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PROCEDINGS

CHAIR NICHOLS: We have a quorum here or so I'm told, so let's get started.

Good morning, everybody. I could say welcome to Fresno, but this is not my home town. It is the second time I've been in this building though. I was here just a couple months ago to testify in front of a federal panel on behalf of the California greenhouse gas emission standards. This is where they chose to have their hearing. And I'd never been in the building before. This room is awesome. It was obviously designed however for a somewhat different era, not for everything being wired or for a Board that's as big as this one is. It makes me feel like we should be, you know, doing some flamenco or something on the stage.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: But you're not going to get that treat either today, at least not until maybe after the meeting is over.

But before we proceed with the formal part of the festivities, I would like to ask our Board member who is from Fresno to say a word or two of greeting.

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: Thank you very much. Really appreciate the ARB Board and staff coming here. I think it shows a great deal of respect for the community.
I know personally when we meet outside of Sacramento when we've gone to Riverside, when we've gone to Diamond Bar, these are -- it's very important meetings. It's a great chance to get closer to the communities that we serve. And I know it is a great deal of effort to -- to move the circus around. But really appreciate, particularly for today's Board meeting to come, and welcome.

Everybody should walk out on the balcony. Hopefully the fog will clear a little bit. Hopefully, that's not air pollution. Hopefully it's fog, and it's the -- it will lift and we'll be able to see the glorious Sierra.

But again, thank you all for coming. Welcome to the valley. Welcome to the heartland, the agricultural heartland. And I hope people get off 99 on their way back to wherever they're going, so they can get a little -- a little flavor of what's out there.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you so much. If you saw me looking around looking somewhat confused, it was because I was wondering where the flag was that we were going to say the Pledge of Allegiance to. But there is one over there.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: So thank you very much. That was really resourceful. So with that, would everybody please
rise and join me in saying the Pledge.

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

CHAIR NICHOLS: We really are the Air Resources Board. That was impressive.

All right. The Clerk will please call the roll.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Dr. Balmes?

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Mr. De La Torre?

Mr. Eisenhut?

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Senator Florez?

Assembly Member Garcia?

Supervisor Gioia?

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Here.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Ms. Mitchell?

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Here.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Mrs. Riordan?

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Supervisor Serna?

Dr. Sherriffs?

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: Here.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Professor Sperling?

Ms. Takvorian?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.
BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Vice Chair Berg?

VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Chair Nichols?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Here.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Madam Chair, we have a quorum?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much.

I believe a couple of our Board members are driving up this morning from Southern California and will be joining us in a little bit.

Okay. A couple of announcements before we get started. Interpretation services will be provided today in Spanish for Item number 19-1-1, the PM2.5 State Implementation Plan for the San Joaquin Valley; and also for 19-1-3, CARB's Program Priorities for 2019. Headsets are available outside the room at the sign-up table, and can be picked up at any time.

I would like for the translator to repeat these remarks in Spanish.

(Thereupon the interpreter translated in Spanish.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

For safety reasons, please note the emergency exit to the rear of the room. We go out through the lobby. In the event of a fire alarm, we have to evacuate
this room immediately and go down the stairs to the left of the elevator and out of the building. And then when the all-clear signal is given, we're able to return to the room and resume the hearing.

Anyone who would like to testify should fill out a request-to-speak card. These are also available outside in the lobby. And we appreciate it if you'd turn it into the Board Clerk over here, or an assistant, prior to the commencement of the item that you're interested in speaking about.

Also, speakers should be aware that we will impose a three-minute time limit. Please state your first and last name when you come to the podium and put your testimony into your own words rather than reading it, if you can. It makes it much easier for us to follow. And if you do have written testimony, it will be also taken into the record, so we'll have an opportunity to review it and respond to it as well.

Okay. I think with that, we are ready to get started. And the first item on our agenda, and the reason -- main reason why we're here in Fresno today is the 2018 State Implementation Plan for fine particles for the San Joaquin Valley. The last time the Board was in Fresno to take up a similar SIP, we deferred action, and directed the staff to work with the District and
stakeholders to find additional emissions reductions.

While the process has taken longer than anyone anticipated at the time, the new plan that's before us today is the most comprehensive ever developed for the valley. This plan seeks to attain all four of the PM2.5 standards, whereas the prior plan addressed only one of those standards. Staff has advised me that this plan is the result of a new level of partnership that has been developed between CARB and the District, as well as some productive dialogue between the District and community advocates.

Continuing this collaboration after the Board acts today will be extremely important to the success of the plan. We can't just adopt a plan and then walk away. It's going to take work to make it into a reality. We know that implementation is going to be challenging, and will require positive engagement from all parties, including business, agriculture, activists, advocates, the District and CARB ourselves.

So with that, I will turn it over to Mr. Corey, our Executive Officer, to introduce the item.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Thanks, Chair Nichols. The PM2.5 plan establishes a comprehensive strategy to attain four -- as you mentioned, four federal air quality standards to protect public health from fine
particulate matter pollution in the San Joaquin Valley. Staff developed this plan, as you noted, following Board's direction to craft a robust plan with a balance of mobile, stationary, and area source measures to reduce NOx and PM taking the time to conduct an extensive public process.

CARB's commitments in this SIP on the mobile source side will look familiar. Just three months ago at the October meeting, the Board adopted the San Joaquin Valley Supplement to the 2016 State Strategy for the State Implementation Plan. That action, along with the Mobile Source Strategy laid out CARB's commitment to achieve the needed emission reductions from mobile sources.

The SIP includes District actions to achieve direct PM2.5 reductions from more stringent controls on wood burning fireplaces and heaters, incentives to install control technology on commercial under-fired charbroilers, and a commitment to conduct additional research on enhanced conservation management practices. The District measures also achieve NOx reductions from a suite of more robust district rules for flares, boilers, steam generators, and internal combustion engines used in agricultural operations. The plan is unprecedented in scope and we recommend its approval.

I also wanted to briefly mention a separate matter regarding the District's use of emission reduction
credits that was covered in a recent report. In that report, Earthworks identified what it sees as shortcomings in the District's ERC bank. In response, I've begun discussions with the District APCO, Samir Sheikh, and others, concerning our plans to evaluate the credit system.

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

Laura.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: Thank you, Mr. Corey. Good morning, Chair Nichols and good morning, Board Members.

This morning I'll be presenting the PM2.5 plan for the San Joaquin Valley that demonstrates attainment of four PM2.5 air quality standards. I'll start by discussing how we got to where we are today, then summarize the control strategy in the SIP, and wrap up by talking about the next critical phase for the plan, which is implementation.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: The first thing I want to highlight is that the Valley PM2.5 Plan is a
significant step forward for the valley. This is the first time that a plan addresses and shows attainment of all four federal PM2.5 air quality standards. Plan development was shaped by an extensive public process, with new levels of collaborative dialogue between CARB and the San Joaquin Valley Air District and stakeholders.

As a result of that collaboration, the plan balances reductions in direct PM2.5 and NOx emissions from a range of important sources in the valley. It includes controls on stationary and area sources, like flares, residential wood burning, and commercial charbroiling. And it also relies on significant reductions from mobile sources like trucks, agricultural equipment, and off-road equipment among others. Using a combination of rule-based and incentive-based approaches.

--00--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: As the Chair alluded to, you may recall that two years ago, the Board considered a moderate area plan for one of the PM2.5 standards in the valley. That plan was just for the 12 microgram per cubic meter annual standard, and demonstrated that attaining the standard by the moderate area deadline of 2021 was impracticable. It also included the District's request to be classified as serious nonattainment for the 12 microgram standard.
The plan was adopted by the District board. But when CARB considered the plan in October 2016, you decided to table the plan and provided direction to staff, namely: Conduct a more thorough public process, find additional direct PM2.5 and NOx reductions from both mobile and stationary sources, and finally, return to the Board with a path for attaining all PM2.5 standards in the valley.

The comprehensive Valley PM2.5 Plan is the response to that Board direction --

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: -- and that brings us to where we are today with a plan that demonstrates attainment of four federal PM2.5 air quality standards.

Two of the standards shown above the arrow are for PM2.5 levels on a 24-hour basis. And the other two shown below the arrow are on an annual basis. There are multiple attainment years for the various standards. And the standards become more stringent over time.

With implementation of the proposed plan, the valley will attain the 65 microgram 24-hour standard by 2020, the 15 microgram annual standard also by 2020, the 35 microgram 24-hour standard by 2024, and the 12 microgram annual standard by 2025. The plan meets Clean Air Act requirements for a non-attainment area classified
as serious for each of these standards.

For the two standards with the 2020 attainment date, the 65 and 15 microgram standards, emissions reductions from implementation of existing control measures are enough to get the valley to attainment. To attain the two more stringent standards with later attainment dates, the 35 and the 12 microgram standards, further emission reductions are needed, and those are provided in this plan.

Just a note on the rest of the presentation. To try to avoid confusion with the multiple attainment dates, the presentation focuses just on 2024, since that year is the first of those future attainment years where new reductions are needed.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: One thing we want to emphasize is that the public process was a vital part of developing the Valley PM2.5 Plan. Part of the Board direction in 2016 was to conduct additional public process in the valley.

And over the past two years, CARB and the district have done exactly that. We've worked closely with each other, U.S. EPA, and industry, and health advocates. CARB and the District hosted ten public meetings on the strategy for the Valley PM2.5 Plan,
including, for example, the one shown here in a screen
capture from the webcast.

This was a joint public meeting held in Fresno in
August of last year to discuss the draft plan. And it
featured a panel of District and CARB Board members,
including Senator Florez, Dr. Sherriffs, and Mr. Eisenhut.
And it was very well attended by the public. We had a
packed house with standing room only.

That meeting exemplifies both the level of public
interest in this plan and the close level of engagement
from CARB, the District, U.S. EPA, and stakeholders. It
illustrates that everyone came to the table, literally as
well as metaphorically to develop this plan. As we work
on other plans moving forward, we want to use the level of
outreach and engagement in this process as a model.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: Turning now to
talk about the emissions reductions needed in the control
strategy, the Valley PM2.5 Plan provides the reductions
that are needed to get the valley to attainment for all
standards focusing on direct PM2.5 and NOx as the two most
important contributors to PM2.5 levels in the valley. The
plan also reflects a mix of controls on mobile,
stationary, and area sources.

Reductions come from implementation of currently
existing programs shown in dark red in the charts, as well as from new District and CARB measures shown in green. Implementation of current and new measures gets us down from baseline emissions, shown in gray on the left-hand side of each chart, to the emissions levels in yellow that are needed for attainment.

Over the next few slides, I'll cover the District and CARB measures in the SIP that achieve the reductions needed to get to these attainment targets.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: Starting with the District strategy, the District commits to an aggregate reduction of 1.3 tons per day of directly emitted PM2.5 and 1.9 tons per day of NOx emissions in 2024. The direct PM2.5 reductions come from three main measures.

First, the District is strengthening its residential wood-burning rule by lowering curtailment thresholds in the most heavily impacted regions of the valley, and increasing incentive amounts for residents to replace their wood-burning stove or fireplace with a cleaner burning device. The District has, in fact, already started the public process for this rule amendment and is aiming to have the updated rule in place next winter.

Second, the District is reducing PM2.5 emissions
by strengthening its controls on commercial charbroiling, setting up reporting requirements for underfired charbroilers and providing enhanced incentives for restaurants to install control technologies.

Third, the District recently announced incentives for pilot projects for low-dust nut harvesting equipment, and alternatives to open agricultural burning, reducing direct PM2.5 emissions and addressing concerns raised by the public about those sources of emissions.

And finally, the District strategy tightens a suite of existing rules to get additional NOx reductions from flares, boilers, process heaters, glass plants, and other stationary sources.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: Looking at the District strategy in detail, this table shows the estimated reductions of direct PM2.5 and NOx emissions by 2024 from each District measure. It's important to note here that like CARB, the District commits in the plan to achieving aggregate emission reductions - in this case, 1.3 tons per day direct PM2.5, and 1.9 tons per day NOx.
So that while the table includes estimates of the emission reductions from each of the individual measures, final measures as proposed for adoption into the SIP may provide more or less than the initial emission reduction.
estimates, while still achieving the aggregate emissions reduction committed to in the SIP.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: On the Mobile Source Strategy side, implementation of CARB's current mobile source control program achieves most of the needed NOx reductions. And new mobile source reductions coming from the 2016 State SIP Strategy, and the recently adopted San Joaquin Valley Supplement to the 2016 State SIP Strategy achieve the remaining needed reductions.

The Valley Supplement to the State SIP Strategy in particular will seem familiar, since the Board adopted it in October of last year. New measures detailed in the strategy achieve one ton per day reduction of directly emitted PM2.5 and 32 tons per day reduction of NOx emissions, based on an aggressive timeline for action and implementation.

In the near term, for example, the Board can anticipate seeing the California Low-NOx Engine Standard and Accelerated Turnover of Agricultural Equipment Measures.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: Shown here are some selected measures from the valley strategy. And you can see listed here the California Low-NOx Engine Standard
and the Accelerated Turnover of Agricultural Equipment measures, which I just mentioned, along with the two measures on lower opacity limits and amended warranty requirements for heavy-duty vehicles, which the Board already adopted in May and June of last year.

Like the District, CARB's SIP commitment is to achieve aggregate emission reductions, in this case one ton per day direct PM2.5 and 32 tons per day NOx. So if a particular measure does not get its expected emission reductions, the State is still committed to achieving the total aggregate emission reductions through other measures.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: These measures result in reductions of direct PM2.5 and NOx emissions that get the valley to attainment. And here we can see the breakdown of the measures' contribution to total reductions.

Looking first at direct PM2.5, about half of the new reductions come from area source control measures, shown here in orange, including the strengthened residential wood burning rule, commercial charbroiling, and enhanced conservation management practices.

The other half of the needed reductions come from mobile source measures, shown here in blue, especially
from the incentive-based turnover of agricultural equipment.

And looking at NOx, most of the new reductions come from mobile source measures, including again turnover of agricultural equipment, and turnover of trucks and buses, and the Lower In-Use Emission Performance Level measure. Additional NOx reductions come from tightened controls on stationary sources like flares, boilers, process heaters, and internal combustion engines at ag operations.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: Taken together, reductions from all these District and CARB measures provide significant air quality benefits for the valley, and we can look at the impact that reductions will have on actual PM2.5 air quality levels taking Fresno as an example.

As shown in this slide in the plan base year of 2013, the 24-hour PM2.5 concentration is 60 micrograms per cubic meter. And after implementing the proposed District and State measures, we can see that the plan delivers about a 40 percent improvement in air quality, getting to attainment of the 35 microgram 24-hour standard in 2024.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: As the Board
heard last October, incentive funds will continue to be a
critical element of successfully reducing emissions. The
District already administers a successful incentive
program in the valley. And we want to make sure that
incentive dollars continue to flow to keep the programs'
success going.

To put incentive funds in context, while
regulatory actions account for almost 90 percent of the
emission reductions in the Valley PM2.5 Plan, emission
reductions from incentive programs are needed for that
last increment to reach attainment.

About $5 billion in incentives will be needed in
the valley through 2024 to successfully achieve the
emission reductions needed for attainment. A good portion
of that estimated amount is needed to continue to fund the
successful work of the ag industry to retrofit and replace
ag equipment above and beyond the accelerated pace they've
already set.

The Valley PM2.5 Plan estimates that about 12,000
pieces of ag equipment will need to be replaced as part of
the effort to get to attainment. And the District and the
ag industry are working now to distribute over $200
million for fiscal years 2017-18 and 2018-19 to get a head
start on that number.

--o0o--
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: So as we start to think about the next phase for the plan, transitioning into implementation, securing a steady stream of incentive funds will be one of the areas we'll want to focus on and make a priority.

This will be a joint effort with CARB, the district, the ag industry and others working together to pursue those incentive dollars. Another important focus, as we move forward, will be the implementation of the residential wood-burning rule. Multilingual education and outreach will be an important component, as will health-protective daily air quality forecasting, and stepped up enforcement.

The District has already started the process of exploring feasible alternatives to open agricultural burning, such as soil incorporation, and that will continue into the plan implementation phase.

Lastly, CARB has a number of research efforts underway to improve the understanding of various ammonia sources in California. This involves deployment of a mobile measurement platform equipped with a state-of-the-science ammonia analyzer and other advanced instruments, as well as studies on the effectiveness of various alternative manure management practices to reduce emissions.
These are all subjects that came up repeatedly from the public and from Board members during the development of the Valley PM2.5 Plan. And CARB and the district will continue to be closely engaged on these issues as we move forward with implementation of the SIP.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: Another important piece as we move beyond plan development and into plan implementation is regular reporting on our progress, to make sure both CARB and the District are staying on track to meet our goals laid out in the SIP.

Based on direction received from the Board during the October 2018 hearing, CARB staff proposes to report annually to the Board on the status of implementation of the plan. The purpose of the reporting is to provide an opportunity for staff and the Board to evaluate in a transparent manner whether we're progressing as expected towards meeting the valley's clean air goals, and, if not, to allow for needed course corrections.

Staff is proposing to update the Board on the six topics shown here. Reporting on air quality and emissions trends could include how PM2.5 air quality changed in the last year regionally and locally, and whether control measures are resulting in reductions in direct PM2.5 and NOx at the needed pace.
On enforcement, CARB will report on what the State and District are doing to enforce our regulations and rules in the valley, including potentially an update on CARB's roadside inspections for heavy-duty trucks, and implementation of the District's wintertime residential Check Before You Burn program.

While the Valley PM2.5 Plan is based on the best currently available science, there are a number of studies and research efforts currently underway that could provide new information on how PM2.5 forms in the valley. So staff plans to update the Board on preliminary findings from these projects, and any implications for the SIP control strategy, including potentially on ammonia, NOx from soils, and species-resolved PM2.5 monitoring in Fresno.

On regulatory actions, CARB will report on whether we and the District are on track with meeting our rulemaking commitments, including an update on workshops already held or scheduled and the date of any scheduled Board action.

And, of course, staff plans to report on the status of money secured to fund the incentive-based projects needed to accelerate the last increment of reductions and any update to the amount of funding needed.

Separate from the Valley PM2.5 plan, there are
other concerns that CARB is tracking and could also include in these annual reports to the Board. As Mr. Corey mentioned, we'll be working with the val -- or with the District on evaluating the valley's emission reduction credits, or ERCs, and progress updates on that process could be included here.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CARR: It's been a long process to get to this point, but the two years of work on the Valley PM2.5 Plan have produced a SIP that shows attainment of all four PM2.5 standards and will result in significant air quality improvement for the valley.

So staff recommends that the Board adopt the two PM2.5 plans being considered and direct the Executive Officer to transmit them to U.S. EPA as a revision to the California SIP.

Adoption of the tabled 2016 moderate plan for the 12 microgram annual standard is still needed, and CARB must submit this plan together with the 2018 comprehensive Valley PM2.5 Plan as a package to fully address Clean Air Act requirements for the 12 microgram standard.

That concludes the presentation. And I would now like to introduce Samir Sheikh, the Air Pollution Control Officer of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District to provide a few comments on the SIP.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning. Welcome.

MR. SHEIKH: Thank you, and good morning. And welcome to you actually to Fresno.

CHAIR NICHOLS: It's true. It's the other way around.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, welcome to our meeting.

(Laughter.)

MR. SHEIKH: No. Thank you. And I know -- I know most, if not all, of the Board members are certainly no strangers here to Fresno and to the valley. But it is always nice to see you here. I wanted to welcome you to Fresno. And actually this building used to be where our agency was housed about 20 years ago or so. So it is nice to see you here.

And this building in particular there's a little bit of a District history to it as well. And I would encourage everybody to go out and hopefully get some fresh air a bit perhaps later. Looking at the readings, it's looking pretty good today so far. But as you know, during the wintertime, we do have some difficult PM issues. So hopefully we don't see that rise a little bit later today. We do have a no-burn day, by the way, in effect today just to note.

So I wanted to first start off by thanking the
Board for your attention to this plan, and really encourage you to adopt this plan today. It's been a lot of work by -- by not only the Board, who's kept a very close eye on the activities related to the plan, but really the staff. I wanted to thank Richard and Kurt -- and I'm looking around the chairs over here -- a lot of the staff that have been involved Webster, and Laura -- great presentation by Laura -- and Sylvia and Michael, all who have taken a lot of time to be in the valley for a lot of meetings, meeting with us, meeting with stakeholders, through public workshops. You know, actually dozens of meetings really when you add it up, in addition to the public workshops that have been taken to help support adoption of this plan.

