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VICE CHAIR BERG: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Good morning ladies and gentlemen. As we're getting settled here on the dais, I want to welcome you to our March 21st, 2019 public meeting of the California Air Resource Board, and we will bring our meeting to order.

Our first line of business is the Pledge of Allegiance. So if you'll all join me, please.

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

VICE CHAIR BERG: And if I can have the clerk of the Board please call the roll.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Dr. Balmes?
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.
BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Mr. De La Torre?
BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Here.
BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Mr. Eisenhut?
BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here.
BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Supervisor Fletcher?
BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Here.
BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Senator Florez?
Assembly Member Garcia?
Supervisor Gioia?
Ms. Mitchell?
BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Here.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Senator Monning?

Ms. Riordan?

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Supervisor Serna?

Dr. Sherriffs?

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Yes.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Professor Sperling?

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Ms. Takvorian?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Vice Chair Berg?

VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Vice Chair, we have a quorum.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.

Well, I have a few announcements before we get started this morning. Interpretation services will be provided today in Spanish for Item 19-3-2, an Update on CARB's Actions to Minimize Community Health from Freight, as well as 19-3-1, AB 617 Community Air Protection Program, and 19-3-3, the Update on CARB's Response to the SB 150 Report Findings.

Headsets are available outside the hearing room at the attendant sign-up table, and can be picked up at any time.
(Thereupon the interpreter translated in Spanish.)

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.

For safety reasons, please note that the emergency exits are to the rear of the room and through the lobby. In the event of a fire alarm, we are required to evacuate this room immediately, go down to the stairs to the left of the elevator and out the building. When the all-clear signal is given, we'll return to the hearing room and resume our hearing.

Anyone wishing to testify today, should fill out a request-to-speak card available in the lobby outside the Board room. Please turn it into the Board assistant or the Clerk of the Board prior to the commencement of the item. And we will be watching how many people that we have testifying on the various items. And if it becomes necessary, we'll let you know if we have a last call for signing people up to speak on a particular item.

Also, speakers, please be aware that the Board does impose a three minute time limit. Please state your first and last name for the record when you come up the podium. Both podiums to the left and the right are working. You can feel free to use either one.

We really appreciate if you can put your testimony in your own words. It's often easier for the
Board to follow. And if you go straight to your point of what you want us to hear, because three minutes goes by very quickly.

If you have written submission, please know that the Board does get a copy of that, and that will be entered into the record.

So with that, let's jump into our first item, and that is Item 19-3-4. It is the Proposed Research Project for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 with an Update on the implementation of the Triennial Strategic Research Plan.

The proposed research projects are broad in scope, and will guide CARB's air quality planning efforts, help us with our regulator decision making, advance efforts to meet our Global Warming Act, our State Implementation Plans, our community air protection goals, and other commitments, facilitate important collaborations with other research funding organization.

Mr. Corey, would you introduce this item?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Vice Chair Berg.

Today staff will present the proposed research projects for fiscal year 2019 through 2020, and an update of the implementation of Triennial Strategic Research Plan. The proposed projects for fiscal year 2019-20 were developed from a public solicitation of research ideas and
supplemented by discussions with CARB program staff, stakeholders, other State and federal agencies, and experts in these fields of study. The proposed research projects support CARB's regulatory priorities related to health, environmental justice, air pollution, and climate change.

I'll now ask Sarah Pittiglio -- dr. Sarah Pittiglio of the Research Division to give the staff presentation.

Sarah.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIGLIO: Thank you, Mr. Corey.

Good morning, Vice Chair Berg and members of the Board.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIGLIO: In April of last year, the Board approved the first Triennial Strategic Research Plan. The plan describes priority research initiatives that we intend to focus on over the next three years. These initiative guide our annual selection process of individual projects. And the projects may be fulfilled through in-house work or funded through external contracts.
STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIGLIO:

Building on the success of the plan, we are taking the next step and broadening the scope of our projects and fulfilling the plan's research initiatives with large multi-disciplinary projects. These holistic projects address anticipated challenges associated with achieving our long-term air quality and climate goals, and will ensure that we successfully implement our programs with benefits for the economy, and health in all communities.

Today, I will provide an explanation of our highest priority projects that fit within our budget of $3.2 million. These projects were chosen because the results are urgently needed to meet program milestones, are relevant to multiple CARB programs, are technically viable, leverage resources, and support future policy development.

However, there were many priorities that we were unable to address with our limited budget. In order to achieve long-term goals, a larger investment in research is needed.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIGLIO: The research planning process begins with an open public
solicitation of research concepts. The concepts are considered along with internal input and priority projects are aligned with the triennial plan's research initiatives.

Proposed projects are developed with input from State and federal agencies, academics, environmental justice community members, and other research entities. Today, we're asking the Board to approve the proposed projects.

To assist the Board in managing a sound research program, the Legislature created the Research Screening Committee, or RSC, to oversee the program. The RSC consists of scientists and engineers with expertise in air pollution, health, climate, and environmental justice issues.

Once researchers for each project are selected and full proposals are developed, the RSC approves each proposal.

So historically, we have come back to the Board for approval of individual contracts on consent. In order to expedite the contracting process, we are proposing that the Board delegate approval of the contracts to the Executive Officer with consultation of interested Board members. We'll continue to bring proposed projects to the Board every year as we are doing today.
STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIGLIO: Today, we're asking the Board to approve the proposed research projects for fiscal year 2019-20, which includes four large projects and three white papers. In the next few slides, I will provide more detail on the four large projects. But CARB is also proposing to fund three white papers that will analyze the state of science on emerging priority topics, and identify research gaps to inform future funding cycles.

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIGLIO: We are currently fulfilling multiple research initiatives from the Triennial Plan that are relevant to our first proposed project on health and exposure in vulnerable populations. A portion of our health research has focused on assessing the health impacts of exposure to pollutants near roadways from both tailpipe and break and tire-wear emissions. Preliminary work has begun to develop a tool to estimate the health impacts from Sustainable Community Strategies that promote active transportation. However, additional health metrics are needed to determine the effectiveness of our programs at reducing exposure to harmful emissions from vehicles, including through Sustainable Communities Strategies.
Current work on the health impacts of short-term exposures is examining the feasibility of a one hour PM2.5 ambient air quality standard and identifying the sources of exposure disparities using advanced methods to identify hot spots of PM2.5 and toxics. However, we need more information on where health is being impacted by short-term exposures.

There is also current work aimed at evaluating GHG reductions from Sustainable Community Strategies, such as congestion management strategies. But more tools are needed to model the GHG reductions from changes in land use.

These lines of research will converge to address how we can leverage emerging technologies to develop new tools and metrics to assess the health impacts of our regulations and programs.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIGLIO: CARB currently uses mortality hospitalizations and emergency room visits as metrics to assess the impact of our regulations on health. This project aims to extend our metrics to asthma symptoms. By using GPS-enabled inhalers, we'll be able to identify when and where asthma symptoms are prevalent.

An example of this type of research conducted in
Kentucky is shown on the right. Not only can this research be used to develop an asthma metric of exposure, but it can also help identify areas that require additional exposure mitigation. This research in Kentucky led to several policy recommendations. CARB currently assesses the health and co-benefits of strategies aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions, such as those in the Scoping Plan. But additional tools are needed to accurately assess the co-benefits of newer strategies, such as those associated with natural and working lands, that aim to reduce the incidence of wildfire and those associated with SB 375 the alter mobility program -- patterns and increased active transportation.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIgLIO: We are currently fulfilling multiple research initiatives from the Triennial Plan that are relevant to our second proposed project on indoor air quality and energy efficiency in buildings.

Indoor exposure research has identified sources of toxics, such as formaldehyde, has informed regulations to reduce exposure. Other research is focused on the efficacy of high-efficiency filtration systems to reduce exposure to particulate matter indoors. But understanding
the impacts of new building technologies on indoor health is a remaining research gap.

Our buildings research has modeled the GHG reductions associated with any -- energy efficiency strategies in buildings, and has investigated the best way to provide information on personal energy use to influence building occupants to achieve voluntary reductions. However, real-world measurements of the GHG emissions associated with energy efficiency strategies are needed to validate our models and ensure that reductions are achieved.

In-house and contracted work is using monitoring and satellite data to identify exposure disparities in EJ and non-EJ communities in ambient air. The research we're proposing will identify exposure disparities in indoor air.

So these lines of research will converge to inform the next cycle of the Building Code regarding the health effects of employing energy efficiency strategies in multi-family housing. And this was particularly important because multi-family housing represents over 50 percent of new residential housing in California, and houses a disproportionate percentage of disadvantaged families.

--o0o--
STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIGLIO:

Pollutant transfer from the exterior and between units in multi-family housing is already a known health concern. The last cycle of the Building Code required that new multi-family units seal leakage points to improve energy efficiency. While this may reduce the introduction of pollutants from outside the unit, it's unclear how it will impact indoor air quality.

The project will evaluate pollutant transport and explore the health implications of building electrification by conducting this research in buildings powered by electricity or mixed fuel use. While past work has modeled the GHG emission reductions associated with energy efficiency strategies, this project will directly measure the climate benefits of sealing units in multi-family housing.

So collectively, this work will ensure that the Building Code leads to both climate and health benefits.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIGLIO: I will provide some background on the research initiatives in the Triennial Plan that are relevant to our third proposed project on health and air quality impacts of wildfire.

So past research focused on assessing the health impacts of exposure to pollutants in vulnerable
populations, such as children and the elderly. Work done by the Department of Public Health showed that 2018 was the first year that 100 percent of Californians were exposed to heavy smoke from wildfires.

Additional work is needed to understand how the health of all Californians, including vulnerable populations, are threatened by wildfire.

CARB continues to fund work to refine emission estimates and explore the efficacy of mitigation strategies for carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, and short-lived climate pollutants. While our black carbon inventory from anthropogenic emissions has benefited from decades of road-side monitoring, our inventory of black carbon for sources that we cannot control, including wildfires, need more measurement data to improve our modeling efforts.

A portion of our air quality research aims to identify sources of PM2.5 in the San Joaquin Valley. Current work is improving our ability to model secondary organic aerosols, and in-house research is evaluating ammonia emissions from agricultural sources. However, the impact of wildfire emissions on local and regional air quality are not currently incorporated into our models.

So these lines of research will converge to determine the impact of wildfire events on local and
regional air quality and long-term health.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIGLIO:

California's fourth climate change assessment showed that the frequency and severity of wildfires will continue to increase. Given this challenge, one objective of this project is to improve CARB's ability to model wildfire emissions to improve the inventory and understand the impacts on air quality.

Researchers will collect emission samples in the laboratory, in field plots, and from plumes from prescribed and wildfires through a collaboration with NASA's FIREX-AQ program that has airplanes equipped with sampling instruments.

The health component of this research will extend a current study that has monitored the health impacts of monkeys at the UC Davis Primate Center that were naturally exposed to wildfire emissions when they were infants. The study has shown that early life exposure led to reduced lung and immune function. And now that the monkeys are older, the investigators will assess how early life exposure to wildfire smoke impacts health later in life.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIGLIO: So we are currently fulfilling multiple research initiatives
from the triennial plan that are relevant to our fourth
proposed project on incentivizing new mobility options.
So current research is aimed at identifying high emitters
and understanding the emission discrepancies between lab
and real-world measurements.

Current work on the potential of advanced
technologies to reduce emissions is modeling the emissions
associated with the future use of connected and automated
vehicles. However, the impact of other new mobility
options on vehicle emissions is a remaining research gap.

CARB has funded research on the impacts of
Sustainable Community Strategies on the amount of driving
that individuals do. Results from this work led to the
creation of a tool that models the benefits of local
communities implementing new strategies.

Current work is assessing the co-benefits of
affordable transit-oriented developments to inform the use
of incentive funds. But additional work is needed to
understand how new mobility options will impact our
ability to achieve goals to reduce vehicle miles traveled.

CARB has also funded research that yielded
insights into what motivates drivers to purchase, drive,
and plug in their cars, and seeks to understand and
address barriers that prevent low- and moderate-income
drivers from purchasing these cars. But more information
is needed to continue to incentivize the purchase of zero-emission vehicles.

So these lines of research will converge to address how we can incentivize electric, shared mobility options without increasing vehicle miles traveled.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIGLIO: Large cuts to greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector are needed to meet statewide climate goals. The graph shows the total reduction in emissions that are needed. The baseline shows what emissions would be without California's efforts to mitigate climate change. Reductions are expected to come from VMT and zero-emission vehicles, in addition to the Renewable Portfolio Standard.

Travels current -- travelers currently have an expanding number of mobility options from personal vehicles and public transportation to transportation network companies like Uber and Lyft, as well as micro-mobility options like bike and scooter shares.

Current Sustainable Community Strategies are also trying to encourage active transportation, like biking and walking, by funding infrastructure that safely allows for these options. The objective of this project is to inform strategies to overcome barriers to low-emission mobility and to create scenarios to achieve reductions in VMT,
while accelerating ZEV adoption and ensure that new mobility options are accessible in all communities.

Surveying consumers will provide a greater understanding of the motivation behind their mobility choices. The results from this research will help to inform incentive programs on how to encourage mobility choices with the lowest carbon footprint.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIGLIO: To continue with this year's shift to large, multi-disciplinary projects that align with the research initiatives outlined in the Triennial Plan, we are already looking to tackle additional long-term challenges in next year's projects. Although we will be limited by our budget allocation, we hope to fund projects within these product categories, which include creating additional health endpoints and monitoring for cumulative exposure, particularly in disadvantaged communities.

Large scale, integrated field campaigns that simultaneously assess the chemistry and modeling of criteria pollutants and climate forcers will also be a priority.

Finally, the three white papers that we are funding this year will help to identify priority research gaps that need to be addressed to achieve carbon
neutrality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, in multiple sectors synergistically, and ensure successful mitigation of toxic emissions.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST PITTIGLIO: We recommend that you approve the research projects for fiscal year 2019-20, and delegate authority to execute individual contracts to the Executive Officer. If the research projects are approved, staff will work with our research partners to develop full proposals and execute the contracts. We will then return to the Board to provide updates on research results.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you. That was a great presentation. Thank you very much. I really enjoyed the way that you integrated the research items with all the various focuses that we have. That was really a great job.

Board members, we don't have any comments for this item. Do we have any comments from the Board?

Dr. Sherriffs.

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Thank you. Thank you for the presentation. I have a couple of small questions. But, yeah, the research is so important in terms of being sure we have a solid basis in terms of the policies, in
terms of being successful in what we do. And better the science that we have to drive that, the better. And appreciate the process very much for getting ideas for projects or needs.

A couple really minor questions. One, I want to be sure I understand the visual on slide number 11. We'll be dealing with more wildfire smoke in the decade of 2040 than we have in the past 10 years, yes? That's our best estimate?

RD CLIMATE ACTION AND RESEARCH PLANNING SECTION

LEAD SCHILLA: (Nods head.)

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: Okay. Just wanted to be sure.

And the other, I'm curious, what is a typical Uber or Lyft auto? How many miles per say is that? Do we have a ballpark? I think it's pretty obvious, if we can electrify that, that would be huge. What are we talking about?

RD CLIMATE ACTION AND RESEARCH PLANNING SECTION

LEAD SCHILLA: So you'll hear a bit more about it later today. But CARB is beginning the process of developing the Clean Miles Standard Regulation. And we will be looking into that exact question, but I don't have an answer for you yet.

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: No ballpark right now?
LEAD SCHILLA: On how much Uber and Lyft drive?

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: At 9:27?

(Laughter.)

LEAD SCHILLA: The Public Utilities Commission did put out a report last year about some information about their -- the amount of miles that they travel. It's a small share of the total miles, but it's more miles to travel -- to move a person one mile than it would be if that person drove one mile in their own car.

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Yeah. Okay.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Again, thank you for a nice presentation. And a couple of years ago, Chair Nichols charged Dr. Sperling and me to help think more strategically about our research initiatives. And I want to say that I think you've done that. And so I want to compliment staff.

And, in particular, I like the fact that we're now trying to focus some research related to our environmental justice goals to reduce health disparities, especially about toxic emissions, which I think are really where we need to go in terms of protecting the most vulnerable populations in our state, so I like that.
And then I'm really glad that we're starting to do something about wildfires. As Dr. Sherriffs just pointed out, by emphasizing slide 11, it's not going to get any better over time. And I actually think that the Board, as an agency, needs to get much more involved with regard to both monitoring exposures to wildfire smoke and trying to get a better sense of health impacts of that wildfire smoke, working with our sister agencies in the state.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

Dr. Sperling.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So first of all, I'd like to concur with Dr. Balmes that -- you know, that the -- I think we're really on the right track with our research program. The two of us have spent a lot of time over the years interacting. And I think it's been very productive conversations were the staff on how to steer a limited research program to make it a -- leverage it, make it effective.

So I do have just a few quick thoughts on that. And that is, you know, one -- some of the accomplishments or some of the improvements that we've seen over time is that we have seen that the Research Division has become more integrated with the rest of the agency, in terms of being -- you know, figuring out -- I mean, what should we
be studying? What do we need in terms of the mission of
the agency? And I think we've come a long ways on that.
So that's a productive change.

Another change is that we've seen a lot more -- I
mean, maybe not a lot more, but more external engagement.
I mean, that's partly because the problems have gotten
more complicated as we've taken on climate change, and
partly because we have a limited budget, so we have to,
you know, leverage others.

And we've also seen better communication. And I
think this report here, you know, document is evidence of
that. We didn't use to see -- at least when I came on the
Board 12 years ago, we didn't have documents that were
very readable and available -- that -- and available. And
there's a lot of the research briefs that are being put
out, and I think that's a good thing. Investing more in
that is a good thing.

But, you know, as I said, it's all gotten a lot
more complicated. And that is why -- I mean, so I see
there's a shift in the strategy. And I think that makes
sense in the sense of the problems are more complicated,
in the sense as we take on climate and air quality, you
know, like the project I'm linking together, indoor air
quality with energy efficiency, with equity, EJ concerns,
you know, that gets pretty complicated, and all the
transportation ones gets more complicated.

And by the way, the answer to the Uber question down there is that the Uber and Lyfts are now accounting for about one percent of trips, which is about the same as the number of bus trips. And it's going to rapidly exceed bus trips, because bus trips are going down and Uber and Lyft is going up. And that's just on a trip basis. And so we're probably going to see that trend continuing in the future.

So just in the end, I think that two little thoughts is, one, we really need a lot more money. So that's a message more to the Legislature than to the staff, but -- you know for our research.

And the other thought is the part about consulting the Board, the Executive Officer, you know, that -- you know, I suggested that in the staff briefing. And, you know, I just wonder whether that should be made a little bit more formal, that there should actually be a subcommittee of the Board. I know there's at least two of us that are enthusiastic about doing that. But maybe a committee of three or four that will be part of the process in approving these research initiatives.

And it was written into the resolutions, I saw, that there would be consultation. So I don't know that we need to act on that in a more formal way. But I can see
Mr. Corey looking at me. I'm not sure exactly how -- what
the -- the expression means.

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR BERG: So, Mr. Corey, if I could jump
in here, I think what I'm hearing is that you have some
willing Board members here that are interested in
participating. And maybe you could give some quick
thoughts on how you would see that working.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I got the theme. I
understand the -- what's trying to be accomplished, and
I'd like to give it some thought internally and
structurally. So I can work through some options, I
think.

VICE CHAIR BERG: And, Dr. Sperling, you're fine
with the resolution language as it is?

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Yes.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Great.

I, too want to add -- is there any other -- oh, good. Ms. Takvorian, please.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I just wanted to add
that I'm excited about the fact that disadvantaged
communities and environmental justice communities are so
greatly integrated. And I appreciated the connection with
some of the other programs that you -- that you've made,
and so I very much appreciate that.
I said to staff during my briefing that I do --
I'm concerned a little bit about incentivizing the new
mobility options in the way that you described it. I
think -- I appreciate that your caveat is in -- and not
increasing VMT, which I think is really important. And so
I appreciate that that's there.

I think that those companies have great ability
to incentivize themselves. And that I don't want to be
actually incentivizing them or subsidizing them. So I
don't think that's what this research is, and I'm not
opposed to it. But I'm just concerned about it, because I
want us to be focused on how we're incentivizing
non-single car travel for everyone. And I don't think
that that particularly has an environmental justice or
disadvantaged communities focus.

And I think it's difficult. And that's reflected
like in the SB 150 report. So I think there's a
connection there, and it will be interesting to see what
the research comes back with. But that was just a caution
that I wanted to raise. Otherwise, I feel like the
research projects are really good, and ones that we should
support and go forward with. So thanks.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Ms. Mitchell.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you.
In light of Dr. Sperling's suggestion, I would
offer an amendment to the resolution to add that the
authority is delegated to the Executive Officer and to as
a CARB subcommittee -- subcommittee of Board members.
That would be in the final paragraph, the "Now,
therefore...", paragraph.

VICE CHAIR BERG: So I appreciate that sentiment.
My concern is, is that us amending really before staff has
an opportunity to figure out how that works, I'm not
sure -- Mr. Corey, I can see you're moving down.

(Laughter.)
VICE CHAIR BERG: He's abandoning me already.
(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: While, he's abandoning you?
VICE CHAIR BERG: Yes. Could -- yes, would you
have a thought about that?

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I would just -- I would
support Dr. Sperling's feeling expressed on the mic that
we could work this out without an amendment, because I
think that's -- the staff has already reached out to
several of us. And I appreciate that other Board members
would want to get involved, but I think we could probably
do without an amendment if that's going to cause problems.

VICE CHAIR BERG: I'm going to go back. So I
understand wanting to formalize that, but would you be
comfortable letting the resolution go forward as is, and
have staff come back to us with what the actual structure is going to be?

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Sure. I think that's fine. I mean, right now, the entire CARB Board approves it is what I understand.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Yes, that's correct.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: And so this is not that different, you know, except you delegate it to a subcommittee with the Executive Officer. It's a little more refined than what we currently have. But I think that's fine if staff wants to consider it and return to us with that. That would be fine.

VICE CHAIR BERG: I really appreciated that, Ms. Mitchell. I think as we're sitting up here and saying creating a subcommittee of the Board, we're pretty enthusiastic until other than Dr. Sperling and Dr. Balmes gets the call about us all getting together. So I think a little bit of additional discussion would be helpful.

Okay. Great. Thank you, Board, for a great discussion. You know, we do have no question a great deal on our plate, and we so depend on research, and how we look at research in the future.

When I was -- had the opportunity to be the MC at the Haagen-Smit presentations, it was really -- I loved that day, because it really gives us an opportunity to
hear from a lot of the researchers how they think about this, how they think about the future. And one of the things that Elizabeth and I were talking about, and I would like to suggest, is that we do have a research symposium maybe within this year to bring people that are really not only experts, but interested in various topics. And we talk about the challenges we're facing today and what research do we need in the future thinking a little bit more down the road, but also how can we get this research sooner, and get it back to us, and continue this great work we're doing.

So I would just like to throw that out as a suggestion, looking at what my fellow Board members were talking about, the importance of toxic emissions, and the EJ community, the wildfires continue integrating outside with agencies, as long -- as well as inside. Our external engagement communication, the complicated issues, and the fact that we need more dollars, it seems like it's really ripe for a really fun day of getting people together to really talk about this.

So I'd like to put that on the table as well.

Any closing thoughts, Mr. Corey?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: No. I think it's been summed well, so, no.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.
Then I will close the record on this agenda item. And the Board has before us Resolution 19-6. I think we've done a great job in discussing the major change, which is giving the Executive Officer the approval for the final projects with the understanding that there is a subset of the Board that is very interested in being part of that final solution. And Richard will be getting back to us on what that structure would look like.

Do I have a motion?

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: So moved.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

And a second?

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Second.

VICE CHAIR BERG: All in favor?

(Unanimous aye vote.)

(Senator Florez and Supervisor Serna not present.)

VICE CHAIR BERG: Any opposed?

Any abstentions?

Thank you very much. Motion passed.

As staff makes their changes, we'll go ahead and introduce our next agenda item, is the annual update on California's Action to Minimize the Community Health Impacts from Freight Facilities and Operations.

One of the key programs to respond to the needs
of AB 617 and other disadvantaged communities, it's crucial that the Board keeps tabs on the activities to further reduce air pollution from this segment of our economy.

Diesel pollution generated by transportation freight or cargo in the state is still the biggest contributor to the air toxics and criteria pollutants like fine particulates and ozone that affects everyone's quality of life.

For the benefit of our new members, the Board heard extensive testimony in March 2017, and again in March 2018 on sustainable freight issues. Dozens of community residents expressed both concerns about operations at large freight facilities and frustration about the pace of air quality improvements.

In CARB lingo, freight facilities include seaports, railyards, airports, warehouses, and distribution centers, as well as border crossings, truck stops, and other places that diesel cargo vehicles and equipment.

At the March Board meeting last year, staff presented a suite of nine additional new actions to minimize emissions from freight facilities on top of several commitments for new measures already in the State Implementation Plan. Many of these items are focused on
transitioning the freight sector to zero-emission operations. The Board directed staff to proceed expeditiously and report back annually on its progress. And today is the day to do that.

Since this item is informational only, we are not asked to take any action today. However, know that staff will be very interested in our feedback, questions, and concerns.

Mr. Corey, will you introduce this item, please?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Vice Chair Berg.

Our comprehensive agenda for freight transport, as presented a year ago, covers three elements. First, new regulations for virtually all freight vehicles and equipment under CARB’s control including the fuels, trucks, ships, harbor craft, locomotives, and other equipment used to move cargo.

Second, the facilities where this equipment operates will play a critical role in enabling the push to zero emissions by providing charging or fueling infrastructure.

And third, guidance for local officials and facility developers regarding their decisions on siting and design of new freight operations.

Staff will report on progress in reducing freight
emissions and on the commitments for additional actions. This informational update describes a coordinated effort to utilize the many tools available to CARB, while leveraging opportunities for collaboration at the local, State, and federal level to reduce the community health impacts from freight facilities.

Staff will summarize the priority actions which are well underway and scheduled to be heard at the Board meetings -- several Board meetings later this year. We'll also report on the development work to build the scientific foundation for subsequent regulatory measures. These actions will help realize the common vision of California's air, transportation, energy, and business agencies as defined in the 2016 Sustainable Freight Action Plan.

That visions includes transporting freight reliably and efficiently by zero-emission equipment everywhere feasible, and near zero-emission equipment powered by clean, low-carbon, renewable fuels everywhere else.

I'd now like to ask Andre Freeman of the Transportation and Toxics Division to give the staff presentation.

Andre.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was
TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN:

Great. Thank you, Mr. Corey. Good morning, Vice Chair Berg and members of the Board.

Today's presentation will focus on our current freight activities, highlighting the regulations and guidance documents currently in development.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: Last year, we proposed a path forward on freight actions to minimize community health risks. As shown here, that path includes multiple CARB efforts, from tighter international standards to more health protective California rules at both the State and local level, complemented by incentives to cut emissions from freight facilities.

These facilities include seaports, railyards, warehouses, distribution centers, border crossings, trucks stops and more.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: CARB Board direction and the policy of the State's transportation, energy, and business agencies, calls for a sustainable freight system powered by equipment with zero emissions everywhere feasible, and near-zero emission renewable fuels everywhere else.
This chart shows the new actions to be considered by the Board between 2018 and 2022 to minimize the health impacts of freight facilities. These actions will accelerate the transition to cleaner freight vehicles and equipment, as well as establish the necessary infrastructure to support this rollout.

The actions that focus on achieving zero-emission operation are shown in the yellow above the timeline, and cleaner combustion measures are in blue below the arrows. Cleaner combustion may be powered by diesel, natural gas, or other fuels for equipment sectors on a longer term transition to zero emissions.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: In 2000, CARB set targets to cut emissions of toxic diesel particulate matter and the associated cancer risk statewide. And in 2006, the Board adopted an Emission Reduction Plan specific to ports and goods movement.

The resulting strategies covered virtually all diesel vehicles and equipment under CARB's control or influence, including the fuels, trucks, locomotives, ships, harbor craft, transportation refrigeration units, and other equipment used to move cargo. State, local, and federal incentive programs were essential to accelerate the deployment of these technologies.
Industries operating in California made substantial investments in cleaner diesel fuels, vehicles, and equipment to comply, reducing diesel particulate matter, nitrogen oxides, and sulfur oxides, as you can see in the next slide.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: To help visualize just how far we have come, this chart shows the significant decline in air pollution from freight activities statewide, starting if in the year 2000 and projected through 2035, based on adopted regulations and programs.

This progress is remarkable. The Board, the air districts, environmental and community advocates, and the entire spectrum of the freight industry can be justifiably proud of this accomplishment.

As this Board is well aware, we still have much work left to do. These emission reductions are not sufficient to meet the current health-based ambient air quality standards across California, to protect the most vulnerable communities from near-source air -- near-source pollution impacts or to meet the State's climate goals.

Because the first generation of freight controls focused on cleaner diesel, we see minimal progress in reducing greenhouse gases from these sources, other than
the recent GHG rules from trucks and trailers.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN:

California remains the nation’s largest gateway for international trade and domestic commerce with an interconnected system of ports, railyards, highways, and roads that allow freight from around the world to move throughout the state and nation.

This system contributes to one-third of the state’s economic product and jobs. However, the pollution from freight transport is still the biggest contributor to our unhealthy air that negatively affects everyone’s quality of life.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: To hear from those most affected by freight operations, we continue to consult with impacted communities, environmental advocates, the freight industry, air districts, and State agency partners, and other stakeholders.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: Before I describe staff efforts to develop the new regulatory proposals and programs, it is useful to emphasize that all those new actions will be designed to
meet our community health, regional attainment, and climate change goals.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: We will now switch over to a more detailed look at the development activities that are currently underway. This slide list the items that I'll cover.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: Community members have long urged CARB staff to develop a freight handbook that identifies best practices for the siting, design, construction, and operation of freight facilities to minimize community exposure to air pollution. And Board members have been very clear in wanting this guidance as soon as possible.

The fundamental purpose is to encourage better land-use decisions to protect communities from the harmful effects of freight pollution. At the same time, CARB's recommendations must also be sensitive to other State priorities like increased affordable, and transient-oriented housing.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: Key objectives included creating a resource for community advocates and defining best practices for facility
developers and operators. Board members have also
directed us to include specific recommendations on the
authorities and mechanisms that local decision makers can
use to avoid or mitigate air pollution in new development
approvals.

This might include specific conditions in local
development permits or agreements regarding facility
operations and the types of equipment allowed onsite.

One of the most critical objectives is to make a
compelling case for zero-emission operations, including
the installation of enabling infrastructure during the
initial construction, when it is least expensive to do so.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: The
handbook will be developed in phases. This year, staff
will propose a main document describing universal
recommendations and a separate warehouse and distribution
centered module.

The Board is scheduled to consider this item in
fall of 2019. Subsequent facility-specific modules will
follow in later years.

Now, we'll take a closer look at a number of the
regulations in development, including when staff expects
to hold the next set of public meetings to discuss
concepts and proposals.
TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN:

Staff is developing a suite of regulations to further reduce emissions from both new and in-use trucks, including introduction of zero-emission trucks in applications well suited for their operation.

On the zero-emission side, the Advanced Clean Trucks Regulation, formerly known as Last Mile Delivery, will be considered by the Board in two phases, but both phases will be implemented at the same time.

The first phase, due to the Board later this year, would establish zero-emission sales requirements for manufacturers of trucks and delivery vans, as well as fleet reporting requirements.

The second phase, to be heard in 2022, would require large fleets that are choosing to purchase new trucks to make a certain percentage of those purchases zero-emissions technology.

For cleaner combustion, staff has two major new rulemakings underway and scheduled to come to the Board in 2020. The heavy-duty omnibus regulation includes our commitment for new low-NOx engine standards that are so critical for the State Implementation Plan in the South Coast and San Joaquin Valley. It also subsumes a number of other in-use requirements to keep
low-emission engines running clean.

The third regulatory package would establish an Inspection and Maintenance Program for on-road heavy-duty vehicles. Staff anticipates that this proposal would rely on remote sensing and other technologies to measure emissions while vehicles are in normal operation.

---o0o---

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN:

CARB's existing regulation for ships at berth at California ports requires three types of vessel fleets to control emissions during 70 percent of their visits now, rising to 80 percent by 2020.

The new regulation under development would capture more vessel visits, more vessel types, and more ports and marine terminals. The additional vessel types include tankers, like oil tankers, and roll-on, roll-off vessels carrying automobiles.

