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CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning, everybody.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: There it goes.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I think -- I don't think --

I don't think it's no.

CHAIR NICHOLS: It is now. It is -- the sound

system is on. People, please take your seats. We're

starting our meeting at this time.

I know there's a quorum, but we are going to take

the roll, as soon as we do the Pledge of Allegiance, which

is how we always start our meetings. And after that, I'll

have a few comments. But let's begin now first by coming
to order, which we have done, and then please rise and say

the Pledge.

(Thereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was

Recited in unison.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. That was good.

Okay. Now, Madam Clerk, would you please call

the roll.

BOARD CLERK CARLOS: Dr. Balmes?

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.

BOARD CLERK CARLOS: Mr. De La Torre?

Mr. Eisenhut?

BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Aye. Here.

BOARD CLERK CARLOS: Supervisor Fletcher?
Senator Florez?
BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here.
BOARD CLERK CARLOS: Assembly Member Garcia?
Supervisor Gioia?
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Here.
BOARD CLERK CARLOS: Ms. Mitchell?
BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Here.
BOARD CLERK CARLOS: Senator Monning?
Mrs. Riordan?
BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.
BOARD CLERK CARLOS: Supervisor Serna?
Dr. Sherriffs?
BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Here.
BOARD CLERK CARLOS: Professor Sperling?
Ms. Takvorian?
Vice Chair Berg?
Chair Nichols?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Here.
BOARD CLERK CARLOS: Madam Chair, we have a quorum.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much. Before we get started on our agenda, I want to mention the fact that we have emergency exits at the back of the room and on both sides of the podium here. And in the event of a fire alarm, we are required to evacuate this room immediately,
go down the stairs, not the elevator, and go out to the
park across the street and wait until an all-clear signal
has been given. This has actually happened at a Board
meeting in my time, so it's good to pay attention to it.

Anyone who wants to testify should fill out a
request-to-speak card - those are available in the lobby
prior to the commencement of the item. The Board
normally imposes a three-minute time limit. Although,
depending on the number of speakers on a particular item,
we may shorten that to two.

Now, I want to note that we seem to have a large
number of public comment -- people who are signed up for
public comment. And I believe that the bulk of them at
least are here on one particular item. And so I want to
figure out whether what we should do is move the public
comment period back from the end of the day when it is
normally scheduled and make it earlier. But to do that, I
think it would be more effective if I could ask someone,
or one or two people, on behalf of the group of speakers
who are here, to speak with the clerk who is the person in
the pink dress at the back of the room right there headed
for the door --

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: And discuss with her -- she's not
really headed for the door. She's just walking across the
back. I'm being facetious. If I could ask you to come forward and discuss with her the total number of people that you're expecting, how much time you're going to need, and whether your presentation is coordinated as opposed to just a list of individuals making totally separate comments. This would be very helpful to us in trying to organize our time, because we already have our agenda. And there's a lot of -- a lot that we need to get through today. So I'm going to ask someone on behalf of the public commenters who arrived here this morning, most of whom I think have not been at our meetings before, if you would come forward and help us sort out the timing on this particular item.

While that's going on, however, we'll get started on our regular agenda. There is a consent item, which I understand needs to come off of consent. So I'd like to start with that with Mr. Corey, because apparently we received comments on this proposed regulation setting requirements for advanced payment. This is a pretty technical issue, but it's obviously important to some people.

So, Mr. Corey, could you please make the staff presentation on this issue.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair.
established Health and Safety Code section 39603.1, which authorized CARB to provide advanced payment to grantees of a grant program or project if CARB determines specified conditions are met.

Health and Safety Code section 39603.1 further requires CARB, in consultation with the Department of Finance, to adopt a regulation implementing this section to ensure the monies are used properly. This proposed regulation order will enable grantees to understand more easily how to request advance payments, streamline the review and approval process, and provide procedural safeguards to ensure the advanced payments are adequately regulated.

Small air districts need to demonstrate that an advance payment is needed to meet the purpose of the program and that they have adequate budget controls in place. In addition, as called for by statute, larger air districts and other grantees will also need to provide a spending plan and agree to not advance payment to any other entity.

So that concludes my remarks on the action.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Do we have any witnesses who have signed up to speak on this item? Is there anyone who wants to summarize the comments that we received?
Here, we are. Sorry.

Jhana Valentine, please come forward. Thank you.

MS. VALENTINE: Good morning everyone.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Wait just a sec.

MS. VALENTINE: Thank you.

Good morning everyone. Thank you for hearing this comment. My name is Jhana Valentine. I'm representing Beneficial State Foundation as the program director for the Clean Vehicle Assistance Program.

Beneficial State Foundation strongly urges the clean -- the California Air Resources Board to reconsider and revise the advance payment criteria that requires all other entities, including nonprofits, agreeing not to provide advanced payment to any other entity. Beneficial State Foundation is a non-profit that has qualified for advance payment from CARB for administration of the statewide Clean Vehicle Assistance Program.

We can attest to both the importance of advance payment for nonprofit grantees, and the significant barrier that requirement -- that the requirement to not pay other nonprofit grantees advance payment poses for successful project implementation.

First of all, we want to thank the Air Resources Board for making nonprofit grantees eligible for advance payment. We would not be able to administer this project
without advance payment.

It is important for us to bring this comment forward though, because nonprofits are an important subset of CARB's grantees, and it is key that an advance payment regulation supports the financial health of non-profits, so that we can continue scaling the impact of CARB programs.

For Beneficial State Foundation, advance payment is absolutely necessary, because we rely on very few funding sources to support this Clean Vehicle Assistance Program. What nonprofits like ours and other non-profit grantees need is an advanced payment process that is streamlined and simple, because delays in funding can hold up project implementation. So we have submitted a more detailed proposal of the advance payment process that could work for Beneficial State Foundation, and we appreciate the CARB staff consideration and team work in moving this forward.

We strongly urge CARB to give nonprofit grantees the ability to advance pay to other nonprofit grantees however, as is allowed for small air districts. The proposed regulation is -- explicitly prohibits this. But by passing this regulation, CARB would severely limit the ability for nonprofit grantees to establish partnerships that can enhance and scale the impact of these CARB
For example, a key reason Beneficial State Foundation has been successful in launching the Clean Vehicle Assistance Program is due to a partnership with an organization called GRID Alternatives. Acting as a subgrantee, GRID Alternatives implemented the charging station grant portion of the Statewide Financing Assistance Project.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I'm sorry, your three minutes are up. But I think we understand the gist of your comments. Here. You want more entities to be eligible and you are not in favor of the requirements that there have to be a spending plan. As I understand that, however, these are both elements that are in the statute. And so we don't actually have a choice about making that change through our own regulations.

I knew you wanted to make the comment and I appreciate that you, you know, have come and given us that. But I think you need to take this up with the Legislature. We were not the authors or the proponents of this bill in the first place. We obviously are in favor of expanding the ability to make advanced payments, but we can't alter the specific terms of the statute itself. So I think we have to act on what we've got, but appreciate your comment.
MS. VALENTINE: Thank you for hearing our comment.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

I think I can close the record on this item then and ask if there's a motion and a second to adopt the resolution.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: I would so move, Madam Chairman resolution 19-23.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Do we have a second?

BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Second.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Second from the good doctor, and we will call the -- no, we'll just do this on a voice vote.

Ail in favor please say aye?

(Unanimous aye vote.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Any opposed?

Any abstentions?

Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Am I the bad doctor?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: You said the good doctor.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: I'm sorry. I knew I was getting in trouble.
(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Things are falling apart already.

All right.

Supervisor.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yeah, just don't say there's a good and bad supervisor too will you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Never mind.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: I think we all know who we're talking about.

So let us move on to the next item on our agenda, Item 19-9-4, the Proposed Fiscal Year 2019-20 Funding Plan for Clean Transportation Investments. I would note that this is already rather late in 2019. Why are we just approving the 2019 funding plan?

The investments in -- that are covered by this plan are just a part of the broader portfolio of incentive projects that complement our regulatory program to reduce emissions and increase access to clean transportation.

The plan serves as a blueprint for expending $533 million in incentives that have been appropriated to this agency for this year. This includes the annual funding for low carbon transportation investments from Cap-and-Trade auctions proceeds and the Air Quality Improvement Program, or AQIP, now entering its tenth year.
The plan represents another significant investment in zero-emission and other clean technologies with a priority on directing funds to disadvantaged communities and low-income communities and households to ensure that the cleanest technologies are deployed where they are needed the most.

The proposed investments were guided by the three-year plan for zero-emission vehicle markets and clean transportation equity investments and the heavy-duty investment strategy, which were also updated this year.

These multi-year strategy documents provide updated technology and market assessments, and forecast the investments needed over the next three years to meet program goals.

We're continuing to make progress towards meeting our Z-E-V, ZEV, deployment goals and helping to advance the technologies that are needed to meet our near-term and long-term emissions reductions needs. These investments have been successful in helping to drive the progress.

The Clean Vehicle Rebate Project and the Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project have both seen dramatic increases in demand over the next -- over the past several years. So much so, that both projects have been oversubscribed and faced with lengthy waiting lists.
Next year, staff anticipate that demand will again exceed funding. In light of these resource limitations, we must make strategic policy changes to ensure that these projects can continue to promote the adoption of zero-emission and other clean technologies. The presentation for this item is going to be split into two parts. After the first part, we're going to take a brief 15-minute break to visit the training room across the hallway and view a bunch of posters that have been developed for our light-duty and heavy-duty projects, so the Board will have a chance to actually view these projects in somewhat more detail than we could do through the presentation.

Before I continue, however, I just want to make sure. We do have a number of people standing in the back of the room. Sometimes staff stand back there. But if you're here for the meeting and you want to be listening, I hope you'll find a seat, because there are quite a number of vacant seats in the sides and down towards the front.

Appreciate that.

Okay. Mr. Corey, would you please introduce the first part of this presentation.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. Thanks, Chair.

Incentive programs, as noted, are part of CARB's
strategy to accelerate the introduction of the cleanest mobile source technologies complementing our regulatory programs. These incentives provide important early steps to transform the transportation sector to zero tailpipe emissions powered by lowest carbon energy sources, supporting the emission reduction strategies identified in the Climate Change Scoping Plan, State Implementation Plans, California Sustainable Freight Action Plan, and the ZEV Action Plan, as well as the Governor's Executive Orders calling for California to deploy at least 1.5 million ZEVs by 2025 and five million ZEVs by 2030.

These incentives are also designed to increase access to clean transportation for disadvantaged communities and low-income Californians. These investments will help implement the recommendations from our Senate Bill SB 350 study on overcoming barriers to clean transportation.

In the budget appropriations for these projects, the Legislature provided specific direction to continue with many of the projects we funded in past budget cycles. This funding will continue to support many successful projects, such as consumer rebates for zero-emission passenger cars, clean truck and bus vouchers, and transformative equity projects, including car scrap replacement and car sharing among -- amongst others.
This year, the proposed heavy-duty demonstration and pilot project investments will provide investments in the pre-commercial demonstrations that are needed to advance the next generation of zero-emission and other clean commercial technologies.

While we're also investing a considerable amount of money with this plan, we must recognize that these investments are but one piece of the State's overall clean air, clean energy, and climate investment portfolio, which includes other State and local agency investments, as well as the regulations this Board has adopted or will be considering. We've designed our programs, so it complements these other programs.

Today, staff will speak of our success over the past decade and present an evolution of the major programs in these investments to achieve our zero-emission targets. I'd also like to thank the California Energy Commission for collaborating with us on this important effort and thanks to Commissioner Patty Monahan for joining us today. I'll now ask Ashley Georgiou and Jason Crow of the Mobile Source Control Division to begin staff presentation.

Ashley and Jason.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was Presented as follows.)
MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:

Thank you, Mr. Corey. Good morning, Chair Nichols and members of the Board. Today, we'll be presenting the proposed fiscal year 2019-2020 funding plan for clean transportation incentives.

--o0o--

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:

This presentation is organized into two parts, which collectively tell the story of CARB's low-carbon transportation and Air Quality Improvement Program, or AQIP, investments. I will be providing an overview of CARB's clean transportation incentive portfolio, which provides context for how today's staff proposal fits into the larger picture of incentive programs and contributes towards achieving our air quality, climate, and equity goals.

I will also provide an update on accomplishments, lessons learned, and how we are building upon our investments. We will then be taking a short break to view project posters and hear from grantees and staff on lessons learned.

My colleague Jason Crow will provide highlights of the light- and heavy-duty investment strategies followed by staff's proposal.

--o0o--
MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:
First, I will provide a brief history and overview of CARB's clean transportation incentives portfolio.

--o0o--

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:
California faces tough air quality challenges in the years to come. As this graph shows, the progress to date indicates that pollution in 2030 from federally regulated sources will be greater than those regulated by the State. It is imperative that we work together with our State, local, and private partners to continue advancing technologies that reduce motor vehicle emissions.

Regulations and incentives have been providing a critical two-pronged strategy to reduce emissions over two decades. Incentives play a critical role in providing climate, air quality, and economic benefits. This includes improving air quality in the most burdened populations, meeting attainment of federal standards for ozone and particulate matter emissions, achieving carbon neutrality by 2045, and reaching our scoping plan goals.

--o0o--

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU: As seen on this slide, CARB's larger transportation incentive
portfolio includes other programs beyond low carbon transportation and AQIP that are in the funding plan and covered today. CARB works to coordinate its overall investment strategy across this broader portfolio of incentive programs. CARB works with stakeholders to develop overall program guidelines, while local and regional agencies make funding decisions.

Large-scale, multi-year statewide investments send a market signal and move the needle in advancing technologies in a way that locally-focused investments simply cannot match. However, these broad investments are not as well suited to target the unique regional and community scale air quality challenges. Thus, locally directed incentive programs play a key role.

Investment recommendations laid out in this funding plan are made in close coordination with our other incentive programs. CARB conducts an extensive public outreach process across our portfolio.

Given the clean transportation policy drivers and different regulatory requirements of each program, we are faced with the continued challenge of weaving a complicated quilt together in a way that maximizes benefits from our investments and increases efficiencies.

--o0o--

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:
We have invested over $5 billion in funding over 20 years. In the first decade, the Carl Moyer lower emissions school bus and Proposition 1B regional programs focused on replacing the legacy fleet with cleaner diesel and alternative fueled engines. They aim to achieve near-term air quality goals, reduce criteria pollutants and diesel particulate matter in the goods movement corridors, and provide clean and safe school buses for children.

The Carl Moyer Program, which is the red shaded area, is the only study reliable and continued source of funding through 2023 that local districts can rely on to meet SIP commitments.

Since 2009, AQIP, seen in green here, has been focused on statewide priorities. It is designed to pay for projects that reduce criteria pollutants, toxics, and for the first time GHG emission reductions as co-benefits. This is where CVRP, HVIP, demos, an truck loans came into existence. AQIP provides a steady, continued source of funding through 2023 that the state can rely on.

Beginning in 2013, when CVRP demand increased rapidly, auction proceeds came into play, as seen in the blue shaded area. The goal of this funding was to pay for shovel-ready projects that would obtain GHG reductions with criteria pollutants and toxics as co-benefits. These
dollars started funding AQIP projects that provided GHG reductions, including CVRP, HVIP, demonstrations, and in later years pilots. Funds are provided on a annual basis, subject to legislative appropriation and are not continuous or reliable.

The last patches in this quilt include FARMER, Community Air Protection, and year-to-year appropriations from auction proceeds. Volkswagen and proposition 1B provided a one-time influx of funding. We are happy to announce that the first installment of Volkswagen funding for zero-emission buses just launched on Monday.

It should be noted that low-carbon transportation is the only funding source for light-duty vehicle investments. Together with all different tenets of these programs, CARB has created projects that are designed to help California meet its near- and long-term air quality and climate change goals with an eye towards a zero-emission future.

--o0o--

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:

One of the ways our projects meet these goals is to support advanced technologies across the commercialization pathway. This graphic is an example of how heavy-duty funding has allowed for that to happen.

The Low Carbon Transportation Program funds projects from
the pre-commercial demonstration phase, pilots, and early commercialization. HVIP and CORE play a key role providing a bridge between early commercial deployment and market scale adoption.

Programs like Volkswagen Mitigation Trust also fund broad purchase incentives and fleet turnover as do Carl Moyer, AB 61, and FARMER. AQIP funds are now largely going to help provide financing assistant for small fleets ready to transition to cleaner vehicles.

Today, you are going to hear a lot about advanced technologies that are supported through a variety of programs that we are proposing to have transition out of HVIP. This transition is on the table for two reasons. The first being that we can focus the overlapping programs to better suit how the advance technologies move through their commercialization. The second is that there is a limited number of funds in many of these programs and we simply cannot support all clean technologies in every program.

--o0o--

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:

Now, I will provide you with an update on the progress and status of our current Low Carbon Transportation and AQIP projects.

--o0o--
MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:

Each year, CARB staff has made improvements through the funding plan development process. One mechanism has been increasing transparency. CARB has also expanded our outreach and education for low-income and disadvantaged communities, which will now be referred to as priority populations.

Over the course of this past year, CARB and our partners have conducted several special events to support further information sharing and engagement, such as the heavy-duty technology forum this past March. Additional outreach materials have been developed to provide updates on our demonstration and pilot projects.

In addition to numerous outreach opportunities, this year's funding plan development process included three public workshops, and 21 public work group meetings. CARB's One Stop Shop pilot project is further expanding outreach and education efforts on clean transportation and mobility options for priority populations.

Developing strategic methods by which we reach communities and better assess their clean transportation needs is a central theme of this year's plan based on lessons learned.

--o0o--

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:
CARB staff are often asked what are the trends in low carbon transportation and AQIP investments. Are we moving the needle forward? Demand for CVRP and HVIP has grown rapidly, as shown here. Funding has not -- has run out faster than anticipated, which has resulted in adjusting projects.

Our other flagship program, the AQIP-funded Truck Loans Program has also seen a steady increase. I will talk a little bit more about that program later.

--o0o--

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:

This is how California light-duty clean vehicle market looked in 2010. In 2014, we made strides in increasing the number of clean vehicles across California communities.

Now, look at how far we have come. As of 2018, there are over 300,000 total vehicles that received CVRP rebates, which is representative of about half of zero-emission vehicles in California. With this momentum, with are on track to meet the goals of 1.5 million zero-emission vehicles on the road by 2025.

Note that the data is being collected for 2019, so we will update these maps over time.

--o0o--

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU: In
2010, 2014, and today, you can see a similar trend with HVIP due to increased demand. These maps are useful for understanding where there is priority or opportunity for further outreach and education to increase program participation.

---o0o---

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:

Shifting gears, let me now update you on progress for additional programs funded through low Carbon Transportation and AQIP.

This year, staff organized the light-duty projects in the funding plan into vehicle purchase incentives and clean mobility investments. Vehicle purchase incentives include CVRP, Clean Cars 4 All, and financing assistance. To stress outreach as an overall strategy to advance our goals, One Stop Shop is a separate outreach component in the plan.

This project was allocated $5 million through 2016 Volkswagen settlement funds that furthers effort to increase awareness, and streamline the process for consumers to apply for and qualify for CARB's clean transportation equity projects. The vision is to eventually include energy, housing, and other consumer-based incentives consistent with Senate Bill 350 barriers report recommendations.
These investments are an essential element of CARB's incentive portfolio as we explore innovative ways to increase access and support the secondary zero-emission vehicle market.

--o0o--

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU: As an essential element of supporting the transportation needs of priority populations is the Clean Mobility Options Pilot Projects. These projects have been allocated nearly $47 million in total. We have ten projects now underway.

So what have we seen from these investments over the last five years?

There's increased interest in funding and expanding these innovative projects, which offer multiple options to community residents, based on their clean transportation needs. There's desire for further connectivity between modes of transportation to increase access. Residents are learning more about clean technologies and how they can play a part in reducing emissions in their community.

CARB is working with our partners to get projects into communities more quickly so residents can experience the benefits, but we understand pilots take time.

--o0o--
MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:

One of the foundational tenets of meeting our equity goals is to build upon and create strong partnerships with environmental, advocacy, research, and broader clean transportation stakeholders. Here, you can see some of the many groups with which we have collaborated in implementing clean transportation equity projects throughout California.

We look forward to the next chapter of our work together and to determining additional opportunities to bring innovative mobility projects to communities across the state.

--o0o--

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:

Now, let’s talk about progress with our heavy-duty investments. CARB is implementing a heavy-duty investment strategy to meet goals of advancing and establishing sustainable markets for advanced technologies. We are building from the momentum of past investments across the commercialization path. There are 30 advanced technology demonstration and pilot projects now underway throughout the state.

Over $360 million State funding allocated to these projects has been matched by $318 million in private investments. They include a variety of technologies
spanning the full range of vehicle and equipment types highlighted here.

The yellow dots on the map represent where vehicles and equipment are domiciled. The blue areas represent where clean vehicles will be operating throughout the state.

The 2016 Truck and Bus Pilot Project catalyzed tremendous growth in the heavy-duty sector. We started with approximately 150 vehicles in that pilot. We now have taken orders for more than 2,500 zero-emission trucks and buses in HVIP as these sectors enter the next stage of commercial deployment.

The Clean Off-Road Equipment Voucher Incentive Project, or CORE, and demonstration projects in the off-road sector are bringing zero-emission equipment to commercialization. CORE has been allocated $40 million to launch fleets later this year and will provide vouchers for things like zero-emission forklifts, yard trucks, and transport refrigeration units.

As a result of funding these projects, we have seen a growth in the green economy with new jobs across California.

I would now like to ask our light- and heavy-duty project partners in the audience today to stand up and be recognized for their continued hard work and dedication.
(Applause.)

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:

Staff and partners will be available in the Klamath Training Room at the break between CARB staff presentations to discuss project posters developed for light- and Heavy-duty projects and answer any specific questions Board members may have.

--o0o--

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU: So what reductions have resulted from Low Carbon Transportation and AQIP investments?

Bidding upon these programs has contributed to significant progress in meeting our emission reduction goals. To date, they have collectively reduced 3.6 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, 13,900 tons of nitrous oxide emissions, and 213 tons of particulate matter. But emission reductions are not the only metric to measure the success of CARB's programs.

Through our investments, we have seen other benefits including: technologies advancing rapidly, a draw green businesses and jobs to the state, and an increase in zero-emission vehicle and equipment models.

In fact, here you can also see where the $1.7 billion has been allocated to date and how each of these programs have directly benefited priority populations.
This funding has contributed to the transformation of fleets to zero-emission and resulted in valuable lessons learned for project success.

--o0o--

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:

Lessons learned have helped develop and guide investment decisions. Successes have resulted in CARB making difficult choices in where to make program adjustments and prioritize funding. The supply of funds available given the large uptick of program participation, including for CVRP and HVIP, is a challenge.

