

State of California  
AIR RESOURCES BOARD

**Notice of Public Availability of Modified Text and Availability of  
Additional Documents**

**PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE  
CALIFORNIA CAP ON GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS AND MARKET-BASED  
COMPLIANCE MECHANISMS**

Public Hearing Date: December 18, 2014  
Public Availability Date: May 20, 2015  
Deadline for Public Comment: June 4, 2015

The Air Resources Board (ARB or Board) adopted sections 95801 to 96023, title 17, California Code of Regulations at its October 2011 public hearing. These sections comprise the California Cap on Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Market-Based Compliance Mechanisms Regulations, including Compliance Offset Protocols (Cap-and-Trade Regulation).

The Cap-and-Trade Regulation provides a fixed limit on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the sources responsible for about 85 percent of the State's total GHG emissions. The Cap-and-Trade Regulation reduces GHG emissions by applying a declining aggregate cap on GHG emissions, and creates a flexible compliance system through the use of tradable compliance instruments (allowances and offset credits). The Cap-and-Trade Regulation became effective January 1, 2012. The first auction of emission allowances occurred in November 2012, and the first compliance period began on January 1, 2013.

In 2014, ARB proposed amendments to the Cap-and-Trade Regulation related to program implementation and modification to the Livestock, Ozone Depleting Substance, and U.S. Forest Compliance Offset Protocols. The amendments were heard by the Board in September 2014 and approved in December 2014 after additional 15-day modifications. These amendments took effect on January 1, 2015.

On October 28, 2014, staff released a Notice of Public Hearing to Consider Amendments to the California Cap on Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Market-Based Compliance Mechanisms in response to continued Board direction and further discussions with stakeholders. Following the 45-day comment period, the Board considered the proposed amendments at its meeting on December 18, 2014.

At its December 18, 2014 public hearing, the Board considered the Initial Statement of Reasons Staff Report released on October 28, 2014, and adopted Resolution 14-44 directing staff to consider the comments submitted during the rulemaking and make appropriate modifications. The Board directed the Executive Officer to make the modified regulatory language, and any additional conforming modifications, available for

public comment, with any additional supporting documents and information, for a period of at least 15 days as required by Government Code section 11346.8. The Board further directed the Executive Officer to consider written comments submitted during the public review period and make any further modifications that are appropriate available for public comment for at least 15 days, and present the regulation to the Board for further consideration.

The resolution and all other regulatory documents for this rulemaking are available online at the following ARB website:

<http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2014/capandtradeprf14/capandtradeprf14.htm>

The text of the modified regulatory language is shown in Attachment 1. The originally proposed 45-day regulatory amendments to the Cap-and-Trade regulation are shown in **bold underline** to indicate additions and ~~**bold strikeout**~~ to indicate deletions. Amendments proposed at the September 18, 2014 hearing that were considered but were not final are shown in single underline to indicate additions and ~~single strikeout~~ to indicate deletions. Although these amendments were subsequently approved and became effective January 1, 2015, the single underline/strikeout is kept for consistency. New deletions and additions to the proposed regulatory language that are made public with this notice are shown in ~~double strikeout~~ and double underline format, respectively. Modifications to the originally proposed protocol language are shown in Attachment 2 (Rice Cultivation Projects), and Attachment 3 (U.S. Forest Projects) in ~~single strikeout~~ to indicate deletions and single underline to indicate additions.

In the Final Statement of Reasons, staff will respond to comments received on the record during the comment periods. The Administrative Procedure Act requires that staff respond to comments received regarding all noticed changes. Therefore, staff will only address comments received during this 15-day comment period that are responsive to this notice, documents added to the record, or the changes detailed in Attachments 1-3.

#### Summary of Proposed Modifications

The staff's proposed modifications in this document are summarized below and are set forth in detail in Attachments 1-3 to this notice. All references are to sections 95973, 95975 or 95990, title 17, California Code of Regulations, and the updates to the Compliance Offset Protocols.

The following summary does not include all modifications to correct typographical or grammatical errors, changes in numbering or formatting, nor does it include all of the non-substantive revisions made to improve clarity. For a complete account of all modifications in the proposed regulatory amendments and offset protocols, please refer to Attachments 1- 3.

