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BRAWLEY, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, APRIL 4, 2016
8:11 A.M.

-INTRODUCTIONS-

SARAH RUBIN: We're starting a little late, but we do need to get going because we have a big day.

Okay. So we -- good morning, my name is Sarah Rubin, and I am with the Institute for Local Government. The Institute is the nonprofit research and education arm of the League of California Cities, the California State Association of Counties, and the California Special Districts Association, and I'm providing facilitation for you all today.

So we will do some introductions after we have some initial welcomes from our host, Luis.

LUIS OLMEDO: Good morning. Welcome to the City of Brawley and to the County of Imperial, as well as Valley of Imperial. It's an outstanding community. And it is -- I'm really glad to see all the members come out here.

In Imperial yesterday, we had a tour. We started in Brawley, saw a lot of the projects in terms of transportation, some of the visions, and also got to sit with a lot of people from the community, who were giving you your only personal guided tour. That's what I hear.
So I think it's very appropriate to be able to have these more personal conversations. You got to go all the way to the border, which is great. And I find that really important, especially because, you know, having to go to Sacramento.

I know in the past a lot of our meetings are in Sacramento, and I think it's hard, you know, whenever we talk about the issues and the border, about how we interact with Mexico and, you know, the issues of transportation. And I think a lot of times, it gets overseen, even sometimes overshadowed by San Diego. You know, most people know where San Diego is. But where is Imperial? I mean, I've been doing this for 15 years, and I still remember where I had to kind of tell people, you know, put it in the map.

After a while, honestly, I just say, you know, "I'm from San Diego." It just made it easier. But, you know, I mean, I think the whole environmental justice movement, and I think the -- you know, everything from AB32 and all these policies that are happening since I've been working on environmental justice, I think it's really, you know, kind of piecing it all together. And, you know, I know it's work that has been happening for decades and decades, you know, but I'm just happy to be a part of it for the last 15 years. I'm glad to be a
member. You know, I'm very honored to be a member of this
Environmental Justice Advisory Committee with the Air
Resources Board. I want to welcome all of you.

I do want to make some mentions here and get the
chance to speak with our -- just looking around the room,
I want to recognize that we do have two board members for
the Air Resources Board, which it really honors us to have
two of you board members, Diane Takvorian and Senator Dean
Florez, the two new ARB Board members, and, you know, just
friends come out here. I think it's great. I've been
trying to get Mary to come out here, but we have the next
best thing, which is Steve.

Steve -- where is Steve?

STEVE CLIFF: Here.

LUIS OLMEDO: Oh, Steve Cliff. So Senior
Advisor of Mary Nichols as your Board Chair of ARB. You
know, in the audience, we also have the City Manager, who
has been very helpful, and her staff. You know, I'm
sure -- you know, it all came together, we pulled it
together thanks to Rosanna Bayon Moore, our City Manager,
and of course with all the support of the -- the -- of the
council.

And we have some of the council members here --
so if you just want to stand up -- Norma Jauregui, Council
Member; the Mayor of the City of Brawley, Donnie Wharton;
and we also have a County Supervisor, and he'll have the chance to do a welcome; Ryan Kelly, the Imperial County Supervisor. And so -- and as well as John Hernandez, who wears many hats. You met him yesterday. And among them, you know, he's an IID Consumer Advisor and Senior Legislator and so on. So I'm sure others will come in.

I want to thank my board members who are here, as well, which is Oscar Suarez, one of the board members of Comite Civico, and Maria Lizaola. And I'm hoping I don't forget, of course Martin, who was very kind to give us a tour throughout the Imperial Valley.

So with that, I welcome you. I hope you feel a warm welcome from everybody so far. Yesterday was a great dinner, and I thought it was a great opportunity to get together and get to know each other better.

So with that, I'd like to bring in the Mayor and say a few words, and then followed by our County Supervisor, Ryan Kelley.

MAYOR DONALD WHARTON: Thank you, Luis, and thank you for that great introduction. I'll keep it brief. My -- my job here this morning is just make sure everyone is comfortable and more than welcome for being here. So we thank you very much for, I think, making a little history. This is the first meeting in Imperial County, and you can't get much further south. So welcome
here this morning.

I had a chance to just shake a few hands before getting started here this morning, and Senator, next time -- because I think he drove in -- just give me a call. I do fly. We can get you in here a little quicker.