I also wanted to thank all of the stakeholders that have really taken the time. A lot of these meetings are in the evening. It's not easy to come out and go through what often is, you know, very dense information about PM2.5. Health advocates who have been at the table, the industry stakeholders who are all a part of this plan. I really appreciate all the time that everybody has taken to really help shape this and make it the best plan possible over these couple of years that we've been working on this.

Our boards did lay out a challenge for all of us
to, you know, go back and sharpen our pencils and see what
we can come up with in terms of what the best possible
measures could be under this plan. And I think before you
today you have a plan that's very comprehensive. It
includes a number of measures across stationary and mobile
sources, everything from getting residents involved with
the residential wood-burning strategy to all of the
industries. And then, of course, the mobile sector, where
obviously CARB, you know, is putting a lot of attention
into dealing with those issues.

And there is no doubt that even with all the
progress we've made over the years, we have invested, as
you all know, billions of dollars across all of the
measures. Fleets right now are currently complying with
the State Truck and Bus Reg. Stationary sources are
complying with even upcoming deadlines with our existing
rules. Those have taken a lot of resources to put into
place.

But even with all of that, we know there's a big
challenge here with dealing with PM2.5. And so this plan
really keeps that ball moving forward. It's very
aggressive. It's bold. It's innovative. It has a number
of measures that I think we can all, upon adoption of this
plan, continue to work on, so we can actually focus on
implementation, and move forward with these measures. I
wanted to thank the Board again for keeping an eye on that.

I wanted to just talk really quick about -- about the plan, and what it really means for us here in the valley. There are, as I just mentioned, a number of really important measures in this plan. As was mentioned by staff, the residential wood-burning strategy is one that we've been working on for a long time here in this region. It's been evolving over time. We've done rule after rule to continue ratcheting down on those requirements. We've done a lot of public education and outreach. Because if we don't do that, you actually can't implement that measure, you know, without having the public totally bought into what we're trying to do, have some incentives available so we can transition to natural gas and other technologies, and then have folks listen to us when we go out there and do, you know, no burn days, you know, make sure we have complete buy-in.

And I can tell you that the public is -- you know, over these years that we've implemented that strategy is increasingly and I think strongly behind efforts to move forward with that strategy. And I think with -- what we have in the plan, where we continue to ratchet down on the no-burn threshold, while providing that education and outreach with incentives, really moves
that bar forward. And I hope to see some great progress in that area as we move forward with that.

I think on the other areas there with under-fired charbroiling, this is again one of those community-level measures that we've been working on. It's the first of its kind. I know there's been talk about doing these types of things in other areas. I can tell you with the measure we have in this plan, it really will, you know, once again put the San Joaquin Valley on the map in terms of coming up with the first and sort of unique measure for that category.

It's not an easy one to tackle. There are a lot of small businesses out there that are -- we're now engaging with, trying to understand, you know, what it's going to mean to put on controls on their restaurants. And we know there's a very small, you know, bottom line, you know, when it comes to those types of businesses. But we have incentives that we're trying to make available. Of course, we could always use more resources to help with that, because it is a very bold measure.

And so we're going to be moving forward with that. We're already engaging with those restaurants, polling them, registering them, and also inviting them to participate. And we're seeing increased response from them and taking advantage of our funding to put on those
new technologies, so we can prove them out, have local
eamples that others can look at, and see that they work,
and then in a short amount of time actually make a big
difference hopefully with that measure -- you know, with a
regulatory backstop that's going to be -- that's going to
go along with those incentives with that measure.

On the other areas, you know, I wanted to also
let you know with adoption of our plan, we've also moved
very quickly forward with a couple of key areas that came
up during the public process.

The nut harvesting operations. You know, upon
adoption of our plan, we actually approved the new
incentive program to really move forward with those
technologies that could reduce emissions from those
activities. That program is up and running. We're having
a lot of interest in that program. And it's one that we
continue to want to grow over time and see if we can make
a major shift happen with those activities as a result of
that type of an effort.

And then we also opened a new program to pursue
alternatives to ag burning, particularly practices like
the soil incorporation or whole orchard recycling, as
sometimes is referred to. Actually, that program is also
seeing a lot of interest. We're seeing growers that are
interested in trying those practices and really learning
from them, coming to us and taking advantage of those funds.

We hope that through those types of programs we can keep promoting those things and answer the kind of questions that I think the growers need to see answered for them to do a wider adoption of those types of measures, because we know that that issue is one that, you know, requires some really creative solutions to tackle with some of the ongoing issues that we've seen there.

And then lastly, you know, one that doesn't get quite as much attention, but I know this Board actually took some action recently, a couple of months ago, at your Board meeting is commercial lawn and maintenance equipment, where upon adoption of our plan -- again, this is a community level program. You know, often it doesn't show up as the biggest issue from a modeling and attainment perspective, but we do think every -- every piece of this plan is important, even if individually they may not be the big -- you know, the biggest measures, you know, when it comes to the tonnage and the attainment modeling.

But there, we did adopt a new incentive program that built upon a pilot effort that was supported by CARB several years ago. That program actually funds zero emissions equipment in the commercial sector. I think
that, along with -- we actually have a comprehensive
strategy in this plan that I think again will be a good
example for other regions. But it includes coming up with
best practices, model requirements that cities and
counties could consider adopting, as well as incentives
for this zero emissions equipment that we hope can make a
difference at that community level with the commercial
lawn and garden equipment.

And when you couple that with the stationary
source measures, as was mentioned by staff, we're out
there right now actually workshopping a new flare rule.
We're looking at boiler -- enhanced boiler and steam
generator requirements, glass plants, IC engines, you name
it. There's a number of measures in the plan that are
going -- going to be going through very robust public
processes, that are going to continue moving the ball
forward with industries that have been heavily regulated
over the years, but where we think we may be able to find
some additional opportunities. There's quite a bit in
this plan to support, you know, with respect to all of
these measures.

On the mobile side, I wanted to thank the Board
again for what you did back in October with the mobile
SIP. It did draw a clear marker for what we would like to
see happen here with respect to the mobile sources of
emissions. There is quite a bit of funding that's going
to be required that goes along with that mobile SIP. And
so we are working with all of our valley stakeholders and
with you to make sure that there is funding out there. As
was mentioned, the FARMER funding and the agricultural
equipment replacement program is a key component of that.

And so we are working right now, as was mentioned
in the presentation, to distribute those $200 million of
State funds that have come our way for those programs. I
can tell you the ag industry is responding, working very,
very closely with us to do as much as we can cost
effectively with those funds, and move that needle
forward.

But we do need to work together to really push
for even more funding to assist us with those efforts.
And, you know, it is a very critical part of this plan,
and we are in the legislative cycle right now. And those
decisions are being made right now. So I wanted to note,
you know, that we needed to work together to keep moving
that ball forward. And we all saw what came out in the
Governor's budget. And I'm not going to get into detail
about that. But, you know, there's clearly some work to
be done to keep pushing that ball forward.

So I wanted to thank the staff again and the
Board, and really just express our gratitude for, you
know, everything you've done to help us put this plan
together. I want to also just note that Mr. Corey and I
have had a conversation, you know, about the emission
reduction credit question that's come up.

I can tell you that we're committed to working
with Richard and with the staff to take a look at any
questions related to that program. And I just wanted to
let the Board know that it's an ongoing conversation, and
we're very interested in being a part of that, and seeing,
you know, where we want to go with that.

So with that, I'm happy to answer any questions
you may have as you continue deliberation on the plan and
thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks for being here, and -- to
support and add some detail to the plan and the process.
If you will be able to stay here for the duration, we may
want to call you back for some questions. But I think for
now, we can just proceed to the people who have signed up
to speak to us.

Thank you.

MR. SHEIKH: Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: So we have a list of witnesses
somewhere. Is it posted behind us?

Okay. People can see it. All right. So let's
begin with Tom Frantz.
MR. FRANTZ: Hello. Tom Frantz from Kern County, Association of Irritated Residents and other groups that I work with here in the valley to promote cleaner air.

So yeah, I took the train this morning in dense fog from Wasco through Hanford and Corcoran up here. But it was a burn day down in Kern County. I just don't understand that. Even if the air is predicted to be moderate, we shouldn't allow burning, especially when there's any chance of that thick fog coming in like it was this morning, and that happens a lot.

I want to talk about only -- I want to talk about cows. I live in the same house where I was raised over 60 years ago. But about in 2004, suddenly 60,000 cows became new neighbors of mine within a few miles of where I live. They weren't there before. And in Kern County as a whole, about three times that number invaded our space. And it's no surprise that the design value for PM2.5 in Kern County has not improved at all the last ten years. It's still where it was. Those cows have a lot to do with that. And the ammonia is a big part of that as well.

Ammonium nitrate and ammonium sulfate make up about two-thirds of our PM2.5 on the worst days in Kern County. That's in all the graphs. The fact that we're still not analyzing properly ways to reduce that ammonia, it's to -- unfortunate. I mean, the plan says we don't
know if it's feasible or not to reduce that ammonia.

    Well, obviously, if they can make it, we can reduce it. And it's unfortunate that within CARB, you know, we have the AB 32 planning to reduce methane from dairies. And part of that is to do alternative manure management. Now -- but nobody looked at alternative manure management in terms of how much ammonia it reduces.

    That should be emphasized in all this planning.

And the air people and the greenhouse gas people need to work together more closely on things like that. If we don't get the NOx emissions needed in this plan, ammonia reductions could be very significant in a place like Kern County. And we need to be looking at that much more closely at ways to get it done. And at the earliest possible moment, if it looks like we don't have the funding to get all these NOx reductions, we need to have a contingency of strong ammonia regulation.

    Thank you.

    CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

    Thank you.

    I won't call your names. If you'll just be ready to come up when your turn comes.

    Thanks.

    MS. CREMERS: Good morning. Noelle Cremers with the California Farm Bureau Federation. I want to start by
expressing my appreciation to staff both at the District
level and CARB staff for reaching out to us and having an
open line of communication as the SIP was developed.

There are significant measures included in this
SIP for emission reduction. They will not be easy to
achieve. Replacing 12,000 tractors by 2024 will take
yeoman's work to get done, but that doesn't mean that
we're not committed to trying to achieve that goal.
Having clean air in the valley is important to all of us,
and this SIP we hope will help get us there.

We appreciate that there are incentives included.
And that's the first focus in working towards reducing air
pollution.

It -- we are committed to working to help obtain
those incentives. We are concerned given that the
Governor's budget only has 25 million to go towards ag
equipment replacement, which is only a drop in the bucket
to the estimated $1.4 billion that replacing those
tractors is going to take.

But we are committed to working -- to increase
those funds. And we ask that the Air Resources Board and
District - which I really appreciate Mr. Sheikh's similar
request -- that we all work together in achieving those
funds, because we're not going to be successful without
the necessary incentives.
Farm Bureau is committed to working and staying engaged as the other measures are developed. Obviously, the IC engine replacement, conservation management practices, and the heavy-duty vehicle inspection and maintenance program all have potential impacts on California agriculture. And we will work with staff and look forward to working with staff to implement all of the measures and make sure that it's done in a way that reduces the impacts to ag in the greatest possible way.

Thank you.

MR. ISOM: Good morning, Madam Chair, members of the Board. My name is Roger Isom. I'm with the California Cotton Ginters and Growers Association, and the Western Agricultural Processors Association. And I too want to welcome you to Fresno. Thank you for taking the time to come here and hear the concerns and comments.

Today, we're here to support this plan. As was stated, this is a very comprehensive plan. I don't want to understate that. This, in a lot of ways, is a culture change. There are significant measures in here. And as we stated back in October with the -- with regard to the mobile source part, this is a significant change, and we are committed to seeing this through.

With that said, I want to start by stating our apprecia -- or stating our appreciation to the CARB
staff and the Air District staff for working with us. One of the measures or a series of measures in there have to deal with conservation management practices. And as we did in the first round of agricultural practices, we are going to work with the universities, with CARB staff, and Air District staff to study those to determine the best measures that actually reduce PM2.5. And we've already started that process, so thank you very much on that.

I also too want to talk about the incentives. And quite frankly, the 25 million that's in the current proposed budget is not enough. If we want this to be successful, and we all do, we've got to get that increased. Already, in the first $108 million that was there, the District received over $250 million in requests. So the desire is there. When we talk about electric ATVs, one that we've never touched before, where we have farms wanting to convert to electric ATVs, in six weeks, the first six weeks of the program, the District has issued over 279 vouchers.

Its -- we knew the desire was there. This created the opportunity, and it's -- farmers are taking advantage of it. The fact of the matter is, is that now six weeks ago, they weren't selling electric ATVs. Today, there's a backlog at every electric ATV dealer in the valley. They're actually having to go out of state to try
to find electric ATVs. So it's an incredible sign.

The last comment I want to make is with regards
to alternatives to ag burning. This is probably the
one -- one of the more challenging ones. As we shut down
biomass plants, what do we do with this agricultural
waste? We have -- our own organization has nine projects
right now trying to find solutions. I'm happy to report
that one of them, which would build one of the largest
cellulosic ethanol plants would be in Madera County here
in the valley just north of here. It actually received
their first $5 million grant from the Energy Commission
this week.

And so we are well on our way to doing that.
That plant alone would handle 330,000 tons of agricultural
byproduct per year. So it's a significant step in the
right direction, but we have a very long way to go. And
we just want to restate our commitment to seeing this
thing through and ask that you guys support this plan
today and support the request to keep those incentives
where they were.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

DR. GAROUPA WHITE: Good morning. My name is Dr.
Catherine Garoupa White. And I'm the coordinator for
Californians Against Fracking and Dangerous Drilling.
Thank you for coming to Fresno -- although, technically I'm from Madera -- and to all of the stakeholders who put in so much time to the PM2.5 plan.

While generally we support this plan, we do believe that regulations and oversight related to the oil and gas industry can go further. So today, I'm going to focus my comments specifically on the request for the emission reduction credit audit, knowing that you've received great detail, and I only have three minutes to cover a lot.

Many of you were probably aware that 75 percent of the state's oil extraction happens in Kern County and that we are one of the leading oil producing states in the nation. So when I started my work, of course, was very concerned about air quality and environmental justice issues in Kern County related to oil and gas emissions. And the emission reduction credit banks immediately came to the fore as a lingering concern that has been in existence for decades.

The lion's share of these credits are owned by the oil and gas industry, so unfortunately it's not surprising to us that by the ARB's own inventory, emissions from this sector continue to go up despite increasing regulations.

So in August 2017, a broad based coalition of
environmental health and justice organizations submitted a letter to your board requesting an audit of the ERC banks. And the response that we got was that we needed to provide further information and documentation of what our concerns were. The result of which was the undeserved credit report that you all received with the January 9th letter that we submitted again requesting the audit of the ERC banks.

Two primary concerns that were documented and validated in this report is that many of these credits appear to be invalid when they were originally issued. There's substantial documentation showing that the San Joaquin Valley Air District who manages these banks at times went against the recommendations of their own staff in originally issuing some of these credits.

The second concern is that the San Joaquin Valley Air District enjoys a special arrangement for what's called equivalency demonstration, which means that old credits stay in the bank, and we are unable to discern how equivalency is calculated. So this piece is unknown to us and why we're asking for the technical expertise of the Air Resources Board.

Our initial assessment has shown approximately a third of the ERCs in the VOC bank and half of the credits in the carbon dioxide equivalent bank may be invalid. And
so we think that further review of these certificates
would likely raise questions of their overall validity
and, of course, of their -- if the credits are invalid,
then the permits using them to meet their emission
reductions would be in jeopardy.

So because of this long and well-documented
history that is shrouded in unverifiable results, we're
requesting ARB staff audit the ERC banks of the San
Joaquin valley starting with NOx, VOCs, and CO2
equivalents. Both VOCs and NOx are precursors to PM2.5,
and thus important within the context of the plan, as well
as more broadly to the attainment of air quality standards
for the San Joaquin Valley and to reducing environmental
injustices, such as the disproportionate burden these
emissions are placing in Kern County.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. ROSE: Good morning. Mark Rose, Sierra
Nevada field representative for National Parks
Conservation Association. I also live and work here in
Fresno.

I want to thank the CARB Board for this
opportunity to comment and for coming down here to Fresno.
I hope you guys come here more often. I also want to
thank CARB staff and District staff for all their hard
work on this plan over the last few years.

Although the deadline for this plan was over two years ago, we are extremely happy to see that the plan has grown stronger and that we finally made it to a vote.

That being said, we at NPCA are seriously concerned that what we have in front of us today is less of a complete plan and more -- as required under the Clean Air Act and more of a IOU to valley residents that leaves numerous sources of particulate pollution off the table.

It is clear that both CARB's mobile source plan and the District's stationary source plan rely unrealistically on the premise that everything in the plan will go -- go just right to allow the valley to reach attainment with all four of these PM2.5 health standards.

This includes an assumption of nearly full compliance with various regulations in the plan, as well as roughly $5 billion worth of incentive funding, $4 billion of which has not been identified or secured.

EPA's own guidance states that voluntary incentive based strategies must be surplus, quantifiable, permanent, and enforceable. That standard seems out of reach in this case. Should this plan fail to secure billions in incentives or achieve reasonable progress towards attainment, we are told that CARB will commit to achieving aggregate emissions reductions with no other
specifics on what that means.

This kind of ambiguous black box planning is legally -- legally dubious and ignores the voices of valley residents who rely on CARB and the District to clean up air.

In the face of federal roll-backs for clean car standards, wood-burning devices, greenhouse gases, et cetera, we in the valley need a buffer to bridge the growing failures of clean air rules coming out of Washington. Further, in light of the recent proposal by the BLM's Bakersfield office to open up 1.6 million acres of nearby federal land to oil and gas extraction, we need guarantees that the valley will be protected from runaway pollution that might push attainment with plans like this out of reach.

This is why we need a plan that includes specific, concrete, and enforceable contingency measures, whether this comes from EPA during their review or from the District and CARB throughout implementation.

We also desperately need more resources put towards educating the public about existing rules and ensuring that those rules are properly enforced. We are happy to see that 90 percent of the reductions in CARB's portion of the plan will come from regulations. However, in order to reach attainment with PM2.5 standards by the
2024 and 2025 deadlines, this plan relies far too heavily on the ten percent of reductions that will come from billions in incentives, while simultaneously ignoring a variety of stationary sources.

I'll leave it to my co-worker Ulla and our allies to discuss what some of those solutions might be to improve the plan in the upcoming years. In the meantime, we look forward to working with both agencies and EPA to ensure that the plan is effectively and timely implemented.

Thank you very much.

MS. REEVES: Good morning. My name is Ulla Reeves. I'm also with National Parks Conservation Association. I am advocacy manager in the clean air program.

I'm originally from California, born and raised, but I don't live here anymore. And I treasure the opportunities when I get to visit like on this trip. On Tuesday, I was treated to stunning long range views of the snow capped Sierras, and of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Park. I was reminded of this incredibly special natural resource literally right here in the backyard of the Central Valley. But sadly I know that that view was only available to me, because of recent rains and it's typically non-existent.
Those mountains and California's national parks are usually lost in the haze of air pollution that coats the valley. This is simultaneously harmful to our lungs, and it's also devastating for our special ecosystems in those natural -- national parks. So my comments today come from both a personal and a professional place.

As Mark mentioned, regarding the plan before CARB today, there are numerous solutions that should be detailed and implementation that don't require the tenuous reliance on incentive funding. Many of these are additional specific stationary source reduction measures, and we're concerned that they're not already here.

The absence of them spells weakness and potentially sets the stage for a failure to reach attainment of the PM2.5 standards. Specifically, while we appreciate the new pilot program to explore alternatives to agricultural burning, the cost of burning variance permits needs to increase, and other alternatives should be quickly identified and implemented as most stringent measures.

The fees that are required for prescribed burning on National Forest or National Park Service lands ought to be decreased or removed. All oil and gas operations, not just the major ones, ought to be required to reduce emissions, including flaring, boilers, steam generators,
and process heaters. We're also still concerned about the hot spot strategy as a whole. Despite good improvements here, we should move toward a single standard for wood stoves for the entire valley. And incentives for new wood stoves and charbroilers ought to be available valley wide.

