

AB 32 Environmental Justice Advisory Committee

May 10, 2016

Committee Member Attendees:

Kemba Shakur (KS), Urban Releaf; Sekita Grant (SG), The Greenlining Institute; Mari Rose Taruc (MRT), Asian Pacific Environmental Network; Rey León (RL), Valley LEAP; Katie Valenzuela Garcia (KVG), Oak Park Neighborhood Association; Luis Olmedo (LO), Comité Civico Del Valle; Gisele Fong (GF), End Oil; Eleanor Torres (ET), The Incredible Edible Community Garden; Kevin Hamilton (KH), Central California Asthma Collaborative; Martha Dina Argüello (MDA), Physicians for Social Responsibility; and Colin Bailey (CB), The Environmental Justice Coalition for Water.

ARB Attendees:

Floyd Vergara (FV), Trish Johnson (TJ), Dave Mallory (DM), Theresa Richardson (TR), Johnnie Raymond (JR), and Senator Dean Florez (DF)

Facilitators:

Katie Valenzuela Garcia, (KVG) EJAC Leadership Team,
Mari Rose Taruc, (MRT) EJAC Leadership Team
Cynthia Teague (CT), Center for Collaborative Policy

Action Items:

- EJAC members will survey partners on workshop contents.
- Discussion for May 24-25 meeting, how do we continue the dialogue?
- Revisit meeting notetaking process (summary notes, stenographer, transcriber, etc.)
- EJAC to identify a Chairperson for meetings and rotate among the group.
- EJAC formed a community workshop subcommittee (see below for members)
 - Subcommittee will meet May 13, 2016 @ 9am via teleconference
 - Work on Agenda for May 24-25 is forthcoming. Items to include are:
 - Dates for initial community workshop meetings.
 - Budget figures for community workshops
 - Will look at possible survey questions to prepare for the Workshops, then facilitate the next conversation with the larger group
 - Set parameters on Workshop length
- ARB follow-up w/regional EJAC members on meeting dates/locations/times before May 24th. Include budget requests
- ARB draft Flyer (Lindsay)
- EJAC to confirm two options for workshop locations and the contact person by Monday May 16 and will continue circulation effort on policy proposal to universities and the private sector
- Trish will ask GGRF staff to put together answer of what they did before with workshops and provide this to the EJAC.

- FV to look into the feasibility of contracting with community partners.
- FV to look into reciprocity for ethics training.
- EJAC members were requested to review what we did in Brawley.
- EJAC members to confirm workshop dates and locations by May 16.

Attachments

- Video feed of meeting available at: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/ejac/meetings/meetings.htm>
- [Draft Scoping Plan Timeline](#)
- [Draft Engagement Proposal](#)

Meeting Goals

1. Draft EJAC Working Timeline through Completion of Scoping Plan
2. Update Timeline after Reports from ARB and EJAC
3. Plan Community Workshops

Key Discussion Points:

- ARB expanded the timeline for comments as far as they could while meeting necessary milestones.
- The ability to share information with EJAC members and their communities and ensure that community members have an equal voice is important to EJAC members.
- Community Workshop content, scope and direction will vary from region to region. Some communities require more resources and preparation to hold their community meetings than others. These additional resources may require alterations to the overall timeline to allow for community feedback.
- Health and impact issues resonate with a number of communities and regions, incorporating these discussions into the community workshops will assist with engaging communities.

Welcome and Overview

MRT introduced herself as helping with facilitation for the day along with KVG. She reviewed the note taking process. Notes will be developed based on Sarah Rubin's template. Notes from today will be reviewed at the May 24-25, 2016 meeting when the EJAC will discuss and decide how to proceed with note taking for future meetings. MRT and KVG asked everyone to provide a self-introduction and share something unique about their community. Those present introduced themselves. Several committee members were delayed by a traffic accident, these members made their introductions throughout the morning.

Comments

- KVG gave an overview of the agenda, noting that some of the presentations are highly technical. There will be time for public comments. The day will finish with making changes to upcoming plans.

- LO expressed concern that the agenda was a little generic. He shared that detailed conversations on issues have taking place and wanted to see that covered today. KVG assured the group that the detailed conversations would be covered.

ARB Report on Scoping Plan Timeline

ARB staff provided an update on the Draft Scoping Timeline developed by ARB staff and the EJAC Leadership Team. They heard that additional time was needed. They added three months to the plan and moved the 2nd board hearing out three months to March 2017. This is the latest it can be extended. The EJAC came to agreement on the overall extension of the timeframe while still meeting critical milestones.