You're looking at a little perk of Brawley.

But outside of that, we ordered up plenty of sunshine, so enjoy the day. You've got some very important work to do, and each and every one of you Committee Members that take your time for this cause, for the work you do, we thank you, and it is absolutely our pleasure here in Brawley. Anything you need, please let us know.

Luis, thank you for hosting and making all this happen. I know it's a big -- there's a little bit of an army behind it to make it all happen. But welcome and enjoy.

LUIS OLMEDO: And our District's Ryan Kelley,

RYAN KELLEY: Thank you, Luis, for the invitation to make a formal reception and introduction. I'm Ryan Kelley. I'm the County Supervisor for District 4, which is the north end of the Valley, and this past year, I was the presiding chair for the Board of Supervisors.
I know that I was trying to become a little bit more acquainted with what the topics were and the AB32 greenhouse gas emissions for 1990 levels by 2020.

Within the County of Imperial, we have been -- we've been stressed to have a lot of the information available. One of the larger contributors is Mexico into our -- I say airshed, and Luis always corrects me -- it's air basin. But another marked contributing factor is the open desert to the west of us, and if we could maybe get San Diego County to pay for some of the air mitigation in Imperial County, that would be -- or maybe the Federal Government, the Bureau of Land Management. We've already stoked those coals.

In addition, the largest potential problem for air in our valley is the Salton Sea, and so -- well, some of the things that have taken place in the past year is, the County of Imperial and the Imperial Irrigation District settled a lawsuit, a 12-year running lawsuit, over the validation of the Quantification Settlement Agreement, which was the water transfer from the Colorado River and Imperial IID -- Imperial Irrigation District's allocation. Three hundred thousand acre feet of water going to urban use in San Diego County and in Coachella Valley. The full impacts of that will be realized on December 31st, 2017, when the mitigation of water that
were ordered by the State Water Resources Board is in.

And if you've been in the Sea, and I hope you

got that on your tour, you can see the receding shoreline
and the exposed playa. Estimates are between 5- and 7,000
acres that are already exposed. The significance to
Imperial County is that most of the elevation on the Sea
is on the south sea, And that's where you are going to see
most of the exposed playa as the years progress.

So moving forward, we had a -- on March 18th, 2015, there was a workshop by the State Water Resources
Board, and we made a case that the State of California had
an obligation for mitigation above the water order to --
and $133 million from the San Diego County Water
Authority, CVW, and Imperial Irrigation District.

What's taken place since that time, is the
Governor created a task force made up of CARB, also
Natural Resources Agency, and few other departments within
the Governor's office, and they came back with a
recommendation, and that happened in late summer. An
Assistant Secretary for Salton Sea Policy under the
National Resources Agency was created. And since that
time, we have been having stakeholder groups almost every
month since November, and Assembly Member Garcia passed a
bill, signed by the Governor in early October, AB1095,
which required shovel-ready projects to be identified by
March 31st.

So our status today is that we have a workshop scheduled for next Monday here at Palmer Auditorium, wherein you can hear everything that's taken place to today, and you'll also be able to hear about all the shovel-ready projects and what will be priority funding going out in the short-term. Also, medium-term, what does the management program look like for the Sea. And then long-term still has not been decided.

There are a lot of concepts out there, but the reason I bring this to you is because the State Water Resources Board is also having another workshop, and they will continue to have these quarterly. So our next workshop is on the 19th of April, and once again, we will be advocating a united voice for Imperial County and Sacramento. But if you have the ability, please attend April 11th at Palmer Auditorium at 6:00 p.m. It is the opportunity for the local community to speak here in front of the people that are going to be advocating for you in Sacramento.

Thank you.

LUIS OLMEDO: Thank you, Supervisor Kelly, for highlighting one of the biggest challenges of our time in Imperial, Imperial Valley and Salton Sea. It's a huge task and a huge challenge.
So we have two dignitaries as well here. It's Senator Dean Florez and Diane Takvorian.
So do you want to say some opening remarks?

SENATOR DEAN FLOREZ: No, thank you.

DIANE TAKVORIAN: I just wanted to thank you, Luis. I just want to welcome all these wonderful students who could join us. Do you want to --

LUIS OLMEDO: Absolutely. Oh, yes, I want to recognize -- well, first of all, Mr. Florez, where you at? Is he here?