The new rule is also designed to hold terminals, parts, and technology providers accountable for doing their part to successfully reduce emissions at berth, in addition, to the vessel fleets that are responsible under the existing rule.

As shown in the photos at the bottom of this slide, there are three technologies to reduce emissions at berth. Starting on the left, plugging into shore-based
electrical power allows the ship's auxiliary engines to be shut down. This remains the gold standard, because it provides zero emission operation at berth, but requires substantial investment on the terminal and to retrofit every vehicle that will plug in.

Shore power is the best technology for container, reefer, and cruise vessel fleets where the same vessels return to California ports multiple times a year. But it may not be the most cost-effective choice to retrofit tanker or roll-on, roll-off vessels that visit California much less frequently.

In the center is one of the two commercial barge-based emissions capture and control systems. The shiny metal duct goes over the smokestack on the ship to capture the engine exhaust and route it back to the control system on the barge. This is the most flexible of the control options.

The newest technology is on the far right. Another capture and control system, but this one is based on the dock rather than a barge. This one is mobile and can be moved to nearby berths. The capture and control systems offer the potential to control emissions from the ship's boilers, as well as the auxiliary engines. For oil tankers, the NOx and PM2.5 emissions from the boilers that pump product to shore can be substantial.
Under staff's concept, the vessels -- the vessel fleets and terminals would choose the control technology that best suits their needs.

---o0o---

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN:
Staff performed an in-depth assessment to determine whether there are viable control options for all vessels types at all berths that would be covered by the new rule and to estimate the cost of compliance.

The assessment included a satellite view of the berth, plus consultations with the bar pilots and terminal operators to better understand the safety and operational considerations.

As an example, this slide shows the Port of Richmond. It has no existing shore power infrastructure and does not have ships that are frequent visitors. This would be seen as a good candidate for a flexible barge-based capture and control system. But you can see that the channels are very narrow, and using a barge next to a ship at these two berths could prevent other ships from safely passing to reach interior berths.

Our conclusion is that the two berths that you see here would be best served by a land-based capture and control system. This is also likely to be the technology of choice for several marine oil terminals.
TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: The new at-berth regulation could significantly reduce both health risk in communities closest to California seaports and NOx emissions contributing to high fine particulate and ozone formation in the South Coast.

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: The goal of this measure is to advance zero-emission operations for transport refrigeration units, also known as TRUs. These are small diesel engines that power refrigeration for perishable goods, like produce, meats, pharmaceuticals, and other items. They may be an integral component of smaller delivery trucks or mounted on interstate trailers and containers that travel by truck, ship, and train.

CARB is implementing an existing regulation that requires TRU owners to upgrade their equipment over time to reduce emissions. The vast majority of TRUs today are still diesel units.

Much of the cancer risk from TRUs comes from operation of the diesel engines when the units are running but stationary; waiting for warehouse access when a truck driver is resting at a truck stop or motel; or when they are keeping turkeys frozen behind grocery stores before
Thanksgiving.

Staff's concepts include requirements for smaller truck TRUs to be fully zero-emission technology. These tend to operate locally over short distances and return to home base each night, making them the best candidates for battery and cryogenic technology.

For the trailer TRUs and TRUs on shipping containers that operate across the U.S., we are focusing on use of e-TRUs, which are hybrid diesel-electric units that can plug into grid electricity. As currently envisioned, the regulation would propose that all trailer and container TRUs use this hybrid technology and plug in when stationery for more than 15 minutes or go fully zero emissions.

To enable these plug-ins the facilities were TRUs frequently operate would be required to install and maintain all necessary electric infrastructure.

---

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: The biggest challenges in developing this regulation are related to plug-in infrastructure. On tens of thousands of facilities where TRUs operate in California, which ones should be required to install the electric hookups? We are seeking to identify the most important locations to reduce community health impacts and support zero-emission
operation, but minimize the total number to cut costs.

For the facilities with infrastructure requirements, we are researching the process, permits, timing, and costs to install plug-in pedestals. We are also evaluating the utility side questions like whether there is adequate electrical capacity at facilities or if more substations must be installed to bring in more power.

Infrastructure issues, combined with the useful life of engines already purchased to comply with CARB's existing TRU rule, will inform the timeline to implement the new requirements.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: Over the last two years, CARB staff has been developing health risk assessments to support the universe of new freight actions. We found that many of the highest potential cancer risks in communities near freight facilities are associated with cold storage warehouses. TRUs are driving these high risks, much more so than the trucks serving these facilities.

There are a number of locations across the state with clusters of multiple cold storage warehouses in close proximity to each other and to residences. You can see one example here from Salinas California.

The near-source cancer risk from high-activity
facilities, or clusters, can be over 1,000 chances per 
million. The new regulation is being designed to reduce 
this unacceptable cancer risk, as well as provide regional 
NOx reductions.

--o00o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: For 
railyards and locomotives, staff is developing a proposal 
to reduce emissions that consolidates the two concepts we 
described last year, one to reduce idling activity, and 
another to address California operation of older 
locomotives.

Meanwhile, Union Pacific Railroad, and BNSF 
Railway are implementing the 1998 agreement with CARB, 
which requires their locomotive fleets in the South Coast 
to meet Tier 2 NOx levels on average. Both railroads are 
fully complying with this agreement, which is in effect 
till 2030.

These companies, and some of the local shortline 
railroads, like Pacific Harbor Lines, are working with 
technology developers to demonstrate zero-emission capable 
locomotives and to expand the number of the cleanest Tier 
4 diesel locomotives used in California. These grant 
projects are being managed by air districts in the San 
Joaquin Valley, South Coast, Sacramento, and Bay Area.

--o00o--
TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN:

Based on extensive data reported to CARB by each railroad under the 1998 agreement, the stacked bars on this slide show the amount of work being done by locomotives certified to each of UPS -- U.S. EPA's emissions tiers. The black line across the top shows the associated NOx emissions in South Coast.

As rail activity has grown between 2010 and 2017, we see the deployment of more Tier 3 and gradual introduction of Tier 4 units, albeit at a slower rate than expected.

But we also see increasing use of older Tier 0 and Tier 1 locomotives up 70 -- 47 percent during that same time period. While many of those units have been rebuilt and slightly upgraded, they're still substantially higher emitting than Tier 3 and Tier 4 models. The net result is to keep NOx emissions essentially flat.

We are concerned about the reliance on older dirtier locomotives to meet growth and demand. This highlights the need for a new strategy to address interstate line-haul locomotive emissions across the state.

CARB staff is collaborating with the South Coast District to leverage our different authorities on rail. We would welcome new partnerships with the major railroads
to better address both regional air pollution from rail operations and long-standing environmental justice concerns from communities near rail yards.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: We are also beginning development of concepts to amend and strengthen CARB's existing Commercial Harbor Craft Regulation for existing vessels and new engines. This rule covers both freight-related vessels, like the tug you see at the top of this slide, and passenger vessels like the zero-emission Swedish ferry below.

Staff is evaluating multiple emission reduction strategies. These include requiring upgrades of engines in existing vehicles to the cleanest Tier 4 levels, retrofits, and zero-emission technologies.

The biggest challenge is the physical space available in the engine compartment of existing harbor craft. The new Tier 4 engines with after-treatment controls take up more room than the original engines.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: To better assess the space available, we contracted with the California Maritime Academy out of Vallejo to purchase the 3-D scanner and map the engine rooms on a number of existing harbor craft.
This approach gives us the ability to review diagrams like the one on the far right. It shows the space needed for additional pollution controls on the top half, superimposed on the three engines already in the bottom of the compartment. If we can overcome the space constraints, repowering harbor craft with Tier 4 engines offers the potential for near-term, cost-effective reductions in both NOx and PM2.5. District and port incentives can accelerate these activities.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: I've mentioned several examples of how incentives are supporting demonstration and deployment of zero-emission technologies. These inform the technical feasibility evaluation that is part of every rulemaking effort. CARB, the Energy Commission, the air districts, and seaports are all contributing incentive funding for cleaner freight equipment. The same entities, plus the Public Utilities Commission, and individual utilities are supporting infrastructure installations.

Here, we have an example of CARB's Low Carbon Transportation Program funded with Cap and Trade auction proceeds. This map shows projects funded under the Zero and Near-Zero Emission Freight Facility Program. Several of these innovative technologies were on display at the
convention center this week, as part of our technology showcase. We have some of the posted displays outside the hearing room today as well.

The Board will hear an update on CARB's investment strategy at next month's Board meeting. And we have representatives here today from the Public Utilities Commission and the Energy Commission to describe their actions to develop the supporting infrastructure.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: To support the regulatory work, CARB and its contractor are about midway through the development of a centralized reporting database for off-road freight equipment and the facilities that equipment serves.

When completed, this freight regulation reporting system will provide operators with an easy to use, web-based portal for submission of registration and reporting information. Major seaports and rail yards will rely on it to confirm that trucks seeking access are compliant with all CARB rules.

We will use it to aid with regulatory implementation and enforcement. The system will also provide public access to data that is not considered confidential business information.

--o0o--
TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: In addition to our own programs, staff is continuing its partnerships with the State's transportation, energy and business agencies to implement the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan. These agencies are working with industry on related initiatives, including projects like safe truck parking and seaport efficiencies, as well as workforce development efforts to improve training and access to jobs in the freight system.

This slide shows an example of a transportation efficiency project at the new Otay Mesa border crossing between San Diego and Tijuana. This project was designed to facilitate the growing volume of trade and alleviate both the chronic congestion and the resulting truck pollution along the border.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: CARB staff continue to participate in planning activities conducted by several seaports and Caltrans for our major freight corridors and facilities.

We are pleased to learn that the Port of San Diego has committed to developing an air quality plan and look forward to collaborating with the Port on this effort.

--o0o--
TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: The South Coast Air District staff is responding to its Board direction to develop both Indirect Source Rules and MOUs with the four types of freight facilities shown here and others.

Staff from CARB and the District are collaborating with the common goal of each agency using its authorities and its strength to establish requirements that are effective and complementary.

--o0o--

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN:

There are several steps to continue California's progress on sustainable freight. In addition to adoption of new CARB and air district regulations, we will need to focus on development of freight infrastructure with our State partners.

California also needs to continue the incentive programs that are already making remarkable progress in advancing zero-emission technologies. And we'll also look to local decision makers to set the bar higher by requiring new freight facilities to be zero-emission operations.

With that, I'd like to thank you for our attention today and we have staff available to answer any of your questions.
VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much, Andre. Before we go to questions, I would like to welcome our sister agencies and certainly our partners. These strategic partnerships and investments are required to deploy the necessary infrastructure that is critical to the State's zero-emission effort. And they are critical to our success.

So it is the California Public Utilities Commission and the California Energy Commission are key partners in our success with this.

And so, Kevin, are you going to go first? I thought so too, but you confused me and...

First, we do have Judith Ikle from the Energy Division at the California Public Utilities Commission. And welcome. We really appreciate you being here with us.

And then our second presentation will be from Kevin Barker from the Fuels and Transportation Division at the California Energy Commission.

MS. IKLE: Good morning, Board. I'm very glad to be here. My name is Judith Ikle, and I am with the Energy Division from what was originally the Railroad Commission.

So happy to be here today to talk about the medium- and heavy-duty freight sectors, which represent approximately 60 percent of the $1 billion dollars in transportation electrification -- electrification
investments the CPUC has approved to date.

The CPUC, of course, is an economic regulatory agency, and we regulate private utilities, investor-owned utilities, such as Southern California Edison, Pacific Gas and Electric, and San Diego Gas & Electric.

We are well on our way to transitioning this critical sector, the heavy-duty sector, but understand that there is much more work that we all need to do. The CPUC's role in accelerating ZEV in the medium- and heavy-duty space is focused on fuel, meaning the fuel mixed within California's grid; grid management, meaning the distribution system that we have; and infrastructure.

The investor-owned utilities are fuel providers. The CPUC is mandated to ensure that California's energy mix is clean and we are now approximately one-third -- and now receive approximately one-third of our power from renewable sources.

To utilize this fuel to clean up the transportation sector, the investor-owned utilities have implemented and are continuing to design rates specific to electric vehicles, including heavy-duty vehicles, with the goal of also ensuring that electricity is a lower cost option than conventional fuels.

IOUs are also the grid managers. We have large general rate cases with our investor-owned utilities, in
which we decide with them how to rollout the distribution
system, and how to basically provide a space for the load
that EVs are going to create in the future.

The CPUC is working with the IOUs to ensure that
additional load from EVs are integrated in a manner that
does not negatively affect the grid, but provides grid
benefits. This includes ensuring that the distribution
grid is reliable and modernized for current and future EV
load, that the installation of EV charging stations is
strategic, and that EV charging load is appropriately
managed.

IOUs as infrastructure providers. In addition to
providing incentives for charging infrastructure, these
investor-owned utilities also play a critical role in
ensuring sites are ready for customers to install charging
infrastructure and provide support for the installation of
charging stations.

California's IOUs are spending approximately $1
billion in ratepayer funds on EV infrastructure over the
next three to five years, with 606 million of that
approved for medium- -- for the medium- and heavy-duty
sector. All of the medium- and heavy-duty programs were
approved through the SB 350 proceedings, the De Leon
bill -- the -- from 2015.

The Commission authorized 578 million for two
large-scale projects at Southern California Edison and Pacific Gas and Electric in May of 2018, which are both still in the planning and early phases of implementation. The Commission also authorized 27.9 million in the medium- and heavy-duty pilots at Southern California Edison, PG&E, and San Diego Gas & Electric in January of 2018, which are all midway through implementation. These pilots will support delivery fleets, such as FedEx or UPS, shuttle buses, port equipment electrification, airport ground support equipment, school bus electrification, and renewable integration, idle reduction technology, and transit bus electrification.

Southern California Edison's approved program is the largest with $342 million in budget to support a minimum of 870 sites to support the electrification of at least 8,490 medium- and heavy-duty vehicles. Some of the requirements of this decision and program are a minimum of 15 percent of the budget is to serve transit agencies, a maximum of 10 percent of the budget is to serve forklifts, a minimum of 25 percent of the budget is to serve vehicles operated at ports and warehouses, and a minimum of 40 percent of the budget is to be spent in disadvantaged communities.

Rebates will cover up to 50 percent of the cost of the charger sites in disadvantaged communities and for
transit and school buses.

PG&E's fleet-ready program will spend approximately 236 million to support a minimum of 700 sites to support the electrification of at least 6,500 medium- and heavy-duty vehicles. For the PG&E program, the requirements include a minimum of 15 percent of the budget that will serve transit agencies, a maximum of 10 percent that will serve forklifts, and a minimum of 25 percent of the budget to be spent in disadvantaged communities.

Again, rebates will cover up to 50 percent of the costs for sites in disadvantaged communities and sites that support transit and school buses.

In addition to the large scale PG&E and Edison medium- and heavy-duty programs, which include off-road vehicle electrification, the CPUC is also overseeing several off-road vehicle electrification projects — pilots. Southern California Edison has two pilots at the Port of Long Beach to electrify nine rubber tire gantry cranes, which today are the second largest source of NOx emissions at the terminal, with each crane emitting approximately 210 tons of CO2 annually; and to electrify 20-yard tractors all helping the port meet its zero-emissions goal by 2030.

San Diego Gas & Electric has two off-road vehicle
electrification pilots to electrify airport ground support equipment at the San Diego airport, partnering with American Airlines, and to support electrification of the San Diego Port.

PG&E is working with Albertsons on an -- grocery store on an idle reduction technology pilot to install 25 transportation refrigeration unit ports.

The Commission is also reviewing an additional 107 million of proposed - these are only proposed programs - in San Diego Gas & Electric's territory that is similar if structure to Sand -- to SCE and PG&E's programs.

As proposed, this program would be available to customers electrifying medium- and heavy-duty on- and off-road vehicles, which is consistent with the vehicles covered by PG&E's and SCE's programs. The proposed program would serve a minimum of 300 make-ready installations and a minimum of 3,000 additional EVs directly attributable to the program. Each site host must agree to buy at least two new EVs or electrify two conventionally-fueled vehicles.

And most importantly, in December, the CPUC opened a new rulemaking on transportation electrification to provide guidance, structure, and certainty to the EV market, including medium- and heavy-duty vehicle sectors.
Up until now, all transportation electrification applications have been considered on a case-by-case basis. This rulemaking, and the transportation electrification framework, directs CPU[SIC] staff to draft and better help coordinate efforts among State agencies, align goals, and streamline the CPUC application review process.

This rulemaking, the transportation electrification framework, and the ongoing coordination with our sister agencies will help guide the next chapter of policies and programs supporting California's Freight Electrification Program.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you. Good morning.

MR. BARKER: Good morning, Vice Chair Berg and Board members. My name is Kevin Barker. I'm here representing the Fuels and Transportation Division at the California Energy Commission.

My team is responsible for managing a portfolio of investments that help achieve California's ambitious goals on climate change, air quality, petroleum reduction, and adoption of zero-emission vehicles.

Thank you for inviting me here to speak today. We look forward to continued collaboration with the Air Resources Board and the Public Utilities Commission on this important topic.
In 2017, 32 percent of California's electricity was produced from renewable sources. That, coupled with a reduction in coal imports has resulted in the electricity sector being 40 percent below emissions where it was at in 1990.

We're also home, as you know, to nearly 50 percent of all zero-emission vehicles in the United States. So coupling the clean electricity from the grid with ZEV trans -- the ZEV transportation makes our ZEVs much cleaner than the rest of the United States.

We've also attracted nearly 90 percent of the total U.S. investments in clean transportation here in California. As of 2016, California's economy met the goal of reaching 1990 levels of GHG emissions four years ahead of that goal, which demonstrates we can make headway and do so on time scales thought unfathomable in previous years.

Thankfully, we still have some, what could be considered, low-hanging fruit, one of which we're here to talk about today with the medium- and heavy-duty transportation sector.

We're here to -- we must make strategic investments that help widespread adoption of zero- and near-zero emission vehicles. That couldn't be more true than medium- and heavy-duty sector. Even though the
medium- and heavy-duty sector only represent three percent of California's vehicle stock, the same subset of vehicles is representative of about 22 percent of on-road emissions.

Providing zero- and near-zero emission technology options in this sector can dramatically reduce emissions, while only targeting a relatively small number of vehicles. My team is focused on supporting this transition.

The Energy Commission's Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program invests about $1 million in a broad portfolio of transportation and fuel technologies to accelerate the development of clean, efficient, and low-carbon technologies to reduce the state's greenhouse gas emission reductions and petroleum dependence.

Unlike other programs in the state, the ARFVTP focuses on bridging research and commercial deployment through small-scale demonstration projects. To date, the program has invested over 125 million in advanced clean technologies for heat -- heavy- and medium-duty vehicles.

By leveraging private capital, our program has supported the demonstration and deployment of nearly 430 different commercial vehicles. Some of the most notable vehicle projects to date are the Cummins Westport near
zero 8.9 liter and 12 liter natural gas engines, which have achieved CARB's low NOx certification.

We also have the first of its kind United Parcel Service fuel-cell electric hybrid walk-in delivery van developed in partnership with the Center for Transportation and the Environment. We actually are testing this vehicle in the streets of West Sac today.

We've also funded three heavy-duty all-electric refuse trucks developed by Transportation Power and Peterbilt Motors that will operate in disadvantaged communities here in Sacramento County.

Just within the last four years, our program has invested in over 90 zero- and near-zero freight vehicles and equipment demonstrations at the ports of Long Beach, Los Angeles, and San Diego.

We also support advancements in refueling infrastructure for zero-emission freight vehicles and equipment. Some of the notable projects are and $8 million grant to build an demonstrate a renewable hydrogen station at the Port of Long Beach. That project is in partnership with Shell and Toyota, and will be used in refueling hydrogen-powered trucks.

We have multiple projects to demonstrate the potential of WAVE's wireless charging systems for freight equipment at the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles.
And finally, we have a bio -- we funded a biogas-to-vehicle fuel infrastructure project with Cal Biogas at a Kern County dairy cluster. The project will build a facility to convert biomethane into renewable natural gas for trucks operating in the Central Valley.

Under leadership of our Vice Chair, Janea Scott, the ARFVTP 2019-2020 annual investment plan is scheduled to be adopted, we hope, next month. That investment plan is a roadmap for our upcoming investments in the 2019-2020 fiscal year.

In that plan, we have proposed, out of the 100 million, in investments 17 and a half million for medium- and heavy-duty vehicle technology advancements. Our goal is to make targeted investments that progress zero-emission technologies within this sector.

By any measure, our program's approach to medium- and heavy-duty sector has carefully considered the advancement of near- and zero-emission technologies all while considering disadvantaged communities, and the economic and environmental challenges facing the state's goods movement and transit sectors.

My team, in close coordination with the PUC and the Air Resources Board, will conduct a deep analysis of the state's charging infrastructure needs. This analysis was made into law by Assembly Bill 2127 signed in 2018,
and requires the Energy Commission to lead the charging infrastructure assessment. It expands on current projections. Our current projections have only focused on the near-term 1.5 million ZEV goal. And this effort -- and for light-duty, this effort will expand to include medium- and heavy-duty in the ports and airports, along with other off-road vehicles and will expand the look at infrastructure needs to meet the five million ZEV goal.

We expect our first published publication of that report at the later half of this year, with the final full report being at the end of 2020. We do have the obligation of biannually re-examining the assessment of infrastructure and reporting back to the Legislature.

In closing, I'd like to reiterate the importance of the transportation sectors role in achieving our clean-energy future. If we're going to achieve the goal of 40 percent GHG reductions below 1990 levels and the goal of five million ZEVs, we must plan accordingly, and ensure that the energy grid is ready, and that our supporting and refueling infrastructure is as well.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.

That's a tremendous amount of information. And we really appreciate the breadth. You know, I'm sitting up here thinking about we hear about these projects, but
to hear about them in one report it's amazing what is going on, and to get this information back.

So, Board, we do have currently 13 people signed up. So I would encourage anybody who would like to sign up to testify on this item to please do so, so that we can cutoff the number of people. We'll give you a few more minutes while I turn to the Board to see if there's any questions that we would like to ask staff or our guests. And we hope that maybe you could stay for a little bit to answer questions. That would be great.

Ms. Takvorian, do you want to start off?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah. Just briefly. I just wanted to thank you for -- well, to thank everyone. I'll get with -- to CARB in a second, but -- or after the testimony. But I just wanted to ask from CEC and CPUC, if you all could provide your testimony, your reports to the Board and to our -- so that we can post it too on our website, because it was just chock-full of information, and I think we'd all really appreciate that. So thank you very, very much.

MR. BARKER: Happy to do so. Thanks.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. Thanks.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

Any other?

Dr. Sperling.
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Just a quick question for PUC. How is the -- to what extent is the PG&E bankruptcy going to affect the investments that are planned?

MS. IKLE: I probably need a bankruptcy attorney. But from my perspective, which is I am not involved directly in the bankruptcy, but I do oversee a number of other endeavors that CPUC is engaged in, like their renewable portfolio, their procurement, their R&D program, and my understanding is that when they are ongoing activities that are part of being a utility, they're able to go forward. But I -- I think it's difficult for me, because I don't want to step into, you know, saying something that I can't -- I shouldn't.

But they are -- they are able to basically still operate as a ongoing entity. That's the sort of bankruptcy they're in, right? They're not -- so we haven't really seen an effect. I've -- recently, we were looking at a contract that they were going to hold and we said, yeah, they can still hold that. That's fine. So it seems to be, you know, fine.

VICE CHAIR BERG: At least business as usual I think we can determine.

MS. IKLE: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you. Any other quick questions?
Then we'll go ahead and move to testimony. I have asked the court -- clerk of the court, Ms. Davis, to help me manage the calling of the names. Although are we going to post it.

Oh, voila, our system is working. That's nice.

Okay. Our names are posted here. And so if you will come up as you see your name, we really appreciate that. And, welcome.

MR. NUDD: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this item. My name is Greg Nudd. I am the Deputy Executive Officer for Policy at the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

And first of all, I'd like to thank ARB and staff for their efforts in this area. We have a particularly good and cooperative relationship with CARB staff on freight management. And I've spent many hours in meetings with them and the Port of Oakland trying to work through these issues.

Our technical analysis in West Oakland and CARB's analysis in Richmond point to high impacts from ships at berth. Meeting our exposure reduction goals in these vulnerable communities will require significant reductions from these sources.

So I just want to put the Bay Area's kind of weight behind as stringent as possible requirements on
these particular sources.

    Harbor craft and rail are other significant sources that are driving risk in these communities. As the trucks get cleaner, these sources, which have kind of lagged behind the trucks in cleaning up, become greater and greater percentages of what's driving the exposure in these communities.

    Now, our technical staff and our legal staff recognize that there are a number of challenges associated with these particular sources. But if we're going to meet our public health goals in impacted communities, these sources also have to do their part.

    In summary, a firm regulatory stance is needed to drive change. What we've seen in our work with the Port of Oakland is that transitioning to zero-emission freight activities is going to be greatly helped by regulatory certainty at the State level.

    So thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

Good morning, Mr. Rushing.

MR. RUSHING: Good morning. I want to first -- my name is Rocky Rushing representing Coalition for Clean Air.

First, I would like to thank and commend staff for their continual outreach to stakeholders and advocates
on this important issue. Thank you very much.

Coalition for Clean Air supports CARB's roadmap to reduce or eliminate freight-related emissions and associated health impacts, especially in these heavily impacted communities, neighborhoods around ports, freight hubs, railyards, freight routes.

We urge CARB to be aggressive in implementation of all programs, such as SIP and the Mobile Source Strategy to meet clean air and climate mandates. Reducing -- the equation is simple, reducing exposure equals reduced health risks.

At the legislative committee hearing yesterday, I heard what I thought was a stunning statistic. The medium- and heavy-duty trucks in California roll up 60 million miles per day. I hadn't heard that before. But with that in mind, CCA anxiously awaits the adoption this year of the long awaited Advanced Clean Truck Rule. The rule should mandate increased production of zero trucks in all -- zero-emission trucks in all classes. And this Clean Truck Rule is the logical step in line with the Transit Bus Rule and the Airport Shuttle Rules.

Regarding fleets, the rule should incorporate company buses and delivery trucks. The latter increasing pollution in our neighborhoods. Drayage trucks should be incorporated into the Fleet Rule or in a separate
rulemaking, but as soon as possible, no later than 2020. Passage of an inspection and maintenance legislation, as well as Ditch Diesel legislation currently working their way through the State Legislature is critical to California's air quality.

Regarding ships at berth, CCA encourages CARB to christen ships-at-berth rule this year. And it must ensure that all vessels at our ports are captured by CARB-approved emission controls to eliminate ship exhaust. We want CARB to go for the entire armada, including oil tankers. That's critical to the health of nearby communities.

At the local level, CARB can provide great assistance and expertise in helping communities and local regions design new warehouses, zero-emission infrastructure, and equipment planning and deployment, including loading docks, zero-emission equipment and renewable power, and anti-idling and other emission control measures.

And with that, thank you so much for your attention.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

MR. SCHOTT: Good morning, Board. My name is Tim Schott. I'm the Executive Director of the California Association of Port Authorities, which is comprised of the
state's 11 publicly-owned ports.

California is home to most productive system of ports in the nation, including three of America's largest container ports and a diverse system of niche ports. Our ports manage more than 40 percent of the containerized cargo coming into the United States and nearly 30 percent of the nation's exports flow through ports in the Golden State.

Our ports serve as the -- as one of the principal gateways to our freight transportation respon -- freight transportation system, which, as I think you heard earlier, is responsible for a third of the economy and jobs here in California. Freight-dependent industries account for about 700 billion in revenue, and about five million jobs.

Our ports are on the cutting edge of environmental stewardship. In fact, they are leading the nation, and in indeed the world, in developing environmental-friendly port operations. We're very proud to have reduced emissions since 2005 on the order of 80 percent for diesel particulate matter, 90 percent for SOx, and 50 percent for NOx.

And we've been able to achieve this, in large part, through our partnerships, partnerships with you and your Board and your staff, partnerships with CEC and PUC,
with our local air quality management districts, and with
our industry and community partners as well.

State funding is critical and has been critical
for achieving the great successes that we're very proud
of, proud to report on today.

A few brief highlights, if I could. The ports of
Los Angeles and Long Beach combined are the largest port
complex in the nation. And I think you'll hear a little
later a little bit about their Clean Air Action Plan,
which is, you know, kind of world shaking, if you will.

But the Port of Oakland, the other large
container port here in California, has also been working
very hard to reduce emissions. And, in fact, has cut
between 2005 and '15 has reduced truck emissions by 98
percent. The Port of Oakland actually has the most
shore-side power visits of any port that we're aware of
anyway, with 1,100 plug-ins in 2018.

Our large ports aren't the only ones working to
achieve emissions reductions. Our smaller ports are
engaged in a host of efforts as well, including shore-side
facilities at our cruise terminals at both Port of San
Francisco and Port of San Diego. In San Francisco,
working with their rail operators and the Bay Area Air
Quality Management District, they have been converting
 locomotive engines to biodiesel, and, in fact, are working
on a new Tier 4 locomotive that will decrease emissions by
more than 90 percent.

Again, we want to thank you for your time, thank
you for the partnership that we've developed with the
AQMDs, and with CARB, and with our other industry
partners.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Next we have Jacqueline
Moore, Mike Jacob, and Will Barrett.

MS. MOORE: Hi there. Jacqueline Moore, Port of
Long Beach.

First of all, the Port applauds CARB for leading
the progress to minimize community health impacts from the
freight industry and appreciate this update, as well as
this opportunity to speak now.

The ports of Long Beach and L.A. led the maritime
industry in 2006 with our Clean Air Action Plan. Since
then, our boards have adopted the Ambitious 2017 update to
that plan with even more progressive strategies and goals
to transform the fleet of CHE by 2030 and drayage trucks
by 2035 to fully zero emissions. And the ports have
already successfully reduced emission in surpassing two of
our CAAP goals already.

We understand the need to invest substantial
funds, over two billion, thus far through our TAP as well
as demonstration projects to accelerate the adoption of clean air equipment, drayage trucks, as well as infrastructure for shore power. And we have also aided in and hosted CARB staff and their consultants in support of the TRU amendment, harbor craft, I&M program, as well as the EMFAC updates as well as others.

Further, we are committed to the development of the seaport MOU with AQMD to reduce emissions for mobile sources. This will be based on the implementation of specific CAAP strategies that will meet the requirements to generate the SIP credits that South Coast will then have to submit to EPA. We are actively participating through staff discussions, the formal working group, as well as the technical working group processes.

The ports have submitted MOU language earlier this year for review, and also seek to clarify how the emission reductions will be calculated and quantified for each of the facilities going through their own ISR or MOU processes.

We believe this is imperative to creating really successful MOUs that can secure real and true SIP certifiable reductions. We are committed to working with AQMD to meet their timeline for their Board to adopt in November of this year.

Thank you. And look forward to continued
discussions and collaborations as we both realized our 
shared goals.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

MR. JACOB: Good morning, Madam Vice Chair and 
Board members. Mike Jacob with the Pacific Merchant 
Shipping Association representing ocean carriers and 
marine terminal operators at California's ports.

We want to thank you for having this item, and 
making it a regular occurrence, at least annually, with 
the Board. We've enjoyed collaborating With staff on 
these items. Last year, we were pleased to come up in 
support of the Board direction moving forward with respect 
to vessels at berth, cargo handling equipment, and 
Indirect Source Rule, and do the same again today.

We've been proud to collaborate with various 
members of the Air Board, including Dr. Sperling and the 
staff on sustainable freight. And now seeing that turn to 
the next step of implementation of items that are 
consistent with the SIP and the AQMP, but also with SB 32 
Scoping Plan and AB 617 Blueprint are things we support. 

Specifically with respect to ships at berth, we 
look forward to coming back. On the timeline that they 
didn't point out was that they're looking to have another 
set of rule amendments to you by the end of this year
after their workshops they did layout in their timeline.
We support that. We want to see some specific amendments
to help us comply with that rule, better, more
consistently, and produce better results in December of
this year.

In that context, we are -- we're very proud of
moving forward in a way that is unprecedented. You heard
from Tim that the Port of Oakland plugs in more ships than
any other port in the world. In L.A. and Long Beach,
they're very close behind in terms of just the overall
numbers. But if you combine both of those, obviously,
it's a significant number of ship plug-ins.