1. In section 95975(e)(4), the changes originally proposed were incorrectly identified in the proposed 45-day regulatory amendments. The phrase "Compliance Offset Protocol U.S. Forest Projects" should not have been shown in bold. The "October 20, 2011" should have been shown in single strikeout, not bold indicating it was deleted in the amendments proposed at the September hearing. The first "[INSERT DATE]" was single underline in the September package reflecting the new U.S. Forest protocol being proposed. In the December package, the single underline "[INSERT DATE]" from the September package should have been single underline, bold strikeout. Microsoft Word shows this as bold underline bold strikeout. This indicates that the version of the U.S. Forest protocol proposed at the September hearing would no longer be an eligible version to list under upon approval of the U.S. Forest protocol version presented at the December hearing. The second "[INSERT DATE]" should have been in bold underline indicating that upon approval of the December regulatory package that version of the U.S. Forest protocol was the only version eligible to list under. Attachment 1 correctly reflects the changes to the text.
2. In section 95975(e)(6), the words "incorporated by reference" were removed because the rice protocol was already incorporated by reference in section 95973(a)(2)(C)6.
3. In sections 95990(c) and (k), the references to the Climate Action Reserve (CAR) Rice Cultivation Project Protocol were removed. These modifications were necessary because the CAR protocol contains provisions which are not consistent with the Rice Cultivation Compliance Offset Protocol proposed for adoption;
4. In section 95990(i)(1)(H), the references to the Climate Action Reserve (CAR) Rice Cultivation Project Protocol were removed. These modifications were necessary because the CAR protocol contains provisions which are not consistent with the Rice Cultivation Compliance Offset Protocol proposed for adoption;
5. In section 95990(i)(1)(H)1., additional limitations were placed on the eligibility of early action offset credits resulting from the American Carbon Registry Voluntary Emission Reductions in Rice Management Systems methodology. These modifications were necessary to ensure all offset credits issued by ARB are real, additional, quantifiable, verifiable, and enforceable as required by the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.
6. Rice Cultivation Projects Compliance Offset Protocol:
  - The definition of "Baseline Period" was changed. The modification clarifies that rice cultivation during a period of emergency is excluded when determining the baseline scenario, but should be included in the calibration of the DeNitrification-DeComposition model.
  - The definition of "Checks" was modified to indicate that the checks are not the

separation between the sub-fields, but the actual sub-field itself separated by low levees and dikes.

- The definition of “Cropping Cycle” was modified to add “Rotational Cropping Cycle” as an alternative term with the same meaning.
- The definition of “Cultivation Year” was modified to clarify how ratooning, fallow, and winter crops are considered when determining the cultivation year.
- The definition of “DD50” was modified to clarify that the model must be run at the end of the cultivation year to reflect the actual weather that occurred during the cultivation year rather than the average weather data the model is populated with at the beginning of the cultivation year.
- The definition of “Field” was modified to reflect the modified definition of checks.
- The definition of “Unadjusted Emissions” was added because it was previously undefined.
- Subchapter 2.2(b) was modified to clarify that the project only needs to follow one of the subsequent sampling requirements based on project location.
- Subchapter 2.2(b)(1) was modified to allow fields to drain earlier as long as the soil is still saturated at day 24. This was necessary because fields may take different times to drain.
- Subchapters 2.2(b)(1)(A) and (D) and 2.2(b)(2)(A) were modified because “plant” more accurately reflects what is being measured.
- Subchapters 2.2(b)(1)(C) and 2.2(b)(2)(C) were modified to clarify that representative samples are more important than evenly spaced samples, which may not always be possible.
- Subchapter 2.2(b)(1)(G) removes the exception allowing for early drainage 26 days after field sampling determines 40 percent heading because actually achieving a 50 percent heading sample before starting the countdown to early drainage will better preserve yield. Redoing the sampling to achieve 50 percent heading will better preserve yield and outweighs the limited effort required to redo the field sampling.
- Subchapters 2.2(b)(1)(H) and 2.2(b)(2)(H) were added to require documentation of the heading sampling procedures used.
- Subchapter 2.2(c) was modified to clarify that at least 10% of a field perimeter must be accessible for late broods to exit the drained field. This allows for up to 90% of the field to be inaccessible.
- Subchapters 2.3(c)(4)(A) and (B) were modified to clarify that representative samples are more important than evenly spaced samples which may not always be possible.
- Subchapter 2.3(c)(5)(C) was modified to clarify how to determine which of the two prescribed timeframes for calibration must be followed.
- Subchapter 3.1(a)(4) was modified to be more grammatically correct and for ease of reading.
- Subchapter 3.1(a)(5) was modified to clarify that all fields do not have to implement the same project activities.
- Subchapter 3.1(a)(6) was modified to indicate how many significant figures must be used for determining the three percent.

