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CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning, everybody. Would you please take your seats We're about to begin. Will you please take your seats. I guess -- I think people are having a really good time, but it's time to start the meeting or we could have a meeting of our own, I guess.

All right. It seems that that's what I had to do. The March 22nd, 2018. Public meeting of California Air Resources Board will come to order. Thank you all very much for being here.

Before we begin our agenda, we will all please rise and say the pledge of allegiance to the flag, which is right here.

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

CHAIRPERSON NICHOLS: Would the clerk please call the roll.

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Balmes?
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. De La Torre?
BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. Eisenhut?
BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator Florez?
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Assembly Member Garcia?
Supervisor Gioia?
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator Lara?
Ms. Mitchell?
BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mrs. Riordan?
Supervisor Roberts?
Supervisor Serna?
BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Sherriffs?
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Professor Sperling?
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Ms. Takvorian?
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Vice Chair Berg?
VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Chair Nichols?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Here.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Madam Chair, we have a quorum.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. A couple of announcements
to make before we get started.

First of all, I want to let everybody know that interpretation services will be provided in Spanish for the discussion items. Headsets are available outside the hearing room at the attendant's sign-up table, and can be picked up at any time.

Madam translator, would you repeat that, please?

(Thereupon interpretation in Spanish.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Gracias.

Anyone who wishes to testify should fill out a request to speak card available in the lobby outside the Board room. We'd appreciate it if you will turn that into a Board assistant or to the clerk seated over here at this table prior to the commencement of the item that you're wanting to speak on.

Also, since items 18-2-5, the update on implementation of the State strategy for the SIP, and the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, and 18-2-6, the update on concepts for minimizing the community health impacts from freight facilities are two agenda items that are closely related, we are going to hear them both together. So the two items will be combined in the presentation, and then there will be one comment period for both items.

I want to make sure that speakers are aware that
the Board will impose a three minute time limit. We appreciate it if you give your name when you come up to the podium and then put your testimony into your own words. It's easier for us to follow it if you will just get straight to your main points.

We appreciate all the nice things you want to say about our staff, but you don't have to take up the time that you want to take up with making other points by saying good things about them. And you don't need to read your written statements, if you have one, because it will be automatically entered into the -- into the record.

So with that -- oh, for safety reasons, please note the emergency exits to the rear of the room. There are two. In the event of a fire alarm, we're required to evacuate this room immediately and to go out of the building. When the all-clear signal is given, we will return to the hearing room and resume the meeting.

Okay. I think that's it for the pre-announcements.

The first item on the agenda was listed as a consent item, a public meeting to consider the South Coast Air Quality Management District's on-road heavy-duty vehicle incentive measure. I need to ask the clerk if any witnesses signed up to testify on this item.

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Madam Chair, we had two
people sign up to speak for this item.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Since we have had a request now then, we need to remove this from the consent calendar, and follow the normal procedure for a Board meeting.

So, Mr. Corey, would you please summarize this item.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair.

The 2016 State strategy for the State Implementation Plan was adopted by the Board March 23rd, 2017. The State SIP Strategy contains the State's emission reduction commitments for the South Coast Air Quality Management District, including commitments for meeting the 80 parts per billion 8-hour ozone standard in 2023.

While regulations form the basis of the strategy and are critical to driving the technology development and deployment of the cleanest technologies into the fleet, incentive efforts are needed to expand the deployment of these cleaner technologies in time to meet the federally mandated air quality standards.

Among the proposed measures in the State SIP Strategy was a commitment to develop the incentive funding to achieve further emission reductions from on-road heavy-duty vehicles or the South Coast's incentive
measure. This item delivers on that commitment.

The South Coast incentive measure supports the need to expand deployment of the cleanest technologies by using Carl Moyer Air Quality Standards Attainment Program funding to accelerate the penetration of near-zero and zero emission heavy-duty trucks operating in the South Coast Air Basin and produce emission reductions in 2023.

For these emission reductions to be approved by the U.S. EPA for SIP credit, staff followed U.S. EPA guidance as it worked with U.S. EPA and district staff to develop the first-of-its-kind prospective incentive measure. This effort will serve as a template for CARB and air districts to take prospective credit in the SIP for emission reductions from the incentive programs in the future.

This proposal would establish the accounting framework needed to receive prospective SIP credit for turning over on-road heavy-duty trucks to cleaner trucks through existing incentive programs such as Moyer.

U.S. EPA guidelines outlined the requirement states need to meet in order for the emission reductions from incentive projects to be SIP credible.

California already has in place the accounting framework to receive SIP credit for incentive projects after the projects have been completed, and the funds
expended. The South Coast incentive measure extends that framework to future projects for incentive programs where the future funding stream is guaranteed.

If approved, the South Coast incentive measure will be submitted to U.S. EPA for inclusion in the California SIP.

That concludes pie remarks

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Corey. We have three witnesses who've signed up. We'll start with Shirley Gamble. Ms. Gamble, would you please come forward to speak. There you are.

Thank you. Just to be clear, everybody, come on down, and you'll be speaking from the podium here.

Thanks.

MS. GAMBLE: Good morning.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning.

MS. GAMBLE: My name is Shirley Gamble. I'm here from the Watts Clean Air and Energy Group. Thank you for giving me this opportunity.

I'm here for two reasons: One to say I hope you have the courage and the commitment to draft for the no emi -- zero emission for the drayage trucks. And I just learned what that words means, so that's the one that -- the trucks that go from city to city, from the port to the -- to the other cities, so that's one of the reasons.
And the other reason I'm here is I'm hoping that the draft includes we say good jobs, but good jobs to me mean jobs that can afford a family to support itself. So thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you for coming. Appreciate that very much.

Next is it Kent Minault. I hope I pronounced it correctly.

Hi.

MR. MINAULT: Good morning, Board members. My name is Kent Minault.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Minault.

MR. MINAULT: That's quite all right.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Pronounced the French way.

MR. MINAULT: French names are awful difficult.

I volunteer with the Sierra Club. And I work as an adult education teacher. My remarks are neutral, because I'm perfectly in favor of the incentives, but I'm concerned about what are called near-zero emission vehicles.

Right now, I'm teaching a class of students through L.A. Trade Tech to help them pass entrance examples to union apprenticeship programs. And the unions that are looking to recruit are the ones like IBEW Local 11, whose members will build the battery electric buses
that will be deployed across Southern California in the
next 12 years, as well as building the charging
infrastructure to go with it.

Now, we're calling on the Board to show courage
and save lives. As a result of inaction, children are
dying. Now, zero-emission vehicles are the solution. We
ask that you start moving us to a zero-emission truck
rule. What we have now is dirty air and bad jobs. The
only winners are the fossil fuel and goods movement
industries. Workers are stuck in low-paying jobs, while
their families struggle with dirty air. With a clearly
thought out plan to move us to a zero-emission
transportation system, we can promise our children a clean
air future, and their parents decent paying, collectively
bargains jobs.

Let's demonstrate the leadership that will get us
to the future we want. Thanks for your attention.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

The third speaker on this item has also asked to
speak on the other 2 items that were on our consent
calendar. And so I am going to pull also items 2 and 3,
the cap on greenhouse gas emissions, and the consideration
of research proposals.

And I think what we'll do is ask Mr. Corey to
briefly speak to those items and then we'll let Mr. Eger
come -- or Eder pardon me, Eder, come forward and speak on all of them.

Okay.

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Madam Chair, before we move to the next item, I believe we need to vote for this item?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Excuse me?

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Take a vote for this item?

CHAIR NICHOLS: I'm not understanding. Yes, he also wanted to speak on this item as well.

Oh, well, he has to be allowed to speak before we can take a vote. Yeah, so I was planning on just doing them in order, is that all right?

Okay.

Would you go ahead, please.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair.

So the second consent item I'm going to briefly describe it. CARB staff has proposed amendments to the Cap-and-Trade Regulation in order to accomplish two goals. First, CARB staff seeks to clarify existing requirements related to changes of facility ownership. Specifically, the proposed amendments clarify that the Cap-and-Trade Regulation requires a successor entity after change of
ownership to be responsible for the outstanding pre-transfer compliance obligation of the predecessor covered entity. This clarification is made in light of ongoing bankruptcy litigation involving a covered entity in the program.

Second, CARB seeks to clarify the regulatory procedure for establishing the auction reserve price. Under the existing California regulation, the auction reserve price in effect for a specific joint auction is determined as the higher of the annual auction reserve prices established individually by California and Quebec after converting the prices to a common currency.

California's regulation does not reflect changes in Ontario's regulation, and does not recognize the possibility that the joint auction reserve price could be set by the Ontario auction reserve price.

The proposed amendment is necessary to reflect that Ontario and Quebec use province-specific inflation rates when setting their annual auction reserve prices. Without the proposed amendment, in the unlikely event that Ontario's auction reserve price were higher than both California and Quebec's, this could prevent CARB executive officer from certifying the auction result.

The proposed amendments do not change the structure of the program. CARB staff will also continue
with the rulemaking process to propose more substantial modifications to comport with the requirements of AB 398. That process will conclude after the -- in -- over the course of this -- this year.

And the third consent item concerns research proposals. The research covered by the research proposals before you today support the Board's regulatory priorities related to health, environmental justice, air quality, and climate change. The proposed projects will support California's air quality and climate goals by evaluating the effectiveness of multiple criteria pollutant emission reduction programs, identifying high emitting vehicles, measuring brake wear emissions, developing an instrument to measure toxic metal aerosols, and creating a framework to measure greenhouse gas emission reductions in zero net carbon communities.

These research projects were presented to you as concepts in the research plan, and have now been developed into full proposals. They have been reviewed by CARB's research screening committee, as well as by other State agencies and funding organizations to promote coordination and avoid duplication.

The majority of these proposals includes low overhead rate and leverages the expertise of researchers within the University of California and California State
University systems.

And we recommend approval of these proposals.

That concludes the summary.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much. Okay. Okay
No. Sorry.

Mr. Eder, would you please come forward.

MR. EDER: Good morning. My name is Harvey Eder.

I'm speaking for myself and for the Public Solar Power
Coalition. First, I have a process question.

Am I getting three minutes on each -- you know, each of the three items?

CHAIR NICHOLS: I think three minutes total, sir.

MR. EDER: I protest that, and say that my time is being cut. I don't know how the Brown Act fits in or whatever.

Anyway, for the district on one again echoing what the previous two speakers said there should be zero-emission vehicles, trucks, battery. I incorporate by reference the February issue of The Economist, the article on electric vehicles, electric trucks. They're here today. Anyway, it's cost effective, and whatnot. And been looking at this and talking to manufacturers.

On greenhouse -- okay, first of all, for natural gas, it's biased. This plan is a fossil fuel natural gas plant. All the plants for the state have been. Ninety
percent of gas is imported into the state. Health and
Safety Code 530002(b) says the legislative intent is to
not use fossil fuels, especially non-renewable imported
into this State. This is not even published in the blue
book, this 53000. And it also includes for a solar
financing secondary mortgage entity. Anyway, this -- this
has been purged. This is 81 from Row Behrity[phonteic].

The particulate matter -- they have not looked
at -- talked with Dr. Linda Smith. There needs to be a
study on dirty gas as toxics, looking at formaldehyde
benzene deaths per million has never been done. NOx, SOx,
PM, that's where the body count is at $9 million per. In
South Coast you say 4,000, that's $36 billion per year, 10
years. Thirty years to 50 years life of a solar system.
You're talking over a billion to billion -- trillion to a
trillion and a half dollars. Anyway, the research should
be done on natural -- dirty gas as a toxic.

Also, there's a lot happening with --
concentrating solar and thermal storage at less cost and
more viability and options that it can perform, including
seasonal storage.

I don't see my time thing here is that -- oh,
okay. Well, it looks like I'm out of time. I am -- we
are litigating against you folks and had a tentative
couple days ago in court. And consider this part of
settlement discussions. Talk to me.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you. We had one last late minute sign up from the Sierra Club -- or someone representing the Sierra Club. Estrella Arana, if you're here.

MS. ARANA: My name is Estrella and I am from San Bernardino. I'm disappointed that 200 gas trash trucks are being distributed to disadvantaged communities in the Inland Empire. We don't need anymore gas. Purchasing near-zero emission vehicles, natural gas vehicles, is a half step that will achieve little, if any, environmental long-term benefits in order to achieve California's greenhouse gas targets, SB 100. We must push for completely zero-emission vehicles, especially in areas with the worst air quality.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Okay. I think we agree with you on the drive to zero-emission vehicles, but that's not specifically covered in any of the items that we're voting on at the moment.

I think we need to take them up in order. So let's start with the first one, which is the incentives. I'm sorry. I didn't -- I'm trying to learn how to use the system. Okay. Got it.
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: No problem. Thank you. I'm glad actually we pulled some of the items. I would like to ask staff and -- in the future, I know this item on cap and trade is on consent. I'm just wondering, given the timeframe of the legislation, given the ongoing conversation in this realm, whether or not we should not put cap and trade on consent moving forward, and for a couple of -- couple of reasons.

You know, first, from my perspective only, and maybe staff can delve a little more into this, the resolution is to inform the Board on what specifically? So I'm trying to understand what the resolution is actually trying to accomplish?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: Sorry. So Senator Florez, the -- this is actually a regulatory amendment, and it has two main parts.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Yes.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: One piece has to do with making sure that as companies are going through bankruptcy that their emission obligations are passed on. And we think that the regulation is clear on that, but we wanted to clarify. So that's one piece, and it relates to a current proceeding that is happening right now.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: The second piece
was an oversight in the drafting of the regulation when we linked with Ontario. And currently, if the Ontario floor price is the one that is -- is the floor price that we should us, there's no mechanism in the regulation to choose that. So these are very, very small surgical changes that, as Mr. Corey said, don't affect the broader structure of the regulation or the broader regulatory changes that we are currently workshopping and having conversations with stakeholders about.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. I appreciate that. Madam Chair, I don't know if there's, at some point -- you know, the goal of the Board obviously is to hear the public, but there's also this other sector called the legislature that things bubble up over there. So maybe staff can, on this topic, come back with three items through the Chair, on the Chair's timing. One is what is the status of the advisory board. I know the Senate made an appointment. I know the Assembly has yet to make an appointment to give us advice as we move through this.

So maybe we can get an update checking in with the speaker on the timing of that. I think that's important, only because I think it brings this advisory board -- the purpose of that was to bring a little bit more into this.

The other has to do with the treatment of
offsets. LAO did a pretty thorough job of trying to understand and give some thoughts on this new rule or new legislation instate/outstate. I'd like to know if, in some sense, where that's going. Maybe just an update for the Board, you know, what is instate what is outstate, how are we thinking about it, how are we communicating with the public. And, of course, the always -- the always upfront conversation about oversupply, is there, is there not? Again LAO opined on that.

And I would like to know from staff in this particular realm, you know, what -- you know, how we are looking at this issue kind of moving forward. And so I appreciate that the resolution is very specific. It's aimed at two items. I definitely will support it. And that meant -- but I think on a larger scale these three items continue to brew in the legislature. I think we should be ahead of it with a Board conversation. And I think we should, in some sense, have some Board conversations on those three items: Again oversupply, you know, some sense of where offsets are, and, of course, the status of the advisory committee. So that would just be my comment.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Well, I'm going to take that as a Board member request of the staff, and --
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: However, you'd like to do it.

CHAIR NICHOLS: -- ask the staff to respond.
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Yeah, I just wanted to make sure at this point.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah, absolutely.
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIR NICHOLS: I think it's a good -- a good point that it's time for another update on how things are going with the program and let's try to get that -- let's try to get that scheduled. I know a little bit about too much about all of those things, and I -- but I don't want to start the conversation right now. I know.
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: At some point.
CHAIR NICHOLS: No, no, it's for you -- for the Board and for -- and for the public as well. So, yes, we need to do that.

On these two items that are in front of us, I do want to mention on one of them that it was actually in response to a legislative issue about our authority to require a successor company when somebody goes through bankruptcy to continue to be responsible for the allowances. And we were asked that question in a hearing. And some doubt was raised about our position.

So we thought it was really important to get that
one fixed and clarified right away. So any other Board members wanted to comment on item number 1? If not, we can have a resolution.

I have a motion.

Yes. Sorry.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Hello.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Your yellow light is flashing.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: We need a technical manual. Thank you. I just wanted to comment on the public comments in regards to the need to go to zero emissions. And I ask that question of the staff in regards to item number 1. And my understanding, I just want to clarify this, is that there is flexibility in that incentive program, and that zero-emission trucks -- trash trucks and drayage trucks could be -- would be eligible as well. So I just wanted to confirm that, so that while I know that there was a -- more of a focus on natural gas vehicles, that there is the ability for the district to utilize those incentive funds for zero emission. And I just wanted to get that confirmation.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: That's correct. The method -- it's a methodology for accounting. It does not preclude zero at all. It's included.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes.
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you
CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. All right. May I have a motion then?
BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So moved.
VICE CHAIR BERG: Second.
CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. All in favor of Item number 1, the South Coast heavy-duty vehicle incentive measure, say aye, please?
(Unanimous aye vote.)
CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed?
Any abstentions?
Okay. Great.
Let's then move to Item number 2, which is the amendments to the cap and the market-based compliance mechanism. And again, the only witness we had on that one was Mr. Eder. I understand his basic issue is around solar energy, and the need to be moving on solar energy, which again we agree to, but I think it's probably not going to affect this particular item. However, I will ask for a motion and a second here.
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: So moved.
VICE CHAIR BERG: Second.
CHAIR NICHOLS: All in favor, please say aye?
(Unanimous aye vote.)
CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed?
None.
And any abstentions?
Okay. Great.
Then on item number 3, which is the seven research proposals, no one has addressed those seven research proposals.
I don't know if any Board members have any comments on them?
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I think I have to recuse myself as a UC employee.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. All right.
Any other?
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Likewise also.
CHAIR NICHOLS: So, all right, Dr. Sperling as well. So our two -- our two actual researchers can't vote on the research proposals, but I guess that's the -- that's the way it is.
With those two excepted, I'll ask for a motion from --
BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Move approval.
BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Second.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Motion and a second. All in favor please say aye?
(Unanimous aye vote.)
(Professor Sperling and Dr. Balmes recused.)
CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed?

None.

And the two abstentions. All right. That concludes the opening items.

We are now going to move on to the staff's proposal for regional greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets pursuant to Senate Bill 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008. As we discussed at our December meeting, SB 375 is an important component of our State strategy for achieving our climate goals through more sustainable land use, and transportation planning.

Today, we will vote on a staff proposal for updated regional targets. This proposal builds upon the new framework that we discussed back in December. Since December, there's been a lot of further discussion between the staff, the MPOs, and members of the public. And I particularly want to thank the MPO's who staff members have worked very closely with our staff, as well as those members of the public who took the time and provided very substantive feedback on the new approach.

This is not simply an update to the numerical targets. As we know, SB 375 was not intended to simply lead us to develop better modeling, but also to prompt changes in land use and transportation policy. This
update presents a new framework for SB 375 that brings greater focus to tracking and monitoring the policies and investments that are occurring at the regional level.

Today, we will take action on what can be accomplished via SB 375 while recognizing the fact that we all have more to do. SB 375 is not the final word on what it's going to take to get to the kinds of land use and transportation decisions, investments and plans that we need to make lasting and serious progress on our greenhouse gas and air quality problems, but it is an important step in that direction.

We have several MPOs that are here to speak today, and we look forward to hearing from them. But first we will hear from the staff.

Mr. Corey.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair Nichols. At the December 2017 Board hearing, as you noted, SB 375 program staff reported on the target update process to date, and presented initial thoughts on a new framework for CARB target setting and evaluations of the MPO strategies.

During that discussion, the Board expressed interest in staff's proposed direction and provided comments focusing on helping address challenges the MPOs faced, as well as the importance of setting targets to
achieve concrete benefits for communities around the State.

Since presenting at the December hearing, CARB staff held four public workshops in Fresno, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and San Diego. Staff also met individually with staff from many MPOs. These meetings have allowed staff to refine the approach to this new target paradigm.

In addition, staff has begun work to implement Senate Bill 150 passed in 2017. SB 150, by Senator Allen, requires CARB to monitor regional greenhouse gas reductions under SB 375, and report to the legislature every four years beginning with a report due later this year.

The report must provide data regarding strategies to meet the targets, a list of best practices, and challenges faced by regions, including the impacts of State funding and policies. Today's proposed target update and staff's work to develop a monitoring program in response to SB 150 are anticipated to work together to strengthen the program implementation moving forward.

I'll now ask Heather King of the Air Quality Planning and Science Division to begin the staff presentation.

Heather

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was
presented as follows.)

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you, Mr. Corey. Good morning, Chair Nichols and members of the Board.

--o0o--

AIR POLLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: For today's presentation on the SB 375 targets, I'll walk you through staff's current proposal, which includes an updated framework for how we at CARB approach our role in SB 375. I'll share some of the stakeholder feedback that we heard during our most recent series of workshops, and then I'll talk about what's next for the program. I'll conclude by summarizing staff's recommendation.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: We came to you in December with an informational update on staff's current thinking on the SB 375 targets. These are, of course, the per capita greenhouse gas emission reduction targets that apply to passenger vehicles. At that time, we also recommended a paradigm shift in how CARB evaluates the sustainable communities strategies, the SCSs, that are prepared by the state's metropolitan planning organizations, the MPOs. And we also talked to you about how we plan to approach tracking implementation moving forward.
Staff is proposing three key elements as part of the proposal before you today. The first is to adopt the proposed higher numeric targets. This is the same proposal you heard about in December. The second element would direct staff to work with the MPOs to recognize and isolate actual progress due to the land-use trans -- and transportation policies and investments inside each of their plans.

Our goal here is to overcome the effects of assumptions about fuel price, vehicle fleet efficiency, economic conditions, and other factors, and focus more squarely on the efforts that jurisdictions are actually making from one plan to the next.

So in other words, the MPO will be asked to show us what is the increment of progress achieved through the strategies in your plans from one plan to the next?

The third element of our proposal before you today will be to direct staff to work with MPOs to introduce a new additional reporting and data tracking component to how the MPOs' investments and their project lists support their commitments to greenhouse gas reduction.

So in other words, what did the MPOs say they would do, did they do it, and was it effective?

--o0o--
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: For the targets themselves, this slide summarizes the existing and proposed 2035 targets for the four largest MPOs in the state. As we discussed with you in December, preliminarily SACOG's target is going to be structured as a pilot. Under this recommendation, SACOG's target is 19 percent with SACOG responsible for developing some innovative programs to address challenges that are unique to the SACOG region in its 2020 MTP.

If State funding and other commitments that are necessary to support those programs are not secured, then SACOG's target would be 18 percent. And James Corless, Executive Director of SACOG, is here today and can talk with us more about this project in more detail.

If adopted by the Board, the proposed targets would take effect October 1st, 2018, which is exactly eight years from when the original targets were established. CARB is able to set targets for years 2020 and 2035, though not listed on the slide, the 2020 targets would be brought in line with the existing anticipated performance of the current SCSs, which we see as a necessary clean-up step. And as 2020 approaches, it will become the first milestone reporting year under SB 375 for implementation.

--o0o--
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Here are the existing and proposed higher targets for the eight San Joaquin Valley MPOs. These targets would apply to the third round of SCSs prepared by the valley MPOs.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: And here are the existing and proposed targets for the six remaining small MPOs in the State. The proposed new reporting framework would be phased in to apply to these 6 MPOs for the SCSs adopted after 2020.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you.

This slide shows graphically the aggregated statewide greenhouse gas reduction benefits of staff's proposal. From left to right, the existing targets, what MPOs' adopted plans would achieve in the center, which outperforms the existing targets, and staff's proposal shown in the right most bar.

As you'll recall from our discussion in December, there's a gap between what the scoping plan scenario calls for from this sector, and what the SB 375 Program can realistically achieve. We did hear from stakeholders who want SB 375 to be more ambitious. For example, several
stakeholders have said that targets should be set at 25 percent right in line with what the scoping plan calls for from this sector.

So why not just make the targets 25 percent? Let's talk about that. SB 375 allows the MPOs to recommend their targets to CARB, which they have done so. The MPOs' recommendations to CARB were very much a continuation of what their existing SCSs would more or less achieve, if they're implemented. And as we describe in our final staff report, which we published in February, we do believe that the MPOs can do more. Our proposal is a push on the MPOs to do more than what they would achieve on paper today.

And I say on paper, because the operative phrase I keep using on whether the SCS meets the targets is, "if implemented", if these plans are implemented.

Let's all remember that having an SCS is voluntary. The RTP, the regional transportation plan, is a federally required action, but having an SCS that hits the targets as part of the RTP is voluntary.

Ms. Mitchell, you asked us, you know, a very good question and made a good comment in December, very accurate, that this is really hard, because the local governments are the ones that implement the land-use piece of SCS, not the MPO, and it requires them to work
together.

We've heard from several stakeholders during our workshops about local land-use policies that can even create particular implementation challenges with SCS. So there are real and great challenges with this program.

The MPOs have all prepared SCSs that show meeting their targets on paper, but there are a lot of questions about whether we'll hit this 18 percent bar in the middle when 2035 rolls around. And a lot of MPOs have these questions too.

So our proposal before you today aims to take a major step forward into making this less of a paper exercise and getting at what we care about, which is on-the-ground implementation of SB 375.

So CARB could most certainly ratchet the targets all the way up to 25 percent, but what could that actually look like?

One scenario is that we stop getting SCSs. And in that scenario, we run a risk of going backwards. So, you know, we have local jurisdictions that are starting to use the streamlining provisions under SB 375 to build some desperately needed housing that's affordable, that's transit oriented, and those projects could be held up in litigation for years to come.

There are disadvantaged communities who are
seeking certain pots of State funding to implement some of the projects that are in today's SCSs. And those jurisdictions could, in some cases, become effectively ineligible overnight for that money.

And I haven't even brought up yet the new challenges that are ahead for MPOs, which are total wild cards, which is deployment of autonomous vehicles and new mobility services.

Depending on how these new modes are deployed, this could cause vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions to go up or down. Depending on the policies that are rolled out with those. So we as the State and local jurisdictions have to take responsibility for our own roles in getting to where we need to go as partners with the MPOs and provide policy direction that serves the public interest.

CARB is fully committed to getting to 25 percent as a state. The SB 375 targets are one tool to get there, but it's not the venue to get all the way there, not based on what we know today, but we do have a path forward to close this gap, and I'll come back to that.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Over the last two months, as you've heard, we've conducted four workshops around the state to reach out to more of our stakeholders.
about how to get more out of SB 375. We had 130 stakeholders attend in person.

One question we got, and we continue to get over the years, is why are we doing this? Why are we doing any of this? Why do we need to reduce vehicle miles traveled through land-use change? Won't technology and fuels take care of this for us? And the answer is simple, we will not hit our climate goals without it.

And reducing VMT can solve problems that electric vehicles can't. There are so many benefits with this program. The narrative we heard from our stakeholders explains the scope well. We've got many stakeholders who took time out of their schedules to come to our workshops, who took time to come travel and be with us here today, who live in overburdened communities. They're overburdened with pollution, daily stress, high rents, and a general lack of access.

The transportation system isn't working in so many of our communities. It literally takes a single mom 90 minutes one way by transit to reach her job only 20 miles away. She can't afford a home near her job. She can't afford to buy an electric car. That's just a false narrative for so many folks still in our communities in California.

SB 375 was always about providing choices,
choices for where to live, choices for how to get around. And today's proposal seeks to acknowledge the need for further progress, not only on emissions, but for access to choices, and providing those choices will lower VMT.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: The other major need we heard in our workshops is this hunger for increased transparency and accountability in the process. That is exactly what we're proposing by adding these new elements to our evaluation process for SCSs moving forward under SB 375.

Historically, CARB has based its determination of whether an SCS meets the targets on results of travel demand models, which reflect many confounding factors, several of which have nothing to do with the MPOs' land use and transportation strategies, and can even mask the effects of those strategies, or work against them.

So we will still be looking at the modeling. That will still be a part of the work we do at CARB, but we're going to start asking the MPOs to report to us the increment of progress in 2035 directly tied to their land use and transportation strategies through a plan-over-plan comparison.

In addition, just last year, SB 375 was amended to add a third piece to CARB's role in SB 375. Until now,
we've been limited to setting targets and reviewing SCSs. But this new piece calls for monitoring SB 375 implementation to date. So as part of this target update, we're introducing a monitoring component.

We'll ask the MPOs to report on how far the region has come on implementing their SCS, and whether their strategies worked?

So simply put, we're monitoring compliance and effectiveness, which completes the cycle in CARB's evaluation process under SB 375.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: In addition to adding the new monitoring component, CARB will be preparing a report to the legislature on the challenges faced by the MPOs, and the best practices that exist. We've collected a lot of challenges and barriers to further progress under SB 375 through the target update process. We've been in the collection phase for some time now.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: That serves as the basis for this list of seven focus areas listed on this slide. We're organizing around these seven topics: healthy communities, land use and the struggles with local control, the affordable housing crisis, access to
transportation choices, incentives and the price of driving, next generation mobility, and the decision-making process itself as to how the money gets allocated and how do the projects get selected.

We heard in our most recent series of workshops that these seem to be the right scope of the issues. But the narrative I shared earlier explains the scope much better than this slide. This system isn't working for everybody. The choices of where to live and how to get around are not equitably distributed.

The land value near transit of high quality is so sky high that the people who rely on transit most cannot afford to live near it. Transit ridership statewide is going down, and we only partially understand why. And VMT per capita, the most important measuring stick of whether SB 375 is working, is recently starting to head in the wrong direction.

Land use change take time, but we can't take a wait-and-see approach either. So this is a call to action to all parties involved that play a role in housing, land use, and transportation policy to remove barriers, so we can get to the desired outcomes in these areas. That is to take the next steps in the scoping plan, to get to 25 percent, and to get the system working for everybody.

To do this, we'll need different tools. We'll
need stronger tools. We'll need stronger land-use tools to produce more housing affordable to all income levels. We'll need pricing tools that promote the public interest as technology shifts towards new mobility services. And we'll need to look at how resources get spent in a way that can help improve the quality of life for those that are most overburdened.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: During the next several months, we'll take what we learn, we'll extract out what are the right metrics to track, what are the actionable items and what are the best practices?

This spring we plan to conduct a public process to solicit input on how we'll update our program guidelines for evaluating the SCSs. We anticipate having a draft available this summer, and we plan to finalize those guidelines prior to when the new targets would take effect later this year.

We've begun conversations and we anticipate providing MPOs and stakeholders more details very soon on the new metrics and the reporting we expect under the new monitoring program. Next, we'll take our recommendations forward in the SB 375 progress report to the legislature due September 1st.

We'll update you, the Board, prior to your joint
meeting with the California Transportation Commission later this year with some of these action items that could potentially be brought to the table for those meetings.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: A draft environmental analysis was completed for the proposed target update, which was released last June. Staff determined that implementation of the proposed target update may have potentially significant impacts for -- to some resource areas. However, those impacts are mostly related to short-term construction activities.

Staff determined that the overarching statewide benefits of our proposal on greenhouse gas emissions would be beneficial.

The draft EA was released for a 45-day public comment period, which ended July 28th, 2017. Staff prepared a final EA and written responses to all comments received on the draft EA. And we posted those to our website earlier this month.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: As you've heard today, our recommended proposal to update the SB 375 targets aims to achieve multiple goals, one of which is to complete a statutory requirement to update the targets every eight years. CARB may update the target every four
years, as conditions change. So your next opportunity to
revise the targets would be in 2022.

Staff recommends that the Board approve the
written responses to comments, certify the final EA, make
the required CEQA findings, and Statement of Overriding
Considerations, and approve the proposed target update.

Thank you. And staff would be happy to answer
any questions prior to moving to public comment and
discussion.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Thank you very much.
Dr. Balmes, just had a brief comment here.
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Heather. And I
think I can speak for Supervisor Serna as well, this is
the kind of staff presentation that really engages the
Board. I really want to compliment you, because instead
of just sort of going through reading, you engaged us in,
you know, a thought exercise.

And I would just say for future staff
presentations, you know, you set the mark.
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Very good. Thank you. I agree.
So I guess this is a question or comment at this
point. One piece that seems to be missing from the
discussion, maybe it's included elsewhere, is the role of
funding. And the -- it gets brought up all the time by
the MPOs is, okay, so you've got a plan. Now, where's the money going to come from to actually implement it?

And we now have, as a result of some legislation, a process at least whereby CARB is going to be meeting on a regular basis with the California Transportation Commission, which is the entity that actually gets to approve where all the money gets spent.

And I'm wondering if you can give us, or someone can give us, a brief update how that's going, and what you think is likely to come of that process.

Maybe, Mr. Corey, you want to take that one?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Sure, Chairman.

So, the -- and I think it was AB 79, but it basically called for twice-a-year meetings with the -- between the Board and the CTC. So I've been working with the Executive Director of the California Transportation Committee to get these discussions set. The first one is set for June. We're working through the logistics.

But more substantively, I think this was really at the core of the bill, presents an opportunity, for instance, the conversations of the implementation of the scoping plan, the implementation of 375, the intersection of transportation policy and funding. Just as you said Chair, that the CTC plays a significant role over in terms of transportation funding and decisions that will be with
us for decades, and the opportunity to -- for the Board to engage with CTC in terms of that decision-making process, and how it comports with the State's long-term policies, in terms of air quality, climate policy, and some of the issues that are raised with 375.

So we are working through the agenda now and really excited. I think it's going to represent really an exceptional opportunity to pull the pieces together that really haven't been there substantially so far in terms of the interaction with CalTrans, CalSTA, CTC.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I mean, it hasn't actually happened yet. Obviously, it's just set for -- but the fairly near future. But one of the things that I think is frustrating to everybody who's been involved in this topic from the environmental or health side is that transportation projects, as projects, are put into plans, and they live for decades, not just years.

And then they come up for funding, and they've been on the books for so long, that they end up just getting funded and going ahead, long after there's any real desire or need to have those particular projects get built, or least since they -- you know, they're no longer a solution to an actual problem, let's put it that way.

And so I think maybe there's at least some hope on the horizon that we may have found a new mechanism that
might -- that might help with that problem.

Okay. I've got several people who want to speak
starting with Supervisor Gioia.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Thank you, and thanks to
staff. I'll just second my colleagues comment about the
nature of the presentation.

AGP VIDEO: The microphone is not on.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Is says the mic is on
Can you hear me?

Here, we go. All right. There we go. That's
better.

So I wanted to ask staff about how we can
include - and I know we're going to hear about this issue
from a number of speakers - greater leverage in our
resolution requiring, encouraging, incentivizing social
equity analysis as part of the development of the SCS. We
have language in the resolution specifically that -- on
page five that acknowledges that -- that this target
approach quote "Is consistent with CARB's environmental
justice policies and does not disproportionately impact
people of any race, culture, or income.

And I think we know that as one implements these
plans, there is a great potential in some regions to
impact people who are living in these communities,
especially lower income communities. And I was involved
in the development of the first SCS in the Bay Area, Plan Bay Area. And that issue was discussed frequently. And there was a lot of thought given to that.

I am concerned that all the plans will not have a robust discussion of that. And I'm not certain that folks would agree with this statement in the resolution that this approach does not disproportionately impact people of any race, culture, or income. It depends how each plan is developed. And that will vary widely around the state.

So I'd like to see us explore the greatest amount of leverage we have to get a social equity -- a robust social equity analysis in these plans, which could include the directors when they come up making a commitment to doing that or -- and/or including that in the resolution.

And so I'd like to hear the staff's thinking on that, and ultimately to hear comments from the MPOs as you come up and speak. Because I think it's going to be approached differently around the state. And I'm not sure I agree with the finding here that there is not going to be a disproportionate impact. There is clearly a potential that some of these plans will -- could.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: Supervisor, Gioia, Kurt Karperos, CARB staff.

We very much agree with you that there is a need as we move forward with implementation of SB 375, and
particularly with the requirements that have been added under SB 150 for the tracking that we're talking about --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: -- to fully evaluate the social equity impacts of the SCSs.

This particular finding relates to the target-setting process.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: No, I realize that.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: Right.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I realize that.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: So in terms of the finding, from staff's perspective, I think we're square here. But going forward, as we examine the SCSs, I think it's absolutely critical that we get a robust set of metrics and analysis from the MPOs on the social equity issues.

We've started that conversation already with the MPO directors, and I know that they will be speaking to that in their prepared remarks. And certainly, we'll take the direction that you're giving us here, that we -- we pursue this element of the SB 150 tracking with vigor.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I mean, I know this is an issue that my -- a number of my colleagues have raised as well. And so what does it take to ensure that we're getting a commitment to doing these things?
Because I'm not so certain that when folks walk out of the room, that when push comes to shove, knowing sort of the discussions that go on in each of the regions that we -- that we would get those strong metrics. So I'd like to consider how we would put that in the resolution, and also hear commitments from MPOs, and any other potential mechanism to enforce that.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: So I certainly think it's within the Board's prerogative to add to the resolution specific direction in terms of the type of metrics that you want to see when we report back to you. And as we provide to the legislature through our reports, the first one being done this summer, as we listen to the testimony from the MPO directors, I think we can probably help craft some language that could be added to the resolution.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: And maybe as MPO directors come up, they can give their thoughts on how to achieve this as well.

Okay. Thanks.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Professor Sperling.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: I just have a few short comments, because I want to have a more robust discussion later. But I first want to repeat what Professor Balmes said, that was, I thought, the most brilliant, insightful
staff presentation I've heard in a very long time. It was sophisticated, and clearly I agreed with it.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: You made her blush.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: But I'm serious. And I liked the statement this -- there has to be a call to action. We've been doing this for almost 10 years now. And frankly, we've not accomplished much, other than we've created a discourse, which has been positive, and that's good. But we need -- this is a -- has to be a call to action now. And I think we start -- we're starting to appreciate that.

And I want to reaffirm what Chair Nichols said is that focusing on the funding, but I'm not clear -- I've been one advocating for that a long time. But there is funding out there through SB 1, through the transportation programs. And I think the quick comment that was made in the staff presentation about creating performance metrics and being able to evaluate it, and those performance metrics being applied with the CTC and the transportation funding to actually accomplish the goals we're talking about. That has not happened, and that would be a great contribution.

And so I'm -- I think we're on the right path,
but we need to really up our game. And we can talk about the details later.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I think it's time then to turn to our list of witnesses. And we have four MPOs. I'm not sure if they want to just come in that order or -- is that how you'll do it?

MR. IKHRATA: (Nods head.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Great, starting with Hasan Ikhrata from SCAG.

MR. IKHRATA: Thank you, Chairwoman, Board members. Welcome to the SCAG region. This is part of the SCAG region.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

MR. IKHRATA: We need the rain, so I'm not going to say sorry for the rain, but I'm sure you probably were expecting different weather here.

I'm going to add my voice to some of you, and say that you have an excellent staff. Richard Corey, Kurt, all the team has been working with us very closely, very openly, very honestly. So I couldn't say thank you to Richard, and Kurt, and the team.

We met several times. We talked about what's happening, where we need to go. A couple of things I want
to mention and I want to commit to today. And my
colleagues from San Francisco, Sacramento, and San Diego
will also speak to that.

There is -- it's not a secret that per capita
vehicle mile traveled in the nation and in California is
going up. Going in the wrong direction. These are actual
data. You can't hide it. And regardless of how good your
modeling tools are with this trend, it makes you think,
okay, what do we need to do to reverse the trend, and make
these reductions that we need to make under -- under the
law.

SCAG in the last couple of weeks have done --
couple of months have done a major transit study. We ask
UCLA researchers to look at why transit ridership is down.
And they came back and frankly it was a bit surprising.
But between 2000 and 2015, the SCAG region added 2.3
million people.

The SCAG region also added 2.1 million vehicles,
which is four times the rates of the 1990s. The economy
has never been better, income in the Bay Area up by like
30 percent, up here but not as much. So people are buying
cars.

So with all of that, we've been discussing here
how do we reduce per capita greenhouse gas emission? Now,
the transit decline doesn't mean that transit is bad.
We're investing heavily in transit in Southern California. L.A. County just voted $120 billion to build more transit. But that means we need to look at transit differently. And like your staff presentation, Heather indicated we are committing to look at the investment by mode, including the underserved communities. The supervisor mentioned -- Supervisor Gioia mentioned social equity, environmental justice. We actually do that. And at least at SCAG, we've been used as an example of how to do environmental justice in the context of planning. And we'll continue to do that, not just because we want to comply with SB 375, because I think it's the right thing to do.

So that reporting we commit to you today that will be done by mode. When it comes to development, Supervisor Mitchell's mention -- I mean, Board Member Mitchell mentioned that land-use authority lies with the cities. That's absolutely true. MPOs have no authorities over land use.

Having said that, I think MPOs, with the help from ARB and CTC, could bribe the cities to do the right thing by providing them funding. And I think we have done that in the past, and it works. I think many cities, if you incentivize them, they'll be willing to do the right thing. So we will be reporting in and tracking homes and
jobs being developed in underserved communities in high
good transit areas, and making sure that we're not
driving the original residents out of their homes because
we're doing transit-oriented development. We will commit
to that, and we spoke to your staff about that.

The question in front of us is we need to reverse the trend that's happening right now. I think I'm supposed to push some buttons here to get --

---o0o--

MR. IKHRATA: Okay. We are supposed to reverse the trend that's going in the wrong direction. We're also supposed to reduce and get to the 25 percent. I believe we can. And what the approach that your staff proposing to you is a good one, it is not like us saying let us go through our modeling exercise, but coming back to you every year, and saying to you, hear what we did differently, hear how it's working, and hear how it's going to lead to us getting that 25 percent.

We have to be smart about, you know, the Professor from -- I call him the Professor from Davis here just published a book called the Three Revolutions. Now, I would like to think that we're going to look at transit differently to make it more effective in the context of the shared, the autonomous, and the electric vehicle that's coming. Do we have the right ARB policies to guide
us through that?