Since 2006, when we adopted that At-Berth Rule,
we have gone from diesel PM emissions from ships at berth,
both because of plug-ins and for cleaner fuels from about
1.43 tons per day of diesel PM to a projected, by CARB's
latest estimate of 0.06, 120 pounds in 2021. That's a 96
percent emissions reduction.

It tracks our SOx emissions reductions over the
past 10 years of 98 percent. Ships were the largest
contributor to SOx in the South Coast Basin. And now we
have emissions that are on track with what we are
predicting. And our industry globally is moving to a
cleaner fuels standard over the next two years that's
going to cost us tens of billions of dollars, but it will
reduce or overall emissions worldwide, not just locally and regionally.

So we're proud to collaborate with the CARB staff moving forward. We'll be coming back to you hopefully in December with some additional amendments that will not just expand the rule to additional fleets. You heard about that from some of those advocates being important, but also help us comply, because we're already subject to the rule.

So we look forward to working with you on those items, and also were the TRU, CHE, and commercial harbor craft items as they move forward.

Thank you.

MR. BARRETT: Good morning. I'm Will Barrett with the American Lung Association in California.

First of all implementation, of the Sustainable Freight Strategy is a critical public health need. The 2-15 Freight Strategy documents estimated $20 billion in annual health costs, over 2,000 deaths per year, and over 1,000 emergency room visits and hospitalizations annually in California due to the goods movement sector. We know that these impacts fall to low-income communities and communities of color who, far too often, bear the greatest brunt of the goods movement and diesel hot spots.

As noted in the PowerPoint that the staff gave,
the more recent health evaluations point to the continuing ongoing significant need -- significant health risk that must be avoided through the strong policies outlined in the presentation, both in terms of zero emission technologies and greater certainty for in-use performance of combustion equipment.

The American Lung Association supports CARB establishing a California specific low-NOx standard at least as stringent as the voluntary low-NOx standard of 002, or an equivalent of about 90 percent improvement or more from the current low-NOx -- current standard.

CARB should adopt its rule and continue to work with federal EPA to create a strong national rule to complement California's policy that ensures on-road in-use performance improvements.

We support CARB developing the strongest possible ships At-Berth Rule, as others have discussed, to cover port ships at California ports using CARB mitigation programs with limited exceptions. As I think Rocky pointed out, the fully armada needs to be covered including those tankers, and they have to use the best possible local solutions.

We also agree with the commentary that the Coalition for Clean Air put forward. We'd like to see Advance Clean Truck Policy move forward faster with
greater certainty for larger deployment of zero-emission technologies.

That was a cell phone not my buzzer.

(Laughter.)

MR. BARRETT: So we'd recommend that the -- is it mine?

(Laughter.)

MR. BARRETT: No. Sorry.

We'd recommend that the fleet policy that's moving forward also does include the drayage trucks that will be subject to a separate zero-emission rule, as well as those company buses that operate on our city streets.

The Freight Handbook finally -- the Freight Handbook is a good step forward for CARB to continue to weigh in on local policies and environmental reviews, to ensure that new and expanded freight facilities support that sustainable freight system that we know we need for public health reasons.

CARB's voice and expertise on freight clean-up issues is valuable, especially to local communities impacted most directly by local pollution hotspots.

So we're urge you to really move forward aggressively with all of these policies, we've laid out a few that we think we just wanted to call attention to, and look forward to working with all of you as you move
forward to protect public health and ensure a sustainable freight system.

Thank you very much.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: All right. Next we'll have Pete Okurowski. Apologies if there was a mispronunciation and Casey and Sean.

MR. OKUROWSKI: Thank you very much. Members of the Board, my name is Peter Okurowski. I'm on -- here on behalf of the Association of American Railroads, Union Pacific and BNSF Railway.

We support the statements today by others in the goods movement sector, and we also want to thank staff for working with the railroads over the year. And finally, we look forward to continuing to partner with ARN as we continue to explore new technologies both locomotives and within the rail yards.

Thank you very much.

MR. ELLIOT: Good morning. Casey Elliot on behalf of the Port of Hueneme.

The Port of Hueneme has a long history of recognition for its sustainability. Recently, in 2017, the port was recognized by the Green Shipping Summit as greenest U.S. port. And the port was the first in California to receive the Green Marine Certification, a verification by the preeminent maritime facility
The port has begun developing a custom clean air plan, which is being written proactively and in conjunction with the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District. That air plan is the Port of Hueneme Reducing Emissions, Supporting Health Plan, also known as PHRESH.

The plan will incorporate a full emissions inventory, setting of air quality goals, and an assessment of potential emission reduction strategies and funding opportunities. In conjunction with PHRESH, the Port is spending more than $150,000 to install the only EPA reference-grade air quality monitor in the surrounding the port region, which it plans to utilize to monitor local air quality and make the data available to the public.

Over the last five years, the Port has invested nearly $15 million in a shore-side power system. Hueneme also just received a ZANZEFF grant for an additional three million to install electrical infrastructure to power future EV cargo handling equipment.

The Ventura County Air Pollution Control District supports the shore-side power project as the greatest air quality improvement associated with a single project in Ventura County. The project has achieved significant reductions in the generation of air pollution from the port.
In conclusion, the Port of Hueneme is committed to working with CARB and local air pollution control districts to further improve the air quality in Ventura County.

Thank you.

MR. EDGAR: Good morning, Vice Chair Berg and Board members. Sean Edgar. I'm the Director of Clean Fleets. And I'm here to celebrate the morning. I'm here to celebrate a good effort of your staff to work through the HVIP item we discussed a few months ago. Here to celebrate the positive contributions and facilities that are net zero now and where they fit into the freight facility discussion. And personally, I'm here to celebrate my 20th year dealing on the Diesel Risk Reduction Plan. So I got to appear in front of the Board 20 years ago as you adopted that plan. And guess what, I'm still here. They haven't taken me away yet. So thank you for your time.

I'll just touch on -- I have the privilege of serving on the Advance Clean Local Trucks Committee. I've served on TRAC, which helped implement the Truck and Bus Regulation. And then on behalf of the Board and under contract of the Board, I went out and did the Truck and Bus Educational Outreach Program for about 6,000 fleet owners.
So I've been dealing a lot with the truck strategy. And I'll just, number one, accent thank you for the Hybrid Voucher Incentive Program restoration for the waste industry. We had a spirited discussion about that, and staff got us together and figured out a way to work through that. So thank you very much, because those facilities -- I'm sorry those clean trucks are delivering freight in terms of waste and recycling.

It may be as stinky freight. It may be an undesirable freight that the public is throwing away, but they deliver freight to facilities that may be of concern to you. And the good news is by fixing the HVIP problem, thousands of cleaner trucks will be rolling to those facilities.

As I was also here to -- excited and celebrate Energy Commission mentioned three zero-emission trash trucks being put out there. And that's great. And hopefully when those mature to help replace some of the 15,000 thousand waste and recycling tracks that are in the state, our folks will get excited. However, hundreds of near-zero emission, the best that we can do today, are being rolled out through the HVIP Program.

I'll just touch, as you discussed the definition of freight facilities as you developed the future plan, to recognize that there are over 100 solid waste facilities
and 50 compost facilities that our group works with. All of those go through the CEQA process in California. So those facilities look at ton, traffics, and other impacts.

And so as they go through that process, just I'll ask that you consider additional facilities that will be needed to help divert the organics through SB 1383, which you may be hearing about, because that's a huge new push to take organics out of the landfill.

And finally, I'll just ask that you consider positive impacts of the waste and recycling industry, because net zero I know is a goal of this Board. And whether it's the largest company in the waste sector that is about three times net zero today, or some of the smaller operators that do not have landfills are up to 25 times net zero. So the short answer is net zero is now. Consider the contributions of the waste industry.

And finally, I'll just say that in an atmosphere that it's a big cycle where we all work together. So clean trucks go to clean facilities.

Thank you.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Next we have Chris Shimoda, Katherine Garcia, and Kevin Hamilton.

MR. SHIMODA: Good morning, Chair Berg. Chris Shimoda, California Trucking Association.

Over the past decade, California truckers have
spent about a billion dollars a year transitioning out of older, high-emitting equipment. And I'd like to thank staff for highlighting that progress in their presentation.

Modern trucks reduce NOx by over 90 percent and virtually eliminate diesel particulate matter. Tier 4 TRUs, which there is a regulation requiring those for trailer TRUs, reduce particulate matter by 97 percent. As CARB and the industry have implemented these rules on trucks and TRUs, we've worked together to ensure that the regulations are fairly enforced to level the playing field for compliant fleets and that incentives are available for fleets taking early action. And as we consider updates to the TRU regulation, we'd like to continue focus on both enforcement and incentives.

And new rules must not simply create more burdens for the compliant fleets who are already struggling to meet current requirements, while 20 to 30 percent of the TRUs fail to comply with existing standards. Also, deploying charging infrastructure is likely going to be a process, leaving fleets in the early years with electric standby TRUs with few places to plug in.

And so incentives for early action can help mitigate some of the risks for those fleets purchasing electric standby TRUs in the early days, while
infrastructure is being built out.

So we'd like to thank the Board for the opportunity to comment and we look forward to working with staff on further implementation of these rules.

Thank you.

MS. GARCIA: Good morning. My name is Katherine Garcia, and I'm an advocate for Sierra Club California. We represent over 400,000 members and supporters across California.

Thank you for CARB's work to minimize health-threatening emissions from California's freight system. CARB should engage in local projects where it can to encourage best practices. CARB can offer critical insight into zero-emission infrastructure and renewable power at freight facilities. We urge CARB to move forward with the strongest possible ships At-Berth Rule.

As my colleagues have said, covering all visits to ports must be the CARB standard. This represents a vital public health measure. Anything less than all visits would be harmful to sensitive communities located near port facilities. These are the communities most affected by our transportation emissions.

The Advanced Clean Truck Rule should include manufacturer requirements for a greater number of zero-emission trucks in all classes. Pairing the
manufacturer requirement with a fleet requirement will be the most effective. We urge you to include the widest possible range of fleets, including company buses, drayage trucks, and delivery trucks.

Thank you for this opportunity.

MR. HAMILTON: I guess I don't have to wait for my name to be called.

Kevin Hamilton, Central California Asthma Collaborative. Good morning, Board. Good to see you all.

And on this particular issues, I really want to thank staff for working so hard with us on this on the California Clean Freight Coalition. It's been a joy to work with you people, and I think very professional, and we were able to move some of these things forward.

I have some specific concerns though for the San Joaquin Valley with regard to the timeline here. I'm sorry Mary is not here. I was going to pound on the podium a little bit for her, since we missed out on the last time, but...

You know, we really need to see that timeline moving forward aggressively. I'm concerned that we're lagging a bit there. I know we're -- you feel like you're moving as fast as you can. But the San Joaquin Valley needs this for our SIP and for the health of our communities. So we have a number of communities up and
down the region that are significantly impacted by diesel pollution.

We have at least two large urban areas in our valley that are now considering becoming inland ports. We recently learned that our air district and partner -- partnership with a couple of those cities is actually putting out a study -- an RFP for a study to look at the feasibility of inland ports in a couple of these communities.

So I just want to be really clear on that. If they want to be a port, let them be a port. All the rules of a port. That truck, that's a ship, so zero-emission, right?

So that brings the Handbook forward. So it's really important that this Freight Handbook that's coming out, the first generation, the first volume, really have very clear and descriptive guidelines for building these facilities. We need zero emissions built into these on the front end. We keep forgetting to do that. Then they have to be retrofitted in. They always cost twice as much. And we need to do that more proactively and aggressively.

I would really like to see CARB launch an outreach effort to local agencies, especially local government and local planning and development offices, to
make sure they understand what this Handbook is all about, and talking to the local transportation planners, how to use it, what the incentives are, and again what the potential penalties are for not using it.

So we hear a lot of our local agency folks who I talk to say, "well, what are you talking about? Handbook? What do you mean? What's going on"? So that shouldn't be happening. So if we're going to make this work, it's going to take some really, you know, concerted on-the-effort. And organizations like mine standby ready to help you.

So we should put fleets forward. Fleets are low-hanging fruit in this situation. Again, there's a lot of incentive money out there for fleets to make these changeovers. And you get a lot of bang for your buck in that situation.

We need to advance the I&M Rule. We need aggressive inspection and maintenance on these vehicles, and it needs to be random. And it needs to be in the off-roads, the back highways, where a lot of the folks, again in the valley, are traveling on a regular basis with some really old beat-up vehicles.

I did want to mention before I leave, I really am pleased to see this interagency cooperation. This can't be done in a silo. I've mentioned this before, that the
Commissions and you folks are all here together gives me hope that we might be able to pull this off.

So have a great day.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you, Kevin.

Hi, Stephanie.

MS. TSAI: Hi. Good morning, Board members. I'm Stephanie Tsai from the California Environmental Justice Alliance, CEJA as you know us.

I want to echo the comments of some of my fellow advocates here today. And I'm here to speak specifically on behalf of CCAEJ, the Community for -- excuse me, the Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice in the Inland Empire region, and Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability in the Fresno Central Valley Region.

I think as we're all aware, these are a couple of the communities that are most severely impacted by freight and goods movement activities, right? And what that means for them is that the continuing expansion of goods movement infrastructure and the, you know, logistics industries means that these communities are literally paying the price with their health, you know, their well-being and their lives.

And I just want to, you know, let us sit with that and carry that with us as we move forward on this
stuff, because we really appreciate, you know, the work of
the staff and the interagency collaboration. We're
excited to see, you know, especially some of the
zero-emission electric, like, fully electric, you know,
zero-emission regulations and actions coming up. You
know, we were -- we were encouraged to support, you know,
the passage of the Innovative Clean Transit Rule, because
we feel like that's really, you know, a step forward, and
the technologies are similar in helping to push that
forward. And we're, you know, looking forward to working
on the Advanced Clean Trucks Rule too and other
regulations of that sort.

I just want to highlight one other thing in
particular which is that, you know, we're well aware of
some of the -- some of the challenges in implementing some
of these policies. And we're -- you know, we really want
to collaborate with CARB, and we really want your help in,
you know, being bold and moving forward with this stuff.

And one of the issues I wanted to highlight in
particular is, you know, the misclassification of truck
drivers in the trucking industry. You know, we see this
as a huge overlapping issue with EJ communities, because
many of these workers are -- you know, live in our
communities, right? They're low-income workers of color.
A lot of them are immigrants undocumented.
And that is, you know, not just a moral issue and, you know, something that intersects with our communities, it's also, you know, an impediment actually to the implementation -- you know, the rollout and transition of zero-emission and clean trucks. So that's something we'd like to work together on, you know, addressing.

I'll leave it that.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

Lauren will be our last speaker. Welcome.

MS. NAVARRO: Good morning. Thank you for the honor. My name is Lauren Navarro. I'm with the Environmental Defense Fund. Good morning, CARB Board members.

EDF sees CARB's significant focus on ZEV freight, including ongoing funding to purchase these technologies as critical to meeting California's clean air and carbon goals. We strongly suggest and request that you, CARB, move forward with certainty to a cleaner ZEV-based freight system for California.

And with that, I'll keep it very short.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Comments?
VICE CHAIR BERG: Well, as we know, this is an informational item. And so there is no record to be closed. However, we want to have some Board feedback. And so Supervisor Gioia.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Okay. Great. Thanks.

I think this was really important and timely as a presentation. And I agree with a number who -- a number of folks who say that really this -- we can't do this fast enough. And I wanted to raise an issue that happens on the ground, because I'm in local government, and I also address new land-use applications. And why it's really important to move -- to continue to be aggressive on the implementation dates for zero-emission trucks, and why the Freight Handbook is important.

So in many parts of this state to support our economy, there is still a lot of expansion of freight infrastructure. That's a good thing from an economic standpoint. But it also holds the challenge of increasing emissions in already burdened communities.

Case in point. I live in Richmond. I represent Richmond. We're an AB 617 community. And we are seeing in North Richmond land-use applications for warehouse facilities to meet growing demand in the Bay Area. So what we're doing -- and this takes a lot of effort and work, because it's new. Because I serve on this Board and
the Air District, I'm familiar with what's happening here -- sitting down with our planners to look at how do we condition these new projects so we're not introducing hundreds of new diesel trucks -- diesel trips into a community when we're actually trying to develop an emissions reduction plan for the exact same community.

So we're developing an emissions reduction plan, right, after doing monitoring to reduce emissions from mobile and stationary sources, while in another venue is the potential to increase diesel emissions by improving these projects.

So what we're trying to do is come up with the conditions through our EIR process of having fleets come -- having zero-emission fleets come into these facilities, electrify the infrastructure, the loading docks.

But local planners need help. The best meaning, the well-intentioned and smart local planners, this is new to them. That's why the Freight Handbook is really important. That's -- the Freight Handbook, sharing the tools -- the land-use tools that these planners can utilize. Across the jurisdictional line in the City of Richmond, they recently approved -- although things will change hopefully going forward -- some similar warehouse and didn't impose these conditions. Whereas, in the
county, where we're doing the land use, because I'm familiar with what we're doing here, I'm able to link them with good folks here. We've talked to folks here at ARB and at the air district.

This is what is happening on the ground. And my worry is if we don't act fast enough, more -- we lock in more diesel emissions into communities, because we're approving - we, the collective we in local government - new freight expansion policies or freight expansion facilities, because they're needed with growing demand. So that's -- that's the challenge in real life.

And so I just want to emphasize why it's important to get the Freight Handbook out as soon as possible, and work with local government, and give the tools to advocates to advocate for these things, and to try to aggressively work toward adoption.

And I will close with this last point, which is something I also make under the comment of AB 617. So right now, most of the State funding going to local communities to implement AB 617 reductions is to reduce emissions from existing facilities, which is a good thing and a priority.

But what about those disadvantaged communities that are also trying to get economic activity? We need some of that investment to go to support clean vehicles
and clean infrastructure as part of these new projects. Otherwise, these communities won't get the benefit of economic activity and will -- and it's not a level playing field.

So I want to suggest that we think about how some of the money we send down to districts on AB 617 can also help support bringing in a clean technology, as opposed to having an industrial site sit vacant. We bring in clean fleets and help the folks who are trying to locate in these communities to create jobs with clean technology.

So the -- and I want to raise that again under AB 617.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you. And so I'd just like to take a moment for timing, because we're looking at a little bit after 11:00 o'clock. And we want to make sure on these next items that we have plenty of Board discussion. So I would like to make a recommendation that after this item, we'll take a quick break, maybe 10 minutes, and come back. We'll start our 617 item, and we'll have a working lunch. So as people can go back and have lunch.

For those of you in the audience that are going to be testifying at 617, and if -- so we'll take that break. We'll have staff presentation. And if you want to scurry out, get a little bite to eat and come back, that
way you'll be taken care of as well.

And so is that fine with everybody?

Great. Okay. Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Well, I just want to second what my colleague Supervisor Gioia has said about trying to be aggressive with regard to moving forward to reduce diesel emissions, and -- because AB 32, as well as AB 617, is supposed -- or it mandates us to make sure that there is economic benefits, as well as health benefits with regard to disadvantaged communities, if I'm not mistaken.

I really second what he was saying about trying to help these disadvantaged communities have new jobs -- new job and economic opportunities that are clean.

And just to, you know, throw in the health effects issue, because he was talking about, you know, implementing policies that would help these communities. But again, these are the communities that have the most health effects related to diesel emissions. And we can't forget that.

And then with regard to land use, from my experience chairing the AB Consultation Group meetings, that's come up time and time again, that if we really want to make impact on reducing emissions in these communities, we have to be able to be working with the planners in terms of land-use decisions. And there's a land use --
well, I'll just leave it at that. I think that's very important. And I don't know the best way for us as an agency to move these land-use discussions forward, but I think it's really important. And so I think we need to work hard on that.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Can I just say I think that the two prongs of success are tools to the advocates to advocate for it, and tools to the planners so they can implement it, because that -- and that's why the Freight Handbook, right, is oriented toward both those two audiences, because the advocates will be there to ensure that the right conditions are placed on a new development. And then the planners need the help to understand how to implement those, understanding technology. So it -- I think that the Handbook can help both.

VICE CHAIR BÉRG: Thank you.

Yes, Dr. Sherriffs.

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Supervisor Gioia, thank you for organizing my notes on that topic.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Well put.

Yeah. And as also was emphasized, we need to be sure that there's education that everybody out there knows that this is in the works, and people ought to have some idea of when this will be out, or some kind of draft that
can be put out of at least, whether this is three months, six months. When is it, by the way?

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:

We hope to be able to release a rough draft of the Handbook within the next month and a half or so, and start a series of community meetings and meetings with other stakeholders. It's due to the Board this fall.

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: Excellent. So -- but it's also time to start the education process, so that entities like the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District that's partnering with South Coast, City of Merced on looking at feasibility of an inland port, what the environmental advantages might be, and being sure that, you know, we've got some guidance in terms of how to assess the local impacts and make that more positive.

So, yeah, now is the time. Coming soon to a bookstore near you.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: A little different.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: And it will be free.

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: Right. A little different topic, but also near and dear to the valley, methane capture. The dairies was mentioned -- the collaboration with the dairy cluster in Bakersfield. And thanks to our partners for being here today and sharing
the good work that you're doing.

Do CEC, the PUC have goals, a roadmap, what other projects are there to, you know, take advantage of this renewable energy source and redirecting it into the -- primarily probably as a transportation fuel, but potentially a transportation fuel and electricity, maybe natural gas?

MS. IKLE: So methane and methane capture is a strong area of focus of our gas section. And there -- frankly, I think sometimes biogas is used for transportation, because there are so many incentives in that area, and because then it doesn't need to make pipeline quality. It doesn't go into the pipeline, so it avoids issues related to gas quality in the pipeline.

So the CPUC has been quite active promoting biogas. And there are three different uses that we, you know, commonly see. One is gas into the pipeline. One is gas for transportation, which basically kind of avoids the PUC in a way, you know, because we're neither -- and the other one is gas for electricity generation.

So those are the three emphasis. And there is a lot of collaboration with the CDFA on promoting pilot projects and funding pilot projects. And then there also have been some contracts that the utilities have with those projects. So it's an area of strong emphasis and --
as well.

I would just say talking about the CEQA and planning discussion that just happened, I was wondering -- it used to be that CEQA had a part of it for new buildings and things, new -- if you had -- that related to utilities, and utilities being sufficient to support a new project. And so it's a part of CEQA that I think traditionally has been used fairly lightly just to check if there was water service or electricity service and things like that. And so I think in the context of the discussion about Richmond and things, if you built into the CEQA review that you would need to have sufficient utility service to serve a charging load, that might help planners embed electrification in planning some of the things that were just talked about.

So, yes, we do -- and the -- there's -- there's a -- I can maybe directly connect you to the person who follows the biogas area more directly, so -- and Southern Cal -- some of the utilities are also talking about a green gas push and a certain amount of their gas being from biogas, not necessarily dairies, but -- and not necessarily in-state, but, you know, that's -- it's in the right direction.

MR. BARKER: I was just going to add I know the question was around renewable gas. But I would know that
the Energy Commission is leading, along with the Public Utilities Commission and ARB, and actually the California Independent System Operator, a vehicle grid integration roadmap, which we hope to adopt this year. And that is looking at excess renewables, mostly solar and wind, but looking at smart charging specifically of fleets, but then also potentially of using fleets as storage devices to send back energy at times of most value.

So it's not necessarily gas related, but we are working on a roadmap for vehicle grid integration of fleets.

MS. IKLE: So I think just getting back to the dairy, you know, the CPUC has been involved. There's bioenergy plans and stuff that's been in the works for years. And we have been working closely with CDFA on trying to rollout more and more of these projects.

And there are also so many co-benefits from the water quality perspective as -- and also from just local air perspective as well.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Okay. Yes. Ms. Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you. Thanks to the staff for a really, really good report. And not only the report itself, but for the tremendous amount of work that went into it, and particularly the outreach to communities that are most impacted by these freight
facilities. And I think everyone that you've heard from today has expressed that appreciation. So I'd like to add mine.

I feel like it's really important that you're building this strong relationship to the AB 617, the CAPP Program, and hope to circle back to that also later.

I agree with Supervisor Gioia that we need to provide that partnership and help. And the Freight Handbook I think is a -- is good, but I also think guidance isn't enough. So I'm going to harken back to the Land-Use Handbook, which we were very involved in in the development of it. It's been really useful in local planning efforts, when local planners and decision-makers have wanted it to be useful, to be quite frank.

So I do think that we need to look at requirements. And I -- I think that the progress that we've made with the environmental justice elements being required in the general plans is a good example of the way that we can move forward for actually being more directive with local land use. And local land use is -- you know, maybe, if we search all our documents lately, I think it might be the most used phrase in much of what we're doing.

So I think it's really important, but we also need to look at how we're actually able to move that forward from the transportation, the SB 375 work that
we're doing, the 617 work, the freight work. We -- we're able to move, for instance recently, a required truck route in San Diego from -- next to the port. We had a resolution 10 years ago, and it wasn't being enforced, so there's a new truck route that's been established with a prohibition on residential streets that are right adjacent to the port. Yes, that took -- that was a local opportunity that was taken, but it took 10 years to get that done.

There should be a requirement that truck routes should not go through residential communities. And I think that, while I understand the complexity of that, I do think that there needs to be a stronger push from CARB, frankly, on that. It just makes total common sense, but doesn't seem to happen. Things like buffer zones need to also be evaluated.

I was pleased that you were incorporating the Port of San Diego's direction to staff for the new Clean Air Action Plan, which is great. It also has been at the result of really a decade of work by local communities. And I don't think it would have happened without your work on freight emission reductions. I really think CARB's work is critical to that moving forward, and also to the AB 617 Program, and the emission reduction focus there.

So I believe that the new development focus that
Supervisor Gioia had is really important as part of the guidance. I also want to make sure that we're looking at new operations, because, for instance, in some ports in other places, it isn't necessarily a new development. It may be a new tenant that's bringing in lots of new activity, and therefore lots of trucks, and ships, and new operations. So that -- those requirements need to be written into those leases, and MOUs, and agreements as well.

So thank you very much again for your great work and look forward to moving it forward.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.

Mr. De La Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you. Thank you, staff. It's -- ever since last March when you gave the briefing on the ports, I've been looking forward to getting this broader perspective. So thank you very much for doing that, for making it as broad as it is, touching on all of these issues that my colleagues and I are really focused on.

I want to just say two things. One, on the ports, I appreciate that the ports are here today. Last March, during the briefing that we received, it was clear that the biggest bang for our buck was from onshore power from the ships polluting in those neighborhoods. And so
that's what's focused here. And it may not be what maybe
the ports have been talking about in the recent past. So
we obviously need to get on the same page. But going
after the biggest polluters within the port complex is our
priority. And if that's what the data showed, then that's
where we need to focus all of our efforts, collective
efforts, to address that problem.

Second, railroads. The chart on page 21 I
thought was very instructive and depressing. Clearly,
there is increased rail business going on. I know it's
hard to rollout all the cleanest technologies all at once.
But what this shows me is not even the medium clean
equipment is being used. There -- the dirtiest, the Tier
0 and the Tier 1 are what's being used to handle this
increased cargo. And that is just absolutely
unacceptable.

We need to push for the development of zero and
near-zero emission technologies, such as hybrid options
when they operate in our communities. Just last night, I
was talking to staff about somebody's train. I don't
remember whose. I don't want to name names or call them
out. But when they go through some of the towns in the
Central Valley, they switch to hybrid-electric mode.
That's the kind of thing we need to see up and down the
state. And I realize we -- there's not a lot of those
locomotives available, but they're will be, and there need to be. And so we need to work on that.

On a day-to-day basis, again, it shouldn't be the 0s and the 1s, it should be the 3s and the 4s that are running in and out of California, and up and down our corridors. That is absolutely unacceptable that they're using the dirtiest locomotives they have in our communities.

It's been 20 years since that MOU. When I was in the Legislature, we were talking about that MOU. I've been here quite a while, and we're still working off of that MOU. Clearly, that MOU is not giving us the results we need. If it allows for the railroads to unilaterally decide to uses Tier 0s and Tier 1s that is unacceptable.

So I think it's time for CARB and the South Coast Air Quality Management District to regroup and identify options for cleaning up this sector. I don't know if that's more expansive ISR rules, multi-state regulations, enforceable agreements, another MOU, or some combination of strategies, I don't know. But I do know by looking at that chart, that it's time that we do something.

Tighter national standards are clearly unlikely.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So we should look at any examples across the country, as I've -- I've talked to
staff about this, there have been approved and -- in some cases approved and not implemented, some cases approved and implemented measures in other states. We need to look at those with regard to the railroad sector. Clearly, they have made their way through the process. They're happening. It's something we should look at and see if we can't mimic here in California.

We need to do everything we can, because those communities that are on those corridors or adjacent to the railyards, as I'd had in my district - the railyards in Commerce were in my district when I was in the Legislature, and we were having these same discussions back then. It's just been too long. So, you know, come up with your approach and let's continue to have this discussion.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

Ms. Mitchell.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you.

First of all, I want to compliment staff on all the work that they have been doing. We all recall the contentious meeting we had in Riverside a year ago in March. And many of the people that we heard at that meeting, I have heard again at our local air district meetings. And I'm going to focus for the time being on
the warehouse issue, which was raised by some others here on the Board.

Because in the last week, I made a trip out to the inland ports area. And it's really quite shocking where you see acre after acre of these new warehouses. And there's still a lot more land out there where that can happen. And that's the reason that I think this Handbook, which we've already talked about -- and I understand that the Handbook is -- your first chapter, your first Handbook is going to be on warehouses.

And a couple of questions about that, since you are -- it's in development. Are you going to be focusing on what happens inside the warehouse or what happens outside the warehouse? Can you tell me a little bit about what we might expect to get from the Handbook?

TTD FREIGHT POLICY SECTION MANAGER FREEMAN: So I think we're definitely initially focused on all of the above. We are looking at the buildings themself, about energy efficiency measures. We worried about the operations that are happening within and outside of the buildings as well, and then the vehicles and equipment that will be deployed onsite.

And then going back to the buildings, also establishing that zero-emission infrastructure early on, primarily during the early construction phases, so that
they don't have to go back and put that in down the road. So we'll definitely try to hit all aspects of the facilities being built and operated.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: And so -- and that's why I think that's so important, because so many of them are getting built right now, and that -- those kinds of measures that could be included in building ordinances. And as many of you know, or certainly our staff knows, the South Coast is working on facility-based measures. Those kinds of regulations could be in a facility-based measure that deal with what kind of plug-in capability they have, what kind of charging capability they might have, and other kinds of things that can be imposed on the building itself.

The struggle, of course, is -- for us in the South Coast is how do we regulate the trucks coming in and out? And, of course, that's CARB's domain to regulate the mobile sources. But I think good collaboration between CARB and the air districts, wherever they're working on these issues, is really critical.

We see so often that what we're dealing with here is an intersection between air quality, land use, and transportation. And it comes up in many different contexts. Here, warehouses. It comes up in the ports. It comes up in AB 617. And we have to sort of tear down
those silos where that's happening, and have a
collaboration of the key players in each of those areas,
so that that intersection comes together.

And I know we're all struggling with it.
Facility-based measures can help that. AB 617 can be
another pathway to making that work. But remember, 617 is
focusing on very specific communities. We have done a
good job in picking communities where some of these issues
come into play, the warehouses, and the rail yards, and
the ports.

So there's a lot of work to be done. And while I
am thankful that we've come this far, I have this anxiety
that we're not going fast enough. And I just think part
of that is because of deadlines looming in all of our
districts to meet federal requirements. But a lot of it
is that as these things get developed, the health impacts
are descending on the residents in the areas, where the
impacts are felt, and we're losing control, we're losing
the ability to exert the kind of control that we could
exert, if we can move a little bit faster, so...

And we know some of the speed with which we can
move forward depends on the technology and the development
of technology. And so we're well aware of that, but we're
seeing a lot of that transforming now and coming to some
fruition as a result of our efforts in our past
regulations.

So that's all I'm going to say right now.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you, Ms. Mitchell.

Dr. Sperling.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Yeah. I think, you know, what we've heard is that the staff, the agency is making good progress on dealing with the technology side of the problem. And that's a really hard one, and that's in wheelhouse of CARB, and that's good. And it's going to, you know, take a lot of our resources -- staff resources and others to make that happen.