That said, project impacts for communities go beyond the numbers of participation or even greenhouse gas reductions. It's hard to operationalize or quantify some project benefits because each community experience and set of needs is different. The solutions we are working to build on not one size fits all.

One key lesson across projects has been timing. Design, development, and implementation of a pilot and demonstration project takes a significant amount of time and requires hand-on outreach and education to maximize benefits and establish strong partnership networks.

CARB has also learned that installing clean transportation infrastructure across light- and heavy-duty projects is complicated and has resulted in delays in
project launch.

CARB collects data and analyzes the data from projects, builds upon lessons learned, and shares project outcomes with our partners, communities, and others through project implementation and the three-year planning process. The more we learn, the more analysis can be done on funding needed to support advancement of clean technologies across the state.

--o0o--

MSCD STAFF AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST GEORGIOU:

Before going to the Klamath Training Room to view the project posters and meet the teams that develop and implement these projects, we would like to see if there are any questions from the Board on this portion of the presentation.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Questions from Board members at this point?

I think it's pretty straightforward. I would like to just highlight your last slide though about the obstacles and delays in implementing some of the infrastructure projects. You know, this is kind of dry, bureaucratic language. What I hear anecdotally is that permitting delays at the local level are a huge problem. Some of these things are just built into the way decisions
are made at the local level, the number of different check-offs that there have to be, sometimes a Fire Marshal who doesn't like a particular type of project or whatever.

But I'm wondering if you have anything to -- something perhaps more illustrative of what you're really talking about here when you talk about the delays in these projects? Does anybody want to --

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:

Let me just --

CHAIR NICHOLS: -- comment?

Jack, hi.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:

Hi. Good morning. Let me kick this off and others may join in. But you're absolutely right, it is a much more comprehensive issue. And it's actually a challenge both on the micro scale for an individual project. And then as we grow more and more of this with additional regulations, there's sort of a macro issue on infrastructure of making sure the grid is good and we've planned appropriately.

But on the individual project basis, I do say we do have the benefit of the light-duty area plowing this ground a little bit for us for the last ten years. And that's been helpful, but it -- we found it's certainly not enough. One of the key points we find is bringing in the
partners as early as possible, trying to share the
information. You're right, the permitting process can
take a long time. The construction process can take a
long time.

In the heavy-duty sector, a typical truck, whether it's a zero-emission or whether it's a gasoline or
diesel takes 18 months to build very often. But if the
infrastructure process takes two years, your six months
behind right at the beginning. So we've implemented some
processes to make sure that partners are informed as
quickly as possible and we get them together. When we
have demo projects, the partners there are a key aspect of
this.

We work with our CEC and utility partners quite a
bit. And there's more discussions going on there. But it
is an ongoing area that we know we need to continue to
work at.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, it was an impressive group
that stood up and identified themselves here today. And I
was -- I know that they represent considerable geographic
diversity, as well as different kinds of partnerships.
But I think this is an area where we're going to be
hearing more in days, weeks, and years to come about the
need for ways -- new and better ways of establishing those
types of relationships, I guess. So I'll just -- I'll
leave it at that.

I think we should take our break to go to the training room and take a look at the actual presentations about the projects and try to be back here for phase two at 10:00 o'clock.

Thanks, everybody

EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Chair, we'll have staff that will escort members of the public as well as the Board members. It's on this floor. Klamath is around the corner. We'll walk you there.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

(Off record: 9:43 a.m.)
(Thereupon a recess was taken.)
(On record: 10:15 a.m.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, as predicted, it's hard to get people back together. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to get started.

The mic is on, but you can't hear me.

Apparently, we're having problems with our webcasting system. So people who were trying to follow this from a distance are not able to do it. We're sorry about that, but I know that they're trying very hard to get it up and running again. Meantime, we do have sound in this room and we can see each other, so that's all good.

The visit to the exhibits in the training room
was, I would say, exhilarating. It was really impressive to see some of the projects that we are helping to fund and also to catalyze really for demonstrating new technologies and new ways of deploying those technologies to make a really significant difference in our air quality issues. We probably all have our favorites that we saw, so I'm not going to tell you mine.

But let me just say that --

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: -- heavy-duty vehicles and locomotives are my thing, so --

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: -- I was pretty excited about some of the things I saw.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Pretty cool.

CHAIR NICHOLS: They had an electric locomotive.

Yeah, pretty cool. Exactly.

So we now turn to the second part of this presentation.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Madam Chair?

Madam Chair?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. I'm sorry. Sorry. Yes.

Excuse me, Mr. Florez.

BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Yes. I'd like to, just from a time -- thank you. From a timing perspective, I
know we do have a lot of folks here for comment period. I'm respectful of what you asked for at the very beginning. But I'm wondering if we could bifurcate the comment period for a short -- shorter conference of -- comment period from -- so we can hear from Senator Bradford and the Mayor, and then continue that longer comment period as we proceed through our agenda items. I wonder if that would be -- the Chair would entertain that?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, given that we're a public agency and all of us are appointed by one or another elected official, if we're not elected officials ourselves, we honor a tradition of calling on any electeds who are here out of turn. And so if the Senator and the Mayor are here and wish to speak now then, I would invite them to come forward.

Thank you.

SENATOR BRADFORD: Thank Madam Chair and members, and especially my former colleague, Senator Florez and Supervisor Fletcher. It's good to see all of you here today.

My name is Steve Bradford and I'm Senator from the 35th Senate District. And I'm here -- while our legislative session is over, I'm here to speak to an issue that is of great concern to my community, the CEQA review process and streamlining pursuant to a piece of
legislation that I authored with Assemblywoman Kamlager-Dove. The project under review is the Inglewood Basketball and Entertainment Center project.

As you're aware, both Assembly Member Kamlager-Dove and myself authored the legislation to assist in helping make a dream a reality for the City of Inglewood and surrounding communities of L.A. County. My presence here today is to stress also the urgency of now. Dr. King wrote a book, *Why We Can't Wait*, and I'm here to say that this project can no longer wait.

Your roll in assisting the dream to review and determine the project will not result in additional greenhouse gas emissions.

As you are also aware, I recently submitted a letter to express my frustration and grave concerns with the long period of time this application has been before you for action. Our legislation clearly stated it should be reviewed in 120 days. We're far beyond that. My purpose today, however, is to express how critical this project is and what the economic and environmental benefits it will bestow on our community. I cannot stress enough and urge you to accomplish your review and approval as soon as humanly possible.

Yes, this project brings with it desperately needed jobs, thousands of them, both construction and
permanent to a community that has been without jobs for a long time and now we're on the uptick. So I want you to please consider that fact as it has tremendous impact to the community.

I have personally worked with the project sponsors and I know how hard and committed they are to bring state of the art, environmentally sound, and friendly facility to this community. We are excited about all aspects of this project, as I know you would be as well, if it was in your community.

Over my years of serving in the Legislature as both the Assembly and the Senate, I have constantly supported the efforts of others to achieve transformational projects for their communities, i.e. San Francisco, Sacramento here, Oakland soon, and our -- and we just look for our opportunity now in Inglewood. The State Senate passed this measure 34 to nothing. So it shows a strong commitment of the Legislature to move this project forward.

Many have doubted that our communities of color would ever experience -- I'm out of time.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Senator, we have a three-minute time limit on public comment. I would appreciate it, if you could finish up your remarks as quickly as you can.

SENATOR BRADFORD: Okay. Many have doubted that
our communities of color would ever experience the possibilities of a project such as this. But despite those doubts, it's within our grasp, and you must make it possible -- make this possible -- project a reality. To do anything different would not only allow New York outsiders to determine Inglewood's fate, but destroy a tremendous opportunity.

This project not only offers, as I stated, jobs, but you have a commitment of $75 million of affordable housing. That's not offered in San Francisco. It's not being offered in Sacramento and it's not being offered in other arena project in the State. So just in the interests of time, I will abbreviate my comments, and just say, for years, I voted in the State Legislature to support legislation expanding your role and helping to improve and protect our environment.

I worked for four years as a project director at L.A. Conservation Corps. I have also done -- done sincere -- I -- actually, I should say I have done so in sincere belief that we can achieve projects like this while making great strides toward improving the quality and reducing environmental impacts.

This project reflects my beliefs and my constituents are counting on it to be done. Thank you for this opportunity.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, sir. And really, we appreciate the commitment that you and your fellow members have shown to this project, the interest. And we agree with you that this has the potential to be a model in every respect for any kind of a new facility coming into our state. So we pledge to work as expeditiously as we can to get this done. Thank you.

SENATOR BRADFORD: Thank you.

CITY OF INGLEWOOD MAYOR BUTTE: Madam Chair Nichols and members of the Board, first of all, I greatly appreciate the fact that you allowed myself and the Senator to come and speak early, and that you will allow all of the speakers from Inglewood -- there are 50 people here from the City of Inglewood. All of them have businesses or jobs. And about 25 of them are going to speak. And so to not consolidate them is greatly appreciated.

I also would ask one more indulgence. Because of the fact that this is a transformational project for our city, and 8,000 jobs are in the balance for it, that you would allow me to take one of our speakers cards and give me their time, because it will take more than three minutes. And I'm asking for that indulgence.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. We can do that.

CITY OF INGLEWOOD MAYOR BUTTE: Thank you very
much.

I'm here for a couple reasons: one, to have the opportunity to talk to you directly; and two, because I am so concerned about some of the recommendations that were put forward by your staff that are solely -- so incongruent and so unprecedented with actions that this Board has taken before.

One of the recommendations was that we implement 1,000 gig cars into our City of Inglewood. Inglewood is 9.3 square miles. Sacramento has 180 gig cars and they're almost 100 square miles. The legislation that gave us the nine-month CEQA truncation it suggested -- it was suggested by the Legislature that within 120 days this be moved out of CARB. For perspective, the Chase Arena in San Francisco that the Warriors recently occupied was pushed through in 63 days. We're at 280 delays and counting.

The staff wanted to be an unheard of net new requirement for this arena, that if this arena opens, that if there's a backfill in the Staples Center, that we, the City of Inglewood and the Clippers, would be responsible for the mitigations for the net new. By that type of logic, when Staples took the Lakers and Kings from us, then they should have been required to account for any net new GHG that came from our backfill. And as you know,
that's not happening.

This arena is the most important project. The single most important development project occurring in Southern California now. And I was wrong, it is 9,000 jobs that hang in the balance. But these aren't just jobs, they're career and life-changing employment opportunities. They're not $15 an hour minimum wage jobs. They're 60 to 90 dollar an hour jobs. And what's holding this up?

In a letter that we received, it said it was controversy and carbon emissions. The only controversy that's been generated about this project has been by a competitor that doesn't want there to be another arena that can hold concerts. They've sponsored supposed community groups, one neighborhood IRATE, that doesn't have a living being account associated with it. And they funded lawsuits on multiple fronts. One of the lawsuits is to place affordable housing in an area that the FAA put forward grant funds to remove all the residents and relocate them, and tear down the housing, because it was incompatible with habitation. And that's one of those lawsuits that was sponsored by Madison Square Garden.

Eighty-two percent of the voters voted against Madison Square Garden when they and their affiliates sponsored a candidate that didn't live in Inglewood but 30
days before the registration period to run for Mayor. He got 18 percent of the vote. It's often written that Inglewood is a predominantly Black and Latino community. And that's very true and we're very proud of that. And for years, the brand for our city was unemployment, high crime, and gang violence. And that despite it's great location in the center of our freeways with a microclimate that is very -- is envied by all of Los Angeles, it was an undesirable place to be.

Well now, we have a low crime rate. In ten months of this year, there are less murders in Inglewood than in Torrance, Pasadena, and Santa Monica. I was the Police Chief in Santa Monica for 15 years. And I went there to celebrate the retirement of a Captain who was going to become Police Chief up in Washington. And I told him I don't feel safe here anymore and I'd like an escort to the freeway to Inglewood where it's staff.

(Laughter.)

CITY OF INGLEWOOD MAYOR BUTTE: We aren't measuring ourselves against what we were, but against what we can be. This project represents hard work of a lot of people. And it may look like a mere business deal to some, but to us, it's the final piece of a transformation of a city that was once known as a city of champions and will be the city of champions once again.
In closing, all of Inglewood, all real people in Inglewood, and all of south bay, and indeed all of Los Angeles County is united behind this project, because there are more jobs that are generated between this and the NFL stadium, there are more jobs generated than there will be people looking for work.

Hanging in the balances -- in the balance are thousands of union jobs, not just construction, but hotel and restaurant jobs as well. Hanging in the balance is $75 million for affordable housing. The total community benefits package put forth by the Clippers has Steve Ballmer is $100 million, the largest in the history of any project in this country.

So who would -- thank you. Who would invest a similar sum? We're not asking for 75 million from the State for affordable housing. We're asking it of the Clippers. It should be the goal of every elected and appointed official to facilitate the development of affordable housing and to support high quality union jobs.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I guess, at that point, we will now return to the presentation on the vehicle funding. So, Mr. Corey.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I will kick it to Jason Crow who will do the second part of the presentation focused on this year's proposed funding plan for Low Carbon Transportation package.

So Jason.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: Thank you, Mr. Corey, Chair Nichols and members of the Board.

Thank you for taking the time to look at our posters and learn more about our projects. I also want to note that there is a booklet with information about the posters that is in your Board packet and you can review that later.

Again, my name is Jason Crow. I'll be providing the next part of this morning's presentation in an overview of the investments and recommendations for the fiscal year 2019-20 funding plan for Low Carbon Transportation and AQIP.

--o00--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: Let's begin with the priorities for this year's funding plan. The investments in this funding plan are designed to:

Continue to support the long-term transformation of California's fleets to zero-emission vehicles and equipment; build on the successes resulting from previous
investments and incorporate lessons learned from previously funded projects; support the ongoing implementation of recommendations from the SB 350 study on overcoming barriers; and, ensure our investments are designed to maximize benefits for priority populations.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: There are several key policy drivers and documents that provide guidance for meeting our future air quality and climate goals. These form the foundation of this funding plan and help to guide the investments in the plan. In addition to the documents represented here on the slide, there are also a number of key pieces of legislation and executive orders that guide the investments in this funding plan.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: Also guiding and informing the decisions in this year's plan are the detailed three-year investment strategies for light-duty and heavy-duty projects. These strategies are designed to meet the requirements set forth in statute. They help to provide direction and identify specific investment needs for future funding plans.

The light-duty strategy includes a three-year forecast of funding needs and an assessment of when a self-sustaining market is expected. It also includes a
discussion of pathways to sustainability for clean transportation equity projects. The heavy-duty strategy builds on the guiding principles established in the initial strategy with the identification of beachhead technologies that can be built on further technological advancement. It contains recommendations for investment priorities over the next three years, and it also includes a report on progress made in cleaning up the State's school bus fleet.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: Now, I'll go into more detail regarding the funding available in this year's plan.
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MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: For fiscal year 2019-20, the Legislature appropriated $485 million in Low Carbon Transportation funding. The Legislature further suballocated the appropriation into specific bins designated to go to the following categories: $238 million to the Clean Vehicle Rebate Project, of which $25 million is reserved specifically for increased rebates for low-income recipients; $65 million for transportation equity pilot projects; and $182 million for heavy-duty incentives.

Staff proposes to allocate $142 million of this
to HVIP and $40 million for demonstration and pilot projects.

--o0o-- crow

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: This year's budget also provides just over $48 million for Air Quality Improvement Program. AQIP is used to fund projects to reduce criteria pollutant and air toxics emissions from mobile sources. The proposed focus for AQIP this year will continue to be with the assisting small business truckers in reducing emissions from the legacy fleet through the Truck Loan Assistance Program.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: Next, I'll move on to the proposed investments for vehicle purchase incentives and transportation mobility projects.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: Starting with the outcomes from the three-year plan, as it discusses vehicle purchase incentives, it includes an updated forecast of funding needs. It highlights growth in the zero-emission vehicle market, and notes that there are now over 40 vehicle models available. Per the supplemental report of the 2018-19 Budget Act, it also includes an evaluation of the growth needed to meet the 2030 target for zero-emission vehicle adoption of five
What we have seen is that major changes will be needed to ensure the project does not run out of money this year. Even with these changes though, demand may still exceed the budget available. We know from the plan, that broad incentives will still be needed until zero-emission vehicle sales reach 16 to 20 percent of the total market.
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MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: This year's Low Carbon Transportation allocations for vehicle purchase incentives is a total $248.9 million. Of this, staff proposes $213 million for standard CVRP rebates and 25 million for increased rebates for lower income consumers.

For financing assistant, staff is proposing an allocation of $10.9 million. And while no funding is being allocated to the new year -- in the new year for Clean Cars 4 All, approximately $40 million in funding from previous years remains available, and will be more than sufficient to meet the expected demand of 25 to 30 million dollars for this fiscal year.

One new element to the Clean Cars 4 All project this is the provision from SB 400 that adds bike sharing and electric bicycles to the mix of eligible clean mobility options that participants can choose from in lieu
of purchasing a replacement vehicle.

These proposed allocations will continue our focus on investments in CVRP to support broad zero-emission vehicle deployment coupled with equity-focused investments that increase access to vehicle purchase incentives for California's priority populations.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: For CVRP, California's electrical -- electric vehicle market saw rapid growth leading to a quicker drawdown of last year's CVRP funds in the last six months of 2018 than had been expected. The program saw record participation with average monthly applications volume, doubling to about 8,000 to 10,000 per month between July and December of 2018.

Due to this growth in demand, the fiscal year 2018-19 funds for standard rebates ran out in early July 2019, resulting in a wait list. As previously approved by the Board, applicants for the increased rebates are prioritized and are not subject to the wait list, so these applications will continue to be processed as usual.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: Staff is proposing five key changes to CVRP to ensure that this year's funding allocation provides a meaningful incentive
to encourage electric vehicle purchases, while maintaining a program that is viable for a longer portion of the upcoming fiscal year than would be possible with the current program design.

Staff worked with stakeholders through public working groups to discuss various options for program changes and to determine how to design the program to fit within a $238 million budget.

After receiving input from stakeholders, staff is proposing the following changes:

First, to decreasing the standard rebate amounts. This change includes a reduction of $500 for fuel cell, battery electric, and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles and a reduction of $150 for zero-emission motorcycles. Of all the changes proposed, this change provides the largest cost savings, though it will also be the most noticeable to consumers since rebate amounts have not been changed in the project since 2012. Staff is proposing to keep amounts for the increased rebates for low-income consumers at their current levels.

Second, shortening the application window from 18 months to three months to reach consumers who see this rebate as essential.

Third, staff is proposing to decrease the limit on the number of rebates per person to one per person for
the life of the program going forward. This change will increase the number of unique applicants the program can serve.

Fourth, setting a base MSRP cap of $60,000 for vehicle eligibility in the program. As part of our ongoing efforts to target the rebates where they have the most impact, we aim to limit the rebates to vehicles where the rebate is a greater percentage of the purchase price. Through discussion with stakeholders, staff determined that a maximum base MSRP of $60,000 is a limit that would help meet this goal while not eliminating a significant number of vehicles from the program or discouraging the introduction of new models. Fuel cell electric vehicles will not be subject to this program change as this technology is still in the early phases of deployment and an MSRP cap of $60,000 would still be too limiting.

And finally, staff recommends increasing the minimum all-electric range requirement for plug-in hybrid electric vehicles from 20 to 25 miles, following the Urban Dynamometer Driving Schedule, or UDDS, in an effort to focus this funding on the vehicles with the highest all-electric range.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: In addition to guiding future vehicle purchase incentives, the
three-year plan also included an assessment of projected funding needs for the clean mobility investments and outreach projects, and identified potential policy changes or adjustments that would help to better meet each project's goals.

CARB's primary role will now be to facilitate coordination across projects to ensure that best practices are shared and to help projects operate on a larger scale. Stakeholders and project administrators have expressed a need for more time to deal with lengthy administrative processes, as well as more predictable funding to plan for and commit to future budgets. The three-year plan begins to lay out some options for addressing these concerns.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: Looking at the proposed allocations for clean mobility projects and outreach, staff is recommending a total of $53.45 million. You can see the proposed financing amounts here. This year's proposal will continue programs that have been successful and also adds two new projects.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: CARB's proposed investments for clean transportation equity funding will help to: address community identified transportation needs from our SB 350 study; it will expand
and adapt existing transportation equity projects; share
air quality and equity goals with the AB 617 Community Air
Protection Program; provide a holistic approach to
increasing access and awareness; and, pilot cleaner
transportation options for California's priority
populations.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: As noted
previously, the funding plan proposes two new projects
this year. The first of these is the Sustainable
Transportation Equity Project. This new $22 million
equity pilot takes a community-based approach to address
some of key the challenges outlined in the SB 150 report
that came before the Board earlier this year. The report
evaluated progress toward meeting the SB 375 sustainable
community goals and helping to overcome barriers
identified in the SB 350 Barriers Study.

This pilot addresses these challenges by
providing grants to accomplish two goals: reduce vehicle
miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions; and to
increase transportation equity and mobility.

The pilot will provide funding to partnerships of
local agencies and organizations to address community
identified-transportation needs and implement a suite of
clean transportation, land use, and planning projects.
These projects are intended to work together to create a cleaner, more accessible, and more integrated transportation system that benefits the disadvantaged and low-income community residents who need it most.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: This year's funding plan also proposes to expand on existing CARB outreach efforts and provide additional funding to communities, particularly those with limited resources that struggle to compete for project funding.

We've been working closely with community-based organizations and advocacy groups to identify strategies that better coordinate and effectively deliver information and assistance on our low carbon transportation projects. These efforts complement work being done through the Community Air Protection Program.

An important element to accessing clean transportation funding and related consumer-based incentives lies in the development of a streamlined application, which is the foundational effort of the One Stop Shop Pilot Project. This funding will be build upon a portion of the Volkswagen settlement funding from 2016.

With this funding, we also aim to integrate technical assistance and capacity building, including strengthening partnerships into our projects to better
enable project development and increase funding accessibility for priority populations.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: Next up, I'll discuss our proposed heavy-duty vehicle and equipment investments.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: To further guide our investments, staff updated the heavy-duty investment strategy with new updated technology status snapshots that show the current state of the technologies. The key outcomes from this plan also include a new three-year funding priorities table, identifying barriers to further adoption of advanced technology heavy-duty vehicles and equipment; outlining a process to help determine when technologies have matured and can graduate from incentive programs; and, highlighting the accomplishment of cleaning up over 11,000 school buses since 2001.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: For our heavy-duty vehicle and equipment projects, this year's funding plan includes $182 million in Low Carbon Transportation funding and $48 million in AQIP funding. It includes support for technologies along the entire
commercialization spectrum providing funding for demonstration, early commercial pilots, as well as vouchers and loans for commercially available technologies.