Thank you for engaging the students. He's been doing this for several years, and I mean, I think it is a good problem. Having a seating problem is a good problem. And I'm glad to see the students and, you know, the leadership of Mr. Florez to his superintendent to the school and the Board. I know they've been very active participants in environmental issues and bringing it into the schools. So thank you for bringing the students and thank you for caring enough to be a part of this.

DIANE TAKVORIAN: To think that you're a great -- thank you so much for being here, and that you're a great reminder of why we're all here. And I just want to thank Luis and Comite Civico and Brawley, all of you who are here. I want to say that California doesn't end in L.A., being from San Diego, so I get it. So we're
thrilled to be here today, and I -- I also want to say that I'm really honored to be in one of the first two positions for environmental justice with Senator Florez, and I hope that we can take environmental justice forward.

I was privileged to be the co-chair of the California Environmental Justice Advisory Committee that issued its recommendations in 2003. So the long arc of justice, I think is a reminder of that, and I know that there -- this community is critically important.

I also had the honor of being on the first EJAC. So I want to listen and participate, and I hope that we can really move environmental justice forward today. So thanks so much.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

Okay. Welcome from ARB, starting with Steve.

STEVE CLIFF: Well, thank you. I had the pleasure of working with EJAC back in 2014 and left the Air Resources Board for a couple of years, but I am now proud to be back, and really great to be here to see all of the EJAC folks that I worked with in 2014, as well as some of the new members.

I want to welcome everybody to the EJAC meeting, but more importantly, thank you for opening up your community and allowing us to come in and talk to you here. It's not often that we get out of Sacramento, but it's
very important that we do so, and I think it's just really
great how you guys have opened the community and really
welcomed us in. We had a really nice dinner last night,
and it was really a pleasure to sit and talk with a lot of
the folks from the community, as well as interact with
EJAC members.

I have about forty slides I'm going to go
through -- no, I'm kidding. I really do appreciate that
the students are here. I understand we're going to have
about a hundred students throughout the day come through,
so that's really great. As Diane said, this is a good
reminder of why we're all doing this, it's really for the
next generation and generations to come.

So I hope that as you watch these discussions
and interact that you'll be able to take that back, and
hopefully you'll have an opportunity, as your careers
progress, to engage your community and carry this sort of
tradition on. I think sustainability is really about
those future generations, and that's really what we're all
about here, so I appreciate that -- that you'll be
listening to this and -- and -- and take that -- that
message back. I'm really proud to see that this is the
kind of engagement that we're getting.

So thank you very much, and I look forward to
the discussion.
SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

Floyd, do you want say good morning?

FLOYD VERGARA: Good morning. Do I have to stand up there, too?

SARAH RUBIN: No.

FLOYD VERGARA: Yeah, thank you. I'm Floyd Vergara of the Air Resources Board. I'm the Chief of the Industrial Strategies Division. My group is in charge of this session of EJAC proceedings, and I'm very happy to be here. I think you've heard me say before that I am personally committed to making -- making sure that this process works for all of you, providing you with meaningful feedback. And part of that commitment is to make sure that we're here in the communities that are being affected, so I'm happy to bring my entire team down here. Steve had to pay for his own way, because I'm not paying for him, but yeah, we're -- we're happy to be here and provide responses to the EJAC's prior comments, and then, you know, hopefully we'll -- we'll have as productive or more productive a meeting as we had last time.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. In the facilitator world we have this phrase called "going slow to go fast," and all these welcomes have been fantastic, but we are going to need to start going fast because you have a huge agenda in
So what I'm going to do now is I'm going to go around for all the EJAC members to introduce themselves. As you can see, we have different reference materials on the wall. I'm going to touch on our meeting goals and our agenda, and then we are going to dive in because we're already behind on our first agenda item.

So let's see, you guys got to introduce yourselves. Stephanie, I'm going to hand the mic to you, and then we're just going to go around.

STEPHANIE KATO: I'm Stephanie Kato, I'm one of the lead staff on the Scoping Plan update at Air Resources Board.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Kevin Hamilton, Executive Director for Central California Asthma Collaborative, from Fresno.

THE REPORTER: Can I have you speak up, please.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Wow, that's the first time that's ever happened.

