

## **AB 32 Environmental Justice Advisory Committee**

### **May 24-25, 2016**

---

#### **Committee Member Attendees**

Martha Dina Argüello (MDA), Colin Bailey (CB) 5/25 only, Gisele Fong (GF), Tom Frantz (TF), Katie Valenzuela-Garcia (KVG), Kevin Hamilton (KH), Luis Olmedo (LO), Mari Rose Taruc (MRT), Eleanor Torres (ET), Monica Wilson (MW) 5/24 only

#### **ARB and State Agency Attendees**

Floyd Vergara (FV), Trish Johnson (TJ), Johnnie Raymond (JR), Sara Nichols (SN), Diane Tavorkian (DT), Stephanie Kato (SK), Jakub Zielkiewicz, (JZ), Dave Mallory (DM), Claire Jahns (JH), Susanne Hague (SH), Strategic Growth Council, Office of the Governor (Sustainability Council), Wes Ingram (WI), Mary Nichols (MN), Chair

#### **Facilitator**

Sarah Rubin, Institute of Local Government  
Cindy Teague, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS  
Mark Wilson, Transom Communications

#### **Action Items 5-24**

- FV populated the meeting calendar to coordinate with experts and workshops for delivery by 5/25.
- ARB will schedule a publicly noticed phone call for coordinating with experts and scheduling workshops.
- ARB will coordinate, to the extent feasible, EJAC meetings with other ARB meetings being scheduled.
- SK will follow up with the Energy Team on whether or not all cities are included in recent Governor's Executive Order on water use.
- TJ or SK will follow up with EJAC on whether Cal Recycle considers social equity in terms of selecting suppliers. Specifically, the cost-benefit issue and how suppliers are assessed.
- SK will provide a hard copy of the overview on the current statutory review for Waste Sector to EJAC members.
- SH to connect with MDA regarding Natural Lands "right-of-return" and displacement of disadvantaged populations.

#### **Attachments**

Summary Recommendations

## Action Items 5/25

- FV will work with his staff to see how E-3 Pathways Study and Assembly Bill (AB) 693 policies mesh with current ARB priorities.
- FV to provide information to TF on deep-dive workshop (transportation) conducted for EJAC.
- Bay Area meeting on land use and planning meeting in July of 2016. CB will make sure SK gets a notice.
- TJ will set a committee call to vote on recommendations and approve slides.
- FV to provide translation services from in-house staff for flyers.
- FV will check on design team availability.
- Center for Continuing Education (CCE) will assist with language translation needs that ARB does not have in-house.
- HFC ARB contact person(s) from FV to KH.
- FV will see if GGR staff can be available to include costs on Cap-and-Trade.
- Provide information on the D of F website link to come from TJ
- FV will set up calls between graphics and EJAC members so posters can be populated with appropriate data. Workshop Subcommittee will be on the call.
- KVG's slides into agenda so members have an electronic copy.
- FV will clarify from a legal and budget-wise perspective what is possible through CCE for workshop financial assistance.
- Sector slide preferences are for the first workshops being held.
  - o San Bernardino and Oakland prefer Energy, Industry, Natural and Working Lands, and Transportation to start.

## EJAC Requests and Pending Questions

- There was an issue expressed relating to the best use of organics. EJAC wondered whether there is a better way than current gasification.
  - o Is Cost and community health well-being taken into consideration?
  - o KH will respond to these items specifically in relation to the green buildings discussions on the Executive Order on Water Conservation (EO-B-37-16).
- The E-3 Pathways Study is available on the ARB website for the January 15th Scoping Plan Meeting. AB 693 also is in existence. How do these policies mesh with priorities ARB is recommending now?
  - o What quantification needs to take place?
- How does Cal Recycle consider social equity in terms of suppliers? Cost-benefit issue and how is that assessed. (TJ) Trish or Stephanie will find out more about that program and get back to committee, LO.
- EJAC recommends that the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) section staff attend all EJAC/ARB meetings.
- EJAC requests that ARB to provide a detail of the process and incentives for newer, greener standards. EJAC believes ARB has a lot of leverage with the Governor right now to see incentives provided to move in this direction.

## Meeting Goals

1. Discuss Community engagement opportunities for 2030 Target Scoping Plan
2. Continue drafting initial Scoping Plan recommendations after reports from ARB, engaged state agencies, and EJAC
3. Learn about Environmental Justice Community in Los Angeles County, California

## Day 1 Welcome and Introductions

### 10:30 start for quorum

Quorum allowed for 10:30 a.m. start to meeting. Introductions by all participants were made with each person listing a hidden talent. <sup>1</sup>

MVD welcomed the EJAC to San Gabriel Valley (SGV). SGV has large and quickly changing population with lots of water issues. Martha lives in Silver Lake, a gentrified area with displaced persons. Air impacts in urban core and oil extraction have a huge impact on the southland where many live and work. Implementation of AB 32 addresses this issue, but SGV competes with the central valley for credits and air quality improvements. Sarah then covered meeting goals, listed above and did some housekeeping.

### Public Comment – 10:30

No comments.

## Graphic Overview – Workshops

Modules for each topic:

I Planning:

- Logistics
- Outreach
- Content Planning
- Rules
- Data Aggregation—framework

II. Workshop Happenings:

---

<sup>1</sup> Sarah Rubin started and said she can hula-hoop. Cindy is a mezzo-soprano and likes singing opera. Mark plays guitar. Tom Frantz is a gardener supreme. KVG can parallel park a 40-foot passenger bus. Monica knits really hard things. Martha is an amazing baker. Diane T. is a really good vegetarian soup cooker. Wes really knows how to use a shovel. Sara just found out she bowls really well. Stephanie plays piano, violin and is quite a dart thrower. Luis can make a sling shot out of recycled materials. Floyd can waste money on comic books! He's an investor galore. Trish's secret talent is that she was high school mascot. Johnnie is a second degree black belt. Mallory makes really good beer. Mari Rose shared she does Philippine martial arts. Jakub can juggle. Claire has very good balance in different applications. Kevin Hamilton plays guitar and fishes.

- Consistent Content
- Custom focus
  - Data Collection – start with themes we already have.

III. EJAC meeting post-workshop discussion and EJAC recommendations will emerge.

### **Additional Workshop Comments**

Off-topic comments that are really important, but may not be appropriate for workshop need to be captured and conveyed. Let people know that you are doing that while in workshop setting. Make a record of the source for later use.

There are non-workshop opportunities to provide input. It is important for an Environmental Justice (EJ) contacts to play a part in that role.

### **ARB Briefing**

FV provided an update on the budget.

1. Sarah's facilitation services were retained for the May 24-25 meeting.
2. The budget has been submitted to the Board for consideration.
3. Mobile source control and climate investment etc. to create synergy for community outreach issue was raised. We are in process of populating calendar for your consideration during planned workshops.

LO reminded group with question regarding the expanded facilitation role. Legal gave the approval. Bagley-Keene is met with small subcommittee meetings or pre-meeting work for phone calls or meetings of the EJAC. LO felt it important that all members are communicated with, receiving handouts, etc. and we just wanted to confirm that individuals outside the EJAC could handle that role.

Consolidation of outreach efforts – length of workshops is two maybe three hours. KVG said it would be for workshop participants to attend only the portion of interest. If experts from other ARB meetings could hang around for workshop sessions, that would be great. There could also be shared meetings with these expert sessions. Coordination may need timeline and budget discussion.