This includes funding to support our flagship HVIP and truck loan programs, as well as the three proposed advanced technology heavy-duty demonstration and pilot projects. This year the Clean Off-Road Equipment voucher incentive project already has $40 million available from a previous allocation, and so staff is not proposing funding from this year's allocation.

Staff is, however, proposing that $4.5 million in fiscal year 2018-19 funds allocated to a freight project that's no longer moving forward, be used to augment funding for the CORE project.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: As I noted earlier with CVRP, CARB's flagship HVIP project has seen phenomenal growth over the past couple of years. And while that growth has been a sign of the project's success, it has also led to the project running out of funding and resulting in a fiscal crisis.

Because HVIP is so severely oversubscribed with a wait list of almost $90 million, at this point, staff is proposing to take a number of steps to address this crisis.
while maintaining progress.

These proposed changes include: discontinuing all voucher enhancement, with the exception of the enhancement for vehicles operating in disadvantaged communities; limiting stacking or combining with other funds with HVIP, not allowing State-funded incentives to be combined with HVIP, such as the Energy Commission's School Bus Incentives Program or the Carl Moyer Program - however, this would not apply to stacking with local funds; and, reinstating the 200 voucher limit per fleet per calendar year.

We know that even with these changes, it won't be enough to keep the project whole for this whole year. Staff's proposal would better align eligible technologies with HVIP goals for the 2019-20 fiscal year by graduating out technologies that we can no longer call early commercial. These technologies may be ready to move to another program in our incentive portfolio or they may be ready to stand on their own with no further incentives necessary.

Consequently, staff is proposing to graduate new hybrid vehicles and hybrid conversions and graduate the 8.9 liter and 11.9 liter low NOx natural gas engines from HVIP eligibility.

One additional change to HVIP this year comes as
a result of recent legislation. AB 784 provides an exemption from the State's general fund portion of the sales and use tax for zero-emission transit buses purchased through HVIP until January 2024.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: This year's proposal also includes a $40 million allocation for advanced technology heavy-duty demonstration and pilot projects. Three specific projects are included in this proposal.

They include: a $20 million allocation for a large-scale zero-emission drayage truck pilot; a $10 million allocation for a system to capture and control emissions from ocean-going vessels; and a $10 million allocation for the Golden State Carbon Challenge, focused on developing innovative ways to reduce emissions from the freight sector.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: And finally, for fiscal year 2019-20, all of the proposed AQIP allocation will go to funding CARB's flagship Truck Loan Assistance Program. To date, approximately $115 million of State funding has provided almost $1.6 billion in financing for truck loans. Having access to the Truck Loan Assistance Program makes the difference between
obtaining truck financing or not for many small businesses.

This year's allocation is expected to help fund about 15,000 new truck purchases. We expect that demand will grow as the DMV begins verifying compliance with the Truck and Bus Rule with vehicle registration starting in 2020.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: I will now make a few final points as I conclude the presentation.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: The suite of investments included in the annual funding plan is part of our coordinated strategy of making progress toward multiple climate change and air quality goals. As you can see, we strive to develop and fund projects that support multiple agency goals and objectives.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: Because of the likelihood of demand exceeding supply again this year, particularly for our flagship projects, staff is proposing that the Board again grant the Executive Officer the authority to allocate funds from next year's budget, once it's approved, to the current year in the event that funding runs out.
Staff will utilize a transparent public work group process to help guide any adding or scaling back of funding levels and making technical or administrative changes.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: Staff's proposal is designed to advance access to clean transportation for all Californians. It will continue to assist in making progress towards meeting our climate and air quality goals by accelerating the commercialization of zero-emission technologies. It further expands the clean transportation market through our flagship rebate and voucher projects. And it will continue supporting the types of clean transportation equity projects needed to help meet local community needs.

--o0o--

MSCD AIR POLLUTION SPECIALIST CROW: In conclusion, staff recommends that the Board approve the proposed funding plan. I would just also like to note that the light-duty and heavy-duty poster project -- project posters will still be available until 1:30 today in the Klamath room.

And then finally, before we proceed with questions, we would like to invite Commissioner Patty Monahan from the California Energy Commission to come up
to the podium and provide some remarks.

    CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Welcome, Commissioner.

    CEC COMMISSIONER MONA HAN: Good morning, Madam Chair.

    Am I on?

    Good morning, Madam Chair and Board Members. It is a pleasure to be here. I'm Patty Monahan from the California Energy Commission. I am a very new Commissioner and the lead for transportation.

    I'm pleased to be here today to share my perspective on how our agencies are working together to clean up transportation and help the state meet our very ambitious targets for climate and clean air.

    As you all know, transportation is the state's biggest source of global warming pollution. It's arguably our biggest obstacle to achieving carbon neutrality by 2045. And as Board Member Dan Sperling likes to say, we're on the cusp of major changes, major opportunities to be able to capitalize on new technologies and business models to dramatically reduce carbon emissions and air pollution from transportation.

    So to reach our goal of having five million electric zero-emission vehicles by 2030, and 100 percent clean energy grid by 2045, we have to ensure that our energy grid and our refueling infrastructure are both
ready for this challenge.

Through vehicle grid integration, zero-emission vehicles, especially battery powered vehicles, but also fuel cell, if we produce the hydrogen correctly, can help the state integrate renewables, provide grid services, and reduce rates for all electricity users.

We need electric cars to soak up the sun. The amount of curtailed electricity that we had in the month of May could have powered every single one of our battery-electric vehicles for the entire month. So if we can develop the right policies to ensure that vehicles are timed at -- are charged at optimal times for the grid, we have a win-win situation.

So there's so much potential for zero-emission vehicles to be part of the solution to some of the major issues we face in energy. But these benefits only accrue if we carefully manage how zero-emission vehicles are charged, and use these zero-emission vehicle technologies correctly.

I also want to say that as we're facing more shutoffs for public safety, we have to think really carefully about reliability and grid management issues as we bring more zero-emission vehicles onto the grid.

As the State's lead agency for zero-emission vehicle fueling infrastructure deployment, the Energy
Commission is making strategic investments in innovative solutions to advance vehicle grid integration and to fill an anticipated gap in charging infrastructure.

As the State's lead agency for clean vehicles, the Air Resources Board is advancing regulatory programs for zero and near zero-emission vehicles and making strategic investments to support early adopters. Our two agencies have to work hand-in-hand. We have to work closer than we have ever worked before in order to make sure that infrastructure deployment, charging management strategies, and vehicle deployment are coordinated.

AB 2127, which was signed into law in 2018, requires the Energy Commission to lead a statewide -- a statewide charging infrastructure assessment for 2030 that expands on the Commission's current projections.

My team, in close relation -- in close coordination with the Public Utilities Commission and the Air Resources Board, is going to conduct a deep analysis of our state's charging infrastructure needs for all types of vehicles. In addition to light-duty, we're looking at off-road, and heavy-duty as well.

So we're going to be taking a comprehensive look not only at how many chargers are needed but also electrical upgrades and charger functionality.

So we look forward to working with the Air
Resources Board on this very important assessment that will help us set up for much more aggressive goals going forward on zero-emission vehicles.

In addition to the AB 2127 analysis, my team is responsible for managing a $100 million per year grant program. The Energy Commission's Clean Transportation Program - which I'm glad to say is no longer going by its former name, which was the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program, which is very hard to say - invests about $100 million in a broad portfolio of transportation and fuel technology.

We have an advisory committee that helps us develop annual investment plans to tailor our funding to the highest need. I'm happy to report that the Air Resources Board is an active member of that -- of that advisory committee.

This year, for the first time, we also engaged the Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group, which was setup through SB 350, to help advise my agency and the Public Utilities Commission.

So with input from the Advisory Committee, the Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group, and the public, we have tailored our most recent investment plan to focus on advancing zero-emission transportation. Our plan includes $32.7 million for light-duty vehicle charging...
infrastructure, 30 million for medium- and heavy-duty emission vehicles and infrastructure, 20 million for hydrogen infrastructure for fuel cell vehicles, ten million for zero and near zero carbon fuel production, and lastly 2.5 million for workforce development.

Our plan is to really focus in on infrastructure as we spend these funds, but they're -- we should be mindful that there are potentially some areas of overlap, especially in the medium- and heavy-duty front. I think, at this point, we're trying to -- you know, there's a lot of room, I think, for many investments in medium- and heavy-duty vehicles because we're behind the curve on zero mission heavy-duty transportation, but we're really trying to think through as we do these investments how do we make sure that there's a strong connection with the grid. So vehicle grid integration is going to be key elements of our investment portfolio.

Our agencies need to be increasingly strategic as we work together to ensure that our joint efforts build on each other and are not duplicative, or at least if they are duplicative, we've very mindful of that. And we have really good rationale for why -- why they are duplicative.

We recognize that the funding is going to be more constrained as the market for zero- and near zero-emission vehicles continues to grow. That's a good problem to
have. I actually think the oversubscription of the CVRP that's good problem to have, so -- but we just need to be mindful and to think through how do we tailor or investments, so over the long run, the industry will thrive without any government support.

Grant and incentive funds are very appropriate for clean techn -- transportation technologies in early stages of commercialization. But the CEC and the ARB are beginning a discussion about how to support wider deployment of clean transportation technologies that have been successfully deployed and commercialized thanks to State incentive support and regulations for over a decade.

We are considering as these technologies become competitive in the marketplace, what are other modes of supporting them besides grants, for example, loan programs and other new models of support.

So I want to conclude by saying that our two agencies have to collaborate more closely than ever to make sure the state can reach its goals for zero-emission vehicles and a carbon neutral economy by 2045. I really look forward to continuing our collaboration. I think that the strengths of the Air Resources Board paired with the strengths of the Energy Commission can really give the state a powerful platform to move forward on accelerating our goals for clean transportation.
My advisor, Ben De Alba, is going to remain here for the duration of this item in case you have questions that come up after I've already left, but thank you.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Can I ask a question?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you very much, Commissioner. This is indeed a good partnership. And I look forward to making it even stronger.

CEC COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I have a question.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Questions. Yes.
BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: First, thanks -- thanks for coming. There's been great cooperation between both agencies. And so thanks for that. I actually wanted to ask your sort of thought on a -- on one or two of the potential changes. And I want to ask the same questions of our staff, so I thought I'd ask you. Since the CVRP program is clearly underfunded and, you know, we're trying to figure out how to really use the funds most effectively, what is your thought about whether this move from 20 to 25 miles on range? To me, that doesn't seem to be enough of an increase. It seems that we are still funding these hybrid vehicles that don't have very much electric range and either lowering the rebate further for those vehicles and/or raising the minimum mileage required of those vehicles. Do you have any thoughts about that?
CEC COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: Yeah. I mean, I think that range anxiety is a real fear in the average consumer, and that, you know, one of the rationales for continuing to fund plug-in electric vehicles that -- hybrid PHEVs, is that for those folks that would not otherwise buy electric, because they're afraid they won't be able to charge their vehicle, that's a safe option.

You know, we're working hard to make sure that range anxiety goes away and that we have --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Um-hmm.

CEC COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: -- a robust charging infrastructure, so that you can feel confident. If you want to go to Tahoe, you can do it. I don't think that many folks have that confidence today. So the rationale for continuing to fund plug-in hybrid electric vehicles with a limited range is that that helps consumers just feel more confident and continue to buy electric.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Um-hmm.

CEC COMMISSIONER MONAHAN: Whether that's the right number, 25, or -- I can't say.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right. Right. Okay.

Thanks.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Okay. I think it's time to move to the public comment, if I'm not mistaken.
But we have -- sorry? Oh, okay -- a very long list of witnesses which is up on the Board.

Yes, and you're it to begin.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: But before you step up, I did want to say something about the timing, because at three minutes a person with the list that we've got, I think we're going to be here a very long time. And I anticipate that most people can say what they think in a shorter period of time. So I'm going to start right now with shortening the public comment -- the comment period to two minutes. You'll get a yellow light, and then a red light, and a buzz. Okay. Thanks.

MR. SHEIKH: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, members of the Board. And I didn't want to be presumptuous by just marching right up here until you were ready for me. So thank you.

First, you know, the staff did such a great job presenting what's just a huge and diverse set of programs that have been so important in the region. I'm Samir Sheikh. I'm the Air Pollution Control Officer for the San Joaquin Valley Air District.

We've long partnered with your great team on looking for really exciting projects under this plan that you put together. So first, I just wanted to voice very
strong support for all the hard work that's gone into
this. There was a great event that we were a part of in
Modesto. That was a great showcase for the wide range of
technologies that are possible under these types of
projects. So thank you very much for that. And I will
work on a more condensed version of my comments to meet
your two minute goal.

As you know, our region faces very difficult air
quality challenges. We've been working very hard with
CARB and other partners to figure out exactly how we're
going to be able to meet the federal standards. As you
also know, there's a very tough PM2.5 plan that we put
together that has a wide range of measures in stationary
sources, mobile sources.

I'm very happy to report we're working very hard
with -- in partnership with CARB to implement a number of
measures right now, as we speak. One of the very
important areas in our region is heavy-duty trucking. As
our region serves as a major goods movement corridor, we
all know that heavy-duty trucking is actually the single
largest contributor to our local emissions. And so
looking at what we do with this program has always been a
very important part of how we, as a region, really think
about how we're going to meet the very tough commitments
that we have in our plan.
And just as a reminder, and I know you are all aware of this, but in our plan as part of the mobile strategy, we have a very ambitious goal of turning over 30,000 heavy-duty trucks, Class 7 and 8 trucks, with near zero or preferably, at some point, zero-emissions technology. The fact of the matter is that right now in the near term over the five-year time frame that we have to implement that plan, there really isn't a zero-emissions technology that is viable today. And so --

I'm sorry, was that two minutes already?

CHAIR NICHOLS: It is.

MR. SHEIKH: All right. If I can make my recommendation then.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Just finish up then.

MR. SHEIKH: Very brief. So the main point I wanted to make was that one of the technologies that has become available that just got certified recently is the 12 liter engine that provides that 0.02 gram NOx technology. I wanted to make a suggestion that as part of this plan that you consider allowing that funding to remain as a viable option under the HVIP Program. We think in the near term it's going to provide some solutions, especially when coupled with in-state RNG that also achieves the decarbonization goals that we're all shooting for. So that would be my very specific
suggestion.

And then just a shout-out of support for the clean mobility pilot projects. We have two of those. Thanks to the staff are very -- very much for all the flexibility and the recommendations on the continued work to make sure those pilots are successful.

And with that, just thank you very much overall for the program and your attention.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Thank you, Samir. I know you're one of our largest target areas for these grants and appreciate all your support.

Thanks.

MR. NASTRI: Speaking of large target areas.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: That would be you.

MR. NASTRI: Good morning, Madam Chair.

(Laughter.)

MR. NASTRI: Good morning, members of the Board.

My name is Wayne Nastri. I'm the Executive Officer of the South Coast AQMD. I want to thank you and I want to thank the staff for working with us toward our shared goals of cleaning the air for everyone who lives and works in the great state of California.

Strong CARB regulatory actions to reduce emissions from mobile sources have produced tremendous
results, allowing the population growth and economic
growth that we've all enjoyed. Incentive programs have
played a key role in our overall success. However, as you
know, South Coast Basin still needs to reduce harmful NOx
emissions by 45 percent in 2023, and 55 percent by 2031.

What that really translates to is we need to
reduce 150 tons per day of NOx by 2023 and an additional
50 tons per day by 2031. And we know that these emissions
are predominantly from mobile sources, particularly
heavy-duty trucks, locomotives, ocean-going vessels. And
as you're well aware, we have legal requirements. We have
obligations to meet these standards with significant
potential federal sanctions for failure to do so.

However, it's virtually impossible for us to
attain those standards for ozone and PM without the rapid
implementation of transformative measures, including
significant development and deployment of zero and near
zero-emission technologies.

We all agree we want a zero-emission future in
the freight industry. And the best way to achieve our air
quality and climate goals is -- and our community emission
reduction goals in the future encompasses pushing out
those technologies. But the question is not about the
long-term vision of a sustainable freight industry in
California nor about a national debate on fossil fuels.
The question is about our ability to obtain those short-term immediate emission reductions, particularly again, as I said before, by 2023.

Our -- and I will do as Samir did and get straight to the recommendations, which again is to encourage flexibility within this plan, particularly for the 12-liter engines. We need to get as many and much of the NOx reductions as we can, or we're faced with the loss of federal highway and the billions of dollars a year, which will far greatly impact not just our region, but the entire State.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. NASTRI: So again thank you for all that you're doing.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Appreciate that.

I know it's tough when you are planning on three minutes.

MS. CHARKIEWICZ: Good morning, Chair Nichols, CARB Board and staff. My name is Steffani Charkiewicz and I'm representing the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. It is a pleasure to for me to speak to all of you today in support of the fiscal year 2019-2020 funding plan for clean transportation incentives.

The District believes this is an excellent
opportunity and looks forward in working with CARB to put these funds into communities to reduce emissions and keep California at the cutting edge of clean transportation.

Sacramento has successfully deployed several Cap-and-Trade programs awarded by CARB, which have transitioned into programs in the funding plan.

We have successfully launched, and are on our second expansion of the Our Community CarShare Sacramento program, an innovative and first-of-its-kind zero-emission vehicle carsharing program for low-income housing communities. The CarShare Program is currently serving seven communities with expansion into four more by the beginning of 2020. I have had the pleasure of leading the implementation of all three phases of the CarShare Program for the District.

We have also launched one of the nation's largest electric school bus deployments, where we partnered with three local school districts and several technology partners to put 29 zero-emission buses into disadvantaged communities.

The Sac Metro Air District is looking forward to launching the Clean Cars 4 All Program and potentially working with several stakeholders on the Clean Mobility in Schools and other innovative programs. We support the expansion of existing programs. By focusing funds on
these existing successful programs, it allows for more in-depth learning and future program growth. This includes lessons learned from feedback running our Community Air Protection incentives and the FARMER Program.

The Sacramento Air District believes the funding plan overall is a good strategy. We do want to make note that the changes in HVIP and how this could impact our program.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Any other recommendations, if you have any specific --

MS. CHARKIEWICZ: Yes. We would like to recommend the difficulty with the changes to the HVIP Program. It makes it difficult for some of the school districts to be able to continue funding, because they do need those funds in order to convince their board to pursue these zero-emission programs. We've had great success with working with them. And we feel like we wouldn't have as much success if we cannot accompany the HVIP funds with the other current existing funding that we can use. And we are a medium-sized district, so our local funds are limited. So we would like that to be continued.

Thank you again. And we look forward to working -- continued work with the CARB staff and thank
you for letting me speak today.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. NEWARD: Hi. Madam Chair and members of the Board. My name is Michael Neward and I'm here representing the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to speak in favor of the proposed 2009-2020[SIC] funding plan for AQIP and Low Carbon Transportation investments. I'd like to thank Mr. Corey and his staff for putting together such a comprehensive plan.

Overall, the Air District strongly supports CARB's investment strategy that reflects a balanced portfolio providing near-term reductions with clean combustion, along with programs that will provide long-term reductions using primary advanced technologies.

However, I'm also here to raise one concern with respect to one of the proposed changes to HVIP Program, specifically the proposal to disallow or significantly limit the stacking of Moyer and other State and local funds. According to CARB staff, the plan states that about 70 percent of HVIP funds have funded projects in and around disadvantaged communities. However, zero-emission vehicles and buses are still significantly more expensive than diesel or natural gas options.

Removing the ability to stack the State and other funds is premature and contrary to the State's goals of
addressing equity and incentives adoption of electric
vehicles for both private and public fleets. For private
fleets, the proposal would mean the small operations would
be incentivized to apply to Moyer or other diesel funding.
The proposal would also negatively impact public fleets
and both public and private school operators.

Over the past two years, the Air District has
awarded over $11 million to school districts to replace 65
diesel buses with electric. Most of these buses were in
disadvantaged communities. For these 65 buses, the school
districts leveraged our grant funding with $10 million
from HVIP. Without the ability to address the total cost
of replacement, operations in school districts will be
disincentivized from adopting cleaner options.

We strongly believe that allowing the stack of
Carl Moyer and other State and local funds with HVIP funds
for all costs and fees is essential to supporting the
transition to electric vehicle technology sooner rather
than later.

Therefore, we ask the Board to modify staff's
proposal --

I'll just wrap-up with the --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Finish the sentence.

MR. NEWARD: -- the sentence -- respect the HVIP
stacking limitation in order to allow the State and local
funds to continue to use provide a full cost of
replacement. If the Board decides to go ahead with some
limitations to HVIP stacking, we ask the Board to modify
the staff's proposal to at least allow private and public
school bus owners to continue using HVIP funds.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. ELRICK: Madam Chair, Board, thank you for
your continued global leadership in this. The Fuel Cell
Partnership continues to support the public-private
collaborative approach to these goals to reach all of our
common environmental and energy goals. And similar to
last year's Fuel Cell Revolution, which we submitted to
you, which outline a sustainable light-duty fuel cell
vehicle market, I'd like to - I hope you have this in your
hands now - submit our newest fuel cell electric bus
roadmap. This outlines how we can help achieve the ICT
Rule, which you recently adopted.

It includes 11 action steps that lead to the
success. I'd love to sit down with you and your staff to
discuss further. But what I'd really like to focus on is
the biggest challenge, which is infrastructure for all ZEV
deployments. This is where we need the most help in
transform the market.

I did a quick back-of-the-envelope analysis of
the current public ZBus plans, for example, and found that a range of anywhere from $50,000 to $450,000 in infrastructure costs per bus. That means to fully transform the market like ICT wishes, it's anywhere from $500 million to $4.5 billion.

This is individually daunting for the transit agencies individually. But looking at it more collectively, the impact on the grid, hydrogen production as a system statewide is still unknown and needs to be investigated.

I was really pleased to hear the Commissioner's comments earlier about looking at a statewide approach for charging. We need this for hydrogen infrastructure as well. Going a step further looking at the renewable energy carriers, hydrogen and electricity, how they work together, not just in a mobility, but all of our renewable energy markets.

So my recommendation is that you direct staff to develop statewide strategies for all ZEV infrastructure deployment and renewable energy development as quickly as possible in all the markets, light-duty, buses, trucks, so we can achieve the targets you've put out in front of us.

So it won't occur without your comprehensive approach and planning. Again, thank you very much. I look forward to working with you further.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. LEVIN: Madam Chair, members of the Board, I would like to commend this Board and your staff for your successful investment in fuel cell electric buses. We are now launching from the funding that you've provided us with projects in Orange County and in Alameda County, where we've reduced the cost of the fuel cell bus by 50 percent. We've -- we're building two new fueling stations, high-capacity stations, that can fill 50 or more buses in record time equivalent to CNG and diesel. And we are seeing ranges of over 300 miles, which reflects the ability to provide one-to-one replacement.