My name is Kevin Hamilton, and I am the CEO of Central California Asthma Collaborative, and I'm an EJAC member from Fresno.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

SEKITA GRANT: Sekita Grant, legal counsel with The Greenlining Institute in the Bay Area.
TOM FRANTZ: Tom Frantz. I'm president of the Association of Irritated Residents, which is about air quality among other things, and I live in Kern County of the San Joaquin Valley.

GISELE FONG: Good morning, everyone. My name is Gisele Fong, and I come from the port community of Long Beach, California. We are a community that's very, very much affected by freight transportation, and I run End Oil and Communities for Clean Ports.

MARTHA ARGUELLO: Good morning. My name is Martha Dina Arguello. I'm the Executive Director of Physicians for Social Responsibility of Los Angeles, and morning traffic was really a pleasure this morning. And we -- our organization works in a range of issues. We started as an organization of a land and nuclear organization, and now we work on planet change, toxic chemicals, and we do extensive work in South Los Angeles and in Watts around building healthy communities, land use, climate change, and toxic chemicals.

MONICA WILSON: Morning. I'm Monica Wilson with Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives. We work with communities on stopping incineration and lead towards safer alternatives.

LUIS OLMEDO: Luis Olmedo with Comite Civico Del Valle, and we work on environmental health and
environmental justice issues here in Imperial County.

MARI ROSE TARUC: Good morning. My name is Mari Rose Taruc. I was the -- formerly the State Organizing Director for the Asian Pacific Environmental Network and currently the CO chair of Filipino/American Coalition for Environmental Solidarity, and I'm based in Oakland.

REY LEON: Buenos dias. Good morning. My name is Rey Leon with the Latino Environmental Advancement and Policy Project out of Fresno. We work with valley communities to achieve environmental and climate justice mostly for farm workers. Thank you.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Good morning. My name is Katie Valenzuela Garcia. I'm with the Oak Park Neighborhood Association working or working on anti-indemnification efforts and affordable housing and clean air in Sacramento.

ELEANOR TORRES: Good morning. My name is Eleanor Torres. I'm with Incredible Edible Community Gardens from San Bernardino County. We address agroforestry issues and public health, and we have a number of community gardens, orchards, and a massive tree planting program.

TRISH JOHNSON: I'm Trish Johnson. I'm the lead staff for the AB32 Environmental Justice Advisory
Committee for the Air Resources Board.

-MEETING GOALS-

SARAH RUBIN: Fantastic. And for those who came in later, my name is Sarah Rubin. I'm facilitating today. And for all the students, besides being an elected official or on the board, you can grow up and be a facilitator. Another job.

Okay. So I'm going to go over our meeting goals. I'm going to walk over here. We've got them up on the wall.

Good morning. Here we are, and hopefully people picked up copies of the agenda when you walked in, or you have one.

Goal 1: Draft initial scoping plan recommendations after reports from ARB and EJAC members.

Goal 2: Outline and EJAC working time line for the next three to six months based on ARB updates and EJAC priorities.

Goal 3: Learn about California climate investments and identify the EJAC's role.

And our 4th goal, which I feel like we did so great yesterday, was learn about the environmental justice community in Brawley.

All righty. So we are just about done with our
welcomes. We are going to be diving into follow-up from the February meeting, and in a moment I'm going to be turning to Mari Rose to kick off that discussion that really has to do with the time line.

On this back wall, we have the months, and the content I have up there is the same content that is in your meeting summary from February. And as we -- as throughout the day, or towards the end of the day, we can go back and put up whatever we want on those month lists.

Then, we're going to get into the 2030 Scoping Plan. We've divided it into these chunks. So we've got Part 1, Economic Analysis, Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Reduction Strategy, then we'll take a break at 10:00. Because your court reporter --

Raise your hand. Want to say hi?

THE REPORTER: Hello.

SARAH RUBIN: -- is going to need a break, and so will you all. So if anyone needs to use the restrooms, they're right out the door, then we will pick back up. Hopefully you have it in front of you.

We've got Part 2, Part 3, we will take public comment at noon, break at 12:15 for lunch. We're going to pick back up at 1:00 o'clock. We'll have our California Climate Investments Presentation, then we'll move into Part 4, 5, and actually, at 3:00 o'clock, I'm going to
move us back to the time line in your actions so that you're clear about what you're doing from here.

Does anybody have any questions about today's agenda? Okay. Fantastic.

