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PROCEEDINGS

MODERATOR LUCERO: We're going to be starting shortly. If we could stop the side conversations. If you do have a pressing conversation, please take it outside. It makes it very difficult for those in the room to hear each other.

So for our Air Resources Board Member and our Environmental Justice Advisory Committee members, we do have name tags for your seats. Most of you have found your spots. We have a couple people filtering in, but we've got a lot to discuss. We want to make sure we start moving.

Before we commence any further, our emergency announcement.

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JOHNSON: In the event of an emergency, we need to exit down the stairs and out the building to the park across the street and then we'll wait for the all-clear signal when we're -- when that's given, we can come back to the room to resume the meeting.

There are water fountains and restrooms that way (indicating).

EJAC MEMBER BAILEY: What if the emergency is a flood?

(Laughter.)
MODERATOR LUCERO: Boats will be provided by Water Board.

All right. So thank you all for joining us today. As you can see from our agenda, we have a lot of discussions and we want to make sure we get through this very quickly. My name is Stephanie Lucero, Center for Collaborative Policy. I am here to guide our train and make sure we have the ample time to talk and have the discussions highlighted and keep on schedule.

So really quickly, welcome and introductions. We will be doing welcome and introductions with Air Resources Board members and our Environmental Justice Advisory Committee members, EJAC for short.

And we are requesting that EJAC members provide your name, the group that you're with and just some of the main issues that you're seeing on the ground. And for our Air Resources Board members, if you can provide your name obviously, your region, and a little bit of history that you have with cap and trade and/or the AB 32.

Give then, we're trying to have these announcements about a minute or less. So succinct. We want to make sure we have plenty of time for the discuss EJAC Recommendations, which will have a little bit of introduction for each of the sectors from our EJAC members, but really that is intended to be a discussion
with the group.

    I'll be giving you some time checks so that we can make sure we get through all the sectors. And we'll work from there together to get through all of them. We will have a some time for public comment, which I will explain in a little bit.

    And then we'll be discussing options for addressing the EJAC's recommendations with the Board, and then we'll be doing closing remarks.

    For the public that is joining us, thank you for being here today. We do have public comment. If you are interested in providing public comment, please fill out one of the forms in the back. Rana is raising her hand. She can help you with that. I will take those and provide -- provide the time during public comment based on how many we have. We're looking at a 1 to 2 minute max inn terms of public comment to ensure everybody has an opportunity to speak, and we can get through our agenda.

    Please note that you will get one opportunity for public comment, so make it count.

    All right. With that, I'm going to pass it on to our EJAC and ARB members.

    Any quick questions from those in terms of process?

    Great. Mary
CHAIR NICHOLS: Hello, everybody and welcome.
I'm just going to introduce myself. I'm Mary Nichols, Chair of the Air Resources Board, and I do want to thank the members of both the EJAC and the Air Board, and our staff for turning out. And I know there's a few others who are not yet here, but who are planning on filtering in, so we'll just have them pick up when they arrive.

I have been on the Air Resources Board since 2007. I was appointed first under Governor Schwarzenegger and then reappointed under Jerry Brown. It was actually my second time being appointed by Jerry Brown, because I also served under him when he was Governor during his first 2 terms of office. And so I consider myself a lifetime member of the Air Resources Board

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Not quite, but it definitely feels like my home. I joined the Board after AB 32 had been passed and signed, and before the scoping plan was done. So I had the role in shaping the first scoping plan, and in shaping the original Cap-and-Trade Program. There's a history there, as many people know, to the views of the Governor Schwarzenegger, who was very much in favor of having a Cap-and-Trade Program, and the legislature that passed it, which was willing to allow him to do it, but under some fairly strict conditions.
And so in putting that first scoping plan together, I think that we were very careful. I certainly was very mindful of the fact that I was part of an administration which was committed to having a market-based program, but had left it completely to the Board to design the program. And so I think, as most people know, the first scoping plan that we developed included a Cap-and-Trade Program, although the program itself did not start for several years, because it had to actually be designed and the details worked out.

But our vision of the Cap-and-Trade Program was that it would be only one piece of the total California Global Warming Solutions Act Plan. And as it turned out in the scoping plan itself, we asked -- we said we would have a program which would be responsible for approximately 18 percent of the emissions reductions that were called for under AB 32. Although, we hadn't, at that point, worked out all the other regulations, but we certainly already knew that we were going to be relying primarily on our vehicle emission standards, and then also on renewable electricity, and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard to make up the total reductions.

So that's my history with cap and trade.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Good afternoon. Great to see everybody. My name is Sandy Berg. I'm Vice Chair. And I
was appointed to the Board in 2004 by Governor Schwarzenegger. I hold one of the 2 public seats. And at the time, Governor Schwarzenegger wanted a business person or some -- a regulated party. And I am President and CEO of Ellis Paint Company. And it's a small family company in Los Angeles. And so understanding regulation and how to bring that together was a criteria that allowed me to be appointed.

Also, being in the Boyle Heights area, I have a strong connection to -- to the -- my community there. We've been there as a family since 1929. And so working with the various community members and things with the schools and various issues with them has allowed me to have an appreciation between economic opportunity, environmental issues and business.

I also was part of AB 32 when it passed, and was on the Board for the first scoping plan. From my perspective, it really was taking a blank sheet and figuring out what California was going to do as a leader, and putting knitting together, being part of a program that could be duplicated, and as a leadership entity how we could lead the way.

In my recollection of cap and trade being just one element of that, and becoming educated as to a program of that nature, and not only its ability to participate in
brining down the emissions, and -- as well as all the
other elements. And so that was, from my perspective has
been a big learning curve. Thank you.

EJAC MEMBER BAILEY: Good afternoon, everyone.

Excuse me. I'm Colin Bailey with -- executive
director and an attorney with Environmental Justice
Coalition for Water. I've been doing environmental
justice work for the better part of 2 decades. As an
organization, we're working on building resilience in
communities most vulnerable to the water-related impacts
of climate change, which do have some bearing here. Given
recent events, it's important to note that the cost --
absorbing the costs of evacuating flood is, in fact, an
environmental justice issue.

Our work at the State level in water has focused
a lot on the human rights to water, which California in
2012 became the first State in nation to memorialize into
code. We are hearing from our communities, and we invite
you to attend the meeting here in Sacramento on March 1st
with our Sierra colleagues looking at forest management
and upper watershed management as one in the same. The
opportunity for job creation is very present there, as
well as all the water quality and improvements that you
can make.

As a statewide organization, we are well attuned
to the trade-offs that many environmental justice and tribal communities are being asked to make, including pitting some groups against others. And we are trying through this process to reconcile those, so that the environmental justice is realized for all.

With that, I'll pass it on.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Hi. I'm John Balmes. I'm a physician scientist at University of California, San Francisco and UC Berkeley School of Public Health. And I was nominated to the Board by Governor Schwarzenegger and actually had my hearing the same time as Mary. And despite the fact that I wrote in my materials to the Senate Rules Committee that I was going to champion environmental justice, I did manage to get confirmed.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: And I tried to keep that commitment that I put in writing at that time. And I won't -- I think we need to move along, so I won't go into a long history about my involvement with environmental justice issues, but other -- to say that I've tried to keep public health co-benefits as a key theme, with regard to our climate change mitigation policies under AB 32. And I'm particularly interested in doing more with regard to what we are now calling adaptive management. When we have cap facilities that produce a lot of greenhouse gas
emissions, we also have to try to reduce toxic emissions.

EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Good afternoon. Katie Valenzuela Garcia, Sacramento area representative. Born and raised in Oildale in Kern County. The environmental justice movement here in Sacramento is younger than it is in other regions, but our communities have, as my friend Jonathan London likes to say, long memories. And our neighborhoods here, as in many neighborhoods across the State, were built to be racially segregated. And we still see to this day, car-centric land use, poorer health outcomes in our communities of color in the north and south part of Sacramento.

So that's what largely informs my positions in this committee, and my positions on the scoping plan. Some of our priority areas since we are the self-proclaimed farm-to-fork capital are urban agriculture and urban forestry, as well as energy and water and transportation improvements, since that's where the largest share of our pollution burden comes from in this region.

So thank you again for this meeting and the time.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Good afternoon. My name is Barbara Riordan. And I represent the small and mid-size air pollution control districts. I happen to serve on the Mojave Air -- the Air Pollution Control
I was on the Board when AB 32 passed. And I have been here since the passage, of course, of the first scoping plan. So I have some history knowledge based on that service of time.

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: Thank you.

Good afternoon. My name is Martha Dina Argüello. I'm the executive director of Physicians for Social Responsibility. And my history with AB 32 goes back to, I think, 2005 or '06, when it was still an idea of a bill. And was around in Sacramento when it was passed and have been on the Committee from -- from, I guess, the very first Committee.

And my background is in public health. I've spent about the last 40 years working in a lot of different public health arenas from AIDS, tobacco control, to breast cancer. And then sort of realize these seem to have an environmental component. I'm going to go work on environmental justice issues. So that's what I've been doing for the last 18 years at PSR.

We work on our -- a principle of first do no harm, and that we should move upstream to prevent environmental degradation, as a way of protecting public health.

Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Good afternoon. My name is Diane Takvorian, and I am Board member. I was appointed a year ago, actually February. So this is my anniversary, I guess.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: And I was appointed as the then Speaker Atkins appointee as a result of legislation that passed, which required that there be 2 environmental justice representatives appointed to the Board.

And I come from -- I'm the Executive Director of the Environmental Health Coalition, and one of the founders. We're a 36-year old environmental justice organization. We are a binational organization. We have offices in Colonia Chilpancingo, in Tijuana, which is next to the largest maquiladora park in the Tijuana region, and then our offices are in National City. And we work in the most disadvantaged, low-income communities of color that are also very impacted by pollution, primarily pollution from transportation, large industrial facilities, and port facilities.

So I had the opportunity to serve with some folks that are around this table on the first Environmental Justice Advisory Committee in the early 2000s, which I think really birthed a lot. And one of the things I think
we're proud of is that it really resulted in the CalEnviroScreen coming forward, because we really emphasized cumulative impacts and the importance of that. And I think we all know where we live and what the impacts are on our communities, but CalEnviroScreen allowed us to really demonstrate that in an objective and scientific way that has, I think, borne a lot of understanding and fruit for our communities.

I also served on the first EJAC. So I had the opportunity to participate in the scoping plan. And I think that I want to just express my appreciation to the Board members and to Mary and to the EJAC members for the incredible amount of work that you've done for this last year, and for coming to this table today. I think this is kind of a historic moment that we're all together here at this table, and that we're going to have the conversation we're going to have.

So I just wanted to express my appreciation to everyone. Thanks so much

EJAC MEMBER FRANTZ: Tom Frantz from Kern County. I'm head of a group called the Association of Irritated Residents. We've been working on air quality. I've been a student of air quality issues in Kern County in the San Joaquin Valley the last 19 years.

The -- I'm a farmer, and I was also a math
teacher for many years. But I'm a farmer first, part of 6
generations on the same piece of land. And my concerns --
my biggest concerns in looking at AB 32, this scoping
plan, and so on is what are we doing with the carbon cycle
in regard to biomass, sewage sludge, biogas, biofuels,
carbon capture and sequestration, and trash incineration.
And all of this concerns us in Kern County. We see it --
we see all these things all around us, including the oil
and gas industry down there.

So we're concerned about air, but also land and
water, and, of course, greenhouse gases.

Thank you.

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: Good afternoon and thank you
for his meeting, board members and Mary. This EJAC
Committee actually marks my return to policy after 16
years. Incredible Edible Community Garden is a
volunteer-run organization, of which 95 percent of all our
grant funds and contributions go directly to our projects.

As a volunteer-driven organization, we are proud
of the difference we're making, and we believe that
communities need to be involved in all discussions
regarding neighborhood restoration and climate adaptation
from within the neighborhoods.

We believe that successfully mitigating and
adapting to the cumulative effects of environmental
degradation and poverty requires a clear understanding, and -- I'm sorry, clear understanding and empowerment of the community not for exploitation, but for shared neighborhood building solutions and decision making. With that in mind, Incredible Edible Community Garden facilitates a dynamic vision for transforming our communities, while creating cohesive standards and best management practices in growing spaces for food production, active living, ecosystems, training, and services, while engaging our communities in creating and learning urban solutions to grow, heal, and build collectively and effectively.

With these principles IECG is very proud of the fact that we also advocate for environmental justice principles, but we also implement those policies. So it's very important to us that these policies are -- we are able to implement these policies.

Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Good afternoon. My name is Judy Mitchell. I am City Councilperson in the City of Rolling Hills Estates in Southern California. And I represent the South Coast Air Quality Management District Board on the Air Resources Board.

I'm elected to that board by the 50 -- a majority of the 51 mayors in the western half of Los Angeles
County. I have a history of interest in environmental quality issues. I was very active in the League of California Cities, in my course of being an elected official. I was president of that organization in 2009-2010. And that was the time when we were working with Darrell Steinberg and Tom Adams on SB 375, which is the sustainable communities plan. And that was very controversial for all of the cities across the State of California.

They've come to a point now where they adopted and have embraced it, so I'm happy to say that we've come that far.

I was appointed to the Air Resources Board in 2013. And so I'm relatively new to this process, and cap and trade was pretty much a new process to me as well, but, you know, we've had to sort of break in here and learn all the ropes on it, and -- so I'm still learning.

But anyway, appreciate coming together with all of you. Very anxious to listen to your concerns and work with you to find solutions.

EJAC MEMBER OLMEDO: Good afternoon. And this is, as Board Member Takvorian mentioned, it's quite historic. I don't remember every doing this. This is the second time I've been in the EJAC scoping plan, and wasn't quite expecting this, but I'm, you know, quite honored to
be around the Board members. So thank you.

I'm the executive director of Comite Civico Del Valle, a community based organization. And a lot of my colleagues here have highlighted a lot of the issues that concern us. What I bring here is Imperial is the furthest, I think, along with San Ysidro, from Sacramento. We're probably not as loud of a voice. And sometimes -- I know Stephanie reminds, you don't have to use your outdoor voice, but I think we do --

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER OLMEDO: -- because we're so far.

But there's a lot of issues, you know, that happen, you know, from dairies, you know, to feed lots. I mean, I think a lot of the same issues that have -- that are of concern in rural communities are just as the same, even more, you know, with the heat, and, you know, probably living in one of the hottest areas in California. Add to that the border, you know, and the fact that, you know, we're also consumers of products and energy from Mexico that we feel the impacts in the border.

So I like -- you know, I bring that here to the discussion. We have been working on projects of, you know, both engaging the community, but also more recently in the last 2, 3 years, we've been working on citizen science, or community monitoring, and crowd sourcing, and
bringing more data. And I know that's something that I
continue to bring, because we need to measure
effectiveness at the community level. We need to know
what's happening in the neighborhood, not just, you know,
at the higher levels, the average, but is our area
improving, are these programs not affecting certain
communities or transferring pollution to other
communities.

And I really will continue to stress that we need
to engage the community to participate, because we know
that there's not enough money to go around when it comes
to environmental protection. We know that we need to
engage the community, and to be able to bring the
expertise, the technical knowledge to be able to level the
conversation for all communities in California. So thank
you for this opportunity.

And I knew that, at some point, there would be a
highlight for me as a member. And this is really, I
think, my highlight here. This is my peak of a moment
being a member.

So thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: We should take a group photo
before this is all over.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Really.
EJAC MEMBER FONG: Good afternoon. My name is Gisele Fong, and I am from End Oil and Communities for Clean Ports in Long Beach. This is the second time I've been on the EJAC.

And just to kind of start with something really personal that I left a career as an academic to move into environmental health and justice work, because I was raising my babies in Long Beach. And the more I learned about what it meant to raise kids in degraded air quality, the more I really figured out that I wanted to make an extreme change for my professional energies.

So some of the -- really briefly, some of the issues that our communities of Long Beach and San Pedro, and Wilmington and Carson, the port-adjacent cities deal with, of course, are the air quality issues and the community impacts that come from freight transportation and goods movement. We also are surrounded by a ring of oil and gas operations.

So everything from oil and gas extraction and the kind of off-drill -- offshore drilling to the pipelines that run under our cities to really literally a ring of refineries around -- around our communities that are really within 500 feet of high schools and parks and so forth. So -- and then, you know, also just kind of thinking back of our community workshops last summer, I
think that people are really thinking about what it means to be, what it means to live in very dis-invested cities, very dis-invested communities.

And so when we think about the solutions towards that, we're really looking at how is it that -- how is it that people live these experiences and what can we do to not only have the bigger targets about emissions reductions, but really to improve quality of life and true investments in our communities.

Thank you. And thank you again for this opportunity.

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Somehow I got stuck -- yeah thanks, Sean. I didn't have a workplan from you to guide my research.

My name is Kevin Hamilton. I'm a registered respiratory therapist. I'm a resident of Fresno, California, and have been since 1986. I'm originally from Youngstown, Ohio, where you get to experience environmental justice firsthand. And at the time I experienced it, it was before it had the name.

When the steel mills turned our skies black and our rivers red every day, and we thought that was just the way it should be, where people that regularly sacrificed their lives to go work to every day and make sure their families were fed and housed with the anticipation that
they would be taken care of long after they died, which
normally was very soon after they retired, if they made it
to retirement.

This is the kind of history that we want to avoid
repeating, and that our technology today allows us to
avoid. And it's one of the things that I fight for every
day that I have the opportunity to do that.

I'm also the Executive Director of the Central
California Asthma Collaborative, and a founding member
Central Valley Air Quality Coalition and Medical Advocates
for Healthy Air. You kind of get from the name that I've
been working on air pollution and health for a long time.

This actually comes out of personal experience
with both my family, where my mother suffers from COPD,
and my wife and 2 of my children out of the 4, and 4 out
of my 10 grandchildren all of asthma. So a number of them
have now moved out of the valley, where they have better
health now, are not experiencing all the symptoms from
asthma that they were when they lived in the valley.

It's unfortunate to me that my children had to
move away from me in order to experience clean air and
good health.

But CCAC works to see a -- San Joaquin Valley
where the health of every resident is our foremost
concern. And we envision environments and systems of
support for health that are reflected in the resources, information, and activities and policies in every community.

So when the Governor passed the bill that said health in all policies, I was really thrilled, because our health is our primary asset as a human being. Everything else we have to earn. Our health we get coming in. And it's ours to lose over time. We make bad choices that cause us to lose our health, well, that's on us. But when those choices are taken out of our hands and other people are making those, or we're forced to sacrifice them in order to make a living every day and feed our families, I see that as completely unfair, and a poor decision to have to make.

And so the communities that we live and work in every day are making that decision. And I have people who argue with me that in order for them to have a job, they may need to sacrifice something, and that something appears to be their health, simply so that they can go to work every day in an industry that, as a by-product of its economy and value to the society, is also causing significant health consequences to not only the people who work there, but what they often don't realize and the folks who are doing that work don't realize, it's affecting the health of the very people they're trying to
protect, their wives, their children, their husbands, their grandchildren.

So I think we all do this work every day to change that dynamic, and I think we have an opportunity with this scoping plan, and the subsequent work that comes from that, the policy work, the legislation, the regulations that fall from that, and then, of course, most importantly, how it's integrated and implemented at the system level.

And I think it's great to be part of a group where everybody shares those goals in that work. And so I thank you for that opportunity today, Ms. Nichols and Board. This is the way we should meet all the time, and this is the way you should meet all the time. You should just tear that thing down up there --

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: -- and, you know -- and this is what we should do is just have some conversations.

Thank you.

EJAC MEMBER ROSE TARUC: Hello. I'm Mari Rose Taruc. It's great to be here on this joint meeting. I, as an immigrant, grew up in the small town of Delano in an EJ community in the Central Valley. I have worked for environmental justice for 25 years now, and I used to be a young person who was starting out -- Diane remembers me --
starting out in the Southwest Network for Environmental
and Economic Justice that was focused on Dozens of EJ
communities in the southwestern United States and northern
Mexico.

And as a young person, I was entrusted with the
task of serving these dozens of EJ communities in the
southwestern, northern Mexico. And so I had the
experience and responsibility of visiting EJ leaders
in -- in Texas towns dealing with military toxics, with
border towns dealing with waste dumps coming from -- waste
coming from the U.S., tribal lands who were being mined
for uranium and other materials, farm workers, farm worker
towns dealing with pesticides and the -- and the injustice
to them as workers, and to the urban areas, including oil
refineries that explode constantly.

And so I found myself working at APEN, the Asian
Pacific Environmental Network, for 2 decades. And so an
example of the Chevron oil refinery and the daily threat
of that, as well as these large explosions that a few
years ago sent 15,000 people to the hospital. So not only
the daily assaults, but these huge, huge fires that would
then happen because these industries are about explosions,
and burning, and burning of fossil fuels.