But I think what we're hearing here is that there's another part to it. And when we did the Sustainable Freight Action Plan, and I know Ms. Marvin and Doug Ito are sitting there very knowingly smiling, because it was a frustrating experience. But, you know, we understood it that there's two parts here. You know, one is technology, the other is usage, logistics, truck VMT is the second part.

And so I know there's been a -- I know we've devoted most of our resources to the technology side. And that makes sense, because that's something we have authority on, we can move on. But what we're hearing from the Board is a lot of frustration about how do we deal
with all the truck usage, and, you know, some at the
ports. But a lot of it comes -- you know, it's tied in
with the warehouses and distribution centers.

And, you know, so I just wanted to add another
perspective on that, and that is that what came out of the
Sustainable Freight Action Plan is the focus on the
logistics, the truck VMT. And we have much less authority
about that, so -- and that's much more challenging how to
deal with it. But it is really key. And it's partly key
because we don't really understand even. We don't have
good data. You know, I know a few academics are starting
to look at the warehouse, you know, issue and how many,
and where. You know, and a lot of the problem is us of
course, because we all want our socks delivered in two
hours.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: And there -- but, you
know, tying it back into that, you know, I say that just
half jokingly, because that really is the source of a lot
of it. And, you know, I don't know what the answer is.
There are little things, you know, truck routing and some
things that can be dealt with perhaps through 617
initiatives.

But all I'm -- I guess I'm affirming what every
-- a lot of the Board members are here saying is we've got
to keep it on the table. And I know we less authority and
we have less idea what to do, but we can't let it go.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Senator Florez.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Thank you. Thank you.

Appreciate the conversation. I guess maybe
leaving off Sustainable Freight Plan, what we are doing,
our own investments, mostly questions, and then a
statement.

You know, one of the things I wonder about -- I
think Kevin Hamilton may have made reference to it, and
knows about it, inland ports, and the move to convenience,
the growth of Amazon, San Bernardino, Kern County, the
Inland Empire. You know, all of these places that are
becoming inland ports in a very large way. What are we
doing with our investments from our particular funds to
make those particular areas and those particular inland
ports better players?

I know we do a lot on the port side, on the
regular port. I know we've made some investment, but what
can you tell me about the inland ports?

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:

So we've seen quite a number of proposals, I
would say over the last 10 years or so --

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Um-hmm.

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:
-- whether it's bringing things in by barge from Oakland, or by rail from their into the Central Valley, or towards the southern end of the state.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Um-hmm.

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:

Most of the projects that we've seen so far that are termed inland port are not proposing to use any different technology, other than the trucks or the trains that are already available.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Um-hmm.

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:

We have tried to advocate within the development of those projects and say, you have the potential to do a good thing. But if you just do business as usual, what you're doing is bringing more diesel pollution to already impacted areas in the valley.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Yeah.

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:

There's a way to do it and make it positive, but we've not been able to get traction on that yet.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. And so maybe the -- and appreciate PUC and CTC we've had some discussions on some of the logistics and travel aspects of this from the Board. But it seems to me that, you know, I'm not sure what our Board can do in order to make these GHG friendly
or, you know, what I call net zero ports, right? The places that have microgrids, solar, various types of facilities that are reflective of what's coming in. So a truck is going to come in one way or another, right?

So what is mitigating against that, at least not just on the CO side, but on the greenhouse gas side? Are we coordinating with the other agencies on these types of efforts? These -- I know the word that no one really says and we always kind of run into the problem here of land use, right? So who's in charge of land use? Is it, you know, the counties? Do we have a say in this? Is there someway that we can look at land use as being a part of the, you know, sustainable greening when you look at inland ports?

How do you -- how do we communicate that with the other agencies on some of these sustainable net-zero ports -- inland ports? So in other words, the next big one is going to be built in Fresno. It has to be net zero. Do we ever just say that?

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:
We absolutely say that.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay.

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:
We routinely say that in written comment letters submitted under CEQA analysis. We have a whole long list
of them posted on our website for warehouses, and railyards, and port expansions. That's also going to be a huge focus in the Freight Handbook and the Warehouse Module.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Um-hmm.

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN: Our general approach is not to say don't build it at all.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Um-hmm.

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN: It's build it in a smart location and make it zero or as close to zero as you can get today. And if it's not zero today, put plans in place, so that it can be transition as quickly as possible.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: And as we weigh in, how successful have we been with our letters and advocacy?

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN: Not very.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay.

TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN: There's a couple situations where there is litigation generally from local communities. And we've been able to be supportive of those litigation efforts with our technical analysis. Sometimes folks do ask us for consultations. I would say that's probably been the
place that we've been most successful. We would certainly
hope to expand that.

    BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Okay. Thank you.

    BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Chair Berg, can I?

    VICE CHAIR BERG: Yes, please. A follow-up from
Ms. Takvorian.

    BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'm sorry. I just
wanted -- from my perspective, Ms. Marvin was a little bit
modest related to -- I think to health answer your
question, Senator Florez, is that CARB provided a really
important analysis when the 10th Avenue terminal in San
Diego was going to expand. And we were able to utilize
that data to really push for and advocate for mitigations
that have now taken place, and that I think others are
looking at as models for how to reduce emissions.

    We are not at zero emission by any means, but I
think that it really helped to offset what would have been
a huge expansion of emissions at that port right next to
the community. So I really want to thank you again for
that. That's four years ago now, but we really appreciate
it. And I think the community is still benefiting from
it. So thanks.

    TRANSPORTATION AND TOXICS DIVISION CHIEF MARVIN:
And we're not going to stop trying. I just want
to be clear on that.
VICE CHAIR BERG: No, we do appreciate that you are tired and your team there are tired advocates. It just points out how complicated these major changes that could -- we could even call are revolutionary in so many ways, and they have so many pieces. And I'd like to, you know, add to not only air quality, land use, and transportation, but also it's a changing landscape. And therefore, it affects labor, and it affects how jobs are going to look like in the future.

And we're seeing that not as many jobs because of the technology, and that's fearful. So there is just a tremendous amount of moving parts. It's no longer just a single dimension chess game. It feels like it's become a multi-layer.

I would like to ask our guest Judith and Kevin, if you have any closing comments that you'd like to make?

MS. IKLE: I just will make a comment on the comment that you just made just to -- one of the things that the Public Utilities Commission is -- that we want to make sure that the infrastructure that ratepayers are subsidizing in part is used. So that's critical.

But it is a chicken and an egg thing. You know, so I think making sure that these new warehouses do have adequate infrastructure, you know, whether it's the
distribution center of electricity. That person is very critical.

But another thing is that because this is coming from all ratepayers, we want to make sure that it's not a transfer to a large corporation. So I just wanted to say that the IOUs are working with large corporations like Albertsons, which I mentioned, American Airlines, which I mentioned, Dole, UPS, and Amazon on their medium- and heavy-duty programs.

However, the Commission did weigh the issue in the governing decisions. And in D1801024, which approved the SB 350 priority review projects, stated that, "To ensure that San Diego Gas & Electric's fleet delivery services project creates as many high quality jobs as possible, and has the most direct benefits to ratepayers, we direct San Diego Gas & Electric to identify minority-owned business enterprises, women-owned business enterprises, and/or locally owned fleets in deploying this project beyond the infrastructure deployed at the UPS sites.

"All of the infrastructure beyond what is deployed at UPS sites must go to supporting up to 30 vehicles at minority- and women-owned businesses, and/or locally-owned fleets.

"Further, staff is working to address the issue
of San Diego Gas & Electric working with Amazon, which we believe is not compliant with this decision”.

So this is a live issue in some of our proceedings in terms of working with these companies, and a little bit of tension in those two imperatives.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.

Kevin.

MR. BARKER: Hi. I would just make two points. So one going back to Professor Sperling's initial question, I think that was directed to the Public Utilities Commission, with regard to PG&E's bankruptcy. So as, you know, not a regulator of the utility, but as a funder of projects that are located within the utility, we have seen some of our recipients get cold feet with regards to just the uncertainty of what will happen.

Maybe everything will be business as usual, but the uncertainty. And so have -- we have received some applicants decline funding because of the uncertainty.

And then one statement on the sort of inland ports. And not to put a target on the energy -- come here and put a target on our back, but one of the side pieces that we do at the Energy Commission are building standards. And so under Title 24 this last go around, we really focused on residential. One of the previous goals was zero net energy for residential by 2020. We didn't
necessarily hit that, but we did hit all cost-effective measures, one of which was solar -- mandate solar on the rooftop.

With the great strides that we did on the residential shall, the next go round for the 2021 standards is really going to focus on non-residential. So really looking at that commercial sector. And with the much more integrated energy system in what we're looking at today, one thing that we looked at and what we will continue to look at is the transportation piece, and the transportation loads at new commercial buildings.

And so that is I think one area in which we can, through regulation on the building side, help with some of the issues on the increased air emissions and GHG for the inland port buildings.

MS. IKLE: And I'd just add there is a Green Building Council, and they sometimes put out kind of preliminary pilot ways to get points, so a way to kind of front load on a more voluntary basis in developing that would be to work in that space, which the energy community -- efficiency community works in, you know, at both of our Commissions.


BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yeah. You raised a really
interesting question or point that I think just wanted to fully understand, the issue of whether there's enough electric infrastructure. And this question has come up in our projects in North Richmond.

So how do we best ensure that if we want to have new operations, as Director Takvorian talks about, or new development that's going to put a greater demand on the load, what's the best way to handle that?

MS. IKLE: Well, I think in terms of planning a facility, you need to estimate the load, and you check for an interconnection. If it's a new build you's check for --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

MS. IKLE: And so --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: But I mean, if there's not the capacity in the system in that community to serving that area.

MS. IKLE: Then there -- then the utility will presumably plan to serve that load by building a new substation or building --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

MS. IKLE: -- you know, or microgrid, or whatever, you know. But I think what I was saying that in CEQA -- in the CEQA checklist now --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.
MS. IKLE: -- there's a -- is there adequate utilities?

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

MS. IKLE: Are you going to have a strain on the utilities. So right now, you might estimate the util -- the use of the building without all that electric load --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

MS. IKLE: -- that you foresee.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

MS. IKLE: So I would build in the project. You know, you would put the higher load, but then -- and then you would make sure that it could be served and --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Who paid -- so who would pay for that infrastructure that the utility would have to install to meet -- so let's say you have, you know, an area that's a pretty large area --

MS. IKLE: If there -- there are interconnection rules. So sometimes it's -- there's some complicated rules. But I think if you have it in the planning, then you would --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yeah.

MS. IKLE: -- you would figure out. And you also might say, hey, a microgrid makes sense here --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

MS. IKLE: -- because, you know --
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yeah.

MS. IKLE: -- because the utility -- we do have some interesting studies on avoiding deferring updates -- upgrades to substations by doing distributed energy resources instead.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right. Right.

MS. IKLE: So, you know -- but I think you want to put on the table --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Something to follow up on.

MS. IKLE: -- initially, so that the builder knows that that --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

MS. IKLE: -- they have to embed those costs in the project.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

MS. IKLE: That's the only way the project is going to be accepted --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right. Right.

MS. IKLE: -- because is --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right. Thanks.

MS. IKLE: But I'm not a CEQA expert.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Well, no question that we have just started once again another full conversation that is going to be going well into the future. But as we said, we need the future here today. And so I think staff it's
fair to say that our gratitude for great progress and our
hope that we will find a path forward faster than we
anticipate.

So with that, thank you very, very much. I want
to thank our guests. Thank you, Judith. Thank you,
Kevin. Thank you for staying for this full time. I
really appreciate it.

We're going to go ahead and take a 15-minute
break. 12:05, please be back. And then, Board, we will
do a working lunch. And so we'll come back and we will do
an update on 617.

(Off record: 11:48 a.m.)
(Thereupon a recess was taken.)
(On record: 12:08 p.m.)

VICE CHAIR BERG: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen,
we're going to go ahead and get ourselves settled in.

Well, thank you very much for being very
expeditious on our break.

I want to let everybody know that the Board
members can hear the presentation and what's going on here
back while they're finishing up part of their lunch. And
they will be back joining us.

This is a very important item, and it's very
important to all the Board members. We are -- and so
they're very excited to be back on time for the testimony
and also, of course, I'm expecting some really great comments and -- coming from the Board.

So our next agenda item is an update on the implementation of AB 617, the Community Air Protection Program. There has been tremendous interest in this program since its inception. AB 617 represents a significant change in addressing local scale air pollution through community participation and community actions.

Last September, we selected 10 first-year communities to develop community emission reductions program, to conduct air monitoring or both. Since that time, community members, air districts, and CARB have been working diligently to develop and implement various elements of the Program.

During the same time, CARB staff has been developing technical tools that will enhance our ability to characterize local air quality issues and identify pollution sources.

We look forward to -- this is going to be a great conversation, because as all of you know, we had a legislative hearing on Monday. And so we're really following in those footsteps to open up the discussion, not only hearing from staff, but the next steps are going to be just critical, not only to us but to these communities.
So members of our communities, air districts, and other stakeholders that are here with us today, that are also listening on the webcast, today is going to be a milestone in this process.

While everyone involved recognizes the challenges of doing something new, of creating a new way of looking at air pollution and resolving it within the communities, it is also clear that the successes from the first year will serve as a model for future communities. And we're all invested in that.

Since this is only -- this is an informational-only item, we're not taking action today. But it will feel like action, because there is a lot of vested interest. And so I'm really looking forward to a great conversation.

Mr. Corey, would you please introduce this item?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Vice Chair Berg.

And as you noted, AB 617 is about taking concrete steps to reduce air pollution burden in the state's most impact communities. And last September, the Board approved the Community Air Protection Blueprint, and selected, as you noted, the 10 initial communities to implement either community emission reduction programs or community air monitoring, or both.
AB 617 requires these communities to deploy community air monitoring by July 1st of this year, and adopt community emission reduction programs by October 1st of this year.

Today, the Board will hear about progress made on multiple elements of the program. In the last six months, as you noted, a great deal of work has been done to meet the AB 617 implementation milestones through active collaboration between community members, the air districts, and CARB staff.

And later this year, and through early next year, we'll bring individual community emission reduction programs for the first-year communities to the Board for a view and action. As the program enters its second year, CARB staff has begun holding community meetings to discuss how to provide a more transparent process and factors that should be considered for community selection, based on Board direction from last September.

In December of this year, the Board will consider potential second-year communities.

CARB staff has also been developing three major tools to support community-level analysis, a data portal to visual community air quality data, a best available control technology database to support emission reduction strategy development, and enhanced emissions inventory
data.

The Board will hear an update on how these tools are evolving to support the needs of this new program. But before turning over to staff, I want to share recent progress regarding the Fresno AB 617 community. Over the last several years, CARB staff and I have had a number of productive discussions with Samir Sheikh, the Air Pollution Control Officer of the District, and community leaders.

The District has been working with the steering committee to reach agreement on adjustments to the South Central Fresno community boundaries. A number of potential adjustments to the boundaries have been discussed. However, in a hearing that you noted earlier this week of the Assembly Natural Resources Committee, community advocates presented a revised proposal to the boundaries.

The District has discussed this proposal with the community representatives, and concurs it represents a path forward. Given the significance of the boundary expansion, the district asked CARB staff if the adjustments conformed with AB 617, as well as with the blueprint. We've confirmed that it does.

Thus, the community and the District have reached a consensus position on the boundaries, and are moving
forward to develop and implement a robust emission reduction program.

Doing so will, of course, take ongoing resource support, by way of administration and incentive funding they receive under the program. But I want to acknowledge Samir and the steering committee for their hard work and commitment to the process for ensuring AB 617 delivers on the benefits that the communities need.

This recent development is very encouraging and underscores the fundamental role of district and community collaboration on the successful implementation of this program.

I'll now ask Pippin Mader and Tom Olson of our Office of Community Protection to give the staff presentation.

Pippin.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST OLSON: Thank you, Mr. Corey. Good afternoon, Vice Chair Berg and members of the Board. For this next item, we'll provide an update on the AB 617 Community Air Protection Program.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST OLSON: To start things off, let's being with a quick recap of the Board actions
in September of last year. At that meeting, this Board
approved the Community Air Protection Blueprint, which
outlines the program requirements and provides guidance on
the implementation of the program.

The Board additionally approved 10 initial
communities for the program's first year. This selection
initiated work for these communities with a deadline of
this coming July to start collecting air monitoring data
and this September for the District Boards to adopt their
community emission reduction programs. These plans will
provide actionable air quality data and meaningful
emission reductions for their communities.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST OLSON: As we begin our
update, it's important to acknowledge that a lot has been
accomplished since last September. CARB and our partners
in the implementation - the districts and community
steering committees - are learning and adapting as we
progress through this first year together.

On Monday, we also had the opportunity to discuss
the Program at a hearing of the Assembly Natural Resources
Committee. CARB, air districts, and the community
steering members described the work underway, as well as
challenges and concern. We heard of a number of areas
where can all continue to make adjustments and the role
CARB can play in facilitating the success of the program. We are following up with the districts and community members, so that we can act now while we are still early in this process. There is still a lot of work to be done, and we look forward to continue to build partnerships with the communities and the districts going forward, as well as working with the Legislature on program implementation.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST OLSON: Our presentation is broken up into two parts. The first part provides an update on the work that is underway in the initial communities. After that, my colleague, Pippin Mader, will provide an overview of the technical tools we are developing to support the program.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST OLSON: Okay. So to start the community updates, let's begin with the communities selected for community air monitoring, which are expected to start monitoring this coming July.

In the community of Richmond, the community used a phased approach to create their steering committee. After the kick-off meeting, the community-formed design team, along with the air district, hosted a summit to collect recommendations on the steering committee.
formation. This newly formed steering committee will have
their first meeting shortly to start developing their air
monitoring plan.

In San Diego, the Portside Environmental Justice
Communities have made significant progress in developing a
community monitoring plan. The community is focused on
monitoring the impacts of toxic metals and black carbon
emissions from the Port and local truck traffic. In
addition, the community has already begun deploying mobile
monitoring to collect detailed community level data, and
to validate the initial plans for fixed-location
monitoring equipment.

In South Sacramento, Florin, the steering
committee is working to assess the needs of the community
to support development of their monitoring plan. Their
focus is on trucking routes, and the impacts of local air
pollution on sensitive receptors. The committee is
considering the use of low cost sensors as a screening
tool as they look to start collecting community scale
data.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST OLSON: Transitioning to
the emission reduction communities, which have until this
September to deliver an emissions reduction program to
their district boards, it is worth noting that except for
West Oakland, all of these communities were also selected for community monitoring as well.

To start things off, in West Oakland, the community steering committee as identified a wide-ranging set of emission reduction strategies from coordination with local governments on land use to strategies focused on port and truck emissions. From this extensive list, the community will prioritize strategies that best match the community needs.

In the Imperial community of Calexico, El Centro, and Heber, the steering committee has been discussing the sources impacting their community the most. This includes windblown and traffic dust, border impacts, and agricultural and large industrial sources. The community is also developing a monitoring plan which builds on community-led monitoring already in place.

In South Coast, the three selected communities have begun discussing strategies based on the priorities of their specific community. In Wilmington, West Long Beach, Carson, the strategy development is focusing on refineries, including flaring, port-related diesel emissions and truck traffic.

In East L.A., Boyle Heights, West Commerce, strategies are being considered for warehouses and freight and the related diesel emissions from truck and rail
traffic.

Muscoy San Bernardino is looking at truck traffic related to warehouses and a nearby rail yard as part of their initial strategy development.

The San Joaquin Valley Air Quality Management District has been working with us to complete the technical assessment for the communities of Shafter and South Central Fresno.

Shafter community members have identified dairies, oil and gas production, pesticides and truck traffic as some of their primary concerns. The Department of Pesticide Regulation presented information on pesticides monitoring and impacts to the steering committee at their March meeting.

In South Central Fresno, the community has identified industrial sources, warehouses, and truck traffic as among their top concerns. And as you heard from Mr. Corey, the steering committee will be moving forward quickly to begin developing strategies now that the boundary has been finalized.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST OLSON: As with any new program, we are working collectively -- we are collectively working through and making adjustments to respond to new challenges. There's a short time frame for
designing the monitoring and emissions reduction programs, and a lot of information to discuss in order to support tease plans. This includes going through the blueprints, understanding sources and community concerns, finalizing boundaries, and developing needed strategies.

AB 617 is a significant shift and we're all working together to develop this new community-centric approach, including building relationships and ensuring the steering committees are a forum for active collaboration and partnership in developing the needed solutions for their communities.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST OLSON: There are a number of ways that help support an effective process.

First, good facilitation can encourage productive discussion and make sure all perspectives are heard and considered.

Second, having a clear decision-making process, a schedule, and goal for each meeting can provide a common understanding and process for the development of each plan. Training, sharing materials in advance, and providing additional opportunities for discussing information in more detail can also help everyone find effective ways to deal with large amounts of information.

Finally, the legislation and Blueprint recognized
the importance of having a diverse set of perspectives in developing the monitoring and emissions reduction program. However, it is also important to have a clear expectation and policies of -- to ensure transparency, so that steering committee members know that -- where these perspectives are coming from.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST OLSON: As quick as it may seem, it is already time to begin the process for considering additional communities. We are building on last year's process, which established the broad list of potential communities. Board discussion last September also provided direction to guide this year's evaluation process. This included monitoring communities having priority to move to emission reduction program once they are ready, and recognizing that there are communities that were put forward as priority last year, both by the air districts and community groups, that were not included in the initial 10.

We are working on ways to make the selection process clearer and more transparent. We are -- we have already conducted several community meetings, and CARB and the districts will continue to conduct additional outreach, as well as discussions with the Board and the consultation group.
We also need to make sure there is sufficient resources to support implementation efforts in the initial communities, as they provide the foundation for any communities that follow. We'll be working to identify what's working in this initial set, so that these strategies can be transferred to a broader set of communities with similar challenges.

This wraps up the community update. And with that, I'd like to hand over the discussion to Pippin Mader who will begin the second half of this presentation with an update on the technical tools being developed to support AB 617.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MADER: Thank you, Tom.

This slide illustrates how, as part of the AB 617 program, we are developing tools that enhance the data that is needed statewide to support community level action.

The key questions we keep hearing are, "What is the air quality in my community?", "What are the sources in my community?", and "How can emissions be reduced?"

The tools shown here what -- are what we currently use to answer these questions at the regional and statewide level. To provide answers at a community
level, improved tools are under development. These new tools will contain high resolution data including: community focused air monitoring data, detailed community-level emissions inventories, and current and future emissions reduction technologies.

Finally, we're working with stakeholders to develop a combined mapping tool that integrates these three tools into a single system to provide a one-stop-shop for air quality, emissions, and control technology options statewide.

In the next three slides, I will share more information on the development of each tool.

---o0o---

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MADER: Starting with air quality, an initial air quality website known as AQ-VIEW will be rolled out this summer, which will make air quality data more accessible and help communities identify pollutants and areas of concern.

This slide shows our long-term vision of how the community air monitoring data housed in AQ-VIEW could be depicted. As part of this program, we're also actively supporting community based monitoring programs by assessing the capabilities of different monitoring tools and making this information available on our website.

---o0o---
STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MADER: Now, we would like to share a short video on the ongoing emissions inventory enhancement efforts. Community-level emissions inventories are being developed jointly by CARB and the air districts. This video illustrates the type of more detailed data that is being developed for the Imperial County community corridor of Calexico, Heber, and El Centro. It is important to note that this is just one piece of information needed to understand resident's exposure to air pollution.

As part of developing effective strategies, we will also be looking at where houses and schools, for example, are located near these sources and the impacts these sources cause

(Thereupon a video was played.)

MODERATOR: Emissions data is the foundation for the State's programs, including informing emission reduction strategies. This video focuses on the enhancements to the emissions inventory as required by Assembly Bills 617 and 197, and the development of new tools to provide greater access to emissions data by community residents.

Historically, emissions inventories have been published at an air district or county scale to support community level work. Across the state under AB 617, we
are increasing the resolution of community level emissions data for all source types.

To illustrate these improvements, let's take a closer look at the AB 617 community of Calexico, El Centro, and Heber in Imperial County. In response to AB 617, we have scaled down the resolution of our statewide mobile source emissions estimates from the county level down to one kilometer grid squares.

We are now in the process of developing an even more detailed inventory to estimate on-road mobile emissions on individual roadways within selected communities.

Next, we will discuss the enhancements to our area source emissions inventory, like dry cleaners, gas stations, and fugitive dust. Like mobile sources, the area source emissions inventory has recently been scaled down to one kilometer grid squares. In AB 617 communities, we are further refining our inventory through collaboration with local air districts to transition many area sources, such as gas stations, to point sources, based on their actual location.

We are also making improvements to the stationary source inventory. Our existing inventory is represented by the purple dots on this map. To support inventory development for this first year community, we have worked
closely with the air district to improve it, by including more permitted stationary sources as shown in blue.

Moving forward, we are working to improve our existing emissions inventory and online tools to provide increased public access to emissions data, including the information collected through our new reporting regulation.

Once complete, the new emissions inventory will enhance the consistency and transparency of criteria, air toxics, and greenhouse gas emissions data statewide.

(End of video.)

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MADER: Thanks.

Next, I'll discuss the final tool in the system, the Technology Clearinghouse.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MADER: Last fall, we released an interim version of the Technology Clearinghouse that contains emissions control strategy information for new and existing sources. We will continue to expand the scope of, and add to, the data in the Technology Clearinghouse. Our long-term vision is a tool that will assist the public in identifying cost-effective solutions for both stationary and mobile sources impacting communities.

This slide illustrates one of the features that
will be available in the new Clearinghouse, the technology comparison tool. In this example, we highlight the level of PM control compared to similar sources statewide for a power plant peaking turbine. Similarly, a user will be able to compare emissions from a long-haul diesel truck.

The new Clearinghouse will also contain control approaches and costs for both advanced conventional technologies in place today and zero-emissions technologies.

The development of these new systems includes stakeholder discussion and collaboration with air districts. As these projects are completed, we will continue with our research -- outreach efforts to ensure the development of user-friendly tools for community members statewide to understand and consider solutions to their air quality concerns.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MADER: There are a variety of other elements that are also a key part of AB 617 that are supporting burdened communities across California. These include:

Expedited Best Available Retrofit Control Technology schedules, also known as BARCT schedules that will update stationary source regulations, which will be critical to reducing emissions in many communities;
Statewide emissions reductions strategies, like our mobile source regulations; Collaboration with State and local agencies to leverage strategies and investments in communities; And finally, air grants and incentives. In the next couple of slides, I want to highlight the progress being made on implementing the incentive and air grant programs.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MADER: As we have discussed in prior presentations, the Legislature appropriated 250 million in the 2017-18 State budget, which the air districts have already begun distributing for cleaner trucks, buses, and other mobile sources. Example projects include hybrid gantry trains[SIC] at the Port of Oakland, zero-emissions trucks in the South Coast, and zero-emissions school buses in San Joaquin Valley.

For this fiscal year, the Legislature expanded the scope to include stationary sources and community-identified projects, in addition to mobile sources. The Board will be considering the guidelines for these new types of projects next month.

--o0o--

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MADER: We are
also supporting community involvement through funding provided by the Legislature for grants to community-based organizations. This slide shows the 28 grantees that received grants as part of the first solicitation of $10 million to participate in the community air protection process.

For example, in Ventura Community Air Action Teams led by community members will help document air pollution sources. In Fresno, schools students will learn how to identify unhealthy air quality issues. And in East Los Angeles, residents will learn about the long-term public health impacts of air pollution exposure and air pollution reduction measures at a public housing development.

An additional $5 million will be awarded through a second round of grants. The solicitation will be released this spring and the grants will be awarded in the fall.

---o0o---

STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST MADER: Over the next year, we will continue to provide multiple opportunities to check in on progress. This will include periodic updates to the Legislature, as well as progress reports for the Board as we all learn from this first year and continue to adjust and develop effective practices for
ongoing implementation of the program.

We will also come back later this year with recommendations on the consideration of additional communities. And finally, starting later this year, we will be bringing for the Board's consideration the seven community emissions reductions programs. These Board meetings will be held in local air districts, as it is critical that residents and members of the community steering committee can participate and share their perspectives with the Board.

We look forward to the next year of this groundbreaking program.

Thank you.

And now, I would like to introduce Larry Greene on behalf of CAPCOA.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

MR. GREENE: Here we go. Good afternoon, Vice Chair Berg. I'm Larry Greene representing the CAPCOA.

I will be giving a short overview of project status in each of the districts on the initial 617 communities. The cover slides you see will be from the joint ARB/CAPCOA presentation earlier this week at the Assembly Natural Resources Committee.

We have key leadership from each of the districts
here. They're present to answer questions from the public and the Board. From San Diego, we have the Air Pollution Control Officer, Bob Kard; from South Coast, Dr. Phil Fine; From the Bay Area, Greg Nudd; from Sacramento Mark Loutzenhiser; and from San Joaquin Don[SIC] Klassen.

Two communities have been selected for the first year action in the Bay Area, West Oakland and Richmond. West Oakland is primarily affected by mobile sources, so that the air district is working in partnership with the community committee to address mobile source emissions.

Strategies include: continuing and tracking progress of current emission reduction plans, addressing incompatible land use, preventing truck traffic through the community, providing incentives for clean equipment and infrastructure, installing air filtration where needed, and planning -- planting vegetation barriers and trees.

Richmond is affected by both mobile and stationary sources. However, because the air quality data does not fully explain observed health issues, monitoring is required to understand emission sources and air quality impacts.

Next, we'll be building an air emission inventory reduction strategy targeting those sources. The district and the community have had many meetings to ensure that
the monitoring design will be effective and that it will be implemented successfully.

The Bay Area is on track to deliver community monitoring and emission reduction plans on time.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. GREENE: Imperial Valley community steering committee totals 30 members working to ensure the community monitoring and emission plans are successfully developed. The committee is analyzing available data, developing a monitoring plan and beginning work on an Emission Reduction Plan.

The committee is on track to deliver the monitoring and emission reduction plans by the June and October dates -- due dates respectively.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. GREENE: As shown on the CARB slides earlier, there are three groupings of communities in South Coast approved by CARB for year one. The South Coast is working with over 140 members between the three steering committees, and has held monthly community meetings to discuss air quality issues.

Thus far, over 200 air quality concerns have been identified. The steering committee will continue to meet
throughout 2019 to prioritize these concerns. And they're already identifying measures to address them.

District staff has received much positive feedback from the communities regarding their level of engagement and facilitation of people's needs.

This work is also on track to meet 617 targets.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. GREENE: Sacramento has one community in year one, the South -- the South Sacramento Florin community. This area includes numerous schools, parks, and hospitals. It is heavily impacted by emissions from freeways and major roadways, meaning the most significant pollution source is from mobile sources, cars, trucks, and locomotives.

There's been significant interest from and engagement with community members. The district continues to meet with their community -- committee to develop a community monitoring plan. And they are also on track to meet their 617 targets.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. GREENE: San Diego's Portside Environmental Justice Neighborhoods have been selected for monitoring during the first year. Those far, the committee has
approved two monitoring locations and has also commenced
with mobile monitoring, because similar to other
districts, emissions from transportation significantly
impact this community.

The data collected from the mobile monitors will
be used to locate areas with elevated pollution levels
that need immediate reductions.

Although the Portside Neighbor is only being
monitored, the district and community -- committee is
looking ahead to emission reductions by increasing current
inspections at stationary sources of emissions, as well as
increasing mobile inspections within communities and at
border crossings.

Last slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. GREENE: In the San Joaquin Valley, CARB
approved community recommended communities in South
Central Fresno and the City of Shafter. Community
steering committees have been established in each
community. Meetings are assisted by a facilitator and
designed to provide an open and comprehensive discussion
of topics. Supported by significant community
interaction, the staff has reviewed 32 district rules
applying to cap-and-trade facilities that are subject to
BARCT.
The district has committed to accelerated review of five to six rules per year starting with 2019. This will ensure BARCT is implemented by 2023 as required by 617.

Investment in emissions reduction through incentive grants has been ongoing for years and will continue with support from significant 617 funding. In the Shafter area thus far, investment has been over $19 million with 1,400 projects resulting in 3,700 tons of emission reductions.

In the South Central Fresno area, previous investments total more than $97 million with 92,000 -- with 9,200 projects and 9,100 tons of emission reductions. The district is well on track to meet its 617 obligations on time.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.

Does that conclude our presentation?

