that started in the east  
2 part of the country. The problem with green roofs here is  
3 our arid environment, and it really doesn't function that  
4 way. However, green roofs have been very effective in  
5 insulated buildings.

6           The other issue I have, particularly with the --  
7 well, smart growth, the fact is, with what's going on in  
8 Southern California and in terms of funding that's been  
9 made available to them, to Southern California, we only  
10 had, by virtue of the criteria that's been established,  
11 one city that got funded in Southern California for this  
12 kind of affordable housing. So that -- that's a real  
13 problem that needs to be addressed.

14           The other issue is affordable housing. And  
15 you -- you started talking about it, Katie, but the -- the  
16 stock that is currently available, protocols to weatherize  
17 or any number of strategies that you can use, we need to  
18 retrofit those houses, because it's great that we're doing  
19 new builds that are green, but with -- the fact is, we  
20 have a huge stock that needs to be addressed at this  
21 point.

22           Urban forestry, there's a way that we could  
23 integrate urban forestry in terms of working with  
24 communities to do strategic planting, whether it's the  
25 homes or commercial properties or any of that. But with

1 residential, you can reduce your energy consumption by 20  
2 to 30 percent by strategic planting. I also would like to  
3 include beside urban forestry in the language, green  
4 infrastructure. Because it's not just urban forestry or  
5 just trees, it's the integrated approach of green  
6 infrastructure when we're talking about green building or  
7 great planting.

8           You asked about how we can get this into the  
9 communities or -- I -- I don't know how it happened, but  
10 this is something that we really encourage regions, is  
11 being able to be a part of the master planning. That's  
12 exactly what we're doing in the County of San Bernardino  
13 with the Director of Land Use for the County to make  
14 recommendations, for instance, to grow -- well, to install  
15 urban gardens into developments or low income developments  
16 and whatnot.

17           That's it.

18           SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

19           So one of the things that happens is we start to  
20 get tired -- is -- I've been in Trish's spot a lot. So  
21 if -- we have 20 minutes left before we move to public  
22 comment. Can you start by saying, "This is a comment" or  
23 "This is a recommendation," because when you are in her  
24 seat, you are listening, "This is a recommendation," and  
25 it's really tiring.

1                   So go ahead.

2                   REY LEON: Recommendation. I would like EV  
3 infrastructure passed. EV is electric vehicles. You  
4 know, it's -- as far as I know, the Cal ISO is conducting  
5 an assessment of that, but only at a statewide level. My  
6 recommendation is that it is conducted at a community  
7 basis level. Because we have low income communities,  
8 DACs, as we're identifying them, that don't have the  
9 capacity yet. On this other end, we have all these  
10 incentives, the help Plus-Up and everything else, helping  
11 those same communities to purchase a vehicle, an electric  
12 vehicle or a plug-in hybrid, and we aren't ensuring that  
13 the infrastructure for the future, as it keeps on growing,  
14 is not sufficient, then it's a problem. So we need to  
15 really do an assessment on the communities, DACs and rural  
16 communities, to ensure that -- to get an idea of where --  
17 where it's at in regards to the EV charging capacity and  
18 the -- identify what we got to do there. Right? Of  
19 course we're going to have to build it up. Thank you.

20                   SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

21                   Mari Rose, then go to Martha.

22                   MARI ROSE TARUC: I'm going to start with a  
23 question. We did not get a deep dive session for energy  
24 yet, and so we need to do that. And so I was relying on  
25 the 2008, 2013 emissions chart. And so one of the things

1 that I noticed about electricity there, for the 2011 to  
2 2013 period, is that we -- there were increases in  
3 emissions of 9 million metric tons for in-state  
4 electricity generation, and then we reduced electricity  
5 import emissions by 5.5 million. So I'm wondering -- the  
6 question is, why is that happening, where our in-state  
7 generation is higher than our imports?

8           And then, so from there, my first recommendation  
9 is for developing aggressive renewable energy targets. I  
10 think I want -- I want to echo the EJAC recommendations  
11 from 2014. So all of those recommendations, let's bring  
12 it back, because I feel like there's -- there's a lot  
13 that's in there, both on ideas for bringing in renewable  
14 energy and rejecting some false promises of how we reduce  
15 our energy or electricity emissions. So bring those all  
16 back.

17           So in terms of the aggressive -- one of the  
18 recommendations from 2014 is to aggressively pursue a  
19 hundred percent renewables for California. And I know  
20 right now in statute, the law is to get to 50 percent  
21 renewable energy by 2030, but I think we need to be more  
22 aggressive than that, especially if the other industrial  
23 sectors are not performing the -- or reducing the  
24 emissions that we need to get to to 2030. So we can even  
25 benchmark that in terms of achieving the 50 percent

1 renewables before 2030.

2           Also, from the 2014 ideas that I want to bring  
3 back, and this is a little bit of a new take on it, there  
4 are -- we can create microgrids where communities or  
5 neighborhoods are self-sufficient in terms of electricity,  
6 where we have our own generation and we can use that and  
7 access that. So especially when we talk about climate  
8 disasters like a wildfire or a big storm that takes out  
9 energy, the transmission lines then don't work, and so our  
10 communities are left in the dark, literally. And so we  
11 can actually create microgrids that are self-sufficient,  
12 and I think let's pilot ten to a hundred of those, and the  
13 primar- -- starting and primarily happening in  
14 environmental justice communities.

15           I also want to recommend that we don't dilute  
16 California's progress in electricity emissions reductions.  
17 There are clean power plan recommendations to basically  
18 continue Cap-and-Trade through the Clean Power Plan, and I  
19 don't want us -- I don't want California to commit to that  
20 or have this leakage of our renewable energy benefits  
21 taken away from California to other states. So I want to  
22 maintain the California benefits to our clean energy  
23 infrastructure and improve upon those.

24           And then the last recommendation is to maximize  
25 our job and economic benefits, not just through energy,

1 but I actually think -- so throughout -- and I've heard  
2 that idea from Rey and Sekita and others -- I actually  
3 want to see a section in the Scoping Plan around job and  
4 economic benefits, and that there is a specific plan and  
5 target for the environmental justice communities.

6 SARAH RUBIN: Martha.

7 MARTHA ARGUELLO: I'm really glad that -- I'm  
8 really glad Mari Rose talked about this idea of a pilot  
9 project. So I also think that dealing with this -- the --  
10 so these are comments, and then hopefully it will get to a  
11 recommendation.

12 So this idea of how you deal with rental units  
13 and all of the barriers that Katie talked about. So I'd  
14 like to propose that we do a pilot project. We did one  
15 very similar with apartment owners in doing integrated  
16 pest management. And when we got them to agree, we went  
17 in and did the pest management, came back and evaluated  
18 whether it worked. So can we develop a plan that -- with,  
19 you know, substandard low-income housing and how we do the  
20 retrofits, how we bundle services, so that you're going in  
21 and you're -- if HUD has money for lead remediation, well  
22 that gets done, if there's weatherization funding, that  
23 gets done, all of those things. Much like they're trying  
24 to do with access to energy efficient appliances and cars,  
25 where there's now one place to call and you get all those

1 services. And that's how we start getting to the rental  
2 units, by working with landlords.

3 And then I also want to reiterate this idea that  
4 we need community-generated power that leads to  
5 community-generated jobs.

6 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

7 Tom. Go ahead.

8 TOM FRANTZ: Yes. On carbon capture and  
9 sequestration, I recommend we should recommend that it be  
10 totally eliminated as a possibility in California for  
11 reducing greenhouse gases. And the reason why is, it's  
12 either going to be done to get more oil out of the ground  
13 or enhanced oil recovery, or it's going to be simply  
14 injected into the ground next to an environmental justice  
15 community like in Kern County, Buttonwillow, or Kings  
16 County, Kettleman City. That's where -- the only place it  
17 will ever be permitted, so just forget about it. That's  
18 the first recommendation.

19 Second, pumping water in the state is one of the  
20 biggest energy users. Northern California water ends up  
21 in San Diego and it has to be pumped. There should be a  
22 goal of CARB to make the pumping of water in California  
23 100 percent renewable by 2030, both the massive state  
24 projects and agricultural and urban water pumping. It  
25 should be a specific goal. And too many farmers today are

1 taking electric pumps out of commission and putting in  
2 cheaper fuel pumps, such as diesel and gas. Today.  
3 Something is wrong with that. Something is wrong with our  
4 rules that that's even allowed today with all these other  
5 goals. But it should be 100 percent renewable, and  
6 farmers are doing their part, as well, they're putting in  
7 solar panels. Because this is a goal that pays for itself  
8 in like seven years. There's no reason not to do it. The  
9 investment in renewable energy pays for itself. Solar  
10 panels. It's ridiculous that we can't move water with a  
11 hundred percent renewable energy in this state, and we  
12 should do it very quickly. Thank you.

13 SARAH RUBIN: Kevin.

14 KEVIN HAMILTON: So -- comment. We need to be  
15 pushing back against the drive-by investor on the  
16 utilities to hold back progression of solar in this state.  
17 They have launched an aggressive effort saying there's too  
18 much solar coming too fast to personal houses and  
19 residents, and they want within their districts -- now, it  
20 works very well for them, because if you don't live in an  
21 investor-owned utility district, this is isn't going to  
22 affect you. But they're actually carved out in a plan in  
23 various places with special considerations. I would  
24 recommend that we remove special considerations for  
25 investor-owned utilities. They should be treated like

1 every other utility in the state. There should be no  
2 carve-out, no special consideration.

3           The second thing is, we need to ensure that in  
4 requiring them to develop power that is the most efficient  
5 and the most effective and reliable, that the investment  
6 in that infrastructure that they have to make does not  
7 fall back on rate payers. And that's how the  
8 investor-owned utilities have done this to date. So what  
9 happens is, I get a solar panel in a community, a  
10 disadvantaged community, it gets put on the house, PG&E  
11 turns around and says, Well -- and they've actually passed  
12 this rule -- you can't really accumulate your benefit from  
13 that more than one month. If you feed us more power than  
14 you use, then at the end of the month, if it didn't cost  
15 as much as you used, you don't get to carry that over into  
16 the next month. So they've got the gain of having that  
17 power, but they no longer have to pay you back for that.

18           They also are charging those consumers for  
19 simply being connected up to their network. And when they  
20 do use power, they're back on higher rate plans. So when  
21 they reach peak rate periods, they're paying extreme  
22 rates. So we're seeing low-income households all over our  
23 community, and the community-based organizations that  
24 serve them, that help them pay electric bills, are being  
25 just rolled under by the number of people coming to them

1 with applications whose electricity is being turned off.  
2 Meanwhile, the stockholders in these corporations are  
3 seeing the best returns on their investment they've seen  
4 in history.

5           So I have no problem with them getting returns  
6 on their investment, but they need to play on the same  
7 playing field that the municipally-owned utilities are  
8 playing on. There should be no special carve-outs for  
9 investor-owned utilities. So I'm just going to leave it  
10 at that. I've got other things, but --

11           SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Luis, did you want to add  
12 in, or not now?

13           LUIS OLMEDO: So I've got just a couple of  
14 thoughts and recommendations, but desert communities, tree  
15 forestation -- so desert community -- add to that desert  
16 native tree forestation and tree canopy to reduce energy  
17 consumption.

18           I know we talk a lot about urban forestry and we  
19 never think about desert forestry. But as you will  
20 experience later today, you're going to go outside and  
21 you're going to be under a shade, and the heat will reduce  
22 significantly. Desert areas consume an enormous amount of  
23 energy because, as you experience today, you need to have  
24 air conditioning. You need to have high ceilings. And  
25 it's something that, you know, in the desert a lot of

1 people don't think, Well, why are we going to plant trees?  
2 It's the desert. Well, there are native trees that can be  
3 planted, and they can be a native forestry plan for  
4 deserts. And that's something that has been left out.  
5 That's something that has not been considered in the whole  
6 scheme of reducing the emissions from -- from -- through  
7 energy efficacy.

8 Another thing is, I want to throw it out there  
9 that we should really be careful of what technologies are  
10 put on the table when it comes to utilizing natural  
11 resources such as water to create an energy source. And  
12 there should be considerable amount of reinvestment in the  
13 community elsewhere if that is a option that's being  
14 sought out, and I want to say such as geothermal.

15 I know that yesterday we heard about some  
16 technology that won't use water, but I really think we  
17 really need to pay attention to whether there are  
18 community benefits going back or whether it's just taking  
19 one natural resource to create energy, and really where is  
20 the offset.

21 The other thing I was going to say is, we talked  
22 about solar. For those of you who travel from San Diego,  
23 you might have seen some of the desert lands that were  
24 once undisturbed, now large scale, but you don't see them  
25 on our rooftops. You have to go to San Diego or L.A. or

1 to large cities. Why is it such a trend to put it on top  
2 of ceilings, and why isn't that trend carried out to  
3 desert communities. And yet that energy isn't being  
4 reinvested in our community, that energy is going to  
5 San Diego. Now, how equitable is that?

6 Another problem that we leave out is, when you  
7 talk about job creation, we're actually killing jobs.  
8 Because when it becomes too difficult for companies and  
9 energy companies to build on desert land because of all  
10 the CEQA and DEPA and all other permitting processes, they  
11 go to agricultural lands because that becomes easier.  
12 Well, what happens? Well, you take food out of  
13 production, you take farm workers out of their jobs. And  
14 we never bring that into the discussion. But yet we're  
15 saying, Oh, we're creating jobs. Yeah, you're creating  
16 jobs, six-month jobs. But then a hundred years of jobs to  
17 farm workers have just been eliminated. And so -- so some  
18 things to consider.

19 Energy efficacy, I think we should start looking  
20 at how we can not just benefit owners, because there are  
21 areas where you have owners, but you have a lot of  
22 renters. And they're not getting the benefit. And the  
23 formulas just aren't adding up. We need to bring low-cost  
24 technologies, stacking technologies, as well, whether it's  
25 weatherization technologies to, you know, like Smart, and

1 learning types of meters for -- for air conditioners, for,  
2 you know, solar, and weatherization, and a number of  
3 technologies, but make sure that those returns are going  
4 back to the renter, as well. Because why? When you put  
5 that return back into the renter, you're also creating a  
6 lot more confidence that the owner will get the rent.  
7 Because people are having to make the choice whether they  
8 pay for electricity or they pay the rent, and they're  
9 really not a participant, they're not a beneficiary, when  
10 they're putting these technologies on roofs.

11           And the other thing that's really impairing our  
12 ability to have more gains is the fact that it's the  
13 low-income bracket. If you don't fall within that  
14 low-income bracket -- this is a disadvantaged community  
15 from top to bottom, from Coachella to the border. It's a  
16 disadvantaged community. And we need to start thinking  
17 about how do we carpet these technologies in the areas  
18 where we can actually have greater gains versus trying to  
19 checker board it, you know, here and there. And we spend  
20 more money, more resources in consultants and supplies,  
21 materials and so on than the benefit. So just another  
22 thought that we really need to kind of approach it from a  
23 whole disadvantage versus just the low-income. And it may  
24 work different in other areas, but here, I believe that  
25 that would be the best approach.

1 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. We're just about to wrap  
2 up. We're almost to the top of the hour.

3 ELEANOR TORRES: Just a question. I haven't  
4 heard anything about wind energy. Is there any reason why  
5 that's been left out of the discussion? Because as you  
6 were saying, Luis, one of the great things about the  
7 desert, at least the high desert, where I'm from, wind  
8 energy is a wonderful renewable source.

9 SARAH RUBIN: Last comment.

10 LUIS OLMEDO: I just want to say that there are  
11 other experts in the audience, and I want to encourage  
12 them during the public comment to please step up to the  
13 mic and bring in your expertise. Because all the  
14 discussions here, you might just be sitting there saying,  
15 I know the answers, so please utilize the public comment  
16 period to bring in your own concerns.

17 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. We have one more comment,  
18 then we're going to move to public comment.

19 REY LEON: You know, I guess to remember, we had  
20 a workshop in Huron for the west side of the Valley up  
21 there up north, and we had people from Huron and Avenal  
22 mostly, but it turned out that the only ones that  
23 qualified for the Plus Up, which was, you know, a big  
24 prize of \$16,500 of an incentive, was the community of  
25 Huron. And the community of Avenal, which is very similar

1 to the community of Huron, didn't qualify. You know, and  
2 this is for the electric vehicles. And so, you know --  
3 and while I'm thinking, it's -- it's dependent on  
4 CalEnviroScreen. We're on the 2.0. I'm very confident  
5 that we're moving towards 3.0 and 4.0. It's getting  
6 better.

7 But, you know, it's based on the power levels  
8 and pollution. And the situation with Avenal is that they  
9 have a prison, so it muffles up their demographics.  
10 Right? And so -- so I think the, you know -- I guess  
11 the -- for the CalEnviroScreen, we really need to push  
12 that we can, you know, further improve it, and also that  
13 there's no air quality monitors in that little sub valley  
14 that is where Avenal is situated. Although we do know  
15 that 23,000 tons of garbage per day are being shipped in  
16 from the County of L.A., and of course we have to deal  
17 with diesel trucks, and there's no monitors. You know,  
18 we're going to be conducting a survey, and hopefully after  
19 that, do something similar to what our colleagues here in  
20 Imperial are doing, some great work in regards to  
21 monitoring. Thank you.

22 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Okay. We're moving to  
23 public comment. Because we have a lot of people, if  
24 everyone could please -- just a minute, I'm going to her  
25 first. If folks could keep it to two minutes, please, we

1 would totally appreciate it. You're welcome -- anyone is  
2 welcome to comment in English or Spanish.