And so APEN also -- and the Richmond community is
one of the hubs nationally in the climate justice alliance
focused on how we -- a just transition project for how we can envision where -- how to transform these communities to have clean energy, and to have local ownership of new industries and technologies in our economy, and to take that back for ourselves. And so I bring that perspective into the scoping plan and this work.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Hello and welcome to Sacramento County. My name is Phil Serna, and I have the honor of serving on the Air Resources Board now for about 3 and a half years. I was appointed in 2013 by Governor Brown. I am the result of legislation that added a member back in 2012, I believe, when then Assembly Member Roger Dickinson sponsored a bill that added a position to represent the 5 regional air districts in and around the Sacramento -- greater Sacramento area.

As is the case with Board Member Mitchell and a few of our other Board members, I have, I think, a unique perspective, in that I'm both a practitioner of local governance as an elected member of the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors, but also serve on the local air district here, as well as on the local transit district board of directors. I'm coming off 6 years of serving on our local COG board as well. So almost daily, I see the intersection of much of what we do here, in terms of implement -- policy implementation, resource allocation
that's associated with that, as it actually hits the
ground. And I think to the delight probably of Ms.
Valenzuela Garcia, the lens I really look through,
especially in the context of today's meeting, is really
looking -- looking at how cap and trade can certainly
benefit the disadvantaged communities that I have the
honor of representing, communities like Del Paso Heights
and South Oak Park here in Sacramento County, some of the
poorest areas you're going to see anywhere in this greater
Sacramento region.

And so I, too, agree this is a historic day. And
I'm really pleased to see a great turn out. I did have
the pleasure of serving briefly as a liaison from our
Board with the EJAC when it was reconstituted a few year
back. I'm glad that we do have our dedicated members now
representing environmental justice on our Board. I think
it's a very fitting complement to work we do, and look
forward to getting on with today's work.

Thank you.

EJAC MEMBER SHAKUR: Hi. My name is Kemba
Shakur. And I'm the executive director and founder of
Urban Releaf, an urban forestry organization. Prior to my
work with Urban Releaf, I worked at Soledad Prison. And
at Soledad I saw -- being born and raised in San
Francisco, I saw a lot of the males that I grew up with
there. Once I left Soledad and moved to Oakland, I was
amazed at the lack of greenery. The prison grounds had
more greenery than many other streets of Oakland.

I wanted to create a program -- or I created a
program actually 18 years ago, where I wanted to merge
young people with green jobs and training. So within the
last 18 years, we've planted over 17,000 trees, engaged
local youth around environmental justice -- well, no,
excuse me, around environmental education, job training,
and environmental awareness.

Another really positive thing that we've done is
engaged in research. We've engaged in over four or five
research projects with Center for Urban Forestry Research,
and equated trees as they relate to water, air,
psychology, and tree mortality.

I first got involved with the environmental
justice movement I think round 2006. Margaret Gordon
said, you know, she was focused on the port and goods
movement, but she was like we need a tree person.

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER SHAKUR: Because I kept telling her,
hey, trees are the solution, you know, so -- so with that,
I'm really glad to be a part of this Committee. I've
learned a lot and am learning every day about policy.

Thank you.
DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: Hi. I'm Edie Chang. I'm with the California Air Resources Board. I'm a Deputy Executive Officer, and I oversee our climate change programs. So I was one of the early staff to start working on climate change programs. And I worked on the first scoping plan. I worked on the second scoping plan, and we're working on this round, the third scoping plan.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I'm Richard Corey, Executive Officer of the Air Resources Board. And when I joined the Board, actually it was the result of some legislation, toxics legislation, that had been passed in 1983. So I came to the Board in '85 and worked on a number of toxics regs, and believe in our mission, but I also believe in learning, and being as effective as we can. I'm really looking forward to the discussion today.

So thank you.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Okay. And Board Member De La Torre we skipped over you.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thanks. Sorry, I had to step out to get a call.

I think this is great. We had the session last week in Berkeley, where we talked about some of these issues. Obviously, last month at our regular Board meeting, we had a conversation about this. And I think it's very important for us, as -- at the Board, to really
go through all of those recommendations that you presented to us, and identify the things that we can move forward on, and frankly not wait for a scoping plan.

    If it's stuff that can be done short term, we should jump into it. If it's stuff that can be done medium term, then we put that obviously in the scoping plan, and then long term in the scoping plan.

    In my time on the Board, we've had a few issues related to goods movement, things that I -- that I personally experience in my part of California, goods movement is very, very important, railyards, the trucks, the ports. And so in my time on the Board, I have felt that we're always kind of waiting for something more. And I think it's just time. It's time to move forward. Obviously, we'll put it into the scoping plan as we see fit, but we need to use all the tools at our disposal.

    Cap and trade is part of it. Our regulatory authority is part of it. Toxics control, we don't do that, but we know the people who do. GGRF is part of it. So all of the tools that we have here at CARB and with sister agencies, we need to bring into this cause, because the impacts aren't just ours, the stuff that we oversee. The impacts are happening -- water as well -- our happening in these communities, and my community, and we need to come up with a bigger framework than just the
cap-and-trade framework, because it is -- it's -- the
impacts are all over the place.

And so that's what -- where I would like to see
this end up, and I think we can. I think this dialogue is
part of that.

Thank you.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Mary, did you want to give
just a quick overview of kind of the expectations of what
we take from the discussions today moving forward,
timeline, and so forth?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Sure. Several of us had an
opportunity to meet with Stephanie by telephone prior to
today, and that's where the agenda came from.

And again, the idea is that the Environmental
Justice Advisory Committee members will present the
recommendations in groups, basically, based on the work
that they did to get to those recommendations. These --
this is not the first time that they've been presented to
the ARB, but it will be the first time that we've had a
chance sitting around the table to talk about them.

And the hope is that board members will get a
chance to ask questions informally that we can -- you
know, this is not a hearing. Obviously, that was one of
the reasons for having the meeting arranged this way.

But the -- I think that respecting our roles
means that we get to hear from the Committee something about how they arrived at their recommendations, not just the bottom line, which we could read for ourselves, but really the thinking behind the recommendations, and that the Air Resources Board members will also get a chance again, hopefully in a pretty informal way, to ask questions or comment in a way that is designed to try to further all of our understanding.

I know everybody those this, and it sounds maybe a little bit too basic, but at the end of the day, the Air Resources Board is charged with developing a scoping plan and regulations. Under the climate legislation, we also have the overarching responsibility for achieving air quality standards in the State of California.

One of the reasons why -- I think, in many ways, probably the main reason why the legislation that created the California Climate Program, also called upon the Board to create an Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, was a concern on the part of the legislature that in beginning to deal with this global issue of -- of climate change, that the Board would lose its focus, lose its a -- lose attention, or even perhaps do things that might avoid its responsibility to deal with health problems of residents of the State of California, in the interests of, you know, moving ahead on this international agenda.
And so they wanted to make sure that we heard from people who actually represented the communities that are the most impacted by our current levels of pollution. And the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee was one of a couple of committees that were actually called for by AB 32. But the other 2 pretty much disbanded, because they gave their recommendations. They weren't necessarily all followed, but they felt like they had done what they could do as committees. And most of the members of those committees -- well, all of them were either representatives of a long-standing industry organizations, or environmental organizations, or academics who had ongoing relationships with the Air Resources Board in one place or another.

And the environmental justice community, as an organized presence in California, still seems to be relatively, new compared to the other entities, and more of a more of a situation where the Board really needed to have an opportunity to get formal advice from people who came from the constituency. So we -- we reconstituted the EJAC after the original scoping plan, and have had now the opportunity to, I think, do a better job, at least in terms of engaging at the staff level, having opportunities for the EJAC members to introduce ARB staff to many members of their communities, through the events that
we've gone out and done around the state, and also to get
to know our folks, and some of the thinking that goes into
their work.

But, you though, we still have a situation where,
you know, we have another plan to do, and we need to hear
from the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee as a
group, as well as hopefully individuals as well. It
seemed like this was a good opportunity to do that.

I think in terms of expectations of where we
would end up, it would be wonderful if, at the end of the
day, we adopted a plan, and, you know, the Committee got
up and said that's just wonderful. It's just everything
we ever hoped for.

I think that's probably not likely to happen.
But what I really am hoping for is that we can acknowledge
the areas where we have really responded to advise that we
were given to the -- that we can note things that we've
done that were a success, as well as those that weren't,
things where we need to do further work, and that we can
come up with a process, whereby if we don't agree, we can
park -- we can park an issue and continue working on it,
so that, you know, if the scoping plan that does get
adopted isn't everything that you all hoped it would be,
that that isn't the end of the story, that some issues may
get addressed, either in later implementation of the plan,
in further planning efforts, or even possibly in other places where -- whether at the ARB, in our regulatory proceedings, or in working with other agencies around the State as well, because a number of the issues that you all have identified, and that we've identified, are things where we need other agencies, and frankly, other resources to be involved in actually accomplishing what our goals are, like, you know, changes in the priorities for transportation funding, just by way of a simple example.

So having said that, that's what I hope we can get out of this next -- this next half of the program, and looking forward to it.

MODERATOR LUCERO: So. Before we go to the next step, which is really for the EJAC to give an overview, and start a discussion on the sectors, just a quick reminder, if you do have a question or comment, pull this up this way. I'll keep track as best I can of order of preference. Anybody want to add anything before we move on to the sector and recommendations?

All right. Let's get down to business.

All right so for those -- Diane.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I don't if there's a webcast -- no. So it's internal webcast.

MODERATOR LUCERO: No. It's internal to ensure that ARB staff that need to hear these conversations can,
and we have enough room the public.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Mari Rose, mic.

EJAC MEMBER ROSE TARUC: Just for notes, so somebody is officially taking notes, right, so that we can report back.

MODERATOR LUCERO: We have court reporter.

EJAC MEMBER ROSE TARUC: Court reporter.

And then is it possible -- so some of us, especially from this morning's EJAC meeting, are really visual in terms of like next steps, can we -- is there -- can we get a flip chart to -- all right. Very good.

Thank you.

(Laughter.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: I'm here for you, Mari.

(Laughter.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: All right. Any other process or quick questions?

While we're on process, you know who you are, turn those phones to silent. We had a couple ring. Just put them to silent or turn them off, if you can. I've been there myself. I understand.

All right. So with that, let's move on to our EJAC.

Who's going to be doing our overarching issues
Well, I mean, I think that our overarching issues have pretty much stayed the same -- consistent, I think, for almost every single EJAC. And before I go into them, I did want to sort of give you a little bit of what lies behind our thinking. And when Mari Rose and I were prepping I kept thinking of a scale, right? And if you think of the scoping plan as a scale that has to improve air quality, set the stage for this new economy that we want to propel, that's not based on the extraction and burning of fossil fuels. But also part that's embedded in AB 32 is this idea that you're not going to make things worse for communities that are already here, right?

So how do you balance that scale with benefits and burdens? And how do we understand this information that we're getting that we -- that we've -- that we've known on the ground that if you're not careful with a Cap-and-Trade Program, there is this risk of increasing air pollution. And that's actually what we're seeing now in -- we've begun to see some of that information in these early warning systems.

And so that really is shaping our thinking, that
we've got to figure something out. And, yes, I know we're not going to get everything. But I think it's important to go back to that mission that we feel all of us have of improving air quality, creating a new economy, and a just transition, and balancing those benefits and burdens, and making sure that the communities that have been sacrifice zones are now ones that we invest, and we build the amazing resilience.

Because we have to remember that given all these assaults, our communities are amazingly resilient already. And so what -- and I'm going to borrow from Margaret Gordon, since we've talked about her today. It's about making sure that our communities are able to thrive, and those are 2 very different things.

And so our overarching concerns have been related to how we do that. And that's -- one is around encouraging public engagement in a different conversation right with the Air Board. And this idea that health comes first, right, and that those health benefits have to be measurable. So we want to be able to demonstrate those community level solutions, and what are the -- what's the information and the tools that we need with CARB to be able to show the community level improvements.

And we also believe that there is a continuing life for EJAC. And the one difference between EJAC and
the other committees that were in the bill is that we were not -- there was no sunset date for us, right, because achieving environmental justice and balancing those scales is an ongoing work.

And so this idea of grounding our work in equity -- I'm going to kind of deviate a little, because of what's been said. So I want us -- and I said this at the last Board meeting, our attempt here is to make this program work as best as we can, and we are partners with the Air Board in doing that. And that's going to require, on both of our sides, some compromise, and some looking beyond the dogma of what's -- what we have versus what is possible.

And so while we are right now, you know, as an original member of EJAC, and one who sued around the scoping plan, we continue to feel that the scoping plan lacks real specificity on what are those health benefits that are going to come, and we recognize the data gaps in getting there, and so we want to work with you to get there.

We also realize that until there is an acknowledgement that there is another way, that we can reduce air emissions, that we can put a price on carbon, and we can improve air quality and health. Until we acknowledge that there is that other way, we're a bit at
loggerheads. And so need a commitment from the staff and the Board to examine the possibilities of a carbon tax. And I got quoted in NPR, and I'd had too much coffee, and I was kind of pissed off --

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: -- and I said, "I don't care about political expediency", just in case any of your heard it.

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: And I do care about political expediency, but I care more about people's right to breathe clean air. And so we actually need to not get so stuck that this is the only way, and see that there might be another way to achieve the benefits that community people want, right -- because we get fixated. This is the juice I like. If you give me another one, I'm not going to like it, but I'm might -- I won't taste it, right, if I'm my 7-year old niece, huh-uh.

So we need to be flexible and say that there is another way, and actually credibly look at that other way with a carbon fee. And I know you gave me a minute, but I'm going to pretend I didn't see it.

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: And the other part of the overarching issues is that we really need to be
partners in collecting the data that will allow us to evaluate and you see as our -- we are your troops for ground-truthing, right? We are your boots and pumps on the ground that will help you both protect the program and make it better. And that's where we want to be with the Board and staff.

Thanks.

CHAIR NICHOLS: So can I just ask one question, is that all right?

My question is about the scoping plan versus other places. I know we're here to talk about the scoping plan, and that's what's before the Board at the moment, but you also know, because you've worked in this area for a long time, but there's a State Implementation Plan, there are local district plans, there are things that both our -- doing what we want them to do, and there are things that maybe are not doing as much as we want them to do. And I guess I'm asking if your conversation is intended more broadly, if your comment is intended more broadly?

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGUELLO: Yes. And I have to say, and I almost feel like this is with my PSRLA hat, I'm working in the South Coast, and my staff is working at the South Coast on the AQMP. And then I know that that relates to the SIP. I'm not the lawyer. I'm not the policy -- you know, but I know that they're related.
And sometimes I feel like we're not having --
like why is this conversation that we have here at EJAC
feel so separate from the worker that we're doing on the
ground, whether it's on zero -- you know, on the freight
stuff that's happening at both South Coast and in the
Central Valley?

And so maybe there is -- I think that's a really
good question, like, how do we see the full scope and --
yeah, the full scope of the things that are going to get
us to those goals?

CHAIR NICHOLS:  Thanks.

MODERATOR LUCERO:  And I'm just going to point
out, because I don't see any cards, the EJAC does have a
set of coordination recommendations in appendix that
relate to some of this I think that what you're talking
about, Martha.

John.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES:  Thank you, Martha. Just a
quick response. This is an idea that I haven't vetted
with my Board colleagues, staff, or otherwise. But even
if our current analysis, which I've been briefed on,
suggests that cap and trade -- continuing cap and trade is
sort of the best way to go in terms of greenhouse gas
emissions right now, curbing them, I think it would be
nice for the scoping plan to say that we have an open mind
about the future.

    We have a big, you know, lift to get to the
greenhouse gas emission reductions that we need to. And
it may be that cap and trade isn't the way to get all the
way there, so -- and I'm not considering political
expediency when I look at my colleague Hector.

    (Laughter.)

    BOARD MEMBER BALMES: But it just seems like
having that in the scoping plan, that we have an open mind
for the future would be a small way to respond to the
legitimate concerns of EJAC.

    Just an idea.

    EJAC MEMBER ROSE TARUC: I agree with John on
that open mind. I also wanted to raise -- so we were
presented with 5 scenarios basically in the scoping plan.
And even yesterday, we were getting briefed by the staff
on those scenarios, and we're -- and even some of the
discussion from the last Board meeting when EJAC
presented, there was such an interest in health metrics
and air quality metrics in looking at -- and evaluating
which scenario is the best for California.

    And so yesterday, even in the staff briefing, we
did not see what those -- like any health or air quality
metrics in those scenarios. They would say, well, these
are -- these are advantages to this scenario, and these
are -- these are disadvantages, but -- or downsides, but then none of them actually talked about health and air quality.

And so we want to see in the scenarios those health metrics, so that we could see, well, this might be good on the economic side of things, but this is -- this scenario is better in terms of health outcomes, especially for EJ communities, et cetera. And so we haven't seen that yet, and we want to see those in the scenarios.

And I wanted to see is there -- maybe, Edie, like, is there some of that already going to happen before the full -- before the final draft is put out.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Any responses?

VICE CHAIR BERG: I just wanted to understand and get a clarifying question, is -- are these health metrics and air quality metrics, is it a one-size-fits-all in every community?

EJAC MEMBER ROSE TARUC: Well, Martha, do you want to --

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: Ask me that again?

VICE CHAIR BERG: So when you're asking for these health metrics or the air quality, I just wanted to understand is it the same metrics for every community? Is it a one size fits all?

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: And Dr. Balmes and I
both worked on the Environmental Health Tracking Program, so we probably both -- so, yes. So there's part of it where we actually -- it has very little to do with CARB, but you could really help is in pushing the Environmental Health Tracking Program, local health departments to do a better job of geocoding and collecting data.

The other piece is around air monitoring, right? What's happening with particulate matter? What's happening with other toxic air contaminants?

And so that early warning system that's supported by data is what we want. So, yes, we should be tracking birth outcomes. We should be tracking actual asthma cases, not just ER visits. There's a whole series of things, and then there's the air monitoring, very localized. And you could right now say, you know, if this is a community that has 10 traded entities, we should be very, very carefully tracking all emissions, right, because that's how you get it. And I will stop, because he's the Ph.D.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: M.D. not Ph.D.

Well, I just was brief -- I was just briefed by -- I was just briefed by staff this morning about the scoping plan, and they -- I missed the January meeting, where this apparently came up, but I was very pleased to hear that there's an effort by staff to monetize health --
potential health benefits of cap and trade.

It's not exactly what you're asking for and I totally support better track -- as you know, better tracking of health outcomes across California, but especially relating to disadvantaged communities.

And you know CalEPA -- CalEnviroScreen gives us, you know, an opportunity to do this. And all I can say is I totally agree that we should be trying to gather data on the public health impacts, negative or positive, with regard to our policies, including cap and trade, but across the board actually.

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: It's really important that whatever instruction is given, it's about measure the impacts, because if you -- if I'm -- you're my boss and you give me an assignment to go find you benefits. You know what I'm going to do? I'm going to go find you benefits. But if I'm assignment is to find you impacts, that's different. And I think that's a really important distinction.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Martha, you're a little soft spoken, so I'm going to make sure speak right into the mic.

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: Nobody has ever said that to me.

(Laughter.)
MODERATOR LUCERO: You're trying to behave.

(Laughter.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: Okay. So I next have Diane.

EJAC MEMBER ROSE TARUC: Is there a staff response wondering -- I asked if, from staff, there is going to be health metrics for assessing the 5 scenarios that are presented in the scoping plan.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: So as Dr. Balmes said, we're in the process of -- you know, we did get some Board direction on this, so we're in the process of looking at how we can provide health outcomes, and then monetize those health outcomes for the different scenarios.

There is also a table that's in the draft scoping plan that provides estimates of the criteria pollutant emission reductions from each of the proposed measures that are in the scoping plan. We're going to restructure that table, so it's easier to see what it looks like from each different scenario. And then we're also continuing to talk to folks to see if there's any other additional health work that we can do.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Diane.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes. So I appreciated, Mary, you question about how does all this fit together? And I know you asked it more eloquently than that, but I
think that's the question that our communities have been asking. And frankly, I've experienced some frustration on the part of Board and staff in regards to that question getting asked, because what I think we're all really about is healthy communities.

And so what's the plan for that? And if the plan for that is, you know, 500 parts, and we've got to be at the air district, and we've got to be at the ARB, and it's -- it's just very diverse and very spread out, and we're really not sure what it all adds up to, then that's really not good enough.

Really, our communities deserve to be healthy, and we do -- while I absolutely support what Martha is saying about tracking and monitoring, we know a lot. So we know a lot right now about what communities are the most impacted, what communities have folks in them that are very sick, kids that are very sick. And it's our obligation to do all we can about that. And I think it's diverse. I don't think it's a one size fits all.

And frankly, I'm a little -- I think on many sides, you know, this odd allegiance to cap and trade -- I appreciate what you said about -- I remember, the Governor was very enamored with -- let's -- with cap and trade. There's this market mechanism. This is going to make it right for everyone. And I think we're seeing that perhaps
it isn't. But if it -- if it is, then we need proof of that, and I don't think that's on the table yet.