Okay. Great.

Okay. We do, as a point of our timing here today, we have 11 witnesses, but I would like to ask Assembly Member Garcia to start us out. As we have heard, there was a hearing this week with the Natural Resource Committee. I did watch four and a half hours of the -- on its webcast. It was very well done. Lots of great
But as we know, this program being rolled out from a blank piece of paper has a lot of positive things happening. And as with any new program, we have some things that we need to take a look at and to figure out how to do better.

So I've asked Assembly Member Garcia if he would lead us off. We'll take the testimony, and then I know we've got lots of discussion from the Board.

So Assembly Member Garcia.

ASSEMBLY MEMBER GARCIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. And appreciate knowing that you were watching the hearings for four hours.

There were -- there weren't members there for four hours. I was one of them in full disclosure.

But you're absolutely right, this is certainly an important conversation that now moves here to the Air Resources Board from the hearing on Monday. And I'd like to just focus my attention to what we intended as a bottom-up approach for addressing the air quality problems in our community.

And what I mean bottom-up is really that the community have a tremendous amount of say in the development of these community plans. And much of the takeaway for me, both at the hearing and in conversations
with some of our community stakeholders before the meeting and after is that they want to be sure that the Air Resources Board is aware and understands that its role ultimately is to look at these plans and ensure that they're meeting the highest level of standards that the law has set forward. And that there be no mistake that if there are plans that come before us that have been developed by the air districts locally that are not reflective of those expectations, that it's made very clear that here at the Air Resources Board we have a definitive say via, you know, our team to be able to modifies those plans to be reflective of what the communities are saying ought to be the prioritization, along the lines of the law that AB 617 has intended to accomplish.

So I want to just really emphasize how important the community stakeholder process is in order to get to a places where these plans truly are reflecting the prioritization that's coming from these conversations locally, and that our Air Resources Board team knows that we have that authority to ensure that that exactly is what happens.

I think there's a sense, and it's unfortunate, from community members already, that the plans as they are being developed may not reflect the true input that's
being given during these community processes. And they're looking for the Air Resources Board to reinforce, you know, what the intended goals of AB 617 are. And so I just wanted to, you know, ask a couple of questions that can maybe be done in the presentation or responses from our team.

But really, what are we doing to facilitate those conversations between the community and the air districts to get to the overall intended goals when these plans are ready to be presented for adoption?

And then the second is, as I reinforced, we have the final say here at the Air Resources Board. And I wanted to ask, you know, if that's clear to our team? Does it need to be more clear that ultimately a plan that comes before us that's not reflective of what the community is presenting that we have the ability to modify that plan, if necessary, and give the direct -- direction to the local air districts what AB 617 and the communities are asking to be done here as a priority?

So those are my comments. I appreciate the amount of work that's gone into this effort. Right out the gate when the policy was adopted, you know, the Air Resources Board team got to work immediately. And it's good to see the progress that's being made. Know that my colleague, Cristina Garcia is probably watching this
hearing today, as you were all watching her and Laura Friedman in action on Monday, and that there will be some follow up to the conversations that took place on Monday in the Natural Resources Committee on the follow-up of this conversation.

So it's kind of the follow-up to the follow-up, because we're seriously committed to this work. We finally, in our communities, feel that we are focusing on the right issue as it relates to pollution. And all eyes are on us, and we certainly want to make sure that we recognize that we'll be held accountable. And we are here representing the Legislature for those reasons as well.

And so thank you staff for the work that you're doing. And I'm hoping that maybe Mr. Corey or someone else can kind of share your thoughts on the role that the Air Resources Board plays when it comes to the input we're hearing from our community, the air districts, and ultimately the plans that will develop and come before us for adoption.

Thank you.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks Assemblyman Garcia. To your direct question on 617 and the role of the Board, 617, as you note, is explicit in terms of the Board's role to consider the community emission reduction programs that are developed by the
districts in consultation with the steering committees. So those plans will come back to this Board for consideration of approval or disapproval and revisions as necessary.

But I think even equally important were conversations we've had with the Board over the last year and a half, which was take steps so that those plans that become before the Board are solid, and are approvable, and reflect a comprehensive strategy for characterizing the emissions at the community level, as well as specific measures/actions with specific time frames and are built on a foundation of collaboration with the local communities.

The way we started that process a year and a half ago was to develop the Blueprint, because we knew that bringing a community emission reduction plan before this Board with a recommendation to approve or not approve, what is the benchmark? What -- by what -- how are you judging the effectiveness of the comprehensive nature of a plan?

That was why so much effort was put in that Blueprint, and the level of detail in that Blueprint, which has not only a comprehensive characterization of the expectations in a community reduction plan, but a comprehensive checklist. That checklist is gauged against
the plans that will become before the Board.

And the other part of it, and this is really important as the districts are working, and working really closely with the steering committees, and all that goes with that, learning how to work together more effectively. And I would say that of us as staff as well, in terms of working more effectively at the community level and kind of I think some of the hiccups that you go through in learning and working through that relationship. Are we seeing that locally and in our own relationships?

I think so. I think there's a learning process that's playing itself out and I think that's just a honest assessment that we're working together. We're learning through that relationship.

But staff is also, our staff, attending each of those steering committees, so that we've got a good gauge of how that relationship is working, and how we're proceeding, and providing assistance as well. Because what we all want is to have the confidence and increase that the confidence by the time a plan is developed, it's a plan that the community is behind, it's a plan that the -- that the -- both the district and communities have worked closely on, it's an implementable plan.

So really those are the checks and balances. It really started with what is the benchmark? A solid
Blueprint. Two, the establishment of the steering committees, ongoing public engagement, participation and reporting how that process is playing itself out.

So maybe I'll stop there.

But it really started from the signage of 617. Within about a month of that, we, the districts, were out there getting moving, because we knew that the time frames are really tight and effectively deliver on the promise that 617 requires to get out the gate really early. So that continues to play itself out.

You know, and commitment that you get from us, from me, is if I see issues, in terms of how things are playing out, that I see a real problem, you know, I have a responsibility to report back to this Board, rather than just bring a plan that we have an issue with to see it coming, as well as to the Legislature. So I'm mindful of that and that commitment is there.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you. I know we're going to have a lot of discussion. I mean, this brings up even a lot of questions for me. And so -- but I think it would be very useful for our time to hear from the public. And so names are going to be posted here to my left. And we'll start out with Josh Klassen.

MR. KLASSEN: Well, good afternoon, members of the Board.
VICE CHAIR BERG: If they signed up.
I'm sorry. Go ahead, Josh.

MR. KLASSEN: Thank you. Good afternoon, members of the Board. I'm Jon Klassen with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. And Samir Sheikh, our Executive Director, wanted to be here today to make some comments, but today is also our local governing board meeting, so, of course, he had to be there for that.

But I am happy to be here to make some comments regarding the implementation of AB 617 for the San Joaquin Valley. So, as noted in the presentation, there are two areas of the valley that were selected for this program, South Central Fresno, which was selected as an urban industry area, and then Shafter, which was selected as a rural community.

We've had five community meetings so far, both in Shafter and South Central Fresno. Our first meeting was a kick-off meeting to get the process started. And then after that, we've had four formal steering committee meetings in both Shafter and South Central Fresno.

In Shafter, we've been going through the process well, going through the topics. We've talked about the committee charter, got that established, established the boundary for Shafter. We've had a good discussion of the emission sources in the area, looking at the concerns that
the Committee has and the public has in Shafter. We've talked about air monitoring. We had a good presentation from the Department of Pesticide Regulation on the work they're doing in Shafter.

And we're looking forward to continuing to work with this group to get feedback on establishing that the air monitoring network for Shafter and the community emissions reduction program going forward.

For the South Central Fresno process it's been going a bit slower. We've made some good progress. Established the charter. We've had some good feedback on the initial air quality concerns in the area. We've looked at emissions sources in the South Central Fresno area. But a lot of the discussion so far has been on the boundary for South Central Fresno, as Mr. Corey noted, a little bit ago.

So on the issue, as Mr. Corey noted, we've been working closely with CARB, with the committee to come up with the final boundary. And as mentioned, that's now been finalized, which is good news. So we're looking forward to moving forward with the committee working on looking at those sources of concern in the new boundary, establishing the community air monitoring network, and then, of course, establishing the community emissions reduction program for this area.
So thank you again for your time this morning, and we're looking forward to implementing this important program for the San Joaquin Valley over the coming months. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Yes, you can. We have one question for you before you leave.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Excuse me, just a specific question. It was mentioned in the staff presentation that ambient pesticides are part of the Shafter emissions reduction plan. Can you tell me a little bit more about that.

MR. KLASSEN: Sure. Yeah. So when DPR came to our meeting last month, they gave a presentation on the work that they're doing. Already in Shafter, they've been doing that for a number of years, and they gave us a good overview of all the work they've done, some of the results.

And there was a discussion there on how could that continue going forward, how could that be in the emissions reduction program, and what that might look like?

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: So I guess I'm asking the plan in going forward is to include ambient pesticides in the emissions reduction.

MR. KLASSEN: Yeah, that's a part of the current
ongoing discussion with the committee and with the DPR of what that might look like, but nothing is final yet.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yeah, I would courage that inclusion.

MR. KLASSEN: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Yes, Micah.

MR. OLIVAS: Hi. My name is Micah Olivas. And I'm a member of the community steering committee for South Fresno. And so I wanted to first thank CARB for moving quickly in approving that boundary expansion. And I wanted to talk a little bit about how impactful that has been so far on the proceedings of our committee meetings.

So this moment having this boundary approved marks the culmination of several months worth of planning and careful deliberation by the members of the committee between the members and the air district. And during this time, you know, the community -- community steering committee meetings really served as an important time for the community to rally together and to talk about important, you know, pollution sources, and the effects of those on family life and work.

So it's really had to miss in these meetings the emotion, you know, and the stories of a lot of community members. But it's also I think even more difficult, you knee, not to notice the sensibility and really the earnest
intent behind these decisions to coordinate this boundary expansion. And these are moments that are very important to the progression of this project, especially because these are groups whose livelihood is going to be impacted significantly by the boundary in which we can proceed.

And so given the influx of industry projected into this region of South Fresno which has recently been included in the boundary expansion, it's -- it is, you know, very much incumbent on us to really consider the impact of a pollution on regions, which have just been included, namely those of Southwest Fresno, which are in very high population and exceedingly high CalEnviroScreen score. So they serve kind of as a point for some really intense consideration of the impacts local stationary source pollution.

And so to facilitate, you know, a solid exchange moving forward, I think that it's really of high import to us to really delineate the advisory role, which the Committee serves specifically in collaboration with the air district. And I look forward to developing that as this moves into year two.

So thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much. And thank you for taking the time to come up and see us today.

MR. OLIVAS: Yeah, absolutely.
VICE CHAIR BERG: Appreciate it.

MR. OLIVAS: Thank you so much.

Good afternoon.

MR. MENDOZA: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you, first of all, for giving us the opportunity to speak before you. So my name is Jesus Mendoza and I come from the City of Fresno. I am a member of -- I work for Communities Center -- Central California Environmental Justice Network, but I've been invested in South Central part of the Fresno for -- since 2004. I used to work at Roosevelt. And we used to -- had the pilot program for 21st Century Assets Program.

And that is an example of what great things we can do when we take into account the opinions, the presence, and the feelings, the experience of parents within those neighborhoods.

And so I actually bring a message from different parents would couldn't come. Some, like the Vasquez family or the Gomez family, Donya Alejandra as well. The first two they work in the fields, and they had not been working because of the weather, but now that the weather has started.

So they just -- financially, they can't. So that's why it's important also that for us to say what they conveyed is that the air district, and especially
CARB, has taken into consideration all the time that they've invested in attending these meetings and being taken seriously. So they want to be thankful, they are thankful for making the decision of expanding the boundaries. And they feel that it's going to go a long way.

Another student who couldn't make the way -- her way over here Frankie Martinez, she -- she's a student at Edison High School, which is in southwest part of Fresno. She wants to say thank you for including the southwest. That gives her opportunity to get to continue knowing AB 617, and at the same time continue monitoring the air, and all the opportunities that young students like herself have to engage the community and make a difference. So definitely want to mention that.

And she sees that moving forward in the next year, there are opportunities that she foresees where she can be engaged, because she noticed that making that trip around South Central part of Fresno, and the southwest she mentioned that she noticed how certain pollutants affect communities. For example, this company named Vitro Flat Glass, she noticed that there piles of glass shard right there. And just these past two, three days being windy, she noticed that the house -- the very next house is only 20 yards away, and understanding that the families are
exposed to this.

So it's for her to continue to engage in the process. And just like the Gomez family, they mentioned that they live right next door to one of the big factories right there on south of Jensen and Cedar. They just learned about the process and this gives them hope, and they want to be engaged, not only the parents but the grandparents as well.

So I just wanted to bring this out to you. Thank you very much again, and we're looking forward.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.

Supervisor Serna also has a question.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Actually, it's just a comment, a statement. Your testimony was rife with thanks for CARB. But I would like for you to please go back to the people that you're representing today and offer to them our sincerest thanks for their willingness to engage. They're very busy people. They have, you know, lives and families of their own -- of their own. And to have their engagement means, I know, everything to the local districts. It means everything to everyone of us Board members and our staff. This will not work without community engagement. So while you're here to offer thanks, it really should be directed the other way. So
appreciate that.

    MS. MENDOZA: Thank you. I appreciate that, Supervisor Serna. I'll let them know. Thank you.

    And just Ms. Nicolasa Rodriguez she just found out about this yesterday. She says next time, I -- she's 63 years old, and she says she's looking forward to jumping onto the ship. So thank you.

    VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.

    Good afternoon.

    MR. TORRADO: Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you so much for the opportunity to talk today. My name is Paula Torrado. And I am the air and toxics policy analyst at Physicians for Social Responsibility. I am currently working in the implementation of a community air protection grant in South Central L.A., which aims to strengthen the capacity of community residents to understand and identify air pollution sources through conducting air monitoring and ground-truthing. The core mission is to ensure that the principles of environmental justice and public health are at the center of environmental policymaking.

    Regarding AB 617, we are asking CARB to provide strong statewide leadership and guidance to the air districts to truly work in partnership with communities environmental justice organizations, to reduce emissions
and health impacts. South Central L.A. communities are exposed to overburdened air pollution and those health threats are rising from the combination of different sources and cumulative impacts.

South Central was not selected as one of the first ten communities and we have not seen or heard any explanation as to why only 10 are selected. We're asking that CARB provides a transparent explanation for how the decision is made for the second community selection process. Without this clear explanation, the process will continue to be confusing and overly competitive.

For communities that were not included in the first 10, we need a clear explicit commitment for emissions reductions strategies and lessons learned from the first-year communities, so that they are applied in the second-year communities with similar types of air pollution issues.

Additionally, the purpose of -- any intent of AB 617 is to improve air quality and those public health in communities overburdened by cumulative impacts. So it is very important for the program to also include health data and health based metrics wherever applicable to accurately track the success of the program.

Also, we believe that there must be clear enforcement for the emissions reductions plans; that there
also must be measurements and precautions if CARB and air districts do not meet the expectations of the program and fail the communities once again.

And lastly, that the air monitoring programs should use a combination of best available technologies and ground-truthing to ensure that the data collected is leading to true enforcement and true emissions reductions. We strongly advocate for investing in plans that are actually helping to reduce emissions.

Finally, as a staff member of PSR-L.A. and a longtime air quality and environmental justice advocate, we're excited about the opportunities within AB 617, but we also acknowledge that we have yet to see direct emissions reductions in our communities. We're hoping that CARB takes the steps necessary to ensure the successful implementation of AB 617 with the center focused on emissions reductions and preventing most overburdened communities to be exposed to harmful pollutants.

Thank you very much.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you. And thank you very much for coming.

MS. TORRADO: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Good afternoon.

MS. SAUNDERS: Hello. Good afternoon, Vice Chair
Berg and Board. Thank you for hearing my comments today. My name is Ivanka Saunders, and I am a community steering committee member of the South Central Fresno selected community and a policy coordinator with Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability.

AB 617 has thankfully brought community residents, air districts, and local government officials to the same table to speak on the realities of the environmental injustices found in air quality issues. For this reason, the legislation should be lifted up and applauded.

We would also like to thank Mr. Corey, Samir, and the air -- San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District staff for honoring the wishes of the South Central Fresno committee and community. We look forward to continuing to work with you on the air -- on the monitoring and the community emissions reduction programs.

We do ask that the CARB Board continue to direct its staff to truly support the community steering committees and clarify the authority, the roles, and the responsibilities of the steering committees and the air districts.

Looking ahead to the year two community selection process, we feel that the selection process must be more equitable and more transparent. Last year's process
largely overlooked rural and agricultural areas, where regulatory air monitoring has been very sparse. CARB must ensure that all the lessons learned from year one are put into implementation into year two in regards to transparency by the air district, stronger blueprint language and clear decision-making authority by the community steering committee.

Communities need clarity on how districts -- on how air districts will be making their community selections as well. The air districts should release their selection criteria, so we can ensure that it follows an equitable and just process.

Also, moving forward, there needs to be greater interagency efforts with AB 617 if the program is going to be able to address the issues of land use. Without better control of where facilities end up being located, AB 617 will not be able to deliver on its promises. We welcome working with you to continue this process.

In closing, thank you to the CARB staff, Karen, Veronica, Trish, Brian for tirelessly traveling up and down this large state to make sure that the truth is actually heard and coming back to Sacramento.

I would also like to thank you, Dr. Sherriffs, for including in the 617 conversation the inclusion of area-wide sources and pesticides into the community
emissions reduction program.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much, Ms. Saunders.

BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Next, we have Noelle Cremers, Kevin Hamilton and Dalia Arenas.

MS. CREMERS: Good afternoon. Noelle Cremers with the California Farm Bureau Federation.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment and appreciate San Joaquin Air District's process and engagement and the Air Resources Board process and engagement, and would like to continue the message that I brought before in that we want to make sure that implementation of AB 617 is successful. And that the resources are focused in a way to allow it to be successful.

One of the points that I would like to bring up is to ensure as community boundaries are changed or efforts -- monitoring efforts are undertaken outside of the community boundary -- or community boundaries, that the committee membership is reflective of the new boundaries or -- and also that there is a formal process for individuals and businesses outside of the community to participate if the -- within the monitoring.

So for Shafter, for example, there is discussions
about including monitoring within seven miles of the community boundaries. But there isn't a formal process then for those farmers outside of the community of Shafter that's in the 6167 program to formally participate in conversations about how that monitoring would take place. And we think that that should be incorporated.

We also think it's very important to ensure close coordination with the Department of Pesticides Regulation. Obviously, there's been numerous conversations about pesticides and pesticides being included in AB 617. And given DPR's role as the regulator of pesticides, we think that they need to be included in any of those conversations, and appreciate that they are engaged and have given presentations down in Shafter.

Then finally, since it was brought up in the staff presentation, this is a separate piece, but the statewide monitoring and reporting requirements, the regulations that are being considered right now by the Air Resources Board and have recently been changed significantly. We do think that that takes away from implementation of 617, in that we are using resources to gather data in areas where there is not an air quality concern. And we think that the focus really should remain on the communities where there is concern, rather than, in our opinion, wasting resources to gather data from the far
reaches of the state.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

Kevin. She called your name this time. Did you hear?

MR. HAMILTON: I did not.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Oh, good. So we wanted to make sure that you've loved.

(Laughter.)

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

MR. HAMILTON: So good afternoon again. Kevin Hamilton, Central California Asthma Collaborative, steering committee member, and also member of the San Joaquin Valley AB 617 environmental justice steering committee.

Before you on this map, you see the work of the Fresno community steering committee. I think people should take note that the purple area here represents the one percent, the most impacted --

(Phone rings.)

MR. HAMILTON: This always happens.

(Laughter.)

MR. HAMILTON: -- the one percent of the most impacted communities in CalEnviroScreen in the State of
California. I mean, that's a telling moment --

VICE CHAIR BERG: Yeah.

MR. HAMILTON: -- when in the original boundary, we saw maybe 40 percent of that group included. But now, we see the majority of those areas are now included in the boundary. So -- and also, you can see the source apportionment there to all of the different types of sources. There are significant amount of air pollution and air toxic sources within this area.

This is the result of, yes, five meetings. And it seemed like a long time. But, you know, the community really came forward to these meetings and filled them every time. They are involved. They are engaged. And I want to compliment and thank the air district, Samir Sheikh, for really staying involved here, and going the extra mile, and learning to work with the community, which I know our air district doesn't always have those skill sets. But they are definitely picking them up.

And I want to thank ARB staff again. And I think Supervisor Serna, I think you were right on target. You're right, they should be and you should be thanking these community members who are taking the time out of their day and out of their evening with their families to show up and show how important it is to be in these meetings and do this work.
And to disrespect them and to not consider their opinions as valid, because maybe they don't know everything, is insulting. And so we need to make sure those kinds of things don't happen. And I think this process has evolved to the point where we're beyond that now, and that's exciting for me.

The idea of bringing pesticides in is not foreign to us. We know that ARB often contract -- is contracted by DPR to do pesticide monitoring, so we felt why not. It should be included in the plan, and we'll be pushing that in Shafter.

The District also was very ready and did a great job expanding the boundary down there from simply the city boundary to the seven-mile diameter that they've now adopted. I know there's concern. Somebody mentioned farmers being able to participate. In fact, they can. They now are inside the boundary, so they are welcome to show up at steering committee meeting and participate actively.

You know, we have excluded from the process sort of government affairs people and folks like that. But we want the people who live and work in those communities to definitely be in these meetings, and that's who we have right now.

So I was going to talk about air toxics and how
we need to move forward with that, but apparently that's not going to happen. So thank you very much.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Well, thank you very much, Kevin. And thank you very much for your continued hard work and leadership in this area.

MR. HAMILTON: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Could I ask a quick question of Mr. Hamilton before he --

VICE CHAIR BERG: Yes. I'm sorry, we just have a quick question.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Could we go back to the map.

MR. HAMILTON: Sure, if you want to put it back up there, John.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: I just have a clarifying question. The green boundaries and the dotted -- the dotted white line, can you explain those?

MR. HAMILTON: Sewer. Absolutely. If you could put that back up again, please.

This is days like this, you wish you carried a laser pointer in your pocket, right?

(Laughter.)

MR. HAMILTON: So the green boundary is the original place approved by ARB in the original boundary. Okay. The white boundary is through all of these numerous
meetings, both at the committee and with residents and committee members outside the committee, and a lot of community education, on the part of my colleagues and the District, to help everybody understand where these sources were and help the District understand the disparities that have been occurring in these communities for the last hundred years, we were able to come to a point where we could point out a demarcation there with these white dotted lines of where the people live, where the sources are, and where the two intersect, and especially the potential emissions from those two intersect.

So this map was very thoughtfully done. If you'd seen the committee meeting, you would have seen the processes. There's other slides that show the process that we use to come to this. There was more than one map as we went through this process very thoughtfully. It was very data driven.

And right now, some of the staff is working with Samir to put that map on the district website where it will be distributed to everybody and published as final. So as I said, I'm pretty excited about this, and that was the process we went through. Did that answer your question?

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Yes. Thank you.

MR. HAMILTON: You're welcome.
VICE CHAIR BERG: Good afternoon.

Buenas noches.

MS. ARENAS (THROUGH INTERPRETER): Good afternoon.

My name is Dalia Arenas. I come from the West Fresno Community in the City of Fresno. I'm here to say thank you for expanding the -- and agreeing to expand the community boundaries to my neighborhood and my community, the neighborhood that is most disproportionately burdened by contamination.

My story is I'm -- we are a family of six, my husband and I, and we have four children. And all six of us have asthma. And I have a son who has special needs who's most vulnerable and most impacted. So that's why I'm here to say thank you for expanding these boundaries, because it's going to help everybody who's impacted by asthma. And in West Fresno in my community, every morning we smell a lot of burning in our area, and that odor is really strong.

So that we always have to carry our inhalers with us. We can't go anywhere without them, because of the severe contamination issues.

Listen, I don't think it's fair that for those of us that are impacted by asthma, and in my family particular, we have to leave Fresno and take trips down to Monterey to be able to breathe.
So thank you for expanding those boundaries. And if you could speed up what you need to do so that we can get clean air, that would be good.

(Laughter.)

MS. ARENAS(THROUGH INTERPRETER): Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much for coming and taking time out of your day to be here with us.

MS. ISLAS: Good afternoon, Vice Chair Berg --

VICE CHAIR BERG: Good afternoon.

MS. ISLAS: -- and members of the Board.

My name is Angela Islas, and I am the policy advocate with Central California Asthma Collaborative.

I'm here today to actually speak on behalf of one of the residents of Southwest Fresno, who unfortunately was not -- also not able to make it today to present or -- and testify on behalf of her gratitude for having the CARB staff, as well as the Air District, be able to approve the boundaries expansion for this community.

I want to be able to read this word by word. She -- her name is Catalina Vasquez. And this testimony is based off of whole family. So I want to make sure that I have this time to really read it word by word.

So, "We are the Vasquez family. We have lived in Southwest for almost 15 years. Our community, known as
Casa San Miguel, was developed when we were relocated from a mobile home park near Malaga that was next to a Superfund site. We thought our lives were going to be better, but now I know that the area where I live has bad air quality and is for the most part, forgotten. The representatives of this area don't give us the attention we seek. They always give us, and to other people, excuses, like the air quality isn't bad, or that they don't have sufficient funds to improve the air quality, which is lie, a lie that isn't acceptable.

"We are working families. We pay our taxes. We have little children that are the future of this country, and we deserve to have clean air. Our representatives don't consider that. Sadly, we couldn't travel to Sacramento to be present and inform you in person. That's why we, as a family, write this letter to inform you of how much our air is polluted in our area, and why we need to be included in AB 617".

And I just want to also be able to say that she will be very grateful to be a part of the committee, to be a part of this process, and to be able to be alongside with the other communities to form a very strong air pollution reduction plan, and for there to be an opportunity for all those affected by pollution to finally get their just transition into a better cleaner future.
Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you. And please let the Vasquez family know that we heard their letter and appreciate the time they put in that.

MS. ROEDNER SUTTER: Good morning. I'm Katelyn Roedner Sutter with Environmental Defense Fund. Thank you very much for the opportunity to provide some comments today.

This Community Air Protection Program is extremely important and has immense potential to really create some transformative change in the parts of the State that need it most, including where -- where I live in San Joaquin Valley.

But we do have some suggestions of how it could be even more successful and be stronger. And these aren't unique to EDF, but I did want to take the opportunity to share them today.

First, I think the role of the community steering committees needs to be clarified and strengthened. These steering committees have the expertise that we're looking for to improve air quality in local communities. And I think in this morning's presentation, you know, you talked about this is a community-centric approach, and that is what these steering committees are. So their role in identifying sources, developing plans really needs to be
of paramount importance.

Secondly, it seems like there needs to be a little bit more -- or maybe just greater accountability of local air districts to CARB, to the community, and to the goals of the program. You know, we have a lot of different air districts in this state, and they all deal in different scenarios, and have different capacities, and -- but there needs to be an equal standard for all of the air districts to ensure that there's robust plans and positive and meaningful experiences for all of the communities engaged in this program now and in the next round.

I think we'd also like to see some clearer metrics of success. So we -- it's obvious what success is going to look like, and we're sure that local communities actually realize real emission reductions under these forthcoming plans.

And lastly, I just want to thank CARB. I think it's really important to support the meaningful and effective implementation of this program, that -- it's really important that you're moving forward on the rulemaking for criteria and toxic emissions inventory. It's a mouthful to get out. Sorry.

But it's really important to have this statewide comprehensive data of all emissions, so -- especially for
local communities. So we just -- we really appreciate that you're moving forward on that, and thank you for your work.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

MS. TSAI: Hi again. Is this one working?

VICE CHAIR BERG: Yes. Good afternoon.

MS. TSAI: Stephanie again with the California Environmental Justice Alliance. I'm actually really glad to be following Katelyn, because she made a lot of great points that we at CEJA agree with. And, of course, you know I want to support and lift up the comments that many of our CEJA member organizations and residents from around the state have made today.

I think I'll just be brief in kind of highlighting that, you know, with AB 617, you know, the bottom line is emission reductions, and we need cleaner air in our communities, right? And I think -- I think you all understand that, and we've really appreciated, you know, working with the CARB staff. I know there's -- this is a lot of work, and, you know, really appreciate that.

And, you know, this is -- this is where we do really need your help, right? And it is helpful when you step in, and that's what we really need. You know, I think, as we've all heard continuously, the air districts vary so much, right? And so the way the community
steering committee process is going across this state really varies by community, and by region, and air district. And so that's where, you know, again, we just -- we really, really need CARB's help, and we really appreciate all the staff's work this.

And to that end, we know that you need more resources and funding for the staff positions. So we, you know, support that budget request.

Thanks.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much. We do have one -- and our last speaker will be Paulina Torres.

MS. TORRES: Good afternoon, Vice Chair Berg and members of the Board. My name is Paulina Torres and I'm an attorney with the Center on Race, Poverty and the Environment.

I'm here today representing the Central Valley community groups we work with, particularly in Shafter, and many of whom our Shafter steering committee members. I'd like to start off by thanking CARB for their leadership and willingness to work with us throughout the 617 process.

Thank you, Assembly Member Garcia, for your remarks about CARB guidance on the community emission reduction plans. We understand that the plans come to the Board for approval. However, we really do need strong
guidance from CARB throughout the entire CERP development process.

I also want to share that many of the steering committee members in Shafter have become sort of jaded with this process. Since the very first meeting, we have been discussing process and logistics, who gets to vote, who votes ex-officio. Then the Air District took away the right to vote. And so it's really been a back-and-forth over process. And as we finally moved towards the development of this CERPs, we really do urge CARB's guidance with the air districts to ensure the plan brought before this Board actually upholds the intent and purpose of AB 617.

As a representative from the Air District mentioned, pesticide emissions have been a focus during our meetings. And thank you, Dr. Balmes, for your comment on pesticides. In Shafter, there is nearly unanimity on the inclusion of pesticide emissions in the CERPs, unanimity with the community steering committee.

We have focused on the notion that while DPR has jurisdiction over pesticides applications, air districts and ARB can regulate the emissions from pesticides that are toxic air contaminants, many of which are abundant in Shafter such as chlorpyrifos an Telone, also known as 1,3-D.
As mentioned, DPR gave a presentation on ongoing monitoring efforts one in Shafter. And for example, DPR shared that the highest level ever recorded at 50 parts per billion for Telone was measured at DPR's air monitoring station located in Shafter High School in 2018. Levels were likely even higher in residential areas.

And when a level of 30 parts per billion, so 20 less -- 20 billion less, was measured in 1990, Telone was actually banned for five years. And I share this to emphasize the importance of actual reductions in emission -- in pesticide emissions as opposed to merely continued monitoring. And so we look forward to CARB's continued guidance throughout the CERP development.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

And this is not a regulatory item. This is an informational item, so there's no need to close the record.

I turned myself off.

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR BERG: This is a great time to start our discussion. I'd like to call on first Ms. Takvorian, because she actually participated at the meeting on Monday, the hearing. And I'd like to get your perspective, plus your comments, please.
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. Thank you.

So thanks to the staff for the presentation today. And it's really representative of a lot of hard work that you all have done, and quite a bit of travel. And I know we all appreciate that, and know that that's difficult. And I did have the opportunity to attend the hearing on Monday, the Natural Resources Committee.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: John can't hear you. John Gioia.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. All right. I've rarely been critiqued for not being heard or loud enough --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: We want to hear what you have to say.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: -- but I'm happy to step it up. Thanks, John.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Okay. Thank you.

So I appreciate the report that CARB staff did on Monday as well as the Committee holding the hearing -- excuse me -- and Assembly Member Garcia and others being there.

I think the major takeaways from the hearing, and I think not so much from the report today, but from the
hearing I want to kind of reflect on.

And one of them is that 617 I think we all
realize has the potential to provide a significant and
really perhaps monumental change in air quality in the
most impacted neighborhoods. It truly has that potential.
And I think everyone recognized that.

The program is integrated. It's holistic. And I
think that's evidenced just in today's meeting that we're
having today in the research time, in the freight item,
and I expect it's going to come up in the SB 150 item. So
it really has this opportunity to bring a lot of the work
that we're doing together.