- Subchapters 3.1(a)(6)(B) and (C) were modified to add more detail on how to determine soil parameters.
- Subchapter 3.1(a)(6)(D) was modified to clarify that only the listed methods may be used for determining soil characteristics in the absence of SSURGO or STATSGO2 data.
- Subchapter 3.3(e) was modified to allow new project operators more time to notify ARB of ownership change.
- Subchapter 3.3(e)(2) simplified the information new project operators must report to ARB.
- Subchapters 3.4.2(b)(1)-(3) were modified to remove ambiguity about which project activities were eligible in each growing region.
- Subchapter 3.7(c) was modified to be more precise on how to account for a winter crop.
- Subchapter 3.7(h) was modified to indicate that a report with zero GHG emission reductions must still be submitted.
- Subchapter 3.11 was removed because all early action requirements were moved to the Regulation consistent with all other offset protocols.
- Table 4.1 was modified to more clearly indicate that certain emission reductions are not credited and to be consistent with the protocol's calculations.
- Subchapter 5.2(a) was modified because the DNDC model does not have an official final version and project operators must use the version available on the ARB website.
- Subchapter 5.2(c) identifies where the required DNDC parameters can be found.
- Subchapter 5.2(c)(2) was modified to allow for the use of weather reanalysis products in all cases, not just when other weather data are unavailable.
- Subchapter 5.2(c)(3) was modified to clarify what the plastic parameter is.
- Subchapter 5.2.1(a) was modified to require that, in addition to one calibration for the historical period, the crop yield calibration for DNDC be done for every reporting period instead of just once. This increases the accuracy of the DNDC modeling because instead of relying on only the baseline data to calibrate DNDC, actual project data is also used.
- Subchapter 5.2.1(b) was modified to require the crop yield calibration for DNDC be done for every reporting period instead of just once at the beginning of the project. This increases the accuracy of the DNDC modeling because instead of relying on only the baseline data to calibrate DNDC, actual project data is also used.
- Subchapter 5.2.1(c) was modified for ease of reading and to add the data from the first reporting period to the yield calibration. Since the Offset Project Data Report (OPDR) will be completed at the end of the reporting period, the data from the reporting period can be used for the calibrations, which will increase DNDC accuracy.
- Subchapter 5.2.1(d) was added to require that for every reporting period after the initial reporting period, the yield calibration must be done using the current

- reporting period data, which will result in the most accurate DNDC modeling.
- Subchapter 5.2.1(e) was modified to clarify that only the default crop parameters come from table B.1.
  - Subchapter 5.2.2(c)(2) was modified to require the use of the actual weather data from the baseline period for calibrating the DNDC model to more accurately reflect the soil conditions during the project.
  - Subchapter 5.2.2(i) was modified to reduce the number of DNDC runs and clarify how the values are varied for the Monte Carlo simulation.
  - Equations 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.3.1, and 5.3.2 were modified to clearly define all values and remove redundant values.
  - Subchapters 5.2.2.1(f)(1)(B) and 5.2.2.1(f)(2) were clarified to more accurately reflect how fertilization events are entered into the DNDC model.
  - Subchapters 5.2.2.1(g)(1) and (h)(1) were modified to be more grammatically correct and for ease of reading.
  - Subchapters 5.2.2.1(f)(2), (h)(2) and (i)(2) were modified to replace “shall” and “will” with “must” for consistency with the rest of the protocol.
  - Subchapter 5.2.2.1(o) was modified to extend the emergency exemption to local water agency requirements.
  - Subchapter 5.2.3(e) was modified to only require 1000 runs of the DNDC model.
  - Subchapters 5.2.4(c), (c)(1) and (c)(3) were modified to only require 1000 runs of the DNDC model, and selection of the 100th lowest value.
  - Equation 5.4 was modified to use a fixed structural uncertainty deduction rather than a variable value. The structural uncertainty deduction plateaus at 0.128 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e/ha at about 5,000 project acres. ARB expects to have more than 5,000 project acres participating in the program annually, so the fixed value for structural uncertainty will be a much simpler mechanism but still maintain the conservativeness of the calculation.
  - Equation 5.4.1 was modified to reduce the number of DNDC runs to 1000 and more clearly identify where values are calculated.
  - Equation 5.4.2 was modified to more clearly identify the equations where values are calculated.
  - Subchapter 5.3(c) was modified to be more grammatically correct and for ease of reading.
  - Subchapters 5.3.1(a) and (b) were modified to more clearly identify where values are calculated.
  - Equations 5.7 and 5.8 were modified to require all secondary emissions to be calculated, not just increases.
  - Equation 5.10 was modified because the original equation was accidentally reversed and to more clearly define the equation values.
  - Table 6.1 was modified to add parameters used in the protocol that were missing from the original table and correct capitalization.
  - Subchapters 7.2(a)-(c) were modified to remove the requirement for a preliminary report as it is no longer necessary because the structural uncertainty is a fixed value rather than a value dependent on the number of