But I really appreciated Martha's comments of let's see what else there is out there, and I don't really care what we call it, whether it's cap and trade, or Pete, or, you know, whatever it is. Let's -- let's do what we think is the right thing to do that will reduce the emissions and reduce the illness and environmental degradation in our communities.

You know, what's the best path for that, and how do all these things come together? And I know we're going to talk about it more, but I feel like there's very inadequate analysis of what the economic impacts are from a non-cap and trade perspective alternative.

And we just -- as a Board member, I feel that I couldn't support something that was vaguely stated to be the best for the economy without real strong data. And I think that's where we are. And if it's about the same, then why not try something that is potential going to be much better for our communities from a health perspective. So that's what I would ask us to be open to as we move forward.

MODERATOR LUCERO: All right. I have 5 people in the queue and we've got about 3 minutes on this topic, before we start interrupting the next one.
(Laughter.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: So if this meets into other sectors, think about that.

So, Katie.

EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: I will be quick. I think -- I appreciate the comments, because one of the things that we've been talking about an overarching themes and that we mentioned at the Board meeting is that we have no real clear vision of what 2050 looks like, what type of economic activity is going on, what type of jobs are people doing, what do these communities that have been built around oil, and ag, and biomass, what are they going to look like if we shift to something cleaner?

And that is beyond looking at just cap and trade. That is beyond -- I mean, we've brought up questions about what about the air monitors. You know, what if there's miles between air monitors, and in the middle we have this census tract with really high respiratory illness death rates?

Like something has got to be wrong, if we're seeing really high respiratory illness death rates somewhere, and we're missing it. But what struck me, when I joined this Committee -- obviously I wasn't on the first 2 -- was when I read the recommendations of previous EJACs, a lot of the responses were just oh, well, that's
beyond the scope of the scoping plan, which I found kind
of like contradictory in terms, but -- like we're scoping,
so why can't it be beyond the scope of something that's
supposed to scope what's possible.

But I didn't see a lot of effort to really say,
well, this is where it ties in. This is where our
accountability as ARB, even though we're just looking at
the scoping plan, we're going to commit that in our air
quality monitoring system. We're going to be looking at
how to address this concern. Like it was just, oh, beyond
the scoping plan, done. And I'd like to see that
conversation stop as we move forward into this next
scoping plan process.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Thank you for being quick
Katie. Remember, we do have a court reporter. Not too
quick.

(Laughter.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: Eleanor.

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: Just really quickly, I did
leave -- and I don't want to delay the issue. I agree,
again, Martha, that -- and everyone else it's talking
about the data, and, I mean, the OEHHA report just --
yeah.

I have made some comments, but I sent to Trish
virtually a list of things that at least our team in San
Bernardino is looking at, in terms of the different plans have been out there evaluating cap and trade and other scenarios, as well, including a report from Driscoll on U.S. Power Plant Carbon Standards and Clean Air and Health Co-Benefits; EDF report on Public Health and Societal Economic Benefits; the Greenlining Institute, California Climate Investments Reducing Poverty and Pollution; from MIT Joint Program, Market Versus Regulation: The Efficiency and Distributional Impacts of U.S. Climate Policy Proposals by special Sebastian Rausch and Valerie Karplus; The Climate Trust: An Evaluation of Potential Carbon Pricing Mechanism of the State of Oregon Legislation;


And some other reports that we've been slowly but surely making our way. I say this only because, I mean, I feel very conflicted. On one hand, I hear my colleagues expressing a real concern with cap and trade, but at the same time, I'm actually seeing extraordinary amounts of benefit in my community that does address public health and the work towards reducing air quality, as well as economic opportunities.
So I just want to bring that out, and if possible, perhaps that list could be included in terms of passing that out through my colleagues, because I would really love to get their input on some of these reports as well.

MODERATOR LUCERO: So I have Luis, Kevin, and John -- no, not John. I thought I saw John -- and Phil. A minute or less, and then we need to move on to the next one. Sandra, yours was before, right?

(Laughter.)

Luis.

EJAC MEMBER OLMEDO: I just want to add to the conversation of metrics and monitoring, and going back to -- I hope I don't misquote, but Board Member De La Torre mentioned, what are the short-term goals. I really think these metrics are short-term. And I just wanted to cite here, it's like a budget adjustment that was done last year. And it says that $2.3 million were allocated to add more monitoring, and it says here, such as enhancing our community monitoring for toxics methane, particularly near disadvantaged communities, and other highly impacted communities, such as Porter Ranch near Aliso Canyon.

So clearly, I mean, there's a way to expedite, to fast track these types projects. I just think there's got
to be the interest and the will -- willingness of the agency to do this. And so I just wonder, why isn't it happening already. I mean, it seems like it's been years that these low cost technologies, or just other types of regulatory monitors that may be cost effective to deploy in disadvantaged communities could happen right now.

So I'm just wondering why wait? Why does it have to be a 10-year plan, and then 5 years later, then we're now 15 years. I mean, these things just take too long and -- and I hope that after today, you know, given that all board members are here, EJAC members are here, it's been an active discussion. There's plenty of evidence, plenty of research out there that can at least get the agency involved, and not try to find out where are we going to get the money from.

And I'm taking more than a minute.

But I know that's part of the argument is where is the money going to come from? Well, somebody found $2.3 million to take to Aliso Canyon or Porter Ranch. I mean, the money is out there. I mean, there's, you know, this, you know, funds. But anyhow. I hope that we can walk away with some concrete directive, I guess.

Thank you.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Kevin.

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: So I think it -- yeah.
So there's a sense of urgency here that we feel with regard to the health consequences. I don't think I was -- I use the word "underwhelmed" with, I guess -- and I won't do that lightly, because I don't like to cast aspersions on my colleagues in the public health arena, but I really was by the OEHHA health report.

I thought that it didn't well illustrate the consequences of greenhouse gases, especially things like black carbon, which were kind of glossed over and passed off as this is well understood. Well, if it's well understood, then you need to enumerate it in the report.

And what we find is a lot of, especially with carbon, black carbon, and -- I'm talking about carbon in terms of CO2, and black carbon in terms of especially elemental carbon, and methane, these are produced by industries or by activities that also produce criteria plants by their very nature.

So with elemental carbon, you're talking about combustion, whether it's pressure combustion - a fancy name for diesel - or other compressed gases that don't use a spark or spark-ignited combustion, or in the case of these other -- of CO2, again massive amounts of CO2 are produced as part of oil and gas production, for instance, and also as part of combustion. So there are markers for the things that happen to your health.
And we use markers all the time in health. We use these proxies, because we can't measure the direct impacts of this particular insult. So we have to use something else that is always riding along with that one, so to speak.

And so we do have that information. We need to talk about that. I'm seeing reports that are being -- that are clearly illustrating long-term genetic consequences to this pollution that we're breathing. We see work out of -- out of Stanford and other places that's telling us that especially in the region I live in in the San Joaquin Valley, we may be affecting children's immune systems at the fetal stage, and this effect may last for life compromising their immune systems.

There is a sense of urgency here. We know it's affecting the health of those of us who are breathing today, but the consequences to these young ones, who are not equipped to defend themselves in any way, shape, or form, and yet are going to live with these consequence potentially for life.

And as we've learned in the L.A. Children's Study, where long-term association with things like ozone are causing their lungs to be underdeveloped -- which, by the way, when your lungs are done at 23, they're done for life. So if they're not where they're supposed to be
then, you don't get to build more back later on.

So there's an urgency to this that I feel, and I think everyone should, to get this done and get it over with. And we need to think globally, and we need to consider all the opportunities. One of the things with the different scenarios I said is, well, let's combine those.

I see the red flag. Trust me, I do Stephanie.

All right. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: So, so far, I really appreciate all the comments that have been issued. And I know we need to move on, but I think it's really important that Katie's questions about, you know, the scope of the plan and kind of this boilerplate, or what's perceived to be as a boilerplate response, you know, something is outside the scope of the plan, needs to be addressed. And I'm looking to Richard or Edie before we go further, because I think that's a real structural respectful disagreement that really warrants an answer at this point. Otherwise, I think it's going to -- at least for me it's going to hang out there like a footnote to the rest of the discussion.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Supervisor, let me take a stab at this, because I think it is an important question. And I was actually -- and a few of the
commenters, both the EJAC members and Board members
touched on this, and that is that the nature of the -- of
the problem matters. And what we're really talking about
in many cases are community-focused problems. And that
could be elevated exposures to chromium. That could be
associated with the combustion of fuel. It could be a
refinery. It could be, in some cases, an auto body shop.

And what I'm getting at is -- and I think you're
right in terms of the recognition in the scoping plan, not
just a punt, that, hey, this is outside of even
necessarily climate policy. I think one strategy to me is
clear is that, one, there's a lot of arrows in the quiver
to deal with issues. And if the point is there are not
enough, we should be talking about that.

The next point is it's -- it is not one strategy
that gets at even everything I just talked about. And I
think the point is a clear characterization, these are the
problems. These are the issues, and I think I named a few
of them. And I think that leads you pretty quickly to why
haven't they been addressed, and what are the existing
levers?

Are the permit -- local permit limits not tight
enough? Do we not have a toxics rule? Is the toxics rule
that we have not getting it done? Because there are those
authorities, and there are those instruments that could be
more effectively called out, but to me ultimately it's about action, and I think -- I think a clear characterization of the issues, and the potential responses. And I think where that leads, honestly is in some cases do the climate actions, can they get at it? Probably in part. In some cases maybe even effectively, but not completely. I think it's -- but then it leads you pretty quickly to what are the options?

So I think a more complete characterization of the issues and what the responses, and even if the response is not a GHG measure. Does that make sense?

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Okay. So we have a couple of commonalities that I'll start plotting on the Board, but I want to make sure we get to the next group, and then we'll confirm that everybody agrees with the commonalities that are kind of coming out of the discussion.

So let's move on next to energy, green buildings, and water.

MICROPHONE.

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: All right. So our group looked at energy. And some of the highlights that we're looking at is a need to get away from fossil fuel and start bringing renewable sourced energy to our specific communities, as well as lead with community-based
innovation on all the issues that we're dealing with, in terms of energy, green building, water.

Energy in terms of we think it's important to -- if we're going to be purchasing energy from other states, we need to be purchasing clean energy -- from clean energy sources. We need to runoff of more solar, and not be so dependent on the utility systems.

We also need to look at energy pilots for whole communities, so we can start articulating local generation and taking -- coming away from the distributed system. Also, looking at retrofits -- and all of these kind of overlay with each other also. Retrofits that can allow -- or upgrades that allow for energy usage in terms of charging stations, as well as being able to handle your microwaves and everything else, so you don't blow all your circuits.

In terms of water, we were discussing the need for residential water capture systems, specifically provided to DACs. We need to be able to plumb DAC residents to use greywater, whether that's in irrigation or other ways. We also need to take all these different ideas and integrate them much more effectively.

Let me get back to green building. The group also expressed a need to emphasize -- more emphasis on retrofits, not just new builds. Looking at 50 percent
more efficiency with green builds.

All these strategies help bring us to a place of dealing with the economic issues, in terms of jobs, and even potential businesses when we start talking about weatherization of homes, or even as my colleague Rey León was saying, being able to switch out streetlights for instance. These are different skills that we could certainly be training others to do, so that they can be more job ready.

But like I said, these are -- these strategies really address the need -- address how we can better our air quality, provide more economic opportunities, and certainly better public health to our communities.

One other -- a couple of other things was that we were -- I was asked to also say that we -- we need to start looking in terms if we're going to be bringing these investments to the communities. They cannot be reimbursements. They have to be direct to install, because our DACs cannot afford a reimbursement process. We also need to integrate forest management and upper watershed management for suppression of mega fires.

If we do this, we get water supply and quality -- we -- if we do this, we can start really shoring up our water supply and the quality of our soil.

That's it in a nutshell. What do you think? Did
we get it.

EJAC MEMBER BAILEY: (Nods head.)

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: All right.

(Laughter.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: So we -- for those that are interested, this isn't -- it starts on page 8, the green -- energy, green buildings, and water discussions from the EJAC.

Are there any questions in terms of -- and we'll pull up for those that were at the meeting, these were some of the key recommendations that you saw at the presentation in January, but are there any specific questions from Board members?

Judy.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you, Eleanor, for those comments.

I think some of the recommendations that are in this part of the -- of your document, they're being done. They're being done in other sectors in other ways. Let me just mention that the County of Los Angeles is now forming a community choice aggregation plan for energy. And they're right now in the process of finalizing the joint powers agreement. My city has signed on to that. And there will be an opportunity in the near future for other cities in Los Angeles County to sign on to that as well.
So that's the beginning of getting more renewable energy into our communities, and giving communities at street level the opportunity to decide what mix of energy they want in their community. It's also an avenue to get distributed generation into neighborhoods. And there are -- there's a number of entities that are also within L.A. county working on distributed generation.

So some of these things are happening. They may not be happening right here on the -- in the scoping plan you're not seeing them there, but they are being done. And, you know, zero net energy by 2020 is now the rule, and so we're going to see that enacted as well.

So I think that finding the place where some of these things can be done, finding the agency, finding the communities where they are already being implemented is important, and will help us get to where we want to go. There's a lot of things in your document that I think are being done, but maybe not being done in the scoping plan or by the Air Resources Board. Some of those belong to other agencies and to other -- with other responsibilities.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Did you want to provide of why it might be something you want to just comment on.

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: Thank you very much for that information. And I think that's very true that -- I mean,
our experience on the ground has been that there are
different agencies doing different programs. And what
we've tried to do is take a look at that very much like a
menu and develop a suite of strategies for our committee,
so it -- communities. So I suspect that's very much about
what you're talking about.

Thank you.

MODERATOR LUCERO:  Mary.

CHAIR NICHOLS:  Well, I agree with Judy's
comment, but I don't think it fully responds to the
recommendation, or at least to how I think the
recommendation is intended, in the sense that -- and this
is -- this is part of the dilemma I think that we've had
with the scoping plan all along. The scoping plan has
taken on kind of a life of its own, as a -- as more than
just ARB. It's certainly -- more than ARB or more than
even -- even the State of California, in the sense that we
acknowledge or take credit for or, in some ways, try to
push in incentivize or whatever actions that really need
to be taken by other people, and not just -- not just by
ourselves.

This is not something that we're exactly well
equipped to do. And I don't want to whine about
resources, but it is true that, you know, since AB 32
passed, we've hired people and developed expertise in a
whole lot of topics that we didn't do anything about when I first got to ARB. I mean, forestry? You know, ARB has somebody who actually understands something about forestry? Yeah, it's great, but, I mean, it's not exactly our mandate.

So I guess, by way of a comment, I would say I would be hesitant to include in a scoping plan that, was an official direction, if you will, for the State of California things that are totally outside our legal authority to do.

So let's just take for example the reduction in use of petroleum. I mean, we know we have to get to the reduction in the use of petroleum, and to get to big numbers of alternative kinds of vehicles, but we don't have the -- we tried and did not succeed in getting the authority to just mandate a certain amount of reduction in petroleum. So that -- that tends to have an impact on how we put things into the scoping plan, I think.

At the same time, maybe what we could or should be doing is a better job of assessing what else is going on out there in the landscape, or could be going on with some additional encouragement, and just putting it into the scoping plan.

You know, I think we have been maybe a little bit hesitant about -- especially when it comes to stepping on
the toes of local government, you know, adding in things that are already going on. But the fact is there's a -- we know we -- we not only are expecting, but, you know, counting on a lot of action that's happening there.

So I guess maybe that's just intended to get a response.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Hector.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: First of all, just an announcement, John had to step out to go talk to the Maritime Association and tell them about the perils of pollution and diesel.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: He'll be back.

And I think Mary's point is following on what I tried to say at the outset, which is, not just in terms of time, short, medium, long term, but also in terms of category what issues are cap and trade related, what issues are regulatory, what issues are toxics related, what issues are GGRF related? Where do they belong?

And if it's not within our purview at CARB, then who is responsible for it, and identify again the breadth of tools that we have to address problems in EJ communities, because as we talked about last week Berkeley, there is no equity here. And so we need to encompass all of it.
Maybe it's not -- some of this stuff isn't going to be in the scoping plan, but we need to identify where it belongs and who's supposed to be doing it, and work on it from that perspective of making sure we're as inclusive as possible wherever that is, wherever it fits, so that it gets done, because it can't just be a situation where we put stuff into the scoping plan, and then whatever doesn't fit gets left out, and ignored, and then we'll be back here 5 years from now on the next scoping plan having this same conversation.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Just because I'm a facilitator, and -- so there's been 2 kind of comments of, okay, so what do we do with the stuff that doesn't fit, what's the next steps?

I'd like the Board to kind of think about, and maybe if you have like -- so who would take the lead in doing that, and kind of identifying that and reporting it out. And you don't have to answer now, but maybe by the end of the day.

Kevin.

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: So briefly, I understand what people are saying, you know, trying to respect other agencies, local jurisdictions. The Governor came out a few years ago, and said not only are we going to do this, but we're going to use interagency cooperation as a way to
do it.

And I am going to mandate that these agencies, these 13 agencies, cooperate with each other, share information, and work together toward this shared goal that we all have. Now, I've been engaged in a lot of that. We're in meeting with these different agencies.

And by the way, I want to call out Trish Johnson while I'm here, and her boss Floyd, but Trish in particular, for arranging deep dives for the EJAC with those actual agency experts from those agencies from these various sectors, for 3 and 4 hour, if you will, just nuts and bolts of transportation, forestry, energy from all the different aspects of energy. And I think they were surprised that we were just eating it up, and crying out for more. So they actually arranged a second level of deep dives, where we could go even deeper and learn even more.

And I would recommend that to all of you, should you have that opportunity. And then going to transportation planning meetings. I had the opportunity to participate in the California transportation plan advisory that just came out for both the rural communities and the rest of California, and seeing how that is not really translating this idea of working together and taking health into all of these agencies. They're really
struggling with that, by the way.

So the leadership from this agency, which is the lead on this particular area that's -- that really embraces the Governor's vision of the work it should do, should lead them as well, should give them the queues that they need, the information that they need, and call on them for their expertise to inform that.

Now, does that -- this should have been happening right along. I assumed since it was happening with us, it was happening with you folks, too. But this is the way the scoping plan does need to be built. It needs to be built in an interagency fashion, all leading to this goal of reducing these greenhouse gases, and improving the health of our State and our world.

So the opportunity is there, the expertise is there. It's at your beck and call. One thing I found is when we ask them, they're happy to share, and happy to come over and talk about how this complicates their lives and where we can make it all work.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Katie.

EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Thank you. So I agree that -- I understand the hesitancy. Some of this is too specific and it's too local level, but there is this tension that we feel in recognizing to reach these ambitious targets, we're going to have to do everything
we've done better, and more, and even more than what we've ever done before if we're going to get anywhere close to reaching these targets.

So funny story. You know, I help run this urban ag coalition locally that just passed some ordinances, but I kill succulents. It is totally outside of my area of expertise to do urban agriculture. It's not what I do well. I can't grow anything. But I recognize a need in the community, and I made a commitment to help work with the people who do know how to do that to make it done.

So I don't think it's outside of ARB's authority to commit within the scoping plan to work with agencies who have different expertise or authority. And I also particularly don't think it's beyond the scope of the scoping plan for ARB to name when you have to work with the legislature to address authority gaps.

Say we've seen an issue. We don't have the authority to address it. We don't think other agencies have the authority to address it, and we are committing to work with the legislature to figure out how to address this issue. Those are types of commitments that I think can be made within the scoping plan, even to say, look, this isn't within AB 32, but we recognize that there's a gap and we're going to commit as ARB to making sure that that gets connected whether it's with the legislature or
with another agency.

And I want to name the agreement again. I've seen notes pop up, which I like, that I think we're all in agreement that there is a limit to what the scoping plan under SB 32 can do, but that we don't want to let that limitation stop us from naming within the scoping plan when there's opportunities for this out -- this collaboration of other programs, other agencies in the legislature that's still needed to reach the 2050 goal.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Martha, I saw your card go down, so I'm going to go to Diane.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah. I just wanted to build on what Hector said because -- and I guess what Katie was saying as well, is I would like clarification, because I -- I absolutely agree that if there are areas that the scoping plan or the agency does not have authority for, but we understand that those are things that should be done, that we -- we include those. And that's what I heard you saying to say that in order to get to our goal, we're going to need to include -- these agencies will have to take these actions.

But I also see that already in the scoping plan, and I also think that some of those things like implementation of SB 350, implementation of freight action -- the Sustainable Freight Action Plan are here and are,
to some degree, relied on in order to reach our goals. So I feel like there's inconsistency here, that we're -- that we are citing them, which is a good thing, and including them as part of our plan, but in other areas we're hesitant to do that.

And if anyone has that -- some clarification about that, that would be appreciated.