So I think that the downside is that the local
programs are uneven. I think we heard that across the
Board on Monday, and we've heard that today, and we've
heard that in previous hearings. And I think the
unevenness is and inconsistency is really around public
participation, and the manner in which the districts have
set up their public participation guidelines. The
recognition of the community solutions that are being
offered, that seems to be uneven.

I think it's hopeful that the boundaries in the
valley have been worked through. And I think that's --
it's hopeful for both the Valley as well as for the other
communities. But I think that CARB needs to step up a
little bit more in a more authoritative way. The guidance has been great and CARB has this perspective across the state that has been really useful I think to the communities. But I don't that it's being accepted across the board at -- in each of the local programs.

Our understanding is that everyone understands that the community members are not interested in continuing to engage over and over again in these conversations about the emission reductions that they desperately need to protect the health -- their health and the health of their families over and over again. And they just cannot -- they need a guarantee that that's not going to fall on deaf ears. That somehow those ideas are going to go into the ether and not be recognized.

And we understand that the steering committee's job is to develop recommendations. And that we also understand that all those recommendations are not going to be agreed to by all members of the steering committee. There's not going to be a consensus across the Board.

But that shouldn't be, in my view, the end of the conversation. And I don't think we have a clear path for how that doesn't end the conversation, because what I'm hearing is in some communities those ideas don't show up in the meeting minutes. They don't -- they don't get reflected on the board, if somebody is taking minutes.
They are dismissed by some folks who may say, well, we don't -- the district doesn't have the authority to do that, or that's CARB's job or that's, you know, the local land-use planner's job, so we're not going to put it up here on the Board.

I just think that's really unacceptable, and I think it reflects a lack of understanding of what the true purpose of the steering committee is. So I'd like to ask how we can ensure that all of those recommendations make it into the reports and into the plans? And it may be that there's an analysis that some of those don't have a pathway for success, that they can't be done for one reason or another. It may be that some of them are going to require legislation. They could require a new rule at the local level. But all of them are memorialized. And that we ensure that they all come forward, so that everybody's voice is heard.

And, you know, I'd love to hear from staff. I have ideas about that, but I'd love to hear from staff as to what you think some ideas as to how to do that would be, because I think it's essential that all of that get memorialized. And I think we can just think about things that we thought five years ago weren't possible, and today we're moving forward with them. So even if these can't all be worked on today, I think they could come forward at
some point.

And then a separate point. I heard from both, I think, Mr. Mendoza and Señora Arenas that there may be emergency situations in both of your communities from what you're describing. And I wanted to ask the air districts, and perhaps CARB staff, as to what's the mechanism within the steering committee meetings, and the steering committees, to actually hear those kinds of concerns, and to take action? Because in many cases this is the only place that community members have to come forward with those kinds of concerns. And this seems like a real opportunity for the air districts and the communities to work together to solve problems that perhaps can be solved pretty immediately. So those are my two questions.

Thanks.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Great. So just as a matter of process, do you want to go ahead and respond to each member, or shall we kind of get a laundry list? What's our thought? Is it easier just to respond as we go, Karen?

OCAP DIVISION CHIEF MAGLIANO: I think so.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Okay. Great. Thank you.

OCAP DIVISION CHIEF MAGLIANO: Hopefully, I remember you were asking.

So one of the questions you asked about obviously
was how do we make sure that all of the perspectives that
were shared in the steering committees really are
memorialized? And that was something that we thought was
very important as well. And so in the Blueprint itself,
we specifically call out that there needs to be that
documentation about what the breadth of perspectives were,
as well as providing opportunities for community steering
Committee members when the air districts are taking the
plans to their Board, and especially when those programs
come to our Board that they have that full opportunity to
be able to talk about those as well.

And that's one of the reasons why when those
plans come back to our Board, we really want to go back
down to the air districts, so that the community steering
committee members can participate in that process as well.

The other thing that I think we all have been
talking about is that it's important at the steering
committee meetings themselves, that there is good
documentation about what that discussion is. And
sometimes, you can't make the follow-up then, but there's
a commitment that there is going to be follow-up and
perhaps a recap at the next meeting as well.

And I think the third part of it is we also
recognize that there are going to be a range of issues
that are addressed. And, you know, some of the fall into
CARB, air district, many others don't. And that's why we also thought it was very important that CARB staff and others are there, so that we can then identify who do we need to follow up with, you know, for example, bringing DPR into the conversation.

I know Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment is going to be at the San Diego steering committee tonight, as well as addressing what can we do related to local land use. It may be that we can help coordinate and collaborate with land use at agencies, and make that advocacy.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: So all of that is great and sounds like the right path. Is that consistently happening and who's fraking that? Because from what I'm hearing, there -- it's -- again, it's uneven. That in districts the minutes are clear, the next steps are clear, there's good facilitation in terms of following up, and in others that's not happening.

OCAP DIVISION CHIEF MAGLIANO: So I think obviously part of all of our collective learning and adjustment in this process, you know, I think we're starting now is we've had staff at the meetings sharing what we've observed and, you know, this was a good -- this is something that worked in another committee sharing that back. I know the air districts are also doing that
amongst themselves. And we're looking for opportunities to do that, you know, potentially like in our consultation group meeting that will be coming up, so that we can also have a broader conversation to make sure that those best practices are being implemented.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: So maybe we can say today that for the districts that are here and listening that all of us would love to see exactly what Karen just described on your websites soon after each meeting, so that there's the ability to track. I don't know with that's feasible for everybody, but I don't know how else to do it, because I think the community deserves that level of recognition and a way to track.

So that seems simple to me, but we -- and I think there's more than needs to be done, but I don't think people want to wait for the plan to come forward. So if we can take that forward in someway today with the Board, that would be great. I think the staff is really trying to make that happen. But again, the feedback is it's not consistent.

VICE CHAIR BERG: So it would be interesting just if one of the air districts has a best practice that you are using that is working. Do you have something you'd like to share?

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Could I ask a question
just before this? Who is taking lead in terms of staffing
these meetings? Is it the local district, or CARB, are
you sharing the staffing? How does that work
procedurally? This is a procedural question.

Did you hear? I'm sorry, Karen.

OCAP DIVISION CHIEF MAGLIANO: I'm sorry, yes.

VICE CHAIR NICHOLS: So that question --

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Let me go back. My
question is who is -- who's taking the lead to staff these
local committee meetings? Is it the air district, or is
it CARB, or some combination of the two? How does that
work?

OCAP DIVISION CHIEF MAGLIANO: So the air
districts are responsible for convening the steering
committees, working with their local partners to do that.
But as we've talked about, we also have CARB staff that
participate in those meetings, both from my team, from
Veronica's team, both to be able to provide support, but
we also know that mobile source emission reductions are
going to play a key role in these emission reduction
programs, and we need to be at the table and in
partnership in helping to provide that support as well.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Okay. And these are
public meetings, correct?

OCAP DIVISION CHIEF MAGLIANO: They are.
BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Are they noticed at some --

OCAP DIVISION CHIEF MAGLIANO: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: -- particular place?

Where would they be noticed?

OCAP DIVISION CHIEF MAGLIANO: All of the air districts have dedicated websites for their AB 617 communities, and so they post all of the information about when the Meetings are going to be happening. Most of them I think have now gone to standard dates for the meetings, you know, the first Wednesday of every month, for example.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Okay.

OCAP DIVISION CHIEF MAGLIANO: And that's where they post information about agendas, presentation materials. Many of them are also doing audio/video broadcasting of these meetings, so that it allows a broader participation in the meetings too.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

MR. NUDD: Thank you, Vice Chair Berg. I appreciate the opportunity. And Dr. Fine might add to my remarks when I'm finished.

I want to talk a bit about three elements that I think the Bay Area has really put into this program when
it comes to community relations.

The first step is we have a team of community engagement professionals. And this is their job. This is their training. This is the kind of work they do.

We've had a bad experience in the past of sending engineers into communities to try and make presentations. And in spite of how clear our stacked bar graph with arrow whiskers are to us, they're not necessarily the best way to communicate this information to the community. So that's the first piece.

The second piece is in each of these communities, we have a community co-lead. And that is an organization that has a presence in the community, the trust of the folks in that community, and they don't just co-host the meetings with us, we meet with them multiple times every week to set the agendas and make sure that whatever we're bringing to the committee is something that they buy into. And frankly, we're learning as much from them as they are from us.

And then the third piece of this would be independent facilitation -- independent professional facilitation. A lot of times you go into these communities, and there's a lot of pain there. I mean, we've heard a lot of that today about the impact on people's health in these communities. And when somebody
is sharing their experience, you don't want the air
district staff to be, oh, hey, you know, we need to stay
on schedule, so moving on to the next item, right?

So it's really important to have that independent
facilitation to keep the meetings on track in a way that's
done professionally and with empathy and concern for the
people who are participating in the meeting.

And so, that -- those are my three best
practices. And I want to make another suggestion, which
we brought up in the hearing on Monday with regards to the
structure of the AB 617 program. Since I was given an
opportunity to make a pitch, I'm going to make it.

Right now, we've got monitoring communities and
emission reduction plan communities. We need a third
category that I call capacity-building communities. And
that's not necessarily the best set of words to use.
There are some communities, and San Diego Portside is a
good example, where there are very strong local
organizations who have been doing community-driven
land-use planning for years and years, and they understand
the planning process, right? West Oakland is the same
way.

But we have a lot of communities in the Bay Area,
Pittsburg/Bay Point for an example where you don't have
that kind of structure. And so if we were to put them
forward as a year two community, boom, the 12-month clock
starts, right? And six months of that is eaten up with
CEQA. So you really need a year or two in kind of a year
zero mode to get these communities prepped up.

And so I'll yield the mic to Dr. Fine.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

DR. FINE: I'd love to talk for a long time about
the progress we've made. But just specifically the point
of best practices in the interests of time. So one of the
things that we've done is, as Karen mention, is Facebook
Live. This was a suggestion at one of our kick-off
meetings. And as a district we're agonizing over how much
it's going to cost to get in the audio/visual.

Apparently, Facebook Live is really easy, and free, and
everybody loves it. And the people who can't make the
meetings can watch it live or they can watch it any time
they want afterwards.

Like Bay Area, we have co-hosts at some of our
committees and facilitators -- and/or facilitators at
other meetings. And it's different, because the
committees themselves expressed interest in doing it
differently. So there's a lot of tension between this
statewide standardization, but also having each committee
operate independently and listening to that committee
about how they want the process to go forward. So it's
not as simple as straight standardization because that's
not -- also not listening to the wishes of each committee.

And then finally, and this goes to Ms. Takvorian's point, what we do is we've done a lot of
break-out sessions, where we have white boards or paper,
and we write down every single thing everybody says, every
suggestion, every priority. We take photos of that right
at the end of the meeting, and we post that as soon as we
can onto the website, so everything that is said and
recorded. We don't dismiss anything that's outside of our
authority or outside the process, and it gets put on the
website right away.

We do meeting summaries that we can never get out
fast enough, but we try our best to get them out. They're
four or five pages long and talk about everything that was
discussed at the meeting.

Those are just some ideas. There's a lot more
that we're doing and we're learning as we're going.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you, Dr. Fine.

One of the things that does occur to me, although
it doesn't play to immediate like tomorrow, but having a
maybe best practices where the districts could all get
together with CARB staff, and sooner would be better than
later. So making it a priority to really talk about as
Assembly Member Garcia said, this bottom-up approach,
because language matters, the way that we approach things matter. We can learn from each other. And so I would like to put that on the possible solutions list for us.

Thank you, Ms. Takvorian. Was that helpful?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah, it was helpful. I appreciate it. And I think we're just going to keep looking for that consistency, which I know you're looking for. I don't think I got an answer to the emergency question, about how that's being handled in the districts?

OCAP DIVISION CHIEF MAGLIANO: I might actually defer to some of the districts to address that.

MR. KARD: Good afternoon, Vice Chair Berg, Board members. I'm Bon Kard with Air Pollution Control Officer for San Diego County.

You know, good question, for emergencies. And I think one of the benefits we saw, and I mentioned this at the Assembly Natural Resources Committee the other day, is when we hear about problems, and Board Member Takvorian you notice, we want to act on it. And frankly when these meetings started, before the steering committees were even formed, we were surprised at how many people actually didn't know about us. They didn't know who to call if there was an issue. But if we hear of something, we have been investigating right away. I don't have a specific example in mind. But anytime, we get a complaint, we are
out there. We'll investigate. I'm very aggressive on that kind of thing, because it's super important. Our job is protecting public health.

And then with that, what I wanted to say is we do have a webpage with all the documents. Board Member Takvorian, you know that. And everything is posted. We also do things bilingually. We take meeting notes. And the meetings have been very productive. And one thing I do say at various meetings, and I said it the other day, is that if you see that we're not doing something, or that I'm making a mistake, or that we've screwed up somehow, tell us. The reaction you will see will be embarrassment first, only momentarily, and then we'll fix it, because that's how I work. Always have. And I want to know what people want.

And Board Member Takvorian, if you see an issue with me, I know you're not hesitant to tell me, even in public, which is great. And I ask for it, so --

(Laughter.)

MR. KARD: But that's how we work. And Assembly Member Garcia, I can assure you we're doing well. It doesn't mean we can't do better. There's always something better to be done, but we'll pursue this. And certainly, if there's more to be had - there's a meeting tonight - I'll hear it from my staff. If I can make it back there,
I'll go to that meeting. But we do want to do the best job possible. We do are represent people and the health concerns they have, and that's how we act.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

You can make a quick comment, and then we're going to move on.

MR. LOUTZENHISER: I'll make it very quick.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: We have some comments on this side, too.

VICE CHAIR BERG: I'm sorry.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: There's some comments on this side.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Oh, no. I'm not moving on from you guys.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Oh, okay. Got it.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Moving on from this.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Move on from them.

VICE CHAIR BERG: No, I know that, but we -- okay. I gotcha.

MR. LOUTZENHISER: I'll keep it very quickly,

Vice Chair Berg.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

MR. LOUTZENHISER: Mark Loutzenhisier, Sacramento. I just also wanted to address, as a air monitoring community here in Sacramento, I just want to
touch a little bit upon the emergency piece as well. As we've shared with our community all along, if there are things that we can take action on now, we're not necessarily even waiting on risk reduction plans, if there are things that are identified here and today that we can move on. So to that extent, it is.

Much like the others had mentioned, we have everything posted on our website. We have noticing lists. We have a special listserv for it, among other things. And the one thing that I appreciate Vice Chair Berg's suggestion on this is I think there is a just best practice list, because there's no one-size-fits-all. You know, the facilitator is a fantastic idea. We actually approached our Committee with it.

They actually weren't interested. The Committee itself was working well together. Our committee is actually run by the community. So we're there at the table. We help facilitate the agenda, let them know the timelines that we need to meet, and what steps and information we need from it. But they're actually the ones running the meeting. And so they're -- they have chosen to facilitate that themselves.

That may not work all in groups though. We have a smaller committee. So that is actually workable for them. So I think it's important just to acknowledge there
are a lot of great ideas that work in different settings, and it's important just to make sure that we know those tools, but to keep that flexibility that the districts and, more importantly, the communities can pick the tools that work best for them.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Great. Thank you.

Supervisor Serna.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Thank you.

So I'm not sure who is best equipped to address my general question. But, you know, whether it's Richard, or maybe someone from a local district, or Larry. But one of the things that I think we can all remember quite clearly during the legislative process, that led to eventually the signing of 617, was a lot consternation, a lot of concern by local districts about cost, and the means necessary to implement the letter and spirit of the legislation.

And I don't know about other Board members up here, but I continue to hear those concerns kind of expressed quietly in one-on-one meetings, not so much necessarily in these chambers. So I have not doubt that they -- you know, they continue to be an issue for local districts, at least for those that I represent here in the Sacramento Valley.
But what I didn't here today from anyone necessarily was how are we, in the course of these community meetings leading up to the plans, keeping our -- keeping our thumb on the pulse of appropriate expectation setting, in terms of the resources that are necessary to develop the plans, to implement the plans, to implement the totality of 617?

Because I -- again, I'm hearing kind of side-bar conversations on a pretty consistent basis about these outstanding concerns of resource needs, but I'm not hearing it here. So I don't if it's Richard, or Karen, or someone else that may want to speak to that. But I -- it makes me a little nervous that I hear about that frequently, and then I don't hear about it in a setting like this.

VICE CHAIR BERG: And it was -- the time frame was brought up in the meeting on Monday on several accounts, not to postpone things, but the concern about the -- how quickly things are coming around. But before you answer, I think Mr. Greene, how are you?

MR. GREENE: To respond to that questions.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Yes.

MR. GREENE: It just so happens that while I was serving as interim director of CAPCOA, I got to work on that particular question a fair amount.
I would say -- I would answer that in two ways. First of all, when the districts went in last year, they had a spreadsheet, which anticipated all the work areas, and put a cost number on those. And one of the things I did in the last couple of months is work with these guys here and all the districts to update that based on a year's worth of experience.

So they have a much better idea right now what it would cost in the current communities. They've had several meetings to talk about, okay, what are the parameters we're measuring, what is each other -- and try to true it up between the districts, so that everybody is talking about the same thing.

And there is a number, and we can provide that. And they wanted that going into the legislature, so that they're looking at current communities, how much more money is going to be needed there; but the new communities, what do we anticipate in cost. And I think one of the things that they found out is that the cost in a community differs from community to community. Even though the work is the same technically when you go in, communities are different. They're bigger and smaller. They have more stationary sources and more mobile sources, different kinds of things. So you really can't totally anticipate that.
But, yes, you can get a good estimate on that. And so we have a good number for looking forward, and they're using that in the lege arena. And that can be shared. I think we've probably shared that with ARB as we've gone through this process, but certainly not the Board yet. That's sort of a detail that we wouldn't have bumped up to you.

The second thing though, and more important, is the districts have been staffing based on a year's amount of money. So they know what they got this year, and this is a big effort. So what they've been doing -- they cannot hire up very -- really quality people real fast. So they've brought staff from the districts that they already have doing other things, and brought them over to this process. And all of them have been very committed and brought their best people over to this process.

But looking forward, if you want to hire great people, you need to know they're going to be around. And you need to know you're going to have to have funding to support those people. So some part of this needs to be part of a continuous appropriation, so that the districts have surety for funding, and so they can hire the staff they need looking out over years, because this is not a one-year process. This is going to be something that's ongoing, and there's a lot of other communities that are
interested in being part of this process.

So we need to have a real good discussion about
the cost, understand what we really are going to need, if
we're going to do this; and secondly, have the thought
that that needs to be continuously appropriated in some
form or fashion, at least at some base level, so the
districts can have solid funding looking out over the
years.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: And I -- I do appreciate
that. I guess my -- the more precise question though is
in the context of this more immediate aspect of plan
implementation, how is that entering the conversation with
communities who may want -- may come to these meetings,
the steering committee members may participate with a much
greater expectation than can feasibly be met, given
limited resources, so how does that conversation take
place in public setting? Because I think it's -- I think
it's incredibly important. Otherwise, you get far down a
path, where expectations are X, and the ability to meet
them are Y, and that's when you have issues.

MR. LOUTZENHISER: Absolutely. And to be honest,
from day one that has been at the forefront of my mind is
managing expectations along with the resources.

So what we've been doing at least with our
community is we've been open with them that there is a limited -- we have resources, and we want to basically put them in the best manner forward on how they would like to see those resources being used.

So one of the things we've been doing is we've told them that is not a one and done deal. We do hope to have their support as well in terms of securing those long-term funding needs for the -- these communities, not just the ones now, but the ones in the future, but also just that what we may be able to do come July 1 is sort of a phased approach. As they identify what their priorities are, it may mean that we're able to get in and do their top three priorities. But they have many priorities that are equally valid, but we've asked them to sort of prioritize. We're going to hit their top priorities first. And as we have the additional resources, we're going to continue and expand the program in addition to that.

And one of the other discussions, and we're still in this development phase with them about the next meeting, is actually sort of locations. Where are their priorities to be monitoring?

And so one of the things we're going to talk with them is that, okay, if we do this type of plan, it means we can go this much right now. If you want this instead,
it may mean less or more locations. And so we're having those discussions with them to let them know that even if they have higher expectations, they're not out the door. Sort of going to that question earlier about taking -- you know, taking things off the list. We don't take them off the list. We just simply say where are your priorities on these elements, and here are some options that we can present to you on how to best address that. And then let them work through a little bit more do they want five sites with a lot of detail, do they want one site with a lot detail, and maybe 30 other sites? So that's sort of that balancing act in terms of managing that -- those expectations, at least on how we're approaching it so far.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. Corey.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yeah. I'm going to -- and I'll be brief, but a little more detail in this conversation probably just to put a flavor to it.

For the most part, the proceeds to run the program are those generated by the Cap-and-Trade Program, right? Cap-and-Trade Program, there's allowances that are auctioned. They get deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, subsequently appropriated by the
Legislature, which has happened the last few years.

But that appropriation really has different elements to it. It has what you heard from the districts, which is basically the support to administer the program, which is an important element, both at the State level and the district level.

There's the incentive programs. Significant legislative appropriations the last few years to support -- realizing 617 is much more than incentives, just tighter rules, regulations, but incentives have a role. So the legislature has recognized that, and included the last few years appropriations. It also is separate line item for the community assistance grants, recognizing that community engagement and building that support was an important element of the program as well.

And in this year -- so there's a proposed budget, so it's the administration's budget, so I don't comment specifically, other than it's the administration's budget, includes each of those three categories. And there's budget hearings that are playing out now, where we have weighed into the administration in terms of there's ongoing work associated with this program. It will take funds to continue to implement.

But many of those -- as we look to implement the program, we're looking at the budget and seeing what's
there in terms of any potential growth and having those conversations. So the budget process, that's what it's for. Those conversations are playing themselves out. We're having subcommittee budget hearings right now. The administration will be releasing a May Revise in a few months. So it's an appropriate question, and those conversations both with the districts, with the administration, legislatively are playing out right now and will be for the next several weeks and months.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Okay. Great.

Dr. Balmes.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Vice Chair Berg. Well, as everyone knows, I place a lot of importance in implementing AB 617 correctly. As I've said many times, it's transformative -- you know, we're -- as far as I know, we're the only state that's actually mandated to try to address environmental injustice and improve public health disadvantaged communities.

So this is important. We have to get it right. Now, there's some tensions that have been talked about sort of, but I'm going to be maybe a little bit more blunt about it. And I'm glad Assembly Member Garcia is back in the room, because I think he appropriately requests -- demands, I would say, sufficient community involvement, the bottom-up approach. I'm totally supportive of that.
On the other hand, the districts, I don't think, necessarily have the adequate financial support to do everything they could. Now, I realize the budget process is complicated, and we are trying to do a lot of things in a lot of different ways, just with climate change and air quality, let alone affordable housing and transportation issues across -- but I do think that maybe there could be some incentive for districts to do it right to follow best practices, and maybe -- they could get maybe a little bit more resources, which they need.

And I'll give you a specific example of a resource issue at the Bay Area level, not just sort of picking on the district, because I think the Bay Area Air Quality Management District has been doing a really excellent job, in part because they have a lot of experiences working with the West Oakland community, you know, multiple years, but -- I'm going to get into the technical weeds, but I think it's illustrative.

The low-cost sensors that are being -- going to be used to measure particular matter in all of these communities, you know, they're not federal reference monitoring devices, and so they only give sort of a relative estimate of exposure. They can be off by 20 percent easily.

So they need to be calibrated against one of
these better devices. Well, in the -- one of the
community air grantees -- the monitoring grantees in the
Bay Area is having trouble co-locating their low-cost
sensors at the District compliance air quality monitoring
site. It's an issue. The District would have to spend a
lot of money to sort of staff that co-location. So the
District, I think appropriately, has said you've got to
talk to CARB. And CARB suggested, well, you could
colocate the monitor in Sacramento, but the exposures in
Sacramento are different than the exposures in Richmond.

I'm not blaming anybody. This is an example of
the process. We move very fast, because the Legislature
expected results quickly. And I understand that
expectation, because the communities say we want better
health. We want lower air pollution and better health.

But we've been tripping over ourselves a little
bit. I think overall we've done a pretty good job
considering that this was a heavy lift. So I'm just
pointing out that we -- there are -- I think we need to do
better, and part of that is, you know, the expectation in
terms of delivering good products very fast was maybe a
little bit unrealistic on the legislator's part --
legislator's part.

I wanted the Specifically address something that
the PSR representative brought up. Martha Arguello, I
guess her boss in PSR-L.A. is a member of the AB 617 Consultation Group, and she's been pushing on the health metrics issue along with other EJ members of that committee. I totally get it, because the communities want health -- better health. And they want accountability and metrics.

But we're having trouble delivering just what we are doing without including health metrics. And this is where I specifically wanted to Assembly Member Garcia to here. If we want to move towards actually measuring potential health outcomes of our AB 617 work, there needs to be additional legislative appropriation for resources to measure -- to monitor the health outcomes.

I would suggest that would need to be done with CDPH and the county health departments. I don't want to go into it any farther. But I don't think there's anyway we can add health metrics to what we already have without more resources.

And then the last thing I wanted to mention was last -- I think it was last month we talked about the toxic emissions inventory, or was it two months ago? In any event, I'm sorry that Mr. Hamilton didn't get to talk about toxic -- his air toxics. You were too wordy about the other stuff, Kevin.

(Laughter.)
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: But, you know, I think that's really where we -- in terms of health effects in the disadvantaged communities, it's the air toxics that I'm worried about as air pollution health effects researcher. And the toxic emissions inventory, you know, I know that's a whole can of worms. But I think to do -- to inform communities appropriately about emissions sources in their communities, and at the very -- at a very high level of spatial resolution, we need to do better.

And I don't quite understand -- well, I don't understand whether the nice video that Mr. Mader played about the tools, in terms of local air sources, whether that's based on our general emissions inventory data, or are we actually getting the information from every district about their permitted sources, and actually other authorization requests that we made about -- for these stationary sources, gas stations, dry-cleaners, chrome platers?

Because I -- what I took from some of the testimony on Monday's hearing from community groups is they want to know about the sources in their community. And modeling is great. And I understand that modeling can cover vast areas much more efficiently than knowing that gas station X emits, you know, Y amounts of benzene. I'm just throwing things out.

But I think we should be able to deliver that
information to our communities to empower them to know
about the sources in their community. So I don't -- I
don't know if the -- those nice dots in the tool were
actually for gas station X and dry-cleaner Y, and chrome
plater Z, because that's what the community -- that's what
I hear stakeholders asking four in terms of...

    So what can I say? I think we've come far. I
don't want to be a naysayer here. And I really appreciate
how much the districts are trying to do. And I know it
varies across districts about how much community listen --
listening to communities there has been. And we're
clearly hearing at the legislative hearing from Mr. Garcia
today, I totally agree, that we have to do more. I agree
with Supervisor Serna that that community involvement is
key here.

    But we've got more to do. And I really think
part of the problem is timing. We've been trying to do
too much too fast is my personal feeling.

    Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you, Dr. Balmes.
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: So I'm going to pick up --
VICE CHAIR BERG: Supervisor Gioia.
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I'm going to pick up on the
last point you made, and I'll try not to repeat what
others have said. I do think timing is really important
here. And we saw that here -- we say that in the Bay Area
where, you know, while there was a committee already
established in West Oakland, the Richmond committee
started from the ground up. And Richmond is a very active
community. Yet, it took time to develop the process to
appoint the steering committee, and because our -- we --
in our process, the Air District did not appoint the
community steering committee. It was -- it was designed
in a way so the community picked it, which is, you know, a
little innovative and hard to put together, and that took
some time. And that means we're going to be on an even
tighter time frame to meet the AB 617 deadlines for
monitoring.

So I do think this may involve some legislative
changes. We want to give adequate time, while having this
go forward as quickly as possible. And likewise, we
want -- clearly, the monitoring communities will be
transitioning to emission reduction communities, but we
should listen to the local steering committee as to when
that happens, because they will know best should it happen
right away, should they do slightly more monitoring before
they move into the full emissions reduction status.

So -- and I think Greg Nudd's point about
capacity building is important. I wouldn't necessarily
say we're going to pick a community -- a community is --
in phase for community capacity building, but give more
time to meet either the monitoring deadlines or the
emission reduction deadlines, because some communities -
and this is true, every community is different - will take
longer to develop their process, and their steering
committee. So I just want to focus on that timing issue.
And again, to the Assembly Member, it may involve
changing some legislative -- you know, legislatively
changing some of the time frames.
Expectations are really -- I'm worried here about
high expectations and not meeting them, which means we
not -- we don't just need more money for the process. We
need to ensure that there's going to be money down the
road to implement what comes out of the emissions
reduction plan. Otherwise, we've waste the community's
time. We've disrespected the community and said, here's
another planning effort, oh, and we don't have enough
money to implement it.
We've been there before. We've seen that. So
that means we really need to ensure that there's going to
be funding to implement that. Otherwise, we're
disrespecting the communities.
The note here, that I covered everything.
The -- and I do agree with what others have said,
we need to be the backstop here. Because I heard the
reports -- I did not spend the four and a half hours like
my colleague to listen to the hearing. I heard a report
from it.

And clearly, there was inconsistencies by
community about how successful this has been perceived
to -- you know, to be. So we know people are going to
come here. We need to take responsibility to be proactive
to ensure that it's going to be community driven. And
frankly, a lot of the support from local air districts,
which could be well meaning, in some cases, they may not
always have the cultural competency to do the work that
they would like to do, right?

So having facilitation is really important, or --
and maybe even having the community steering committee
have their own advisors -- third-party advisors that could
help them in addition to the air district, right? Because
this is really about respect.

So those are my comments. And finally, I'll just
repeat what I said earlier under freight that as we look
at making AB 617 moneys available. It should be not just
for new operations and new development, but all -- I mean,
not just for existing emissions, but nor new operations
and new development as well, so that these communities
have an -- are an equal playing field with others.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.
Dr. Sherriffs.

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Thank you.

You know, this is obviously -- it's a totally new process. It's a ground-up instead of top-down. Very difficult. You know, it's casting old relationships and new balances. I think its demanded a lot more listening from everybody, which has been good. I guess I'm reminded of Tolstoy, who wrote that every happy family is happy in the same way, but every unhappy family is unhappy in their own way.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: And, you know, no wonder there are all these different experiences. We chose these ten communities to be different, because we wanted to get some understanding of trying to address the many problems -- the many local problems of exposure to pollutants. So, yeah, a big challenge is how to thread that needle, but it's respectful, I think, that we let each community and air district find its way that's appropriate.

That said, yes, we have authority. We have a responsibility. Sometimes, you know, the authority is just to remind you, hey, we've got the authority. And hopefully, nobody comes to ask us to exercise that, but understanding we could be the broker is important.
You know, again, just thinking San Joaquin, I commend everybody for their participation and partnership in this, and I mean everybody, stakeholders, the Air District, advocacy groups, business, the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control Board for standing behind the District in this work.

You know, in many ways, at the end of the afternoon, I think the most important slide may be slide 17, which is the ongoing Board engagement. You know, we're not coming back to this in six months or 12 months. We're coming back in probably three months, maybe four months. And that's -- that's so important with this new experiment to take responsibility, track how it's going to see where the rough spots are, and how much we need to engage to help smooth that out, and how much it's best left for the local areas to find the appropriate consensus.

But again, I would really also acknowledge Mr. Corey's ability when people come to the table to bring out the best, which is a wonderful talent.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

Ms. Mitchell.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you.

We're finding out all the difficulties in doing a
program like this. But I will say that, you know, the first steps when you do a new program are always going to have some hurdles and some bumps along the way, but we'll learn from each of those.

What I think Dr. Balmes said is really critical though. We have a program where we're going to monitor the air. Then in some of those communities, we're going to do emission reduction plans. But then the outcome that is expected from our communities is improved health. And I'm not sure that we've thought about that step number 3 when you -- where you get from emission reduction to actual health improvements.

So I do think that one thing we should be paying attention to is the research that we have done, and the research that is on the table, and maybe what research we still need to do to get that final step number 3 in place.

I will say that one of the great benefits of this program I think is that the communities feel like they're being heard finally. And I know that, you know, the people that may have been at the hearing on -- last week, may have -- not have been the people -- some of those people. I mean they may not be truly representative of the greater number of people that are coming to the community meetings.