- project acres.
- Appendix A was modified to remove redundant data requirements and make minor clarifications to the required data.
- Appendix B was modified to allow project operators to use the rice tool that will be available on the ARB website and provide a more detailed and workable method for calibration of the DNDC model.
- Appendix D(f)(4) was modified for internal consistency with (f)(5).

## 7. U.S. Forest Projects Compliance Offset Protocol

- Page 1, footnote 1 was modified to correct an incorrect reference.
- The definition of “Best Management Practices” was modified to better reflect forest practices rather than practices for criteria and toxic pollutants.
- The definition of “Clearcutting” was added to accompany the modified even-aged management definition.
- The definition of “Confidence Deduction” was modified to clarify that the deduction applies only to onsite carbon stocks.
- The definition of “Countable Tree” was added to accompany the new even-aged harvest provisions.
- The definition of “Even-Aged Management” was modified to more accurately reflect even-age management practices and remove the potential for accidentally including areas affected by a significant disturbance such as wildfire.
- The definition of “Forest Owner” was repeated from the Regulation for ease of reference.
- The definition of “Harvest Unit” was modified to remove extraneous text.
- The definition of “Litter” was modified to include leaves.
- The definition of “Logical Management Unit” was modified to provide a more workable definition and exclude areas that have experienced natural disturbance such as wildfire or windstorm, and areas designated as High Conservation Value Forest.
- The definition of “Open Canopy Harvest Unit” was removed because it is no longer used.
- The definition of “Project Area” was rephrased to eliminate an incomplete sentence.
- The definition of “Professional Forester” was modified to rely on the existing tribal lands description in subchapter 3.2(f).
- The definition of “Public Lands” was modified to clarify that tribal lands are not considered public lands for purposes of calculating an improved forest management baseline. They are still considered public lands for purposes of calculating the reversal risk rating.
- The definition of “Salvage Harvest” was added because it was previously undefined.
- The definition of “Seed Tree” was added to accompany the modified even-

- aged management definition.
- The definition of “Shelterwood” was added to accompany the modified even-aged management definition.
- The definition of “Sound Cubic Foot Volume” was modified to spell out the acronym for diameter at root collar (DRC).
- Subchapter 2.1(b)(2) was modified to enhance the readability of the section.
- Subchapter 2.1(c)(2) was modified to clarify when the boundary of a reforestation project is set.
- Table 3.1 was modified to clarify how eligibility is assessed for the various projects types, to be more technically precise about carbon pools and to clarify how the unavailability of reference documents is determined.
- Subchapters 3.1(a)(4)(A)-(E) were modified to be consistent with the California Forest Practice Act for determining the allowable extent of even-aged harvest.
- Subchapter 3.1(a)(5)(c) was modified to clarify that the new baseline for the compliance offset project must incorporate any practices and conditions in the project area as a result of participation in the voluntary program to assure there is no double counting of offsets from the voluntary program.
- Subchapter 3.1(b)(1) was modified to explain that the decrease in standing live tree carbon stocks is evaluated by comparing the 10-year average from the current reporting period and the 10-year average from the previous reporting period and clarify that the 10-year average of standing live carbon stocks cannot be evaluated until the tenth year of the project.
- Subchapter 3.4.2(b)(3)(A)7. was modified to correct a grammatical error.
- Equation 3.1 was modified to clarify that certain calculations are done using the onsite carbon at the end of the reporting period and that only a negative value will result in a reversal.
- Tables 4.1-4.3 were modified to correct a minor grammatical error and ensure the correct project type is reflected for each table.
- Subchapter 5.1.1(d)(1) was modified to allow small errors in the baseline to remain uncorrected.
- Subchapter 5.1.1(d)(1)(A) was modified to correct a spelling mistake.
- Subchapter 5.1.2(a)(2) was modified to use more technically correct and precise language.
- Subchapter 5.1.3(a) was modified to clarify that any data obtained during the reporting period covered by the Offset Project Data report must be used to update the inventory for the Offset Project Data Report.
- Subchapter 5.1.3(b) was modified to clarify that the project is “grown” forward to the end of the reporting period.
- Subchapter 5.1.4(a) was modified to use more technically correct and precise language.
- Subchapter 5.2.1(d)(3)2. was deleted because the language was moved to the definition of logical management unit.
- Subchapters 5.2.1(e)(2)(B) and (B)1.-3. were modified to more precisely define how comparable sites are selected.