I do believe we can reverse the trend that's happening right now, and we do need clearly to link funding to that. But also we have to be very open about the fact that a lot of funding is generated locally and, specified what kind of projects you're going to have. So somehow, we need to figure out how we overcome that.

And we're committing to you today that we're going to expand our working with the stakeholders, we're going to expand the ability to track things, and report to you in our private -- and look, we might couple of years into the reporting say, we can't do it. We need to do something different.

I hope we never come to that. I hope we're going to come to you together with your staff and figure out how we're going to get there. But we have to do it differently. You have to do it smartly. We can't just be throwing money and saying let us do transit and stop. Transit has to be looked at differently, land use has to be looked at, funding has to be looked at.

And all of that should result in us hopefully getting to where we want to get, which is 25 percent reduction.

--o0o--

MR. IKHRATA: And with that, I'm going to turn it
to my colleague from San Diego.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Madam Chair, I didn't quite hear the details of the social equity metrics, or how you were developing that. You indicated some -- you indicated a commitment, but I guess I wanted to hear how you were incorporating the social equity metrics.

MR. IKHRATA: Every plan scenario we run, every plan scenario we run will have a environmental justice social equity. Does it impact negatively, proportionately by ethnicity, by race, by income. So every scenario that we're going to put in front will have a full evaluation of the social equity component of the plan.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Okay. Thank you.

MS. KAWADA: Good morning. I'm Kim Kawada with the San Diego Association of Governments, the MPO for the San Diego County. We have listed here sort of a list of all the things that strategies -- that the region will be undertaking to meet the target, and hopefully exceed it, and go beyond that.

If I could characterize it, it's really sort of in three large categories. One is to plan for transform -- to look at really transformative solutions, to plan for them, to pilot and test innovative new solutions, and then to actually implement them.

So on the planning side, the basis of our
regional plan has been on urban area transit strategy. We adopted that with our last plan. And actually investments really focus on those types of strategies in the urban area where there's existing infrastructure and existing population.

The other plans we're doing -- that's at the regional scale. At the local scale what we've uses is the power of the purse. Our sales tax dollars, our incentive dollars. The 18 cities in the County of San Diego can now only compete for those dollars if they have an adopted Climate Action Plan -- local Climate Action Plan, and Complete Streets Policy. So that's where we're trying to drive -- use incentive to drive local infrastructure investments and plan for clean transportation and clean energy choices.

At the community level, we're piloting things like mobility hub planning, which is really integrating all modes, public transit, bike, walking, active transportation and services. And, for example, we're working in our -- one of our most vulnerable communities in the mid-city area to actually try to get one of those up and running in the next several years.

We're also working on things like regional clean fuel infrastructure, chargers, fueling stations, whatnot to promote a regional infrastructure to actually help meet
the state's goals and our local goals for that. So that's on the planning side.

On the piloting side, we were one of 10 automated vehicle proving grounds that this -- that the federal government designated. There's two in California. We're one of them. And really the promise we see there is to look at how technology can help really change safety and mobility options around the region. Now, it's not just about just sort of new whiz-bang technology, because as your staff has mentioned, not everyone can afford, you know, knew Teslas or new Priuses even.

So that's something where -- we're looking at the intersection of technology is also where we can help support public transit, not detract from public transit. Can technology provide those last mile solutions? Can we make public transit even cheaper to operate, that we can provide more public transit in the region?

And then finally, where can -- how can these strategies, and these investments in these new technologies really help our most vulnerable communities, and our aging populations. We're seeing with the aging of the Baby Boom population the needs to travel to health and medical services and to meet with -- you know, stay involved with the community is pressing.

Not everyone can afford Uber or Lyft. So we
really need to look at how you can transform, you know, senior and para-transit services, and hopefully use technology to support that.

And finally, what's unique about SANDAG different from the MPOs is because we have some implementation authority, we build public transit, we build active transportation infrastructure. A major part of our strategy is actually doing just that. We have a $200 million early action program, where we're building more than 80 miles of bikeways and urban communities. That's underway. Our goal is to get those done in the next -- within 10 years. We have an Extensive network and we're trying to build out our managed lanes, which really prioritize public transit and HOV modes. And we charge single-occupant vehicles a fee and reinvest that fee raised into public transit, so that's another component.

And finally, while it's not technically counted on our ledger, in terms of reducing -- the SB 375 ledger of reducing vehicles and passenger and light-duty truck emissions, our region has been sort of at the forefront in terms of habitat conservation planning.

So local sales tax measure dollars are being used to preserve open space, and preserve -- we've, to date, preserved, and leveraged enough dollars, and preserved about 8,600 acres of open space, real critical habitat in
the region. And what that does it also directs
development into the urbanized areas.

So 8,600, if you -- to get to some sort of scale,
that's about the equivalent of about 10 Central Parks,
which we've done to date, since the sales tax measure was
adopted back in 2004.

The next slide --

MS. KAWADA: -- excuse me, really looks at in
terms of performance monitoring. We do this on a regular
basis. We produce an annual State of the Commute Report,
we do regular performance monitoring of our regional plan.
So you can see here some of the types of metrics.

To answer Supervisor Gioia's questions, we do
have with our plan update a set of performance measures
for the plan overall. We've worked with our community
based organization groups, which are 13 community based
organizations from around the region, around the county,
and really worked on a set of meaningful performance
metrics, in terms of social equity, environmental justice,
and Title 6.

SO we've worked with those groups to identify
those. We've also done statewide working with our
partners to develop a social equity analysis tool that
could be use statewide.
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: And I'm sure my colleague from San Diego will comment about that, since you're in San Diego.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: You can count on it.

MS. KAWADA: So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Alix Bockelman from MTC.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I think I'm just going to let -- ask that each complete their presentations and then we'll have some discussion and questions. I know different Board members have different things they'd like to say about all of this.

MS. BOCKELMAN: Good morning, I'm just trying to get this device to work.

Here we go.

Good morning, Chair and Board members. My name is Alix Bockelman. I'm with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. And I did want to echo the appreciation of staff and the Board in working with us on the target setting recommendations.

MTC appreciates the introduction of best practices into the target-setting recommendations and the focus on elements of the SCS, where MPOs have more control, and can take bold steps at the regional level, and also working in partnership with the State.

In terms of how MTC will approach the more
ambitious targets in the next round, we will need to double down on our focused growth development approach. As discussed in the staff report, this is made more challenging, given the loss of redevelopment, housing construction costs, and the very real threat of displacement.

We're in the midst of a major effort to look at housing crisis in the Bay Area called, CASA, the Committee to House the Bay Area, to agree at a multi-sector level on actionable and meaningful changes to address and stem the tide on the housing crisis.

We will also continue to incentivize, through our One Bay Area Grant, or OBAG, program housing. In the last two cycles, or 10 years, we have invested $700 million supported -- to support the county OBAG program. And that rewards jurisdictions based on housing and also ensures that those dollars are invested near -- in priority development areas or near high quality transit.

Our commission has also asked to return back in the summer to talk to them about more areas where we can further leverage transportation dollars to link with housing outcomes.

The second area is really the Bay Area will also have to continue to encourage pricing strategies where they make sense. This will include a planned 550 mile
express lane network, and could include a bridge toll
hike, if the voters approve it this June, as well as
further additional cities rolling out demand-based pricing
concepts, parking pricing.

Also, in the third area, the Bay Area must
continue to support robust, innovative, and low-emission
mobility options. This could include ride hailing, car
sharing, and future AV options that reduce emissions. It
could also expand and make more universal bike and car
share programs.

Through our climate initiatives program, we will
continue to foster various TDM strategies from
trip-based -- from personalized trip -- sorry. Trip
planning to trip caps in various jurisdictions. And we'll
also continue to accelerate electric vehicle adoption, an
area that MTC has partnered closely with the Bay Area Air
Quality Management District to set ambitious goals, and to
leverage both transportation and air quality dollars
toward vehicle, infrastructure, and education programs.

And transit is also an area of plan where we
invest 60 percent of our dollars just to make sure that we
are modernizing and keeping up on transit. And this will
continue to be a major focus area, as well as we invest
significant dollars to expand the transit system, but
we'll also need to continues to invest in this high
quality transit and focus very much on the first and last
mile connections as those are very important.

--o0o--

MS. BOCKELMAN: In terms of performance
monitoring, MTC has long championed performance-based
planning. Performance based analysis is fundamental to
our planning approach with a detailed project assessment
that we do for all of our mega projects.

Also, to inform planning and to provide the
public with details on how the region performs in various
areas, we have a real-time performance monitoring system
that we called Vital -- we call Vital Signs. And it tracks
key indicators in the areas of environment, land and
people, equity, economy, and transportation.

To Board Member Gioia's comment on social equity,
MTC has several specific performance targets focused on
equity, such as housing affordability, equitable access,
and economic vitality. We conducted a detailed and will
continue to do a detailed and in-depth equity analysis as
part of our plan.

And also in this last plan, we also developed an
action plan, because we found that in some of the areas we
were moving off target, in particular on housing
affordability. And that has led to some of our other
initiatives such the CASA initiative I mentioned earlier.
Vital Sign also tracks health, housing affordability, and other real-time indicators related to social equity.

And I'll now it over to James Corless to give you the SACOG perspective.

MR. CORLESS: Well, Thank you, Alix, Chair Nichols and the Board. Thank you again for having us here. We just wanted to kind of wrap this up. I was going to give a couple more slides about SACOG and then talk a little bit about sort of statewide how we are enthusiastic about partnering with the State and your agency and many others.

--o0o--

MR. CORLESS: The Sacramento region is considered one of the big four, but in many ways, we have sort of a foot in the Central Valley economy and a foot in the Bay Area economy. We in an interesting in-between place. We are not participating in the infill, and, affordable and attached housing boom that's hit the coastal markets.

Yet, we have commercial corridors that are struggling, and retail that's going empty that is the perfect place to put affordable housing and mixed use services, and frankly high frequency transit. That's one of our strategies we're looking at to get to 19 percent.

Our public transit numbers are dropping like
everybody else's. And the good news is our region and our board is really open to rethinking how we are providing service. RT, our main service provider in the county of Sacramento, is about to embark on a restructuring analysis, where we have software that is actually open to the public. And you can change routes and see ridership and equity in low income and communities of color.

But we're also looking at micro transit and first/last mile solutions. And one program, the staff mentioned a pilot program that we would love to basically open source, and be the front yard of the State Capitol, and try things in experiment.

We are ready to try and fail. We have a program called Civic Lab, which is a nine-month program. We have nine teams, city, county, staff, transit agencies, where we're trying solutions. We're going to fund those pilot projects. We're going to get some of the universities to come in and evaluate those projects, and we're going to see if they work or they fail, because the future has never been more uncertain, and so we want to begin to embrace that. In terms of monitoring and data, we just last year released our regional progress report, sort of getting ahead a little bit on the SB 150, perhaps not as deep as we'll get into in SB 150 in monitoring.

Some of our numbers look good and others do now,
and we want to be very honest with both our public, and
you all about where those trends are heading.

And then finally just on the SACOG side, I just
want to mention a couple of things of again areas in which
in addition to Civic Lab we're really excited about, but
we're willing to experiment on.

The first electrification and EVs.  We're
thrilled to have Electrify America investment in the City
of Sacramento.  We're taking to our board a bigger green
region framework next month.  And we're really looking at
how we can make sure that everybody has access to those
electric vehicles, putting them in public housing
facilities, and making sure that the unbanked have access,
not just to electric vehicles, but we're rolling out
electric bike share this summer as well, and we're going
to be doing a lot of monitoring of that.

We have a very unique rural urban connection
strategy program.  We have a huge ag area, and we're
making sure that we don't pave over some of the nation's
prime farm land, and that we actually bring back some of
the -- our ability to actually use more of our food
locally, so we're not trucking it to out of state and
trucking it back in.  That's a big part of our RUCS
program.  And then finally, we've got a lot on data and
zero emissions.
Supervisor Gioia, you mentioned the equity question. And I -- and I want to put at least -- I've been out of California for 10 years. I've sort of come back. I worked at MTC for quite awhile. I would just say to you, I'm -- we are, I think, in a really interesting and challenging place, which is you're asking us to predict the future, and we are up to that challenge, but we also understand that future has never been more uncertain.

And from an equity analysis perspective, we are absolutely going to run that through our long-range model, and look at everything we can look at within the model. But I'm going to tell you I don't think the models are good for many things. I worry they're not as good for your equity question.

What we would like to do is actually look at testing and implementation of things on the ground. So, for instance, in our Civic Lab Program, we're looking at high school -- low-income high school youth who get summer internships. The first job they've ever had. They are showing up late, an hour, two hours late to -- why? Because they can't take three buses and make it work, and they're relying on family members for rides. So can we actually look at a micro transit solution that goes door to door, multiple kids in one vehicle, and get them to
that work site on time?

I don't know how we can measure exactly that into the 20 year plan, but I am more interested in trying to figure out this access to opportunity question, and how transportation remains a barrier in the short term, and testing ideas and solutions that might overcome that. So that's, I guess, one thought on your equity question.

And just finally, I wanted to kind of wrap for all of the MPOs here, we understand -- your staff again did an excellent presentation. There is a gap, we get that, between 19 and 25 percent. We want to help fill that gap. And we're excited about SB 150 in terms of performance monitoring and really looking at kind of testing what works, but we also think that we can't just be doing these things in isolation.

We need more partnerships with universities and higher education institutions in terms of evaluation. And we think that statewide, we ought to be leading the charge as we are on climate change to be looking at and implementing some of these new forms of autonomous and shared electric mobility. We ought to be the global leader in this. And frankly, we're not yet.

But we stand ready to work with you, to work with State agencies to make sure that we can actually reestablish ourselves as that world leader in these forms
of mobility as this disruption only accelerates.

So again thank you for your time. I think all four of us are happy to answer any questions.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I think before we proceed with the rest of the witnesses list, if there are really specific targeted questions just for the MPOs on their presentations, let's do those now.

Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes. Thank you, all. I'm particularly interested in active commuting, active transport. And I think almost all of you mentioned something about that.

And it's not just reduced vehicle miles traveled that I'm interested in, but also co-benefits in terms of health. And there's now modeling -- models available to do that kind of projection with regard to health benefits of active transportation, biking, walking. And I'm just wondering if you -- if any of you have used those models or are you just looking at reduced vehicle miles traveled?

MR. CORLESS: We going to awkwardly look at each other.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Sure. You can all come up and just speak briefly. That's fine.
MS. BOCKELMAN: Alix Bockelman again, MTC. We did look at health benefits associated with active transportation I think using the -- an ITHIM model.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yeah.

MS. BOCKELMAN: But I'm not very familiar with the details of it, we did do that in our last plan.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: That's the kind of thing I was looking for, yeah.

MS. KAWADA: We did not use that model. We're still -- we're using our AB -- AB ABM model. And so it's not, I guess, the most ideal, but we are quantifying how much time is spent -- one of the measures that we're tracking metrics for our next plan update is tracking the amount of time spent walking and using active modes. And I just want to quantify that at least. So when we compare scenarios, we know which ones do better than others.

I would say it is incomplete in this area with this -- with, you know -- with an ABM model. I don't think it's perfect, but it's a tool that we have to measure.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I would just say that the ITHIM model is actually pretty decent and staff -- CARB staff are working to make sure that it's well validated for use in MPO planning.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thanks.
Any other quick -- yes, Supervisor Serna.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you, Chair. This question I posed to any of the executive directors of the MPOs that are here. I think it's a really important one, and it goes to the point that was stressed during the staff report. There's been a lot of advocacy and strong intent and focus on, well, you know, trying to get to that 25 percent or perhaps even higher reduction of VMT.

What are we doing to educate folks that may not, you know, be steeped in understanding modeling, the connections between land use and transportation, growth projections, the stuff that professional land planners and transportation Experts know very well, but perhaps the layperson who, you know, really is passionate about reducing VMT, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions may not have that sophisticated understanding of that subject matter. What are we doing to reach out to those groups, those people to do our best to educate them on the challenges that we have in just getting to the levels that we have now?

MR. IKHRATA: Well, that's a great question. And I think -- I mean, we met with the advocates, the same one that come and says you need to do 25 percent. This is the wrong argument to have. This is the wrong approach to be arguing 19 or 25 or 15.
Right now we have a trend that's going in the wrong direction. How do we make it go in the right direction? How do we report to you, so you have a comfort level, you have a call to action that we are going in the right direction?

To that end, how do we do that? We need to do a lot more public outreach to those advocates. We need to include them in our planning. We need to talk about, and be very honest about the trends. I mean, people -- people say, oh, we need to build transit. And transit is great, we should build transit, but when you look at the transit ridership and it's declining, what do you do?

You stop listing transit? No, you look at transit differently. You try to do transit in the context of how do I make transit convenient for people to compete with the vehicle? With the rising incomes, with the good economy, that's a good discussion to have.

A lot of it need to take place. And is like we talked to your staff about, the new approach that Heather just spoke to you about is about reporting those things. And, you know, we might come to a point where we come to you a year or two years from now and say we're still going in the wrong direction. Then at least that gives you a chance to say, okay, let us -- let us do it differently. And for that, we need to educate a lot of the stakeholders
and advocates. And we do that through our planning, but we need to do more of it.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Can I ask a follow-up. So what -- so I understand and appreciate the expression of need to do more, but what -- what is the plan? What -- is there a common one for all the big four MPOs? Is -- are there individual plans and process? What has been done to date to really be transparent and intentional about -- not from a top-down, let me, you know, sit you down and tell you how it is approach, but doing your best to distill down the important elements that go into these types of considerations outside of the elaborate models.

MR. CORLESS: Supervisor Serna, honestly, I think we've spent a lot of time this last 12 months working with your staff to try to figure out how we can reach the 19 percent targets for the big four. I think SB 150, I think, should provide a beginning forum for that discussion on that kind of gap and how we fill up to 25.

And so I think we are -- we're willing to commit to figure that out. I can't say necessarily that we -- we are worried about going in the wrong direction, if that wasn't clear from the four of us.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: And I -- and I get that. I guess what I'm -- maybe I'm not communicating this as well as I could. I'm -- my concern is really focused on how
are we working with the public, so that they understand
outside of the language of professionals --

MR. CORLESS: Right.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: -- in the realm of land use
and transportation, the hurdles, and why it's so
challenging just to get to the targets that we have today.

MR. CORLESS: A couple of quick thoughts. First
of all, I'm not sure we're doing the best job that we can
do to work with the public to make this meaningful. I was
over in London early -- late last year, where they've
actually translated all of their greenhouse gas emission
stuff into health. I mean, the public understands the
health impacts of all this stuff, and it seems to be more
motivated to work with that. And it's about kids.

I mean, you all know this. I don't have to tell
you, number one. And number two, I think that we have a
lot of programs rolling out around shared, shared electric
bike, shared electric vehicles. We have to do our part in
terms of getting folks to understand how to use those
things, working especially in disadvantaged communities.
And then I think, you know, we have other -- we have other
programs that actually are around gamification frankly
to -- for having younger folks get excited about trying
new transportation modes, and so there's a tool, and a
whole suite of strategies. In order to connect this
To the general public, I think we have a lot of work to do.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Yes, go ahead.

MS. KAWADA: I can just briefly talk about it from a -- from a engagement -- community engagement place. We have used community based organizations. So partnered and basically hired community based organizations in, you know, representing kind of, like I said, the most disadvantaged and vulnerable communities from around the county.

And one of the things they do, they do meet with us as a staff on a monthly basis with actually Board members that Chair the Committee. My chair basically is committed and he's going, as an elected official to listen to these voices. The charge of the -- we've given them for the community based organizations is to take the information that we get, this, you know, very technocratic kind of language that we speak, and we understand, and then help us. And they're responsible for translating that and understanding it enough to take it out to their communities, and push that information out, and basically solicit the information back in from their own communities in their language, in their -- in the ways that are
meaningful to them and then bring back -- that back to us.

So where we've seen progress in terms of that is things like we -- we can measure mode share. We can measure VMT and we're committed to doing that as part of our metrics for the regional plan, but it wasn't -- those weren't the only metrics that meant something, because people -- how do you translate it as someone struggling to get to work or struggling to get to school? What does VMT mean to them?

It doesn't mean anything to them. They're looking at how quickly can I get, you know, on any kind of -- whether it's transit, driving, carpooling, within 30 minutes? Do I have access to food? Do I have access to health care within 15 minutes. So there -- that's where we've had meaningful back and forth in dialogue in terms of what metrics are meaningful to people in our communities.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Question?

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Thank you.

Kim, you had mentioned Climate Action Plans from cities. And I guess one question I have is does every city have a good Climate Action Plan that helps you do your work, and how could we better those? Would it be helpful to have guidance the way we're talking about developing guidance documents for freight facilities to
help communities, to help local governments in this process?

    MS. KAWADA: So we've used -- we've had some cities, even -- so right now, we're getting ready to release about twenty to thirty million dollars of competitive funding for local governments to do things like planning for smart growth, planning for infill development. And we've done that for a number of years.

    This year that's different is we're requiring them to actually have, and we're funding them, but requiring them to have Climate Action Plans and Complete Streets policies to be -- in order to compete for funding.

    To ask whether we need regulation, I'm not quite there yet. Because even before we have this sort of incentive stick, if you will, we've had cities on all -- across the spectrum that have done it on their own. So the City of San Diego, for example, the first, you know, enforceable, actionable, Climate Action Plan, they've come up on their own, and other cities have followed suit.

    We have, you know, the whole spectrum. It's sort of like with housing you, have the whole spectrum, right? So I don't know if -- I mean, what I'm hopeful is that I think if we can do this incentive approach first and to see, you know, can they achieve certain targets, or measurable things in mobility, in terms of clean energy,
clean choice, because I think we need them to -- and it needs to -- it needs to boil up from the bottom from listening to their communities, and see what's really reasonable and, you know, actionable for them.

So I would, I guess, maybe some -- a framework for it, but I wouldn't say real specific requirements quite yet, because I think they're still -- they still are experimenting, and figuring out what works for them in what areas.

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: Yeah, and I was seeing these documents as guidances, guest -- best practices. And you've talked about San Diego, what about the other MPOs? Is this something that's everywhere in the State, or is...

MS. BOCKELMAN: In the MPO --

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: Looking for ways to help you get your job done.

MS. BOCKELMAN: Right. In the MTC region I know a lot of the cities obviously adopt Climate Action Plans. It's not something that we have required. We've required other things as -- in terms of when we provide funding, we've required all the cities to have Complete Streets adopted policies. We've required every city to have a housing element adopted. We think that really strengthens the ability to get SB 375.
So this is an area where we probably can partner better with the cities, because they are doing a lot in this area with the Climate Action Plans.

MR. IKHRATA: And we're the same as San Francisco. We don't require, but we encourage. You know, we obviously do the regional housing need assessment. We ask them to tell us how they're going to zone for all kind of housing. We -- we have a sustainability program, where we provide funding for cities to do, but we don't require it.

But, you know, back to the -- how do you -- even with the local city or the public at large, how do you get them to understand the world we're talking about?

SCAG region is about 19 million people. And when we hold workshops that we're required to hold for the regional transportation plan, we're lucky if we have 10 show up.

You know, if you ask -- if you ask 100 people now on the street, how your transportation funding gets done, you probably get one person to give you an answer.

So this is -- I mean, we could feel good about say we're going to reach people, but this is a language that very few understand. And we have an obligation to do the outreach and to encourage cities to do Climate Action Plan. But frankly, we have to be very clear about what's
happening. The trend that we're facing. How the land use in California lends itself to where we're going.

And so but we do -- we do encourage cities to do Climate Action Plans.

MR. CORLESS: Dr. Sherriffs, I don't know how many of our jurisdictions. I can check on that for you. I'd imagine a majority do not. And this gets a little bit back to what Supervisor Serna was saying earlier. Our jurisdictions, many of them, are struggling economically, as many cities across the State are. So we've actually used a Strategic Growth Council grant to provide technical assistance to do main street revitalization, small business incubation, and we think there's many climate benefits to those kinds of things. But the thing that our jurisdictions want is an economic plan that then ideally has environmental and equity benefits.

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Well -- and again, I was asking not to burden anybody with more work, but hey, if this is a useful tool to doing your work, well, then we ought be thinking about do we promote that, how do we get it happening, yeah.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Ms. Mitchell.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you, Madam Chair. Welcome. Thank you all for coming today and presenting your ideas to us.
A couple of things that I want to touch on and ask your comment on. When we started this process back in 2008, 2010, the nation was in recession. And so what we have seen over the last 10 years or so is a nation recovering. And so part of that is that the unemployment rate, which was very low back then, is now -- or very high back then has now become very low, and we have -- most of our population is employed.

We've also seen, as Hasan mentioned, increase in population, so that we're seeing impacts from a recovering and thriving economy now. And we're going to have to address that when we look at what we're doing with this program.

So I'd just like maybe your input on that aspect of what we are dealing with. It's an un -- it's to some degree uncertain, but we see ourselves recovering now, and we have to deal with it now.

So, first of all, your comments about that aspect of what we try to accomplish here.

MR. IKHRATA: So I think you, more than anybody, you sit in the SCAG board. You're familiar with kind of the discussion. The economy recovered, incomes are rising, people are buying cars. You know, at one point, we need to figure out how we have -- it's not the car versus the transit or versus the bicycle or the walking,
it is how you make a transportation system work for
everybody, and how you price it in such a way that it
works for everybody, and how you develop policies that's
really for the revolution that's coming in the near
future.

But I can tell you right now, like your staff
very clearly indicated, we're going in the wrong
direction. That should not discourage us, and we said
very clearly, we're going to come back to you in the
interim and report to you about not only what action we
take, but progress we make. And we might come -- I might
stand in front of you or somebody from my agency stand in
front of you a year from now and tell you, you know, we're
trying, but it's not working. We need to do something
else.

And we need to factor in these cycles, the
recession, when a lot of people weren't working. When
actually we've seen a decrease in absolute number in
vehicle mile traveled. And in a good economy like now --
and frankly, right now, we do have a lot of questions to
be answered in how we factor these cycles into our work
moving forward.

And I think we discussed with Richard and Kurt
and the staff about maybe, in our performance reporting,
to be very specific, the modes, about the social equity,
disadvantaged communities, where are the housing getting built, what did it do to the original residents. And all of that has to come together in a annual or biannual reporting, so we can be educated in the cycle's impact.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Come on.

MS. BOCKELMAN: Well, I think in the MTC region we feel this point very acutely. We've added 500,000 jobs in a time when we've added 60,000 housing units, and that is a huge problem for us. So some of my comments earlier really focused on the fact that, you know, we have a housing crisis. I know California does. We really have it as well, and we are trying to do everything we can to figure out how to really get housing built and also do it in a way that we're not displacing residents. And it is a real challenge.

And so we're trying to bring together all of the smart minds from all the different sectors, the business community cares, everybody cares. We've got to do something very different. So it is a huge challenge.

In terms of our transit system, I think while there may have been pretty big declines in parts of the state, I mean our rail systems have seen huge increases in ridership. We may have reach a plateau, because we're at the point where people -- you know, can't really get on the system. So we're really trying to continue to invest
in core capacity improvements to our transit system. Ordering new BART cars are kind of rolling in. They need to roll in faster. New train control system to increase the frequency through our Transbay Tube by 30 percent. We're electrifying Caltrain or extending BART to San Jose. We need all of that.

And we are trying to make sure -- I mean, the dollars in cap and trade and SB 1 are -- can be very helpful to making sure all these projects stay on track, which are really important for us to be able to just keep what we have said that we are doing in our plan.

CHAIR NICHOLS: That's an important point. You have to look more specifically at the different regions. I -- thank you. I think what we should do actually is take a 10 minute break for the court reporter. Obviously, we've got a lot of people signed up who want to speak on this item, but I think this could conclude our colloquy with the MPOs, and everybody could use a brief comfort break.

So we will break for 10 minutes and be back at 11:10.

Thank you.

(Off record: 10:59 a.m.)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record: 11:09 a.m.)
CHAIR NICHOLS: Our next witness is Matt Regan from the Bay Area Council. I don't that we've posted the list of speakers anywhere.

MS. JENSEN: Mary, one minute. It will show up on your screen in one minute.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Can the people in the audience see the list when it gets posted?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHANG: Yes.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Okay. Good. Thank you. Excellent. Okay. So we have 34 witnesses before lunch. I think many people do not have a lengthy testimony, but if you could try to get it down to two minutes, that would be terrific and much appreciated.

Mr. Regan, hi.

MR. REGAN: Chair Nichols, Board members, thank you for the opportunity to make public comment today. To be honest, I was expecting to be disappointed by this hearing. I was expecting to hear a wonkish, navel-gazing discussion about 19 percent versus 25 percent. And it has been actually quite different than that.

To hear staff make a call for tools -- land use tools in our to make these plans successful. And Board Member Sperling to hear him make a call for action rather than just more plans is very encouraging. And to hear our MPOs say that, you know, things cannot stay the way they
are, that the status quo cannot remain, and we cannot expect to meet our goals in terms of greenhouse gas reductions, unless we -- something changes.

I should begin by saying I'm here from the Bay Area Council representing about 300 of the largest employers in the San Francisco Bay Area. We were the first business group in California to support AB 32. We were early supporters of SB 375. I was actually on the rooftop of that Sacramento parking garage 10 years ago, when Governor Schwarzenegger signed the bill. I always find that somewhat of an ironic place to sign this legislation, but -- and I also sit on ABAG's Regional Planning Committee, and MTC's Planning Advisory Committee. So I know way too much about this law than any human being should.

But I also know that, particularly in our region, it's not working. Alix Bockelman mentioned some statistics. In 2015 alone, we created 133,000 jobs, and permitted 16,000 units of housing. That is not sustainable. And what we need, as has been mentioned, we need the tools in order for these plans to succeed.

Plan Bay Area is a good plan, but it's based on the premise, on the supposition, on the assumption that the cities in our region, our 101 cities and our nine counties have bought into the plan, that they understand
that their -- they have a responsibility and a role to
play in reducing VMT, reducing greenhouse gases. But my
experience, spending way too many Tuesday nights, and
planning commissions is that they have not bought into the
plan, and they do not understand that they have a
constructive role to play.

And unless this body and others like it bring the
hammer down on noncompliant cities, we cannot ever meet
those goals. So thank you. Looking forward to working
with you in the future on this goal.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

MS. HOLMES-GEN: Okay. Good morning, Chair
Nichols and Board members. Bonnie Holmes-Gen, American
Lung Association in California.

The Lung Association has been a key partner with
you working toward healthy sustainable communities over
the nine years of the implementation of 375. We still
believe this program has potential for transformative
healthy climate benefits at the state level, local level.
We still have a long way to go, given the need to achieve
the 25 percent GHG reduction, and seven percent VMT
reduction by 2030, and appreciate all the discussion and
recognition of that robust goal that we have, and the
challenges of getting there.

Much is at stake. We don't have time to lose in
our climb efforts. And stronger targets, together with
strong State and local partnerships, and along with
measurable VMT reduction strategies, more active
transportation, focused investment programs, and health
metrics will not only help clean up the air, but will --
but the increased physical activity and -- will bring us
tremendous public health gains and reduction in chronic
disease rates.

And your staff analysis cites the tremendous drop
in chronic illness, early death, drop in cardiovascular
and other diseases that we can achieve from even very
modest increases in physical activity.

We submitted a health letter. I have -- had a
copy of it. It's not right here with more than a dozen
health organizations, state and local groups calling on
you for action, underscoring the importance of stronger
regional targets, and the pathway to getting to the 25
percent GHG reduction, asking CARB to be vigilant in
utilizing new funding resources to better assist local and
regional agencies, and communities in getting to these
goals.

And we've asked also -- we've asked the Board to
support and elevate ongoing health analysis. And I
appreciate Dr. Balmes bringing this up. I know Dr.
Sherriffs has been very active in this. Several regional
planning agencies have begun integrating health into the planning efforts, and you've heard some of that today.

There has been health analysis on a regional level, MPOs and COGs have hired public health and active transportation staff, integrated their work with county health departments, and taken other steps.

But there is more to do. We're not at the level we need to be yet to truly flesh out the health benefits. We need to do more than regional analysis of health, but be looking at more the neighborhood, subregional level to truly flesh out and show these health benefits that will help excite our communities and cities about what we can accomplish.

And we need to be able to really show the benefits of innovative projects, like we've been discussing, widespread bike share, widespread innovative transportation.

We agree with the call to action, and let's focus on elevating health as we move.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

MS. TREMONTI: Hello, Chair Nichols and members of the Board. I am Ashley Tremonti with the City of San Diego here today to express our support for the targets set forth in the proposed update to SB 375, and to suggest
that the Board consider revisiting these targets on a more frequent basis, possibly every two to four years.

   Additionally, we support an increased focus on performance metrics, including regular reporting and monitoring of these metrics. The shortfalls associate with greenhouse gas modeling and calculations can be lessened by supplementing with analyses of performance metrics to ensure real progress and success is occurring.

   The City of San Diego requests that CARB monitor funding distribution across the state to ensure that these ambitious targets are being met. However, we need the financial resources and investment to accomplish them. So we would like to see a more equitable distribution of funds, including in the San Diego region.

   And lastly, I wanted to address Board Member Sherriffs' comments about a potential regulation with Climate Action Plans. And I would invite you to come and talk to the City of San Diego or SANDAG as we are preparing a regional greenhouse gas framework for Climate Action Planning, for monitoring, for reporting that I think would be of interest to the Board.

   So thank you, and that is all.

   CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

   BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: And I just want to clarify. I wasn't asking for a regulation. I was asking
if it would be a useful tool, and then how we could promote that. So I'm glad to hear that you're working on that.

MR. TREMONTI: Yeah, so that's what -- we're basically trying to develop a useful tool.

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: Great.

MS. TREMONTI: And SANDAG has been coordinating cities across our region for many months to prepare this documentation that hopefully our region will follow and will have a consistent greenhouse gas reporting and monitoring framework moving forward.

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

Sorry, question?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I keep doing that. I keep wanting your microphone.

I just had a question for you.

If I might --

(Closer to the microphone.)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here we go.

I'm just a little bit confused, because my understanding is that the revelation at the end of last year in regards to vehicle miles traveled miscalculation puts the San Diego Climate Plan's ability to reach its goals at a great risk, that VMT was grossly overestimated
in 2010. And as a result, it appeared that there was
great reduction in VMT. We find that to not be true as a
result of SANDAG’s Calculations.

And my understanding that the city was quite
cconcerned about that. So how -- how does that square with
your support for the target and what you're going to do
going forward. Maybe you could let us know about that.

MS. TREMONTI: Yes. I was not prepared to
respond to that question specifically, and that's a bit of
a loaded answer in response. There was no miscalculation
in 2010 in regards to VMT. We used the best available
data at the time, which was derived from SANDAG modeling
of VMT. Those numbers were subsequently updated, and we
have since updated our inventory to reflect those updated
VMT numbers.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: So are you saying the
City is not worried about meeting its 22 percent of all
commuters' goal of getting them on transit?

MS. TREMONTI: Our goal is 50 percent of
commuters by 2035.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Right.

MS. TREMONTI: And we are still on track to meet
that goal. We're still developing programs around
increasing the number of mode shift or increasing mode
shift.
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'm speaking of the 2020 goal, and the fact that -- so are you saying you're on track to meet that?

MS. TREMONTI: At this time, I'm not really prepared to go that deep into this. I just wanted to provide comments on SB 375.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: No, I appreciate that. I just -- I want to make sure that we're aware of what the current conditions are. And you are in the best position to give us that information.

MS. TREMONTI: Yeah. So for now, I would encourage you to look back at our annual report. So each year we provide updated numbers on where we are in regards to all of the goals we've set forth in our Climate Action Plan, transportation included. And if you'd like to have a more deeper conversation with that, the city would be happy to talk to you.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah, I know where to find the city. Thank you very much.

MS. TREMONTI: Right.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thanks for being here.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

You don't have to wait. It's not like TSA.

(Laughter.)
CHAIR NICHOLS: You just come on up.

MS. REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you.

Can you hear me?

Okay. My name is Ana Castro Reynoso. And I'm here on behalf of over 5,000 members of Environmental Health Coalition, or EHC. EHC is a 38-year old environmental justice organization based in San Diego, California.

EHC strongly urges the California Air Resources Board to require an emission reduction target of 25 percent for the San Diego Association of Governments. The system SANDAG has built and has worked to maintain is expensive, car centric, increases toxic pollution, and contributes to climate change. A 25 percent emission reduction target would change that.

Low income communities of color suffer the most from SANDAG's focus on freeway expansion. Residents from disadvantaged communities like Barrio Logan and West National City rank in the top 10 percent of the most impacted census tracts for pollution in the entire state, due, in significant measure, to their proximity to freeways.

San Diego is the eighth largest city in the country. Yet, it's transportation system lags behind cities with much smaller populations. As a result, low
income communities of color are fronting the impacts of high levels of pollution, and can only reach 29 percent of jobs within 90 minutes on public transit.

On top of that, SANDAG is not accountable to the people of San Diego. It has a long history of misleading San Diego residents. In November of 2014, the California Court of Appeal held that SANDAG violated CEQA by approving a defective Environmental Impact Report in connection with its 2011 Regional Transportation Plan.

And this past summer, Voice of San Diego exposed SANDAG for wrongly projecting revenue from tax measures during the last election cycle. One thing is clear, SANDAG is not doing their part as one of the large four MPOs to achieve a real paradigm shift in San Diego's transportation planning. We need them to do more.

Lumping SANDAG as part of the large four MPOs provides cover for their mismanagement, and further silences the community members and stakeholders that are here today asking for ARB's help.

We are asking that based on the community stories and testimony brought forth today that you ensure SANDAG is held more accountable with a 25 percent emission reduction target. These pieces of data and stories of scandal are not anomalies. They are SANDAG's status quo.

CARB staff's proposed target means more of the
status quo for San Diego. A 25 percent target is not a paper exercise. It gives us a more ambitious target to push for. And finally, the passage of Assembly Bill 805, or the SANDAG reform bill --

CHAIR NICHOLS: You can finish your -- finish your sentence.

MS. REYNOSO: Okay. Thank you -- clearly demonstrated that we need strong enforcement from CARB to truly reduce greenhouse gas emissions and serve the community members that suffer the most from the pollution plaguing their communities, homes, and lungs.

A 25 percent emission reduction target would truly meet the intended purpose of SB 375, and the CARB staff's adjustments to target frameworks and SCS evaluation process.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. CEVALLOS(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Hello. Good morning. My name is Llesenia Cevallos and I live in National City. I'm also a member of the National Coalition Environmental. I'm here to ask that the ARB vote for 25 percent emission reduction target for SANDAG. It is very important to me that we address the inadequate transportation system in San Diego, because I am concerned with the health of my children.
And I am concerned that we are flooding the street -- the streets with cars and the freeways and we are producing more pollution. I have three children and I am worried about the future that awaits them. The main issues that I have, the Interstate 5, at only 600 feet away from my home. The window in my room faces the freeway. When I open the window, pollution comes in and marks the walls of my room with a black and sticky substance.

This is quite concerning then, since my children have breathe this black sticky substance. I also ask myself how Kimball Elementary, which is also quite near the freeway. The children in community breathe this each day when -- whenever they go to school. The Board needs to ensures that SANDAG complies with the intentions of the law, and they truly reduce the emissions by 25 percent. We need a firm solution that generates an efficient and low cost public transport system. We need your support to have a SANDAG that takes into account the health of my community and our families. We expect a 25 percent reduction and we want SANDAG to take action to reach a real reduction. The health and the -- of my children's lungs are in your hands.

Thanks for your time.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.
MS. MARGANO (THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good morning. My name is Margarita Margano and I live in National City. I'm a promoter of the Environmental Health Coalition. For my family and my community, it is important that SANDAG reduce transportation emissions by 25 percent. The problem in my community is that SANDAG has not created a transportation system that takes into account my community and its needs.

I have a son who has asthma, and pollution damages him a great deal, which causes him -- causes for his lungs to always be swelled up.

The solution is a transportation system that does not contaminate the communities. And this is only possible if the Board requires a 25 percent emission reduction target from SANDAG. The Board needs to ensure that SANDAG complies with the law and that it actually reduces pollution emissions.

Please demand a 25 percent emission reduction for SANDAG. Thanks for your time.

MS. MARTINEZ (THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good morning to everyone. My name is Carmina Martinez and I live in Logan Heights. I've been living in this community for 18 years, and I am a mom of three children. It's very important for me to -- and my family to reduce pollution.

I'm here to ask the Board to give priority to the
communities that are mostly impacted by these harmful emissions. The problem in my community is the pollution produced by the transportation system. SANDAG gives priority to the freeways. In my personal experience, I have suffered for eight years of an allergy in my skin caused by the environment.

The proof of this pollution is in our own bodies. The solution to this problem is to reduce the emissions. There are contaminants. To really achieve real change, the Board needs to demand a reduction of emissions of 25 percent. We need your support to have a SANDAG that supports our communities and our families.

Please demand a 25 percent reduction of emissions for SANDAG. Thank you very much for your time.

MS. GONZALEZ (THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good morning. My name is Esperanza Rosales -- Gonzalez.

I'm a resident of the community of City Heights of San Diego. I'm a promoter of the Environmental Health. For me, it's really important to have a -- in my community an efficient transportation system of lower cost, and that reduces emissions.

We need that the Board -- the ARB Board assure us that SANDAG will achieve this type of transportation system. The problem in our communities that there is no -- not enough transportation -- public transportation
to travel that -- without taking a long time. It's very
difficult to use the public transportation to be able to
raise your job, go shopping, go to school and other places
in San Diego.

We have worked for a long time, many years, in
our community to improve the transportation system. But
we haven't seen enough change. SANDAG doesn't hear the
needs of our communities. The solution is a higher goal
for SANDAG, one that assures that really is inverting in
the more -- the communities are in greater need.

As well as my friends and companions, we need the
Board -- the ARB Board to demand lower of emissions of 25
percent for SANDAG.