3 -oOo-

4 -PUBLIC COMMENT-

5 ANITA NICKLEN: Thank you so much. Anita  
6 Nicklen, and I'm part of the community for the air  
7 monitoring project. I just want to say that I think we  
8 are in the right direction. The fact that we have, you  
9 know, the EJAC at this table, you know, that's very  
10 important. 99 percent -- 99 percent of us are not usually  
11 part of this type of conversation. It is usually the top  
12 1 percent that create the plans and policies that benefit  
13 them. Usually, you know, the motivation is to increase  
14 their profits. And adding a little bit more on that, you  
15 know, as Luis was saying, yeah, we're here in Imperial  
16 County. We're paying, you know, high rates in  
17 electricity. All the projects that you have seen here,  
18 the solar projects and the wind turbine project, that  
19 will -- excuse me. You were asking about that. We can --  
20 after the meeting, maybe we can talk about that. Okay.  
21 Because that would be another couple of minutes, and I  
22 only have a couple of minutes.

23 So definitely I support, you know, the proposal  
24 of having not only ten, but maybe more workshops, because,  
25 you know, those workshops have to be presented in

1 different communities. They are the experts. They know  
2 what they're -- they understand very well what's happening  
3 in terms of the environment. They know their own needs,  
4 and they are the ones experiencing the greatest  
5 environmental challenges.

6 Like, for example, the Imperial Valley,  
7 something that you have not mentioned here, the emissions  
8 from off-road vehicles. That has not been, you know,  
9 mentioned, or at least, you know, in the time that I have  
10 been here.

11 So someone was saying that adding the economic  
12 reviewer to the panel is important. I think that, yeah,  
13 that's crucial, but also adding, you know, a health expert  
14 is crucial. But this person needs to understand also  
15 what's happening in the communities. Because you can hire  
16 or get someone on that panel, but if that health expert  
17 does not understand the health issues here in Imperial  
18 County, it's not worth it. So, you know, you need to have  
19 that expert. So yeah, thank you.

20 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

21 RAY ASKINS: I'm Ray Askins, and recently, I've  
22 been using a lot of public transportation. But what you  
23 presented here today is a eutopic viewpoint. The  
24 practical side is if the Imperial Valley Transit System  
25 bus breaks down, you're sitting there for another hour for

1 the bus to come through, and that makes you late to  
2 wherever you're going, say from Calexico to Costco. So  
3 I'm trying to think from Costco, there's no bus, so I got  
4 to find another way of getting back to Calexico. And so  
5 here comes Numero Uno. That's \$2.50 for one way, where I  
6 paid .60 to get to Costco. I think this is where you  
7 don't require the bus companies to make up when the --  
8 when the buses break down. They got to pick up the slack;  
9 otherwise, your public transportation is worthless and  
10 then I got to look for another way. I mean, unfortunately  
11 by the time I get to Costco, it's about 2:30, 3:00 o'clock  
12 in the afternoon, when the bus travels to Calexico. But  
13 if that bus breaks down on the return, there's no bus.  
14 What do you do? This is not included. You must require  
15 these public transportation companies, when they do break  
16 down, they must pick up the slack.

17 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

18 MARK BAZA: Good afternoon. Mark Baza. I'm the  
19 Executive Director for the Imperial County Transportation  
20 Commission and Local Transportation Authority, which is  
21 the sales tax measure agency for Imperial County.

22 With that said, we are a self-help county, but  
23 we -- 92 percent of our funds go to local roads on our  
24 sales tax measure, so our community has made a definite  
25 commitment to local roads, as many of our roads are a

1 hundred years old and are in desperate need of  
2 improvement.

3 I wanted to support the recommendation by Katie  
4 that said, you know, where land use and transportation  
5 planning is important to us all, but it is -- it's also --  
6 it helps us achieve our SCS goals, but we have a challenge  
7 to meet those goals, and funding is a part of that, for  
8 transit in particular. Transit is a big part of how we  
9 are able to meet those goals, and funding is not -- does  
10 not come very easily for smaller populations like  
11 ourselves. Yes, we get State monies, yes, we can get  
12 Federal monies for transit, but it's based on a population  
13 formula. And you don't have the flow population of a  
14 hundred and eighty thousand people.

15 So that is our challenge. You know, just as an  
16 example, we are part of SCAG region, multi-county -- six  
17 county metropolitan planning organization. Now, we were  
18 able to meet our SCS goals, in part because L.A. Metro has  
19 a major sales tax measure that helps them to build a lot  
20 of transit in the L.A. Metro area. But what does that do  
21 for us here in Imperial County. That is our challenge.

22 To build off of Luis's earlier comments related  
23 to our cross-border travelers every day. We have -- here  
24 in Imperial County, we have 45,000-plus people crossing  
25 into our border every day. We have to provide transit

1 services for those folks that travel into our county every  
2 day. We also have our own citizens that are transit  
3 dependent, as -- as you heard earlier. And yes, we may  
4 have challenges on occasion, but not very often in terms  
5 of broken down vehicles.

6 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

7 All right. We've got a couple more comments  
8 here, and then I'm going to come to the other side of the  
9 room. You're next.

10 Okay.

11 KIMBERLY CLARK: My name is Kimberly Clark. I'm  
12 from the Southern California Association of Governments,  
13 SCAG, and I wanted to echo Mark's concern regarding  
14 funding. And, you know, funding is so important for the  
15 implementation of a sustainable community strategy. And  
16 the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program  
17 saw a good opportunity for that, but more needs to be  
18 done. Obviously, you know, Southern California needs to  
19 get a fair share of funding.

20 I also wanted to --

21 SARAH RUBIN: Can you say what SCAG is?

22 KIMBERLY CLARK: Sure. Absolutely. There is a  
23 question to basically describe what SCAG is.

24 SARAH RUBIN: No, just say it.

25 KIMBERLY CLARK: The Southern California

1 Association of Governments. We're the metropolitan  
2 planning organization for Southern California.

3 Lastly, I just wanted to add, I applaud ARB and  
4 the EJAC for having this meeting in the Imperial County.  
5 Imperial County is a very important part of the SCAG  
6 region and has meek environmental justice issues, and to  
7 see the EJAC have a meeting here is really important.

8 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Thank you.

9 JOHN HERNANDEZ: My name is John Hernandez. I'm  
10 a local community member. Been here all my life and have  
11 lived in this -- this community. And we just have a whole  
12 shitload of problems, because, you know, fennel is our  
13 number one industry. And all the trucks that come from  
14 the border go all the way to Long Beach, and you know what  
15 they do all along the way. And I just want to thank, you  
16 know, folks for looking at our direction, and I want to  
17 continue to support your efforts at the State level, at  
18 the Federal level, and the local level where we -- we  
19 are -- we are crying out. We are desperate for -- for  
20 help. People are -- our families and our friends are  
21 dying around us. People are -- you know, look at the  
22 cancer, look at the asthma, look at the economic  
23 depression here. We are a hundred-year, you know, this  
24 area. And when I walk in here and I see the time, you  
25 know, I said, Yeah, we're going have good times, and then

1 things started heating up, you know, and that's good,  
2 because now things are cooling down and we're processing a  
3 lot of this good information. So thank you. I hope I can  
4 talk to some more people in the course of the day.

5 SARAH RUBIN: Everyone who has commented, if you  
6 could please give our note taker your name, that way  
7 she'll have it for the notes.

8 Okay. Who wants to go first?

9 EFRAIN SALDIVAL: (Translated from Spanish.)  
10 We're a group of truck drivers in the Imperial Valley, and  
11 we are here together to express issues regarding them  
12 requesting purchasing trucks. They only give us a certain  
13 amount miles. Five thousand miles is all we are allowed  
14 to use.

15 Two years ago, they provided us with 50,000 to  
16 work during four months. So now, they're only allowing us  
17 5,000, and because of the generation of smoke, they're  
18 only allowing it for four months' use, and this is not  
19 beneficial for us. It's not a good offer for us. We work  
20 in agriculture, and 5,000 miles are not enough for us to  
21 work for these four months. This is a problem for us. We  
22 don't know how to deal with this. We would like to get  
23 some feedback or advice from you, if you can give us a  
24 comment regarding this issue that's a problem for us.

25 MARTHA ARGUELLO: He said that they are being

1 required to buy new trucks, and I don't think that was  
2 translated. I just want to make sure, because that's  
3 important to you.

4 SARAH RUBIN: With the mic.

5 MARTHA ARGUELLO: So one of the things he  
6 said -- and I'll let you go back, I'm sorry -- said that  
7 they're required to buy new trucks. That's the part of  
8 the translation that didn't make it through.

9 EFRAIN SALDIVAL: So they mentioned to us, but  
10 he's bringing us a document of the entity requiring to buy  
11 the -- purchase the new trucks, and it's California  
12 Environmental Protection Agency, Air Resources Board that  
13 make this request.

14 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

15 FLOYD VERGARA: So real quickly, the folks who  
16 implement the truck and bus regulations are not here at  
17 the table, but if you give me your name and number, I'm  
18 happy to follow up with you, get the right folks to talk  
19 to you about, you know, what your options are and that  
20 sort of thing okay.

21 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

22 Okay. We have another comment over here.

23 RITA GALINDO: (Translated from Spanish.)

24 Hello, my name is Lisa [sic], and it's the first time that  
25 I'm attending one of these meetings, and I'm very happy to

1 see there are so many people interested in our issues. I  
2 come from the Coachella Valley, and I would like to get  
3 some information regarding how I can be involved and be a  
4 participant to help with these issues, as well. I  
5 understand that we have a lot of needs, and we also need a  
6 lot of people to get involved. Thank you.

7 SARAH RUBIN: Anyone else have a public comment?

8 Okay. We have one last burning add-in, and then  
9 we're going to break for lunch.

10 ANTONIO CAMPOS: All right. Based on all the  
11 comments made by ARB, you have to consider that Mexicali  
12 is -- and Calexico is one urban community. Even though  
13 they have that political border right up the middle of it,  
14 what happens in the Mexicali affects Calexico, or for that  
15 matter, Imperial County, and vice versa. So when you do  
16 your planning, consider taking that they have -- consider  
17 the problems with this urban community, Calexico and  
18 Mexicali. Because if you just consider Calexico, then  
19 your objectives will fail. But if you include Mexicali,  
20 you will reach your goals. Now, I do cross back and forth  
21 from Mexicali, and I do see the disadvantage of just  
22 saying, Well, Mexicali doesn't exist. And that's wrong.  
23 So if you want to meet your objectives, include the total  
24 urban community. Thank you.

25 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. We are going to break for

1 lunch. We're going to come back at 1:00 o'clock. Let's  
2 do a round of applause for the great work this morning.  
3 Great job.

4 Okay. EJAC members have lunch supplied; other  
5 folks, lunch is on your own. The meeting will reconvene  
6 at 1:00 o'clock.

7 (Whereupon, at the hour of 12:15 p.m.,  
8 a luncheon recess was taken, the  
9 proceedings to be resumed at 1:00 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

BRAWLEY, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, APRIL 4, 2016

1:00 P.M.

-PROCEEDINGS-

SARAH RUBIN: We are going to look to wrap up our meeting today before 4:00 o'clock, and just as a reminder, we have our meeting goals on the wall over here in English and Spanish. And the one thing maybe we can get for the meeting notes, I just overheard a future best practice, which is when we have interpreters, to have all the presenters have a copy of the PowerPoint for the interpreters to help them with the -- the wording.

So our first meeting goal is what we're a little more than halfway through, which is draft initial Scoping Plan recommendations after reports from ARB and EJAC. We're doing that within -- kind of dividing it in five parts. We did three this morning. We have two left.

Outline an EJAC working time line for the next three to six months based on ARB updates and EJAC priorities. We started that this morning, and at 3:00 o'clock, here at the back of the wall, we've got the months, and we're going to be coming back to this at 3:00 p.m.

Now, we are about to check off our third goal,

1 which is learn about California climate investments and  
2 identify EJAC's role. So I'm going turn it over to Matt  
3 for his presentation, and then we'll go to Q and A and  
4 look to clarify the role you want to play.

5

6 - CALIFORNIA CLIMATE INVESTMENTS PRESENTATION -

7 MATT BOTILL: I have the unenviable position of  
8 doing a presentation after lunch, so I will do my best to  
9 keep this interesting and engaging.

10 My name is Matthew Botill, and I am a manager  
11 with Air Resources Board, and my team works with State  
12 agencies on implementation of California on the  
13 investments. And I've been sitting in the audience today  
14 listening, and I just wanted to say a couple of things  
15 about what I've been hearing.

16 So really, really good and positive discussion  
17 on community engagement, how best to do that with talking  
18 about state level policies and major programs. So I'll  
19 talk a little bit about what our experience has been on  
20 the climate investment side in the presentation.

21 Also, this question about how do you evaluate  
22 performance? How are these programs doing, and what kind  
23 of information does your committee need? What does the  
24 public need to understand what's going on with these  
25 different programs? And maybe what you need is

1 capability, and so I'm going to talk a little bit about  
2 how we see that working within the Climate Investments  
3 Program and get your feedback, too.

4 So if you could go ahead and advance the slides.

5 So what I'm going to do -- and I'll look for  
6 visual cues in terms of if I'm going too fast or too slow,  
7 or if there's other information you would like to see --  
8 but I know that you have been talking through the  
9 individual sectors with ARB staff doing these deep dives  
10 on the programs and bringing that information back so you  
11 can talk about recommendations that you'd like to make to  
12 ARB. I'm going to try my best, in the short time we have,  
13 to give you what's called a medium dive on the California  
14 Climate Investments Program, so we have some time for  
15 discussion at the end.

16 My presentation is broken up into two parts.  
17 One part is on the program design and structure, how it's  
18 been established and what are the kind of objectives. And  
19 the second part of the presentation is about outcomes.  
20 What are we seeing from just a first year and a half of  
21 implementation on the California Climate Investments  
22 Program. And I also left a little bit of a present in  
23 front you to take a look at, but try and restrain  
24 yourselves while I get through the presentation so we can  
25 talk about it.

1 All right. So what are California Climate  
2 Investments? They are comprehensive and coordinated  
3 investments throughout California to further the states  
4 climate programs.

5 You can go to the next slide for me.

6 Now, the funding for California Climate  
7 Investments's, as you all are probably familiar, comes  
8 from the State's Cap-and-Trade Program, specifically from  
9 the auctioning of allowances under the State's  
10 Cap-and-Trade Program --

11 THE REPORTER: I'm having a hard time hearing  
12 and understanding what you are saying.

13 MATT BOTILL: All right. I'll try and talk  
14 slow. I think Katie and I suffer from the same fast  
15 talking.

16 So the funding for California Climate  
17 Investments comes from the State's Cap-and-Trade Program.  
18 We are, I'm sure, going to be talking at length about that  
19 program, but they really are a kind of off shoot of how  
20 that program was designed.

21 To date, the program -- the Cap-and-Trade  
22 Program and the State owed allowances in the Cap-and-Trade  
23 Program generated a little over \$4 billion in  
24 State-auctioned proceeds. There's also an important  
25 component of that part of the program that is the

1 California Climate Credit, and that is funding and is  
2 generated for the investor-owned utilities that is  
3 returned back to the rate payers. So I'm not going to  
4 talk about that program, but it is an important component  
5 that also provides return on funding back to the  
6 communities throughout California on their electricity  
7 bills.

8 So Trish, if you could go ahead and jump to the  
9 next slide.

10 How am I doing on -- better?

11 THE REPORTER: Better.

12 MATT BOTILL: So like a said, I'd like to spend  
13 a few minutes talking about program design and structure,  
14 and I think these are kind of important concepts, but I'm  
15 going to try to go as quickly as I can through them.

16 Next slide.

17 So I think this is one of the fundamental  
18 questions that we all struggle with on this program, is  
19 how does funding move through the process? And so the --  
20 the Governor and the Legislature and the reaction that a  
21 number of bills in 2012 basically established the  
22 framework of how the funding flows from the account that  
23 it's deposited in into the individual programs or  
24 projects. And the process that they identify includes an  
25 investment plan, so there were three years -- and

1 investment plan was drafted that provides priority  
2 recommendations for the use of the proceeds.

3 That investment plan, I'd like to kind of refer  
4 to it as a menu of options. It's here are the types of  
5 investments that the State could make. The investment  
6 plan is given to the Legislature by the Department of  
7 Finance, and the Legislature then decides through either a  
8 single budget act or I think the annual budget act where  
9 it will appropriately get funded. So the Legislature will  
10 look to our state agencies to establish objectives for  
11 funding and establish a specific funding amount where the  
12 budget process happens. Typically, that's in July.

13 That implementing statute also set out a number  
14 of responsibilities. So the California Environmental  
15 Protection Agency and the Secretary of Environmental  
16 Protection identifies -- we'll have a disadvantaged  
17 community -- we'll talk a little about that in a sec. The  
18 Legislation also gave ARB the responsibility to develop  
19 guidelines and quantification methods, which we'll talk  
20 about. And as I mentioned in how funds are distributed,  
21 the legislation and the program's responsibility to the  
22 State agencies that receive appropriations on implementing  
23 their programs and how they find projects and how to  
24 reform.

25 And then finally, the report on profits, which

1 we'll talk about quite a bit today.

2 The next slide, please.

3 So what are the objectives of the -- the  
4 program? There -- there -- can broadly roll into these  
5 three objectives. So first and foremost, because these  
6 funds come from the implementation of the AB32 program,  
7 the funds need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. There  
8 has been additional legislation that's been passed  
9 through -- the legislation also directing that beyond the  
10 greenhouse gas reductions, these funds need to be directed  
11 towards the State's most disadvantaged communities and  
12 also to maximize economic environmental and public health  
13 cobenefits. So this gives us a set of three main  
14 objectives that we drive out with the use of these funds.

15 Okay. In terms of disadvantaged communities, I  
16 think you are all familiar with this, but I'll talk real  
17 quickly just for those of you that may not be. Senate  
18 Bill 535, which was the secular benefit from the previous  
19 slide about directing investments to disadvantaged  
20 communities, it sets what we call floors for investment,  
21 which are ten percent of the Cap-and-Trade auction  
22 proceeds should be invested in communities, and 25 percent  
23 to be invested to benefit communities. There's quite a  
24 bit of discussion of what it actually means to benefit a  
25 community, and I'm interested in the feedback.