- Subchapter 5.2.1(h)(1) was modified to allow small errors in the baseline to remain uncorrected.
- Subchapter 5.2.1(h)(1)(A) was modified to correct a spelling mistake.
- Subchapter 5.2.2(b)(1)(B)1. was added to provide a method to model an area relatively free of harvest for 60 years if an actual comparable area cannot be identified within the project's assessment area.
- Subchapter 5.2.2(e)(1) was modified to allow small errors in the baseline to remain uncorrected.
- Subchapter 5.2.2(e)(1)(A) was modified to correct a spelling mistake.
- Subchapter 5.2.3(a)(2) was modified to use more technically correct and precise language.
- Subchapter 5.2.3(a)(3) was modified to remove an incorrect reference to equation 5.10.
- Subchapter 5.2.4(b) was modified to clarify that the project is "grown" forward to the end of the reporting period.
- Subchapter 5.2.5(a) was modified to use more technically correct and precise language and to correct in incorrect reference.
- Equation 5.10 was modified to rename variables to clearly distinguish secondary effects from harvest wood products.
- Subchapter 5.3.1(d)(1) was modified to allow small errors in the baseline to remain uncorrected.
- Subchapter 5.3.1(d)(1)(A) was modified to correct a spelling mistake.
- Subchapter 5.3.2(a)(2) was modified to use more technically correct and precise language.
- Subchapter 5.3.2(b) was modified to clarify that the amount of carbon harvested should be averaged over 100 years.
- Subchapter 5.3.3(b) was modified to clarify that the project is "grown" forward to the end of the reporting period.
- Subchapter 5.3.4(a) was modified to use more technically correct and precise language.
- Subchapter 6(f)(3) was modified to clarify that the forest inventory must be updated for the reporting period that is being reported.
- Subchapter 7.1.1(a)(15)(F) was modified to remove extraneous text.
- Subchapter 7.1.1(a)(22) was modified to clarify that this provision applies to regeneration cuts or harvests and not regeneration.
- Subchapter 7.1.1(a)(25)(B) was modified to use more technically correct and precise language. It was unclear what was meant by the location of a constraint.
- Subchapter 7.2.2(b)(6) was modified to clarify that a reversal must be reported within 30 days of occurrence per the Regulation, and cannot be delayed until the next full verification.
- Subchapter 8.1(a) was modified to clarify that any modified OPDR must be given to the verification body at least 10 days prior to a site visit. This is already a requirement for the initial OPDR and it was necessary to clarify that the 10 day requirement also applies to all modified OPDRs.