We need your support to have us -- we need your
support to have a SANDAG that takes into account our
marginalized communities and our families.

Please demand lowering of the emissions to 25
percent. Thank you very much for your time.

MS. PRATT: Honorable Board members, my name is
Linda Giannelli Pratt, and I reside in San Diego,
California. Prior to retirement, I was part of the City
of San Diego's team that developed their Climate Action
Plan. And so I do understand the complexities and the
opportunities inherent in this planning process.

I am now on the advisory council for Stay Cool
for Grandkids, which is a non-profit organization of volunteer grandparents, elders, and other citizens in San Diego region dedicated to preserving a livable community in the name of those too young to have a voice, our future generations.

We recommend adopting a more ambitious target for SB 375, specifically 21 to 25 percent GHG reduction by 2035. We believe it is unconscionable for any of us to leave the burden of mitigating and adapting to dangerous climate change on the shoulders of young people.

According to a recent report, we are handing young people alive today a bill of up three -- $535 trillion just to cover the cost of quote "negative emission technologies" that would be required to remove atmospheric CO2. And that does not include the cost for the severe health impacts, food and water scarcity, irreversible damage to the natural environment, including wildfires and drought, and untold degradation of life -- of the quality of life for future generations.

Intergenerational equity is at the heart of the lawsuit Juliana versus United States. The 21 plaintiffs, ranging in age from 10 to 20 years old, state that the federal government's refusal to take serious action against climate change unlawfully puts the well-being of current generations ahead of future generations.
And so far, the courts agree, despite attempts by the Trump administration to have the case dismissed. In March 2018, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals allowed the suit to go to trial. This followed an earlier decision in November of 2017 when the District Court Judge Ann Aiken sent -- set a judicial precedent ruling that climate change may pose an unconstitutional burden for younger generations.

We believe that the California Air Resources Board has the opportunity, and the obligation, to adopt ambitious greenhouse gas emission targets -- reduction targets pursuant to SB 375 and to provide guidance to state, regional, and local governments on how to effectively implement plans and strategies that will lead to meeting these targets.

There are over nine million children under the age of 18 living in California today, who are depending on us, and there is no time to delay. With that in mind, I will turn the podium over to Bob Leiter who will deliver our specific recommendations.

After more than 30 years in public service, I still believe that the noblest motive is the public good, and that should include those future generations.

MR. LEITER: Hi. I'm Bob Leiter. I'm a retired urban planner, living in -- live in Poway, California. So
I'm focusing my comments on the San Diego region. And I'll just mention I've met many of you or worked with many of you. I was a city planner for the Cities of Escondido and Chula Vista in San Diego County. Then became the planning director for SANDAG. And I was the SANDAG planning director for about seven years, including the start-up of SB 375 planning.

Since -- when I retired from SANDAG, I worked as a consultant with four other MPOs on their Sustainable Communities Strategies, and have worked with other public agencies on plans to promote sustainability, so -- but I'm speaking as a retired urban planner.

And I want to emphasize that the recommendations that we're making from Stay Cool reflect our understanding of the long discussions that have been held among the various staff and elected officials about these targets.

And I'll just briefly highlight our recommendations. We had -- submitted a letter to you dated March 19th. Our first recommendation is that CARB should adopt a 2035 GHG emission reduction target for the San Diego region that is no less than 21 percent, and preferably up to 25 percent.

We understand that CARB and SANDAG staff believe it would be difficult to replicate the 21 percent GHG reduction that was shown in SANDAG's most recent Regional
Transportation Plan. But we believe that by working together, CARB and SANDAG staffs would be able to identify opportunities in the San Diego region to receive GHG reduction credit for future, what we call, multiple benefit projects, and also for multi-jurisdictional projects.

And I'll go back to that a little bit more with my other comments. We also think it's extremely important for the Air Resources Board to weigh-in on the implementation of Senate Bill 743, and will -- we can explain that in a little more detail. But that is a critical component of the legislation that's been enacted to help implement SB 375, and we think that's important to follow through on.

So I'll go back to our individual recommendations with the remaining time available. First of all, we recommend that the ARB staff work with SANDAG to provide guidance on the use of multiple benefit plans. And we've provided a good example of that in our letter. The idea of complete streets has been well accepted as a way to reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.

The idea of Green Streets is that you can design Complete Streets that also reduce stormwater pollution runoff, and promote water conservation, and still reduce
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greenhouse gas emissions. And the advantage of taking
that approach is now you qualify not just for
transportation funds like SB 1 funds, you also qualify for
a number of other State sponsored grant programs. And I
can give you examples of that, but I know that time
doesn't permit that.

I would just add that our other recommendations
are that you really take a closer look at multiple
jurisdictional efforts, including city and county Climate
Action Plans. We think there's a lot of opportunity to
more clearly understand the relationship between the
regional targets and the local implementation plans. And
then again, we think SB 743, which is the law that says
that under CEQA now, you focus on vehicle miles traveled
and GHG reductions, rather than on traffic congestion.

We think that every city and the County of San
Diego should already be implementing that. And we think
ARB can give a gentle shove to the State agencies, and the
local and regional agencies that are -- that are trying to
figure that out.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Would you wind up, please. I'm
being a little generous here with the timing, because we
shortened it, but we do have a lot of people waiting to
testify.
So if you can try to condense your remarks and get to the bottom line, we would appreciate it.

MR. COURSIER: Chair Nichols and Board members, my name is George Coursier. I'm a volunteer for the Sierra Club. I'm the Conservation Chair for the East San Diego group. And I attended the San Diego meeting, which was outstanding from the CARB staff.

My takeaway was that the San Diego meeting was the targets proposed by the MPOs, and by my own MPO SANDAG were consistently below the GHG reduction threshold is required. The very agencies here responsible for reducing pollution and GHG were willing to fail that mission.

This is unacceptable for residents of San Diego, and it must be unacceptable for CARB as well. Rather than missing scoping goals and standards, Sierra Club encourages CARB to make this a turning point, when required by legislation, and demand a 25 percent reduction in the pollution of greenhouse gases that the MPO's are not working with at this time.

It's surprising and shocking that my own MPO in San Diego does not meet these standards and is not willing to. You know, it's time to stand up for disadvantaged communities. These are impacted by vehicle pollution. Stand up for the public transportation, and against trying to build more freeways near our schools and homes.
And the fact that freeways, you know, are so congested and failing on a daily basis should really be kind of a bright light to all of us here that this is not working. And I assure you in San Diego, it is not.

Vehicle miles traveled are increasing in California, and this should be the call to action for the MPOs for SANDAG to take cars off the road, find public transit incentives, and remove the vehicles. The present efforts are failing.

Today is the opportunity to break the cycle of GHG pollution and failed freeways. Please act on the scoping report gap. And that would demand a 25 percent GHG reduction. Social equity and environmental justice are at stake just as much as the GHG requirements. Please consider your voting impact on the people of California.

And thank you so much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. GRUBB: Good morning, Chair Nichols and Commissioners. My name is David Grubb. I'm Transportation Chair of the San Diego chapter of the Sierra Club. My colleagues in the environmental community have done a wonderful job of presenting the arguments. So I'll be very brief, and just ask you to please set the targets for the big four MPOs at 25 percent for all of the reasons that you've already heard. Thank you.
MR. RENTSCHLER:  Good morning. My name is Kyle Rentschler, and I'm a conservation organizer at Sierra Club San Diego. I'm here, along with our partners at Climate Action Campaign and Environmental Health Coalition, to speak in support of higher greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets in the San Diego region.

As you well know, on-road transportation is the greatest cause of greenhouse gas emissions throughout the country and throughout California. But it's particularly high in San Diego, where transportation accounts for 55 percent of our total emissions. Decades of reckless sprawl development have encouraged reckless freeway development alongside it. And it is crucial to acknowledge at this pivotal point in our history that this is not the time for continued recklessness.

And that's really the point of SB 375 to integrate planning for transportation, land use, and housing, and to fundamentally reshape our communities to reduce greenhouse gases and improve quality of life. Continued recklessness will poison our lungs and drown our coastline even more than current projects predict.

This is also not the time to abide by one-sided accounts put for by San Diego, especially when that agency's leadership has demonstrated time and time again that emissions reductions, public health, and equity are
nowhere near the list of their top priorities.

I wouldn't chose SANDAG as the governing body that determines the future of planning and transportation in San Diego County, but I don't have a choice. So I need your strong leadership and your oversight to make sure my region's future is safe and healthy for all communities and mine and future generations.

That's why we need a 25 percent greenhouse gas reduction in San Diego region. We are behind and we need to catch up. You're not going to hear it from SANDAG, but you're hearing it from all of us. And as much as the region as a whole needs action, health disparities from poor air quality and lack of access to mobility options strike hardest in low income communities of color.

CARB said despite California's market progress, greater innovation and effort is needed to avoid the worst consequences of climate change. That's a statement we can all get on board with. The people of San Diego live between and ocean and a desert. We don't want our sea level, nor our temperatures to rise, but a 19 percent target is a lazy goal that does not require innovation nor effort, nor is it enough for the people of San Diego to avoid the worst consequences of climate change.

Thank you for your time.

MS. WOLFRAM: Good morning. My name is Sophia
Wolfram and I work with Climate Action Campaign, an advocacy organization that advances policy across the San Diego region to stop climate change and improve quality of life, especially through the adoption and implementation of local Climate Action Plans.

While we support a greater focus on tracking and monitoring, I'm here today to ask this Board to set a 25 percent emissions reduction target for SANDAG, which is what is needed for the San Diego region simply to catch up to the rest of the state.

This is no time for compromise between the top-down and bottom-up approaches to target setting cited in the staff report. We're asking for your leadership to help wake up our region's leadership, and finally shift their thinking from tinkering with the status quo to flipping the script and putting core outcomes first, equity, public health, and greenhouse gas reduction.

The staff report highlights the importance of additional local and regional action on transportation and land use. But the fact is in the San Diego region, the City of San Diego has already set targets far surpassing those that SANDAG has been willing to commit to.

Our cities are working hard to do their fair share to meet State climate targets, and they need support from this body to meet those targets.
San Diego's legally binding Climate Action Plan calls for 50 percent of commuters in the urban core walking, biking, or taking transit by 2035. AB 805, passed last year, requires that SANDAG seek to harmonize the upcoming regional transportation plan with local Climate Action Plans.

Yet, members of SANDAG's Board of Directors have openly stated that they don't believe the RTP should be consistent with Climate Action Plans, and that reducing vehicle miles traveled, a core focus of SB 375, is a irrelevant to climate goals.

And it's not just idle comments that demonstrate SANDAG's indifference. San Diego dedicates a significantly smaller chunk of its funding to transit than MPOs elsewhere in the State do. And in RTP after RTP, SANDAG fails to seriously consider scenarios that would prioritize transit and infill development over freeway expansions and sprawl. It has ignored its own urban area transit strategy, which would maximize transit ridership and reduce VMT in favor of more of the same.

Also, since 2013, the Early Action Program, which is meant to build out the backbone of the bike system in the county, has spent $61 million and completed just four miles of bike facilities. Our cities need your leadership to meet the reduction targets, which are aligned to State
targets. And our communities need your help to shift the
direction in which our region is headed toward a more
equitable, a healthier, and a safer future.

   We implore you to set the highest possible
target, 25 percent for the San Diego region. Thank you
for your time.

   MS. NERI: Good morning. My name is Alli Neri
and I'm a volunteer with Climate Action Campaign.

   I'm here to echo the call for stronger greenhouse
gas reduction targets for the San Diego region. CARB's
own analysis has found that a 25 percent emission
reduction is needed to be on track to meet the State's
climate targets. California rightly prides itself on
leading the way on environmental policy for the nation.

   But what kind of precedent would we be setting by
compromising targets that we need to hit to avoid the
worst impacts of climate change, and who's really
benefiting from that compromise?

   Not us, not our communities, and not future
generations.

   What SANDAG claims is about lack of revenue and
the VMT rebound effects is in reality about lack of
political will and unwillingness to innovate and apply
bold and creative strategies to advance transit, walking,
and biking, and to shift away from the stereotype of
southern California sprawl.

We need strong targets to put us back on the right track. The kind of leadership that's going to solve the greatest crisis facing humanity is not going to come from SANDAG, not in 2018 at least.

And that's why we're here today. The families and communities that we work alongside are ready for change, and we're asking you for your leadership and support to help us realize the vision of sustainable communities for the San Diego region.

Thank you.

MR. TIPPETS: Good morning, Chair and Board.

Bill Tippets, Southwest Wetlands Interpretive Association, a small organization in southwest corner of the state, Imperial Beach.

Our main interest is conservation and preservation of wetlands. Southern California has lost 75 percent due to development, and without significant and rapid reduction of greenhouse gases, we'll lose the other 25 percent. We've got plenty of resources. We can show you the literature that shows this. We're really concerned about it.

We also support all the recommendations of our sister environmental, transportation, and social justice groups that are talking to you. We believe that it's
feasible for SANDAG region to achieve at least a 21 percent reduction in GHG, which they have in their current RTP, and potentially up to 25 percent that would be needed to close the GHG emissions gap in your own scoping plan. And we believe that SANDAG, working more closely with the local jurisdictions, can do that through improved land use and transportation strategies. Another big point of ours, that there are several reputable transportation experts have examined SANDAG's approach to scenario development and land use transportation and trip modeling, which they believe have either misleading, or incorrect, or wrong assumptions and approaches.

And we've got information and documents that can show better ways to do transportation planning in San Diego. The fact that total VMT continues to increase within SANDAG region, and other places in California, strongly supports the call for changes in SANDAG's approaches, and that it must aggressively pursue new strategies and new technologies.

Just as a rational GHG reduction strategy requires reductions in both total and per capita GHG emissions, a land use and transportation strategy must also include required reductions in total and per capita VMT. It has to do that. It's the only way it's going to work.
And a tighter linkage between SB 375 plan
measures and SB 150 monitoring is absolutely needed. A
lot of the suggestions that the staff presented in this
overview are very good. We completely support them and we
like the idea of separating monitoring from compliance
monitoring, did you do it or not, to effectiveness
monitoring, which is the most important thing. That's
what we really want, reduce greenhouse emissions, and show
that the co-benefits are being produced that the plans
propose.

Also, a rapid turn around information system will
allow us to adaptively change the measures we're using,
incorporate our advanced measures that may have been
project -- put down later in the sequencing, and include
and consider new measures that are comparable that could
still be implemented under CEQA. You don't even -- SANDAG
doesn't even have to recirculate the EIR. If they
comparable measures, that would be fine. We think that's
absolutely necessary and possible.

Thank you very much.

MS. WISE: Hello. My name is my Ella Wise. I'm
the State Policy Associate from Climate Plan, a network of
more than 50 organizations across the state committed to
sustainable and equitable communities.

We submitted two letters on SB 150 and 375
recently, signed by more than 20 organizations. And I'll
go over a few key points of those. We want to thank so
much our partners from the San Diego region who have a
strong message here today.

The key message is the proposed targets are not
enough to meet the goals of SB 32, and we know that. We
want to thank staff for their hard work. We appreciate
working with them. But unfortunately, we all know that
these targets do not go far enough to meet the State's
goals.

According to the scoping plan, we need a 25
percent reduction from land use and transportation. The
proposed targets will achieve a 19 percent reduction. The
State has a VMT gap that we need to close as Madam Chair
stated before.

So what do we recommend in terms of 375?

One, ambitious targets. ARB should adopt more
ambitious targets that require a change from business as
usual. A currently -- the currently adopted plans would
achieve an 18 percent reduction in GHGs. We're proposing
a 19 percent reduction. That's a one percent change. We
can do better, but we'll only do better if we overcome a
fear of failure, and if we set our aims higher.

Two, improve trans -- improve transparency. We
appreciate the State's -- staff's proposal to improve
transparency. Right now, it's very hard to understand how these plans will translate to changes on the ground and to meeting the actual targets.

So we recommend that staff go further to improve transparency. And distill the plans to shift power to the public and the communities, so that we all know what is actually in the plans and how those translate to meeting the targets.

Third, accountability. ARB staff is currently working on SB 150 tracking, and we need to align those metrics directly with 375, so that we can use those 150 reports to measure the actual reductions compared to the anticipated reductions.

Two more things. We strongly support equity, and we appreciate that that's been discussed here today. We need a commitment to social equity analysis, both in the plans and in the 150 tracking of implementation. So both in the SCSs and in the metrics.

And fifth, prioritizing VMT reduction. We ask that the Board use the resolution language to make clear that the main purpose of SB 375 is to reduce VMT and to do it equitably, and we have proposed specific language in our letter.

Thanks very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.
MR. RUBIN: Good afternoon, Board members, Carter Rubin, Mobility and Climate Advocate with the Natural Resources Defense Council. I'm here to echo the comments from Climate Plan and my colleague Ela. We are part of that coalition, and sign onto and endorse their comments. I will briefly put a point of emphasis that it's unacceptable in this era of climate urgency that we plan for anything less than what's needed to reach our greenhouse gas emissions goals.

We need to adopt a 25 percent goal and force a conversation with local agencies and our regional planning organizations about land use and transportation, and ensure that our current plans are in alignment with our climate goals. As the Chair said, we have decades old highway projects that are still on the books, these zombie projects, that stumble forward, and that we need to put an end to in order to reach our climate goals.

The 25 percent goal will shine a light on these bad projects and policies in place, and allow us to grapple with them in a way that let's us move forward and reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

Thank you.

MS. LINDBLAD: Hi. Good afternoon. I'm Bryn Lindblad, Associate Director of Climate Resolve, a nonprofit in Los Angeles focused on advancing local
solutions to climate change, and also part of the ClimatePlan Network and signed on to that letter.

I don't -- I don't think I need to tell you members of the Board how critical it is for the health of our planet that we act with urgency to address our climate crisis. I think you know that the consequences of inaction, how scary that future could be that we'd be leaving for generations.

And sort of on a note of inspiration, I think you also realize that if we're able to figure this out and get an institutional framework that really works to wean us off of our bad climate-polluting habits, that the world is watching, and we can inspire action cross the globe.

And I'm afraid -- I hate -- I hate to say it, but I think the current proposal is really -- it's a kicking the can down the road kind of move. It's a one percent increased GHG reductions from what our current plans have on the books, is essentially a continuation of business as usual.

And our communities deserve better. They deserve safe access to our streets, as pedestrians, and as cyclists, as -- in wheelchairs, and transit commutes that don't take them two hours to get to work.

And so I'll speak from experience in the SCAG. The current RTP SCS in the SCAG region, we're still seeing
50 percent of growth outside of transit priority areas. A lot of that is green field development. There's still highway capacity expansion happening in there.

So when we kind of -- when we say we're doing all we can do, when 19 percent is as high as we can go, I don't quite buy it. So I want to mention one new freeway proposal that's in that plan, the High Desert Corridor Freeway, you heard earlier of the $120 billion that L.A. county is putting into transit, most that is into transit. $118 billion worth is doing -- is doing a lot to reduce daily VMT by 7.8 million, but two billion of that package is going to this new freeway. It's a sprawl -- it unlocks sprawl development.

And that 2 billion it cuts in half all the VMT reductions that the rest of that package of investments would achieve. So it's -- you know, to draw an analogy, it's like we're trying to air out a smoky room, opening all these windows, and yet we're fueling the fire that's in the room.

So really support Madam Chair's encouragement that we need to -- we need to look at some of those zombie dinosaur highway projects that have been on the books. We need to not do anymore harm with our transportation dollars. They really need to be working to help us address the problem, not perpetuate it.
And, you, know I think we really -- we can't afford to take our current plans as sacrosanct. We need to call the question and use the performance metrics that help us do that job.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. ESPINOZA: Good afternoon. Chair Nicholas[SIC] and members of the Board. Thank you for the opportunity to speak at the meeting today. My is Demi Espinoza. And I'm a policy manager with Safe Routes to School National Partnership.

And my work focuses on enhancing policies to make walking and biking easier and safer for children and their families. And I do that in the Inland Empire here and in Orange County. And we are here today because we believe that investing in active transportation is one way that can help us achieve greater GHG reductions.

And for that reason, we supported a coalition letter, facilitated by Climate Plan and other organizations here today. We are invested in the implementation of SB 375, but support higher targets. The proposed 19 percent target does not go far enough to meet our goals.

And I'm concerned that areas within the SCAG region are not doing enough to meet these goals or we're
not addressing our State's VMT gap. Within my region of Southern California, especially within the Inland Empire and Orange County, highway expansion projects and sprawl developments are issues that need to be addressed.

For example, we need to consider the removal of long local highway expansion projects from RTPs, and curb sprawl development. These types of projects only contribute to increased VMT, and become barriers to walking and biking and transit. We can have more connected communities that do not need to be car dependent.

Investment in active transportation projects and reducing displacement pressures by doing more equitable, affordable, infill development are strategies that can help us reduce emissions.

Lastly, we want to use the forthcoming SB 150 report to hold our regions accountable for meeting these targets. So we recognize that your staff is developing metrics and report to track SB 375's implementation. So this is a great opportunity to use these reports to measure actual -- actual results and get to some of the issues around social equity consideration that we're talked about. And so we appreciate those discussions being implemented in the SB 150 report.

And also, you know, we encourage the transparency
around this process, around SB 375, to make it more accessible for community members to understand where these targets come from, what's really at stake. So the proposed targets only really require one percent emission reduction change from what we've already done. We can do better as a region and as a state.

So thank you for your consideration, and work during this process.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. YANCEY: Honorable Chair, members of the Board, and staff, my name is Andrew Yancey. I'm an attorney with Latham and Watkins. I represent the Golden Door, a world class resort and agricultural operation in San Diego County. And I also review statewide greenhouse gas issues for our firm.

I'd like to talk to you today about the San Diego region. I'd just like to note at the beginning when Ms. Kawada gave her presentation earlier from SANDAG, she noted one of the things SANDAG is trying to do is promote development in the urban areas. SANDAG even performed a stress test last year, which was part of the materials in your packets today that looked at if they could get additional GHG reductions out of an even more dense development model, and determine that the development plans are already pretty smart in San Diego. And that
additional density wouldn't really help much.

What they didn't look at was what happens if the
development model switches to more of a sprawl-based
model. Unfortunately, the County of San Diego is
proposing to do just that.

Dr. Sherriffs asked earlier about climate action
plans in the SANDAG region. Well, just last month, the
County of San Diego approved a Climate Action Plan that
unfortunately ignores vehicle miles traveled. Instead of
looking to vehicle miles traveled for one of the
mitigation measures for unplanned growth, it allows almost
exclusively on a program to allow offset carbon credits to
be purchased from anywhere in the world.

Because the unplanned projects this would apply
to are not within the SANDAG model, the VMT from these
projects would be in addition to what SANDAG has been
looking at. One such project is the Newland Sierra
project, which is expected to come before the Board later
this year, is 2100 homes on a currently rural site located
more than six miles from the end of the transit line in
Escondido. It would increase VMT.

Now there is a school of thought that VMT
shouldn't matter. Vehicle technology improvements will
make VMT obsolete. Supervisor Ron Roberts, who's a CARB
Board member, who you all know well, is a proponent of
this approach. He has, in public presentations, called VMT a political model, a pathetic metric and a stupid metric. Unfortunately, he's not here today to discuss this. I'm sure you've heard his impassioned case before.

And, you know, maybe Supervisor Roberts is right, maybe Supervisor Roberts is wrong. I don't know the answer to this question. I'm not a technical expert. But I think the State policy is pretty clear.

Miss King pointed out in her staff presentation earlier that vehicle technology improvements are not going to get us to the 2035 targets. Reductions in vehicle miles traveled is an absolutely necessary component of meeting those targets. There is a more detailed description of that in staff's written response to comments. It's also in the scoping plan, and OPR's SB 743 guidance.

So what we're looking at right now in the SANDAG region is a tragedy of the commons. The county is playing buy its own rules and ignoring VMT.

I'll wrap-up quickly, Madam Chair.

This leaves the cities holding the bag and having to do more to be able to meet the VMT reduction models. And Chair Nichols asked earlier about funding. That's going to create a funding issue where new sprawl growth is going to be competing for highway dollars that could have
So I just wanted to leave you with a thought about the call to action that we've heard about today. It's not just about the targets being approved, it's about the implementation. And I understand that CARB doesn't have land-use jurisdiction. I understand that CARB cannot and should not be reviewing every development proposal and plan in the state.

And when you have a situation like San Diego County that is clearly implementing a policy that ignores VMT, perhaps some direct guidance would be necessary to make sure is that there's a level playing field for the developers in the county and the cities, and for all the members of the MPO there to make sure that everyone one is playing by the same rules to meet the targets.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. HAMILTON: Good morning, members of the Board, Madam Chair. My name is Kevin Hamilton. I'm with Central California Asthma Collaborative. First, I want to -- a shout out to Dr. Sherriffs and his idea of providing this Climate Action Plan for cities for their land-use planning, something that focuses at R1, R3, C and industrial level development outside of traditional freight facilities, similar to the freight handbook, I
think would be tremendously useful for cities as they move forward with their planning, and helping them integrate that planning more effectively with transportation agencies.

But that's not what I came here to talk about today. My concern is the way that the Board has addressed the target setting in the San Joaquin Valley. I notice we have the first four MPOs in the room today, but we lack the fifth and sixth, which, of course, is Fresno County and Kern County.

In fact, the City of Fresno is actually larger than the City of Sacramento. I don't know if you knew that, but by about 40,000 people. And there's around -- as of 2020, we expect over a million people in Fresno County. This is a large place. This is a lot of people. The people are severely lacking a constructed transportation system, though it's not for lack of trying.

In Fresno, the COG there is moving forward with some pretty adventurous stuff, building solar islands in the incorporate cities, that the solar arcs that allow the public to charge for free in their electric vehicles really pushing hard to bring test drive events, and get the people engaged in EV technology.

And, in fact, if you look at the statistics, Fresno county is the largest adopter of EV vehicles in the
State, which is how it got added to the Volkswagen settlement, as the fifth green city -- or sixth green city, I forget which.

So we believe strongly that this Board needs to, instead of treating the San Joaquin valley as -- from just my perspective, my feeling, a poor relative who just can't quite step up to the plate here, and isn't ready, they are, in fact, ready. They are fully capable. They definitely have money. Though you wouldn't see it on the face of it, it's there.

And, in fact, they understand this technology very well and the way this system works. To not challenge them to the same targets you do the other large MPOs is a terrible disservice to the citizens of our communities.

Health consequences in the Valley from climate and air pollutants are tremendous. We have some of the highest rates in -- of asthma for instance in California, and some of the highest in the nation, especially in children who have been diagnosed with it during their childhood.

It's incredible that we've seen this rate jump over the last 20 years so high. We have high rates of heart disease. We have high rates of stroke. Our ERs are overflowing. And a lot of that is very well corresponding with the levels of these pollutants in our atmosphere from
mobile sources. So we really need your help there, and we need you to tell our folks step up. So don't back off on us. Push hard.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. GALE: Good morning, Board Members. My name is Genevieve Gale. I'm a Policy Associate with the Central Valley Air Quality Coalition, or CVAQ.

I'd like to stray from the norm. I'm not going to offer any policy recommendations, but rather tell you a short story, a true story.

This story begins last year. The Fresno County Council of Governments, or FCOG, conducted a robust public survey to solicit input on preferred land use and transportation scenarios in the county. FCOG hosted or participated in over 32 community meetings, and also circulated an on-line petition. This survey resulted in almost 1500 responses. And demographics mirror the county's demographics pretty well.

The preferred scenario by the public was Scenario B. It focused on transit-oriented development, high quality transit options, walkable and bikeable streets, and compact and mixed-use development. So that's Scenario B as in bike.

The least desired scenario was Scenario C. And
this moved investment away from active transportation and
towards highway-widening projects and road enhancements.
So that's Scenario C as in car.

When the scenarios were evaluated, Scenario B
ranked highest for GHG and VMT reductions. It offered
more transit rides, more bike rides, more walks, and it
ranked lowest for premature deaths.

Scenario C trailed in all respects. It offered
less transit, and less bike rides, and less walks, and it
had just a one percent lower reduction in GHGs. You can
think about what your preferred scenario is.

In the end Scenario C was chosen. And the
argument was that all scenarios met CARB's GHG reduction
targets for the region. So while Scenario B outperformed
and was the public's number one choice, it wasn't
necessary, because the status quo was good enough.

So the people of Fresno County will see more
investment in our freeways and roadways, and it will be
easier to drive a car. It will not be easier to bike, it
will not be easier to walk, it won't be easier to breathe.

So like I said, I won't give you any policy
recommendations, but the moral of the story, I'll leave
that up to you to decide. But I can't help but wonder, if
we had just a one percent higher target, what our future
would look like.
Than you.

MR. FIGUEROA: Steve Figueroa. I'm with the 200 also locally with the Inland Empire Latino Coalition.

I'd like to echo what the supervisor said earlier on, basically what I heard is, the unintended consequences of your policy making or decisions that impact our community. Especially, in the area of housing, I'm sorry, if you build your housing in your urban neighborhoods, we can't afford to live in them. It's too expensive. It's unrealistic.

How many of you came here through public transportation?

No, because you can afford your own cars, right?

Nobody took the bus, right? And nobody came on metro, right? So let's walk what we talk. How many of you would tell the Governor to take his 12 -- his $100 billion bullet train to put that toward electric cars, right? And that would do more to reduce the greenhouse effects than anything you can propose, anything you can propose, right?

So how many of you would tell every Senator and Assemblyman that they could only drive electric vehicles or use public utilities going back and forth? You gotta walk what you talk.

But you see because the decisions you make impact
the businesses I advocate for, or the families with children with disabilities who don't take public transportation, because, quite frankly, it's not comfortable, it doesn't work, and that's why the buses are empty. You can't even fix the current system to make it usable for those who need it.

That's what needs to be worked on. That's what needs to be worked on. How -- you know, when CEQA is used to create red-lining districts in our neighborhoods, to say guess what, not in my backyard, because we're going to use CEQA to say we don't want any brown people, or black people, or low income people in our neighborhood. You guys have the tools. They're going to use what you develop here to discriminate against us.

And it's happening. It happens in Moreno Valley all the time, the neighboring city here. And, doctor, I understand. I'm a chronic heart failure. I have an ICD. I have COPD.

But the bottom line is I want my children also to afford a house and to get a house. So we have to balance that. And nobody knows more than somebody who advocates for families with children with disabilities who refuse to take public transportation because it's so inconvenient. How many of you would sit next to a homeless man who uses public transportation for his home and housing nowadays.
Okay. Stays on there, smells like urine. I'm not criticizing, because I work -- I work with the homeless. I do all that, okay.

How many of you can stomach that with your disabled child all day who's having a seizure, who's going to the restroom on himself and the bus or transportation won't stop in between. You've got to be realistic in your outreach toward the communities.

I heard earlier, nobody from MPO came on public transportation. They don't walk what they talk. Nobody from any of the MPOs discuss how it impacts the disabled or those who don't have access to whatever you're developing.

I noticed you gave lots of people 10 minutes here, because we were timing it. So what we're asking, one, is walk what you talk. He had a great idea, the CEQA study that you did was inadequate. Reach out to the Hispanic chambers, to the black chambers. You'll fill up -- you'll fill up your places, because they're looking for supply-side diversity contracts to help you do what you got to do, but there's no outreach from CARB to minority organizations.

And I can say that, because I'm a member of LULAC locally, the Hispanic Chamber for the State, and you guys have never come to us. You've never been to one
convention. You've never been to one function that we've put on. Okay. Nobody. I think Dean was there when I was with MAPA, Mexican American Political Association, but that's about it.

Okay. So walk what you talk. Use public transportation to see what we go through and why we don't take it, because you guys are developing the criteria, so you should live by what you develop. Thank you.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you very much. I'm Jennifer Hernandez. I'm at the law firm of Holland and Knight, and I represent The 200. I was here in December, and presented you with a fairly long and quite detailed comment letter objecting to parts of the scoping plan that expand CEQA, that try to restrict people's access to use a vehicle to do basic needs, including get to and from work.

That letter remains outstanding, and I want to restate the content of that letter for the purposes of today.

But I'm here to support the staff recommendation. We support the staff recommendation. Just let that minute pause.

(Laughter.)

MS. HERNANDEZ: But here -- but here that your environmental analysis was a complete absolute failure. Everyone of
these MPOs has had to a Program EIR that chronicles the adverse -- significant adverse impacts of increasing density. I'm not saying that's the wrong thing. There's trade-offs. But I am saying your staff has punted again under the California Environmental Quality Act.

If you guys want to increase the targets from 18 to 19 percent, then all of those significant unavoidable impacts identified in the EIRs done by your MPOs are all worse.

And SCAG alone has 30 of them, significant unavoidable impacts that are going to be more significant. And then I want to pick up on Supervisor Gioia's comments on disparate impacts. You have not, you have never, looked at the impacts of this program on working families. Most families work. In this county, most families that work are Hispanic. They do not have a college education. They get paid when they show up at work. They don't have a keyboard economy job at Starbucks.

By restricting mobility, by increasing fuel costs, by increasing the cost that people have to pay every day to heat and cool their house, by making housing more expensive with net zero what? What we understand is that your organization thinks that somehow you're going to materialize from thin air 10 -- 10 million tons of greenhouse gas reductions from VMT, in the absence of any
evidence whatsoever that that's remotely possible.

The only comprehensive study that was ever done on this topic was done by UC Berkeley, Carol Galante and Ethan Elkind. And they claim that the VMT reduction from this whole scheme would result in 1.67 million metric tons of GHG per year, not 10, 1.67.

And that's 1.67 at what cost? The end of homeownership. Well, guess what, minorities have lost all homeownership that they gained after years, decades of civil rights progress.

Global greenhouse gas reduction does not equate to an end to home ownership. It does not equate to denying people the right to drive to and from in cleaner cars. In the sixties, we had dirty cars. We've reduced tailpipe emissions 99 percent, because we thought about it for criteria pollutants.

We reduced CO2 by 60 percent, without thinking about it. Let's think about it and let's make those cars cleaner. But we spent -- Gil Cedillo spent how many years? A decade trying to get undocumented immigrants a legal driver's license, so they could exercise their right to work and take their kids to cool.

The attack on mobility is an attack on minorities. And your analysis, your environmental analysis, your economic analysis of that issue fails.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Your time is up.

MS. HERNANDEZ: But we support the staff report.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Your time is up.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thanks. I think I was the only person to actually be cut off.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I don't think so, because I counted a couple of others.

Ms. Gurin.

MR. GURIN: Hello. My name is Katy Gurin. And I'm on the steering committee of 350 Riverside. I also collaborate with San Diego 350. So I'm here basically to echo a lot of the statements that have been made regarding the emissions target. I support a 25 percent reduction in emissions. SANDAG -- for SANDAG.

SANDAG has long ignored community pleas for a strong transportation system that meets the needs of underserved communities. Instead, SANDAG has favored an expensive toxic and car-centric approach.

SANDAG's adamant adherence to emission to an 18 or 19 percent emissions reduction target that so clearly absolves them of any really changes should be rejected.

Thank you very much.

MR. HAGUE: Hello. George Hague, volunteer with the Sierra Club. Glad you're here in this building with
the supervisors above you who many times make decisions that are counter to what should be happening.

The same thing with Riverside County Transportation Commission. I'm glad I saw the focus areas that were presented at the very beginning. But when I read SB 375 when it first came out, the word farmland was in there, ag was in there. And I do not see that being represented hardly anywhere in the past 10 years.

In Riverside County, it continually disappears. Why? Because the majority of the supervisors support leap frog development actually developing brand new cities.

RCTC, Riverside County Transportation Commission, likewise seems to support these new cities. And a good example of this is the Villages of Lakeview that was approved earlier this year by a majority of the Riverside County Board of Supervisors, where they have 9,000 or 8,750 units next to San Jacinto Wildlife Area, leap frog development in the middle of ag in between the cities of Perris and the cities of San Jacinto, an RTCC[SIC] just a year or two prior to that facilitates this by building a or approving a almost $2 billion expansion of the Ramona expressway, turning it into the Mid County Parkway, 16 lanes, plowing through the city of Perris, eliminating 400 people's homes and businesses, causing people around that to suck in the pollution that will result from the Mid
County Parkway.

This continues in our area, where we expand and build new cities, build new roads, and destroy agricultural lands in the meantime. Something hopefully these incentives that somebody mentioned can be done with our county -- get our county to work with our cities to place homes closer to existing urban areas, instead of in the middle of nowhere, where it would be appreciated.

The city -- the county is also thinking about a project called Paradise Valley at the southern border of Joshua Tree National Park, another 8,000 homes. Agreed we're in a housing crisis, but why build new cities in the middle of basically nowhere, where people have to drive to look for jobs?

It's a problem that no one in this county is trying to resolve, and building new roads to get there.

I thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. EDER: Good afternoon. I'm Harvey Eder with the Public Solar Power Coalition and I'm here to talk about this 25 percent reduction based on 2005 by 2035 and AB 7 -- 375 versus -- excuse me, SB -- SB 350 that requires by 2030 a 40 percent reduction from 1990 levels, which was about 400 parts per million CO2 equivalent than. So we're down to about 250 these numbers are off. The
greenhouse gas numbers, the real numbers in the '16 plan a
year ago I came and talked to you about this. There's
been a 30 percent -- on the chapter 10, pages two and
three written by Dr. Aaron Katzenstein that now runs the
laboratory for South Coast.

There's been a 30 percent increase in methane
over the last 12 years. And that these numbers come out
to right now about 750 parts per million CO2 equivalent
now, right here in river city, not by 2050 by 2100. And
that all of -- all of -- the t difference is like 500
parts per million going back to the 350 requirements,
which you folks have to enforce the law.

And all of the Climate Action Plans and
everything else deriving from this are off and wrong. We
have to use the best science, the best evidence. We're
involved in litigation. We brought this up on August 12th
of '16. We submitted these numbers working with Dr.
Katzenstein, and there was no evaluation from the
district, no evaluation from CARB. It was just purged,
and that's part of our litigation now.

Also, worked on the first social equity low
income -- there was a low income solar equity program. I
worked as a consultant to the PUC in 1980 and '81 under
Leonard Grimes in the first solar proceeding. We got a 10
percent mark out for low income, and increased that in the
future. Also litigated again to Rose Bird's court and got her vote, and so Breiner did not vote against to look at all models of public solar, not just using the industry-owned utilities to finance it. There is a question of equity, low-income subsidizing, upper income solar, and also of antitrust.

And that's still an issue now. Extending the monopolies into a non-monopoly area, this is illegal and cannot be allowed to continue. And in terms of social equity, we've worked on this in the past. And we also support and housing with the homeless program, whatever. We need to have rent-to-own and other programs like that, that includes solar and transportation, heating and cooling and distributed heating and cooling as well.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Eder.

Last witness.

MS. DARYANANI: Hello. My name is Nikita Daryanani with Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability. We work with low-income communities of color throughout the San Joaquin Valley, and work with five value MPOs on their RTP SCS updates.

I'd like to echo the comments made by Climate Plan earlier, as well as those made by CVAQ and CCAC, and highlight the need for greater transparency, so residents
can see tangible results and actually experienced the
co-benefits that come with access to transit and active
transportation.

The current modeling approaches do not clearly
translate into on-the-ground improvements, and changes.
And greater clarity around modeling assumptions will allow
residents and advocates to better assess their region's
progress in achieving our emission reduction goals.

I urge ARB to encourage MPOs to move beyond the
status quo and front-load projects that benefit
disadvantaged communities. We want to see projects that
result in greater connectivity to and from essential
services, especially for rural communities. And land-use
planning that limits the sprawl development we continue to
see in the valley, and prioritize infill development in
existing communities.

I think there are still plenty of opportunities
for alternative modes of transit, and vanpooling in rural
communities that agencies must be more proactive in
seeking. Many agencies in the valley are also still very
reluctant to study social equity and transportation
inequity, leaving so many communities out and ignoring
decades of historical neglect.

More ambitious and stronger regional reduction
goals will help us achieve our State's ambitious climate
goals, and encourage the valley to reduce emissions by implementing more stringent, equitable, and innovative land use and transportation policies and programs.

Again, we need to move far beyond the status quo to combat climate change, and advance social, economic and environmental justice.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. That concludes the list of witnesses who've signed up to speak on this item. I'm now going to quickly turn to the staff -- I'm going to close the record for this item, and just make it clear that any written or oral comments received after the comment period is closed will not be part of the official record on this item.

I would like to ask if the staff wants to respond to any of the comments at this time?

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: We did receive some comments on our environmental analysis, and we would like the opportunity to respond, but we will need a little bit of time to prepare that response, so we could have that ready to go after lunch, if we wanted to conduct the vote at that time, so we can have the opportunity to respond. But if the Board has any further discussion, you could --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, we certainly would like a
response.

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Yes.

CHAIR NICHOLS: So I think that's the better part of valor. So why don't we do that. It's a good time to take the lunch break. But we are on a tight schedule today, because we have two more items today, one of which has quite a lot of witnesses who've signed up to speak on it. Although, it isn't action item, it's still important. So let's try to be back here, I want to say, 45 minutes, but let's just make it 1:30, and be -- we will resume at 1:30 then.

Thank you.

(Off record: 12:39 p.m.)

(Thereupon a lunch break was taken.)
CHAIR NICHOLS: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome back to the meeting. We are ready to resume our discussion on the SB 375 numbers, and the updates on GHG targets. And so I'd like to move now to Board discussion, and then we will -- hello. Oh. Okay. I'd like to move to Board discussion, and then when we're done with that, we will ask the staff to respond to comments, close the record again, and then proceed.

So before I do that, I would like to call on Board Member Sperling. I asked Dan to summarize some of what we heard and help put it in context to frame the discussion here.