VICE CHAIR BERG: I really appreciate the level of the conversation, and I'm just wondering as we look back on when we first started the scoping plan, two generations ago, and had all of these agencies, because we knew at that time we were going to be collaborating. And it was a totally new experience for all of us. And it seems to me how do we measure what progress we have made, because when I think back at when we started the first scoping plan, there -- we really were miles apart, and it was brand new to all of us, and it seems to me that many of our State agencies have come around and are embracing quite a few different lines of thinking. They're looking at this in different ways as they're putting their programs together.

So how do we measure in a way that we can see the progress, recognize what we still need to do, and then specifically be able to say what we're going to be able to do over this next period of time, so we, in fact, see
progress rather than kind of talking about it in a way, as if we hadn't moved at all in the last 8 or 10 years?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: To Diane's question, I think it's sustainable freight is relatively new. It's less than 2 years old, and it's an official initiative from the Governor's office.

CHAIR NICHOLS: It has an Executive order that created it.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: And that's -- so it's not something we made up. It's something that we were all told you should be doing this. And so I think that's probably why it's in there, is because it's this official thing that was given to us by the Governor's office. And so these other things we're talking about, they would be us telling these other agencies thou shalt do this, or you should be doing that, and there's a sensitivity to that -- that kind of approach that I've seen at CARB.

And it's a gentle dance that needs to happen with those kind of things, where we're the ones who are taking the initiative as opposed to the Governor.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Martha.

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: Can I just --

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'm sorry. I appreciate that. And I -- I -- you know, appreciate the dance, and, you know, the Governor set the goal. And if CARB is
charged with achieving the goal -- setting out a plan to achieve the goal, and CARB can't do that alone, and there are these other agencies that need to step up, or there's other parts of the plan that need to step up -- I mean, maybe they're not the agencies, but I don't -- I don't know. I mean, maybe that's a conversation the Board needs to have about how politically sensitive is it to say these are areas that we don't have authority over, but they need to be addressed, because otherwise we don't get to the goal.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I'm all for that.

I know I said that to Kevin's point as well. We get it, but there's --

MODERATOR LUCERO: You need your mic, Hector.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: To Kevin's point as well, I -- I'm very much one of those people who wants to just, you know, let's go, but there is a sensitivity that I have experienced a few times.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: And so that doesn't mean we don't do it. It just means we have to be clever about it.

MODERATOR LUCERO: So I'm actually -- I'm going to put, as a parking lot, for us to discuss a little bit later, because I suspect it's going to come up over and
over again, is this concept of how can the scoping plan be
creative for calling out those other agencies or
authorities that are not within the purview of ARB, but
are responsive to the recommendations and the things that
EJAC is saying needs to be done?

So we need to have that conversation more. It's
going to come up throughout the sectors. I can tell you
right now. So that's going to be a discussion item for
us. So if you have comments on that, let's hold those.

And then are there any other comments or thoughts
in terms of energy, green buildings, water?

Katie I your card up.

Martha.

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: No, it was not about
that actually, so maybe I'll hold off.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Why don't you put it out here
and then we can plop it on the Board, and then we'll move
to the next one.

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: So as a
self-appointed historian, I wanted to say that the first
EJAC said several things. One, adopt standards and
regulations, because we used to say thou shalt not
pollute, it works; providing incentives, and putting a
price on carbon via a carbon fee.

And the reason that we made these
recommendations, and I think there's been some consistency
is that the trading schemes we were concerned about how
they would function, but also that it crowds out other
things that might work. And I think we keep seeing this
concept of getting stuck on an idea that may crowd out
other things that work.

Because what's working is, yeah, you give me
money, I can solve a lot of things, right, but where did
that money come from, and what else -- what are the
trade-offs for that. So I think those are really
important, and that it also -- what we need is really
an -- we said 3 things, trading schemes don't work and
they crowd out things that work; trading shifts
innovation; and offsets make things worse. And so that --
for me, that's remained very consistent.

And the other thing that we used to talk about a
lot is this idea that we have this opportunity to merge
and do what we do in the field, right? We talk about
working intersectionally, and that means around race and
gender and community. But what the means, how do -- how
do institutions like this work intersectionally?

And I personally have heard from people from the
Department of Transportation, Housing, Health, like, do
more, push more. I mean, they personally come up and said
push more, because we need to be doing this collaborative
work. And so how do we tap into the folks within those institutions that are ready to do that and are willing to take on the heavy lift of managing up within their own institutions.

MODERATOR LUCERO: So we are about 10 minutes over. Eleanor, your card is up, did you have a --

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: (Shakes head.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: Okay. If you do not have a comment, put your cards down.

We have as an action item, based on earlier, we need to figure out how to get the coordination actualized.

(Phone ringing.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: And we've got a phone going off. All right. Right next to the facilitator.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: That's me. Sorry. Sorry.

(Laughter.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: Oh, and that's what I was going to check.

So, Katie, go ahead.

EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: I wanted to respond, Sandra, to your comments about, you know, we have made progress, we have made progress. And I understand how it might be frustrating, given all of the progress that I do believe has happened at the State level with
better coordination, when you have folks like us coming in
and being like it's not happening. You know, there's
still a lot of households in Supervisor Serna's District
that have knob-and-tube electrical.

    That when you go out and talk about climate
programs, like at you and say, what climate programs? So
I think the gap that we're identifying here is due to lack
of community-based metrics, and that's what you're hearing
us call out throughout our recommendations, is that we
want community-based metrics, because all of the
coordination at the State level and the world doesn't help
if households in Supervisor Serna's district still don't
get benefit from the climate programs and policies and
visions that we're trying to set out.

    So that's one of the big gaps that we see in the
energy section of the scoping plan, and all sections
really, for that matter. It's an ongoing theme is, you
know, how do we set measurable things, so that we have a
goal. Like, Martha said, staff will meet the goal that's
set out. And so if we say, well, our goal is we want X
number of disadvantaged communities households to have
seen these types of energy improvements and these types of
reductions in their energy bills, that's how the staff
will craft the program, if that's the goal.

    And we haven't done a good enough job, I think,
of identifying those community-level impacts that we're hoping to see as a part of this big statewide plan.

VICE CHAIR BERG: And then -- and as I look at this and have been taking notes, access keeps coming to mind, is that it's the lack of access, the lack of having the opportunity. Then what also comes to mind, and I know in my own community of Boyle Heights, where do we put together the ability -- the champions who are going to champion these things and go after them, are we expecting others to come in to the community? And I know that's not a popular thought.

And so it's that grassroots and how do we develop those champions with the resources they need, the knowledge they need to be able to really spur on this community engagement, involvement, and economic development? So putting these all together. If we could come up with that, we would get a Pulitzer Prize of some sort.

(Laughter.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: So I'm going to point out, because I know based on EJAC discussions, some of the recommendations were trying to get to that, that how do we build the grassroots up, that question you just asked. So maybe one kind of homework for us to think about or hear is what is missing in that EJAC
recommendation that gets to that point of, well, this is how we see it can be done that the AR -- maybe ARB or ARB staff aren't -- aren't kind of seeing. So let's think about that.

Let's do Eleanor's question, and then move to the next sector.

Okay. It just means we have less time for the other.

So Eleanor and then Mari Rose.

EJAC MEMBER ROSE TARUC: Really. So -- so there is -- our recommendations are actually based on community experiences, particularly, you know, in this -- in this energy sector, there's so much groundwork that has been done around communities taking clean energy projects, and wanting more of that to happen in disadvantaged communities, whether some of that was generated by the green jobs movement nationally, and the funds that came through the stimulus funds, there's resources that were from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. There are -- there are -- there's -- there's both experience with projects, job training.

So even in Oakland, community colleges that have -- that have added green jobs training programs to the classes that they offer. So what's lacking is the siting of these projects and creation of these projects in
the communities, because if you want to hire locally because the projects are local, and not necessarily out in the desert, and big solar farms, but rather smaller projects distributed generation, we want -- we want that signal from the State, so that this access piece is -- the signal isn't necessarily sent yet, or it's not sent consistently.

So one of the things that we saw in the draft scoping plan, or the full draft is that there's -- there's an acknowledgement of SB 350, and the 50 percent RPS, but it's not necessarily lifting up the equity part of that, which is that there are barriers to low income folks being able to access this. And so this clean energy and the economic benefits that are part of it, and we need to actually lift that up to say in the energy sector, in our reducing our emissions from dirty fossil fuel energy is that there is a part of it that is signaling that we should create these projects and locate them in EJ communities, because there are economic opportunities that are part of it.

So there's groundwork there, and I was part of the SB 535 Coalition, now called the California Climate Equity Coalition. And there's an energy committee that included local government and community-based organizations, and worker training groups that over 2
dozen groups in there, that are trying to figure this out. And so there's groundwork we need to send the signals, both in energy and the other sectors.

MODERATOR LUCERO: We are way over to next one.

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: All right. Really quickly. I just want to make it really clear. The issue in terms of cap and trade -- again, this is my issue. I would love to hear or see more and have a robust debate with my colleagues, and maybe people who have experience in this field. But the fact is I really don't want the successes of, for instance, my community being diminished in which, you know, I've got a training program we were able to do as a result of that money.

And it's not about just the money. It's actually about how we're using cap and trade as a tool to start building greater capacity in a county where no one was really working it.

And it's been a huge, huge benefit to our community. And I'd have a hard time talking to our volunteers and our community saying that it was not a benefit to them. So how do I talk to them?

MODERATOR LUCERO: So it sounds like we've got --

EJAC MEMBER ROSE TARUC: I mean, it will lead to the industry discussion also. I think there's -- there is confusion around the funds for climate benefits and
greenhouse gas reduction that could come from cap and trade, it could come from a carbon tax, it could come from a carbon fee that there are those benefits, and that there is -- there is benefits -- then there's the program itself that is about reducing emissions and improving air quality. And that is different than the additional benefits that are supposed to come from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund.

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: But that's not true for my community though. That is not true for my community.

EJAC MEMBER ROSE TARUC: Well, I think there are environmental justice communities --

MODERATOR LUCERO: Eleanor, Mari Rose, so we need to focus on the issues. What I'm hearing from Eleanor is there are some benefits you are experiencing that address some of the issues with cap and trade. What I'm hearing from Mari Rose is there may be benefits. It may not need to just come from cap and trade --

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: I'm not saying that -- it's part of the tools --

MODERATOR LUCERO: Mic. So part -- cap and trade is part of the tools that you're utilizing.

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: Yes.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Okay. So let's -- let's emphasize on what you're seeing that works and then what
you're seeing that's not working, and so we can have the
dialogue and figure out what would be the best path
forward.

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: I don't want to diminish
what my colleagues are saying. What I also don't want to
do is diminish the real benefits I've seen on the ground
with the communities.

MODERATOR LUCERO: So let's just quickly, those
benefits are job training --

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: Josh training, capacity
building, volunteers, actual tree planting programs,
because that's what we're doing, actual engagement of
community, like a climate change task force that's being
organized at this point, the ability to start
understanding how you sequester carbon, and making active
decisions.

We're actually changing business as usual. We've
included now in our community, right now, ten cities as
well as 3 school districts right now who are seeking to
come get trees planted in their area. We've seen an increase
in our volunteer roles from 300 to now 850 people.

I mean, people are really excited in my
community, and this gave us an ability to be able to
really express what was the full scope of things we needed
to look at.
Not only that, but we have a real community trying to engage in this discussion in terms of what we want to see in the scoping plan. And, I mean, we have an unusual -- we have a remarkable perspective, given the fact that we are working shoulder to shoulder with our communities to get the scoping plan out to them and the dialogue.

I don't want to go and make a decision for my community without talking to them first about the benefits or the liabilities of cap and trade, or any other strategic tools that we're using at hand.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Okay. Now, Mari Rose, you mentioned that some of your concerns are going to be really well dictated in industry. So let's get to that. Phil, a quick comment on this dialogue in terms of green or -- okay.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: It's going to take 15 seconds.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Go for it.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: So I just -- for the scribe in the room that wrote down there, "How can the scoping plan respond to components outside of our purview?" I just want to put a finer point on that. Could it include fed, State, local utilities, nonprofits?

MODERATOR LUCERO: Perfect. Thank you.
Okay. We'll keep adding on those. Yeah, great.
All right. So Sandra yours is up, but can we
move to industry?

VICE CHAIR BERG: (Nods head.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: Great.

VICE CHAIR BERG: And Judy actually had her card
up.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Judy, go ahead really quickly.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: It seems like one of the
issues that we're addressing is how do we take the broad
principles that are in the scoping plan, and the ideas
that are here on the table from your -- from the EJAC
community and actually get them working in the
communities? I mean, how do we get them filtered down.
And Eleanor has done it.

But let me suggest that local government is a way
to get there. Both Phil and I represent local government.
And there are city officials, county officials, there are
councils of government, which are part of the State
structure that consist of cities. And they get together
and do plans for their region.

In my region, there is the South Bay
Environmental Services Center, and that's what they do.
They go out and they help restaurants clean up and make
sure they're recycling, make sure that they're keeping the
parking lots clean for -- so we don't have water polluted into our storm drains.

But they also make use of what is called a public goods charge that's on every utility bill. And they've worked with Edison to get those funds into their program, then to reuse to do building efficiency. They did retrofits on the college campus of Dominguez College. They retrofitted all of the dormitories, and they did water conservation in those buildings, a number of things to make those buildings efficient.

So there are those entities out there that can be utilized. And maybe we're not using them enough, but that's just a suggestion from somebody who represents local government.

MODERATOR LUCERO: And I'm going to tag this again for the Board to think of what role the scoping plan can play in utilizing those other resources, or at least calling them out, because I think that was mentioned earlier as well.

Luis, we are 20 minutes past time for industry -- into industry. Is it quick or can it be moved to another one?

Quick.

EJAC MEMBER OLMEDO: I just wanted to also bring to this discussion about cities, not specifically to all
the discussion, but I always try to plug it in where the
disadvantage isn't just individual that lives in these
conditions. I work and live in a community that the
disadvantaged in the city, disadvantaged in our utility,
disadvantaged is in the business. So I just wanted to
bring -- shed some light to that.

MODERATOR LUCERO: That's an important one on the
local of -- limitations of that authority and power.
Okay. So let's move on to industry. As I said,
we're 20 minutes over on that, but we don't want to cut
that time.

So, Mari Rose, are you doing the overview?

EJAC MEMBER ROSE TARUC: I will start off, and
then any members of the industry work group, anti-industry
work group can chime in.

(Laughter.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: Go for it.

EJAC MEMBER ROSE TARUC: So to us, the vision for
our recommendations around cleaning up industry and
emissions from there is really to imagine a transformative
change, a transformative change because what we see in EJ
communities right now is there's still oil drilling in
south L.A., in Kern County. We're seeing the
transportation of these -- the oil and gas through rail,
and pipelines that some call them bomb trains, and these
pipelines that leak to refine -- oil refineries in Richmond, in Wilmington that explode, and are also trying to expand their facilities, because there are tar sands in Canada that are available.

I mean, the -- the fight by the Standing Rock Tribe and the national attention that that has around really keeping fossil fuels in the ground, because they -- drilling for them or putting pipelines in our communities, and certainly refining them, and releasing them into the atmosphere is catastrophic. And we need to stop doing that.

And so we want to see transformative change in the communities that exist in California right now that are experiencing these impacts, and that we need a mechanism to reel in these industrial emissions for the improvement of these communities, and the workers that are in them. And the way -- what we're seeing the scoping plan, the way it's written is that it's -- it's -- we're seeing the staff or people at ARB are having a hard time imagining something different than this -- this dirty industrial process, and that it's more about tinkering at the edges.

So right now, the preferred scenario that staff is offering is, you know, well, let's tinker at the edges and maybe we can reduce emissions from refineries by 20
percent. We want transformation. These facilities have health -- they harm kids and families that are living fence line to them. And so we want to imagine something different.

And I think the earlier comments about being open to other possibilities around how we reduce the largest industrial stationary and mobile emissions need -- need that kind of vision. And so what we're seeing in the initial studies that were presented by OEHHA a couple weeks ago, and then a few months ago by the academics, including -- the Cushing Report, we -- one is we need better data. That data -- there's huge data gaps.

And then with what they can see, there's strong correlations between GHGs and criteria toxics pollutants. We also see that offsets are actually outsourcing our emissions reductions from California, because over 75 percent of offsets are out of state, and that we are seeing the perpetration of racism in California, because a lot of the facilities that are actually increasing their emissions are in environmental justice communities that have higher proportion of black, brown, and Asian folks.

And so what we need to see is an emphasis on prioritization of emissions in EJ communities, no matter which mechanism we choose, moving forward towards 2030. And we need to address where we're seeing this with
urgency.

Oh, and part of this whole -- when Martha was talking about the scale -- so AB 32 to us has this promise of reducing emissions. And so those are benefits that we're seeing. And, you know, the -- the investments, you know, whether in urban, forestry, and others we're seeing benefits. But then there are design flaws that we're seeing in the cap-and-trade system that are then contributing to the harms.

So if offsets are primarily -- the emissions are primarily outside of California that seemingly over 95 percent of the allowances are given freely to polluters, that it's an economy-wide cap, instead of a facility cap, and the lack of co-pollutant data that we're seeing that researchers can't even find right now, that those are all harms that -- and burdens that is tipping the scales away from our mission for environmental justice.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Thank you.

I've got Katie, Judy, Eleanor.

Katie.

EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yeah, to carry-over on Mari Rose's point, when you go on to the adaptive management tool and you circle communities like Eleanor's, you circle communities like the ones my nephews living in in Kern County, the emissions -- the covered
emissions are going up. And so I think our biggest
imperative right now is to get on the same page that the
system the way it's designed is not working the way we had
hoped, that we had hoped that we'd be proven wrong.

You know, we'd hoped that the cap-and-trade
system might result in the type of reductions and
innovation that we all hoped it would. And what we're
seeing is that it's not, and particularly not in some of
our most underserved areas. And that, to us, is a really
strong sense of urgency. It's an early indicator that
requires action.

Second, I want to emphasize the need for just
transition investments, because when we talk about
tinkering around the edges, we're missing the fact that in
the future, we want totally different industrial jobs.
Like, I want the people in the avenues in Oak -- what is
that -- where is noise coming from. Is that -- okay.
Thank you.

Someone is calling me. I know I'm doing really
well.

We want a just transition to a new industry. And
so like the Next 10 report that came out about the Central
Valley that talked about benefit to our communities,
right? And it talked about all these jobs that were
growing in the Central Valley, when you looked at the
methodology of that report, those were industry jobs. Those were more people that went to high school with me in Oildale that were going to work out in oil fields, than they were before the program started.

So again, something else that's not working the way we hoped it would. We'd hoped that we would see increases in jobs in these communities for clean jobs, for clean industry, for those types of investments.

And so I think -- I want to talk about it in terms of like how do we start imagining what the new industry looks like, and what mechanism will get us the type of innovation and investments to get closer to that new industry, rather than worrying so much about keeping jobs that are putting people's lives and health and danger across -- communities across the State.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Eleanor, you went down, so -- okay. Diane.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah. Just quickly, I want to be sure that we're not confusing -- I mean, this was the danger, I think, when the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund started. And I think that we need to really be clear. And I think this is partly in the industry section, partly in the investment section that whatever market mechanism is selected, if there's revenue that's generated, there has to be a decision about where those
revenues should go.

And I'll always support that those revenues should go to the communities that are most impacted by greenhouse gas emissions and by pollution. The city of National City where our office is received $9,000,000 from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund in order to complete a affordable housing project that as abandoned by the redevelopment program that the Governor ended.

So good use of dollars, but never on the backs of communities that continue to suffer, and have increase in emissions of greenhouse gases.

So let's be sure that we're separating those issues. We cannot confuse benefits that our communities absolutely should get, more money for affordable housing, more money for clean energy, more money to improve the quality of life, so that people can actually have homes that solar panels would actually work on.

Most of the homes in the west side of National City will not support solar panels, because they're so poorly constructed. So we have a long way to go, but I we have to separate those conversations. And our goal is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce them, first, from the places -- from the sources that are the most troublesome.

And I think we've heard a description of that.
And if there's revenue derived from whatever program we
develop, then we should determine - and I think we've gone
a long way in that way - to how those dollars should be
allocated, and what we hope jobs will be created as a
result of that.

Let's not intermix those 2 things. We have --
that's -- we have -- our goal is to reduce the greenhouse
gas emissions and air pollution. So I hope we can kind of
stay on that on the industry side.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Martha.

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGUELLO: One of the -- you
know, we often talk about, at our organization, being the
public health voice for the new economy. And our allies
are talking about a transformative economy, an unextracted
economy. And I know that's beyond our scope, right? But
it isn't something we all -- I would venture that all of
us know that at some point we're going to have to be
serious.

From a policy standpoint, are what are the
building blocks to get us there, right, and what is the
resources that have to be shifted?

And so, for those -- and so we're impatient,
right? And so we know that we bring you things that
you're like what are you talking about, right? This is
not what we do. This isn't how we do it, but we feel that
urgency of now, right?

And so the folks who are sick in all of our communities, the folks who are suffering from dis-investment, and -- or who never got any dis -- who were never invested in in the first place, right? So you feel that urgency in and what we're doing.

