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CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning, everybody. I've now figured out that a red light means on, which is not usual, but the sound system is working. It's working well. Thank you, engineers. Thank you to engineers in general. This is Saint Patrick's Day for anyone who hasn't been following world events. And Saint Patrick's Day is a very important day for us, because Saint Patrick's Day is celebrated with wearing of the green, which of course is the color of the environmental movement. And also as the daughter of an engineer, I grew up with a song about how Saint Patrick was an engineer. Now, I'm not planning on singing it for you all, but maybe during a break we might, you know, have that discussion.

Anyway. Welcome to the March 17, 2016 meeting of the Air Resources Board. And we will begin as we always do by saying the Pledge of Allegiance. So if you'll please stand.

(Thereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: I suppose by rights, Mrs. Riordan should be running the meeting this morning. Oh, well. Some of us only wish that we were Irish.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Everybody is Irish on Saint Patrick's Day.
CHAIR NICHOLS: No, by special dispensation.
Madam Clerk, wherever you are. Please call the roll.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Over here. To your right.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Ah, there you go. There. Got it.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: All right. Dr. Balmes?
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. De La Torre?
Mr. Eisenhut?
Senator Florez?
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Gioia?
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Mitchell?
BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mrs. Riordan?
BOARD MEMBER RIORDNA: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Roberts?
Supervisor Serna?
Dr. Sherriffs?
Professor Sperling?
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Takvorian?
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Vice Chair Berg?
VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Chair Nichols?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Here.

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Madam Chair we have a quorum.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much. Okay. A couple of announcements. Anyone who wishes to testify on anything that's before us today should fill out a request to speak card. They're available in the lobby outside the Board room, and you can give it to the clerk. We appreciate it if you do that prior to the item beginning.

Also, all speakers should be aware that the Board enforces a three minute time limit, except when we have a group presentation that has been previously been approved. So we appreciate it, if when you come up to testify, you would just state your name. And then particularly if you have written testimony, if you would summarize it, rather than trying to read it. It makes it much more effective for us.

I'm also supposed to announce that there's an emergency evacuation procedure in the event that a fire alarm or other emergency happens that would require the evacuation of the building. You can proceed out either of the doors to the right -- to my right, your left, if you're in the audience, down the corridors and out of the
main entrance.

Once outside the building, the evacuation point is the grass lawn in the center of the parking lot of the arbor courtyard. And there are staff will be available to direct you to that point. So just be aware of that, please.

Before we begin our regular noticed items this morning, we always have a place for Board Member comments. And I wanted to take a couple of minutes out of this morning's time before we launch into the important business that we have, because we are in Southern California. And there's been a lot of publicity recently about events at the South Coast Air Quality Management District that people are concerned about, and rightly so, I believe, with the precipitous firing of the executive officer, which was preceded by perhaps an even more substantive discussion about the reclaim program, the NOx trading program, that's been on the books in the South Coast for a long time.

And I thought it would be useful for the staff to briefly go over what this issue of reclaim is about and what the ARB's role is in dealing with it, because this is going to be coming back before the Board at some point, I imagine. Okay. Mr. Corey.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thank you, Chair.
So I think from a context standpoint, it will help to provide a little background on the program and the action that was taken in December -- back in December. So reclaim established in 1993, so it's been around a long time. It's for larger industrial sources. It captures -- about today, there's about 270 sources captured under reclaim. Larger meaning they emit more than four tons a year NOx or SOx, so it was a market based program to provide flexibility for those sources, but also yield reductions. In fact, since '93 it's yielded about a 70 percent reduction in NOx, since that period of time.

But as part of the program, it's been a key element in terms of reducing NOx as part of meeting SIP obligations and demonstrating a path to achieve our help-based air quality standards. And as part of the 2012 air quality management plan, there was a commitment to further tighten the reclaim, and there was also a commitment with respect to its contribution to the upcoming SIP, basically meeting the 2023 80 parts per billion standard of ozone, as well as the 2031 75 parts per billion.

So staff, South Coast staff, went through an analysis and developed a report. And part of that was looking at individual sources, for instance, at refineries, boilers, catalytic cracking units, basically
look in total at the level control that they're at today, and what is achievable. And there's a specific definition that achievable means. It's related to best available control technology, retrofit technology they look at, that ultimately informs a recommendation with some head space as to how much to shave, how much to reduce the program which issues basically credits to industry, but that is basically a proxy for reducing emissions.

Staff proposed based on that analysis a shave of 14 tons per day of NOx, so -- and the rationale was this is what this is more consistent with BARCT, this will further bring refineries into alliance, into consistency, more consistent with what is achieved by refinery control elsewhere in the State, for instance the Bay Area, because the refineries actually have a lesser level of control here with respect to boilers, as an example, than they do in other parts of the State for example.

The Board discussion deliberated. In fact, there was considerable push-back on the proposal, particularly by the refineries, because the refineries had really an additional shave to do just what I described, to get them closer to what's achieved at refineries elsewhere in the State.

The South Coast Board ultimately approved a 12 ton per year shave. In response to that action, ARB,
under my signature, wrote a letter to the Director --
Executive Officer, Barry Wallerstein, identifying several
concerns we had. The fundamental concern was we had
concerns whether State law was being met. Reclaim needs
to meet this BARCT demonstration. In other words, it's
achieving emission reductions that you would otherwise
achieve had you gone command and control by individual
sources, and in the aggregate, does it get you to the same
place? So it was a fundamental question, does it do that?
We had some serious concerns as to whether it does or does
not, and said we're going to do our own independent
evaluation.

Two, on its face, it was leaving two tons a day
of NOx on the table, when we all know, and the South Coast
has been a very serious partner in this, we have a serious
air quality problem. We need to make progress towards
achieving the health based air quality standards, two tons
matters. And the other one was the additional time. The
proposal also provided additional time, a smoother
reduction curve, a declined curve.

In response to my letter, Barry Wallerstein laid
out a, one, disagreed with our assessment, in terms of the
legality. And my point was, we're looking at that. Let's
have that discussion. Two, there were two commitments in
that letter. It referred to the intent of the South Coast
to consider over the course of this year pulling some
additional credits out of the market, for instance, that
are associated with shutdowns. And it also identified the
intent to revisit, not necessarily the Board's action, but
other strengthening of reclaim. And where we left that
exchange was that there was to be a collaborative work
between myself and Barry, and possibly a board-to-board
discussion, with a subset of board members to see if we
could work through the issues.

Since that time, shortly after, because we were
involved, engaged in those conversations of putting these
discussions together, see if we could work through those
issues, the executive director was dismissed, released.
And, at this point, we are still discussing with staff.
But honestly, it threw a wrench into this, in terms of the
path that we were on, and the conversations that I was
having with the executive director.

So what we have been looking at is in terms of,
you know, the question that you asked, Chair, what are the
next steps? What do we with this, because we clear --
there's an issue in front us. And ultimately, Chair, you
made a point, this year -- later this year, we'll be
bringing before this Board a SIP submittal for South
Coast -- specifically for South Coast, in terms of
Demonstrating how we're going to achieve the 2031 75 ppb
standard. Not only does that include mobile source measures, which we've been working very hard with South Coast on, in terms of how we can get to an 80 percent reduction from the mobile source sector, but stationary sources matter a lot. In fact, if you look in 2031, today they represent about 15 percent of the NOx emissions down here, 2031, 40 percent.

The more we do on mobile, the greater share stationary sources represent and the importance of taking additional reduction opportunities for those sources. So -- and that's going to be a proposal that we bring before this Board later this year, and we want to bring a proposal that the Board can support, can adopt, basically because it moves on to EPA. And it's got to be the one -- the stationary and mobile source elements, basically the SIP, go through this Board. The Board has to approve it for it to advance to EPA. So working these issues out with South Coast now are critically important.

The Health and Safety Code specifies some options for us to work out. First of all is, in my -- from perspective, continue to work with staff to see if we can work through issues.

Two, there is in the Health and Safety Code a -- I'm going to call it a meet and confer provision that basically says if we are unable to reach resolution at the
staff level, I'd return to you and report just that point. The Board would appoint or identify a subset of members to confer with South Coast board members. The whole objective is can we find some common ground of an approvable reduction strategy.

If that is unsuccessful, the Health and Safety Code also calls out a more aggressive provision, where this Board would have a hearing in South Coast and consider adopting amending reclaim, adopting another measures to ultimately have a SIP that is ultimately approvable by this Board.

So we have some months to work through this. I don't want to say it's not endless time. We're mindful of the time frame. Staff is still doing the -- my staff is still -- our staff is doing the evaluation of the reclaim package that was submitted to us, in terms of this legal requirement, as well as working with South Coast staff. My plan is to report back to this Board on the staff-to-staff discussions to see if the meet and confer process needs to be initiated.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, thank you. Obviously, this was not an agenda item that was noticed. There's no action before the Board. But if anyone has a question that they would like to ask from staff. Yes, Mr. Florez.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you. Thank you for
your report. Just a couple questions in terms of this Board's ability, as you mentioned, and interim step in terms of a subset talking to the current Board members without executive director, what is the audit function of CARB at this point in time, of this Board in terms of the South Coast? What powers do we have to continue on? And that's a question one.

The second is, we are building towards this report, as you mentioned, with a deadline. And I guess I wonder why do we wait so long in order to -- can we get a monthly progress report from them. I know, you sent the letter out in December. I applaud you for that. But just how do we kind of stay on track with our statewide plan, with you have boards out there making these types of decisions? How does one account for that?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I think there are a few options. One, to the core of your question, in terms of you referred to it as a audit function, which I'd characterize the very review that we're doing of their role and their rationale is that very point, basically. And this is a complex evaluation. This is a 2,000 page document. It's hundreds of sources that are under it. And it's basically BARCT for those sources, and what would BARCT have otherwise gotten you too to basically have an informed basis for what it ought to be, in terms of where
you ought to land it, and what should have landed.

That evaluation is going -- taking place now. In terms of keeping the Board informed, a few options for that. One is individual briefings. Two, I could do a regular report. That could be in writing or it could even be as part of Board hearings, just to be informed as to how we're proceeding, because there is certainly a lot of work going on as I just described.

And the point I think -- your core point is calling early enough. If really we get to an impasse, from a staff standpoint, and really we need to -- assistance from the Board standpoint, that we've left ample time to work through those issues. And I'm very mindful of that point.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: And just, what's the end node for that type of analysis? When does this need to be resolved, so we can work backwards from there?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The ultimate resolution is when the SIP -- proposed SIP is brought before this Board towards the end of this year. But the whole point of this is that that SIP be an approvable SIP. So the markers, in my mind are, finishing our evaluation in about the month to two month time frame. And if we, at that point, have not resolved with staff, to me, that is the board-to-board confer timing. And that allows a window so
that we are not in a position of getting jammed.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Ms. Mitchell, were you --

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Yes.

CHAIR NICHOLS: -- about to speak?

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: I was getting the microphone ready. As the representative from the South Coast District, I want to say that, you know, I encourage our two boards to work together to reach the resolution that is needed here.

As you all are aware, there have been some major changes on our board, some new people have come in, and they are indicating a direction that they want to be more friendly to business, to industry. And while I think we can be friendly to industry, but we can still be green. And so I think one of the things that we need to be working on is the orientation of our new Board members. And, you know, I will be helping with that.

We're also certainly in an unsettled state right now with the loss of our executive director. As you know, we are preparing a AQMP at this time, the 2016 AQMP. So we have that in front of us. And we have in front of us now a search for a new executive director, and immediately a new interim director.

So there's a lot sitting on our plates, let me say that. And all of you know that I worked for the 14
tons per day reduction. So I want to work with our staff as well and with the ARB staff and the air resources -- the district staff to try to get to a point where we're on the same -- on the same plain. So anyway, thank you for the work that you're doing, Richard, and the work that you're doing, Chair Nichols. You've heard me say here many times, we have to have those NOx reductions, dramatic reductions by 2023 and then 2031.

And I don't know where we're going to get them, but we need to work on where we're going to get them. So thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. And appreciate very much your efforts to try to bring this to a successful resolution. I do admire your careful choice of language. Your Executive Director wasn't exactly lost. He was sent packing. But be that as it may, I think Richard has laid out a careful set of steps and a time frame for us to get to a resolution here. But I've been asked many times what power the Board has to deal with this situation?

And I think it is important that the Board understand that it's a power, it's also a responsibility that we have to act if we find, at the end of the day, that the SIP is not adequate. We may and would have to actually step in and fix the plan. So I don't think that's anybody's desire. It's hardly a pleasant thing to
do, but it is something that we have to hold out there as the ultimate potential resolution here, so -- but hopefully we will be able to move on.

And moving on, as far as our agenda is concerned, we have an informational item. I know that there are many people here in the audience who are here to talk about the site choice for the new laboratory.

But before we get to that, we do want to briefly lay some groundwork here in terms of the Board's implementation of our mobile source regulations. And this is an opportunity to get a bigger picture on how staff actually carries out these regulations, and hopefully at least a little bit places the role of the laboratory in that context.

So, Mr. Corey.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Today staff will present to the Board an overview of the comprehensive process it uses to implement mobile sources regulations to ensure that the emission benefits associated with those regulations are fully realized after those regulations are adopted by the board.

Typically, program implementation follows a cradle-to-grave approach, that starts with certification and on-board diagnostic system approval, continues with new vehicle/engine compliance testing, and ends with
in-use compliance testing on vehicles and engines in customer use.

Staff will also discuss the latest innovations in implementation to address new vehicle technologies and advancements in vehicle evaluations.

At this time, I'll ask Kevin Curley to begin the staff presentation.

Kevin.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was Presented as follows.)

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Corey. Good morning, Chair Nichols and members of the Board.

Today, I will be presenting an overview of how the Air Resources Board's mobile source regulations, specifically emission standards, are implemented through our certification and in-use compliance programs. I will also discuss how those programs may need to evolve to address lessons learned and future challenges.

--o0o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: The successful implementation of mobile source emission standards is critical in ensuring that the emissions benefits associated with these regulations are realized. Once the regulations are adopted, the implementation process
follows a cradle-to-grave approach beginning with the certification that manufacturer products meet the emission standards.

ARB signals approval of the products through issuance of an Executive Order, over 3,000 each year, which allows manufacturers to legally sell their products in California. Staff tracks in-use emission compliance through a variety of in-use testing programs and the collection of in-use data. If violations of standards are discovered, staff will follow up with enforcement penalties.

Finally, staff from multiple ARB divisions utilize information and knowledge obtained during implementation to identify potential amendments to then enhance the efficacy of future regulations.

--o0o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: So before we get into more details, let's start with an overview of approximate timelines of the implementation programs. As you can see, it's a very active process that tracks the life of the products. You may notice that dialogue between staff and the manufacturers starts one to three years before a manufacturer starts production of its engine and vehicle, and it continues years after the products are produced.
AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: So what do we certify?
ARB certifies a wide range of on-road and off-road mobile source products as shown here. On-road products include passenger cars, pick-up trucks, motorcycles, and heavy-duty engines in vehicles. While off-road engines include lawn mowers, weed trimmers, forklifts, all-terrain vehicles, recreational boats, and large construction and farm equipment.

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Let's first focus on the events that occur prior to the red dotted line that leads to the start of the manufacturers' production. Product preview meetings start up to three years ahead of time, and include discussion about new regulations or requirements for the products, as well as the manufacturers' plans to comply with emission regulations. Once the application is completed, it is submitted for final review, and if approved, the manufacturer receives and executive order making it legal to sell its products in California.

Now, let's go into greater detail on the substance of the discussions between the manufacturers and staff and the information that goes into the final
application for certification.

--o0o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: The red highlighted rectangles highlight areas that require extensive information exchange between ARB and manufacturers. Starting from the top red box, first the manufacturer must describe in engineering concepts how the emissions will be controlled with both hardware and software technologies.

Moving to the right box, the manufacturer must discuss in detail the existence of all auxiliary emission control devices, AECDs, which are basically computer software programs that disable parts of the emission control system under specific circumstances.

AECD documentation may be hundreds of pages long, and I have an example of one AECD document here on the table, just to give you an idea.

Next, manufacturers must put together a plan and demonstrate how the emission control system will be durable and control emissions for the full useful life of the vehicles. In some cases, this can be 15 years or 150,000 miles.

Finally, a significant tool, on-board diagnostics, or OBD, is now available on every vehicle sold, not only in California, but nationally and around
the world, all of which was conceived, developed, and implemented primarily by ARB for the United States. I will cover OBD in more detail on the next slide.

The rest of the blue rectangles are primarily submitted by the manufacturer and reviewed by staff for meetings standards and requirements including the final emission test results, the manufacturer's statement of compliance, a description of how the vehicle will be developed to be emission performance tamper resistant, and finally a copy of the emission label that will be applied to the vehicle and their emission warranty statement.

--o0o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: A significant part of the certification review is the manufacturers' planned OBD systems. Usually, one OBD monitoring system application will cover several vehicle makes and models. And I have an example of the OBD application here as well, just to give you an idea of the size.

I can barely lift it.

The OBD system does not measure emissions directly, but measures signals from the engine and emission control system to determine if a malfunction is practice. The system consists primarily of software and an engine computer with minimal additional hardware. The OBD system monitors virtually every emission related
component that can affect emissions if it malfunctions.

When a malfunction is detected, the OBD system illuminates a warning light, also called the MIL, or malfunction indicator lamp, and stores a distinct fault code that pinpoints the malfunction.

Thirty-one states are currently using light-duty vehicle OBD II for their inspection and maintenance programs, including the Smog Check Program here in California. The OBD program has been quite effective and is now the primary mechanism used in the Smog Check program to identify and address vehicles in need of emission repairs.

To ensure the OBD system functions as certified, OBD compliance testing is performed on a subset of production vehicles and may be conducted either by the manufacturer or in-house by ARB.

--o0o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Staff handles an exceptional number of manufacturers and certification applications every year. Last year, ARB issued over 3,000 executive orders, which covered the certification of over two million on- and off-road products. To achieve this, certification staff had to review and process over 18,000 certification documents in 2015.

Each certification document can range from a few
pages to thousands of pages. And with the addition of new categories and new regulatory requirements, the amount and complexity of certification documents has been growing over time.

--o0o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: A tremendous amount of technical information is collected during the mobile source certification process, and many entities outside of the certification group rely on this data. For example, regulatory groups use the data to identify current emission control system trends, and they use the emissions test data to establish current baseline emission levels.

The Bureau of Automotive Repair, BAR, and the service industry use our data, so Smog Check stations can determine if tested vehicles comply with the regulations. The public, and Section 177 states, use our certification websites to find information about California certified products.

And finally, ARB incentive programs and local districts use certification data to identify potential engines eligible for funding, such as under the Air Quality Improvement Program, AQIP, and the Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project, HVIP.
AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Now, let's move on to programs that occur after the certification of new products. Manufacturers build and sell after-market parts performance improvements and retrofit kits with new cleaner technology. In the next couple of slides, I will discuss how the after-market parts and retrofit verification programs are implemented.

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: To ensure that the emission control systems operate as designed, the California Vehicle Code prohibits modifications that increase emissions from mobile sources. Staff evaluate after-market parts to ensure that they do not increase emissions, and will issue approvals in the form of exemptions.

An exemption from California's anti-tampering law in the Vehicle Code is required before any add-on or modified part can be sold in California. One area of importance is after-market catalytic converters. If your vehicle fails Smog Check, you may use our databases of approved after-market catalytic converters to find a replacement, which is generally less expensive than the original manufacturer parts, but has been evaluated by ARB to ensure it performs as well as the original catalyst.
The after-market exemption program may also evaluate the application of alternative fuel and hybrid conversion systems, as well as other experimental technologies.

--o0o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Another type of after-market program is the diesel retrofit verification program. This program supports the various heavy-duty fleet rules by evaluating after-market diesel particulate filters, or other technologies, that could be added to existing vehicles and engines that obtain substantial emission reductions.

A successful retrofit reduces emissions, is durable and compatible with normal operation, reduces toxic exposures, and allows the continued use of existing engines. A verified product must also supply a product warranty and is subjected to in-use testing and compliance requirements. To provide outreach to fleets, a retrofit advocate facilitator assists fleet personnel with retrofit technology and compliance issues.

--o0o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: The final step on our timeline focuses on in-use compliance programs. In addition to certifying vehicles prior to being sold in California, ARB has established several programs aimed at
monitoring in-use vehicles for continued compliance with emission standards. The primary objective of this program is to verify that vehicles are produced as certified, and that they are compliant throughout their useful life.

--o0o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Over the years, ARB's in-use compliance program has been successful in identifying non-compliant vehicles and has forced the recall of over three million vehicles in the light-duty sector alone. Traditionally, staff procure cars from actual consumers, bring them into the laboratory, and test their emissions.

To give you an idea of what type of impact the program has had, in 1982, every vehicle group brought into the laboratory for testing failed emission standards. The threat of recall, encouraged manufacturers to produce durable emission control systems. As a result, by 1999, only 11 percent of the vehicles brought into the laboratory for testing failed their compliance testing.

In 2000, the compliance assurance program, or CAP2000, was adopted, which requires that manufacturers conduct their own in-use testing and submit the data to ARB. Using this test data, staff target vehicles most likely to have noncompliance issues for testing in our lab. Last year, all vehicle groups brought in for testing
failed their compliance testing, indicating that CAP2000 has helped ARB target non-complying vehicles. As a result, in each case, the manufacturer recalled and fixed the failing vehicles.

---o0o---

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: As you know, ARB has testing facilities located in El Monte, Los Angeles, and Sacramento that cover a large swath of mobile source categories in support of our mobile source programs. This is an example of the testing that takes place on light-duty vehicles at ARB's Haagen-Smit laboratory, or HSL, here in El Monte.

Typically each vehicle test can take from one to three days to complete. ARB's lab conducted over 1,200 tests last year in support of various programs, including confirmatory testing, special test cycles, investigatory testing, regulatory development and in-use testing.

---o0o---

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: This is an example of the evaporative emissions test equipment HSL. It is called a Sealed Housing for Evaporative Determination, or SHED. It is used for measuring evaporative emissions from fuel systems in passenger cars, recreational boats, and small equipment.

---o0o--
AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: ARB also has heavy-duty emissions test capabilities in Los Angeles and Sacramento, where we conduct emissions tests on heavy-duty vehicles and engines.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I was going to flag you. You used an acronym, HSL. That stands for Haagen-Smit Laboratory, right.

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Yeah. Sorry, I should have made that clear.

CHAIR NICHOLS: That's here where we are.

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Yeah.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Just calling you.

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: That's where we are right now.

(Laughter.)

--o0o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Moving on. Small engines. This test cell here has the capability to test emissions from small engines, such as lawn mowers, generators, and hand-held lawn and garden equipment. New engines can be brought in for audit testing and confirmatory testing.