FV asked for his staff to get out shared calendar and hopefully by tomorrow he can share with the group. He hopes to have coordinating phone call to discuss this. ARB will need to schedule a publicly noticed phone call to coordinate with experts as the workshops are scheduled. FV said coordination with other ARB meetings may not be possible for the first couple of workshops, but within next few weeks, coordination can take place.

Added to May 25, 2016 discussion. Meeting notices for all other EJAC meetings. KH is seeing a lot of other meetings being scheduled. If ARB already has another meeting scheduled, efforts should be combined with EJAC workshops. It would be easier for everyone involved. KVG stated

that budget is of concern. FV has enough money currently in budget for first few months of workshops.

## **Scoping Plan Part 1: Waste Management (WM)**

### **Expert: Stephanie Kato, Staff Air Pollution Specialist**

In addition to ARB, waste has seven other agencies dealing with Waste Management. SK started by providing background on this sector, and by framing existing measures.

- The 2008 Assembly Bill (AB) 32 Scoping Plan initiated the process of identifying opportunities to achieve greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions from the Waste Management Sector (Waste Sector).
- Control of landfill methane emissions was identified as an early action measure.
- The 2008 Scoping Plan also identified the need for mandatory commercial recycling and other programs to develop and implement alternatives to landfilling.
- Over 40 % of waste stream is organics. The majority of this can be diverted. State has statewide capacity until 2057, but now the state is trying to get resource conservation goals closer to 75%.
- In the Scoping Plan Resolution 11-32, the Board directed the Air Resources Board (ARB) staff to work with the Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (Cal Recycle) and other stakeholders to characterize emission reduction opportunities for handling solid waste, including recycling, reuse, remanufacturing of recovered materials; composting and anaerobic/aerobic digestion; biomass conversion; waste thermal processes; and landfilling.
- Cap-and-Trade Regulation Resolution 12-33, called for ARB staff to propose a comprehensive approach for the most appropriate treatment of the Waste Sector under the Cap-and-Trade program based upon the analysis of emission reduction opportunities.
- In response to the Board directive, ARB and Cal Recycle established a joint workgroup to determine the best use of recycling alternatives, examining ways to increase the use of waste diversion alternatives, obtaining funds and incentives for building the infrastructure, and evaluating the need for additional research to achieve GHG reductions and meet waste management goals.
- Methane control measures were put in place for collection of gas and there may be opportunities to improve methane output.

### **Discussion on Waste Sector**

Recommendations include using 2014 priorities are being carried over as guiding principles going forward. EJAC concern was biomass with fewer localized impacts:

- Renewable fuels in trucks.
- Power generation.
- \$100 million in budget by the governor with \$10 million specifically for food reuse portion. Meeting is currently going on today.

- Grant program handout with map of points and weighting values, specifically on page for disadvantage communities. This includes jobs, impacts on air and water and providing letters of support if your community supports an issue.
- Food rescue program is looking at crafting a scoring plan, so if EJAC members would like to weigh in, they can.
- EJ efforts in Cal Recycle do exist. We might want to coordinate with them on community efforts.

ARB discussed the need to address conflicts between individual vs. EJAC recommendations. It was confirmed that recommendations from April 4<sup>th</sup> are from the whole EJAC. Those added today are all full EJAC recommendations, not individual ones.

- Food rescue recommendations are important. Follow through on implementation is important too. It is a convenient program when farms provide the food rescue waste, but much of it becomes someone else's problem. Then it ends up back in landfill.
- A homework function would be helpful.
- EJAC members can get these recommendations back from Mark in an organized fashion, then members can vote on them or prioritize them.
- MDA: Rules around siting technologies would be helpful. EJ members do not want a lot of these facilities in their communities.
- ARB are discussing facility locations that are somewhat undesirable.
- Small committees within EJAC membership do provide topic expertise for agencies in between meetings.
- MRT clarified that sector discussions would follow process of ARB presentation first; second, would be cross-referencing these recommendations with first set of responses from the Board which has not yet been published.
- Question: Would landfills get any credit for avoided methane offset?
  - Answer: Landfills are different than dairies or others. No credits for not producing – it must be diverted and society pays for that.
- GF: In this Scoping Plan, we would like to see how ARB sees state goals translated into local goals front and center in the recommendations. This may include some best management practices or local level activities.
- Talks have started, EJAC should make these local recommendations at the Scoping Plan level – not to be overly prescriptive, but provide a framework of the priorities. Put this in Scoping Plan not buried in the appendix.

### **Waste Management Recommendations (Mark Wilson, Editor/Writer)**

- Do not use gasification and biofuels as qualifying renewable options, since those technologies have other pollution issues associated with them.
- Do not invest in gasification.

- Communities should take full ownership of their waste so that it is not exported to disadvantaged communities. View it as a resource, including recycling and cleanup of landfills, look at both new and existing generation.
- Set composting as the primary goal for incentivizing waste diversion. Promote composting by providing education and assistance to implement composting in all communities. Support the expansion of infrastructure for composting, and map out the mechanisms for composting in each community. Incentivize neighborhoods to compost food waste, from schools and at the community level. Establish communications plans that show Californians how to compost and that motivate people.
- Determine if the supporting infrastructure is in place before making decisions on how to manage woody or organic waste.
- Do not incinerate biomass; instead, identify and support methods for returning it to the soil.
- Do not count incineration of any material as a renewable energy source.
- No credits should be given for GHG avoidance from landfill or for bio-digesters.
- Provide a baseline credit for applying carbon back to soils.
- Divert dairy waste before it can convert to methane.
- Identify waste management technologies, which have been found to be problematic.
- Identify the metrics being used to quantify GHG reductions for this sector. Discuss and agree upon these metrics with the interagency working group.
- Research and identify alternatives for dumping bio-solids (sewage sludge) in disadvantaged communities. Pilot a program to explore and demonstrate better options.
- Identify effective methods for implementing food rescue programs, especially strategies for getting food to those who need it. Incentivize these programs. Promote communication plans for projects, so all communities have access to successful plans.

## After lunch

Welcoming attendees back, Sarah passed out red, green and yellow cards to allow members to vote on proposed recommendations. Red signifies you cannot live with it and those will be discussed at a later date. A yellow card needs a little tweaking and we will discuss today. A green card is a go.

## Scoping Plan

### Part I Remaining Sectors: Energy, Green Buildings, and Natural and Working Lands

**Important Issue:** ET heard short-lived climate pollutants last week, mostly on methane and dairy waste management. The comment period closes on the 26<sup>th</sup>. Issue is interface exists

between EJAC recommendations and the comment period. She would like to make sure comments are incorporated. ARB can file comments in time for the closing period.

- ACTION ITEM. EJ comments are already in the strategy plan.
- All EJAC members will be apprised of the forthcoming comment deadlines.
- (KVG) She wants EJAC's comments registered for short-lived climate pollutants (SLCP).
- Tom's letter is what they want submitted and today's informal comments from this two-day meeting.

## Energy

### Timeline overview.

There will be an informational board hearing in June. Summer months will have workshops. Two workshops already occurred. Details and locations will be announced. The Draft Scoping Plan is scheduled for release August/fall.