1           As I mentioned before, the secretary for  
2 environmental protection, Cal EPA, they identify what is a  
3 disadvantaged community using the CalEnviroScreen tool,  
4 CalEnviroScreen 2.0, which includes socioeconomic and  
5 environmental factors and much discussion on what's a  
6 disadvantaged community and how to identify them, and it's  
7 done currently through CalEnviroScreen.

8           Next slide.

9           This is just from statute, and so I won't spend  
10 too much time on it. But these are the -- the identified  
11 cobenefits that the implementing legislation had directed  
12 us to -- that you use with these funds. And it included  
13 things like economic climate cobenefits like job  
14 opportunities and opportunities for air quality and the  
15 public health benefits, as well as engaging with  
16 stakeholders. And so that's something that I think you'll  
17 all be looking at in terms of the broader Scoping Plan  
18 impact, that their Scoping Plan Development, the impact  
19 that climate change will have on our communities and  
20 trying to lessen the impact that -- of climate change  
21 going forward with these investments.

22           All right. So this is a question I get a lot,  
23 which is what exactly is the ARB's role in the California  
24 Climate Investments Program? We have three primary  
25 responsibilities as an agency. So the first is assisting

1 the administration, and administration here is the  
2 environmental natural resources and energy agencies, as  
3 well as the Governor's office and the Department of  
4 Finance in developing an investment plan and reporting  
5 profit outcomes. So this is not an ARB solo document,  
6 this is something that we do on behalf of a broad mix of  
7 State agencies.

8           And then, more specifically, ARB is tasked in  
9 legislation to provide guidance on the implementation of  
10 the program, and the guidance has to include how to  
11 maximize benefits to disadvantaged communities, how to  
12 quantify the greenhouse gas benefits from these  
13 investments, and how to track and record these investments  
14 going forward.

15           The third responsibility that the agency has is  
16 to administer a specific funding pod for low carbon  
17 transportation so they have an incentive program that --  
18 for those projects, as well.

19           The screenshots here, actually, you have the one  
20 on the right in front of you, those are the three major  
21 documents, the investment plan at the bottom, the annual  
22 quorum, and then the funding guidelines on the top.

23           So beyond the ARB's role, what about the rest of  
24 the State agencies role? They are responsible for  
25 implementing better rates and incentive programs. They

1 are responsible for doing it in a way that aligns with  
2 ARB's funding guidelines and ensure that project achieve  
3 greenhouse gas reductions. The State agencies, they --  
4 they are responsible for identifying specific projects for  
5 funding, so they will -- they will pick projects -- they  
6 will pick the ones that moved forward. They will be  
7 tracking the benefits of those projects over time and  
8 reporting them back to ARB and to the administration to be  
9 folded up into this annual report.

10 All right. So visually, what does this whole  
11 process look like? It means that we start out with an  
12 investment plan, it sets the principles, and it selects  
13 the kind of a menu of options for funding. The Governor  
14 and the Legislature establish a budget and it identifies  
15 the specific programs and funding amounts. ARB's funding  
16 guidelines are in effect and they provide general guidance  
17 on program recountability, on GHG quantification and on  
18 reporting and on disadvantaged community benefits, and  
19 then the individual entities can start funding the  
20 projects based on the guidelines or solicitations that  
21 they issue for that specific entity.

22 As an example, Community Services and  
23 Development has a low-income weatherization program that  
24 receives funding through the California Climate  
25 Investments, and that program has a set of guidelines --

1 Community Services and Development has a set of guidelines  
2 that dictate which households are eligible, what kinds  
3 of measures will be installed on these houses.

4 THE REPORTER: I need you to slow down.

5 MATT BOTILL: Like I said, I get on a roll.

6 So once -- once the agency identifies which  
7 projects that it would be funding and a tour of those  
8 projects, it then -- they're responsible to report any of  
9 the outcomes of the projects and to do an assessment of  
10 how they are doing, which is that last slide there.

11 All right. Next slide.

12 So in terms of community engagement, I want to  
13 spend a little bit of time on this. We have -- in the  
14 development of the overall program, the design of the  
15 program, we have spent quite a bit of time working with --

16 You can go to the next slide.

17 -- working with communities.

18 Go to the next slide, please.

19 So these are the specific elements that are in  
20 the funding guidelines, kind of accountability and  
21 transparency, tracking, performing and guidance on  
22 disadvantaged community benefits. I was giving you the  
23 average, because I saw that picture, which is from another  
24 workshop they left there.

25 Next slide.

1           So in terms of guidance for how these funds are  
2   benefiting disadvantaged communities -- and I'll bring up  
3   just an example an example here -- we have, as an agency,  
4   established the criteria that the agency needs to use to  
5   identify whether or not the project is actually benefiting  
6   the community. It's not straightforward. This was done  
7   through extensive outreach, and it was something that  
8   we're committed to revising and upgrading over time.

9           But what we have here are the current major  
10   tenets of identifying whether or not a project is a  
11   benefit. The first is that for a project to be of benefit  
12   to a community, it needs to provide a direct, meaningful,  
13   assured benefit, and this is something that we just added  
14   this year, it needs to address an important community  
15   lead. And we can talk more about what that means in a  
16   second.

17           The second is that beyond these principles, an  
18   individual project needs to meet at least one very  
19   specific criteria in the funding guidelines that we have  
20   worked on over the last year and a half with community  
21   representatives and with the other state agencies in terms  
22   of power projects. And so this is just one example.  
23   There are I don't know how many dozens in the funding  
24   guidelines for the individual projects among the sectors,  
25   which is transportation, energy, natural resources. But

1 this example gives you an idea of the level of specifics  
2 we need for individual projects.

3           So if a transit agency, for instance, is funding  
4 the expansion of a transit line, how do we know if that  
5 expansion is actually benefiting a disadvantaged  
6 community? Well, we set up criteria, and this is what  
7 this is more or less meant to get at, that the project  
8 needs to reduce air pollution on a fixed route that's  
9 primarily the benefiting in the community or for vehicles  
10 that serve transit stations or stops in disadvantaged  
11 communities. So there's a lot of things here embedded in  
12 the criteria. One, that it's providing a quality benefit,  
13 and two that it's providing a direct benefit in or near a  
14 disadvantaged community, and that requires us to actually  
15 understand what the projects are doing on the ground.

16           Okay. This is the slide I was talking about.

17           In terms of outreach and working with the  
18 organizations and State agencies, on the funding  
19 guidelines alone, we'll have over 12 workshops over the  
20 course of a year and a half, 80 written comments, two ARB  
21 board meetings, we heard quite a bit from community  
22 organizations as well as folks in this room on the  
23 developments of the funding guidelines and how we talk  
24 about disadvantaged communities. And you don't see this  
25 as apparently one thing, this is something that we're

1 going to constantly work on over time.

2 This is what happens when you work on a  
3 presentation. Okay. Next slide, please.

4 Real quickly, and I think there were some  
5 questions about cobenefits and cobenefit quantification,  
6 and I want to talk about ARB's role in terms of  
7 quantifying benefits from the investments that it needs to  
8 impose.

9 So ARB is developing -- has been developing for  
10 the past year quantification methods that are very  
11 specific, very specific project-level methods that follow  
12 and support the overall regulatory and voluntary programs  
13 that ARB has established. And we've done over 50  
14 different project types in just the last year alone on how  
15 do you quantify greenhouse gas reductions from these  
16 investments. And the intent here is to make sure that  
17 when these 14 State agencies that are all running  
18 different programs in different sectors with different  
19 ideas, that these programs, these projects, are being  
20 consistently evaluated. That is the number one objective,  
21 that we're giving you a fair and equitable representation  
22 of the investments that are being made and that we're  
23 following the structure the State has set up for  
24 greenhouse gas reduction.

25 So the process, the quantification methodology,

1 it's not simple, it takes time, as you can imagine, and  
2 it involves things like literature reviews, input from the  
3 public, and regular updates and improvements.

4           Okay. So with all that program design and  
5 structure stuff out of the way, let me talk a little bit  
6 about the types of outcomes we're seeing. And just to  
7 remind folks, too, this is a new -- this program really  
8 launched in earnest about a year and a half ago with the  
9 first round of budget appropriations that were made, and  
10 so we are still very much in the learning phase and in the  
11 review phase.

12           Next slide.

13           So this is the three-year list of budget  
14 appropriations. So if you were to ask me who got money  
15 and what is it for, this will give you a little bit of an  
16 indication. So you -- you heard some folks talk about  
17 this in the different discussions from the sectors today,  
18 things like the Affordable Housing and Sustainable  
19 Communities Program, the Strategic Growth Council has  
20 determined its role in the programs that's funded with  
21 these dollars that's included on the slide up here.

22           The gray box is the transportation projects, so  
23 these include things thing like helping implement --

24           THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, can you say that  
25 again?

1 MATT BOTILL: Sure.

2 The items on the gray box are transportation  
3 projects, and these include things like helping to  
4 implement SB375, helping to expand transit in California,  
5 helping to connect communities to the point of development  
6 of high speed rail, and helping provide intercity  
7 community options for communities. As well as zero  
8 emission vehicles and near zero emission vehicles helping  
9 to provide vehicles and mobility options to disadvantaged  
10 communities.

11 The items in the blue box are energy-related  
12 programs. So these are things like weatherization and  
13 solar and reducing the carbon intensity of the water that  
14 we all use, as well as there's been some projects funded  
15 for a dairy digester that we had quite a bit of discussion  
16 on this morning. And then at the bottom, these are the  
17 natural resources projects.

18 In total, we have -- next slide.

19 THE REPORTER: Can you turn off the fan. I  
20 can't hear him.

21 MATT BOTILL: In total, we have a little over  
22 2.6 billion in funds that have been specifically  
23 appropriated to the Legislature -- or from the Legislature  
24 is to State agencies. So when talking about outcomes, I  
25 do want to just pause on the slide for a second. The --

1 the way the funding moves from the State level down to  
2 local projects is multi-step process. So it involves the  
3 appropriation of funds in a budget act, and the State  
4 agency that has those funds. They didn't identify what  
5 are our priorities? What are our priority projects that  
6 are going to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, that are  
7 going to provide cobenefits and impact disadvantaged  
8 communities. So the term "allocated" is the term we use,  
9 that the agency uses, if the State agency has decided if  
10 they have, let's say, \$200 million, we're going to  
11 allocate 50 million to zero emission vehicles, a hundred  
12 million to -- and I'm just making these numbers up -- but  
13 the term "allocating" is used to describe how the agencies  
14 identify different elements for funding.

15 The environmental works projects, we went  
16 through a solicitation process and identified applicants  
17 throughout California based on their product details and  
18 then awarded those funds. And then to implement those  
19 funds, so they actually put those funds into specific  
20 projects, and we've been finding individual locations of  
21 those projects through the implementation stage. You  
22 know, let's say for car-sharing, somebody puts a proposal  
23 in for a car-sharing project in the L.A. basin, and that  
24 car-sharing project is awarded, it's not implemented until  
25 we know where we're specifically going to put those

1 car-sharing services, where they're going to put their  
2 vehicles, and that's the very specific implementation of  
3 those funds that were awarded.

4 And then completed, which is the part of the  
5 funds that went out the door, our tracking of benefits of  
6 these funds, and we get an understanding of what those  
7 benefits are.

8 So go ahead and do the next slide.

9 This is the current status of funding, so  
10 2.6 billion appropriated to date. 1.7 of that 2.6 billion  
11 has actually been awarded to projects. And then of that  
12 1.7 billion, 912 million has been implemented into very  
13 specific locations. And implement is very important for  
14 identifying whether or not projects are benefiting  
15 disadvantaged communities.

16 Next slide.

17 In terms of greenhouse gas reduction -- this is  
18 the report in front you -- using our ARB-developed  
19 quantification methodology to be working with State  
20 agencies, they are projecting an estimated benefit of  
21 14.30 million metric tons of CO2 would be reduced over the  
22 lifetime of these projects. There's a lot wrapped in  
23 these numbers, but this gives you a sense of the total  
24 reductions.

25 Next slide.

1           In terms of public outreach, how did they  
2 identify these projects? Between ARB and 14 other State  
3 agencies, we've held over 300 public meetings, over 16,000  
4 participants in these meetings, and this is one of those  
5 things where I'm not saying you're not doing a great job,  
6 I'm saying outreach is always important, and it's  
7 something that we always are trying to do and trying to  
8 improve upon. And I just wanted to highlight the steps  
9 that we've taken in just the last year and a half.

10           So how are we doing the funds that are a benefit  
11 to disadvantaged communities? So if we have the statutory  
12 floor of ten percent in disadvantaged communities,  
13 25 percent to benefit the communities, what are we seeing  
14 in the first year? Using the -- the project data that  
15 we've gotten so far, we're finding that a little over 50  
16 percent of the funds is benefiting disadvantaged  
17 communities and 40 percent are actually going straight  
18 into disadvantaged communities by their location.

19           And just one point, this is using the  
20 \$912 million, so we still have -- we still have a ways to  
21 go. But these numbers are going to -- they're going to  
22 change over time, but as we get information, we'll be  
23 updating these figures.

24           In terms of disadvantaged communities census  
25 tracks, we have a map in the report that shows the -- the

1 communities that have at least some level of investment,  
2 and this gives you a sense of which communities are  
3 seeing -- which disadvantaged communities have received  
4 funds to date. I think we need to make it an objective to  
5 try and fill that pink area on the right.

6 All right. Next slide.

7 Oh, I know we're running out of time, but this  
8 is to Luis' point. So if you can go back one. Luis made  
9 a really good comment about large-scale solar, and why  
10 aren't we seeing individuals -- household residential  
11 solar in Imperial. We are. It's still in the earlier  
12 stages of roll out, but the program for Community Services  
13 and Development has funded a couple of residential rooftop  
14 solar for local residents in the Imperial Valley, and it's  
15 also a funded a number of other projects. So it's still  
16 in the early stages, but we're starting to see those  
17 projects happening, which I think is great. Some of the  
18 other projects that are happening locally include zero  
19 emission vehicles from the truck side, being the passenger  
20 side.

21 Okay. So I think what I'm going to do, since  
22 I'm on the last slide, and since I'm out of time and I  
23 want you to ask -- I want you to ask questions, is I'm  
24 going to leave these slides for a discussion, if you want  
25 to. What I have is individual sector breakdowns. So in

1 the transportation sustainable community sector, how are  
2 we doing? In the energy -- clean energy sectors, how are  
3 we doing? And in the natural resources sectors, how are  
4 we doing in terms of disadvantaged communities? But I'll  
5 leave these for the discussion since we're just about out  
6 of time.

7 KEVIN HAMILTON: I think we'd rather have you  
8 finish your talk, if everybody agrees.

9 SARAH RUBIN: I see nodding heads.

10 MATT BOTILL: Okay.

11 MARI ROSE TARUC: Well, can you just say what  
12 the goal of this particular section is?

13 SARAH RUBIN: Yes. So to remind you, on your  
14 agenda, Goal Number 3 isn't to just learn, but it's to  
15 identify -- sorry -- to identify the EJAC role. So if we  
16 want to have a little more and then -- we only have 15  
17 minutes. So if there are questions of clarification or  
18 things you don't understand that you need clarification  
19 on, I'd say let's prioritize those types of questions, and  
20 then dive into what role do you want your group to have.

21 MATT BOTILL: Okay. So I'll be brief. In terms  
22 of the sustainable community and clean transportation  
23 projects, a couple pictures on the bottom actually  
24 represent --

25 THE REPORTER: I can't understand you. I'm

1 sorry.

2 MATT BOTILL: I speed up, sorry.

3 They are examples of projects that are actually  
4 kind of kick-off projects that have been funded with these  
5 dollars. The chart on the right represents women in the  
6 sector, which is the -- this is the biggest sector  
7 receiving funding. How are doing in terms of the projects  
8 benefiting disadvantaged communities? So that's  
9 30 percent of the funds in and 51 of funds benefit  
10 communities.

11 Next slide.

12 This is just an example of the car-sharing  
13 project that was just done in Los Angeles, that I think  
14 would be great for down here in terms of the  
15 opportunities.

16 Next slide.

17 So in the energy efficiency and the clean energy  
18 sector, this sector is a little more discreet, so we're  
19 going to put a focus on product locations and things like  
20 weatherization, rooftop solar, low-income solar, and then  
21 water energy efficiency. So hopefully growers reduce the  
22 energy associated with pumping and supplying the fields  
23 with water. And so oftentimes, this looks like  
24 agricultural pumps and micro-irrigation, and just water  
25 pumping needs. For these funds, a little over -- right

1 around 64 percent is in benefiting communities.

2 Okay. That's -- this is an example of the water  
3 efficiency funding program that the department had.

4 Next slide.

5 And then in terms of natural resources, these  
6 are projects like urban forestry, the forest health  
7 projects, wealth administration projects, and the suburban  
8 projects, and these are being funded through the  
9 departments like CalRecycle, Natural Resources Agency,  
10 Cal Fire, and a little over 41 percent of the projects in  
11 disadvantaged communities, and 51 percent benefiting,  
12 which I think given the sectors locational dealings, this  
13 is a great number.

14 Next slide.

15 And this is an example of just an urban forestry  
16 project being funded through Cal Fire.

17 All right. Next slide.

18 And this is the standard -- information --

19 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't understand  
20 you. If we can wait until the students come in. I'm  
21 going to move closer to see if I can maybe hear you.

22 SARAH RUBIN: Students, you are welcome to grab  
23 those chairs that are pushed against the back wall. And  
24 there's some chairs over here.

25 Okay. Matthew?

1 MATT BOTILL: I'm done.

2 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So any questions of  
3 clarification? Sorry, just EJAC members.