--o0o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: As part of the in-use compliance monitoring efforts, staff also tracked
emission warranty claims and performed field evaluations. Warranty information on defective emissions control components is submitted by the manufacturer to ARB. If a defect rate is found to be high, ARB will request the manufacturer to initiate corrective action, usually in the form of a recall or an extended warrantee.

The OBD system present on vehicles can identify and pinpoint most of the component defects that would not be detected otherwise. Field operations is an integral part of the compliance program that provides staff on the ground that can inspect dealerships for problems and investigate and help mediate warranty complaints from vehicle owners.

Staff will be bringing a regulation to the Board later this year that will address warranty reporting based recalls and extended warranties for heavy-duty engines.

--o0o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Corrective action usually involves recalling and repairing vehicles to replace a defective part. Updating the engine computer software or offering an extended warranty to the owner to replace a defective part for the full useful life of the vehicle. Data collected from 2008 to 2015 indicates that the number of total vehicles affected by corrective action has increased almost three-fold evidence of the
effectiveness of warranty to capture emissions-related
defects.

---00o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: So where do we go
next?

In recent years, there have been tremendous
advances in vehicle and engine technologies, such as
hybrid electric vehicles, plug-in hybrids, and very low
emitting gasoline and diesel vehicles. These advances
provide both opportunities and challenges for ARB staff on
the implementation side of our programs. As vehicle
regulations push for every lower criteria and greenhouse
gas emissions, vehicle technologies, as well as the tools
for evaluating those technologies must evolve.

---00o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: Real-world
emissions or actual emissions from vehicles in use are the
next milestone to target. Staff is developing and
investigating increased capabilities to evaluate
real-world emissions by expanding the use of OBD data,
expanding the use of special test cycles in the lab, and
expanding the use of on-road screening devices, such as
roadside remote sensing and on-vehicle portable emissions
measurement systems, or PEMS.

Finally, as connected vehicles become the norm,
staff will evaluate the ability to take advantage of the connectivity to locate problem vehicles quicker.

If these new tools prove to be useful for certification and in-use compliance purposes, staff will likely propose regulatory changes in the future.

---o0o--

AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: But what can we do now? Focusing on lessons learned from the recent Volkswagen non-compliance case, this chart lists the current, enhanced, and new pathways to improve targeting of non-compliant vehicles. In addition to the traditional screening methods, staff will conduct enhanced AECD review, increased interrogation of OBD vehicle systems, and better screening of vehicles on the road to identify candidates for in-depth testing.

For example, roadside remote sensing may be used to narrow in on likely violating vehicle models. These candidate models would be tested in our laboratories, and on the road using PEMS. They will be subjected to new cycles and test approaches that are not restricted to only the standard emissions test cycle.

These enhanced approaches should collectively help ARB identify problem vehicles and focus our laboratory testing on vehicles most likely to have noncompliance issues.
AIR RESOURCES ENGINEER CURLEY: In summary, our emissions standards will only be as effective as our successful implementation of the mobile source regulations. Processes like certification are the cornerstone to achieving California's clean air goals and must be rigorously continued and must keep evolving as the technology advances.

Thank you for your time, and we welcome you to tour our HSL, or Haagen-Smit Laboratory, this afternoon.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. I know a number of Board members have signed up to take the tour, so that's great.

Any comments at this point about the need for process improvements and updates to our certification process?

Dr. Sperling, you look like you're thinking.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: I'm thinking looking forward, and I'm thinking, you know, there was the point about evolving. And clearly, the technology is changing. It seems to me the biggest changes are we're moving towards electric drive technology, plug-in hybrids being especially tricky, because the fuel cells and the battery electrics are zero emission. But the plug-in hybrids are a very complicated technology and likely to play a bigger and bigger role. And we also see more and more software
being used and electronic controls being used.

So I wonder -- so I guess the question I have is, going forward, what are you thinking about the kinds of changes that will be needed in the equipment and the testing and the facilities taking into -- and that it seems to apply to both light-duty and heavy-duty.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER AYALA: Let me --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Alberto.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER AYALA: Let me take that. You're absolutely right. One of the things that we are very interested in doing is to make sure that our program responds to the changing of technology. And even though we didn't get into this, one of the major projects that we're currently conducting, and perhaps you'll have an opportunity to talk to staff about this, is we are currently testing plug-in hybrids on the road very much using the same tools with PEMS and other systems, because, as you said, indeed, the technology is changing. But at the same time, we continue to rely on the combustion engine to some extent.

So, you know, one of the things that we need to understand is in the context of electrification, what role will these combustion engines will continue to play in the future? So that is just one example. And clearly, the lessons that we've learned, because of the VW scandal, we
need to take those lessons and also turn to the heavy-duty sector where perhaps making sure that we're getting the emission reductions that we're expecting is even more important.

So we are definitely in a process of evolution. The time is discrete. So, you know, we're thinking of this in terms of not 10 years, not 20 years, but perhaps two to three years. There's great interest around the world. We have our counterparts approaching us, asking us now that ARB uncovered this problem, what should we all do? So there's a great deal of dialogue and interest in terms of getting the perspective from us, in terms of how do we evolve and go from here, taking the lessons that we've learned, as the staff presentation suggested?

CHAIR NICHOLS: In addition to what you've just described, I'm concerned that we may be sort of in the situation that the FBI was in with respect to the cell phone that they retrieved from the San Bernardino shooter, in the sense that we've got mountains of software out there which are difficult, if not impossible, to crack from outside, may contain all kinds of information that we don't want or need, but on the other hand we now know for a fact that it's capable of being abused in a way that can defeat our current ability to detect.

So we certainly can work on better detection
methodologies, but shouldn't we also be investing in computer scientists to help us figure out, you know, how to extract information that we need from those little tiny chips that seem to control everything?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER AYALA: Certainly. And if I refer you back to the staff presentation, if you look at what staff described as enhancements, one of our priority areas is going to be to try to identify additional time and resources to look at the OBD component of things. And understanding that OBD is mostly software, clearly that's an area that we are going to have to invest some time and energy into it, in addition to other things.

I mean, you know, the key message that I want you, as a Board, to understand, and I say this with confidence, California has the most superior certification and compliance program in the world. That's the reason we identified the excess emissions in the diesel scandal. But most importantly, that is the reason we were able to determine why those emissions were happening.

And what we are doing is mobilizing our resources to make sure that we respond, not only to the opportunity, but perhaps more importantly to the responsibility we have to share what we've learned in our experience as we go forward.

CHAIR NICHOLS: So lots of potential jobs for
software engineers --

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: -- aspiring lab technicians.

It's very exciting.

Okay. Any other comments. If not, we can move
on to the lab issue -- oh, sorry.

Hard to see people unless they wave their hands.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you.

Just a quick question that probably will move
into our next agenda time conversation. But you mentioned
technology is changing very rapidly, evolving, software is
eating industries. So what does that do to the physical
plant of what we do here in El Monte? So what happens
when we build a new facility? What happens when we're
going to have things like remote sensing device screenings
and PEMS and those types of things? Is our new facility
going to be reflective of that? We have a budget request
of somewhere within the $366 million of reformulating new
equipment for the new facility. How is that reflective in
terms of what you see in this new software age?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER AYALA: The short answer
is yes. Certainly, the new lab is reflective of these
future needs that we currently don't have facilities for.

One concrete example is when you take a tour,
you're not going to see a dedicated test bay, where we can
do PEMS testing. Meaning, not only bringing the equipment to the vehicle, but vice versa, putting the equipment and the vehicle on the road and testing. In our new lab, we are anticipating having a dedicated facility, so that we can do more and more of this type of investigation.

The other thing is we obviously will continue to collaborate and build the partnership with our friends at the U.S. EPA. And they, themselves, have laboratory facilities that, frankly, we need to leverage, because, for example, EPA is developing capabilities to test at cold temperatures, they are developing capabilities to look at actual electrified system batteries and things of that sort.

So to the extent that we can continue to work with them, you know, let's not duplicate those capabilities, but let us ask ourselves how do we build from there?

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: So one follow up. I guess the heart of my question is, given what you've just said, and given what we do here in El Monte, given what we could be doing in terms of workforce, physical folks at the actual plant, is that changing? Could we do things more remotely? Would people be doing things in other places where they'd normally have to drive to somewhere? How does that change in the new software environment? Are
some of the testings going to be what we're currently
doing here, you know, being able to offer somewhere else,
so that people aren't necessarily driving in or coming
into the plant itself? How does that change in this new
environment?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER AYALA: Yeah, I mean --
unfortunately, we're still very much depending on -- I
mean, the core of what we do is experimentation. You
know, we're not able to operate in a -- yet, in a virtual
environment where we could be elsewhere and have the --
you know, the vehicle rolling on the dynamometer.

So we do need people to be on-site. We do need
the ability to, as we say, kick the tires. We're not at
the point yet where we can basically remotely, you know,
send a car off on the road, and we are sitting back in our
offices monitoring the emission performance that we're
interested in.

Perhaps in the future that's where we're going to
be, but right now -- and again, what we need to do to
respond to the scandal is short-term. You know, in the
next one, two, three years, we're going to have to come
back to you and give you our recommendations in terms of
how should we approach the future certification and in-use
performance. And for that, we are going to need to rely
on our engineers and scientists to essentially be kicking
the tires in the lab.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I think that's probably -- sorry, Ms. Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: So the new lab will give us -- could give us virtual transportation, right, and then no one would need to be anywhere except --

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Sorry.

CHAIR NICHOLS: And we'll be out of business.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Then we would accomplish all of our goals. No, I did have a serious question.

So I wondered -- this was a great presentation and primarily focused on the testing. And then the compliance that results from that, what about the lack of compliance and penalties, how are they directed? And in light of the new rules related to SIPs, and the percentages that need to go into environmental justice communities, how do you see that? I know it's a new rule, but I just wondered if you could give us some insight into how you're handling that?

CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: In terms of the whole SIP process, the CalEPA has set up a process going forward, where they're going to actually set up a pool of projects. And this will all go our for public comment. So it's definitely in progress. Already, ARB's Enforcement
Division does direct a substantial number of its own staff resources to find these cases to EJ areas. And so we're -- and then often the SIPs then would relate to that area. So we're already in that process. We're very aware of the new requirements and we are -- we have drafts in progress. CalEPA is organizing it, so the different -- all the other, the Water Board, Pesticides, and so forth would be in the same program.

So we're definitely moving along, and we can brief, you know, individually if you'd like as to how that process is going. There will be public comment on it. So if that answers your question.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. Great. Yes, it does. And will that be coming back to the Board at some point this year or --

CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: We could -- typically it's -- it would not be a regulatory item. We can do an informational item. We in the -- I think in June, the Director of the Enforcement Division, Dr. Todd Sax was going to do an update on the enforcement program that occurred in 2015, because we'll have all of the stats and all of the different settlements. So that would fit in neatly into that.

He actually did cover that in -- as part of the freight work. He talked about the increased enforcement.
That was the meeting before that you were on the Board. But we can definitely put that as part of Dr. Sax's June presentation. It's tentatively set for June. And if not, we can do a separate briefing for the Board on as a Board item, and we can also, at any time, answer any of your questions personally. And I know Senator Florez is particularly interested in this topic as well and many of our other Board members.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Great. All right.

Our final agenda item for today is consideration of a site recommendation for the proposed new motor vehicle and engine emissions testing and research facility in Southern California. This does represent a milestone in a long effort; it goes back actually to, at least in my recollection, 2007 when I rejoined the Air Resources Board and said to Tom Cackette, "What's going on with El Monte? It seems to be a deteriorating facility," and just curious about, you know, what can be done. And he informed me at that time that actually he and the staff had done a lot of work on a proposal to update -- upgrade the lab, but that unfortunately to do that would require moving because there simply wasn't enough land on site here.

So we're going to shift personnel a little bit here. Do people want to take a brief break before, or are
you ready to launch into this item?

Okay. All right. Good.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Chairman?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: I'd like to first of all say that I will recuse myself from this item. There is no real conflict of interest, but there is the appearance of a conflict. I sit on the South Coast Air District Board. And so, I recused myself from motions that involved this project on that board. But to avoid any appearance of conflict, I will recuse myself from the discussion here today. And I will at this point leave the meeting and wish you all well in your further deliberations.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I appreciate your making that clear.

So let's just launch into the discussion. I do want to say before we begin though that I find myself in a position of in some ways wishing that this was a decision that someone else would get to make, because we are blessed with two very impressive and attractive site opportunities and they both have a lot to offer. The staff has done a lot of work, along with the Department of General Services and the Department of Finance. And the two universities and the communities that are represented here represent a very high level of interest that has come
to us from both Riverside and Pomona, and both of these
groups and in particular the campuses and their leaders
have bent over backwards to find ways to meet our needs
and to accommodate all of our concerns, including making
significant modifications in their proposals, so that we
really have before us two potential sites that appear to
meet our needs. And so the challenge before the Air
Resources Board is to decide which of those two sites best
represents ARB's desires and goals for the future, and
where we can best put down a mark for the future of the
State's air program.

    So with that, I want to thank all of our staff
for their patience in this process. These kinds of
efforts are inherently disruptive and it's particularly
true that moving and the thought of moving, the idea of
moving and then actually moving are among the most
psychologically stressful things that anyone can go
through, right up there with a death in the family or a
divorce, I think, in terms of the pressures that they put
on people. And the Air Resources Board functions in a way
that I think is maybe not perfect but is pretty close in
my mind to an ideal of an organization where people really
pay attention to the quality of life issues for their
colleagues and strive to work together for the good of the
organization and the good of the cause.
So I want to say at the outset how much I appreciate the fact that there's been active engagement but also a lot of listening that's gone on at every level within the organization as we've gone through this process. And of course whatever decision is made on the part of the Board, we're still years away from actually having a place to move to. So this is really not an end; it's only the beginning of another phase.

And with that, I think I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Corey to introduce the item.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was Presented as follows.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes, thanks, Chair Nichols.

In cooperation with the Department of General Services, ARB staff has completed its evaluation of three potential sites. Two of those sites are in Riverside one is in Pomona. And as you mentioned, this has been a thorough process to evaluate the many attributes for each site. And really, and as noted, most of the attributes were comparable. We really have two sites that can work.

The staff identified proximity as an important and distinguishing attribute relative to ARB's operational needs. Now, I really wanted to iterate how appreciative we are of the support that representatives of Riverside,
of Pomona, DGS, and ARB staff have provided throughout this process. We could not have completed the evaluation without that support.

So now I'd like to ask Deidre Cyprian, our Space Acquisition Manager for the project, to begin the staff presentation.

Deidre.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was Presented as follows.)

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Thank you, Richard.

Good morning, Chair Nichols and members of the Board.

Here is my agenda for today's presentation.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: It's coming.

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: So here is my presentation -- agenda.

The following slide provides an overview of the Southern California Consolidation Project.

---00o---

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: ARB facilities in Southern California consist of the State-owned Haagen-Smit Laboratory, five leased buildings, and a limited heavy-duty testing facility located at the MTA yard near downtown Los Angeles. These facilities
consist of about 135,000 square feet of space and accommodate approximately 400 staff.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The existing facilities are now stretched beyond their capacity, cannot support ARB's existing and future testing needs, do not provide adequate infrastructure to expand or upgrade equipment, and are not energy efficient.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: In recognition of the inadequacies, ARB is proposing to relocate and consolidate existing operations at a new emissions testing and research facility that will better serve our current and future needs.

To support the project, a feasibility study was completed in January 2015. This study provided information on project scope, size, and cost, as well as providing the basis for the current year's budget proposal.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The goals for the project are listed on this slide and establish the overall framework for not only site selection, but for the construction and operation of the proposed new facility as well.
SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: As mentioned previously, the feasibility study provided information relevant to facility and site requirements. The study concluded a facility size of approximately 299,000 square feet is necessary to meet ARB's needs. The site requirements are approximately 14 to 17 acres and the total project cost is estimated at $366 million. If all goes well, ARB would take occupancy in 2020.

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: In the Fiscal Year 2015-16 budget, ARB was authorized $200,000 for site evaluations and $5.7 million for developing performance criteria for the new facility. These criteria are used in the process for selecting the team that will design and build the facility. In approving the funding, supplemental budget language requires ARB to allow representatives from both Riverside and Pomona to make formal presentations to the site evaluation team, and provide a summary of the Board action to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee for a 30-day review.

For the Fiscal Year 2017-18 budget year, ARB will need to submit another budget proposal for the balance of the funds needed for the project.
SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide identifies the various timelines associated with the acquisition and performance criteria phases of the project. These tasks will be completed with the assistance of the Department of General Services and the master architect. Maintaining this timeline will be critical in moving the project forward expeditiously to meet our testing needs and ensuring the project is within the projected budget.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide identifies the various timelines associated with the design build and construction phases of the project. Please note that the Public Works Board must approve the performance criteria prior to the design build contract being awarded. ARB looks forward to breaking ground in the November 2017 time frame, with occupancy around November 2020.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Since the budget was approved, ARB and DGS have been working diligently to evaluate three sites.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: To provide a common framework for this evaluation, ARB and DGS
developed a site evaluation matrix that included over 100 different attributes.

DGS hired four specialized contractors to support environmental, nontechnical, zero net energy, and LEEDS analyses. Representatives from Riverside and Pomona were also very helpful in providing information, including making formal presentations to ARB management and staff in October of last year.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The next two slides provide some of the general attribute categories used for the site evaluations. The categories include site area, transportation and circulation, location, zoning, local codes, and ownership, architectural and engineering, and environmental.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The remaining general attribute categories are shown on this slide. They include security, neighborhood characteristics and surroundings, staff amenities and diverse uses, LEEDS certification and zero net energy, and alternative fueling. The results of all attribute analyses are provided in more detail in the staff report.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: As discussed
in our December 2015 update to the Board, we evaluated three potential sites on this slide.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide shows an overall view of the three potential sites and the existing ARB facilities.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide provides a view of the Pomona site. It is located on non-prime agriculture land referred to as Innovation Village 2 or, most recently, Spadra. The Spadra property is about 165 acres and is currently used in a college of agriculture's educational program. A proposed site for the project is represented in light blue; however, the precise boundaries are subject to change.

The Pomona site consists of about 19 acres. The university has indicated that they would consider further discussions on additional land to support ZNE, but has not committed any specific property at this time. The site is flat and relatively rectangular, allowing for flexibility in project design.

Retail, shopping, and transit are within walking distance and lodging is nearby. The center of the Cal Poly Pomona campus is a little less than one mile away. The cities of Pomona, Walnut, and Diamond Bar are nearby,
and the now-closed Lanterman Development Center is adjacent to the property.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide provides a view of the Riverside Number 1 - Technology Court - site. It is located about one-half mile from the University of California Riverside Center for Environmental Research and Technology, and about three miles from the main UCR campus.

The Riverside Number 1 site consists of about 17 acres and is a combination of public and private land. The county owns about 7-1/2 acres and has indicated they would acquire the private land to make up the needed acreage. Representatives have also indicated a willingness to acquire additional land if needed.

Although Ce-Cert and a new Metrolink station is about one-half mile from the site, there is very limited access to retail, shopping, lodging, or other transit near the site.

The site is expected to have slightly increased construction costs due to an uneven topography of the site and the need for retaining walls. In addition, the elongated nature of the property makes it more challenging from a design perspective.

--o0o--
SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide provides a view of the Riverside 2 - Iowa Avenue - site. The site is located on a 100-acre parcel that is planned for campus development. The land is likely designated as prime agricultural land and is currently being used as part of UCR's agricultural research program. The university has indicated that any ongoing research would be relocated if ARB recommends this site.

The Iowa site consists of about 18 acres. The university has indicated that they would consider further discussions on ways to support ZNE, but has not committed any specific property at this time. The topography is flat and rectangular, which allows for flexibility in project design.

As the slide reflects, retail, shopping, lodging, and transit are within walking distance. The center of the UCR campus is about three-quarters of a mile away and the site is about two miles from downtown Riverside.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: On December 17th, 2015, staff provided the Board with an informational update. The update provided an overview of the project, details of the site evaluation process, preliminary site evaluation information, and the next steps. Based on the information presented, there were several specific
follow-up items that Board members requested.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The Board directed staff to develop an open process for El Monte staff to make their views known, conduct detailed evaluations of the Pomona 1 and the Riverside 2 sites, evaluate transit options for staff, and evaluate transit options for people ARB routinely does business with or interacts with in Southern California.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The following slides provide the results of the site evaluation analysis, including the information developed in response to the Board's direction

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: ARB and DGS evaluated over 100 individual attributes for each site. As indicated in December, all three sites are workable from a site development perspective and all are available at no cost to the State.

However, the Pomona number 1 and the Riverside number 2 sites are preferred over the Riverside number 1 - Technology Court - site. The Technology Court site has a sloped topography and is elongated in orientation that makes it a little more difficult to develop. In addition,
the site has very few amenities nearby. Therefore, the rest of this presentation is focused on a comparison between the Pomona site and the Riverside Number 2 - Iowa Avenue - site.

---o0o---

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: For the vast number of attributes evaluated, the results showed that the results were similar. In several of the categories related to site development, staff identified issues that weren't further consideration during the site development process. These are discussed in the following slides. However, staff also found that none of these identified issues would preclude site development or result in any significant difference that would definitively favor one site over another. These particular site development issues are presented in the next few slides.

The staff did identify that there were significant differences between the sites related to certain proximity attributes identified in the site evaluation matrix, and I will discuss these differences as well.

---o0o---

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The staff report details the various site development issues related to the attributes identified in this slide. ARB would
need to fully evaluate each of these issues in accordance with applicable requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act and implement measures to address the issues as appropriate.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: In general, the Riverside Number 2 site appears to be a somewhat easier site to develop than the Pomona Number 1 site, as the staff analysis identified fewer potential issues. The staff report discusses these issues in detail.

As indicated previously, none of the identified issues would preclude site development.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The staff found that there are significant differences between the two sites related to proximity attributes. This slide lists the various proximity attributes that were included in the site evaluation matrix. In the next series of slides I will discuss each of these proximity attributes.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Is attribute representing convenient access to the general public was included in the site evaluation matrix to provide a characterization of the location of the site relative to the public, including common stakeholders.
The analysis showed that there are about 7 million more people located within 35 miles of the Pomona site than the Riverside site. This is significant to the extent that the new facility is a focal point for events, symposia, and workshops, as well as educational opportunities. Locating closer to more people would provide more diverse opportunities for public interactions.

ARB evaluated driving distances for common stakeholders that included automotive manufacturers, community and environmental justice organizations, various independent emissions testing laboratories, ports, major railyards, refineries, fuel terminals, and bulk plants. Of the 82 entities evaluated, about 80 percent were located closer to the Pomona site than the Riverside site and 70 percent were located more than 20 one-way miles further from the Riverside site than the Pomona site.