ARB is looking at a release of the Discussion Paper for the Scoping Plan towards the end of May. The informational board hearing to discuss status of the Scoping Plan development is scheduled the third week of June. ARB requested the EJAC to provide feedback on the Discussion Paper about a week after this meeting (end of June), so they can incorporate those additions to the draft release. This includes the CEQA and Econ analysis in August. Then a CEQA review period. The October board meeting is the first meeting that will cover the scoping plan with the impact analysis. The expected release of the Scoping Plan with revisions, including public comments and board direction, is January through March 2017. The Scoping Plan would then go to the Board during the March 2017 hearing date.

Comments

- SG confirmed that the July 1 recommendations needed on the Discussion Paper would be from the EJAC. SG indicated that May to July 1 is the time that the EJAC is doing Community Workshops to develop those July 1, 2016 recommendations.
- FV shared his understanding was the goal for the second EJAC meeting, May 24-25 will provide access to the experts on Scoping Plan, allowing for questions. Then, EJAC can make recommendations and discuss those in the June and early July EJAC meetings.

Draft Engagement Proposal

KVG reviewed a Draft Engagement Proposal she prepared with the EJAC Leadership Team and ARB staff. Based on these she identified the potential need to adjust the recommended timeframe to August to receive recommendations. FV confirmed that referenced dates are not deadlines, but are there to provide guidance to the EJAC and ensure that ARB have time to incorporate recommendations. The Draft Engagement Proposal was summarized as follows:

- Two May meetings.
- Then workshops over eight weeks, approximately 10 meetings held through June and July.
- Meeting in early August review feedback and draft initial recommendations for second draft of Scoping Plan.
- August/Sept will be time for ARB to review feedback, make revisions and prepare documents.
- Late September is the release of the next draft of Scoping Plain and EIR and planning next round of community workshops.

- October/November will be a second round of community workshops.
- Remember all public meetings must be noticed.
- December two-day meeting is to talk about report and make recommendations for final plan. There is also report coming out during that time can be utilized to inform final recommendations.
- Scoping plan time allowance for ARB to review
- A final meeting to review the drafts before going to a final vote by the Board in March 2017.

Comments on Proposed Timeline and Engagement Proposal

- SG confirmed with FV that the community meetings require public notice at least 10 days prior to the meeting.
- KVG stressed the need to set initial dates to ensure those first up can coordinate with schedule meetings soon to ensure that the meetings are properly noticed.
- LO discussed that he can pull off either timeline, but there are still issues with having limited resources to make this meetings happen. MRT: We need to be compiling recommendations so those that go to ARB will need to move to that date as its about 45 days off. Early July is when ARB needs it, but mid-August is pushing it too close. FV will see what wiggle room there is between July and August. They need more than a one and one-half weeks.
- KVG: Can we present to ARB in November?
- FV: Needs clarification so we can post the EJAC meetings in bold on timeline. Are those ok with everyone, so they can be posted on the website.
- KVG: Timeline pushback? Late July would be the best or even early August.
- FV: We need sufficient time to do the job and check on pushing ARB presentation to November. His tentative response was that it's probably doable. He'll confirm in the next few days.
- KVG: Recommendations move to mid-August, then? Two specific location suggestions per each workshop location with contact information. FV would appreciate that so they can move forward on the rest of planning and costing.
- MRT requested a clarification of ARB's role for community meeting by mid-June. MRT requested confirmation by end of the meeting of: the staff who be committed; who facilitators will be; and call the subcommittee together for next week, so we can contact EJAC committee member to prepare. Who will be ARB contact? First is southern CA, SB Valley.

Community Workshop Planning

In reviewing the timeline for the Scoping Plan and Draft Engagement Proposal, EJAC members discussed the various considerations relating to the planning and implementation of the proposed community workshops. Those discussions are summarized as follows:

- SG sought confirmation on whether these community meetings can be incorporated into existing community outreach efforts/meetings. For example, if communities already meeting through the regular course of their public engagement. Is it possible to integrate this into additional meetings, without requiring the planning of a separate workshop.
- SG also sought clarification on the goal of these meetings in terms of the level of community understanding. Is the focus to be collectively broad, but is there flexibility to focus on specific matters versus getting the community up to speed on all scoping plan elements. She stressed the value in focusing on specific conversations on those scoping plan components that are more relatable to different communities. For example some communities may not be interested in dairy digesters.
- KVG that is a good point and the content is up to the EJAC hosts. She stressed that understanding of AB 32 varies from region to region.
- RL discussed how this relates to the communities he, Tom Frantz and KH work with in Central California (San Joaquin to Kern). They are looking at up to 15 different engagement opportunities for up to 15 different communities. He stressed that there are certain clusters far away from county seats and the need to share information with those areas to ensure access, but also incorporate other stuff in the discussions to ensure attendance. For a lot of community members these workshops are an introduction and the goal should be to bring people on board, build their understanding and strengthen the democratic principle of ensuring people get involved by ensuring their understanding the content.
- KVG also discussed additional needs based on geography. She referenced that not all EJAC members cover the entire state and they cannot speak for all the communities in or near their regions. There may be a need to coordinate with Native Americans, particularly north of Sacramento. Likewise, live workshops may not be the only answer for outreach.
- RL stressed utilizing networks to strategically coordinate with and outreach to communities throughout the state. He also recommended utilizing Caltrans and state agency tribal liaisons to reach tribal communities.
- KH expressed concern with holding community meetings that do not provide information that communities need. One thing we don't want to see is agencies get together and say we're holding workshop on some specific date. He recommended a survey of the target audience first, to have them define success for their group. A local community leader or tribal leader needs to be asked, not just the agency saying we are bringing this to you. Find out what they need according to geographic needs or whether or not the community has the capacity to get involved. First, find out from the people what they need and want. Four months is approximately how long this will take and it will be labor-intensive. Communities need to meet and collaborate, so they can have a successful contribution. Large areas have larger population, but resources to go with them in planning folks, etc. But, we need to reach the mid-size and smaller cities so holding workshops in these locations will be successful. Requested a

recommendation of how the process will work, since the current process is designed and driven by Sacramento. He stressed that a more thoughtful process would take at least four months to complete.

- KVG recommended thinking through what makes sense with the time we have between now and the next EJAC meeting on May 24-25. She also asked whether the two sets of community workshops can be adapted to meet the timeline concerns KH brought up? She also pointed out that some regions may be able to put on workshops sooner rather than later.
- KH agreed that there are some communities prepared earlier rather than later, but stressed that there are differences in terms of preparation. Resources, capacity, expertise, etc. have advantages that make putting on these meetings easier.
- KVG indicated next step for surveying community members.
- KH shared that they have a proposal to complete their outreach, but it will take time (at least three weeks) and resources just to collect survey results.

Pre-Workshop Ideas and Comments

EJAC members discussed various concerns and ideas revolving around the scope, context, goals and timing of the community workshops. Those discussions are summarized as follows:

- MDA proposed that how the EJAC reaches people is as important as the when and why. She proposed the EJAC discuss: What pre-work do we need to do and how can we prepare workshop participants?
- ET expressed the need to put a face on these discussions. They created a survey re: what is climate change. She wrote op-ed piece that was recently published. Her group has also produced 12 Public Service Announcements that everyone can use.
- EJAC members asked whether a survey be created in Sacramento and shared with members? We'd like a tool that we can all use with some regional tweaking.
- KH: How much of these workshops includes providing information and how much is gathering input from community? KH prefers an informed event where people share what they want out of the meeting, a facilitated conversation versus a presentation of information.
- LO: There is a lot of information. He requested examples because rural areas want good transportation but you do not have basics. The onus is often placed on. He expressed a desire for more context-relevant examples and opportunities. Area-specific needs should take precedence as opposed to ARB trying to creating packets. The recommendation is to develop a packets done or mostly done. Test these packets up front with some community members, then develop modules and customize the information to address specific challenges.