4 KEVIN HAMILTON: So I have two questions, but  
5 the first one is on slide --

6 SARAH RUBIN: Louder. Louder. In the mic.

7 KEVIN HAMILTON: Yeah, in the mic would be good,  
8 wouldn't it?

9 So on Slide 17, which is where you showed the  
10 appropriations, what drives the decision-making here? I  
11 see money being expanded in certain areas of 2015. I  
12 think one of the things that concerned me, is a program  
13 that we've been making very effective for our communities  
14 by doing outreach and enrollment for families, or  
15 facilitating it because the folks who actually are  
16 contracted to do it don't do a lot of outreach, but we've  
17 been connecting people, is energy efficiency and  
18 weatherization.

19 And it looks like you cut the CEC's energy  
20 efficient from 20 to zero, and then in the wetlands and  
21 Cal Fire -- and again, Cal Fire has been doing a pretty  
22 good job with the money they've had. You cut them to  
23 zero. So what happened? What's up with that? Did they  
24 just not spend their money, so they didn't need anymore?

25 MATT BOTILL: So I do want to make one point

1 really clear, that the Air Resources Board does not have  
2 the authority or the responsibility to identify the  
3 specific funding amounts by State Agency. It is entirely  
4 up to Governor in enacting the budget.

5 KEVIN HAMILTON: Say no more. That explains  
6 that part.

7 So the other part of this is, are they able to  
8 use some of this funding -- this came to me after a  
9 conversation with a friend from SCAG here yesterday of how  
10 important this idea -- we're converting and we're sticking  
11 all this technology in these neighborhoods, and we've  
12 talked a lot about hiring people from those neighborhoods,  
13 but of course the people say back to me "where we can."  
14 Well, that's really a way of saying People don't know what  
15 they're doing. They don't know how to do this work. So  
16 do these agencies have the ability to modify these plans  
17 to include workforce development?

18 MATT BOTILL: Yes, with the additional  
19 expectation that those projects that have funding are  
20 reducing greenhouse gas emissions. So sure, that is an  
21 example of a State agency through the -- energy efficiency  
22 in public buildings, which would include a specific  
23 problem, like a specific building for weatherization, and  
24 part of that project would include bringing in workforce  
25 training, people on the ground training on how to

1 weatherize the building, how to install solar. So as long  
2 as it's met it's component of making those greenhouse gas  
3 reductions, that's a component of the program we in fact,  
4 in many of the discussions, or through the agencies have  
5 encouraged them to do just that and there are people  
6 evaluating it to them.

7 KEVIN HAMILTON: It would seem to me that  
8 working with local vocational schools and community  
9 colleges, especially, would be a great way to check on  
10 some of this money to get more bang for your buck. There  
11 is a lot of people who can do work in these kinds of  
12 areas, and to do it in the middle of a shovel-ready  
13 construction project is really difficult on the  
14 contractors. And it really makes the cost -- the  
15 program's cost goes way up artificially, because you've  
16 got to slow down, or you've got to actually have one  
17 trained person for the untrained person. And you're kind  
18 of training them on the job. And when the project ends,  
19 they may or not -- or may not have enough skill set at  
20 that point to actually take another job or go up.

21 So some formal training and building capacity to  
22 work -- to have more workers who are ready to work in  
23 these industries that are going to decrease our carbon  
24 footprint. So that's the vision forward, I would think,  
25 if it would be worth exploring.

1                   MATT BOTILL: And just briefly on that point.  
2     So in terms of the responsibilities of my group at the  
3     Air Resources Board, we set those funding guidelines  
4     regarding a higher level of principles. And we'd like to  
5     see the agencies instill the properties and we'd like to  
6     see the agencies implement them and move forward with them  
7     and the appropriations with the funding that's on the  
8     slide.

9                   Those agencies develop their own sets of  
10    requirements and expectations for projects that may or may  
11    not include workforce developments, so there's been a few  
12    touch points of the overarching guidance that we provide  
13    and on the agencies development of their individual  
14    program. And certainly, with the overarching guidance,  
15    one of the big pieces of feedback we've heard from the  
16    community groups and from the outreach that we did is that  
17    workforce development and employment opportunities are  
18    really important, and so we set part of the guidance  
19    principles. That's a really great way to benefit  
20    disadvantaged communities, agencies, when they're  
21    implementing their knowledge and see people do it that  
22    way.

23                  SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

24                  So we have a little less than ten minutes left.  
25    We can stretch to ten minutes on this. We want to get to

1 the EJAC's role.

2 I want to say welcome students. We're very glad  
3 you're here. To warn you, the last group that was here,  
4 did you hear that we put them on the spot? Anyone hear  
5 that? So we asked for a couple of volunteers when we were  
6 between meeting agenda items to share something that was  
7 either interesting or boring about this meeting. So be  
8 sure to listen.

9 Luis, question or clarification?

10 LUIS OLMEDO: So I have a couple questions.  
11 I'll try to be quick, though. But, you know, I saw some  
12 of the programs that talk about urban forestry earlier,  
13 talk about desert areas. In terms of the outreach, is  
14 this going to be ongoing, continuous?

15 MATT BOTILL: Absolutely. One of the  
16 expectations we set up listed outreach as a really  
17 important part of this program, primarily as we move  
18 forward, and we've added the expectation that projects are  
19 addressing community needs. And so one of the key ways  
20 you can identify that a project is addressing community  
21 needs is actually talking to the community and conducting  
22 the outreach. But beyond that, the additional  
23 opportunities include working on -- or doing additional  
24 workshops and working with communities on the program  
25 design questions like the funding guidelines.

1                   LUIS OLMEDO: I think it's important for EJAC to  
2 play an important role in advising on the outreach to  
3 DACs. I was doing the math, and for the amount of  
4 resources, 300 meetings, the amount of resources from the  
5 different agencies, I would imagine between ARB, does not  
6 match the parts of the basin. That means that at every  
7 meeting, we're gonna have probably less than 50 people,  
8 maybe even less than 30 people.

9                   The other thing I was going to ask is what role  
10 does Cal EPA have in the outreach, in that they do have  
11 a -- at least here, they have a department. But overall,  
12 what -- what role does Cal EPA have?

13                  MATT BOTILL: So let me ask our facilitator --

14                  LUIS OLMEDO: Let me ask a few more questions,  
15 and maybe --

16                  MATT BOTILL: Yeah.

17                  LUIS OLMEDO: If you don't mind, let me just do  
18 this real quick. I know we're limited in time.

19                  I also wanted to put a comment out there in  
20 terms of solar. Something that you might want to take a  
21 look at is these programs, and can I just -- because I  
22 think this falls into the overall concern that I have, is  
23 that there's so much more access to those communities that  
24 are closest to Sacramento that have a greater ability to  
25 be at ARB on a weekly basis, on a daily basis. And I have

1 concerns that ARB and its different programs may find it  
2 easier to work with those who are there all the time. And  
3 those who are furthest, you know, our reaches and getting  
4 reached aren't enough.

5           And so you mentioned here about making sure that  
6 it's equitable. And I wrote a note here that uniform,  
7 robust and accessible, and I don't think it's there. And  
8 I think that they are needing to rethink of how it's  
9 reaching out or how it's partnering with a really small  
10 representation versus looking at it from a uniform and  
11 robust and accessible way.

12           I do want to say that I think the EJAC should  
13 play an important role on the outreach to our DACs and  
14 other parts. We -- we can't have, you know, the left hand  
15 not know what the right hand is doing. And also that all  
16 GGRF projects must be transformative for DACs. They must  
17 be transformative.

18           And so, you know, I'd like to be able to be a  
19 productive participant in that and through the EJAC. I  
20 think the EJAC -- I think it's more equitable then, again,  
21 having one voice or two voices in Sacramento. I think the  
22 EJAC is more representative of a statewide representation,  
23 and we should play a larger roll in informing. We should  
24 be the first stop for information directly to ARB staff,  
25 and let the politicians deal with everybody else.

1 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

2 Okay. I'm going to make a process suggestion,  
3 which is that right now, EJAC members, you work in pairs  
4 for maybe a minute and a half, two minutes, and you answer  
5 this question together. You can use these big Post-its or  
6 the index card. What do you think EJAC's role is? I feel  
7 like you have to jump start this conversation.

8 So quickly, with whoever you are sitting next  
9 to, what do you think EJAC's role should be specifically,  
10 and then we're going to hear from you. We'll have a  
11 report out. Okay. Maybe the three you can talk together.  
12 Okay? I'll come back to you in a couple minutes.

13 (A discussion was held off the record.)

14 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. I hope you had enough time.  
15 So I am looking -- if I can have everybody's attention.  
16 Yoohoo. Yoohoo. So I just want to pop very quickly from  
17 pair to pair, and if you can report out what you think the  
18 EJAC's role should be.

19 Here we go.

20 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So outreach and  
21 accountability in forming the guidelines in the investment  
22 plan, and really -- Like Luis said, outreach, checking in  
23 with our priorities --

24 SARAH RUBIN: Slower, slower, slower.

25 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Sorry. Helping the

1 agencies prioritize funding as the programs continue to go  
2 forward and we see opportunities for changes.

3 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Help me, Katie, because I  
4 want to make sure we're getting the biggest -- so  
5 accountability with the outreach?

6 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: No outreach and  
7 accountability as two separate, but related.

8 SARAH RUBIN: All right.

9 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: And helping agencies  
10 prioritize and informing the guidelines and investment  
11 plan.

12 SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

13 REY LEON: Continuous oversight, just ensuring  
14 that the monies are hitting the ground in an equitable way  
15 and, you know, geographically. But, you know, making sure  
16 that they're making a difference on the ground and not all  
17 going into like L.A. or something. So, you know, because  
18 right now, the way it is, is the EJAC, we get together  
19 like every three years; right? It's just like a  
20 short-period type of thing. But having it so it's just,  
21 you know, year after year, maybe a couple of meetings, you  
22 know, having some oversight or getting information and  
23 data, and just making sure that it's happening the way it  
24 should be happening.

25 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So just to re-clarify,

1 especially for those who maybe have just joined the  
2 meeting, what you all are saying is you would like the  
3 EJAC group to assist with the outreach, or be involved in  
4 the outreach, to be involved in the accountability, to  
5 help the agencies prioritize, and to provide continuous  
6 oversight.

7 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: You missed the  
8 guidelines in the investment plan.

9 SARAH RUBIN: Oh, guidelines --

10 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: The guidelines on the  
11 investment plan.

12 MARI ROSE TARUC: I think there's also the idea  
13 that -- so these investments are additional greenhouse gas  
14 pollutant reduction, and so we need to be able to  
15 prioritize communities, especially as we're seeing  
16 increases in emissions through other programs, whether  
17 that's Cap-and-Trade or not; that the EJAC is making those  
18 connections and that whether that's to the ARB Board or to  
19 the Legislature or the Governor, that we need to be really  
20 heavily investing these funds into the most polluted and  
21 disadvantaged areas.

22 LUIS OLMEDO: Two things. One is that I want to  
23 make sure members of the public, just wanted to highlight  
24 that they're really concerned about the large area in  
25 Imperial, highlight it as an area that has not been

1 touched. So having said that, I do want to recommend that  
2 we play a key role in assuring that it's part of the  
3 accountability that ARB is uniform, robust and accessible,  
4 and that we play a key role in providing that oversight  
5 and accountability.

6 MARTHA ARGUELLO: I think our group said many of  
7 the same things. So we said many of the same things. We  
8 want to play a stronger advisory role around the  
9 investments. We want to -- should review the investments  
10 plan. Again, assist with outreach, but also, we want us  
11 to be the first line. And this is where we would engage  
12 our networks in being able to see on the ground where  
13 we're seeing problems with some of the investments, and  
14 figure out how we can move upstream to try to correct some  
15 of those.

16 Developing sort of guidance around some of these  
17 investments. So defining what -- defining what community  
18 benefit is, defining what transformative is, because, as  
19 someone from our community says, you know, these catalytic  
20 projects have catastrophic impacts on low-income  
21 communities. So we want to make sure we're capturing that  
22 and assisting with setting priorities.

23 SEKITA GRANT: Great. I'm glad you went before  
24 us, because two of those were the same ones that we had.

25 To define -- to support the defining and

1 tracking of the benefits in disadvantaged communities, so  
2 I want to support that. The other one, going to ground  
3 truthing specific projects and making sure that they are  
4 actually -- we are seeing the realized benefits that's  
5 being -- that are being claimed. So I want to support  
6 that, as well.

7           And then the additional one is to bring  
8 community-driven projects and ideas to funding agencies.  
9 So bringing projects from the communities that, you know,  
10 are able to receive funding and should receive funding,  
11 and knowing that it's not always easy for the State to see  
12 exactly everything that's happening, but we can play the  
13 role to bring the great projects that the communities are  
14 coming up with.

15           SARAH RUBIN: What was the second word that  
16 should be defined besides transformative?

17           MARTHA ARGUELLO: Community benefits.

18           SARAH RUBIN: I just want to make a quick little  
19 personal apology. I had eye surgery in February, and  
20 because the of the change, it's taking like three months  
21 for my brain to get back to what it used to be. And so I  
22 feel like with this stuff I'm not as sharp as my normal  
23 self, and so just thanks for being patient. I can tell  
24 I'm not my regular self.

25           Yeah, go ahead.

1           FLOYD VERGARA: So I just have a -- kind of a  
2 process question here. I'm trying to understand what you  
3 are doing here in terms of listing out elements of the  
4 EJAC's role and how this operates vis-a-vis the guiding  
5 principles that, you know, were discussed extensively in  
6 the first two EJAC meetings. So is your intent to kind of  
7 incorporate these into the guiding principles to better  
8 define the EJAC's role or --

9           SARAH RUBIN: No. This is completely specific.

10          FLOYD VERGARA: Just specific to the investment  
11 plan?

12          SARAH RUBIN: Just specific to the investment  
13 plan.

14                 And process wise, to answer your question, I  
15 actually don't have any intent. This, for me, is just  
16 taking what the members say and what the group wants to do  
17 with that, how they want to -- if they want to have that  
18 be their focus or not. That is something the group needs  
19 to decide on.

20                 Let's see, let's do a time check. It's almost  
21 2:00 o'clock. We're almost 15 minutes behind.

22                 Do I have one or two quick reactions when you  
23 look at this up here? You know, we had a couple of things  
24 where people checked, when we get up and do some stuff  
25 around the room, people could put more checks of the items

1 that are most important. Any reactions to what you see?

2 No? Okay.

3 For the sake of getting through everything, I'm  
4 going to suggest we let this sit for a moment and we move  
5 on. Okay. So Stephanie, you are going to be up next.

6 Anybody need like a three-minute bathroom break?  
7 So let's take like a very short three-minute break, grab a  
8 drink, run to the restroom, and we'll start the next  
9 agenda item.

10 MARI ROSE TARUC: Can people do that  
11 individually? I feel like there's two major sections that  
12 we need to --

13 SARAH RUBIN: All right. We'll keep going. Get  
14 a drink, stand up if you're getting tired, and why don't  
15 we have Stephanie move us to the next agenda item. And  
16 can you do a little bigger like what you are going to be  
17 talking about since we have new folks here.

18

19 - TARGET SCOPING PLAN: PART 4 -

20 STEPHANIE KATO: So basically, I've been giving  
21 updates on some of the interagency working group  
22 discussions, and those are groups made up of about 25  
23 different State agencies. They are divided up by economic  
24 sector. And so what I'm going to be talking about is the  
25 industrial sector, and we've already had some

1 conversations about transportation and energy.

2           And what those groups have been doing is, doing  
3 an inventory of measures that have been adopted or newly  
4 adopted, the concepts that would be new for this Scoping  
5 Plan, and then getting, you know, feedback from EJAC on  
6 whether these are a complete list, because we're tending  
7 to utilize this list of measures in the modeling scenarios  
8 to see if can get to our 40 percent reduction target by  
9 2030.

10           So for this category, I'll just highlight some  
11 of the actions since the original Scoping Plan and some of  
12 the more recent activity. So ARB has adopted a regulation  
13 requiring large industrial facilities to conduct an energy  
14 efficiency assessment of greenhouse gases, and also  
15 determine potential emission reduction opportunities.  
16 Those -- results of those audits have been compiled into  
17 reports, and I understand they are being posted on our  
18 page as they get completed.

19           ARB staff is also currently working on oil and  
20 gas regulation, and that would apply to the production,  
21 processing and storage phase of that. It's intended to  
22 reduce fugitive and vented emissions for new and existing  
23 gas facilities, and that is anticipated to go to Board for  
24 adoption during the first quarter of next year.

25           Some of the measures on high global warming

1 potential gas actions, or early action measures that the  
2 ARB did adopt at the January 2010 deadline, several of  
3 those are actually listed in this table. Further  
4 improvement in that area is proposed under the Short-lived  
5 Climate Pollutant Strategy, and in this table, the reason  
6 why the last four line items pertaining to ITWP gases are  
7 listed as possible, is because we feel that the most  
8 traction in that area can be achieved through national and  
9 international agreements. And we're hoping that action on  
10 the Montreal Protocol sometime this year will actually get  
11 us there. If we don't reach agreement, then we are  
12 talking about ARB evaluating feasibility of a program just  
13 for California. So that's why those are listed as  
14 possible, at least at this juncture.

15           The other major measure for this category is the  
16 Cap-and-Trade Regulation Program. I understand EJAC had a  
17 deep dive conversation with program staff about the  
18 current amendments that we're working on for the third  
19 compliance period, and also to get alignment for the  
20 Federal Clean Power Plan. And so I understand that I  
21 think there was a deep dive last Friday on conversations  
22 about the sector based offset credits --

23           THE REPORTER: Sorry, I didn't get that.

24           STEPHANIE KATO: There was a deep dive  
25 conversation last Friday on offset credits for forest

1 deforestation. So I don't -- those are the main things I  
2 wanted to highlight. I don't know if EJAC members wanted  
3 to provide updates on the deep dives, but --

4 TRISH JOHNSON: Just to add to what Stephanie  
5 just said, there was a specific ask by three EJAC members  
6 and one person from an environmental justice organization,  
7 not a member of the EJAC, to specifically discuss concerns  
8 about the proposal for sector-based international offsets.  
9 So there was a conference call held. Mari Rose was on the  
10 phone along with Katie, and Martha was invited, but I  
11 don't think she was able to call in. The non EJAC member  
12 was Amy Vanderwarker.