This analysis is significant in that it provides an indication of access, both from the perspective of stakeholders traveling to the new site as well as ARB staff traveling to meet with stakeholders. Operational needs are improved when less time is spent on the road.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: ARB staff conducted enforcement inspections at the various sources
shown on this slide and bring collected samples back to
the laboratory for analysis. As discussed above, most of
these sites are located closer to the Pomona Number 1
site. If the Pomona site is selected, ARB enforcement
staff would be reducing typical travel time by about 45
minutes to an hour and, in turn, increasing productivity
as less time is spent traveling.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide
shows that both sites are close to Ontario Airport. The
Pomona site has some advantages based on the proximity to
other major Los Angeles airports, thus providing somewhat
more flexibility for travelers to select airlines, travel
times and air fares.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The Pomona
site is approximately five miles from the South Coast Air
Quality Management District. By being located nearby, ARB
has more opportunity to facilitate coordination on a
variety of topics such as the State Implementation Plan
and the Sustainable Freight Initiative. In addition,
Sacramento ARB staff traveling to the ARB facilities could
visit both ARB and the South Coast in a single day. In
the past, ARB management typically did not visit ARB
facilities if they were attending meetings at the South
Coast AQMD or vice versa.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Another one of the proximity attributes included on the site evaluation matrix was the impact on ARB staff commutes. ARB used the current residences of ARB staff to analyze the driving distance and time, and public transit options and times to each proposed site.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide identifies the geographic location of current ARB residences relative to ARB's El Monte facilities and the proposed sites.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The results of the driving distance and driving time analysis are represented in this slide. The median round-trip driving distance and time to the Riverside site is approximately 50 miles and about an hour greater than to the Pomona site. About 75 percent of the employees would have a round-trip commute time of 90 minutes or less to the Pomona site, as opposed to only 21 percent for the Riverside site.

The incremental vehicle miles traveled is about 3-1/2 half million miles compared to the current commutes.
to the El Monte facility if everyone drove. On average, ARB employees would incur over $6,000 in incremental annual commute costs if the Riverside site was selected and all staff drove to the new site.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Our analysis of the public transit options indicates that the combination of buses and trains is challenging at both sites, but Riverside is significantly more challenging. The chart on this slide indicates that fewer than 30 percent of the staff would have a public one-way transit travel time of 90 minutes or less, as opposed to only 1 percent of staff for Riverside.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Due to the travel distances and times, most ARB staff would likely have to relocate, retire, or resign if the Riverside Number 2 site was selected. Public transit is not a practical option for ARB staff traveling to Riverside from their current residences.

Conversely, the travel distances and times to the Pomona site would minimize the impacts on ARB's high quality workforce and minimize impacts on ARB's operations.
SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The information on this slide is not contained within the staff report. However, in response to concern that the site recommendation only considers current staff, we conducted an analysis of how ARB staff demographics might change in the future.

As noted, the preceding analysis was based on the current demographics of the ARB staff. ARB will not take occupancy until at least the end of 2020. To assess the impact of staff changes over time, we analyzed data on the current age of the staff and their years of State service time. In addition, staff are placed into two categories: Engineers, specialists, and technicians; and administrative, office, and other staff. The analysis indicated that over 90 percent of the El Monte staff are within the professional or technical category. Therefore, we base the analysis on all staff.

Using this information, we then projected the staff makeup in ten years. In the analysis, we assumed that any new staff additions would choose where they lived based on the siting decision for the new facility. Historically, ARB has a very low turnover rate, excluding retirements. Therefore, we assume no other turnover for this analysis and assess the impact of potential
requirements in a separate analysis.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: This slide shows that currently almost all of the ARB staff are younger than 64 years of age. Projecting ten years into the future with the assumptions listed on the previous slide, over 75 percent of the staff are younger than 64 years of age. Therefore, the staff commute impacts would still affect the significant number of staff assuming that there are no early retirements at age 55.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: To assess the impact of potential retirements, we looked at both age and state service time. The decision to retire is dependent on many individual factors. For this analysis, we assumed that staff could retire at the age of 55 if they had at least 30 years of state service time.

Using these assumptions, the analysis shows that in 2020 about 33 percent of the current staff would likely be candidates for retirement. However, if all of these staff retired, approximately two-thirds of the existing staff might still be working at ARB. Therefore, the ARB staff commute analysis is still valid for many employees years into the future.

--o0o--
SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Now I will speak about public transit. Based on the staff commute analysis, we concluded that stakeholders would have the same regional transit options as ARB staff. This means that regional transit options to either site are challenging, with the Riverside site being somewhat more challenging.

Note, we did not identify any future regional improvements that would significantly reduce transit times. Local transit options exist for both Pomona and Riverside and are expected to improve in the future.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The last proximity attribute that we evaluated was the difference from the existing ARB El Monte facility. The analysis showed that the normal commute distance from the El Monte facility to the Pomona site is about 17 miles, compared to 48 miles from the El Monte facility to the Riverside site.

The significance of this attribute is related to the need for ARB to pay relocation expenses if the ARB headquarters is moved to Riverside.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Recent changes in the bargaining unit contract for engineers and specialists require that ARB pay relocation expenses under
certain conditions. The first criteria is that the new headquarters must be at least 35 miles from the existing headquarters. The previous slide shows that the normal commute distance to the Riverside site is approximately 48 miles. Therefore, ARB would have to pay relocation expenses for a move to Riverside if an employee meets all of the qualifying criteria.

ARB estimated the costs to be in the range of $1,000,000 to $7,000,000 based on the number of employees that might choose to relocate.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: In summary, proximity is important to ARB's operational needs. The Pomona Number 1 site facilitates coordination with stakeholders, the public, and the South Coast AQMD, as well as ARB enforcement.

In addition, the Pomona site minimizes the change in staff commutes, thus minimizing disruption of the ARB operations. Finally, regional public transit is not a practical option for daily commutes to Riverside for existing staff. Coupled with the long driving distances and driving times to Riverside, ARB staff would likely have to resign, retire, or relocate if the Riverside site is selected.

--o0o--
SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: In response to Board direction, ARB conducted a survey of staff to obtain their views on a potential site. The results indicated that the top three attributes were proximity to their current residence, availability of quality transit, and the neighborhood surroundings and site esthetics. Due to a variety of reasons related to personal and family considerations, 85 percent of the El Monte staff preferred the Pomona site.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: About three years ago, ARB first discussed the potential for locating the proposed new facility next to a university to facilitate various partnerships. At that time, ARB staff visited with UC Riverside, UCLA, UC Irvine, and Cal Poly Pomona. These universities were all located within a 50-mile radius of existing ARB headquarters and, at the time, were consistent with State requirements that provided an upper bound distance for paying relocation expenses.

Since that time, we have carefully considered whether proximity to a university is necessary for these partnerships to flourish. The conclusion reached is that it is useful but not critical. Therefore, the site selection process proceeded without a component that
mandated proximity to a university.

ARB has long relationships with many academic institutions and other entities relative to conducting research on many aspects of air quality and climate change programs. In addition, ARB has conducted collaborative research programs both at ARB facilities as well as university facilities. These programs are expected to continue in the future, and ARB will continue to contract and collaborate with those institutions that provide the best value to the State.

However, ARB recognizes that there is some value in locating near a university to create win-win opportunities that can assist ARB in addressing a wide range of challenging policy and technical issues, and providing unique experiences for university faculty and staff.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The South Coast AQMD approved a $1,000,000 endowment to UCR's Ce-Cert if ARB selected Riverside as the proposed site. The endowment would be used to develop a training and research program for ARB and South Coast AQMD staff. ARB supports the concept of the endowment and supports its implementation regardless of the site selected.
SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: The next two sides present the staff recommendation and next steps.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Based on the comprehensive site evaluation process and consideration of multiple attributes, staff recommends the Pomona site.

--o0o--

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Following a Board recommendation, staff will prepare a summary of the Board meeting and forward the summary to the Department of Finance. The Department of Finance will then forward the summary to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee for a 30-day review.

Prior to any action, ARB will carefully consider any comments provided by the JLBC prior the taking any action.

Thank you. That concludes the staff presentation.

If there are no questions from the Board, I will now introduce Chancellor Wilcox of the University of California Riverside.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Welcome, Chancellor.

CHANCELLOR WILCOX: Thank you, Madam Chair. And I'll be joined by Rob Fields from the Riverside County.
Thank you for the time and thank you for the report.

It seems to me the Board this morning has a choice. And the choice is between moving the Haagen-Smit Laboratory and creating a world center for air quality research. Both options clearly have advantages we just heard. But it seems to me the first option, simply moving the laboratory, are primarily short-term advantages. Creating a world center for air quality research is about long-term advantages. And if there's something that the ARB stands for, it's the long term. We, in fact, wouldn't be interested in air pollution or air quality if we weren't interested in the long term - the long-term implications on environment, the long-term implications on health, and the long-term implications in society.

So why do I say world center? We already know the attributes and then strengths of ARB and all that it brings to the discussion. Well, let me tell you a little bit about UCR.

We have dozens of faculty members, 46 of them externally funded, doing research on air quality. And we have hundreds - undergraduates, graduates, and post-doctoral students - working in this area. Two of the most respected entities in the country are ARB and UCR when it comes to air quality. Putting those two together
will be dynamic.

Right now, we have about $22 million worth of funded research at UCR in air quality. 13 percent of that is actually funded by ARB. But importantly, the other 87 percent is NIH, NSF, Department of Defense, Department of Energy, key partners here in Riverside and in California in thinking about the future of the quality of our air.

And those 50 some, 60 some faculty members aren't just in engineering and chemistry. They're in public policy, they're in medicine, they're in business. Because as all of you know, science doesn't clear the air. Science provides information. It's policy change, it's funding, it's politics, it's social engagement - those are the things that clear our air. And at UCR we're not just a place that studies the particles in the air. We're a place that thinks about our environmental future, in a way that's going to be achievable and sustainable over the long term.

And we're very proud at Riverside that we haven't done this by ourselves. We've done it in lockstep with ARB over decades. As Dr. Haagen-Smit was doing his pioneering work, it was scientists at UCR who first realized that the damage they were seeing in the leaves on crops may well be related to air and the quality of the air. It was James Pitts, arguably the first person to
argue for regulation of NOx's. And that's what led to the
work at ARB early on, which in turn led of course to the
work at EPA. This has not been a short term nor an
independent effort on our part. It's been a partnership
over a very long term with ARB.

So where are we today and where are we going if
this is about the long-term future?

Number one, following up on our discussion
earlier about the VW scandal. UCR -- and arguably we're
number one, we're number two discussion in the
universities is West Virginia University, that also does a
lot of air quality research because of the coal industry.
The two of us though, West Virginia and UCR, have combined
forces, and we are together lobbying our congressional
delocations and the EPA with a hope and the aspiration
that when there is a settlement in VW, that there will be
a fair amount of that money devoted to air quality
research; not just remediation but the future. We at UCR
feel a responsibility to the State and the nation to take
that kind of leadership.

We're presently adding 300 faculty members to our
campus - 300. And we're doing it in lots of ways. But
one of the key ways we're doing it is trying to identify
themes that are important to our university and our state
in the future.
Let me read you some of those themes: Air quality and public health; global climate modeling; renewable energy; policy impacts of air quality; environmental toxicology. And one that has an acronym, it's BREATHE, I'll tell you the A stands for aerosolized and T stands for toxins. I won't -- the letters. But it's medical school, it's engineering, it's the notion that what we breathe now is -- we don't have to worry about the big chunks of stuff. It's now the small things. And it's not that they're small; its that they're dynamic in your lungs and they do things once they're in your body.

That's the kind of question that we need to be addressing in the future. UCR's preparing for that.

I have to say to the staff really one important thing: We want you very much in Riverside. I don't want to diminish the short-term considerations. I don't want to diminish the personal pieces. The Chair said it better than anyone can say, it's physically hard, it's emotionally hard, it's financially hard, it's tough to move. And we appreciate that. But at the same time we want to do all we can to make you feel welcome.

I have just -- we just passed out - and I have a few extra copies for staff members as well. I'm afraid I didn't bring enough -- the list of things that we're
committed to at UCR to help them make this transition a little easier: Our spousal job referral system, our relocation system, our commuter and van pool system. We intend to give every CARB member a faculty staff I.D. so they can take full advantage of the things at the campus. Priority at our child development center for their children. We want to do everything we can to make this not UCR and CARB, but UCR/CARB, an entity that is going to be, in all candor, in all seriousness, the center for air quality research in the world.

We're excited about the opportunity. We certainly -- I certainly commiserate with your decision, but I really do think it's an important one for decades.

And people have said, "Kim, how could you devote property to this effort so easily?" It was a no-brainer for me. And I can tell you, if this decision is made to move to Riverside, future boards will never be in your position again, because future chancellors will see it as just as much a no-brainer, to add to the complex to make sure that our position in California remains the leadership one in the world.

I'd now like to ask Rob Field to take the mike.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. FIELD: Thank you, Chancellor.

Yes, good morning. Rob Field. I'm an assistant
county executive officer with the County of Riverside. I've spoken with many of you before.

First of all, greetings and happy St. Patrick's Day from a person who's got Irish blood. This is a special day for us.

First, my remarks today is not to poke holes in the ARB staff report. We did a lot of work with the staff and we respect and admire the work that they have performed.

However, there are some things that we think bear additional consideration, and which will bear considerable cost, have significant cost implications for the attempt to relocate to Cal Poly Pomona. And, importantly, these are not factors that would impact the relocation to Riverside.

And, in particular, there are the concerns that are articulated in the pages 61 through 64 of the staff report with respect to the environmental challenges at the Cal Poly site. There was a phase 1 analysis of that site done. There was not, however, a phase 2 site analysis done, which would have identified and confirmed the existence of those challenges that are articulated in the phase 1, define their extent, and potentially found other site challenges.

It would be important to me -- we do a lot of
construction in the County of Riverside. I've personally
been involved in the construction of over a billion
dollars of public facilities. We do phase 2's routinely.
I think the absence of a phase 2 to influence this
decision is an important oversight that needs to be
corrected frankly before a final decision is rendered.

You do not know actually what the cost of site
development is going to be. A great deal of analysis and
a great deal of time has been paid to what it's going to
cost for relocation benefits. Frankly, the costs
associated with the environmental mitigations would likely
dwarf those costs. One of concerns that I would have is
delays. Right now construction costs are going up about 5
percent a year. You have about a $400 million project
here. If you're delayed one year by these problems,
that's $20,000,000 in site costs -- or in the cost
escalations for the project. That's far more than the
$7,000,000 potential, and sort of speculative, relocation
cost that is associated with the Riverside site.

A couple of other things that were not really
touched on in any great detail in the ARB study.

Operational cost control. The City of Riverside
has a public utility - I think the city manager's going to
touch on that later - but there are significant cost
reductions available through Riverside public utilities
that would not be available through the investor-owned utilities that serve Pomona.

Entitlement control. There is a note that the UCR land is prime ag land. Actually it is not. It has been the subject of several iterations of a long-range development plan process. It has been evaluated several times, as recently as 2011. The Board of Regents adopted a statement of overriding considerations, that is no longer a concern, a consideration at the Riverside site.

Finally - and I think the chancellor kind of touched on this - there's -- it's difficult to put a dollar value on opportunity costs or lost-opportunity costs. But it seems that -- it seems to us important that, despite the conclusions of the staff report, co-locating with a major university that has a med school and a public policy school and then various engineering schools, there's a lot of value to that portion of the assessment, wasn't really assessed. And I don't -- and from our perspective - I'm a little biased naturally, and partly as a UCR grad, also as a county guy - but it's important to co-locate, to take advantage of all the different assets that a major research university, especially one that has all of the graduate programs and of course the specialty program offered at Ce-Cert. To miss that opportunity, I don't know how you assign a cost
to that, but it would be significant. And we would urge you to at least take that into consideration as you're going through your analysis and decision-making process on that.

And with that I will close on my remarks. Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I probably should have said this at the outset, but I know we're taking up a lot of time of some very high level folks. And I understand if you may not and stay throughout entire discussion with the Board. But I do hope we'll have an opportunity to ask some questions. I know a number of my fellow Board members are going to have things that they'd like to ask.

Okay. Thank you.

And now...

SPACE ACQUISITION MANAGER CYPRIAN: Now I'd like to introduce Pomona.

MS. ALVA: Good morning. My name is Sylvia Alva. I'm the vice president and provost at Cal Poly Pomona.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

MS. ALVA: Good morning, Chair Nichols and members of the Board. Thank you for the opportunity to make this presentation.
At Cal Poly Pomona, we are excited about the prospect of welcoming the Air Resources Board to our campus, and are pleased to see that so many of your employees share our enthusiasm for making Cal Poly Pomona the future site of the Air Resources Board.

As my time is limited, I'll jump right in. I'd like to give -- my presentation focuses on the attributes of Cal Poly Pomona as an ideal location, a great workplace, a nationally recognized research and teaching institution, and a committed sustainability partner.

We're also joined by strong supporters who would like to say a few words and answer questions that you may have following my presentation. We'll open our presentation with a special message from our president, Dr. Soraya Coley, who unfortunately not be here today.

See how this goes.

(The following is a video presentation.)

DR. COLEY: I'm Soraya M. Coley, President of California State Polytechnic University Pomona.

On behalf of our university community, I want to reaffirm our commitment to establishing a dynamic partnership with this Board and your entire organization. Both Cal Poly Pomona and CSU Chancellor White would be honored to host ARB's new Southern California facility on our campus. Here's some compelling reasons why we believe
Cal Poly Pomona fits with your stated goals and needs. We have the right experience, resources, people, and facilities. We're committed to emerging technology, continued growth in research and development, and attracting new public-private partnerships. Our core values, especially in promoting sustainable practices, intersect with the aims of the ARB. Given our polytechnic identity and focus on learn by doing, there are many opportunities for collaboration in the advancement of our organizations.

Through our Center for Training, Technology and Incubation, industry leaders and innovative startups have space to exchange new ideas, collaborate, and explore new research frontiers.

Organizations, large and small, have found Cal Poly Pomona to be an ideal location, including Southern California Edison and the American Red Cross, which collectively bring 2,000 employees to our campus. They have access to our extensive meeting facilities, academic and public policy forums, student interns, and library and database services.

We are a leader in environmental sustainability and have been widely recognized for our green efforts, especially in our work to become carbon neutral by 2030. Not only does Cal Poly Pomona's commitment to
excellence make for a great partnership, but the
avantages of our location in Los Angeles County are
clear. Our site exceeds the Board's physical location
requirements and our campus offers great amenities and
easy access to entertainment, recreation, and quality
dining. We're at the crossroads of three major freeways,
several airports, and public transit systems with
additional plans for expansion. And we're located only
five miles from the offices of the South Coast Air Quality
Management District. A move to Cal Poly Pomona allows the
ARB to retain its long-standing connection to L.A. County
and its many partners in the region.

Additionally, we are proud of the widespread
support among our community and business leaders, elected
officials throughout the San Gabriel Valley and all five
members of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

Finally, we look forward to pursuing mutually
beneficial opportunities in education, science,
engineering, and innovation that will support the mission
of the Air Resources Board.

I am excited at the prospect of building a strong
and lasting partnership in this groundbreaking journey
together. Thank you.

(end of video.)

--o0o--
MS. ALVA: As President Coley underscores, Cal Poly Pomona has a lot to offer and we're honored and excited about the opportunity to partner with the Air Resources Board.

As noted earlier, we are an ideal location for the Air Resources Board. We're close in proximity highly-trained and valued workforce and also to the South Coast Air Quality Management District in Diamond Bar. As the Air Resources staff has already noted, Cal Poly Pomona offers the least disruptive option for your employees and operations.

Cal Poly Pomona is also a great place to work, offering a host of services and amenities for employees.

Cal Poly Pomona is also a nationally recognized research and teaching institution. We're a polytechnic university, one of only two in the State of California. We have the top engineering program in the United States. We take seriously our commitment to attracting and graduating the talented and diverse workforce of the future, and it shows. We're proud to acknowledge that about 66 of your current employees are Cal Poly Pomona graduates.

Finally, Cal Poly Pomona is a committed partner, with a solid record in the area of sustainability. We're ready to support your goals of reducing greenhouse gases
and carbon emissions. As noted in the staff report, commuters would reduce about 1,500 tons of carbon emissions annually if the Cal Poly Pomona site were selected.

--o0o--

MS. ALVA: We think of Cal Poly Pomona as an ideal location for the Air Resources Board. As this image shows, the Air Resources Board will be located directly on the campus of Cal Poly Pomona on a large parcel of land known as Spadra. The proposed site for your facility is also close to numerous resources and amenities on the campus. Welcoming the Air Resources Board to this location aligns very well with our campus plans to explore ways to expand the use of this parcel.

--o0o--

MS. ALVA: Currently the Spadra parcel on campus is primarily used by as an agricultural research field lab. We recognize the value and importance this parcel has on our academic mission particularly to the students and faculty in the plant science program.

At the same time, we see our partnership with the Air Resources Board as a win-win opportunity. The opportunity is committed to building a strong partnership with the Air Resources Board and others, all the while limiting the deleterious impact of any future plans for
the parcel on our academic programs and instructional needs.

--o0o--

MS. ALVA: Moving forward, the future use of the Spadra parcel will be informed by three strategic planning processes that are unfolding currently, and concurrently, on the campus.

The first is the university strategic planning process, a comprehensive review and planning process to identify the priorities for the campus.

The academic master plan will involve systematically reviewing our academic degree programs and courses.

And, lastly, the academic master plan will inform the physical layout of the campus and the vehicular and pedestrian movement both into and throughout the campus.

Our strategic planning efforts will include meaningful engagement and broad consultation with students, faculty, staff, and external stakeholders, and will include agricultural leaders and stakeholders to provide counsel and input on the future of agriculture.

--o0o--

MS. ALVA: Looking ahead, we have much to offer the Air Resources Board. We have had a solid track record of partnering with other industry leaders who have thrived
on our campus and have in return expanded and enriched the academic experience of our students and faculty.

Our Innovation Village, for example, is home to 1,200 employees of Southern California Edison and 800 employees of the American Red Cross. Collectively, they have access to and benefit from our high quality programs and academic resources, opportunities to pursue degrees and certificate programs, research, and job-ready interns and graduates, and, of course, a beautiful campus.

Allow me to spotlight one of Edison's most recent graduates.

My niece, Melissa.

(Laughter.)

MS. ALVA: As a student, Melissa interned at Southern California Edison. And upon completing her engineering degree, she accepted a full-time job at Southern California Edison. Today Edison offers her the time and the financial support to return to Cal Poly Pomona to work on her master's degree in engineering.

By the way, for the record, I had nothing to do with her success.

(Laughter.)

MS. ALVA: She did all of this before I became provost at Cal Poly Pomona.

Like Edison, our industry partners value our
polytechnic and learn-by-doing approach and will tell you that Cal Poly Pomona graduates enter the workforce ready to make a difference.