- Background: This group looks at natural gas and energy efficiency. The energy facilities are massive and the networks are extensive. As of 2013, the Energy sector has already seen 20% lower emissions than in 1990.
- Coal generation was cut in half by 2013. More can, and needs to be done. Progress has been made. SB 1368 established emission performance standard in coal plants that has cut coal generation in the state.
- Solar energy helps and we have seen that double in capacity 2010 to 2015. Other programs have also helped, including solar roofs, federal tax credits, and green energy. A portfolio of clean energy was put in place. GHG emissions were reduced. Overall, this is about 20% of all statewide emissions.
- Energy efficiency has to consider more than the supply side.
- Consider how to reduce demand side (for example appliances etc.) Energy Efficiency is the most cost-efficient approach for the long term reduction (up to 20%) of the state. 87% of current homes are going to be in the housing stock by 2030.
  - Appliance standards, LED, utility investment programs, rechargers, building standards are increasing in stringency as they get updated.
  - Energy assistance programs for disadvantaged communities, as well a zero-net energy construction. Work is being done on this.

### Energy Discussion

- Overview with inter-agency workgroup has to get the lay of the land to better understand where we are now. This includes, literature review of prior Scoping Plans and past legislation. SB 350 requires 33% of energy derived by renewable sources now, and then leads to a 50% level.
- Working with sister agencies; organizing inter-agency work groups Energy, PUC, the Governor's office, Cal Recycle, Cal EPA, CA Food and Agriculture and others have identified existing Scoping Plans so we do not re-invent the wheel.
  - How do we further ratchet down emissions or adopt new programs?

- TF raised the issue of imported energy.
  - Are we looking at those sources?
  - Do we look at whether those are renewable?
  - Answer: It is a valid question and it is case-dependent. Recommendation is that if the entire grid is 5% renewable, it should only be 5% renewable.
- Low-income communities can use gas if it is available and cheaper, are we still trying to convert to electric so it meets 50% goals?
  - ARB does not have the answer to that at this time. Dilemma is looking at trade-offs, but internal process is not currently complete.
- ET raised the issue using urban areas where we can use natural settings to create synergy.
- Energy savings recommendation that GHG or energy reduction be considered from a whole disadvantaged community approach, and formulating figures based on that.
  - A blanket approach is a novel idea, but it's a difficult concept. We want to provide the resources to cut down energy to help the disadvantaged community and also cut costs. Various programs now allow you to qualify. If you marry programs and provide the whole package to an entire community, then low-cost technology would help an entire community.
- MDA gave an example of 4-block radius in Watts, all low income and all old buildings. The question was everyone would be enrolled.
  - LO: Yes.
  - MRT suggested that the community comes together, fills out all the paperwork as a group. This compares to micro-groups. "The technology is there, let's just do it."
  - LO compared this idea to net metering.
- How is rental housing being considered in the design of programs, for example, energy efficiency, weatherizing, water, etc.?
  - Landlord/tenant/agent problem does not have a quick answer to it. We are trying to get better information and make it more readily available. California Energy Commission (CEC) is looking at this issue. Programs for aforementioned ideas with incentives have been established that better incorporate these goals. There is no one-stop shop for that now. Funding comes from various sources, local, state and federal.
- EJAC recommends creation of a pilot program because this is a big problem.
  - HUD for lead paint removal is an example of the Landlord/rental problem.
    - Landlord does not raise rent or evict or sell property and the city remediates.
    - Healthy Homes Program model was suggested. Cards were passed out for additional comments on sample, successful programs.
- Question: Does the Energy grid allow us to tag a source?
  - Answer: Yes, we do have e-tags that can be attached to certain streams of energy.

- We spend a lot of time enrolling people in programs, e.g. lead abatement and got them access to Healthy Homes Program. Power providers have different requirements and criteria, e.g. PG&E. Government does not require Social Security numbers, but PG&E does in order to qualify for low-cost energy.
  - Recommend that these programs be offered universally.
- Recommend a metric with before and after measurements. No one checks to see if reductions actually took place on energy efficiency.
  - EJAC should make accountability a guiding principle. Universal access and identification. Measure the impacts of the program – why or why not is it working.
- ARB funded a pilot program with weatherization and targeted Women, Infants, and Children program (WIC) families. This Department of Community Services and Development program was one-stop shopping. We should go back to that.

### **Summary of Objectives and Goals for Energy Sector:**

- Transform the demand side for Electronic Vehicles (EV), plus population and economic growth.
- We are currently using assumptions from SB 350 and utilizing some of the programs we just talked about.
- On the supply side a shift off fossil fuel, and go to other cleaner sources. From a supply/demand perspective these are themes we are looking at now.
- EV infrastructure.
- Grid expansion
- Accounting for inefficiencies in our fossil fuel system. These need to be addressed and mitigated.
  - SB 350 is addressing most of these goals.
- Existing programs need to be stressed. More innovative approaches need to be stressed and pushed from the local government level.
- Incentive R&D needed so electric and natural gas issues are looking to micro-grids.
- New technologies of various kinds are necessary.
- Do we need to look at the recommendations versus what is in the statute of SB 350?
  - MRT would like to see us shoot for 100% renewable.
- Can we do more of the things we are sure of on emissions? If you can decrease industrial emissions, then invest in 100% renewable so we can get to emission targets sooner.
- EJ communities should be seen as a resource to help adopt renewable energy.

### **Energy Recommendations (Mark Wilson, Editor/Writer)**

- Do not give full credit for out-of-state renewables if that state then needs to use fossil fuel to generate the same amount of electricity for itself.

- Encourage a transition from natural gas-based appliances and technologies to all electric.
- Support tree planting and green infrastructure to reduce the energy needed for cooling.
- Approach energy reductions (building retrofits, weatherization, etc.) in a way that addresses the entire disadvantaged community, rather than addressing individual buildings.
- GHG reduction funds should address the whole disadvantaged community, and the disadvantaged community itself should qualify for funding, rather than having each residence having to qualify individually.
- SB 535 investments in these communities could address energy efficiency, solar, and micro-grids.
- Develop an innovative pilot program to consolidate programs to create a one-stop shop for energy efficiency. Support efforts among state agencies and others to coordinate renovation and weatherization programs so efforts can focus on the whole house, rather than on one aspect at a time, and so multiple program offerings can be more easily accessed.
- Identify and implement metrics to track savings from energy efficiency efforts, to quantify energy reductions. Standardize the metrics and conduct post-project assessments to ensure accountability.
- Survey local activities to identify which strategies are working and which are not. Use Environmental Justice communities as a resource.
- Increase the current California renewables target to 100% renewables, to reach emissions reduction targets sooner. (This was a 2014 recommendation.)

## Public Comment

Amy with CA Chamber of Commerce introduced herself. She reminded the group that California has one of the most efficient energy sectors in the country. The renewable goal of 50% will stress the grid. Higher renewables are important. SB 350 will be driving more renewable objectives.

Southern California Gas commended the work that EJAC is doing. The goal of electrifying everything gets talked about a lot. There are benefits to having a diverse energy portfolio. Recent outages showed how difficult life can be without natural gas as an option. Customers have already paid into the system, so you do not want to strand those assets. Customer choice is also an important consideration. Cost-effectiveness is also very important. 90% of energy is delivered from the sources with natural gas, as opposed to only 30% from electricity. Storage is also a consideration with electricity. Please take a look at all these issues.

## Green Buildings

- The concept is to move beyond energy efficiency. This refers to mitigating all impacts of the built environment. There is EO B-37-16 already and state agencies are working

towards water conservation. Dept. of General Services (DGS) does monitor those targets. An annual report and prior year's data is available for state-owned and state-leased buildings.