The District needs to additionally regulate PM2.5 from biomass facilities, and require the most up-to-date control technology on all of these facilities. Lastly, we remain deeply concerned about the role that ammonia emissions play as an extremely influential precursor to PM2.5 pollution.

I'm pleased to see that that's in the plan, but CARB and the District must continue to evaluate aggressive and feasible strategies to control ammonia from dairy farms and CAFOs.

Thank you for your time. I hope that through your diligence to boldly and courageously tackle the air pollution challenges in this region, I might some day return and see those stunning views of the Sierras and know that it wasn't a fluke or a rare occurrence.

Thank you.

MR. SUNDERGILL: Good morning. Ron Sundergill with National Parks Conservation Association, the Regional Director of NPCA.

When I was a child with my parents visiting
national parks, I really gained an appreciation for the beautiful vistas and landscapes of our national parks back in the fifties and sixties.

But fast forward to 2019, and most of those landscapes and vistas -- scenic vistas, especially the ones that are close by here, are pretty much gone. And that's from the impact of fine particulate matter and ozone on these parks. And that impact is pretty devastating, and it needs to be corrected.

So what are the impacts?

Okay. Well, there's the scenic views. We lose an average of 90 miles of scenic view at Sequoia Kings Canyon National Park, and we lose about close to 60 miles of views at Yosemite.

Another impact, of course, is health. When people come to these parks, they are exposed to extensive pollution. It's actually worse in Sequoia Kings Canyon and Yosemite often than Los Angeles. Worse than Los Angeles.

The effect on plants. They can -- the pollution can stifle the growth of plants. It interferes with the basics of photosynthesis and other basic functions that affect plants. And UC Merced researchers have found that these pollutants may, in fact, be contributing in a significant way to the die-off of the trees in the Sierra
Nevadas.

So when I go to Beetle Rock Overlook at Sequoia Kings Canyon, the last ten times I've been there, I haven't really seen much. That's an incredible view of the valley from Sequoia National Park. The last ten times it's been pretty bad over the last 15 years.

Twenty years from now when my grandson is 27, and I'm 85, I am looking forward to coming back to Sequoia and hopefully seeing that wonderful view. And so I urge you to be vigilant and do what you can to make even improvements on this plan.

And lastly, I wanted to let you know that we have submitted a petition and letters from about 2,000 people here in the region, and you have that. I gave that to staff.

CHAIR NICHOLS: We have that.

MR. SUNDERGILL: And thank you. Great. Thank you very much.

MS. YOUNG: Good morning. My name is Connie Young. I'm a Fresno resident, a retired registered nurse, and a volunteer with Citizens' Climate Lobby, also known as CCL. Thank you for coming back to Fresno.

I appreciate too all the time and effort that you, our valley air district board and staff, and our dedicated community air quality advocates, and other
stakeholders have put into this PM2.5 plan. It certainly will be an improvement. And for that, I am grateful.

However, according to the first law of holes, if you find yourself in a hole, stop digging. The world currently has found itself in a big hole. It's called climate change. What it looks like in our already polluted air basin is more dust from severe droughts, possibly more ozone from increasing heat waves, more pollen from a longer -- from longer warmer growing seasons, and more smoke from wildfires.

Since many of our air pollutants contribute to climate change, it's imperative that we take every opportunity to eliminate, or at least reduce, those pollutants.

The new PM2.5 plan will help. But given the urgency of climate change as described in the recent fourth National Climate Assessment, even more needs to be done. I ask that the Board take advantage of several opportunities for oversight.

First, review the valley's largest stationary sources of PM2.5 to find potential opportunities for emission reductions.

Second, audit the ERC banks in the San Joaquin Valley, and address any problems that may be uncovered.

Third, increase oversight and expedite a review
of the valley's agricultural burning program. Every
effort must be made to find and implement alternatives to
this polluting practice.

Finally, I would also like to briefly mention
federal bipartisan legislation, which could have a
significant positive impact on our air quality.

The Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act was
introduced in both the U.S. House and Senate late last
year, and it will be reintroduced in this session of
Congress. If enacted, it could reduce carbon emissions by
40 percent in 12 years. This would considerably help to
clean up our air, and save lives. I hope you all support
it.

We're in a deep hole and we need to stop digging,
or in our case, make every effort to reduce the greenhouse
gas pollution that we're putting into the air that we
breathe.

Thank you.

MR. RUSHING: Good morning. There we go.

Good morning. Rocky Rushnig with Coalition for
Clean Air. I want to thank staff and especially the
community advocates that have worked very hard on this
plan. I thought it was worth mentioning what's at stake
here. We're talking about the health of millions of
valley residents. And here too many children rely on
inhaling, too many elderly residents are house-bound by
air that's poisonous to them, and there are too many
preventable deaths occurring.

And for those reasons, CCA supports the plan
before you and urges its adoption, as it is a step
forward. However, the underpinnings of the plan aren't as
strong as we would like to see them. In particular, and
as has been mentioned by other speakers, the Governor's
budget, as proposed in January, casts a shadow over the
strategy. On paper, the strategy is sound, but there is a
big hole as others have mentioned. And that's the fact
that four-fifths of the incentive dollars needed to -- for
implementation have not been identified.

In particular, clean trucks, buses, and freight
equipment would decline, according to the Governor's
budget by an already inadequate 180 million to 132 million
in the budget year. Ag and diesel would come down from
132 million to 25 million. And staff has identified ag --
equipment replacement as a key component of this plan.

And we know California's share of the Fiat
settlement will not go far enough to plug these holes. It
won't be adequate at all. Advocates like Coalition for
Clean Air and others here in this room will be working
with the legislature, will be advocating for more money.
But I don't think a comprehensive strategy, as this has
been described by staff, should rely on the success of
advocates under the dome.

Coalition for Clean Air wants to incorporate our
comments with others regarding the ERC program here in the
District, and we support a call for an audit of that
program. And like others have mentioned, I think it's
going to take a strong outreach, education awareness, and
enforcement to ensure that wood burning and charbroiling
come under control. And I think that's going to take work
with valley organizations and individuals to develop a
comprehensive strategy to make that happen.

I want to thank you for your time and attention
and go Bull Dogs.

Thank you.

(Laughter.)

MS. MORROW: Thank you very much. Madam Chair
and Board members, I am here today on behalf of Southern
California Gas Company's thousands of customers and
hundreds of our employees and their families who live and
work in the San Joaquin Valley. I personally live and
work here in Fresno.

SoCalGas has engaged in the development of this
2. -- in the multiple 2.5 plans actually from the
beginning and support its adoption. The plan shows that
heavy heavy-duty diesel trucks contribute over 58 percent
of the NOx emissions from all on-road vehicles. Thus, we appreciate ARB's recognition that State action is needed to accelerate NOx reductions from this sector.

Compressed natural gas engines that are 90 percent cleaner than the most stringent engine standards have been available since 2016 for heavy heavy-duty trucks. And when paired with renewable natural gas, which can have a deep carbon negative intensity, they provide not only significant NOx emission reductions, but reductions in greenhouse gas emissions as well.

As has been mentioned many times, last October this Board adopted the supplement for the San Joaquin Valley to the 2016 State Strategy. It included a State measure to provide funding to accelerate the turnover of 33,000 trucks and buses beyond the rate of natural turnover achieved by implementation of other adopted measures, but Board action was only committed to in 2021.

To achieve the NOx reductions that ARB committed to for the San Joaquin Valley, ARB cannot wait to act. Even with a motivated and highly efficient local San Joaquin Valley Air District, it will be a huge challenge to orchestrate turnover of 33,000 trucks.

ARB needs to begin right away. And I actually saw some of this in the presentation and was incredibly pleased, so to secure the necessary billions in truck
incentive fundings, develop an -- so secure the funding, develop an alternative fuel infrastructure plan and ramp up truck fleet outreach.

It will also be important to closely monitor reductions from all accelerated turnover measures, including this and the tractors for example. In your adopted supplement for the State strategy, we want to see ARB fulfill its promises to the people in the San Joaquin Valley. And SoCalGas is ready to support staff and assist in planning, implementation, and outreach -- outreach to achieve success.

Thank you very much.

MR. MENZ: Good morning. My name is Thomas Menz. I'm a resident of Fresno County. I live about ten miles south and east of here in an area that your modelers showed would not reach attainment by the 2024 attainment deadline for the 24-hour fine particulate standard.

I don't believe that this plan does all that it can do with respect to residential wood burning. And I don't believe it fulfills the statutory requirements with respect to most stringent measures. My next door neighborhood has an old uncertified wood stove from the early seventies that's very dirty. It produces a massive amount of disgusting smoke. So whenever the Air District says, hey, the air is no longer bad, everybody can go
ahead and burn, I go from bad to worse.

So, you know, I never get a break. That's the way the rules are designed. And I seldom have a day of cold months where I'm not inundated with smoke.

So I'm aware that were I living under the protections of Santa Rosa, California, I wouldn't face that additional assault on my health, because that category of residential wood-burning heater is forbidden. It can't be used ever. And if I were living in the Tacoma-Pierce County Smoke Reduction Area, again, I wouldn't have that smoke pervading my garden, and infiltrating my home, because the protections provided by the implementation plan of the State of Washington, which forbids that source category of residential wood-burning heater, you can't even have one in your home there.

So when I read in your staff report that this implementation plan applies the most stringent measures that have been implemented or achieved in practice for any source or source category anywhere else in the United States, that is not the case. That's a fiction.

This valley air district has estimated that there are 26,000 of these dirty devices. So multiply that out. Thirty grams an hour, times 26,000, times four hour of an average fire, and that's over three and a half tons of emissions per hour potentially from this source category,
which other areas have banned outright.

Now, this plan curtails their use only at -- for a portion of the year, at 12 or 20 micrograms per cubic meter, depending on the county. So the extra 25 days of the year of protection that this plan affords is an improvement, but it doesn't meet what other places are doing.

And that isn't the only source category to which this plan applies more lenient measures compared to what other districts are doing. So the Clean Air Act requires of this plan the most stringent measures that have been implemented or achieved in practice for any source or source category anywhere in the United States. This plan does not do that. It falls short.

And I believe that the Clean Air Act does give you the tools that are necessary to achieve those reductions and achieve attainment.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. MARTINEZ: Good morning. My name is Nayamin Martinez. I am the director of the Central California Environmental Justice Network, better known as CCEJN.

For almost two decades, we have been working with residents from disadvantaged communities across the San Joaquin Valley. These residents unfortunately were not
able to come today, because they are, you know, harvesting
our fields as we speak, or doing whatever job they do.

However, I am here to be their voice, because
when we shared this plan with them, the main concern they
had is what is going to happen if the $5 billion that are
required for this plan to give all the incentives that are
needed don't -- cannot be found.

And these residents might not have an
environmental science degree, but they are smart enough to
understand that if you rely on money that is hypothetical,
you are in trouble. So their question is what is going to
be plan B? What is going to happen if this money doesn't
come through? And I wish I could have a response from all
of you, from the CARB, from the Air District, so I can
take back to these residents and share with them.

I also have some concrete recommendations that
definitely go beyond hoping that we are going to get those
five billion. I want you to take seriously your role as
public health entities. You are mandated to protect my
health and the health of everybody else in California.
And there's some ways very specific that you can do that.
For one, what is going to happen in the meantime -- in
these five or ten years that it is going to take to clean
our air?

We need to start protecting people that are
already out there working in the fields, doing landscaping, or working in construction. All days where we have high levels of PM2.5, how are we telling them to protect their health? That's an easy fix. We need robust, comprehensive educational campaigns, both at the State and the regional level that let residents know how to protect their health.

Second, we need to change behaviors. And having a billboard that says Check Before You Burn, but don't explain why your personal choice is affecting public health is not going to cut it. So we need that you and the Air District work together with public health experts to come up with campaigns that educate and change behaviors of these people that are burning their fireplaces just for because it's cozy, because that was part of their family traditions in Christmas or the wintertime.

So those things are very easy to do, even if you don't get the five billion. But I would really want to have an answer of what is going to happen if we don't get those five billion?

Thank you.

MR. POWELL: Hello. Good morning. Thank you being here and thank you for having me. I'm Daylon Powell. I'm here with CART from Environmental Science
Lab. And I go to Bullard High School as well. I'm concerned about the air quality, because my family's health and my personal health.

This semester, I'm collaborating with Nayamin Martinez who works with the Central California Environmental Justice Network. And I believe PM2.5 should be reduced in communities ASAP.

I'm concerned about the air quality, because I have friends at my home school who are student athletes, that have their practices canceled because of the terrible air quality. I know some studies like the Children's Air Pollution Study have found that the lungs of children and youth like me, who are born and raised in places with high PM2.5 don't develop equally to others who live in the areas with clean air. I deserve to grow healthy and so do my peers around me in the community.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. CALDERWOOD: Good morning. My name is Katherine Calderwood, and I'm a teacher at CART, Center for Advanced Research and Technology in the Environmental Lab. And I appreciate the opportunity to be here with some of my students, where they can learn about air quality and their community around them.

They're learning about -- well, as a teacher, my
students are always learning about how it's important. It's necessary to work together. And at CART, we have students from Clovis and Fresno Unified from schools from both districts, from all different walks of life who are working together to complete projects.

They have this wonderful understanding that it is necessary to work together, and that your individual choices impact those around you, and we need the participation of every single person to make things happen.

For years, the Central Valley, San Joaquin Valley has tried, and we've failed to meet standards. I was born and raised here in Fresno. I didn't develop asthma until I came back from college. But petly much all of my friends, my family have asthma, my husband.

And I grew up out in the country. Those of you who are from the Central Valley, if you go out 180 going to Kings Canyon and Sequoia National Park, I grew up right in front of Jesse Morrow Mountain. And there were times that we couldn't see the hills from Centerville, which is like two miles away, because of the air quality in Fresno.

And honestly, we have a lot of things that work against us environmentally speaking. We are a basin, and so we collect wonderful pollutants from everywhere. And it just hovers in here and makes things horrible. So it
makes it imperative for all of us to be cognizant and --
of our own choices and be able -- have to be able to work
together, businesses, individuals.

And I come from a farming family. And I have to say I appreciate that this initiative takes into account
that we need incentives for our farmers to be able to trade in older equipment to be better prepared and to work
for a more sustainable and cleaner practice.

I will say I'm grateful that my students have the opportunity to learn more about their hometown, and how impactful particulate matter is in their lives and the people around them. I'm also grateful they have the opportunity to understand that sustainability and clean air is difficult, and it's complicated. It's a complex matter that involves participation on all sides. And it comes with sacrifices and consequences for everyone, for the community at large, but also for our future.

Thank you so much for this opportunity.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Thanks for being here.

Yes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I just wanted to thank both the student and teacher from CART for being here today. I have been doing research in the Fresno area for actually
almost 20 years, and we've had the opportunity to work
with CART students and provide projects for them to work
on. And it's just really been -- it's a great program,
and I appreciate you being here.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. CUNHA: Good morning, Madam Chair and Board
Members. Manuel Cunha, President of the Nisei Farmers
League, the NFL. If I had the NFL money, we would have
all the problems solved. We can take all of the
cap-and-trade money and we can just take it from the NFL.

But again, I want to thank Richard Corey, Kurt
Karperos, Lucina and her entire staff and everybody that
have worked with us since 2008, when we first started
doing the farm equipment program. And I also want to
thank Jared Blumenfeld who was the first EPA regional
administrator that actually crushed a tractor on the
tractor trade-up, Madam Chair, and supported it 100
percent.

And that's where we are today in our third phase
of the farm equipment program through FARMER. But Michael
we want to thank you and your entire staff for working
with us and believing us and Lucina and everybody,
especially the two ladies that I've called the crushing
ladies is Michelle and Erin both got on the big tractor
and crushed the tractors a couple months ago, and did a
better job than anybody of any -- the men that were
there -- seem to outperform these two ladies. So the two
crushing ladies, I want to thank them for their work.

(Laughter.)

MR. CUNHA: But Madam Chair, this plan has a very
important part of it. And that is it's had two years of
tremendous amount of workshops. As the Chair of the CAC,
citizens advisory, to the San Joaquin Valley Board, we had
over 12 workshops at night, daytime, and whatever. So we
did reach out to all parties.

This plan is important for us to get approved
today and move forward to EPA. But it also is based on
incentives. The farm equipment program through FARMER is
crucial. The 25 million in the Governor's plan we
definitely need to sit down with him and educate him. But
I know that Jared Blumenfeld understands the importance of
the farm equipment program.

Secondly, if the Parks and the Forest Service
would pay attention to their own problems in cleaning up
and maintaining the forest, we wouldn't have a 108 people
that died in the Camp Fire in the Paradise Fire, as well
as the Napa Fire. So maybe worrying about my farmers
burning, we're doing a tremendous job on the ag burn
program and all that.

Maybe they should worry about cleaning up and
maintaining their own parks and forests, so we don't have
the amount of smoke for four or five months that
devastated. All the cleaning we've done went out the door
because of that.

So again, I want to thank all of you, Madam
Chair, especially you believing in our incentive programs.
The farm equipment, you were the first one. If you
remember in 1997 under President Clinton, under the
President -- the Secretary of EPA at that time, you
believed in us, and you helped put that program to start.
And I want to thank you for that effort in believing in
farmers, and agriculture being ahead of everybody.

But NRCS is the USDA just put 25 million into the
valley for California for air equipment for farm equipment
replacement. Again, like Roger said, ATVs, thank you all.
I hope you go forward with this. But all of the staff at
ARB have been great. And especially Richard Corey who's
really stuck out his -- and has worked closely with us to
understand the farming.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much. We always
give extra time to people who say nice things about our,
staff, so...

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: That was good.
Okay. Mr. Aguirre

MR. AGUIRRE: Hello. Good morning -- or good afternoon, everyone. My name is Gustavo Aguirre, Jr. I'm with Central California Environmental Justice Network. And I traveled here today from Kern County. Some of the communities that I work in in -- are in Arvin, Lamont, Weedpath, Bakersfield, East Bakersfield, Shafter, Delano, Lost Hills, et cetera.

So they're very rural communities in the San Joaquin Valley, mostly in Kern County that are at the forefront and the front line of this exploration of, you know, new tech, and monitoring equipment, and emission reduction controls, right?

But they're also at the very forefront of where all the pollution is generated. Here today, we have the California Air Resources Board and we have the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District that has coined, you know, the term no stone left unturned, right?

And there is lots of stones that are unturned. And there is a lot that we could do. There is a lot of flaws in this plan that need to be addressed, especially in Kern County, especially in these communities that we -- that -- you know, that I'm echoing concerns for.

You know, we -- I heard I believe the Director of the Valley Air District today say that there was no burn.
Actually, when I was driving down Pixley there was three burns, but because I was driving, I couldn't report it.

So I mean, there -- in our communities, in oil and gas communities, there's this thing called oil and gas operators. And oftentimes in these communities that I mentioned, they're small producers. And these small producers are often times exempt from the vast majority of, you know, the big producers emission reduction controls.

So there is a lot that needs to be done in these communities. In the community of Arvin, which I was just in a couple of days ago, our -- during -- you know, after storms there is just the most beautiful views of the southern tip of the Sierra Nevadas. Oftentimes, you are not able to see those mountains being at the foothills of those mountains at the southern tip of the Sierra Nevada.

And so in this plan, there is a lot of flaws that need to be addressed. There is emission reduction credit banks that need to be audited. You know, there is a lot of concerns around, you know, one of the talking points of, you know, 50 percent of our NOx and PM emissions come from mobile sources.

Well, guess what, the mobile sources use petrochemicals. And the petrochemicals, guess what, are explored, and refined, and transported in our communities.
And so in this plan, we -- I am echoing the concerns of a lot of these residents that we've spoke with since the beginning of this -- of the development. We wrote a letter. You guys should have a copy of this letter. If not, we could resend it. But a lot of our communities are tired. They're participating in a lot of these, you know, steering committees, and -- I mean and they're exhausted. They're tired. They see no future in participating in this.

There has been a very large investment from California State to do, you know, environmental justice approaches, and collection in these rural communities. But these rural communities, I'll invite you to them any day that you guys want. The frustration of them time after time doing comments, doing public comments, doing letters and being ignored, I mean, something has to change, right? And we're hoping that maybe this is a vehicle that could help that change.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. ESTELA (through interpreter): Hello. Good morning to everyone. My name is Estela. I live in Fresno.