- ET: We are trying to partner so besides getting scoping plan input we build capacity for ongoing communication.
- LO: It is important for workshops to have additional efforts in disadvantaged communities. They have difficulty seeing how this pertains to them. We need to make the connection. A lot of good information, but often people are left confused and keep up with their own lives. Include program examples for disadvantaged communities. Example of EPA partnership to understand services and funding that are available. He'd like to see technical or facilitative need to address EJ needs. Attendees need to understand the relevance of it and ownership of it—the scoping plan.
- MRT: Goal is to get feedback to fold into recommendations that EJAC is providing into the Scoping plan.
- RL: He'd like us to get demographics of the participants so we know whether or not we are engaging the right people. What data do we have and what questions do we need?
- ET: the building partnerships piece should add local initiatives.
- SG: EJAC is one of three different efforts and meetings going on, can we tap into that energy? Can we meet our goals on our agenda, but also get to specifics, e.g. cap and trade or investments?
- KS: How did we gather information prior to having funding? We have never had workshops before.
- TJ: The ARB took workshops out on SB 535 community groups partnered with ARB on how to spend the money on input for guidelines and how to help disadvantaged communities. The community recommended locations. Feedback was incorporated into guidelines by ARB.
- LO: These are very important questions. Answers should come from ARB.
- TJ: Trish will put together answer of what they did before with workshops and provide this to the EJAC. It's a large number of populations being represented by these board members, so we need to all have the same information.
- GF: Building and understanding of the relevance of this scoping plan is important. We need to point out the linkage. This needs to be the starting point always.
- KH: How do we get into the heads of 4.1 million people, for e.g. short-lived pollutants? How do I help them take ownership? Relevance? He feels this agenda and workshop planning is premature, because he has not fleshed out with his community members. He wants to see survey data first before community workshops are planned.

- RL: In 2004, the best way to make it tangible was to explain connection with air quality and asthma. One of the worst regions is his, so greenhouse gases made sense to people's health. It gets their attention when connected to family health issues.
- KVG grew up in Oildale, so she has been through the experience of having the light go on. She knows that understanding particulates in the air where she grew up made sense. Low carbon, transportation restrictions etc. get attention after you start with something people can then understand and relate to. Her broad-brush approach to workshops is where she can see this happen.
- MRT: The workshops are all going to be different, but there are some common elements.
- MDA: They have info-graphics that allows people to move through it as they begin to understand ozone, GHGs, climate-change issues of all kinds. Maybe this should be a methodology we employ. MDA volunteered for the Community Workshop subcommittee.
- EG: PSAs could also be used address individual sectors – about 3 minutes long for each one.

Surveys

EJAC members discussed the efficacy of surveys for workshop planning. Discussions were summarized as follows:

- MRT: Surveys can take place in many ways. Some take place in advance and some survey questions will occur during the workshop.
- RL provided that a pre-survey in his area is more for officials and big cities.
- KS: Her survey is for three things: What they do know, what they are interested in knowing and what are they willing to do? She will do a pre-survey.
- KVG: She will go straight to workshop.

The Community Workshop Subcommittee will look at the questions, then facilitate the next conversation with the larger group

AB 32 Draft Community Workshop -- Planning Part I

The EJAC discussed the community workshop goals, Draft Agenda, Locations, Dates, EJAC Hosts, Workshop outreach, and budgets. Those discussions are summarized as follows:

Goals:

- Build understanding, relevance and ownership of climate policies and programs, including program examples for environmental justice communities
- Get feedback and collect data on what's happening now with AB 32; community needs and priorities.

- Get feedback on what should be included in 2030 Scoping Plan.
- Build partnerships and capacity with community, including local government.

Draft Workshop Agenda:

1. Opening/Introduction
 - a. Game with information and graphics from MDA. Education, informative and doubles as icebreaker.
2. Environmental Justice, AB32, 2030 Scoping Plan
 - a. Health frame
3. Climate Programs
 - a. What do you see now?
 - b. What would it take for this program/strategy/plan to succeed in your community?
 - c. What are barriers and incentives?
4. Discussion topics: The EJAC members offered the following list of questions and considerations that the Agenda may address:
 - How is climate change impacting you?
 - Do you worry about how climate change will affect your family?
 - How do we increase community empowerment in decision-making?
 - Do you have trees in your community? Greenery?
 - How much do you pay for gas/electric each month?
 - How far do you walk to catch the bus?
 - Do you have an electric vehicle?
 - Are there electric vehicle chargers in your community?
 - Do you recycle or compost?
 - Do you have a drought-resistance yard?
 - Do you have electric gardening equipment?
 - Do you have water-efficient shower/toilet?
 - Do you have an edible garden?
 - Does a member of your family have asthma?
 - Have you ever heard of the 2030 Scoping Plan? Is it--
 - Air pollution?
 - Water pollution?
 - Greenhouse gas?
 - All of the above?
 - What are your concerns/hopes/dreams around:
 - Health?
 - Cost of Living?
 - Jobs/economy?
 - Environment?

- Barriers:
 - Cronyism
 - Institutional racism
 - Lack of jobs
- EJAC to report how their feedback will inform on EJAC recommendations and process.