13 SARAH RUBIN: Stephanie, do you want to just  
14 finish everything else you have to present, and then we'll  
15 take comment from the deep dives and then go right into  
16 the recommendations, so we can kind of get to the  
17 recommendations.

18 STEPHANIE KATO: I mean, I hadn't intended to go  
19 through these line by line. I think they kind of got the  
20 flavor that on the GWP side, we are looking to the SLCP  
21 Strategy for movement on that if you don't get national  
22 and international agreements, you know what's happening  
23 Cap-and-Trade, maybe something we can focus on is if  
24 either there's specific policy surrounding Cap-and-Trade  
25 or because I didn't mention earlier that we were planning

1 to do a greenhouse gas scenario in the modeling that would  
2 not include Cap-and-Trade, then, you know, I think there's  
3 the assumption that we will be short of our 40 percent  
4 target. So where could we get more traction in some of  
5 the other areas, either that are currently regulated or  
6 maybe new areas.

7 SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

8 MARI ROSE TARUC: We are also covering reports  
9 that there was adaptive management and offsets.

10 TRISH JOHNSON: Sure. I was wondering if you  
11 wanted some additional detail about the deep dives. The  
12 bulk of the deep dives actually did pertain to the  
13 Cap-and-Trade Program. The first deep dive was regarding  
14 the Adaptive Management Program, which is to assess the  
15 impacts of Cap-and-Trade as it's implemented.  
16 Additionally, we had one specific to the Cap-and-Trade  
17 Program, where we talked about the mandatory reporting of  
18 greenhouse gas emissions.

19 Also, there was a second series held, where we  
20 talked about the Clean Power Plan and California's  
21 compliance with it utilizing the Cap-and-Trade Program.  
22 And then finally, a part of that, we did get into the  
23 sector-based international offsets, since those are right  
24 now going through an informal public process for comment.

25 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So we -- I

1 participated in most of the deep dives and on the  
2 additional REDD calls, after a request from SAHA that sent  
3 a letter asking for delays in that, those public  
4 workshops. What I had learned -- one of the interesting  
5 things that I have learned that I did not know is that an  
6 adaptive management tool, for those of you who signed on  
7 and looked at, that total number emissions. I was worried  
8 that that was an emission like post auction and, you know,  
9 numbers, but that is the actual number. And so I  
10 appreciated Tom's analysis looking at just a simple  
11 comparison of California and the rate of increase in Kern.

12           What we are seeing across the state is that  
13 emissions are going up pretty significantly, and they've  
14 been going up since 2010. That rate of change is very  
15 different in environmental justice communities. And Tom  
16 pulled the numbers for Kern County. He even had a little  
17 chart that he generated from the adaptive management tool  
18 that illustrated the startling accelerated rate of  
19 increase in Kern County versus the state as a whole.

20           So I think when talk about modeling, I keep  
21 noticing that ARB staff was saying modeling without  
22 Cap-and-Trade. And I don't just want this to be a if we  
23 do nothing modeling scenario. We're also looking for --  
24 and I keep repeating it because I think it's important to  
25 clarify -- like, we want a model that's without

1 Cap-and-Trade that includes other potential programs.  
2 What would it like if it was a carbon tax? What would it  
3 look like if it were these other approaches? Not just a  
4 with or without --

5 THE REPORTER: Slow down.

6 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Sorry.

7 Not just a with or without Cap-and-Trade option,  
8 because of course, if we just took Cap-and-Trade off the  
9 table and didn't replace it with anything, of course it's  
10 going to be terrible. Right? So I don't want that to be  
11 the restriction of the modeling that we do.

12 And I also -- we brought this up on the call on  
13 Friday, so I'll just repeat it for the group. I'm  
14 troubled that there's been really continuous concerns  
15 about social justice and environmental justice rights in  
16 these international communities, where we're talking about  
17 creating these new offset programs. I'm concerned both  
18 for their rights, because there is no history of these  
19 countries working well with their indigenous populations.  
20 There's actually a very different history in those  
21 communities that I'm worried would be accelerated with the  
22 focus of CARB allowing more industries that play a more  
23 active role in those countries. But I'm also concerned  
24 from a fact that we are not seeing emissions going down in  
25 California, and so before we say, Oh we've used all the

1 offsets we can use, we're going to move to another  
2 country, I want to see us actually seeing the reductions  
3 here. I want us to actually max out on what we can do  
4 here before we start allowing industries to go out of  
5 state. I think that's important, and I think it's the  
6 least we can do.

7           And I'm troubled that despite these repeat,  
8 repeat, repeat objections for environmental justice  
9 communities on programs like REDD -- which for  
10 clarification, REDD is the acronym for this international  
11 program that would allow industries to basically go out  
12 and save forests in Brazil and in Mexico instead of when  
13 they pollute here. But despite continued objections, the  
14 process just kind of seems to keep moving forward, and  
15 that's a really big problem, and that's why the SAHA  
16 letter went out, is it was this general feeling that they  
17 -- nobody was being listened to.

18           So I hope that that's something that the EJAC  
19 would concur, and I would make a formal recommendation  
20 that REDD not be included in the Scoping Plan. And that  
21 is it.

22           SARAH RUBIN: Gisele.

23           GISELE FONG: I just have a process question on  
24 the deep dives. So can we just clarify? So for the deep  
25 dives, is it only that those folks that have signed up for

1 those different group things get invited to the deep  
2 dives? Because I -- I mean, I don't -- I know I wouldn't  
3 be able to come to all, and I appreciate the reports back,  
4 but there are others that I really actually would be  
5 interested in, like the adaptive management tool and so  
6 forth. So just process wise, how -- is it only the folks  
7 that signed up for them or, you know, is there a way of  
8 including more EJAC members if folks want to be part of  
9 those discussions or part of those presentations and  
10 discussions?

11 TRISH JOHNSON: So the deep dives were proposed  
12 at the February 5th committee meeting. And at that same  
13 meeting, each of you signed up for specific working  
14 groups. That allowed us to have an informal discussion  
15 with a small number of you and not have to publicly notice  
16 it. If there is seven or more members, that's a quorum of  
17 the committee, and we're required to publicly notice the  
18 meeting ten days in advance and make sure we can also  
19 accommodate members of the public that are interested. So  
20 these informal discussions -- they can also be called a  
21 one-on-one -- gives us a chance to go over our program and  
22 also hear specific questions from you so that you can work  
23 on your recommendations for the Scoping Plan.

24 While we've had the ones that we've discussed  
25 today, we can continue to have more. If you want to have

1 more than seven members, then we can ten-day notice it in  
2 advance and make sure that the public can also  
3 participate, or you can keep it into a smaller group, and  
4 then we can continue to have these informal, you know,  
5 one-on-one discussions about the program to -- to further  
6 help you specifically so you can contribute to the  
7 committee's recommendations.

8 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you for that clarification.

9 So especially for the students who came in,  
10 behind you on this wall are these different sector areas  
11 that we're talking about, and you see the names of the  
12 members who've signed up. The orange stickies are these  
13 deep dives or kind of one-on-one deeper discussions that  
14 ARB is putting on, and the yellow ones are proposed. And  
15 my goal is that we get more of those yellow ones on today  
16 so that ARB is clear on what you want.

17 When I look at those lists of people, generally,  
18 you are not really close to seven, so more people  
19 generally should be able to join. So I didn't see the  
20 order that all these things went up, so why don't we go --  
21 we'll go Tom, Kevin, and then we'll circle back.

22 TOM FRANTZ: Okay. I guess two things on that  
23 adaptive management issue that I made comments on and  
24 Katie pointed out, the draft there showed Kern County  
25 emissions planning 7 million tons over a four-year period,

1 2011 through 2014. So 7 million increase in that county.  
2 That means criteria air pollutants that are associated  
3 with those increased greenhouse gas emissions were also  
4 climate. That doesn't mean our air quality got worse  
5 because there's so many things that come into play there,  
6 but we certainly had an increase. So I would like to  
7 see -- I don't know if Johnnie does this or who, but you  
8 said that when that situation occurs in the future on the  
9 Adaptive Management Plan, the study that we have, to see  
10 if any of those increases were due to things such as  
11 Cap-and-Trade.

12 So I would like to see a preliminary study done  
13 on that Kern County situation to see what the study would  
14 even look like in the future if -- you know, explain why  
15 emissions went up, how it was or was not related to  
16 Cap-and-Trade, and how co-pollutants may have gone up or  
17 down at the same time. And I'd like to see -- it would be  
18 like a practice study for the future that we could all see  
19 and make comments on that to see if it helps out. Is that  
20 possible?

21 JOHNIE RAYMOND: So -- so what we do is -- the  
22 current process, we look at individual facilities and  
23 where emissions are going over time. We look at  
24 situations where you have a group of facilities and see  
25 where the emissions are going. When we're given the

1 analysis with the grouping of facilities, we'll also  
2 compare that to the corresponding county level emissions  
3 as well as maybe at the air district or a larger  
4 geographic scale. That -- that will all be part of the  
5 research, the review of the emissions and the analysis.  
6 So we look at whether or not emissions are going up, are  
7 going flat, and then also observing if they are going to  
8 be decreasing.

9 Now, when we prioritize, of course we look at  
10 the increases, but also through this, you were bringing up  
11 co-pollutants. And so if we see situations where  
12 emissions going up, we'll look at the corresponding  
13 criteria and toxic emissions for those facilities and see  
14 if those are going up. Because again, those -- those  
15 would be causing the localized impacts, not necessarily  
16 the greenhouse gases.

17 Greenhouse gases are used as a surrogate or  
18 proxy for changes in the emissions in connection to AB32  
19 related activities, which could be one reason, could be  
20 Cap-and-Trade, could be changes in the efficiency, or  
21 changes in production, or it could be a whole gamut of  
22 different reasons why emissions are going up or down. And  
23 it would just be part of our analysis to go through try to  
24 investigate what is going on in these situations.

25 TOM FRANTZ: So I'm requesting, can you do that

1 analysis?

2 FLOYD VERGARA: Let me -- let me answer that  
3 question directly. When we go to the Board this year for  
4 our proposal for adaptive management, that is exactly what  
5 we're planning to do is layout the process and also  
6 discuss, to some degree, kind of a preliminary analysis.  
7 Basically, a run-through of the process that we've laid  
8 out, and kind of discuss with the Board and the public  
9 what that suggest. And then, you know, as we define the  
10 process in the coming months, we'll get into the, you  
11 know, what are the post potential causes and some of the  
12 things you are talking about. So that -- the kind of  
13 pilot scale evaluation is exactly what we're proposing to  
14 do.

15 SEKITA GRANT: Thank you. I'll look forward to  
16 that.

17 SARAH RUBIN: I just have to remind everyone, we  
18 are kind of quickly running out of time. We have 15 more  
19 minutes for this piece, and we want to get from you every  
20 single recommendation folks have. So even though it's  
21 super frustrating, the more you could be like, Here is the  
22 wording in my recommendation. If we have time left within  
23 the 15 minutes, then we can come back for more Q and A.

24 TOM FRANTZ: I'm recommending that an analysis  
25 be done.

1           But on the REDD program, this -- let me give an  
2 analogy. I'm fortunate enough to own about five acres up  
3 in the Sequoia National Monument and several thousand  
4 trees up there. I can -- I can, in theory, cut a lot of  
5 those trees down. I could do logging up there. I'd have  
6 to get -- there's a lot of permitting, but I could do it.  
7 Someone could pay me not to do that. That'd be fine. I  
8 don't intend to do it anyway.

9           But about half of my trees died in the last two  
10 years. And you know why, it's climate change. It's all  
11 these greenhouse gas emissions that we're putting into the  
12 air. So even though you are paying me to protect that  
13 forest, it would still -- it's still being destroyed. So  
14 you got to get real reduction somewhere here in California  
15 to stop -- the tropical forests are being destroyed  
16 because of the -- because of California's emissions and  
17 the rest of the rich world's emissions and our consumers.  
18 That's what's driving the destruction of the tropical  
19 forest. Our greenhouse gas emissions up here and our  
20 demand for more and more and more, it's destroying our  
21 tropical forests. Yet you are saying with this REDD  
22 Program that the oil industry can keep polluting our air  
23 in Kern County, keep putting massive amounts of greenhouse  
24 gases in the air, and mitigate that by protecting the  
25 tropical forests. It makes zero sense. So don't --

1 disregard that whole REDD idea and get the offsets in  
2 California.

3 Put electric vehicles and solar panels into the  
4 hands of low-income people, and that's a real offset for  
5 the emissions from our fossil fuel and such. It's just  
6 nonsense when you talk about -- you can't validate what  
7 you're doing in these tropical forests anyways. No way to  
8 validate any gain. There's all kinds of problems with it.  
9 I don't have time to go through the five or six more  
10 problems with the REDD program, but anyhow, I'll put it in  
11 writing.

12 KEVIN HAMILTON: So I want to support Katie and  
13 Tom's position on this. You're right on target. This  
14 idea that you would somehow allow the industry in this  
15 state to -- the recommendation just stands, essentially,  
16 that the REDD program should be dead. Simple enough. I  
17 don't want to, you know, keep harking back to the '80s or  
18 anything like that. But the point is that program needs  
19 to die with -- there's no way to verify in any of the  
20 trades that are happening. We're dealing with communities  
21 and governments that are not sustainable in and of  
22 themselves and have proven in the past that they are not  
23 capable of meeting their own obligations or willing to be  
24 held accountable to those.

25 So -- and it just goes against good common

1 sense. If there is a place within the community, within  
2 California, to get that same reduction to invest that  
3 credit money and get a credit for it, why would we send it  
4 somewhere else? Why would we do that? Again, I agree  
5 with you a hundred percent there.

6 The other piece goes to the Power Plan, the U.S.  
7 Power Plan and the National Power -- I would recommend  
8 that we use our leverage in buying power peak hours from  
9 other states to ensure that that power is coming from a  
10 power plant that is a sustainable, renewable energy power  
11 plant. So if we're buying that power from Idaho or Utah  
12 or Texas, where they still have a lot of coal fire  
13 plants -- and communities are fighting the battles right  
14 now to get those plants out of there, and some of them are  
15 losing those battles. I'm not saying to get our lawyers  
16 to go out there after them, I'm saying we've got a lot of  
17 money here. We buy that power and it generates a lot of  
18 income for the folks who own those plants.

19 So there are clean energy plants in those same  
20 areas, so we need to make sure that it's written into the  
21 plan that when we reach peak hours and we're bringing  
22 power in from out of state -- and we do and we will.  
23 We'll do it again this year. It might come early this  
24 year, in fact -- that we ensure that that power is coming  
25 from a renewable source. And that's it.

1                   MARTHA ARGUELLO: I have a specific  
2 recommendation. I would like to recommend that there be  
3 one other member of EJAC put on the Adaptive Management  
4 Working Group that CARB has right now. There's myself,  
5 someone from the Lung Association, someone from the Center  
6 for Economic and Environmental Balance, and WSPA, and Ag  
7 Industry. So I think that that is not a balanced group.  
8 It would be wonderful to have another person from EJAC on  
9 that.

10                   And then the other, I want to reiterate, this is  
11 exactly what the first EJAC said. We want benefits in  
12 California first. This is what we hear from the  
13 Legislature, when they talk about benefits not coming to  
14 some communities, the benefits that aren't coming to most  
15 communities right now are actually clean air benefits.  
16 And until we get that right, we should not be exporting  
17 our human rights problems to other places with the REDD  
18 program.

19                   SARAH RUBIN: Can you just pass it down.

20                   FLOYD VERGARA: Can I respond to that real  
21 quick?

22                   SARAH RUBIN: Yeah.

23                   FLOYD VERGARA: So, Martha, I really appreciate  
24 the suggestion for additional representation from EJAC on  
25 the Adaptive Management Work Group. We're happy to

1 consider that. You know, as you noted, there are three  
2 representatives for industry, so if the EJAC members would  
3 care to nominate someone, I'd be happy to put that  
4 together and incorporate that person into the next work  
5 group meeting.

6 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Let's keep going with  
7 comments. You can think about if you want to nominate  
8 someone. Let's keep going around. We'll come back to  
9 that.

10 MARI ROSE TARUC: I was part of the -- I was  
11 part of the deep dives for both Cap-and-Trade and offsets,  
12 and so I want to be able to give a little bit of a report  
13 to get to the recommendations.

14 I think one of the most shocking things -- and  
15 for the folks in the room who aren't familiar with this  
16 topic, I think the industrial strategy of the state of  
17 California through the Air Resources Board has been the  
18 most contentious with the environmental justice community.  
19 We -- there have been big fights between the Environmental  
20 Justice Advisory Committee and the Air Resources Board  
21 because they chose the Cap-and-Trade program, where they  
22 allow polluters to instead of reducing their emissions in  
23 our communities, they can trade their allowances or buy  
24 offsets in other places that aren't in our communities, so  
25 that those polluting industries can continue to pollute

1 it. So this is a big -- an important topic for us to get  
2 right and to capture our sentiments around it.

3 So in the deep dive, one of the things that I  
4 learned, especially looking at the Adaptive Management  
5 Tool in the emissions reporting, that tool that ARB put  
6 out, is that I kept wondering, how do we know if a  
7 facility is over their limit of emissions? And basically,  
8 right now, we can't -- there is no limit per facility,  
9 because the limit is economy wide. Meaning, if the entire  
10 economy of California is reducing its emissions, then  
11 we're okay. Even if the emissions in EJ communities is  
12 going up. So that's not okay.

13 So there's a problem with the design of the  
14 Cap-and-Trade system that's allowing this pollution to go  
15 up in our communities as long as it's being reduced  
16 somewhere else in California or somewhere else in the  
17 world. So that is a huge problem.