Through our College of Extended University, we envision leveraging our respective resources and expertise to host international delegations and professional certificate programs to further develop and expand the knowledge and expertise to other states and nations on how to reduce unhealthy air pollution, a global problem.

Innovation Village is also an incubator for early stage companies.

--o0o--

MS. ALVA: Polytechnic universities like Cal Poly Pomona can also accelerate and help drive innovation and discovery and produce cutting edge solutions to many of our biggest problems.

This year, we will be launching a faculty cluster hiring initiative to attract faculty in areas of strategic importance to the campus and the region. We recognize that we have the ability and, I would assert, an obligation to provide innovative solutions to the problems and challenges that cities and metropolitan areas face.

--o0o--

MS. ALVA: We also know the benefits of finding a work and life balance, which is why your employees will
appreciate the numerous amenities we offer on the campus. We have modern a library, conference center, hotel, children's center, and plenty of opportunities to engage the cultural life of the region.

--000--

MS. ALVA: The potential opportunities for collaboration with the Air Resources Board are numerous. These win-win propositions will include shared use of classrooms and specialized and state-of-the-art laboratory spaces, such as the wind tunnel in our aerospace engineering program.

Student internships, student mentoring, and opportunities to engage in joint research, grants, and design projects.

Our innovation idea lab on campus would give you access to dynamic and talented students who are coming up with and designing the products and solutions for the future.

At Cal Poly Pomona we have a multitude of outstanding academic support programs that shape our students' learning through theory, experimentation, and practice. These programs offer our students the opportunity to work closely with faculty and industry leaders in their journey of inquiry, and discovery.

--000--
MS. ALVA: I hope that you see what we see — countless opportunities to engage with you in jointly developed educational and research programs, co-sponsored conferences, symposia, and training programs.

--o0o--

MS. ALVA: At Cal Poly Pomona we are working to be carbon neutral by 2030, and some areas of the campus have already achieved that. We're ready to work with you to help promote sustainable communities and transportation systems.

As the staff report indicates, they have calculated that your employees would be driving more than 3.4 million extra miles a year if Pomona is not selected. The EPA estimates that one mile of driving generates 411 grams of carbon. Multiplied by the mileage, that's more than 1,500 tons of carbon emissions you could eliminate annually by choosing Cal Poly Pomona.

--o0o--

MS. ALVA: In conclusion, Cal Poly Pomona is an ideal location, a great place to work, a nationally recognized research and teaching institution, and a committed sustainability partner.

We hope you will vote to support the staff's recommendation to select Cal Poly Pomona for your relocation.
We look forward to building a strong partnership with the Air Resources Board.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

We have a list of people who signed up to testify, and I think we should probably just go right to that. And then reserve all of our questions and discussions until we've heard from the public.

We've tried to group them in according to their own requests. But I have also honored our normal practice of trying to call on elected officials or their representatives first. It's always a good idea to know where your budget comes from and also just to respect the people who are here on behalf of others.

So with that, I hope people can read this chart. I can barely read it myself. So I'll go ahead and call names also. But if you can see where you are on the list and be ready to come up, we would appreciate it.

Okay. We would begin with Richard Rae from Senator Bob Huff's office.

MR. REA: Good morning, Chair Nichols and the rest of the Board. I'm here on behalf of State Senator Bob Huff. The senator has already submitted his letter in support of the staff recommendation for the Pomona site, so I'm going to read the whole letter again. I'm just
going to go over some of the points that he did talk about on there.

Obviously he has been following this project closely, as it does affect, you know, San Gabriel Valley, his district, and L.A. County on the whole.

And I'm sorry if I sound a little horse. I'm a little under the weather right now. So I'll try to get through this quickly.

There's a couple points that he did bring up in his letter that I wanted to go over. First of all is the jobs -- the jobs factor. You know, there is that uncertainty as to, well, what will happen with the employees as to relocation or not if you go with the Riverside site, not just to the employees but their families; and the cost financially and the -- on them that will go with that.

You know, we sat here and we looked at a lot of the slides they were talking about, you know, two other impacts as well. You know, you take a look at the financial impact, but also the impact on the environment. We have to make sure we're good stewards with our money but good stewards to, you know, when we're thinking about, you know, greening the future and so forth, and the commute that they would have if they don't relocate and the impact that it will have, you know, to everyone in the
south land.

You know, he does appreciate that the Board is considering staff input on this. And we do hope that you will take that into consideration, as over 85 percent of the respondents did support the Pomona site. And I do, you know, want to pass on his strong desire for you to support the Pomona site.

So thank you so much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. And thanks for staying within the three-minute time limit. You saved extra time.

Mr. Saucedo from Senator Leyva's office.

MR. SAUCEDO: Good morning. I know that we have Supervisor Hilda Solis, so I know her schedule's really tight so I want to let her go ahead of me.

Supervisor.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay, great.

SUPERVISOR SOLIS: Thank you and good morning.

It's a pleasure to be here.

I also want to clarify for myself that -- I am a graduate and alumni of Cal Poly Pomona. I majored in political science. So we do have a very good public policy school. And I would like to say that --

(Laughter.)

SUPERVISOR SOLIS: -- on behalf of the county...
board of supervisors, now, and as chair, I represent the first district. I represent this area right here in El Monte as well as Pomona.

But more importantly, what I would like to say is that your staff report indicates location, location, location. And I have to tell you that there are people in the audience that you're going to hear from, they're going to have a more compelling argument than I am, that they will have to face relocation if Pomona is not selected. Some may retire sooner. Some will have to give up their activities with their community and their families.

But I would like to say on my part as the County Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County is going through a fantastic recovery. In fact, I happen to also sit on the Metro Board, and we are looking at expanding our light rail system, our transit system, to help Cal Poly as well as to achieve access all the way to the Ontario Airport eventually. That may happen in the next few years. But I'm telling you from the horse's mouth, from Metro Board, is that we are very excited about the opportunities to help fulfill job opportunities, transit, alleviate congestion, get people where they need to go.

I definitely want to say that the people that I represent here in El Monte where you saw the cluster of households that were aggregated there as well as in west
Covina, those people have invested in their families and their properties. To have to somehow uproot and have their young children re-enroll in a foreign school or -- school that is unknown to them and have -- perhaps their spouses have to leave their jobs as well, I think is also a cost factor that isn't in your analysis, that I think is also something that has to be weighted.

I am very proud of the collaborative projects that we have ongoing with Cal Poly right now. In fact, I'm a big supporter of their innovation project. And having served their as an alumni and faculty member two years ago, I saw for myself the technology that is being -- that is emanating from that campus, in manufacturing, in environmental industries, in IT, in -- but most importantly, what I think is important is that it is going to be on campus. You will see the dynamic interaction with the students. The students represent the areas of El Monte and Pomona. That's who you're going to see on campus. That interaction alone is going to help to provide incentive for many of our young people to aspire to work for ARB, to get into engineering, especially women, females. And Cal Poly has an outstanding record of graduating many female engineers.

And I'd like to say that they're also a premier institution that graduates many, many more Hispanic
engineers. This is truly a dynamic institution, that has
changed far from when I was a student.

And I would just like to tell you that your staff
report is great. Want to also share that I received a
petition of 259 individuals from your -- that are your
employees that are saying they want to go to Pomona. And
also 24 organizations that represent not just Pomona, but
L.A. County and the San Gabriel Valley that are behind the
Pomona project.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks. And thank you for all
the time you've put in. This is not the first time we've
had the opportunity to see you and to talk with you about
this project, and we really appreciate your support.

Mr. Saucedo.

MR. SAUCEDO: Good morning, Chair Nichols and
Board members. My name is Manuel Saucedo and I'm here
representing Senator Connie Leyva.

Senator Leyva supports the proposed location for
the ARB in Pomona for these reasons:

First, we can lose the approximately 400 jobs
from this region that could have a huge economic impact in
our local economy.

Second, moving to the Riverside location could
cause from 1 million to 7 million dollars for relocation
costs. Keeping ARB in Pomona would likely retain more ARB
existing and highly trained workforce necessary to support
ARB and those responsibilities and would be less
disruptive to ARB's operations.

Lastly, I commend the ARB and staff in
considering your employees' views in this decision where
85 percent of the staff prefers the Pomona site. We ask
that you approve the staff recommendation.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Ms. Robles.

MS. ROBLES: Good morning. On behalf of
Congresswoman Napolitano I wanted to come and read this
letter that was mailed to the Board on March 3rd this
year.

"Dear Chairwoman Nichols and Board Members. I
write in strong support of the staff recommendation that
the Air Resources Board's consolidation facilities should
be located at the Pomona site.

"I am proud to represent the ARB's current
vehicle and engineer emission testing research facilities
in El Monte. The work that is done at these facilities is
incredibly important to maintain a clean environment and
the healthy communities in our State.

"I am also grateful for the economic benefit that
these facilities bring to the San Gabriel Valley and to
the constituents of mine that work here.

"As you are aware, your internal pooling
concluded that 85 percent of the employees supported the
Pomona site location. I ask that you respect the
overwhelming request of your employees and my constituents
so they are not further burdened by this relocation.

I applaud Cal Poly Pomona and the CSU system for
their commitment to keeping ARB in L.A. County. I am glad
that Cal Poly Pomona signed an MOU with the State for the
acquisition of the former Lanterman Development Center
that requires the university to accommodate the real
property needs of ARB.

"This proposal will be beneficial for both ARB
and Cal Poly by creating partnerships within state
scientists, regulators, professors and students which will
improve ARB's current work and create hands-on workforce
development opportunities for the next generation of ARB
scientists and staff.

"Thank you for your careful consideration of your
staff recommendation."

Signed "Congresswoman Grace Napolitano." And she
wanted me to thank you for your consideration, and she's
available to talk to any of you if you'd like.

Thank you.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Please extend my personal best wishes to Congresswoman Napolitano.

Mr. Torres.

MR. TORRES: Good morning, Chair Nichols and members of the Board. Robert Torres representing Assembly Member Freddie Rodriguez, whose district is directly impacted by this project.

Our apologies. The Assembly Member made every attempt to come down here and speak before this body. But unfortunately legislative business required that he remain in Sacramento for the duration of the week. But like many of the folks here today, the Assembly Member is supporting staff recommendation to relocate to Cal Poly Pomona for these three reasons:

It's the jobs. Losing approximately 400 jobs to Riverside County is unacceptable. And it's not just the jobs. It's the economic development opportunities that come with housing, retail, and the potential to increase the area's tax base.

The second reason, which we've heard today from many folks, is the direct and immediate cost to relocate many of these employees.

And last, and certainly not least, the Assembly Member would ask that you take under heavy consideration the will of your employees. Many studies have shown that
unhappy employees lead to low productivity levels, poor
customer service, and costly high employee turnover rates.
Some studies that I've read say that the employee turnover
costs half of the employee's salary. Sometimes more,
depending on how high the level of expertise the job
requires.

But we really thank you very much for considering
Cal Poly Pomona and the city as a whole. And the Assembly
Member sends his apologies and thanks you very much for
taking this under consideration.

Thank you very much.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.
Mr. Marquez.
MR. MARQUEZ: Well, good morning, Madam Chair and
the Board. I had a speech ready, but it seems like all
the points were already made, so I'll keep it very brief.

My name's Jorge Marquez. I'm on the city council
over in the City of Covina, and I'm here just to support
the families and also the employees of ARB to keep it in
the City of Pomona. And that's all I have.
Thank you.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.
Senator Roth.
SENATOR ROTH: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of
the Board. I'm Richard Roth, member of the State Senate,
privileged to represent western Riverside County. And I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak in favor of the UCR proposal.

In that regard I would urge you to carefully consider the staff report and the recommendation, both what it contains and what it does not contain. I ask you to consider the site issues identified, specifically the liquefaction and the environmental issues associated with the Pomona site that one of the prior speakers referenced, and the absence of any consideration of transportation mitigation measures such as vanpooling or ride sharing for the Air Resources Board.

I ask you to do an overall cost benefit analysis of the proposals, because apparently neither the Department of General Services nor the Department of Finance did a formal written analysis with cost benefit contained there in.

I ask you also to consider the demographics of the workforce that we've spent some time discussing here this morning, both now and at the point four or five or six years from today when this facility is actually occupied. Frankly, I was told by your staff during my staff briefing that today about 20 percent, perhaps a little less, of your workforce currently is over 50 and moving toward retirement eligibility. I don't quite know
how to respond to the demographic analysis that was
presented this morning since it wasn't in the staff report
and was not posted, so I don't know how the analysis was
derived or the methodology used.

But bottom line, this State project, we're
building not for the workforce today but for the workforce
of the future, 40 50, and 60 years from today, wherever
that workforce is located.

Now, with respect to the relocation cost issue on
that point: It's my understanding that your senior staff
has been briefed, and I'm certainly here to confirm as
budget subchair, that the legislature is committed to
covering the cost of relocation in this capital cost
project budget on a going-forward basis to the extent
relocation cost is implicated.

Finally, let me say this: Inland California and
our most vulnerable communities, areas that the Air
Resources Board is chartered to protect, have been
underserved across the board for decades. And I don't
think I need to tell you that.

They say our air is bad. They say that the
quality of our job applicants is poor. Frankly, it's not
true. You know that. But it's as if we don't count.

So I ask you to consider the strong signal that
siting this facility at the University of California
Riverside would send to all in Sacramento and throughout this State; and that signal is this: That inland California counts.

Thank you for listening to me. Thank you for giving me an opportunity to present, Madam Chair.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Thank you also for the time you've put in on this project. Really appreciate it.

Mr. Tavaglione.

MR. TAVAGLIONE: Thank you, Madam Chair, Honorable Chair and members of the Board. It is my honor to be here in front of you again today, or some of you today. We had the opportunity to meet before Christmas.

I just want to say another -- one more time. We would love to have the CARB headquarters in Riverside, the City of Riverside. Born and raised as I was, and seeing the community grow and prosper and become a dynamic region that it has become over the last number of years, has been tremendous for us. And there's a reason that it has become what it is today. And that's because people are deciding to come out here from Orange County, from L.A. County, out to Riverside to join and to raise their families. Why? Because of affordability.

And I was a bit perplexed. I have to say, I was a bit perplexed by the staff report. I don't like to talk
about my past life. But my past life prior to my 20 years
in public service with the board of supervisors was in
commercial real estate. The largest commercial real
estate firm still in the country. And one of the things I
did was represent corporate, corporations, corporations
that were relocating. And I also represented the GSA on
the federal and state level. And I will tell you this:
When they look into the future for a new location, I will
tell you they do not look nine years down the road. They
look 25, 30, 35 years down the road because they're going
to be there for that long. And they're also looking at
their future employees and who their employees are going
to be; and what they can afford, most importantly what
they can afford in terms of housing, schools, quality
schools, recreation. And we provide all of that, as you
saw in our presentation when we were down -- when you were
down in Riverside.

You have to look into the future. We're not
talking -- yes, we are talking about some of the employees
of today. But as it was mentioned, many of them are going
to be retiring over the next five to seven years. You
have to look at the ones that are going to be getting
their degrees, bringing their families out to
affordability, affordability and quality schools; and the
ones that are going to be your next generation of
employees, that are going to be there for decades to follow. And so that's all that I ask you to consider, please, when you look at this relocation.

As the senator who preceded me, our fine senator from Riverside, Senator Roth, mentioned, let's do a very detailed analysis as I recall that there was done when I worked with GSA at the state level. Let's make sure that that's done so that you're getting all the right answers on behalf of your employees who will treat you and -- not treat you, but serve you for many, many decades in the future.

I have a letter here from our five-member delegation in the Congress for Riverside and San Bernardino County that I think you all have copies of. And also my distinguished colleague, Josie Gonzales from our county to the north, she wished she could have been here today. I talked to her yesterday afternoon. So she says -- gives her blessing to all of you.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. And we do have the letters, so they have been distributed to the Board members.

Mr. Barth.

MR. BARTH: Good morning, everyone. My name is Matt Barth. I'm a professor at the University of
California Riverside. I've been there for 25 years. And also serve as the director for the Center for Environmental Research and Technology, a role I've had now for ten years.

So normally I like to talk about all the great things that we're doing at Ce-Cert and how it really aligns well with what the Air Resources Board does in terms of air quality, global climate change, and a lot of other issues. But today I really wanted to speak on, you know, what we're doing now with the Air Resources Board and potentially what we could do well into the future.

So as you heard our chancellor say, if you take a snapshot over the last year, UCR as a whole is doing about $22 million in research projects dealing with air quality. About 20 million of that is directory at Ce-Cert. In fact, around 15 percent of our funding at Ce-Cert does come from the Air Resources Board. So we're obviously doing quite a bit in terms of research contracts and grants.

There's certainly more than that. There's a lot of outreach. There's a lot of technology transfer. In fact, right now we're hosting an international conference on portable emissions measurement systems, something we heard earlier today. It's a two-day conference. We have over 200 participants. And I believe - I checked the
registration before I came this morning - about 20, 22, are ARB staff members that are attending that today.

So that's what we're doing now in today. But certainly in the future, that's the critical part. So if ARB does come to UCR -- you know, we heard a lot about proximity and how, you know, it's not really critical if you move close to a higher -- a university with higher education. But it really does matter, and I'll give you a few examples of that.

So, first of all, if ARB does come to UCR, you know, we're going to have a formalized internship program. And this is not just at the bachelor's levels, but it's master's, its Ph.D.'s. It's where the students get to come into the lab, work with the ARB staff members, and really create a win-win situation, obviously for the students - they get to learn about real-world problems - but in addition, you know, ARB gets the benefit of that additional workforce.

But the key thing, there is pipeline, right? So you're creating now student that are going to move into these staff positions and grow the ARB well into the future.

We're also looking at this AQM -- South Coast AQMD endowment. That's another critical piece that's going to go into the training that's necessary for the ARB
staff members. So that's going to be focused on professional education. So, you know, a staff member could go off and take a class and simply just walk across campus and take a course perhaps in health effects; they could take my course in embedded systems, learn about OBD. So there's a lot of different options there.

And proximity does matter. I mean, simply doing that in an afternoon is easy to do. But if you're off site, it's much harder to do.

We heard a little bit about our faculty. We are embarked on a very big comprehensive cluster hire program, and we're really filling in the gaps of what we already have in terms of air quality, public policy, and school of medicine. And so you're going to hear a little bit more about those different cluster hires. And, you know, we're going for at least five faculty hires this year that fit very well with what the Air Resources Board is aiming at.

So I just want you to consider the long-term value of this educational piece. And when you weigh that compared to the short-term cost of relocating, it's clear to me that this long-term benefit is the most important decision.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Mr. Lo.
I'm David Lo.  I'm a distinguished professor of biomedical sciences and senior associate dean of research in the UCR School of Medicine.

If the concern of the ARB is air quality, it's likely because of health. So I think it's appropriate to represent the views of the School of Medicine.

I'm very happy to report that the School of Medicine is a new school of medicine. It's growing very fast. We'll be graduating our first class of medical students next summer; as well as expanding program in medical residents, all who will serve the inland Southern California area.

The stated mission of the School of Medicine is unique in that it is specifically to improve the health of inland Southern California. And so part of that is through the expanding UC health system where there's an emphasis on primary care. But as one of the six UC Medical School campuses, it is also expected that we bring world-class research to the Southern California area. And so I'm going to highlight one of the programs that we've initiated. It's called the BREATHE initiative and it stands for bridging regional ecology, aerosolized toxins, and health effects. And it brings together the School of Medicine, Ce-Cert, the School of Public Policy, as well as
the Center for Conservation Biology. And the importance
of that is that as an interdisciplinary program, we're
looking at the impacts of air quality in a lot of
different aspects.

For example, the Center for Conservation Biology
looks at climate change, invasive plant species,
allergenic pollens, soil microbes as they are aerosolized.
So we have efforts ongoing in places as the Coachella
Valley to look at those kinds of particulates as well as
their impact on pulmonary cardiovascular health.

We have concerns, for example, in the drying of
the Salton Sea and the drying lake beds and the
aerosolized particulates including the concentrated
pesticides and toxins.

In collaboration with Ce-Cert, we are doing
modeling studies and impacts of pulmonary inhaled
particles on health.

And the ongoing cluster hires, with the Breathe
initiative, for example, we're right now recruiting a
climate modeling faculty position. We have positions in
public health, environmental microbiology, as well.

There are also ongoing searches in environmental
toxicology that also fit with the missions of the BREATHE
initiative as well as Ce-Cert.

So in some there's ongoing growth in research
that directly affect air quality and health impacts and we look forward to working with you all soon.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Mr. Pazzani.

MR. PAZZANI: Good morning. I'm Michael Pazzani. I'm the Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development at University of California Riverside.

In my life I've lived in Marina del Rey as a student at UCLA. As a faculty member at UC Irvine I've lived in Irvine. And four years ago I moved to Riverside where I'm now the vice chancellor for research.

I love Riverside. The skies are blue. It smells of citrus. There's no longer something called a smog cough. Children in Riverside grew up with that 20 years ago. And in part we have CARB to thank for that. But we also have the results of research to thank for that.

What research is, it's the discovery of new knowledge. And in the California system it's the University of California in particular that has the goal of awarding doctoral degrees and doing research that discovers new knowledge.

The Cal State system and Cal Poly should be very proud of what they do. They offer master's degrees, where you master current knowledge and apply it to current
problems. But you don't have the quest for new knowledge. And to me it's the new knowledge that's going to solve our air quality problems, the nitrous oxide problems that we talked about earlier.

I really don't want to compare our universities, but they have different missions. If you try to compare Cal Poly to us as a research university, well, for publications, we're ranked 44th of all universities; Cal Poly's not on the list of the top 750. We have $133 million of research funding; Cal Poly has 5-1/2, less than 4 percent of what we have. We have 300 patents, 20 of which are related to air quality; Cal Poly has two patents for the entire university.

But it's not their mission. We've used Cal Poly, for instance, to do landscape architecture at our chancellor's house. We don't have the landscape architecture program. They've done a wonderful job of that.

It wouldn't be simple for Cal Poly to replicate what we have at UC Riverside. In Ce-Cert alone we have 50,000 square feet of space, $20,000,000 of equipment. We've got a medical school, atmospheric chemistry statistics. And so there's a much greater activity happening here.

Chairman Nichols, earlier today you talked about
computer science. If you were located at UC Riverside, you'd be a mile away from someone who's decompiled the Android phone, found flaws in it, and has reported them to Google and others. They can report them to Volkswagen and to you as well.

(Laughter.)

MR. PAZZANI: That's the sort of research that happens at a top-class research university.

I do understand the difficulties in relocating. I've done it myself, and I love Riverside. I'd like to welcome you there as well.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

Penny Newman.

CHAIR NICHOLS: It's been a long time.

(Laughter.)

MS. NEWMAN: It's nice to see you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Nice to see you.