I'm worried about the contamination that is here, because I have a son who has asthma, and he constantly has
to use two inhalers. He has to use one that is to be used daily, and he also has to use one on emergency basis when the contamination is very dense. So I'm worried because my son is sick with asthma. And not just because my son is sick with asthma, it's just that there are other kids who also have asthma.

Not only do I worry about the kids, but also the people that are of advanced age. I'm also worried because the communities that are disadvantaged are the ones that are mostly affected. These are the people who live around the industrial areas or the fields, also around the dairies.

I'm asking that these regulations become more strict. Okay. I also am requesting that the wood not be burned in the fields. I would request that it be blended, mixed, taken apart some other way, and that we may continue planting more trees.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. HAMILTON: Good morning, Madam Chair, members of the Board and welcome to Fresno. My name is Kevin Hamilton. I'm the Executive Director for Central California Asthma Collaborative. Central California Asthma Collaborative supports this plan being passed today
with some concerns. We have some suggestions for the future, because I think the future is the issue here. The plan is going to pass today. We understand that, and we welcome that. It's an opportunity to move this forward, this great work that we're trying to do to clean the air here in the San Joaquin Valley.

However, I believe that it's going to require all hands on deck. We're going to need the Air District and the Air Resources Board to watch this plan very closely as it advances. We'd like to see ARB set up a panel or a subcommittee that could include folks from the Air Board and community members, and advocates who would meet regularly to review the progress on this plan, and ensure that it is indeed moving forward smartly.

I would recommend to my friends here at the Air District that they re-establish their public advisory work group. And have that work group also advise the plan and monitor plan progress moving forward, and act as a -- as a table where everybody can meet and talk as we move along, and determine what are the barriers to moving forward and how we'll overcome them.

I think the major part of this work is ahead of us. We -- some of us who have been working on this plan for almost two years now at various levels, including being part of that work group and part of other work
groups we might say, oh, you know, we've done all this really great work. Well, we've actually done the easy stuff. We got a plan.

Now, the really hard work of building the rules that create the bones and the body of this plan begins. And so there's where the energy really has to be put from this day forward. We're very concerned about things like these emission reduction credits that have been hanging around, in some cases it appears for 40, 50 years or more that are still being used to justify, and is a mitigation tool for emissions from some sources.

We're very concerned that it seems to be cheaper to open burn your pile of almond cuttings than it does to use other strategies that don't pollute our air at the same time. We have to look at that.

Underneath all of it is the health of our community. So we are indeed seeing rates of asthma rise in the San Joaquin. And we have -- we first tagged this back at the turn of the century. And it was worrisome then, but we thought it might be just an anomaly. But it's growing, and it's growing at a rate that's not really comfortable. And it's most evident in our children, but we're also seeing it in adult patients.

Now, is it the air pollution, is it a combination of other things? We don't know, but we know the air
pollution is a factor. And in our world, we have to work
on the things we know, and see if we can reduce those so
we can uncover maybe something else, but we know that's
real.

So for our communities, for our health of our
communities, we understand the economics of this, and
we're worried about that as well. But we're primarily
concerned that we have healthy people in the San Joaquin
Valley and it's a great place to live. So thank you very
much for your time.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks for your testimony.

MR. MARTINEZ: Good morning, Madam Chair and all
the members. My name is Lupe Martinez. I come from Kern
County, and certainly I want to talk a little bit about
oil and gas.

And I can give you statistics, give you all of
the numbers and so on, but I want to talk about health
instead. And actually, I had all kinds of pages written,
but I'm not going to talk out of that.

I think when we talk about oil and gas and being
the largest stationary resources of direct PM2.5, and NOx
in the San Joaquin valley. It puts, as was mentioned by
Mr. Aguirre a few moments ago, of the impacts in our
communities that suffer as a result of these pollution
contaminations.
As Ms. Estela was mentioning right now, that's our biggest concern is our children. I'm at a disbelief that when a child is born, they're already talking about perhaps asthma. How is that possible? Or a child who is six months, how is that possible?

How do we -- how do we deal with these things? It's impacting our children, our elderly. I'm there in age. And not as strong in my lungs as I would like to, but certainly has a huge impact.

So this plan, and knowing that oil and gas are the largest polluters in this instance, and to see so many wells next to sensitive areas, next to apartments. For example, in Arvin, there's -- there's wells that are next to a kidney dialysis, to different places where people are probably even more impacted.

How do we make sure that that doesn't happen any more? How do we make sure that this plan is aggressive, it is radical, so that we can make the changes? And that, at some point, this Board is going to leave a legacy of having cleaned up our air. I think that's the biggest thing.

What I would not like to see is further wells, for example in Bakersfield, where they're next to the restaurant. But you can't really tell, because they're somehow disguised. They either have paintings of a palm,
et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

I'm hoping that this plan does not have the same disguises as how they tried to sell it to us in the valley.

Thank you.

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY SUPERVISOR PATTI: Good morning, Director and Board members. My name is Tom Patti. I have the distinct honor of being an elected official from San Joaquin County. I am a County Supervisor, District 3. District 3 happens to be largely encompassed by farmland. And for those of you that might be somewhat unfamiliar with San Joaquin, Stockton is our big city. But San Joaquin County is known to have the most productive farmland in the history of the world. So we're very proud of that -- that industry and very dependent upon it.

I've talked to a lot of my constituents that are out in the farm lands, and they have challenges just to stay in business. So I'm not a scientist in any capacity, but I do know that for every action, there is an equal and sometimes perhaps unintended consequence or reaction.

So while there's issues that are going to be imposed and restrictions and new mandates, the only guilt that some of these farmers have is that they're in business as farmers. And as we all know, groceries are
not grown in grocery stores. They come from the farm.

So if you guys are going to put in some mandates
on them, while they're also getting labor demands for
higher wages that are going up, that's happening.
Unquestionably, it's imposed on them. You've got water
that's now being deferred away from them. So there's
going to be challenges for water. You've got pesticide
mandates that are imposed on them and regulations. You've
got a fluctuating market that can change with weather and
factors of market rate for commodities that they're going
to grow.

Some of -- farmers are some of the greatest risk
takers that exist in business today. So if you're going
to impose any new mandates on them, and I understand where
this is going, make sure that you have something that can
help offset those incentive packages that soften the blow.
You have second and third generation farmers that
they're -- their next generation are not going to the
farms. You have farmland going -- that is going fallow,
because it's not worth the risk, and there's people that
don't want to assume that risk to buy that land, try to
reap a harvest that's going to yield, payoff the debt to
the banks and everything that it takes to stay in
business.

So I would encourage you -- and I'm going to
speak next on the crane initiative, but I want to talk about that.

Lastly, as for CARB, I would encourage you get involved. If you want clean air for the state of California, for the world globally -- global warming and all these issues that are of great and paramount concern, get involved with forest management. There's so much regulations and restrictions. Once upon a time, we had over 120 logging companies. Now, we have 20. What used to be 400 trees per acre properly managed is now thousands of trees per acre. It's overgrown. You see bark beetles used to average two to three million trees a year. Last year, it was 129 million dead trees. And forest management prevents them from even harvesting out the trees that are dead by beetle -- by the beetles to get them out of the forest, where they become tinder and fires.

So you guys have a monumental task, and how you manage all of these things. Being as a supervisor, I sit on multiple communities, where there's a shortage of funding in every aspect. I understand it. But I just want to engage in some of those important issues as it relates to my district and our country. Thank you.

MS. GALE: Good morning, Board. Thank you for coming to Fresno. My name is Genevieve Gale. I'm the
Acting Director of the Central Valley Air Quality Coalition. I'm also an outdoor person. You'll find me in the mountains often. And every time I'm up there, I turn around and I look back at the valley, and I see the soup that I live in. And I think every day I have to wake up and go to bed in that soup. And there a four million people, some of which much more vulnerable to pollution than I, have to do the same day-in and day-out.

And I get angry. I do. And I have to get back in my car and drive back into that soup to go to bed. So a couple years ago, I quit my job and I started volunteering at CVAQ. And I was a volunteer when I asked this Board to deny the plan the first time around. And I'm still thankful for your action.

This new plan represents a significant -- significant improvement. I believe your staff outlined the improvements really well. And I'd also like to thank Samir for his leadership. I think it represents a new found commitment to making this plan work.

However, success relies on a range of uncontrollable variables. For instance, we need to come up with $4 billion. That's a massive gap in funding. And we rely on that funding to speed up attainment by the deadlines required. So CVAQ's ask today is to approve the plan. I don't think anyone here could stomach the
alternative.

But I do ask your Board to exercise more oversight. Start looking for a plan B now, so we are prepared to act when the other shoe drops.

I passed out a handout today that outlines a few emission reduction opportunities that focuses on the largest sources of pollution left unaddressed in this plan. One opportunity is to examine the agricultural burning program here in the -- here in the valley. This agency gives the valley air district exemptions to the law governing the phase-out of agricultural burning. And that exemption process could be brought before your Board for discussion and approval, and we could expedite that review.

We could also review the largest stationary sources of direct PM2.5. Just four oil and gas corporations create more PM2.5 -- direct PM2.5 than all passenger and light- and medium-duty trucks combined. Chevron alone emits more than all locomotives and airplane direct PM2.5 emissions combined. And nothing in this plan addresses direct PM from oil and gas. So what opportunities lurk there?

I'll end by saying, yes, please approve this plan, but please also start the work necessary to ensure that all opportunities for success are being faithfully
pursued.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. BOHIGIAN: Good morning. My name is Ron Bohigian. I'm a life-long resident of Fresno. I strongly support aggressive measures to control PM2.5 and NOx in the valley. And as a citizen, or as citizens, we really rely on your staff expertise, technological knowledge. But it's important for you to hear our opinions, and I appreciate the opportunity to share these opinions.

My wife and I just a few years ago converted our wood-burning fireplace using your incentives. And that's worked out really well. We love burning that natural gas, and we plan on buying our second electric car within the next few months. Well, actually, it's the second one. The first one got broadsided by a Chevy Tahoe.

(Laughter.)

MR. BOHIGIAN: Fortunate for my wife, the airbags worked really well.

A number of our friends have left the valley over the past several years. And as a life-long resident, I've got -- a life-long resident of Fresno, I've got to say the only thing that would cause me to leave Fresno would be issues of air quality. I don't know why I don't have asthma. I sound like I do. But I don't know why I don't.
But a lot of people obviously this is a serious problem for.

I'm not telling you anything you don't know already. So I encourage you to really move ahead aggressively. And it sounds like even more work needs to be done down in Kern County in that area with the fracking and all that's going on down there.

And one of the things, we're fortunate to have a cabin up in the mountains. So my takeaway from today is that last year I burned slash from the trees that I was cutting down, the dead trees. This year, I'm going to rent a shredder and I'm going to shred those trees.

So thank you for the opportunity.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Good for you.

Thank you.

MS. STATHAM: I'm told that Sam Molina had to return to work, so I'm the next one. I don't know if you want to call to see if he's here.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Excuse me, I'm sorry. Who are you?

MS. STATHAM: I am number 24, Clare Statham. I a was told that Sam Molina had to leave.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Oh, he submitted written testimony. Yeah. Thank you. I'm sorry.

MS. STATHAM: Good morning.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning.

MS. STATHAM: My name is Clare Statham. I speak today as a private citizen. In the past, I have addressed our local board about the necessity of banning residential wood burning. The 2.5 PM proposal presented to you today adopts a fairly mild, but politically palatable approach to residential wood burning. The decision has been made that the public will not support a ban at this time.

So today, I would like to address the question of why not? And the answer is clear. It is found in the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District scientific survey of over 1,500 residents presented in its 2017-18 report to the community. This survey reveals that the public, despite the horrendous air quality issues caused by recent wildfires, is unaware of the toxic nation -- nature of wood smoke.

Only 36 percent of those surveyed knew wood smoke is harmful. Only 24 percent had heard of the District's Burn Cleaner program. In four years, these numbers had improved by only seven percent. It is worth noting that according to this survey, 75 percent of wood burners are English speaking and more than 23 have above median incomes. Yet, even among our more affluent residents with access to English language media, the toxic effect of wood smoke is not understood. Something must be change.
Better public education is the answer. Education is essential to bringing about rapid and voluntary change. I propose, therefore, that in implementing this new plan, CARB also fund for the Air Valley Pollution Control District a full-time position dedicated to educating the public about air quality issues, wood burning, and auto emissions in particular.

What would a robust education program look like beyond offering incentives? Our local education coordinator would, for example, hold workshops for coaches and the medical community, distribute information packets from booths at malls, colleges, sports events, the big Fresno Fair, the Clovis Rodeo, Big Hat Days, arrange for public service announcements to air on all local radio and television stations, direct an active and imaginative presence on all forms of social media, offer monthly public information workshops on how individual choices affect our air quality, reach out to civic organizations and give the district's informative presentation at their meetings.

In short, a robust education program, combining old fashioned outreach, current social media, and accurate, accessible information is desperately needed.

I ask you to recognize the vital role education plays in effecting change and to fund a full-time position
for our local district, so that such an education program becomes reality.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

We have one more witness who signed up after the sheets were put together. Lori Apodaca. And that -- you will be the last witness.

Thank you.

MS. APODACA: Yes. Good morning. My name is Lori Apodaca. I am director of regulatory affairs at California Citrus Mutual. We represent citrus growers in the State of California.

I would just like to recognize the Air Resources Board on the implementation of the SIP today, and also to give support to your adopting this program as well.

Our members are committed to making improvements towards clean air. We have multi generational family growers. We have young growers. We have a multitude of growers who range from the coast to the valley to up north in the mountains, and they all do care about where they live.

They consider themselves stewards of their land. They want to pass it on to their children. They raise their children on their groves. And they are very concerned about their community.
So -- and as -- it's been spoken of before by our other ag organizations, these standards will be difficult to implement without further incentive funds. We've had a range of funds that have been provided and our growers are taking advantage of them. But to try to replace 12,000 tractors by 2024 in the valley, that is asking a lot.

However, in any way that we can support you, we will. And at any time, if you have any questions about what our growers do, or any of the challenges that they face, feel free to reach out. And again, thank you for coming down to the valley today.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you so much. I believe I can now close the record as far as testimony is concerned or information coming in, but we will proceed to have some discussion on the part of the Board.

We have quite a few members of this Board who have been involved in some of the issues that you all have been raising for a long time. I can't look around without thinking about previous hearings that we've had here or elsewhere where some of these issues have come up in the past. And while I don't want to rehash the entire history of how we got to where we are today, when I started at the beginning and talked about how far we had come with respect to this plan and the progress that had been made between the District and CARB, it was reflecting on some
of those previous hearings.

    And so, of course, we are very happy -- we're
very happy at the progress that's been made and to be in a
position where our staff and most of the witnesses who
have spoken have advocated that we adopt the plan that's
before us, but asked for certain additional things to be
done.

    So I think we can focus on what those additional
things are that need to be done and recognize that, as I
said at the beginning, the plan doesn't carry itself out.
There will be a great sense of relief and a great sense of
temptation probably to go take a rest and maybe even go
out and celebrate after the plan is adopted, but that's
really only a milestone on a long journey towards --
towards the kind of progress that needs to be -- needs to
be made here.

    And so I think we may want to focus some
discussion around some of those issues that have been
raised. Particularly, we could certainly look at what was
submitted to us by Genevieve Gale on behalf of CVAQ and
their partners. We could also -- I made a note about the
issue that was raised at the very outset about whether
we've adequately looked at the tradeoff or the potential
tradeoff between ammonia and NOx.

    I think we should be talking more, not just here
but statewide, but particularly here, given the really
shocking numbers of asthma victims in the area about what
type of educational campaign CARB can and should be
involved in here, certainly not on our own, but in
coordination with other people.

But those were kind of the main issues that we
were asked to address. There is one that I personally
would like to mention, and that is the sort of what do you
do if the money doesn't come, and what is plan B? Because
having been around for longer than I probably care to
admit, this is a -- this is an ongoing problem. But it's
especially a problem now, because we've become so much
more dependent on the use of incentives to really make
progress. And we need to be. We need to be creative
about how we use those incentives, and come up with
probably better ways to leverage the funds.

But to the extent that we're reliant on money
that comes from the State, I just want to make it clear to
folks that CARB doesn't have the money. We don't control
the money. The money comes from the Legislature. We can
advocate. We advocate for the Governor's budget. To the
extent that the Governor's budget doesn't have as much
money in it as people in the community feel is needed,
it's incumbent upon everybody to go to Sacramento and make
the case for why this is a priority.
I think it's a very good case to be made, not just in terms of the need to protect health and to comply with laws, but also the fact that we, as a State now, are really increasingly talking about the divide between the urban and rural areas of the state. And it was only two weeks ago that, you know, in the State of the State Address the Governor spoke about his desire to bring together rural and urban California. And I think that this is very consistent with what he said. So hopefully, the legislature will also pay heed to that injunction as well.

But I want to invite fellow Board members who have issues or comments that they want to make about any of the comments that have come before us about the plan, and I'll just start at this end and we can go around.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I'll be brief. I'll just say I think the community should feel proud that its voice at the meeting we had here, almost two years ago --

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: More than two years ago.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Pardon?

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: More than two years ago.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: -- more than two years ago was vital and important to moving this plan further than originally proposed. So I think while nothing is ever perfect, I think there's been a lot of progress made, so
the community should feel proud that its voice here helped move this forward, and I think to remember that.

    And we all believe that the partnership between the community, the local air district, and the business community is important to maintain, but it is important for the community to continue to advocate for stronger measures. And we intend to ensure that this plan that there be commitment to moving this plan forward. And we will check in. And there are members here who come from this community who will continue that as well.

    So I just wanted to acknowledge that effort.

    CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

    BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you. So I, too, want to echo the statements just made by Supervisor Gioia, and perhaps just add a little in terms of really offering thanks to the community for their advocacy, but it's the kind of advocacy you've presented. It's one that's really steeped in making sure this Board and our staff understand the critical links between public health and this plan.

    I think oftentimes what you read about CARB in the press, and certainly if you look at our agenda, our agendas on any given month, we, in years past, have really been focusing quite a bit on greenhouse gas reduction, as we should. But if you look at our charge as an agency, it really is steeped in protecting the public's health. And
this plan I'm convinced is going to go a long way to us
meeting that charge here for the State of California and
San Joaquin Valley.

    Thank you.

    BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: This is truly a milestone
that we have reached today that we have a plan in front of
us that accomplishes as much as it accomplishes. And a
big thank you to the community, and to the staff, to the
Air District for working together to get us here.

    The -- but then the next challenge rises up and
that is implementing this plan. And a lot of people have
mentioned incentives, because you have on the plate here
five billion needed by 2024 to implement. I am very
sympathetic to that, because I come from a district where
we face the same challenges.

    And there are incentives available under Carl
Moyer under the Cap-and-Trade Program that will help the
turnover of the fleets and the turnover of stationary
sources as they improve to meet newer requirements.

    One thing that was mentioned that I think is a
good idea with the consent of the Air District and CARB
would be to continue maybe the working group that you
have, some kind of oversight committee - Kevin Hamilton
mentioned that - to keep working on these problems. And I
think that might be one of the elements that we ask for as
we move forward.

   Certainly, public health is the whole issue here. And we know this area has such a high incidence of asthma. And that affects -- obviously affecting children, affecting babies, almost as soon as they're born, as one of our people came forward and testified to. That's very concerning. So that would be our primary motive as we try to implement this plan, we want to improve the public health for the whole community.

   Someone mentioned that what we need also is a better education campaign for the wood burning. And in the South Coast, we also have wood-burning problems. And we have no burn days. And I think one of the things -- I don't know exactly what this air district does, but an educational campaign can be very helpful along those lines to educate people as to what the toxic effect is, but also educate people today is a no burn day. And so that's up to the Air District of course how they implement that. But there are some examples and ideas out there for us to look at.

   So congratulations to the Air District, to you Samir, and our CARB staff for -- and the whole community that worked together to bring this about, because this is truly a milestone, and we look forward to seeing it implemented and seeing real improvements here in the San
Joaquin.

Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Thank you, Chair Nichols. This is a robust plan. I believe it deserves our support. I also believe -- I guess the term I would use is trust but verify.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: And I think I'd like to talk about process. In my briefing, I asked -- because there's been continuing conversations about updating and the schedule of updating. And it was suggested, in response to my question, that we would probably see our first review in late summer, early fall. Since we don't meet in August, I would suggest that that's no later than September. Otherwise, we're into winter. So I just put that out there as a challenge to staff. I don't think it's too far away to have an initial evaluation, because there are a multitude of pieces that need to come together for this plan to work and to work correctly. And that there would be no less than annual reviews subsequent to that first review.

I also -- it was raised more than once, including by the District, we received a letter not too long ago regarding credits. And whether we call it an audit or a review, I would encourage that action and encourage --
spend a little bit of time looking at the data reviewing the process that the Earthjustice engaged in to create that report.

    I think it's troubling, and that it does deserve our attention. And I would like to at -- I'm not going to put a date on this, but certainly this year -- to have the results of that review shared with the Board.

    Thank you.

    CHAIR NICHOLS: That could perhaps be an amendment when the motion is actually formally in front of us. I'd be happy to have you make it.

    Ms. Riordan.

    BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Thank you. It's such a positive day today. I'm very impressed. I'm impressed with the efforts of the communities of interest to come together, along with those of us who are professionals and really work on a plan that I think has great potential.

    And let me just share on the education part, our CARB staff has, I think, a lot of experience with educational programs. It goes further than just, you know, health and -- but it also includes how to reach out to those people who need to adopt new standards, and what incentives can be used, and how to use those.

    And I would hope to our staff, and I'm now talking to our staff, we work with the District. I'm
going to assume the District has a public information
officer. And probably some assistance there on our part
could make for a very good outreach program that can be
utilized throughout this vast district. I know you have
to work with a whole lot of different entities because of
it being so vast. You don't have just one newspaper, or
one radio station, or one TV station. So you've got a
challenge in front of you.

But I think we can be very helpful if we put our
minds to it as we move through the process of adopting
what I hope is the implementation plan that's before us.

And again like others, congratulations.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Ms. Berg.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

I do just want to add how grateful I am for the
communities, and for the District, and for our staff the
work that has been put in over the last two years. It is
extremely impressive. And to me it sets a standard, a
high bar, which is a role model on how to come together.
And I have been one of the Board members that has been
attending over several years. And this is a different
day. And it does feel good.

That said, I do understand the challenges. I
understand the challenges from a business perspective, as
I run a business full time. And I understand that the push and pull of the need to take care of those children's health that we heard testimony today.

And so as we continue to work together to honor both sides of the importance of having strong economics, and great health, I am very excited about this Board, and our staff, and working in partnership with the District and with the community to see how we get this done and become a example of how to do it right.

So thank you very much to everyone, especially the students that came and testified. It's exciting to see the new generation and how they're going to participate.

So thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Thank you very much.

Thank you for all of your comments from the Board so far.

You know, a reminder. A little over two years ago, there was no vision for a way forward. That was the plan. There was no vision for a way forward. And a commitment was made by this Board, and the Air District, and the community, in fact, to start working on a process to have a vision for a path forward. I don't know where we'd be today if we had gone down that other path. Certainly not here. Certainly not here.
We now have an achievable pathway. Is it simple? No. Everybody in this room has made a commitment to continue to make this work. It is far from over. Many comments about the work that remains to be done.

But, yeah, the businesses, the farming community, we need to be willing to expend our political capital in Sacramento and in Washington to make this plan work. I see a number of doctors in the audience. We need to be ready to expend our moral capital working with our professional organizations to work at the State and the national level on these issues. The community representatives need to continue to be ready to bring their stories and aspirations to the table to help move us forward on this.

So it's an achievable pathway. It's five years in the future. Who can predict what's going to be out there five years from now. Well, it was seven years ago, two years ago. And, you know, I would also suggest the other thing that's going on here, reminding everybody we have a commit -- we are moving forward regardless of EPA. We're not waiting for EPA to approve this. The Air District has already made commitments in terms of what it's doing in terms of examining the wood burning rules and so on. We're not waiting. We're moving forward. So that's another positive that's come out of this.
Now, obviously, there's some speed bumps that we all recognize. The ERCs have been noted. And by amendment, we certainly need to address that. And the Air District has stepped up, I believe, to a commitment to be sure that's a transparent and viable process.

State legislation, federal commitments to money, that's a potential speed bump, let alone the speed bumps we don't know.

The next steps are obviously critical. And I think that the staff did outline how we are going to do the incentive funding, looking at residential wood burning, alternatives to open ag burning, research on ammonia. Those have all been highlighted in testimony as critical areas we need to continue working on.

The suggestion of a public advisory committee is, I think, a good one to help us stay focused on those. And that might be, in fact, a very good forum to look at some of the other areas that we may be able to find, that we will be able to find reductions. Largest stationary sources, supporting alternatives to ag burning, among others.

So it is a giant step, but it's just a step on that pathway. And we're clearly committed to monitoring that progress, because it never goes smoothly. But we have an -- we have an achievable pathway, which is not
something we had two years ago.

    So thanks to everyone for their participation in that.

    CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

    BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you.

    Let me add my congratulations. The improvements are more than significant. It's really a credit to the local community, to the environmental justice community, and the advocates, and to the CARB staff, and to the District staff who just decided that it was better to work together than continue to get our swords out and fight each other.

    So I think that it is -- it is truly a culture shift. And I would agree with Dr. Sherriffs that it's appropriate that CARB is here in this community, that CARB came to this community that's been so impacted and so challenged for so long. And I hope that CARB can continue that culture and travel around the state to impacted communities where I think that community members would like to see us and like to engage with us more directly.

    I want to say that I agree with Chair Nichols that monitoring is key, that we can't just walk away. This isn't going to do itself. So I want to reinforce what I think others have said.

    The monitoring has to be on the incentives. I
believe this is unprecedented in terms of the amount of money that we're counting on for this plan to be implemented and to be successful. So I would second, if that's appropriate, Mr. Eisenhut's amendment that would say let's -- let's look at this again in September with all of the benchmarks that we really need to look at, so we can see how they're going. And I know we'll have a good -- a better sense at least, at that point, as to where the State budget will be, so -- but work to do between now and then, so that we can make it as good as possible.

I really agree that we have to do a review of these emission reduction credits. This is a troubling report. This is unacceptable and we really need to know what the facts are about -- about this situation, so that we can make amendments, if necessary. So I would say those two things.

And lastly, I think the issue in regards to alternatives in regards to both the ag burning, as well as the increase in the ammonia. And that we need to look at alternatives to both of those methodologies as well. They keep being brought up. And while I think we've made some progress, there's clearly farther to go. So congratulations. I think we should move forward, but with the amendments that have been noted so far.
Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Well, I also would like to say it's really a pleasure to be here when both the community and the Air District are more or less on the same page. And I think that's a credit again to both the community input and to the new leadership of the District.

As I've said multiple times, you know, I've been working in the Fresno community in terms of air pollution health effects research for 20 years now, initially funded by the Air Resources Board. And I do understand the impact of the unhealthy air that we have down here multiple times during the year on the health of children. It's not just asthma that was highlighted.

My group is about to publish hopefully effects on diabetes -- well, I should say, pre-diabetes, pre-hypertension, and pre-metabolic syndrome in children here in -- young children here in Fresno. So it is a public health problem that we have to continue to focus on.

You know, that said, I'm really pleased with the plan. But as Kevin Hamilton and others have said now comes the hard part, the implementation. I think -- I mean, I was pleased to hear a member of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District board, Dr. Sherriffs, endorse Kevin's idea for a public advisory
group.

I'll just say my experience chairing the AB 617 Consultation Group, where we've had stakeholders from industry, the districts, and environmental justice groups has been, I think, a pretty good forum for dealing with AB 617 issues. And I think that having a continued public advisory group here in -- to help the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District implement this plan is a good idea.

I definitely endorse Mr. Eisenhut's amendment to our resolution. And I really am very upset about the emission credit issue. And I just -- despite the fact that I've been involved in Fresno air pollution work for 20 years, I didn't even know about these credits until I got the report from CVAQ and the anti-fracking coalition.

It's troubling. We need real reductions in air pollution, not paper ones. And I'll just put it on the table, we should not be subsidizing the oil industry period. I know there are jobs that are involved in the oil industry here in the valley, in Kern County. And I think those are important. And we have to -- just like we have to transition coal miners from their jobs to better and cleaner jobs, we need to do the same thing in the oil industry as far as I'm concerned.

But CARB whose mission is to clean up the air,
protect the climate, cannot be subsidizing in any way the oil industry to have emission credits where they don't have to really reduce emissions as much as they should.

I know that's a broad stroke, and I'm oversimplifying, but I think that's the bottom line for me. So I'm very supportive of the efforts on the part of our Board to work with the District to do an audit of these emission credits.

So again, shifting back to congratulations, I think this is a good day for air quality in the San Joaquin Valley.

Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I just have two comments. One on that latter point, which everybody has said, when we did not accept the previous plan and sent you all to go back to work, we didn't know that this would be the outcome. We just knew that that was unacceptable. And so it is very impressive. It took two years. You went away. But you came back with a much better plan that we are all obviously from the comments supportive of.

Number two, on the credits, this is not a San Joaquin thing only. It's a statewide thing. When I heard about it, it wasn't in the context of here. It was in the context of multiple places up and down the state. So when we do this and ask staff to look into it, whether you call
it a review, an audit, whenever, it has to be district by
district statewide.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Can't be in place where we're
talking about agricultural burning without calling upon
the last member of this Board, who has such a long history
of having worked on this issue.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you. Thank you,
Madam Chair. I don't know if this is on or not.

First and foremost, thank you for coming to
Fresno. I'm always reminded of an early trip under the
Schwarzenegger administration. As he was flying down to
do another Temperance Flat press conference on water, when
he commented to, at that point, Kevin McCarthy, looked
down at the valley and said, boy, it's a foggy day there.
And everyone said, no, that's smog from his plane.

And I thought it was kind of an opening -- an
eye-opening moment for then the Governor to look down on
this bowl that, I think Lupe Martinez just said, where
kids are born with the thought that asthma is in their --
going to be in their lifetime.

And obviously, this has been my home. I
represented this area for over a decade. And I think one
of the things the Board did right a couple years ago was
just to hold up and ask the question whether or not we
could do better. And I think that was great. And I want to thank Samir particularly for doing better.

And it is leadership change here as well at the Board, not necessarily at the Board level, but I think, as an executive. I want to thank you for your leadership. I think it's quite a marked change for someone who has dealt with this Board for many, many years. And I just want to publicly acknowledge the trajectory you're on right now. And I hope it -- I hope it can remain. And I know you're a subject of a Board as well, so I know it's a tough place to be.

But I would like to add two things that Genevieve Gale mentioned. First, we're not sure that incentives will solve this. We're not sure, as the Chairwoman mentioned, we don't have enough money in the world to meet this. I'm sure if I asked Samir back to the mic, he would say something in the billion dollar range. So, in that, I would hope that one small item I would add to our action is to have the District and the Air Board look at the largest stationary sources and really review that back-up plan, that plan B if you will. What are we going to be doing with some of these larger oil companies here in the valley? What's the back-up plan if incentives aren't going to get us there. So just somehow have a dialogue a bit about what that inventory looks like would be very
valuable.

The second would be obviously on the burning program. I think the board took a significant action -- the local board took a significant action this year and offered a million dollars to farmers to look at an alternative to burning. It's very hard to compete with a $0.01 match. It's always the most economic. And I applaud the District for creating a $1 million program that I assume is already oversubscribed within the first couple of weeks. And I think it's a signal to the Governor and to the Board that we need more funding in that particular category for this particular board.

I think it should be something like $30 million. And if we -- if the Governor starts to rearrange dollars, I would hope that he would look at that as one of the more significant actions in terms of funding.

But I also would like to have staff, if possible, Madam Chair, look into the fact that -- I guess every five years we look at the particular role from this level and approve exemptions. And I would hope that we would have a pre-review prior to that rule being approved, which I believe is the next couple of years. So I think maybe interfacing with the District on that exemption well early, so that we don't run into a -- into a real problem the day of the Board meeting, but are aware of it coming
into this maybe a year ahead.

One of the recommendations that Ms. Gale put out is really that expedited review. So I would hope we could some find a way to incorporate that.

And I very much appreciate the advocates who live here every day. Tom Frantz is a regular. And I think I want to thank everyone here who lives here Lupe, Tom, Genevieve, the entire -- everybody -- when we leave and you're still here in some sense dealing with these issues, I would just like to say that we need to have more meetings like this in these affected areas. Rural communities sometimes are, you know as the Governor said in his inaugural, you know, I see you. I hear you. And I'm really happy that the Board is doing this here today. So hopefully we can continue that dialogue.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Voting on the resolution may seem like it's anticlimactic after --

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: -- after all the discussion. But I was hoping we could sort of get all the issues out and -- you know, and then proceed to a formal vote.

We can probably give the staff direction without actually amending the resolution in a formal way. But I want to make sure that we've got clarity on what it is
that we're asking the staff to do, and that they're in
agreement that this is something -- that these are things
that they are able and willing to do.

So maybe I'll turn to Mr. Corey or Mr. Karperos
on these issues. But particularly on coming back early,
as early as September shall we say, to let us know how
things are going. We certainly will know more about the
budget situation. And we could, I think by that time,
have some better information at least about the ERC
situation here and statewide, as Mr. De La Torre has
suggested.

On the question of oversight, I don't want to
dictate from here what the committee or kind of a
committee ought to look like. I think it's a little
difficult to do that. But I think you're hearing from
everybody that there is a need for ongoing engagement,
which includes the community, and also includes ARB, and,
of course, the District, so -- and others from the
regulated -- regulated community, as well as the advocacy
community.

So we can hopefully at a staff level, those of
you who are engaged on a regular basis in thinking about
outreach and oversight can get together on that. And
similarly, on the design of a better -- this is an ongoing
issue, but there are always new ideas and new ways of
doing these things, ways of educating a community about both the harmful effects of pollution and also about the no burn days and, you know, specific actions that need to be taken. But I think I need a response at this point from the staff.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yeah. Thanks, Chair.
So I'm going to just summarize what we captured as next steps from a Board direction action.

One, it was really just capturing the point that you made, Chair, which was the plan -- the plan is significant, but it is really predicated on implementation, and the expectation of the Board for an annual report on the status of implementation. And that means the status of the rules on the books, the enforcement of those rules, the adoption of new regulations and rules, as well as incentives.

And to Mr. Eisenhut's point, September actually this year is a good time, for the reasons that you just pointed out, Chair. We'll be past the budget. That will be a good touchpoint. But the expectation is an annual report back, at a minimum, in terms of implementation going forward beyond 2019.

That report back to the Board in September would also be a good time, as Chair Nichols just indicated, for a status of our evaluation of the ERC program. We'll be
initiating that very soon. I need to sit down with the District, other folks, pull a team together and begin that. That effort will begin in the near term next month actually. So as part of that September report, we'd be including the evaluation that we've gone through, what we found, next steps. It may inform to Mr. De La Torre's point a process with respect to other districts that we may want to look at down the road.

I also think that that September report could include the point that Senator Florez mentioned concerning are there additional opportunities on the large sources -- large industrial sources, because there is an effort to broader apply BACT to large sources throughout the state. And I think we can talk about progress on that, where we are, and how we're moving forward.

And really I wrap-up on this by just underscoring the progress that's been made, as you all pointed out, but also the public process, and the engagement, and the opportunity that this has provided for us as a team to establish a tighter relationship with the community, the Air District than really we've ever had. And it's really going to take that going forward. And really we take the message here and the direction from you to heart, because this really is a key milestone, but clearly much to do to deliver on what's captured in this plan.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. With all of that, I think it would be a good time to have a motion to approve the resolution.

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Thank you. Motion to approve.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Second.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right and seconded by Dr. Balmes. And I think I could just ask that this be a unanimous vote, if there's no dissent. Let's make it unanimous.

All in favor please say aye?

(Unanimous aye vote.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed?

None.

Very good. Thanks and congratulations. And we'll get on with the next step.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Let's take a very brief stretch comfort break. Be back in 10 minutes.

(Off record: 11:30 a.m.)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record: 11:43 a.m.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Board member, if we can assemble. People who want to socialize can do so out in the hall, but we need to get back to work here.
Okay. The next item before us is amendments to On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel-Fueled Residential and Commercial Solid Waste Collection Vehicles, and a regulation to include heavy cranes. So those of you who love giant cranes, and who does not love giant cranes, please need to come forward so we can begin this item.

The sound system works, I believe in the side haul area for any Board members who have to step out for a moment.

Do we have the staff that are ready to present on this item.

They look ready. All right. While we're -- just before you begin, if we could talk about the schedule for just a minute. I'd like to complete this item, and then take a half hour lunch break today, because I know there are people who have planes to catch. And at least for the Board members, we can, I think, do lunch in a half an hour.

So, okay, let's begin. I may have even have some opening remarks here, if I could find them. And if I can't, we could just begin.

No.

Well, let's just say that this next item here involves a staff recommendation that the Board approve two different changes to our existing regulations. The first
is to add a reporting requirement to ensure that solid
waste collection vehicles that comply with our regulations
don't experience delays in registration with the
California DMV due to recent changes in California law.
This is a very technical amendment, but obviously it's
important to those who have these vehicles.

And then the second is to try to find a feasible
compliance path for specialized heavy cranes. And I
understand we have several people here to testify on that
as well. So, Mr. Corey, would you please introduce the
item.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair.
The proposed amendments, as you note, really
focus on the solid waste collection vehicle
regulation. And they include a new reporting requirement
for solid waste collection vehicles without changing
compliance requirements. It also expands the scope of the
regulation to include heavy cranes with a newly added
phase-in schedule.

Prior to 2014, staff worked closely with crane
operators, crane manufacturers, and organizations to
investigate and collect data on specialized crane
operations. They ultimately determined that retrofitting
with PM filters or replacement engines was not feasible
for the most specialized heavy cranes.
As a result, the Board approved amendments in 2014 to the Truck and Bus Regulation that applied to a wide range of trucks and added a new compliance option for heavy cranes. The 2014 amendments to the Truck and Bus Regulation, however, were challenged in court on procedural grounds and are being rescinded.

The proposed amendments to the solid waste collection vehicle regulation would provide a newly added phase-in schedule that would allow time for crane operators to upgrade equipment, and in a manner that's consistent with crane certification safety standards. The proposed amendments to the Solid Waste Collection Vehicle Regulation to include cranes also recognizes the high cost of replacing the spec -- this specialized equipment.

These amendments are needed to ensure crane operators continue to make progress in reducing emissions to protect public health.

I'll now ask Chris Franceschi of the Mobile Source Control Division to begin the staff presentation.

Chris.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was Presented as follows.)

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: Thank you, Mr. Corey.

Good afternoon, Chair Nichols and members of the
Board. Today, I will present to you the proposed amendments to the Solid Waste Collection Vehicle Regulation to include heavy cranes.

---000---

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: I will first present some background information followed by objectives for amending the regulation. I will also discuss the proposed amendments which includes reporting requirements for solid waste collection vehicles and the addition of heavy cranes to the regulation, with a feasible compliance path to upgrade these cranes.

Finally, I will provide staff's recommendations.

---000---

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: There are two distinct components to the staff proposal. The Solid Waste Collection Vehicle Regulation became effective in July of 2004 and required affected vehicles to have particulate matter, or PM, filters installed by December 31st, 2010, and included an exemption for low-use vehicles, but does not have a reporting requirement.

The regulation was one of several regulations approved by the Board to reduce adverse health effects from exposure to diesel PM from diesel vehicles operating in California.

Single engine heavy cranes are currently subject
to the Truck and Bus Regulation and are now subject to the
same requirements as other diesel vehicles, because the
heavy crane compliance option was rescinded last year,
which I will describe in more detail later.

   However, most heavy cranes could not be safely
retrofit with PM filters or newer engines and were able to
operate under the PM filter extension that expired January
1st on 2018.

   Currently, many heavy cranes are out of
compliance and must immediately upgrade. These cranes
have a very high replacement cost and owners need
additional time to phase newer cranes into the fleet.

   --o0o--

   AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: Now, I will
describe the reasons for each component of the proposed
amendments.

   Solid waste collection vehicles will need to be
identified to avoid registration delays with the
California DMV, as heavy-duty diesel vehicles that do not
meet the requirements of the Truck and Bus Regulation
beginning January 1st 2020 will not be able to renew
registration with the California DMV next year.