18 We can -- so one of the recommendations related  
19 to that, is I think if we were to continue with  
20 Cap-and-Trade, we need to make sure that there -- we are  
21 measuring and creating caps to emissions based on sectors  
22 and facilities. Because if we can't track what those  
23 facilities or sectors inside the industry are polluting,  
24 then it's not effective, and we can't force them to reduce  
25 their emissions.

1           Another thing that I heard from the deep dives  
2 is -- let's see, there's a lot. I have a lot of notes. A  
3 lot of what we hear around offsets is -- oh, there's other  
4 things. Allowance -- when they -- when they have these  
5 allowances per metric ton of carbon, they allow -- right  
6 now, it's about -- if you had a ten dollar bill, you could  
7 buy a metric ton of carbon dioxide, so, you know, if  
8 you're Chevron, you could buy a whole bunch of those.

9           KEVIN HAMILTON: \$12.

10           MARI ROSE TARUC: \$12. Ten dollars is the  
11 floor. What we're seeing is they continue to offer the  
12 price of the allowance at that low amount, and part of it  
13 is in the auctions. The lowest price is what they are  
14 accommodating instead of the highest auction price  
15 offered. And so that is also design flaw in the  
16 Cap-and-Trade system. Yeah, so the price is too low. And  
17 I hear that the ARB Board or by statute can actually help  
18 increase that amount, so looking to you Dean and Diane.

19           SARAH RUBIN: Should we be getting that one on  
20 the board?

21           MARI ROSE TARUC: Yeah. If we are to continue  
22 with the Cap-and-Trade system, we need some design fixes.  
23 So that includes what I said at first around the sectors  
24 and the facilities being given limits to their pollution.  
25 There's making sure the price is actually the real price

1 of carbon, not just the lowest price. That the auction  
2 price should not be the lowest price offered, but the  
3 highest price offered.

4 And then under offset, so folks have talked  
5 about offsets. Most of what I heard from staff is that  
6 offsets are allowed into the program because they want  
7 to -- to make it affordable for polluters to pollute in  
8 California. And so that doesn't make sense to us in EJ  
9 communities, because we want it to be as unaffordable as  
10 possible so that they can reduce their emissions. So we  
11 want to make sure that offsets are not used to pollute  
12 more in our communities. So there needs to be some way to  
13 limit or eliminate offsets.

14 So one of the things that I have been seeing --  
15 so in the energy sector, there's actually a loading order  
16 for which energy should be prioritized first. Like, for  
17 instance, do renewables first and do distributed  
18 generation, et cetera, et cetera, before they can get to a  
19 gas power plant. So there could be a loading order for  
20 the offsets in California. We can say it has -- you know,  
21 it should be primarily EJ first, and if you can't do that,  
22 then it has to be California, and then if you can't do  
23 that, don't do it at all, especially not the international  
24 REDD forestry offsets. And that there should be a  
25 consultation with environmental justice communities in

1 California and these indigenous groups, tribes, where  
2 these offset programs may be created. So it has to be --  
3 there has to be a consultation to reduce the risk to our  
4 communities, or eliminate the risks.

5 Oh, and last one, we -- since with energy we  
6 have an RPS of something like -- in SB350, we have to get  
7 to 50 percent renewables by 2030. I think we should --  
8 even though that part of the bill in SB350 around oil and  
9 gas didn't get included, let's put it in the Scoping Plan.  
10 Let's aim for 50 percent reduction in -- in oil and gas  
11 sectors. Okay.

12 LUIS OLMEDO: Another comment on the deep dives.  
13 I think these deep dives need to be attestable to  
14 everyone, every member. I'm not here participating  
15 partially, I'm here participating wholly. I need to be a  
16 part of every -- all materials and all information, and  
17 they should be Livestream. We have Livestream here. I  
18 don't see why they can't be Livestream and make it  
19 available to the public. There should not be any  
20 conversations, discussions that are coming out of ARB that  
21 should not be available to the public. And I think  
22 there's a way probably to Livestream and get all members  
23 involved and give them the link. And people can  
24 participate as, you know -- as they would like to  
25 participate. It may not be as interactive, but I think

1 people can, you know, have their questions either answered  
2 at the moment or later.

3 But I also wanted to make couple mentions. One  
4 is I think it's important to have mandatory reporting and  
5 real time monitoring and oversight. And -- and if there  
6 is no capacity to do real time monitoring, and if that  
7 needs to be built in, then you need to put serious  
8 consideration into crowd sourcing and citizen science.

9 Also, it seems to me that -- you know, just to  
10 give you an example of the So Cal mandate, it seems to be  
11 always the case that it's cheaper to mitigate elsewhere  
12 instead of where these incidents are occurring. And that  
13 is something that, again, these types of offsets need to  
14 happen where the emissions issues are occurring, not  
15 somewhere else.

16 And the steps is also something I wanted to  
17 bring in. You know, with an ARB, what is the mechanism to  
18 bring restitution to these communities where these  
19 violations are occurring, and what is the responsibility  
20 of ARB when it comes to its projects? That's hard to  
21 bring out. You know, these programs, you know, these  
22 steps need to go back to these communities where these  
23 violations are occurring, and I don't think ARB currently  
24 has a program or a plan on how they are going to do that.  
25 And so I'd like to see more of that going back to the

1 communities, disadvantaged communities, or any community  
2 where these violations are occurring.

3 REY LEON: I just got informed that the webcast  
4 that is in our EJAC URL or web page is not on the calendar  
5 or on the workshops page of ARB on the webcast page. I  
6 would recommend to verify that, I guess.

7 Also for the deep dives, it would good to  
8 include them on those, as well.

9 TRISH JOHNSON: We did put this EJAC meeting on  
10 the climate change events calendar, on all climate -- or  
11 all-AB32 relates events.

12 REY LEON: On the webcast and workshops?

13 TRISH JOHNSON: Yes.

14 REY LEON: Okay. Good. Then my contacts are  
15 fired.

16 Okay. Now, what I wanted to say, you know, very  
17 seriously, you know, just been listening the whole day and  
18 chiming in when I can. But I mean first of all, I'm glad  
19 we're -- we're having this meeting in a rural area, you  
20 know, a disadvantaged area, a region that needs a great  
21 deal of attention. This area reminds of me my region in  
22 San Joaquin Valley. You know, and many times it feels  
23 like we're the rural red-headed step children of the state  
24 of California, where we don't get the -- an equitable cut  
25 of the resources for infrastructure and a number of other

1 things.

2           And so just thinking about that, a couple of  
3 sessions back, we put in a recommendation where Luis was  
4 able to adjust the language to add geography, but even  
5 after we left it there, it said "in consideration," taking  
6 geography "into consideration." And I would like to go  
7 back to that at some point. You know, it doesn't half to  
8 be now and take up more time, but to make it intentional  
9 that, you know, the geography should be a part of -- of --  
10 of the process and the -- and the -- you know, equitably  
11 distributing resources. That's -- you know, a lot of  
12 organizations, that's what we do, but I think sometimes  
13 folks forget about us -- us -- us campesinos, you know,  
14 and we've got to speak up to make sure that we aren't  
15 forgotten.

16           And Luis makes an excellent point in regards to  
17 monitoring, air quality monitoring. When I first started  
18 air quality work, one thing that I noticed in the maps  
19 showing the pollution, the east side of the San Joaquin  
20 Valley was the most polluted. Later, I see a map of where  
21 all the air quality monitors were at. Guess where they're  
22 at? On the east side of the valley. At that point, I  
23 worked with more of the legislators and we starting  
24 working towards putting up the first air quality monitor  
25 on the west side. We were able to do, but it was one out

1 of a whole huge span of area that has them. Right? And I  
2 think we just need more air quality monitors in a lot of  
3 these rural areas where humans are breathing, where humans  
4 are living, and where, you know, communities like Avenal  
5 don't get left out of the -- the Plus Up program because  
6 they don't have a monitor that, you know, shares exactly  
7 what's going on in terms of the air quality, and their  
8 demographics are muffled because of the prison and  
9 whatever, whatever.

10           You know, I think there's a special attention  
11 that needs to be paid for rural areas, and I think  
12 sometimes our colleagues just miss. And I think at the  
13 next meeting -- I think we -- we need to keep having these  
14 meetings in rural areas. I think at the next one, I'd  
15 invite it to be in Huron, California, San Joaquin Valley,  
16 the west side. You know, the same area that is  
17 continuously considered by the American Human Development  
18 Report as the poorest, least -- provided the least  
19 education and healthiness, you know, in some respects. In  
20 other respects, they're a lot healthier because we still  
21 eat a lot of tortillas. So anyhow -- so -- so yeah, just  
22 a big, you know, reminder that rural areas are -- we need  
23 a lot special -- you know, more attention. Let's put it  
24 that way.

25           SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So Martha has been waiting,

1 and then I'm going to come back to Luis.

2 MARTHA ARGUELLO: So some patience from the  
3 committee members. I -- I was on the adaptive management,  
4 two of the calls, and have been sort of thinking about it.  
5 I think -- I think we really do need to think about what  
6 are the -- you know, what are the data sources we want  
7 CARB to look at.

8 Then the other issue is this issue of authority.  
9 So we've talked about we all want real time reporting  
10 about what's happening. But one of the things I hadn't  
11 thought about is, actually, some of these aren't  
12 violations. They may be increases, but they're not  
13 technically violations. So it means that facility by  
14 facility may have -- overall in the region, things have  
15 gone up. But when you look at facility by facility, that  
16 one is still complying with its permit, that one is still  
17 complying with its permit.

18 So these are fundamental design flaws that I  
19 don't know that we have a handle on just yet in terms of  
20 -- I think we know what data we want, but what to do and  
21 how to understand that data, and then what to do once  
22 you -- once CARB has collected data. And I can't believe  
23 I'm saying this, but there's not a lot they can do because  
24 it's at the Air District level who has the authority to  
25 act. So we're going to have to figure that out. And

1 maybe the best thing we can do in this first year is  
2 figure out the architecture for the data collection that  
3 we need and really think about it carefully and what is in  
4 your purview of CARB to do.

5           And then I'm not sure what to do with the rest  
6 of it, because, you know, we work -- we gave up working at  
7 the Air District because we couldn't do anything under  
8 Barry, and now things just got worse. So, you know,  
9 that's where -- you know, that's where we live. We don't  
10 want emissions to go up at the local level, but we don't  
11 really have the tools not only to measure it, but what  
12 happens when they're legally allowed to permit that much  
13 and what does that mean.

14           You know, so -- I -- yeah, that -- I know I  
15 don't have a recommendation or a thought, but it's been  
16 really troubling me that we don't have -- yeah, right, we  
17 don't -- we don't have tools. And so we -- all we do is  
18 talk at cross purposes. So that, if anything else, we've  
19 got to figure that one out.

20           SARAH RUBIN: Johnnie, do you want to respond?

21           JOHNNIE RAYMOND: So one thing I wanted to look  
22 at and maybe know, Martha has been talking about a work  
23 group, and I just didn't want it to get -- get everyone  
24 confused with deep dives with other things that are going  
25 on with EJAC. So let me just give you just a little bit

1 of an overview of what the work group is and what's the  
2 purpose of it.

3 SARAH RUBIN: Which work group?

4 JOHNNIE RAYMOND: So it's the adaptive  
5 management work group.

6 SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

7 JOHNNIE RAYMOND: So -- so we -- we assembled  
8 the adaptive management work group really to help us out  
9 with identifying when we review these emission trends --  
10 and, you know, part of Tom's recommendation is looking at  
11 county level emissions -- and so at what point does it  
12 further -- does it trigger ARB staff to do a full blown  
13 analysis of a deeper dive into the data? And so Martha  
14 sits on -- as a major environmental justice key player  
15 within that work group. Also in the work group, we have  
16 industry representatives, as well as public health,  
17 environmental, NGOs, we have the local air districts  
18 sitting on the work group, and so we've had a couple  
19 meetings so far, and we plan to continue a couple more  
20 meetings where the work group will, you know, discuss and  
21 hopefully come to a consensus on how ARB staff, us, how we  
22 proceed with reviewing emissions and identifying emission  
23 changes that warrant us to take a deeper dive and further  
24 review. So hopefully that helps.

25 SARAH RUBIN: Go ahead, Luis.

1                   LUIS OLMEDO: Okay. I've got about three points  
2 here. One is, when we started the meeting, we talked  
3 about the need for resources, the importance of resources.  
4 I think we're moving in the right direction. I think  
5 there's a lot more that is being provided in terms of  
6 resources to the advisory, but we're still not there yet.  
7 We still have a lot of cells, locals that are moving along  
8 ideas, moving along recommendations, moving along the  
9 development and the rule-making, and we're not privy to  
10 any of that. And so I want to encourage that we get the  
11 proper resources so that we are able to be informed in  
12 every aspect and at least have the opportunity to be a  
13 part of it. Otherwise, we're not really -- it's -- a  
14 fundamental problem is that we're still disadvantaged even  
15 as an advisory.

16                   But the only thing I wanted to point out is,  
17 just in following up with Rey in in terms of making  
18 things -- he said -- what was it that you mentioned --

19                   REY LEON: Instead of consideration.

20                   LUIS OLMEDO: Instead of consider, making it  
21 a -- and like for that to happen --

22                   SARAH RUBIN: Geographically.

23                   LUIS OLMEDO: -- right now versus saving it for  
24 later.

25                   SARAH RUBIN: Is that on the list? Did we get

1 that on the list?

2 LUIS OLMEDO: Yeah, if you could put it on the  
3 white paper that I think that should be changed. And  
4 so --

5 SARAH RUBIN: I'm sorry, Trish, is this the list  
6 of recommendations?

7 TRISH JOHNSON: Yeah.

8 SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

9 TRISH JOHNSON: But you said it was on the white  
10 paper?

11 SARAH RUBIN: So do we need to retype it? Let's  
12 make sure we have it.

13 (Simultaneous speaking.)

14 SARAH RUBIN: For our note taker, we need to  
15 speak one at a time. Would someone like to repeat what  
16 you would like the recommendation to be so we have it for  
17 the record, please?

18 MARI ROSE TARUC: So the geographic  
19 consideration was initially in the transportation  
20 recommendation, so -- so you mark it here and you also  
21 mark it in the transportation recommendations that instead  
22 of putting "geographic considerations," you would put  
23 "geographic equity."

24 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So Trish, use "geographic  
25 equity" rather than "geographic consideration."

1           Rey and Luis, do you feel like that language  
2 gets it, or would you like different language?

3           REY LEON: Well, Eleanor really makes a good  
4 point in terms of -- because it's a density; right? It's  
5 one of the reasons why, you know, we are, you know, less  
6 competitive is partially or in great part due to the lack  
7 of density that, say, you know, Boyle Heights has to, you  
8 know, Huron, or something of the sort. You know, and so,  
9 yeah, that's -- how can we term that? I mean, you know,  
10 I'll put it out there for recommendations.

11           SARAH RUBIN: Do you want different language, or  
12 can you live with this language, at least for now?

13           LUIS OLMEDO: It's fine.

14           So here's my final question. There's a lot of  
15 recommendations going around, a lot of comments, but I  
16 want to hear from ARB. You know, we have, I think, a very  
17 good representation. I understand not everybody is here,  
18 but I'd like to know how is that going to be moving  
19 forward? You know, I just go back to the meeting we had  
20 in Sacramento, and that just felt like that worked  
21 wonders. But we've had many of these meetings and things  
22 seem to go -- moving very slowly. And so I'd like to know  
23 how we can make this happen?

24           KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So Luis, if I may, so  
25 when we designed this agenda, our goal, our primary goal,

1 is to make sure that at least we knew what all the initial  
2 recommendations were for the first draft, because that's  
3 going to come out in May. Part of the next step that I  
4 would like to see from staff -- and I was going to bring  
5 this up at the end, but I'll bring it up now -- is to have  
6 an accounting of the recommendations we made and whether  
7 or not they were included in the draft Scoping Plan that  
8 we'll see in May and why. So that's part of the next  
9 step. But just simply due to time and the urgency for  
10 this draft plan, we're trying to make it through all the  
11 sections to make sure at least our initial thoughts are  
12 recorded before they respond in the Scoping Plan.

13           LUIS OLMEDO: I understand we're not going to  
14 get into details, but let me just say this: That I think  
15 there's a lot that can be done in terms of building  
16 confidence of the advisory that things are going to get  
17 done. And I think everybody here is committed, but it's  
18 always a little refresher to know, yes, we're going to  
19 make it happen, and I think that's very important.  
20 Because that gives the confidence to be able to go to the  
21 executive staff, to the board members that I know that are  
22 there to help us and support us in this. And I think it  
23 never gets old to get the reaffirmation that we have -- we  
24 are going to get the resources, we are going to get the  
25 access, we're going to make it equitable, we're going to

1 make it accessible.

2 FLOYD VERGARA: Thanks, Luis and Katie. I  
3 appreciate those comments. What we intend to do is -- you  
4 know, part of the reason why we have a court reporter here  
5 is so that we can have a much better idea of the exact  
6 recommendations that are provided. As you've noted, they  
7 were coming out fast and furious there. We need time to  
8 get them processed, and then, you know, make sure that the  
9 court reporter certifies them as accurate. So we're  
10 willing to, you know, pay additional funding to expedite  
11 the processing of the transcript so that the staff can  
12 then start working on responding to the recommendations  
13 and at least at the next one.

14 I heard earlier that there was a suggestion to  
15 have a quick follow up to this one like in ten days. I  
16 don't know if we have, you know, the ability to respond to  
17 all of the recommendations within ten days, because there  
18 is a certain amount time the court reporter requires to go  
19 through and validate all the transcript. What I can say  
20 is, within that next one, we could -- we will intend to  
21 get back to you on the time line issue once and for all,  
22 and then as many of these recommendations as we can, with  
23 the idea that the next formal EJAC meeting, we will have  
24 covered all of those and specifically responded to  
25 recommendations.