So Professor Sperling.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Well, thank you very much. You know, I listened to the discussion this morning, and there were a lot of very frustrated people. And I have to say that includes me also very frustrated. On the one hand, to deal with that frustration, I think CARB needs to take more responsibility and more leadership. And that means dealing, for instance, on this -- on the money issue with the California Transportation Commission. And we have that. We're moving in that direction, which is good.
We need to be -- hold the MPOs more accountable in terms of specific actions and with performance metrics. We are moving in that direction, which is really good. And we can do more. We can do things like having clearing houses of information, so that we can provide more assistance, in fact, provide technical assistance to the local governments and the community-based organizations and the NGOs.

There's a lot more we can do, but at the end of the day most of the responsibility is not CARB's. Most of the responsibility is not the MPOs in making progress and reducing VMT. Setting aggressive targets, it's appropriate, but way too many people are way too focused on whether it's 18 or 19 or 25 percent. And I have to say, having been a modeler and worked with all of the transportation modelers, they're very clever, they're very effective. If you want a different number, they can come up with a different number. And as Chair Nichols said, we need to move away from focusing on the modeling and moving towards action.

So at the end of the day, the key responsibility really is -- I know a lot of people don't want to hear this, but it really is at the local level. And I'm going to give examples of that in a moment. And we heard all of this testimony this morning about from different groups
testifying that they're -- about their -- the focus needs
to be on all these changes. But I'm going to say that the
focus needs to be much more so on local decision making.

They need -- we need the MPOs, and the cities, the
local governments, the counties to be much more
focused on what are -- exactly are the strategies and
priorities for moving forward?

And I'll -- you know, just as a little digression
on that. There was a discussion about transit. You know,
pouring a lot of money into transit is not the answer. It
might be part of it, if we do it in a clever way. But
transit -- we're putting money into transit and ridership
is going down. And even worse than that, transit really
only accounts for a little over one percent of the
passenger travel -- passenger miles traveled in
California. It's not serving a large role, except in some
very specific corridors and for a few people. And it's
not serving low-income communities very well.

We can do a lot better, and we should do a lot
better. But just putting more money into transit is not
going to accomplish that by itself.

So here are the four strategies that I think I'd
like to see articulated better by the MPOs, and by all of
us. And this could be -- you know, this is my take on it
having worked from both a research perspective and a
policy regulatory perspective for many years.

So number one is what I call pooling. What that really means is increasing the utilization, the load factors, and all of our vehicles. And that means, you know, more carpooling, that means more of the Lyft Line, uberPOOL, not the conventional Lyft and Uber Services where there's just one passenger, but the pooling services.

It means the microtransit services, like Via. It means conventional transit as well, and figuring out how to increase the ridership and the utilization. And that will be one of the most effective ways of reducing VMT. And I would emphasize this is a local challenge, not totally, but mostly. This is -- means coming up with ways of incentivizing the pooling, figuring out working with transit how you do the first/last mile, where they partner with some of these other companies, private providers, or maybe even get into the business themselves in some cases.

It means increasing the utilization of bus and rail, where it works well, and not -- and getting away from supporting it or funding it where it does not work so well. There's other ways of doing that.

The overall strategy may be that to use and thinking about this overall is what we need to do is reduce VMT, but increase passenger miles traveled. And
that responds to a lot of the concerns here. And what
that means is provide more services to people. And it can
be -- it has to be in unconventional ways.

We sink a huge amount of money into transit. And
as we've heard the ridership is going down, so we've got
to get creative and innovative about it. But we can do --
and so if we do that, we can increase the passenger miles
traveled. That means providing more accessibility for low
income disadvantaged communities, elderly people, a lot of
people, young people as well.

Okay. So that was number one, the pooling, and
that's -- and that is a local -- mostly a local issue.

Number two is housing. That's a real crisis in
this State that everyone understands and acknowledges.
And that is also mostly a local issue, whether you call it
transit-oriented development, or whatever you want, but
it's somehow dealing with that housing crisis, so that
people are not moving way -- long distances away to get
cheap housing increasing their VMT.

Number three, this is also local, and that is
creating the incentives and disincentives for everything
I've just talked about. And that means the -- dealing
with reducing the sprawl, the transit-oriented
development, the pooling. You know, one little example of
that is that airports for instance. Most airports put a
tax on the Lyft and Uber, but they do it per ride. They should change it to do -- to reduce it for the vehicles that have multiple riders, and increase it for the ones that have a single passenger, as just, you know, one simple example.

And the fourth one is one for CARB and is more of a statewide priority and responsibility. And that is we do need to restructure the transportation funding. The SB 1 money that -- there's a lot of that SB 1 money, other transportation funding, the cap-and-trade funds. We need to restructure it in a way that it rewards cities and counties that are implementing the kinds of strategies and projects that do result in less VMT and more PMT, as I said a moment ago.

And so at the end of the day, you know, I think a lot of the people in the audience have to think about this as partners in this. This is not -- you can't just point at a CARB or even the MPOs. Most of these decisions are at the local level. And CARB should play a strong partnership role in that. And in a lot of ways that -- you know, including the funding and including performance metrics and so on.

But at the end of the day, you know, it's the responsibility of all of us. And a lot of the local community-based organizations and NGOs have a big
responsibility in this. And I know there's frustration, tried hard, sometimes it's failed, but that is the way the change -- most of the change is going to happen, if we're really going to be successful.

Thanks for letting me do that speech.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

Ms. Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you. Thank you very much.

So I just wanted to start by thanking all of the community members who were here today from throughout the state of California and who testified today. Clearly, there is a strong appetite for more ambitious targets and for CARB intervention.

And this is the question before us today, and this is the question that we must focus on and respond to, the strategies for how to achieve those targets do need to be develop at the local level. And MPOs have a responsibility to advance the kinds of strategies that Dr. Sperling just talked about. And CARB needs to set the appropriate targets to make those to create that incentive to have it happen.

I'm going to focus my comments for now on San Diego, because San Diego environmental justice, and
environmental community groups, and community residents have been advocating for decades for SANDAG to move towards true VMT, and transparency, and GHG reduction. And San Diego's interest in this issue are clearly very high. I think they comprised at least over 50 percent of the -- of the testimony that we heard this morning.

So I want to also thank staff for the important changes that you're recommending that would be incorporated in the performance objectives that would include transparency, accountability, all of that is very good.

What I'm disappointed about is, I feel, staff's presentation was not responsive to the San Diego community -- community's call for increased targets. And, in fact, there was initially no meeting in San Diego planned. That there had to be a request made, even though San Diego representatives were the only ones that were here at the December meeting. That was disappointing.

And we did appreciate that staff did come forward and held a really productive meeting in San Diego, and we really appreciated that.

So we appreciated that the MPOs are satisfied with the cooperation that they have felt, but I didn't hear that sentiment from most of the folks who testified today or from the impacted communities. So we need to be
clear that the report and the recommendations are obviously not universally supported.

I'm concerned about some of what I heard, which I think are a little bit worst case scenarios. I think we have to challenge and incentivize the MPOs. The communities are really ready to step up and work for this. This is about the lives of their families. And the worst case scenarios are happening right now in the asthma rates that -- in some of our communities that are three times that of the county average. That's the worst case scenario that a child is limited in their lives, and aren't able to achieve what is a rightful, healthy, quality of life. So the worst case is happening now, and we have this opportunity to really change it.

SANDAG's problems are legendary, frankly. It's unfortunate. I don't like being the representative from San Diego that has to say that, but they've been well articulated by public comment here and in previous hearings.

There were incorrect VMT calculations, inaccurate revenue and expenditure projections. And as a result, our Measure A was rejected by San Diego voters in 2016. So we don't have those sales tax dollars to utilize. So it's true that there is a lack of funding or as much funding as we would like to have.
We are, as a result of all of this disarray that has been really building over the last several decades, a very unusual and significant step was taken when AB 805 was signed into law in 2017. That bill, by Assembly Woman Lorena Gonzalez Fletcher actually reorganized SANDAG in very significant ways.

State of California stepped up to require a course correction for San Diego. And among the changes is there's an establishment of an audit committee to oversee the revenue and expenditures and metrics that San Diego is using, so we hopefully can get ourselves on the right track, so we know what the data is and how we can move forward.

There's a reorganization of the transportation committee to focus on VMT reduction and prioritization of transit. And there's a specific incorporation of disadvantaged communities as defined by CalEnviroScreen in State law that has to be incorporated into the Regional Transportation Plan. And I think this relates to the social equity analysis that Supervisor Gioia was talking about.

SANDAG's model doesn't include a cumulative impacts approach as CalEnviroScreen does, so it tends to skew the communities that are identified as most impacted. So SANDAG's target probably should be 25 percent
as many people have asked. It's clearly needed, but I'm going to recommend 21 percent that we amend the resolution to change it to 21 percent. I think it's justified by CARB's own report that was put out in June. The February report really did not provide clear evidence or a metric-based rationale for the change.

San Diego is the only -- or SANDAG is the only one of the big 4 MPOs that did not propose a higher target -- target higher than their anticipated 2015 SCS target.

And so therefore I'm going to make an amendment -- a motion for an amendment that would call for SANDAG's target to be changed to a 21 percent emission reduction target by 2035. And I would like to move that that be incorporated into the resolution.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I think we need to put the motion forward first, so then you can propose the amendment to it. I think that's how we need to do it.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. So do you want to come back to me when we're --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, let's just have whatever more discussion there is, understanding that you intend to make that amendment.
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah.

CHAIR NICHOLS: So we'll move on.

Any others?

Supervisor Gioia is next.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I just wanted to add a little bit to my colleague Dan Sperling's comment. I do think local action is important. But let me just qualify that a little bit. I assume when you say local action, we're mostly referring to local regional action, because there's really no way that these issues are going to get resolved city by city, county by county. I don't think there's the -- frankly, in some cases, the political will. There's a lot of -- and I say this, having been in local government for like 30 years, that there's just -- these big issues just won't get solved in each individual jurisdiction. So I take it by local action, you're referring sort of the MPOs, the regional action.

I do think the frustration that we heard is that different regions of the state are going to have less rigorous plans than other regions of the state, and the frustration that there may not be a similar approach statewide. And that's where our ability to set some, I don't want to say minimum standards, but to set as much guidance as possible to get more quality around the state in how these plans are approached.
Like I honestly believe the Bay Area's plan is more robust than SANDAG's plan, for example. And this is not meant to try to criticize any part of the state. But I think we can play a role in trying to incentivize and support the regional actions to be as strong as possible.

I don't have -- I wish I could have more faith that local government can step up to solve all of these issues. I think there is a value to statewide standards, and statewide incentives.

So that's just -- just maybe to amend your comments a bit, and see how we can achieve that in our resolution.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Mr. Florez. Senator Florez.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you. Trying to figure out the system here. Well, I would just say first and foremost, I agree with John Gioia, and, of course, my colleague from the EJ community.

I think the value of this is not only being engaged in the game, but getting dialogue. And I just want to take the Board back to a moment in Fresno, where we had a pause, and we had an opportunity to pull people to the table. And that was time well spent. I think it was getting folks to dialogue, to shoot towards maybe the higher goal. And us being engaged in this, I think, was
very much of a positive.

So I would support Ms. Takvorian's motion when it does come up.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Great.

I think we're now actually ready to get to that point. So we have a Resolution 18-12.

Do I have a motion and a second?

CHIEF COUNSEL PETER: Excuse me, Chair Nichols. I think the staff wanted to do a CEQA response.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I was told that I was supposed to reopen the record after that happened.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: I apologize, Chair Nichols, if I was unclear. Reopen the record just before the vote.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. All right.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: So right now.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I appreciate this carefully nuanced legal advice that I am receiving here.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. All right. Before we act to put forward the resolution, let's hear from the staff in response to the comments then.

ATTORNEY MONROE: Chair Nichols, this is Gabriel Monroe an attorney for the SB 375 program. We're going to start with some responses to some comments that raised
some questions of economic analysis related to the current proposal. And then we're going to come back to staff for some supplemental responses to the environmental analysis.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

CHIEF ECONOMIST WIMBERGER: Chair Nichols, hello.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, you're hiding behind your screen.

CHIEF ECONOMIST WIMBERGER: I'm hiding behind a very large monitor, sorry.

This is Emily Wimberger. Staff heard comments on potential economically regressive consequences of the SB 375 targets. In addition to ongoing staff work and whatever that the Board directs staff to do, it is important to note that staff have, in fact, carefully considered these issues. Specifically, the SB 375 staff report refers to the economic analysis for the updated scoping plan, which the Board approved in December.

The scoping plan update recognizes the role that reducing growth in VMT plays in supporting other important public health, equity, economic and conservation goals.

The modeling for the scoping plan was conducted using two Models, E3's PATHWAYS Model and REMI, a macroeconomic model that was run internally by ARB, and it used cost and emission reductions estimated from the PATHWAYS Model.
The PATHWAYS Model includes inputs for vehicle stock VMT and vehicle efficiency. And these were derived from the VISION Model, which draws from EMFAC 2014, with VMT updated to reflect adopted RTPs and SCSs. The economic analysis in the scoping plan includes the incremental costs between the reference or business-as-usual case, and the scoping plan scenario.

The inputs between the reference scenario and the scoping plan include changes in VMT and stock that come from the VISION Model.

The REMI Model is then used to estimate the impact of the scoping plan on the California economy, California employment, and personal income. And we use personal income as a proxy to estimate the impact on households. The estimated impact to households in 2030 from -- of the scoping plan implementation is estimated at $115 to $280.

The economic analysis also includes an assessment of the impact of the scoping plan by region, as well as comparing the impact on disadvantaged communities relative to other census tracts.

The results show that there is not a discernible difference between the impact to disadvantaged communities relative to the overall regional in which they are located. In other words, the modeling which staff has
conducted does not show a disproportionate economic impact to disadvantaged communities. On the contrary, we anticipate that SB 375 and the scoping plan in general will support more equitable access to housing and transportation. Staff is also supportive of continued work to develop metrics and tools in this area.

Lastly, staff did quantify and monetize the avoided health impacts associated with implementing the scoping plan, which includes SB 375. The analysis shows that there are health benefits, including avoided premature mortality, avoided hospitalizations, and avoided ER visits due to implementing the scoping plan.

These health benefits are estimated to range from 1.2 to 1.8 billion dollars in 2030, and these estimates do not include any benefits associated with increases and active transportation, which may be substantial.

Thanks.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Any questions on that?

Then let's move on to the responses to the CEQA comments.

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KING: Thank you. We did receive comments claiming generally that our CEQA analysis was inadequate. We respond that generally our CEQA analysis, including the draft and final environmental
analyses and related processes, were legally adequate, and analyzed all reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts at a programmatic level appropriate to this high level target-setting proposal.

We also received a comment that the environmental analysis should have considered detailed impacts from development across the state. Staff responds that the environmental analysis prepared for the target update -- this target update proceeding is necessarily programmatic in nature since CARB's action involves setting regional greenhouse gas reduction targets.

Staff has reviewed the environmental impacts resulting from regional planning agencies' actions, as disclosed in their planning level environmental documents, and prepared our final EA in a manner that discloses those impacts as an appropriate level of specificity for the high level planning action provided before you today.

The regional planning agencies have discretion as to how to incorporate those targets into their planning level documents, which will include their own CEQA analysis as appropriate. Individual development projects will also be subject to even more specific CEQA review requirements when specific development projects are proposed.

The commenter is essentially asking for multiple
levels of duplicative CEQA review that is not required at this high level planning stage.

A commenter also referenced her separate comments on the scoping plan update proceeding in December 2017. Staff responds that the scoping plan update proceeding was a separate proceeding, not under consideration today, with its own environmental analysis. Responses to the commenter's scoping plan comments were prepared and approved prior to the scoping plan update approval. Staff's responses to those comments, which the Board has already reviewed and approved, are incorporated by reference here.

We also heard a comment that CARB failed to consider impacts to population and housing. Another commenter raised impacts of the program on agriculture generally, though it is not clear that this was intended as a CEQA comment. In any event, staff responds that it did consider those potential impacts as set forth in chapter 4 of the final EA.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Thank you.

At that point, I think we do close the record. And let's -- let's bring forward the resolution. We have a motion and a second.

And now we can consider amendments.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I was moving the staff
recommendation with the amendment.

  BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Second.

  CHAIR NICHOLS: I see. Well, I think that's fine. We needed a second to your amendment, I think.

  BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Second.

  BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I think we had one.

  CHAIR NICHOLS: And you had that from Mr. Florez.

Okay. That's great.

  BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: And I have some

  whereas to go with it, which I can read or I can
dispense with that just -- whatever your pleasure is.

  CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, you could go ahead and do

  that. I wanted to add one more amendment, which is very
simply to incorporate the comments that -- the responses
to the comments that we've just heard from staff as part
of the resolution that we'll be voting on as well, so it's
clear that they are part of the resolution. If you want
to add.

  BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Sure. Thank you.

  So whereas the San Diego Association Of

  Governments is undergoing implementation of Assembly Bill
805, and according to Section 7 of Article 11 under
chapter 4 - thank you - of Division 11 of the Public
Utilities Code; whereas SANDAG is the only MPO in the
state organizational structure that also mandates its
prioritization of transit and requires that SANDAG's regional comprehensive.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: You're going to have to start over again, because he can't hear you.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'm sorry. You want me to start from the beginning?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Or you could just give him the language. I think if it's substantially what we discussed before --

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: It is. That's why I was asking if you wanted me to read it.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I see. I'm sorry. We're not used to actually proceeding with this amount of formality. So I think we're all just kind of improvising here. I think it's acceptable if we all understand that what you're doing is changing number to 21 from what was proposed by the staff, that that's the proposal. We don't have to --

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: For San Diego. Yes, that's right.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Only for San Diego.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: It just references in the whereases the changing environment that AB 805 presents.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.
Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALTINES: I just want to be clear, only for San Diego?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: That's my motion.

CHAIR NICHOLS: That is the motion

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. That's it.

Any other -- are we all set?

Okay. In that case, I think we're prepared to vote at this point.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Do we vote on that -- those changes or are we just voting --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, the two changes are the responses to comments and the movement to 21, yes. I thought the correct procedure -- I may need help here -- was to vote on the amendment separately first and decide whether we were going to agree to the amendment, and then vote on the resolution. Okay.

I see heads nodding.

ATTORNEY MONROE: Sorry, Chair Nichols and Board members, if you do -- it's Gabriel Monroe over here. If you do approve this increase in the target for SANDAG, we would have an additional bit of language that we would like to suggest that you include in the resolution along with that, that I can read in now or if you want to discuss it and vote on it first, I can read it in later.
CHAIR NICHOLS: I think you'd better give it to us now.

ATTORNEY MONROE: Okay. So it would be another -- it would be language that would say, "Be it further resolved the increased targets are within the scope of the existing draft and final EAs would not present any new or substantially increased significant impacts not already analyzed in the final EA, and would not present any of the scenarios set forth in section 15088.5(a) of the CEQA guidelines requiring recirculation of final EA.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. So the change in staff's view does not necessitate any further analysis, which I think we would want to -- we would want to know that. So let's proceed.

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: Um-hmm.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Because I'm really uncomfortable with the fact that we're singling out one MPO. We also had someone ask us to increase Fresno, but they're, you know -- I'm uncomfortable as to since San Diego is at 19 percent as the other large MPOs, they started out at 13 and went to 19, I believe. And it's not that I disagree with my fellow Board member, it's just I
don't feel very qualified to make a decision strictly on one MPO.

And so, Diane, maybe if you could help me as to why we would increase San Diego and not increase the other three MPOs, not that I'm advocating that, because I think there's great challenge here. And I also agree with Professor Sperling. We can pick a number and how the modeling turns out is that really going to give us more action?

And so I want to be supportive. I agree with what we need to do here on SB 375, but I just need to express my concern to make sure that we're moving forward in a way that we expect to.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Ms. Berg. I appreciate the question, and I wanted to speak specifically about San Diego, because that's the region that I know the best. And it seems to me that because of the unprecedented State action that was taken in 2017 with the adoption of AB 805, which amends the Health and Safety Code and -- amends the Health and Safety Code related to the operation of SANDAG. It changes the organizational structure. It applies new responsibilities to SANDAG to be more focused on transit, to actually incorporate disadvantaged communities in -- in their planning.

And in their planning specifically of transit, it
also sets up a new audit committee that holds them more accountable because there's been problems in the past.

Those are some of the reasons why, in addition to what you've heard as inaction moving towards reducing VMT, that we think it's appropriate, I think it's appropriate, that their target be increased. So that's the rationale that I'm presenting to all of you for consideration.

VICE CHAIR BERG: So, and I would -- I understand they were one of the lowest ones at 13 percent. And they've come out now to meet the others, where they were at 15, 16, and another also 13 to 19. So you don't feel that going those extra, you know three, four percent up to the 19 doesn't meet your criteria, you think it should go even more?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Well, I share Dr. Sperling and your, I think, and probably other people's concerns about metrics and about how these things have been calculated. The best we can do -- and that's why I think staff's approach is really a good one, that we're going to improve metrics, that we're going to focus on it, that we're going to have a common set of metrics and ways that we measure this progress going forward, and that's desperately needed, because we've been off in San Diego.

But what we can focus on is that, for instance, SCAG and Bay Area are spending tens of millions more. I
think some 50 percent more in transportation dollars and
transit dollars than SANDAG is spending per capita.

So we've got evidence that the performance just
isn't at the same level as well. So I think that, coupled
with the new structuring that's happening, and the new
eyes on their performance from both CARB, as well as from
the State are reasons for them to perform more.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you for helping me.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah, I think that Ms. Takvorian
has provided a good basis for distinguishing San Diego
from other parts of the state, which also had people here
to advocate for higher numbers, but I'm not going to
support the resolution anyway, the amendment, because I
feel that we've heard enough to know that these numbers
are largely symbolic. And therefore, to symbolically go
after San Diego because of the -- what have been found to
be deficiencies in their program in the past, when we
haven't really had that engagement with them before now is
like the ARB just coming with a -- you know, from out
of -- out of nowhere in effect and giving them a higher
number without having given them an opportunity to justify
why they're already being asked to do a lot more than
they've already been asked to do before.

I have to admit I feel a little -- although, he's
not here. It's not -- you know, he can't speak for
himself, but it does bother me a little bit that the representative of San Diego who is on this Board isn't here to speak on this issue. So I feel somewhat troubled about that as well.

Any other comments on the amendment?
If not, I think we'll have the clerk call the roll please on the amendment -- on the amendment, yes.

BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Balmes?
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: No. Excuse me. No.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. De La Torre?
BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: No.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mr. Eisenhut?
BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: No.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator Florez?
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Aye.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Assembly Member Garcia?
Supervisor Gioia?
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yes.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Senator -- oh, I'm sorry. Ms. Mitchell?
BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: No.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Mrs. Riordan?
Supervisor Serna?
BOARD MEMBER SERNA: No.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Dr. Sherriffs?
BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: No.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Professor Sperling?
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: No.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Ms. Takvorian?
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Vice Chair Berg?
VICE CHAIR BERG: No.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Chair Nichols?
CHAIR NICHOLS: No.
BOARD CLERK McREYNOLDS: Yes votes win, the
motion passes -- or, I'm sorry, the motion does not pass,
10 to 2.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. All right. We'll now
move to the main motion
Three yeses.
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Metrics.
CHAIR NICHOLS: You've got to count every vote
you get. This is important. All right.
DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: Chair
Nichols?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.
DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: I apologize
again for the procedural issues. Your amendment about
incorporating the response to comments.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Do we need a separate vote?
DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER KARPEROS: You still need to dispense with that.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, I think we can dispense with a separate vote on that, unless anybody wants to call for a separate vote on that.

Hearing none -- nobody suggest that. Let us move to the resolution as amended. And I think we can probably do that without going through a roll call vote.

All those in favor please say aye?

(Unanimous aye vote.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: All those opposed?

Abstentions?

Thank you. It passes.

So thank you, everybody. This was a good discussion, and very good hearing. Really appreciated the participation of the -- all of the people who came in to try to help us.

We now need to shift the cast of players at the table. We're moving on to three different, but very related items. An update on the progress of the State strategy for our State Implementation Plan, and the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, an informational update on concepts for minimizing the community health impacts from freight facilities, and an update on implementation of Assembly Bill 617, the Community Air Protection
We'll hear the first two items together as I mentioned this morning, and then follow up with the update on the Community Air Protection Program. We've organized these three items today, put them all in one day, because they encompass a range of programs currently in place as well as new actions to clean up the air, both in the Los Angeles region and in communities across the state that continue to be impacted by air pollution.

So we'll hear from staff about the work being done to implement the SIP, since it was approved last March in this place actually. And we'll hear about the multiple regulatory programs to clean up ships and trucks, cargo handling equipment, and refrigerated trailer units and other contributors to the air pollution that communities near ports, railyards, and distribution centers are disproportionately exposed to.

The update on 617 will outline the progress that we're making in consulting with communities around the state and trying to assure that we develop programs that really slash emissions, both toxic and smog causing emissions, with specific directed programs developed for, by, and with those community members.

The schedule that the staff has laid out for this multi-pronged attack is an aggressive one. It's not too...
aggressive. It is -- it's needed in order to deliver on the promise of the legislation, as well as on the need that is out there.

I want to underline that a major driver in our approach is that we want to accelerate the movement to zero emissions, freight hauling, and freight handling technologies. Electrifying the equipment that is now pumping smog-forming emissions and toxic diesel soot into the air in and around the most impacted communities is really at the heart of this effort.

So we'll start with the staff's presentations on the SIP and the freight. And then we'll perhaps take a break before we hear again from the public. I'm not sure that we actually need that. But if we do, we can take it.

Then we'll hear the staff's presentation on 617, which has its own separate opportunity for comment. So there will be a break before 617.

But none of these items is an item that the Board is required to vote on. Obviously, we're -- our attention and our input are being solicited by the staff, so we should be prepared to engage, but we're not actually taking a vote on any of these items today.

So, Mr. Corey, would you begin, please?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair Nichols.
So last March, as you noted, the Board adopted the State SIP Strategy in South Coast AQMP, and directed staff to provide an annual status report on progress made during the implementation phase. The State SIP Strategy describes CARB's measures and commitment to achieve the mobile source and consumer product emission reductions over the next 15 years, and was a critical component of the South Coast AQMP.

Both CARB and district staff have begun implementation of the plans, both rulemaking and incentives, to deploy cleaner technologies. Staff's briefing will identify the metrics we're using to ensure we're on track to get the needed emission reductions. Underscoring a link between the SIP and freight actions, the SIP includes commitments to develop 13 new measures to reduce freight emissions.

Since March of last year, CARB staff have been working closely with the South Coast District, community groups, and industry to develop additional concepts for reducing community health impacts from freight facilities. Today, staff will present those ideas and describe the path forward.

Kirsten Cayabyab will provide the first staff presentation on the SIP Strategy and South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, followed by Ajay Mangat, who will
cover the freight update.

Kirsten.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: Thank you, Mr. Corey. Good morning, Chair Nichols and members of the Board. Today's presentation is a combined update on the implementation of the State SIP Strategy and South Coast AQMP, and concepts to minimize the community health impacts from large freight facilities.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: Before we jump into these items however, I'd like to take a moment to delve a bit more deeply into what Chair Nichols was just speaking about. CARB has multiple complementary goals that we are moving towards, including attaining our regional air quality targets and climate goals, reducing near-source risk, and most recently the push for community level programs under the auspices of the efforts of AB 617.

It's clear that there's a lot of overlap, both in terms of sources and pollutants, and the types of technologies we need to achieve our targets. Over the last few years, CARB staff has been engaged in a coordinated planning process that informs the development
of a single Mobile Source Strategy to meet these multiple goals.

This type of planning process is essential to address the interplay between pollutants and sources, and to enable consideration of the benefits of different technologies and energy sources. That's because actions deploy near -- excuse me, to deploy zero-emission and cleaner combustion technologies is essential to transform the mobile sector to meet our multiple goals.

Over the last year, what we've heard from the Board and community members has further underscored the need for a comprehensive transformation to cleaner vehicle technologies, fuels and energy sources.

That's also in part why after this joint SIP freight item, you'll be hearing an update on implementation of AB 617, the Community Air Protection Program.

In fact, throughout this afternoon's presentations, CARB staff will be discussing proposed actions that in common this genesis; they have been developed to support our push towards a more sustainable transportation system in California.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: As you may recall, we were back here in Riverside last March when the
Board approved the State SIP Strategy and South Coast AQMP. There was significant community input, and Board discussion last March, about the importance of reducing health risk from freight operations, so the Board directed us to provide annual status reports on progress in implementing the strategy, and also gave us direction on reducing risk from large freight facilities, which you will hear more about in the second half of this presentation.

I'll begin by providing an update on staff's efforts to implement the State SIP Strategy. I'll also touch upon the South Coast Air District's efforts to implement their local Air Quality Management Plan, or AQMP, as our two agencies are partners in ensuring the region achieves its clean air targets. The two plans work synergistically towards this goal.

I will then transition to my colleague Jay for an update on concepts to minimize the community health impacts from large freight facilities. And at the end of our joint presentation, we will open it up for public comment on both items.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: Jumping right in to the update on the State SIP Strategy.

--o0o--
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: I'd like to remind the Board what they adopted last March. This was a two-part commitment. The first was a commitment to achieve specific emission reductions from mobile sources by the required attainment date. And the second commitment was to take action on a new suite of measures, according to a designated schedule, which you see here on the left of the slide.

Board members, a more legible version of this is in your packet, and for the public it's out on the table outside this auditorium.

This table is an excerpt from the State SIP Strategy document that was approved last year. And it really shows the suite of new measures that were introduced in the State SIP Strategy, which call for actions to transform the State's mobile sectors, ensuring that the vehicles and engines used to move people and freight throughout the State are the cleanest available.

CARB's mobile source control programs have achieved tremendous success in cleaning up the mobile fleet throughout the years. Ongoing implementation of the current control program will continue to provide substantial reductions through 2031, providing a significant downpayment on the needed emission reductions.

To ensure that these reductions are fully
realized, staff continues to engage in efforts to ensure that we are effectively implementing the regulations that the Board has already adopted, for example ensuring full implementation of the truck and bus regulation.

Building upon these emission reductions, the new SIP measures call for actions to transform the technologies and fuels we use, the design of our communities, and the way we move people and freight throughout the state. The new measures also play a substantial role in reducing NOx emissions in the South Coast Air Basin.

The SIP measures include 14 new regulatory measures to introduce the cleanest technologies across all mobile source categories, including the logistics sector. These regulation controls are complemented by the remaining SIP measures, which are designed to accelerate the deployment and penetration of advanced technologies through incentives and other programmatic approaches.

Funding pilot and demonstration projects will continue to advance cleaner technologies in other sectors, while supporting the identification of future regulatory efforts. At the same time, other actions will ensure that the in-use fleet continues to operate as cleanly as possible.

--o0o--
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: Last March, in response to public comment, the Board told us to come back with proposed metrics for tracking progress and implementing the State SIP Strategy. There was also significant discussion about the need for expeditious regulatory action, and close tracking to ensure that we're getting the funds we need to accelerate turnover to the cleanest technologies.

To be responsive to this direction, we're proposing metrics in three major areas: rule development; advanced technology deployment; and emission reductions achieved.

In the subsequent slides, I'll walk through these metrics and provide a brief update on the implementation status for each.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: The first area for which we are proposing metrics is rule developments. This is intended to track progress in developing and bringing to the Board the 14 regulatory measures identified in the State SIP Strategy. We're tracking progress through two metrics, which are shown on the left of this slide.

The first is staff initiation of the regulatory development process. Initiation of that process at CARB
is considered to have begun when public workshops are held, a stakeholder working group is convened, or when a staff report is released, whichever comes first.

The second metric is ensuring that we bring those regulatory measures to the Board for action by the dates committed to on the schedule for the SIP measures.

We're making great progress. As you can see on the right side of this slide, we've currently initiated developments of 11 of the 14 regulatory measures. And two of these have already been approved by the Board. Beyond regulatory approaches, we've also been working to develop the needed programmatic framework for the reductions that will be coming from accelerated turnover to the cleanest energy technologies.

You approved, earlier this morning, the South Coast heavy-duty vehicle incentive measure, which will utilize Carl Moyer Program incentive funds to replace and repower older on-road heavy-duty vehicles with approximately 1,300 low-NOx trucks.

CARB staff has worked closely with the South Coast Air Quality Management District staff on the development of this measure to ensure it meets U.S. EPA requirements to achieve SIP credit.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: Reducing
emissions from on-road trucks and buses is a cornerstone of the strategy, due to their significant contribution to NOx emissions in the region. The strategy calls for low-NOx trucks that are effectively 90 percent cleaner than today's standards. And with targeted introduction of zero-emission technologies in heavy-duty applications that are well suited to the early adoption of zero-emission technologies.

At the same time, to ensure that the in-use fleet continues to operate as cleanly as possible, includes a measure to adjust in-use emissions. As I mentioned earlier, the two regulatory measures have been approved by the Board. This includes the innovative technology certification flexibility regulation, which enables early deployment of the next generation of truck and bus technologies. And last month, the Board approved the California phase 2 GHG regulations for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles.

Development has also begun on five other heavy-duty measures which you see listed here. CARB staff began regulatory development efforts on more stringent heavy-duty low-NOx emission standards in 2016. Currently, CARB's optional low-NOx standards are paving the way for these more stringent emission standards, with certification of two commercially available heavy-duty
engines to the optional NOx standards occurring last year. An additional engine size is expected within the next several years. CARB staff is also developing regulatory amendments to lower in-use emissions performance levels and to improve detection of potentially high emitting trucks in use and in buses and to develop a comprehensive vehicle inspection and maintenance program for heavy-duty vehicles.

The strategy also calls for targeted introduction of zero-emission technologies and heavy-duty applications, where zero emission technologies are currently available and feasible, such as transit vehicles, airport shuttle buses and last-mile delivery trucks.

Actions to promote zero emission in this -- in these applications are important to foster further technology development so they become suitable for broader use in the future.
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AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: The strategy calls for similar actions to reduce emissions from off-road sources, with a focus on more stringent emission standards for new engines, complemented by targeted deployment of ZEV technologies and smaller equipment types, such as forklifts, airport ground support equipment, and small off-road equipment, such as lawn and
Staff has initiated the public process to develop regulatory actions to control emissions from a wide range of off-road sources, which you see here on the right. Staff has begun development of concepts to transition small off-road equipment, or SORE, to zero-emission technologies. To further reduce emissions from ships visiting California ports, CARB staff is in the process of developing amendments to the current at-berth regulation to look for additional reductions from additional vessel fleets, types, and operations.

CARB staff is also in the process of reducing emissions from transport refrigeration units, or TRUs, from cold storage.

Additionally, CARB petitioned U.S. EPA last year to request more stringent emission standards for locomotives. These requested amendments would bring critical emission reductions, particularly in communities that surround railyards.
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AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: The second area for which we are proposing metrics, is the pace of deployment of the needed advanced technologies. The strategy was developed with the intention that the regulatory measures will drive the introduction of the
cleaner technologies to markets.

Due to the magnitude of emission reductions needed, however, additional strategies, which includes funding mechanisms, are also necessary to accelerate the transition of the mobile fleets to these advanced technologies.

While regulatory measures are anticipated to deliver approximately 70 percent of the mobile source emission reductions needed, funding to expand the deployment of the cleanest zero emission, and near-zero emission technologies will achieve the remaining increment of necessary reductions.

The South Coast AQMD has estimated the sustained funding levels of approximately $1 billion per year through 2031 will be needed to support the necessary scale of technology transformation.

For this area, we are proposing metrics that are track incentives secured, the number of the pieces of equipment and the engines turned over, and any new regulatory actions or emission reduction control strategies that are identified throughout the implementation process.

In the 12 months since the strategy was approved, there has been a substantial first year allocation of over a billion dollars of incentive funds statewide.
Additionally, discussion over the last year has identified additional potential actions to reduce emissions from the freight and goods movement sector, which my colleague will speak about in more detail in the latter half of this presentation.
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AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: The slide provides a snapshot of those incentive funding pools received over the last year. The important takeaway from this slide is that CARB is operating a number of incentive programs, including those that are funded through the approximately $1 billion approved by the legislature for the fiscal year 2017-2018 budget that I mentioned earlier.

Together with the Volkswagen settlement funds and remaining funds from Prop 1B, these programs collectively represent over $1.5 billion in grants available to reduce emissions from on- and off-road vehicles and equipment statewide.

Again, this at the statewide level. And while we are appreciative of having received such significant funding this year, it is important to remember that this scale of reductions needed in the South Coast called for approximately levels of funding in the ballpark of $1 billion annually sustained over the years of the strategy.
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AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: The third area for which we are proposing metrics is tracking the emission reductions achieved. This metric is intended to track the pace of emission reductions achieved relative to the emission reductions that we projected when we adopted the strategy.

As I mentioned earlier, ongoing implementation of the current control program will continue to play an important role in providing emission reductions from attainment. So staff is currently engaged in tracking efforts to ensure we are realizing the emission reductions from our existing suite of control programs. Concurrently, we are developing and bringing to the Board the new regulations and actions identified in the State SIP Strategy.

We knew when we developed the strategy that the focus in the initial years would be in developing and proposing to the Board the regulatory and programmatic measures we need to achieve the emission reductions anticipated in the later years of the strategy. And that's been borne out.

Staff has been engaged in outreach and development efforts to ensure that we get the process right and we'll be back before the Board frequently over the course of this year and the next few years to propose
a suite of regulatory measures we heard about today. These early regulatory efforts really lay the foundation for the emission reductions that will be coming in the future years.
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AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: This graphic shows where we anticipate achieving the needed emission reductions as we move through these phases of implementation. The blue column on the left shows the total NOx emissions from mobile sources in the base year of this strategy 2015. The dashed horizontal line indicates the 2031 target for mobile emissions. You can see that achieving the targeted 80 percent reduction mobile emissions by 2031 will require a significant push.

The emission reductions provided by the current control program offer a significant downpayment on the needed emission reductions getting us a little over halfway to the target, as you can see from the yellow portion in the 2031 column.

Reductions from the State SIP Strategy provide the remaining increment of emission reductions. The red color on top indicates emission reductions from the defined measures in the strategy, while the green portion indicates the emission reductions that will be achieved through accelerated deployment of advanced technologies.
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: The remaining portion of my presentation touches upon the implementation efforts that our partners at the South Coast Air District have undertaken in the past year to implement the AQMP.

As part of the direction to staff last March, the Board asked that we report back on progress that the South Coast Air District has made in meeting their AQMP commitments. This slide highlights the three most significant commitments in the AQMP: to sunset the RECLAIM program and reinstate BARCT level controls to secure the funding necessary for incentives critical to achieve -- accelerating the deployment of cleaner technologies and to work on developing facility based mobile measures to provide the benefits at both the regional and community level.

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: The South Coast District has made tremendous progress in the transition of the RECLAIM Program towards a BARCT level command and control regulatory structure. A significant first step was taken in 2016 with the removal of the excess credits still available in the system from shut-down facilities.

In 2018, the district has taken several
additional actions, including preventing new facilities from entering the program, freezing credits of existing facilities, and a release of the draft transition plan earlier this month, which establishes the guiding principles for all RECLAIM facilities to leave the program.

In addition, the district is also developing new rules and amending existing rules to ensure that there are established BARCT-level landing rules in place to control emissions from these facilities as the RECLAIM program is sunsettled.

This year, the district is developing source-specific BARCT rules for RECLAIM equipment and industry-specific BARCT rules for refineries and electrical generating units, or EGUs.

---

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: As the Board is well aware, funding for incentives is critical for the South Coast to attain the ozone standard. The South Coast, along with CARB, is working in different areas to secure this funding. The district has identified a number of new sources that will contribute to meeting their goal. The district's voluntarily incentive program will provide over $60 million for new cleaner technologies, and AB 134 will provide the district with over $100 million to lower
emissions from mobile sources.
And while the exact amount of funding from the Volkswagen settlement for the South Coast is not certain, that amount is expected to be substantial.
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AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CAYABYAB: And finally, the district has been working on facility-based measures. Last spring, the South Coast governing board directed district staff to work with facilities on voluntary measures, and if necessary, to begin development of regulatory measures, including industrial source rules, or ISR.

The South Coast board also directed the district staff to report back in one year on the progress made, and unless sufficient actions have been identified, to initiate rule developments. Over the last year, the district has had held 17 working group meetings in which CARB staff has participated.

As shown in this slide, district staff are proposing five different facility-based measures, and is recommending a suite of approaches, including MOUs, or memorandums of understanding, and Clean Air Action Plans, in addition to regulatory measures, such as fleet requirements for vehicles servicing these facilities.

The district board will consider staff's
recommendation to move forward on this approach early next month.

And with that, I'd like to turn it over to my colleague for his update on concepts to reduce the health impacts from large freight facilities.

Ajay.

AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:
Thank you, Kirsten.
Good afternoon, Chair Nichol and members of the Board.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:
This presentation is a report back on staff's evaluation of concepts to reduce community health impacts from large freight facilities, including recommendations for additional CARB actions.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:
In the early 2000s, CARB set targets to cut emissions of toxic diesel particulate matter and the associated cancer risks statewide. The resulting regulatory agenda covered virtually all diesel vehicles and equipment under CARB's control, including the fuels, trucks, ships, harbor craft, transport refrigeration units, or TRUs, and other equipment used to move cargo.
We have made significant progress in reducing
diesel PM through these regulations together with large
scale private investments and public incentives. But more
recent health science emphasizes the need to do more to
protect children and other vulnerable residents living
near large freight facilities.

In recent years, much of the discussion before
the Board has been about further reducing NOx emissions
from freight equipment as part of the -- as part of the
SIP Strategy. Our conversation today focuses on the
impacts of this equipment on communities near freight
facilities using the potential cancer risk from exposure
to diesel PM as the primary metric.

But staff's evaluation of potential emission
reduction strategies considers all pollutants to meet
local, regional and global needs.

In its 2015 *Sustainable Freight: Pathways to
Zero and Near-Zero Emissions* document, CARB recognized the
importance of setting a goal for freight of zero emissions
everywhere feasible, and near zero-emissions with
renewable fuels everywhere else.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT: A
year ago, the Board directed staff to come back today with
concepts for an indirect source review, or ISR, rule, and
alternatives to reduce pollution from large freight facilities. These include seaports, railyards, warehouses and distribution centers.