   With regard to heavy cranes, due to the court's
ruling in the California Trucking Association and Lawson
Rock and Oil lawsuit, flexibility options approved by the
Board in 2014 are no longer available. This affected a
compliance option for heavy crane owners that justifiably
need adequate time to upgrade their equipment.

Specifically, the compliance option for heavy
cranes that was included in the Truck and Bus Regulation
provided a flexible phase-in schedule and allowed cranes
equipped with PM filters by 2018 to meet the final
requirement. A timely amendment is needed to minimize
enforcement action on these vehicles.

The proposed amendments, which I will discuss in
further detail on the following slides, would help to void
potential registration delays for solid waste collection
vehicles, and would reinstate a feasible compliance option
for heavy cranes.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: This slide
summarizes the proposed changes that apply to solid waste
collection vehicles. Staff is proposing to clarify the
definition of affected vehicles and to add reporting
requirements beginning in 2019 so that we can identify
these vehicles and avoid delays with California DMV
registration starting in 2020. This will include a
requirement to report annual mileage for vehicles
designated as low use.

--o0o--
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI:  I will now describe the proposed amendments for heavy cranes. Staff have worked closely with the heavy crane industry since 2012 to address issues specific to these vehicles. The proposed amendments would apply to a fairly narrow segment of the crane population and is focused on the largest specialized on-road cranes typically used for building freeway overpasses and major construction projects.

The definition does not include two engine cranes and off-road cranes as they are already subject to other heavy-duty diesel equipment regulations.

The following slides will provide more detail on the specific challenges and proposed solutions for these heavy cranes.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI:  Heavy cranes are currently subject to the Truck and Bus Regulation and now must meet the same requirement as other vehicles, and no longer have the flexibility to phase in 2010 engines until 2027. Many cranes use the extension for vehicles that could not be safely retrofit with a PM filter until that extension expired in 2018 and began making upgrades to meet the initial requirements of the extended phase-in of 2010 engines or to take advantage of the credit for heavy cranes that were equipped a PM filter
prior to 2018. Now that these flexibilities have been rescinded, these actions are no longer sufficient.

Crane fleet owners need sufficient time to replace remaining equipment. There are about 700 single engine heavy cranes in 200 fleets.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: Heavy cranes differ significantly from other trucks, because they are highly specialized equipment and are only available from a handful of manufacturers worldwide. Heavy cranes have strict OSHA requirements that limit the ability to retrofit or repower the engine. And it is not feasible to recertify most heavy cranes.

New heavy cranes also have a significantly higher cost than most other diesel trucks. And the ability to purchase used heavy cranes is considerably more challenging.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: It is not practical for heavy cranes to meet the same fleet turnover requirements as other trucks. There are currently 683 heavy cranes in California. Of these, 25 percent have been upgraded to 2010 or newer model year engines. About 30 percent have originally equipped or retrofit PM filters and are currently compliant, but will now have to be
replaced over the next four years. Cranes that could not be retrofit with a PM filter represent 37 percent of the population and are currently not in compliance.

Existing requirements for heavy cranes to meet the same fleet turnover requirements as other trucks could disrupt the California economy. We believe it is not feasible to replace this many canes in this short of a time period, and it is not viable solution to immediately park this many cranes.

The regulation could also have a direct impact on smaller crane fleets and would create ripple effects from delayed projects that need cranes services.

For these reasons, we do not expect to achieve the same emissions reductions from heavy cranes that is currently required by the Truck and Bus Regulation.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: I will now summarize the proposed requirements for heavy cranes. Fleets must phase in 2010 or newer model year engines from 2019 to 2027 at a rate of ten percent of the heavy cranes per year, beginning with a 20 percent requirement in 2019. Heavy cranes already equipped with a PM filter before 2018 would receive credit to be treated the same as those with 2010 or newer model year engines.

Reporting is required until 100 percent of the
crane fleet has a 2010 or newer model year engine

---o0o---

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: Shown here is a more detailed look at the proposed phase-in schedule. It provides a feasible compliance option with sufficient time to add single engine heavy cranes with 2010 or newer model year engines to the fleet. This proposed schedule also maintains a level playing field for all heavy crane owners by remaining consistent with the schedule previously approved by the Board.

---o0o---

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: Staff is also proposing an optional compliance pathway that is based on the model year of the engine to ensure that the proposed regulation meets the useful life criteria required by Senate Bill 1.

---o0o---

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: Staff is also proposing some exemptions to address long lead times in replacing cranes and to address low-use vehicles. Staff propose to allow additional time if the crane owner enters into a contractual agreement, at least four months prior to the required compliance date.

Staff is also proposing a low-use provision that exempts heavy cranes from the requirements if they are
operated less than 1,000 miles per year without an hourly restriction. This maintains a level playing field for all heavy crane owners by remaining consistent with the low-use exemption previously approved by the Board.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: Staff are proposing that fleets report all heavy cranes and meet record keeping requirements until all heavy cranes have been upgrade to 2010 engines. Reporting will continue to be through TRUCRS, the system they are currently reporting in.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: I will now describe the economic impacts of the proposed amendments. For solid waste collection vehicles, staff estimates that there would be a slight increase in administrative costs due to the proposed reporting requirements. For cranes, projected costs are lower due to the extended upgrade schedule, which smoothes out compliance costs over several years with a total savings of about $59 million for the analysis period of 2019 to 2032.

The cost savings are based on comparison with a scenario that assumes full compliance with the existing requirements without the amendments previously approved by the Board in 2014. Until this year, staff updates to the
Board have reflected the compliance requirements of the Truck and Bus Regulation as amended in 2014.

In this analysis, the crane inventory was updated using recent data from DMV registrations, information reported to us in the TRUCRS reporting system, and with data collected in 2012 on operating hours and miles from heavy cranes. This is described in the staff report and the detailed data used for the analysis is available on our website. Costs and emissions were compared using the same scenarios.

The next two slides show the updated emissions analysis for cranes.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: The projected PM2.5 emission from the proposed amendments are lower than the existing conditions in every year, and achieve nearly the same emissions level as the existing 2011 Truck and Bus Regulation after 2027 when all cranes have PM filters.

While the staff report characterized the 2011 Truck and Bus Regulation as a baseline reference point, staff would like to clarify that language was intended to designate the baseline for purposes of the Administrative Procedure Act, which requires that CARB compare costs and emissions to existing requirements.
The CEQA baseline, as shown clearly in these figures, is the existing conditions at the time environmental review began in 2018. Similarly, the delta between projected future emissions under the hypothetical existing 2011 Truck and Bus Rule, assuming full compliance scenario and the proposed amendment scenario, is not an impact from a CEQA perspective, given that emissions will continually decrease under either scenario from the existing conditions baseline.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: This slide shows the projected NOx statewide from heavy cranes. The projected emissions from the proposed amendments are lower than the existing conditions in every year and will continue to reduce NOx, but not as quickly as if assuming full compliance with the 2011 Truck and Bus Regulation.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: In summary, the environmental analysis shows a continued trend of reducing diesel PM and NOx with the proposed amendments, and there is no increase in emissions when compared to existing environmental conditions in 2018.

The air quality analysis shows projected emissions levels under the various scenarios from 2019 to 2021. One scenario was based on the 2011 Truck and Bus
Regulation, hypothetically assuming full compliance with a requirement that we believe is not feasible for heavy cranes. We need to continue reducing emissions from heavy cranes to protect public health and will continue to do so with the proposed amendments.

The population of heavy cranes represents less than one percent of trucks and emissions affected by the Truck and Bus Regulation and will not impact the State's ability to meet long-term SIP requirements as I will describe on the next slide.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: The proposed amendments continue to maximize emission reductions from heavy cranes in nonattainment areas, and would result in 0.2 percent and 0.4 percent fewer statewide PM2.5 and NOx emissions reductions than expected from the 2011 Truck and Bus Regulation in 2023.

The proposed amendments continue to satisfy the federally enforceable State Implementation Plan commitments in 2023 and continue to provide needed reductions for 2031.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST FRANCESCHI: Staff recommend the Board approve the proposed resolution, which includes adoption of the environmental analysis and the
proposed amendments. It is critical that we have a timely
effective date to provide a viable compliance option for
heavy cranes to minimize enforcement action and avoid DMV
registration delays for solid waste collection vehicles.
Because the 2014 amendments to the Truck and Bus
Regulation were rescinded last year, many heavy crane
fleets are currently out of compliance.

Today, your decision will make it clear to these
fleets what the requirements are and will avoid
enforcement challenges.

This concludes my presentation.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. We have a list of
witnesses in front of us. We've got six individuals who
signed up to speak, so why don't we get started.

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY SUPERVISOR PATTI: Are we on?
Testing.

Great, I'm back.

So, boy, we have a lot to say, and I know that
myself and others will stay afterwards as this is kind of
winding down.

First off, staff congratulation. Fantastic.
Monumental task to get this far. I mean, you guys have
done a great job. I represent small business people. As
a -- as a county supervisor, prior to that and currently
now, I own a business with 49 years of continuous service.
Every year annually, I serve probably 400 companies locally and regionally in my area, San Joaquin County. There's one challenge here, one challenge that I think needs to be amended. And it's for -- your Board's decision here is going to have an impact economically with ripple effects throughout the State of California. And I cannot emphasize that anymore. The decisions you make today will rep -- will have repercussions across the state of California.

This is not a one size shoe fits all. The one issue, and I want to emphasize one issue here -- we're not asking for funding, because we know in the last hearing that it was surmised that the funding is not available, not even yours to allocate. We have a new governor with priorities. There's one issue, the 1,000 mile a year exemption, not one size shoe fits all. If I had a company right in downtown Los Angeles or right in San Francisco, I could do my crane business with 300 miles a year.

That's not how all businesses are working, the one size shoe fits all. It used to be 5,000. When we had by hearings in Sacramento and Los Angeles, we were talking about 20 to 30 thousand. I implore you, we need 20,000 mile a year exemption. We're talking about hundreds of piece of equipment. You know, when it comes to equipment, you guys have highlighted when it comes from -- you're
removing one category, the truck cranes. Also, there's crane trucks. I have boom trucks mounted on diesel carriers. Same exact models. They're four hundred, five hundred thousand dollar piece of equipment with about 80 to 100,000 dollars diesel component to it.

I cannot throw away my $350,000 crane because the motor is not compliant. I implore you, we need 20,000 miles. Staff has done a brilliant job, and you guys have a monumental task. But your decision today will have repercussions throughout the economy, myself and dozens and dozen of crane companies, not even -- it's not hundreds, but there are dozens of crane companies serving their community much like an auto mechanic, much like a dentist, much like a fire department serves a community.

One big fire station in San Francisco will not cover Northern California. Those big companies that work 24 hours a day and make millions of dollars a month, I am a small little dot when it comes to the economic impact. But I'm an important component to my local economy and the people that I employ.

I am begging you, 20,000 miles. Leadership has shown by actions taken to bring success to others. Do not make a decision today that will hurt the economy of California. I thank you very much, and I got lots of notes. And we are here to answer any questions, because
we engaged in this for a long time.

But I will close with this decision is not just
the heavy truck cranes, also boom trucks. My 80,000 pound
crane that rides down the road on a Peterbilt is a boom
truck. It's 50 tons. It's $450,000 to buy a new one. I
can't by a new one, but I am going to replace my 1990
truck very soon, once I've paid off my 2009, which will
not be compliable very soon.

So this artificial, you know, mandate is not one
size shoe fits all. I don't flip my fleet. I will have
my cranes, because I take care of them, on a small
independent business owner. And I'm speaking on behalf of
multitudes of people like me, and we employ lots of people
to state of California, and we serve hundreds -- actually,
thousands of companies. You will have a demand -- a
damaging effect to California's economy, if you think this
is one size shoe fits all, and we are all penalized
equally or have the equal same mandate.

Please, I implore you. And I thank you so much.
I truly respect and appreciate all that you guys do.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks for your comments. We
will be talking about this further.

Next.

MR. VLAMING: That's a tough act to follow.
Madam Chair, members of the CARB Board, staff, my name is Michael Vlaming. I am the Executive Director of the Crane Owners Association and the Mobile Crane Operators Group. Collectively, the members of these two organizations represent over 30 crane rental contractors that have both small, medium, and large sized crane fleets. I would say conservatively these members own in excess of 500 mobile cranes. This regulation directly affects them, and that is why I'm here in Fresno today to testify.

As has been said, this regulation, there's been a lot of work done. And I want to take a moment and commend CARB staff Steve Cliff and Beth White. I want to really call them out and appreciate the work that they've done in providing two workshops. I mean, we've had a lot of meetings over the years. But on this proposed amendment, we've had two workshops in the state of California. We've also had some small group meetings.

And I appreciate the opportunity to express our concerns. While we may have disagreements, it always feels good to be able to get the issues out on the table and have an open discussion about them.

This regulation is very important. It's very -- and I appreciate staff's work on it. I think the report calls out the differences between cranes, and trucks, and
buses, and even solid waste vehicles. They're very unique pieces of equipment, both in terms of configuration and in operation.

Collectively, they have a very small footprint. But I will tell you that we share your mission in clean air in achieving cleaner air. The key is the balancing of interests and resources in accomplishing the goals, right? Success is truly a balance of where you allocate your resource to achieve maximum success.

These cranes provide a vital service to the California economy. And their ability to continue to operate both as a small fleet company, a medium-sized fleet company, or a large fleet company is very important to California and its industry.

Because you have different sized fleets, you have different impacts. But collectively, the implementation of this amendment as quickly as possible is important, because as staff has said, we have companies that are going into noncompliance because of the Lawson case.

I would suggest that because of this impact -- the disproportionate impact on small- and medium-sized fleets, greater flexibility is required for them to have success in complying with the regulation.

Mr. Patti has brought up the notion of increasing the low use, low mileage exemption. And we would support
that, because it really helps the small and medium fleets. We would be happy to work with staff. If we can get the regulation passed, and continue to work with staff to accomplish success for all sized fleets.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. KONLE: My name is Mike Konle. I'm the owner of Champion Crane in Southern California. And the one size fits all is what our problem is here. And it was mentioned that the level playing field that all the crane companies would be on a level playing field. The larger crane companies have a greater advantage over the smaller crane companies because they have multi-state facilities, and they can move their older cranes out of California without any penalty to them at all.

It's really hard on the little guy that's only in California to replace the fleets and compare to a Peterbilt truck that costs $150,000. Our cranes cost anywhere from $750,000 to three or four or five million dollars a piece. And they have the same exact motor as a Peterbilt truck.

So the cost comparison to the advantage of cleaning up the air makes it a little tough on the small businesses like we have.

OSHA, when we're talking about the PM filters to
put on our on-road trucks, the -- OSHA will not allow us
to. And I gave you guys a brochure that shows that OSHA
won't allow us to change it unless the manufacturer
approves it. And I've got letters from all the
manufacturers saying they will not allow us to modify the
 crane because it will take the certification off of it.
And with all the compliance regulations that we're up
against, taking the certification away from the crane
means that we can't use it.

So forcing the small crane owners to put PM
filters on their cranes illegally is really a big hardship
on us, because we have a choice of illegally putting the
PM filter on the older cranes or selling it and getting it
out of the state of California. That's our only two
choice. And it's such an expensive operation. And the
safety is one of our biggest issues. We're in a
teeter-totter mode every day of tipping over, so we can't
modify this crane in any way, shape, or form because it
affects their certification.

So the unintended consequences of getting rid of
all the little guys and making only the big guys left is
the travel time. These cranes are hard to move. Travel
time to the big companies are probably two or three hours
from a job as opposed to me being 30 minutes from a job.
The unintended consequences of losing the little guy is
going to cause more pollution than giving us a break in
the travel time or -- I mean the minimum mileage that we
can travel.

Twenty thousand miles would save us all. I had
5,000 miles and I had to park my cranes for three months
just to comply with the 5,000 miles. And I'm in a city
area as opposed to some of these guys that are in the
rural area.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. KRAZAN: Good afternoon. My name is Tom
Krazan. And back in 2014, I got on a waiting list for
drilling my well deeper. And my wife and I, we were
already retired. And we went around and talked to a lot
of the drillers, and everybody was behind anywhere from
six months to two years. And I noticed that the industry
was dominated by family-operated operations, in other
words, everybody is pretty small. And I live in the
general Fresno area here.

So I looked over -- talked to my wife and said,
you know, why don't we take our retirement money and let's
buy a drill rig. Looks like there's a good industry. And
then in 2015, Brown then had the emergency drought
declaration.

And to make a long story short, we made almost a
million dollars for just one truck. Of course, it takes 
other trucks to go and support all that. And then I 
brought in two partners. I got them to go and quit their 
jobs and join me in this dream. Okay. 

And then I started attending some of the local 
association meetings, and I found out it's really pretty 
loose. There's not a good association group, even though 
they call themselves the California Groundwater 
Association. And then one day I found out about this 
thing called SB 1. And I read it a half a dozen times, 
and upside down, right side up, right side down. Because 
at first it's just a few sentences. But for me, it felt 
hard to understand, until I finally realized it was really 
telling me if I have very low use on my vehicle, I'm going 
to have to retire it in 18 years. 

Now, last year, we only drove our drill rig, 
which is our center piece, we only drove it 600 miles. 
And if I calculate out at the end of 18 years, I'm going 
to have this almost million dollar piece of equipment, I'm 
going to have less than 20,000 miles on it. And I'm 
taking a look at an industry that's really struggling. 

We're not very sophisticated. What I found out 
is I came from a different -- I'm also an engineer. I 
came from a -- kind of a different background, and I'm 
joining a bunch of blue collar people that work really
hard. A lot do not have a college education. A lot of them just look at their business as family owned. But we're beginning to see folks now becoming spooked not knowing what they can do with these expensive pieces of equipment that they're going to have to retire.

So we're similar to cranes. We have to raise it directly when we have towers and things like that. But if you take a look around the table, look at all the water bottles. Okay. Look at all the containers. You guys are drinking groundwater. I have to worry about the air too, but I have to worry about the groundwater also. We're in an area that that's our only water source. And you only have a small number of drilling companies -- in fact, within the Fresno market here, we only have 10, and most of us own one drill rig, as well as maybe some support vehicles. So statewide, we may have 1,000 drill rigs total.

So we impact groundwater hundred percent, and we're the only contractor, C57 contractors, allowed to drill to groundwater, whether it's for a city, whether it's for a private party, whether it's for a disadvantaged community.

And just to kind of share with you real quick before the red light pops on, a couple minutes ago my -- I stepped out, and my partner called me and said, hey, we
have a family here that can't afford a new bladder tank, a
new pressure tank, what do we do? I said give it to them.

So we're here supporting the community as a
private entity, and at the same time, we're, you know,
acting a little bit like a nonprofit too. So anything
that comes to mind that could maybe help our industry.
Again, we're not well connected, but we really work hard.

Thank you so much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

MR. RUSHING: Rocky Rushing with Coalition for
Clean Air. Coalition for Clean Air neither supports or
opposes the proposed amendments. We understand the
dynamics behind them. We understand the complications
faced by the crane owners, operators, as expressed by
Supervisor Patti from Stockton and others here today.
Stockton being my home town, the cradle of my youth.

But despite that, home town bonding, CCA would
ask the Board to go no further than the proposed
amendments. Pump the brakes where staff has proposed.
CCA believes, and I'm sure the Board and staff agrees,
that there should be no reverse gear on California's clean
air regulations.

Thank you so much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: People are inspired to want to
get up and speak. And I don't want to close the hearing
prematurely, but please if you're planning to speak, could you go turn in a card right now. We just two new ones. But Kevin Hamilton I think is next, unless Mr. Krazan is here. Is Kevin here. Okay. He may have left. All right. Then it would be Thomas Preston.

MR. PRESTON: All right. Number one of the inspired ones that I just popped in. So appreciate the time. I just want to start, appreciate -- get closer, okay. Appreciate the staff's immediate attention to the issue that kind of, you know, came up in 2018.

Speaking as a small business, owner that -- in the crane industry, this really does have that impact that the previous folks have talked about. And if we look at all the small and medium fleets out there in the state, they really do have that impact on the rural communities. It will affect the urban as well, but the rural is really the one that's impacted the most by it.

