

Lois Henry

18-7-3

Comments to ARB re: AB 617 BLUEPRINT
Sept. 27, 2018

Thank you for the opportunity to speak about the implementation of AB 617.

I represent BizFed Central Valley, a newly formed organization of businesses and business associations. We have 50 member between Kern and Madera counties that represent all walks of business from farming to civic organizations. Those 50 members represent more than 20,000 businesses who collectively employ more than 300,000 people.

Our members live and work in the valley, which has significant air quality challenges and also operates under the most strict air regulations in the valley.

Air quality is a vitally important issue to our members not only because they, their families and employees all breathe this air, but it's a challenge to recruit and retain employees and businesses given the widely known reputation of our air quality.

So, our members have a very strong interest in seeing AB 617 implemented properly with the best chance for success to improve air quality and allow our economy to thrive.

That said, we would like to point out some issues in AB 617 that could be improved.

Exceeding health-based standards.

We thank CARB staffers for improving the Blueprint in the area but remain concerned that the revised language in proposed Appendix C will still be interpreted to encourage air districts to set emissions reduction targets below state and local health-based standards. ARB provides no clear justification for this step.

We have existing regulations and statutory requirements that AB 617 must abide by. It doesn't operate in a vacuum. The **Air District can't set emissions reduction programs that go beyond legal standards**. AB 617 does NOT supersede existing air quality laws and regulations, **so community emissions reduction programs cannot include measures that seek to reduce emissions below applicable standards**.

- We would ask the board to direct staff to clarify this area of the Blueprint.

One other point involves exceeding AB 617 statutory authority.

We are concerned that Appendix C requires community emission reduction plans to **contain "regulatory, enforcement, incentive and permitting strategies"** and the "most stringent approaches for reducing emissions." These proposed requirements go well beyond statute and set an impossible standard for community emission reduction programs, leaving them vulnerable to endless criticism about what strategies or measures qualify as "the most stringent approaches." There also is no discussion here about technical feasibility or cost effectiveness.

- We ask that the board work with staff to remove all references proposing use of "the most stringent approaches" and state that emissions reduction elements are options that may be selected by the air district to the extent they are technically feasible, commercially available, achieved in practice, cost-effective and necessary to achieve emissions reduction targets in the prescribed timeframe.

Again, to thank you for this opportunity to state BizFed Central Valley's position.

Lois Henry