Mari Rose? Oh, yes, Mari Rose is going to help out with timekeeping. We were going to rely on this clock, but it's more fun to have us help each other out. Mari Rose, is your mic on, if you want to take over?

-FOLLOW-UP FROM 2/5/16 EJAC MEETING-

MARI ROSE TARUC: I think so.

So we wanted to start off talking about our recent meeting with the Chair of the Air Resources Board, Mary Nichols, and there were -- there was a request to meet with members of the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, so when you hear EJAC, it means the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee. And so there were six of us from the committee that were able to meet with her. We had Luis, Eleanor, Tom, Katie, Martha, and myself, and Senator Florez also joined us. And the -- Steve was there and Chair Nichols.

And we -- I think the meeting was inspired by two letters that we had written to the ARB staff talking about how the time line for completing the Scoping Plan
was too short for us to truly engage Environmental Justice Communities in the Scoping Plan, and so that we needed an extension of that time line to properly bring this information and solicit the feedback of our community members to be integrated into the Scoping Plan.

We also talked about the letter that we had written to ARB, that this committee has been under resourced and understaffed, that the first meetings were -- were not how we would like to see our meetings, they were not effective meetings, and that we wanted to make sure that the staff meet inside ARB to really support our work in looking at the next 15 years of how we -- how we plan our greenhouse gas emissions reductions, and that all those times in between and following up with next steps from our meetings were -- were addressed.

So the meeting was walking through some of that information, and really, it was an invitation to see environmental justice communities and the EJAC as partners in the -- in the implementation of AB32, and so we took it from there. I think we started to talk about staffing that we wanted to see, and others can elaborate on that, as well. And so for those who were there, please feel free to add.

SARAH RUBIN: Anyone -- or Floyd, do you want to go ahead and share? Anything you have about the time
FLOYD VERGARA: Okay. Yeah, so --

KEVIN HAMILTON: Excuse me. Mari Rose, so what tangible outcomes did you get from that discussion?

MARI ROSE TARUC: We -- we -- Chair Nichols told us that through Steve, probably, that we would get communication about next steps around how she would consider that with her team. So we have not heard word since that April -- since that March 24th meeting, and we were hoping that at this meeting that ARB would come with some follow-up about staffing and time line.

KEVIN HAMILTON: So you -- I don't know that people here know what you mean when you say "time line," so could you just briefly talk about what we're asking for there.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yeah. So we initially were given a September 2016 time line to complete the Scoping Plan, which would involve all the climate investments and basically and extension of programs through 2030. Really early on, we realized we just didn't have the data or the staffing support to make informed decisions to ensure that the policies, as they extend to 2030, really addressed the need, both of California, as well as specifical communities like Brawley and other EJ communities across the state.
So we asked for additional time so that we could collect some of that data. There is an OEHHA report that's scheduled to come out in December that would start to point to some data that we can use to inform our discussions and to allow us to do public workshops across the state to really ground truth and make sure what we think is happening at the state level is actually what's happening in the communities.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Thank you, because we're referencing something that I don't think most the people in the room, other than us, are probably familiar with.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

STEVE CLIFF: Thanks, Mari Rose.

So it was a good meeting, and I think a good discussion. It was the first opportunity for me to hear a little bit more about the requests, and as a follow-up, did get the letter that you had sent I think in late January. And I appreciate you sending that to me. I will turn it over to Floyd to talk a little bit more about the time line.

With regard to some of the specific requests, as was noted, we have the court reporter here today. So that was one specific request, was to make sure that we had proceedings from the meetings, and that was transcribed so that there would be the ability to -- to go back and
review what was said at the meetings. And so we do have
the court reporter here today.

As a follow-up discussion, we are looking at how
we can provide more staffing internally at ARB. That will
be a little bit longer time line to finalize that, because
that would require requests for more resources, and so
that is ongoing work. And hope to have that -- you know,
a more specifically designed approach to how we get more
staffing at ARB in the coming weeks. But that is a -- you
know, that is something that's on the radar, and we
appreciate Senator Florez's help in identifying where
resources can come from to help with that.

On the question of providing more support for
the commun- -- committee, staff is actually putting in
place some contracts to help provide some more support for
a technical writer and, as I mentioned, a court reporter,
so that is ongoing work. Of course, it takes a little bit
of time to get some contracts together, but I think there
is a fast track for having that happen. So that's maybe
something that Floyd can talk about a little bit more.