Kind of second what these guys have said, just looking for that exemption on the mileage to be extended to a larger number. Just allow us the opportunity to really get our fleet in line, but still continue to be a successful member of the state, community. And just a company that can be effective while meeting guidelines and
still moving towards the same goals.

    CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Mr. Durdella.

    MR. DURDELLA: Good day. My name is Todd. I own
a small crane company in Southern California. I bought my
 crane company about eight years ago. And this issue would
affect about a third of my fleet. It would cost me more
to replace that third of my fleet with new compliant
 cranes than it did for me to buy the entire fleet upon
 purchase eight years ago.

    I agree with the other gentlemen, I'd appreciate
the 20,000 mile, or thereabouts, instead of the 1,000
 mile, because it allows me more time to generate the
profit required to be able to replace the cranes in a
timely manner.

    Thank you for your time.

    CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. And thanks for coming
and sharing your specific story here.

    I was joking about the last minute requests, but
if there's anybody else who wants to speak on this item.
If not, I'm going to close it off for the testimony and
proceed to conversation among the Board.

    Seeing none.

    Okay. Let's then move on to -- to the situation
at hand. So we have one very specific request for a
change in the language that relates to the distance
exemption for small -- basically, low mileage -- low
mileage, that's the word I was -- thank you.

And I think other folks are just experiencing
different types of problems with accommodating to this
rule, which is quite understandable, because it is
challenging. However, we've been through this before with
every other kind of truck and bus that seems like in the
state. So it's now time to face up to it I guess with the
it cranes.

So I guess the first question has to do with just
what flexibility there would be at this stage in the
proceeding? We're dealing with a response to a court
action, some compliance deadlines. And anything that we
did would have to be on a notice -- a 15-day notice to
make further changes, unless we wait and bring it back the
next time we look at this rule, which is also something
that could happen.

So should we talk about just timing of all of
this. I don't know who wants to respond. Jack. Mr.
Kitowski.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:

Yes. This is Jack Kitowski. Yes. The way you
characterize that is exactly right. There are a large
number of fleets due to the lawsuit that are out of
compliance now. And so any action this Board -- any
change from the proposal we had would require additional months that those vehicles would be out of compliance.

I think the main issue that was brought up was related to the low-use exemption, and where that threshold could be.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Right.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:

And I think the -- kind of the focus or the point that's worth mentioning when we went through this proposal, our desire, our driver was really to reinstate the 2014 amendments that were rescinded by the lawsuit.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Um-hmm.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:

And that 1,000 miles is consistent with those 2014 amendments. So there are a number of fleets, over 50 percent of the fleets, that have already taken action to either retrofit or replace consistent with the 2014 amendments. And changing that now would create equity issues with those fleets as well. They're not all represented here. But you do see that balance that, you know, we were faced with as we were trying to come back to the Board. And what we fell back on was the consistency with the 2014 amendments that were already in place, and that equity with those -- the other fleets.

I think it's worth mentioning that from the data
we have, the average fleet mileage is about 10,000 miles, so -- for these cranes. They don't do a lot of mileage. So something even -- what we've heard most of the time a 5,000 mile request. We've heard 20,000 miles here. That would be a big loophole in our view.

CHAIR NICHOLS: There would be very few people who wouldn't qualify for that is what you're saying.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI: Correct.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, yeah, I guess -- sort of as a policy matter, I am sympathetic to the distinction between urban and rural as we were talking about earlier today. But the only place where I was just asking this question of Vice Chair Berg earlier, because I was -- I remember that, at some point, we had done something in a regulation that made a distinction between different areas of the state and the rules that would be applicable on mobile sources.

And I think we were concerned about logging trucks up in the far north area, where you had counties that were actually in compliance with the air quality regulations, but where they thought -- you know, where making them shift over was going to be prohibitively expensive. And we did -- we did acknowledge that in the regulations, but it was definitely not in a situation
where you were in an area that is violating the air
quality standards and has the kinds of health problems
that we've been hearing about. So that sort of changed my
view about this situation.

Well, are there any other comments from Board
members or questions of the staff about this?

Mrs. Berg.

VICE CHAIR BERG: So I do remember in 2014 we did
have a lot of discussion on the amount of mileage that
should qualify for low use. And there was -- there was
discussion at the time should it be 5,000, should it be
10,000? I know industry put out 20,000, but I don't think
that was a serious consideration for the Board because of
the impact of the pollution for that amount.

But even my recollection was is that the impacts,
even at 5,000 and 10,000 were going to affect our ability
for attaining the SIP. And do you have a recollection of
that, Mr. Brasil?

MSCD TRANSPORTATION AND CLEAN TECHNOLOGY BRANCH

CHIEF BRASIL: Yes, that's correct. Okay. That is
correct. Tony Brasil, Branch Chief.

When we did the 2014 amendments, we did look at
the 5,000 miles and we did actually, in the amendments,
propose -- the Board approved a 5,000 mile exemption that
expired in 2020, so that we would still have all 2010
engines for most of the trucks in the state to meet the
2023 goal of getting the maximum emissions reductions to
meet the 2024 SIP deadline. So it was a consideration.

Also, when we did our analysis here for this
report, we also looked at what would happen if we gave a
flat out exemption, that 20,000 mile limit would be a --
effectively an exemption. Emissions would actually go up
from cranes. It wouldn't go down over the next year,
which would also present a CEQA challenge, in addition to
not achieving the air quality reductions we need for
meeting the SIP goals.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Well, and the crane industry
wasn't the only industry. We had the moving industry also
that was looking at their mileage, because they also don't
drive. They drive every day, but not as far.

And so this has been a difficult issue for these
smaller- and medium-sized industries that do attract a lot
of small- and medium-size.

When we look at the proposal of what we're
suggesting on slide 11, the phased in schedule, that is
the same schedule you're saying that we did vote in 2014?

MSCD TRANSPORTATION AND CLEAN TECHNOLOGY BRANCH

CHIEF BRASIL: That is correct. And that is in part to
maintain the equity balance with all the fleet owners who
have already made upgrades. So we've, in essence, kept
the proposal almost identical to the 2014 amendments.

VICE CHAIR BERG: And then --

MSCD TRANSPORTATION AND CLEAN TECHNOLOGY BRANCH

CHIEF BRASIL: With a very few exceptions.

VICE CHAIR BERG: And then the optional model year schedule, that's new that you're bringing in. And how are you seeing that that optional schedule could benefit timing wise for industry, because it does seem pretty tight to me.

MSCD TRANSPORTATION AND CLEAN TECHNOLOGY BRANCH

CHIEF BRASIL: It is. It's a -- one, it's a requirement of SB 1 that any amendments we make to a regulation or new regulations that there is this minimum useful life rule -- associated with the vehicles. So those model year schedules do match that.

It will ultimately depend on the individual fleet. If somebody has one crane, it may, in fact, give them more time. It may not.

And so -- but it is an option there to make sure that we maintain consistency with the legal requirement.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Well, I am very sympathetic -- oh, yes, Mr. Kitowski.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:

I'd like to clarify on that, that the optional model year schedule is there only to provide additional
VICE CHAIR BERG: Okay.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI: It doesn't bring anything up. So it is -- it is providing that additional time in the few cases we think where there might be an overlap with the SB 1 requirements on minimum useful life.

VICE CHAIR BERG: So I am very sympathetic to what industry is facing and I have -- have 19 trucks that I've personally had to reinvest. And a lot of them came up at -- for renewal at the same time. Six trucks one year under the Truck and Bus Rule, 2010 models, that quite frankly didn't work as well. I had to work my way through that. So I am very sympathetic.

The problem that I have is that trying to change things at this point in time, we have found that it does create this inequity to what we've put out to the rest of the industry. And so I'm just quite frankly, Madam Chair, not sure where else we can help today. But is there something that staff could think about that we should consider or --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well --

VICE CHAIR BERG: What would our recommendation be?

CHAIR NICHOLS: I was concerned by the comment
that there are already fleets that are out of compliance. That doesn't make me feel good. It makes me irritated, if not worried, because what are we going to do about these people? I mean, are we just going to like decide objectively that we don't think we can enforce the rules and create an amnesty for a while, or --

VICE CHAIR BERG: So the out of compliance though, these are people that got an exemption because of the safety rules. So I didn't get the impression that they were --

CHAIR NICHOLS: I don't think that's -- that wasn't what I heard.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Okay.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Maybe I need clarification of what that comment was.

MSCD TRANSPORTATION AND CLEAN TECHNOLOGY BRANCH CHIEF BRASIL: This is Tony again. I think if I can describe it, it's as of last year, most of these fleets were compliant with what they believe the regulation required, which reflected the 2014 amendments. So if ten percent of the cranes in the fleet had a 2010 engine, they were compliant. Because of the lawsuit, that just changed over night.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Okay.

MSCD TRANSPORTATION AND CLEAN TECHNOLOGY BRANCH
CHIEF BRASIL: And so now these cranes that were in a fleet that complied, technically do not comply with Truck and Bus Regulation.

VICE CHAIR BERG: I said it was driven by the law suit --

CHAIR NICHOLS: By the lawsuit, yes.

VICE CHAIR BERG: -- not because people are choosing not to comply.

MSCD TRANSPORTATION AND CLEAN TECHNOLOGY BRANCH

CHIEF BRASIL: By the lawsuit.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I understand.

MSCD TRANSPORTATION AND CLEAN TECHNOLOGY BRANCH

CHIEF BRASIL: Yeah. And this is why we're kind of bringing this in relatively short order. It is roughly four months ago we determined that this is the way we could address it.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah. There will be --

MSCD TRANSPORTATION AND CLEAN TECHNOLOGY BRANCH

CHIEF BRASIL: Reinstate the flexibility. Otherwise, they are out of compliance. They'll have to take action. And then there's overlap with the lawsuit and enforcing our regulation, of course, is something that's a balance we have to make.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Supervisor, you feel compelled to say something here.
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY SUPERVISOR PATTI: No, just. There was a question. So if we can answer anything, we are here. If it didn't work in 2014, our equipment hasn't magically repaired, or fixed itself, nor run its lifecycle. Remember, it's not just the truck, it's equipment that's worth hundreds of thousands of dollars. And there's some of us that able to get More compliant than others. There's big companies that can absorb this and move on and get new equipment. Every couple years, they automatically buy new equipment, so they can say absolutely they are compliant.

And the only thing that we're asking for that exemption doesn't mean if you give us 20,000 miles, it doesn't mean we're going to do 20,000 miles. There's some in rural areas that may do 12,000 miles. I might do 18,000 miles, but -- and then some people might do 4,000 miles. So that's just the -- that's why we ask for that 20,000. It doesn't mean we're going to go out driving up and down the state of California just to get it to our 20,000 miles. We don't enjoy polluting.

We are in the service of others, on call, as needed. And when a service happens, it's urgent. We have to comply -- we have to and reply and give service, otherwise we're out of business. If you restrict that because of these mandates, because the miles, or because
we're not compliant with all buying that new equipment, we can't buy that new equipment. I don't have 1.2 million. And we're not asking you today to find us the funding in Sacramento to offset.

Give us 90 percent of the money, we'll buy the new fleet. No problem. Absolutely. I will buy it. Give us that 90 percent of the money. It's not there.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Right.

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY SUPERVISOR PATTI: Twenty thousand miles gives us an exemption, gives us a life line that in the next five, six, eight years, we're automatically going to be there guys. If it didn't work in 2014, it's not working in 2019. Our cranes aren't magically different. They still have a life.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah. Understood.

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY SUPERVISOR PATTI: Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you. I understand why you're successful in running for office.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Very eloquent. Yes. Mr. De La Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So on the Truck and Bus Rule, as many of you know --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: -- I was not
supportive of doing an extension them. I'm not supportive of doing an extension in any way now. There are people who have been in good faith keeping up with the regs. And the only thing that changed was the lawsuit, which was recent. The 2014 rules were in effect for all that time. So, to me, it is very similar to that Truck and Bus Rule, where we had given an extension, and then that extension was running out, and then the Board decided to give another extension. I was not supportive of that.

I'm not supportive of changing the rules that have been in effect since 2014, because the only thing that's changed is the lawsuit that was actually on the other side. It was more aggressive, not less.

So going back to the 2014 structure makes sense. The one thing I wanted to say, which I talked to staff about, was the mileage versus utilization. Clearly, these vehicles get driven somewhere, and they are parked for sometimes a significant amount of time, which is why they have low mileage.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Right.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: And they are working, meaning their engines are running, even though they're not moving for that whole period of time. So to -- no, that's not the case.

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY SUPERVISOR PATTI: That's not
true.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: That doesn't --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Hold it. Hold it. The court report has to actually report what's said from the microphone.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Somebody -- somebody. The fleet. Well, staff what's the -- what's the breakdown --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks. We'll just let the staff cover it here.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: -- roughly of mileage verse -- of vehicles that have an engine that runs when it's parked and doing its thing.

We talked about this in my briefing.

MSCD TRANSPORTATION AND CLEAN TECHNOLOGY BRANCH

CHIEF BRASIL: I don't recall the numbers right now. But it is true that the miles would represent a relatively small portion of the total operation. I know we have -- in the staff report, we've identified about how many hours they operate a year.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So to me that's the important number. It's one or the other or a combination of both. And so that's where we should be looking at is not just on the mileage but how much is this thing on and polluting? And that's what we need to base our --
CHAIR NICHOLS: I was just about to say -- not to interrupt. I apologize.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yeah. That was it.

CHAIR NICHOLS: It's important to remember that the reason why we're here is because we've tried to do something for this particular category of vehicles. Years ago we thought they should be carved out for a special treatment, and we were sued by competitors essentially, others from the trucking industry, and we lost.

So we're back here now trying to find a way to help these folks in a situation where we've already been told that there's certain things we can't do that would represent discrimination or some form of improper conduct by us.

So I realize that's a difficult position to be in, and we're not happy about it either, but that's where we are. So I don't know that there's anything more to add at this point.

MR. KONLE: Can I respond to the amount of mileage that's used going down the road and the amount of engine that's used when it's on the job?

The engine going down the road is a fairly good sized engine, but when it gets to the job site, it barely gets over an idle. So the work that the engine does on the road is 90 percent of its workload during the day.
Ten percent would probably be the fuel burned on the job site, because it's at an idle 99 percent of the time on the job site.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I'm technically going to rule this out of order, because I had already closed the public comment portion of this hearing. I apologize for everybody. It's been a little bit loose, but we understand that people feel strongly and have something to contribute to the conversation.

So I think we're going to just have to bite the bullet so to speak.

MSCD TRANSPORTATION AND CLEAN TECHNOLOGY BRANCH CHIEF BRASIL: I can actually identify the hours that we actually have data on.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

MSCD TRANSPORTATION AND CLEAN TECHNOLOGY BRANCH CHIEF BRASIL: So we do have in the staff report that on average for year, a crane will do about 676 hours a year, most of that being stationary. So that's relatively -- relatively a lot. And the Truck and Bus Regulation today does have a 100-hour limit too, plus the 1,000 mile limit.

And so here we're proposing to not put an hour limit to provide the flexibility, which is consistent with the 2014 amendments.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you. All right. So I guess we should proceed on the -- on the resolution that is before us then. Do I have a motion and a second?
BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I'll move it.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Second.
CHAIR NICHOLS: And a second.
All those in favor, please say aye?
(Unanimous aye vote.)
CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed?
Abstentions?
Okay. Thanks all for your participation.
I'm sorry, we weren't able to accommodate all the requests that people had for changes. But I would say that our staff with other rules has been pretty good about working with industries on a case-by-case basis. I know Vice Chair Berg personally has been involved in some of these situations with individuals who had questions, or issues, or concerns about how to come into compliance. And she has once again volunteered her good offices to assist staff in this regard. And we hope that people will take advantage of that.

So thank you. We will take a break and come back at 1:15
(Off record: 12:38 p.m.)

(Thereupon a lunch break was taken.)
AFTERNOON SESSION

(On record: 1:21 p.m.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. We're about to resume after the lunch break.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. There's something about this place that just brings out the goof in all of us, I guess, at least me.

Welcome back, everybody. We are now on to our final item of the agenda, which is a report from the Executive Officer to talk about the Board's program priorities for 2019. And no action is called for on this on the part of the Board, but it's here because Mr. Corey wants our input. He wants our support and a discussion, I think, about what's in the document. We will take public comment, I guess, if anybody wants to comment from the audience.

And with that, Mr. Corey, take it away.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY:

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Thanks, Chair.

So what I'm going to do for closing out today's board meeting is highlighting our accomplishments, really the Agency and the Board's, in 2018, as well as this
year's priorities going forward. So really two key elements reflected in my remarks.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: So first I'd like to begin though the presentation by taking a moment to welcome Governor Newsom and CalEPA Secretary Jared Blumenfeld. Really looking forward to working with the Governor and the Secretary to continue the important work of fighting climate change and providing clean air for all Californians.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: CARB had a number of groundbreaking accomplishments in 2018 that we should all be really proud of. Launching the AB 617 Community Protection Program in one year was a great success. But as everyone of you know, we have a lot more to do to implement this program. Greenhouse gas emissions fell below their 2020 target four years ahead of schedule. And we made significant progress on zero-emission technologies. We enhanced our actions on climate change and adopted an important criteria pollutant and toxics emission reporting regulation.

And in 2019, we'll continue to implement AB 617. We'll also work hard toward meeting the ambitious goal of statewide carbon neutrality. We'll continue to act on the
climate change scoping plan and our State Implementation Plan as discussed today. We'll also develop a more holistic approach to transportation, which is a necessary component of meeting our ambitious goals. And finally, we'll continue to strengthen our collaboration with other states and nations.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Now, I have -- now, I've given you some of the highlights. What I'd like to do is breakdown how we move forward in this conversation with -- really according to four broad themes: focusing on communities, acting on climate change, advancing clean transportation, and collaborating with our partners.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The first thing we'll talk about is focusing on communities.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Last year, the Board approved the landmark Community Air Protection Blueprint, which outlines CARB's process for identifying impacted communities and criteria for development of community emission reduction programs and air monitoring. The Board also identified the first set of communities that will be subject to this framework.

--o0o--
EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The Legislature has appropriated significant funds to be investigated -- or rather, invested in communities. CARB's 2018-19 incentive budget is on the order of one billion. And CARB is targeting these funds at impacted areas. CARB awarded ten million in community air grants to 28 different community groups to support their participation in AB 617 process.

And in 2018, the Board also approved 423 million Volkswagen Environmental Mitigation Trust for which we're working with the air districts to implement. Our investments extended well beyond financial resources. We've also been focusing on more effective ways of engaging communities.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Environmental justice was central to our -- to our community work. Veronica and her team worked to increase transparency, accessibility, and relationship building throughout the policy development process, including attending every AB 617 community steering committee meeting.

New forms of community outreach were pioneered. For example, CARB member De La Torre has worked with our EJ team to facilitate dialogue between CARB's Executive Office and environmental justice communities.

--o0o--
EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: We've also focused on providing communities with more accessible transparent and actionable air quality information. Last year, we updated our pollution mapping tool to include greenhouse gases, criteria, and toxic pollutant emissions data for every facility subject to mandatory reporting of GHG emissions. Now, community members can see how much facilities and their communities emit.

Our data collection efforts were also enhanced. In December, the Board adopted the regulation for reporting of criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants. This regulation will further support community level information as well as action.

---00---

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: For this year, it's important to keep the momentum with implementing the Community Protection Program. This means developing reduction targets, emission reduction measures, implementation schedules, and enforcement plans. Staff will provide regular progress reports to the Board.

We'll also prioritize spending incentive funds that were appropriated. In addition, we're working with the air districts to develop programs for the Volkswagen Environmental Mitigation Trust and expect these funds to be hitting the streets shortly.
Finally, the Board will consider additional communities for selection based on the priorities discussed last year. The Board will also consider emission reduction measures under the Community Protection Program.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: This year, we'll continue to explore new ways to work with community -- communities to ground-truth established inventories. We're also collaborating with local community groups to use automated license plate readers to better characterize vehicle fleet mix and activity in their communities.

This year, we'll also launch a new statewide community air monitoring data portal, a comprehensive data repository and web tool that allows for meaningful and easy interpretation of community air data.