But I'm sure that what we have accomplished is
that the communities now feels like it is being heard. But expectations are one thing that we need to pay
attention to. Expectations mean certain outcomes, and we need to clarify what that is. What is the outcome that is expected. And I think that Dr. Balmes hit on it when he said improved health. You know, let's reduce the incidence of asthma. Let's reduce the cancer incidence. That is a big leap. It certainly is a big leap, but it's something we need to be paying attention to.

And if we can't improve those outcomes or reach those outcomes, at least let's be realistic about what we are communicating to the community about those outcomes and what we expect may come from them.

I think Dr. Balmes really hit on a very good point. I compliment you on that. I hadn't thought about that aspect of it, but I think that is really key to what we're doing.

Thanks.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you. Any other comments?

Staff, do you have some wrap-up, Mr. Corey?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I think the high level takeaway, and this was actually a really useful conversation, and the point made by several Board members in terms of the ongoing nature and the expectation of
periodic updates, that's correct. And that will continue
to play out. We benefit from this, and I know that the
stakeholders do as well.

But I thought, Vice Chair Berg, a suggestion in
terms of lessons learned and a -- sort of a touchpoint
with districts and others. That's really useful. Some of
the points that I was hearing, Ms. Takvorian and others,
for instance, just appoint a steering committee, and I
remember, was reflecting on the conversation that took
place at this Board when the Blueprint was adopted. And
there was a conversation recognizing that there were
likely to be some differences at the local level with the
steering committee and wanting to include some flexibility
recognizing that. So there is a balance in terms of some
fundamentals that were raised in terms of facilitators --
good facilitation and posting of agendas, and minutes, and
so forth.

I think the regroup will do. That kind of the
lesson that I take from this conversation is a follow up
with our district partners, and really sitting down and
talking about it, because there's some great things going
on locally that can be shared, and probably more
effectively communicated, and cross-pollinated. We'll
have that conversation, and see how we can further
strengthen the program.
And there's comments about, you know, even future, the next cycle. What are some strengths that we may want to make to the Blueprint, for instance. We'll have that conversation as well.

So that's what I'm walking way from this conversation. One, ambitious program. We've achieved the statutory deadlines, many that were already established for the first year and a half. We have a lot of in front of us, and we're not pulling any punches about the difficulty of this program. I'm trying to be really straight up about that, and kind of layout the fact that -- that we're going to -- there are going to be, the point I made, some hiccups and some learnings and we'll be open about that. We'll be open with stakeholders. We'll be open with you. But how can we learn from one another in terms of the adjustments Blueprint, adjustments in terms of how the steering committees are playing out. And really periodic reports to you.

So short run, we'll continue to be participating in the steering committee process. I'll be regrouping with the districts and some others in terms of this -- a touchpoint in terms of lessons learned.

VICE CHAIR BERG: And I appreciate that. I'm -- I'd like to turn back to Assembly Member Garcia and assure you -- I'm hoping that you've heard through the various
comments how committed not only this Board, but our fellow partners are. I think that I so appreciate the example of different skill sets, sending the engineers in versus -- that are very technically oriented. You give them a problem, they can solve that technical problem. But this is a dual process, as we heard from our people that testified. The emotion of being in decades of disadvantage of being in pollution and wanting resolution, to marry those two things together and that skill set is a steep learning curve. And I'm hearing an appreciation for that and a willingness to do that.

I think also that CARB needs to step up just a little bit differently in a partnership role. And that partnership is on mobile sources, and being fully present at the meetings on those communities that have mobile source concerns, and that we're at the table listening, and hearing from our fellow districts, and from the community members, and what are we going to do, what solutions are we going to bring, how are we going to bring those electric buses to those corridors first, what are we going to do to interact to see absolute solutions as quickly as possible? So I would like to offer that.

And, sir, do you have any final thoughts?

ASSEMBLY MEMBER GARCIA: Well, I'll say that it's refreshing to hear that I think we're all on the same page
as it relates to the level of commitment in the implementation of, one, the development of these plans, and then, of course, the implementation. I know that every year, right, we have many people come into the Capitol asking and making their case that more resources is how we'll be able to address their issue.

And there's no doubt that we will need to make a strong commitment to fund these efforts on a reoccurring basis. There's no question about that. We received the two-year funding allocation last year. And I know that the conversations will be before us soon as it relates to moving forward.

But I want to share that there are some, in the Legislature, that believe that much of this work is work that should have already been getting done, focusing on communities that are disproportionately impacted by stationary and mobile sources of pollution, right? And so there are some that believe that the work that we've put forward is more concentrated, but certainly work that fell already within the portfolio of our local air districts and even some responsibilities falling on the Air Resources Board.

I truly believe that we do need to give the resources to our air districts to exercise all of the requirements that we're asking of them to do.
Lastly, I'd like to just state that, you know, our community members, they know what the problems are. They know them probably better than any of us. And so we don't want to kind of question their intelligence on the ground. It's how we communicate with our community members, and making sure that it's the right people in the room having that dialogue and walking away with the reflection of what's being discussed, deliberated, or for that matter suggested that become a priority as we begin the implementation of these plans.

So I believe that, yes, there's been a lot of learning along the way. There's also been a lot of expression of frustration from our community members for years and years of neglect on the very specific issues that they've seen cause tremendous amount of public health problems in their communities.

And as it relates to a public health component to be able to ultimately measure the overall success and the outcome, I am in full favor of that. And if it is something that requires action here or legislative direction, then we're in a very good position, I think, to move that conversation forward.

But I want to thank the level of attention and interest that we've given this in a very short period of time. And I know that it's going to continue to be part
of, I think, what we highlight as an effort to addressing, you know, the long-standing issues in our environmental justice communities that all of us care deeply about, and know that we're making up for a lot of time that we've not paid attention, as we should have, to these very important issues.

So thank you to the staff, Board Members for your comments, as well as for the community members who participated here with us today.

Just briefly.

(Thereupon Assembly Member Spoke in Spanish.)

ASSEMBLY MEMBER GARCIA: And thank you again for allowing me to make some closing remarks.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Okay. As we said, this was an informational item.

And so we do have one last agenda item left, but we're going to take a quick five-minute break, so that means 10 minutes, but it's an honest 10 minutes. So think five, and I'll see you back here at 20 minutes to 3:00.

(Off record: 2:30 p.m.)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record: 2:39 p.m.)

VICE CHAIR BERG: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, let's go ahead and take our seats.

Well, great discussion on our last item.
So our last agenda item number 19-3-3, an informational update as well, on SB 150 report findings. We are now a decade into the implementation of Senate Bill 375, which seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from personal vehicles through a more sustainable land use and transportation planning.

Under Senate Bill 150, CARB was asked to report whether the state is on track in this area. Are the Sustainable Community Strategies adopted by the Regional Metropolitan Planning Organizations resulting in the greenhouse gas reductions as expected.

At our joint meeting with the California Transportation Commission last December, we heard the report findings. Unfortunately, we found that the state is not on track and that currently many metrics are headed rather steeply in the wrong direction.

The outcomes that we see are the result of many agencies at the local, regional, and State level responding in understandable ways to conflicting mandates and to the current structure of incentive, political forces, and policy restrictions.

One thing is clear, there is no easy solution to the complicated topic of how we reverse a century of increasing auto dependence. It is imperative that we build communities in which people of all incomes and
backgrounds have access to affordable housing and can get where they need to go without having to drive long distances.

We know that this will improve public health, reduce time and money that local residents spend on long commutes, reserve natural and working landscapes, and bring more economic opportunity and travel choices to the regions' most underserved residents. If regional Sustainable Communities Strategies are not coming to pass as designed, those benefits are likely being lost as well.

Today, we have an opportunity to talk about what CARB can do better, aligning efforts to address climate, housing, and transportation in ways that build sustainable communities and transportations for all Californians addressing these issues.

Although we cannot solve all these alone, much as the last conversation we had, we must lead by example and make our own efforts to respond to a call for structural changes that are essential to achieve California's greenhouse gas reduction mandates.

Mr. Corey, will you introduce this item for us?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Vice Chair Berg.

Before we get to staff's presentation today, I want to first share some additional thoughts from the
December joint CARB/California Transportation Commission, or CTC, meeting on really where we can go next.

And coming out of that joint meeting, we realized that our two agencies, despite both having an integral role to play in supporting sustainable transportation in communities, are still at the early stages of building our capacity to discuss and take action on these issues in a coordinated way. And really have to also note the significant progress, as you noted as well, will require building stronger partnerships with many others, including local planning agencies and developers.

To recognize the report's call to action and a desire by the Board to make progress, we're bringing back this item for discussion today. And since we've realized -- or rather released the report, action has already started. For example, the Institute of Transportation Studies, led by Professor Sperling, has held roundtables throughout the state to identify priority policy and research needs for the State of California related to the introduction and transition to shared, automated, electric, and connected mobility. And last month, the Board heard from James Corless, the Director of the Sacramento area MPO about SACOG's innovative efforts to improve implementation of SB 375.

Initially, the report has also accelerated
interdepartmental conversations about what CARB can do in this space.

So where do we go next?

The staff will propose actions CARB can take, but we'd like the Board's input and direction as we identify priorities and embark on this path.

I also want to take this opportunity to talk about some important structural changes we're making in our -- in the organization to ensure close coordination between transportation planning, technology regulations, climate investments, transportation incentives, and research much, we've established a new Sustainable Transportation and Communities Division we'll touch on. We'll share more about that in a moment.

I'll also ask at this point Carey Knecht of our Transportation Planning Branch to begin the staff presentation.

Carey.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: All right.

Thank you, Mr. Corey and Vice Chair Berg. And good afternoon, members of the Board.

A decade ago, Senate Bill 375 took the visionary step of connecting regional housing and transportation
planning to state climate goals. In the years since, many have wondered is this improved planning process changing outcomes on the ground? What progress has been made in this space?

Last year, CARB released a report under Senate Bill 150 to address this question. It asks have we as a State successfully improved our land use and transportation systems in ways that reduced greenhouse gas emissions from personal vehicle travel by making it easy the drive less, potentially also saving families time and money, improving public health, conserving natural resources and making it easier for everyone to get around.

In those 10 years, important work has happened. In regions, with the engagement of thousands of stakeholders, and local cities and towns, every metropolitan planning organization, or MPO, has now created a sustainable Communities Strategy that meets the greenhouse gas targets, and implementation has begun.

At the State too, the Cap-and-Trade Program was launched and has funded significant new investments. Most recently, Senate Bill 1 made important changes to transportation funding. Under SB 150, we ask has all of this been enough? Are we on track as a state?

Unfortunately, what we have learned is that we are not. We are not on track and the outcomes are moving
in the wrong direction.

Today, we will review those sobering findings, and then discuss what we can do about them.

This presentation also supports Resolution 19-10 that Board members will find in your packet.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: Let me begin by providing some context about transportation and California's goals. California has been a pioneer in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. We met our 2020 emissions target four years ahead schedule, in 2016, all while our economy has grown. But we need to pay special attention to transportation. It accounts for nearly half of our GHG emissions, and even more of other air pollution. And despite the rapidly growing number of low- and zero-emissions vehicles, as you can see on the graph, emissions from transportation are stubbornly rising, because of growth in vehicle travel.

And the challenge may be greater now. The Trump administration has proposed to effectively eliminate the greenhouse gas passenger vehicle standards that California, the Obama Administration, and the auto industry agreed to in 2012. So we need to do more.

We need to do more as we look toward achieving our 2030 target and our 2045 goal for carbon neutrality.
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: To understand this trend under SB 150, we looked almost two dozen indicators. Wherever possible, we compared regional Sustainable Communities Strategies against actual on-the-ground progress. We also conducted interviews with over 25 experts from academia, local, regional, and State government, real estate development, and community groups. And we discussed our initial findings with regional agencies and in four public workshops.

A central finding of our analysis is that we are not on track to meet state climate goals under SB 375. We often use vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, as a key indicator of successful Sustainable Communities Strategies progress. Both greenhouse gas emissions in blue, and VMT in orange per person are not much lower than in 2005, and are headed in the wrong direction.

They are not headed toward the green dots, which represents the anticipated progress.

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: There has also been little shift in the proportionate spending planned for mode. We did find some changes in transportation spending, such as shifts in planned spending in some regions from road construction to road maintenance, and...
increase spending on active transportation and transit spending.

But as you can see in this graphic in the four largest regions, when we compared the spending planned by mode for the next couple of decades, we did not find a significant shift between the last and current plan at this macro level as we would have expected.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: Transportation leaders from across the state told us that to solve our transportation challenges, we needed to address the housing crisis. Home construction is greatly behind what is needed, especially for lower income homes. And this is causing costs to soar, as shown in the graph, and maybe lengthening commutes if people have to drive further to find a home they can afford.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: Last, while spending on active transportation and transit has grown, transit service per person, on the left, has only barely recovered from the recession. And as of 2014, transit ridership shown on the right is falling.

So is carpooling to work. Around 75 percent of commuters driver alone, an amount that is staying the same or growing in most regions.
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: These are just a few of our findings, but numbers cannot fully capture what all of this means to people's lives. How we build our communities matters. It helps predict who is healthy and who is sick, and how long people live.

In the San Joaquin Valley for example, life expectancy by zip code can vary by as much as 21 years. And long-standing patterns of segregation mean that this can lead to major inequities among different racial and socioeconomic groups.

We also heard from stakeholders that when we fall short of building homes for people of all incomes near jobs, schools, and parks, it has real impacts on people's quality of life. When people cannot get around without driving, some people have difficulty traveling at all.

One resident from the Barrio Logan neighborhood of San Diego, has a three-hour commute to work each way. She leaves the house at 5:30 in the morning, bikes for 90 minutes to the bus stop, then rides the bus for another hour and a half before she arrives at work. Then the return trip is similar getting her home at 8:30 at night.

So communities are at the heart of California's efforts to address climate change: urban and rural ones, big and small ones. We cannot meet our goals without
reenvisioning the way we plan, and build, and support them.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: So why is this happening and what can we do?

CARB consistently heard concerns over the continued pervasive and longstanding disconnect between the factors that shape growth and development and the state's environmental, equity, climate, health, economic, and housing goals. The report does not conclude that any one particular entity or group is to blame for this. The outcomes are the result of all entities caring out their mandates and acting within the current structure of incentives, laws, and politics.

But the report is a call to action, encouraging governments and agencies to work together to make systemic and structural changes that address that disconnect, and build sustainable communities and transportation networks for all Californians.

The Governor has made clear actions have to include looking at the connection between transportation and housing. Specifically, he has called for California to build 3.5 million homes in the next six years. We'd be building a generation's worth of housing in a very short period. And these homes will then shape communities,
travel and traffic patterns for the next century.

Now is also a pivotal time in transportation. California's regions are poised to spend more than $1 trillion in the coming two to three decades. So we are building tomorrow's infrastructure today, and we must think about how it can make communities more healthy, sustainable, and equitable.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: Many different players are needed to move the ball forward and efforts will need to advance many goals together. To find these solutions will take many agencies, communities, and local leaders working together. Therefore the report recommends that a high level interagency body be asked to undertake a public process to produce a joint action plan, a plan that: identifies responsible parties at the State, regional, and local levels; sets timelines for work on policy, investment strategies, and research; and, recommends improvements to State law.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: But we wanted to bring this to you today to discuss how can we at CARB respond to this call for action.

CARB can play an important role as a leader and through the programs that we have authority over. Of
course, CARB can't do it alone. Real success will require partnerships between agencies and with communities. Those conversations are ongoing and need to expand, but we can also immediately start planning actions that we can take in this area.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: One opportunity relates to how we can help support the construction of homes near jobs, transit, and other opportunity areas. California has already contributed important work to help with the housing crisis.

To date, the Legislature has appropriated over $1 billion in Cap-and-Trade proceeds for projects that connect affordable housing and transportation. CARB also plays a role by providing information and support to local governments as they craft plans that shape land use.

Given how where people live affects their health, local governments need to carefully weigh the benefits of infill development against other considerations, such as exposure to traffic emissions.

CARB's 2005 Land Use Handbook recommended that new sensitive uses not be cited within 500 feet of busy roadways. But how does that square with the need to build affordable housing where people have access to high quality transportation and jobs.
Then to help protect public health while recognizing the benefits of infill in 2017, CARB identified scientifically-backed strategies for reducing air pollution exposure, for those who are living in road -- near roadway environments.

Another resource that we released this year substantiates recommended thresholds of significance used by the Office of Planning and Research in its work under AB 743 to change transportation impact analysis under CEQA for new construction, including housing, in ways that promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multi-modal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses.

But we need to do more, if we're going to help meet our significant housing needs. To support community decision making about the risks of air pollution exposures and the benefits of infill, CARB staff are currently evaluating research needs and possible decision support tools that address CARB's goal of promoting infill and reducing air pollution exposure.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: Just as important as where people can live is what choices do people have for getting from place to place? How can we improve those choices and reduce barriers to mobility?
CARB has a history of building upon successful work in the past, while incorporating important new issues. CARB's mission began with air quality and toxics, important work that continues to today. Then with the passage of AB 32, CARB undertook significant efforts to address climate change.

Now, California is leading the nation in clean vehicle adoption with more plug-in electric vehicles on its roadways than any other state, supported by CARB's Low Carbon Transportation Program and other investments.

Equity for disadvantaged and low-income communities is a core part of California climate investments. Over half of the implemented projects benefit priority populations. The Community Air Protection Program is working to reduce exposure in the communities most impacted by air pollution.

And under SB 350, CARB studied the barriers that low-income residents face to access clean transportation and mobility options. A top recommendation was to conduct Community Transportation Needs Assessments because understanding local needs is critical to making investments that address those barriers.

In response, CARB has already begun to, "Engage community-based organizations and low-income residents...as part of clean transportation access"
community needs assessments, outreach, and regional one-stop shops.

To support this, CARB is also going to undertake a research effort to develop indicators of access to mobility options at the neighborhood scale and plans to create a map of these indicators to help identify disparities between communities. This will help CARB expand programs that address those barriers.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: As we learn more about the barriers to clean mobility, we can increase efforts to address them. Given the scale of the challenge, we must assess what strategies will quickly develop -- deliver positive transportation outcomes. CARB can play a key leadership role here by promoting pilot projects. For example, last month, you heard from the Executive Director at SACOG about their regional effort to promote innovation. Pilots help us test innovative ideas to more quickly find solutions.

Another example is our Clean Mobility Options for Disadvantaged Communities pilot program: grant projects designed to address barriers and transportation needs by funding zero-emission and plug-in hybrid car sharing, vanpools, electric and regular bike sharing, and other clean mobility options.
This program awarded the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and a number of public and private partners, $2.25 million to create mobility hubs in affordable housing complexes in San Jose, Oakland, and Richmond. They will provide electric vehicle sharing and e-bike sharing, and subsidize ride-hailing and public transit services for 2,800 disadvantaged community residents.

One exciting element of this project is that before those mobility options are deployed, the transportation needs of each community will be assessed as envisioned in the SB 350 barriers report.

These projects are already showing success. We also learned that we needed to make it easier to access these funds, especially for smaller projects and in communities with limited resources. Therefore, CARB has allocated $17 million for a statewide administrator to assist and streamline funding.

Another new pilot project will be working to bring transformative changes and clean mobility in schools.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: These pilots have been showing success. But as we learn more about the barriers, needs, and about what is working, we can expand
support for pilots and experimentation, and replicate successful models throughout California.

So CARB will consider new pilots that further advance access to clean mobility, especially for priority populations and identify areas where additional funding is needed to meet the demand for expanding clean transportation and mobility programs.

As the pilot projects show success, CARB can identify areas where additional funding is needed, especially based on lessons learned and from expanding local community needs assessments.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: New mobility options, such as transportation network companies, like Uber and Lyft, can increase access to opportunities and destinations. However, if we don't intervene with thoughtful policies, these services will likely worsen VMT congestion and emissions.

Last month, we kicked off a new regulatory, program, the Clean Miles Standard, in response to a bill authored last year by Senator Skinner. The Clean Miles Standard focuses on reducing greenhouse gas emissions per passenger mile from transportation network companies. The new program will encourage the use of zero-emission vehicles in these platforms, and promote an increase in
passenger miles traveled while reducing vehicles miles traveled.

Strategies include increased vehicle pooling, and connections to public transit, and active transportation modes, such as bike, scooter sharing, and walking.

Through the Clean Miles Standard development, we will explore how the regulation design can promote access of these -- to these transportation opportunities to all Californians in an effort to maximize transportation equity.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: Beyond the Clean Miles Standard, we want to further integrate new mobility options into our programs. There's no question that the deployment of automated vehicles will transform transportation system and our communities.

To improve alignment between California's automated vehicle policy and California's sustainability and social equity goals, staff from State agencies, including CARB, developed the Automated Vehicle Principles for Health and Sustainable Communities. The Clean Miles Standard is the first time a CARB program will be developed following these principles.

Much remains unknown in terms of the impacts of automated vehicles and other new mobility options.
Therefore, we continue to follow and support research in this area.

---o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: CARB can also strengthen its work under SB 375. In 2018, we updated the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for the first time since the program was established. In most regions, targets increased from the original targets set in 2010 and the Board provided new direction regarding how Sustainable Communities Strategies are to be evaluated.

Following that direction and building on what we've learned by reviewing plans for 10 years, CARB is updating the SCS evaluation process with greater focus on four key components: tracking implementation in the regions; assessing the strategies, key actions, and investments committed to in the SCS; reporting on incremental progress from one plan to the next; and highlighting how regions address equity.

---o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: I also want to highlight some important restructuring going on at CARB to meet these new Challenges. We've recently developed a new division, the Sustainable Transportation and Communities Divisions, to bring together key programs at the nexus of sustainable transportation, communities, housing, health,
and equity.

The new Division will make it possible for CARB to address the call to action from the SB 150 report in a more coordinated fashion. It also will make it possible for CARB to increase its engagement with other State agencies to learn from their technical expertise and offer our own.

--o0o--

AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: The presentation today outlined the actions that staff have identified to take, and we have many of the program staff with us today who are leading these efforts to answer any questions you may have. Staff then proposes to come back to you next year with an update on this work.

My question for you today is do these actions capture the most important opportunities that CARB has to advance sustainable transportation and communities for all Californians?

We do know that what we can do alone will not be enough. Our key recommendation continues to be that a high level interagency body host a broad discussion and produce an action plan that will address these issues in a coordinated fashion. We also look forward to working with other local, regional, and State agencies to advance this effort in other ways as well.
AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST KNECHT: Thank you very much. And I'm now happy to take any questions.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much. That was a great presentation. We have eight people signed up to testify, so I think we'll go ahead -- is --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Can I make a comment, because I may not be here at the end?

VICE CHAIR BERG: Oh, yes.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Thanks.

Thanks. This was a very good report. And I appreciate, we've gotten some good public input through letters. I just wanted to say I think the most proactive thing we can do is to -- well, there's many. But I think the most proactive would be to link some of the funding that we make available to local districts as incentive dollars to communities that are taking the right action.

I mean, coming out of local government, it's, I think, the collective failure in local government to take actions that are needed. The plan -- the SB 375 plans, which -- some of which are pretty well thought out, still take local action by cities and counties to implement them. And there's nothing I think more effective at getting local action than tying incentive dollars.

And I think the Governor has taken an interesting
approach by suggesting that some transportation dollars be held back to communities that also aren't meeting certain housing goals. And I think he understands, coming out of local government, that that does get communities to act. And I think there's some value to doing that.

So -- but to the extent that we can control funding, that we -- that we, in our guidelines on that funding, can link that. And I know there will be good ideas discussed here. But link that to the positive actions that are needed to achieve the goals of SB 375.

So I'm just saying that I think that is probably the -- one of the single most important things we can do to get better local action.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Great. Thank you.

And I know, Dr. Balmes, you'll be leaving too. Would you like to make any comments?

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Okay. So again, I agree that this is a very timely report with a lot of good ideas. I guess I'm most concerned about the fact that we, as you point out, need an interagency cross-sector approach to this. I mean, we can't deal with affordable housing having -- have a rational transportation plan, and meet our climate change mitigation and equity goals. And, you know, just to point out a specific example in the Bay Area. I was -- this is the one I was going to bring up
during the freight discussion, but I saved it for this.

So the Macarthur Maze, famous traffic
intersection in the Bay Area, the Department of
Transportation, Caltrans, is talking about raising the
bridges to accommodate trucks -- bigger trucks, taller
trucks to improve freight movement on -- right now dirty
trucks. I mean, they're not as dirty as they used to be,
but they're still diesel.

You know, who made this decision? Was there a
consultation with the Bay Area Air Quality Management
District? And why do they even have to raise these
bridges at the Macarthur Maze? That's because they won't
route trucks through 580 in the -- during the -- in the
wealthy neighborhoods, the predominantly white
neighborhoods of Oakland Hills and Piedmont. They have to
take the connector -- I forget the -- the connector
between --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: The 980 connector, yeah.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: -- 880 and 580, which is
the most direct -- instead of going a quicker way through
Oakland -- through the affluent areas of Oakland and
Piedmont, where -- how are they going to reroute the
trucks when they raise the bridges? It's going to take
years. It's going to add to traffic congestion. It's
going to -- it's already a nightmare traffic congestion
area. I know about it when every time I drive into the city.

It's just going to get worse, which will cause more pollution, more greenhouse gas emissions, and they'll route the trucks through West Oakland, I mean, an already impacted area. I mean, that's an example of the craziness how our Transportation Policy doesn't fit in at all, isn't integrated appropriately with our climate change, health equity policies.

So that's the main thing I wanted to say.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.

And thanks. Have a great weekend when you leave.

Okay. Let's go ahead to our public testimony. We have eight people. Your names are listed up here to my left. And we'll start with Ms. Martinez.

MS. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, Vice Chair Berg and Board members. I am Carolina Martinez with the Environmental Health Coalition. We represent environmental justice communities in the San Diego region. We applaud the Board and the staff for the 150 report, and for your commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The report made the difficult but necessary finding that California is not on track. EHC calls the Board to lead with solutions that demonstrate rapid greenhouse gas reductions. This state's failure to reduce
GHGs puts EJ communities at risk in San Diego. For example, EJ communities are the transit number one customer. However, they cannot rely on the system. Seventy percent of the jobs are not reachable by transit. The system is making our communities sick. It is extremely expensive and very inconsistent. But things are changing slowly. SANDAG recently decided to delay the update of the Regional Transportation Plan after realizing -- after realizing the business-as-usual planning would not achieve the 19 percent GHG targets by 2035. We ask the Board do the same and take bold action to support the MPO -- to support MPOs and hold them accountable.

The following is a summary of the five recommendations that we just submitted in a letter today.

Number one, we ask the Board to support strengthening SB 375 to go beyond target guidelines and require measures proven to connect climate goals with regional and local planning, just as it was mentioned right now.

Number two, expand the 617 Communities Program to include monitoring of MPO performance in EJ communities, understanding local travel patterns, identifying best practices to reduce VMT, and work with 617 communities to implement pilot projects.
Number three, prioritize new technology deployment in EJ communities.

Number four, implement a mobility action plan that demonstrates immediate progress towards VMT reduction.

And number five, support the intersection of affordable housing and environmental protection. CARB must ensure that the urgency to address the affordable housing crisis does not result in the weakening of air quality and land-use guidance.

We are often told that we could just use, for example, filters. And so are our kids supposed to stay indoors 24/7? Is that a measure to address the issue? No. Just because we need affordable housing, we cannot build it next to the freeway. We know that.

So we know that from local experience that if we advance environmental justice, everyone benefits.

We look forward to working with you in the future as we make GHGs and VMT reduction realized.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you. And thank you for coming and staying this afternoon.

Good afternoon

MR. RUSHING: Madam Chair, Rocky Rushing, Coalition for Clean Air. Thank you.
The SB 50 -- 150 report was both illuminating and alarming, regarding how far California regions are behind in meeting GHG reduction mandates. Significant investments are needed in affordable housing near transit and jobs with coordinated planning at the local and regional levels. That's not happening.

VMTs and gas consumptions are on the rise and they're not tracking with the little green dots that we on staff's presentation.

Transportation sector turns out more GHGs than any other sector in our economy. The housing shortage and affordability contributes to longer commutes. At a seminar yesterday, I heard yet another alarming statistic that California has six million cars on the road that are 20 years or older. And these are the very same vehicles that are making these long commutes because of the housing shortage and affordability.

SB 526 by Senator Allen, which CCA supports, would implement recommendations of the SB 150 study, but its passage is far from guaranteed.

CCA urges CARB and air quality districts to better engage in local and regional planning decisions when feasible. And I think air quality districts are uniquely qualified to weigh in on local and regional planning decisions as they're comprised of elected
officials at the local and county level. And I think we heard this morning and this afternoon during the freight and 617 discussions how in some -- somewhat enlightens the discussion about how CARB and local air districts can better engage.

And we think the notion of linking funding to 375 implementations, as well as the suggestions by the Environmental Health Coalition just presented to you makes sense, as well as those by staff deserve good consideration.

Amid this complex issue of the -- is the Clean Miles Standards. The Clean Miles Standard is an incentive program currently being crafted by CARB staff. As you know, it's the implementation of SB 1014. It is not a panacea for the housing/job/transportation conundrum.

However, it's a small but important step in reducing emissions per passenger mile by putting transportation network companies, like Lyft and Uber, on the road to electrification. Staff is now working to create a baseline, which will be the basis for future emission reduction targets. And we urge staff to aggressively seek data from TNCs to ensure that the baseline and the subsequent targets are sound.

And we would also like to see within the Clean Miles Standard incentives for clean technology, reduced
VMTs through fewer so-called deadhead miles, increased transit linking, active transportation, and ride sharing.

And with that, thank you so much. Have a great rest of your day.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you. And have a good evening too.

MR. BARRETT: Hi. Good afternoon. I'm will Barrett with the American Lung Association.

First off, I wanted to thank staff for the excellent report. It really was a wake up call. And I think its a prompted a lot of thought, and shows a real need for action. So I really do appreciate the thorough necessary of that report.

In our letter with about a dozen health organizations throughout California that we submitted, we really just wanted to restate our commitment and our strong support for implementing 375 to the greatest extent possible, and acting on the progress report.

All of our organizations that sign on to that letter in the broader public health community are deeply troubled by the lost opportunities identified in the report to improve local health, boost active transportation, reduce our dependence on vehicle travel, and cut harmful pollution from the transportation sector.

We also recognize the inequities caused by land
use, and transportation, and housing decisions that
displace established communities, generate those super
commutes, and all of the pollution, health, equity,
family, and social challenges that that creates.

So we do urge the Board to move forward, to the
greatest extent possible, to move all of the
recommendations forward that are in the report. We hope
that you can address those issues that you can control
directly, and work with your partner agencies, local
governments, the MPOs, and other stakeholders to move
these discussions forward, bring these solutions to life,
close the data gaps that are identified in the report.

I think a really important note is that there's
no single public agency tracking displacement in
California. Now, that was a stunning finding in the
report, and I think really poses a lot of thought that we
need to address, and also harnessing the new mobility
opportunities that I know Dr. Sperling's group is working
hard to work on.

The progress report really does make it
abundantly clear that we need stronger actions to ensure
that the work of the MPOs, the local governments, and our
other State agencies are really moving forward in the
right direction.

The key finding in the report, it was
recommendation number one, identifies that basically our transportation, and land-use investments can't be working across purposes anymore to our health and climate goals. So really appreciated what Dr. Balmes and Supervisor Gioia started this conservation with on that front.

And just to note that we are co-sponsoring the legislation by Mr. Allen, SB 526, to really bring this discussion forward, implement the progress report recommendations, ensure that data-driven SCS reviews go forward and really prioritize the most beneficial projects are put in place when -- when we find that those plans -- the SCS plans are not delivering as we intended them.

The last thing I wanted to say was just in the restructuring of the ARB divisions, I think that is a great example of leading by example. And I hope that other State agencies take that to heart, follow your lead, and really make this issue central to their missions.

So thank you very much for all the great work. We're looking forward to working with you. And, you know, expressing again the public health organizations commitment to this critical topic.

So thank you all.

MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Vice Chair Berg, CARB Board members, and CARB staff. My name is Aidan Smith, and I'm a policy coordinator the Leadership Counsel for
Justice and Accountability. Leadership Counsel is a community-based advocacy organization that works in the San Joaquin Valley and the Coachella Valley.

We appreciate CARB staff's hard work in producing the SB 150 progress report and the attention that the CARB Board has given to addressing the report's overarching issue, which is that California is not on track to meet its GHG emission reduction targets.