The message was loud and clear. Do more to lessen the health impacts for communities living next to large freight facilities.

This report describes our evaluation and conclusion of the most effective CARB -- effective actions CARB can take to achieve that objective. We begin with the bottom line.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT: In the coming years, CARB is already committed to develop and consider a dozen new measures to reduce freight pollution shown in blue below the timeline.

In response to the Board's direction, we identified nine additional CARB is to reduce emissions and community exposure to freight pollution. Five are regulatory. These additional actions are shown in green above the timeline.

We expect to deliver these new actions for Board consideration over the next five years. We appreciate the need to move as quickly as possible to address the health impacts near freight facilities. This schedule considers several factors.
The push to zero emission operations will require successful regulations to address complex infrastructure issues. There must be a strong record for Board decision making, including thorough environmental and economic analyses to meet statutory requirements, and address stakeholder concerns, and the contribution to community health risk. We've provided advanced written materials with detail on each action, and I'll cover the highlights in this presentation.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT: We began our work last year to evaluate ISR and other concepts by identifying the outcomes crucial to success. And viable concept would need to be effective in delivering real-world benefits for communities with a high degree of certainty that the concept could be implemented to achieve emission reductions. Of course, the concept would also need to be feasible for industry to comply with and the agencies to enforce.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT: Then we began consulting with our air district and State agency partners, impacted communities, environmental advocates, seaports, the freight industry, and other stakeholders.
AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

Staff co-hosted five community roundtable discussions with local advocacy groups to hear from residents of freight-impacted communities. Residents provided a wealth of information during these meetings and we've posted detailed summaries of the community meetings on our webpage.

AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

Our initial evaluation focused on facility-based approaches. These concepts consider the facility as a whole, and include all of the mobile vehicles and equipment serving the facility.

CARB has some experience with these types of facility-based actions. For example, an enforceable agreement that quantified and reduced diesel PM emissions at major railyards, CEQA comment letters that recommend how projects can minimize risk to nearby communities, and $150 million in incentives for zero and near-zero emission freight facilities project funded by the cap-and-trade auction proceeds.

When we looked at the potential regulatory approaches, we considered legal authority, the scope of impact, and enforceability. An indirect source review
rule, or ISR, is one type of facility based approach, but not the only kind. The air districts have the strongest authority to pursue ISR rules in California. The blue area on this slide highlights a few pros and cons of potential facility-based regulatory actions.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

Some people assume that an ISR -- an ISR rule can only mean a cap on facility emissions. But there is an endless variety of concepts for design. This slide shows just a handful. The San Joaquin valley Air District adopted the first ISR rule in California in 2005 that requires builders and operators to use clean equipment during construction and operation of new development or pay a mitigation fee.

Other examples might include an emissions target for a facility per unit of cargo to encourage efficiency, or a requirement to use a certain percentage of zero-emission equipment on site.

The South Coast Air District is exploring ISR concepts that include requiring facility plans, like the Clean Air Action Plan, developed by the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles. And the district staff is also considering a voluntary certification program for truck fleets cleaner than required by CARB's Truck and Bus Rule.
This coupled with a facility requirement for warehouses and distribution centers to use these cleaner truck fleets.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

Staff also considered our more traditional approach based on reducing pollution from specific types of equipment, which we've referred to as "sectors" here.

Most mobile source regulations utilize a sector based approach, including those established by CARB, U.S. EPA, and international bodies. Approaches that set an emissions or performance standard for the manufacturer or owner of specific equipment are typically more straightforward -- more straightforward to implement and enforce than a facility approach.

But there are drawbacks too, because zero-emission operation requires infrastructure that may not always be in the control of the operator. For example, the operators of ships at berth, or TRUs, capable of plugging into the electric grid and turning off their diesel engines are dependent on the availability of a connection.

The next four slides take a closer look at the types of freight facilities that the Board identified as priorities. CARB staff performed screening-level health
analyses to assess the relative contribution from each sector at, for example, freight facilities.

We wanted to gain an understanding of which sectors operating at these facilities have the greatest impact on health risk in nearby communities. We analyzed 2016 and 2023 when most existing CARB diesel regulations are fully implemented.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

Our first example facility is a very large seaport dominated by containerized cargo activity. The left bar shows the contribution of each sector to the average near-source cancer risk in adjacent communities. In this case, the average near-source risk considers the cancer risk in community locations between the edge of the port property extending to about one mile inland. As always, when considering exposure to air pollution, the proximity of the emission source to people matters a lot.

For this analysis, we quantified and modeled diesel PM emissions out to 40 nautical miles offshore for ships and harbor craft, out to three miles from the port boundary for trucks and locomotives, and on site for cargo equipment that operates a marine terminals.

In 2016, working from the bottom to the top...
bar -- top of the bar, the locomotives have the greatest impact on near-source community risk, followed by harbor craft, then ships, cargo handling equipment, and drayage trucks.

It is worth noting that when CARB staff did a health analysis for the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach based on 2002 emissions, ships at berth and cargo handling equipment made up the lion's share of the cancer risk.

The Board subsequently adopted regulations for both of these sectors, and looking at 2023, you can see that those regulations combined with port initiatives, industry investments and agency incentives continued to drive emissions down.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

Now, if we turn to risk at intermodal -- at an intermodal railyard, we see that locomotives are the biggest contributor in 2016 relative to the TRUs, trucks, and equipment. Three-fourths of the locomotive health risk comes from interstate line-haul locomotives under U.S. EPA's control. The remainder comes from railyard switchers and on-site locomotive testing.

The next most significant contributor to risk is transport refrigeration units shown with the orange and
black stripes, followed by drayage trucks, and cargo handling equipment.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

We also evaluated the emissions from freight activity associated with a one million square foot distribution center. Trucks are the biggest contributor in 2016, but their relative contribution declines significantly by 2023 after the Truck and Bus Rule is fully implemented.

Then on-site diesel equipment becomes the biggest contributor to cancer risk. Note that much of the equipment at distribution centers is already powered by electricity or propane to reduce worker exposure indoors.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

For cold storage warehouse, the near-source cancer risk in both 2016 and 2023 is dominated by emissions from diesel transport refrigeration units, with very small contributions from trucks.

CARB's existing TRU rule is expected to reduce emissions by half by 2023 through cleaner diesel engines and particulate filters.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:
Staff's analysis considered legal and practical issues, input from community advocates and industry, and which sectors are driving the near-source health risk. We reached these conclusions.

The most effective approach for CARB to achieve significant, enforceable emission reductions from freight is to regulate both the equipment and the facilities. The focus is on transitioning to zero emission, supplemented with near-zero emission technologies.

CARB can use its mobile source authority to require equipment owners and operators to transition to zero emissions. And CARB can also use its toxics authority to require owners and operators of certain freight facilities to make charging or fueling infrastructure available to equipment operators, and to ensure that only compliant equipment is allowed on-site.

CARB can prioritize rulemaking, based on community risk to achieve that greatest health benefits first, and CARB can continue to work in close coordination with the South Coast Air District, and any other districts considering new ISR rules to weave in the state and local regulations together.

This is important to maximize their effectiveness.

Let's now turn to the nine new actions that CARB
staff will undertake for freight.

Each slide highlights the proposed action and lists some of the considerations that must be evaluated and addressed in the public process during development.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

We'll start with drayage trucks serving ports and railyards.

CARB's existing rule and port initiatives transform the drayage truck fleet from the dirtiest to the cleanest in the state. The next step is to move to zero emission operations everywhere possible.

First, staff will advocate for drayage truck rates at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach that provide clear market and financial advantages to zero and near-zero emission truck trips.

Second, staff will develop a statewide rule for drayage trucks to direct transition to zero emission operations.

The many technology demonstration projects underway will provide valuable information on performance and costs for the regulation.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

CARB is implementing existing rules that require
diesel PM controls for harbor craft and cargo handling equipment. For harbor craft, the next step is for CARB staff to develop lower emission standards for both new and in-use vessels. We expect this effort to focus on cleaner combustion and hybrid systems.

For the cargo handle equipment used at ports and railyards transitioning to zero emission -- zero emissions requires substantial planning and investments in the associated charging or fueling infrastructure. It also raises the prospect that marine terminal operators might choose to automate some operations concurrently, which would impact labor.

Staff is proposing to develop the harbor craft regulation first, because the sector offers the opportunity to achieve greater reductions in toxic diesel PM and NOx emissions than cargo handling equipment.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

The federal Clean Air Act preempts California from setting emission standards for the newer remanufactured locomotives that generate most of the emissions and health risk from rail operations.

CARB staff is proposing to focus on two areas where we have authority. First, a new regulation that would limit idling of all combustion-powered vehicles and
mobile equipment operating at railyards and other locations. These may include passenger rail stations, maintenance facilities, and rail sidings to name a few. We will also look at mechanisms to reduce emissions from other locomotive operations while they're stationary.

Second, a new regulation to require upgrades on older freight and passenger locomotives that are not preempted.

Community members have urged CARB to staff to develop a freight handbook that identifies best practices for siting, design, construction, and operation of freight facilities to minimize community exposure to air pollution. This advisory handbook can serve as a resource for local land use decision makers and lead agencies, community advocates, freight facility developers and operators.

The community emission reduction -- community emissions reduction programs developed under AB 617 will inform the priorities for the types of freight facilities to be addressed.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

Residents living near large freight facilities, see and feel the effects of diesel soot. They stress the need for CARB enforcement April warehouses an distribution
centers. CARB is forming anew team to respond to this priority.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

This table lists the nine additional actions that we've described to reduce the impact of freight pollution in communities. This is beyond the dozen freight commitments currently in the SIP.

Given the importance of freight, we will provide an annual update to the Board describing our progress, as well as highlighting any issues and changes that need to be considered.
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AQPSD FREIGHT SYSTEMS SECTION MANAGER MANGAT:

The nine additional actions are a part of a suite of approaches that comprise CARB's path forward to reduce emissions from freight facilities, and lower the health impacts in nearby communities.

New regulations that require equipment owners and facility operators to participate in the transition to zero emissions, support for any district's facility-based measures and port initiatives, stricter federal standards for trucks and locomotives, and international standards for ships, incentives that support the transition to zero emissions operations through grants and other means. All
of these actions will work together to protect communities
near freight facilities, and support the goals of the
Community Air Protection Program established under AB 617.

Thank you for your attention and we welcome any
questions or comments that you may have.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks. It's obviously a
complicated agenda, but I know that there is also a lot of
people here wanting to urge us to do more and to do it
faster and so forth. So I think we really ought to hear
from them, but if there are any questions at this point.
I don't see any.

Oh, I do. Sorry. Dr. Sperling.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Just to try to
understand, it is complicated. There's a slide -- the
second set of slides, 13, that was on distribution
centers. It shows that in 2023 trucks play -- have almost
no impact. And it's all on-site equipment.

And I heard a -- I thought I heard that rules had
already been adopted to deal with the -- no, that's not
it. I think it's 30 according to your -- we have a
different set of numbers here.

Yeah, that's it. So it shows that trucks have
almost no role in warehouses and distribution centers in
2023. And it's almost all on-site equipment. And I
thought I heard a comment that rules had already been
adopted on on-site equipment.

And then on slide 34, there was a reference to new CARB rules to transition cargo handling equipment to zero emission. Can you explain -- I mean, this is really important, because it's kind of the key -- one of the key strategies and key problems here.

Am I understanding this right?

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:

Yes, professor Sperling. This is Cynthia Marvin.

If you look at slide -- the slide on distribution center risk. We do see that dramatic improvement -- that dramatic reduction in trucks. The reason that you don't see a noticeable change in the on-site equipment, that equipment is regulated under our off-road equipment regulations. Most of the benefits have already been implemented by 2016.

So you see relatively consistent emissions between 2016 and 2023. The equipment that operates at warehouse and distribution centers is not covered under our Cargo Handling Equipment Rule, which is specific to ports and railyards.

But there are commitments in the SIP to look at zero-emission operations for off-road equipment, which would certainly consider some of the equipment that would operate at a distribution center. There's also the SIP
commitment to look at zero-emission forklifts.

So both of these things will help address some of the equipment that's operating at those facilities.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So to the extent we're worried about warehouses and distribution centers, that's what we should be focusing on it sounds like, that on-site, equipment, right?

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:

Relatively, yes. But, of course, we're concerned about all of it. The other thing is that these analyses are a snapshot of what's happening on site at the facility. It doesn't include the additional emissions and exposure that happens as those trucks travel to and from the facility. So the impacts on the community from trucks would be larger than what you see as this narrower view of just the impacts from what's happening at that facility itself.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So when you say on-site truck, you draw a boundary -- you know, maybe a quarter mile or something like that, is that what that means?

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:

In this particular case, this is only the truck operations on the physical property of the facility.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Okay. Thank you.

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:
So the -- the answer is always is we care about all of it.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I had a question. I had a comment.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Another question, yes.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: So I just wanted to amplify one thing. In the presentation, you state that local air districts have the strongest authority to develop ISR rules. I'm already hearing there may be some push-back to that.

So I'd like to understand, I know we'll discuss this more later, what conversations you've had with local air districts on this, and what you've heard from local air districts?

ASSISTANT CHIEF COUNSEL SEGALL: Sure. I'll take that one, Supervisor. This is Craig Segall.

We've spoken with several of the districts, including South Coast and Bay Area, met with Greg Nudd, I believe, at Bay Area recently and discussed these issues with him. It seemed like a positive step forward there with some subtleties that I ma happy to talk through with you. South Coast has also posted a public memo on their authority affirming it recently.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: A public memo on their
website?

ASSISTANT CHIEF COUNSEL SEGALL: Yes, that's correct.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: There's already comments on it.

ASSISTANT CHIEF COUNSEL SEGALL: That's my understanding and we can get you a copy as well.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yeah, if you can send it, that would be great.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Dr. Sherriffs.

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Thank you. A couple --
a couple questions about freight. I've always wanted to drive a locomotive.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: But to share my ignorance and why they won't let me in the cab obviously. You know, the locomotives by the bar graphs are a huge contribution to the intermodal rail yard cancer risk. And I'm looking at the next steps slide and railyard idling and non-preemptive locomotives are pretty far out. And, you know, I'm ignorant, how hard is it to turn off a locomotive and then turn it back on? I'm wondering how we move that up.

It doesn't sound like it needs a lot of new technology to -- but I don't know.
TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:

I wish things were that simple. Part of the complexity on this particular issue is that there are federal regulations already that affect the same locomotives. There are some regulations that require certain safety and testing. And so it's always a bit challenging to determine what is necessary, i.e. federally mandated idling and what is unnecessary idling, which is the piece that we can tackle.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Let's go to our witnesses then. Have we got the list projected here yet?

It will be in a moment.

Okay. So now you can see where you are in the line, and beginning with our first Ms. Rizvi. Please come to the podium here, yeah. Hi.

MS. RIZVI: Good afternoon. My name is Maha Rizvi. And I am here representing Assembly Member Eloise Gomez Reyes. And I'm here reading her letter.

"Dear, Chair Nichols and members of the Board. In February of last year, I wrote a letter to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), regarding the review of its air quality management plan. In it, I stated, 'Although we understand the need to collaborate with stakeholders around what may be done voluntarily, we cannot delay action'.

"
"Further, I made clear that need of emissions reductions standards that improve the quality of life for residents across California, ultimately actions by the SCAQMD has stalled. I have been heartened by the Air Resources Board (ARB) and staff activity, and along with advocates, thank you for work being done to prioritize addressing pollution from freight facilities.

"There is a lot to like regarding the proposed regulation for drayage trucks, cargo handling equipment, and enforcement action, which includes a new freight handbook. However, there is still much work that needs to be done, and it is imperative that we speed up Board action and engage meaningfully in and discussions around more stringent regulations.

"Specifically, I am disappointed that contrary to my previous letter, local air districts still seem to be focused almost exclusively on an incentive-based approach to clean up freight. This is not to say that incentives should not be part of the equation.

"During my time in the legislature, I have successfully advocated for hundreds of millions in investments into our State's most successful medium- and heavy-duty vehicle programs. However, in order to get where the State desires to go, involve markets, and protect our most vulnerable communities, regulations such
as Indirect Source Rule must be taken seriously.

"Given the current lack of action, ARB must take
the lead. Although, I am mindful that regulations cannot
be crafted overnight, we cannot further delay regulation
that of those around zero-emission cargo handling
equipment proposed to be completed by 2022, especially
since they were expected this year. Taking swift action
to address the number one source of transportation-related
pop -- pollution in California, it must be one of the
Board's top priorities.

"I recommend in order to accelerate the timeline
for freight regulation, ARB temporarily redirect staff to
reflect their prioritization.

"I often state that my constituents are usually
sold a false narrative that they can have either clean air
or good jobs, but not both. It is our..." --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Go ahead.

MS. RIZVI: Okay. "It is our responsibility as
government to help evolve the economy to protect
communities like mine who want both environmental quality
and economic prosperity. I look forward to working with
advocates, the Board, and SCAQMD to enact solutions that
enforce this ideal.

"Sincerely, Eloise Gomez Reyes. Assembly Member,
47th District".
Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

Good afternoon.

DR. LYOU: Good afternoon. We're really close here. My name is misspelled, but that's okay. A lot of people do that.

(Laughter.)

DR. LYOU: I'm Joe Lyou. I am the Governor's appointee to the South Coast AQMD Governing Board and have been for the past 10 years. And Chair Nichols, I don't know if you remember, but we went through confirmation together 10 years ago.

Oh, yes. Actually, Dr. Balmes you were there too. And she was cool as a cucumber, like no problem. Walk in the park, and I was nervous as all get out and go.

But anyway, it's been 10 years. I've been asked by my counsel to let everybody know that I'm speaking on behalf of myself, not on behalf of the governing board. As you might know, that our governing board hasn't really taken a position on what staff is -- your staff is proposing here, and also hasn't come to conclusion about what we're going to do about our indirect source rules or not.

And I'll get to that in a little bit. But I want to remind you of a couple of things that are of key
importance. Forty-five percent NOx emission reductions by 2023, and that's above and beyond what we've already adopted. So that's what we have to do in order to attain our most pressing criteria pollutant standard on time for the Clean Air Act. And so the reminder is really that we have a long way to go, and we have a very short time to do it.

Secondly, the Governor issued his Sustainable Freight Action Plan not that long ago. And within that action plan was an analysis provided by your staff that the Governor signed off on that showed that the consequences of the freight industry operations in California were an estimated 2,200 premature deaths per year, at a cost of $20 billion annually.

So there are serious public health consequences, and serious economic consequences of not -- of delaying action and not acting quickly. So the recommendation, as Chair Nichols said, do more sooner if you can at all possibilities.

When I attended workshops on this issue, your staff indicated to us that they had to make some choices about doing things sequentially instead of simultaneously when it came to rulemaking. I'm encouraging you, please provide them the resources to do the rulemaking simultaneously, so that the rules can come to you sooner.
rather than later.

And lastly, we -- I want to remind you that when the South Coast AQMD adopted its Air Quality Management Plan, we made a commitment to assist you in this process of dealing with mobile sources. Now, I need to be careful here, because we have an open thing -- open hearing process going on at South Coast. And as Mayor Pro Tem Mitchell and I are both in the room, we have to be careful about Brown Act issues, but I think that the staff presentation on what South Coast is proposing to do and what South Coast may actually end up doing, maybe two different things.

We need you to do everything you can. So I can answer some questions perhaps, but we need to be a little careful on what we say.

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Understood.

Thank you.

MR. JORDAN: Good afternoon, Chair Nichols, members of the Board. I'm Tom Jordan with the San Joaquin Valley Air District. I'm here today to speak in support of ARB going forward with an aggressive mobile source statewide strategy. In particular, the efforts to get early implementation of the optional low-NOx standard and zero emission equipment throughout the state.
We are the other part of the State that needs substantial NOx emission reductions. And as most of you recall, our challenge is similar in scope to South Coast. The pollutant that's driving our issue right now is particulates rather than ozone. We still have an ozone challenge, but particulates the more pressing of the two issues.

The reason that's important is the timeframe with which we have to get to attainment is very short. Whereas you're looking in the 2030s for ozone, we're looking in the mid-2020s for particulate matter.

You guys will probably also remember that your Board directed your staff to work with us on looking for everything that both the State and the locals could do to attain that standard as quickly as possible. We're very near to -- my understanding is the modeling is very close to being finalized, demonstrating attainment. We have gone back to our rules and looked for everything we can do to tighten up on our sources. And the State has done the same on the mobile source.

But like South Coast, the only way we're going to get there is with an aggressive program to clean up heavy-duty equipment. And so we're fully supportive of that.

The discussion of the Indirect Source Rule and
warehouse and distribution facilities, it was mentioned we've had a rule for 10 years, which is correct. And we've seen a lot of benefits from that in cleaning up truck fleets. We actually had to go back and modify our rule this last year, because there was a -- kind of some land-use issues where some of the industrial facilities didn't fall under ISR. But we've tightened that up to make sure those facilities are now part of the rule as well.

But once again, we're fully supportive of the State pushing forward for reductions from heavy duty.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

I hesitate to do this, because we're getting to the point in the day when everybody has reasons why they would like to go first, but we had a special request of the clerk earlier on behalf of Michele Hasson, who is number 13 on the list and is the person who's going to be presenting a letter, I believe, on behalf of the CCAEJ. So if you would go head, Michele.

MS. HASSON: Thank you, Chair Nichols. I very much appreciate the switch up in procedure. Very much appreciated.

I not only will present a little bit about the letter, but more than anything I really want to talk about two things that aren't in the letter, time and
accountability. Today, I come humbly before you trying to represent 13 community members that could not speak today, because we were misinformed about time. We had a call with staff three days ago and were told that we should be able to expect our community to testify at 11:00. It's now 3:00, and I don't think our community would have made it. They have lives. They had to go, and they stayed all day. They stayed until 1:30 and wanted the opportunity to engage with this process. And because of time, they weren't able to. And who can we hold accountable? I understand how difficult staff's job is. I would never question that.

But there needs to be a level of accountability to ensure that community -- when community reaches out to staff to say we want to coordinate, we want to work with you, please don't misrepresent the times, because it really limits 12 people that are from this community that couldn't speak today, and I come on their behalf.

Another thing, I really want to highlight about time, we have no more time. We need regulations. We don't need actions telling us that regulations will be on the books. We need regulations now.

We can't -- ARB is one of the primary regulatory agencies and enforcement agencies in the state, and you cannot enforce rules that are -- that take three years to
make. We need rules at the end of this year at the very least, because our communities are suffering.

And I know that's hard. I know it's hard, but it is so hard to have a child with asthma. It is so hard to take your day off and sit here all day with your small children while they are sick just because you want to speak, and you want to tell this Board how urgent it is, and you can't because of time.

We don't have time anymore. We also don't have time to not -- to be falling between the cracks of accountability and authority. Last year, you stood before us and said that in one year we would review the South Coast Air Quality Management District's plan for an Indirect Source Rule. And here we are, and we have nothing.

We have a Board that is poised to refuse to admit that staff's recommendations are valid and logical. They will not even start on a rulemaking process. We need you to hold them accountable. What is it -- we would like ARB to come back and tell us what can you do to hold our South Coast Air Quality Management District accountable, when they will not take the time to even start rulemaking.

So on behalf of the community that can't be here and the time that I have been allotted, I thank you all. And I request please give our community the time to speak,
and please hold yourselves accountable to the supreme
honor that you have to make rules and enforce them.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. We will stay here
until we've heard from everybody. And I do apologize if
there was a miscommunication about when this item was
going to be called.

Thank you.

DR. JAKPOR: Thank you. My name is Dr. Karen
Jakpor. I'm here to speak with you today as a physician
volunteer with the American Lung Association's Doctors for
Climate Health Campaign. I'm both a physician and a
patient here in Riverside. I've been admitted to the
hospital or the emergency room so many times, I've lost
track because of asthma. And I even had to give up my
medical practice because of asthma.

My friends in American Lung Association sometimes
say I'm like the canary in the coal mine because my
breathing goes up and down daily depending on the air
quality conditions.

My daughter is unable to play outdoors 100 days
per year, because I can't supervise her outside on
unhealthful air days. Along with our coalition partners
here today, the American Lung Association supports the Board's efforts to move forward with strong regulations for cleaning up railyards, trucks at warehouses, port equipment, and ships. Our major concerns is with the time it will take to adopt and implement these rules and deliver on the critical health benefits we know we need.

We need certainty that there will be staff resources available to create the clean air rules. We need certainty that the ARB will have local partners in directly reducing pollution from freight facilities throughout the State.

We need certainty that we will see relief come as quickly possible from pollution hot spots that contribute to asthma, heart attacks, cancers, and premature births and deaths.

We need certainty that we can move beyond clean air grant discussions to strong rules and enforceable actions that deliver real lasting relief. Zero-emission solutions are the key to this certainty. And strong actions by the Board are needed to drive these benefits as quickly as possible.

The public health risk analysis highlights that we need to move forward with a broad suite of measures as quickly as possible to reduce health risks. As a resident affected by warehouse scene industry, I welcome the
creation of the freight hub enforcement team to the
ongoing discussion of how we can move more quickly to cut
pollution across the freight industry.

I need your support to be able to breathe and
you'll have our support in getting us there.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

(Applause.)

MS. TOMLEY: Good afternoon. I'm Heather Tomley,
Environmental Planning Director for the Port of Long
Beach. I first want to thank the Air Resources Board
staff for their long working relationship with the port.
Through an approach of early voluntary action at the port
supported by statewide source control regulations, and the
monumental efforts of our industry partners, our port's
emission's inventory has shown significant emission
reductions in a little over a decade.

We recognize there's more work to be done. So to
build on this progress, the boards for the two ports
recently approved the third iteration to our Clean Air
Action Plan setting forth aggressive goals to move to zero
emissions.

Achieving these goals will be a huge challenge
and will require all of us to continue to work together
collaboratively. We're very appreciative of the grant
funding support by the Air Resources Board over the years to help support these efforts. Funding for early action to accelerate vehicle turnover to install electrical infrastructure and to demonstrate emerging technologies has been a critical component to achieve these emission reductions and will continue to be a critical component into the future.

We look forward to continued cooperation with your agency and other stakeholders as we work to demonstrate these new cleaner technologies to evaluate their feasibility, and to identify the remaining challenges for drop -- broad deployment, including operational capability, infrastructure availability and economic factors.

These studies and demonstrations need to play out, and will be a critical component to help inform our approach and to ensure we can be successful into the long term. We support the prioritization identified for ARB actions, and we look forward to continuing to work with your staff through the details on development of new strategies to reduce emissions from freight sources, and advancing our shared goals for clean air.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. ROSENFIELD: Thank you, Board members. I'm
Cody Rosenfield with the Coalition for Clean Air. First, I'm going to very quickly thank the staff and the Board for working so hard at trying to regulate these freight facilities.

The Coalition for Clean Air supports the freight facility measures and regulations proposed, but asks that the Board consider further stronger regulations and allocating more resources to accelerate the rulemaking and implementation timelines.

Last March, this Board directed staff to report back on concepts for an ISR regarding these facilities. The Board direction recognized that the State Implementation Plan with its overreliance on voluntary and unfunded incentive measures would not be adequate to achieve the emissions reductions necessary to bring the State into attainment with federal clean air standards.

Since that meeting a year ago, it's become very clear that air districts lack the will to adopt ISRs for freight facilities. Voluntary- and incentive-based programs must be balanced with enforceable regulations that drive innovation and investment in clean technologies.

We continue to believe that facility-based emission limits are necessary to protecting community health, and we urge CARB to work with the air districts to
see that those limits are adopted.

Meanwhile, infrastructure projects that bring more freight vehicles to highways and communities are being approved, and more warehouse are being built every day in Southern California. This growing problem necessitates a faster timeline than proposed by CARB staff for many of the regulations and measures.

In light of the failure of air districts to make headway on effective ISRs, CARB should pursue direct technology controls on trucks, trains, ships, and equipment as proposed by staff. We support transition to zero-emission engines wherever the technology exists. And for vehicle and equipment, where there is no viable alternative, we support near-zero technology paired with low carbon renewable fuels.

We support moving forward expeditiously with rulemakings on drayage trucks commercial harbor craft, cargo handling equipment, locomotives, and railyard equipment, as well as with infrastructure requirements for these facilities.

We understand that staff will need additional resources to -- in order to begin the rulemaking process for all these measures simultaneously rather than one at a time. CARB must allocate further staff to tackle this problem and protect communities that continue to be harmed
by the freight industry. Delaying these timelines not
only postpones the transition to cleaner vehicles and
cleaner air, but sets a precedent that CARB deadlines are
fluid at a time when there's more urgency than ever,
esspecially if there's any hope to reach attainment with
state and federal clean air standards.

We believe the proposed measures and regulations
are a good starts, but should only be the first step
toward reining in emissions from these sources. The Board
should consider stronger direct controls going forward and
provide the staff necessary to fast track these rules.

The Coalition for Clean Air remains supportive of
the freight handbook that will give other agencies tools
to tackle this problem on the ground.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. GARZA: Good evening, Board of Supervisors.
My name is Cristian Garza. I'm a volunteer at Sierra Club
and youth council member of the air quality management
district.

I am born in Mecca, California. It's a small
farmworkers town. Literally, you go 10 feet to the right
of the end road, farm; 10 feet to the right, farm. It's
about a mile and half -- a mile and a half long. Small
little town, right?
I have a dying sea, 10 miles back the Salton Sea. I have helicopters that fly by and pour pesticides on all the fields that are, what, five feet away from my school -- my elementary schools. And what I'm trying to get at here is that you don't need to know that the air is bad. You can see the dust. You walk outside, you can see the smog.

I -- I'm personally -- I'm tired of waiting for tests. We know that the air is bad. We know it's not good for us. We know there's toxins in the air, all these particulate matter. And I'm here to ask for action. I was born with asthma. Two years ago, I had an asthma attack that resulted in a collapsed lung. I actually almost nearly died, because of my collapsed lung.

The doctor told me if I -- if I did not get there 10 minutes before I got there, I would have died. My whole lung would have collapsed. In that moment, I realized it was that much more serious for me. And I am just -- I was the lucky one. I am one of hundreds of thousands of kids in my valley that are -- we're allowed. I had the chance to live a second time. And I'm grateful for that. That's why I'm here, because for the ones that could not make it that day. I'm here because I got a second chance.

And I'm here because I don't want to go through
that again. I don't want to see my mom have to see her
child go through that again. I don't want to see any
other parent have to see their child go through that
again. It's terrifying. So I'm here saying stop with the
tests. You know, we have the data. We have the
information. I've done a lot -- I go through all the
logistics work. I go to the meetings. I know it's a big
process, but we need action by the end of this year. Some
plan, something in the works or our community is going to
slowly die off.

And I love this place. I every -- I love my
community. I love my valley, and I don't want to see that
happen. So for my valley, my people, and my community,
you, I wish more action by the end of the year.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Bianca.

(Applause.)

MS. VILLANUEVA: Good afternoon, Chair Nichols,
members of the Board. My name is Bianca Villanueva. And
I am here to read a statement on behalf of CAPA.

On behalf of the California Association of Port
Authorities, CAPA, which is comprised of the state's 11
publicly-owned ports, we are pleased to submit the
following brief comments regarding the informational
update on concepts to minimize the community health
impacts from freight facilities.

CAPA sincerely appreciates the efforts of CARB
staff to work with all stakeholders. We thank you for
maintaining an open dialogue with our ports and with the
freight industry. Ports share the same goals to reduce
impacts from port operations, but we may take different
approaches to get there.

We strongly believe that a robust study,
including a careful examination of potential cargo
diversion and related job loss must be undertaken as
additional efforts are considered. This study should also
include a thorough analysis of potential emissions
leakage. Cargo, diverted to ports in other states and
nations, and then trucked into California could
significantly increase local emissions and greenhouse gas
concerns.

CAPA believes that the imposition of a statewide
Indirect Source Rule for freight facilities is
unnecessary. Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. HAMILTON: Good afternoon now. Kevin
Hamilton, Central California Asthma Collaborative, and
also a member of the California Clean Freight Coalition.
And I believe you have our letter already submitted to you
on that, so I'm not going to belabor that point.

Instead, I'm going to express my concerns with this plan and the timelines it expresses, and the changes that have been made or the proposals that have been made around them. The San Joaquin Valley can't wait for this. Your timelines are stretched out way too long now.

A year ago, we stood right here in this spot and I stood right here at this podium, and I watched Mr. De La Torre put a resolution in effect that this Board adopted to commit to this process and to move it forward expeditiously.

And the goal was by now we would have some kind -- at least a commitment and some draft rules ready to go or regulations that we could look at. That's what I took away from it. And I'm not seeing those. I'm excited about the plans for the things that I'm seeing. This freight handbook, great thing. We've been working on that with staff. I really think it's a beautiful thing coming forward. I'm not excited about the fact that it's now in two different chapters with one coming much later than the others.

But I want to be very specific. So we need the mobile source reductions in the San Joaquin Valley in order for you to honor your commitment to us for our SIP to work. It's as simple as that. When I look at dates
for trucks for lower use performance level multiple regs, and I see a date that drifts between 2018 and '24, '24 is not going to cut it for us. We need all these things by 2021.

Okay. If we can't get them by then, we can't start getting clean enough air to meet our SIP commitment, which means you don't meet your SIP commitments. So without them, we lose. Advance Clean Trucks Regulation last mile delivery, those trucks are all over our region. We know that 80 percent of these trucks -- the trucks in our valley belong to us. They originate in the valley and they end in the valley. They are last mile trucks. They are drayage trucks.

I'm very concerned about the freight handbook. We have a number of areas in the valley that are being considered for inland port status, already in South Kern, Merced is moving forward with this idea. I expect Fresno to be not far behind. If they're an inland port, you should treat them as ports.

They should have the same assets and incentives that ports have, because they have all the same stuff, other than a few ships and a crane. But everything else on that site is looking pretty much the same. And we need those same incentives in the valley.

Not only that, we don't have the ocean wind
coming in every afternoon changing the tide and taking the pollution back out with it occasionally or the Santa Ana winds coming through twice a year. Not that people aren't suffering under the pollution in between that, don't get me wrong. We don't have anything like that in the valley. Instead, we have stagnation events. I mean, you haven't lived, till you've lived through a stagnation event. Over between Christmas and New Year's, we had one, where particulate matter PM2.5 hit 156 mics one day. That's incredible. That's higher than the pollution -- particulate pollution in Beijing China. I mean, this is crazy.

So we need your help, and we need it now, because the valley is also growing. This freight transport is growing. You're running out of space down here. So where is it dumping over into? The other place where there's land. We got your used cows last time, so now we're getting -- and I'm really worried about your used port equipment.

If we're not designated a port, where are you going to put all that used stuff that you change over for zero equipment down there. I'm very concerned about that, and I hope you understand it.

So as you look down this list, please think of the numbers 2021, and direct staff appropriately and give
them the resources they need in order to accomplish that, and we'll help you advocate with the industry to do that.

    Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

    (Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Mr. Minault.

MR. MINAULT: Thank you. Thank you, Board. Kent Minault from the Sierra Club.

    I want to thank staff for the very detailed and well thought out report that they just made. And I liked a lot of what I heard, but I have a concern. I heard staff say that the principle of the report was deploy zero-emission vehicles wherever feasible, zero-emission everywhere else.

    My concern is what do you mean feasible?

    I mean, I just made a quick calculation between the ports in San Pedro and Long Beach to the center of the logistics industry in Fontana is about 70 miles. Right now, you've got battery electric tractor -- or truck tractors that can make that trip on one charge, so that's feasible, right? I didn't hear any detail about those kind of things in the report. And I'm interested in that.

    And here's the fine point of it, community health impacts from freight hauling will not be seriously reduced by so-called near-zero vehicles. Rather, those impacts
will be moved from communities near warehouses to communities near fracking sites and gas storage facilities like Aliso Canyon.

Now, before I made the point that zero-emission battery electrics are key to serious job growth, when you implement incentives and regulations, you must distinguish clearly teen nero-zero and real zero and seriously prioritize the zero.

And finally, would you explain to all of us, please, what happened to the $23.6 million this Board gave to South Coast Air Quality Management District in 2016, specifically for battery-powered trucks? Please tell us what happened to that money. Thank you so much.

(Applause.)

MS. PORTILLO: Hi, Board members. My name is Esther Portillo. I'm with the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice.

First of all, I would like to say that our community members and our organization felt really disrespected that due to the fact that the -- you prolonged this meeting. I came here at about 8:58 a.m., and when I walked into the -- to this room, everybody was chit chatting. And I was actually really surprised that this Board wasn't meeting as soon as 9:00 a.m.

Our community members are used to coming to city
call -- sorry, city hall meetings, they go to planning commission meetings, some of our community members here we're at a planning commission meeting to 10:00 o'clock on Tuesday night. So they're used to attending these type of meetings. But unfortunately, 20 or so were not able to stay. Actually one of our community members who has children with asthma had -- just had to leave about 15 minutes ago, because she just couldn't stay anymore. She had to go back to her family. So I really think that as we proceed, we really have to respect the time of community.

I want to say that in the Inland region, currently, we have about -- about 1.2 billion square feet of warehousing. And SCAG just released some data that shows that they will need that two -- that the commerce and everything will need two billion more square feet of housing. So that means that in the next couple of years, we're going to need -- there's going to be three billion square feet of housing, and -- I'm sorry of warehousing.

And we already see this. We go to meetings, city council meeting, planning commission meetings where they're discussing and approving projects of a four million square foot warehouse. And they're estimating thousands of trucks coming to this warehouse. The draft EIRs are stating this.
This is not something that we've come up -- are projecting. This is in the Draft EIR. So we see this tidal wave of warehouses, tidal wave of trucks that are going to be coming into our communities. And the -- every year these warehouses get closer to our schools, closer to our neighborhoods. There's actually a -- really, I think it's 700,000 square feet of warehousing across the street from an elementary school.

I mean -- and it's just outrageous how this freight industry and the logistics industry really disrespect our community.

So what we're asking for is for protection. We need protection from this tidal wave of warehousing, this tidal wave of diesel trucks. And someone has to step up, because our cities, our local jurisdictions are not stepping up. There's developers that are coming into our cities, they're buying off our city council members, they're buying off our planning commissioners.

So someone has to take the next step to protect our health and to really regulate and enforce some laws on these -- on this industries.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CORT: Hi there. I am not Adrian Martinez.
My name is Paul Cort. I am also with Earthjustice. First, I want to say that we definitely support the new proposals to address freight. But as you've heard from many folks, there's still much more that needs to be done. I think there were three issues that were not addressed in the staff's proposal, three questions that you need to be asking and getting answers to.

First, why is staff delaying regulatory actions? In the SIP presentation, they presented a metric that said they would measure progress against the various deadlines, but there was no analysis, no showing of how those deadlines are being met. The Board resolution adopted last year called for cargo handling equipment rule by 2019. Staff has decided that 2020, 2022 is better. Staff has also proposed to push back the at-berth ship regulations, the Clean Transit Rule was supposed to be adopted last year, and we still have no proposal. And we can see, those of us working on it, that the clean truck rule is nowhere near on target to finished this year as promised.

If freight is to be a priority, resources must be shifted to make this happen. Now, we understand the arguments for a strong record to support some of these rules. But four years to develop that record, that's not about developing a record. That's about delaying the
start of that regulatory rulemaking process.

Second, if the freight strategy is to rely on local districts to adopt an Indirect Source Review rule, what is ARB's plan to make the districts adopt those rules?

This Board adopted Resolution 17-7, in part because the State Air Plan lacked specific action. I think Mr. Eisenhut referred to it as faith-based planning at the time.

Staff have concluded that ARB will not pursue its ISR rule, and will support local ISR rules, but they presented no plan for how those ISR rules will come into effect. Now, ARB may not want to specify what local air districts must and must not adopt, but ARB has the ultimate authority to reject plans that fail to meet air quality standards. And so if that's the sort of action that's being left off the table, ARB is within its jurisdiction to say, no, go back and try again.

Third, we heard that staff was going to report back on the metrics of incentives. Are we finding those incentives dollars that were assumed in the plans? Staff gave you no answer. The answer is no, we have not found the money that these plans assumed would be there to make all these voluntary actions possible.

South Coast needs a billion dollars a year
through 2031. Staff have identified a billion dollars
statewide. And they have not done the analysis to show
that the dollars that they have found fund the voluntary
turnover of vehicles that all these plans assume.

If they're going to present metrics, they need to
show you that this plan is not on target.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks, Mr. Cort.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Joy Williams I guess is next.

MS. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon. I'm Joy Williams
from Environmental Health Coalition in the San Diego
Tijuana region.

We agree with the comments on staffing and
timelines made by other residents of other communities
impacted by freight. Reducing the health risk from
freight is important in San Diego also. The Barrio Logan
and Logan Heights areas, for example, are in the top 5
percent statewide on the CalEnviroScreen diesel
particulate matter indicator. And we have children's
asthma hospitalization rates three times the average for
the region.

We strongly support new regulations that will
require electrification of the freight industry. In the
case of the 10th Avenue terminal in San Diego, the port is
committed to voluntary replacement of 26 pieces of cargo-handling equipment on a set schedule. And they've agreed to do that regardless of whether the increases in cargo throughput materialize or not. So that's a positive direction, and we're happy to see that.

However, those 26 pieces of cargo handling equipment only represent 22 percent of the total of what they have now. And that obviously would need to increase, if they get more cargo. So we believe regulations are needed to ensure that all the cargo handling equipment is replaced with zero-emission equipment.

Likewise, there's a number of port tenants who have gotten grants to -- to get a handful of drayage trucks that are zero emissions. But the large majority of drayage trucks are not zero-emission vehicles. No commitments have been made on harbor craft and we support an early timeline for moving this forward.