MS. NEWMAN: My name is Penny Newman. I'm the Executive Director of the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice. We've been there for 38 years serving the communities, the really disproportionately hit communities, low income communities of color in Riverside and San Bernardino. I don't work for UCR, so I'm a little out of place.

I first want to congratulation the State for the
new Board members that have been added. With Diane Takvorian and Senator Florez.

It is a recognition that those most directly and most heavily hit by air pollution need to be at the table. And I hope that today that recognition carries into your discussions in this decision.

We thank you for the opportunity to add to and assist in that decision that you're going to make. We know that the amenities offered by the universities are important. We respect the concerns of the staff. But there's also the issue of fairness and equity. And I think that needs to be highlighted.

I have to say as a long-time, life-long resident of Riverside County, I was fighting really not to be insulted by some of the discussion that has taken place. It sounds as if the staff would be condemned to some outlying area in a foreign frontier for the rest of their lives to suffer under very severe conditions; and it is not that case. Riverside is a delightful place to live. We have great art and culture. We have a lot of recreation to offer. We have a lot there. Affordable housing.

We also have some challenges. And for communities, especially communities of color, those challenges are immense. We have the highest ozone
pollution in San Bernardino. We have a railyard with the
highest cancer risk of all railyards in the State of
California, at a whopping 3300 in a million. We have Mira
Loma, which is consistently high for particulate
pollution, and is keeping our basin from meeting the Clean
Air Act standards. And we face the prospect of a major
warehouse coming in that would have the highest greenhouse
gas emissions in the State.

And a lot of our pollution blows in from L.A.
And yet we have no presence of ARB.
While the statistics are often used to emphasize
the problems, we rarely receive the resources to correct
those problems. We have four and a half million people
who live in our area. We have five major universities.
We're the fastest growing area. You've heard the
offerings of UCR.

But the other consideration is that we suffer
from pollution. It is often overlooked. Our region is
often overwhelmed by Los Angeles. If ARB staff lived and
worked in our region, we would have greater appreciation
for the challenges that we face and the urgencies in which
it must be addressed.

So on behalf of all the members in the
disadvantaged communities throughout Riverside and San
Bernardino, we strongly urge the Board to vote to relocate
the El Monte facility to UCR. You have an opportunity to
recognize a disadvantaged region, much like the San
Joaquin area, to recognize us as somebody who is important
and that you recognize the problems we're facing and are
there to help us.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. And thanks for your
letter also.

Professor Loveridge.

PROFESSOR LOVERIDGE: My name is Ron Loveridge.

I was a local elected official for 33 years, 19 as mayor
and 14 on the council. I was honored to serve for 20
years on the South Coast Board and eight years with CARB.

2016 marks the 50th academic year which I've
taught at least one course in political science at UCR.
The CARB lab relocation is a 50-year decision. It is a
major public investment by the State of California. It is
a decision that should not be primarily decided by VMT and
commute times. Rather, it should be a decision made in
the public interest.

Well, what's the public interest?

Here is a widely accepted definition. It is the
welfare of the general public in which the whole society
has a stake and which warrants recognition, promotion, and
protection by the government and its agencies.
The public interest is represented in three choices:

First is a choice between UCR and Cal Poly. It is in the public interest that CARB labs should be located at a major public research university. As you heard from the chancellor, or read in the letter from President Napolitano, University of Riverside is such a choice. Its programs, research, and students will enhance the CARB labs and the public health of all of us in California.

The second choice is between the Inland Empire, counties of Riverside and San Bernardino, and Los Angeles County. There is unanimous agreement that California's divided by income between the coastal and inland counties. Whatever the measurements, the incomes of four and a half million people in the Inland Empire lag, and significantly so, behind Los Angeles, Orange, and Ventura. It is time for the State of California to invest in its inland counties.

And the third choice is between Riverside and Pomona.

Riverside is the largest city in the Inland Empire. It is a city that's long championed clean air. It took place at UCR with the leadership John Middleton and Jim Pitts, Art Winer, Alan Lloyd and now Matt Barth. It took place in citizen advocacy groups such as Clean Air
Now. It took place when Mayor Ben Lewis declared a state of emergency and sued EPA. It took place in the city's green action plan, ranked as the national best practice. It took place in 2015 when Riverside won the CARB CoolCalifornia Challenge.

Riverside has walked the talk of being an advocate for clean air.

Equally important, Riverside and the Inland Empire are impacted by bad air with too many days that exceed health limits. Every morning when I walk Mount Rubidoux I can see the public interest choices where the welfare of the general public is at stake are those of UCR, the Inland Empire, and the City of Riverside.

Thanks for your attention.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much. And good to see you again.

Anne Mayer.

MS. MAYER: Good morning. Thank you. I'm Anne Mayer, the Executive Director of the Riverside County Transportation Commission.

Mobility or the lack of mobility is certainly a driving factor related to quality of life and economic vitality in the Southern California region and particularly in the Inland Empire. And since mobility and proximity seem to be a driving factor in the decision
you're going to be making, I think it's important to
really talk about some details related to proximity and
mobility.

The staff report seems at first glance to offer
significant data justifying the Pomona site from a
commuter and proximity standpoint. However, until today
we didn't see any simplistic or realistic scenarios for
comparison purposes.

The staff report accurately notes that over time
it appears that many employees have located their
residences near the El Monte facilities. And it certainly
is reasonable to assume that over time the same thing
would occur for a CARB facility located in Riverside,
particularly given the significant housing costs and
quality of life advantages that we have.

The staff comparative analyses regarding commute
distance and times assume status quo for residential
locations without incorporating reasonable assumptions
regarding residential relocations, resulting in
exaggerated, skewed, and unrealistic data for the
Riverside site. It also contains vehicle miles traveled
compared or that again exaggerates the disadvantages of
Riverside because it neglects to acknowledge the likely
impacts of attrition and staff relocation to residences
closer to the Riverside location.
The staff report has significant analyses of public transit comparators which again exaggerate the negative impact, but it doesn't put this information into perspective given that right now we have usually about less than 10 percent of our commuters are using public transit. And that's something that we're working very hard to change in Riverside County. And we are committed to ensuring that public transit is a sustainable option now and in the future.

The report does not recognize our very significant ongoing investments being made to expand rail and bus interconnectivity both within Riverside County and externally to and from other Southern California counties.

RCTC and Metrolink are opening the Perris Valley line this spring, which will extend rail service 24 miles into Riverside and add four stations. Three of these stations will be in proximity to the UCR location with bus, shuttle, and biking options readily available.

Additional rail capacity improvements are also in the works throughout the Southern California system which will allow the addition of reverse commute trains to better serve Riverside County job hubs.

These investments in integration of enhanced multi-modal and commuter programs directly enhance mobility options for existing and future CARB employees.
and stakeholders.

A compelling case has been made here today for the location of the CARB facilities in Riverside. And the Riverside County Transportation Commission strongly urges this Board to consider the reasonableness of the data with respect to transportation impacts.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Mr. Kleinhenz.

MR. KLEINHENZ: Good morning, Chair Nichols, Board members, ARB staff, and everyone else. I'm Robert Kleinhenz. I'm an economist and Executive Director of Research at Beacon Economics. I have over 30 years of experience in the economics of cities and regions, and particularly here in Southern California.

Beacon Economics has partnered with UCR and has had a working relationship with the County of Riverside, and so we were asked to offer a third-party perspective on the report that was submitted by the ARB staff.

And while we have the -- we only had a limited amount of time to review the report, and we don't have the in-house expertise to scrutinize it all, but I would like to make some key observations especially on the cost estimates contained in the report that I think should, you know, prompt perhaps a reassessment of some of these
reported costs.

You've heard from so many speakers, I don't want to go over the same territory. But this is a location decision that will be in effect for decades, during which the Southern California region will go through many changes. The Air Resources Board can control many aspects of that facility decision: The location, various attributes of the facility itself. But its ability to a priori influence the locations decisions of its future workforce and its stakeholders over the next 25 years or even 50 is limited. These decisions are made by individuals, by households, companies, and other organizations in the future. It won't be made by the Board, and they will generally not be made by the facility's current staff of employees.

But much of the report and many of the costs are based on what we know about current staff, their location, their commutes, and so on. It's somewhat static exercise to evaluate the commuting and housing costs associated with a future facility based on what we know about the current staff. Here's why.

We already heard that -- there were the original estimates of cost that were submitted in the report, table 12, with respect to location costs and so on. And then we heard this morning about some revised estimates based on
some assumptions of relocation and so on. The normal staff turnover for an organization is about 15 percent per year. Now, I'm not saying this is the right number to use, but I'm just saying let's consider that number for the moment and we apply that to CARB's current staffing. Within five years less than half of the current staff will still be employed at CARB. Within ten years less than 20 percent. So the individuals who replace those people may or may not be -- and those who may be added to the staff may or may not make the same kinds of living and commuting decisions that the current staff does. So that's just so important I think to keep in mind.

Demographics show that the Inland Empire will get a million and a half new residents over the next 20 years versus 900,000 for L.A. County. The center of gravity for the Southern California region is moving inland.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I need you to wind up. I'm sorry.

MR. KLEINHENZ: I understand. I will.

And so finally I would just observe that there are so many assumptions that have to do with the current staffing situation for the current Air Resources Board location, I would urge you to reassess especially the estimated cost of relocation in light of what may be some more reasonable assumptions about cost, commuting, and so
Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Mr. Russo.

MR. RUSSO: Well, good morning. I'm very, very happy to be here to discuss why the City of Riverside and UC Riverside are such an obvious choice I think for this organization. And I'm not going to go over a lot of what was said. And I'm going to apologize in advance to our friends from Cal Poly Pomona. I have two 17-year olds, both of whom want to go there. So I hope you won't hold this against them.

(Laughter.)

MR. RUSSO: Look, you've heard -- you've heard what the questions are about the staff analysis. And I run an organization, it's a large and a very diverse organization of more than 2400 employees. And I know how important employees are, how critical they are to the success of an organization, and how important their moral is and their feelings are. But with all due respect, when 85 percent of the employees have taken a position and the employees are in charge of the analysis, you are bound to get an analysis that has some biases in it. There are some small ways in which that bias was apparent during the presentation. Let me just pick one. And I don't mean to...
be nitpicking. And one of the speakers said -- Rob Field said he wasn't here to poke holes in the staff presentation. I am.

(Laughter.)

MR. RUSSO: At one point there was a discussion that talked about: The Riverside site has hotels nearby. It has walking distance -- walking distance, but Riverside's downtown is two miles away.

Then when discussing Pomona, the discussion was: Well, these other cities are nearby, and no mileage was given.

Why? I don't know. I didn't look. I don't really know. But it seems to me those are the small ways.

Now, here are the big ways and the ones that really matter to the Board.

Because the stewards of the public board, as I am, these costs are very important to you and to the state, and time is money. So first, there is no dispute in Riverside. We all want you there. There is not unanimity in the Pomona community. That creates entitlement risk for you. It creates political risk for you. It can hold you up.

Two, as noted in the staff -- as noted in our earlier critique of the staff report, the UCR site does not have any potential remediation costs. At Pomona
you're buying a pig in a poke. You don't know what your remediation costs are going to be and how long it will take to remediate them.

    Third, Girish, are you here?

    That gentleman is in charge of the utility for the City of Riverside. And his people tell me that the costs of the utility development on the UCR site are overstated in this report by nearly $2-1/2 million. But more importantly, we own our own utility. And its estimated that we will cost you 500- to 800,000 less a year in Riverside. So consider that over 40 years.

    I'm going to wrap up.

    (Laughter.)

    MR. RUSSO: Over 40 years. That is a huge differential that dwarfs the 1- to $7 million relocation costs.

    Please, embrace the rational and dynamic choice; reject the easy and comfortable choice. I just moved to Riverside. I hated moving. I told my wife, "I'm never moving again. I'm in this house till we die." But I am so grateful now when I smelled the orange blossoms this spring that I made the decision to move my family to Riverside. You will be grateful in no time too.

    Thank you very much for your attention.

    CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Us East Bay folks still remember you from the East Bay, John.

MR. RUSSO: Many are glad I'm gone.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I didn't say I was one of them.

(Laughter.)

MR. RUSSO: I love you too, pal.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay, folks. We actually have a second page of witnesses coming. So we are about 10 away from our court reporter break, which we will take when we complete the witness list and before we bring it back for discussion, just like a 10-minute break.

So, let's move forward.

We I think are shifting gears here, because I see a number of X's in the support for staff report position. So let's begin with Christina Romero.

MS. ROMERO: Hi. Good morning, Chair Nichols and members of the Board. My name is Christina Romero and I'm a graduate student at Cal Poly Pomona in the College of Agriculture.

The decision to be made by the Board is very personal to us because we will be sharing our educational farm with the new CARB facility, which is extremely important to us. I am here today on behalf of the
concerned agriculture students of Cal Poly Pomona to
express support for the proposed site recommendation as
Pomona for the new CARB facility. We acknowledge CARB to
be a valuable asset to Cal Poly Pomona, the surrounding
community, and Los Angeles County.

As you know, we are strong advocates for Spadra,
our educational farm, which is proposed to house the new
CARB facility, and we understand about 10 percent of the
farm will be allocated for this development. However, we
feel as long as the rest of the farmland is left to still
meet our learn-by-doing philosophy, we will be able to
meet the needs of our students, our program, and our
agricultural mission. We are in support of this
development.

We are entering into a new long-term strategic
planning process with the university, and we feel that the
CARB facility coming to Pomona is a huge new opportunity
for the College of Agriculture to collaborate and partner
with CARB to conduct cutting-edge research in regards to
agricultural practices and equipment, to reduce greenhouse
gas emissions, to bring about long-term policy and
solutions for the agriculture community.

We are more than willing to do our part to
address Governor Brown's mandate setting a target to
reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the State to 40 percent
below 1990 levels by 2030, helping making it possible for California to achieve reductions of 80 percent below 1990 levels by year 2050.

We are in a unique setting in urban Los Angeles County; and because of our valuable agriculture resource, we have the ability to enter into long-term research projects and collaborations to address increasing green gas emissions in agriculture practices and helps to achieve state-of-the-art improvements in agriculture for California, the nation, and the world.

By choosing Cal Poly Pomona, ARB will get a bonus lab area to address air quality in another area of need, which is agriculture.

So I would like to reiterate again on behalf of the concerned students of agriculture, we are encouraging the Board to choose Pomona as the site for the new CARB facility with the condition that the rest of our farm be left intact for educational purposes.

And we'd like to thank you all for letting us be a part of this process and listening to us and being open and willing to communicate.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Chair Nichols, could I just ask a question please of Ms. Romero?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you so much for coming and testifying today. At the last Board meeting where we had a presentation, the ag students came up and they were pretty strongly against this project. That was just a few months ago.

Could you just help us walk through -- I know you've had a lot of meetings and -- but the process that allowed you to reconsider this.

MS. ROMERO: Well, because we reestablished our position on factual information about how agriculture's important to the community, especially in an urban area like this. We were -- with the help of the agriculture industry and a lot of political officials and our university coming together, we've all decided collaboratively that it's best for us to work together. They have recognized the value that we bring to the table. They've allowed us now to be part of the process. And we feel that we can forge a very strong partnership both with ARB and our university and agriculture moving forward. And it would be very unique in Los Angeles County because it's something that you don't normally see in this setting.

So it's a very positive movement forward.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.
MS. ROMERO: Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: It's really quite a remarkable piece of this whole process that this has been able to happen.

MS. ROMERO: Yes. And we're really pleased and we really appreciate, like I say, everybody's willingness to work with us and listen to us and take into account what we have to offer and what we bring to the table.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. ROMERO: Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Stephany Luevano, also from Cal Poly.

MS. LUEVANO: Hello. Good morning. My name is Stephany Luevano. I'm a business student at Cal Poly Pomona, a resident of unincorporated La Puente, and a small business owner as well.

So through these multiple descriptions I have realized the importance of being civically engaged, so that is why I'm here today.

So I'm going to be the first in my family to receive my bachelor's degree this year, so I'm super excited about that. But I want be able to use all this great education and hard work in my own community, to reinvest what I have learned into the cities that have given me so much already. So I've spoken to a lot of
students, and we are all having issues finding jobs locally. That's an issue. There are over 23,000 students at Cal Poly Pomona. And as a business student, I know the importance of keeping jobs locally; more so how these jobs would help for economic development. And that location is very, very important.

So, as the analysis had said earlier, 33 percent of the employees will retire, and that there are over 7 million people that reside in Pomona. So out of these 7 million people, there are more skilled students that come not only from Cal Poly Pomona but also by local universities and schools like Mt. SAC, APU, and Citrus College.

So all in all, us students may not all have the same major or share similarities, but we all have the same end goal which is to get internships and jobs within our local cities that we have come to love. So use us because we're great.

Thank you.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Fabiola Perez.

Nice to see you again too.

MS. PEREZ: Nice to see you -- all of you.

Hello, Chair Nichols and members of the Board.

My name is Fabiola Perez, and I'm here on behalf of the
concerned agriculture students at Cal Poly Pomona, to express our support for the California Air Resources Board Southern California Consolidation Project proposed site in Pomona for the new CARB facility, with the condition that no further development take place on Spadra farm.

I am the first in my family to attend a university. And as a child I grew up working and watching my parents work in strawberry fields and wine vineyards in the Central Coast. It is hard work that my parents endured for years. And I'm continuing my education because I know how hard it is to work in the fields, and I want better for myself. Cal Poly Pomona has given me the opportunity to continue my education and do better for myself.

Currently Spadra farm is used by different majors and several educational disciplines such as plant science, irrigation science, agriculture science, agriculture education, urban agriculture, pest management, and environmental biology. It is on this property that students learn how to grow crops using fewer pesticide applications, utilizing biological control, minimizing water use for crop production, practicing new and efficient technologies for locally grown vegetables, and managing soil erosion and agriculture water runoff.

Agriculture education and research is vitally
important in the agriculture industry and in the world as the world moves into the second part of the century, and we need the meet the new needs of the world.

My career aspirations would be to pursue a license in agriculture pest management and to work as a pest control advisor to help farmers in California integrate better pest management methods. My goal is to help farmers better regulate how they spray their fields for the protection of the field workers and the environment.

The learn-by-doing philosophy at Cal Poly Pomona has helped me gain the skills necessary to achieve those goals. And a partnership with CARB would further supplement developing and integrating better agricultural practices.

As we support CARB coming to our farm, we also respectively request that no further development take place on this land. Spadra farm is an extremely important source to our students, our college, and the region.

And I want to take this opportunity to thank you for being cooperative with us and being -- taking us into consideration. And we really look forward to working with you.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.
Michael Woo. I should say Dean Woo.

MR. WOO: Thank you. Thank you very much, Madam Chair, members of the Board. It is a great honor to come before you today in this hearing. I am dean of the College of Environmental Design, and I'm accompanied by several of our other deans of other colleges at Cal Poly Pomona.

I do not envy you your choice. You are faced with two great universities with many strong attributes. I don't want to dispute the figures you heard from the UC Riverside speakers about pure research. I would say that Cal Poly Pomona really excels at applied research. The learn-by-doing statement is more than just a slogan. It really reflects the involvement of our faculty and our students at taking research and making a difference in the real world, which I think would be a great asset to the Air Resources Board.

I also want to be perhaps the only Pomona-affiliated speaker who is going to quote Chancellor Wilcox. In his remarks to you a few minutes ago, he pointed out to you that it's not just science, but it's going to be changing public policy which will really clean the air. I couldn't agree more. As you may know, I am your appointee -- I was your appointee to the Regional Targets Advisory Committee set up by the Air Resources
Board to help figure out how to implement SB 375. And I think my involvement with your committee helped to show me that there are many opportunities that we could use to work with Air Resources Board to work on that mission of cleaning up the air.

Ultimately, however, this is not a question of what is best for either of the two universities. The main question before you is what is best for the Air Resources Board, for its employees, and for the people of the State of California. In view of your mission under AB 32 and SB 375, to reduce emissions and to reduce climate change especially as it relates to land use and transportation, including commuting, it seems to me the facts provided in the analysis basically point to one choice. And this is not just a choice for the year 2016, but it is actually a choice for the future in terms of what can you do to reduce vehicle miles traveled, what can you do to reduce commuting and reduce the impact in terms of air quality and climate change. So it seems to me that it is very clear based on the evidence that Pomona should be your choice.

And, again, as I said, this is not just for 2016. As many of you know, the voters of Los Angeles County are being asked this November to consider again raising the sales tax to pay for expansion of transit. This is
another test, but a test we have passed before and a test
I think we will pass again, to demonstrate our commitment
to non-vehicle alternatives for people. And so, with the
expansion of the rail system and the expansion of other
alternatives, I think that means that Pomona could clearly
be the superior low emission choice for this Board.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

David McElwain.

MR. McELWAIN: GOOD morning, Chair Nichols,

members of the California Air Resources Board. My name is
David McElwain. I'm a resident the City of La Verne, and
I work in the City of Pomona managing an employment
assistants program for low income residents.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Wait, that's not fair. Somebody
hit the wrong button.

MR. McELWAIN: I'm also a member of the board of
directors of the Pomona Chamber of Commerce. I'm here
today representing the chamber and our business community.

We strongly support the staff recommendation to
your board to approve relocating the ARB operations to the
beautiful city of Pomona.

Pomona, is part of Los Angeles County, but
economically, environmentally it's also part of the Inland
Empire. I mean, we're over the hill right over there. I am a proud Cal Poly Bronco, but my two children are graduates of UCR.

(Laughter.)

MR. McELWAIN: There are sound arguments from both institutions, both with strong engineering and research capabilities. I think, however, these considerations are less significant, since I'm sure both Cal Poly and UCR will happily compete for any and all future research grants. After all, we all do have email. May the best proposals win.

I'm a 100 percent jobs employment guy. I've spent 25 years helping to build self-sufficiency through employment. Of course Pomona, with a higher unemployment rate than the averages of Los Angeles and San Bernardino and Riverside counties, needs and deserves the solid jobs and economic benefits that will result from consolidation at the beautiful facility at Cal Poly campus. However, in training hundreds of job seekers each year, I always emphasize to our students that it's not enough to have an outstanding resume or even to successfully describe your transferable skills in a interview. The final and critical step is to ask the employer for this -- for the opportunity to do the job.

On behalf of the Pomona Chamber of Commerce, our
business and residents, I'm asking your board for this opportunity to do the job of serving the air quality needs of California in the next century.

Thank you. --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

We next will hear from David Diaz with Bike San Gabriel Valley. And then we're going to hear from some of our staff.

Hi.

MR. DIAZ: Good morning. I could still say that when I wrote this speech. I initially put "Good morning," but we're now into the afternoon. My name is name David Diaz Avilar. I'm here to represent Bike San Gabriel Valley, which represents the local bicycle coalition. I'm the programs director.