And so the challenge though is we're at the 15 yard line. We have not gone over the goal line to commercialize the technology and to reach price or cost parity with battery electric. And we will need both battery electric and fuel cell electric to meet the ICT regulation.

So we can reduce -- we know we can reduce the fuel cell electric bus price or cost by another 30 percent, if we can procure 100 buses at a time. But the key to doing this is infrastructure funding. We are turning the heads of public transit agencies that want to -- here in the state that want fuel cell buses, but the challenge is building infrastructure.
CEC, you heard Commissioner Monahan talk about their investment for heavy-duty infrastructure, but it's not enough. And so our recommendation to this Board and to your staff is do not eliminate infra -- infrastructure vouchers. We need that. Tie those vouchers to a match with the CEC money, so it isn't automatically granted. But if we can get CEC money and pull it together, we can build the additional infrastructure for transit that will continue to move us forward with commercialization.

And I will conclude. Please don't leave your investment at the 15-yard line. We need to move over the goal line. We need your continued help. Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Maybe the analogy today could have been we're almost at the hoop and we've got to get the ball in the basket, since we have so many basketball folks here.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: It works. That's great.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: It's a basketball rather than football day today.

MR. PEEPLES: Yes. We seem to be able to put unlimited money into sports arenas, but that's another matter.
Chair Nichols, members of the Board, my name is Chris Peeples. I'm an elected at-large member of the Board of Directors of AC Transit. And I'm here today to encourage you to continue to allow funding for infrastructure, particularly on the fuel cell side.

As you know, we have 29 zero-emission buses. Most of them are fuel cell. We have five electric buses sitting in the yard, because PG&E hasn't gotten around to hooking up our chargers. They're a little occupied with other things right now.

But we're going to be presented next Wednesday with a series of plans for how we meet your Innovative Clean Transit Rule. One of the elements of that is infrastructure funding.

We know that for many reasons in many situations fuel cell buses work better. In our situation, they have estimated that electric buses can only handle about 20 percent of our runs. So we're going to be doing both. But now, there's a heavy thumb on the scale when it comes to battery electric buses. The PUC has ruled that IOUs can use ratepayer funding to build the infrastructure for battery electric buses. There is no equivalent funding for fuel cell buses.

So I would encourage you to direct your staff to allow your funding to continue to be used for
infrastructure, so that we can get -- we don't need it. We're rebuilding our Emeryville yard. It's going to have heavy-duty high-speed funding and that will take care of our next increment of buses.

But to convince other transit agencies to try fuel cell buses, they need to be able to pay for the infrastructure.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. KINMAN: Good morning. I'm Michelle Kinman with the Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator. And I'd like, first of all, to thank the staff for the difficult and thoughtful process that I know you've gone through to put together the proposal before the Board today. I'd also like to offer very specific support to some of the heavy-duty programs.

As quick context, last fall, LACI came together with CARB and the CEC and the Ports of L.A. and Long Beach, and we issued a Request for Information to industry on the state of zero-emission trucks, infrastructure, and pilot concepts. And we learned about the rapid development of this sector of zero-emission trucks and infrastructure, as well as the need for continued and coordinated incentives for both the trucks and infrastructure.
We also learned of a readiness from seven different OEMs to participate in a 50 to 100 drayage -- zero-emission drayage truck pilot to serve the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

And with that in mind, we'd like to offer strong support for the proposal today to focus all of the HVIP funding to zero-emission technology at this critical juncture in this -- the development of that market.

We'd also like to provide support for the proposal for the zero-emission drayage truck pilot. And then as an incubator that ourselves we run a modest -- two modest start-up global competitions each year. And we've seen firsthand how such competitions can spur innovation. We'd really like to support the Golden State Carbon Challenge. We would encourage you to broaden the scope of that to include on-road as well as off-road trucks, but we're quite excited about that challenge.

We've submitted written comments with more details, but wanted to thank you all for your consideration and your leadership.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

By the way, I'm hoping that everybody who intends to speak on this item has signed up. If you haven't, please do it now, because we're -- we've got a very long
list and I'd like to be able to cut it off at 54 speakers. Thank you.

MR. WALKER: Great. Thank you. Hello, Madam Chair -- Chairman -- Madam Chairwoman and the rest of the Board members.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Whatever.

MR. WALKER: My name is Jon Walker and I am the Sustainability Manager for Lyft, Inc. I think most of you know who Lyft is. But we are a rideshare company based right here in the state of California. So I'd like to talk today about a proposed change to CVRP implementation.

So, first, thanks to the staff for working with us throughout the year. We first brought our idea for a potential change to staff in February of this year. And I'd like to talk a little bit more about it today.

So what are we proposing?

I do agree with Commissioner Monahan who earlier stated that it is a good thing that CVRP is oversubscribed. And now our goal is to make the most and expand the value of that limited funding.

So what if we came to you and had a proposal to make $1 act like $4 within that limited budget? And that's what we have a proposal to do today. What we're prosing is to increase the existing cap on the rental car provision from 20 vehicles to something more commensurate
with the TNC use case.

We note that Senate Bill 1014 and Health and Safety Code 44274.4 ask CARB to consider the role of TNCs and TNC rental partners in CVRP. And so we are asking to increase from 20 the rental car provision up to something more commensurate like 2,500, which would be around three percent of the total budget.

So for this three percent of the total budget, the State would reap the following benefits:

First, electrifying one TNC vehicle is the environmental equivalent of electrifying four personal battery electric vehicles, because of the number of EVMT per vehicle. That's not just us saying it. UC Davis just came out with a study that supports that.

Secondly, this is a great way to support charge networks. We have a chicken and egg problem with charge networks, which leads to long lead time. We can bring the chicken so to speak.

Thirdly, this is a great way to allocate this money to disadvantaged communities and communities that are not typically accessing CVRP funding. More than 50 percent of our drivers are low-income.

And then my final point is just to --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Excuse me just a seconding --

MR. WALKER: Yeah, go ahead.
CHAIR NICHOLS: -- Supervisor Fletcher has a question.

MR. WALKER: Yeah, please.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Thank you. I just have a quick question. So what you're supporting then is CARB funding to electrify the cars for your drivers for your fleet of vehicles, is that your -- that's what you're looking for?

MR. WALKER: Through the rental car provision. So we work with partners like Hertz, Avis Budget, and there's a current provision for 20 vehicles for those types of entities.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Right.

MR. WALKER: And we have a partnership with them, where they rent to our drivers. We're suggesting expanding that 20 to something larger.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Got it. So -- but again, it would be folks utilizing your service. So it would be electrification of vehicles for utilization on Lyft?

MR. WALKER: Correct. And other TNCs, yeah.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: So then the -- the driving of a car would appear to be core to your business model then --

MR. WALKER: I'm not sure if there's question.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: -- which has been in
dispute, whether like the actual driving of a car is core to Lyft's business model. And I just think given that you're here advocating for government funding to electrify the vehicles of your cars, I just want to point out it certainly appears to be me that it is core to your business model. So thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I think your time is up --

MR. WALKER: Yeah. Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: -- in any case.

Thank you. Thank you.

MR. ROBINSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. My name is Matt Robinson with the California Transit Association. And if I could throw in another sports reference, I am the designated hitter for Michael Pimentel today who I think most of you are familiar with.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: You're off the -- you're off the bench.

(Laughter.)

MR. ROBINSON: That's a controversial subject, I realize that.

As you're aware, our two organizations have worked extremely closely together over the last several years to develop the Innovative Clean Transit regulation. We continue to support the rule, and as our comment letter attests, are working daily to ensure that our members have
the tools they need to fully electrify by 2040. I come to you today to voice concerns not about the rule itself, but about the proposed changes to the funding programs that are vital to its implementation. These proposed changes would take funding away from transit agencies, just as they are taking on extraordinary new capital expenses. And to put that in perspective, L.A. Metro, our state's largest bus operator has a $1 billion cost to fully electrify its fleet in the timeline prescribed in the ICT. We understand that you do need to make some difficult choices today. However, we urge you to show support for transit agencies and your beachhead approach to electrification by considering the following: The funding plan proposes to eliminate the HVIP's voucher enhancement for infrastructure. And we urge you to recognize the chronic funding shortfalls faced by transit agency, as well as our inability to easily generate new revenue and to preserve the enhancement specifically for transit agencies. The funding plan also proposes to grant the Executive Officer the authority to reduce the voucher amounts by up to 20 percent. For the same reasons, we ask that this authority not extend to transit systems. I would note that we worked very hard to pass AB
784, which was mentioned earlier today, which would result in about a 30 to 40 thousand dollar cost savings for the purchase of these buses. And some of these changes negate all of that effort.

We also ask that you consider that transit agencies, due to their long procurement procedures, are not able to make fleet purchase decisions as quickly as their private sector counterparts. And given the first-come first-served nature of HVIP -- I'm sorry, of HVIP, this could mean that the private fleet owners swoop in and soak up all the rebates before we got a chance to. I realize that two minutes went really fast. I shouldn't have made the designated hitter joke.

If I could just conclude.

(Laughter.)

MR. ROBINSON: We're at a critical point, Madam Chair. I think you know that. We are now tasked with electrifying our fleets through the regulatory process and we need all the help we can get. And some of these changes could have negative effects on that electrification process. So thank you for your time.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. DAVIS: Good morning, Madam Chair and Board. I'm Stephen Davis with Robert V. Jensen. They are a major oil and fuel distributor in the San Joaquin Valley. I'm
here for the support of infrastructure for hydrogen.

    With the handout that I've -- that I gave to you, as you can see, we can do a lot with hydrogen. We can fuel trucks, forklifts, cars, backup generators, fuel cell generators, all kinds of things to do. But we need infrastructure support to do it and commercial stations to do so. And the business model right now, unfortunately, we need grant money to make that happen. We can't make money quite yet without some help from the State for the infrastructure.

    California and now -- and so Fresno -- Central Valley not only the traffic -- truck traffic on 99 is immense anymore. It's just like a -- it looks like a long train. That's where our emissions are. That's our biggest bang for the buck is truck emissions and buses.

    We can mobile fuel. We can do all kinds of things with the hydrogen, we just need the infrastructure to do it.

    Thank you for your time.

    MR. GAFFNEY: Good morning. My name is Bob Gaffney. I'm with Advanced Emission Control Solutions out of Fresno. And I'd like to thank the Board for letting me speak this morning.

    I'm here to talk about accelerating the movement of hydrogen. My partners are petroleum jobbers out of
Fresno, Robert V. Jensen, Incorporated. And they've been in business for about 70 years moving petroleum. They have a keen interest in moving hydrogen. And we would like to be able to produce hydrogen fuel in the Fresno area. We don't have anything going on, either a hydrogen station or anything. So we need to get things going in the middle of the state, where range anxiety for hydrogen can be potentially eliminated.

And so what I'm proposing that we do is have like a pilot project out of Fresno, where we can get set up with transporters and bobtails to move hydrogen fuel up and down the valley initially, and then reach out to independent petroleum jobbers throughout the state to move hydrogen all over the state.

So that's why I'm here today is to get -- gain your support to pilot such a project, because the transport equipment is extremely expensive and it would be most helpful to gain some type of grant monies to be able to get that moving.

And I'm speaking on behalf of Bill Jensen, who is the owner of Robert V. Jensen in Fresno.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

And next?

Move on to whoever is 14?
Fifteen?
Are folks here? We got letters, so I guess that's okay.

Whoever is next in line, come on -- come forward.

MS. MASSEY: I'll just take the stand, number 16.
Hello, everyone, my name is Joy Massey. I'm from Transform. And I currently lead the Carsharing and Mobility Hub's pilot, which is a project within the California Air Resources Board clean mobility options that was presented before the public comment started.

We're working with Transform and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, MTC, to collaborate with three cities in the Bay Area, Oakland, San Jose, and Richmond, and affordable housing developers to learn which mobility options low-income communities need and the best approach to increase access and affordability for each option.

Our project was initiated by conducting a community transportation needs assessment to tailor implementation efforts for each site and to make sure we deliver clean transportation options that resonate and meet the unique needs of low-income residents at each of our sites.

We're proud that our needs assessment approach is being modeled for CARB's new Clean Mobility Project, the Sustainable Transportation Equity Project. And we really
do look forward to continue to share lessons learned as we launch our Mobility Hubs Project.

I'm here today just to offer support on CARB staff's proposal to provide expansion funding to existing clean mobility pilot projects, including ours. This expansion funding will allow our project and others within this category to continue to build on implementation efforts and create mobility hubs that link residents to clean transportation options.

You can visit our poster after to learn more about our lessons learned and kind of our issues with really trying to install charging infrastructure and offer carsharing in these communities.

But I just want to close by saying thank you to the CARB staff. I'll just highlight Sam Gregor and Ashley Georgiou who have both been extremely supportive and flexible as we navigate the realities and constraints of delivering this project to meet the low-income needs of residents at our sites.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Maybe you should be chatting with the folks from Inglewood who are here who are interested in how to implement some transportation ideas along with the low-income housing that's going to be coming with the new arena.
MS. MERZA: Good morning. I'll take you back one step. I'm number 15 on the list. My name is Ritta Merza. I serve as Policy and Programs Manager at Foothill Transit. I'm here to urge you to maximize investments zero-emission buses and supporting infrastructure. Foothill Transit is the primary transit provider in the San Gabriel and Pomona valleys in the eastern Los Angeles County.

We have been the leader in battery electric bus deployments since 2010 when we deployed our first three battery electric buses. Since then -- currently, we operate 33 battery electric buses with two more battery electric double-deck buses that are slated to be deployed next spring.

While we're very proud of this progress, and -- it has been largely due to the HVIP Program, and we're very proud of this progress. However, this still only represents ten percent of our entire fleet. We found that the high cost of battery electric buses and the high cost of the infrastructure has made it a challenge to scale our fleet. We've also found that the cost and complexity of electricity rates has also made it hard to predict and budget for the costs associated with transportation electrification.
For these reasons, we at Foothill Transit ask that this Board establish a set-aside for zero-emission buses to ensure that transit agencies receive a minimum amount of funding; secondly, to retain the voucher enhancement for infrastructure to be preserved for all transit agencies; and lastly, to exclude transit agencies from potential reduction -- reductions of voucher amounts.

Thank you very much for your time and attention.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. HELAK: Hi. I'm Martha Helak with the SMUD, the Sacramento Municipal Utility District. Thanks so much for the opportunity to provide comments today.

In general, we support the regulatory changes in the plan. However, SMUD does oppose the provisions that eliminate HVIP and stackability with other State agency incentives. Given different funding provisions across different state regions and their supporting air quality management districts, elimination of stackability would put Sacramento at a disadvantage. Many AQMDs across the state lack major sources of funding from local incentive funds and rely solely on State funding to promote zero vehicle emission technology.

Thus, we need the provisions of stackability to cover medium- and heavy-duty vehicle electrification in our region. We do recognize that CARB is trying to solve
the issue of eliminating stackability above the 100 percent cost level. And we would urge CARB to allow partial stackability up to that 100 percent level, but no more.

We also request for the inclusion of any other infrastructure costs coverage as well, but no more than 100 percent.

And yes, thank you so much. Under two minutes. Thank you.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Well done. You get extra points.

MS. BERTRAND: Yes. Chair Nichols and your Board members. Hi. My name is Donna Marie Bertrand and I'm with Dannar. Dannar is a manufacturer of robust, off-road, battery electric mobile platform. That's a lot, but I'll let you absorb that. It's in the packet. We do have our poster as part of the packets that you already have.

We offer multifunctional capabilities that efficiently replaces multiple pieces of single purpose conventional off-road equipment. We appreciate ARB's -- A-R-B's strong support for zero-emission off-road funding, particularly with the recent successful deployment of Dannar's zero-emission off-road equipment with the Port of
Stockton. It was a great project. It continues.

We thank you for this opportunity and I have five sentences, even though one of them is a run-on sentence.

Here we go. Number one, Dannar strongly supports the proposed inclusion of 40 million for pilot demonstration project in the medium-, heavy-duty, and off-road sectors.

Two, within the funding, we respectfully request that the criteria for this project be inclusive and allow for a wider range of zero-emission and off-road applications.

Three, today, ARB has primarily limited the funding for zero-emission off-road equipment to ports, airports, and goods movement.

Here is a recommendation sentence four. Expanding the pilot programs to be more inclusive will allow for more off-road applications, such as equipments[SIC] for cities and counties, universities, State fleets, and other end-users, while continuing to fund the zero-emission freight applications.

Five, deploying the zero-emission off-road equipment in all sectors will help expand opportunities, as well as really get the reductions throughout the state, and especially to the priority populations.

We thank you to the Board and the entire staff
that supports you.

      Thanks again.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. CANCINO: Good morning, Madam Chair and Board. My name is Raymond Cancino and I'm the CEO of Community Bridges Puentes de la Comunidad in Watsonville, who serve one in ten county -- Santa Cruz County residents. We strongly support the proposed plan with a couple of exceptions.

We'd like to first though thank the staff at CARB, Stella, Sam, and Veronica, for supporting our goals of reducing greenhouse gases in the priority area and providing first access to clean energy to a population who is regularly disadvantaged, people with disabilities and seniors.

As a nonprofit transit agency that serves 40 percent of all paratransit rides in Santa Cruz County and specifically targeting those priority populations, without this funding and this trial period for our current project that you can see out in the hall, we wouldn't be able to provide this clean energy. And without your investment, we wouldn't be able to be at the forefront of it instead of behind it.

So we would like to recommend that in the future you include nonprofit transportation agencies such as ours
to be a part of these working groups to ensure that non-profits are not disadvantaged by legislation, regulation, and road blocks. We find ourselves as the primary people that are dealing with the reality of rural communities, where transportation companies or transportation agencies are not able to meet those needs of rural living people. And as cost of living becomes a real factor, people are moving further and further away from central cities.

So it's really critically important that you also allow non-profits to use the stackability funds, because as a nonprofit, you know that funding is really critical and core to investing such as these projects that's really critical to not vehicles but the people, mobility, and social equity.

Thank you.

MR. COSTANTINO: Hi. Good morning. Jon Costantino on behalf of Trillium, but also on behalf of a group of natural gas -- natural gas vehicle coalition members. And I'm going to be sort of the lead speaker. I'm going to tell you what the ask is and I'll let other people tell you the why, that way we're a little more coordinated and not duplicative.

And I'm happy to be here, not only because there's electricity, but because this is the end of a long
road on HVIP.

So the ask is three -- three things, continued funding for the 12 liter with in-state natural gas under HVIP; a commitment to expedite the landing spot, which is most likely the Carl Moyer Program. There are some fixes that need to be done to bring natural gas vehicles into that program and have it work as well as the HVIP currently does. So we certainly want that -- that commitment to work hard on fixing that program. And then finally, there's a definition of low -- of near zero that is sort of weedy and in the weeds. But working on that definition that works for low NOx would be appreciated as well.

And then taking off my coalition hat for a second and putting back on my Trillium hat, Trillium produces heavy-duty infrastructure. We also support the hydrogen infrastructure request previously made.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. GRANHOLM: Good morning, Chair Nichols and Board. My name is Ben Granholm on behalf of the Western Propane Gas Association. WPGA would first just like to thank you for the opportunity to comment this morning and align our comments with the previous speaker and the coalition.
And we'd also like to mention that we believe that low NOx heavy-duty trucks using renewable fuels are and will continue to be a vital piece to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation sector -- in
the -- excuse me in the transportation sector.

WPGA advocates for all low carbon solutions, but specifically on the side of propane, which provides reliability, affordability, stability, and resiliency, and all of which are extremely key when looking to transition California's transportation sector to cleaner fuels.

When looking towards the future, the propane industry has invested heavily in renewable propane, which is derived from sustainable sources like beef tallow or vegetable oil. Continued funding of heavy-duty low NOx trucks through the HVIP Program can play an incredibly important role in the production of in-state renewable propane, and the continued production of low NOx engines to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions for decades to come.

The Western Propane Gas Association appreciates all of your work on this issue, as well as staff's time and dedication and look forward to working with all of you as the State continues and strives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through comprehensive clean energy solutions.
Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. ASTI: Good morning, Chair Nichols and Board Members. My SMUD colleague set a high bar so I'm going to go through these fairly quickly.

I'm David Asti with Southern California Edison. I would like to say that we appreciate the opportunity to provide our support for the proposed fiscal year funding plan. We commend the staff's hard work to map out a path to 2030, because the decisions and investments we make now will determine our long-term success.

We are committed to support the State's efforts to achieve its climate and air quality goals. And transportation electrification, of course, is a linchpin of those efforts.

We agree with staff that the next three to five years are critical years for the EV market, and strong, clear, and consistent funding signals are important. Transportation electrification is making great strides, but reliable and adequate funding for incentive and reward programs remains a key to continuing success.

It is critical that funding plans are sufficient to weather setbacks, such as those of the loss of incentives and regulatory drivers particularly at the federal level.
Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. ASTI: I'll take my glasses, because it helps.

MS. VAN CLEVE: Good morning. My name is Sarah Van Cleve and I'm on behalf of Tesla.

First, Tesla really appreciates staff's diligent work on the funding plan which attempts to keep the programs solvent as the demand grows but the funding remains flat. However, we do have a few concerns with the proposed changes to CVRP.

As staff mentioned with the increasing demand for electric vehicles, the program does not have sufficient funds to continue as is. Given these funding limitations, we ask that CARB focus the limited CVRP funds on vehicles that can make the largest contribution towards the State's clean energy goals, fully zero-emission vehicles.

Numerous studies have shown that many miles driven with plug-in hybrids use gasoline. In fact, CARB's own analysis from the Advanced Clean Cars mid-term review demonstrated that only four to ten percent of annual vehicle miles traveled on some of the most popular short range plug-in hybrids were emissions free.

As shown by the popularity of battery electric vehicles, and recent announcements by some manufacturers
to stop producing plug-in hybrids altogether, we are quickly moving past the era of plug-in hybrids. Thus, we must object to the continued funding with limited CVRP funds for plug-in hybrids.

However, if the Board chooses to continue the inclusion of plug-in hybrids that's eligible for CVRP this year, then we highly recommend that the Board state that this is the last year that such funding will be available for those vehicles.

Additionally, if the Board chooses to keep plug-in hybrids in, we recommend increasing the minimum range from the staff proposal of 25 miles to at least 40 miles.

And to Supervisor Gioia's point earlier, we don't think 25 is enough, particularly given that staff uses the Urban Dynamometer Driving Schedule or UDDS, range metric, which doesn't reflect real-world driving conditions.