We continue to believe that facility caps are needed also, such as could be required under an Indirect Source Rule. Again, using the 10th Avenue terminal as an example, the mitigations for the expansion project itself have reduced the cancer risk to below 10 per million for that project.

However, the risk from the terminal as a whole is higher and there's another cargo terminal and a cruise
terminal that also generate freight-related health hazards.

We have urged the port to adopt facility-wide air quality and health goals, but they have not done so. So we support the freight handbook and we continue to appreciate that staff commented on the CEQA analysis for that terminal expansion, but we're still looking for enforceable facility standards.

Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Hello, Board. My name is Allen Hernandez. I am with CCAEJ. I'd like to start by expressing some very deep disappointment. We had 13 community members come here this morning. They're really affected by the pollution, the trucks, the warehouses, the LNG tanks, everything going on in the community. They really wanted to share that testimony today. They couldn't. They had to go back home. Responsibilities. It's hard coming out on a Thursday at 9:00 a.m. So they stayed as long as they could, but ultimately they had to leave. So I'm very, you know, crestfallen over that, because they have a testimony I think everyone here needed to hear.

So I'll try my best to try to capture some of the sentiment going on. I'll share a little bit of myself. I grew up in Fontana. I'm a homeowner in Fontana now. And
on the south part of Fontana, they are building warehouses like crazy. They are, you know, taking over homes. It's kind of like an industrial gentrification. Like, really, there are -- there are full intact houses behind green construction fencing where people used to live.

They're putting this in residential neighborhoods, next to high schools. There's -- there's going to be a couple warehouses that are going to go up next to three high schools. Bloomington High School, Citrus High School, Jurupa Hills High School, and a middle school Ruth O. Harris. And there's nothing being done about it. What we would like to see is if you could use your power to put some pressure on the South Coast AQMD to start adopting an Indirect Source Rule for our communities, please.

Right now, these trucks are just running wild. They're coming in through our neighborhoods. My little niece, who's six years old lives right in the middle of what's becoming this new warehouse corridor in South Fontana, in Bloomington. She was diagnosed with respiratory problems at about nine months old and was finally told she had asthma at four years old.

So we have to regulate her running around, her being outside, which is really hard to do with six-year old. It's really something you don't want to do to a six-year old. You don't want to say, hey, like, stop
running around, don't be a child, right? You have to think about your health. This is a lot of the reality for a lot of our community in the region.

So what we're asking for is, you know, we need to see more action. We need to see it a lot quicker. And we need to see this Board really put a lot of pressure on our local AQMD to start doing something to mitigate some of this work to try to get us to zero emissions, because we are out of compliance. I mean, we are, you know, dying dead -- like daily. I think right now the stat is 15 people die a day in our basin due to the bad air quality.

We really need to stop that. And I think one of the ways to start addressing that is really start focusing on an Indirect Source Rule.

So thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: I just want to make sure that you all understand that we are here because we're presenting work that is being done or which is intended to be done by ARB. And we're also here to listen to what people have to say about that, and we respect and care about your views, and we'll be talking more about how we can respond.

But I don't want it to be thought that we just shuffled the hearings around. The Board was here at 9:00 o'clock. We had a quorum. I had a hard time getting
everybody into their seats. And it was the audience that
was not in their seats, not the Board members, and we
ended up starting a few minutes, about 9:10 a.m.

So if there was confusion about when this item
was going to happen, again, I would apologize about that.
Although, I understand that information was conveyed to at
least some representatives of the groups that are here now
explaining that this wouldn't happen. This couldn't come
up until afternoon, because we had another meeting that
also involved a lot of community people, where we had to
actually vote on something for regulatory purposes that
started earlier.

So there was Absolutely no intent to delay, to
inconvenience people. We don't ever want to do that. We
wouldn't be here if that was our intent. So just please
know that we're going to continue. We'll stay here as
long as you want to and as long as we can, until they
throw us out of the building to make sure that everybody
gets heard.

So I just wanted to convey that. Otherwise,
you're being great. It's fine to applaud. You're all
doing it very politely, and that's really nice.

Thank you.

Okay. Next Penny Newman, I believe?

Is Penny still here?
No, she's not here. Okay.

Demi Espinoza.

MS. ESPINOZA: Hi. Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to speak again today. Again, my name is Demi Espinoza. And I'm from Safe Routes to School National Partnership. I do most of my work in the Inland Empire, and I've been -- I'm a resident of Riverside, California. And, you know, I am here today because I'm concerned about the growing development of warehouses and freight facilities near schools and residents.

And when I grew up, it -- the picture looked a lot different. And I'm concerned about how a lot of the warehouses are being approved. And through our coalition work with environmental justice organizations, we've witnessed the policy struggle between freight warehouse expansion at the expense of children's health.

And the environmental justice and freight communities are carrying the burden of the struggle and paying the price for poorly regulated warehouse industries. So, for example, in the City of Fontana, we have witnessed warehouse expansions be approved through overriding considerations left and right.

Despite being in dangerous proximity to schools and residents who are already carrying the burden of a 90th percentile CalEnviroScreen profile are low income and
disproportionately represent communities of color.

Furthermore, the project that I'm speaking of was documented to be inconsistent with the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan, inconsistent with CARB's recommendation for buffers between sensitive receptors and distribution centers, inconsistent with RTP S -- RTP SCS, and ultimately jeopardizes our region's ability to meet GHG reduction goals and SB 375.

And we elevate this example to demonstrate that we need to do -- we need to have more air quality accountability and cooperation from local, regional, and State agencies. The air quality management district needs to adopt an Indirect Source Rule to ensure accountability from logistic centers emitting harmful pollutants so close to schools.

CARB should not continue to approve air plans until the staff recommendations are integrated into the plan, and this rulemaking process for Indirect Source Rules is implemented.

I appreciate your consideration of these comments, and want to support the comments of local residents who were here today who may not have had the chance to speak, and environmental justice organizations who are here today. We hope and urge that you continue to work with regional/local agencies, but especially working
with community members to eliminate not minimize impacts
from freight.

Thank you again.

(Applause.)

MS. PORTILLO: So Erika Flores and Jessica
Rodriguez, Eduardo Galvani, they are three of the
community members that had to leave. So Thomas Rocha will
take their place.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Welcome.

MR. ROCHA: Good afternoon, Chair Nichols, Vice
Chair Berg, Board members, staff members, Senator Florez
and Senator Lara. My name is Thomas Rocha. I'm from
Bloomington, co-founder of the Concerned Neighbors of
Bloomington. And as you can see by my shirt, Bloomington
lives do matter.

Don't you just love this rain outside? That's
God's way of cleaning the air, I guess another way of
cleaning the air.

You know, Blooming is an incorporated area, a
community of color. We live next to the 10 Freeway next
to railroad yards. Some say we have two strikes against
us. We love our community, and don't want to be forced to
move out. But we are on the verge of being overtaken by
warehouses, and these diesel-polluting trucks.

We are a strong community, and we are not afraid
to stand up to unscrupulous realtors or roofless developers. I have a job where I work 40 hours a week -- 40 plus hours a week to support my family. And I took off today because I thought it was very important for me and my family and my community to talk to you guys, and I waited all day. And I'm also here to speak on the 12 people -- I'll be their voice for the people that had to leave earlier.

I have a full-time job though. That is to protect my wife, my children, my grandchildren, and now what has become protection of my community. You guys are very strong -- a very, very strong agency. You, too, have a job. Your job and responsibility is to protect our air, and protect the public from the harmful effects of air pollution and to ensure that we have a safe quality of life.

Here, in California, we're known as leaders. We are asking you to do your job and lead and protect our environment. It's time for you to stop making recommendations. It's time to close the loopholes. No more gray areas. It's time to start making regulations, have stricter standards, and stand up to corporations and be proactive instead of reactive, before it's too late.

It's a sad day in today's society when we let developers of warehouses build less than 70 next to homes.
Seventy feet, picture that. Everybody has a kid, or a grandchild that's been in little league. Home to first base is 60 feet. Can you imagine that behind your house?

Or less than 200 feet from an elementary school, or across the street from our little league parks. That's what's happening to now -- today.

When we walk away from these hearings today, let's put in place standards and regulations, let's make a regulation to keep warehouses and these diesel polluting trucks a minimum of 1,500 feet from our homes, schools, playgrounds. You guys cannot sit and be silent anymore.

Martin Luther King once said, there comes a time when silence becomes betrayal. Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter.

Thank you and God bless you.

(Applause.)

MS. CARLOS: Hello. My name is Ana Carlos, and I'm taking the place of Jessica Rodriguez someone who had to leave. I had a long letter written. I practiced it yesterday, but I'm just going to speak from the heart. I'm tired. I've been here all day. But I just want to speak fro the heart.

I live in Bloomington. It's a beautiful rural community. We do have the railyard, right, running right through the middle of our town. We have the 10 Freeway
running right through the middle of town. And now, we have a lot of proposed warehouses. And if they were more strategically placed, I'd be okay with that, you know, in the commercial industrial zones.

But what's happening is they are coming right into the middle of our neighborhoods in zones that are zoned for homes and right next to schools. And that's where I have the problem. I feel that this agency -- well, actually, I was looking at your website, and I said, you know -- well, before I looked at the website, I said, wow, there has to be someone that can help us. This is an environmental injustice. There has to be an agency that can help us with cleaner air in our neighborhood.

And there I found CARB. And basically, one of your priorities should be environmental justice. And what's happening in Bloomington is an environmental injustice, because we are a poorer community, a community of color, they are targeting us. They're coming into us because we're easy targets. We already have the railyard. We already have trucks going in and out. And now they -- to put warehouses in the middle of our neighborhoods, that's going to be a big health hazard for us.

We cannot just stand there. And I'm proposing something that seems very easy to me. I don't know how hard this would be, but I'm proposing that you implement
or enforce a rule that states no warehouses next to homes
or schools, at least 1,500 feet away from homes or
schools. That's -- that seems easy to me. That seems
possible to me.

We have to set a standard, so that they don't
keep coming in, because it -- they come up really quick.
We can't wait a year for this. There already have been a
law proposed, passed, and there's just more to come.
They're overtaking our neighborhood, and we can't have
this. There has to be a regulation that we can do a rule
that states that they cannot come within a homes or
warehouses, so I urge you to please protect the community.
Like I said, our children deserve it. I'm a teacher. I
see the warehouses coming right next to the schools and I
just -- I can't even imagine this. So thank you very
much.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. LARIOS: I'll take the spot of Eduardo
Galvani. I know him so we're good. We're good.

(Laughter.)

MS. LARIOS: I'm actually Graciela Larios with
CCAЕK, Center for Community Action and Environmental
Justice. I'm a community organizer that. And like
fellows like Eduardo Galvani that -- you know, I'm here
representing them. He couldn't take off another time from work. And you know people like Gene Proctor, who has bronchitis today. He lives in Mira Loma village where he -- they just, you know, approved another warehouse. They're looking into approving a truck stop. They got 800 trucks going up and down, north and south of the street right adjacent to his community in one hour.

This man has bronchitis. His granddaughter has asthma. I mean, I'm here for those people that couldn't make it here today. And especially those people that always have to be there for their families, and couldn't make it to daily meetings. And I guess one of their main requests is no more meetings, no more studies, no more time.

We need the rules now. We need the regulations now. Zero emissions now. And the time, we don't got it anymore, especially their children who, like our executive director just said, they can't play. They can't be kids. And for us to tell them that it -- it is ironic for them to go outside and play, because it is unhealthy, that's ironic. And I said that ironic - and I said that wrong. Sorry. But that's ironic for them to go outside and play, because it's healthy for them. That is ironic for us to tell them that it's unhealthy for them.

So please protect us. Be a good leadership and
we depend on you, because local officials they take too much time. We need you. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. VIADURRE: Hi. My name is Andrea Viadurre. I grew up in San Bernardino and Riverside counties. I wanted to come up here today and give you my personal and direct experience as a resident in these environmental justice communities.

Now, I'll also try to share the stories of some of the people that won't be here, because of how inaccessible this meeting is to a lot of working class people. So I'll try and share some of their stories and then my experience.

Moving on. I'm not sure how familiar you are with this region, so I want you guys to imagine like our lives here. I want you to imagine what it's like growing up with your loved ones or your little ones and teaching them how to walk or teaching them how to ride a bike, and imagine having to do that at a park where there's a freight always driving by there.

I want you to imagine at an intersection where you're walking with your grandma or your grandpa, right, and there's these trucks passing all the time, right in front of you. We can't simply just turn them off, so they stop idling, correct? Like, they stop there. There's
traffic.

I want you to also imagine the local high schools that are literally getting engulfed by distribution warehouses around them, particularly the one in Fontana, who now has warehouse neighbors on the side of it. So instead of attracting new families and children, they're attracting warehouse neighbors.

I want you to -- and maybe many of you have ran track or cross-country. Imagine this high school's team. Instead of running a track or running around their community and up hills, they run adjacent to these trucks that are driving around them. They're -- the trucks have a street and the kids don't even have a sidewalk sometimes to run on.

Just imagine that picture. These are the communities. That. We're talking about.

I want you to think about the homes that are here with the families who only wish to see their children grow up safe and healthy, but instead they battle against developers and cities who forcibly displace them, or they built giant warehouses right outside their kitchen window. It's -- instead of seeing the mountains outside, which is something I think people here are used to and like, instead now they are seeing these really giant White buildings, right?
I want you to continue to imagine our freeways and what our freeways look like, the ones where the good movements go back and forth, the ones that we live right next to. I want you to think about being stuck in traffic, and you have to put your windows down, right? What are you doing? You're stuck in traffic with all of these trucks around you and you're breathing in this air.

I what you to imagine the truck drivers who also are stuck with their trucks, right? And it gets hot in there. And what do they do? They put down the windows and they're choking on this air. We cannot keep living like this.

Zero-emission technology exists, and it must be required. And I hope that a lot of you become advocates for that. We're looking at you to do your job and protect our lives because we literally depend on it.

We've beared this brunt for far too long, and I ask you how much longer will we have to endure this?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks. Your time is up.

Okay.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Mr. Hague.

MR. HAGUE: Hello again. George Hague, volunteer for the Sierra Club. Live in Moreno Valley, where they approved the 40 million square foot world logistic center
with this 14,000 daily truck trips, where the city council has been, is currently in place thanks to over a million dollars of donations from the developer.

We need your help. We cannot rely on local agencies and decision makers. We need you to step forward to protect the people. Moreno Valley selected a truck route going past three elementary schools. I mean, it's crazy, and yet this is happening again and again.

The warehouses in Moreno Valley are not going to be covered with solar. Every warehouse should be covered with solar. If you talk to some developers, they say they haven't even made their roof able to hold solar panels. You need to require all warehouses to at least to have the capacity to hold the weight of solar panels, and ideally be solar ready, but they're not.

The World Logistics Center is right across the street. I mean, there's going to be houses, and that wall will be an 80-foot building right across where people are living. In fact, within the World Logistics Center, this wonderful city council that owes its allegiance, at least a majority owes the allegiance to the developer, actually enclosed many homes inside of the development, and said you can't even change anything in your house because you're now part of this specific plan. These are individual homeowners, and yet they were encapsulized
inside of this development, and they're still there. Some have now finally run away because they realize their future is bleak, but there are still homeowners that are forced to be within this specific plan, and they can't do anything to upgrade their home, because they've been forced into this situation.

Ideally, we will have solar on these roofs, and these trucks and these yard equipments will run on sunshine. And that should be your goal is to have all of these vehicles running on sunshine. And in Southern California, it's crime that they are not, and that you're not requiring such.

Warehousing, they're selling it as a job for people. They're saying we're going to bring you jobs, and economic benefit. What's really going to happen is, as you know, these are all being automated. They're being automated to the point that the city of Moreno Valley is covering all of their available land with warehousing, or at least much of it, and they're going to turn around and all these people who were promised jobs are going to have to be hitting the freeway to find jobs somewhere else, because all of the land was taken up by a business or an entity that is automated.

I want to point out one more thing I couldn't say before, on the other entity. If you allow for
electrification of vehicles, you're not solving the problem of farmland, because you're still going to impact farmland with electric vehicles.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I'm sorry, could you just say that again. I don't -- excuse me, I didn't understand what you just said.

MR. HAGUE: On the previous time I spoke, I ran out of time. This time I going to say what I wanted to say on electric vehicles.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

MR. HAGUE: If you use them as a solution to SB 375, you're still going to be impacting farmland.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I see. I understand.

MR. HAGUE: It's not a solution to that part of SB 375.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I understand. Thank you.

MR. SHIMODA: Good afternoon, Chairman Nichols. Chris Shimoda with the California Trucking Association. Thank you, Board members, for the opportunity to speak today on this item. As today's staff presentation demonstrated, trucks with modern emission controls virtually eliminate diesel particulate matter.

Since 2008, as this Board is well aware of, our members have spent millions to comply with ARB
regulations, which require all trucks to be outfitted with
diesel particulate filters, selective catalytic reduction
by the year 2023.

Last year, thanks in large part to the leadership
of the Senator, we were successful in making sure the
trucks that do not comply with your regulations are not
registered by the California DMV, which is going to make a
huge difference. This year, we plan on taking on
high-emitting glider kits that some rollbacks from the
federal government have allowed. We want to make sure
those don't enter the state.

Still, truckers operating compliant trucks and
TRUs face an unlevel playing field, even 10 years after
we've adopted these rules. I received unfortunate news
last week that a CTA board member, an ag hauler from
Fresno County is going to be leaving trucking. And one of
the two reasons he gave us is he is losing business to
non-compliant competitors.

So with that in mind, I know a lot of today's
item is about the future. But for the here and now, I
urge this Board to continue to prioritize enforcement in
getting everybody to play by the same set of rules.

We look forward to working with staff on their
recommendations in this area on the freight hub
enforcement piece, and will continue to work with staff to
implement the other new and proposed measures.

Thank you.

MR. EDER: Hello again. I'm Harvey Eder speaking for myself, and for the Public Solar Power Coalition.

We're involved with litigation with you and the district. And we spoke with you a year ago and should be solar -- immediate total solar conversion. We put this in response to the '91 plan with the district, in '92, and filed two cases, including in that went back to when we had the red car in L.A., and it was torn out, and there was -- incorporated into the record is there a 60-minute program? I said they ripped them out of 40, 50 cities. And there was litigation. There was $1 fine. This is bad stuff.

Also, we knew about greenhouse gases back in the late 1890s, early 1800s, a guy named Svante Arrhenius, second winner of the Nobel prize wrote on this. And this is when we were trying to decide what fuels to use for vehicles. And we had this knowledge. He's no slouch. He actually, for 20, 30 years, ran the Nobel organization.

Anyway, so -- and, you know, 40 years ago, the oil companies knew about this. And they did some study, and then they went into the deniers.

And the stuff I brought up before about what we're -- actually, right, it's like 700 -- 800 parts per
million CO2 equivalent now. I mean, if -- we know this. We have the facts. We have the evidence.

And to not act on this and denying it is doing what Trump and the climate deniers are doing in D.C., except it's worse, because we know this stuff is going on, and we're not dealing with the real situation. And that's -- that's what we've got to deal with.

So we litigated. Then we litigated on the '12 plan and on the recent plan. We went to the judge a couple days ago. He said, well, there's law and policy. He said to me I'm talking a lot. I said, well, look, we've got de León and -- you know, 50 percent by 2030, and he wished he'd done 100. Now, there's Senate Bill 1 they're looking by '45, 100 percent.

But that's just for electric. That's not getting into heating and cooling and other processes. And also, we've got to do environmental impact of what electrification is on our bodies. Electromagnetics and whatnot, the impact, and also for hydrogen fuel cell electric vehicles.

Talk some more later. Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. BANUET: Hello?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Sorry, just not for you. Another comment. Just for the audience as a whole, we have one
more item on our Board agenda for today, which is related, but which we took separately. It is the report on implementation of AB 617, that Community Air Protection Program. And apparently, according to the Board clerk, we are sort of getting requests to speak kind of dribbling in on that, one by one or whatever. I would like to ask that we close off the list of people who are testifying on that item like in the next five minutes. If you're going to speak on that item, let us know, so we can organize the list, and then maybe also think about how we can use the time most efficiently.

Sorry. Go ahead.

MR. BANUET: That's okay. Thank you so much.

I'm here on behalf of Colton and the Colton High School Eco-Friendly Club, as well as the high school. Two of the other members Judy Mendoza and Richard Oluyole could not make it, because they had to leave early. They were here earlier, but because other responsibilities they had to leave.

I thank you for taking this time, and I'd like to thank everyone who came here today, because this is super important. And I don't know, I really love the idea of everyday people coming and addressing their concerns.

Now, the concern I have really goes to the local level at my school, which is Colton High School. We have
trains passing by every day, highways filled and congested, and air pollution rampant. And really it's a shame to see that so many people in my own school have to go through this every day, and deal with this bad air pollution.

I, myself, deal with asthma and my mother deals with asthma and bronchitis to an even worse extent. And my mother has to deal with this even more so, because she's always on the road trying to just to commute to her job. And the pollution in the air has gotten worse and worse over the years. And as time goes on, the climate itself has been changing and making things even worse. And I see other companies and corporations moving in on warehouses into my own area, which is also worrying.

So I just wanted to bring these own concerns that I had to everyone in this forefront. And just try to exemplify how important it is, and especially to students at my own school. Students at my own school are outraged that they have to deal with such poor control and pollution. And it's a real shame.

But I see a lot of progress is going to be made in the coming years. All I ask is that we try to go and make these regulations and decisions faster and even stronger, and to be rougher about the way we approach things, because things need to be done as quick as
possible. Thank you for this time. It means a lot. Have a great day.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Excuse me.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Victor.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Excuse me, Victor.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Come back.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Just a quick question.

So your high school, Colton High School, is it located next to a warehouse or several warehouses or is it next to a busy --

MR. BANUET: No, it's next to a busy highway and train.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Highway. I just wanted to be clear, yeah.

MR. BANUET: And the warehouses are more further down.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Okay. I just wanted to clarify. Thank you.

MR. BANUET: Thank you so much.

MS. CHANG: Sorry, I'm a little sick. Hello, everybody. My name is Elisa and I'm a third-year transfer student here at UCR. And I'm also part of an awesome organization here on campus called CALPIRG students.
We basically a statewide student advocacy group that works to organize college students around public interest issues. And one of the things that we also do is we train and empower students to make real social change happen. The students that are out here with me right now in the middle of finals week, they're all out here because we care about these issues.

And Southern California has been my home for the past 12 years. Riverside has been my home for the last 5. And this is where I hope to build family in the future as well. And over the years, I've seen the development of warehouses, the increase in traffic, the increase in trucks, in highways on my way as I'm driving to school.

And the school that I transferred from was Moreno Valley College, a campus and community that have become like a home to me. And so the effects of these facilities are especial prominent in Moreno Valley because I'm not sure if guys are aware, but about two years ago the City of Moreno Valley passed an agreement to build these mega warehouses into the city.

And warehouses means trucks, which means emissions, which means poor air quality. And they say these are going to bring like great job opportunities to the people. But the thing is these are low quality jobs with low pay and bad shifts.
And many of my friends that have had to rely on these warehouse jobs, these jobs of poor condition, they don't like it. And as students, it is our priority to voice our concerns for clean air, so that we can focus on our studies and our education, because this isn't the future that we want.

With CALPIRG student's, we've been able to organize grass root movements collecting over 20,000 petitions -- student petitions statewide in support of clean energy. We've also generated student leader sign-ons, faculty sign-ons, been to Sacramento to lobby for these bills that we support, like Senate Bill 100, a bill that's supposed to get California to commit to fully renewable energy by 2045.

And we've also been trying to encourage our own UC campuses to commit to 100 percent renewable energy, because as higher institutions we can lead the way. And as students, we're at the heart of these grass root movements, and always will be. And that's why we're here today.

We want to voice our concerns to government agencies and have them listen to us, because we're your constituents, and we care about these issues regarding the future of our environment. And we're students, and we're doing everything that we can.
So we urge the California Air Resources Board to prioritize clean energy and to implement strong environmental policies in order to build a clean and sustainable future.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. LAWSON: Good afternoon, Chair Nichols and Board members. My name is Thomas Lawson with the California Natural Gas Vehicle Coalition. We submitted written comments, so I'm not going to repeat those. I did want to talk a little bit about the 11.9 liter. I was just in Sacramento yesterday talking about fleets and goods movement, and the need to focus on those. So this conversation is timely.

Most of you know, that the Cummins Westport 11.9 liter ultra low NOx engine is now certified. Manufacturers are working really hard right now on merging those chassis and that OBD wiring to get the new engine ready to go. We expect to have a debut at the ACT Expo in Long Beach in May. So that's going to be exciting. We think it's important and it's going to play a vital role in allowing the folks that work in and around these freight facilities to clean up the air.

I also wanted to point out that incentives matter, and sometimes there's an opportunity to do
something that doesn't necessarily require money. That's why we're working with Assembly Member Frazier on AB 2601, which provides a weight exemption for alternative fuel vehicles near zero and zero emissions. And that allows folks that are carrying goods movement to be on par with what they're carrying, and not lose any load because of the alternative fuel systems.

So we -- you know, we want to just show that's an opportunity to think a little bit outside the box on incentives.

I think lastly what I'll say is -- and it's important, since we here in Riverside, last year, and UC Riverside and Southwest Research Facility did some in-use emission tests on the 8.9 liter, which is kind of the baby brother of the 11.9 liter. And that engine actually was -- the standard was 0.02, but it was rated a 0.01. So it was 99 percent reduction from the 2020 -- the 2010 standard. And we think that's a very, very important.

I think the other part of that testing would show that the diesel engines were actually five to nine times dirtier than the current standard.

So we are excited to work with staff and the Board on these measures, and we look forward to working with you on those. And thank you for the time to talk today.
MS. MORENO: Good afternoon. I'm clearly not Kevin Maggay. That's actually my co-worker. He had to leave and pick up his children. But anyway, my name is Edith Moreno, and I'm here representing Southern California Gas Company. Anyway I start -- I want to start off by saying that SoCalGas does support the effort to reduce emissions from freight facilities, but we do have a little -- some concerns with some of the concepts that have been presented.

We did provide a comment letter, and that goes into a little bit more detail. But we do oppose the proposed rules, because they are -- we feel that their technology mandates for technologies that currently don't exist. It's not practical to develop regulations that require undeveloped technology.

Instead, we feel that CARB should develop performance standards that are based on best available technologies.

Also, in one of CARB's freight facility concept workshops, staff cited that the quote unquote, "Timing and certainty of implementation as a consideration in developing the concepts". However, battery-electric technologies are still being tested, therefore there's absolutely no certainty on the timing that the technologies will become available, and what emissions
reductions can be achieved.

With that -- with that said, low NOx engines and renewable natural gas are available today that can achieve near-zero emissions for NOx, and depending on the source, RNG, or renewable natural gas, can have carbon intensities that are even lower than electricity at a fraction of the cost.

So thank you for your time. I know it's been a long day and we've all been here. So have a good evening.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

It has been a long day, but it's going to get longer. And because of that, I think we need to take a little break, comfort break of about 10 minutes, and we will get back not later than 10 minutes from now, so 25 of 5:00.

Thanks.

(Off record: 4:25 p.m.)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record: 4:37 p.m.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: We will resume, and I have my mic on.

Okay. Back to the hearing process. We just heard from Taylor Thomas, right. Now, it's Lizette Hernandez.

Hello.
I have my mic on supposedly. I'm waiting for our next witness here.

Hi, Lizette.

Someone will help you.

MS. HERNANDEZ: I turned it on.

AGP VIDEO: Test, test.

MS. HERNANDEZ: All right. Great.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

MS. HERNANDEZ: All right. I'm already wearing a lot of hats today.

CHAIR NICHOLS: We like your hats.

MS. HERNANDEZ: I've been -- thank you so much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Go Dodgers.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. I'm actually an organizer with the Sierra Club. I did drive a set of folks from Los Angeles here. We woke up really early, so we're a little bit tired as well.

And I just want to say that the Sierra Club will mobilize about 80 folks today to today's hearing. We've also been mobilizing to hearings here at CARB and at AQMD for a good number of years, sometimes up to 100 people talking about the AQMP, talking about how -- like in communities like ours -- I live in South Central L.A., and I organize -- help organize the Watts Clean Air and Energy Committee.
In that community of Watts, we have a life expectancy of 10 years less than the rest of L.A. The asthma in Los Angeles County for African-American children under the age of 17 is 25 percent. So basically, about 1 in 4 African-American children have asthma, whereas other children have less than half of that in terms of the propensity to have asthma.

My son has asthma as well. He's a black/brown child. I have had him testify at several hearings. He has had to be put on breathing machines. And I'm not sure if Board members here or in the AQMD -- you know, it seems like we don't understand the -- what we feel is a delay, a stalling. You know, we hear of studies. We hear of plans.

However, we don't see the outcomes driving the conversations. And so we would like for you to make decisions that are based -- that are outcome based that affect or improve the equity and justice for our communities, you know -- and just addressing the fact that, you know, all of these trucks, for example, go through our communities from the ports all the way through our communities into the Inland Valley.

And I really value, and many of the communities that are represented from L.A., value the testimony from the Inland Valley and the ECUV. We've learned a lot from
the volunteers, and all the people that have spoken over
all these years about the conditions that they face.

Many times they can't testify because they're
sick, their lungs have collapsed. I mean, we've had high
school or college kids have to drop out, or stop going to
school because they have medical issues. And one thing
that we do know is that many of the Board members - I
don't about here, but on other boards, you know - don't
live in our same communities. We've met that, you know,
using the CalEnviroScreens. You know, a lot of you live
in the hills, live in the beaches. You don't live in the
communities that we live. You don't understand what it's
like to breathe dirty air day-in day-out it seems like.

At least that's how it feels. Because if you
did, you would know and you would have the urgency that we
do.

We also understand that the AQMD is currently
looking at the Indirect Source Rule. And unfortunately,
instead of creating a plan or a rule on that issues, they
are looking to tax us to be able to implement that. So
you're telling us that they're willing to tax diapers,
they're willing to tax school books, they're willing to
tax, you know, shoes for our kids, but they're not willing
to tax the warehouses that pollute our communities.

And we think that that is incredibly egregious
and immoral. And we've been incredibly patient for the last few years. And we implore you to take immediate action that will result in outcomes that we feel are tangible in our community.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. HERNANDEZ: Otherwise, you leave us no option, but to take the power back.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. You got the red light.

MS. THOMAS: Good afternoon, Board members and staff. My name is Taylor Thomas. I'm a resident of Long Beach, and -- okay. I'm a resident of Long Beach and I'm with East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice representing the communities of East L.A., Commerce, Southeast L.A., and Long Beach.

And I would usually be before you asking for something, but today I don't want to ask. I want to demand. So I'm demanding that you uphold your responsibility to protect public health. Mitigation and incentives don't cut it. We need rules such as ISR. Regulations don't kill jobs, industries just shift as society progresses.

There's a reason we're not hunting whales any more to harvest their oil, to burn in our lamps. We've moved beyond that, and it is time to move forward again.

The notion that zero-emission technology is not
ready or available is a red herring. All of us know that when policies are passed, they may take a while to implement. We're in a marathon for the health of our communities and the environment. We're crawling when we should be running. It's time to pass the baton and get us across the finish line.

Combustion technologies and voluntary measures are not solutions. We need immediate and direct mandates. We need zero emissions now, and we need the rules that have been proposed by staff to today to not have the implementation -- excuse me -- dates pushed back.

Thank you.

MS. JONES: Hello. My name is Asher Jones, and I'm from Riverside. I'm a 19-year old, 19-year resident, and I'm currently 24 years old.

I'm here to stand with the Sierra Club and other environmental justice organizations in saying that we need logical, effective, and timely regulations on clean and sustainable modes of transportation. We don't need incentives for polluters acting -- acting under the exchange of carbon credits. We need regulation -- we need regulations and accountability measures, such as the Indirect Source Rule now.

Our communities are on the front lines when talking about zero-emission trucks and cleaning up the
pollution in and around freight facilities. If companies that pollute are able to continue to pollute, more people will die. These same communities need sustainable green jobs and zero-emission infrastructure.

This Board has the power to stimulate this conversation and implement that. I am a student at Riverside City College -- Riverside Community College, and we need training for these jobs in all fields, so the future has a future, as highly skilled candidates hoping to enter viable employment opportunities.

I skipped class - let me say that again, I skipped class, a class that I need to pass to graduate this June and transfer, because it is important for me to know about what impacts me and my community here in Riverside.

As a body who votes on resolutions that directly affects community, it is imperative that you understand what is at stake, if you do not take the strongest stand in order to protect community. Fifteen people die per day. In the 70s, it was 200 people per day.

We, as a collective body, who care about the environment and community need to make sure that we don't go back to these days. So therefore, I urge you in the strongest way possible do your job and do the strongest regulations, not incentives to these polluters who are
harming community and don't care about the babies on the respirators or the children who have to stay home when there's smog alerts.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Chair, members of the Board, my name is Todd Campbell. I represent Clean Energy. And I'm going to give you guys a little love. I want to give Cynthia Marvin and her staff some kudos for doing a really great job of going up and down the state and finding out what the community needs were to come to you today and present what -- you know, their findings. And I just want to give them a little tap on the back and thank you. And I want to thank each of you for serving on this Board.

This Board is a pretty tough board and you guys are doing strong leadership. So I just wanted to kind of give you that too. I know what it takes to sit on dais. It's not an easy job. And so thank you for spending your entire day with us.

Clean Energy is very supportive of all the efforts to minimize or eliminate emissions from freight operations. And we have been a proud clean air partner with the Air Resources Board, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, and the San Pedro Bay Ports.

If we want to reduce emissions immediately in
communities that have and continue to suffer from freight operations, we need all the advanced clean technology tools in our toolbox. We can achieve this by sending a clear policy signal that both zero and near-zero strategies are needed to combat freight pollution over the next decade and beyond.

We support the important work that ARB staff is doing on freight operations. We also believe it would be prudent to immediately consider performance based approach that would allow us to achieve deep emissions reductions from freight sources now rather than pursue a future technology mandate of zero-emission strategies that needs to be demonstrated, commercialized, or achieve greater economies of scale to become affordable.

It would be a fine that the performance based approach ultimately graduates to a zero-emission endpoint. But adopting a zero emission mandate without strong policy support for a near zero-emission truck adoption today, does not provide the certainty required to have near-zero emission strategies back-up any of the unforeseen short falls of zero emission technologies in the heavy-duty space.

In short, a ZEV mandate for drayage trucks may subject communities to many more years of high-risk air pollution and further delay meaningful action.
We are also concerned about the economics required to support a heavy-duty ZEV mandate, given the state of the technology and the logistics that would be required to deploy the technology. The current expense of heavy-duty ZEV demonstration is roughly three times the cost of near-zero commercial-ready trucks, while the emissions performance between the two strategies is practically equivalent for NOx emissions.

The vehicle cost, of course, does not take into consideration facility upgrades, charging and power supply logistics that all can add significant unforeseen costs and implementation delays to those fleets operating the equipment.

Our ability to get to freight emissions right now will be critical for both the South Coast Air Quality Management District and the San Joaquin Valley. Both of these regions are currently the only two extreme nonattainment zones in our nation.

In fact, the SIP and the air quality management plans for these regions call for a need to turnover hundreds of thousands of Class 4 to Class 8 trucks to near zero levels to reach attainment by 2023 and 2031. Now, that SB 1 limits ARB's ability to impact fleet turnovers, this rulemaking should start now and must be inclusive of near-zero technologies that are demonstrated and
commercialized.

We therefore ask you to direct staff to take a more comprehensive, inclusive approach for both ZEV and near-zero technologies with strong policies that demonstrate support for both strategies. A performance based approach that ultimately gets us to zero-emission transportation is ideal -- is the ideal approach --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Todd.

MR. CAMPBELL: -- as it would deliver --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Todd, I called other people, I've got to call you on time.

MR. CAMPBELL: I was just -- it was the last -- last -- I was finishing the last sentence.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I know, but it's a very long last sentence.

(Laughter.)

MR. CAMPBELL: No, it's just -- it's just literally the last sentence. I was just going to say --

CHAIR NICHOLS: It has no period has and many clauses.

MR. CAMPBELL: But I think a performance-based approach would be ideal.

Thank you.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: I understand your point. Thank
you.

   (Laughter.)

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

All right. Mr. Jacob, hi.

MR. JACOB: Thank you, Madam Chairman, Board.

Mike Jacob with Pacific Merchant Shipping Association. We represent ocean carriers and marine terminal operators. And in the interests of time, I'll also speak for my colleague, Thomas Jelenic, following me on both items on the SIP and the freight facility update briefly. And we submitted some extensive comments as well.

So we appreciate the opportunity to do that, to work with Board members, senior executive staff, and with the freight division. All very helpful and we appreciate all of your time. We do have some concerns moving forward with respect to the SIP action on at-berth amendments.

We are participating in that process. We support the amendment process that's outlined in the SIP. We do want to improve the existing rules with respect to implementation and compliance by the Board early enough to help us facilitate our next compliance deadline, which is an 80 percent emissions reductions for ships plugged in out of the fleets that are applicable cruise ships, container ships, refrigerator ships to get to 80 percent
by 2020.

That will probably require -- we're very confident it will require some amendments. We would like to see those amendments approved on an expedited basis. And, if necessary, they should be advanced independently of whether or not additional vessel fleets and types are added under the Mobile Source Strategy compliance start target date of 2022, which is outlined in the plan.

We do have some additional issues and concerns with respect to the cargo handling equipment regulation. You've heard from some people about that today. Most notably, I'd like to point out what the staff said and what we all know.

The transformation of the ports is not a simple rule amendment. We already have a rule. We have a best available control technology rule for cargo-handling equipment at the ports. We've achieved 91 percent emissions reductions in our DPM at the Port of L.A., according to the last emissions reduction. That's a good story.

We want to transition to zero. That is going to take transformational change. That is not a simple regulation. It's not just a new fuel. It's not just putting on a new filter. It's not just talking about the next emissions standard. It requires substantial
infrastructure investment and new technology introduction. That will take time.

We're committed to working with staff on doing that. Our concerns are that you move forward in a way, which you foreclose options, you pick technology paths, which are not feasible. You make commitments to infrastructure paths, which are excessively expensive and not financeable over time. It's exceptionally complex.

So we very much look forward to working with the staff on moving forward with that. But again, I think we've really appreciated the opportunity over this past year to have a discussion about it, to look forward about all of the challenges and complexities that come forward. We've been in the legislature asking for incentives to transfer -- transform ourselves to zero emissions.

We were here in December at your Board meeting asking for the opportunity to participate in our -- in the incentive plans. And so we very much appreciate the opportunity to continue to look forward on this very complex and challenging issue. Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. GARZA: Hi. My name is -- that was pretty loud.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: You're close to the mic. It's
MR. GARZA: Yeah, I am. It's the second time being up here. I was here last career.

Hi. My name is Ruben pronouns are he, him, his. I guess I'll start off already.

Well, I'm from a small town named Mecca. I'm here today to emphasize that CARB go for zero not near-zero emissions plan. The intent to move away from fossil fuels is a respectable decision and should be commended, except when you plan to replace it with another pollutant.

It's counterproductive to continue to pollute our cities while effectively making our communities' members sick. These same community members are often either people of color, folks in lower income areas or both, such as myself.

To disregard the fact that we do have the technology to root out this problem shows a lack of consider -- lack of concern for these same communities in favor of earning a profit.

We can't breathe money. We just can't. Now, I ask that the Air Resources Board skip right over the natural gas and change to go straight to electrification. The burden is not yours to endure alone to make this change. We are all responsible, AQMD, community, and
yourselves.

We have a duty to protect our families, friends, and even our neighbors. Stop informing us about what the community already knows. Stop these researches because leaders don't make excuses, they make improvements, so make one today.

Thank you.

(Appause.)

MR. ROCHE: Good afternoon, Board members and staff. And by the way, thank you very much for your service. This is a very tough job, so thank you for that.

My name is Greg Roche. I'm with Clean Energy, and I work out of an office in Carson, California, and spend most of my time around the Ports of L.A. and Long Beach. What I do is I work directly with truck owners. This could be anybody from an independent contractor that owns one truck to a fleet that owns several trucks. What I do is I help them transition from their old truck they have today to a clean near-zero truck.

Now, I've heard the passionate, well-intended advocacy to you today to go with clean zero-emission trucks and bypass near-zero altogether. And what I suggest is that this really should be cleantech against status quo versus cleantech versus cleantech.

Because one thing I've learned from working with
the owners of trucks, there's a great interest in upgrading trucks to clean trucks. They need two things, they need funding. They need incentive money to transition. They also need choices, because this is not a one glove fits all industry. It's a diverse industry. It's diverse in its operations, its applications. It's diverse in its business models and its ownership.

They need technology choices so they can make a decision what is the best way for them to continue their operations, contribute to the economy, provide jobs, and still deliver emission reductions.

This is really a case of don't let the perfect be the enemy of the very, very, very good, because the near-zero technology accomplishes 100 percent reduction of diesel particulate matter, 99 percent of reduction of NOx compared to in-use diesel trucks, is far, far, far quieter than a diesel truck, and they run on renewable energy, while at the same time manufactured by companies like Kenworth, Peterbilt, Freightliner, Volvo, and Mack, so they can be rapidly scaled to achieve rapid emission reductions today.

So my -- my message is I urge the Board and the staff to prioritize early emission reductions, incentivize, develop rules that prioritize deployment of near-zero trucks, so that emission reductions can be
accomplished quickly.

Thank you very much.

MR. LUGO: Hi. Good afternoon, members of the Board. Just like my colleagues I was here last year on March 23rd, I think it was. A year ago exactly.

So I just have some comments that I want to make. You know -- so I'll just start my comments.

While some local agencies have demonstrated leadership in tackling the freight pollution, we cannot rely on these local efforts to advance mandatory programs to clean up the industry. CARB needs to go further, specifically when it comes to directing local air districts to use their authority to regulate freight operations.