- Subchapters 8.1(b)(2)(E)-(H) were modified to provide new verifier sampling techniques to accompany the modified even-aged management procedures in subchapter 3.1(a)(4). These are taken from the California Forest Practice Act.
- Subchapter 8.1.1(a) was modified to allow paired sequential sampling even if a small percentage of monument plots cannot be located.
- Subchapters 8.1.1(d) and (l) were modified to clarify that this provision also applies to the paired analysis.
- Subchapter 8.1.1(e)(4) was modified because plot selection must occur with a strata rather than a stand.
- Previous equations 8.1-8.4 were renumbered to account for the addition of a new equation 8.1.
- Renumbered equation 8.2 was modified to correct an error in the stopping determination.
- Appendix A(f)(3) was modified to correct an inconsistent conversion factor.
- Appendix A(h)(1) was modified to use more technically correct and precise language and remove extraneous text.
- Appendix A(l) was modified to clarify that the confidence deduction is not applied to the baseline carbon stocks.
- Appendix C(a)(2) was modified to clarify how wood products may be aggregated.
- Table C.1 was modified to add values for Alaskan Exports which will support the addition of parts of Alaska as eligible project areas.
- Appendix C(a)(3)(E) was modified to account for the new Alaskan Export values in table C.1.
- Table C.2 was modified to add values for Alaskan Exports which will support the addition of parts of Alaska as eligible project areas.
- Appendix C(a)(4)(E) was modified to account of the new Alaskan Export values in table C.2.
- Equation C.7 and appendix C(a)(5) were moved to their correct location in the protocol. They were inadvertently misplaced in the previous draft of the protocol.
- Equations C.8 and C.17 were modified to correct a contradiction within the text of the appendix. The carbon values should be for the bole of the tree only without bark.
- Appendix A(b)(1) and Equation C.11 was modified to correct an inadvertently misnamed variable.
- Table C.3 was modified to add values for Alaskan Exports which is required for the addition of parts of Alaska as eligible project areas.
- Appendix C(b)(3)(E) was modified to account for the new Alaskan Export values in table C.3.
- Table C.4 was modified to add values for Alaskan Exports which will support the addition of parts of Alaska as eligible project areas.
- Appendix C(b)(4)(E) was modified to account for the new Alaskan Export values in table C.4.

These modifications do not change implementation of the Regulation in any way that affects the conclusions of the environmental analysis included in the Staff Report because the modifications consist primarily of definition and provision clarifications that do not alter the compliance responses, so no additional environmental analysis or recirculation of the analysis is required.

### **Additional Documents Added to the Record**

In the interest of completeness, staff has also added to the rulemaking record and invites comments on the following documents that are proposed for incorporation by reference:

- Mill Efficiency Data (updated with values for Alaska), May 1, 2015.
- Assessment Area Data File (updated with values for Alaska), May 1, 2015.
- Supersection maps and GIS shapefile (updated to remove fields not relevant to the protocol that have not been used in any project quantification), May 1, 2015. Unfortunately the GIS mapping software does not allow the new version to be shown in underline strikeout so the fields are just removed.
- UDSA Forest Inventory and Analysis Database Description and User Guide for Phase 2 (V6.0.1), Appendix D, April 2014.
- USDA Soil Quality Test Kit Guide (July 2001)

### **Agency Contacts**

Inquiries concerning the substance of the proposed regulation may be directed to Ms. Rajinder Sahota, Chief, Climate Change Program Evaluation Branch, at (916) 323-8503 or Mr. Greg Mayeur, Manager, Climate Change Program Operations Section at (916) 324-8031.

### **Public Comments**

Written comments will only be accepted on the modifications identified in this notice and may be submitted by postal mail or electronic mail submittal as follows:

Postal mail: Clerk of the Board, Air Resources Board  
1001 I Street, Sacramento, California 95814

Electronic submittal: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/lispub/comm/bclist.php>

Please note that under the California Public Records Act (Gov. Code § 6250 et seq.), your written and verbal comments, attachments, and associated contact information (e.g., your address, phone, email, etc.) become part of the public record and can be released to the public upon request.


In order to be considered by the Executive Officer, comments must be directed to ARB in one of the two forms described above and received by ARB by 5:00 p.m. local time,

in one of the two forms described above and received by ARB by 5:00 p.m. local time, on the deadline date for public comment listed at the beginning of this notice. Only comments relating to the above-described modifications to the text of the regulations or the additional documents added to the record shall be considered by the Executive Officer.

If you need this document in an alternate format or another language, please contact the Clerk of the Board at (916) 322-5594 or by facsimile at (916) 322-3928 no later than five (5) business days from the release date of this notice. TTY/TDD/Speech to Speech users may dial 711 for the California Relay Service.

Si necesita este documento en un formato alterno u otro idioma, por favor llame a la oficina del Secretario del Consejo de Recursos Atmosféricos al (916) 322-5594 o envíe un fax al (916) 322-3928 no menos de cinco (5) días laborales a partir de la fecha del lanzamiento de este aviso. Para el Servicio Telefónico de California para Personas con Problemas Auditivos, ó de teléfonos TDD pueden marcar al 711.

CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD

  
Richard W. Corey  
Executive Officer

Date: *May 20, 2015*

Attachments

*The energy challenge facing California is real. Every Californian needs to take immediate action to reduce energy consumption. For a list of simple ways you can reduce demand and cut your energy costs, see ARB's website at [www.arb.ca.gov](http://www.arb.ca.gov).*