- Continuous updates to the "CalGreen" Code (CalGreen) occur every 18 months to 3-year cycle. CalGreen has mandatory and voluntary tiers. Local jurisdictions have an option of adopting those provisions and can make the tiers mandatory. Sources of information will be available on CalGreen website this year. These tiers can serve as models for other local governments.
- Issue of whether all cities are included in this EO B-37-16? SK will get back to DT on that.
- With regard to existing buildings stock and clean-air issues: Last August the CEC did adopt existing retrofit plan. That is a very large document outlining a number of actions and milestones to figure where the gaps are and formulate strategies to address this. Cost requirements are a big hurdle, e.g. reducing combustion costs. Legislative action may be required. CEC is working on that plan now. Milestones and targets are documented. Locate energy staff to address this. AB 758.
- Green Building Workgroup's biggest concern besides drought, were water requirements including mold potential. Mandatory green roof requirements were set aside for now until the mold potential is better researched. ET: Water issues have been a problem on the test case. Building codes for existing buildings will be forthcoming.
- This group recommended new construction targets for future zero-carbon. This would harness energy efficiency and active transport. Timing of this target is as follows: Inter-agency group will use the timeframe up to 2020 to get more input on a zero-carbon building, and the target goal will be for 2030. Some examples in Europe exist. Late this summer a project will be looking at technical feasibility of getting to zero-carbon.
- Recommendation is zero-carbon on new buildings construction.
- No toxic building materials, the LEED-Certified building standard, which includes active living building standards, is more appropriate here. Regenerative building standards, so building acts as part of nature (such as chiller and greenhouses, photovoltaic). Likewise, other metrics considered, such as transportation.
  - How do we incorporate emissions?
- LO: rehabilitation vs. new buildings. Are there examples of LEED-Certification construction?
  - There are lists of materials with demolition standards so it adheres to green standards.
- One option is to require standards at time of sale – this was one idea. Green building standards are everything to low-income communities. There is a challenge to communities who do not have access to these resources, or the means to get access to them.

- Recommend having a more inclusive definition for LEED-Certified building, because not all buildings are shiny and new, especially in disadvantaged communities. CalGreen should be expanded – sharing space, using recycled materials.
- What percentage of our emissions is coming from existing stock? What portion of emissions in the future going to come from existing or new buildings? A higher-level prediction would be very helpful.
- FV clarified that our intent is to provide higher-level recommendations as opposed to granular, in-the-weeds data in the recommendations. The process is new with inter-agency working group. Internally we are not yet ready to say what business-as-usual will look like in 2020. The draft in late summer or fall should contain some of that information.
- EJAC requests that ARB to provide a detail of the process and incentives for newer, greener standards. EJAC believes ARB has a lot of leverage with the Governor right now to see incentives provided to move in this direction.
- Emission reductions break-out is not advantageous. There is a desire to look at this theme throughout the Scoping Plan.
  - We are working within the confines of the model that looks at energy flows.
  - The majority of policy issues e.g., SB 350 is something we need to look at very carefully.
  - There was a study looking at models at 2050 with 80% goal, which provided a set of scenarios for 2030. We are using the same pathways model. Those discussions have not happened yet. That over the summer to be able to make informed recommendations.
- E-3 Pathways Study is available on ARB website from the January 15th Scoping Plan Meeting. AB 693 also is in existence. How do these policies mesh with priorities ARB is recommending now?
  - That quantification needs to take place. We look forward to seeing that come out. ACTION ITEM FV will work with his staff to make sure the quantification of how E-3 Pathways Study and AB 693 policies mesh with ARB recommendations takes place and report outcomes to the EJAC.
- How does Cal Recycle consider social equity in terms of suppliers? Cost-benefit issue and how is that assessed. ACTION ITEM TJ and/or SK will find out more about that program and get back to EJAC.

### **Green Buildings Recommendations (Mark Wilson, Writer/Editor)**

- Set a target of zero net energy (ZNE) for all new construction by 2020.
- Set a goal of no natural gas or biogas in new buildings.
- Support the development of standards for “living buildings” (regenerative buildings that more closely follow natural ecosystems, with features such as solar, water capture,

efficient and affordable transportation options, etc.) to encourage development of such buildings.

- Broaden the definition of a “green building” to include retrofits of existing buildings in disadvantaged communities.
- Identify the current state of green building technologies, and set goals for green buildings in California.
- Identify the percentage of GHG emissions that are coming from existing buildings in the state, and estimate the portion of emissions expected for the future. This will identify the level of improvement expected.
- Provide direction to industry on best practices for rapidly moving toward widespread design and construction of green buildings, and incentivize developers to adopt the standards and implement them. Ensure that building or retrofit costs are not passed along to low- and moderate-income tenants by providing tax incentives, or adopt policies that prevent having those costs passed on to them.

## **Natural and Working Lands (NWL)**

### **Suzanne Hague, Sara Nichols and Natural Resources Agency, Claire Jahns**

Overall vision established by the Governor in 2015 that agencies to manage all of our lands to store carbon. That is the primary goal of 2030 Scoping Plan. A discussion paper was released prior to the meeting. The initial ideas and draft goals that will be looked at as we continue to develop strategy in NWL. Four major goals:

1. Protect: Minimize conversions and manage to preserve the sequestering potential of forests, rangelands, farms, wetlands and riparian systems.
2. Enhance: Manage and restore land to increase carbon storage and minimize GHG emissions in a sustainable manner.
3. Innovate by seeking synergies that optimize contributions from NWL while sustaining lands and rural economies.
4. Increase urban forestry canopy.

Inter-agency working group meetings are developing a comprehensive approach. Looking at ways to integrate economic impacts, but there is a lot of overlap between sectors. Value comes from use of existing efforts, which inherently complement each other. For example, forest carbon; SLCP have many overlap opportunities. In general, the plan is to follow these individual processes and adopt these so they do not duplicate efforts.

The Pathways model will be used to estimate the amount of land we need to create renewable energy. Ongoing efforts being made now trying to fill data gaps:

- Forest carbon plan with specifics metrics and targets in Scoping Plan
- Statewide emission plan – wall to wall of GHG working lands
- Other state resources.

The Natural Resources Agency is the umbrella over forests, water and agricultural lands and the Department of Conservation. This Scoping Plan offers a shift from forest to covering carbon emissions. First update made agriculture much more substantial, then natural and working lands, including wetlands, urban areas and even oceans.

- We are trying to increase adaptive strategies. Agriculture (Ag) and timberlands and then natural lands which is everything else, even federal lands which is about half of California's land. This is important because of wildfires. They produce about two-thirds of black carbons. Conserving open landfills balances urban infill. We are looking for forest opportunities so they do not burn, but increase growth and help sustain them for carbon storage.
- The concept paper looks at what that might mean. ARB took a risk by putting out the first paper and setting targets to manage climate change.
- We broke out urban separately and feel it deserves its own focus. There's not a lot of consensus on how to measure carbon releases right now. We do know some things because of older goals on forest lands.
- Wetlands preservation.
- In urban space, there are numerous goals – tree canopy increase by 5%. Pushing to increase that by 2030.
- Proximity to parks for ecosystem services for water collection and cool urban heat island.
- Reducing heat island effects to reduce ac demands
- Transportation sector and others.
- 

#### **Comments on the paper:**

- Support for overall tone of paper.
- Guiding principles.
- Most of the goals could be moved to broader Scoping Plan goals.