But I want to know at -- when? And if not you, who have now sort of been charged with this in someway, right, when do we start having that conversation? And my fear is that -- or my anxiety -- well, both fear and anxiety, right, that the funds that we currently have are not going to be able to do that, right?

How do we tell refinery workers, you know what, we're going to create a trust fund for you, because you're 45, and we may not be able to train you for another job, and we know that that's true. But what are we going to do, right? Because those social costs of those refineries, we all have created and borne, right?

It's like I can hate capitalism, but I really like shopping.

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGUELLO: So I know those contradictions, right? I'm just saying that there are contradictions, right?

So we want to be partners with you in this grand
vision. And, you know what, in this grand vision, yes, there will be things that we're going to tell the legislature, that they also need to do.

But unless -- unless we find an institutional partner, we're going to be the crazy people throwing stuff at you, right? But we're not crazy. I mean -- and now we know -- we know that, because a lot of the things that we said would happen have happened.

And so that's the -- in terms of industry, those are the -- so when we go to talk to people in Wilmington, they just want it to stop, right? And the rest of us are like, well, how are we going to drive our cars, how are we going to do this?

Well, that question has to be asked. And we have all these other plans, right? Going full solar, all these other things, but there still isn't how are we going to tell a worker that we're going to protect you, and where is the revenue for that, and who is going to pay -- you know, I say that the richest industry in the world should be able to pay for that, but, you know, that's just me.

Yeah I'm going to stop there, because I can babble. But I just -- I guess I want you to know that what we're asking is big and visionary, and we're saying we can help you make that happen.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I don't know if this
gets to that point, but it's definitely about industry and about green jobs, which has been talked about quite a bit. UCLA is doing study, even as we speak, they started last fall, on green jobs, because we don't have our arms around the big picture of what are the green jobs, how many are there, where are they, et cetera?

I expect that, at some point this year, we'll get those results. And that will -- to me, is take-off point for this conversation. We have pieces of it, little statistics, or factoids, or whatever, but we don't have a big picture of what is it? And I think that will be very, very helpful.

They're talking to labor. They're talking to government -- other government agencies, not just to us. They're reaching out and trying to have as comprehensive a picture of green jobs as possible. That gives us an idea of what's their today and things that are promising, in terms of things that there are today.

But going forward, those replacement things that you're talking about we just don't know. You know, there's a refinery in Paramount, one city over from where I live, that is now doing jet fuel that is renewable jet fuel. It's taking waste stuff and it's not oil based, and biofuel -- thank you. And they've flown, you know, a United Airlines flight from LAX to San Francisco. I'm
sure they've done many, many since -- since last spring
when they did the first one.

They're selling to the military for their jets.
And that is a refinery, except they're fining stuff in
good -- better stuff into the fuel. And so that could be
a promising thing for those refinery workers. We don't
know. And so as this thing kind of plays itself out, I
think what we're going to try to do is to identify those
things that are working in the markets and encourage
those.

And, you know, whatever we know today, we'll
encourage today. Whatever we know a year from now, we'll
encourage those, and we'll just keep going as we go along.
But I think -- that's the way I perceive it to play out,
because we just don't know sitting here today how we're
going to get there.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. We have about 5
minutes left for this conversation. I've got John,
Eleanor and then Mary.

John.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Thanks. I just wanted to
follow up. I think the challenge for all of us, right, is
how develop -- it's really a couple of tiers here. One is
the larger program to reduce greenhouse gas emissions with
also revenue priority to impacted communities, but also
looking at the specific toxic and criteria regulations at the local level.

And I say this as someone who lives in Richmond, grew up in Richmond -- pardon?

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Just say who you are.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Oh, I'm John Gioia. I serve on the Air Resources Board. I apologize for being late. I drove up from the Bay Area from some other meetings. And I also serve on the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Board and represent the Richmond area on the Contra Costa Board of Supervisors.

So I -- let me just say, I acknowledge and understand the urgency for people who live in cities like Richmond, like myself. I had to pick up my son in the middle of shelter in place at the Chevron refinery. I understand what it feels like to have to pick up your own child, while there's a shelter in place going and an -- and a release at a refinery. So I know that there's great urgency to this.

So I think -- and I agree with the comment that we should prioritize the revenue from cap and trade for those communities that are most impacted. I do think we need to acknowledge that the Air Resources Board can have a large role, but won't necessarily have the only or maybe even the most important role on reducing toxics in local
communities. I think there's an important role for ARB to play, because frankly a lot of the specific regulatory authority are at the local air districts, like where I serve, and we are enacting regulation after regulation to decrease toxics, and criteria pollutants around facilities. And sometimes, a very specifically crafted toxics revolution -- it should be a revolution, actually.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yes, it's a revolution.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Maybe that was the right word.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: And by the way, you know, someone said we shouldn't call our regulations regulations, let's call them protections, because then when people say do away with regulations. That sounds like that's a good thing. That's doing away with protections. And in this case, it's protections for the community, protections of our public health, protections of our clean air.

So we've passed a number of crafted sort of protection measures, I'll call them, at the local level to specifically reduce toxics and criteria pollutants around industrial facilities. So I think it's about how the Air
Board also works with local air districts to craft, you know, surgical measures that actually achieve these reductions, because I think some of the most effective -- in my 4 years -- 10 years -- or 11 years on the air district, and I realize there are different air districts around the State, which -- with different levels of political will to do that.

I think in the Bay Area we have been pretty progressive about trying to do that. We're trying to do more. So maybe CARB's role in having some more uniform regulations around the State -- it's not fair to some communities who live in one air district to maybe have less protective measures for their community than folks who live around a similar facility that happens to be in a different air district, right?

So maybe that's the role CARB can play, so that people around the State aren't at the mercy of whatever the local air district is and have unequal health standards. So I'm just saying it's sort of a -- it's complicated, right? And having the -- but the Air Board is not going to be the be-all end-all. It can do a lot, and it -- but it can partner or set standards with local air districts. So I just wanted to add that. And I -- so the partnership of doing this I think is really important.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Eleanor and then Mary.
EJAC MEMBER TORRES: I just want to reiterate. I think it would be really good, and I'm certainly open to any thing that you and my colleagues or anybody else would give me. In terms of the list and the literature review, I recommend it again. I sent that to Trish, and maybe, at some point, she can send it to everybody else, as well as my comments having to do with OEHHA.

MODERATOR LUCERO: So let's put that just as an action item that lit review will be passed away -- around to the EJAC, as well as throughout Air Resources Board, so that you know that that lit review has been reviewed, and the analysis of OEHHA, and then we can discuss further.

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: Well, I think more importantly too is I want to have informed discussions, so I can bring that back to my community, and engage them in those discussions.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Thank you, Eleanor.

And then Mary, and then Hector just walked out.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I want to build on John Gioia's remarks, which I completely agree with. So in the context of this discussion, I think we do want to put up on the board that talks about where we go from here, how we can make sure that districts across the State are implementing the very best in the way of toxics controls for the benefit of communities that live around the most -- the
most egregious facilities.

I did want to say something else about the oil refinery situation though. And this is really to Martha's kind of big picture comment, because I've actually given quite a lot of thought to the question of the future and how you get there in the least disruptive way possible.

And I've been on the receiving end as -- you know, as a public official of a lot of the mobilizations that the oil industry does every time we try to impact their operations in any way. And I do think that the thing that is having the greatest effect on their planning, and their investments, and their decisions about perhaps actually looking more seriously at alternative energy is the work that we're doing to try to get people into transportation that doesn't use any of their current product.

I mean, the thing that's making -- even though it's tiny, there -- the fear that they have of, you know, massive increase in electrified transportation, not just passenger cars, but buses and trucks and trains and all of that, is really the thing that's impacting their planning for the future. And so I do want to see us doing a better job in the scoping plan, and elsewhere, of articulating that connection and that policy direction.

VICE CHAIR BERG: So I really hesitated to jump
in here a little bit, because what I worry about, truly worry about, is expectation. And when I hear expectation of green jobs, I get the impression that there might be a thought that there is an economic society somewhere that has jobs that somehow doesn't involve any risk or has some ability to be able to take place day after day that everybody likes and everybody is comfortable with and so forth.

And even in these green jobs, I'm listening to Hector describe this biofuels, and I'm picturing how that whole process is happening. And even though I think it absolutely will be healthier, it's still going to be a hard job. I think about all the electricity we're going to be needing, and pulling these wires, and updating things, and stuff. These are still hard jobs.

I'm just wondering if we can frame the importance of economic development around lifting up jobs that are good wage, fair, clean, good -- best practices, things that people would be proud to participate. I think of my own business and we're in the chemical field, but I'll tell you, I have a workforce that really loves to be there. And we do a lot of things to protect our workers, but we still use hazardous chemicals.

And so I guess I would just offer in the discussion, as we're framing these types of things up, to
think about specifically, so that when these jobs -- we can create them, that we can say this is success.

And so thank you.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Can I add on to the jobs issue, at the right time, after -- at the right time.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Yeah. We are at time for this, and I know I have 3, so each of you about minute or less. And I've got Luis, Kevin, and then John.

Luis.

EJAC MEMBER OLMEDO: I think it's important to clarify what jobs are, because I know earlier we were talking about metrics and whether there's one metric for all communities. And I think to some extent there is. There are some unique metrics that need to be in place.

But just an example, I live in an agriculture community. Over 100 years of policies that support that industry, low income, disadvantaged communities, a target for a different type of interest, more heavy industry, more chemically intense industry.

By mitigating those pollutants, contaminants, greenhouse gases, you do create green jobs. So I think it's not just about setting up a solar field or wind or other, I think there's a lot of green jobs that are created by making sure that we are reducing those contaminants, or putting operators in place to operate
those and building the capacity.

Sorry.

MODERATOR LUCERO: That's fine.

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: So when I think of -- I appreciate your comments there, Ms. Berg, because I've done a lot of jobs in my life, and -- starting with working on the family dairy farm that's been there for 250 years. My family came over here in 1714 interestingly enough.

But also then being in the Navy, and talking to my friend Kevin in the hallway there finding out we're both Machinist Mates in the Navy, so, you know, we work pretty hard, as you can imagine.

And then my first job coming out was actually in the steel mile I was talking about that went out of business, because what happened is it couldn't keep up with the future. And the Japanese were learning to build steel with electricity, and we still using blast furnaces, which, you know, create all the pollution that we're talking about versus the electricity.

So your chemical industry as an example, I'm sure you take great care of your workers, and it's a great place to work, and they've got a good job. And I'm also equally sure, because of your position here, that you make sure that the waste you're talking about is appropriately
dealt with, and doesn't become a hazard to the community around it. We will always need those things. This table here, this folio, all this stuff here, we need all this stuff. And it's not a pretty process to make most of it.

So when I think about jobs, I don't call them green jobs. I call them good jobs that come from a green energy industry. So it's creating another industry. It's going to create a lot of reductions in the amount of insults that we have to deal with from industry as a whole that doesn't take the kind of care you do with your industry.

So that's what I'm -- when I'm talking about jobs, I really hesitate to use the word green jobs, but that's really what I -- what I mean when I'm talking about it. I think you mean the same thing, right?

VICE CHAIR BERG: I do with all of the comments.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I think this discussion of jobs is important. And again, ARB is not going to be the total be all on this, I think -- but it is about how the State can work together among its various agencies with local governments to develop the transition. I think people call it the just transition. I think we can get caught up labeling it green jobs, or this job. It's basically the jobs that are going to develop as this energy system shifts away from a fossil fuel based system,
right, whatever they are.

Some of them will be industrial type jobs to support a new renewable source of energy. But whatever it is, it's trying to understand what training skills are needed, so that we could help train individuals for the new jobs that will become available. I hear from folks in my own district, folks who are trained to install solar, who are looking for more opportunities to install solar, to individuals who work in a refinery who say, okay, what skills can I have to transition if it's going to be a non-refinery job well off in the future.

I just -- I think we need to respect that we want to help those -- if there are going to be less jobs in the existing sort of fossil fuel sector over time, how do we help folks transition to other jobs, and then how do we help new people coming into the job market for the newly developing. And so I really think it's going -- it's a larger discussion than just this climate -- the climate change plan. It's how we sort of work together generally as the -- this is a changing economy. It goes even beyond our energy system. So we're a part of that discussion.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Diane, do you have less than a minute on jobs?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Okay. Because we are over --
or sorry, industry. Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. I just wanted to
lift up 2 things. One, I received the staff briefing for
the scoping plan presentation that will be made tomorrow,
yesterday, and was appreciative of a description of an
analysis of the cap-and-tax alternative. And I thought
that that would be helpful for the folks that are here
today to hear about, because I was heartened by some of
the research and analysis that was going on there. And I
thought that it -- because Emily, who was doing the
briefing, talked about a cap on all sectors and that there
would have to be development for that.

And I thought it corresponded well with the use
of the loading order for industry sectors that is in the
EJAC recommendations, that we're talking about a cap on
all industry sectors in priority order in terms of their
emissions.

So, one, I wanted to hear from staff if there's
something that you can provide to all of us on the
cap-and-tax analysis that you're doing, and perhaps then
from EJAC on the loading order recommendation.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Do we have any thoughts from
staff or -- go ahead, Richard.

INDUSTRIAL STRATEGIES ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF
SAHOTA: Hello, is this mic on?
I'm back here. It's Rajinder back here.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: This was a long-winded way of --

INDUSTRIAL STRATEGIES ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF SAHOTA: I found a mice that works back here.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: -- punting to Emily our economist -- Rajinder.

INDUSTRIAL STRATEGIES ASSISTANT DIVISION CHIEF SAHOTA: We're here. So based at the January 20 -- 27th Board hearing, there was a request that we do more -- provide more information on the cap-and-tax scenario. And we went back and we took what was already in the scoping plan, the proposed plan, and we fleshed out the details. And we did a preliminary analysis of the economics, the macroeconomics of that analysis, which we presented at the workshop on February 9th.

What we really did in that scenario is we looked across all sectors of the economy. So this is energy transportation industry, recycling and waste, agriculture, and high global warming gases. And we said if we want to get from to 2020 -- the estimated values in 2020 and get to 2030, what does that look like? So let's make everyone fair partners in this effort.

What we did was we realized that that indicates a 4.5 year-over-year decrease in each of these sectors.
What you'd have to do is take that 4.5 percent year-over-year decline and translate that into individual facilities, individual entities, fuel suppliers, natural gas suppliers, and the State.

So there's additional work that would have to be done to actually design that measure and actually implement it, but we fleshed it out in a way that allows us to do the economic analysis to the same level of detail that we've done for the proposed plan, and for carbon tax, and all direct regulations.

One of the challenges with the 4.5 year percent -- 4.5 percent year-over-year decline is, there's some sectors that really can't do that year over year. So if through the process of actually having to try and design this, we realizes that some of those sectors can't do this, you're going to be asking other sectors to do more.

And when you're looking at 4.5 percent, year after year, and there's no flexibility in being able to carry-over some extra credit from year 1 to year 2, because you're really asking them to do it continuously, so you have the continuous potential co-benefits, where you end up is a lot of businesses not investing in and keeping that industry or those jobs in California.

And as we think about modeling that, what we're
seeing is you're looking at a 25 percent reduction in fuel use at some of the industry in the State. On top of that, you're looking at 10 to 15 percent electrification, and you're still not getting the 4.5 percent year over year reductions.

So we did flesh this out. We have done the preliminary analysis. We will go over it tomorrow, because I know Board Member Takvorian is really interested in this one. But we are seeing some challenges here, and I think it's important that we remember that there's multiple objectives that we're trying to balance here, but we are seeing some challenges really in -- and is it even doable to ask everyone to go -- to go and reduce 4.5 percent year over year?

MODERATOR LUCERO: So I'm not going to let you guys put your cards up for this one, but we can come back to it if we need to. We're going to do a public comment. I've got 3 public comments. You are limited to 1 to 2 minutes with the caveat that after your public comment we're going to a break.


Okay. Mic is coming to you. Sean, you've got 1 to 2 minutes.

MR. PENRITH: Thank you. Sean Penrith with the
Climate Trust in Portland, Oregon. So two really important comments I heard. One was from Martha Argüello and the other one was Luis Olmedo.

You made the point about there's not enough money to go around for environmental protection, which is a good one. And Martha said health comes first. And there's really 2 lungs that we're talking about here, one being the human lung and the other being the natural lung.

So the Climate Trust in Oregon is 20 years old. We've run one of the oldest offset programs in the country. Because of our investment into offsets, we've been able to stimulate rural economies, many of the projects that we invest in are in disadvantaged communities. We're losing 26 million acres of forest between now and 2030.

If we don't have the offset mechanism, we cannot attract the finance that we need. Many jurisdictions are short on their public balance sheets. We at the Climate Trust have an impact fund where we are attracting outside institutional capital. If we didn't have the offset mechanism, none of that capital would be available.

Thank you.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Thank you.

Shelly Sullivan, raise your hand. Over here on the this side of the room.
MS. SULLIVAN: Is this on?

Hi. Shelly Sullivan with the Climate Change Policy Coalition. And I think this is a really important discussion that we're having today. But my question actually goes back to a process and timing question. I think that -- and maybe this is going to be addressed in the next agenda item of discussion of how addressing the EJAC recommendations, and maybe -- so maybe I'm putting the cart before the horse.

But -- so I think stakeholders want to know when we are commenting on the January 20th, 2017 draft, are we only commenting on that draft? And then what happens if some of these Environmental Justice Advisory Committee recommendations get put into this scoping plan? Is there going to be another version and another time for us to take a look at that new plan and make comments on that? And does that push back the further Board approval of the scoping plan?

Thanks.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Under 2 minutes, excellent.

So let's have that as a question we'll do after public comments in terms of process. We'll get to that one.

Kevin Jefferson.

Where is Kevin?
Tim Tutt.
Over here on this side of the room.

MR. TUTT: Good. Hello. Good afternoon. Is this on?

Yes. Okay. I just wanted to say I think we all, in this room, support the goals of the environmental justice community. We want more health, better health for the disadvantaged communities. We want the benefits to be spread through all of our State, not just to areas where, you know, are not disadvantaged.

What I would say is that I think that the opposition to the Cap-and-Trade Program is misplaced. And what I would give as an example, I spoke at a Board meeting where I said this period what we just went through is too unusual, and too short to make long-term conclusions about the success of the Cap-and-Trade Program on any of those aspects.

And I wanted to go back to in the January Board meeting, there was a presentation about the ARB's 2017 goals. And in that presentation, there was a chart that showed diesel PM -- diesel PM reductions from 1990 to 2015.

And in that chart, there were 3 separate periods for 2 or 3 years where those diesel emissions trended up. Whereas overall, there was an 85 percent reduction over
time. So imagine what would have happened if somebody came in at the end of one of those 3-year periods and said this program isn't working. We need to throw it out and start over again. We wouldn't be getting to that 85 percent reduction, I can guarantee you.

So that's my comment.

MODERATOR LUCERO: All right. Thank you. Thank you for our public, and also thank you for sticking to the time. I know that can be a little daunting and stressful.

So we are at 4:10 on that clock -- okay, 4:12 on that clock. We're going to come back at 4:28, just a little before 4:30. If you dawdle longer, we have less time to talk.

So we'll see you back here. Thank you, all. There is refreshments in the back. Bathrooms are that way.

(Off record: 4:13 p.m.)
(Thereupon a recess was taken.)
(On record: 4:28 p.m.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: All right. Let's come back to the able and reconvene.

The time we take to get to the table is time that we don't have to discuss.

Please make your way back to the table.

All right take your seats, and start back up.
We are officially 22 minutes behind schedule, so let's start -- I know there's a couple people filtering back in. And hopefully, it's not the people we need to present the next section.

(Laughter.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: We are on transportation. All right. Kevin, go ahead.

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: All right. Thank you very much. I'm trying to strip this down a little, but -- so with transportation, we had sort of these overarching principles. I just wanted to briefly mention where we really see a California where all communities can breathe clean air and have access to safe, affordable, clean transportation options.

And we want to make sure that that transportation planning and the activities are inextricably linked to public health. So, you know, that's enough said about that.

We've talked about access. That includes, of course, to transportation technologies and clean transportation technologies, and making sure we have meaningful investments in these disadvantaged communities. By the way, I want to see meaningful investments in every community in California, just to be clear.

(Laughter.)
EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: But we do say that the people who have suffered the most should probably come first. But yet, we do want to see it for everyone. I'm not somehow suggesting that I don't want to see health across California, and no one in this room is.

So let's never forget that, that because we are advocates for environmental justice communities doesn't mean that we don't think of our whole state as the place we live and our neighbors who we want to see realize these same benefits. So let's just be clear about that.

But again, these communities have suffered the most for the longest. And while I sympathize and empathize with my friend Eleanor, I will say this, that while I do honor everything that's happened there and I don't suggest that we don't in any way, shape, or form. However, not all of our communities in California have felt that same -- that same relief or experienced those same benefits.