1           Let me speak real briefly on the -- the ask that  
2 was raised earlier with regard to additional deep dives  
3 and one-on-ones. As we noted earlier, we're happy to work  
4 with you folks to figure out what additional topics need  
5 to be deep dived or revisited and all of that stuff. We  
6 went through, just briefly, the need -- well, not the  
7 need, but why we went with smaller groups versus larger  
8 groups. We're happy to do the entire EJAC, if that's the  
9 will of the group. I just want to make sure you  
10 understand some of the legal constraints that we're  
11 operating under.

12           As Trish mentioned earlier, if we do a gathering  
13 of the EJAC members that's greater -- you know, that's a  
14 quorum or greater, we have to publicly notice it. Just so  
15 you understand what that means, minimum of ten days public  
16 notice, advanced notice before, the -- each member that  
17 plans to not be there in person, but calls in, they have  
18 to identify the specific location where they are going to  
19 be, that location needs to be ADA compliant, and it needs  
20 to be open to any member of the public to come in and join  
21 you. So if you plan on, you know, calling in from your  
22 home, that would be -- you know, you would -- you know,  
23 it's not something we'd recommend calling in from your  
24 home on these things because of those sort of constraints.

25           But I'm not saying that's -- you know, we're

1 happy to work with you, I just want you to understand some  
2 of the logistical and legal challenges that's involved.  
3 But we're happy to work with you to make that happen, if  
4 that's the will of the group.

5 LUIS OLMEDO: You can turn them into public  
6 workshops.

7 FLOYD VERGARA: And that's -- that's fine, too.  
8 You know, each one of these meetings is -- is a challenge  
9 for us, so I just want to make sure everyone understands  
10 that.

11 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Kevin?

12 KEVIN HAMILTON: So I -- I had a quick comment  
13 -- sorry, did you need to leave?

14 MARTHA ARGUELLO: No, I'm just standing, but --  
15 because it's in response -- is it okay?

16 KEVIN HAMILTON: Yeah, of course.

17 MARTHA ARGUELLO: So I have a real challenge,  
18 sort of -- so we fought really hard to have the court  
19 reporter, and it's wonderful, but I -- you know, it's sort  
20 of like the good cop, bad cop. And so I have a real  
21 challenge, and I don't even have the words right now,  
22 about actively complying with one of our requests and then  
23 using it to justify sort of delaying action on some of the  
24 things that we're asking for. So I think that given that  
25 Trish is taking notes around the recommendations, that we

1 may not have to wait. Because I think that's important  
2 for our legal record and long-term, but I -- I don't think  
3 we need to delay.

4 FLOYD VERGARA: That's -- that's a fair point.

5 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Quick, and then I'm going  
6 to be making a suggestion for what we do between now and  
7 when we adjourn.

8 Go ahead.

9 KEVIN HAMILTON: So I just wanted to come back  
10 very quickly to the geographic equity issue, because I --  
11 I don't think it's clear enough, or at least not to me.  
12 And I dealt with this a few years ago with Department of  
13 Health Services when they were lending out money to  
14 communities to enroll people in the new Medi-Cal programs,  
15 when the adults became eligible for medical. And we were  
16 able to negotiate this geographic piece, and we -- we got  
17 them to change their formula. And there's a formula for  
18 applying this funding. And so we got them to agree that  
19 geography was equal to density in scoring. So I don't  
20 know how to -- I don't know how it put that in here  
21 exactly, but that's what it came down to. Because they're  
22 scoring all of these proposals for where this is going to  
23 go and where the money is going to go.

24 So we found that geography was very low on the  
25 totem pole when it came to scoring, like a two, whereas

1 density could be three, four, five, six even, if it's high  
2 density. But we were dealing with, and we continue to  
3 deal with, you know, hundred degree -- I mean hundred mile  
4 trips just to get to certain communities. And so I just  
5 want to make sure that that's -- that that is captured in  
6 there.

7 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Great. Thank you very  
8 much.

9 So here is my recommendation. It's ten minutes  
10 to 3:00. My goal is at 3:00 o'clock, we are moving  
11 towards -- I'm going to be asking you to be using your  
12 Post-its and different things, and we're going to be  
13 moving around the room, putting up what deep dives you  
14 want, getting into issues around the time line. If we do  
15 not get to that, you will leave here frustrated, and we  
16 absolutely have to get to what you are going to be doing  
17 next so there's clarity.

18 So what I recommend that we do now is we have  
19 Stephanie do her short introduction piece for this last  
20 agenda item, then any recommendations that EJAC members  
21 have, rather than doing them verbally, you write them down  
22 and you hand them in. I do not feel like we -- we had a  
23 very ambitious -- we could have easily had this be a  
24 two-day, ten-hour meeting, or even a 12-hour, two-day  
25 meeting. We don't have time to do 20 more minutes of

1 verbal comments. You won't have enough time. You'll run  
2 out of time.

3 THE REPORTER: I'm going to need a break.

4 SARAH RUBIN: And so while you are doing the  
5 handwriting, our court reporter could use a break.

6 So I have one comment here.

7 Okay. So Stephanie, is that okay with you?

8 STEPHANIE KATO: Sure.

9 SARAH RUBIN: Does anyone want to say no, we  
10 can't do that, they want to spend the rest of your time  
11 verbally doing recommendations and skip next steps?

12 MONICA WILSON: I don't want to preclude us from  
13 moving on to the next topic, but I just want some clarity  
14 about how to proceed on the recommendations for this last  
15 section. Do I need to give them to you before I leave to  
16 try to get to my flight, or can I e-mail them to you, or  
17 you know, what time line are we talking about?

18 SARAH RUBIN: You are welcome to e-mail them.

19 TRISH JOHNSON: Individual recommendations, for  
20 them to come through the committee should really be  
21 brought up right now. So I would expect you to say them  
22 verbally, at the very least. I'm trying my best to  
23 capture them, but from you, individually, through an  
24 e-mail, it's just from one member and doesn't represent  
25 the whole committee.

1 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. But each individual person  
2 who's sharing their suggested recommendation, are you  
3 considering that --

4 TRISH JOHNSON: We're doing it right here in the  
5 public meeting, so I just want to make sure she speaks up.

6 SARAH RUBIN: So does that mean that my process  
7 suggestion that if people write it down and hand it in to  
8 you it doesn't count, even if it's happening during the  
9 meeting?

10 TRISH JOHNSON: I don't know how the other  
11 members would know what it is.

12 MARI ROSE TARUC: Can we say key words and then  
13 hand it in?

14 SARAH RUBIN: Yeah, you can do that.

15 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: I mean, honestly, none  
16 of this is committee consensus. I mean, we're not taking  
17 votes on anything here. This is just for us to throw out  
18 all of our ideas to be included in the Scoping Plan. So  
19 if I have to take a minute to say the three things I want,  
20 I can do that right now. I also have it written down, so  
21 whatever you need me to do.

22 SARAH RUBIN: Right.

23 So Monica, could you work on writing down  
24 whatever you want right now. And the other thing is, if  
25 it's said out loud in the meeting, like say you were

1 verbally impaired, it would still count. So even if you  
2 have to leave, if you leave it, someone could say it out  
3 loud.

4 Okay? Is that cool?

5 Okay. Stephanie?

6

7 - TARGET SCOPING PLAN: PART 5 -

8 STEPHANIE KATO: See if I can do this really,  
9 really quickly and just highlight a few things.

10 So for the natural working lands sector, on  
11 March 25th there was a workshop in Sacramento. And one of  
12 the things that was produced with that is a discussion  
13 paper, so hopefully the EJAC members did get a chance to  
14 read that. You know, that basically frames out the major  
15 strategy for that sector in terms of, you know, preserving  
16 land, means to enhance carbon resilience, ecological  
17 function, considering research and demo projects that  
18 would improve ecosystem health, and also building green  
19 infrastructure through, you know, reducing the urban heat  
20 island effect, and increasing tree canopy coverage.

21 To the extent that some of those goals in that  
22 paper were able to be kind of more quantitative, some of  
23 them that are in there, you know, there's some thresholds  
24 of acres of managed wetlands to be restored, I believe the  
25 forest sector also has some, you know, targets for

1 bringing numbers of acres under managed plans. And so one  
2 thing I was thinking about when Luis was talking was, I  
3 think one of land areas that might be missing from there  
4 is the desert lands. And I know we had a lot of coastal  
5 and other things, but maybe we'll want to take a focus on  
6 that and see if we have specific recommendations for  
7 desert lands.

8 As far as the agricultural operations go that  
9 are not land based, the ones that pertain to animal  
10 operations, we're basically subsuming the recommendations  
11 from the short-lived climate pollutant strategy, and  
12 that's largely focused on the dairies. And so that will  
13 be promoting the 40 percent reduction target that you saw  
14 in the draft strategy that was released last September.

15 So I guess some of details we'd like to hear  
16 about that, are there is different ways to manage the  
17 manure and to do with the -- with the resulting biogas.  
18 We know electricity generation is one of them. A lot of  
19 folks feel that, you know, if the traditional engine route  
20 is not the way to go, maybe you want to see more  
21 ARB-certified options like, um, microturbines and fuel  
22 cells or further clean up of the biogas into biomethane  
23 and injection into the pipeline. Maybe that could be part  
24 of an integrated strategy where you use biogas fuel from  
25 dairies to replace, you know, diesel that's being used in

1 the trucks right now.

2 As far as the waste management sector goes, the  
3 major strategy there is also outlined in the short-lived  
4 climate pollutant strategy, SLCP, and that is building off  
5 of the AB341 goal of diverting 75 percent of organics by  
6 2020 and 90 percent by 2030. That also has, you know,  
7 various avenues to deal with organics. We've been talking  
8 about perhaps doing a food rescue target as part of that,  
9 so that will just, you know, reduce the amount of waste in  
10 the first place, and then once that is done, you know,  
11 there's different options for managing the organics,  
12 composting or putting in a digester.

13 So those are some of the things that we've been  
14 talking about. In the waste water treatment, water is  
15 something that we're talking about, that they'll need to  
16 capture the methane that's generated there and do  
17 something useful with it, whether it be for energy or  
18 further clean up and injection into the pipeline.

19 So those are the -- some of the main points.

20 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. So we absolutely have  
21 to give Kim a break. Kim; right? Yes. Kim needs a  
22 break. So let's take a few minutes where she rests her  
23 hands.

24 Please write out your recommendations, and then  
25 we'll come to you to paraphrase it and hand it in to

1 Trish. We'll come back to you in a few minutes with your  
2 written out recommendations.

3 (Recess.)

4 SARAH RUBIN: Okay. If you are feeling an  
5 afternoon low, please go get some coffee or drink some  
6 water or stand up and run in place, because for the next  
7 half hour I really need people to be on their A game.  
8 What I'm asking from folks in the next half hour is really  
9 significant. And I know you are all with me. Because at  
10 3:30, we're going to do more public comment, and we have  
11 to stay on time because we want to hear from folks who  
12 are -- we're so grateful that they've joined us.

13 And many of us are on the last flight out and we  
14 cannot miss our flights, and so we absolutely have to  
15 leave on time. So if you're worried about the meeting not  
16 ending on time, don't worry, the meeting is ending on  
17 time. That's why I'm being so pushy.

18 Okay. Who wants to read out loud their  
19 recommendations for the record? Anyone? No commentary,  
20 just read it.

21 MONICA WILSON: Okay. Well, first I would  
22 recommend that an overarching principle that has that the  
23 State be building biomass, not burning biomass. And by  
24 that, I mean using compost to increase carbon  
25 sequestration instead of burning biomass and releasing

1 more CO2. So it's an overarching principle that I'd  
2 recommend, and it's written down. That relates to -- I'd  
3 like to repeat a recommendation from the 2014 round, so  
4 that could just be cut and pasted. It's -- I wrote it  
5 down on here, two -- no, F2F is where you find that  
6 recommendation.

7 Let me see. Another recommendation is that we  
8 do -- we integrate the growing research around carbon  
9 sequestration benefits of compost on grasslands, and I've  
10 got sources on this document.

11 SARAH RUBIN: Great. And you can hand that in.

12 MONICA WILSON: Great. And then the last one is  
13 the funding and permitting assistance of increased compost  
14 operations, particularly in Southern California, as well  
15 as markets -- market drivers for using that compost and  
16 applying it to areas that are going to increase carbon  
17 sequestration and improve health.

18 SARAH RUBIN: Great. Reading a next  
19 recommendation.

20 TOM FRANTZ: Yeah, for urban areas, the goals  
21 for urban canopy -- I mean urban forest canopy need to be  
22 far higher than the suggested ones right now, and the  
23 goals for more urban gardening with composting needs to be  
24 set at a much higher level, with the aim much higher than  
25 the current goals in the last few years.

1           And then reiterating Monica's thing, we got  
2 to -- dairy manure need to be composted with biomass  
3 because there are so many cobenefits, because you get  
4 methane reduction, you get reduced fertilizer imports, you  
5 get reduced N2O emissions and reduced water nates. That's  
6 far more than what you get from capturing a little methane  
7 from just a few dairies.

8           SARAH RUBIN: All right.

9           KEVIN HAMILTON: So with regard biogas  
10 conversion to biomethane, make that a priority and mandate  
11 that vehicles that are servicing the adjusters and  
12 convertors utilize that gas as a primary fuel source.

13           And then, we need to increase accountability of  
14 local government with regard to reductions they claim for  
15 their Cap-and-Trade funded activities of the counties and  
16 cities.

17           SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Next. Luis.

18           LUIS OLMEDO: Okay. So some of the things that  
19 come to mind at the moment is the cattle dairy, the dust  
20 factor. I know we discussed already the dust factor.

21           Also, it is talking about fuel burning, as well,  
22 pesticides and chemicals, and not to disregard what we  
23 discussed earlier about our close proximity to Mexicali  
24 and those contributions.

25           Also, in terms of food rescue, I just wanted to

1 mention that once we get into the nuts and bolts of it, I  
2 think when we talk about foot rescue, really define what  
3 that means. Because just in my experience, we don't want  
4 to be giving away rotten food and then get credit.

5           And in terms of waste management, I'd just like  
6 you to think about geothermal. You know, it's being  
7 presented in many different ways, and not to get into the  
8 whole debate, but there is waste and it needs to be  
9 managed and it needs to be part of the -- whether it is  
10 productive, efficient and useful or not, the waste needs  
11 to be a part of that formula.

12           SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Eleanor, then Katie,  
13 then we're moving on.

14           ELEANOR TORRES: I'd like to recommend that we  
15 identify wildland interfaces. They need to be included in  
16 this urban/rural interfaces and the need to design  
17 membranes of research BMPs for urban forestry and  
18 establish more refined metrics to determine the benefits  
19 of trees, including stormwater and sequestration. We need  
20 incentives for compact development for urban environments.  
21 We need -- I'd like to recommend that we look at the  
22 integration of built environment and green infrastructure  
23 and trees as a utility. And thank you, Tom. Increasing  
24 tree canopy would be wonderful.

25           SARAH RUBIN: Great. Okay. Katie.

1                   KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So Number 1, add urban  
2 tree and green space maintenance, not just planning and  
3 creation.

4                   Number 2, add forest management for wildfire  
5 protection and require tribal consultation in that plan.

6                   Number 3, include urban agriculture.

7                   Number 4, disincentivize and/or discourage  
8 locating biomass or digesters in disadvantaged  
9 communities, particularly close proximity to housing.

10                  Number 5, protect green space by better  
11 enforcement of SB375 and the Sustainable Community  
12 Strategies.

13                  And 6, to echo Luis in agricultural farming.

14                  SARAH RUBIN: Great. Martha, do you have one?

15                  MARTHA ARGUELLO: Yes.

16                  SARAH RUBIN: Okay. We've got to wrap this up.  
17 Yeah, go ahead.

18                  MARTHA ARGUELLO: I'd like to recommend better  
19 coordination between what CARB is doing and CalRecycle,  
20 but also understanding what the Department of Toxic  
21 Substances is doing around both its waste reduction and  
22 diversion so that they're all working together and not  
23 making a mess somewhere else.

24                  SARAH RUBIN: Rey?

25                  REY LEON: Can I go?

1 SARAH RUBIN: Go. Go. Go.

2 REY LEON: Conduct an assessment of potential  
3 carbon capture and ground water recharge pilot projects,  
4 the being --

5 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, can you say that  
6 again?

7 REY LEON: I'm sorry.

8 Assessment of potential carbon sequestration and  
9 ground water recharge pilot projects neighboring DACs,  
10 disadvantaged communities. I say this because near Huron,  
11 there is a definite opportunity where that can happen, and  
12 around this community they've already put in about eight  
13 wells and, you know, it's subsided to something that's  
14 real and it's impacting underground water resources. And  
15 so we need to not only sequester carbon, but also recharge  
16 the underground water sources that we have.

17 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

18 Okay. What I want you to do next is take your  
19 big stickies, and I should have been handing out markers.  
20 We're going to do -- dive into two things. Have you guys  
21 help me pass those out. I want you to put down whatever  
22 deep dives you want. So whatever deep dives you'd like to  
23 see, write whatever you want, and you're going to go put  
24 it on these Post-its. So I'm asking all the EJAC members  
25 to get up and get out of their seats, even if you aren't

1 putting any deep dives up, and then you're going to meet  
2 me on this side of the room and we are going to talk about  
3 the poster paper over here, which has to do with staffing,  
4 what's going to lead us into our time line discussion and  
5 next steps, and then we might be moving to the back of the  
6 room. Everyone up, put your deep dives, and then meet on  
7 this side of the room, please.

8 KEVIN HAMILTON: You mean, put them on the -- on  
9 each one of those?

10 SARAH RUBIN: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. Put whatever  
11 you want up there.

12 KEVIN HAMILTON: Can't we just put our name on  
13 it?

14 SARAH RUBIN: Yeah, you can do whatever you  
15 want.

16 KEVIN HAMILTON: Okay. Otherwise, you have to  
17 write out a whole bunch of these things.

18 SARAH RUBIN: Yeah, just put whatever you want.

19 If everybody on this side wants to get up and  
20 walk to the other side, you'll be able to see what we have  
21 on the wall and we're about to talk about. If you guys  
22 want to move to the other side of the room, you'll be able  
23 to see what we wrote on the wall and what we're going to  
24 talk about.