#### **Weaknesses:**

- Statewide project quantification of GHG goals
- Specify types of land types were covered.
- The need to define terms.
- Ability to make specific recommendations especially in terms of Ag.
- Setting the bar too low.
- Water was raised as an issue.
- Do we have money for jobs or have you identified jobs?
- Economic modeling is not necessarily applicable now.
- The tools we currently use do not measure increase of watershed, protecting habitat etc.

Job impacts are very important to the EJAC.

**Strengths:**

- GHG benefit was the biggest piece of feedback we got.
- Metrics on water use efficiency and carbon capture has co-benefits. So water programs and legislation may be useful.
- Benefits need to be tied to other programs – welcome suggestions at the Natural Resources Agency.
- Comment period is still open.

**Discussion on NWL and Concept Paper**

- Several EJAC members received concept Paper favorably. Issues raised:
  - What is the scope of what you will be looking at regarding carbon neutrality?
  - As you quantify things, how can EJAC weigh in?
  - Two themes to consider:
    - Solid carbon sequestration. CDFA healthy soils initiative. ARB is collaborating with CDFA. EJAC can get involved in that.
    - Biomass approach. There are options. We have dead and dying trees, they have to go somewhere. We need to look at all options. No silver bullet. There are tradeoffs with all solutions proposed.
- The accounting of this entire process often does not make sense. A study has been proposed on all of the biomass waste. We have 33 million dead trees. Tree mortality task force is looking at this issue to figure out this massive logistics issue. Reforestation is the focus as well as public health issues. This is a good example of the issues we face – what do we with this material?
- Recommendation is do not turn agricultural (Ag) land into solar and wind which only provides temporary jobs of 6 months. Energy goes to other communities, not the disadvantaged communities. Desert lands should not be turned into solar.
- Recommendation is to have definition of desert and urban forestry and rural desert forest. These desert areas need protection. Protect what we have so no more Owens Lake and Salton Sea. What is Natural Resources Agency doing to influence Scoping Plan?
- Rural and urban interfaces should be looked at by the Natural Resources Agency. Agency hears a lot from low-income communities who do not qualify for funding. They would like input on this from EJAC. Cal Enviro Screen is a good program and took a long time to create. There are a lot of red communities, as opposed to orange or yellow. The

red ones get the funds. This is a good tool, but many are working hard to keep the tool appropriate and useful. KH doesn't want to see tons of money being sunk into forests.

- Metrics on health benefits – what does ARB want from EJAC? Suggested use of strategies that look at co-benefits from other programs.

### **Natural and Working Lands Recommendations (Mark Wilson, Editor/Writer)**

1. Develop and implement metrics to quantify the GHG benefits of managing natural and working lands. Achieve consensus on how to measure GHG emissions reductions from activities in natural systems.
  2. Revise the goal of increasing tree canopy by 5% by 2030 to 10%, and conduct research to identify methods of achieving that increase given drought conditions.
  3. Quantify potential jobs created from regenerating forests and jobs for maintenance of green spaces, and increase funding to support those activities.
  4. Create green spaces *within* disadvantaged communities, rather than *outside* those communities.
  5. Do not turn agricultural lands into solar and wind projects. They often produce mostly only a few, short-term jobs, the electricity goes to large population centers, and farmworkers are displaced, resulting in a net job loss.
  6. Do not scrape deserts for renewable energy sites.
  7. Expand the definition of “urban forestry” to include “rural desert urban forestry,” so those areas can qualify for funds to support tree planting.
  8. Support training, education, and incentives for planners to design and develop infill building projects rather than sprawling developments. Provide incentives such as guarantees for a more rapid planning and approval process for infill projects.
  9. Support life cycle analyses of sprawling developments to determine long-term economic and societal costs versus infill projects, to identify actual costs.
  10. Identify, develop, and implement policy tools to prevent the current trend of gentrification in California pushing lower-income residents and people of color inland. Do not provide GHG reduction funds for improvement projects that will displace current residents.
- Susanne Hague was on telephone to talk about Land Conservation and Future Growth/Land use and development. She began with explanation to put growth in context.
    - Question. Why does growth go where it goes?
    - Answer. Working land loss is due to population growth and graphic shows there is a huge opportunity for Scoping Plan. We can leverage how and where we grow. Loss of agricultural land loss was shown for Fresno.

- Illustration of infill where land is conserved was shown. CO2 impacts are shown with how land consumption and development patterns affect community. Density and growth patterns and the interactions of private and public sector activity were up next. Policy that supports sustainable growth at the state level can be affected by Scoping Plan recommendations and incentives for moving in the right direction. Tomorrow will detail how population growth can be shaped.
- Sprawl is not really understood and the sustainable plan, even when approved, is not enough to incentivize communities. Green space usage should perhaps come with penalties to help prevent sprawl. Speeding up planning process was recommended with incentives. Getting developers into conversations was also recommended.
- Rural sprawl needs to consider costs of getting food and transportation. Planners need to understand long-term sustainability of urban sprawl. Workshops are being offered by the state at this time to address this issue.
- Maps are helpful to see the inland growth. A lot of people of color are being pushed inland due to economic reasons. Gentrification of low income communities needs to address existing areas, especially where “donut” effect has taken place. Policy makers have not done a very good job in addressing those populations. We do not have the tools at this time. Use money wisely. Do not provide money to developers that will result in people being displaced. Right-of-return policies do not work. We have to get better. Workshops will give us an audience of people who are on the front line of helping displaced people. MDA does not have a lot of solutions. In Los Angeles a lot of development is displacing people.

## Public Comments

- With regard to infill we want to see it happen but also battle with getting approvals.
- AB 32 according to business standards agrees with the EJAC on emission goals.
- Why are we looking at LEED when one is a third-party certification as opposed to the state standard of CalGreen?

## Day 2 Welcome and Introductions 5/25

### Transportation, Water, Industry

Sarah started meeting after introductions by covering the meeting goals. GF from Long Beach briefed group on south bay area issues, which is home to two ports. The Long Beach and Los Angeles ports bring in 40% of all goods for this part of the country. The goods movement has

many EJ issues, e.g. diesel particulates, which is of great importance to the EJAC as it grapples with proximity of pollution sources.

Both the Long Beach and South Beach area are affected by presence of huge refineries. Many facilities populate the area. The effects of oil drilling, extraction and production are also a huge factor contributing to pollution impacts. Long Beach and LA are both fighting for zero emissions – fastest way to affect impacts in our communities. This EJAC is so helpful to be a part of in terms of community benefits. It helps to understand all the sectors which address housing and all the other aspects that contribute overall to pollutants.

Sarah reviewed the agenda for the day and timing of events. A big part of the afternoon is for getting into the weeds of what resources EJAC members might need to use in the workshops. Also, time will be spent on voting your preferences on recommendations for input on Scoping Plan. Gisele asked for some time to share learnings from subcommittee calls. Participants paired up to discuss issues of importance that should be shared with the larger group.

- GF appreciates the steady efforts towards a culture shift, so efforts can be equally based in communities, as well as at the state level. Let's use a clear communication plan at the community level.
- MRT heard there was a meeting of workgroup on how to incentivize or de-incentivize on low carbon fuels.
- Air monitoring in certain EJ community regions come up short. The location of the monitors was large part of the project. Are we missing important data?
- LO felt the exercise on learning modality was very good. He likes to learn visually.