And then on the question of the time line for
the Scoping Plan, I understand that the original time
line, what has been proposed is to have a Scoping Plan
finalized by the end of this year. That conflicts with
this OEHHA report that would describe the impacts of AB32
on communities. And, you know, so what we're -- what we're trying to figure out is, is there a way to fast track that OEHHA report or extend the time line for the Scoping Plan so that there is sufficient time to evaluate the findings from that report to make comments and make -- you know, so that EJAC can provide input to the Scoping Plan based on review of that document.

So I have initiated some conversations with Cal EPA in hoping that we can either bring up the deadline for that report or, if necessary, push out the Scoping Plan. As I understand it, there's a challenge in making the time line for the Scoping Plan extend for another year, that that's not possible to do, but there's probably some wiggle room in that final date. And so I don't know exactly what that is at this point, but, you know, to extend for some time period beyond December seems like it's possible.

Maybe, Floyd, I can ask you to -- to elaborate a bit on that.

FLOYD VERGARA: Yeah, so -- all right. I apologize for my froggy voice. I am coming out of a week-long flu-like thing. Don't worry, I'm not contagious anymore.

So, yeah, with regard to the time line, just to kind of step back a little bit, as you recall, the
original time line called for the EJAC to provide comments
on the draft Scoping Plan sometime in the March, April of
this year time line. You know, obviously, that's already
passed. We heard that comment, and the comment was -- the
concern that was raised by EJAC was that's insufficient
time to provide us time to evaluate it. By the time
the -- the draft Scoping Plan comes out with the economic
environmental impacts analyses, you know, it would be too
late to provide meaningful feedback because that
wouldn't -- you know, it would be set in stone, basically,
as I understood the comment.

So we heard that loud and clear. We revised the
time line to provide for a discussion draft to come out in
May, and that discussion draft would contain the Scoping
Plan measures that we're contemplating at that point, and
we'll hear -- and we heard that -- that discussion draft
in May will have the Scoping Plan concepts, and it would
be -- it would go out to -- for public comment without the
impacts analyses. And we heard that loud and clear. That
was the main concern at that point.

We understand that the concern still is you'd
like more time to evaluate that, plus the OEHHA report
Steve mentioned, so we are looking at that. We don't have
a -- a final amount of time, that we're still trying to
sort out, you know, the feasibility of accelerating the
OEHHA report, plus how much room can be -- how much flex
room is there in the schedule, but we are sorting that out
and we're looking at that. So we should have a response
to you real soon on an exact amount. But like Steve said,
we think that is -- some more extension there beyond
December should be feasible.

With regard to the contracts, my staff had put
them together. We are going through that process. As
soon as I'm able to share that, the scoping -- the scope
of work for those contracts, I will share that with the
EJAC members. I do want to get a clear understanding of
the technical assistance that the EJAC members have asked
for. Our interpretation of that is that you need a
technical writer to help you draft up the report and your
recommendations, and I want to understand that -- I want
to make sure that I understand that that's the extent of
the technical assistance, or were we looking for -- you
know, is that the complete nature of the technical
assistance or is there anything else? And I'm happy to
talk to EJAC members to make sure that the contract that
we're drafting would provide that assistance that you are
looking for.

And as you can see, we do have a court reporter,
so you won't have to suffer through my staff's note taking
anymore, and I'm sure they are happy to not have to do
that. But we will -- we are instituting that, so we heard
that -- that issu- -- that concern loud and clear.

I will take any questions on what I just said.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So I'm really pleased
about the court reporter. I was looking again at the
notes from San Bernardino and really bummed that I just
felt like they didn't really capture the essence of
conversation that we had, and the folks who weren't there
and not able to hear it in person missed out on a lot, so
thank you for that.

Part of the reason we wanted to bring this up in
front of the full EJAC in this meeting is a bag-leaking
issue. Right? Like, we've been doing a lot of this
outside of your meetings, and it's been leaving out
certain members of the group simply because we don't have
the ability to communicate on a larger scale in between
our meetings. We started bringing this issue in December,
and it's now April. And as we continue this negotiation
process, more and more time is ticking away at our ability
to do our job. Given that it's April and we haven't seen
any write-ups, and right now the charts we've been given
are incredibly sparse, and we don't really even know what
the teams are working on, and hopefully we'll hear more of
that today.