For example, we understand that the Prius Prime has a UDDS range of 38 miles. But in reality, it only has a U.S. EPA range of 25 miles.

Thank you.
manufacturer of zero-emission battery electric school buses, trucks, and shuttle buses. We are in support of your new program with the 1920 for the low carbon and 142 million for HVIP.

The funding likely will not serve the demands of vouchers expected over the next year. We support staff's proposal on focusing investments on zero-emission technologies to help maintain a continuous and effective program. We're also in support of the $40 million that is being spent for Class 8 trucks and tractors as we build.

Lion also supports the $55 million for Clean Mobility in Schools Act and Project, and that's for disadvantaged communities. So we're in favor of that.

Most importantly, we'd like to ask you to keep the voucher program for HVIP stackable for the local and regional funding. It does affect a lot of people, a lot of school districts, a lot of fleets, and would impact people directly. This current plan could limit that.

The other part is zero-emission is -- right now, it is currently effective, and it is provable, and it is trackable. And we have a history of it already in the last three years. And our grants are -- your grants are working. That's the bottom line. Your grants are working the driving companies like ours to be in Sacramento and to build manufacturing facilities.
In the past, a vehicle was $600,000. Now, it's in the 300s. The trucks can go up to 250 miles on one charge and a school bus can go up to 155. The turning point now is to close with zero-emission is the ability to stack funding as necessary through the air districts to remove cost barriers and to create more success stories in the region and in the state that we have done here.

Thank you for your continued support and we appreciate everything you do.

Two minutes. Slam dunk.

(Laughter.)

MR. SCHRAP: Beat out the buzzer.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Board today. My name is Matt Schrap. I'm with Velocity Vehicle Group and Crossroads Equipment Lease and Finance.

I'd first like to commend staff on their hard work in putting together this comprehensive approach in addressing the multitude of challenges in this highly charged environment.

One item in particular that's near and dear to our hearts is the CPCFA and the ARB on-road loan program. As I stand before you today, I represent over 6,000 individual business owners who have originated a program eligible loan through our organization. Over 20,000 of
these businesses have utilized other lenders to help their businesses keep rolling and growing. And this is due in no small part to the leadership and the vision of this Board.

It is truly, to use the basketball analogy, a slam dunk. It has been a very successful program and we look forward to continued allocations.

With the spirit of the leadership of this Board and to keep with the basketball analogy, it is clear that staff has put a full court press onto the modification of HVIP in order to extend out funding over the next few cycles.

Nevertheless, removing the low NOx -- excuse me, the ultra low NOx engine from this program is akin to benching your rookie right when he's starting to show some of the most promising efforts out there on the field of play.

The program, although it's looking to help people get into the technology, and -- I can understand the need to graduate these type of technologies out. Unfortunately, from our perspective in being one of the largest dealership networks in all of Southern California and in the southwestern U.S., that the natural gas engine, although it works in the low NOx capacity, fleets are not ready to fully adopt this equipment.
And without additional incentive funding like HVIP, which does not require a scrap and replace component, for fleets who utilize these incentive dollars to get these pieces of equipment into their fleets, it will be an indication to other fleets that these -- that they work. And it truly is necessary to help offset the incremental cost, while this equipment is more expensive. Granted, we all know the end result is going to be electric, but we shouldn't give up on this bridge technology. Again, let's put the rookie back in the game.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. MAGGAY: Good morning, Chair Nichols, Board members. My name is Kevin Maggay. I'm with SoCal Gas. And I'll try to be brief.

We support the comments and recommendations made by the Natural Gas Vehicle Coalition letter. I did though want to highlight one specific item, which was the definition of near zero. The term has never been clearly defined, but has been used synonymously with low NOx and the 0.02 gram engine, which reduces emissions by 90 percent.

It's been used synonymously by different agencies through multiple documents. For example, in this year's CEC Clean Transportation Program Investment plan, the
document uses the term interchangeably. The CARB pathway to zero and near zero document states that near zero technologies will achieve a 90 percent reduction in NOx. And the South Coast AQMP, which is ultimately adopted by CARB, explicitly states that near zero is the 0.02 gram engine.

This document defines near zero as EPTOs and hybrids. This definition could have impacts on a number of bills, regulations, and policies, and would add even more confusion to the term.

We ask that staff work with stakeholders to develop a thoughtful, thorough definition of the term "near zero" moving forward.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. SEAN EDGAR: Good morning, Chair Nichols and Board members. Sean Edgar. I'm the director of CleanFleets.net. And I'll briefly touch on, myself and the next two speakers, relating to the solid waste industry and our continuing partnership with the Board.

There are two specific items that I'll ask you to look at. And that's maintaining the 12 liter incentive that you've heard from others, including the air districts in the state. And I'll ask you to also explicitly fund the wait list that may be existing in the HVIP Program,
because I think that will be an important step for those who are already participating in HVIP.

So with that, I'll just ask respectfully that the Board look at when you graduate the program, please don't graduate us back to pre-school. And what I mean by that is that we've made tremendous strides to go above and beyond. And just in my 20 years in front of this Board, we've made great strides in the refuse industry to making cleanest vehicles available.

And that's telling in the statistics that your staff has given you, because we know that the refuse collection fleet number is less than one percent of the statewide fleet. But in the documents you have before you, you've seen that they're 14 percent of the participants in the HVIP Program. So that should tell you that its tremendous and ability of the refuse industry to step forward and participate in the HVIP Program.

And I'll just add that a lot of that is conducted above and beyond any regulatory requirement. In 2003, you gave our industry a challenge to clean up the diesel fleet. As an industry, I think in general, I'll just say we sucked it up, didn't sue you, and did the right thing, and implemented clean diesel regulations. Many companies have gone beyond that and implemented over 1,000 clean natural gas vehicles using the HVIP incentive.
Extremely important to us, and I'll just reiterate we'll ask that because we're heavy hitters on heavy-duty trucks, we'll just ask you to respectfully look at the 12 liter incentive maintaining that. And until such a time as we have a firm landing spot in Moyer, we'll have ask you to maintain the program eligibility until we have that firm landing spot, because otherwise you'll hear a lot of the companies will talk about going back to diesel.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. PARDO: Hi. Good morning, Chair Nichols and Board members. And thank you to staff. My name is Veronica Pardo. I'm with the California Refuse Recycling Council, Northern District, representing over 34 industry member companies that are very often categorized as simply haulers. But many of our members have been engaged in organics management for decades in their local communities helping mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and producing important products like compost and renewable natural gas.

However, we do have a long way to go. And I'd like to echo the comments of Mr. Sean Edgar, but I'd also like to put into perspective the infrastructure needs we have and meeting the goals of SB 1383. Our short-lived climate pollutant strategy. We have to divert and...
additional 25 million tons at least beginning 2025 of our organics.

And just to put that into perspective, our recent CalRecycle presentation addressed foreseeable compliance mechanisms to meet SB 1383 and the agency projects that five million tons will go to anaerobic digestion. Right now, we have a capacity of around half a million tons. So we still have a very long way to go. And in regards to compost, ten million tons is expected to go to compost. We currently manage around six million tons.

So we have a very difficult, but incredible opportunity ahead of us to manage organics in a manner that reduces greenhouse gases, supports in-state renewable energy and fuel production, and fosters healthy soils through products like compost.

So strongly support leveraging resources to meet the goals of SB 1383. In particular, you've heard that low NOx incentives in HVIP have helped accelerate these organic management projects.

And here in strong support of any potential amendments to continue funding low NOx incentives in HVIP. Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. ALONZO: Good morning, Chair Nichols and members. My name is Nathan Alonzo here on behalf of
Caglia Environmental, a family-owned company operating in the Central Valley. For over eight decades, our family shares a goal of being great environmental stewards while working to meet our local Air Board and this Board's goal of emissions reductions.

We've been an early implementer and continue to strive to make our fleet cleaner and more efficient. In addition, as a recycling facility, we're supporters and suppliers of organic material that can be converted to RNG, which helps fuel our fleet of trucks.

Today, we run six trucks fueled by CNG, which -- with hopefully more on the way should help be provided. We see these efforts as part of a carbon negative future that we see in our region. As a company, we're excited about some day having zero-emission trucks available in our operation.

Our reality is that we're unable to move faster than the technology does and we're unable to strategically plan without some certainty, specifically as it relates to truck grants.

To reduce our emissions, our company has converted most of our fleet to CNG from diesel, and we look to converting more, but we can't do it alone. So we join our air district in supporting the 12 liter incentive as it signifies an important step for us in our industry.
Our aforementioned efforts are not possible without a strong, reliable partnership with our air district and with CARB due to a $50,000 increase cost in our trucks as compared to new diesel trucks.

So in conclusion, we are supportive of our air district's efforts and encourage this Board to bring all resources to bear in helping us reach our clean truck targets. We can't do it alone.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. SHANNON: Good morning, Madam Chair and the Board, and the rest of the CARB team. I'm Tim Shannon. I'm the Director of Transportation at Twin Rivers Unified School District. We are the largest deployment of electric school buses in North America. We have 25. And we're soon to have 30 -- 35 with a CEC grant. And I want to talk a little bit about stacking of HVIP funds. We couldn't have done it without the stacking of HVIP funds. If we were able to stack HVIP with CEC, we would be at 45 buses by the end of 2020. And our end goal is actually 82 buses in five years, all electric, zero-emission.

So I really would encourage the Board to look at at least allowing school districts to be able to utilize stacking of all funds, so that they can procure as many EV buses for the sake of clean air for kids and community.
MS. LEVIN: Good afternoon. Julia Levin with the Bioenergy Association of California. I want to echo the comments of the first two speakers from the South Coast and San Joaquin Air Districts, that while we focus long-term goals, we also have to address urgent short-term needs.

While they were referring to air quality, I want to make the same point on the climate change side. Chair Nichols you know this has been my focus for more than 20 years. And I think it has to be all of our focus, along with air quality. The IPCC has said we have less than 12 years left to avoid totally catastrophic climate changes.

There are very few things that will make any difference in 12 years, but reducing short-lived climate pollutants is one of them. And the Air Board has said that itself in your short-lived climate pollutant strategy.

The State is counting on short-lived climate pollutant reductions for more than a third of all of the climate pollutant reductions needed to meet SB 32 requirements by 2030. More than a third of our State's plan on climate change is relying on short-lived climate pollutant reductions.

The State has also invested hundreds of millions of dollars in projects to reduce short-lived climate...
pollutant emissions, mostly by converting organic waste to low carbon fuels and energy.

Most of those projects are focused on vehicle fuel production with a lot of the CalRecycle funding, the CDFA, Department of Food and Agriculture funding, PUC funding, and other grants. So we need the vehicles that can run on carbon negative biogas to reduce short-lived climate pollutants.

As the Bioenergy Association of California, we strongly support the plan that Jon Costantino laid out, and we also support tying incentives for near zero-emission trucks to in-state biomethane, which is the way that we can reduce short-lived climate pollutant emissions in California.

Thank you.

MS. HUGHES: Good morning, Madam Chair, and Board, and staff. Thank you for having me. I'm Danielle Hughes from the Capital Program Manager for the Tahoe Transportation District.

MR. HUGHES: I'm here today to talk about some of the initiatives we are trying to move forward in Lake Tahoe. As the Commissioner mentioned this morning, everybody loves to come to Lake Tahoe. We get over 20 million visitors a year annually. And most of those visitors travel by car. It is important that we get the
infrastructure necessary to support those visitors that come to the basin.

We serve as a recreation area and a revenue source for the State of California, a significant revenue source. But that infrastructure investment is not happening in Lake Tahoe, and we need to provide those solutions and move forward. We're hoping that you look at Lake Tahoe as a -- the low-income community that we have and actually look at us as a prime pilot project. We're looking at fuel cell. We're looking at battery. We've got the first ever overhead charging systems coming in with our partners at Proterra. We're looking at -- we would like to put in the infrastructure necessary for a ferry system.

But as everyone has mentioned today, the permitting process is a long process. So while we're trying to look to set the stage for the fuel source, we need to also move forward with those -- that project infra -- and that permitting infrastructure. And we're hoping that you can help us move forward by working with staff to get that funding necessary to do so.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. WATSON: Good morning, chair and Board members. Charles Watson on behalf of Alan and the
Proterra team.

Proterra is a leading U.S. manufacturer of zero-emission battery electric transit buses with headquarters located in the City of Burlingame and manufacturing located in the City of Industry. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed 2019-2020 plan.

Proterra strongly supports the proposed allocation of 142 million for the HVIP Program. Within the staff proposal, and recognizing the program is suspected to be oversubscribed, Proterra strongly supports staff's proposal of limiting HVIP vouchers to technologies that are zero-emission.

There is a need to focus limited funding on technologies that will help fleet operators achieve zero-emission requirements, especially with the approval of the Innovative Clean Transit Initiative, the Airport Shuttle Bus Regulation, and the anticipated development of the Advanced Clean Trucks Rule.

Thank you to the Board and staff for your efforts to maintain a successful program.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. DOUGLAS: Thank you, Chair Nichols, members of the Board. I'm Steve Douglas today representing the
members of both the Alliance as well as Global Automakers, that's 23 car companies, representing about 97 percent of the new vehicle market.

The combination of compelling vehicles and complementary incentives like the CVRP is making a difference in California. Last year, sales approached eight percent. And that's a -- that's a -- that's great news and it's quite an accomplishment, but we're not there yet.

Electric cars are not mainstream cars yet. And we hope they will be soon. But if we take our foot off the accelerator, we have the real possibility of losing the progress that we've made.

We've worked with staff on these proposed changes with the idea to do the least amount of harm. There's kind of no harm proposal here. But nonetheless, we -- with the exception of the MSRP cap, we support the proposed changes.

We do not support the MSRP cap, because, first, CVRP already contains an income cap. And the data would suggest that people who can afford a 60 to 120 thousand dollar car would not get the CVRP because of the income cap.

Second, pickups and more capable vehicles are coming on the market and those would likely not be -- not
meet the requirements and would not get a rebate because of the MSRP cap.

And finally, when the State picks a vehicle and says this one doesn't get a -- a rebate, it suggests that there's something wrong with that vehicle. There's something bad about that. There are no bad electric cars. We need all the electric cars and we need a lot of them in all price categories.

So we request the Board to remove the MSRP cap, but otherwise support the staff's proposal.

Thank you.

MR. MAGAVERN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair, Board members. Bill Magavern with Coalition for Clean Air. And we support most of what's in the plan and appreciate our collaboration with the staff. But in my limited time, I'll focus on a couple of changes that we recommend.

We support that over time all of the incentives transition to zero-emission vehicles when those become available. So I think it's a good time to start planning for that transition in a number of these projects.

However, as you've heard, when it comes to the 12 liter engine, there is no zero-emission alternative to that, so the 12-liter ultra low NOx is the cleanest commercially available engine, so we support continuing to include that in HVIP eligibility.
We agree with what you've heard from the air districts that that incentive is important to reaching attainment. And we're concerned that if it's not available, then a number of fleets will instead choose to buy diesel fleets and we'd be going backwards.

Also, if you include a requirement for the use of in-state low carbon renewable fuels, then we're also helping to meet our goals for reducing emissions of methane, a powerful short-lived climate pollutant.

And secondly, I strongly agree with Supervisor Gioia's comments that when it comes to CVRP eligibility and the limited funds we have available, we should be focusing on the long range plug-in hybrids. There's definitely still a role for plug-in hybrids that have strong batteries. But 25 in lab conditions that's not even what you actually get on the road is not sufficient to warrant a State subsidy at this point.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. BARRETT: Good afternoon. Will Barrett with the American Lung Association of California.

The initial staff proposal continues the important direction that we've supported to pursue the zero-emission transportation future that we know we need to protect our air and public health.
We also know that this pairs well with the Energy Commission's plan that we sit on that advisory panel and was happy to hear Commissioner Monahan here today.

The public health community generally is looking at ways that we can transition quickly off of fossil fuel transportation to protect our air and public health again. And that's again across the -- the broader public health community. We appreciate the concepts laid out in the CVRP changes and agree that, you know, keeping the rebates whole for lower income communities and consumers is important and agree also with the idea that a stronger battery for the PHEVs would be an appropriate thing to pursue.

On the heavy-duty side, we support the continued funding demonstration projects and look forward to progress -- making progress on those to help commercialize those additional programs.

For HVIP, we do support the graduated -- the graduation of commercialized vehicles as we go forward from the program to make sure that we're really phasing out the need for the incentive programs to begin with. To the extent that the heavy-duty low-NOx engine needs more time or needs additional support for a landing spot, we do look forward to working with staff on the best way to do that, whether through this program or through changes to
the Moyer program going forward. We know that there's an important role for all of the cleaner technologies moving forward. So I just wanted to add that as well.

And as I'm closing just say that again I think that this moves us very much forward on the zero-emission transportation future that we need. And I look forward to working with the staff again and thank the staff for all their hard work. We know that it's a very difficult situation with lower total pots of funding. And as that moves forward, we know that we're going to make it a top priority to really help push the envelope on funding to make sure that we can make this transition as quickly as possible to zero.

Thank you.

MR. GARCIA: Good afternoon, Chair Nichols, and members of the Board. Brandon Garcia with Environmental Energy Consulting speaking on behalf of California Vanpool Authority.

We would like to express support for the five million allocation in the staff's proposal for the Agricultural Worker Vanpools Pilot Project. We want to thank staff for their work on this project for enhancing equity and for helping low-income users.

CalVans provides vanpool services to agricultural workers throughout the state including the Central,
Salinas, Imperial, Coachella valleys. Our ridership is usually low income. They live in low income and disadvantaged communities, and they face linguistic, economic, and other barriers daily. The ARB pilot project provides safe, convenient, and reliable transportation for agricultural workers living in disadvantaged low-income communities while achieving good emissions reduction in areas where they wouldn't have other sources of transportation.

As a result of the project, there's been an increase demand for vanpools in these communities. The pilot project achieves all these environmental benefits while also helping families save money at the gas pump.

Vanpools continue to be an effective way to address VMT and emission reductions while also providing disadvantaged communities with critical transportation. It is for the reason -- these reasons we support staff's proposal for $5 million for the pilot project.

Thank you.

MR. ADDIS: Good aft -- excuse me. Good afternoon, Chair and members. Reed Addis on behalf of CR&R. We're a firm located in Southern California that focuses in on recycling and waste activities. We've been a leader and a partner with California and its various programs to try to help implement environmental laws.
In particular, it's because of the strong signal the State of California has provided that has allowed us as a company to make major investments that support, in particular, two goals that the State is looking at, both reducing short-lived climate pollutants and cleaning up our vehicle fleets.

We've been able to wed those various grant programs on short-lived climate pollutants with HVIP, allowing us to take the gases that are produced from our facility and actually invest them or take them and actually put them into our vehicle fleet.

However, that is a complicated and very expensive process for us. It takes us a lot of time, planning, and requires us to raise a lot of private capital to actually be able to make those investments. And that's why these programs, including HVIP, are so important.

We understand that we can't ask for the moon here and that you have a complicated task in front of you. Therefore, we would strongly suggest at least two ways in which you could have a compromise that would be a win-win both for companies like ours, but also allow you to have a program that's fully funded and meeting the State's goals. One would be, as you've already heard today, allowing the 12 liter engine to be available in the HVIP Program.

Second, it would allow us to work with your staff
in the future on how the remaining needs of companies like ours could potentially be met through the Carl Moyer Program.

Thank you very much.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Good afternoon. Erin Rodriguez with the Union of Concerned Scientists. Thank you, Chair and members -- Chair and members of the Board for the opportunity to comment on the 19-20 funding plan. For the heavy-duty investment, UCS supports the proposal to focus HVIP on the zero-emission trucks and buses. Hybrid and natural gas technologies are now in the early stages of commercialization, and therefore we believe that they are ready to be graduated from HVIP eligibility.

In contrast, zero-emission trucks and buses are in the next wave of advanced technologies and they need more financial support to continue their scale-up.

Zero-emission trucks are providing emission benefits today. Over 2,500 zero-emission trucks and buses have been awarded HVIP vouchers, ranging from delivery trucks to school buses, shuttle buses, and beyond.

For equity investments, UCS supports the clean mobility projects proposed including the addition of the sustainable transportation equity projects.

For the CVRP program I have a few comments. First, we are supportive of the proposed reductions and
the incentive amounts to help ensure that the program is available through the end of the fiscal year. We also support the decision not to change the rebate levels for qualified low-income applicants.

Second, we believe you should consider modifying the PHEV range requirement, specifically the use of Urban Dynamometer Drive Schedule range should be replaced by the combined -- should be replaced by the combined city and range -- highway range, as shown on the vehicle's window sticker.

The UDDS range of electric vehicles is difficult to locate without inspection of vehicle's certification data, while the combined range is easily found both on-line and at a dealership. A consumer program like CVRP should use eligibility criteria that are easy to understand for both dealers and car buyers.

Third, we are supportive of the MSRP cap for base model vehicles. However, we suggest that you consider a mechanism to prevent gaming of this requirement, which we did see occur in Canada.

Last, we urge the Board to be more specific on the criteria and process for determining availability of a wait list in the event that the FY 19-20 CVRP funds are exhausted prior to the end of the year. Any uncertainty in the program availability could negatively affect ZEV
purchase decisions contrary to the intent of CVRP.

Thank you.

MR. CHAVEZ: Thank you Chair and members of the Board. I'm here on behalf of the California Association of School Transportation Officials and the School Transportation Coalition.

First, I'd like to thank the Board and staff for their commitment to replacing school transportation, old dirty school buses. Every year, school district's home to school transportation expenses rise, overall school districts budgets tightens, buses get older, and State funding for ongoing costs stays the same.

Without CARB's efforts to support the one-time costs of school bus replacement, the children on the bus and the community outside the bus would continue to be exposed to these old dirty school buses or the route will be cut entirely cutting off safe access for these children.

The commitment to cleaning up California's old dirty school bus fleet is evident in this year, and last year's, and previous year's funding plans. Whether it's the Rural School Bus Pilot Project with 55 million to date, the Clean Mobility in Schools Project with ten million to date, and then the 11,000 that was just reported today. That's -- there's 24,000 school buses in
the state. That's a significant number replaced through
the effort.

So thank you.

The need for your assistance in cleaning up the
school buses that transports students to school every day
to and from school can be soon in the oversubscription of
every school bus replacement program that's put forward.

With that, we worry the recent changes to the
HVIP Program of graduating low NOx engines, along with the
restrictions on stacking could have negative impacts on
the choices made at the school district level.

The difference in pricing could be a huge
obstacle for these districts with their tight budgets. So
once again, on behalf the 20 CASTO chapters throughout the
state and conglomerate of school transportation interests,
we thank you for your commitment.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. REMILLARD: Good afternoon, Madam Chairman
and members of the Board. My name is Ashley Remillard.
And I'm vice president of legal at Agility Fuel Solutions.