### **Transportation**

These are high-level goals. The car culture has huge component. Mobile sources: cars and heavy trucks have traditionally been on fossil fuels. Those mobile sources are the largest contributors to ozone. How do we address these levels?

- Fuels. Liquid fuels. Gas use has decreased between 2005 and 2015 and diesel has seen 7% decrease. In addition, there has also been uptick in growth in alternative fuels, e.g. EV, hydrogen, natural gas. We need to reduce consumption in fossil and we are heading in that direction as we get alternative fuels and electricity in use.
- Infrastructure and land use. We have all these mobile sources over 175,000 miles of roads and highways in state. We also look at pedestrian and bicycle pathways and we are progressing in those areas.

- Ports are a huge economic driver and job provider. But huge health aspects and infrastructure our transit and freight systems also deliver all the goods to homes and businesses.
- Land use and location of facilities: This is a new topic in policy perspective and how we interact with the land and developers. Vehicle miles traveled is only one metric and the GHG's associated with vehicles.
- Themes around non-vehicle travel, smart travel and other ideas have also been looked at here. This GHG goal of 40% by 2030 is the overall large goal. Reduce petroleum use by 2030.
- Achieving federally based goals is also going to be addressed by mobile source sector. Huge impacts from mobile sources on poor air quality. Focus has been on vehicle efficiency and alternative fuels, reducing energy consumption and addressing vehicle miles traveled is a concentration in the Scoping Plan. Strategically and practically this is how we are approaching this in the Scoping Plan.
- Land use and infrastructure – SH asked EJAC to use the model of work being done across state agencies on transportation. Imagine three legs of a tool:
  1. Vehicles
  2. Fuels
  3. Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT)
- The most recent update is addressing the demand side of this equation. From GHG perspective we need reduction of VMTs because lower cost efficiency improvements are also important. Most reductions will come through vehicles and fuels, but reducing demand is a key piece.
- VMT is growing faster than technology can keep up, so another reason the GHG perspective will continue to see a rise in emissions. Zero emission vehicles still require energy and there are emissions in producing energy.
- Total 15% reduction of VMT by 2050. Transportation and Caltrans updated plans also put strong emphasis on VMT reduction. Transportation needs to do its part for goals in reducing emissions.
- Outside of the state, a report called by Moving CA Forward by Energy Innovations used many of the same assumptions but modeled future growth scenarios. They found the will state be hard pressed to meet targets if VMT is not aggressively acted upon.
- Reductions are above and beyond the Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS) standpoint. GHG reduction has to do with access (e.g. Palmdale 65K people where commuters are traveling about two hours to work). VMT trickle-down effects are important, such as family time. Choices of travel options besides cars. We need to

service more economic ranges, types of people and provide options to these populations.

- Serving existing communities is a priority as opposed to new communities. Growing smarter and reducing VMTs.

### **Transportation Discussion**

Discussion question is how VMT reductions will come from already approved SCS plans. What ideas do you have so our projections are on track? Measures we adopt have a lot to do with modeling and future scenarios on which we rely.

- ARB is looking at metrics for benchmarking implementation. We are not there yet. From a policy perspective we are talking about adding policies on top of existing SCS.
- SCS review is done every 4 years. We look at targets and functionality of where they are successful or unsuccessful; such as, can SB 375 alone achieve desired results.
- VMT specific measures have not been addressed yet in inter-agency talks. We need to look at technology to see if it actually helps GHG reductions or any other goals that have already been set.
- Questions to consider:
  - What is working in your community?
  - What would you like to see in your community to help reduce GHG?
  - What portion of vehicle emissions is part of the total reduction?
- MRT is asking for a “pie chart” look at where reductions fall.
- The targets 2020 and 2035 and we have to look at metrics. 2020 will not be revised because it is right around the corner, but 2035 will be revised.
- At this time, we don’t have modeling or results to share a pie chart of emission reductions.
- Eventually we will know where the reductions are coming from.
- Total transportation reduction is more than half and the Energy Innovations says if we do maximum aggressive efforts, we will barely get there.
- Technology and fuels are a huge part, but VMT must be addressed.

### **Discussion Continued:**

- 1) MDA comment that vehicles must be addressed, but getting people to jobs requires redesign of entire communities. This is really a comment -- carbon does not provide jobs, but economics are an issue. Cleaner fuel is not going to bring jobs closer to a community where housing is more affordable. How do we get there requires developing a new methodology for analyzing displacement. Study conclusions are vague. Help us to understand the drivers!
- 2) Recommendation to reduce VMT while increasing accessibility. Land use control under local governments:
  - a. How do you envision this relationship happening?

- b. Strategic Growth Council (SGC) seems to be one of the few agencies that can affect this.
- 3) SGC would like to hear some answers from the community. We have to do many things simultaneously e.g. density of buildings impact on VMTs, reduce transit fares to reduce VMTs, speeding reductions, ridesharing – all these interventions reduce a small amount.
- 4) To address the mobile source strategy we need to address different issues within different communities because all needs are different. So we now have about 150 different options but how do we address this at the state level? We need a large toolbox with a plan in place. Recommended Tools:
  - a. Infill development incentives and change the market dynamic.
  - b. Planning and Development Departments should have some incentives that work besides what they have now.
  - c. Location of efficient housing is a good tool.
  - d. Infrastructure improvements: paying for it and how it gets employed.
- 5) Questions to consider:
  - a. What additional measures besides what they have now?
  - b. What types do you see would help in your community?
- 6) VMT is going to go up because population is increasing. It would seem the renewable energy and fuels should be the priority. Ten million extra people are not going to get on public transit.
  - a. KH: Future projections do assume increase in fuel costs, which does decrease VMTs. In the modeling if you added a carbon fee to gasoline, it should reduce VMTs.
  - b. SH brought up other tools in the bucket: a) Pay as you go insurance on miles traveled which controls VMTs; b) location/destination fees (e.g. to travel to downtown areas) also reduces VMTs.
- 7) How can we get 75% of San Joaquin Valley farm workers into EVs? They need a community level approach to shared infrastructure with a policy overlay. Plug in vehicles are a huge goal at this time, but the issue is how to get them into the hands of low-income residents.

### **Transportation Recommendations (Mark Wilson, Editor/Writer)**

1. Target truck fleets and vehicle fleets to achieve the quickest, most significant reductions in emissions.
2. Spend Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funds (GGRFs) to incentivize local economic development so people do not have to travel far for employment. [NOTE: this overlaps with California Climate Investments: a and j]
3. Reduce VMT while increasing alternative transportation options and accessibility.

4. Design and implement new incentives beyond tax credits to encourage infield development over sprawl. Consider code and permitting changes to streamline planning. Help pay for infrastructure improvements, and mandate that activities target the most pressing needs.
5. Promote and support clean and renewable energy sources to power vehicles, and coordinate those activities with energy and transportation agencies to help ensure their success.
6. Study the emissions reduction benefits from increasing gasoline prices.
7. Identify what tools are being used to gather emissions data on both sides of the rural California/Mexico border, and how California's approaches interact with the Mexican framework of rules and regulations. [NOTE: this overlaps overlap with Overarching Issues: c]
8. Conduct equity analyses when evaluating and implementing transportation options, to prevent adverse secondary effects in disadvantaged communities (e.g., the Los Angeles FasTrak program, which resulted in more vehicles on artery streets, creating even worse air quality problem for those communities.)
9. Conduct equity analyses in transportation projects to ensure that investments go to the highest area of need. Track where projects are implemented.
10. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) should only approve transportation projects that are compliant with the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).
11. Include transit costs and planning in the SCS process. [NOTE: this overlaps overlap with Transportation: a]
12. Measure emissions reductions by per capita VMT.
13. Identify the state policy direction for transit costs and routes. (Increased fares in Sacramento to more than \$6 day, and eliminated bus routes.)
14. Conduct and provide funding for a program that enables a large percentage of people in disadvantaged communities to drive EVs and install charging infrastructure.
15. Pilot the placement of EVs in seven or eight low-income communities across California. Ensure a proper diversity of density and urban versus rural areas, and choose areas with aging infrastructure. Proving success in these pilots will demonstrate how it could work elsewhere.