5. Key sector dive recommendations:

- a. Housing, energy efficiency, investments, economic development, freight, refineries, oil and gas, jobs, displacement. Los Angeles
- b. Jobs, wealth building. ET Inland Empire
- c. Jobs, wealth building, industry, energy. SG, MRT Oakland
- d. Natural lands, transportation, LCFS, SLCD. KH Central California

6. Summary and Conclusions

Workshop Schedule: Location with months, EJAC host, translators needed:

1. San Bernardino
 - a. Mid-June
 - b. ET, LO Hosts
 - c. Spanish
2. Oakland (City Hall)
 - a. Late June
 - b. SG, KS, MRT, MW
 - c. Spanish, Cantonese, Lao
3. Los Angeles (South)
4. Los Angeles (Metro)
5. Los Angeles (South Bay)
 - a. All three late June, early July
 - b. GF, MDA
 - c. Spanish
6. Coachella Valley
 - a. No date yet
 - b. LO, SG, ET
 - c. Spanish
7. Imperial
 - a. June
 - b. LO, SG, KH, ET
 - c. Spanish
8. Sacramento
 - a. July
 - b. KVG, CB
 - c. Spanish, Hmong, Vietnamese, Mandarin/Cantonese not sure

9. Modesto
 - a. July
 - b. RL, TF, KH, SC, KVG
 - c. Spanish, Hmong
10. Fresno
 - a. July
 - b. RL, TF, KH, SC, KVG
 - c. Spanish, Hmong
11. Bakersfield
 - a. July
 - b. RL, TF, KH, SC, KVG (also to help with Arvin and some unincorporated areas)
 - c. Spanish
12. San Diego
 - a. No date
 - b. DT, MRT
 - c. Spanish
13. Sierras
 - a. June/July
 - b. CB
 - c. No listing
14. Ontario and High Desert
 - a. Mid June
 - b. ET, LO
 - c. Spanish
15. Apple Valley and Victorville
 - a. Mid-June
 - b. ET, LO
 - c. Spanish
16. North of Sacramento – Redding and North Coast
 - a. No date
 - b. No one yet
 - c. No listing

Outreach Needs

The EJAC focused on workshop outreach materials needed. The summarized the following needs:

- Radio (PSA marketing)
- Print (local editorial opportunities)
- TV
- Flyers with ARB design through press office/local EJAC contact info
- Press conferences and press releases

Budget considerations per workshop:

- Room rental \$0 to 1,000.00
- Audio/Video included in CSUS contract
- Food \$0 to 500.00
- Translation \$0 to 2,000.00
- Note-taker included in CSUS contract
- Childcare \$0 to 500.00
- Transit Stipend \$0 to 500.00
- Outreach/Coms. \$0 to 500.00

Comments/Questions:

The foregoing discussions also lead to clarifying questions and comments regarding workshops, ARB roles, EJAC roles, and opportunities. Those comments and questions are summarized as follows:

- Transportation and Lodging already taken care of for EJAC Board.
- FV: Floyd reiterated it is helpful to get some of actual lines items in terms of costs so he can pencil it out. ARB needs a quantification of the blanks like: cost of facility, types and costs of services. FV cannot go to management to request funds without more details. FV proposed that this is defined at the May 24-25 meeting.
- DA: \$700 to \$800 for a room along with a few sites they can use for free. What about audio-visual help?
- Long Beach can find something close to public transportation. What trade-offs are available? Workshop Subcommittee will help set parameters on workshop length.
- CB: There needs to be a budget for each presentation. Board members may need compensation for travel and lodging because some locations are 5-6 hours away.
 - FV reminded everyone they go through same process as state employees for reimbursement on travel.
- FV: It would be most productive if we quantify where, cost of facility and what types of services you need to fill in the blanks. We don't have a full picture of the costs at this time. Before FV can go to management, but he needs more details. May 24-25 meeting can be possibility to get a budget figure.
- MRT: Make a wish list and then ARB can crunch numbers.
- CB: A straw proposal would help. Estimate 50 to 100 people per meeting.
- LO: Response to RL's budget is not finalized yet. Need to compare costs to go with CSUS or use existing contract. CB: Can we contract out to community partners? Contracting process may be difficult to do but FV will look into it.
- ET: She offered to help with PSAs. Her group has Joel Green on board.
 - Budget question about what you will need in terms of materials?
 - Can ARB help you?
- RL: Radio could be good for outreach. PSAs will help, along with an actual marketing effort the first time out. As organizers, board members can do media both print and electronic.

