July 20, 2018

Mary Nichols, Chair  
California Air Resources Board  
1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: July 26, 2018 California Air Resources Board Meeting

Dear Chair Nichols:

I regret that I will be unable to attend the California Air Resources Board meeting in Sacramento on Thursday, July 26, 2018. I hope you will accept these written comments on several agenda items up for consideration next week, and request that you please forward this letter to the rest of the Board for their consideration.

**Item 18-6-2: Public Meeting to Consider Senate Bill 350 Integrated Resource Planning Electricity Sector Greenhouse Gas Planning Targets**

I appreciate the work that staff at the California Public Utilities Commission, the California Energy Commission, and CARB has put into this important target setting process, and am supportive of the staff’s recommendation for this item. However, as discussed at the Joint Legislative Committee on Climate Change Policies hearing on July 2, 2018 (“Decarbonizing the Electric Grid”), further efforts to decarbonize our grid may face obstacles. Stakeholders at that hearing specifically warned against leakage concerns, as smaller buyers of power may only displace clean power in other states and won’t generate enough demand to warrant financing new renewable energy projects. California needs to figure out how we can bring new renewable power generation online and how we can further refine our accounting of power generation to ensure emissions are counted as accurately as possible. I look forward to working with agency staff and my colleagues at the Legislature to address these serious issues so we can all enjoy the environmental benefits of a cleaner electric grid.
Item 18-6-3: Public Meeting to Consider Cap-and-Trade Auction Proceeds: Funding Guidelines for Agencies that Administer California Climate Investments

I am very supportive of staff’s proposed changes to the Funding Guidelines for Agencies that Administer California Climate Investments, and want to thank them for their exhaustive efforts on this update. Integration of the new targeting of funding called for by AB 1550 (Statutes of 2016, Chapter 369), the new funding priorities outlined in AB 398 (Statutes of 2017, Chapter 135), and the goals of addressing cumulative pollution burdens as outlined by AB 617 (Statutes of 2017, Chapter 136) is integral to increasing the likelihood that these investments reach the communities who need them the most.

I have been working this year on AB 1945, a bill that would address what I believe to be some systemic issues preventing equitable access to these important resources. Specifically, we’ve observed that more suburban communities are having issue competing for resources with more densely-populated areas, and that San Diego and Imperial Counties are having a hard time justifying the level of transportation or other resources they need to accommodate over 200,000 daily northbound border crossings from Mexico. I’ve appreciated the input your staff has given to us on this important bill. I look forward to continuing to work with CARB staff as we learn and adapt to the needs of communities that struggle with mitigating and adapting to the effects of climate change.

Item 18-6-6: Public Meeting to Consider Board Members’ Initial Staggered Terms

As the lead author for AB 1967 (Statutes of 2016, Chapter 250), I am pleased to see CARB move forward with implementation of term limits for Board members. Regarding the memo sent to Board members by the Executive Officer and Chief Counsel on July 13, 2018, I understand that it is staff’s proposal to initially stagger these terms so that three members term out in 2018, five in 2020, and six in 2022. I also understand that staff has identified which Board members will fall into each tier. I have several questions about the staff proposal:

- Why were Board members not more evenly distributed between terms ending in 2018, 2020, and 2022? It would seem that having more even distribution – maybe four in 2018, five in 2020, and five in 2022 – would avoid significant turnover in any given year and help maintain a more seamless governance transition should Board members not
continue for another term. I would appreciate staff explaining their rationale for the proposed distribution of terms.

- **Why were newer Board members given earlier term endings?** Board members who would not have completed six years under their current terms were given terms ending in 2018, while Board members who have been on the Board for much longer than six years were given terms that end in 2020 or 2022. It would be more logical and aligned with the intent of AB 197 to have Board members who have served longer than six years end their terms earlier than Board members who have not yet reached their six year term. I would appreciate staff explaining their rationale for the proposed distribution of terms.

If you have any questions or responses to my comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Eduardo Garcia

Assemblymember Eduardo Garcia
56th Assembly District
Ex Officio Member of the California Air Resources Board