And I'd like to raise the following points:

First, the SB 150 report calls for a stronger equity analysis within the Regional Transportation Plans. CARB should ensure that the Sustainable Communities Strategy within the plans deliver timely results to low-income and disadvantaged communities, focus on the unique transportation needs of rural communities, adequately respond to public input, and are consistent with fair housing requirements.

As the report notes, the agency has been reluctant to review the extent to which these plans address equity, arguing that its authority is limited to assessing GHG reductions. However, equity as a goal is inseparable from the goal of reducing GHG emissions.

Second, as the presentation showed, there has been very little shift in expenditures by transit mode in the RTPs. And we know we need to explicitly -- we need
explicit policy commitments that further equity and environmental justice in the SCSs. CARB needs to identify mechanisms for reprioritizing project expenditures when emission reduction and equity goals are not being met.

Third, we support the development of pilot projects to address the mobility needs of disadvantaged communities. For example, we worked with the community of Cantua Creek to launch the Van y Vienen program, an all-electric rural ride-share program connecting residents to economic, health, and educational opportunities while reducing greenhouse gases. These types of programs should be expanded and supported.

However, while we are supportive of pilot projects, we're even more supportive of a fundamental realignment of transportation expenditures, so that they better align with State climate goals. We therefore request that in today's resolution, the Board directs staff to initiate these efforts.

And finally, the SB 150 report recommends the formation of an interagency body. We support the report's recommendation to form an interagency body, and would like to see the resolution today amended, so that it -- so that it directs -- and right now it reads that the Board supports the recommendation. But we would like to see it say that it directs CARB staff to form that body in
collaboration with other staff agencies.

This body would help integrate funding streams across agencies, align climate, equity, housing, and transportation goals, and ensure systematic tracking of transportation data across the state.

And finally, we would also like to implore CARB to help shape that interagency body, so as to be inclusive of different stakeholders and diverse viewpoints. That group cannot solely be -- cannot solely consist of State agencies and should create a space for individuals and groups who work on the ground to also engage.

These stakeholders would be able to lift up the challenge they see in the communities where they live and work, and propose solutions that shift current paradigm, a paradigm that we know is failing us.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

Kevin?

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: You call his name and he's not here.

(Laughter.)

VICE CHAIR BERG: I did call it last time.

Well, we're missing Kevin. We'll move on to Stephanie.

MS. TSAI: Hopefully, he'll come back.
Hi again.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Hi.

MS. TSAI: I'll keep this brief. I'm with CEJA, California Environmental Justice Alliance. We, you know, support EHC and Leadership Counsel's recommendations and comments. And I think, you know, just want to -- we just want to point out that, you know, we -- we agree that we need to fundamentally rethink, you know, what -- the scale of this is -- effort is really large, right? We know that we need to fundamentally rethink the way that planning and infrastructure investments are made in our state. And, you know, I want to highlight that for us, one particular thing that that means is that we need to redirect -- we need to redirect transportation infrastructure investments to encourage more, you know, affordable, accessible public transit and other mobility options in low-income communities and communities of color.

And that looks different in different areas, right? We mean both urban and rural. They -- you know, EJ communities -- as my colleague pointed out, you know, people need to be able to get around and they need to be -- you know, they need to have options so that they don't have to rely on passenger vehicles. So that's -- you know, that's a fundamental shift.

And so on that effort, you know, we appreciate
CARB staff really making that effort to work together with, you know, CTC and other agencies. And we really encourage and recommend that interagency collaboration. And, you know, CEJA wants to be a resource in this effort. So we look forward to further engaging.

Thanks.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

Good afternoon.

MR. ESCARCEGA: Good afternoon. My name is Christopher Escarcega. I am the regional engagement coordinator with Climate Plan.

A little bit about Climate Plan. Climate Plan is a network of about 50 organizations statewide working together to build healthier, equitable, and sustainable communities.

First of all, I'd like to thank staff for the robust analysis, findings, and recommendations in the 150 report. The report was a real wake-up call. We are not on track to achieve our targets or expected health, equity, and other benefits envisioned by SB 375. The Board knows this as well.

We appreciate and -- we are appreciative and supportive of CARB's focus on the report, and implementing its recommendations. As proposed by staff, CARB can do a lot to advance research, data analysis, and policy
options. But as we know, this won't be enough. Responding to the SB 150 report requires legislation and interagency coordination as well. We ask that CARB shepherd these recommendations forward to CTC, OPR, SGC, and other agencies, local governments, regional planning agencies, as well as the Legislature.

In particular, as stated by several Board members at the February meeting, we must focus on ensuring that the state's transportation investments support, rather than hinder, the region's ability to achieve these targets.

The joint CTC/ARB meetings provide the space and time to focus on this aim of aligning the state's transportation funding with the state's climate goals. We ask that CARB continue to work towards making these joint meetings action oriented and productive. Fortunately, there is a great opportunity for action on this front.

Today, the CTC is hosting a workshop to kick-off the process to update SB 1 funding program guidelines. We ask that CARB offer their research and analysis expertise to CTC in this important process.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you, and thanks for staying.

Jared, you'll be our last speaker.
MS. SANCHEZ: Great. Hi. Jared Sanchez with CalBike. I just want to generally thank and appreciate the report. Pleased that the impact that it's had has been, I think, quite useful. Thank you. It took some courage in releasing it. So I really appreciate that as well.

First, just want to point out and fully support the comments made by Environmental Health Coalition, and Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability. I think it's important and it should be vital for the most marginalized communities to have the ability to decide what they want and how the communities exist, just like any other community should.

I also understand that ARB is just one actor of a variety of actors. I understand your limit of authority on this issue and topic area, especially when you start to talk about aligning transportation funding investments with State mandates and priorities around GHGs, air quality, and equity.

But with that said, I hope to see more pressure through your interagency coordination, specifically with the California Transportation Commission, and to improve the joint meetings, just mentioned by Christopher, that you hold them twice a year.

I think you made it clear at least month's Board
meeting that CTC is not only extremely resistant, but also
a major roadblock and extremely counterproductive for 375
progress. So I can only hope that you all continue to
model that for CTC in particular, what effort encourages
look like, and to really implement the findings in this
report.

And again, thank you for your leadership on this.
VICE CHAIR BERG: And thank you very much.

So even though this is an informational item, we
do have a resolution to vote on. So I will now close the
record on this agenda item. And going back to staff's
question, they had asked us what additional priorities or
do they have the right priorities in approaching this
challenge that we're having under 1 -- SB 350 -- 375,
sorry. 150. 375. It's getting a little late.

(Laughter.)
VICE CHAIR BERG: So to open this up, I think
we'll turn to Dr. Sperling.

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: How did you know I had
something to say?

(Laughter.)
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: I actually -- sitting
here, I started getting more pumped up.

(Laughter.)
BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: And so, you know, I think
the presentation in the 150 report was clear eyed, and
actually very good. But I actually would say it's a lot
worse than what was presented in the report. And
someone -- one of the test -- commenters used the
expression that the current paradigm is failing us. And I
don't know exactly how broadly that person meant it. But
it's failing us in a really broad way, because it's not
just, you know, greenhouse gases or even sprawl. Say --
you know, fatalities are increasing on our roads,
especially with pedestrians. Congestion is getting worse.

The whole idea of equity I think is being defined
too narrowly, because we're not really fully appreciating
how -- what poor accessibility large percentages of our
population have. And that -- that share of the population
is going to increase as there's more elderly people, as
well as low income, and disabled.

So, you know, in almost every way, you know, it
is failing us. It's kind of -- you know, the more -- I've
been studying transportation for decades, written many
books, and I just think we're not appreciating what's
happening. It's kind of like the frog in the water -- in
the water that keeps getting warmer and warmer. I mean,
that ends really badly. I'm not sure it's going to end
that badly for us. But it's going to end -- it's just
getting worse and worse, and we're tolerating it. And
we're not fully appreciating, you know, how dysfunctional our transportation system has become.

And I say that, because there are now opportunities to do it a lot better. And I think we're not fully grasping those opportunities. So we're not fully appreciating how bad it is, and we're not fully appreciating the opportunities that exist.

So if we look at it -- if we look at it -- you know, we frame it around SB 375. And that's good, you know, in terms of framing it. And as many people have said, it's -- it changed the discourse a little bit, but it didn't really change anything in a fundamental way.

So, you know, looking forward, I think what's -- what I would urge -- so I look -- read the resolution and, you know, it sounds fine, I guess. But what is really needed is, one, a broad appreciation of how fundamentally -- the fundamental problems we have with our transportation system. And it's environmental, it's economic, and it's equity, and it's congestion in a fundamental way.

And so what do we do about this? So I think, you know, you listen to who testified here. It's a tiny fraction of the stakeholders we need to be participating in this, if we really expect change.

And so -- and probably, you know, the
stakeholders, in many ways, that are most critical, are the local governments. So, you know, I was disappointed John Gioia -- Supervisor Gioia left, but we've got a number of other local government people here. Because if we're going to really make progress, they need to be full partners in this. And how do we do that?

So I've been a champion of aligning transportation goals with environmental goals and what that means with funding and CTC. And, yeah, that's all good, but -- and I hope there's smarter and more politically effective people around that are going to make that happen.

But a realistic way to look at it is if there's new funding -- okay. I've got a long speech -- lecture here. I'm sorry, but, you know, I've got passion here.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: We need to start -- okay. So we need to engage local governments. They're not going to -- you know, whether it's land -- how they look at land use, infill development, roads, you know, transit, new ways of partnering with the Ubers and Lyfts of the world, they don't have the capacity and they don't have -- in any way whatsoever to really do much for the most part.

So what's the answer is money. So Assembly Member Garcia and I were having a good chat about it comes
down the dinero, money. And so I think what we need to think -- so I'm raising the discussion here a little bit. But I'd be -- because I think we need to do that.

And what we need to be thinking about is how do by generate new types of funding that can be used to, you know, reward, support, incentivize a lot of these local governments?

So that's why I said, Supervisor Gioia, I thought he was too restrained in what he was saying before he left. And so some of the ideas are that, you know, how -- where do we get new funding?

Okay. You know, we can tweak some of the transportation funding, which is an enormous amount of money. And local -- and there's sales tax sources and other ways. It can be tweaked. But as the report showed, so far it's not been successful.

So what are we talking about? So, you know, we are moving into an era where the gasoline tax doesn't work, and the traditional transportation community knows it. They're getting desperate, so that makes them more open-minded about new ideas. So they're talking about road user charges and congestion pricing. We need to be fully engaged in that, because that can be, you know, a perfect mechanism for generating some of this extra funding that can be used in a different way.
We have parking pricing that can be used in the more dense areas in creative ways. With the 617 -- so Assembly Member Garcia, he's focused on providing more funding through 617. But most of the things that you'd want to do are very well aligned with what we want to do in a broader way with transportation. So that is -- it's a way of tapping leveraging the Legislature in another way. And then, of course, there's the Cap-and-Trade funds, but everyone wants those.

So we've got -- you know, I think that's the way we want to do it. You know, essentially, this is going back to the local governments and getting them to buy in. And it's not necessarily going to be that they're going to buy in on doing anything in particular. But we need to buy -- get them buying in to this whole approach and helping them with their capacity, and -- because they're going to want to do things like, you know, maybe just take empty parking lots and turn them into parks, or they're going to underground wires, or fix sidewalks.

But if we do those things with them, they're going to buy in to some of the broader land-use changes that we need, the transit changes that we need. So I think that's why we need these broader partnerships, because otherwise we're not going to make much progress, I don't think, in my humble opinion.
So, you know, there's lots of ideas here. Pilot testing is great, create a program. And I have to say, I came up with a lot of these ideas, because I testified to Congress on this general topic a few weeks ago.

And talking to the staff of the congressional committees, they were saying kind of what I said, not quite in so much detail, but they said that we're not going to change funding formula -- funding -- existing funding formulas. There's too much entrenched constituencies. You know, maybe we can make small changes. But if we can bring in new funding -- and I think that -- so that's where I've ended up.

And there's lots of ideas. You know, the new mobility, there's lots of things we can do with that. There's lots of things that we create choice that will open up the transportation opportunities in all kinds of ways we can't even imagine. I mean, scooters didn't even exist two years ago. Uber and Lyft didn't exist 10 years ago. Heck, even electric vehicles were really not here 10 years ago.

So a lot has changed and there's a lot of paralysis, I guess, because everyone is afraid of the future. And I -- so, you know, that's kind of more than just responding to the report, but I hope that -- you know, I hope that inspires people. And the challenge for
CARB is, you know, we're one piece of it, but I think we've got -- we're building up the staff through our Transportation Division, which I think is really important, because that provides us with some of the staff capability to support the things we're talking about, because frankly, no one else is leading.

And I think some of the Governor's appointments are going to be sympathetic to this and supportive. So I think we should -- I encourage the staff and the leadership here to really be even more brazen, even more ambitious than what the report suggests, and what the presentation suggests.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Mitchell.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you, Madam Vice Chair.

As a person that represents local government, and a member of the Metropolitan Planning Organization, Southern California Association of Governments, I want to comment that coming through the Legislature this year is quite a lot of legislation that is aimed at affordable housing. And one thing I'm seeing from local government, there is some segments of local government that are really pushing back on anybody taking over their local land-use authority. And there's a group of those people who are
going to pursue a constitutional amendment that prohibits anybody from taking away their local land-use authority.

So I think we have to be careful on how we address this. But collaborative efforts I think could be really successful. And part of what we do when we think about this is we have to imagine -- and MPOs do this, they have to imagine what their region will look like in 20 years, because they plan pretty far out, so -- and that -- that's the hard part of this too, I think, that what we do today, how is that going to fit the needs of the future?

But this is really hard. I mean, we have seen this. The coordinating housing near where you live and near where transportation is, a lot of it is market driven, and we can't control those markets.

So -- but one of -- one thing the Legislature is working on is they're working on new ways of getting funding in for affordable housing. So there's a slough of, you know, enhanced infrastructure districts and that sort of thing.

So there will be some funding along those lines. But I think key to all of this is the proper planning as well. And that -- that's really difficult. You have areas like Los Angeles, the six-county region of SCAG, which is spread all over the place. Even here in Sacramento, when I fly in and see how far the housing goes
outside the borders of this city into the farm lands, and
that's what we wanted to do avoid. We wanted to keep
things more central, and we wanted to keep housing more
dense.

So a lot of people don't want to live like that.
You know, they'd rather drive two hours to work. As the
example you showed, Carey, that there are some people who
get up at 4:00 in the morning, and their journey into
their jobs is three, four hours. That's a life choice
they've made, you know, and -- but it isn't -- certainly
isn't a good life choice.

Anyway these are -- I don't have the answers.
I'm looking at Dr. Sperling for that.

But we certainly have a challenge. There is a
challenge, but I do think more interagency collaboration
is key to this. I think that's a real positive move
forward. So I encourage us to go with that.

So thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Any other?

Mr. Eisenhut.

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: There we go. So I'd just
like -- this is not going to be instructive for staff, but
I'll take a moment to just connect a couple dots, because
I think it's an interesting piece of history.

Fifty-one years ago in March, when then Governor
Reagan signed the enabling legislation for California Air Resources Board, his comment at the signing of that legislation was, "Everyone deserves clean air".

Today, this morning, I heard in Spanish, translated for us, "We deserve clean air", from a stakeholder from -- who came here to talk to us from Fresno. So there's continuing work to be done. But I thought that of the three major topics of conversation today, I am heartened because I reflect on this meeting as one of the most honest meetings I've had since I joined this Board.

It's been -- the freight plan was specific. The democratization of community air control and 617 is honestly addressed and work-in-progress, but there's a sense of joint -- of shared mission. And the 150 discussion was -- is an honest assessment of the challenges that we face. I'm not a big believer in looking backward to assess responsibility, but I am interest in retrospective learning. And I just reflected that this meeting is really, as I see it, a springboard, and I'm heartened. So thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.
Thank you, Ms. Takvorian. Yes, please.
BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you.
Well, Dr. Sperling just shifted my thinking as
usual.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: And I think -- I really appreciate staff and the bold report, as we talked about earlier -- or last year, I guess, December. I think it reflects a lot of the voices of the community. I think it reflects the truth. And I think I agree with you, I liked your statement -- this isn't the one I like the most, but the one I thought was the truest was the resolution is okay. And it takes us that -- it makes that incremental change that we need -- or step that we need to take.

But, you know, we need dramatic action to push this transformation. And when you reflected on where Uber and Lyft were not even five years go or 10 years ago, where we were with electric vehicles, so why aren't we seeing that dramatic transformation with mass transit?

You know, that's the key of -- that one of the things that's going to really move us. And we're not seeing that, and there's probably lots of reasons why. But one of them is, not only with transit, but with alternative forms of transportation, is we've really invested heavily. And getting people into electric cars, we're giving incentives. We're -- we have requirements. So why aren't we giving those kinds of incentives for people who are walking, and biking, and taking the bus? I
mean, why are people who can afford fairly expensive cars getting all these incentives and subsidies, and people who can't, and are taking buses, and doing the right thing, and taking transit, why aren't they getting those subsidies?

So I want that to get really considered in terms of implementation, because it gets to the heart of how folks in disadvantaged communities get around. And they're not getting any incentive. They're getting increased bus fares and not really an incentive to get around.

The other thing that's disturbing to me is that the MPOs aren't here. I mean, they were sure here when we were setting the GHG targets for them, and they had a lot to say about that, but this -- and they got what they wanted, which was a modest reduction in my view. But this is the report that I think is helping them to make that implementation. So they should be here to talk to us about what they think about that. I don't think any of us want to go home and hear, well, there CARB went again and it was reasonable, or we liked it, or whatever. I would love to have heard from them. And I understand that staff was talking to them, but it would have been good, I think, for the Board to have heard from them as well.

I wanted to reinforce what Supervisor Gioia was
saying about incentives for districts and local
governments that are doing the right thing. I think we
should think about those. I appreciate that the Governor
is talking about transportation dollars being held back if
affordable housing goals aren't met. I hope that
transportation and other dollars are held up back if
transportation goals aren't met.

So what happens if those targets aren't met,
which this report clearly says is going to happen? So
perhaps that should be on the table as well.

So those are the things that I hope that get --
we can keep discussing. And while I think it's okay to
form an advisory committee and we support that, I am --
I'm worried about the bureaucracy it's going to take to
create that committee and all of that that's going to move
forward, and that it will slow us down a bit.

So I hope it doesn't. I know that's not the
intention, but just wanted to add that as a caution as
well.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.

Supervisor Fletcher.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Yeah. Thank you. One of
the speakers mentioned this being a wake-up call. And I
think a lot of us certainly hope that is the case. You
know, it is a stark realization that after a decade of
work, and effort, and committees, and task force, and
groups that you continue to see, particularly the
transportation sector get worse.

You know, in San Diego, it was also mentioned our
MPO finally came out and acknowledged we're not going to
meet the goals. And I know Diane is certainly aware of
this. You know, five years ago, I wrote an op-ed that
said, hey, SANDAG, you're not going to meet your goals.
Your Regional Transportation Plantation is not real. It
is not consistent. It's not going to get there. And it
was widely mocked panned. And then here we come back five
years later, and we've essentially wasted a decade in
transportation planning in the San Diego region.

And I think that the struggle that's going on is
one that has to be engaged in and really driven. You
know, you mentioned the local land-use authority. If
local governments want to -- and I say this as a local
elected official local. If local governments want to
retain their land-use authority, then they should probably
become more aware and more appreciative of the realities
of what's happening in these communities with air quality,
and realities of what's happening when it comes to
housing, and the realities of what's happening when
transportation funding is not put in the right ways.

And if local governments don't want to do that,
then maybe they should lose their land-use authority, right? Maybe that is what should happen. Because when we go to local governments and we say you haven't built any new housing in all these areas, and they say, well, tell people to come back when they can afford it, like that's not -- that's not an acceptable way to deal with this.

And we deal with this in our own county. In our county, we have tens of thousands of units of infill development that's available, that could be ministerial permitted. But we have created a unit in our own county where we zone land that say it cannot be built on, because it's fire prone, it destroys multiple species conservation plans, it's in back country, there's no transportation to get there, it would sky rocket VMTs and greenhouse gas emissions, and then developers come in and buy the land for nothing, because you can't build on it.

And then they jam through general plan amendments, because they can get local elected officials to go along with what they want. And so we create the speculation of land use that incentivizes people to do the exact opposite of what they should do.

And so then the only recourse becomes a series of litigation surrounding Climate Action Plans. And so, at a certain point, I hope that this is a wake-up call for our MPOs, I hope it's a wake-up call for our local
governments, and I hope it's a wake-up call for everyone who represents folks who cares about these issues.

You know, it was two weeks go in an interview, I just said, yeah, we should just start being honest about the challenges we face in this situation. I believe we need to have more transportation funding for transit. That means less money roads. I think we need more bike paths, that means less street parking.

And I think that this notion that we can kind of just everyone can have it all. It's like no, we have to fundamentally change our thinking, and our approach, and what we're doing.

Yesterday, in San Diego, we rolled out a ballot measure. We want to go to the voters in 2020 for our MTS, our Metropolitan Transit System, to do a sales tax for a transit-only ballot measure. You know, and everyone said, well, you can't pass it? Well, I don't know. We're going to go out and see if we can or if we can't. But it's not -- we're not saying, well, we're going to widen freeways and we're going to do this.

No. We're saying this is consistent with where we have to go. And so I think it's -- it's hard. But the constant reliance on sales tax, and this comes down to the funding, is a challenge, because a lot of us really don't like sales taxes. It's horribly regressive.
And so I am very interested in what are other possible funding vehicles that could be used. I'm very interested -- I know L.A. County is looking at congestion pricing and how that might work. I'm interested. I read a thing which I'd mentioned about a potential tire fee, you know, which has a direct correlation to the actual miles driven, and it also has a correlation of the value of the vehicle. If you have a 4,000 pound Expedition, your tires cost more, but you can probably afford more. There's a way to do it a little bit less regressive.

But I'm interested in what are those vehicles that local entities, and transportation agencies, and local governments might use, other than just sales taxes.

And then I think the incentive part is key. I think, whether it's strengthening existing legislation, whether it's something we do, but there has to be at some point some carrot and stick. Because when you're in a resource deprived state, and you're trying to make decisions about what's going on, and you have to weigh the ability of passing things with what voters want to fund and those types of things, I think local government is feeling strong pressure, perhaps with a stick, and also being -- seeing the opportunity for strong incentives is really the only way I think we can avoid not being back here in four years saying, well, okay, it got worse, but
it didn't get as worse as it did last time.

I mean, it's -- to move this is really going to kind a take a rethinking of things. And so my hope would be that this report does serve as a wake-up call for folks outside of this room who are probably aware of the challenges than others, so we can really begin to fundamentally realign our priorities, and that does start at the local level.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much, Supervisor Fletcher.

Dr. Sherriffs.

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Thank you.

Supervisor Fletcher, this is the first chance I've had to hear you speak. That was great. Thank you. Say more.

The staff asked for suggestions of specific things that we might do. And I then started hallucinating, because it's getting close to 4:00 o'clock and I'm getting hypoglycemic, and I'm saying, great, we'll send a staff member to every local meeting to think about how what they're doing locally is -- yeah --

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: (Shakes head.)

No.

(Laughter.)
BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Right. Okay. But --
(Laughter.)
BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: But -- well, should there be someone from the appropriate agencies that we seem to working our cross-purposes off? And should there be somebody from PUC, CEC, Transportation Commission, and the list could go on, but -- at all the meetings, so that we can turn to them and say, you know, is this consistent with what you're doing? And if not, well, we need to have another discussion somewhere to figure out how to align these things.

And likewise for ARB staff to be at those meetings to recognize, wait a minute, this is undoing what we're doing. We need to have a discussion somewhere to change this direction.

You know, a lot of the theme of the meeting today is look to empowering local concerns, local folk. Mr. Eisenhut's comments about the theme of the day. Well, we're going to -- we're developing, and soon we'll be out with a Freight Guideline. Do we need guidelines on how to support 375, what you can do locally to support the goals of 375?

I don't know. Maybe that's an impossible task. Maybe it doesn't make sense. But maybe -- you know, they're -- just as we're looking at the Freight Guidelines
as a way to empower other people to help us in this task, maybe guidelines about 375 would be helpful, so...

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you very much.

We have a resolution in front of us.

I just have it here.

Voilà.

Resolution 19-10. What is the Board's pleasure?

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Madam Chairman, I would move approval. It gives us a beginning. And I think that's -- that's what we're -- where need to start.

VICE CHAIR BERG: So I do hear from the Board it is a beginning, but I also heard from the Board that we'd be interested in beefing it up. But for purposes of today, do I have a second?

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Second.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

All in favor?

(Unanimous ayes vote.)

(Supervisor Gioia, Dr. Balmes and Senator Florez were not present.)

VICE CHAIR BERG: Any opposed?

Any abstentions?

And with that, we will pass.

I will just recap what I did hear from the Board, however, which was really funding to reward MPOs or cities
for successes. I heard the carrot and stick is just -- it is very critical. Let's put -- see how we can put some meat on the bones to be able to encourage these cities to align their transportation goals with truly our climate goals. Be bold. CARB being bold in your asking. Also, how do we tap into the housing and jobs, the live and work, what is moving forward along with proper planning? How do we tap into that? And I think we heard a little bit more about that from Dr. Sherriffs.

I really like the idea of incentives for walk, bike, and transit. I think that really has an interesting catch to it. It would be interesting to see CARB put some -- maybe some thought behind that.

Of course, interacting with local governments, regional states. We're already doing that. Maybe we need to step back and figure out how could that look differently? Because what we're currently doing, we're spending a lot of time and effort, but we're not quite getting the return for the time and effort. So maybe we ought to look at that differently somehow.

And then also, a guideline how to support 375. Just again reaching for how can we get the information out even to our local citizens.

So great job, staff. And thank you very much. It won't be the end of this topic either, and not easy,
but we do thank you for all your efforts.

Steve, did you have any closing remarks?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER CLIFF: I just want to say how much I appreciate the comments by the Board and for indulging us and asking a somewhat open-ended question, and for listening to this report on SB 150 now for the second time. I'm really pleased with the report's findings in terms of the open, honest assessment, and really look forward to working with you on making this next one in four years be an actual progress report that shows that we've made progress, and not going in the wrong direction.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Great. Thank you very much.

So as we say good night to our -- as our staff, we do have one public hearing -- one public request to speak. Chris Brown. And, Chris, we have three minutes for public hearing, just like we do for our agenda items. And so the microphone is yours, sir.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. I'm Chris Brown, AICP. I'm Air Pollution Control Officer for Feather River Air Quality Management District Yuba and Sutter counties.

Appreciate being here all day. As a land-use planner, all of this material is stuff that I was talking about 20 years ago in the Bay Area. And unfortunately, it all comes back around again.
I wanted to talk briefly about the City of Marysville. And I did get some good news today from CARB staff. So this is sort of a good news story, but I think it's also a lessons learned story. So I'm going to be very brief.

Marysville is a small community in our community -- in Yuba County. It's 90th percentile in CalEnviroScreen and employment, meaning a lot of unemployment; 96 percentile in cardiovascular problems, meaning a lot of heart problems, a lot of lungs problems; and it's 92 percent in CalEnviroScreen in poverty. This is a poor, low-income, very disadvantaged community for a lot of reasons, so of them related to land use actually.

And as a result of the Camp Fire and a number of other emergencies in Northern California, they are seeing 5,000 trucks potentially a day that are being driven through that community. And those trucks are actually exempt from CARB regulations. This is due to the Governor's Executive Order, and the Declaration of Emergency.

Thankfully, Michael today pulled me aside and said, you know, we are going to get some modeling data, and we are going to get some air monitoring to monitor that situation. But it's taken about a month to get that commitment from CARB. And I know they've worked
diligently to try to do it. There isn't a funding stream. There was an organization many years ago - I've been doing this for too long - called CARPA, which is the California Air Planning Response Alliance, and -- or Air Response Planning Alliance.

And that organization has fallen into disrepair due to some retirements at ARB. ARB used to co-chair it along with EPA. I don't think we can expect much from our federal partners anymore, but I really would hope that ARB would revitalize this program. It lives in the Laboratory Division. And it's really important for us to have regular meetings, trainings, work on coordination.

We're going to see more disasters. Just a short list of what we've seen in Marysville since 2007. We had the dam collapse -- near collapse and evacuation. That included 18 months of trucks going through town going the other way carrying rock up to Butte County. We had fires in 2007 -- or 2017. Did not get a lot of press, but resulted in four dead, 180 homes burned. And that clean-up came through that community as well.

In 2018, we had the largest fire in California history, the Mendocino Complex, which came in and impacted us for months at a time. We're directly downwind from that.

And just this year, of course, we had the Camp
Fire. And now we have the Camp Fire clean up, which is almost a separate incident.

So -- and we're not alone in rural communities facing this challenge. Those of you who represent areas that have been impacted know. So I think CARB could do more coordination with its State partners, and we could have a quicker response to these incidents, and particularly revitalize that office.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you so much, Chris.

MR. BROWN: Sure.

VICE CHAIR BERG: And thank you for coming and spending the day. We have a couple of comments and questions. And So I'm going to first turn to Supervisor Serna.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Yeah. Thank you. Thanks, Chris, for being patient and waiting around to explain something that I think is very important for everyone to hear. I just want to emphasize, specially for our executive team, that I agree with Chris, this is something that whether it takes the form of some resurrected group that was once kind of on top of these types of issues or is something new, I think there has to be a better way than treating these more frequent events on ad hoc basis.

I think you rightfully see the administration go into high gear when is necessary, when we have something
as traumatic as a wildfire that, you know, devastates an entire city. But I think there has to be a lot of thoughtfulness as to what some of the unintended consequences can be, especially from a health perspective -- public health perspective, so that we don't have these kind of after-the-fact conversations about 5,000 trucks going through a very small community.

So I'm hopeful that our team will take the brief testimony we heard today from Chris and other side conversations he's had with staff to heart. And I'll certainly avail myself as a representative for Feather River and the other four districts that I represent here to help facilitate whatever needs to happen, so that we have something in place. I think it's a critically important thing for us to be aware of.

And, you know, unfortunately, I think with the effects of climate change, it's not going to be just, you know, rural areas that are going to see this consequence, it's going to be all of us, urban, suburban, and rural. So I think it's of import for the entire state.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

Ms. Riordan.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Yes. Just a quick question. I am assuming they are hauling debris out,
correct?

MR. BROWN: Yes, they are.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Okay. And are they taping that debris?

MR. BROWN: Yeah. They actually have a very good system for that.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Okay.

MR. BROWN: And everything is wrapped first at the site. It's formed what they call a burrito.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Okay.

MR. BROWN: The burrito then goes in a truck.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Okay.

MR. BROWN: It's tared in the truck, and then a lot of the trucks actually have a second tarp that goes over the top.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Okay.

MR. BROWN: So we're not too concerned about material coming out, although the public is. But it is a concern about the truck traffic. And then the cities, of course, have concerns about trucks going off route and impacting their roads and so on.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Okay. Okay.

MR. BROWN: Marysville doesn't have a freeway. So when these trucks come through, they're going through
town. They're on stop-and-go at each stop light. They're going right in front of the high school.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. BROWN: And so there's a lot of issues with what's going on.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Okay. Okay. Well, they've taken at least one step, which -- to help mitigate it, but there need to be other steps to mitigate some of that other traffic as it moves through.

But it does, it points out some of the problems that we need to face as we look at wild -- the potential of wildfire in the state of California. So I have great empathy for you and hope that we can help you in some way. Staff, I think it's -- I think we really ought to try, and do our best.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Well, we will take this information. We will pass it on. You are working with staff. And I hear Supervisor Serna will follow up, and I will too. And again, thank you so much for taking the time, and coming and talking to us, and lasting through the day. We really do depreciate it.

MR. BROWN: Well, I will point out my fiscal officer is at home recovering from surgery today. She had to sign payroll because I'm not able to get back in time
to do sign payroll, so --

VICE CHAIR BERG: Well, tell her that we thank --
we thank her very much for that. And safe travels back.

MR. BROWN: All right. Take care.

VICE CHAIR BERG: Thank you.

Well, that brings to a close our March meeting.
And so we will close the meeting officially, and safe
travels everyone, and we'll see you in April.

(Thereupon the Air Resources Board meeting
adjourned at 4:10 p.m.)
CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing California Air Resources Board meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and was thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by computer-assisted transcription;

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 28th day of March, 2019.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 10063