- KVG recommended that everyone do their own version of announcements, and providing their own EJAC contact information.
- LO would like to do a collaborative flier with ARB—something general that can be adapted.
- CB: Use ARB professional collaboration with graphics design and personalize with each workshop’s personal information. Press conference idea is a good one.
- RL: Access is an issue for smaller and disadvantaged populations. We will put this all on paper.
- LO voiced concern regarding how to share information in the existing dialogues and said he wants communities to be able to read the information. Communities do not have access to the details, so they need to offer this discussion to the disadvantaged communities. This is where EJAC needs to put money. He wants to know how to close the communication gap.
- KVG: We agree that this should not be the only time the issues are discussed. Katie wondered how others doing this outreach.
- SG: How are we providing the information from the workshop and even outside of workshops – to get the right channel to give feedback to ARB. There was a question regarding how the information should be packaged.
- FV: Expertise is really at the local level so we are counting on EJ committee. LO’s comment about ongoing dialogue in community does need to be integrated, as that is part of our objective. We need to provide a mechanism that keeps this dialogue going at the local level. This was included as part of the Scoping Plan: Continual Communication.
- KH: Scoping plan comments deadline is a different issue. Looking at this as an opportunity to educate people to explain how all these things, e.g. cap and trade, is what we should want to do. Some of our not-so-typical partners would be a good place to survey for second round of workshops, so we can reach deep into communities that are not being included right now.
- MRT: North of Sacramento needs to be included to add tribal lands.
- MDA: What gives her hope is that there is an immense amount of hope in LA.
- DF: Senator Dan Flores is very interested in rural areas such as Shafter where he’s from, and unincorporated areas like Huron. These are places where workshops will get the most bang for the buck.
- FV: There will be lead staff at the next meeting for “deep dive” and the plan is to identify specific places in the scoping plan that touched on the recommendations of where your comments went in.

ARB Staffing and Resources

- FV: In terms of contracts, ARB has put in additional funds with California State University of Sacramento (CSUS), College of Continuing Education (CCE) to support the EJAC through the end of June. FV is working to get more funds to support the EJAC through March 2017. CSUS will provide technical writing and analysis of materials provided as well as logistical assistance. The contract for now with CSUS along with another one for next fiscal year will provide logistical support for environment justice activities.
- ARB is proposing that Stephanie Lucero take over facilitation support in June. She has worked with other EJAC members previously. Mark Wilson will be the technical writer to help synthesize recommendations and language material for ARB. Audio and visual for remote location

meetings is included. The CSUS will be a one-stop shop. They will also secure meeting locations, provide technical assistance and logistical support, such as travel arrangements for EJAC members. We hope this addresses the questions and concerns members had. Facilitation support for the May 24-25 meeting is still being worked out.

- MRT: We, the leadership team, need agenda planning assistance, posting of the notice, and actual facilitation.
- KVG: We need logistical support for these meetings we just scheduled. We'd like to start contract earlier so on May 24-25 meeting, we can be discussing how we will apply these new resources.
- SDF and FV: This contract issue can be clarified – it goes into effect May 15. We didn't have a contract to pay people. Sarah can provide facilitation for these May 24-May 25 and help us transition.
- TJ: Sarah Rubin can facilitate 24th and 25th days, so we are covered. CSUS will be available in June. FV is considering Sarah for the future and in June. They have busy schedules.
- LO: Tara and Sarah are all good facilitators. Decision needs to be made ASAP as this group needs consistency.
- LO: The team ARB is building has become a very legitimate board group. He felt they had really made it happen EJAC and have really cut through the bureaucracy. The record is so important. It serves a lot of functions as a good historical record. He has a teacher friend who is looking at having students break down comments as an assignment. LO felt EJAC leadership team should have a chair, along with a facilitator. Someone should be appointed. The leadership team does not necessarily get information back and forth. EJAC needs a chair to run the meetings, so you always have someone to go to; someone who manages the dialogue; still keep facilitators, but a chair makes sure everybody gets a chance to speak; manages all the communication and data. Leadership role already exists, but maybe it should be renamed as chair.
- FV: To answer the per diem issue, statute says that EJAC public meetings should be covered, including transportation at rate of \$100.00/day when members are having a public meeting or attending public meetings as EJAC members. Members are required to take the standardized ethical training and conflict of interest with Form 700. There's also ethical training around gifts. FV needs people to know that \$100.00 is in lieu of reimbursement. It may trigger other legal issues. The \$100.00 does not cover preparation time. They're looking at retroactive effort for per diem.
- LO asked everyone to please be brief.
- KVG thanked everyone for their efforts regarding the per diem and for keeping efforts going.
- KH confirmed with FV that the ethics training is online.
- KVG asked whether doing the training for other efforts could count for the EJAC. FV does not know if there are reciprocity agreements available.
- FV stressed ARB's commitment to making this process work.
- FV: Back to the two issues that were tabled before. A position may be established in the executive office. They are considering an assistant executive officer, similar to Michael Gibbs who reports to Richard. This person is to represent environmental justice (EJ) and disadvantaged communities, so these issues are at the forefront of our policy making. That is still be worked on,