Ample evidence demonstrate that freight activities continue to create unacceptable impacts in communities around freight facilities and along freight corridors.

Sierra's efforts to regulate freight activities that are required to meet basic health based air quality standards and to curb greenhouse gas emissions. While we are pleased to see additional regulations proposed such as Zero-Emission Drayage Truck Rule, staff has offered a phased-in approach rulemaking that would delay necessary regulatory actions well into the future.
While we understand that regulations cannot be crafted overnight, the freight pollution crisis that continues to plague communities requires CARB to allocate significant staff to protecting communities harmed by freight. In the meantime, there is no actual plan to achieve the emission reductions necessary to meet any of the national ambient air quality standards for ozone.

There is much more work -- much more work needs to be done, because diesel pollution continues to burn in environmental justice communities that are impacted by the freight industry. CARB needs to create a plan and focus on environmental justice communities throughout California.

Example, at the California Mexico port of entry, it lacks enforcement from CARB or any warehouses located within 80 miles from the border, that includes the Coachella Valley. The trucks with good movements bound to Mexico have no regulation measures in California, and are spewing large amounts of diesel pollution into our communities. I have seen trucks in California just make it across the border and break down as soon as it crossed the border.

So the system is failing. CARB is failing us in these enforcement activities at the border, because we see trucks just barely working just to make it across the
border.

One more thing I wanted to add, our community air monitoring network, which might be part of the next item on the Agenda, AB 617, have identified trends in air pollution, where regulatory monitors have not. CARB has developed measures, regulations, and programs that will entirely eliminate emissions.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Where is Albert Prestholt? Mr. Prestholt, are you here? Anybody know him? Is that you, sir, standing up in the back? No, I guess not.

Okay. If that is the end of our list, then we're going to close off this hearing. It is an informational item only, so there's no record to be closed officially. Although, we will be keeping a record of everything that was said here.

It's getting late in the day. I think a lot of us probably have a lot of things that we'd like to say. I'd like to say a couple myself, and then I'll turn it over to my fellow Board members.

So I do remember very clearly when we were here a year ago. And I remember particularly many of the same
people who testified here today actually were here then to express their concerns about the South Coast plan. Some of them were focused on the indirect source review issue in particular, others had other concerns. This question about zero versus near-zero has just gotten more intense as the time has gone on. I want to reflect on just those two items. And there are other things that we've certainly heard about too.

So on the issue of indirect source review, anybody who has worked with me over the years knows that I hate to be told that I don't have the legal authority to do something, if I think it's the right thing to do.

And I have looked at this issue inside and out, and I'm pretty well convinced that the authority to adopt an Indirect Source Review rule lies with the districts, and must be exercised by them. There may be alternative ways to get to the same result, but we haven't found anything that's as clear and as direct as that kind of a review would be.

It fits within the authorities that local agencies and, of course, local land-use authorities have. And this proliferation of warehouses. I do live in Southern California, even though I don't live in the most impacted area, but it's pretty obvious what's going on, and it's not gone unnoticed. It's a really serious
problem.

So we are watching very closely what's going on at the South Coast District. We're not predicting that they will do the right thing or the wrong thing. We're just hoping that they will do the right thing. And if for some reason they don't, then we will have to take action. That is our responsibility.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: So I want to be clear about that. The other piece is on issues where we're talking about setting standards or putting together fleet turnover programs, spending money from the variety of different sources, whether it's cap and trade, or money that comes from other funds like fines and penalties, we have been pretty far out in terms of pushing for the zero emission vehicles, because we believe it's our responsibility to incentivize and push for the best technologies.

This program -- this air quality program, I know if you're, you know, under the age of 50, you're not going to be all that sympathetic to this. But back in the seventies we were being told that the things we wanted to do to clean up the air required new technology, which didn't exist, that all the low-hanging fruit had already been, you know, taken, and anything we were trying to do was going to be too expensive and would take too long.
And we persevered. And I think we made some incredible progress, but it was certainly not enough progress. And we all know that there's a lot more that needs to be done in Southern California in the valley to achieve healthy air.

So we have to keep our eye on the prize. The question is how quickly can we get there? How do we send the strongest possible signal so that investors and inventors, people who need to go out to raise the money to build factories to build the cleanest vehicles have the -- something that they can point to that shows that they are going to have a market for these things and will see that that's -- that we're firm on that, and yet, at the same time, doesn't push it out so long that we're not getting benefits that we could be getting today.

So that's the dilemma. I hate this term near-zero. You know, if you had a choice, would you really prefer near-zero rather than zero? No, of course, not. You know, it does -- it's terrible.

So nevertheless, if it's better than what we have now, and you could make significant progress without sacrificing the longer term approach, would you try to do it? Well, it depends. It depends on how much it costs. It depends on whether it's real, et cetera.

So this is what we deal with as a regulatory
agency. This is our job is to try to figure this out, but we hear the people who have spoken to us loud and clear that you want us to be pushing towards zero. And I just want to say we heard you.

So with that, I have several other Board members who have signed up to speak here, and I'll just go in order starting with Supervisor Gioia.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: We'll figure these mics out.
(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I appreciate the discussion on Indirect Source Review. I know that's been a really key strategy. And the concern I have is, you know, we all -- the communities around the state have the same right to the same level of clean air. And the concern right now is as local air districts look at this issue, and it's acknowledged that local air districts have the strongest legal authority to develop ISR rules, you may have a hot spot in one part of the state where an ISR rule is in effect and improves air quality. You may have a similar type of hot spot somewhere else in the state in another air district, where there are no ISR rules, and therefore there's worse air quality.

So I think we need to figure that out, and whether it's eventually having greater authority here at ARB. It would have to be probably maybe seeking some
statutory authority for some statewide ISR rule, because I think we just have to be aware that some air districts are going to step forward and be more aggressive than others. So I think we should talk about that, and what's the best path forward to make sure that we have consistent standards around the state, because you could argue there will -- there will be even businesses that will argue they're at a competitive disadvantage if they're held to one standard in one part of the state and another standard in another part of the state.

And frankly, community residents are disadvantaged by having different air quality in different parts of the state next to similar types of facilities. So I'd like to understand how we can address that.

And I would argue for greater authority here at CARB and some greater level of guidance, direction with regard to local air districts and open for discussion on that.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Supervisor Serna.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you, Chair. Let me start by saying thank you to all the people that stayed with us for as long as you did and expressing the patients that you have to forfeit a good part of your day, whether it was forfeiting class or work, and understanding hopefully that, as the Chair mentioned earlier, this was
by no means intentional. And it actually happens quite frequently that we'll see a bigger turnout of people to speak on items prior to an important one like this. Other items are no less important to this Board, I assure you. But I, nonetheless, wanted to start the -- start my comments with expressing gratitude for your patience.

One of the things that I heard consistently from a number of speakers was concern about really a land-use matter that, as far as I'm -- as far as I know is -- really lies outside of the jurisdiction of this Board, and it has to do with the proximity of schools and residential areas to warehouses.

And hearing some of the testimony about life experience living and being educated next to warehouses and distribution centers with a great deal of truck traffic especially is very disconcerting. What I'd like to suggest, as we begin to take the concepts that have been presented to us today and I suspect will be further vetted, is that we take into consideration how we might build a more robust connection with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research to begin to feed some of the information that we are gleaning from the testimony from hearings like this, to think carefully about the appropriate agencies that do govern land-use matters, namely local agencies cities and counties, who by way of
OPR's guidelines do take into consideration much of what comes out of that particular State agency.

So I think it's really important not to lose sight of that subject, as peripheral as it may be to kind of the main event here, which is kind of this debate about ISR or not. I think it's one that ought not to be lost on us.

So I'd just like to offer that up as some constructive feedback, as we move forward.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Well, my comments follow nicely from Supervisor Serna's. I, too, want to extend my thanks to all those from the community -- from multiple communities that came here to testify today. And I'm sorry that many didn't get the chance.

I'm the public health member of the Board. I'm a physician studies the health effects of air pollution, and I take environmental justice very seriously. And I give a talk -- I give multiple talks where I actually have photos of warehouses in the Inland Empire, and busy roads and then railyards with, you know, people's homes adjacent to these facilities, so I know exactly what you're talking about.

I haven't experienced it in terms of living near these facilities, but I -- I do know what you're talking
about. And I just want to say that I, in those same
talks, say that people shouldn't have homes that are
adjacent -- immediately adjacent to either busy roads with
lots of truck traffic or warehouses, which are basically
truck farms. And I think I heard somebody say 500 -- or
1500 feet. That's 500 meters. That's usually what I
recommend as a minimum in terms of a buffer.

Why are busy -- why are schools -- public schools
next to busy roads? Because the land is cheaper.

So, yes, I totally agree that that's not really
acceptable, but I also -- not being a lawyer, I also agree
with Supervisor Serna that we probably don't have the
jurisdiction to mandate that. One of the witnesses said
you've got to act now to do this. I don't think we have
the authority. We recommend actually that people don't
live closer than 500 meters, 500 yards, whatever, from
busy roads. Yeah, but we can't mandate that.

So I wanted to say that I hear you. I strongly
agree that it's not healthy to be close to those
facilities with lots of truck traffic, and I think we have
to work. It's a -- you know, there's a call to action
here. So we need to work with other agencies, and I think
it's mostly at the local level. We can push for such
action, but that's all we can do, I think. Sorry to say.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Senator Lara.
SENATOR LARA: Thank you. Microphone, working?
It's this one.
Is that working?
Oh, perfect, yeah. Call here and the microphone
is this one.
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right, right, right, right.
SENATOR LARA: Thank you. I want to just take a
moment to thank the community who was here earlier as
well, and really recognize that we've made tremendous
progress already, in terms of the -- even in the last 10
years when it comes to freight and air quality.
The clean truck initiatives, in my previous
legislation of SB 1204, and the funding that we are
pursuing from the GGRF fund, I think will also accelerate
the use of zero-emission trucks. And that's zero. I
think we've also sent a very strong message to the rest of
the world in terms of investments and market signals with
this latest budget that we had last year, where I don't
think anybody else on this planet or in any jurisdiction
have invested close to a billion dollars, that's a billion
dollars, in ports.
And this is a major investment, and will result
in further advancements I think in air quality for years
to come. And I also want to just bring up a piece that I
want to note, and want to thank the ARB staff for
consider the considerations of the cargo handling sector with our labor community. And I think it's important that we keep the consequences for jobs at the port in mind as we proceed. And our goal should be a sustainable port system of course, as part of the sustainable freight system that includes our workforce and our workers. The workers at the port have been critical to its -- to the port success, and is definitely an economic juggernaut for our State and our region.

And these workers also live in our communities, so they also will benefit from the clean air and the work that we're doing here today. And so for staff, I would just recommend as we continue to tease out the details of this plan which is to strongly urge that we continue to be thoughtful in not fall under the false choice of jobs and clean air, like the Assemblywoman Reyes talked about earlier in her letter.

We can make the investments to achieve the clean air and protect these jobs. This means we definitely keep an eye on the sources of largest emissions and prioritize that immediately, which are, as we all know and continue to talk about our truck emissions, and the warehouse emissions, where we can incentivize continued progress. These trucks move throughout the freight network. And so keeping our eye on how we -- how we do when trying
to achieve the highest emission reductions will really, I think, continue us on the pathway to improve our air quality throughout the freight network, and will bring the most benefits to our community immediately.

And then have those further discussions as we continue to look at what other sources and other targets we use to clean our air in the port and transportation corridors throughout the State.

Thank you

CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Thanks.

Mr. De La Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you.

On the AQMD issue, I was the one who made the motion last year, so I think I should address that. I think Chair Nichols did a -- she said exactly the right thing, which is we cannot preempt any action by the AQMD. It's their task. They're going to do whatever they're going to do, and then we'll see what we do in response to that.

It's -- that's the proper way to do it. As the person who kind of started this ball rolling, I acknowledge that. I accept it. It's the right way to go.

In the meantime though, what we are doing here today -- we're not taking action, but we're acknowledging what's happening, we are taking nine measures on freight
and goods movement, which is incredible -- an incredible workload to be doing in the three main areas that we know have this significant emissions and cancer risk: cold storage warehouse, railyards and seaports.

I, in meetings and discussions, have been clamoring for railyards, because in my for former assembly district, we had -- we have a railyard that obviously impacts neighboring communities. And in my time on the Air Resources Board, we have yet to take action with regard to railyards. That's part of this package. And so to me, that's incredibly important.

And then the other two, clearly, if the emissions are coming from there, and the cancer risk is coming from there, we need to prioritize that. And that's exactly what we are doing with this package.

So I'm very supportive of the direction we're going in. I always want to be more aggressive. And any opportunity we get, as we go along this path, we will try to be more aggressive. I've got some ideas that I've shared with staff about how we can do that. There are models in other states. There are things that are being done in other states that maybe we can take, not expecting that this administration -- not our administration, the other one in Washington --

(Laughter.)
BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: -- will accept it.

But, you know, other states have it, so why can't we? And I think that is a -- that's not a legal analysis, but I think the courts would probably be okay with us copying other states.

So with that, thank you very much staff. This is a wonderful, wonderful start. And we're going to be, you know, keeping your feet to the fire to follow through on all of this. Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Ms. Takvorian followed by Professor Sperling. Oh did you -- I don't see -- your name did not come up. Did you try to --

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: Push harder.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: I pushed it a couple times today and it never came up. Did it not come on.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, go ahead. We'll give you a free pass here.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: You made it. You're there. Okay.

Diane, was -- were you --

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Ms. Mitchell is going to go now and then I'll go after her. How about that.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. All right. Great.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you.
(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: So I, first of all, I want to say thank you to all the people that came today. You're -- I wanted you to know that your health is at the very top of our list. To provide you with the best air quality is our mission, and that's why we do this work.

Secondly, I want to say that I am the representative here on this Board from the South Coast Air Quality Management District. And so all the things that I hear from you are heartfelt and make me want to work harder to get to the goals that we're trying to reach.

The Air Quality Management Plan that came before this Board last year had a lot of different parts to it. The -- we're working pretty diligently on the stationary source reductions that are in that plan. And what we're here today and looking at today was the Indirect Source Rules that were included in that plan.

And at the -- last year, which was one year ago, we said we could come back here at this time this year and review what had been -- what we were doing and where we were with it. So the Indirect Source Rules came before our board, the first draft of those, just in the last month's meeting. And they have not been decided on. They are in process. We will continue to be working on those.

I think there are real possibilities to look at
the railroads and the railroad idling -- railyards and
idling situations under Indirect Source. And I think the
warehouses are a possibility also, but I will say that a
lot of what we heard today on the warehouses are land-use
issues. And I urge you to go to those people responsible
for land use, that would be your board of supervisors,
your city council people, and bring your concerns to them.
There are state resources as well that we may look at if
we find those people abrogate their responsibilities.

I want to also thank the ARB staff and the AQMD
staff, because they have been collaborating extensively on
what is -- on these rules, and on what happens in the
South Coast District. CARB has the regulatory authority
over all mobile sources. That's direct authority.

And when we look at Indirect Source Rules, one
thing we are trying to get to is control of some of the
mobile sources that go to and from these facilities.

So that authority for Indirect Source Rules falls
pretty definitely within the jurisdiction and the
authority of our local district, and -- but I don't
believe we've seen any districts exercise that authority
except San Joaquin Valley. And so this is bit of an
experiment as we move forward in this direction.

I'm wondering as I listened to what people were
saying today, if this Board might consider accelerating
some of the rules on mobile sources that are in the yard hustling trucks at the ports. And then we heard that there will be equipment in the warehouse yards that in the future are going to be the main source of emissions.

	Trucks also, but I'm going to get to that in a minute. So if there's possibility to accelerate to zero-emission equipment used in warehouse yards, and some of the trip equipment used in cargo handling functions, I would have our -- I would like our staff to look into that.

When it comes to trucks, because we would like to go to zero emission immediately. I mean, all of us would like to be there, but it's just not there yet. We are seeing that development. And someone asked about the $23.6 million that was given out last year. That money was combined with money from other sources to add up to $40 million. And it was spent on five electric BYD trucks, a Peterbilt truck, a Volvo truck and a Kenworth truck, all of which had different combinations, hybrids, natural gas, and battery electric to get to cleaner emission trucks.

So your money is getting spent in the development of that technology, and we will continue to work to get to the cleanest zero-emission technology that is possible. Right now, the South Coast District needs to reduce its
NOx emissions by 45 percent by 2023.

   And we have now in certified and commercialized a
low-NOx truck that gets 99 percent reductions, a very high
reduction, in NOx emissions. That's available now. It's
on the streets. You can buy it. You can use it. And we
see in our district, that would be the intermediate step
while we wait for zero emission to be -- trucks to be
perfected and on the street and commercialized.

   So that is the reasoning behind getting down to
low NOx and what we call near zero. Yes, our Chairman is
right, we would much prefer to get to all zero, but that's
not on the street and available and commercialized yet in
a way where the truck driver out there or the fleet owner
out there can go buy one and put it out on the street.

   So we're working toward that end goal. It's very
important to all of us sitting up here, and to the local
air districts wherever they may be in the state.

   I think that's all I wanted to say.

   Thank you.

   CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Then we -- I think you --
you'll do your time, or your seat there, your place in the
queue.

   BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. Thank you.

   So I wanted to add my gratitude to everyone who's
been here all day. I know it's a long day. And my
apologies to those who had to leave and weren't able to have their voices be heard. And I think that we'll all try to do better in terms of time management for the future.

In regards to this matter, I wanted to say for the direct regulations that are being proposed, both the ones that have been in the -- in the works and those that are new, that I strongly support those for the drayage trucks, the cargo handling equipment, the locomotives, the harbor craft, and the increased emphasis on enforcement, as well as the new freight handbook, all of those are good. And I think that everyone from communities that are impacted by these activities welcomes them.

The problem is the pace of the development. And I think my question to staff would be how can the timeline be improved? Is there -- is there a way that we can move resources around? Is there a way that we can get to some of these -- some of the actions that we need to take on these regulations more quickly? And so I'd like to get a response on that.

On the ISR, we were here a year ago. I co-authored the amendment and felt strongly that this was something that really needs to be in places. And I think the testimony that we heard today is evidence of that. The difference between a direct regulation that assumes
that a facility is there, that operations are there, and
that they need to be regulated. A truck needs to be
regulated. The cargo-handling equipment. That's all good
to make it as clean as it can be, but it presumes that the
facility is there.

With ISR, there could be the inclusion of a
holistic analysis of that facility, and whether or not
it's located in the right place. And I understand the
intersection with land use, but I think that we can begin
to explore that.

We can do that. We have a land-use guidance
manual that could be updated, and that could be considered
for regulation, that we would make those buffers
requirements. I heard that from the public today. I'd
like to ask that that get put into the hopper again, so
that we could look at that.

And I think also the EJ element that is required
now as part of the general plans could be incorporated and
we could look at that. I know that everyone on this Board
wants to get to not have these bad land-use decisions
being made. And I know that everyone that has talked to
us about it has been to their local authorities.

I don't think -- with all due respect, I don't
think anybody is confused about where to go. So I think
this Board really needs to exercise its voice to say to
those local authorities to add our voice to the community voices to say this is not acceptable, because of the impact on public health.

So I'd like us to explore other ways. ISR is one. The buffers are another with the land-use guidance to make that not only our voice, but our authority as well.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Professor Sperling.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: I will be very short. I promise.

So I hold the transportation seat on the Board and I'm a professor. So I just want to make a plea that we be analytical and smart about how we address these very real problems and figure out what the problems really are. So if the problem at the warehouses are, as the data seems to be suggesting, is the equipment in the warehouses and on site, then let's deal with the equipment on site, and maybe we don't need a cap or a ISR. Maybe there's a better way of doing it.

And if the problem is trucks in neighborhoods, where it's not a pollution problem, but a noise and disturbance problem, then let's gets the trucks out of there, and out of those streets, and out of those neighborhoods. So just a plea for science, and to note
that there actually are a lot of manufacturers, and a lot
of fleets that are making a lot of investment in
zero-emission technology. And we should be sending them
pretty clear signals how to continue to make those
investments to bring that technology to bear.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. We have no further
comments from the Board, at least nobody has pressed their
button. So I think we bring this item to a conclusion.
Probably everybody wants to stand up and stretch at least
for a minute, because we have one more item that we want
to get through before we break for the evening.

If you're here to talk about that, which is the
refrigerants rule, then stick around. Otherwise -- sorry,
617.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Refrigerants is tomorrow. Sorry.
Sorry. It has been a long day. Yes, it's -- I'm sorry.
It's 617 -- it's the update on 617. If you want to hear
about 617, stick around. Otherwise, go home. Thank you.

(Off record: 5:35 p.m.)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record: 5:43 p.m.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. We're down to the
ture -- the true hard core here. 617. Magic numbers.
So let's begin. This is also an informational update on implementation of the AB 16[SIC] Community Air Protection Program.

Last month, we celebrated 50 years of actions that have helped make California a healthier place to work, live, and play. However, as we know, many communities still suffer greater impacts than others. The Community Air Protection Program will play a critical role in reducing community level exposure to air pollution, providing a specific focus on disadvantaged communities that require special attention and expedited -- special attention and expedited action.

Okay. So, Mr. Corey, would you please begin this item.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, chair.

The focus of this program, as you noted, is on community action to achieve additional emission reductions in the most impacted communities. It's appropriate this item falls the SIP and freight discussions as those programs form a foundation upon which additional community focused actions will build. The program includes a number of specific elements, including emission reduction strategies that work together to improve public health and communities that bear the greatest burdens.

AB 617 sets out an ambitious schedule. CARB must
sell -- or rather set the overall program framework as well as identify an initial set of communities for deployment of community air monitoring plans, end development of community emission reduction programs by October 1st of this year.

To meet these requirements, staff has been conducting extensive outreach and is developing a program framework for Board consideration in September.

Last month, staff released a concept paper outlining a initial proposal for the framework elements along with the process for community members and air districts to submit recommendations for priority communities.

Today, staff will provide you an update on progress since last October, and planned efforts going forward. I'll now ask Andrea Juarez of our Office of Community Air Protection to give the staff presentation.

Andrea.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: Thank you. I was going to say good afternoon, but I might as well say good evening at this point.

As introduce by Mr. Corey, for the last item of the day, we'll be providing an update on development of
the Community Air Protection Program, and our progress since last October.

This program is about achieving new reductions and cleaner air in disadvantaged communities. Many factors have contributed to the air pollution burdens in these communities, including proximity to multiple sources and regional land-use planning, which is under the jurisdiction of other agencies. This makes the solutions more challenging and we'll need to be looking at new ways to engage with these other agencies.

Building the program will take time as we develop new community-level solutions, and provide greater equity in cleaner benefits. We'll be learning from initial efforts as we continue to expand and integrate this additional community focus into all our planning programs.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: As a quick refresher, the program includes a number of elements to focus actions within these communities: These are community emissions reduction programs and additional controls on industrial facilities; community level air quality monitoring that supports actions to reduce emissions and exposure; enhanced requirements for the reporting of emissions data to improve transparency and tracking progress; and increased penalty provisions for
polluters.

The program also includes grants to local community groups to support their active engagement in developing solutions.

CARB and the air districts each have specific roles and responsibilities. And successful implementation requires strong coordination between our agencies. In general, we are responsible for setting the overall direction through identification of communities, establishing robust criteria for these program elements, and new CARB strategies.

The districts have front-line responsibilities for working with communities on monitoring, emissions reduction programs, and local regulatory efforts. The legislation sets ambitious schedules with the identification of communities and the overall planning framework due by September of this year, and district implementation over the following year followed by CARB review.

--00o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: Now, there are a lot of different parts to the program. And lots of different people we need to be talking with. In general, our efforts are focused on discussing the overall framework and requirements for the Program. We are also
coordinating with air districts who are taking the lead on local outreach within their regions.

District community meetings are providing a forum to discuss the process for identifying communities, and understanding their specific issues, since districts will be responsible for program implementation. So that in turn means providing multiple venues and levels of engagement.

We have participated in discussions with community residents, environmental justice organizations, industry, air districts, and other interested stakeholders. In addition, we've established a multi-stakeholder consultation group chaired by Dr. Balmes. And with that note, -- with that said, I'll go ahead and say that the consultation group has had its first meeting in January and will meet again next Monday.

But we recognize the need for a roadmap describing where and when community members and other stakeholders can engage in different aspects of the program.

We are also learning from our initial outreach to identify the most effective ways to sit down with people, to share information, ask questions, and discuss recommendations.

--o0o--
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: We are therefore working on setting up additional opportunities to have discussions with community groups over the next few months. We want to understand impacted communities, and we know that hearing directly from communities is critical.

So last month a number of local community-based organizations in Southern California took us on a tour of their communities. This gave us a chance to see, hear and smell firsthand what community members experience every day, and better understand the types of actions that will be needed.

We are working on additional visits and conversations with communities throughout the state to continue to enhance ways that community residents can be active participants in the program.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: We've also been busy over the last six months working on program implementation, including the four documents shown here. These include our proposed process for identifying communities and initial concepts for different elements of the program.

While we are still in the early stages of developing the program, the concept paper is the mechanism
to seek advice and spark discussion. It includes approaches for statewide strategies and criteria for the Community Emissions Reduction and Air Monitoring Programs.

Feedback on the concept paper will guide a draft program framework, which is scheduled for release in May. We’ve also been moving forward on the initial funding appropriated by the legislature. Earlier this month, we released a solicitation for grants to community-based organizations to support their participation in the program. These proposals will be due mid-April.

And just last week, staff released a proposed supplement to the Carl Moyer Program guidelines to better support the types of incentive projects that can provide immediate benefits in communities. The Board will be considering the proposed guideline changes next month.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: So what is it that we have been hearing and discussing?

This slide highlights five key themes that have been brought to our attention. First, we’ve had a lot of discussion about how initial communities will be selected. Community members have also expressed the urgency of immediate actions to reduce emissions and exposure, and conducting air monitoring that has a clear connection to supporting subsequent action.
There has also been a great deal of interest in identifying and tracking health indicators related to air pollution. And finally, the importance of community partnerships in implementing the program. And I'll talk a little more about each of those over the next few slides.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: One of the first steps is to identify and prioritize communities with the highest air pollution burdens. So we are requesting recommendations from not just the air districts, but also the communities. So we can reflect their local knowledge and experience.

Then, we'll be reviewing and compiling those recommendations for Board consideration in September. As we begin this new program, we anticipate recommending a smaller set of first-year communities where we have a solid technical foundation for identifying strategies and community-based organizations that can be strong partners.

Selecting communities in the first year that reflect a variety of sources can help in developing models for other communities with similar challenges.

We are also required to come back to the Board each year with additional recommendations, so you'll be seeing us again. And we plan to establish a list of communities for future years, which we will update.
annually with new data and recommendations.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: Once the communities are identified, the key focus is expediting action to reduce emissions and exposure. Many factors contribute to the pollution burdens experienced by these communities. And the Community Emission Reduction Programs will need to include multiple strategies to successfully tackle the air pollution challenge.

This will include:

- New regulations that reduce community-level impacts coupled with strong enforcement;
- Incentive programs to accelerate deployment of the cleanest technologies and foster technology innovation;
- Mitigation measures to reduce exposure; and ways to engage on land-use planning.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: Over the next few months, we'll be outlining strategies and defining clear direction for development of the Community Emissions Reduction Program. This slide highlights the key implementation principles that are critical to delivering knew reductions, incorporating community voices, and providing accountability.

The first is requirements for near-term actions,
such as focused enforcement, targeted incentive funding, and mitigation measures to provide immediate reductions. The second is a core regulatory focus through new rulemaking commitments by both CARB and the local air districts.

As you heard in the last item, CARB staff will be working on a significant number of regulations over the next few years including new measures to address the community level risk associated with the freight sector.

These strategies will include a focus on the transition to zero-emission technologies that are critical for impacted communities, but also support regional attainment and climate programs. We will be identifying additional CARB actions for other types of sources that impact communities, and air districts must expedite the retrofit of pollution controls at industrial facilities.

We are also looking at ways we can work with other agencies that have authority on land-use and transportation planning. And this includes informing local land use and transportation planning decisions through continued CEQA review, identifying best practices and tools, and bringing these agencies into community discussions.

And finally, ongoing community engagement, regular reports and metrics for tracking progress will be
essential in making sure that we see real improvements.

---

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: Community air monitoring is another program element with a specific focus on collecting data to support actions to reduce emissions and exposure. These actions can range from: identifying contributing sources, supporting enforcement actions, tracking progress, or informing daily activities to reduce exposure.

In each case, the appropriate methods and equipment must be tied to the action they are designed to support. We'll be developing criteria and guidance to ensure well-designed monitoring programs and actionable data. This data must also be transparent and accessible, and we'll be working with air districts and community groups to provide a variety of ways to access, interpret and act on data.

---

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: All of the elements I've just been discussing are designed to improve public health by reducing exposure to air pollution. Tracking and effectiveness of the program will need to take many forms. We are considering metrics for actions taken the amount of emissions reduced, and, of course, improvements in air quality.
Now, while reductions in air pollution are strongly linked to improved public health, there are also many determinants of health in disadvantaged communities. These factors can include poverty levels and access to health care. And there are often gaps in data available at the community level. This is an important issue, but also a challenging one.

We're discussing with health professionals the types of data collection and research that will be needed over the longer term to track public health improvements, and better understand their relationship to reductions in air pollution.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: The last major theme is the importance of community participation in implementing the program. We've heard the need for authentic community voices, as well as finding ways to bring agencies together to be a part of the solution.

These community partnerships are a core principle to make sure we are working together to provide clean air. We are proposing community steering committees to provide a venue for sharing information on community issues, and ensuring meaningful involvement in the planning and decision-making process for both the emissions reduction and monitoring programs.
We know there are a number of different models and approaches for community participation, and we're seeking recommendations on committee structures and roles.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST JUAREZ: To wrap-up, I want to touch briefly on the timeline over the next six months as we still have a lot to do in a short amount of time.

As discussed earlier, we'll be providing our recommendations for our first-year communities in September, and we are asking air districts to provide an initial list of communities at the end of April, with final recommendations based on continued outreach with communities at the end of July.

In September, the Board will also consider the overall planning framework. Our concept paper is an initial document to guide that framework. We expect to release an initial draft of the framework in May and a revised draft in August. We'll also continue to keep the Board updated throughout the process and look forward to today's discussion.

That concludes our presentation. But first, I'd like to invite some of our district partners to come up and provide a few remarks.

Wayne Nastri, executive officer for the Couth
Coast Air Quality Management District; Jack Broadbent, Chief Executive Officer, Air Pollution Control Officer for the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Tom Jordan, Senior Policy Advisor for the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District; and Alan Abbs, Executive Director for the California Air Pollution Control Officers' Association.

Thank you.

MR. NASTRI: Good evening, Madam Chair.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Good evening.

MR. NASTRI: We APCOs like to roll together.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I see.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Need the protection, do you?

MR. NASTRI: That's right.

We're also very pleased to have Brad Poiriez from Mojave Air District with as well.

So thank you. It has been a crazy last several months. When we think about the fact that 617 was just authorized, signed last year, and all of the work that has gone on during these last several months it's really quite amazing.

So we've been working very diligently to reduce the impacts in our communities from toxics -- from toxics exposure, toxic measures, and we've done it through a
number of different programs. We've done it through a multiple air toxics emissions study. We've done it through our toxics hot spots. We've done it through our localized air monitoring programs, very similar to what we've done in Paramount and Compton through our extended enforcement outreach efforts, as well as was discussed previously.

And through it all, we're working very closely with ARB staff. I think it's extremely important to highlight the fact that the coordination the communication, and really the support that we've been able to provide for one another is really a very positive aspect. I think in the two communities that we've had meetings in Los Angeles County, there's always been questions that one agency or the other was able to answer. There's been a tremendous amount of interest in the technical assistance grants that are being offered to the communities and having a better understanding of what's involved in having each other's staffs present really allows us to answer all of the questions as we move forward.

We at the South Coast are also continuing to work very diligently on dismantling our RECLAIM program. And as you heard the -- bringing BARCT rules is something that requires an intense effort for a program that's been in
existence for decades. And we're bringing many of the rules to our governing board this year.

So our staff has been working diligently on the development of these rules, working on the outreach in the communities, working on trying to make sure that we engage the communities. And as you've heard, there have been a number of different methods in how we actually do that. You know we've had programs, meetings where we've had people come up to an open mic, and we solicit input. And we've had breakout sessions.

And so we've learned a lot of different things. And we have more meetings coming up. In fact, next week, we'll be here in Riverside. And in the coming weeks after that, we'll be in San Bernardino and Orange County.

So we continue to work diligently on these programs. We intend to meet all of the deadlines, and we're going to continue to make sure that we're working with you and with the legislature to ensure that we have the funding to continue these programs.

Thank you.

MR. BROADBENT: Good evening, Madam Chair, members of the Board. Jack Broadbent with the Bay Area.

First, I just want to thank you all for allowing us to be here to talk to you about our efforts in implementing 617.
As we discussed I think at our -- the last time you all heard this, we see 617 as really a new paradigm with regard to air quality management. In the sense that we're going to be talking about -- and really trying to understand and address public exposure. And I think that's -- we at least at the Bay Area are very excited about that.

We're moving forward very aggressively to implement 617. We had our first fairly comprehensive meeting with the communities at night in January, late January, where there was a considerable amount of public interest provided. And we're now in the process of setting up the individual community meetings in each of the different communities around the Bay Area.

For example, tomorrow we have a site tour of Vallejo, and next week we have a fairly big meeting in San Leandro.

And so we think that just in the Bay Area, we think we're probably looking at least about a dozen different communities that will be addressed over the next several years with West Oakland and Richmond being in the first year where we need to address.

So one thing that Mr. Nastri said, and I just want to echo, I think the partnership with your staff, Madam Chair, has been excellent. It's been just
phenomenal the amount of communication, and partnership, and we really -- I just want to commend your staff for working with us.

Just a couple of issues that are clearly, though I just want to highlight for you just at the outset of this effort that I just want to bring to your attention. One has to do with capacity building. This is going to be a -- this is going to be an important issue for both ourselves, as well as CARB to address, in the sense that there's a lot of communities out there we're going to need to really get in and develop the extensive monitoring network.

And yet, there's not necessarily the structure. There's not the community groups and organizers that are there. So you all have a $5 million grant out for to help in that regard. And we at the Bay Area are stepping up also to provide some of our resources for that capacity building as well.

Another issue is communication. A lot of folks as we go and sit down and talk to them, they're only hearing about this for the first time. And there's just a whole conversation we have to have as to who is the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and who is the California Air Resources Board.

So we understand that there's a -- there's a kind
of a learning curve there with a lot of communities. And finally, as Mr. Nastri indicated, resources are going to be critical moving forward. We at the Bay Area have already gone to hire and put in place a number of staff. We've hired eight staff just to -- for 617 implementation.

And so there's going to be a strong need for ongoing resources to implement this important piece of legislation.

So thank you, Madam Chair. And let me hand it over to Mr. Jordan.

MR. JORDAN: Well, good evening. As with everybody else, we've been very busy trying to get this thing going in the valley. Over the last two months, we've had about 10 meetings on the topics, ranging from joint meetings with ARB staff to meetings about our incentive programs and how to get those early action dollars out.

Admittedly, most of those have been kind of your standard workshop formats at our board room, and we want to make sure that we're actually getting out to the communities. We've written just recently many grants with three community-based organizations in the valley to set up meetings in the communities around the San Joaquin Valley to get out and talk to everyone about this program, opportunities for the early action dollars and the like.
Also, getting information out, we've set up a webpage with everything 617 related and the Valley available on there, be it events, be it dollars, be it mapping tools. We've come up with some ideas mapping ideas as far as identifying communities. Also, getting information out. We've set up a web page with everything 617 related in the valley available on there be it even'ts, be it resource -- dollars be it mapping tools.

We've come up with some ideas -- mapping ideas as far as identifying communities that we've made available to the public to get input on communities that we think should be in the initial round for 617.

And then as Jack Broadbent mentioned, we've actually went to our board recently and there were 30 positions authorized between our grant programs and 617, as well as a significant enhancement of our monitoring capacity to do mobile monitoring throughout the valley.

But with that is the realization that when you staff up, you need that ongoing -- those ongoing resources. And we realize part of that will be from local resources, but we think there's a State role to play in that as well, as we continue forward year after year for 617.

Thank you.

MR. POIRIEZ: Good evening, Brad Poiriez, Mojave
Desert AQMD and also Antelope Valley. So before you have
the wide spectrum, you have the large air districts, the
medium districts, and I'm also the Executive Director over
the staff at Antelope Valley as well, which is a rural
district.

And I guess what we've done from the medium-size
in my particular agency is we've linked a lot of the
materials that staff at ARB has provided on their website
to our website. We're trying to get the message
consistently out there what CARB is trying to get out to
the state. We want to do the same.

I felt it was important for me to first educate
my own Board members. And Ms. Riordan is one of my Board
members. So we agendized this item and we had a -- quite
the robust discussion on it. So I thought that was very
important to have my elected officials understand what our
mandated requirements were under the 617 legislation.

And we also are doing our public outreach, and we
are having our meeting. I think our next meeting is next
week that we'll be having in Victorville.

But I think the dollars are very important as
you're going to hear from everyone that comes up here
probably to make sure that we can implement this to the
best possible way to make sure that this legislation is
successful.
And that holds true, especially for some of the really small air districts, as well as our medium districts, not just the large urban areas. And our colleagues -- and my colleagues here in CAPCOA we try -- we strive very hard to be consistent in our messaging, and also work collaboratively to get the message across. And we want to be a partner with the Air Resources Board and make sure this is successful.

So thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

CAPCOA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ABBS: Good evening.

Alan Abbs with the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. I guess it's my job to try to say the things that haven't yet been said. And I'll start off by thanking the Board and thanking Richard Corey for an excellent hire he made in having Karen Magliano lead the staff. And I mean her leadership in this and the staff under her that have been working with her have made this process a lot easier than it could have been with a different person in place. And she's been a great person to work with. And this program is better because of it. So I'd like to say that for starters.

When staff gave the update about where we are right now, six months ago the ink was still drying on this bill. And when the Board heard the presentation, we were
trying to figure out, you know, really what -- what we were going to have to do by October of this year.

And in six months, we've accomplished a lot. And behind the scenes from what you've seen tonight and the documents that have been prepared, and many of you have seen as part of this, as staff has mentioned, we've had these consultation group meetings, which are picking up again next week. We have -- we've had executive level meetings with some of the large air districts, with the air pollution control officers at large.

Many of these requirements in 617, the BARCT, the emissions inventory, the monitoring programs all have separate work groups with CARB staff, and with air district staff. And then even at the CAPCOA level, we have a series of committee meetings where 617 is prominent among the individual air districts when they get together and talk about issues, to the point where sometimes I have to tell these committees, no, you've got to talk about something other than 617. There's other things that we have to work on as well.

And so I just want to reassure everyone that the air districts take this work seriously. We've been engaged in it. We know that there's a lot at stake. We know that there's a lot of work to be done to make the first deadline in October, and then future deadlines as
they come up. And I'm just here to tell you that we're ready to -- we're going to continue to do this, and we look forward to doing this with CARB staff.

    Thanks.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. There you are, the five amigos.

    (Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Okay. I'm going to call to on -- we were just going to go straight to the large list of witnesses that we have here. But I want to ask Dr. Balmes who's been acting as a kind of a special liaison on the health issues to say a few words here.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yes. As was mentioned by staff, I volunteered, and am happy to be chair of the AB 617 Consultation Group, which includes representatives, about 25, from community organizations, larger environmental health advocacy groups, all of the five amigos -- well, I should say three of the -- four of the amigos actually that just spoke, but I appreciate that Mojave and Antelope Valley where present today.

    And it also includes some of the people you'll hear from later as witnesses, Kevin Hamilton from San Joaquin, Martha Argüello, Luis Olmedo. I'm probably leaving out some other people that might be in the audience, but it's been -- we've only had one meeting, but
I think we already covered a lot of ground in that one meeting, because the initial effort from staff was mostly to focus on the community air quality monitoring network, and then the community action plan to reduce emissions sort of based on the data from the community air quality monitoring.

But we found out from legislative staff that were present at that first meeting that health is really where -- was the intent of the legislation. And I want to just say that while I totally support that as a public health practitioner, specifically related to air pollution health effects, and as I've already mentioned today, very much concerned about health disparities related to excessive exposure to air pollution in our disadvantaged communities, getting to the health metrics linking that up with the rest of what we're doing with AB 617 is a heavy left.

The first part is a heavy lift, but getting to health metrics is a heavier lift. And I say that as an experienced air pollution health effects researchers. We don't have data in this state at the community level to link the efforts of the community monitoring network and emission reductions plans. We don't have the health data to actually assess how well the rest of the program is working.
And I was pleased to hear some interest from Senator Lara when I talked to him about this about trying to help get funding for the CDPH as a super -- supervisor of increased resources for the community -- excuse me, the county health departments to help get more granular data at the community level with regard to appropriate health metrics.

And I just want to say I'm not talking about more research about air pollution and health effects. I'm talking about, and I don't need statistical significance at the community level, but we need to be able to see trends over time and appropriate health metrics.

What those health -- appropriate health metrics will be, needs further work. But I both want to say that I'm very happy with the effort we've done so far. As Mr. Broadbent said this is a paradigm shift that, you know, the rest of the country really will be looking to us to see if we can make this work. So it's very important work, but we need to do it right.

And I think on the health side, we need a lot more work. So I just want to thank everybody so far for their efforts. I totally agree with the kudos that Ms. Magliano has just gotten. I support that completely. And I also appreciate Veronica Eady's efforts to help us reach out to the communities.
As I've said in the past, this agency hasn't been that good at reaching out to communities. We're trying really hard now, and I appreciate all the efforts that Ms. Eady is bringing to this. And I definitely appreciate what the district representatives have said in terms of trying to work with us on this really important effort.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

We're going to go to the list now. And I am going to arbitrarily say that we're going to give everybody two minutes, because it's late in the day and I think people can say what they need to say in two minutes. So let's get started.