We're working on creating a healthier, safer, more enjoyable place for walking, biking, and transit within the region, and we strongly support staff's recommendation to locate the new facility at Cal Poly Pomona and keep jobs and opportunities here in the San Gabriel Valley.

The connectivity and access to this site is of particular importance to provide employees with a high quality of life; providing multiple transportation options; and, as people have alluded, L.A. and the region
setting into a more multi-modal-type place.

So as someone who works with young people and everyone across the region, empowering young people with opportunities to become the leaders of their next generation is critical. I recognize that there are issues and challenges in other counties. However, there are issues - social, environmental justice and equity issues - that still need to be resolved here. With that being said, let's continue to connect Angelenos with people, places and opportunities to thrive.

Many thanks for your time today. I hope you guys have a great St. Patrick's Day and a great weekend. Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Thanks for taking the time to come.

Okay. Next we have from Jesse Rodriguez from Professional Engineers in California Government.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Good early afternoon, and thank you all for the opportunity to provide comments.

I represent the Professional Engineers in California Government. We represent approximately 13,000 engineers, land surveyors, and related professionals across the state, including approximately 250 employees who work at this building, and that's both rank and file and supervisory and managerial.
We have already provided written comment expressing our support for staff recommendation for the Pomona site. And contrary to some of the statements made by some of the folks, we do believe the City of Riverside is beautiful; it's just far.

So, a lot of the staff comments that we've heard so far from the employees themselves is that if they are forced to relocate to Riverside, they will have to also look for employment elsewhere. And though we support the staff report, there was one thing that was not mentioned that we think should have been; and that is, a provision in our contract which states departments filling vacancies shall offer positions to employees facing mandatory geographic transfer who meet the minimum qualifications for the vacancy being filled. Which is otherwise referred to as Super SROA.

So in addition to losing staff via natural attrition and retirement, they will also be given kind of super surplus status for any other department or agency that's filling vacancies during that period, which means -- and it applies to all counties, both L.A. County and all counties neighboring. Now, there are many departments or other agencies that are in L.A. County and that neighbor them and they will be hiring and filling vacancies.
These folks, though they love the work they do for the CARB, they live to fulfill the mission of CARB, they've got to think of their families, they've got to think of their own well-being, they've got to think about the additional expense of $7500 a year that it's going to cost them just to travel to and from work.

And so, as pegged, we strongly support the Pomona site and we hope you do as well.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Eloy Florez.

Hi.

MR. FLOREZ: Good afternoon, Madam Chair --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Our photographer.

MR. FLOREZ: Yes.

Good afternoon, Madam Chair. There will be three of us speaking together, so we're hoping that we will be able to put -- combine our time. Is that okay?

CHAIR NICHOLS: That would be fine.

IN-USE VEHICLES PROGRAMS BRANCH CHIEF LEMIEUX:

Good afternoon, Chair Nichols and Board members.

My name's Sharon Lemieux and I'm branch chief here in El Monte; and I'm also an engineering grad of Cal Poly, so I am one of the 66 alumni from Cal Poly here at Haagen-Smit Laboratory.
I should also mention, of those 66, 12 of those alumni are either branch chiefs or supervisors. So Cal Poly has a long history here with ARB.

We really would like to thank you for locating the Board meeting here at El Monte. And we want to thank you for the opportunity to voice our opinion on supporting the staff recommendation of Pomona in person.

We would also like to commend our colleagues on the site evaluation team, especially Deidre and Bob Fletcher that was -- and also the Board members and co-chairs, Barbara Riordan and also Hector De La Torre. So we really appreciate your hard work on that.

I along with my colleagues, Matt Diener and Eloy Florez, are here today, and we're representing over 259 of our colleagues here in El Monte. And we thought it would be nice for you to hear from Matt and Eloy, who kind of represent two spectrums of points in their career, where matt's a young engineer just starting his career here with ARB, And Eloy is more seasoned staff here.

As you know, we have submitted a letter supporting the staff recommendation, and we have over 259 signatures. And I'd just like to mention real quickly why we came together, and we thought it was important to submit a letter.

Basically the Haagen-Smit Laboratory, as you
know, the most important resource is our highly skilled and specialized staff. And the Pomona site is the least impactful to that staff.

Secondly, the Pomona location allows us to better retain that staff and help us as ARB continue our unique capabilities for motor vehicle testing to meet our clean-air goals for 2030 and beyond.

And I'd like to just mention that when we're talking about 2030, that means that we're putting programs in place today. So we're doing research, we're doing testing; and that's things that we have to do today to plan for the future.

Thirdly, the Pomona location is a really great location that helps us draw future staff from all of Southern California communities. So that means Riverside, the inland valley, San Bernardino, as well as Los Angeles. So it's a very nice location.

So with that, I'd like to turn the talk over to Matt.

MR. DIENER: Madam Chair, members of the Board. My name is Matthew Diener, and I'm an air pollution specialist in the Mobile Source Control Division of ARB here in El Monte.

I'd like to provide my testimony today to emphasize the issues that are important to junior members,
the staff, like myself, who are still early in their careers and continue to weigh the balance of where to choose to live and where to choose to work in Southern California.

Before I arrived at ARB I was a contractor to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. I worked as a field chemist on superfund sites across the west. After five years of working for EPA, I sought a career change that would permanently allow me to continue to engage in aiding both the public and the environment. It was because of ARB's close alignment with my values of working to benefit the people of California and a sustainable environment as well as their centralized location in Southern California that I applied for the position I hold now.

After speaking with many of my colleagues, it is clear that many of them share the same values.

The position I gratefully hold today is one that I hope to continue to have for years to come. I, as well as many other members of ARB, its management, staff, and yourselves, are conscious members of a generation that believe in personal responsibility and a service of the greater good. The passion and dedication of the staff here for the programs and goals of the agency runs very deep in our commitment to the environment and the people of California.
The culture, dedication, professionalism, and mentorship of our managing staff also reinforces the sense of pride in the work that we do.

Many of us have grown up in the region. We're instilled with the belief that living and working in Southern California simply meant living where you want to and working where you have to. The new reality is that we should work where we can collaborate and have the greatest impact for the common good and live where we leave the smallest footprint in its endeavor.

The truth is that changing traffic patterns and increased congestion now make long-distance commuting, at the very -- you know, challenging at the very least, but also impractical and unsustainable. It's unfortunate that the possibility of a pending move to the Inland Empire has caused me as well many other colleagues to reconsider if our current positions should remain our lifelong career.

Conversely, the relocation of ARB's facility to Pomona would allow for many of our current and future staff members to retain with this agency.

The majority of the staff also believe that relocating to Cal Poly Pomona would allow ARB to continue to draw from the diverse and high quality applicant pool not only from Los Angeles County but from Orange County and the Inland Empire. It is critical that we not
underestimate the value of remaining strategically located
to provide the people of California with the retention of
ARB's already high-quality staff that are dedicated to its
cause, a cause that they believe in and one which the view
is much greater than themselves.

I would now like to introduce my co-worker and
peer, Eloy Florez, to discuss the impacts the relocation
of our facility could have on vested employees and their
families.

Thank you.

MR. FLOREZ: Madam Chair, members of the Board.

My name's Eloy Florez - also with a Z. I'm an air
pollution specialist with the Air Pollu -- with the Mobile
Source Control Division here at the Air Resources Board.

A little over eight years ago I was employed as a
project manager. The position paid well, but came with a
lengthy commute. I was a new father. But for the better
part my son's first year I was never home early enough to
spend time with him as we was awake -- when he was awake.
I quickly came to realize that no amount of money I was
earning could make up for what I was missing.

I was attracted to ARB because my father was a
mechanic. I grew up turning wrenches, as they say, and we
lived in a small town. So it was a big deal when my dad's
shop was one of the first repair businesses to have the
new smog machine. I can remember distinctively being at
my father's shop as he raised his voice in frustration
after a smog test and he would say, (Spoke in Spanish) -
"This one barely failed."

(Laughter.)

MR. FLOREZ: And then he would -- then he would
look up with his scowl and point to heavy trucks --
heavy-duty trucks smoking across a highway, (Spoke in
Spanish) - "Why aren't they doing anything about that?"

(Laughter.)

MR. FLOREZ: Little did I know those prophetic
words would resonate and by 2008 find me working on
controlling diesel emissions from heavy-duty vehicles.

Anyone that has been to our lab and offices has
seen the decades of wear. If you look around -- I'm
sorry. If you look around the world, there are new
facilities operated by manufacturers, agencies, and
governments alike. But none have achieved what we have
here at the Haagen-Smit Lab. From off-road to
zero-emission vehicles, truck and bus to fuels, on-board
diagnostics to greenhouse gas reduction, this office has
not stopped working. So you quickly realize ARB's
reputation as a leader does not come from machines or
fancy offices; it comes from the staff who work hard. The
people are here because they are dedicated to the mission
Like all of us here at ARB, I have great pride in being able to work on issues that have positive impacts on families and our community. We are here because we seek purpose and to be a part of something bigger than us. But we also choose to work here because it allows us a balance to be professionals and to be good parents and serve the communities we live in. We are intertwined in the fabric that is our community.

I have three kids now, a great home, and a wonderful wife. But yet again, while I truly enjoy my job and the people that I work with, I can't help but to think and wonder will I be forced to decide again: Do I want a career with a commute or moments with my family?

I now turn it over to Ms. Lemieux for final comments.

Thank you so much.

IN-USE VEHICLES PROGRAMS BRANCH CHIEF LEMIEUX:

Okay. Thank you so much.

So we'd just like to close with how excited we all are about the new facility. But the facility is more than just equipment and building, as you've heard; it is the skills and the collective knowledge of the people who dedicate their lives to the service of the people of California. We feel that it's important to select a
location that will result in the continuity of current capabilities, while still providing an environment for innovation and technical excellence; and that location is Pomona.

So we would ask that the Board confirm the staff's recommendation of the Pomona location.

However, we would also like to ask, if the decision is to set aside the staff's recommendation, we ask that the Board delay a final decision until a full analysis of staff impact and mitigation measures can be evaluated to eliminate serious impacts, not only on ARB employees, but also on the program, services, and goals of the Air Resources Board.

So, again, I'd like to thank you. And we appreciate the opportunity to address the Board today.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you so much. It was a excellent presentation.

I personally am hoping that some day in a new laboratory with an auditorium there will be HVAC system that works.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: If you see me up here looking like I'm disapproving because my arms are folded, it's because I'm freezing.
CHAIR NICHOLS: And there doesn't seem to be any alternative other than to freeze or to broil everybody. So we apologize to all of you, but now you know something about what we live with.

(Applause.)

(Laughter.)

(Thereupon Board Member De La Torre took his coat off and put it on Chair Nichols.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Ah, what a gentleman. That earns you I think an extra vote at least.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Oh, my goodness. All right. So we've got a couple more witnesses to hear from and then we will wrap up this phase.

Okay. Ms. Sommerville.

MS. SOMMERVILLE: Good afternoon. I'm Amber Sommerville. I'm director of Market and Communications for the San Gabriel Valley Economic partnership. We're a regional business organization, and we're here to express our support for Cal Poly Pomona as the new site for the Resource Board testing and research facility.

Many of the reasons that we have are reasons that you've heard previously today, but just in interest of reviewing those.
Cal Poly we believe is a better location because of the impact on employees who currently reside in and around Los Angeles and El Monte offices. If a new facility were built in Pomona, most CARB employees would have to relocate their families, more than 400 employees.

We also believe that Cal Poly Pomona is much better situated, with easy access to the I-10, the 57, 60 and 71 freeways, and the Ontario Airport.

Officials flying from Sacramento and Ontario would find it much more convenient to visit the new facility if it were located in Pomona.

Air quality officials and key trucking industry leaders from across Southern California, especially Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, and San Bernardino counties, would find it much more convenient to reach a CARB facility in Pomona than in Riverside.

And it also would be a ten-minute drive from the South Coast Air Quality Management District in Diamond Bar.

Above all, we believe that Cal Poly Pomona is a premier research institution in the state, that there's extraordinary potential for scientific collaboration with the students and the faculty at Cal Poly Pomona, and we desperately are interested in ways that college graduates can be prepared to enter our local high tech industry in
the San Gabriel Valley.

So we strongly urge you to consider Pomona as the location for the research facility.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Ms. Pinedo.

MS. PINEDO: Good afternoon, Madam Chair. I've been practicing my "Good morning" up until now.

But good morning to you and to the members of the Board and the members of the audience. My name is Adriana Pinedo, and I am here to speak to you in support of moving the CARB location over to Cal Poly Pomona. As a resident, as someone that works with community members, as someone that works in a public health agency, I saw that the staff report spoke to the 7 million people around the Cal Poly site, 80 percent of those being stakeholders, and I'm here to speak as one of those 7 million, as one of that 80 percent of stakeholders in the community.

I'm a policy coordinator by trade, but I've been an organizer in Pomona since I was in high school, since I was a member of the Pomona Unified School District. I later graduated from PUSD and then graduated from Cal Poly back in 2011.

I know we keep talking about the orange smell in Riverside. We also have orange fields in Pomona.
(Laughter.)

MS. PINEDO: They're trickled with cows. You will get used to them and you will love them as much as we do.

(Laughter.)

MS. PINEDO: And now I'm a member of HIP, Healthy in Pomona, the city's initiative to look at public health in our community and how we can work with city officials, public agencies, and residents more importantly, on improving our quality of life overall. And I'm happy to say I was also part of an effort with Clean Air Pomona to bring smoke-free parks and recreational areas, from students and by community, to our city as of April 2nd of 2015. And hopefully we can continue to collaborate. And that's really what I want to talk about today.

We serve 47,000 learners in PUSD, both adult learners and K through 12 learners, and they're all looking for a beacon of hope - just as I'm sure that CARB is - a beacon of hope as we look into sustainability and how to maintain the environment as it is now.

We're also looking for a beacon of hope in Pomona, for our students and for our families that want to stay in the SGV but a lot of times have to relocate, not because they want to, but because they have to.

Last October of 2015, PUSD and Cal Poly formed
the Transformation Program, which was recognized by the White House for its efforts to create a pipeline for PUSD students and to two- and four-year institutions. And CARB Pomona would not only be that beacon, but it would really help establish our families and keep them in the SGV.

As we look for long-term advantages of relocating to Pomona, I urge you to also consider the students in Pomona and our neighboring areas that are ready to become the new generation of environmental sustainability researchers, professionals, and farmers. And may you consider coming to us, and may we all work together. I'm sure after this decision process I would love to see us all as friends, especially with Riverside.

Thank you. Please come to Pomona and "Go, Broncos!"

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Amy Wong. You are the final witness, unless there's somebody I missed.

MS. WONG: Hi. Good afternoon. I'm Amy Wong. I work at Day One and Bike SGV, working with Adriana on the Clean Air Pomona campaign. And I personally am an El Monte resident who's very passionate about the intersectionality of public health and environmental justice. And so I'm here to support moving the CARB
location to Pomona, to invest in our San Gabriel Valley region.

So in our region we have a lot of communities of color who do suffer from asthma, diabetes, and other health-related issues in relation to air quality. So I urge you to again be reminded of mission -- your own mission, to promote and protect public health, welfare, and ecological resources through the reduction of air pollutants, and to again just support the Pomona location. Pomona is the largest city in the San Gabriel Valley, and politically this would be very important to again retain our identity in the San Gabriel Valley.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

Thanks to all.

We're now going to recess. It's 12:15 or 17 or close to. Let's get back together at 12:30 please and we'll resume this conversation.

(Off record: 12:18 PM)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.

(On record: 12:36 PM)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. The Board is back in session. And this is where we get to do our work.

So I think it's time for Board member questions and comments. Sometimes we try to get people to ask
questions and then make their comments in a separate round. This time I think I'd rather just hear from the members sort of individually on what their concerns and questions are, and then we'll see where we are after that happens.

So since I oftentimes ignore the people on my right, I am going to start -- I've been accused of that, and it's fair actually.

However, Mr. De La Torre is not back. So in that case I am going to call on Ms. Takvorian, if you are ready.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. Thank you very much. I was just talking with some folks and said that, you know, as the newest -- one of the two newer Board members -- newest Board members, I think I'll just vote for San Diego since that's where I'm from.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: This situation is far more complex than I anticipated it to be. But I would like to thank the staff and the Board members who have worked really hard on this issue. It's clearly complex. And thanks to everyone who's here today and everyone who's communicated with ARB and have been part of this process. There's great information, important perspectives.

It's clearly an important issue that signifies
the future of the agency and, more importantly, our shared State goal of clean air. It's so much more than a decision about a facility or an office building; that's very, very clear.

I have to say that the sites are obviously quite comparable on many levels and I think that that's very clear.

Staff satisfaction is critically important. As a nonprofit director, it's something I spent a whole -- I spend a whole lot of time on every day. And we don't have the resources in nonprofits to provide the kinds of incentives and benefits to our staff that others might have, so we have to be very creative about it, so we think about it a lot.

And so I guess I want to say that it's something -- I want to say to staff, I really appreciate the work that you've done. I really appreciate the organizing that you've done as an organizer. And that is probably the most difficult aspect of this, because I am really working hard to kind of balance that with what's the right decision for the future of the State of California and the people here.

And I certainly think that proximity is a critical issue; but I don't think it can be a driving issue because, as others have said, this really is a
decades-long decision. It's a 50-year decision minimally. And that's the perspective that I think we have to have. So I do think we need to dig in more to what turnover looks like, what the -- what the projection will be for staff going forward for the next 20 years at a minimum, because, you know, if we used our economist's perspective about it, 50 percent of staff may be gone in a few years; I'm hearing strongly from other members that that's not true, that CARB staff have longer rates of retention. So we need to hear more about that.

I think that both Cal Poly and UCR provide great opportunities for partnership. But I have to say that UCR I think really does provide the kinds of partnerships that are more on point and more relevant given the historical relationship, the top transportation and health research facilities, the medical school, they've been on the cutting edge of quality -- air quality research. So those things are compelling me. And if I'm not hearing some of those same kinds of things from Cal Poly, I would be open to hearing more about that, but that's not my understanding.

I also think that the Riverside site provides better opportunities for advancing transportation programs and environmental justice. It's not lost on any of us that the investment in the Riverside community and the UCR
partnerships will I think better enhance CARB's programs through innovation, inclusion, and economic opportunities for students that are often struggling with high levels of pollution and high levels of poverty.

Equity and fairness have been discussed here. An investment in disadvantaged communities I think is critical. And I think that obviously Pomona may be a better site today, but will it be a better site in 20 years, in 30 years, in 40 years? Well, it might continue to be if we don't invest in the places that are -- need that investment now. And I think that's how some of our sites around the State have become those premiere sites, is because the State, our public agencies have taken that initiative. So I'm compelled by that.

And I also think that for CARB to be located in one of the most transportation-challenged and emissions-impacted communities in the State would actually provide incentives, would provide motivation. And I just can't imagine that an agency like -- if an agency like CARB was there, I just think they'll be benefits for all of us to think about how do we move ourselves around in a more sustainable manner. And I think we all need those lessons.

So I would say though that I support the staff, the CARB staff recommendation that there should be fuller
analysis of what the impacts are to staff. I think there's a variety of other questions that I would have about the site at Pomona I'm hearing in terms of the cleanup costs, what are those? I would like to look at what the economic impacts of that might be. And I would also be interested in looking at transportation alternatives for staff, very specifically, as so what those incentives could be, what the benefits could be, and that those need to be laid out.

I have other questions, but I'm sure that other Board members will add to those. But those are my initial ones.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Hector, we started without you. You were making your way back into the room. So I'm going to turn it back to you before we just move on down the line.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: We're just doing questions and comments together.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Okay. Thank you, Chair.

I was on the subcommittee with Barbara for this, and we received both presentations on the first proposals that each of the schools had way back in the fall. And
then when we asked both schools to upgrade their proposals, both did; and I think we got some very good second proposals from both schools. In the case of Pomona, it was more of a clarification. But we got two good -- very good proposals.

I agree with Diane, that they are very comparable in a vacuum. In terms of it's farmland, you're not going to have to knock down a whole bunch of stuff or any stuff. You're going to -- the sites themselves are, you know, flat, et cetera, et cetera. So that part of it isn't much different. But I do want to share my thoughts from there forward.

There -- as was mentioned, staff identified a hundred attributes; and on most of those they were very comparable. And so it does come down to just a handful of things. We had four specialized contractors who worked on this processing and outside agencies, like DGS, who were a key part of the team in terms of analyzing the proposals. So in terms of input, this was not -- someone alluded to kind of an inside-staff process. It wasn't at all. The team was specialized consultants and DGS and others. It was not a CARB inside-staff process at all.

I think -- the question of time frame has come up over and over again. Are we just talking about employees today and who's here today versus 20, 30, 40 years? Both
places -- I live in what I consider central L.A. County. To me, this is far.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: And to go even further east to Pomona is far. And then Riverside obviously is further out than that. So none of these proposals to me, if I was an employee, would I be happy with. So then you're talking about, you know, what is the least distance at the end of day for all of that. And I'm sure we have employees who live -- in fact, I know live in places like Long Beach and have to come here and will have to go to Pomona or Riverside or move. So I think that is very important in terms of your catchment area for employees who want to come and work for CARB.

That's going to be the case five years from now, it's going to be the case 30 years from now, that you have a bigger catchment area the closer in you are to the big population center, which is Los Angeles County.

In terms of the relocation costs, there was some, you know, questioning of economic models, et cetera. I think we can all agree it's not going to be zero, and we know that we have a contract with our employees that requires us to do relocation costs for them outside of a certain radius. So whether the number is 1 or 7 or 3-1/2, there is going to be a cost to going further out. That's
a given. And so, you know, you can question what that number is. None of us really know. But staff has done I think a very good job of trying to put it within the framework, and I think that's very important in terms of the cost estimates.

The environmental mitigation costs were questioned for Pomona. Well, it's -- again, both are farmland. It's not like there's an industrial site on one and farmland on the other. They're both farmland. So whatever -- odds are, that whatever is on one is on the other, pesticides -- you know, whatever normally happens on farms, that's what you're going to have to be mitigating for.

The knowledge base and intellectual property issues. I think the knowledge base -- they're both universities. That was our number one goal when we started this process. I remember several years ago when we approached UCLA and UC Irvine, the other schools that were mentioned in the report, that was our number one goal, was to be associated with a university. Not because we have to, because clearly here we are not. We're in an industrial park in El Monte.

But we wanted to, in order to get some human resource possibilities and some other resource possibilities just in terms of the day-to-day functioning,
to be able to access professors, et cetera, that could
supplement what we do. Not because we're going to be
locked in with that university for research and other
things that we're going to do, because we farm that out
today. As was mentioned by UCR, they get 15 percent of
their funding for their research from us. That's not
going to change. It's going to be based on the merit of
the skillful people that they have there.