### **Water Presentation and Discussion**

Human rights to water issue was raised in 2012 legislation. CB shared a lot of old diesel pumps are used in agricultural groundwater over-pumping. Huge impacts on low-income families are being seen. Workshops provide extraordinary opportunities in especially tribal populations.

A net zero water idea has been put forth where each household captures or generates enough water to cover their own use. MRT would like to see inter-agency working groups meet with subcommittee sector groups.

ET has worked with prototypes for water capture regarding plumbing gray water systems and wants to see some coding for that. Aquaponics is another recommendation that requires only 4% and provides protein sources. Improving range-land practices should also be considered.

### **Water Recommendations (Mark Wilson, Editor/Writer)**

1. Consider providing state tax credits for solar for farms if federal credits for this are discontinued. [NOTE: this overlaps overlap with Energy...Water: i]
2. California needs to build solar panels to pump water for the State Water Project (SWP), using the extensive right-of-way that exists along those canals. [NOTE: this overlaps overlap with Energy...Water: i]
3. The SWP pumps at Tracy are the single largest energy user in the state. Identify the energy use that would be associated with the proposed California Water Fix and Eco Restore project (formerly, the Bay Delta Conservation Plan).

### **Data Gaps:**

- Clean, safe and affordable water goal does not always work. Treatment and transport uses come with a cost. Sustainable groundwater plans may address some of these issues. State policy cannot be one-size-fits-all because all the intersecting pieces have to be considered. Renewables require trade-offs. Formulating policy affects all sectors.
- There are two prongs to consider: 1) Water and sanitary needs of disadvantaged communities and 2) addressing climate change needs.

### **Industry Recommendations (Mark Wilson, Editor/Writer)**

1. Include an emissions profile analysis for both command-and-control and Cap-and-Trade options for the Scoping Plan, for comparison.
2. Address methane emissions from extraction and production of natural gas. (Note: This is already covered in SB 1371.)
3. Through standardized metrics, ensure that emission reductions from AB 32 activities are happening, especially in EJ communities.
4. Conduct comprehensive analysis of costs to not just the industries participating in Cap-and-Trade, but also to the rest of California's citizens, who pay in other ways for the effects of pollution. Conduct activities that minimize cost and maximize reductions.
5. Instead of just using a sector-wide standard for emissions reductions, examine methods that could be used to reduce pollution from individual high-polluting entities.
6. Expand the definition of "health impact" to include health consequences other than cancer when looking at health effects of industrial emissions.

## Comments

We are missing the overarching recommendations/framework ideas from Scoping Plan from April 4 EJAC meeting. FV is considering each of the recommendations in the draft Scoping Plan and ARB will point out where each issue is incorporated or not included.

Staff contact who will coordinate the meshing of the recommendations: Jakub, Stephanie and Sarah, Edie and Rajinder Sahota are all working with sister-agency working groups. Cross-section interactions that overlap that inter-agency working groups are discussing these. It is an interactive process and it has been pointed out to working groups that these are being considered internally and in the document. After draft comes out, there may need to be more attention to that.

- SH added that land use piece is difficult because to model and quantify, we need to identify a common metric, e.g. GHG. It is difficult task to knit these together, but theoretically this is what we are trying to address. Pathways model does not allow for this issue. Mechanics are still being worked on at this time.
  - Metrics issue and measuring on all these fronts needs to be addressed now, as 2020 is so close. We know ratcheting up 2020 goals if we hope to meet 2030 goals.
  - KVG also voiced concerns regarding timing is in place to get feedback at end of August from all the workshops. Plan is still in drafting stage and concern is that ARB has not finished.
- Response: Feedback will be included in the draft plan.
  - KVG thought we would see draft and then add community input to that.
  - FV does not see this is not sequential process. Community meetings are paralleling inter-agency work groups and informing workgroups and individuals drafting plan.
- MDA overreaching goals recommendation to be more specific not just vague such as we are against urban sprawl.

## Cap-and-Trade

- Critical companion piece is adaptive management program. That is critical to track at the facility level.
- Boiler optimization—tweaks to potential fuel increase efficiency. Emissions opportunities exist by changing lighting to electric in huge industrial areas with natural gas. Thousands of gallons through the stack where much of the clean-up is focused, but we have new technology on pilots and actual heating process. Cost benefits must be examined.
- Boilers are in refineries and food processing canned or frozen. Large batches, so thousands of gallons of water at very high temp are used. Oil industry is huge in energy-offset programs. All efficiency efforts by oil industry expect to be paid for it.
- Surveys of energy efficiency improvements (e.g. cement, hydrogen, oil and gas production and power plants) are on the ARB website. All facility types will be grouped

in a report to be considered with workshops to get input on data and specific recommendations people might want.

- Command-and-Control versus Cap-and-Trade comparisons do not consider emissions levels. Do not limit comparisons in analysis to just economics, also look at emission levels. ARB analyzes cost of compliance, which is now required by administrative law.
- MN: We had an auction today and results were posted at noon 5/25. There is going to a lot of press attention, and it did not sell out. The revenue to the state was zero.
- People do not have to bid. We are in an open period. Most businesses feel they have enough offsets, they will not need more. Impact on legislation may be that 2020 goal may see the end of the practice. Auctions do not guarantee profit for the state. Today's results were a dramatic example of that phenomenon.
- Natural gas procurement sights. We need to address the fusion of emissions from extraction and production. Natural gas is covered by proposed draft legislation.
- Improve air quality in EJ communities as well.
- Emissions reductions need to happen.
  - Are polluters allowing compliance under AB 32 through a combination of the free credits and other offset options?
  - Suggest a recommendation for industry to provide a better balance between for EJ communities. More comprehensive analysis including medical costs to EJ community residents.
- Part of what you see with the current tool in adaptive management. What exactly is in there? The tool should be pinpointing specifics between Cap-and-Trade – the issue is the emissions within the fence lines of health impact primary pollutants. Toxics data is more robust and we need to get EJAC input to see exactly why we are seeing those increases. We need to look at health impacts beyond cancer, such as asthma etc.
- Why is the GGR section not here at each meeting? FV needs to see if Cynthia and her staff can be available to include costs. Results cannot be decided without looking at costs.
- What other onsite regulations would EJAC like to see?
- Carbon tax strategy and Command-and-Control leakage issue.
- TJ can respond by providing information on the D of F website link.
- ACTION ITEM. ARB will share the current amendments proposed on new Cap-and-Trade (Standardize Regulatory Impact Assessment (SRIA), as soon as possible.
- SRIA for Cap-and-Trade amendments for post 2020 is parallel to the recommendations being made by Scoping Plan. This ruling is separate. We are talking about reducing industrial emissions for the Scoping Plan. The Scoping Plan will have its own economic impacts analysis of all proposed strategies. Cap-and-Trade has its own separate rulemaking going on right now.