Joy Williams.

MS. WILLIAMS: Good evening. I'm Joy Williams with Environmental Health Coalition and the California Environmental Justice Alliance.

We urge ARB to take a strong leadership role in implementation of 617 to ensure the outcomes that our communities urgently need. In regard to the statewide strategy, it's essential that ARB develops a strategy that lists the strongest possibly emission reduction measures for all types of sources, prioritizing those that have direct emission reductions and zero-emissions technologies; sets clear aggressive goals and timelines to meet, based on health-based metrics — and I hear that
that's difficult, but that's where we think it needs to be measured; requires air districts to prioritize community input in developing the community emission reduction plans; and prioritize the measures that communities want and support; provides clear directives to develop new local regulations as needed; and clearly lays out a process for ARB to step in if air districts do not comply.

ARB's statewide strategy should provide a minimum baseline set of criteria for all air districts and community emission reduction plans to meet and exceed, not preempting or preventing stronger proactive local action.

Regarding BACT and TBACT, we need a clear and stringent definition that is applied consistently statewide. The standard should include the concept of maximum achievable reductions, but may also need to incorporate non-technology concepts, such as limitations on operations. The standard should be geared to a health metric, rather than to cost effectiveness.

In the San Diego region, we have community air quality hazards from both mobile and stationary sources, and we'll be looking to the 617 process for support on land-use issues, such as a required truck route, as well as direct emission source regulations and an Indirect Source Rule for facilities that generate truck traffic within our residential communities.
Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. SULLIVAN: Good evening, Madam Chair and Board, and ARB staff members. My name is Shelly Sullivan. I'm here representing the Climate Change Policy Coalition. And we just wanted to let you know that we support several of ARB's guiding principles in the concept paper, including those pertaining to the need for clear metrics to track progress, a strong science-based foundation to support identification of communities with the greatest cumulative exposure burden, and ensuring scientifically sound evaluations of community air quality.

One exception that is repeated throughout the concept paper is ARB's emphasis on the deployment of zero-emission technologies. ARB's principles should not endorse one particular technology or classes of technologies. And ARB should not presume that zero-emission technologies will be the most effective path to achieving AB 16 objectives in all cases.

ARB requires consideration of cost effective emission reduction measures reflecting the reality -- in reflecting that reality is the ARB, the districts, regulated entities and communities are working with limited resources. For these reasons, the concept paper should promote an overarching goal of deploying the most
cost effective emission reduction technologies to maximize
the benefit per dollar invested in any given community.

We're going to be submitting additional comments
later, but those are our top line goals. So thank you
very much.

MS. MMAGU: Good evening, Madam Chair, Board
members. Amy Mmagu on behalf of the California Chamber of
Commerce. First of all, thank you all for your hard work
that you've done on this. We look forward to remaining
constructive participants in this process moving forward.

One issue that I do want to raise which may not
be directly your issue, but it is an issue that is really
a significant impact on the ability to implement the
program is the fact that local air districts do need
funding to be able to develop and carry-out the programs
at a local level.

Currently, the State budget isn't allocating them
the funds necessary to do that. And as representing
members within those communities and stationary sources in
those communities, we are concerned with the ability for
those air districts to be able to properly implement the
programs.

So I wanted to raise that concern, and once again
we remain committed to working with you in the future.
Thank you.
MR. CHAVEZ: Hi. Chris Chavez with the Coalition for Clean Air. The Coalition for Clean Air supports the broad overall goals and strategies of CARB's initial plans for AB 617. Developing pollution reduction strategies tailored to meet the needs of our most impacted communities is an important and needed evolution in California's climate and air quality policies.

The concept paper rightfully recognizes that community air protection should build upon and complement existing efforts with an integrated approach and to reducing cumulative impacts at the community level.

The workshops hosted by CARB and South Coast AQMD have shown that the suggested metrics for identifying AB 617 communities largely aligns with community wants. One where there could be more overlap is on the area of health outcomes.

While health conditions are difficult to attribute directly to pollution, health emergencies, such as asthma hospitalizations are scientifically linked to air quality and air pollution. Ensuring that community engagement and leadership in local community emission strategies is a must. Communities must have a hand in implementing the program and feel invested in it.

There's been some discussion about defining communities beyond just focusing on specific neighborhoods.
and cities. In some cases, this might be appropriate, particularly communities impacted by freight corridors and the ports and so on. However, we must make sure that we're taking this locally rather than regionally.

The requirement for the best available retrofit control technology must be implemented so that it requires actual equipment upgrades to reduce emissions rather than paper compliance. And short-term emission strategies can't just focus on mitigation.

Filters, buffers and vegetation might be helpful in reducing exposure pollution, but they do not reduce emissions.

Similarly larger mitigation strategies such as developing alternative truck routes and relocating facility entrances must not merely relocate harmful emissions to other areas, rather the focus must remain on reducing emissions. And thank you for your time.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

MS. GALE: Good evening, everyone. Genevieve Gale, Central Valley Air Quality Coalition.

(Timer sounded.)

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: That was just a reset.

MS. GALE: AB 617 is exciting. It's new. It's sexy. However, I worry that it is somewhat distracting us
from some unfinished work that we have in the San Joaquin Valley. So I am actually hijacking my own comments today
to remind all of us that the San Joaquin Valley has yet to
officially come into compliance for a PM standard that was
set in 1997. And we have yet to submit a plan for a
standard that was set in 2006. And that's not even to
mention the 2012 standard.

So we've had decades to clean the air in the San
Joaquin Valley. And this past holiday season, as Kevin
explained, we saw one of the worst spikes in particle
pollution that we've had in years. Dr. Sherriffs, you
probably were there. It was scary.

So thanks to the Board's action in 20 -- October
2016, we've all been diligently working on an integrated
PM plan. However, it's been 18 months, and CARB and the
district have yet to produce a plan that brings us into
attainment.

So like I said, AB 617 is exciting. It's the new
girl on the block. And hopefully, it will bring near-term
benefits to communities across the State.

However, I don't want this Board to forget about
a plan that has the potential to bring clean air to over
four million people in the San Joaquin Valley.

So I'll end by saying go forth with ambitious 617
goals. We support you and your staff, and I support the
comments made by CCA, CCAC, Leadership Counsel, CRPE, CEJA. But also after this meeting, perhaps ask your staff what more we can do to finalize a plan for the valley.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: I think some clapping might be good actually just to get some energy going here.

MR. HAMILTON: It was awesome. That was -- I feel ashamed that I'm not just saying that, so that's --

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, you can just incorporate --

MR. HAMILTON: -- so right on target.

So with regard to 617 --

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: You're pretty awesome too.


I do want to say and give Compliments to the staff here, particularly the folks sitting here who have done yeoman's work in traveling across this state over the last few months since early fall conducting so many community meetings and listening sessions, which should set a pattern hopefully going forward for this Board and its staff, and how they address all of the issues before them.

There were some weaknesses there that we think
could be addressed. The ability to be able to get community members to these meetings. I was laughingly referred to as the van driver on a regular basis, but it's serious. I mean, the facts is that the community that we're trying to hear from has a lot of barriers to engaging on these issues, not the least of which is transportation.

So there are some areas of our State, which are pretty transportation rich, but our region is not. Our public transportation systems are weak and ineffective, and our families are poor. And traveling in the dark across the area on a bus with four children is just not going to cut it as a general rule.

So we in community-based organizations do the best we can to address that and support it, and ensure that those voices are heard. But we feel that they're best heard if those people can show up for themselves and speak for themselves. I'm always cautious and concerned when I -- I'm referred to as speaking for the community, because they have their own voices and they need to be heard.

This process has the chance to really do some work that a lot of us have been pulling for for quite a number of years, and that's characterize emissions and exposures to community folks at the community level. We
all understand that air pollution has been regulated at a
regional level. And that's the legal way that it's done.
That's what the statutes say, but we have this opportunity
to move forward, and find out a better -- better
information and be able to better protect our community's
health.

So we'll be here cheering you on making sure that
that happens and keeping our foot where it belongs when it
needs to be, so thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Macy Westbrook? Here, not here?
Not here -- with the American Lung Association?
Harvey Eder.

MR. EDER: Hello. I'm Harvey Eder for myself and
the Public Solar Power Coalition. This is great that this
is happening. It has to be worked with a solar conversion
program for different areas in the state. We're trying to
amend our complaints with litigation that we've got with
you folks. And one thing is I think I mentioned the judge
said there's -- there's law and policy -- well, there's
laws of nature, and laws of humans. And we're breaking a
lot of the laws of nature. And we've got to adjust our
human laws and policy and laws is where you folks come in.

There is technology forcing, in the Supreme Court
case on coatings versus the air district, South Coast. In
2012, the Supreme court said that BARCT is technology
forcing, that means that isn't cost effective absolutely right now and will be in one or three or five years. That's what shall be done. So this is very important. There's the world -- the whole state to retrofit. And so we were involved also in litigation talking about BARCT, and BACT, and ACT alternative control technologies, and control technology guidelines. EPA has been negligent. It's been 20, 30 years ago. The most recent about 10 years ago. I'm looking at solar and cost effectiveness, but this is typical.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I know two minutes goes fast.

All right. Corie Goldman.

Lupe Guerrero?

MS. GUERRERO(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good evening. My name is Lupe Guerrero. This is the first time that I come to a meeting like this. And I realize that there is a lot of important people here, many people that have degrees that they have been to advocate for their communities. I represent the City of Huntington Park and the communities of the South Side, Southeast -- Southwest of the L.A.

I don't have a degree as many of the people that have been addressing here, like doctorate degrees or being a teacher, but my title is to be wife, mother, grandmother
and great grandmother. And on behalf of the family that I have, I would like to request to have clean air, zero emissions.

And this is what I want to say that I wish my voice, this voice could listen. And I'm going to continue to fight for my community my family.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. AGUILAR(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Almost good evening. My name is Jenny Xiomara Rosales Aguila. I am proud to be -- to have the opportunity to be here. I know that it's been a long wait. Thank you for the time that you have been spending here also. And thank you for the good work that you all take part here.

I come here to speak on behalf of Huntington Park, and CBE is the organization that I represent. I have suffered as a person. My family has been stricken by cancer, by asthma, but I'm here mostly for my community, my neighbors. Some of them are not here anymore, they have gone to a better life. Because of the bad quality of the environment. The bad air that we have endured for years.

So for that reason, I'm asking you, I'm begging you to think for those -- on behalf of those communities that have suffered for many years. We know that we have
better automobiles with zero emissions. We'll have better
quality of life. AB 617 has good opportunities, but we
have to take into account that the number of cars, the
many cars that are going through our communities and are
affecting our lives.

For those families, for those communities, for
our beloved ones, I ask you -- we are asking you to have
zero emissions, please.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Who is next here?

Gabriel, yes.

MR. GUERRERO: Okay. I can speak English a
little.

CHAIR NICHOLS: You speak English. It's up to
you, whatever you like.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I'll just do it.

MR. GUERRERO: No, that's fine. Yeah, my name is
Gabriel Guerrero. And I've been living for 45 years on
the southeast cities, which is Maywood, Huntington Park,
Walnut Park, and South Gate. Actually, I belong to CEJA
and also CBE, and I'm glad to be serving these
organizations.

I'm a volunteer. Okay. The reason I'm here
today is there's so many things around -- happening around
my city. I'm surrounded by freeways. I'm right on the middle of 710, 105, and I got 5 on the north. And then on the west, I have 110.

So, yes, I'm the husband of this lady, she just spoke just a few minutes ago. And I'm also a father, and I'm a grandfather, and son. I've got a great, great daughters. And I'm so worried about life of my kids. I would like to see my kids grow up. I would like to be maybe 85, 90 years old. And I would like to see my babies to be 15 years.

And in order to do that, we need clean air. We got a lot of contamination around our cities. So urge you guys do your best you can. Okay. And 617 is really good for us. She is the sexy lady walking on the street. That's what the other girl says. Okay, right.

So thank you very much. I really appreciate it for your time.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Mr. Gastelum.

MR. GASTELUM(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good evening, everyone. I'm Ricardo Gastelum. And I'm a CBE organizer. My point is that we want zero emissions. We have already too many rules. We have too many policies, but some of them are violated by the people that work in the
governments. We have companies in our area that work
without any permit -- any permits.

They expand without any permission. My question
is where are the inspectors? If I do something illegally
in my house, they come and tear it down. How come those
companies continue to operate? We have also -- we need
also solutions at the port, not only with cars. Those
ships are coming in are contaminating and polluting our
beaches. We cannot go to the beach.

We want rules that affect them. Some of those
ships come and they bring their containers with them. We
don't know what they bring in terms of pollution. We
invite you to go and swim on the beach. The sign says do
not swim, so why do we need the beach?

Airports, rules for the airplanes also.
Sometimes when they are landing, they have to release
the --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Fuel.

MR. GASTELUM(THROUG INTERPRETER): -- fuel -
thank you - because they need to land.

There are no policies affecting those. Where are
the workers that are checking the are and checking the
land. The hospitals are full. They are up to the reams
with people seek people. If I go to the hospital, it will
take me 24 hours to take -- to be taken care of. Besides,
it will take me, it will cost me a thousand or 900 dollars.

We need quality inspectors that work for the people. And if they don't work, we've got to fire them. We need people that work there that like the people. Otherwise our youth are not going to stay. We have just some years, but the youth -- our youth, our kids and grandkids they are coming up. What kind of planet are we going to leave to them?

Sea water is polluted. We cannot go fishing because it's polluted.

Thank you very much. I leave it in your hands.

(Applause.)

MR. OLIVO(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good night -- Good evening. My name is Rodolfo Olivo. I come here to request and demand for you to work for clean air, and also air that is free from toxics -- toxins for all the community. We want you to act fast for a better future for all the generations, both the kids as well as to all of us.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. LOVYA(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good evening. My name is Irma Lovya. I'm here advocating for my children, because I believe they need to be at school.
That's why they are not here with me. Two have problems. One has a heart problem. He was studying at Long Beach. Now, he's now in a different school studying.

I have another son who is 18 years old. I have lots of trouble with him, because I didn't know that what -- the trouble that he had with learning and his learning abilities is because of the environment. I live in Long Beach and doctors tell me that maybe is -- this is because of food, because the food is -- because the earth and the land is still polluted.

That's why I'm here on behalf of my community also, and on behalf of my kids. I don't want you to say when I live here is, oh, poor lady. I know that it is in your hands, and that's why I'm here. I'm here in support of my children, and I want them to study with that aptitude that the disabled person has and -- and because my son is handicapped that's why I couldn't bring it, because he believes -- I believe that he deserves to study.

I know that all of this is in hands. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. ARGÜELLO: Good afternoon. Hopefully, I can be linear, because I'm a little bit tired.

My name is Martha Argüello. I'm the Executive Director of Physicians for Social Responsibility. I'm
also the Co-Chair of Standing Together Against Neighborhood Drilling, and a member of CEJA.

And physicians for social responsibility as an organization of health professionals, nurses, and physicians is dedicated to this idea of preventing harm to human health and the environment. And we've been very much pushing this idea of using health metrics. So we hope to work with you because we know it's difficult.

We hope that what comes out of this is something that the environmental justice and the public health community have wanted a long -- for a long time, and actually real-time Environmental Health Tracking Program, increasing the numbers of illnesses that are actually reportable, so we can start tracking that.

And so we hope to partner with you to move health departments and move the legislature to begin to understand the importance of actually collecting some of that data. Without that data, we can't actually tell people we're reducing cancer risk, which is what one of the metrics for this bill should be.

We can't tell communities we're reducing respiratory risk or reproductive health risk, unless we do that. And that's what communities are demanding. Whether you live next to an oil well, you live next to an oil well, you live next to an agricultural field, or you live...
next to the ports, people are demanding relief and a
decrease in the health symptoms.

And so we have a public health emergency. We
cannot wait. There is enough data to act. Certainly, you
know, just a few -- a week ago, the L.A. County health
department released a report looking at urban drilling and
said we know that this is a public health threat, and that
proximity and density matters, and we shouldn't be
carrying out these practices next to where people live.
It is unhealthy.

We should be moving toward health-based decision
making. That's really what would prevent harm, and
actually begin to force us to do that technology-forcing
regulations that will get us an economy that's benign by
design, and it looks at things from cradle to cradle.

And -- okay. And we should make sure that
monitoring -- I'm going to just say the last thing, that
if we're going to put monitoring equipment in the hands of
community, it should be -- we should be honest that what
we monitor, you can take action on, because we don't want
to raise false expectations of communities, and again
disappoint them.

And we hope a strong implementation of 617 and
that you don't forget 197 as well. Thanks.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Hi. Good evening, members of the Board. It's been a long day, but we're still here. I'm grateful. Thank you for your time. Actually, I wanted to be home earlier because I have T-ball game today happening right now. And I'm there for the children, you know, which is basically what we're here for to speak out the voice that they don't have just yet.

And I think that AB 617 should be implemented all the way. And there should be something that we should take advantage of, reach out to the communities, make the offer that the grant is here, and also build capacity to our communities work this. Community science raise monitors. And everything that we could put back and bring back to the community for their benefit.

One of the major cases that we have affecting -- I'm from Brawley from Comite Civico.

I'm sorry. I didn't introduce myself. I'm Miguel Hernandez, by the way.

So our major issues that we have, among other stuff, will be the Salton Sea and its wind dust that we get over there. You may be aware that it contains pollutants, such as selenium, arsenic, all that stuff from pesticides. So, I mean, having those monitors or that air quality monitoring available to our community, especially
around that area or the southern part that gets affected
the most, they -- it will be something that -- to make the
community aware of what they're facing, what they're
breathing, and for them to take action or be part of those
meetings, and so they can speak out the word too and be
heard, because I'm not the word for the community. They
also have a voice, but I'm here for them, representing
them.

And especially the children that I care the most.
And I think we should put AB 617 to its maximum effort.
And thank you. Appreciate your time.

(Applause.)

MR. OLMEDO: Good evening, Madam Chair and
members of the Board. I'll try to stick to the two
minutes. And I'm just going to read real fast through my
comments.

So AB 617 is critical to improving public health
in the environment in rural areas of California. It's
particularly important that Imperial Valley where fine
particulate matter from fugitive dust, agricultural
burning is prevalent -- that is prevalent.

Also, toxic emissions from the Salton Sea, as you
heard, continues to recede and endangers our local
residents. I know that for a lot of you, especially those
who live here in the Los Angeles area or closer to the
Ports of L.A., we have a large port of entry as well. And also these trucks end up in our community. So it's important to also see those types of strategies of where we can work across districts.

Some of those conversations are already happening, so we hope to see that we have some projects and ideas and solutions that -- you know across districts.

Among the many benefits at AB 617, it promotes the self-determination of my community by putting data in the hands of residents. The IVAN network, for example, provides a glimpse into the promise of AB 617. IVAN has over 40 monitors cited according to criteria developed by residents in collaboration with scientists, public health, and agencies like California Air Resources Board and local air districts.

Residents can also access real-time data, and change their behavior outdoors based on the air quality. Ivan has built local community capacity. Educated residents input health into our own hands to help. We can also now push for zero emission solutions in rural areas, which are often overlooked. AB 617 will also provide metrics to track emissions, reductions, and health outcomes that's what we're hoping. When co-locating with State monitors, we can also ensure that monitors are accurate, and doing their job.
A couple of items that I wanted to also do. Performance measures are going to be very important, providing as much possible. You've heard time and time again that it -- even though that -- to the best of the interests of the air districts, they may not all apply at the same time.

Well, finally, I'll skip some of these. I'll have time to submit public comments, I'm Pretty throughout the whole process. But I do want to say that, first of all, I want to thank Dr. Balmes for his leadership in consultation group.

Thank you, Dr. Balmes.

So we're looking forward to working with CARB, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, South Coast Air Quality Management District, CAPCOA, to reduce emissions in the Imperial Valley. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. GARCIA: Good evening, Madam Chair, members of the Board, and Assembly Member Garcia. My name is Lilian Garcia. I represent La Union Hace La Fuerza, a community based organization focused on environmental justice in the Coachella Valley.

I'd like to share some critical concerns regarding the air quality in my community. Due to the close proximity to the Salton Sea, my community has been
exposed to high concentrations of particle pollution. It is critical for Assembly Bill 617 to implement change in my community for the well-being of all residents in order to comply with State and federal regulations.

I ask the Board the following: The Coachella Valley needs community monitors that provide real-time data. Assembly Bill 617 can make this happen. The Coachella Valley needs a transparent community selection criteria, and we need meaningful engagement in this process Assembly Bill 617.

Finally, no community meeting should happen on behalf of OCAP without community and environmental justice partners.

I just want to kind of share a personal experience. A few years ago, I drove through 14 states in the Country of Mexico. Before I left, I had bronchitis. I arrived over there. I stayed out there for four months. When I came back home to the Coachella Valley, I was out here maybe three or four days, and I got sick again.

So my question is, you know, what's difference? I drove through 14 states in the Country of Mexico, and I come back home and I get sick again. So I thought Mexico was a third world.

And so thank you for your time.

(Applause.)
MS. CALDERAS: Hello. Good evening. I'm Astrid Calderas, and I'm from the Imperial County. I have been doing data analysis for over two and a half years - actually a little bit more - for both community IVAN and regulatory networks.

In addition to agricultural burning analysis, I have also compared PM levels from both networks. Two years ago, I had found several sensitive discrepancies with regulatory monitors through the data analysis. Perhaps I'm hoping that even if it's going to take a lot of time, once AB 617 starts operating, and collecting community data, these type of situations will be resolved.

An important point through the analysis is the fact that IVAN Air has been providing consistent PM10 and PM2.5 data from the 40 low-cost monitors deployed throughout the county, regardless of the harsh environmental conditions for almost three years. I see that both networks, regulatory and community, can complement very well with each other.

Before the deployment of IVAN Air, residents had to rely on data from the five regulatory monitors, some of them -- well, this is all from 13 to 29 or even more miles away from their homes.

Now, they feel more confident because now they have real-time data from community monitored network. And
I am really looking forward to contribute with AB 617 implementation. And thank you for your time.

(Applause.)

MR. TORRES: Hi. My name is Christian Torres, part of Comite Civico Del Valle. I'll try to keep this brief, as everybody has had a long day.

I see AB 617 as a great first step now in fighting particulate matter and other pollutants. I hope that it's a great resource for battling air pollution, in disadvantaged communities that really need help, because they don't have their own resources.

I hope that AB 617 and especially the Community Air Grant Program can help expand and implement air monitoring programs in communities, because they really want it. I'm the air monitoring technician for CCB. And I've seen firsthand what people want and what they demand. They see hope in air monitoring, because it's information that they can have and use to fight for legislation, push for regulation, and everything that they want for -- not just for themselves, but for future generations.

As we've heard before from my colleagues, IVAN Air is shining example, because of their -- our 40 air monitoring networks. The network is expanding. There are partnerships that want to be develop. And I hope that AB 617 gives us a chance to push this network, not just to
the State of California, maybe the whole U.S. eventually, and we can see how the communities can arm themselves with information, and fight for their own rights in cleaning up their air, and not -- let's not just keep it at the air. Maybe one day it will expand and the whole environment will be free of pollutants.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. LUGO: Hi. Good evening again. Humberto Lugo with Comite Civico Del Valle, in the eastern Coachella Valley.

As you heard from my colleagues here, you know, we've -- we have a community air monitoring network, IVAN Air, that most of you are a familiar with by now. IVAN Air was able to identify trends in air pollution where regulatory monitors sometimes were capturing some of these levels. You know, and all their monitoring networks is validated against federal reference monitors or federal equivalent monitoring.

Now, to clean up this air pollution, we must start looking at governmental monitors, because government has allowed pollution exceedance for way too long from meeting any air quality standard.

It would be great -- you know, a lot of communities are at different places for AB 617. Some are
focused more on emission reductions, some are ready for community air monitoring networks. But I think as a goal together, we can all get -- get to where want to get.

So it would be great if we could just remove the pollution, not have to deal with it and have one revolutionary change. And while some of us work towards these goals, others of us can try another course of action, whether it's emission reductions, or it's community monitoring to have this data available for the communities. Because when science is used effectively and when done honestly, it can get us good results such as IVANAir.org.

And there is till value moving the dial in small amounts. So CARB should set clear strict benchmarks and timelines for all community emission reduction plans. This would constitute a consistent statewide minimum baseline that all plans must meet and exceed and adopt the strongest possible measures from the statewide strategy by prioritizing zero emissions.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. McCASKILL: Good evening, Chair Nichols, Vice Chair Berg, and Board members. My name is Richard McCaskill. I am a resident of San Diego, California, a small business owner. And I am the co-chair of your Small
Business Opportunity Advisory Panel.

Today, I'm speaking to wearing all those hats. And I want to impress upon you that the word "community" cannot be separated from the concept of small business. Small business owners tend to live near their businesses. We live in disadvantaged communities often. And our families breathe community air that we live and work in.

Unlike most of our neighbors, we are also direct consumers of the rules and policies at ARB and other regulators pass into law. And those rules and policies differently affect our ability -- or directly affect our ability to succeed in our businesses.

Yet, most of us do not know how to engage with you in a moment like this. So I appreciate the ARB, the Air Resources Board, for establishing a Small Business Owners Panel to engage policy at this level. It's really important.

Through this engagement, I was encouraged to attend the program that I want to speak to you about right now. The program is your AB 617. A community meeting was held in San Diego, which I had an opportunity to attend, our local -- a local resident had a concern about trucks detouring through her residential street in order to get to the freeway on-ramp more quickly.

Because I live in the area, and my business is
not far away, I knew the area, her street, and the issue with the trucks, and I was able to share a couple solutions that could be implemented.

She was very happy to receive them. As I was happy to be helpful. I appreciate the warm welcome also from Board Member Ms. Diane Takvorian. I appreciate you.

It was very great to see you there. And I appreciate you allowing me to come and observe and be involved.

When you bring small business to the table for a community meeting, you help to think about the rule and the policy. You'll get more creative thinking when you want to achieve a more equitable outcome, both environmentally and economically. I encourage you to go out of your way to ask small business owners for their ideas. We have a tremendous impact on the impact that communities try to make for a cleaner environment.

And so when you think of a community, think of small business. We know the neighborhood. Our communities need us, and we are very inventive thinkers.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Thanks for summarizing. We have your letter also.

MS. DARYANANI: Hello. My name is Nikita Daryanani with Leadership Counsel for Justice and
Accountability. We work with communities throughout the San Joaquin Valley and Eastern Coachella Valley. We're a member of the California Environmental Justice Alliance and share the same concerns as our partner CVAQ and CCAC mentioned as well. We believe that in order for residents to meaningfully engage in this process, it must be made more accessible and transparent. So input from community meetings and workshops must be documented and made publicly available, and CARB must also provide responses to this input.

Many of the communities we work with live in neighborhoods with industrial facilities, or a distribution center. So reduction plans must effectively promote equitable land-use planning and policies, so that jurisdictions do not continue to cite and permit polluting facilities in the backyards of low-income people of color.

When we held a community meeting on 617 in the City of Fresno, one resident said, and I'm paraphrasing, we come to all of these community meetings and public meetings and, workshops, make all of these comments, and our air is still awful to breathe.

So this frustration with the current system is not uncommon. So it's imperative that this program leads to actual emission reductions and reduction plans that are enforced with a stringent timeline, so that we're not just
creating plans to be shelved.

Thank you.

MR. FLORES: Good evening, Madam Chair, Board members. Let me take a really good look, because once I start talking, then my field of vision is just right here.

(Laughter.)

MR. FLORES: My name is Juan Florez. I'm with the Center on Race, Poverty and the Environment. Jose Ruby came with me today from Kern County. We're representing communities from Delano, Shafter, Arvin, Bakersfield.

We support monitoring, but you already have enough information to be able to begin immediately to clean up the pollution with your State strategy, part of the Community Air Protection Program.

The State strategy should include early action or immediate strategies for CARB and the air district to, one, establish buffer zones and setbacks. The CCSD report recommends that the State develop policies such as the same space surface setbacks to protect public health by limiting exposure to harmful pollutants.

Scientific literature supports at least a 2500 feet setback between the surface locations of the wells and tanks within an oil and gas site, and sensitive receptors, such as schools, parks, clinics, hospitals,
churches, long-term health care facilities or residences. CARB concept paper for the Community Air Protection Program says that the early action strategies for immediate pollution reduction could include tools such as appropriate setbacks.

Number two, limit production from oil and gas operations. The CCSD report found that even with emission control technologies, local pollution still increases as oil and gas production increases. Emission control technologies will not be effective unless oil and gas production also stops increasing.

Three, implement all the recommendations from the CCSD report. The CCSD report includes all the recommendations between -- within CARB and the air district authority under AB 617.

Thank you so much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. TSAI: Hi. Good evening. I'm Stephanie Tsai with CEJA, the California Environmental Justice Alliance.

As you know, you've heard from many of our members here today throughout this long day. We are a statewide coalition of grass roots community based organizations working to advance environmental justice in State policy. Our members work across California and in
low-income communities and communities of color that are
disproportionally burdened by air pollution and suffer
from the severe negative health impacts.

I want to take this opportunity to remind you all
of a story I shared the last time we were here actually,
right here, talking about AB 617 in October.

So it's a story of Kim a Thomas Rocha who were
earlier -- here earlier today. They live in Bloomington
just a few miles away from here. The Rochas live 1000
feet from a high school, and they already have two massive
warehouses in their neighborhood.

They're fighting against a propose third one that
would be just 70 feet from their back fence. That's 7-0,
70 feet. This means that there are thousands of
heavy-duty diesel drayage trucks in their neighborhoods
every day.

They've seen their neighbors, especially the kids
and the elderly struggle with asthma, other respiratory
illnesses, and cancers. The Rochas have stood with their
neighbors here before you today to advocate for your
support of an Indirect Source Rule in this area.

I urge you -- you know, there are many, many
stories like this, and I just want to highlight this one,
because it's so close by, and, of course, you heard it
earlier today. And I urge you to keep them in mind, as we
move forward with the implementation of AB 617.

I also want to remind you of your mission as a State agency. So the Air Resources Board, as you well know, is charged with protecting the public from the harmful effects of air pollution and developing programs and actions to fight climate change.

These are goals that we support and we share in common. We really want to work together with you all to effectively carry them out and provide relief in the form of clean air in our communities. We know you've heard from us and other communities about the urgent actions we need, and we want to emphasize that this process is not starting from scratch.

Again, as you've heard, the pollution sources in our communities are well known and documented, as are the solutions, so we don't want the process to delay action.

We -- as you know, we submitted many pages of comments, so we have plenty of recommendations and are looking forward to continuing the conversation.

Thanks.

(Appause.)

MR. RIVERA: Good evening. My name is Alicia Rivera. I'm a Wilmington community organizer for Communities for a Better Environment. And other members have come from Wilmington. We battled the rain this
morning. It took us about four hours. We have started
from about 6:00 in the morning. We were afraid that you
were going to switch the agenda perhaps, and that we might
miss the 617 issue.

But anyway, so we are still here. And so are
you, and we appreciate it and everyone else. It's -- you
know, I have to say that I have some notes here, but
everyone is asking you to please and pleading, pleading,
pleading to please, you know, hear or our concerns. We do
this all the time throughout the year, and the air doesn't
seem to improve very much.

Why?

It's because our regulators are not really having
a very strong stand against the polluters. And the
polluters are always the ones who end up with the best
system, which they write themselves in cap and trade.

We're talking about 617 as if this is going to be
the panacea. You can make it a panacea or we're going to
be here in five years still saying that nothing has been
done. How long are our communities going to be studied?
Wilmington has been studied over and over again. Yet,
people keep falling dead through -- you know, with cancer.
The kids are missing school, because they can't breathe.
They have to go to emergency room when they turn blue.

You know, the parents ride the whole way there
and they have to take them to the emergency room. It doesn't seem to be getting any better? Why?

And that is because you need to take a strong stand, and you need to do it now, because you have enough data already, you know. And you can move on from here. You know what is needed in each community that has spoken here today. You have enough information. You just need to get it going.

617 -- AB 617 going to be the panacea that every other project before this has been, and hasn't been. Anyway -- also, you know --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Ma'am.

MS. RIVERA: -- stop allowing expansion like the Tesoro one.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. RIVERA: You need to give a mandate to the local regulators.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

Guzman I just wanted to give you some more perspective on Wilmington, which is where I live. So Wilmington is a neighborhood of Los Angeles. And it's interesting because I live in an apartment complex on the corner of the Pacific Coast Highway, which sees a lot of
traffic, and the 110 Freeway, which goes to the Port of Los Angeles.

And L.A. Metro services our area, and they like to claim this is the nation's largest clean air fleet. But Wilmington and Long Beach get some of the only lines that have the diesel buses still. And it's really a shame, because the 344 line, which goes to the more affluent and less diverse area right next to Wilmington, they get the natural gas bus. It's really -- it's a shame.

But, you know, this 617 I think it's a -- I read some of the grant kind of guidelines. And I think you should really emphasize -- I don't know who's going to actually do the judging, but I think you should emphasize the emission reduction programs, community-led community air protection efforts, and the best available retrofit control technologies implementation. I think those would be best to get some funding.

We also live next to the refineries, of course. And just last -- this past week, I witnessed a flare. And, of course, it kind of fed into the conspiracy that they always tend to flare when it's raining. It was like I actually saw the smoke first. I was at the library, and I see this smoke, and I thought there was a huge fire. And I looked to the right, and the flare was
going on. And it went on for about two or -- right, I think about two minutes. And then I called the South Quality Air -- you know the AQMD. He calls me back up and he says, oh, it's routine. I didn't see anything when I drove by. And they told me that they're just kind of doing what they have to do to routine maintenance.

But, you know, we'd really like to see a reduction in that too.

Thanks.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Mr. Guzman was the last speaker who signed up to speak on this item. It was an informational item. And we got a lot of information. Most of it I take as saying get on with the job, so I think that's good advice for us to take to hear to get on with the job

Any Board member wish to make any last comments on this item?

We have possibility to do that.

So I think we have our Assembly Member here. Perhaps you'd like to say a few words.


CHAIR NICHOLS: Have you got your --

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: You have to push the button on the other side.
ASSEMBLY MEMBER GARCIA: Use my outdoor voice.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER GARCIA: Thank you, Madam Chair and colleagues. You know, AB 617, I'm going to start off with the last comments about it being the panacea, the end-all meet all.

And quite frankly, I hope it's not disappointing that I say this, but it is not. It is a tool, one of many tools for us to meet our overall emission reduction goals, and identifying what's happening in very specific locations, geographic areas of the State of California that perhaps many of you who are here today have felt that have been overlooked for a long time.

Speaking as one of the authors of the bill, I think the goal here was to get to these communities that have been overwhelmingly disproportionately impacted by air quality issues and direct sources emission, and other pollutant criterias, that are affecting the public health and well-being of Californians.

Public health aspect of this is extremely important, at the center of our objectives, but reducing emissions is just as important. It was mentioned, you know, metrics. I think there are some things that we can do, in terms of seeking data from our public health departments as it relates to hospitalization visits.
related to respiratory problems and things of that sort. And I don't know if that would require legislation, or is that something that we can directly ask some of our public health partners and support them with the resources to provide that information. But I think there are some things that we can do to begin tying in the public health component to this.

I want to just, you know, highlight that there are other policies and programs here at ARB are going to be extremely important that go back to AB 32, SB 32, 197 was mentioned earlier, that we will have to continue to carry out. And so as much of an important piece of policy AB 617 is, and the implementation that's taken place -- and I have to commend the team here at ARB for the work that's been done in such a very short period of time to actually carry forward a lot of the community conversations that have taken place, and now at a point where we're implementing things.

I was sharing with the Chair earlier that as a kid I used to drive out to Riverside. And we always assumed that Riverside was just a place that was always filled with overcast. That it was a place that the sun didn't really come out a whole lot, because there were clouds everywhere.

I didn't grow up in Riverside. I grew up in the
Coachella Valley, but that was our perception of this area of Riverside. And for those who grew up in Los Angeles, I would imagine that very similar visualization of what the air looked like. And so I think it's important that we stop and recognize that there have been tremendous strides in improving the quality of the air in this particular region.

And without a doubt a tremendous amount of work that needs to be done. I appreciate those who have come out from Imperial County, Coachella Valley, and have highlighted the important problems that exist that need the additional attention, Salton Sea, the ag related air quality circumstances, and the list goes on and on as it was mentioned.

And that's important. These are parts of the state that I think for many years, tying it back to my comment, have felt that they've been overlooked, underrepresented, or for that matter even underinvested.

And so I think we're moving in a good direction. And I appreciate the air districts that are here that although during the moment of deliberation on the public policy there were some concerns, it seems to be that we're now moving in a direction that we need to be, which is the implementation and making it a point to be as inclusive as we can with the community residents that are directly
impacted by inaction.

So I want to thank again the team here at ARB for the work that you're doing. Without question, those of you who have come out from the Imperial Coachella Valley and other parts of the state.

(Thereupon Assembly Member Garcia spoke in Spanish.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

I can't resist pointing out to the audience, if you are not familiar with the way our legislature works, that the fact that we have an elected member of the Assembly who sits in Sacramento and easily could be spending his time up there, and has the right to hold hearings and get us to all come to him, the fact that he's come out here and participates with our Board, and is overseeing the work that we're doing on behalf of the legislature is a very remarkable thing. I want to thank you for that. Thank you for being here, and for your comments.

So we have one more person. Ms. Takvorian you have your light on here.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Just really quickly thank you Assembly Member for your leadership on this, and today and previously. I just wanted to note that I wanted to appreciate the staff for the evolution of the program
since the last update, and since the update before that. I think the emphasis on action is really very clear and recognizing that each community is different. Some problems have been well documented, as I think Alicia was saying. And action is needed. In others, the monitoring is clearly critical to developing a good strategy.

And I also wanted to observe that this program provides the opportunity to bring together a lot of the key concepts that we've been discussing today, and that are high priorities for the agency is. I think Indirect Source Review is a component that could be included here. And I'm hoping that it becomes an element of the community action plans that would be either required or would elevate the district and the community's ability to move forward with incentives and other benefits.

So I think it's a place for us to include that. I think again the land-use guidance is critical. I appreciated Stephanie's raising of the Rocha story and that's true for so many others in this community and others. We'd have to address this land-use issue because it's really an air pollution and public health issue. So I hope we're able to do that through these plans.

And the last thing I think it relates in part to something that Assembly Member Garcia said, is -- and to the public health standards, asthma reporting is not
mandatory in the State of California, and probably should be, and would give us a set of data almost immediately that the health providers collect, and that is available.

So it's something that we -- would allow us to know a whole lot more. I know it's not that simple, but I think it's one of those things we could reach for. So that would require legislation, if anyone was so inclined.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Seeing no other Board members who wish to speak at this point, I'm going to close this item.

However we're not quite done, because we are required to hold an open comment for anyone who wants to speak on a matter that was not covered by one of our noticed agenda items.

And we have two requests for comment. The first is from Bo Boylan.

So you got two minutes, Mr. Boylan.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: And we have your written material.

MR. BOYLAN: Great. Thank you, Madam Chair, Madam Vice Chair, Board members. I'm going to just skip the slides, and just talk.

I flew all the way from Charlotte, North Carolina
to be with you tonight. So I get the man miles award, or the person miles award I suppose, to introduce Solidia Technologies, my company, in the hope that our brief interaction tonight might stimulate interest on behalf of the Board, to have a more detailed conversation about how our technologies might be able to support your very ambitious and necessary goals for greenhouse gas emission reductions.

Solidia is a cement technology, concrete technology company. We have a cement technology that enables cement producers to produce a low carbon, low energy, non-hydraulic cement. We have a technology that enables concrete producers to take waste stream CO2 and cure their products.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I am going to refer you to Edie Chang. Ms. Chang who is the Deputy Executive Officer is in charge of our climate programs and she will follow up with you.

MR. BOYLAN: So I've --
CHAIR NICHOLS: You've accomplished your goal.
MR. BOYLAN: I accomplished my goal.
CHAIR NICHOLS: You accomplished your goal, because someone is going --
MR. BOYLAN: All right I'm going to fly back to North Carolina. Thank you for your service and your time
Good night.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

And we have one final commenter who is known to all of us Harvey Eder. Mr. Eder this is your final word of the evening, and you are the final speaker of the evening.

MR. EDER: Hi there. I'm Harvey Eder speaking for myself and for the Public Solar Power Coalition.

The CARB uses 7500 premature deaths per year in California. In 10 years -- and that number is disputed and low. It could be off by orders of magnitude at least factors. In 10 years that's 75,000 deaths. In 50, 60 years, which is a short life, that's about 400,000 deaths or one percent of the population, over living in California for 50 years will die from the air pollution.

That's not very good numbers for an advanced industrial society that purports to be a leader in environment and whatnot to the world. We could do better.

And immediate total solar conversion is what's needed. The science tells us that with climate change, and toxins, and criteria emissions and whatnot. In a litigation with you, we've been negotiating in settlement through February and whatnot. And then we're trying to get discovery and amended complaints and whatnot.

Anyway, there's things going on. One thing that
was happening is that -- I wasn't happy about that, there was -- on the second of this month, although we'd exchanged documents, they said there were no points to the demur -- there was an eight point demurrer and a motion to quash service.

Anyway. I said, look, you got State court, State law, the California Clean Air Act, AB 892 is suppose to do a report every three years. The report is due this year.

And anyway, that's undisputed by Noah Krasner -- Golden-Krasner a justice, that there's at least that and hopefully everything to litigate.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

And that I think is the end of this meeting. I want to remind everybody that tomorrow morning we resume here at 8:30 a.m. So be here. We will start promptly.

Thank you.

(Thereupon the Air Resources Board meeting recessed at 7:34 p.m.)
CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing California Air Resources Board meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and was thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by computer-assisted transcription;

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 6th day of April, 2018.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 10063