Thank you for having me today.

I want to join in the prior comments made by
members of the natural gas vehicle coalition, and
otherwise I will keep my comments brief.

By way of background, Agility is the leading
global provider of highly engineered and cost effective
clean fuel solutions for medium- and heavy-duty commercial
vehicles. Agility is neutral when it comes to clean
fuels. We believe there's no one size fits all clean
energy solution. While a significant portion of Agility's
business comes from natural gas, we have adapted to the
every-changing clean energy marketplace by introducing
propane, hydrogen, and electric energy storage and
delivery systems. What is important to emphasize today is
that Agility has an EV program. We got our first trucks
on the road in 2019, and estimate that we will field
dozens of Class 7 and 8 commercial trucks in 2020.

Agility is uniquely situated to provide a neutral
perspective on EV programs. The fact is that heavy-duty
and Class 7 and 8 EV trucks are not readily commercially
available. We aren't just there -- we just aren't there
yet.

We look forward to the ultimate transition to
zero-emission vehicles. That transition is still taking
place. EV programs are not ready for prime time, and 11.9
liter vehicles should continue to be eligible for HVIP.

In closing, it is not just the natural gas
industry that wants to ensure that HVIP funding continues
to extend to 11.9 liter engines, it is also entities, such
as Agility, with rapidly growing EV programs. Continuing
to provide HVIP funding to 11.9 liter engines is critical in ensuring that key fleets do not revert to diesel, an outcome that none of us wants. Agility therefore requests that the Board extend HVIP eligibility to 11.9 liter engines. Thank you.

MR. PORRAS: Good afternoon. My name is Marcel Porras. I'm the Chief Sustainability Officer for the Los Angeles Department of Transportation.

I oversee the blue L.A. Electric Vehicle Carsharing Program that is focused on disadvantaged communities and that is made possible by the low-income clean mobility options. Our program is the largest clean mobility program in the state and is projected to reach 16,000 Angelenos by 2021. Our 100-car pilot has seen over 35,000 trips to date, over 4,000 a month, and has 3,500 active users. Sixty percent of trips are made by low-income users. These are trips that get people to job interviews, to doctor's appointments, to soccer practice, and to the grocery store.

As part of our phase two growth, we will be adding 200 cars and 300 new on-street charging stations, and expanding the footprint into the program to the communities of South Los Angeles, Boyle Heights, and East Hollywood.

Lastly, I just want to thank staff for all of the
work that they've done. This project started off as just an idea and has led to so many more lessons learned. This is not just a mobility project. This is an infrastructure project and has really galvanized our work internally as a city staff to prepare for the oncoming need to electrify transportation and prepare our infrastructure.

So thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. CREGER: Good afternoon and thank you for the opportunity to provide public comment.

I'm Hana Creger and I'm the Environmental Equity Program Manager at the Greenlining Institute. Greenlining is research and public policy nonprofit that has been advocating for racial equity and economic justice for 26 years.

And So I'm here today to comment in support of the clean transportation equity programs that benefit disadvantaged and vulnerable communities. And we are particularly excited about the Sustainable Transportation Equity Project, a.k.a. STEP, because of its approach to center community voices and meet their needs.

And then one word of caution is that we need to ensure that the eligibility criteria for the planning grants is the same for the implementation grants. From Greenlining's experience working on the Transformative
Climate Communities Program, some communities who were able to receive planning grants could not then compete for the implementation grants, which created confusion and misalignment. And so this is why we need that consistency in eligibility both for planning and implementation grants. And so because of this, our recommendation is to target this STEP program specifically towards the CalEnviroScreen disadvantaged communities.

We also are very excited about the Clean Mobility Options in Disadvantaged Communities Program. However, our recommendation is that in future rounds of funding there may be a need to develop strategies to ensure that these communities asking for smaller grants are not competing with communities asking for larger grants.

And lastly, we strongly encourage the Air Resources Board to continuously incorporate equity as a practice throughout all of these programs and research projects. Because equity must not just be a stated goal, equity must be consistently integrated throughout the process of how they are developed, in the implementation, and in the evaluation.

And so we are strong supporters of these clean transportation equity programs, because of their great potential to reduce health, wealth, and transportation disparities in disadvantaged communities.
Thank you for your time and thank you to all the dedicated CARB staff.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. AGUAYO: Hi. Good afternoon. And thank you also for the opportunity to provide public comment. My name is Leslie Aguayo. And like my colleague Hana, I am also an Environmental Equity Program Manager at the Greenlining Institute. And we appreciate CARB's efforts in putting these plans together and working on pilot programs.

I'd like to address the Board about our concerns regarding the trajectory of the funding plan, because of the decrease in funding over the years on equity pilots. The Clean Transportation Equity Projects will see a reduction of $10 million in funding from 75 to 65 million dollars in this upcoming proposed allocation plan. These pilot programs have been successful in garnering interest from low-income and disadvantaged communities and households as we continue to see uptake in applications and has led to most of these programs being oversubscribed.

Programs like the Clean Vehicle Assistance Program and Clean Cars 4 All are key to helping household transition -- households transition from older more polluting vehicles to cleaner more efficient cars. Both
programs have seen a high level of adoption and require more funding for expansion.

   Additionally, programs under the Clean Mobility Projects are now seeing more implemented projects and require additional funding to ensure they reach scale.

   If we want to create meaningful change in our low-income and disadvantaged communities, we cannot slow down the process by continuing to reduce funding. As such, we urge CARB to increase funding to ensure projects are properly funded while CARB works to expedite the approval process, so we can have more projects in place.

   Thank you for your time

   CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

   MS. TUTT: Good afternoon. My name is Eileen Tutt. I'm with the California Electric Transportation Coalition. Today, I want to be here to support the staff's proposal. I can't tell you the untold hours they spent with us and we really, really appreciate it. So thank you.

   We are here today to -- we have a few asks and they're outlined in our letter, but I just want to highlight them here. We are opposing the CVRP change to include an MSRP cap. And that is because the truth is battery electric vehicles are still in the early market. And we have the income cap and we have a lot of trucks and
larger SUVs coming into the market next year. Many of those will likely be over the MSRP cap and that -- and many people rely on those vehicles, particularly in places like the San Joaquin Valley.

We also want to say we very much support the staff's allocation in the pilot and demos and the HVIP Program. On the HVIP side, we support the graduation of the natural gas vehicles. We do think that the ZEV technologies face much greater hurdles and we -- it really is time to double down on the investment on zero-emission, especially when the funding is so limited.

We also have a couple of clarifications that we need that we understand are -- are the staff's intent, but we just want to clarify that the clean fuel reward LCFS program that we're developing is not in conflict with the CVRP. The two are stackable, if you will, and compatible together. We need both of them as we run out of federal funding and these programs continue to be severely constrained.

We also support the stacking, not to exceed the costs in the HVIP Program. We think that's really important. And we really want to support authorizing the Executive Officer to decrease the HVIP voucher amounts, but not just across the board. It needs to be very selective reducing any -- any -- if we allow anything that
emits, we want to reduce or eliminate those incentives first before we reduce or eliminate anything for ZEVs.

Thank you so much.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you for all your help.

MS. GIACHINO: Good afternoon, Madam Chair, Board Members. My name is Alyssa Giachino. I'm with the United Auto Workers. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We -- I'm just going to highlight some of what we submitted in our written comment.

The funding plan presents an opportunity to enhance CARB's program's impact on facilitating a transition to a cleaner, more inclusive economy, that generates co-benefits for workers, disadvantaged communities, and low-income families. To that end, California's incentive programs to accelerate EV adoption should adopt labor standards that promote domestic production and high quality jobs and policies to green government fleets, consumer-side rebates, and initiatives to electrify commercial fleets.

Given funding constraints, in our view, many of the proposed CVRP program adjustments under consideration are reasonable. On electric range, we would caution against more rapid increases in electric range requirements beyond the current 25-mile recommendation. We agree with staff's recom -- assessment that quote, more
choices in larger vehicle categories like SUV, mini-van, and pickup truck, and light-duty trucks in the PEV market are needed for the emerging EV market to be more attractive to consumers and become competitive to the market. Right now, light trucks are over 50 percent of California conventional vehicles sales to put a pin on that.

PHEVs are also good options for consumers who live outside of dense public charging networks or whose housing precludes the purchase of home charging equipment. PHEVs are often a more affordable option as well, on average $10,000 cheaper than a full battery electric.

Under the CVRP statistics, CVRP applications for PHEVs have been higher among key equity communities. Since 2008 -- this is a little bit of an update from the data that's in our letter. Since 2018, sorry, low-income applications, 48 percent of those were used to purchase PHEVs, plug-in hybrids. This compares to just 30 percent for standard rebates.

Thank you.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well done. Thank you.

MR. CAMPBELL: Good afternoon. I am not Thomas Lawson. This is Todd Campbell with Clean Energy. We're swapping spots. But I wanted to thank Chair Nichols, the
Board, and staff for your defense of our clean air and climate regulations. On behalf of my family and other California families, we appreciate your tireless commitment to clean air and also to protect our climate. I just wanted to say that right off the bat.

With regards to HVIP, given California's unique challenges ahead, low NOx trucks must play a critical role in the coming years. We have the cleanest combustion engine in the world thanks to your leadership and Cummins Westport's willingness to meet your more stringent challenge at 0.02 grams NOx.

As the Truck and Bus Rule starts to remove hundreds of thousands of pre-2010 trucks off California's roads, we are presented with a historic opportunity to replace these diesel trucks with commercially available, near zero low NOx trucks.

The Clean Air Action Plan at the San Pedro Bay Ports presents yet another opportunity to implement clean truck strategies. And we thank Mr. Corey and the Board's leadership in sending a recent letter encouraging both harbor commissions to aim high and get going.

Finally, the South Coast AQMD's Indirect Source Rules call out for both zero and near zero low NOx truck deployment in the coming years. It is therefore critical that this Board include the most stringent low NOx engine
within the proposed funding plan's near zero definition as the market certainty -- as market certainty from you is needed to get California fleets to move beyond diesel.

A 0.02 gram NOx engine is not expected to be mandated by this agency for another eight years. So the fact that we have this technology available today deserves your unwavering support. I want to thank Mr. Corey, Mr. Cliff, Mr. Kitowski, and many ARB staff who have worked with us on this item. I will conclude with this. The late Dr. Carl Moyer famously said about 24 years ago, "It's the truck, stupid". And his words still ring true today.

Let's continue to work together, roll up our sleeves, and get those dirty diesels off our roads. Please keep the cleanest low NOx truck within your near zero definition for HVIP.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. SICKLER: Chair Nichols and Board members. I'm Heidi Sickler, Director of Energy and Environment for the Silicon Valley Leadership Group. On July 12th, the leadership group met with Chair Nichols, CEC Chair Hochschild, Energy Commissioner Monahan, and Senator Skinner at UC Berkeley to discuss the importance of transportation electrification to California. Thanks very
much for meeting with us Chair Nichols.

As an outcome of that meeting, we respectfully submitted our recommendations to the Governor on July 30th for accelerating transportation electrification to meet California's goal of deploying five million ZEVs and 250,000 chargers by 2025.

The Leadership Group's top transportation electrification priority is to increase and provide multi-year funding for HVIP and the CVRP to accelerate TE and attract additional outside investment with the focus on accelerating implementation of California's TE mandates to decrease GHG emissions.

The Leadership Group strongly supports accelerated deployment of ZEVs and EV charging infrastructure and is working hard to help increase funding for low carbon transportation, particularly for the oversubscribed HVIP and CVRP.

The Silicon Valley Leadership Group supports the Air Resources Board proposed funding plan for clean transportation incentives for low carbon and commends the Air Resources Board for continuing to accelerate the deployment of ZEVs and EV infrastructure.

At a time when transportation emissions are still on the rise, transportation electrification represents the largest near-term opportunity to reduce GHG emissions and
mobile source pollution. We commend the Air Resources Board for continuing to invest in low carbon transportation technologies and will -- that will modernize transportation systems, support local manufacturing job growth, and improve local air quality.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. BEKEMOHAMMADI: Madam Chair --

CHAIR NICHOLS: I like the change up here.

MR. BEKEMOHAMMADI: I know. Well, why not.

Madam Chair and Board members, my name is Roxana Bekemohammadi. I'm here on behalf of Ballad Power Systems.

We want to echo some of the sentiments expressed by our funds from CTA. We, too, believe that in order to achieve the goals set forth by this Board in the ICT rule further and dedicated investment in transit is crucial. Both zero-emission infrastructure and vehicles costs can be challenging for the operating budgets of California transit agencies. And I'm sure that you've heard of that plenty of times over the last couple years.

While we understand and appreciate that the Board is working with limited resources, we believe that spending on transit is the best way to ensure that those resources are dedicated to achieving the stated goals of...
this body. We, too, would also recommend that the
advanced technology demonstrations and pilot projects
funding be made available to applicants seeking help with
the build-out of zero-emission infrastructure.

We would also like to advise that the HVIP
Program ensure a minimum level of transit funding by
establishing a set-aside for our state's transit property
applicants who so desperately need the funding that -- in
order to achieve the tasks requested of them by the
Board's ICT rule. Similarly, because HVIP vouchers are so
crucial to the acquisition strategies of our transit
agencies, when considering zero-emission buses, we
strongly recommend that any reduction in HVIP voucher
amounts exclude public fleet application -- applicants.

And most importantly, we commend the Board for
its foresight in identifying transit as the market segment
that can lead the way for zero-emission transportation in
California.

Ballard has believed in this vision for over 25
years since its first deployment of a zero-emission bus.
We are absolutely supportive of ensuring that the ICT
regulation is successful. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. EVAN EDGAR: Chairman, Board members, my name
is Evan Edgar. I'm the engineer for the California
Compost Coalition. We collect organics with a Class 7 fleet statewide. We divert organics from the landfill to fulfill the short-lived climate pollutants. We provide RNG and compost from organics. We hold compost and wood chips in our Class 8 12-liter fleet engines. We are the circular economy now. We are net zero now. We are carbon negative fuel now. We want to make more in-state RNG. We're not waiting for 2045 to go deep carbon. We are deep carbon now.

Today, we are graduating with honors from the HVIP Program. About a third of our class are on CNG. We have 15,000 fleet in the class. Another third are planning to go CNG. Another third are coming on later with the 2025 mandates. But with HVIP, we can leave no truck behind. We can get it done.

Without HVIP, a lot of our fleet owners want to pivot towards renewable diesel. That's a viable option. With renewable diesel, we get the carbon intensity down to equal with EVs. It's great to get that EV -- you know, the same equity with EVs with carbon intensity, but we'll not get the NOx reductions like we would get with RNG/CNG fleet. So pivoting towards renewable diesel is an opportunity, but we'd rather stay on the HVIP Program to fulfill the class -- graduating class of 2025.

So please restore HVIP funding for the Class 8
vehicles for the 12-liter engines. And we'd like to fulfill the mandates of the short-lived climate pollutants and go deep carbon now.

Thank.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you

MR. BOCCADORO: Thank you.

Over here.

(Laughter.)

MR. BOCCADORO: Chair Nichols and members, Michael Boccadoro on behalf of Dairy Cares today. I, too, want to support the funding -- ongoing funding for HVIP Program. I think as you're well aware and you've heard me testify in this setting before, the dairy industry has over 100 new dairy digesters that will be coming online in the next few years. All of those are producing RNG for the transportation sector, about 60 million gallons of diesel equivalent transportation fuel. We need to have a home for those, and heavy-duty trucks are that appropriate home.

We're making progress converting fleets. These are new fleets. So we're going to create NOx reductions in the valley. If you do the math on that 60 million gallons of diesel gallon equivalent, you're going to find that that can create about 1,300 tons annually of NOx reduction.
That's hugely significant in the short term. And we want to make sure we not only get the greenhouse gas benefits and the short-lived climate pollutant benefits, but we're getting the additional environmental benefits that we can from that RNG gas.

And let me just also say we're very supportive of the in-state requirement. It's something we've been pushing with staff for some time to make sure we're focused on getting a home for our gas that we're producing here. And we want to have this same conversation about in-state with some other programs like LCFS, which we think is long overdue as well.

And then final point, we're 25 percent, according to CDFA. When all these projects are built, we'll be 25 percent of the 40, so -- or I should say 60 percent of the 40 percent in dairy methane reduction that we're looking for by 2030. So 60 percent, which is 25 percent of that in just three years. We're making tremendous progress toward that goal -- very aggressive goal that was set for the industry. So we want to make sure that we can continue. The incentives are important.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. HAMILTON: Good afternoon, members of the Board. Kevin Hamilton, Central California Asthma
Collaborative. My ring tone is off.

(Laughter.)

MR. HAMILTON: So I want to thank the Board for moving forward with this item. And, in general, we support it. And I want to thank staff for working so closely with us on this over the last six months with multiple meetings and calls. So thank you very much for that.

A couple of things. We support moving all Class 8 and lower vehicles to Moyer. We don't think there's any reason to have those vehicles in HVIP anymore. Time to graduate. I heard somebody celebrating that a minute ago. Great. We support that as well.

We think the 12-liter heavy-duty engine powered vehicles need to continue in HVIP eligibility. Obviously, we don't have that solution yet, and we're hoping to see a very low NOx emission diesel engine. We really get more traction than just with Cummins. So hopefully, we'll see, and I think we will soon, a number of other manufacturers coming out with that engine.

We support the MSRP cap in CVRP. I don't know many folks from the communities we serve in the valley that are popping 60 grand or more for their new vehicle quite honestly, or even buying a new vehicle. But those that are, definitely don't have the income to support that
kind of thing. And continue the full incentive for low income and disadvantaged communities in CVRP.

The other thing is that we support keeping incentives, but increasing the range in the PIHVs, plug-in hybrids, to 35 miles. I was reviewing some of them right now. Ford, for instance, in their new Fusion is at 34. I'm sure they could lie a little and say 35. You know, I just think those batteries are there. So this Board has led on this issue for years now and needs to keep leading. So let's bump them a little bit and get that up.

The last thing is grant the E0 the authority to move that money from this year to next year at need. But we want to be sure that the information developed from that move would be shared back with the Legislature through the members here, ex officio members, and the Governor for future budgeting consideration for these programs.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. ALEXANDER: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members. Meredith Alexander with CALSTART. This is not Meredith Alexander, but we are giving you a two-fer in our two minutes, so that we can hopefully wrap this up today. I just wanted to appear on behalf of our two -- over 220 member companies who are on both sides of zero and near
zero sector and clean transportation to state our deep
respect for the staff making lemonade out of this lemon
budget, I think many of us would agree, and that we will
work very hard next year to make sure that we're not in
this position and that we can fully fund these critical
programs; and also to ensure a soft landing place for low
NOx in the event that you do decide to eliminate it today.

And I'll pass it to Bill.

MR. VAN AMBURG: Yes, Bill Van Amburg, Exec VP at
CalSTART.

And I just wanted to really commend and support
both staff and Board on these tough decisions. But I
think some of the success you're facing is because of the
power of the strategy you've launched. The Beachhead
Strategy for first success market strategy in heavy-duty
has really been a powerful tool.

And I just wanted to share with you just some
lessons from around the world we've launched based on that
Beachhead Strategy, the Global Commercial Vehicle Drive to
Zero Program. We're getting members to sign pledges for
this program against the Beachhead Strategy worldwide.
And what it's doing is really helping to drive additional
volume in key regions around the world, align their
policies and investments to really match what CARB staff
and Board has put up here today.
And this will help us to our ultimate goal driving down volume in the core components in the vehicle. So I just wanted to share with you stay the course. Your Beachhead Strategy is incredibly powerful. And I just came back from a tour of Europe meeting with truck makers. This is directly in their product strategy planning. This is the pathway they're following. Let's keep investing in this place and you're going to get the outcomes you're seeing today.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Good afternoon. My name is Thomas Lawson. I represent the Association of Natural Gas Vehicles industry here in California, as well as part of a coalition of stakeholders that weighed in on the current plan that you have in front of you. We submitted a letter that has a bunch of logos. It wasn't mentioned and I wanted to make sure that you have that in front of you.

I also am the last stakeholder from the natural gas vehicle industry. So you'll -- you'll know that we are -- we are done. I wanted to just quickly articulate our three --

(Laughter.)

MR. LAWSON: -- our three points.

One, obviously, we'd like to keep the 12-liter in
HVIP using RNG. We think that makes a lot of sense. We think it's a good plan. And we'd love to continue this conversation about graduation. But in that conversation, we want to have a, you know, more thorough detailed conversation about where those vehicles are going to land and how we're going to make sure those programs work for fleets that don't just want the 12-liter, but for our folks that are using the 8.9-liter as well that are still trying to adopt those vehicles.

And then lastly, I kind of wanted to talk about the near zero definition. We were one of a strong team that got the AB 2061, which was a weight exemption bill for near zero and zero-emission vehicles in 2018. And that bill provides a definition for near zero. So I would look forward to working with folks to provide some clarity in the State statute on what near zero is. I think it was understand during that process that near zero was pointing to natural gas vehicles as we were trying to duplicate, or implement on the State level, a federal law of exemption for alternative fuel vehicles.

So look forward to that -- excuse me, look forward to that. Thank you for the opportunity to talk this afternoon and hope everyone has a good transition to lunch.

Thank you.
(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. It's hard to be funny
after so many other witnesses. That's great.

MR. DONAHUE: Madam Chair and members, Jake
Donahue on behalf of Red and White Fleet. As California's
first commercial adopter of zero-emission marine
technology, we'd like to, as we have throughout this
process, point out to the Board that while many areas of
our state's transportation sector require funding to move
toward a carbon neutral economy, commercial harbor craft
and the marine sector more broadly are areas that have
traditionally seen minimal investment while producing
significant emissions.

Exacerbating this issue is the fact that marine
vessel are inherently more expensive, and therefore cost
represents a larger barrier here than in perhaps any other
sector. While we do recognize and appreciate that the
Board continues to do what you can with the resources you
do have, and for that reason, we do not take a formal
position on this item, we sincerely hope that the Board
will consider funding marine emission reduction projects
in future funding plans.

Our marine operators, port and coastal
communities, marine wildlife, and all who depend on our
coastal air and waters will thank you for those efforts.
Madam Chair, I thank you for your time and consideration.

       CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

       MR. BORJA: Hello. Good afternoon, Chair Nichols and Board members. Thank you so much for your patience. It's about 12:50, 12:47. I'm going to try to make it quick. My name is Jofil Borja. I'm with Sac Regional Transit. Last time I saw you folks, it was at the joint CARB and CTC meeting up in Modesto -- actually, down in Modesto.