but they are moving to do this. Specifically, ARB is trying to establish EJ-focused staffers. They are in support of this direction, but are trying to figure out how to do that. We are looking to EJAC for suggestions regarding economics and social justice experience. This person would be embedded in fuels, cap and trade, etc. We'll be talking with you more about this. We do not have an organizational solution at this time. The upshot is there is support for both. Probably looking at a team of about 6 to 8, some will be resourced and others will be new. We hope to see this in June to answer questions on timeframe.

- KVG offered the EJAC to have a part in interview process and selection, especially if they will serve as a primary contact to the EJAC.
- CB: Other groups to look to such as Water Board, models that would be good to consider that might work. FV will take those back to his superiors.
- MRT: We are very excited about EJ role in ARB and she thanked them for making this happen.
- LO said they have been very supportive and staff has done a lot to build capacity here. Thank you.
- FV: We're looking to build a team, so he appreciated hearing that. We have a number of very talented people within the agency. He hopes you are finding this is responsive to you, but we are also trying to build the infrastructure for the long term with local communities to make it meaningful for everyone.

EJAC Member Time on ARB Agendas

FV discussed the new workshop format that was changed to allow EJAC members time on agendas for meetings they attend. The intent was to provide a mechanism for EJAC members to provide ARB feedback. FV asked that EJAC members notify ARB staff whether they are in attendance at meetings. This summary lead to a series of comments on the process. Those comments are summarized as follows:

- MRT attended a workshop in April that included EJAC in an ARB slide and at a second workshop she and Katie were given 15 minutes to address the audience.
- KH: Interjected that standing in front of community members and to getting preferential treatment is difficult for me. KVG shared KH's concerns with getting preferred time on the agenda.
- GF asked if EJAC members could share their time at public meetings.
 - FV clarified that EJAC was given the special accommodation to meet statutory requirements. A special forum where EJAC shares time could set a precedent that makes meeting coordination difficult. The time on the agenda for EJAC members was a compromise for EJAC members in attendance. It does not preclude other disadvantage groups discussing with you and you telling the audience their concerns. Also public comments can also be heard at the end of workshop.

Committee Updates

EJAC members went through the various workshops and meetings they attended and provided a brief overview from each meeting.

Offsets workshop: International Offsets was not very new from what the EJAC already heard from ARB. They spoke of pros and cons. EJAC member shared that they would rather see offsets work here in California before trying it abroad. There are tribal leaders that share many of our EJ concerns. It was interesting to hear from international tribal leaders who participated in ARB workshop.

KVG and MRT: April 28 workshop focused on safeguards. They felt there should be safeguards in California for EJ communities first before exporting a climate program. April 4 workshop was on linkages to other countries for offsets and cap and trade. MRT expressed that it was baffling to think ARB can handle international relations better than the United Nations on these complex programs.

Adaptive Management: There are numerous issues, so not sure how this is going to be enforceable. Multiple challenges such as: What should trigger the action? We want to know of all increases because the low-income areas seem to be getting the most increases in emissions. There is no real time system to act on this. There is no early warning system in place.

GF: Next step is trying to figure the metrics to know what triggers a deeper investigation. A specific tool is necessary. Analysis is secondary.

Short Lived Climate Pollutants (SLCP): Bakersfield workshop explained economic impacts, but question about where the health impact assessment was. You see why EJAC is important. Thanks to Trish for texting him!

KH: There is a lot of focus on helping industry survive. Health impacts take lower priority. It is not apparent yet, but hope to see more information in 6 to 8 months. People in Bakersfield – refrigerants are seen as major climate pollutant is going to be severely challenged. Black carbon issue – he did not hear a lot about that, but felt the freight plan will help address this. We need to see a piece that addresses this black carbon issue.