So we want to see how that can be expanded, so that we all get it. And that may be one option, cap and trade. It may be cap and tax. It may be whatever, but we honor it all, right? And that's what we're about. So I don't think anybody is suggesting that.

We really want to see better coordination. Transportation is the one place, besides energy, where
this coordination between the agencies really has to happen. And it thrilled me to see a cooperative between CEC, CTC, and ARB. So I was really thrilled to see that. And that needs to continue.

And then we want to see these impacts happen and be measured at the community level, and driven by robust community presence -- participation. So additional -- more specific points. We support -- and I'm part of CCFC, full disclosure, and a huge believer -- central California -- or excuse me, central California. California Clean Freight Coalition.

And we want to see not only the Sustainable Freight Program happen in port communities and communities adjacent to port. But keep in mind, here's the San Joaquin Valley. We are the central freight corridor for the region and for the western United States.

It pretty much passes through us, if it's not coming to us. And so these last mile and drayage truck projects, and electrification of trucks stops and all this stuff. We really want to see these pilots happen in our region as well.

And I'm just going to give a shout out for Northern California, because I know those folks feel pretty abandoned at times as well, so again, all of California. It would be great to see a project in
Susanville, right? I'm sure they would appreciate that, and Eureka and Crescent City. So we need to really keep thinking about all these communities in all of California. And then we support and strongly suggest you increase the Local Carbon Fuel Standard. And we want to strengthen, especially through transportation, through ARB the SB 375 targets, and the accountability that goes with that. We don't feel that some of these communities, and I can speak for counties in my own valley, who have unfortunately chosen not to set aggressive targets. And there's no way to hold them accountable for that at this point. So we need to build that into this process, so there is some accountability there, so an extra freeway lane doesn't count as your greenhouse gas contribution to your SCS target that you've set.

So we need to clean that up. We support SB 350 and its study findings. We think that needs to keep growing, and we need to see these barriers to accessing this clean technology and mobility options overcome. And we need to see the unique barriers in rural and other small communities out in the desert, up in the mountains addressed and managed.

And I'm going to leave it there, because, you know, we've got a larger list, but I think that's enough said for right now.
MODERATOR LUCERO: Okay. I noticed that Kevin started looking away from where he could see the red sign. (Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: You're right. I was getting a complex there. You're right. (Laughter.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: I will sand in front of you, if I have to, guys. I want to make sure you get to all your points. Katie.

EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: A couple of additional points on Kevin's points. Thank you, Kevin. First with the Low Carbon Fuels Standard, and I know we'll talk about this more with natural and working lands, making sure that an increase the Low Carbon Fuel Standard is not from vie a biofuels. We'd like to see that from renewable electric sources. And that's a point, again, that Tom will cover more.

And then the second point, just because I'm personal pretty passionate about it, and I mentioned it at the Board hearing, but I just want to make sure it doesn't get lost. Within local action, there's this program that would create a system run by CAPCOA that would allow for developers to purchase GHG offset credits for when their projects will increase VMT beyond the level that's
mitigatable.
And I think that's one very clear example of something within the scoping plan right now that is directly contrary to the intent of what we're trying to do with land use and SB 375 and our other targets. And I'd like to see that expressly taken out. And it's a recommendation we made back in December, but just pointing that out.

EJAC MEMBER FONG: We're kind of cleaning up Kevin's comments. Okay. We're adding to it.

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: The red sign. The red sign.

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER FONG: I know. So he ran out of time. We're extending out time. So just to add a little bit more specific detail to the comment about paying more attention to investments in rural communities, we specifically were -- we thought it was important to really look at the infrastructure necessary for the electrification of vehicles that go through the rural communities, whether that is for freight transportation or for personal or public transportation.

MODERATOR LUCERO: All for gaining time, but I also want to make sure we have an opportunity to talk. Since I don't see cards, I will point out that when the
EJAC did review the discussion draft of the scoping plan, the transportation section was the section where they found there was the most incorporation of their items. However, there's still more, as you heard a couple of the comments here.

So any thoughts in terms of those EJAC recommendations that didn't make it into the discussion or scoping -- the scoping plan -- proposed scoping plan? You know, maybe they're fitting into some of these parking lot items we have for later discussion.

Any thoughts?

Maybe the EJAC can mention some of the item they didn't see?

Kemby[sic].

EJAC MEMBER SHAKUR: You called me Kemby. That's cute.

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER SHAKUR: I just want to emphasize the green infrastructure as part of these transportation projects. Because in the City of Oakland, it's like as soon -- I think it has a lot to do with our bureaucracy, but as soon as transportation hits Oakland, say like BART, there's not a whole lot of green infrastructure. And then once it leaves Oakland, still -- I mean, once it leaves Oakland, it is.

Thank you.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Any other thoughts? Do we want to go on to another sector?

Great. John.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Just really quickly to respond to, I think, Katie's good point. I would agree that, you know, there may be some really compelling reason why we would allow offsets when VMT targets can't be met, but I certainly don't like that. I'd like to hear the compelling reason.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Sandra.

VICE CHAIR BERG: So help me think about some of the actual action items that are listed in the scoping plan that have specific amounts? So when you're looking at that you would like to see a 40 percent reduction, for example, in target truck fleets and things like that, when we look at where we are today, and that we estimate that it's about 30 percent of the existing trucks aren't even in compliance with the existing Truck and Bus Rule, and that that -- those -- most of those are single operators. And those single operators most likely are coming from middle income to EJ areas.
And yet, if we were to take a look at an additional 40 percent, one of the things I'm very worried about is as we target different industries that it's going to push it into just big industry, and it's going to take away the opportunity to for entrepreneurialship and smaller companies.

So when you have a specific amount in here like this, how are you thinking about that amount, and in a 10-year period success and stuff and like that?

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Sure. So I have a long history with this having been around for the original crafting, as were you, of the different size of trucking companies where we would -- where we defined a small trucking company as being 3 or more trucks.

So we were very engaged in that. I think ARB took a big hit over the original Truck and Bus Rule, mainly because of the PM filters. And, you know, that's -- you know, sometimes things don't work out. You just shake it off and move forward. You know, you get punched in the jaw, you need to step up and throw one, right? So you need to quit taking those hits and ignoring them, and just brushing it off or feeling bad about it.

What you did was with the best of intention with the technology that you had available at the time to deal with a problem that is a health threat to everybody around
it. So, you know, to -- so I congratulate you on it. And
by the way, when tech -- when new tech is rolled out,
sometimes stuff doesn't work. We know that. And that's
why you pilot it out there, and then you find out what
doesn't work and you go for what does.

So with the idea of reducing the emissions
related to the truck fleet, there's a lot of great
advances happening overall in both the diesel industry,
and certainly with -- some of us in the valley, for
instance, feel that in the natural gas conversion industry
you're going to need to use a bridge fuel here.

We're not going to electrify the 99 and the I-5
from L.A. to Sacramento. I wish we could. I'd love to
see a catenary system there or a rail -- a third rail
system. Yeah, I don't think you've got the money for
that. I don't know that anybody does, even over a 10- or
20-year period.

So we're really thinking of that longer horizon
time, the ability to reduce the engines that are out there
and help those folks make those investments. So we need
to step up with our incentive funding, and we need to make
sure that whatever regulation we put in place has a decent
amount of incentive funding on the front-end of it, but
yet that needs to cycle down over time. I'll use a
trucking term. And, you know, at a certain point in time,
you've got to drop a gear, and that's just the way it
goes, and that's the way it is here. That's evolving even
as we sit. You know, your big truck players are at the
table with you. You've got Cummins at the table and Ford
at the table.

So, you know, you've got all the people in the
room you need. You have the technology coming on board.
So we just need to help -- the guy that bought a new truck
in 2012, we've got to help him figure out so what do I do,
when do I change that out, and when does it make a good
business case for me to do that?

Well, it has to happen sometime in the next 10 to
20 years, okay? So if that happens in 2025, well, that's
the way that happens. So we recognize those realities,
and we're not trying to destroy an entire industry and
drag all these people down, so...

MODERATOR LUCERO: Any other questions or
comments?

I guess -- oh, there you go. Gisele.

EJAC MEMBER FONG: I just wanted to take the
opportunity, because I don't know if the Board had read
through the comments from our community workshops that we
had over the summer. And one of the things that we heard
so much in L.A. and Wilmington were folks, you know,
really supportive or actually relied on public
transportation. And we know obviously that we want to get folks into public transportation.

But in terms of day-to-day barriers, there was such -- because, for example, Wilmington is such a freight heavy community that the basic issues of safety, right? So a young woman was talking about how her mom could not drive her to school, and so asked her to ride her bike, you know, but just that basic safety hazard, I think, in communities that are so impacted by freight and goods movement. That was one issue.

Another issue was really that issue of kind of gaps in where the service is. So, you know, really supportive of folks wanting to take the train, but then that last -- last mile -- and I know that you're aware of this, but I just wanted to give that input. And I would imagine that is very true in other communities that we've heard from, that there definitely are gaps that folks feel day to day in terms of getting into public transportation.

And again, I don't know where that sits for the Board, in terms of what is your authority to manage or to, you know, direct solutions for. But I wanted to put that out there as we have this opportunity to tell you what we heard from residents across the state.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Judy.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: So I would just like to
ask you to help me understand what your position is on the
dairy digesters and conversion to -- of waste to fuels?
And so I'm not quite sure where you are on that.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Tom.

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: You've been really quite
here all day.

EJAC MEMBER FRANTZ: I would have spoke to this
in the next section too under natural and working lands.
But the -- you know, the dairies are the biggest Polluters
we have in terms of criteria air pollutants in the San
Joaquin Valley in terms of VOCs and the ammonia. Just
huge sources.

And by putting money into dairy digesters,
they're like a couple billion for each dairy. Sort of the
money proposed to go into this. It's a huge subsidy to
support a really unsustainable industry. You know,
they're importing over half their feed from the midwest,
probably three-fourths of it, and alfalfa from Arizona
using Colorado River water.

And it's a very unsustainable industry. And this
is a Band-Aid approach. There's other ways the dairy
industry can avoid most of those methane emissions by
using pasture. Feeding the cows so their mature goes back
to the ground immediately is one way. The problem is this
huge lagoon. And it's a waste disposal system, because
there's so many cows on so little land.

They need to change the whole paradigm of how they operate to become sustainable for the future. Just like we all have to change how we live our lives in order to reach like these 2050 goals. The dairy industry. We have over 1,100 dairies in the San Joaquin Valley averaging -- they milk, average, 1,400 cows a day at each one of these dairies.

Each one of these dairies average - the bigger ones are worse - 50,000 -- the equivalent of 50,000 tons of CO2 a year. They should -- they would easily qualify for the mandatory reporting of 25,000 tons a year.

I think they should be regulated like an industry -- like the industry they are, and not have this agricultural exemption. For years, California exempted agriculture from the Clean Air Act illegally. Now, you're exempting agriculture from the Greenhouse Gas Act, AB 32, basically, and trying to pay them to do -- to reduce their emissions.

And so, again, dairy digesters, it's not sustainable. There's never -- dairies hate it, because their lagoons are for the disposal ammonia. And the methane is incidental to getting rid of that ammonia into the air.

With the digester, no one can say what happens to
that ammonia. They have an issue. And who maintains these digesters? You can spend a couple million dollars on one of these, and then in 5 years something goes wrong, they don't want to -- it's just a waste of their time to even bother with these things. That's why no one has gone for it yet. And now, you're solving a problem of them not wanting to do it by trying to throw even more money at them, but it's not going to work.

That's how we feel.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Very complete answer.

Thank you.

MODERATOR LUCERO: We knew who to talk to for that response.

Okay. Do we want to move on to natural and working lands?

All right. So Tom.

EJAC MEMBER FRANTZ: Kemba.

MODERATOR LUCERO: All right. Kemba.

EJAC MEMBER SHAKUR: Before I go on, Tom has a really interested -- interesting philosophy about cheese and pizza.

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER SHAKUR: And, I mean -- but, I mean, it's really real. I don't eat dairy products any more. I don't eat meat, and Tom has a lot to do with that. But,
Tom, can you break down that pizza thing that you talked about?

EJAC MEMBER FRANTZ: Twenty-five percent of the dairy milk produced in California is made into mozzarella cheese. Most of the mozzarella goes to, you know, pasta dishes, but really the bulk of it's going to pizza.

Now, Californians only eat about half of all the dairy produced in California. The rest is exported. But if we cut back our consumption of pizza significantly, we would be cutting back thousands of tons of greenhouse gases at the same time, because if we don't buy their product, they can't produce it.

That's -- and so we recommended that there be a campaign coming out of CARB, which is really a health campaign over obesity and diabetes from eating too much dairy that this is one method of reducing greenhouse gases, make a strong statement that if we consume less dairy, we will get part way there.

MODERATOR LUCERO: And yes, that is one of the recommendations in the appendix.

EJAC MEMBER SHAKUR: Thank you, Tom. I learned a lot from him. But I'm -- we're -- this is the urban forestry greening section.

Let me just get this closer.

Every rooftop, every sidewalk, every open space
is an opportunity for green space. Improved air quality, green jobs, training, and environmental education are also benefits of urban greening. Greening project require long-term maintenance. And GHG funding only provides funding for establishment and not long-term maintenance.

We're hopeful that people will look at the issue of maintenance, because a lot of the funders only focus on planting trees and not maintenance. And I think that's the reason why a lot of -- a lot of trees fail, and the reason why we've lost thousands of trees.

Yeah, that's it. That's all I had to add.

EJAC MEMBER FRANTZ: And since we talked about biogas already, I'll skip that part, and go to biomass a little bit.

We have a phenomena in the San Joaquin Valley called biomass incinerators for energy. They're power plants, but they're small in terms of the energy they produce, but they're huge in terms of the pollution they produce. A 25 megawatt biomass plant pollutes our air in terms of particulates about 30 to up to 50 times more than a 750 megawatt biomass plant.

Or let's put it, for the same amount of energy, for the same amount electricity produced, the particulates out of a biomass incinerator are up to 50 times greater than out of a natural gas power plant. That's how bad
they pollute the air, and how little electricity they're making. It's a very inefficient way. Yet, it's called by CARB -- CARB recognizes some assumption that this is clean renewable energy, when you burn biomass.

Now, over a million tons of biomass is trucked into the San Joaquin Valley every year from landfills in the major metropolitan areas to be incinerated. And up to a million tons of like almond waste wood is incinerated annually as almond trees are removed. For 7 years, we've been working on returning this almond waste to the soil, where it builds carbon in the soil. It actually sequesters carbon that's been removed from the air, instead of -- and it adds so many nutrients. It's just an inconvenience and a bit of an expense.

I'm an almond farmer. I know what it would cost. I know what it costs to take my trees out and have them sent to the biomass incinerator, and that costing a lot of money these days, and it should continue to cost even more money. We should pay the true cost to that.

And then the alternative of returning this to the soil, where it benefits our future crops greatly will then look more economic. But here's what happened this last year. We have some trees dying -- millions of trees dying in the Sierras. Most of them are inaccessible. They're going to stay there.
But somebody got the bright idea that we need to bring those trees out of there, I guess away from homes and roads, but need to bring them down to the valley floor and incinerate them for clean renewable energy. So the PUC agreed with this, and it fits with this scoping plan that this type of energy is clean and renewable.

The words are all through here that this is a good way to produce energy. Yet, there's a little community in south Fresno, called Malaga, 200 homes, sits next to this biomass facility that now got a new lease for 5 years. They have to take 9,000 trucks loads a year of trees from the Sierras and burn them on the valley floor in South Fresno next to 200 people in an environmental justice community, who also sit right next to one of the biggest glass factories in California.

And, you know, everybody -- everybody is complicit in this -- in the State government of allowing this to happen, telling these poor people here that they've got to suck up that pollution, so that dead trees in the forest can somehow be removed. It doesn't make any sense. Those dead trees are carbon that should remain in the forest soil. It's one of our number one places for sequestering carbon.

And those dead trees don't have to removed. You really don't have to do anything with them. They're going
to slowly put that carbon back into the soil and new
growth will suck it up. And you have that cycle.

When you remove carbon from the soil like that,
you're upsetting the carbon cycle in the forest, and it
takes years and years for that to come back. So we've
been making these recommendations, but we don't seem to
have anybody listening to them.

Thank you.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Thank you, Tom.

Do you -- we have anything to add from the EJAC
or any clarifying questions from the ARB?

Barbara.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: I have a couple questions
I'd like to ask the Committee, but not for a response
maybe today, but maybe tomorrow. We were talking about,
in this parking lot area, about how do we respond to
needing to move certain things or identify certain things
that aren't in our purview, but who we are working with.
And I just would like you to kind of look at page 112 and
113. If you look at that, from my opinion, you -- we have
identified -- the staff has identified pretty clearly, I
believe, the responsibility, for instance, of the Food and
Agricultural Department, for the Healthy Soils Initiative,
there are things that are clearly identified.

What I would like to know, is that adequate? Do
you feel -- or should we identify it in some appendix or something else? And I just happen to look at that and think that's a good example of identifying certain programs that are part of the State structure that have to do with this ongoing scoping plan, and what's somebody else's responsibility.

So I'll look forward to maybe a response tomorrow at the hearing.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Or if we have one today as well.

John.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: It's hard to read quickly a couple of pages, but I just --

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Well, thank you, Tom, for talking about biomass. You know, that's one of my research interests is mostly in the developing world, low and middle income countries where biomass is used for cooking and heating, lighting. And so it's not particularly healthy stuff to breathe.

So my question to you, since you have a lot of knowledge, more than me, about these biomass power generator facilities in the valley, what's the level of emissions controls that they're required, or that they have, or -- because you know, I would agree, just burning biomass is, you know, a terrible way to pollute.
I mean, people use the argument that part of the reason we have to get rid of the dead trees is to prevent catastrophic wildfires, which also pollute heavily. I'm not saying that that's necessarily what I believe, but -- so I agree this is an important issue to bring up. And, you know, we heard this several years ago with the first scoping plan. And, you know, I do have problems with considering, you know, burning biomass fuel to be a clean fuel. It's potentially sustainable in that there's always going to be dead trees and vegetation to burn, but it doesn't mean that it's necessarily clean.

So I just wanted a little more clarification, if you would.

EJAC MEMBER FRANTZ: Well, the figure I mentioned, like fine particulates are at a rate of 30 to 50 times greater than a natural gas plant, the controls on those particulate matter, per megawatt hour produced.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Those are the actual emissions --

EJAC MEMBER FRANTZ: Per unit of electricity produced.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yeah, without any kind of controls?

EJAC MEMBER FRANTZ: Well, they have controls. They have some particulate --
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: This is with the controls.
Okay.

EJAC MEMBER FRANTZ: That's with the controls
that -- it's a huge loophole for these things. They can't
burn cleanly. They burn worse than coal cleansed.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I know that to be a fact.

EJAC MEMBER FRANTZ: Yea. So it's like a
loophole. Okay, because the excuse is open burning is
even worst. See that's always the excuse. So if the
farmer burns their orchard prunings in the field that's
really sooty and stuff. So at least at the biomass
incinerator it's cleaner, but neither has to happen.

The way forward is that is good, clean material
that should be in the soil as nutrients, even water, and
avoided meth -- avoided emissions. You know, the
Co-benefits of returning that to the soil are huge. It's
just -- but it's economics. That's all that -- why we're
still doing it, this caveman idea.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Any other questions or
additional comments?

Katie.

EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: I also want to
add into the conversation to Barbara's point about the
Healthy Soils Initiative that -- I mean, I do see some of
the other recommendations around biomass burning as
contradictory to that goal. You know, if we're pulling biomass out from forests, if we're doing all of this for biomass facilities, for repurposing refineries to produce biofuels, that's not contributing to the healthy soils. I think that's a competition.

So I'd like -- I think that's why we're coming so strongly about trying to take that out of the scoping plan, so that we focus more on the healthy soils work and less on using that as a, you know, quote unquote clean and sustainable source of fuel.

And I also just want to pull out our last recommendation in this section that's new around the cultural and prescribed burning for tribes, is something that we've heard a lot about for better forest management and control. I know it's going to be addressed somewhat in the forest management plan. And I've talked to Dave a little bit about that, but -- and we're finally having a call, you know, 3 months later next week with some of the tribal folks. So I'm hopeful that we're moving closer on that.

But I do just think that -- I mean, it's important for us to recognize indigenous knowledge and contributions in this field of forest management. And that's not necessarily reflected in the natural and working lands section as it's currently written. And to
echo comments that were made yesterday, that, you know, again we haven't yet finished the quantification of the benefits in the scoping plan.

So really, natural and working lands is not accounting for any of our proposed emissions reductions to meet the 2030 targets right now. And we think that's a huge missed opportunity. And the degree to which we can start trying to use existing knowledge and methods that are already out there to start trying to quantify that within this scoping plan, I think would be preferable, because we'd like to see more investment go to this stuff. We'd like to see it be more of a part of our climate strategy, and part of the green industry and jobs that we're trying to build.