       So I echo the concerns of other transit providers and Caltrans today. But also highlight the optimism that we can work together in implementing the Clean Transit transition, but urge and your staff to continue working together with all funding partners like CalSTA, CTC, SGC, other MPOs, and other agencies to really understand how difficult it could be for transit to -- providers to cobble together funding to continue and grow our services to our communities.

       Sacramento was recently quoted by the Washington Post as one of the few cities in America that's growing their ridership, in a country where nationwide ridership is in decline. We recently committed with our board and with our local officials a commitment to making sure that the students ride for free and we do so in partnership. We do this because we want to highlight the coordination
and efforts in implementing what we can do together as partners in implementing these rules.

And we ask that you and your staff work with us, not -- not make these implementation strategies be a road back to the backs of our core ridership. It truly does take a village. And what Congresswoman Matsui said a couple days ago when Sac Republic was in it -- was recently put in MLS, it will take a whole republic.

So please, we ask you let's work together, let's get this going, and let's start things off the right way.

Thank you so much and I appreciate your time.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Are you sure you don't moonlight for National Public Radio?

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: You sound like an announcer.

It's great.

Sorry.

MR. KOLODJI: No, that's all right.

Chair Nichols, fellow -- and Board members, members of the California Air Resources Board, last year and earlier this year I come before you -- last year and this year I come before you as the Chair of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers and car -- management and sustainability.
As well, I'm a California corporation owner for Black Swan, LLC and the Kolodji Corporation. I want to thank you, because -- thank you -- well, these companies that I established have established -- have a target of achieving carbon neutrality in California by 2025, 20 years sooner than first mandated by Governor Brown.

Black Swan is supportive of electric vehicles, not for gasoline -- and not for gasoline, diesel, or natural gas driven vehicles which need to go the way of the horse and its buggy.

So if sustainable energy, renewable -- if sustainable renewable energy developed over the last 25 years per the 2018 California Energy Commission's Integrated Energy Policy Report cannot keep up with power demand without electric vehicles, certainly replacing non-renewable fuel driven vehicles with electric vehicles, we -- and their enhanced charging requirements, which -- which the California Energy Commission agrees will quadruple the current energy load and demand.

So when we had electric vehicles, you're adding to the energy -- to the -- to the grid. So if we can't handle renew -- doing -- charging -- if we can't handle our current demand, if you add electrical vehicles, you're going to be quadrupling the energy grid to charge those batteries for the replacement system.
So I suggest, as I did to the California Ener --
to consider additional technologies such as direct air
capture, biosequestration, and flue gas capture for
achieving carbon neutrality.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. And we do have your
written submittal as well.

MR. KOLODJI: Thank you very much, Chair Nichols.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. KOLODJI: I thank God for CARB. I thank God
for Governor Brown, for leading the way. California is
going to lead the way for the -- for the -- for the State,
the country, the world.

CHAIR NICHOLS: And Governor Newsom is carrying
it on.

MR. KOLODJI: Yes.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Okay. Lest we forget
who we work for.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: So let me, at this point, close
the record. Our valiant court reporter is surely
deserving a break. We have more?

What?

Oh. I don't understand what they want.

BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: He's okay.

CHAIR NICHOLS: He's all right. Good.
Okay. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER R IORDAN: He thinks we'll finish early.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, great. I'm sorry. I can't see the court reporter and I don't understand hand gestures all the time, so thank you.

We are in need of finishing this item and then for a break for an executive session, which we have schedule for today, so that the Board can be briefed on some recent and pending litigation. And then we will return and complete the rest of our agenda.

So I would like now to put a motion forward on this funding plan and then once it's there ask Board members who's like to see changes or additions to the resolution to put them forward. I heard a lot of consensus round one, which I think we might be able to do pretty readily, and that was the request of several air districts and the Coalition for Clean Air to retain the potential for funding for the Class 8 heaviest trucks where there isn't a zero-emission option, certainly for this fiscal year that we're talking about, and where clearly the districts are in great need of opportunity to acquire more low NOx vehicles in their regions.

So I see a lot of heads nodding. If there's
anyone who wants to speak --

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: I'll second that.

CHAIR NICHOLS: -- against that as amendment, please do so at this time. But if not, I'm just going to ask that you accept that as an amendment, because I think it was pretty clear. But let's put the -- let's put the motion out and the resolution.

Judy, would you like to do that.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Yeah, I'd be happy to.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Yeah, I will make a motion to -- that the Board directs the Executive Officer to include the 11.9 liter low NOx heavy-duty truck in HVIP funding. And that would be conditional on the use of renewable natural gas produced in the state of California.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Second.

CHAIR NICHOLS: And a second from, Mr. Serna.

Okay. Now, other amendments that people want to put forward at this time?

Yes.

BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: I have six quick points, but I'll leave them off, because I think there's a lot of consensus over what we've done and I think this is the most -- most important. But, you know, I wanted to thank
everybody for their testimony and thank staff for bringing
together really some strong engagement from a wide, wide
range of stakeholders. And this is -- this is big.

So, you know, the fact that CVRP that we're here,
because there's increased demand. Well, that means
success. And I thank you for giving us this quandary.
You know, what do we do with the success? How do we --
how do we manage this?

So thank you for that.

You know, I do -- and thanks for the poster
display. I thought that was terrific. And it was -- what
an education. I wanted to get into one of the big ZEV
trucks and go around the block. But the posters were
fabulous and it was great to get to talk to people. Thank
you for that and thank you for the booklet.

And I'm especially happy looking at the booklet,
because there's so much about the San Joaquin Valley. And
I realize we're particularly troubled. But no, there's so
much going on. It was very, very exciting. Green
on-road, Class 8 low NOx diesel, transit electrification,
rail freight, the zero cargo handling at the Port of
Stockton, the Postal Service. Just a tremendous variety
of things.

So it really does demonstrate, I think, how the
San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District has
become a very strong partner in all of this. And really want to thank Samir for his role, and his Board, and their role in that.

And absolutely, we are challenged along with the South Coast especially in terms of NOx. And it's very, very important to have that option with the 11.9 liter engine. So certainly support that strongly.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Mr. Gioia.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: So I had just three issues to raise. Maybe start with the simplest at least to address. I do believe it's important to -- with the limited CVRP funding to really try to focus on longer range vehicles. I'm not sure what the right range is, but clearly more than 25, whether that's maybe 35 being the right amount. It would be interesting to hear from staff.

I do believe and I understand we want to get people beyond range anxiety. So we do still want to encourage folks to maybe start off with a hybrid, so -- but clearly much more than 25. So I think I'd like to hear a bit from staff at the end about that, proposing maybe something around 35.

Second, we heard from some air districts about this issue of stacking funding. Can the staff talk a bit about that change that sort of prevents that stacked funding that they referred to?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Did you want further comment on the range issue also?

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I'll put the three issues out there. Okay. And then the third is --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: -- we've heard from the transit community about, you know, how do we help in this whole transition to zero-emission with our -- with bus fleets. And I know the last time we had a funding discussion a few years ago, we had a pilot project that we funded. And I know that California Transit Association sort of suggested looking at that approach, but also was concerned about the fact that infrastructure is no longer funded.

So I do think we need to be thoughtful about -- and look at doing something more for the transit industry. We have -- you know, we have with the -- with the Innovative Transit Rule last year, really -- you know, we're moving them along quickly. It's going to come at a cost. There's going to be changes in technology, but we also, I think, need to help them transition. They are public. We don't want to have this result in increased fares to -- in public transit which serves the opposite purpose, right? We're trying to keep transit affordable. So we've put a lot of responsibility on them to transition
to zero-emission.

So I'd like for us to look at how -- and they've suggested a couple of approaches that I'm interested in sort of considering and looking at. So those are the three areas that I'd like to have addressed.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Can -- why don't we just deal with those and then other Board members may have other questions also.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI: Sure. Let me -- let me start with a discussion of the stackability and the transit proposal --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yeah.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI: -- and then I'll turn it over to Lisa who will talk about the plug-in hybrids. So on the stackability, I think the place to start -- this is -- this is a -- the term may have been confusing. And I think some of the folks were maybe confused on the proposal a little bit. So let me take a step back and clarify what we're talking about here.

CARB is extremely supportive of leveraging funds.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Um-hmm.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI: And so it's not a matter of leveraging funds. But the history of this is rather interesting. And it
involves our partners at the CEC down there. They got $75 million for a school bus project. And that's a really good thing. And their initial concept and proposal was, hey, why don't we fund half of it out of our 75 million, then look to HVIP to fund the other half. And that would certainly stretch their monies further, but it would kind of kill the HVIP Program. We couldn't afford anything like that -- that magnitude of the program. And we talked with them and there were -- understood the situation, and revised their proposal, and we went on.

But we realized we had a big gap here, a big loophole where folks were latching onto -- even State funding, latching onto the HVIP program first and then using the other funds to fill the gap rather than the other way around. We didn't feel like we were necessarily funding additional projects from this. It was a matter of moving funds from one underfunded State pot to another underfunded State pot. And it seemed simpler to try and keep them, you know, constrained within their own -- their own pots.

So we -- we put this proposal out there and we worked this for the last six months. We really didn't have a whole lot of issues associated with it. And it's just sort of flared up in the last couple of days, which is why I think there's some confusion about what it
does or doesn't do.

We -- we're happy to go talk with the folks on where it's limited. It doesn't impact local funds. It doesn't impact leveraging with federal funds, but it would limit, you know, how we intersect other State pots.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: So it would -- it would prevent having our funds leverage other State funds, but about not federal or local?

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Of course, a lot of the funding for these are -- tend to be pots of State funds, right, so --

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI: Well, there are a number of State funds. And the idea was, like the CEC program, the CEC was able to revise their proposal to fully fund the number of vehicles that they could.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI: Quite honestly, you know, the HVIP Program is very short of funds. And there are a number of hard decisions we've had to make in developing this proposal.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I understand. Of course, it -- it doesn't say you have to apply for and leverage
funds, but that it gives that option, if you have that ability. Now, you don't have the ability to leverage other State funds, am I right?

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:
I'm not -- I'm not clear on your --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: So when you said it uses up more funds, it just allows you to seek -- a project to seek a number of different funding pots that they couldn't under the new rules?

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:
What was happening is folks were looking for the HVIP program to assume the first position. It is -- they would take as much as they could HVIP and then they would fill in the rest with the other State funds.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Um-hmm.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:
And that was -- that was drawing down our pot too quickly quite honestly.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: And on the other issues, do you want to address the...

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:
The -- there was a broad discussion about transit agencies.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Um-hmm.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:
And they had a number of proposals specifically a carve-out, a desire if we end up reducing funds because we were run out of money -- if we reduce project dollars and because we run out of funds, that they not be impacted by that, and a desire to keep the infrastructure. Again, the infrastructure was part of trying to balance the budget. When we put the infrastructure funds in there, that was a desire. It was a patch basically, because we saw a gap there.

And although, there's still a gap, since we put the infrastructure funds in, we've done a number of changes that have helped with that -- that aspect. For example, you've heard from Commissioner Monahan today, you know, CEC is taking a strong leadership role in allocating more funding than they ever have to infrastructure.

SB 350, working with the utilities, PUC, allocated significant funding, $750 million, for heavy-duty infrastructure. And then the Carl Moyer Program implemented changes where the Carl Moyer Program air districts can fund infrastructure through the Carl Moyer Program. So there's more options than there ever were.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: But are there more funding options for infrastructure among all the pots this year if we remove that class from our funding, than there were
last year?

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:
There are more than there -- there are more
funding opportunities for infrastructure this year than
there were last year.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Because what -- because what
we heard -- we've heard a lot is even as the price per
bus -- the cost comes down, which it will and has been,
that what we've heard is that infrastructure cost is high
for transit agencies to be able to actually support the
vehicles, whether it's battery electric or hydrogen fuel
cell, that there's a major infrastructure cost to them
just to be able to handle the zero-emission buses.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:
We -- there are infrastructure challenges.
The -- you know, I'm not going to pretend that, you know,
there's enough money for everybody. What we're trying to
do is balance --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Right.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:
-- how the HVIP funding can get spent, because we
just -- we don't have enough money to spend it on all of
the different projects.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Well and how do you feel
about having some type of pilot -- some type of project,
MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI: We continue to --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: -- with transit?

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI: For transit, we had a pilot program was discussed as transit. We've spent $35 million on transits over several -- transit demos over several years. They're effective. I think they've helped. We were considering a transit pilot out of, in this year, as we went through the work group process, it was highly considered. It didn't make the final cut, but it was -- it was certainly there.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I think for a lot of us, especially a lot of us up here in local government who, you know, have to address these issues, you know, at that local level about tran -- you know, the ability to have transit be sustainable, affordable, and with the increased cost that will -- that could happen here going forward with zero-emission technology, that I think -- I do think we owe something to public transit in California. And I use the word "public" and emphasize the word "public", unlike some of the other folks who will apply for funding, which who are not public necessarily, who will get the benefit of these funds.

So I think we owe something to our -- to public
transit agencies. So I'd like to hear how my colleagues feel and would like to look -- think about how we sort of address that and provide some certain funding.

CHAIR NICHOLS: We need more money.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: No, we do. But for those of us in local government who are facing sort of the challenges of -- you know, we talk all the time about -- that if we're going to, you know, be successful in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, we have to get people out of their cars and into transit. And if we don't help make -- keep transit and make it more affordable as it transitions to zero-emission, we are going to lose that. At least, I think that goal will be jeopardized. I think that's -- that's the challenge. And I think -- so I think it's okay to think about how we prioritize a public good, a public service, like transit as we think about the funding.

CHAIR NICHOLS: I agree. I think this particular set of monies is, at the moment a, zero sum game.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yes.

CHAIR NICHOLS: And there's a need to look more broadly for other sources, which I'm happy to say is an effort that I think is ongoing right now within the administration as part of the preparations for next year's
budget. But right now, we're dealing with this one pot. And so anybody that you make happier is going to make somebody else less happy, and that's -- that's my only comment. My only point.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yeah, it's the unfortunate reality of any of the decisions we make at all levels of government.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah, I know. Well, we try to make everybody happy.

Supervisor Fletcher.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: I'd like to pick up on this theme of making transit agencies happier and other people less happy.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Still happy, just not as happy. You know as a -- as a transit agency, I want to echo what Supervisor Gioia was saying in the sense of being a public agency and being a public entity, we only serve the public. And so it's not -- it's not the same as subsidizing someone's cost of an electric vehicle. And I support subsidizing someone's cost of an electric vehicle. And on that point, I just want to say I support the changes to the CRVP program, I think, maximizing the impact.

I think the MSRP cap is entirely reasonable. But
even at that, I just want to -- and I support it and it's
good. But we're subsidizing the cost of a $59,000
vehicle. And so we're subsiding the cost of someone who
can afford to buy a $59,000 vehicle. And that's okay. We
should do that. But the question is what is the balance
we should do that in proportion of subsidizing a transit
agency that serves people in the truest sense of a public
entity and public agency. And I think that's -- that's
the debate that we're having here in terms of priorities.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Um-hmm.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: On the CRVP, I appreciate
greatly the fact that even though we're lowering the
dollar amount for those true low-income communities with
the $2,000 kicker, $2,500 kicker that goes in, we're
maintaining that. And I think that's a good program. I
also like the financing programs that are available in the
secondary market.

And as we move forward, I just want us to
encourage in those individual vehicles that we continue to
take into account the equity issues. That we're not
merely making an expensive purchase for someone who can
afford to buy it less expensive, but we're really striving
to bridge the gap of someone who wouldn't be able to get
into the electric vehicle market without these programs.

And so I think those are good and -- and moving
forward. And also programs like Clean Cars 4 All, I understand with the carryover we don't need to fund it. My Air District's thinking has recently evolved and we'll be participating in that program very soon. And so I look -- as we move forward, I hope we continue our commitment.

But back to this issue of transit. So being that -- the new chair of a transit agency, I came in to aggressively push what are we doing on electric buses. We have huge swaths of 617 communities in our areas. Those communities are hugely impacted by our buses, many of our diesel buses that are out there.

And as an agency, and I've spent a lot of time on the budget to say how can we do more? So we have about 600 buses. We replace about 50 a year. Right now, we have eight -- we have six electric buses that we're going to be rolling out next month. We have two more on order, so we have eight.

Our commitment to do this is strong. Our financial ability to do it is not. We have limited resources. And we're going to go to the voters and -- next year and ask for a greater investment in transit. But right now, just to put in context, a electric bus costs us $900,000. That's about what it costs. And it gets a range of about 150 miles on a six-hour charge.
Now, a comparable non-electric bus is almost half that cost and gets well more than double that range. And so our commitment to do this, because of all of the things that we care about is great, but our financial ability to pay twice the amount for something that goes half the distance, makes it really hard.

And so the challenge we face, as a limited agency, that has squeezed every dollar out of our budget we can possibly do is that to make these types of investments means that I have to cut service, which I don't want to do, which doesn't help anything, or I have to raise fares, which has a simultaneous impact on who has the ability to ride a public asset.

And so I just think like we're committed and we're trying. But when you look at the current HVIP funding -- and I get it's oversubscribed. I understand that. But if we got the full HVIP allowable amount for a bus, we're still $150,000 short. Like, we're still short.

Now, the VW money, if we get that, that doesn't make us whole, but it gets us closer. It makes it easier. The infrastructure thing is an issue, but there's a whole bunch of other pots of money. Now, we have to figure out creatively how to go get that and offset that.

But what I would ask us to think about is a couple things. One, how might we be able to apply for the
advanced technology demonstration and pilot projects? Transit agencies are excluded from that.

Now, it's just 40 million, but that could be a difference in bridging, or how do we address the issue of stackability, where maybe some of those fundings is a last bridge or a last opportunity to kind -- I mean, is there someway -- because I understand we want to try and -- we want to try and direct folks to other areas. But the majority of the programs for these are State funded. And I think that an electric bus replacing a diesel bus driving through an AB 617 community has a tremendous potential for what we do.

And so perhaps we could even create a stackability, if it's the last mile kind of opportunity, and if it's to replace a diesel bus, and if it's to replace a diesel bus driving in an AB 617 community. Like, how might we put together something that align a series of our priorities in a way that allows transit agencies that are doing what we can to try and have an impact? And so I don't know if there's any thoughts. I'm trying to -- I'm trying to take seriously your concerns, which I do, but also balance those with the needs of transit agencies and where we have a series of priorities all aligned, how might we have some flexibility?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I want to recognize Dr. Balmes next.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: So one of Supervisor Gioia's three questions was about the plug-in hybrid range. And so I want to start off by asking Lisa to tell us about staff's thinking there.

MSCD INNOVATE LIGHT-DUTY STRATEGIES SECTION MANAGER MACUMBER: Great. Thank you. So our -- in our proposal, what we tried to do was balance a need to make sure that there are enough options for consumers given that there still are only -- there's about 57 electric models available and hundreds on the internal combustion side.

And we want to make sure that consumers have a choice, especially those consumers that are lower income, have larger families, and have maybe only one electric vehicle option. They're using it potentially to commute. There is still a range anxiety issue.

Those consumers that can afford to buy the longer -- the vehicles that offer longer range typically have those as second and third vehicle options. We do agree that over time that number needs to continue to go up and we need to continue to push the envelope on ensuring that we've got the longest range vehicles available.
But what we propose is to do that slowly, to ensure, again, that we've got enough vehicle options available. And that it -- we are sending that signal over time. What we've noted in the plan is that we do think that in the next few years that we would eventually phase out PHEVs altogether. We just don't think we're there yet.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: But --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Just this difference between 30 -- between 20 and 25 doesn't seem to be much.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Yeah, well -- John, if I might.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: So, you know, first of all, as a proud owner of the best plug-in hybrid, the Volt --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: It gets 40 miles.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: -- 60 --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Oh, 60.

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: -- on a hot day, 53 normally.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Yeah.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER BALMES: And so lately it's been doing better than 53, you know, which has been -- it's been canceled by Chevy, because they think it's -- it
doesn't make any sense anymore, because there's the Bolt.

I have to agree with them, as much as I like the car. And I bought the car for range anxiety, because, as Kevin Hamilton knows, I do go down to Fresno regularly for my research - going on Sunday - and I need to come back the same day. And, you know, I -- it's not easy to fast charge a vehicle in Fresno yet, unless maybe you have a Tesla with the proprietary charging.

I looked, while we were talking, at the vehicles that are available at 25 -- under 25, I didn't see too many that are very affordable by poor -- you know, by low-income folks.

I just don't under -- I agree with Kevin Hamilton that we should make it 35. I mean, I would like to discontinue it altogether. The program is underfunded as we've been hearing all day. I rather see it go to battery electric vehicles. I didn't -- I wasn't able to get CVRP, because I make too much money. That's fine with me.

But I just don't see that it really is going to make that much difference to the low-income folks that you're -- you're speaking to. And I think we should be pushing companies to do better than, you know, 25. When looking at the --

CHAIR NICHOLS: So are you saying you support the -- support an amendment that would --
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: To 35, yes.
CHAIR NICHOLS: -- raise it to 35? Okay. Thank you. I'm going to move us along a little bit here.
Dr. Sherriffs, one more word on this and then it will be Ms. Takvorian.
BOARD MEMBER SHERIFFS: You know, I'm not sure what amendment to support, because I think the real issue isn't the number, but it's what number does the public maximize that they're running off the battery, that they're running at the cleanest level. So I think we need to continue to pay attention to whatever data is available out there is how these cars are being used. And whether we pick 25 or 35 this year is not so important, because either way, we want to continue paying attention to the data. What is the number that users maximize there at their battery use as opposed to their internal combustion use?
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I don't -- you know, just -- I'll be quick, Mary.
(Laughter.)
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I'm going to pick on one.
CHAIR NICHOLS: I mean, take it out -- make you guys take it outside.
BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I'll pick on one. No, the -- the Toyota Prius Prime nominally gets 25. That's a
very popular plug-in hybrid. I'm just not sure that we should be -- you know, that's where we should be going.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Using our money on that. Yeah.

Got it. Okay. Ms. Takvorian.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Agreed. I agree with that, so let's make that happen.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I guess overall I -- well, one, I want to thank staff. I think this is an amazing report. I really loved the poster session and learning about the real evolution from demonstration and pilot programs to actual deployment, which I think is exciting.

I think overall what I've gotten out of this conversation is we need to move more money to heavy-duty and that includes bus and transit, and trucks, and all the other vehicles that are classified as heavy-duty. We need to move the money there. And I think we need to move more of the money into that -- into heavy-duty and less of the money into passenger vehicles, frankly.