## **Overarching Recommendations (Mark Wilson, Editor/Writer)**

1. Equity must always be a primary consideration when examining issues in any sector.

2. EJ activities should refocus on neighborhood-level solutions and draw on community input, rather than just taking a top-down approach. [NOTE: this overlaps with Overarching Issues: a]
3. A communications plan should be developed to educate and engage communities on how pollution affects them. [NOTE: this overlaps overlap with Natural and Working Lands: a]
4. ARB should ensure that a sufficient number and distribution of air quality monitors are placed in disadvantaged regions, to account for air quality differences in the region. [NOTE: this overlaps overlap with Overarching Issues: d and f, and Industry: i]
5. Coordinate meetings between the interagency working groups (IWG) and EJAC, to encourage information sharing and mutual cooperation between the groups.
6. The GGRF program should provide information at EJAC meetings.

## Community Workshops

Locations and agenda discussion for roll out of Workshops. We also have ARB workshops that are already calendared. Group is using post-its for 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> choices trying to make no more than two workshops/week if possible. So EJAC members post preferences with existing locations. Please add in additional locations for Oct/Nov.

Yellow is 1<sup>st</sup> choice and blue is 2<sup>nd</sup> choice. Choices were made. Agenda was then covered so workshop attendees would see all of ARB's existing efforts.

PowerPoint of sample agenda and workshop was presented. Agenda topics proposed are:

- I. Where does pollution come from? Slides for each of the sources: pollutants, ozone, CO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>, Toxic Air Contaminants, GHGs.
- II. What climate is all about . . . a gradual rise in temperature on our planet and its ramifications? How do we contribute to it? Health impacts? Health conditions. Impacts to EJACs due to proximity.
- III. A well-rounded presentation of what the Climate Change is. What can you do about it through this process?
  - a. For example Jeopardy Game on Air & Climate to help people digest the content.
- IV. 2030 Target Scoping Plan section by section.
  - a. Transportation
  - b. Energy
  - c. Water
  - d. Waste Management
  - e. Green Buildings
- V. World Café Format with 8 tables – gather input from attendees. Define what success looks like to you.

### **Summary Workshop Comments:**

- The PowerPoint is being finished up by subcommittee. Suggest having 10 minutes per table. Gather answers from people.
- Logistics issues being considered.
  - What if three meetings occur in one day with video teleconferencing for KH's rural communities.
  - What if you have different languages? Should you have the translator travel with each group?
    - Language may present some barriers in different locations too.
  - Some EJAC members may want freedom to develop their own agenda.
    - Localized examples would be best.
  - As information is generated, will different language content be available? For example, flyers in different languages?
    - FV will check Graphic artist availability to design and create outreach materials.
    - FV can provide translation services from in-house staff for flyers. CCE will assist with languages if ARB cannot provide in-house.
    - To increase chances of getting Margaret, in-house boilerplate, one to four pieces of materials maximum should be the goal. Twelve posters are available that can be moved from location to location.
- FV will set up some calls between graphics and EJAC people so posters can be populated with appropriate data. Subcommittee will be on the call.
- Eleanor thanked the agenda creators KVG, MDA and other subcommittee members.
- You can also create own flyer with Generation Now. Please share when it's in creation or completed, so other members can see. ARB can print in-house flyers with own production facility.
- This is an opportunity to galvanize our community folks to further our own personal efforts on climate change San Bernardino will provide transportation.
- MRT raised customizability of agenda presented. KVG responded by saying you can still use overview approach for education, but selection of say 3 sectors.
- ARB will be apprised of focus so they know who should attend which workshops for content expertise.
- To simplify choice of sectors, ARB experts, and ARB staffing, ARB can create a deck of slides in advance.
  - EJAC recommended a comprehensive slide deck of 40 slides as the master set. Experts will still attend to present the module.

### **Breakout Session Results:**

Instructions: Discuss what to do with data: 1) how to record data, record the meetings with video; 2) note-taker at each meeting; 3) handwritten survey or google form to collect data; 4) and beside sector feedback, subthemes are developing out of sector so those might be presented beforehand. 5) Finally, how to get the data to technical writer hopefully electronic form, even handwritten comments should be electronic.

ARB has to put bookends on Mark Wilson’s time. FV clarified there are numerous methods of recording the same information.

**Required List of Workshop Issues/Supplies:**

1. Posters,
2. Workshop flyers,
3. EJAC members to facilitate,
4. Flip charts and pens,
5. Facilitator for each table with role clarity and a plan,
6. Whole-meeting summary,
7. Note-taker (maybe EJAC member) using a public record,
8. Convert KVG’s slides into agenda and electronic version.

We need to get all the right people in the room. LO wonders how much ARB can offer to members who cannot do as much to produce the workshop with their own resources.

Oct/Nov locations can be identified, along with the orgs and resources needed to make the workshops happen. All locations are different in terms of needs, logistics, resources etc.

- KH does not have resources and needs approximately \$1,000.00 to do the outreach in certain communities, but he feels subcontracting might be the answer. FV will get answer legal and budget-wise what is possible through CCE. Hard costs and labor costs may be subcontracted CCE, but not to businesses. TJ reminded group that CCE has offices throughout the state who can handle these kinds of tasks. June 23<sup>rd</sup> is ARB Board hearing with staff stretched thin; please select a few sectors (dates are in yellow is 1<sup>st</sup> choice and blue is 2<sup>nd</sup> choice).
- LO mentioned that if CCE costs are very high, let’s consider alternative sources to do those tasks.
  - Procedures must be followed by ARB because they are a state agency and some of those fixed costs are not allowed. FV will get back to the EJAC on abilities.

**June 2016 Workshops (Other ARB Meetings Calendared)**

<b>Monday</b>	<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>Wednesday</b>	<b>Thursday</b>	<b>Friday</b>
	<i>6/14 Fresno EJ Task Force</i>	<i>6/15 Kings County EJ Task Force</i>		
	<b>6/21 San Bernardino</b>	<b>6/22 Coachella</b>	<i>6/24 Imperial Valley EJ Task</i>	

			<i>Force</i>	
		<i>6/24 Bayview Hunter's Point EJ Task Force</i>		
			<b>6/30 Oakland</b>	

**July 2016 Workshops**

<b>Monday</b>	<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>Wednesday</b>	<b>Thursday</b>	<b>Friday</b>
	<b>7/12 San Diego</b>	<b>7/13 Imperial</b>	<i>7/14 Brawley Env Task Force</i>	
	<i>7/19 Kings County Task Force</i>	<i>7/20 Bakersfield Task Force</i>	<i>7/21 Fresno Task Force</i>	<b>7/22 Fresno, Modesto Bakersfield</b>
	<b>7/25 South Bay/LA</b>	<b>7/26 South LA</b>		<b>7/29 Sacramento</b>

**October/November 2016 Workshops**

Sierra Nevada, Central Valley and North Coast/NorCal – north of Sacramento and Redding are unknown at this time.

**Public Comments**

**Amy with CA Chamber of Commerce**

Cap-and-trade and how it interacts with the industry sector for stationary sources emission source reductions. It only accounts for a few of reductions. Other types of onsite reduction processes are in place. The cap is there to ensure emissions do not exceed this level. Cap-and-Trade is in place for CO2 not for other emission reductions.

Please see attachment for more concise summary recommendations.