MODERATOR LUCERO:  Kevin.

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: So thank you for your comment. And I did a quick read on the pages there. And your'e right, they point to the interagency cooperation and this area in where different agencies have different programs like CDFA. What I would say about that is unfortunately there's no teeth behind those programs that require that individual farmer to participate in that program. You can't make somebody do that.

So -- and that we've constructed it that way, so that everybody is pretty much independent with regards to
how they choose to take advantage of these wonderful assets that are made available to them. And they do that for various reasons.

But I really want to get back to the biomass and the plants on the floor of the valley. We're not just horrified by the emissions coming out of the electricity generation process, how many truck trips do you think it takes to actually bring these trees down the hill, and what kind of trucks do you think they're using to haul. You think those are brand new diesel trucks that are hauling?

I don't know if you've ever been behind a lumber truck, but I have been many times. And I've been almost sick a few times from the stack, you know, being stuck behind it, especially going down a big hill or coming up a big hill, which lots of those in the mountains.

So I think, you know, we -- this is where it's global, right? The problem is much more than just the incinerator. It's how it's fed. So we -- some of us argue, have taken the position, that if those communities -- and I'll illustrate it with North Fork, which is actually doing this -- decide that the way they want to deal with this problem of safety -- which is really a safety issue. Is that tree going to fall on my house? Is that tree going to fall on a road, okay?
I've reviewed a lot of literature now on forestry, more than I ever wanted to as far as dead trees, and there is nothing I've been able to find that suggests that these dead trees actually increase this wildfire risk, okay?

Wild fires happen. Sometimes they're big conflagrations, sometimes they're not. It turns out when trees are dead more than a year or two and they lose all their leaves, they actually don't burn as well, which I thought was fascinating.

So 2 years out on these dead trees, they don't have any leaves. They're just stocks of wood sticking up, nothing to really burn, hard to catch on fire. It's the leaves and the tar in the trees that actually move the fire along. So think about that.

But the safety issue is huge. So if that community decides it wants a one megawatt generator incinerator in their community, and they've made that decision as a community, and they're willing to deal with some emissions that are going to happen with that, in return they're going to get biochar, which they all -- the industry will tell you it's the greatest thing since sliced bread, and they're going to put that back in the soil versus just letting the tree sit there, cutting it, and letting it lay on the ground and rot and go back to
the soil, I wouldn't fight with them. It's their
community, so I'm not going to go there and tell them how
they should do their business.

But I don't want it in mine, so don't transport
your problem to me. And it's the same thing we say to
L.A., just today, Kern County, I was listening to the
news. I listen to NPR, right?

On the way up here, violation from green waste
being brought from Los Angeles illegally to Kern County
and dumped. Wow. What a surprise.

But the thing is it's not a surprise, is every
day there's thousands of tons of that same waste coming
legally to the San Joaquin Valley, and being dumped. So
again, one of the things we've talked about in here, is
the idea of communities taking care of their own trash,
okay?

If you live in Porter Ranch -- and I'm only
calling that out, because I know about it, and I watched
it actually being built. Most people don't know you know
it was called Porter's Ranch.

But anyway, that's a very wealthy community. So
they generate trash. I wonder if they have a landfill
there in Porter Ranch? I don't know, but I bet not.

So we're just saying in the valley at least,
we'll take care of our trash, you take care of yours, and,
you know, we'll all be a lot healthier for it.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Any other comments or questions on this or do we want to move to like where we have agreement, what we need to move on next?

We -- I do want to make sure -- and John, I'm going to call you out. Can you introduce yourself, John? And I think -- I know you had quite a harrowing experience getting here, so I think that's important to share for folks.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Well, I didn't -- there was -- there was -- I don't expect anyone to be coming -- to be coming this direction on Highway 99, but there was a fatal -- there was a police involved shooting that diverted traffic. So I apologize.

I knew I would be here. I knew I would be here late, and I will, to the extent anyone is interested in visiting with me, I will stay until that last person has had an opportunity to visit.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Thank you, John.

I just wanted to let you have an opportunity to introduce yourself. And I knew there was a good reason for you coming in when you did, so -- all right. If there's no other comments or questions specifically on the EJAC's recommendations on the natural and working lands, let's move -- well, first, let's just do one last check.
We didn't use up our full public comment period. I know there's a couple folks who wanted to do public comment. As you guys look at our parking lot, and think about where you saw agreement, we're also going to open up for public comment. This is going to be the last opportunity for public comment.

So if you have one, go fill out one of those. And then my microphone runners.

I have Kevin Jefferson is first up.
Kevin.
Okay. Kevin is gone.
Michael -- and I might mispronounce this -- Boccadon[sic]?

MR. BOCCADORO: Boccadoro.
MODERATOR LUCERO: Boccadoro. Sorry.
There you go.
And you have 1 to 2 minutes. Go ahead. Do you have a mic?
Okay. Go ahead.

MR. BOCCADORO: Michael Boccadoro on behalf of Dairy Cares. I appreciate the opportunity. We've had this conversation Ms. Mitchell and other members of the Board. I'll let the we should rid the earth of pizza comment stand for itself, and let the millions of teenagers across America answer that question.
But it's really important that we have a -- start
to have a more comprehensive conversation about the dairy
industry and sustainable solutions to dealing with methane
production. It's the only way we're going to get to the
solutions that we need to find in this industry.

The reality is, and the facts are, that every way
there is to reduce methane emissions in California
involves some level of other environmental tradeoff.

Going to pasture dairies has a significant
environmental tradeoff. It's highly water insensitive in
the San Joaquin Valley. Huge, huge implications. It's
also not good from an enteric emissions standpoint,
because you have to have more cows to produce the same
amount of milk.

So we need to quit talking past each other. We
need to be invited in to the environmental justice
community. We'd love to come. Let's bring the Air
District, let's bring the Water Board, let's have a
conversation about what the options are, what the
solutions are, what the trade-offs are.

We think we can get to a very sustainable
position of not just reducing methane, but reducing
criteria pollutants through the production of
transportation fuel. That is a tremendous win-win
opportunity that gets to the critieria pollutants that I
heard all day yesterday as I sat through the EJAC meeting that is truly of concerns to these communities. Let's have that conversation. We're willing to do it

Thank you.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Thank you.

Brent Newell. Brent. Oh, over there.

MR. NEWELL: Good afternoon. I'll make this short. Members of the Board, members of the EJAC, Brent Newell. I'm with the Center on Race, Poverty, and the Environment. And, you know, the point I'd like to make is to build off of what Tom said. And, you know, as we move towards a 2050 target, 80 percent reductions from 1990 levels, and even just to meet the 2030 target, we are transforming what we drive. We are transforming how we power our cars -- our homes, how we heat our homes.

We also have to transform what we eat and how it's produced. Producing massive amounts of dairy products in California for export, or to feed millions of teenagers -- my teenager is kind of clueless about what he eats. He just shoves it in his face.

You know, the point I want to make here is that we don't need to eat that amount of dairy products. We can eat less, and eating less is better for the climate. Also, changing how it's produced is important. The pasture-based dairies, the methane -- the manure is
dropped on the pasture. It's decomposed in the absence or
in the presence of oxygen and doesn't emit methane, unlike
those lagoons.

It also helps this Healthy Soil Initiative
that you're working on, where natural grass lands
sequester carbon. So we can have a win-win-win type
situation here with less air pollution, less methane, and
carbon sequestration through carbon farming.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Thank you. Just do a quick,
we have no more public comment requests?

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: (Shakes head.)
MODERATOR LUCERO: All right. Thank you for our
public.

So let's move on to what we agree to, what we
need to work on. And we have some things that we may not
resolve today, but I think we moved in a good positive
direction.

And I'm just going to point out that the
agreements that I have listed up there are the things that
I heard as your facilitator where I was hearing similar
statements in terms of goals and objectives from both
multiple EJAC members and multiple ARB Board members.

So Katie, go ahead.

EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: I just want to
express again how great this time has been, and also how
short this time is. And there's a natural tension here between, I mean, just the time it would take for us to have read through 140 recommendations and get clarifying comments would have been most of the day, and then we would have never had any chance to give you context.

So I hope that our intention and foundational beliefs that went into our recommendations were made clearer today, but I also want to recognize that I feel like additional conversations are still necessary, and we still need to start really hammering into where can we find common ground? Is common ground possible? If not possible, are there metrics we could be establishing that make us feel more comfortable? Are there other things that we could be doing?

And so I -- and I know I'm kind of like -- sound like a broken record about this, but I just feel like there isn't time. I feel like we just don't have enough time to continue having this conversation with you all. And so I'd like to hear as part of these next steps, if after we do our next round of community workshops and we continue to refine our recommendations for the end of March, if another meeting with you all is possible in April, early April, and if that would leave staff and you all enough time to actually incorporate what we talk about into the final plan.
MODERATOR LUCERO: So that's something for consideration. And it was a question we also had earlier, I believe, from the public in terms of process. Do we have any thoughts now or do we want to have that as an action.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Let's hear the whole thing, don't you think?

MODERATOR LUCERO: Yep.

Any other thoughts?

Okay. Hector.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I'll double back to where I started today, which was to break out the 140 recommendations. And I realize that there may be a whittling down. But we can certainly categorize those 140, and put them into, you know, cap-and-trade questions, regulatory issues, toxics issues, GGRF issues, where they fit, or external to CARB -- well, toxics would be one of those things, but maybe there's others -- and put them in the right bucket for us to talk about how we would proceed with each of those. And we can have a pro and con conversation. Staff can do an analysis, because at 140, it's a lot.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Are you going to be -- are
you going to be meaning to prioritize them further, I just wondered?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Given there's 700, but -- in order to, you know, kind of break it down. And I appreciate these categories, but we need to think about where the right place is in terms of the government agencies and the response to actually doing these, which may be different.

So I think that would be very helpful for us to understand how we go about doing these, if we were to take steps in those directions.

MODERATOR LUCERO: And we had a little bit of folks talking over each other. John, you had a question and then Kemba your card is up.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: My only -- my question was really just whether there was going to be additional discussion by EJAC as to whether it wanted to prioritize some of these recommendations even further.

EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yeah. At our meeting on March 29th and 30th we'll be making final recommendations for you all for the final scoping plan draft.

EJAC MEMBER ROSE TARUC: So in yesterday's EJAC meeting, one -- part of our process in coming to our final recommendations is both to have a table that the staff has
promised to us from the beginning that looks at our 140 recommendations, tells us whether it is in the scoping plan or not, and if it's not there, why, so that we can have that conversation. And the EJAC could decide to make adjustments to their recommendations, so that they could be incorporated in there.

But the staff has repeatedly failed to complete such a table, and we still don't have a table right now. So there's -- there's -- there's arguments with the staff and the EJAC about that. So we need to get that table. And what we had said was we need to get it next week, because within 2 weeks is the first of our next set of community workshops, because what we want to be able to tell and report back to the community, again, as, you know, the ambassadors to the scoping plan, the EJAC is fanning out again into our communities, and saying this is how your ideas from last summer made it into the scoping plan, or didn't make it into the scoping plan. And then so from there, what do you think is still priority for us to make sure we advocate for inclusion in the scoping plan?

So we are going through that process. We're going to need that completed table from staff. We're going to report it back to the community through the workshops, and then we will come up with our final
recommendations at our end-of-March EJAC meeting.

And then we're hoping that then there is serious
time that staff who are writing the scoping plan are then
going to read those final recommendations and include it
into the scoping plan before the final draft comes out.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Richard, here's a microphone.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I got it. I wanted
to -- I really need to respond to that, because I think
it's really important, and that is, is that there's been
an absolute effort on the part of staff to be responsive
to the recommendations in terms of how they map. And I
know a few different forms of responses have been shared,
and there was -- one that was discussed yesterday. And I
know that they -- there's not been satisfaction in terms
of the intent.

The intent has been there, which is the
description that Hector and others gave here, which is a
recognition that with each of the recommendations, some
map well the scoping plan, how can we be responsive, and a
description of how we can be responsive.

Some live somewhere else in terms of authority,
how -- what's the follow up? What is that, and what is
that -- what is actionable. In the point that was raised
here, in some cases it may be an authority issue.

And my understanding from the conversation that
took place yesterday and this morning was I heard that there was agreement on the format. And if that's -- we are finishing this. I mean, I'm personally committing to get you what you just asked for, which was for each of those recommendations a summary of how they are addressed, because many are addressed in the scoping plan, because many of these issues -- and I think this is the challenge. Most of them it's not black and white, it's either in or it's out, it's along a continuum.

How can you best respond to the issue, what are the limitations, what are the constraints, and we need to be clear on that.

Those that are clearly out, we need to call that, and call out that why -- why that is, but also indicate is there -- does it -- is there an opportunity with the new toxics rule, is the issue with respect to a local permit tightening?

So that is -- that is the objective, and you've got a personal commitment from me to populate that, to -- you have it, and let's move forward from here.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Kevin and then Mary, and I do want to get back to the agreements and the parking lot items too.

Kevin.

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: So with regard to that, we
did have a discussion. I think I had to get off the phone because I was livecasting it from my office yesterday.

So the suggestion that I had that I think everyone agreed to, and I'm hoping that that's what was agreed to is that you annotate the existing plan with the EJAC recommendations that made it into the plan.

It should be a fairly simple process. I have to write things all the time, reports, white papers that I have to annotate. I mean, it's not like rocket science.

Now, doing it from behind like this is a little more challenging where you have to reread and insert it, but that's really what we need here. So if I see a footnote, if I see a number, you know, a super script behind a sentence and it already -- you already have it footnoted already for other things, so add this document as one of those things.

Now, we still want to illustrate the things that aren't in there and understand those, of course. But for the things that are or that are referred to, it would be great if it said Appendix A, energy and -- you know, energy and whatever, and, you know, page whatever, line whatever. Very simple to do.

And I think that at least allows us to connect very easily to it as we're reading the plan. So at the bear minimum, that would be -- I think -- I appreciate
the -- I looked at all the things that staff has created, and I still don't know why we didn't do that from the beginning.

But man, they have put a lot of hours into this, and I respect that. The amount of time it takes to go through something like this and do that crosswalking they created, that's a yeoman's effort there.

But unfortunately, it didn't get us where we needed to be, which is to understand what's in the plan, and what's not in the plan by looking at the plan. I don't want to have to go to another document to look at that, right?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Thanks, Kevin. That is a clear explanation in terms of what's needed.

So thank you.

MODERATOR LUCERO: And I just want to capture, because I know, Kevin, you've mentioned this at a couple EJAC meetings, is you also -- because you didn't mention it here is for -- there were some items that the level of detail that the EJAC provided, because they're talking to the communities was on the ground. And I'm just reiterating what I've heard from you guys. So correct me if I'm summarizing wrong.

So it's a lot of implementation stuff, and so it didn't quite seem relevant to the plan. So the other
thing that Kevin has requested that if it is -- if it's
situation where the EJAC recommendation is too detailed,
maybe do an annotation there of --

CHAIR NICHOLS: You're turing your head away, so
I can't hear what you're saying.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Oh, sorry.

If it's a general -- a general -- it's too
specific to be in the scoping plan. Maybe annotate the
EJAC recommendation of, well, here's an example of what
the EJAC has said might be a way to implement. So I
just -- I wanted to make sure I captured that, because you
had said it a couple times, and it's in the notes.

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Yes.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Mary.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Maybe I should have put my card
down, because I think the last two exchanges helped. I
wanted to get to the point of saying specifically what do
we do next to get to a document that we can have a
conversation around what's in and what's out. And if you
don't -- if you're not getting that yet, then I don't see
much point actually in trying to go a whole lot further,
other than in a broad generic way, because there's -- you
know, I can't -- I can't rule on something, I can't make a
decision on something without seeing facts in front of me.

I disagree about some of the facts that people
have referred to here today. That is in statements that were made about what is and what isn't, you know. But I -- I don't think there's any point in having those discussions until we see what's in the scoping plan, and what isn't in the scoping plan, and then we can go from there. That's -- that is -- that is the document.

But I -- I would like to say, and I think in general, this -- you know, the conversation has been everything I've hoped for and more. But when we get to the point of sounding like there's been some deliberate failure or refusal on the part of the staff to respond to comments from members of the EJAC or the EJAC as a whole, that does not resonate well with me, because I don't believe it's true.

I mean, the product may not be where you want it to be, but the effort that has gone into it has been extraordinary. And the amount of literally blood, sweat, and tears that has gone in to attempting to satisfy the requests that have come from the group has been beyond anything I've ever seen before.

So I don't -- I just don't want to have to get to a position where we have to argue about that aspect of it, if I can help it, because I would like to be able to wait until we have one more round of documents, and then talk off of documents.
MODERATOR LUCERO: And I do want to acknowledge, we did get an agreement and commitment to get the cross-link table per the instructions earlier today. So we have that.

Mari Rose.

EJAC MEMBER ROSE TARUC: I also want to emphasize the time that we need the information in order for us to be able to get as much of the advice from the EJAC into -- into the scoping plan. And so, yes, we see your staff working really hard. And then we're put under deadlines to get -- to get our recommendations in in order for us to see that they were included. And so even to now, middle of February, when we've had a good set of our recommendations since August to still not have a document that tells us where our recommendations were included, and to have this discussion with the Board about, you know, well, you know, if we actually did have that document and identified where staff disagreed with the EJAC, that would have been a really -- like more maybe animated conversation about which way to move forward, but we -- so this timing issue has been a challenge for the EJAC, based on response, or non-response, or delay that we've experienced with the ARB staff.

And I also want to say, so right now what we're also working under in terms of timeline is that there's a
comment deadline of March 6th for the comments to the
scoping plan, and so -- so right now our process is we're
going to have these community workshops, get feedback from
many people through the end of March, our final
recommendations then like -- is -- will our final
recommendations be addressed even in the analysis or as
official comments to the scoping plan or the environmental
analysis? Like I -- I'm unclear about that.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I wasn't going to answer that
question. I was going to say something else, but it is to
the earlier point, which is just that we started off
talking about 148 or 44 regulations -- recommendations.
Then coming into the meeting where the plan was presented,
it had been sort of reduced down to 38 or 34 -- 38. 38.
That's beginning to be a manageable number of
things to actually talk about. You know, talking about
144 items is like -- it's going through a checklist
exercise. We could probably find, you know, some of them
in various places that you wouldn't be satisfied with.
And I think part of what I'm experiencing here is that I
don't feel that people are addressing their true
priorities really, because every time we get back together
again it always comes down to if it doesn't include -- if
doesn't -- if the plan does include cap and trade as the
preferred option, or does not include something else as
the preferred option, the EJAC is not going to be satisfied that the plan was done adequately no matter what.

So let me just put that elephant in the middle of the room, and say it's here. It's in the middle of the room, okay? And we can respond to that and we can talk about that, about whether the analysis is being done correctly, whether the -- you know, whether the whole program is being designed correctly, or we can talk about all the other things and set some priorities to them, but let's do it with some -- let's do it with some priorities, because otherwise, I don't -- I don't think that you're going to end up being satisfied.

We may be able to say, yeah, we did the right thing, but, you know, it doesn't feel like the kind of relationship that one would have with an advisory group that, you know, was truly giving advice, as opposed to setting up an adversarial process.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Diane.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: So again, I want to thank everyone for being here today. And for the time it took for everyone to prepare for this meeting and participate. I think that -- again, I do think it's historic and I appreciate Mary calling out the elephant. And I think that -- I hope that we can end this meeting in
a positive way, and in a way that really pushes us forward.

So, you know, one of the things that I think is in the way in terms of the elephant is an insistence that we stick with the April timeline. So I'd like to put it on table, wherever that table is – unclear to me how this happens – that we abandon the need to complete this in April. We agree at the last meeting that we would consider moving it, and I think we have good evidence as to why that should be moved.

One, we have -- we have workshops that are extending through March. We won't have the EJAC recommendations finalized, which we have said over and over again that we want until the end of March. And if the CEQA comment period ends on March 6th, let's be clear, that is the legal end.

So whatever staff or the Board does with those comments is not sufficient. It has to be within the CEQA period from my perspective. So I'd like to put that out to me, that's critically important. And without doing that, I think we're disrespecting those comments.

The other thing is is that while I think there's a lot of attention on cap and trade, and on alternatives that need to be analyzed, we were missing the OEHHA report until a week ago. That analysis has not been done. The
375 targets we keep talking about are -- are getting processed. We're going to get a report in March. We're not going to have that now. That's huge, 38 percent of GHGs. So where is that? How do we agree to a scoping plan that isn't clear on what the regions are going to do to reduce pollution from transportation, the response to the Cushing report, so -- and the list goes on.

So with all due respect, it's not just about cap and trade, it's about holding two thoughts in our head at the same time, which is there has been a lot of work that has been done all across the Board. And I really appreciate all of it from the staff, from the EJAC, from the public, and we have an incomplete product.