So I think that if we can move -- so to me, moving the mileage from 25 to 35 does that. The MSRC -- RP cap helps to do that, because it means less of it there, because that market has evolved as well.
And so as we -- as we look at all the rest of the evolutions and we start to say these have a strong market base, we can -- we can start to move out of that. So that's -- that's where I would go. I support the 12-liter ultra low NOx, because that's the option that we're -- that we have at this point. And so I would support that. But I support overall the move towards zero-emission with the voucher and incentive programs.

And then the last thing I wanted to say is that I think the STEP Program has a really strong potential to solve some of the critical equity and mobility problems. And I'm not sure what the issues might be with the planning and implementation grants that was referred to, but I would ask you to pay attention to that, and make sure that those are -- that it's an easy evolution for communities.

But I know that in our 617 community, some of these are the key issues, like first mile, last mile. Transportation projects could easily be, I think, qualified there. And I think that's the kind of thing that other 617 communities are facing as well.

So that -- those are my comments.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Moving in the other direction here, Mr. De La Torre, no.
Mr. -- Sorry. Ms. Mitchell.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: I'll say something.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: All right. Most of the issues have already been covered. But there's a couple things. One is the change in the definition of a near zero. And I don't -- I guess I look at that and think how does that affect the legislative intent of some of the legislation that we're dealing with? And so we ought to take a look at that, that, you know, we don't end up just doing an end-run around the Legislature by changing the definition, if you understand what I'm talking about. Okay. Maybe it's okay. I just think we should have a look at that.

Then, the other thing on the MSRP cap, I support that. But I think we should keep an eye on that cap as we see things like the F-1 -- the F-150 pickup trucks that may come into that range, because I think we really need to inspire zero-emission vehicles in that range, the mid-level. Like so many contractors are using those trucks. And if we can get to a point where they have a good -- a good hybrid model or even a good all-electric, which it seems far off, but -- and it -- maybe that doesn't reach them now, because I don't think there's anything out there that's under development -- or maybe
there's some things under development, but not far enough along for us to be concerned.

But, you know, in the years ahead, to take a look at that $60,000 cap to see if it's suppressing the development of those vehicles or if we can't incentivize that a little bit.

So -- and then on school buses and transit buses, I think that we have our Innovative Clean Transit, and so I do think we need to pay attention to the funding for those and the infrastructure for those, so...

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah. I might just ask Mr. De Alba, because the CEC is also very engaged in this electrification of school buses issue. And I think between the two of us, we are reaching pretty every school bus in the state of California, though there may still be some out there. But do you have -- can you add any additional information on that?

MR. DE ALBA: Good afternoon. Ben De Alba with the California Energy Commission. I don't have the immediate stats in front of me, but our school bus program was oversubscribed. So it doesn't encompass all of the school districts out there. I believe we had some -- hundred and some odd school buses that were funded from the one-time funding of $75 million.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. So not enough again.
Any other comments here from other Board members?
It feels like we need to get to a close.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Mary?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Yeah, I'm sorry. I wasn't clear earlier. I had a question that I made as a statement and I think we moved on. What is the way that you think that we could address the stackability issue to help our transit agencies get those electric buses in impacted communities? So should we just allow it or is there some qualification that would make it work?

But my concern is with what we have here, it's going to make it awfully hard for transit agencies to get electric buses. And I want to get diesel ones off, particularly in 617 communities.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:
Well, my suggestion -- we put a proposal out there to say that -- to -- in order to basically limit the funding obligation within HVIP to remove stackability for other State funds. If the Board was inclined to have transit agencies -- have that applicable for transit agencies, my recommendation would just be that the HVIP Program fills the gap portion of that. That is, it's in the second position. And whatever the other funding source is takes primary position, so that --
BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: So if you were going to
stack them -- so the HVIP Program would still be available
to transit agencies as written now. If you wanted to
stack that on top of another State program, then the HVIP
would be the secondary to close the gap?

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:
Yes, that's -- that would -- that would be the
way that --

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Okay. I would make a
motion that we amend to do that, to allow. And then I
also have a --

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: I'll second. I'll second
that. But I want to make sure I heard something
correctly, if I'm going to second it --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: -- is that if the agency
chose only to get this particular funding, they're not
required to go get --

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Right.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: -- something else and put
this in the second position, right? It's just that --

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:
Correct.

BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: -- we are in the second --
it's in the second position, if there's other funding.
But if this is the only funding, it can still get the --

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: You get the full amount.

CHAIR NICHOLS: That's what it is, right.

MOBILE SOURCE CONTROL DIVISION CHIEF KITOWSKI:
You could do that.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Okay.

CHAIR NICHOLS: That at least opens up a little.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Yeah, a little bit.

So just second quick question then I'll wrap up,
the advanced technology demonstrations and pilot projects
is what -- why were transit agencies excluded from that --
from applying for that?

MSCD OFF-ROAD AGRICULTURAL STRATEGIES AND
INCENTIVES SECTION MANAGER BUFFINGTON: Sure, I can --
this is Michelle Buffington. I can respond to that.

In the demonstration and pilot category, we have
a very limited pot of money. It's at 40 million. It --
in 2014-15 and then in some of our funding from, I think
it was, 16-17 helped fill the gap on a pilot for transit
buses and trucks. And Jack had pointed out $35 million.
So that was specifically for fuel cell buses, but there
was an additional 30 -- approximately 30 million for
battery electric buses.

So we had conducted a pretty deep -- we have a
lot of projects related to transit already in the
demonstration and pilot phase. Now, we're gathering data on those, so that we can help make assessments on infrastructure cost, and deployments, and routes, and range. But now we also have another regulation coming down the pike, right, the Advanced Clean Truck Regulation.

And so we worked on the truck and -- or the bus pilots to help support the Innovate Clean Transit Rule before it rolled out. Now, we're at a point where we need to be supporting the types of trucks that are going to be deployed and needed for the Advanced Clean Truck Regulation.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Okay.

MSCD OFF-ROAD AGRICULTURAL STRATEGIES AND INCENTIVES SECTION MANAGER BUFFINGTON: So when you think about the progression of demonstration pilots to commercial phase, we're at a point where we really need to be supporting that pilot phase in order to make sure those trucks are available when they need to be commercially available for the regulation.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

So are there additional questions pending that you did not get a chance to respond to? I apologize. I lost track here. I don't -- I think we're all -- we're all square that we are changing the eligibility of transit
agencies for other funding, according to the description that was just given. I did not hear any opposition to that.

There's some whispering going on here though. I don't want to interrupt this discussion among the staff. And we asked for a resolution on the Class 8 eligibility for the low NOx engines. Is there anything else that we need to address? And the 35 -- raising the limit, right -- raising the cutoff to 35 from 25 for the CVRP program, because it just seems as though we're ready to move on at this point.

So if that's it, then I think we could just move the main resolution.

We have a motion somewhere and second on that. Yes, all done.

So I'm going to ask, I think, for just a voice vote on this one.

All in favor of the proposal that's before us, please say aye?

(Unanimous aye vote.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Opposed? Any abstentions anywhere?

Okay. Then we've done it and we're about to -- we're about to let loose a very substantial amount of funding to some very needy -- needy areas.
And with that, I think we should call for a half hour lunch break, where we can do our executive session, and members of the public can grab a bite nearby. And we should try to be back here in half an hour.

Thank you.

(Off record: 1:30 p.m.)

(Thereupon a lunch break was taken.)
AFTERNOON SESSION

(On record: 2:08 p.m.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: While we're waiting for everyone else to assemble, I want to, for the record, announce that the Board met in executive session over the lunch break. And we were briefed by our counsel on the status of a couple of pending cases that are listed on the agenda. No decisions were made and no direction was given. And so we closed that -- we closed the closed session and we're now back in open session.

And we can begin with the group that has come with a request to testify about the Clippers project. We have heard from the Senator, Steven Bradford, and from the Mayor of the City of Inglewood. But we have a number of other witnesses who have also made the trip and we want to make sure that they have a chance to be heard.

So I think we can begin. I still have a couple of Board members in the back, but they are able to hear because of the sound system.

So let's begin with Mr. Gaskill, if he's here.

Robert Gaskill?

Or people can come in any order that they want, I suppose. The next would have been -- next would be Vivian Rahwanji. Ms. Rahwanji?

She may be going to get somebody else.
Okay. Well, we'll -- are any of the people who are here in the audience able to step forward and begin?
That would be great.

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Will let the last be first for a change. You got me up there last, but that's okay.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, the last will be first, right?

MR. BROWN: Well, hello. Hello, Board. My name is Willie Brown. And I am the proud publisher of Inglewood Today newspaper in the City of Inglewood. We've been covering Inglewood for over 25 years. And we've been covering Inglewood in ways that no other publication has been able to so far.

And as you probably know, covering Inglewood now means covering the L.A. Clippers. We are so excited to have the NBA return to Inglewood. And reporting on this Arena project has kept us very busy. There is tremendous support in Inglewood for this project by the community.

The Clippers are taking a vacant lot, frankly an ugly vacant lot, and putting that -- that's in the flight path of the LAX, and they are creating a beautiful stadium, a gorgeous arena. We're excited to have this arena. Our people are excited to have the opportunities for jobs. And most of all, we are excited to have one of
the NBA's best basketball team.

That is a major point of pride in our City of Inglewood. And I know from reading news accounts, that other sports projects in California got through the bureaucratic process of yours much faster than the Clippers.

I've asked why? What's the difference? What's the difference with Golden State stadium for the Warriors? What's the difference with the Qualcomm Arena in San Diego? Well, in Inglewood, we are proud people. We're a very diverse community, made up of African-Americans and Latinos and brown-skinned people and others.

And we fought hard to try and improve our community over the many years. And we are certainly sick and tired of a business coming in, one business, that have not participated as a good corporate citizen toward the people and the business community of our city, and are trying to, with their monies coming out of elsewhere, to control and dictate how the people of Inglewood should live the rest of their lives.

I can't believe in California, at this time, that you will not recognize the value that this arena with its jobs and many benefits that it's going to bring to our community will deny our kids from the opportunities, will deny our small businesses the opportunity, will deny our
citizens the opportunity to grow with the rest of the world.

    I beg of you let's get this thing done. Thank you.

    (Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS. Okay. Let's go back to the order, I guess, that we were in to begin with. Is this Mr. Gaskill?

MR. GASKILL: Yes.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Then come on down. You've got a tough act to follow though.

    (Laughter.)

MR. GASKILL: So I will try to only speak for 30 seconds then.

    My name is Robert Gaskill. I am owner of Motev LLC, which is co-owned by Morgan Freeman. We are a green energy transportation company chauffeured service in Inglewood in Los Angeles utilizing hybrid vehicles, and Teslas, and things like that. So it was great to be able to sit through everything earlier on today. I learned a lot. Thank you.

    But the Clippers project is very, very important to my position as the vice chair of the Inglewood Chamber of Commerce. They -- this is a privately funded situation. They are not looking for State funds of any
kind. This is going to bring in a lot of jobs to the local community. I have already seen personally how Mr. Ballmer and the Clippers have been able to take care of children by giving everyone in the Los Angeles School District glasses, reading glasses, the nearly 9,000 jobs that are going to be created -- it just -- it boggles my mind that this -- that this particular proposition has not moved quicker through this organization.

So I just want to beg you, please, please, please let this pass.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

MR. McCallum.

MR. McCALLUM: Good afternoon. Thank you again for the opportunity for us to actually come before you. My name is Gerard McCallum. I've been doing community development in Inglewood since 1996. A few of us here that are actually part of this community came together and said what can we do to actually improve the community, because we weren't getting any help from the State, or from the city, or from our local government.

So we embarked upon it ourselves. And the first project we did was a local church acquired the Great Western Forum after the Lakers Left. And it left jobs. Herbalife left. It left those jobs. And Inglewood plummeted down into 17.5 percent unemployment rate.
So we took the resource that we had, which was a local church and bought the Forum. Hired back, through union jobs, workers that used to work there that were part of the Inglewood Community and moved forward on that.

We also did some other things. I used to be a member of CLCV, a part of the Los Angeles Land Trust. We were also trying to make sure the future development of Inglewood was green, that we live under the flight path. We have noise impediments. We -- the environment cannot be any worse than where we're at.

So the improvements that we were actually embarking upon were based upon green, not -- they never have to come before, because we never got challenged with CEQA and never had outside resources looking to challenge us. We did the right thing.

Now, we put forward this arena here. If you look through the data, and that's one of the things I really want to implore to you is that move this thing along. Two hundred and eighty-seven days is a long time for something to be -- we could have just gone through lawsuits at this point, as opposed to actually waiting for this streamlining portion of it.

But now we're at a critical phase of it, because of the long time it's taken for your staff to actually review the documents itself. But we also ask you to
actually look at the documents themselves. We submitted what we fully believe is a net zero project. It is LEED Gold. It will be the first LEED Gold Arena in Inglewood -- project in Inglewood.

It has photovoltaics all over the place. We have 303 EV charging stations. Inglewood put its first charging stations in last week, two. I drive an electrical vehicle. I never change it in Inglewood, because there weren't charging stations. We would be putting in 303 charging stations. We've even gone further.

That legislation actually requires us to address things no other project like this has before, NOx and PM2.5. Upwards up to $30 million outside of -- what you actually have to evaluate is in that legislation which we will do. We're looking at going to the ports to be able to solve some of those issues within this arena.

We've already talked about the community benefit, from $100 million, $25 million going to after-school programs, $75 million going towards affordable housing. That's all a part of this project. No other AB 900, 987 is the first one, has anything like that. And yet, we are still net neutral. And yet, we're at 287 days and counting.

So I just implore you. I -- you know there's a
lot more. Look at the data. Look at what we submitted. Look at the science. Don't go on opinion. Go on the science, and we think we -- you'll have actually a project that's win-win for all of us.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Mr. Edwards. Mr. Hall.

MR. HALL: Good afternoon, Madam Chair --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Good afternoon.

MR. HALL: -- Fellow Board members, and staff.

Thank you for what you do. My name is Dexter. I'm the past president of the Rotary Club of Inglewood. I'm also on the board of directors with the Inglewood Chamber of Commerce. And I'm also the vice chair of the Education Committee Meeting.

I'm going to read you something here, why the Clippers have made an impact on Inglewood before -- before it even moved into Inglewood. In December 2015, the L.A. Clippers Foundation announced a partnership with the Vision to Learn Program to provide eye exams and eyeglasses to every child in need. This was from pre-K through high school in the City of Inglewood.

In that same year, 2015, the L.A. Clippers Foundation in partnership with the Visual to Learn Program, the City of Inglewood, the Inglewood Chamber of
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Commerce, and the Rotary completed over -- vision screening for over 12,000 plus students in the Inglewood Unified School District.

Those screenings had dramatic results ladies and gentlemen. Just over 1,376 students were fitted for eyeglasses, which they received without cost through the program. This was all free. I just received a call last night from the coordinator from the Vision to Learn Program stating that they're going to be -- restart the vision screening again in the next couple of months. And guess who's funded it? The L.A. Clipper Foundation.

And you see right here, in front here, ladies and gentlemen, this is the vehicle that was bought by the Ballmer Foundation so students -- they were able to go around to each school with this van -- you see Paul Pierce. He used to play for the Clippers -- and provide these awesome vision screenings for students who need it. Steve Ballmer's vision is not just only to play basketball in the City of Inglewood, it's to make a difference in the City of Inglewood community.

Steve Ballmer is a man of his word. Please certify the Clippers arena project. Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Mr. Holly?

MR. HOLLY: Yes. Chair, members, why are we
here? This is something that should have been taken care of a long time ago. Oakland arena took them 60 days, and we're in excess of 250 days. You've heard a lot of people speak to the fact that this is going to provide jobs for the community. This is going to help the school system.

Well, I'm the President and CEO for the Chamber of Commerce. And let me tell you what it's going to do for the community. It's going to help those mom and pop businesses that are struggling to make it and have been for many years. Some have actually closed down. This is going to help the ones that still made it to have other people from outside the community come in. And they're going to be able to not only sustain, but to be profitable being in the city.

We want to continue the growth within the City of Inglewood. We want the Clippers arena to go through. We want it to pass. We want to make sure that it not only helps the residents in the community, but it helps the other businesses in the community. They have a lot at stake as well.

So we implore you to please go ahead and get this passed as soon as possible.

Thank you.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

(Applause.)
CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

MS. HUNTER: Hello.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Hello.

MR. HUNTER: Yes, Hello.

(Laughter.)

MR. HUNTER: My name is Teo Hunter.

MS. ASHBURN: My name is Beny Ashburn.

MR HUNTER: And we are the owners of Crowns and Hops Brewing Company. We want to share with you why it's so important for this project to be approved, and why it's important to other entrepreneurs in Inglewood. We will be the first black owned brewery in Southern California, soon to be located less than two miles away from the designated area for the Clippers arena.

A fact about craft beer, out of 8,000 plus breweries in the country, less than one percent are owned by people of color. Of that one percent, none have the opportunity to benefit from the development of their own -- in their own city. And in this case, the economic activity of the Clippers arena development is estimated approximately 268 million.

This speaks to millions of dollars that will contribute to the support, development, and success of local Inglewood businesses like ours.

MS. ASHBURN: Our name Crowns and Hops is
intended to remind our community that they are deserving of all things premium, from world class beer to safe public spaces to bring their families. The Clippers privately funded project has the development and success of the community at the forefront. Much too often, cities that look like ours, develop without consideration for current residences. This is not the case here.

It's the Clippers' organization's understanding the importance of preserving this community for affordable housing programs, home buyer support, after-school programs, job creation, and more importantly zero net greenhouse gas emissions. They are investing in the infrastructure in the future of Inglewood.

MR. HUNTER: So with that said, we're not only excited to expand the palate of the people with world class craft beer, but we want to expand the community's understanding of what they deserve.

We look forward to the prompt approval of the CARB committee, so that as local business owners we can benefit from the same collateral effect and economic growth found in similar projects seen in wealthier communities all throughout the country.

MS. ASHBURN: As a brewery, we look forward to achieve -- achieving, excuse me, the true zero waste certification which is aligned with what the Clippers are
doing to include zero net greenhouse gas emissions in their development. We are excited, along with the Clippers development group, to show the state of California, our country, and the world the beauty that's found in the community of Inglewood.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. HUNTER: And one thing I will say is we will be located right next to the metro stop in Inglewood, which we are --

(Laughter.)

MR. HUNTER: -- incentivizing for responsible travel.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Now you're talking our language.

MR. HUNTER: Thereby, reducing our carbon footprint.

(Laughter.)

MR. HUNTER: So there's that, Committee. Approve.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Thank you. That's right. Exactly.

MR. EDWARDS: Good afternoon. My name is Edward Edwards. I'm a resident of Inglewood, California. A businessman for over 50 years in Inglewood. Also, I
represent the Clippers in their new project on Prairie and Century. It's going to bring hundreds of jobs to the area for the citizens of Inglewood, and those citizens who are not in Inglewood, and the young adults in the schools, and the improvement of our beautiful city.

I've been there 50 years in business. And for the Clippers to come in and make the commitment they have made to this city is unheard of. Millions of dollars are going to just the citizens of Inglewood, the schools, the children, and the athletic arenas that would be built for the kids, and the senior citizens who are in the area who are walking distance to the arena.

There is nothing like what we're about to present to Inglewood, nothing like it in the world. We will be the most exclusive and modern arena in the world. And we will employ hundreds of people, hundreds. Not $1 out of the citizen's pockets. This has all been done by the Clippers organization.

We will give the City of Inglewood a new look. They will be the most talked about city in the United States. Everybody is looking forward to it. The whole City of Inglewood, the children, the young adults, the high school kids, college kids are all looking forward to it.

Not only today, but yesterday, we have given them...
shoes, clothing, food, and new custom gyms and playgrounds for the kids. Never been done in the history of Inglewood. And I've been with all of the celebrities. I've been in the entertainment business for over 50 years. Any entertainer you name up there, I've been with. I'm the pioneer. I'm the senior of this organization. And the owner of the Clippers came to me and said, Edward, we'd like you to be part of our organization.

And since then, I, myself, along with the owner, have fed many seniors, many, many seniors, and children, and families.

We look forward to your vote. Please give us that vote that we're looking forward to. We've been waiting a long time. Thank you very much for your time. And you're going to be surprised at what you see. And we'd like to invite all you down to a Clipper game in Inglewood.

(Laughter.)

(Applause.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

I think that's the list of people who actually signed up to testify. And thank you for coming and thank you for staying and waiting.

You know you are here at the tail-end of a formal Board meeting. And because we didn't have a chance to
talk with you in advance, we're not prepared to just sit
down and have a chat, which I'd kind of like to do at this
point, about everything that's gone on and is going on
with this.

But I want to tell you that ARB has been, and is
now, actively engaged in talking with the representatives
of the Clippers about their proposal. And we were handed
an assignment, as several of you mentioned, by the
legislation to make some findings. And so, you know, the
technical staffs have been going back and forth trying to
establish the information, and the methodology, and all of
that. And I think that, frankly, there was some time when
people were talking past each other. I wish that we had
had the level of discussions that clearly many of you in
the community have had with the Clippers and with their
foundation. Because on this particular item, I think we
were spending a lot of our time with the consultants that
don't necessarily speak to the owner or owners the team,
and in the way that you all have come to know and
appreciate what the Clippers have done and can do.

So we're taking it on faith that all of the
things that they have promised are really going to happen.
And it's very good to hear that many of those good things
already are happening and have happened. That's extremely
reassuring to me.
I live in Los Angeles. I don't live in Inglewood. I live in central Los Angeles, but I certainly have been to Inglewood. I've been to the Forum. I've been around. I know something about, you know, some of the challenges that the community has faced. And I appreciate the fact that you are all counting on this project to be a big infusion of energy, and funds, and attention of the right kind.

So we're going to do our best to get this wrapped up quickly. I think we have direction on that from the Governor to do that. And so we'll hope to have good news for you the next time we meet. And in the meantime, we'll just say thank you for coming.

(Appause.)

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Can we -- I just wondered if we -- I'm sorry, could we just -- one second, I just wanted to clarify --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: -- that -- because the -- one of the gentlemen that spoke indicated that we might be voting --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Oh, no.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: -- on this.

CHAIR NICHOLS: There's no vote to the Board.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I think it's going to
hopefully be wrapped up much sooner than it would take --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. It will not come back to
the Board.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: -- for it to come back
here.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Right. It's through the
Executive Office.

BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah. So I just wanted
you to know that, so -- but thank you all so much for
coming.

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: And as a San Diegan, Los
Angeles stole the Clippers from us.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: And I want to applaud
you all on stealing it from them. It makes me feel
better. So congratulations.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Are there -- is there anybody else who was coming
to testify on any other topic during the public comment
period?

None. Okay.

In that case, I think we are able to adjourn.

So we are adjourned.

Thank you, everybody.
(Thereupon the Air Resources Board meeting adjourned at 2:33 p.m.)
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