Later this year, the Board will hear amendments to the air toxics hot spots emissions inventory regulation that will strengthen our toxics inventory.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I'd now -- now, I'm going to switch gears to the next theme, which is acting on climate change.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: A major accomplishment
from the last year was that California's 2016 GHG
emissions fell below the 2020 target called for under AB
32, while the climate -- or rather economy continued to
grow. This really underscores that economic vitality and
climate action can go hand in hand.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: The need to act on
climate change is greater than ever. Last year, the
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change released a
special report predicting higher damages at lower global
warming temperatures than previously expected.

IPCC report called for carbon neutrality by 2040
through 2045 to keep temperature rise to 1.5 degrees
centigrade or lower. Unfortunately, California is already
seeing the consequences of climate change. The wildfires
of 2018 were California's most destructive season on
record. 1.8 million acres burned costing the State over
four billion in damages and fire suppression and releasing
about 50 million tons of carbon dioxide equivalent in the
atmosphere. The Carr and Camp Fires tragically claimed 93
lives.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: So what can we do?
Acting on climate change is just one part of a
broader effort to mitigate wildfires in California. On
his first day in office Governor Newsom signed a series of executive actions aimed at wildfire protection. The Governor's proposed budget includes a 105 million increase in wildfire safety funding, in addition to the 200 million approved by the Legislature in 2018.

And pursuant to SB 1260, we're also working with CalFire, in coordination with local air districts, to develop a program to enhance air quality and smoke monitoring and provide a public awareness campaign regarding prescribed burns.

In coordination with our agency partners, we recently published a draft Natural and Working Lands Climate Change Implementation Plan. This plan is aimed at coordinating the State's programs to improve conservation, restoration, and management of California's natural and working lands to meet our long-term climate objectives.

---000---

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: And despite a federal administration that is increasingly hostile to environmental regulation, CARB continued to move forward in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, criteria and toxic pollutants.

Last year, the Board adopted a more ambitious Low Carbon Fuel Standard doubling the stringency of the program by 2030. The Cap-and-Trade program achieved 100
percent compliance rate. We also completed a major rulemaking to align with the legislation direction in AB 398, as well as Board direction for the Cap-and-Trade Program.

We worked with our sister agencies and the research community to better understand how much carbon is sequestered in plants and soils throughout the state. The effort culminated in publishing the first edition of the Natural and Working Lands Inventory for all lands in California. It's the first of its kind in the United States.

And after a court ruling struck down significant portions of the United States Environmental Protection Agency's Significant New Alternatives Program to reduce HFC emissions, or hydrofluorocarbons, refrigerants, CARB began rulemakings to re-erect the program at the State level.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: And on an international level, we collaborated with our partners on climate change. We co-hosted the Global Climate Action Summit, which generated over 500 commitments to international climate action. We co-chaired the United States Climate Alliance and America's Pledge. We continued implementation of over 50 partnership agreements and
memorandums of understanding with international jurisdiction.

And in a notable example of international collaboration, we assisted Canada with the design of the Clean Fuel Standard, a program similar to California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard.

--00o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: This year, we'll be working toward a statewide goal of carbon neutrality by 2045. Carbon neutrality means any GHG emissions are balanced with equal or greater sequestration of carbon.

And as I mentioned a few slides ago, the 2018 IPCC report stated that it will be necessary to achieve global carbon neutrality in that same time frame in order to keep temperature increases below 1.5 degrees C.

To achieve carbon neutrality, we'll need to further decarbonize our mobile fossil energy and industry sectors, while taking action to maximize the potential for sequestration in our natural and working lands.

As part of approve -- as part of approving amendments to the Low Carbon Fuel Standard regulation in 2018, the Board acknowledged stakeholder concerns about cost containment features of the program and directed the Executive Officer to propose technical adjustments if needed.
This year, we'll continue to address short-lived climate pollutants. Last month, the Dairy Livestock GHG Reduction Working Group presented final recommendations for how the State can address the challenges and barriers to meeting methane emission reductions from dairy and livestock operations. Staff will present an update to the Board next month.

This year, staff will also provide the Board with an update on the implementation status of the scoping plan, and bring for Board consideration regulations related to fuel cell net energy metering and sulfur hexafluoride gas-insulated switchgear.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: A key element of reducing GHG emissions is clean transportation. I'll be breaking this part of the presentation down into four sections: cars, trucks, freight, and sustainable transportation.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Between December of 2010 and December of 2018, more than 537,000 electric cars were purchased or leased in California. In 2018 alone, CARB approved over 70,000 rebates to promote the purchase of electric vehicles. CARB was also instrumental in advancing building standards for electric vehicle charging
in multi-family housing.

CARB's scrap and replace programs have helped replace over 3,700 old cars with new cleaner vehicles, targeting low-income customers. CARB also promoted several equity pilot projects, such as agricultural work vanpooling, rural school buses, and statewide financing assistance for low-income consumers.

---o0o---

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: This coming year, we'll continue to develop Advanced Clean Cars II, really as we look at the next generation of the cleanest zero-emission vehicles.

New to 2019 will be a focus on fleet emissions. SB 1014 -- with SB 1014 we'll be researching GHG emissions from ride-hailing services and proposing regulations to reduce these emissions. We'll also take a look -- a closer look at autonomous vehicles and we'll be incorporating the State's new autonomous vehicle policy principles in that work.

And in 2019, the Board will consider electric vehicle charging open access regulations, as well as the 2019-20 funding plan for Low Carbon Transportation and Air Quality Improvement Program.

---o0o---

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Ensuring trucks remain
clean throughout their useful life, CARB was instrumental in a nationwide voluntary recall of half a million heavy-duty trucks manufactured by Cummins. These trucks are recalled due to excess emissions caused by defective catalysts, which were discovered as part of CARB's new Heavy-Duty In-Use Compliance Program.

Last year, the Board approved a number of regulations related to heavy-duty vehicles. These included the phase 2 GHG standards and amendments to the Tractor-Trailer GHG Regulation, as well as the Innovative Clean Transit Regulation, which marked a key step toward meeting CARB's long-term vision of achieving a zero emission transit system by 2040.

Last year, CARB enhanced truck and bus enforcement leading to the implementation of SB 1, which ties truck regula -- registration in California to compliance with the Truck and Bus Regulation beginning in 2020.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: This year, we'll continue to clean up the truck fleet. CARB will develop a heavy-duty low oxides of nitrogen truck standard. Staff plans to present the heavy-duty omnibus NOx regulation to the Board by early 2020. We'll also work on assessing fleets rules that would require zero-emission car and
zero-emission truck purchases.

CARB staff will also propose a zero-emission truck manufacturer requirement that would phase in zero-emission trucks from 2024 through 2030, as well as propose zero-emission airport shuttles, and emission powertrain certification.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Last year, we leveraged CARB funds and public and private investments to award 415 million to freight projects in disadvantaged communities. CARB also submitted formal written comments on ten proposed freight projects.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: To continue reducing freight's impact in communities, CARB will develop a freight handbook that identifies best practices for freight facilities to minimize community exposures to air pollution, incorporate the uses of zero-emission technologies, install any needed fuel charging infrastructure, and maximize the capacity of freight transportation infrastructure.

This handbook will serve as a resource for local decision makers, community advocates, developers, and lead agencies for environmental review and analysis. We plan to present the first module, the freight handbook, on
warehouses and distribution centers to the Board later this year.

We're also planning to propose regulatory amendments to further reduce emissions from ships at berth. And CARB will develop 2020 reg amendments transition transport refrigeration units - refrigeration units on truck trailers - to zero emission operation and to achieve additional reductions from commercial harbor craft.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: At the Board's direction, CARB focused on adjustments to SB 375 implementation. These changes include an emphasis on the land use and transportation strategies that underpin Sustainable Communities Strategies and a need to increase transparency and accountability of SCSs.

Recognizing the importance of monitoring and reporting on metrics in the SCS's, the Legislature tasked CARB with issuing a report every four years analyzing the progress made under SB 375.

At the end of last year, CARB published the first Sustainable Communities Progress Report. This report analyzed the progress made toward meeting the GHG reduction target and included data-supported metrics for SCSs as well as discussion of best practices and
challenges.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: And in response to the adjustments I just described, CARB staff are updating the SCS Program and Evaluation Guidelines. These guidelines will outline how CARB will increase transparency and strategies in the SCSs, future tracking of the on-the-ground implementation, assessment of how MPOs will do more in their next plans, and how regions are conducting equity analyses as part of their SCS development.

Staff released a draft version of the guidelines in December and are currently soliciting comments. We'll also hold a Board hearing this year to discuss the Sustainable Communities Progress report.

This year we'll continue our joint meetings with the California Transportation Commission to coordinate on achieving California's transportation and air quality goals. CARB will also work with the University of California Institute of Transportation Studies and the California Transportation Commission to hold a series of roundtable discussions on the introduction and transition to shared, automated, electric, and connected mobility.

The purpose of these roundtables is to gather input from leaders from the public and private sectors to
develop a plan for State policy needs to guide these
innovations. These mobility roundtables are the result of
Dr. Sperling's offer to help advance discussions in this
space.

---o0o---

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: As our Sustainable
Communities Progress Report highlighted, meeting CARB's
climate goals will require significant changes that
address the interconnected relationship of land use,
housing, economic and workforce development,
transportation investments, and travel choices.

This year, CARB will focus on transitioning to
this holistic approach to sustainable transportation. We
plan on discussing this topic in much more detail at
future hearings.

---o0o---

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: CARB is pursuing a
reorganization that will reflect our evolving approach to
sustainable transportation. CARB's new Sustainable
Transportation and Communities Division will consolidate
light-duty regulatory programs, climate investment
programs, passenger and freight transportation, and
land-use planning.

The reorganization will also split the Emissions
Compliance, Automotive Regulations and Science Division
into two divisions to accommodate a growing corrective action case load and organize our programs in a way that are more aligned and efficient.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Finally, collaborating with our partners across the nations and the world is key to our success.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: In 2018, our contractor began construction on the new emissions testing and research facility in Southern California. In 2018, an art consultant was selected through a competitive process to develop the public art program for the Southern California consolidation project. Our art consultant worked with the art committee, which Chair Nichols is a member, through the adoption of a public art plan, the commissioning of six permanent public art works, and a program that supports community engagement and outreach through the arts. The public art program, once completed, will house the largest collection of permanent public art works addressing air quality and the impacts of climate change worldwide. Anticipate -- our anticipated move-in date is early 2021.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I now have a short
video -- we have a short video to -- with some drone footage to give you a better sense of the progress that's been made on the ground at our new facility.

(Thereupon a video was played.)

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I would have a chosen a different tune, but, you know, it's okay. A lot of progress. Impressive.

(Laughter.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: So as I wrap up here, a few more points. We continued to challenge the federal administration's efforts to abandon environmental progress. CARB has actively challenged federal rollbacks in each of the cases listed on this slide. In some cases, we worked with California Office of the Attorney General to file suit. CARB has supported other states in litigation, submitted formal comments on regulatory proceedings, and in some cases adopted its own rulemaking to ensure environmental regulations remain in tact. These efforts will continue to be a priority for us in 2019.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Last year, CARB collaborated with leaders from around the world. We sponsored the Air Sensors International Conference where leaders from 15 countries and 16 states met to collaborate
on the latest air sensor technologies.

Next week, CARB will host the California
Bioresources Economy Summit where leaders will explore how
to best address organic waste from the state's forest,
agriculture, and urban sectors.

Finally, last year, we took the first steps
towards launching California's satellite by signing a
statement of intent with Planet, a satellite imagery
startup.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: So on behalf of all of
CARB's amazing executive and staff team, I'd like to
personally thank all the members of the Board for its
leadership. Your wisdom, guidance, expertise, advocacy
and decisiveness is invaluable to CARB's continuing
success, and we've had a lot of it.

Some notable examples from this year include Dr.
Balmes consultation on the AB 617 group, Board Member De
La Torre's work with the environmental justice
communities, Vice Chair Berg's works to support linking
the Low Carbon Fuel Standard with efforts to expedite our
transition to electric vehicles, and the Board's guidance
on the 2018 sustainable communities progress report, and
certainly many more I haven't called out.

So thank you again, and I look very forward,
myself and our team, in terms of working forward with you on the challenges in front of us. Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

That was great.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: We're going to be busy. I think, if anything, that's kind of the subtext here. And I did hear, in fact, one point, Chair, that you made on the San Joaquin SIP recognizing how key implementation was going to be. I heard though you gave us the weekend off, which was all good.

(Laughter.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: So it was like implementation will begin Monday. So that's good.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: May I say something?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, please.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I just want to take this opportunity to thank Richard for his leadership of the agency. I think it's -- you have contributed a lot to making the past year a big success. You know, you have a great set of colleagues, some of whom you've recruited to leadership positions. And I look forward to trying to achieve everything you've laid out for next year. But basically, I want to thank all of our leadership.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Good. Could make that unanimous. Absolutely. Thank you for that.
Yes.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Thanks for the summary. I just had a question. So what's the timing of when during 2019 the freight handbook will be out? How is that going?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Supervisor, the target is -- that's the fall, because --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: In the fall.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: -- they have workshops and public process. It's fall, yeah.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: So there will be a -- there will be a workshop.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Oh, yes.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Separate from a Board meeting or at a Board meeting?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Separate from the Board meeting, leading up to the Board's consideration.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Great. And what part of the State do you intend to hold that?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I'm sorry?

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Where will it be held, in Sacramento?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: My expectation, and I need to nail down the discussion in terms of the number of workshops, it's likely to be more than one. And if it's more than one, it will probably be more -- it will be more...
than one location in California.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Got it. Okay.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Most likely central
and --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: You'll let us know ahead of
time, so if we want to go out on that.
CHAIR NICHOLS: I certainly will. You bet.
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Thanks.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Diane.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thanks. That was really
amazing. And I -- it's a -- it was a little overwhelming,
I think, for all of you I'm sure. But I wanted -- there's
a lot to say, but congratulations to all of you who have
worked so hard, and also, obviously, to the Board.

You know, I think about the way I look at most
issues. And when I look at the agenda and get briefed,
and I -- I'm always looking at so what's the impact on
environmental justice communities. And that's like always
my first question. And environmental justice is baked
into almost everything now.

So it's not like we don't have to keep asking
that question, but I think we see it now. It's emanating
from everywhere. And I want to join my colleagues in
congratulating you, Richard, and Veronica. Thank you so
much. I think that the culture has really shifted in this
organization, and we're aware -- we're working where we need to be. We're working in the communities that are the most impacted and that need it the most, and we're maintaining the State and global focus on climate. So we're doing it on the ground and around the globe really in a big way.

So I think that's pretty phenomenal. And I'm really excited about the focus on sustainable transportation. I think that's emerging. And I think when you do this report next year, it's going to look really different the focus on buses and trucks and beyond passenger cars is really amazing. So my one concrete question I guess is when might this Board have the opportunity to discuss the SB 150 report in some depth, because it seems like we really didn't have an opportunity to do that at the -- at our joint meeting.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: It's returning. And I making sure I'm right on this. I think it's March of this year. I think it's the first quarter. Am I right?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: Yeah.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: March. I'm right.

CHAIR NICHOLS: That we will discuss it as a Board not in a joint meeting, but just among ourselves?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: That's correct, because we had the opportunity to briefly discuss in the joint CTC
meeting, we wanted the opportunity to present to this Board.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah. I think that's a really good idea. It was very awkward at that first meeting. I would say -- I have told a number of people that I thought that the first, or really it was the second joint meeting of the CTC and CARB was not a success. And it's easy to identify some elements that were not -- that made it not successful.

But interestingly, I don't think the CTC felt good about the meeting either, although possibly for different reasons, you know. They didn't like it that 100 percent of our Board wasn't there. They were mad that I walked out after only six hours of, you know, not very well organized testimony, and being called a racist, which I thought was, actually, it would have been a good time to have walked out earlier, you know.

It was -- the whole thing was just not well -- not well done, in my opinion. It made it clear, let's put it this way, that we and the CTC are very different agencies and we occupy -- we operate in very different ways. And that's a neutral way of saying it without blaming them for everything.

But the fact is that if this -- if these meetings are going to be of any use, we're going to have to be more
prepared the next time around, and hopefully do a better job of figuring out how to make it useful, because that format was definitely not good.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Can I just --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: And I appreciate, and I've raised it with Richard that these Tuesday dates don't work for county supervisors --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Right.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: -- because we meet on Tuesdays. And there's at least -- there will be a third -- three of us here. So I appreciate that you're making changes to be on a day other than Tuesday.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: That's right. We have circled with CTC and Susan Bransen -- in fact, to the Chair's point, I've talked with -- I think there was a consensus, in terms of your characterization of the meeting.

(Laughter.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: So there -- no surprise there. But really it was how can we be more effective moving forward. You know, and if I put a -- if attempted to put a positive slant on it, it would probably be there really wasn't a challenge of the problem statement, in terms of the intersection of housing, transportation, investment, air quality, and climate. I mean, there were
different opinions on how one would go about responding to it.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Right.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: But that was a step in the right direction. But we are putting our heads together of how can we structure something that is more effective going forward. And to your point, Supervisor, I'm working with Susan on -- because I've got some challenges on the CTC side from the scheduling. So you'll overlay those. We are trying to find dates that -- from a overall critical mass, can meet most our needs. It won't meet all out needs, but most.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Can I just say, I agree obviously with Chair Nichols. And one of the things that was most disappointing to me beyond where we didn't get with the policy was the amazing work that the staff had done on that report. I mean, obviously, it received a ton of exposure in the media. People are talking about it around the state. And we're having this, excuse me, lame conversation -- beyond lame conversation -- in a public forum.

So I think that we -- you know, we owe it to the State, as well as to our staff, to do justice to that report and to its conclusion. So I think -- I appreciate that we're going to do that.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah. But no, you're absolutely right, the report itself deserves to have a life based on the work that was done.

Mr. De La Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I want to go back to the first meeting that we had with them, at the very end of the first meeting, where we talked about the sustainable freight strategy. That that is something that there's a take-off point that staff from both agencies have already agreed to. It's there. Picking up there and trying to move just in that narrow issue area and trying to move something forward there that we can agree on.

And rather than the big picture --

CHAIR NICHOLS: The global picture.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: -- start somewhere we've already been and try to get something done in those few hours we're together, and get some consensus, maybe over two meetings, and try to move that forward, instead of this big thing where everybody just goes to their corners and nothing gets done.

CHAIR NICHOLS: That's a good practical suggestion.

You know, you could -- it would be possible, although it's still early, to take a look at what's already come out of the Governor's office in terms of the
actions that he's taken and the statements that he's made about his views on various things, and to at least overlay that over the list of things that we are already working on, and try to show how our ongoing agenda fits within the priorities that have already been stated, because it's -- you know, we're dealing were a brand new team of people, even though most of them that I've encountered so far are both smart and very experienced in their policy areas.

That doesn't mean that they know anything about what CARB has been doing or how we operate. My experience so far with our new Secretary, and the new Resources Secretary, and the new OPR, and the Governor's staff is that they are all very enthusiastic about working with us. They all have a very good impression of us, particularly of our Executive Officer, who has got a -- his own reputation out there in the community, and this is really terrific.

But that doesn't mean that they actually know the details of any of the stuff that we're working on. And they are all themselves, you know, trying to figure out what their roles are going to be. So some of what I have to do, and what staff has to do, and any of you who are in a position to help, your help is most welcome, is just to, you know, build the relationships that we had developed as the last administration. But we're going to be rebuilding
them with a different group of people and getting to know them better.

And so that's a -- that's a big part of what has to be done is just to make it easy and comfortable to know who to call when something comes up. Because inevitably in a State as big as California, even if it's run as perfectly as you could imagine, there are going to be conflicts between agencies, statutes, programs, legislators popping up with, you know, things that they want to see us do differently.

And so, you know we're going to have to kind of relearn a lot of those neural pathways, I think, in terms of just making this organism work -- work effectively. So not -- it's a -- it's a challenge, but it's a fun challenge. It's a good challenge. It just means that there's a new layer of work that needs to be done.

(Water bottle was squeezed.)
(Laughter.)
CHAIR NICHOLS: Is that plastic going to go into the ocean?
(Laughter.)
CHAIR NICHOLS: It just better not end up in ocean. That's all.

Any other kind of general comments?
If not, we don't have to stay in session.
All right. Thanks, everybody.

Looking forward to a good year.

Bye.

(Thereupon the Air Resources Board meeting adjourned at 1:58 p.m.)
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