So I think both those things are true. And I think with a few more months, we can have a complete product, and not one that I think we'll all agree on, okay? So that's not -- I don't think that's a reasonable goal. I don't think we'll all agree, but we will have a complete product that we can move forward with. And I -- I just don't think we get there by April. And we certainly don't get there with a March 6th CEQA comment deadline.

So I'd like to see us extend that.

MODERATOR LUCERO: I want to see if we can get the deadline -- the timeline discussion going. So raise
your hand if it's a timeline discussion. Keep your tags up. Timeline?

(Hands raised.)


EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: So I just wanted to very quickly address your comment. I agree with you that we need to avoid an adversarial position in any of this as much as we possibly can, while still remaining true to the people who we're responsible to speak with and who've given their trust to us to speak for them. So that puts us all in very -- and you have the same bond, so we're all in a challenging position trying to keep fidelity and integrity to this. And I think everybody has done a pretty -- pretty damn fine job of that, including your staff and the Board, and I think the EJAC has as well. Sometimes that creates what I learned in, as a director in hospital, to term as healthy tension.

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: So sometimes a little tension in the room is really not a bad thing. And good things can come of that, as long as we're all working to at least consensus, which is always my goal, rather than full capitulation, which is what I want.

(Laughter.)
EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: No sense in denying it, right? It's what we all want. I'm not going to lie about it, speaking of elephants in the room.

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: So we want to win. So -- and winning for us may look differently than it looks for someone else. So -- so with regard to the timeline, we are running as fast as we can. I mean, when you -- when you face us -- And I think speak about the valley here where I've got to set up now -- because of this deadline, somehow I've got to set up, as Richard got to see firsthand, meetings across this whole region simultaneously, because I only have one agency in the whole region that has the ability to do that, and that's the air district, which is always fun -- and I am being a little facetious there, yes -- to try to negotiate that, and then work together, and take those comments back from that community and somehow, under this timeline, get them assembled.

And what they're going to be -- we're trying to work to make sure, by the way, that what they're commenting on is this new set of comments where we've also showed them where their original comments were translated into this work. So we're working hard at that you can assume, and it's -- again, it's a yeoman's task, as we
used to say where I come from.

And it is -- it's hard work. You're doing hard work as well as -- and so is staff here. Everybody is working hard. To denigrate that or disrespect that in any way, I can't tolerate, and I won't.

And I don't think anybody on this committee will. We have to make statements sometimes that sound harsh, but, you know, that's politics too, right?

So we -- I just want to support what Diane is saying. And I think we all know that. I don't know why it's a big discussion. I understand someone outside this room has an agenda. We're all subject to different people's agendas. Sometimes they're hidden, sometimes not so much, but we don't have to allow that to happen.

And I think we originally asked for, when I talked to Dean Florez about this originally, I said, Dean, you know, September would be great, but I'd take June.

And he said I can -- you know, April.

And I said yeah, maybe not so much, but whatever. I guess if that's what it's going to be, it's going to be. But here we are facing that, and I think we're recognizing, both from the Board's point of view and from ours, it just can't be done, not and be done well. So I like to do a job well whenever and always, so...

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I think it's an important
discussion to have. I mean, it's always better to do things thoughtfully and inclusively. I'd want to understand, you know, if there -- if we do discuss a time frame change, you know, there's a difference between 1 or 2 months versus a longer period, and trying to understand the other things that are going on that would affect our decision making about that.

So I don't know whether, Richard, you want to comment now or tomorrow at our meeting a little bit about issues around the time -- about other parameters we're working under. So if we allow a change in the time frame, you know, what a reasonable amount is to achieve. It's always a balance, right? We're trying to allow more time. We're trying to get a plan going, given all the uncertainty in this country about this issue, and even in this State and how we move forward, but thoughtful is -- and contemplative is good, so --

CHAIR NICHOLS: John?

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yeah.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I'm sorry, but I'm going to call a --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Okay. A question.

CHAIR NICHOLS: -- flag on this one for the simple reason that tomorrow we have a Board meeting --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.
CHAIR NICHOLS: -- which is a noticed Board meeting.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: We can talk about it there.
CHAIR NICHOLS: We can talk about it then when --
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: And I said to Richard either
now or tomorrow. In my comments, I said, Richard, either
now or tomorrow, to sort of we can comment about that.

MODERATOR LUCERO: I think we've exhausted the
discussion of the timeline. There will be discussion
on -- with -- by the Board tomorrow.

So let's get back to the kind next steps we need
to talk about.

Katie, was it the timeline?

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: I think we should mention
to the Board that it's -- we're not being disrespectful.
Tomorrow, I think, Katie is the only one who can stay
through tomorrow.

So I just wanted to make sure --

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: No, I'm staying too.

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: What?

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: I'm staying also.

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: Oh, you're now staying
also, Eleanor. Okay.

EJAC MEMBER TORRES: I was all the time.

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: So before we only had one
person, so I was feeling like, wow.

MODERATOR LUCERO: No, it's always been Eleanor and Katie.

EJAC MEMBER HAMILTON: She just got a whole load on top of her, so I think -- yeah, so I just wanted -- that's not -- not that we don't want to.

CHAIR NICHOLS: You don't all have to show up at every meeting. Really, you don't. As long as whoever is there can more or less speak for the group.

MODERATOR LUCERO: So just to be clear, because Eleanor wasn't on the mic. Eleanor and Katie will both be there. Eleanor made the commitment to stay there. Luis, are you going to be there too?

EJAC MEMBER OLMEDO: Yes.

MODERATOR LUCERO: And Luis will be there too, so you'll have a full three.

John and then Sandra.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you.

So I just wanted to have a few summary comments on the record here.

And since Mary put the elephant in the middle of the room, I want to reiterate what I said at the start, that while I think basically, just to acknowledge, cap and trade is going to be the preferred option. We'll have more discussion about it, but I think that's what's going
to happen in the short term.

But I think we should have an open mind and should be in the report that a carbon tax could be considered a carbon fee could be considered in the future. That's what I want.

I think it's actually appropriate. It's not just pandering to the EJAC. I think it's -- we might actually need it in the future. Whether it's politically expedient or not is another story. I don't claim to be that knowledgeable about political expediency.

And the other point that was made by multiple people, which I really endorse, and I think this should also be in the scoping plan, is that to think about community benefits, health and economic. It don't just mean cap and trade. It's the whole kit and caboodle of our climate change mitigation policies under the scoping plan. I mean that's a basic principle that I believe in.

And then -- and the Board members and staff will say there's John again about adaptive management. But I think what we're doing with adaptive management is pretty whimpy. I'm glad that there's something there. There's nothing in actually the current scoping plan about it, but we actually are doing a little bit, as you know.

I also think that should be in the scoping plan,
that we're -- we are going to address other pollutants when we find a capped entity that's producing a lot of greenhouse gases. I mean, it's basically, to me, what's in AB 32. So those are the 3, you know, sort of basic overarching principles that I think should be in the scoping plan. It doesn't have to have paragraphs upon paragraphs, but I think it should be in there.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Well, I don't know if we're doing wrap-up comments, but I did want to -- no, no, no. I didn't -- I don't know if we are or not, but I did want to thank everybody. This has really been an extremely thoughtful and really very engaging.

I think the biggest step is putting faces and names and being able to interact for the last almost 6 hours. It really has been very impressive.

But one of the things I wanted to follow up on is, as you go back to your communities, you know, one of the things we talked about is what parts of these can go into the scoping plan, what should we look for other avenues, what belongs to somebody else? How do we get the information to you as you go back out to your communities, so you can educate. You know, one of the things that I did as an owner, I -- I share my financials with all of my people from my people janitors all the way up to vice presidents in the same room. Everybody knows what the
sales are, what the expenses are, what operating profit is.

But you can't do that if you don't help them understand the zeros, because otherwise they don't have any context to put that in, other than they see a lot of money up there. And so how do we give you the tools you need so that you can take that back and people can feel listened to, and heard? And yet, we can't cover everything in the scoping plan, because it doesn't necessarily belong there?

MODERATOR LUCERO: Katie.

EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: I think, you know, we've come full circle to that initial idea, which is, is the cross-linked table with all of the recommendations, and with that level of data, and that transparency that Richard talked about, like, look, we need legislative authority, if we're going to do this. Look, it's Caltrans's authority to expand freeways if they decide to expand freeways, but to really explore like what ARB -- to Diane's point, because you've been given this model of making this plan that encompasses such a broad array of things, what can CARB commit to do to actually follow through with those agencies?

Say, you know what, we're going to sit down and talk to Caltrans about induced demand, because it's crazy
that just 2 weeks ago I heard senior planners there call
induced demand a theory, like it was some alternative fact
out there, that if you expand freeways, you don't increase
congestion.

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER VALENZUELA GARCIA: So, like, what
can -- like, really having those internal conversations,
because that's what we've been looking for since August,
is we've been looking for a document that tells us, not
only did our recommendations get included in an appendix,
but that staff talked about it, that they considered it,
that they looked at what the options are, they looked at
who was responsible, and they actually made a plan for you
know what, if this is coming up, because it's not
happening in the communities yet, and we know that it
should be happening and it needs to happen, what more can
we do?

Can we just call the table together and have the
conversation? And can we commit to that, so that people
in our communities feel like they didn't come to a meeting
and say oh, my gosh, why is the Cap City Freeway set to be
expanded in 2020, the year that our climate goal is
supposed to ratchet down. Moving forward, what can we do,
what are our options?

And we need ARB to be that champion, even if
there's that natural political dynamic of not wanting to get in the air district's territory or other agencies. I think that's a risk that we're willing to back you on, if you're willing to make the commitment to help us figure out how to get that done.

EJAC MEMBER DINA ARGÜELLO: I'm remembering ARB's land-use tool, and the production of that. This big. But it was a very collaborative process with a lot of environmental justice folks. And it addressed that, right? Because what you hear in the community -- in that -- those communities are years of being unheard by multiple agencies.

And so often you get -- you get a shotgun approach. And so -- and our job has been to sort of look through those and figure out, well, what fits. And even we who've worked within -- with the agency in many ways still struggle with that right, the responsibility, the role, but we have partnered before in giving best practices, right, and sort of strategic direction.

And maybe there's a way to take those things that aren't in your purview, that we are hearing from communities, and figure out some -- that, right? Because at the end of the day you're responsible for the air and climate stuff, right?

And these are drivers of more -- of more
pollution. So figuring that out could be really exciting. And that's why we always think the life of this committee should go beyond this, because, you know, embedded in AB 32 that idea of don't make things worse is that recognition of the years of neglect and harm.

MODERATOR LUCERO: John.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: So for me the discussion reminds me a little bit of my experience 19 years representing communities on the county board of supervisors. The communities express a vision, and that vision may involve action by varying levels of government, federal, State, county, city, and that it's important to sort of say, okay, here's what we can -- we have authority to do, here's what we may have authority to influence, and here's what we don't have direction authority to influence.

And to the extent that items in the recommendations are a checklist, are really within the legislature's authority, more than ours, to really be honest and think about that, and maybe sort of separate out, and say here are the recommendations that are more specific where ARB has some either formal or informal authority, and then what are those in which, frankly, communities may be a better messenger to the legislature than ARB, right?
To some in the legislature, ARB may not be the best messenger, but the communities may. So maybe it's about -- as I get back to this point of sort of prioritizing the recommendations, and really trying to separate out those that may involve action by other agencies that we don't have -- where we may not be the best messenger to influence those things.

So I think that's really deserving. And then we will find after that process, I bet, that the recommendations that are directly to us are going to be less, somewhat less than the list. But it's important to have that discussion, because we want to honor that these are visions of communities, including my own, about things we want to achieve. But again, what's the venue where we achieve these things?

MODERATOR LUCERO: All right. So we have 10 minutes left, two more comments.

Luis.

EJAC MEMBER OLMEDO: I want to step out of the circle here. What I hear here is we have recommendations that are being presented. I hear that possibly some decisions that are already going to be made, or there's an inclination that there's some choices that are already going to occur.

I don't think -- I think it goes beyond showing
the numbers, and the transparency in those numbers.
There's a reason why there's a disadvantaged, and the
disadvantaged is very clear. You have communities that
have a lot more access, a lot more influence, and then you
have disadvantaged communities.

That's why these policies are being put in place.
This is a representation of that disadvantage of these
marginalized communities.

Honestly, from where I sit looking at just -- not
as a member, but let's say I remove myself, I'm just
seeing a lot of sort of circulating, but no actions, no
commitments. And I think that's been the concern all
along. I haven't been in every EJAC. I've been in the
last couple scoping plans, but I keep hearing the same
thing. It's like we're bringing recommendations, but
they're not being taken seriously.

I've worked with BDOs for a while, and, I mean,
there's things I still want to get done in the last 15
years. And it's just like, you know, have a -- have a
good friend that says (spoke in Spanish). You know that's
in Spanish.

You guys understand what that means?
(Noes.)

EJAC MEMBER OLMEDO: It's like stirring the --
right, stirring the cup, but -- you know. And I don't
mean disrespect or anything, but, I mean, there's a
certain sense of reality that we have to face, you know.

I don't see this going a whole lot anywhere. I
hope -- I actually see progress here, because of this
meeting, right? That's progress. That's great. But is
that the only thing we're going to walk away with?

I guess that's progress. I don't know. I'm not
very hopeful. I mean I bring this whole issue of, like,
real achievable things that we can do right here, like
monitoring. And that's still, you know, (spoke in
Spanish). We're going nowhere. And that's real small
like.

Like I don't know how we're going to really take
the bigger recommendations, the more transformative. I
just don't -- I don't know. I'm still waiting. I'm
hopeful.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Mary.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I want to yield to everybody
else, because I want the last word.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I guess the Chair gets that
prerogative, right?

(Laughter.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: John, do you still have more
comments?
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: No.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Okay. Kemba.

EJAC MEMBER SHAKUR: I could not resist bringing this issue up, because the Committee members are in here. That's a picture of Urban Releaf planting trees at Aviation High School with the Golden State Warriors. That's he work that I do in my community -- or we do in our community. I don't like to say the word "I".

But we receive GHG funds, and we're really happy about it. It gave us the opportunity. After 18 years, we've never seen funding like this. And it's allowed us to do a lot more.

But when Judy Mitchell spoke about going back to your city and looking at issues of your city, it made me kind of think about -- I think it might have been you, Hector De La Torre.

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER SHAKUR: I think it might have been you or that man that was sitting there. We were at a UCLA conference like a couple years ago, and it was you or him that said, I don't want to see this funding going for new cars, and new desks, and office stuff. I want to see this funding go to the community. Was that you?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: It sounds like me.

(Laughter.)
EJAC MEMBER SHAKUR: Yeah, that sounds like you. I think it was you.

But, you know, I -- it's really hard work. It's not easy work. You know, Andy Lipkis talks about the simple act of planting a tree. The tree part might be easy, but the concrete ain't.

(Laughter.)

EJAC MEMBER SHAKUR: But, you know, we received funds, but another city agency received the funds too. But then that city agency gave their funds to 2 guys who are members of Sierra Club in San Francisco. So now, my organization, Urban Releaf, is competing with Sierra Club, in the flat lands of Oakland.

And it just -- it's created a multitude of issues and problems. You know, I -- it's -- it's not easy getting people to plant trees -- I mean, to want trees. You've got to go to the owners. The residents can't do it, so you're already -- you know, it's a lot of work. I don't want to go into it.

But I just want to say is that there needs to be a strategy -- anti-displacement strategies, so that people can't just come into your city and use big words like "Sierra Club", and, you know, push you out of your own city.

MODERATOR LUCERO: All right. We have 5 minutes
left. Any other comments?

Okay. Closing remarks.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, thanks. Actually, Stephanie was going to do the closing remarks, but I actually did want to be heard on the points that we've just been talking about.

And particularly I think in response to Luis, but also to Kemba. Thank you so much. I have been -- I've been involved in a lot of tree planting issues over the years.

EJAC MEMBER SHAKUR: Four earth days.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I know what you're talking about. I totally know what you're talking about.

I think it would be sad if people left without having a moment to acknowledge at least how much has been accomplished under AB 32 in terms of what the greenhouse gas funds have already begun to accomplish. Even though we've only had them for a couple of careers, we have seen a lot. We haven't -- one of the areas where we've not done as good a job as we should have, and this was internal difficulties within the State, is just getting the information out, so people could see where the grants were going, and what they were doing.

This was government tripping over itself. So, you know, I'm not here to defend everything that
government does or that ARB does, but I do want us to also recognize that there have been some very big things that people have worked on under the greenhouse gas rubric.

And one of the things that I am the most excited about, which didn't come up today, and, John Balmes, you haven't been around for a little while, so I'm going to take you on on adaptive management. I've think we've moved beyond adaptive management.

We've got AB 197 now, which was part of -- part of SB 32. And that's giving us very specific direction. This is not just about, you know, fixing problems. It's about moving towards a much more holistic approach to toxics and health-based air pollutants at the same time that we're working on climate change. This is -- involves a huge shift in paradigm, and it's cross-cutting.

And, you know, my agency, I think, has been as fast to adapt as any ever in any bureaucracy that you could find, but still, you know, we're -- you know, it's a hard thing to do to break down all those silos, and break down all those barriers that have existed for so many years.

We need you. This isn't just something that we're, you know, putting up with. We have to have better ways to relate to communities. And the work that you are doing is essential work, and it's also, I understand, and
some of you have said it directly, it's hard work. It is
hard to be a translator, to be a middle person, to have
to, you know, move between one set of people and one set
of ways of dealing with these things and other, and try to
really be relevant and be useful.

So I am really overwhelmingly grateful to all of you for having given us your time so far. And I just want
to say that I am going to be thinking about what I heard here today, and that tomorrow at the Board meeting, I do expect to address the issue of what happens next in terms of the timeline.

So that's all I'm going to say right now, but I thank you, and we'll see you tomorrow.

MODERATOR LUCERO: Do we want a real quick summary from your neighborhood facilitator of what you guys did accomplish today and not just on AB 32?

John, is that a yes or a no.?

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: No.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I just want to respond to -- sorry. I just wanted to respond to the shout-out from Mary. I'm really glad that you brought up AB 197, because that actually should make us change our culture and paradigm. And, yeah, that's more important than
making sure that adaptive management is in the report --
the scoping plan, but I still would like it to be in the
scoping plan.

   (Laughter.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: I'm going to force you to
recognize what you accomplished today.
And I'm sorry, it's going to be fast.
So this was a historic moment, sitting down
talking with each other about where you come from, what
your issues are, what your concerns are, having the
opportunity to ask questions of why is that important, how
is that important? Let's acknowledge that, and thank you
for taking the time to be here and doing that and braving
the traffic.

   (Applause.)

MODERATOR LUCERO: Agreements. From both sides,
EJAC and ARB, an acknowledgement that public health is an
important focus, making sure that AB 32, the scoping plan
addresses improved health for Californians, and addresses
the issues of EJAC communities.

   The urgency of resolution, that something needs
to be done to address the concerns, and an acknowledgement
that that may not be in the scoping plan. It's a plan.
So maybe there's a need to look outside of the scoping
plan to figure out how to resolve some of these issues.
Everybody talked about better and greater data metrics. Better data, more -- better understanding of data, so we know what the problem is and how to resolve it. That doesn't mean that we ignore existing data. We may not have all the data and all the metrics we want. There is some data out there. The issues are urgent. Let's see what we can do with the data we have.

Look at the full scope of the issues, as well as the resolution. There's a lot of discussion about coordination, the role that CARB may or may not play. They didn't commit, but they definitely said let's think about what role can CARB play in coordinating amongst those agencies?

Where can we push the bounds within the limits of our capability in order to push these discussions. And that was seen throughout in a lot of the parking lot items. Food for thought. Not agreements, but food for thought from CARB of how do we see what type of steps need to be taken beyond what the scoping plan is, how can the scoping plan respond to things that are outside ARB's authority, how can local agencies' compliance regulations, how can we get consistency there, how can we motivate that?

You haven't resolved that, but that's a question you're asking. And I think that's an important thing,
because it's definitely something that the EJAC has expressed an interest in.

Other items that came up is just next steps. How can we identify what other agencies would be responsible for some of the EJAC recommendations? We got a commitment for the cross-link table, and some of that might be include. And then we also got a commitment to continue that.

Now, the other -- this is consistent with both agreements of something that needs to be considered, and then also we still need to figure out how to do it, but that's finding a commonality for the air districts related to toxic controls and figuring out how to engage communities.

And I think we all acknowledged and greed that the EJAC and the organizations and communities you represent here are a vital component to bring the ground truth, the issues that you're seeing, the 700 recommendations that you got from your community workshop, and help filter that up to the scoping plan.

It's at 140 now. It might stay at 140, but hopefully it can be filtered more, so that there's a better understanding of what's going on in the ground, and how the scoping plan impacts that. And so continued discussions are important, and continued discussions will
happen.

    I want to thank you all for staying here till 6:00 p.m. Drive safely. Have a wonderful evening.
    See some of you tomorrow.
    (Applause.)
    (Thereupon the Air Resources Board and EJAC joint meeting adjourned at 6:03 p.m.)
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