Natural and Working Lands: We talked about issues of tree care and maintenance especially in urban areas. How is it funded? Models to use? We discussed best management practices and ability to start generating jobs around tree care and maintenance. Primarily agriculturally focused in Fresno area.

KH said someone from Boswell Farms said incentive programs are useful, but they have no accountability so are not effective. Should be on parallel as regulators. Tree and nut farmers were on board.

RL: There's a lot of land that is flooded, so how can we get these ranch communities to provide some employment maybe invasive species removal, etc.? How do you employ community to take care of this need?

Economic Analysis: This workgroup and EJAC will receive results of this analysis so they can incorporate comments into recommendations. Social costs of carbon need to be put into these studies.

KVG: Macro level analysis was disappointing. Some other scenarios besides cap and trade would be nice.

KVG: We did address the issue of financial impacts on industry if emissions are reduced, since they produce most of the emissions.

Agriculture Workshop: Coolants are an issue here because of the heat for farm workers, as well as the use of cooling devices in Imperial Valley used in warehouses.

LO: He got feedback that community appreciated the facilitated process.

Governor's Office:

SG: Four of EJAC's members met there to discuss how we institutionalize some of these priorities and to make sure we address these issues in a fair and thorough manner. We went over the timeline and they were supportive of extensions and community workshops. Staffing and legislative allocations at ARB for down the road were discussed. They would like to be more informed.

Closing Comments and Next Steps

TJ expressed that Resources for the EJAC will go to May 24-25 meeting since ARB is handling.

TJ requested volunteers for subcommittee to develop the general agenda for workshop.

Community Workshop Subcommittee members:

ARB: TJ, 1 management-level person, and out of these staff members Stephanie, Natalie and Jakub are potentials because they're sector leaders

EJAC: MDA, ET, KVG, and possibly RL.

Next Steps:

1. Survey partners on workshop contents.
2. How do we continue the dialogue?
3. Revisit notetaking: stenographer or other?
4. Pick a chair for EJAC Meetings. Rotate.
5. Community workshops subcommittee:
 - a. Meeting date for subcommittee: May 13, 2016 @ 9:00 invitation forthcoming
 - b. Agenda for May 24-25 meeting
6. ARB follow-up with regional EJAC members on meeting dates/locations/times before May 24th. Include budget requests.
7. ARB Flyer draft (Lindsay)
8. EJAC confirm two options of workshop locations and contact person by Monday, May 16.

May 24-25 workshop

- ARB staff will lead sector discussions as listed here. We have had some discussion with agencies that can be available.
- KVG: Day 2 could be for completing agendas for scoping workshops. These folks could say in a one-page document how each sector are going to do to comply with AB 32.
- MRT: Three major questions were listed:
 - How is this different form the 2014 plan?

- How did you include EJAC recommendations? Why or why not?
- What metrics are you using to measure what happened and what is going to happen
- Proposed Agenda themes were:
 - **Day 1:** Energy, Green Buildings, Natural and Working Lands , Industry and Waste
 - **Day 2:** Water, Agriculture, Transportation
- CB cannot make the May 24 date.
- RL cannot make those dates.
- KH requested confirmation on when the May meeting was scheduled.
- TJ stated that they to put out public notice to move meeting to El Monte, CA (Los Angeles area).
- KVG and CB requested what homework was needed for the May 24-25 meeting?
 - EJAC members were requested to review what we did in Brawley.

Public Comments

- “ARB has done a good job on providing documents on website.” Amy, from the Chamber of Commerce.
- “I’d like to encourage you to hold at least two public meetings for tribal populations. They are truly impacted.” Kai, DTOC.
- TJ: Cap and trade presentation at last workshop is listed under comments.
- KH: We’ll work with others on our survey. We’ve networked with some already, Subcommittee will weigh in on that at their first call.
- CB: Let’s group source on many of these items if we can.
- KVG: We’ll discuss court reporter vs. note-taker at the May 24 meeting, day one.
- MDA: Rotating role of chairperson to work with facilitator. Volunteer? LO will partner with leadership team to develop agenda and partner with facilitator.
- LO: Chair manages the conversation. Guiding-principles enforcer. Next Wednesday we have a call on May 18 2016.
- DF: Need to confirm location and dates by May 16 by EJAC members.