Pomona, I don't know what amount of work we do
with them, but I'm sure we do something, and that will
continue, as it will with Berkeley and Davis and any
number of other wonderful institutions that we have in
California.

That was not the driving reason -- the research
part of it was not the driving reason. It was having
access to the university community and being able to have
interns and students coming and -- coming into the flow of
CARB and hopefully staying around and being employees long
term like we heard earlier.

I'll tell a brief story. The last time I was
here, there was a student -- or an employee that I didn't
remember. He came up and said hi. And I had spoken at an
environmental law class at USC a few years back, and he
came up to me and he said -- because I talked about CARB,
he said that he wanted to do something in the environment
and he was an engineering student. And he didn't know what CARB did until I went and spoke at this class. And he's now an employee, and he thanks me for talking about CARB in this class at USC. USC of all places.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: If they were in the bidding, then I would be a little more less discreet, I think

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: But -- that's a joke.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So it is very important to get young students, undergraduates, graduate students, into our pipeline to have those skilled people that will help drive this agency forward; and that's a 20-, 30-, 40-year decision.

So being close to a university where you can get those students that are undergrads preferably, or graduate students, is a wonderful thing. And that's part of the decision I think that's very important, and equal at both places.

There was mention of this AQMD $1,000,000 endowment at UCR. Well, both Pomona and Riverside are in the South Coast Air Quality Management District. I find it hard to believe that if the decision was to go with
Pomona, that the South Coast Air Quality Management District would not shift that dollar amount over to Pomona to augment what we do. It would make no sense for them to keep the money -- or not spend the money because we didn't choose Riverside.

So that was not a compelling argument to me.

Some of the other points that were made were about people moving and choosing to move for jobs and making that individual decision of what was best for their family and that they moved and that they have had a wonderful time.

That's different than this situation. This situation is not an individual move. This is a wholesale move of hundreds of people potentially, impacting hundreds of people's lives, without them making a conscious decision to take that move. That's the difference between the situations that -- the anecdotes that were described earlier and what we face here.

There is a great history at UCR, a great commitment to what we do. That -- none of that goes away. That continues. As I said earlier, the contracts that we do with UCR, as we do with the other UCs and other schools around California, those will continue. So that's a wash. Being physically located next to it or not is not going to make a difference.
What we have here before us as a board is a binary decision. This is unlike most of our decisions. Most of our decisions on regulatory process or other actions that we take are very complex, and there's give and take, and we make adjustments. Sometimes we don't like some component of something. This Board regularly edits staff's work at this point. The core is always the same, but we tweak things. That's what we do. That's why we're here. But it's never a binary decision. These are com -- those are usually complicated decisions where we make adjustments and then we move ahead or not. But most of the time we do.

This case it is one or the other. There is no tweaking to be done. We're not going to send part of the staff out to Riverside and keep part in Pomona. So that is where this is different. And to me, it comes down to a staff report. And, again, I was on the subcommittee. And I said this to Chair Nichols, I was ready to support whatever result the staff came up with, whether I liked it or not. And so when they came out with this result, I was pleasantly surprised because I didn't know. I wasn't sure that this is what they were going to recommend.

We created a process. This Board created a process. The legislature gave us money to do this process. We did this process. We have a recommendation
based on this process with a hundred attributes, specialized staff, including other agencies, and we have a recommendation before us. And now we're going to say, you know, that process that we put all of that effort into, it didn't yield the result we wanted so we're going to change it. And I have a problem with that.

I've been on other boards, I've been in the legislature, where there are processes like this. If you're going to create something to bring back a recommendation, then it's your obligation to follow through on that recommendation. There was input along the way. And so I feel very strongly that we need to support the staff recommendation.

And I'll close with this. We, the Board, are management. We are the employers in this case of 400 staff. 400 staff who -- of which 85 percent have told us to support the staff recommendation. They've given us their view.

In addition to the air conditioning, maybe we can work at that for the next place.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So we are the employers, we are management, we have a recommendation from a process that we created, and we have 85 percent of our employees telling us what their preference is, which
is to follow that recommendation.

Again, had staff recommended the other way and the employees expressed their opposition, I would have a really hard time but I would still stick with what we committed to. In this case, we have a staff recommendation and we have 85 percent of our employees who want this, 85 percent of our employees who are going to be here for five, 10, 15, 20 years. That young man that I saw from USC, he's going to be here in 20 years probably. He loves this place.

So to me, that is the core of the question here. The rest of it -- again, we can -- we don't need to be physically located there. We don't -- there are wonderful amenities in other places, et cetera. You could quibble about all of that. But the core thing here is a process yielded a result, a process we created, and our employees are absolutely supportive of it. It's pretty, to me, clear at its core of where we need to go.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Eisenhut.

Questions also are welcome at this -- if you have questions of staff, I think we'll just ask them to kind of make some notes and respond at the end.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Thank you, Chairman
Nichols.

Hector used the term binary. I will point out that I feel a little bit like Bachelor Ben.
(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: I have two very quality choices to make.
(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: And I need -- we need to make a choice.

We have as a group studied and critiqued and asked questions about staff report. We've listened over the past period of time to advocates. We -- I have -- I'm on the short part of this list, but we will listen to our comments from colleagues before the final decision is reached. And so I think it's a very full and transparent process. And as Hector outlined, it's a process that started some time ago and I believe is well vetted.

We -- there may be questions -- there will be questions, our questions that accrue as part of this discussion, and it will be a decision of the group as to whether we need those questions answered before we reach a final decision or not. I don't want to presuppose that at the moment.

On a personal level, I feel -- as someone from and familiar with the San Joaquin valley, I feel a
relationship, a kinship to Riverside. We are I think uniformly areas that are underappreciated and sometimes forgotten. And I want to acknowledge that about the -- to the Riverside folks. But we still -- so I just wanted to say that on a personal level.

I'm not going to go down the list of things that I think are -- that have and will be enumerated, those things that I think are basically outlined and are, for me, not -- I'll go to the tie breaker. That was -- that was, for me, as I went down the list of very, very similar issues, similar results. And with the exception of one, I'm not prepared to choose one institution -- one learning institution over another. That -- that is a direction I don't think I have to go and I'm not prepared to go.

For me, the pivotal event -- this is, after all, a lab. Probably 50 or so -- 50 or more of the employees on a daily basis are engaged in outside-the-facility work. That involves going to freight centers, ports, railyards, freeway intersections, sampling, testing. I think very simply -- and I'd be interested, if we do do additional research, on how much time is spent by staff, not so much in their personal relocation but in their daily enterprise, how much time is spent by staff and what the impact would be of a relocation to Riverside, a further distance from those freight centers and the sampling
centers, how it would impact our use. So my pivotal choice, my tie breaker is what I see as an efficient use of our resources at that lab. And so for that very simple and uncomplicated reason, I am inclined to support the staff recommendation.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes
VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

Well, I really feel that Board Member Takvorian really summed up comments from me as well. And so I'm not going to go through the same, but I really appreciated your summary, so thank you very much for that.

For me, I also was involved in this from the very beginning and, with Mary's vision, had the opportunity to visit several sites. And I do feel a bit like I'm choosing between two chil -- my two children which one would best be suited to go for an opportunity. So like my fellow Board members, this is not a cavalier vote for me.

But today what I would really like to encourage is I would like to see some more data. And, Chair Nichols, I would really support the fact of firming up some data. And I appreciate Member De La Torre's comment on the process, because I do trust process. But I have not seen, and don't really understand within the staff report, how we analyzed and measured a couple of the key goals that we set forward on slide 7. So really how did
we measure a world-class facility and becoming a national
and international center; and looking at these locations,
how did we line those up? It seems that the report was a
little bit light certainly from today. I'd be interested
in going over some of the analysis and see how that
measured up.

I also am interested in firming up some of the
data. It does here from our testimony today that some of
the data isn't clear, and I would like to see that. So I
do want to honor the process. I would like firming up on
the data.

I would like to thank our own ARB staff, both
from those that have tackled this project and also El
Monte staff. It's done a great job and I -- I really want
to recognize them.

I think for me, first and foremost, I want to see
this facility built. And I'd like to see it built within
the time frame that we have set forth, and I often
facetiously say "and while I'm on solid foods," but --

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR BERG: -- I think that keeping the
goal in front of us, and really being able to determine
how to get this done, and understanding the nuances that
this isn't going to be an easy move whichever site that we
select, and making that decision and then moving forward.
So thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I would just interject here that answers to some of these questions may either be available here or within the record of what's behind this very short staff presentation, because this -- the presentation that we had this morning, the slides, represent very summary information based on hundreds of pages of documents. So Board members who want to get into questions about how things were analyzed or what was taken into consideration, that information is available now.

Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Chair Nichols. So first, in terms of transparency, I'm a professor at two UC campuses, UCSF at the Medical School and UC Berkeley at the School of Public Health. That said, my wife teaches at San Francisco State. So I support both UC and CSU.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: And like to see the governor and the legislature give more money to both.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Hear! Hear!

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I just say I think it's actually -- to the legislators here, it's incredibly shortsighted to not be investing -- no, really --
(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: -- really. We're talking about the future, we're talking about 50 years. What -- part of what makes this state great is the investment in public education at the higher education level. And, you know, I think it's incumbent upon our current leadership in Sacramento to do more for CSU and UCs.

After I got that off my chest --

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: -- let me just tell you, I think this is an incredibly tough decision. And, to me, I'm balancing research opportunities versus this respect for the staff. And I'll start with the staff.

You know, part of the reason I love being a Board member of this agency is that we have an incredible staff, that is dedicated, works hard for the people of California. And so when they -- when we have a process that the staff has followed through with and when we have an 85 percent staff support of that process recommendation, I respect that. But -- and I actually would say that the -- that the data that staff put together in terms of vehicle miles traveled is a good example of, you know, what we do here. We're a data-driven agency; you know, we need the data from the lab.
That said, I also do air pollution research and I've done it for a long time. And, you know, the first book on atmospheric chemistry that I read was by Jim Pitts. I don't think the UC Riverside folks exaggerated the importance of the work that's been done here with regard to atmospheric chemistry. And a lot of what we do at CARB was made possible by the research -- the basic research that's been done at Riverside.

And the synergism of being co-located is important. I started out my career with the UC - was at UCSF, I'm still there - and I have a laboratory, the human exposure laboratory where we expose, not animals, but people to air pollution in a chamber. But I can only study acute effects. I obviously can't make people sick.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I got lured over to the School of Public Health at Berkeley to be able to study chronic effects of air pollution with colleagues who do epidemiology population-based research. And then through my -- you know, when I put out my shingle as the pulmonary physician who is interested in chronic effects of air pollution, I started working with atmospheric chemists at UC Berkeley. And not to say anything disparaging about UC Riverside, but we have some pretty good atmospheric chemists at Berkeley as well. And I work with
environmental engineers, which Riverside also has.

So -- and my research has flourished because of that synergism of being co-located with multiple disciplines where -- you know, at UCSF there aren't that many folks that are actually that interested in air pollution health effects research. So I don't think we can minimize the synergism that can come from being co-located.

And, again, I teach master's students at UC Berkeley and I greatly appreciate what Cal Poly does with regard to their master's students, but I do think having doctoral students does enrich a research program, another thing that UC Riverside has.

And I guess I would stop -- or try to conclude by bringing up something that Vice Chair Berg mentioned, the project goals on slide 7. I think that's where we have to start: A world-class facility to support motor vehicle emission standards development, implementation, and enforcement; national and international center for air pollution and climate change research. So it's a tough decision. I have an open mind. I'm trying to weigh the staff, the great respect I have for the staff, and wanting to keep them happy so they continue to do good work; with my great respect for what's already a national and international center for air pollution and climate change
research at UC Riverside.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

Start down at the other end with Supervisor Gioia, who does not live in the Southern California area.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I do not. I'm actually coming from the Bay Area. And having attended UC Berkeley for seven years, I have a way out of this. I could think of a couple of good locations in Bay Area that will cause us to get out of this dispute between Pomona and Riverside.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: How's that?

Let me just start by saying I think that the residents of Pomona and Riverside can be very proud that they have representatives, political representatives, business representatives, community representatives, and educational representatives, who are passionate and knowledgeable about advocating for their community. And I'm very impressed with that. And I think that's, to me, just a positive reflection on the leadership in both of these communities. So I think both communities can be proud of all of you who came today to advocate for either Pomona or Riverside.

So for me, and I've -- and I think there's been some request for good information here. And I know we're
probably not going to be making a final decision here today. But I want to say, I mean, this is a really difficult decision, because we're trying to balance short-term needs and issues with medium to long term, and they often cut different ways. I think convenience and proximity for employees means -- is a factor. Proximity for facilities and stakeholders, that's a factor. Opportunities for sort of synergies for research, and the example that has been given clearly by several is the opportunities with UC Riverside is also significant. The slide that was depicted indicating really what our goals are, which is, you know, a world-class research institute. All of these are very significant.

And I think ultimately whichever lo -- both of these are good locations. But, you know, we're tasked with coming up with the best. And I do think that the statement we make of where to locate is significant, because, you know, we do also want to show this agency's commitment to communities that have been impacted by air quality issues. So, I mean, to me, that's a factor. There's both symbolism here as well. And, you know, that cuts in one direction as well.

So I think there's some strong arguments for both. And I'm going into this still with an open mind and looking at the materials, the letter -- letters that have
been provided.

But those from Riverside make some, I thought, very compelling arguments in favor of Riverside. The listings of Pomona and the employees also are compelling. So I think our task is to review all of this information, get some more information back from the questions, and ultimately make a final decision.

But the -- and the final decision may rest on whether we're going to sort of look at some of the long-term implications more than the shorter-term implications. So we will be evaluating that.

And thank you all for really your heartfelt and strong advocacy for both these sites.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Senator Florez.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you.

It's been a long hearing, but I -- you know, we heard proponents for and against. But I would like to take some time, Madam Chair, if I could. We have a wonderful panel sitting right in front of us who actually wrote this report. And I think I would like to actually, with your forbearance, ask about 10 to 12 questions, will help me tend to make my mind up definitely, and kind of get to the conclusion whether we're ready to vote on this or not, if that's okay with the Chair.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Absolutely.
Could I just ask though that if you put the
questions out, we could sort of group the questions
together and then have them answer all of them; is that
all right?

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: I will -- I think we've
got -- you guys can jump in I think in terms of who can
answer, it would be great. I think the Chair did mention
there are stuff behind the recommendations. I want to
talk a little about the behind stuff, if that's okay.

That really helps me.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Sure.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: My first question would be
anyone who wrote the report who is responsible: You know,
how do you define Southern California?

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: It is kind of the major
premise. It says it's the Southern California
Consolidation Project. So could you define what Southern
California is to me.

I'm from the Central Valley, so you can -- and
John's from up north, so we kind of know where our area --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: To us it's all the same
thing.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: But why don't -- I think
that's a very big threshold question. I really mean that with all seriousness. You know, what is Southern California?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, when we did the analysis of general access for the public we actually looked at, you know, Southern California as being sort of anything below Bakersfield. So we -- you know, we looked at sort of up the coast a little bit, into Ventura, down to San Diego. So that was sort of the range.

And you can see how that was done. There's a table in the staff report that kind of maps that out.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Yeah, I saw it.

So if we define Southern California in the way you've just mentioned, I'm wondering why we keep talking about this 35-mile radius as the only radius that could actually be the Southern California site. That's my -- I guess that's my -- you know, we have kind of come down to all of these things as a proximity issue.

So Southern California is from Bakersfield to San Diego. It really isn't a choice, right? We can only really go 35 miles from ground 0, which is here. And that's where we're going to be paying these relocation costs.

So I guess my larger question is -- proximity is such a huge factor; in fact, I've heard just about
everyone here today say that everything's pretty much equal. Which I do have some questions on. But if everything is equal, why did we ask Riverside to even apply? They're 48 miles away. I mean, if truly that is the criteria, proximity as the overriding factor, why didn't we start this process by just telling folks that everybody should apply but they should only be about 35 miles and under to this facility?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, there's some history with that. When we first started this process, the bargaining unit contract was at 50 miles. So it wasn't changed -- the 35 miles wasn't changed until actually this July 1st from 50 --

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. So the process changed in the middle of this?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, it did and it didn't. And I think the consideration is, I mean when we found this out, we -- you know, we immediately told the folks of Riverside, look, there's another consideration here. And the question that we got back was, "Well, does this affect our ability to compete?" And we said, "No, it doesn't." That we were -- you know, at that point we had just initiated the analysis, we did not have all the factual information about how long it takes to get there, what the staff -- we didn't have the analysis of where the
staff lived. So --

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Well, looking at today's decision, was that the right answer to give to Riverside, that it didn't affect them? Because it seems to me that's the overriding factor today.

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, absolutely. I mean, the 35 miles affects the relocation costs, for sure.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: So the rules changed somewhere in the process?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: No, I wouldn't say that, Senator Florez, because we did -- we did -- our commitment here was to do a fair and equitable process of the impacts. And when we started the process -- certainly Pomona is closer, you know, the L.A. area. But we didn't know where the staff lived and -- you know. So we couldn't do the analysis. We didn't know what that staff commute driving distance and time was going to be. And had we got a different result from that analysis, we may have had a different conclusion.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Because I think -- My good friend, Hector De La Torre, who I respect immensely, mentioned the process the legislature set up with you during the budget portion of this, because you went to the legislature, you asked for 5.9 million, but
was a kind of, well, you have to look at Riverside and Riverside has to be part of the process. Correct?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Yes. Yes, we did a request for information to see if there were any other sites that were --

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Was that before the 50-mile change or after?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: That was before. BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. So the process changed?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Our process did not change.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Well, let me just ask another question, if I could.

In terms of going to the legislature for funding, I think it was -- has been mentioned in your PowerPoint that there was a date of '17-'18 budget where the balance of funds will actually fund this project. Is that correct?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: That's correct.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. So I'm kind of wondering, given the path this is going, and the Board having to make a decision, you know, how do you see that going with the legislature in terms of giving them, you
know, the assurance that this has been a process that has
actually -- that they called for in their 30-day notice --
I know it goes to Joint Budget Committee -- how does that
process work?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, I think the
process works that if the Board makes a recommendation, we
follow the commitments that were specified in the
supplemental budget language, and we submit the review.
And as appropriate, we would address comments that came
up. If they were significant enough to affect the Board
decision, we would certainly notify the Board of that.
How it goes from there is certainly up to the legislatures
that are involved.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Right. So the legislature
set a budget of 366 million, 102 million for equipment.
And now we have this relocation cost factor, depending on
what this Board decides, of 7 to 10 million. Are those
basically the numbers that will go before the legislature?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: You know, we have
a master architect that we're bringing under contract. So
we would be looking at all of those numbers. We would be
evaluating the site in more detail to determine whether or
not, you know, things like is there enough space that we
don't have to build a four-story, five-story parking
garage so we can, you know, save some money there. So we
would be relooking at the costs.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Is the cost under the -- is there a cap on the budget, 366 million?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: The only money that the legislature has authorized is the $200,000 for the site evaluations, which is this process, and the 5.7 for the master architect and developing the contract. So we have not submitted any requests and have no authorization at this point for the 366 million.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: So where does that number come from, the 366 million?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: We did a -- we did a study in 2006 when -- as Mary mentioned, we started this quite awhile ago. When -- a couple years ago it was pretty clear that there was a lot of programs that were not even in place in then, so we -- through Department of General Services, we contracted with IBI Group who did a new feasibility study and looked and provided us with that additional updated cost number.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: So I guess the reason I'm asking this is that you -- you've got some number in your mind of 366 million. And so what happens if we look at remediation and you ask us to pick a site but we haven't done a phase 2 on remediation at Pomona, we haven't looked at any of those remediation costs, we don't have any
design costs? Are any design costs included in this presentation?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: I'm not sure what you mean by design costs.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: In other words the site plans themselves, do we actually have some good, hard, solid numbers that it will actually --

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: No, that's what the master architect will do for the 5.7. But they have to have a site to work from to do that so we don't end up doing, you know -- we'll have -- if we -- you know, we would also have to do a phase 2 evaluation on the Riverside site as well, I mean, so there's -- you know, these are done typically to assist in the site selection process; and phase 2 is not usually done until we have -- you know, till we are proceeding along the line.

So if -- you know, I think these are considered normal sort of development costs. You know, I would point out that the phase 1 assessments that were flagged - you know, DGS can joke and speak to this - but they did not identify anything that was considered significant enough that would affect the site development costs.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Just a few more questions.

So DGS has obviously been mentioned a couple of
times during the hearing. Were you a partner in this project or are you overseeing this project? I mean, I guess I -- I chaired a committee that oversaw DGS for about six years in Sacramento, the GO Committee, so I'm fairly familiar with moves and how contentious they can be. But I just always have seen DGS run these processes, not necessarily be a partner with an agency. What's the change there? Why isn't DGS giving us this report versus the CARB staff?

DGS PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

PROJECT DIRECTOR III GRIFFITH: Well, this is a -- it was a staff report to the ARB Board for their recommendation. So --

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Have you analyzed the staff report formally at DGS?

DGS PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

PROJECT DIRECTOR III GRIFFITH: We contributed to this staff report.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: But have you analyzed it? You're our real estate agent.

DGS PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

PROJECT DIRECTOR III GRIFFITH: I personally have looked at it, the report, in its entirety.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Because I do know the legislature as this -- even if we pass this is going
to ask the question whether or not DGS has actually done a
cost benefit analysis of staff report.

We're asked to do a staff benefit ourselves to
try to make a decision. But I guess my training would be
that you're our real estate agent. Have you actually
taken the final staff report and done a cost benefit
analysis of it?

DGS PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

PROJECT DIRECTOR III GRIFFITH: We did a cost analysis.

I'm not exactly sure what you mean by a cost benefit
analysis. Typically, we do cost benefit analysis when
we're looking at different delivery methods; for example,
comparing a lease build-to-suit project versus doing it as
a cap outlay project. And from a site selection
perspective, there's not typically a lot of parameters
that you would put into a -- you know, a lifecycle, if
that's what you mean, kind of an over time --

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: No, I'm just in the
realistic world of moving this through. We're not funding
this. We're actually sending it to a place called the
legislature that will fund it. And they're going to ask
us, as Hector mentioned, was the process followed; number
2, was everything in the process -- did we agree to it in
some sense? And of course they're going to let staff
formulate that. But then they're going to ask DGS, as our
real estate, as our -- the folks that come to us and give
us the decision, "Have you analyzed this?" I think that's
the question I'm asking.

And, for me, I think it's important only because
I'd like to know how you feel about it formally. I really
would. Not that I say I can't judge and go through our
staff report, but I just would like to know kind of
formally, you know, what DGS itself feels, how it feels
about the final report.