25 Okay. Everybody, we are going to keep going.

1 Anybody who is on that side of the room that feels like  
2 coming to this side of the room is welcome to. Folks who  
3 are working on putting up information about new deep dives  
4 or deeper dives, you are welcome to keep doing that, but I  
5 am going to ask that we all get focused on this corner of  
6 the room.

7           Could I have everyone's attention? Yoohoo.  
8 Yoohoo. I'm over here. The meeting is almost over. Just  
9 a little more attention. Okay. No more talking.  
10 Everyone is listening. I'm so proud of you. We are  
11 talking about schedule right now. Put your thinking cap  
12 on.

13           KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Okay. I drafted  
14 something just because I recognize the time and I don't  
15 want to miss my flight. So if you look over there, and I  
16 know you can't see it, but basically the idea that I  
17 propose is that at our next meeting, the EJAC members  
18 bring draft outreach plans for our regions, so that we can  
19 start discussing an outreach plan for our workshops. So  
20 we come into the main meeting, we're going to review the  
21 draft Scoping Plan, because that will be out, we'll spend  
22 time in the meeting looking at that, and then we'll  
23 discuss outreach.

24           In June, I'm expecting that we'll need to  
25 discuss outreach again before we start it, because we're

1 going to be thinking about materials, we're going to think  
2 about ARB support, what we need and how our schedule is,  
3 et cetera.

4 July, August, outreach, recognizing ARB's  
5 capacity, and as much as I'd like to do it all in one day  
6 or one month, I don't think that that's just physically  
7 possible for ARB staff. So if we say June, July, August  
8 we do outreach in our communities, and then in September,  
9 we're meeting to debrief all the outreach we've done and  
10 to think about next steps. So we're creating a process  
11 for the first draft of the Scoping Plan, and then I'm  
12 hoping we can replicate again after the 350 data comes  
13 out, after the OEHHA report comes out and we have the  
14 second draft of the Scoping Plan we're looking for.

15 Does that sound acceptable?

16 SARAH RUBIN: So here's what I want to see if  
17 you are an EJAC member, thumb up if doing a homework of an  
18 outreach plan for your area seems something you're  
19 supportive of, thumb side if you're not sure, thumbs down  
20 if you don't want to do it. EJAC members put your hands  
21 up. Higher. Higher. Monica, I can't see your hand.  
22 Sekita, great. Done.

23 Let's move over here. Staffing. Where is  
24 Eleanor?

25 ELEANOR TORRES: I'm here.

1                   SARAH RUBIN: Come on. Tell us what we might  
2 see on this wall.

3                   ELEANOR TORRES: Okay. When we met with Chair  
4 Nichols on trying to scope the staffing plan --

5                   KEVIN HAMILTON: I was going to help you because  
6 she assigned me, but I wasn't in the meeting. Only six  
7 were allowed.

8                   ELEANOR TORRES: You guys are throwing me to the  
9 wolves.

10                  All right. So we're -- we had a group of people  
11 that met, Katie, Tom, Luis, and we all talked about what  
12 were the scoping plans that the staffing would include for  
13 the purposes of administrative and logistical staff  
14 supporting EJAC members to participate in meetings,  
15 travel, reimbursements, et cetera, all those  
16 administrative stuff, facilitator for our EJAC meetings  
17 and working with Scoping Plan staff authors to share on  
18 up-to-date and all the process and information consults  
19 with EJAC on each sector and also integrate the EJAC  
20 recommendations.

21                  High level ARB staff ensures EJ is prioritized.  
22 AB32 ARB staff can then attempt the scoping appropriately.  
23 It also would be that we look at community engagement  
24 staffing to seek feedback on Scoping Plan from the  
25 discussion draft and to the final draft, as well as full

1 participation of the EJAC by providing per diems for  
2 travel, meals and work time for EJAC meetings. Additional  
3 meetings, calls, workshops and research.

4 So we broke down as far as what this EJ unit  
5 would look like, and we met with Dean, as well. And we  
6 broke it down to we would need a high-level manager,  
7 scientists, economists, a community coordinator, someone  
8 that's a resource manager, data manager, technical  
9 experts, and any other ones you would like to add.

10 Is that about it? Right, Katie? You guys  
11 agreeable? Okay.

12 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Okay. Let's go back  
13 to our original seats. We're going to start to begin to  
14 close out our meeting.

15 MARI ROSE TARUC: Can I add something to the  
16 time line?

17 SARAH RUBIN: Yes. Thank you. I don't know how  
18 I got so sidetracked. So maybe before you sit down, we  
19 need to talk about the time line. And EJAC members,  
20 again, if you want to use your large Post-its, we need to  
21 add to the time line.

22 And can you give you the microphone Mari Rose to  
23 read those out loud?

24 MARI ROSE TARUC: Sure. Can I just yell? I  
25 have a very loud voice. Can you hear me?

1 SARAH RUBIN: The webcast. The webcast.

2 MARI ROSE TARUC: The webcast can't hear me?

3 All right. So what I did was process a  
4 recommendation for how we get our recommendations to a  
5 draft, discussion draft of the Scoping Plan. I put them  
6 in separate Post-its, and I'm going to post it up here.  
7 And it could be -- Yeah, so we'll figure out how that's  
8 going to happen.

9 So additional deep dives in completing the  
10 sectors is going to happen in April. I think also the --  
11 so the EJAC's initial recommendations from today and any  
12 additional ones, also in April. Convening the EJAC work  
13 groups by sector and looking through the initial  
14 recommendations and compiling recommendations in April,  
15 possibly in May.

16 The EJAC sector work groups or discussing our  
17 recommendations with the Scoping Plan authors, and that  
18 ARB needs to introduce us to those authors so that we can  
19 engage in discussion with them.

20 That the release of the discussion draft, when  
21 with EJ considerations, that's up to whenever these  
22 authors can get them processed. So that could be May,  
23 that could be June.

24 And that these five to ten public environmental  
25 justice community workshops to get feedback on the

1 discussion draft is anywhere from June, July, August.

2 And that the meeting in September, after these  
3 public workshops, are going to synthesize the community  
4 feedback on the discussion draft. And ARB staff will  
5 staff us to be able to do this.

6 KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: And if I could add,  
7 Mari Rose -- this is Katie -- I think I would love to see  
8 us schedule all of our meetings more in advance. I think  
9 part of what we're getting caught up on is these posting  
10 requirements. And it would be great if we just had  
11 blocks, even if we didn't use them, like two two-day  
12 blocks every month, and then if we need them for a deep  
13 dive or if we need for a meeting, they're available and we  
14 have them held, and we don't have to delay, we can just  
15 post and go.

16 MARTHA ARGUELLO: I don't know if that -- the  
17 other part is, do we want to consider our future meetings  
18 as two-day meetings or at least one and half days, and so  
19 for all of us to leave here knowing that that's going to  
20 be a commitment.

21 SARAH RUBIN: EJAC members, can I see the sort  
22 of thumb down side for two -- scheduling for two days? If  
23 you don't need the second day, we won't use it.

24 Okay. We've got support for that.

25 All righty, anyone else want to add anything

1 else to the time line, EJAC members?

2           Okay. Let's go back to our seats. We're going  
3 to move towards public comment and ending our meeting.

4 Okay. Again, we're going to do two-minute public  
5 comments.

6

7                                   -PUBLIC COMMENTS-

8           ANITA NICKLEN: Where can I find the draft on  
9 the Scoping Plan so I can start digesting it, if I can?

10           SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

11           ANITA NICKLEN: And then if I have comments, who  
12 do I give them to?

13           SARAH RUBIN: Someone want to explain that?

14           TRISH JOHNSON: So based on the time line that  
15 we discussed at the February 5th EJAC meeting, there would  
16 be a discussion draft of the Scoping Plan released in May.  
17 That is the time line that we're working off of. There's  
18 nothing available as we speak. Actually, the detail we  
19 provided today at the meeting, including those tables, is  
20 something you could take a look at. That's on the EJAC  
21 meeting web page, but there's more to come.

22           My manager is mentioning that we did update the  
23 Scoping Plan in 2014, so that is a document to take a look  
24 at. And the original Scoping Plan was released and  
25 adopted in 2008. I can also help you sign up for an

1 e-mail list to receive e-mails when we post documents.

2 SARAH RUBIN: Great. Next public comment.

3 RAY ASKINS: This may be a little premature to  
4 mention, but you know so often you hear the comments that  
5 government just does the talk, but they don't do the walk.  
6 There is one little plan that could be implemented right  
7 away, and it's about trees. And this is something I do in  
8 my voluntary time is I acquire trees from the EPA and from  
9 Baja California. I also get trees from the Federal EPA.  
10 And anywhere I can get free trees, I get them. And then I  
11 pot them in a little bowl so I get a nice ball of roots,  
12 and then I give them away. And the neighbors plant them,  
13 and before you know it, the trees are growing like crazy  
14 and other neighbors come up to me and say, Hey, I want  
15 some of those trees like that, too, those shrubs.

16 These are the kinds of things that you get, like  
17 the IID can sit there and and grow the plants and then  
18 give them out, maybe in exchange for plastic, plastic  
19 bottles, or for glass, newspapers, to encourage recycling.  
20 These are just -- I'm throwing the seed out there. This  
21 is something that maybe you as a group can think about.

22 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

23 ROBERTO NECOCHEA: I just want to add --

24 SARAH RUBIN: Say your name.

25 ROBERTO NECOCHEA: Rob Necochea. I'll spell it

1 for you later.

2 I just want to add that our border is a unique  
3 situation, and we have the two most polluted bodies of  
4 water, the Salton Sea and the New River. And we're an  
5 international community right on the border. And even  
6 though they passed NAFTA, there are side effects to NAFTA  
7 that the Valley, the residents here, have been impacted by  
8 NAFTA. And it's severe, because even though the County  
9 can have regulations, the State can have regulations, you  
10 can't regulate what happens in Mexico.

11 So I think it's really important to collaborate.  
12 I know you're the Air Resources Board and you're appointed  
13 by the Governor, Mary Nichols is appointed by the  
14 Governor, and sometimes I don't know if commissioners  
15 really have teeth or they just, you know, get together and  
16 have meetings. And I just think it's very important to  
17 collaborate with the different government agencies,  
18 especially here. I'm speaking for the Imperial Valley  
19 because of our New River, Salton Sea, the toxic air, New  
20 River, most polluted river.

21 And I know our State Assemblyman has been an  
22 advocate for this area, but you guys are in Sacramento  
23 with the deep pockets. You guys can make the difference  
24 for us. And what I'm just meaning to find out, even  
25 though I got here late, was there are two more government

1 agencies that are not here at the table expressing their  
2 opinions on the Salton Sea and the New River and our  
3 quality of air, and here is the Air Resources Board.

4 I don't -- I feel like our meetings with  
5 government and stakeholders aren't at the table here, and  
6 I wonder why. It's not my -- I'm nobody in government,  
7 but as a citizen, I think as a state you should mandate  
8 that if you're giving money to other agencies, that we're  
9 all at the same table with the same goals and the same  
10 solutions. Because everyone is operating on their own and  
11 nothing gets done. So you need to get the Federal  
12 Government involved, too, because the NAFTA side effects,  
13 the power energy plants in Mexico is impacting our  
14 communities.

15 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Okay. We're almost  
16 done. Two more.

17 JOHN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Again, my name is John  
18 Hernandez, local resident, and I'm going to be one of  
19 those people that's going to leave more confused than when  
20 I got here. But that's a good thing, because it's going  
21 to drive me to learn those things that I don't clearly  
22 understand and continue to be part of the process. I echo  
23 the conversation here that the stakeholders are missing.  
24 If this is so important, this AB32 and the billions of  
25 dollars that are being put out, and we have Flint Michigan

1 happening here right now as we speak, then where are the  
2 stakeholders? So I'm going to, you know, try to  
3 understand this a little bit more and continue to  
4 collaborate with our local community and try to learn a  
5 little bit more.

6 And again, I want to thank all those that came  
7 from the outside area, those representing the ARB. You're  
8 very important, a very important body for us that suffer  
9 from the air quality issues that are affecting us for so  
10 long.

11 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Okay. Last public  
12 comment. We're going to go to some very short closing  
13 remarks and adjourn.

14 JOSE VELEZ: (Translated from Spanish.) I  
15 wanted to welcome everybody from this committee. I am a  
16 citizen of the valley, and I had two issues to address.  
17 I'm worried about the pressure, atmospheric pressure  
18 changes in the the community. I know that when there is  
19 an increase or decrease of atmospheric pressure, we know  
20 that the pollution increase or decrease, and I would like  
21 to get some feedback on what we can do as citizens to  
22 improve this.

23 And the second issue -- the other issue I wanted  
24 to address was the power companies that are established on  
25 the Mexican side of the border, two to three miles across

1 the border in the city of Mexicali. These do not comply by  
2 electrical or energy efficiency, and this obviously harms  
3 the communities at the border region. I would like to  
4 know what is going to be done to address this problem or  
5 what steps can we take to address this issue, as well.

6 SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

7 So before we have a closing thank you from ARB  
8 and our local host, Luis, I think we should take a minute  
9 to thank and acknowledge our interpreters because they've  
10 done such a great job today.

11 (Applause.)

12 State your name.

13 LUISA: My name is Luisa. Thank you for having  
14 me.

15 ERICA RUPERT: My name is Erica Rupert, and  
16 we're happy to be here. We've been following these  
17 meetings for the past six years or so, so we're happy to  
18 see the progress.

19 SARAH RUBIN: Wow. Great. Okay.

20 And Kim, our court reporter, let's give her a  
21 round of applause.

22 (Applause.)

23

24 -CLOSING REMARKS-

25 FLOYD VERGARA: So I just wanted to spend a few

1 seconds just thanking the EJAC members. Really  
2 appreciate, you know, you allowing us and encouraging us  
3 to meet down here. I think this is a valuable experience  
4 for us.

5 I want to thank Luis specifically for, you know,  
6 making sure that this facility was available for us. I  
7 think it was a really useful, productive discussion. I  
8 certainly took a lot of takeaways away from it.

9 I want to thank the board members and Steve for  
10 taking time off from your busy schedules. I think, as you  
11 heard here, there was some really good comments that were  
12 made, and I think it was -- you know, there were some  
13 things that we can take action on and respond to those  
14 comments at the next one. So I really appreciate that.

15 Again, we'll look forward to continuing this  
16 dialogue. This is an ongoing process for us. And we'll  
17 take a number of these things back with us and take a look  
18 at it.

19 I suspect, even after we get the certified  
20 transcript from the court reporter and we look at our own  
21 notes, we're probably going to have a lot of questions and  
22 clarifications that we're going to need. So I'm going to  
23 ask my staff to set up a call, at least with the  
24 leadership team, if not a little bit bigger than that,  
25 just to make sure we fully understand what the comment or

1 recommendation was before we proceed with trying to  
2 respond.

3 So again, thank you very much. I appreciate it.  
4 And I look forward to the next one.

5 ANITA NICKLEN: Can I make a five-second comment  
6 before? Can I? Five seconds?

7 SARAH RUBIN: Yes.

8 ANITA NICKLEN: I would just like to say that  
9 that first draft is going to be as good as you allow these  
10 members, you know, to be able to give input and also us as  
11 a community. That's the only thing I wanted to add.

12 (Applause.)

13 LUIS OLMEDO: I can't even find the words. I  
14 want to thank everybody for coming here to Imperial, to  
15 the city of Brawley, where Comite Civico has operated  
16 since 1985.

17 And I feel like we as -- you know, all of you  
18 from ARB to all the members of, you know, the EJAC, I feel  
19 we're at a whole different level, you know. You're not  
20 from here, you don't understand the issues, but you came  
21 to the community and got to experience just the warmth and  
22 embracement that the community has.

23 I want to thank the City of Brawley, because  
24 they were very welcoming. They would have done so much  
25 more, but there are limitations. But, you know, they

1 wanted to just roll out the red carpet, and they did in so  
2 many ways, so I want to thank the City of Brawley.

3 I want to thank the two board members who came  
4 here and spent all day. There's no doubting their  
5 commitment. The meetings in Sacramento -- I'm so glad  
6 that we're neighbors -- and we shared the experience with  
7 the border region. And so I want to thank all of you. I  
8 want to thank the staff who came here, you know, Trish and  
9 everybody else. There's too many to mention, so I'm sorry  
10 I started it. Trish gets a mention.

11 (Applause.)

12 I want to thank our sound, our board member,  
13 Antonio. I want to thank him for coming out here and  
14 setting up the sound. I want to thank Roy. He's been  
15 making sure that the community is aware through his new  
16 network as well as providing us the Livestream. And I  
17 also wanted to thank the other experts in the audience who  
18 came here, committed, the students. I also want to  
19 mention that we did have representation here from assembly  
20 member Eduardo Garcia's office. She's here if you want to  
21 say hello.

22 (Applause.)

23 And I think I mentioned most, except the most  
24 important one, which is Sarah. I want to thank her  
25 because she really helped us pull it together. It's not

1 easy to pull all these leaders together here. I mean,  
2 it's a monumental task, and you did such a wonderful job,  
3 and I want to thank you, Sarah.

4 (Applause.)

5 And I want to wish everybody a safe trip back  
6 home. If you stay, please just check with me if you need  
7 any directions, places to go. If you want to go to  
8 Mexicali, I think it's safe to go, you know, if you want  
9 to experience that. So let me know. Whatever you need,  
10 I'm still here. And so thank you.

11 And applause for yourselves, my fellow members,  
12 because you bring such a great service. Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 SARAH RUBIN: We are adjourned.

15 (The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.)

16 -o0o-

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place herein set forth; that a verbatim record of the proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand, which was thereafter transcribed under my direction; further that the foregoing is an accurate transcription thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my name.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

KIMBERLY NOVAK, CSR  
Certificate No. 13135