DGS PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

PROJECT DIRECTOR III GRIFFITH: Right. Well, you know, we
were an advisor to ARB. I mean, it's their report. And
one of my recommendations, I don't know how formal it was,
but was that, you know, I didn't think the Riverside 1
site was very good from a design perspective. And that
was in my advice. And they took that into account and
pretty much took Riverside 1 off the table.

But you speak to process. And I do want to point
out that we did have this matrix, we put it out to
everybody for input. And cost benefit analysis never came
up as something that we were tasked to do --

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. I get it. So let's
just -- so, as you said, the driving force for this whole
discussion today is proximity. And I guess I'm just
wondering how much people really knew about that. So you
mentioned the matrix you put out. So that was a -- here's
where I found proximity. It was a subcategory on page 11
in the sub -- in something that the Board put out as, I
brief in August or last year, you laid out a matrix. But
I'm just wondering how this tiny little cell called
"proximity" out of the hundred factors became the
overwhelming -- the overwhelming deciding point for this.
I mean, why would we make that an outstanding, you know,
this is where the big points are in order to kind of
win the -- you know, win this particular site? Why was it
kind of put as some subfactor under "Transportation,"
buried in a hundred other, you know, approximate cells?
Why didn't we make that a much larger criteria?

Because I think if we would have had that
criteria, then I think some of the responses might have
been different. I think Riverside would have had maybe a
different response. I think Pomona may have had a
different response. But it seemed to -- we took all of
these factors, and at the end of it we kind of said, "All
being even, proximity is the outstanding factor." And I'm
just kind of wondering why that wasn't laid out in your
matrix prominently --

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: When we --

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: -- not as a subcontext
of -- on page 11 as a sub-item.
ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, I think there's a couple answers to that. One is that we've used -- in the staff report we've used "proximity," you know, that term as a surrogate for a number of different attributes that were identified in the original matrix. So in our staff report there was a half a dozen items that were identified. Those are taken directly from the matrix. So they may have been in different categories. But they were represented in the staff report, both as general access to the public as well as staff -- ARB staff commutes.

We couldn't say this -- at the time wrote the matrix we couldn't say that this factor was more important than the other factor because we had only recently gotten the funding to initiate the analysis, so we didn't know what the outcome was going to be.

We had no predetermined information about how these attributes were going to play out. We've -- you know, we worked with DGS to define these, and we could have found very significant differences in some of the others.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: But somebody makes a value judgment. I mean, you say proximity to staff. You could say proximity to a major research institution as well. That could be just as important as proximity to staff.
Somebody makes in your report a value judgment that actually is the defining factor, correct?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: I wouldn't call it a value judgment. I would call it a fact-based analysis of the attributes that we in August.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Right. But then somebody said one is more important -- more top line than the other, correct?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: You know, our staff recommendation when we looked at all of the attributes was just that. And, you know, the significant differences were in proximity. We did -- we had a lot of discussion about the proximity to the university, and that goes back a couple years prior to even the staff report itself.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: I think, you know, I'm going to just end a lot of the questioning but simply say I am in support of you going a little deeper, getting this Board a little more answers. I'm one of those folks that read reports too many times. So I actually have 14 things I'd like you to look at, I would submit to the Chair, if we're actually going to do that, that go a little deeper into this, rather than go into all 14 of them.

I will say that the end result of this is going -- it's going to go to the legislature; and the
legislature from a DGS perspective, they're going to ask you at some point -- not this CARB staff. They're going to ask DGS, you know, what should we do? You're the advisors of the legislature nine times out of ten particularly in these issues, and I don't think the legislature at least according to the statutes I've seen has allowed you to advocate those types of responsibilities to a client agent -- agencies. It just -- I don't see that. There are exceptions in the law for that, but the Air Board isn't one of those.

So I would just hope that you get that process going as well and you report back to this Board what that's going to look like. Because we'd like success for the legislature obviously. But if we're not going to be successful because we haven't taken that next step, I think that's going to be an important piece of something I would actually really, really like to see if that works with you.

One last comment. From a legislative point of view - and I know Hector knows this as well - but, you know, one of the things that, having overseen DGS for a lot of years and a lot of real estate moves, you know, I have never really seen in my five years there proximity used in this way. I've never even seen proximity used. So if I see that from my old vantage point in the
legislature, I can certainly tell you that you should, you
know, well be prepared for that from a DGS perspective of
why in this case proximity became the overriding factor
when it's never been used for most moves in the State of
California. And you can come and show us five or six
moves they've actually used that term and actually been
the basis for a move, I think that would -- I'd be open
for that. But I think it would be highly doubtful you
would do that.

So I'm going to end my comments. I just am
looking forward to getting about 14 things back from you
hopefully.

Thanks.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Dr. Sperling.
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Well, I'm getting hungry
myself.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So I'm going to be very
brief. I usually address these in big-picture what, you
know --

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: But I'm going to go
narrow here. I'm going to go back to my core competence.
And I'm going to just point to one table, 36, and it
says -- I don't want to overstate the proximity issue
either, but that is what I am -- I know a lot about.

There was just a line there. It said percentage of employees driving more than -- driving less than 90 minutes. So 25 -- even for Pomona, there's going to be 25 percent of the employees driving more than 90 minutes a day. And I suspect it's actually -- driving around this area, I can't believe it's even that low for that distance.

But -- so I'm just making a point here. Don't worry about it.

Oh, you changed it?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, I just want to point out this is public transit time and not driving time.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Oh, no. I -- okay. You're looking at the wrong -- table 35.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Another table?

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: It's such small print here.

CHAIR NICHOLS: 35 was driving time?

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: There's 75 percent are less than 90 minutes. So that means 25 percent are more than 90 minutes. You're getting into some really long commutes. And so even for Pomona, if we were to choose Pomona, there's got to be some work here at trying to deal
with that issue. And so --

CHAIR NICHOLS: The traffic is getting worse too.

It's going to get worse, no matter what.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: And it's going to get even worse than that.

So I think the point here is that, as we go forward, we've got to think about how to mitigate some of these costs, some of these downsides. And whether that's through telecommuting and conferencing -- teleconferencing or perhaps moving certain parts of the lab that are not intricately involved in the lab, maybe enforcement, you know, somewhere else. But there's a lot of ways of mitigating this. And I would think it has to be done, whether it's Pomona or Riverside.

And on the other side is the synergy. We really need to be thinking about how do we maximize these synergies. And clearly, there's opportunities with Pomona, probably a lot more even with Riverside, and we want to make sure we get those benefits. And as Professor Balmes -- Dr. Balmes said, you know, this is where a lot of the primary air pollution research was conducted. It's evolved in different ways. There's a lot of good research. But I think there's a lot of opportunities to make these ties much stronger and much more impactful than even what it is now. And I think that's what we really --
we really want to create something really special and
important and that is making a major contribution.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

Mrs. Riordan.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Let me just follow up on Dr. Sperling's comments
for just a moment, because I couldn't agree more.

There are times when we really need to look to
the future. And we have so many opportunities if we pick
up on the synergy and the research and making a worldwide
center for the study of air quality and perhaps climate
change and others; things that we really haven't thought
of, or at least I haven't thought of. I think those of
you who are in the research business and profession do
that all the time. But just the general public, and I
believe I'm sort of the general public, but I can clearly
see things that we've not thought about.

And while I know our staff report says, in
essence, it's good to locate near a university but not
necessarily a high priority; but it truly is in my mind.
I think we have so much potential with the co-location of
our facilities with something -- with a heritage of the
University of California, the heritage of research. There
are -- and I sympathize and empathize with our staff, and
I respect the staff completely for the work that they have
done and the work that they will be doing. But I also know that your work may be getting even more interesting and more challenging as you locate near a university that has a high priority for air quality research.

Madam Chair, I don't have many questions because I had the good benefit of being on the subcommittee and traveling to these sites and to hear the presentations that were made to us, and they were all excellent presentations.

But I do believe that there may not be a way to quantify it in terms of numbers, but there was certainly -- the synergy is, in my mind, so critical to making a decision.

Having said that, I respectfully disagree with my other committee member for just a moment. Had we accepted the fact that we would just have staff go through a process and make a recommendation, then we wouldn't be involved, in my mind, with making a decision over this final recommendation. I think the process includes our ultimate support of the staff recommendation or the respectful disagreement with staff recommendation. And I've certainly told that to staff, particularly Mr. Fletcher, that I may respectfully disagree with the staff report

But, looking to the future, that's how I believe
it ought to be.

Now, I do think there are questions of other Board members, and maybe they -- because of more detailed analysis that would need to be done, you may want to continue it for, you know, some time. But I personally can make a decision now or into the future, whatever.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Well, thank you.

Having now heard from all of our Board members, I think I'd like to make a few comments and a suggestion about how to proceed.

So first, I want to say that when I first started to get seriously involved in this issue, I spoke with our then executive officer - this is prior to Richard Corey coming on board - and I believe it was at that point that we made the decision that we needed a person who could devote themselves full-time to working on this. Was it Richard who made the decision?

Okay. I apologize then. Okay. You get the credit.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Richard, congratulations. You made a brilliant decision --

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: -- to call in a former senior staff person who had acted in various important capacities
at ARB to actually be the leader of this effort, and that was Bob Fletcher. So Bob is retired in theory --

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: — and has been working tirelessly at this task, holding weekly meetings, meeting with staff, meeting with external stakeholders, meeting with other agencies. And we owe him a real debt of gratitude for having gotten us to this point.

I think the staff report is a very good piece of work. And I think if you go back to the data that underlies it and you have questions, you might possibly disagree with the conclusions that they came to, you might disagree with their decision not to get into issues about opportunity costs or potential synergies or things that are perhaps not within their areas of expertise, frankly, but the fact is that for what they set out to do, I don't think there's any point in sending them back to do more of it. Because I don't think you'd get a different answer or a particularly different -- a different product.

I think the issues that I just mentioned are more on the realm of the intangibles.

I'm going to take some personal credit here for having pushed us in the direction of looking at a university as a partner. Although at the time, I wasn't even aware of the fact that we might be able to actually
get two offers of land that would cost us nothing and in some cases, you know, pay us to move to places that would be so appealing and so much of an upgrade from where we are today. So I'm excited in that respect.

I also need to say about process, that to my astonishment, because I expected we would get told by either DGS or the Department of Finance or both of them where we were going, that in fact the Governor's office made it clear from the beginning that ARB was the client here - it's our lab - and that subject of course to the legislature deciding whether they want to fund it or not, that this was our decision to make based on our assessment of the needs and the opportunities here.

So I wish I could buck this decision up, or sideways in some ways, but that's not going to be possible, at least when it comes to giving advice.

I also agree that there are questions that Board members have that clearly would make them more comfortable with making a decision if they had more chance to interact with the staff on this. I don't think anybody wants another public hearing on this or another round. But it may be beneficial to take a short delay.

My question is really not a question, it's more of a hype -- it's more of a dialogue I guess that I'd like to get out there. Has to do with the timing. So a couple
First of all, assuming we were to make a decision today or whenever: Then what happens next? How much time do you really see things happening? And what would be going on during that period of time, again regardless of the site decision, in terms of interaction with staff and opportunities to follow up on the things that Ms. Berg and others have suggested we really need to be working on with staff? Again, regardless of where we go. This is not going to be something that just happens and then it's done.

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER:

Challenged. I think it depends upon what the scope of that is. I mean, we clearly recognize that the public transit aspects to both sites are challenging. I think we would initiate that sort of effort once we had decided on a site. And then we can start breaking, you know, down explicitly what sorts of transit opportunities exist, I mean, that would be useful. And we did look at van pools, we did look at those sorts of things. But with the metric of -- you know, if we went to Riverside, then you still have the same timing considerations, you still have that distance.

So I think we'd want to probably wait for a year or two and let -- make sure that we actually have a
facility that's approved by the legislature before we launched in too much. And then my recommendation would be that we engage into a transit -- you know, we engage a transit coordinator, an expert that can help us sort of, you know, not only define the options but figure out ways that we can encourage the staff to use it.

I mean we found in even El -- at this facility there are some public transit options. They're not great. We do have a really good transit facility close by. But, quite frankly, staff don't use it. And so I think, you know, we need to do our behavioral efforts and look at ways to incentivize how we can get people on to public transit. And you heard Supervisor Solis and, you know, talking about their options. You heard the representative from Riverside as well talking about options as well.

So we're going to have to work very closely I think with the staff on this one -- I mean, with -- yeah, with the staff on this one. But I think we have to have a facility first.

CHAIR NICHOLS: So, okay. We have a site. We -- assuming we have a site. Then what? How do we get to groundbreaking, which is where I want to be?

(Laughter.)

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, there was a couple slides in the staff presentation that talk a little
bit about that, the project -- the key project steps. And
the next step is to work with a master architect to have a
series of design specifications and performance criteria
for the building. And that occurs over, you know, a
period of time. The objective here is to have a vetted
bid that is ready to go to a design build contractor,
assuming that the budget gets approved for the money,
beginning July 1st, 2017. So that would initiate -- we
could award that in August of 2017, and then the design
build contractor goes to work. It'd probably take them a
little bit of time. I think we indicated in these charts
that it would be November 2017 where we would actually
start looking at a groundbreaking consideration.

But we do have a fair amount of work to do with a
master architect and developing the detailed design
guidelines and performance specifications. And they get
down to incredibly gory detail, like do you want a chain
door or do you want an electric door for your test cells.
So this gets down into really -- you know, that's why
there's 5.7 million allocated.

We also have to do our environmental impact
analysis for the facility. We're looking -- you know,
once a site is selected, then you can launch in and do
your EIR work, which we would hope to finish up I think at
the end of the year.
So there are steps. But it's a little bit predicated -- I mean we are working on -- with a master architect now. We are working with the staff to define, you know, some -- you know, kind of reevaluating the needs and that sort of thing. So there's work that's going on that can be done in the absence of the site, but it really gets nailed down once the site's selected.

CHAIR NICHOLS: You got to have that decision. Okay. Great.

Let's see if there were any other questions?

In terms of things that we could ask you for more analysis on, I think a lot was included before that isn't -- you know, it just didn't come up today or that wasn't really responded to today but that individual Board members might want to talk to you about.

And I think -- I'm hoping that you and others would be available to come up with the answers from the documentation from what work you've already done.

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Absolutely, or work that we could do.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah, or additional work that you could do.

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Right.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, I just -- I sort of balance
the need to move quickly versus the need for people to feel comfortable. And I guess what I am going to recommend then would be that we again close the public hearing portion of this discussion, but that we adjourn for a vote at a subsequent meeting.

    And I don't want to make that drag on very long. I don't -- I know you don't either.

    And I'm hoping that we can find a date quickly, like within the next week, that would be possible, if people would then be willing to take the time on their own to ask the questions to get the additional information that they need, so that we'd have at least a quorum willing to vote. And that would also allow for members who aren't here, other than Judy of course who recused herself, but for the other Board members hopefully to look at what is already here and feel comfortable adding their voices to this decision as well.

    So have you had a chance to talk to the Board members about whether there are dates that are available? Because I know if we adjourn, it has to be to a specific date.

    EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: It does. And Chief Counsel Ellen Peter may want to add to my remarks. But if we adjourned and picked up next week, we'd need to get a notice out by tomorrow. We had asked the secretary of the
Board to do some polling, and it did look like we had a quorum for next Thursday, Thursday morning, in Sacramento. We had a facility just as a standby. So that would be an option for us.

CHAIR NICHOLS: And then if there are members who wanted to participate but could not be in Sacramento, would they be able to join us by phone?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Ellen can add to this. But the bottom line is the location where they're calling from needs to be -- would need to be posted as part of the notice tomorrow, and the site would have to be available if the members of the public wanted to join them for when they call in. But, Ellen, maybe you should add to that.

CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: That's absolutely correct. So, for example, if one of the -- you know, and I don't know who's available and who's not. But, for example, it could be in the office of one of the public Board members like Supervisor Gioia, if he could make it, and other people could join him there. But it would have to be noticed. So I wouldn't recommend you doing it from your home, unless --

(Laughter.)

CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: Though you could. People have done that. But we just -- we need to know when -- before the notice goes out.
And also in terms of the information -- and there was some discussion if we should have further public comment or not. If you're only looking at the information that's before you, and including the more detailed staff report, then you could basically rely on the information that is before you.

There's been some suggestion, both by Member Takvorian and Vice Chair Berg, about staff things, and also one of other Board members about future kind of activities. Those could be taken up later. So there's not a preclusion of getting additional information at a later point too.

CHAIR NICHOLS: As long as people are able to make a decision currently based on the information that's available to them, yeah.

CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: That's correct.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Okay. Can I then get an indication from the Board if you're willing to go along with this procedure that I'm proposing --

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Can I just make a comment?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Heads nodding.

Yes, Mr. Florez.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Just not a motion to do just -- it's a comment.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: So I think the issue is I'm not sure we want to have a telephonic vote on a facility that's going to be in our midst for the next 50 years. I just don't think that's good optics. I don't think that's the right signal to send to the public.

And there were four Board members missing here as well today. I guess they could review the transcript. But I'm just not sure -- and I'm going to ask Mr. Fletcher: Does a month or two really slow us down that much?

And give me the reason why?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, every month that we delay delays the schedule back, and it makes it that much more difficult to complete the project on schedule.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Is it impossible?

ASD PROJECT MANAGER FLETCHER: Well, nothing's impossible.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Great.

Then I'll stick to the not impossible. And I think a public -- when we have a chance, I think -- I know there's a wish to do that. I'm just going to give my -- you can take a vote on it, but I guess I would feel more comfortable having a public hearing on it.

CHAIR NICHOLS: We've never -- to my knowledge,
in my time on this Board we've never had a telephonic board meeting. This would be something new. It was -- my idea was actually just to indulge those who have felt strongly but who might not be able to be at the meeting.

Personally, my sense of the timing of this is so critical, I'd rather go for a vote right now than postpone this to even the next Board meeting. So I think that's really what the choice is, is whether --

VICE CHAIR BERG: Could I just ask a point of clarification?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Sure.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Because I thought you were suggesting that we would have a Board meeting in Sacramento on the 24th. But that if there was a Board member that just wasn't able to attend the meeting, where we would have a quorum, they would be able to also call in by phone.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. What Mr. Corey indicated was that we have a quorum for the 24th. So it's not a matter of needing the telephonic vote in order to have a meeting. It was a question whether we would allow someone to phone in.

So maybe this had better be done in the form of a motion then just to be clear, if somebody would be able to -- pardon me -- to make the motion, or to do the
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Chair, can I just -- can I -- before you make a motion, I just have a question. Do you want to take a vote today? I guess we could. So, you know, I guess we could take a vote. It fails or doesn't fail. Then we can then reconvene. But I didn't know if that was --

CHAIR NICHOLS: My thought had been -- and again, you know, this is a board, actually, and so we need a majority to make any decision. My thought had been that there were enough people who had expressed a desire to think about it some more or may -- you know, with a little more information, that it was a good idea.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: So I'll make a motion that we have a meeting in Sacramento next week — sounds like it may be Thursday — to take up a vote.

VICE CHAIR BERG: And I'll second.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Then you've heard the motion and the second.

All those in favor of holding a meeting --

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Madam Chair?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Sorry.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Could I just now --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Question.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Does that anticipate
somebody like myself, who cannot be there, to be able to
 go -- to find a telephone in a public place that would be
 noticed?

      CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, it did.
      BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Okay. All right.
      CHAIR NICHOLS: Questions or comments?
           Yes.
      BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.
      So on that motion, I -- I guess I -- I agree with
 Senator Florez. I think this should be done in a -- I
cannot attend. And if I just couldn't attend a public
CARB meeting that had actually been noticed -- I mean, you
have a tradition of monthly meetings. So to have a
meeting in a week doesn't seem like we can get the
information that at least I've asked for. I mean, there's
a number of paragraphs under the description of the Pomona
site that talk about environmental hazards, for instance.
And I don't see -- and maybe I just don't see it -- but a
cost associated with that. So if that's not there, then I
don't think that's going to be there in a week. So I
don't --

      CHAIR NICHOLS: No, it won't be. But with
respect to your comment -- and perhaps I should have
addressed it at the time or should have had staff address
it -- that is part of what goes on in the next phase; that
is, we are making a decision based on what we think is roughly equivalent. The actual cost of building this project, which includes site remediation, will not -- we will not know that before we decide which of these two offers in effect we are going to entertain. There's no way that we would know that and be able to proceed in any kind of a normal pattern towards a -- towards conception.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Well, actually phase 2s are -- excuse me -- phase 2s are normally done for both considered sites. So you can get closer. I totally agree with you that there are surprises whenever you build anything. And I fully expect that that will be the case and we won't be right on point. But it seems like we're a long way away on that particular point. That's not the only point. But I just -- my major point is that I don't think we can get all the questions answered to -- answered in a week and that we should do this business -- it's obviously critically important. Look at all of you who must be starving who are still sitting here.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I think we ought to do it in the public view, and a meeting that folks expect the CARB to be meeting in.

So I would actually have to say that I would vote against the motion to do it in a week and vote to do it in
a month or whenever staff feel like we can come back and
have that information.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Well, we have a
motion and a second. The motion is to hold a meeting in a
week, on Thursday, with the opportunity for people to call
in if they choose to do so, at which time we would be
voting on the Board's recommendation as to which of the
two sites that are before us we would choose to accept.

So I think we better have a roll call on this
vote.

BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Dr. Balmes.
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes, or in favor.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. De La Torre.
BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Aye.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Mr. Eisenhut.
BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Aye.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Senator Florez.
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: No.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Supervisor Gioia.
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yes.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Riordan.
BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Aye.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Professor Sperling.
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Yes.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Ms. Takvorian.
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: No
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Vice Chair Berg.
VICE CHAIR BERG: Yes.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: Chair Nichols.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.
BOARD CLERK JENSEN: The motion passes 8 to 2.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. So that will be our next move. We will see or hear from as many of you as we can. But there will not be any further public testimony taken on this.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Do you have a time it's going to be held?
CHAIR NICHOLS: A time. Do we know what time it's going to be.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: 9 a.m.
CHAIR NICHOLS: 9 a.m.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: 24th, Thursday.
CHAIR NICHOLS: On Thursday, the 24th.
We will recess until then.
VICE CHAIR BERG: I don't want to be argumentative on the time. But is this the only agenda item?
EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Correct, it is.
VICE CHAIR BERG: So could we just make it a little bit later so we could fly in on Thursday morning?
(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: How about it?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: 10 a.m.

CHAIR NICHOLS: 10 a.m., is that --

VICE CHAIR BERG: Yeah, then I could fly in.

Thanks.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. That's great. It will be 10 a.m. on Thursday then.

All right. Great.

Thanks, everybody.

This is a public meeting where we have to also acknowledge if there's any member of the public who just wants to make a comment on any topic while we're here?

Nobody signed up for public comment.

Okay. Then thank you all very much.

(Thereupon the Air Resources Board adjourned at 2:04 PM)
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