This isn't just a matter of the OEHHA report,
this is also a matter of the ability to consult the communities, and the ability to ground truth these policies, and the ability to do that in a really meaningful way. And I simply do not believe -- and I think a lot of people in this room will agree, given the experience we all have in outreach and in community organizing -- that that's possible this year. It's just not possible.

So the job we've been tasked under AB32 is simply not possible. So I wanted to open it up to EJAC members to talk about next steps. What do we want to do? We need obviously to put a little bit more pressure on this time line question, because it seems to just keep going and going and going. And so I'd like to give this opportunity for EJAC members to talk about what you think an appropriate next step on our part might be. Should we send a letter to the legislature? Should we be sending more letters to Mary Nichols? Should we be going to more board meetings and pressing this more? I mean, what exactly do you all want to see as next steps for the leadership team to implement or for any staff to rebuild this community to implement?

FLOYD VERGARA: Before the EJAC members chime in, I would like to add to what I just said.

In terms of the time line, the concern that was
raised, as you just said, Katie, was the -- you know, the
time that's needed to evaluate these things. So I wanted
to point out that, you know, that since the February
meeting and we revised our time line, we have been very
busy with the EJAC members, holding a number of deep dive
discussions -- I believe there were seven of them -- to
address the concern that was raised, which was to get a
better sense of all these other associated efforts that
are going on, adaptive management, short-lived climate
pollutant, clean power plant, all of those things. So we
provided that. We are happy to take a look at providing
additional follow-up deep dives, because I've heard there
was some -- some interest in follow-up deep dives. So
we're happy to -- to look at having staff provide that, as
well, so I just wanted to get that out there.

SARAH RUBIN: This is Sarah. I just need to
interrupt. So we -- I'm getting messages from people
watching the webcast that it's hard to hear and there's a
lot of feedback. So we're trying to troubleshoot. We
really do want folks out there who want to hear what's
happening be able to. So what we're trying to do now is
just make sure that all the microphones are off except for
the person speaking. So I've gone around and turned them
all to mute. So on these, the mute button is on the left,
and it would be red when it's off. So if we can try that,
then in a minute or two I'll check in and see how it's going.

Katie, did you want to respond to Floyd, and I'm wondering if others would like to comment?

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yeah, and thank you for the deep dives that you provided. They've been really helpful. They've also been really helpful in illuminating where the blind spots currently are in our state administration and the program. And ARB staff has been very open that, look, you're not everywhere --

SARAH RUBIN: Slow down. Slow down. Slow it down for the interpreter.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Sorry.

You're not everywhere. You don't know how this is working in all regions of the state or from all communities, and that really, this, in our mind, is the only way to really understand. As much as we appreciate ARB staff expertise and other agency expertise, we need to get into the communities and ask them these questions in really clear and direct terms with enough time to actually incorporate their feedback into future and final Scoping Plan drafts.

So with that, I'll pass it on.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Remember we have a translator, so we want give her time to translate.
Luis, go ahead.

LUIS OLMEDO: Well, first of all, I want to say, you know, I thought the meeting in Sacramento with the Chair and Senator Dean was very useful. I think they were able to get a court reporter. We've been asking for a court reporter for a long time. We called it a stenographer, and then ARB interprets it, after speaking to Steve, talking about a court reporter, similar to the way ARB has. I mean, yeah, that's -- so I'm really glad to have that.

I know we have professional translation. That's very useful. I think that in many meetings that I've had with Cal EPA they've had expert translators. And you have to have correct translators because not all translators understand the technical language, so I think that you have a good team here, Counselor, so I do want to acknowledge that. I hope that in other areas, they are going to get the same quality of technical translators.

I think that, you know, I appreciate the call you made, Steve, in regards to trying to clarify what is exactly the ask. I want so say that I -- that I'm -- I don't know if it's because of the new ARB board members, new staff, you know, such as Steve and others, Floyd. I'm hopeful that some of these things will get resolved.

Obviously, there is an urgency for the time line that has
been heard loud and clear. I still have questions in terms of how this time line is influenced by market-based forces. And I heard some of that before, but I wasn't very clear. And whether this meeting is appropriate to discuss that or not, I want to know more about, you know, why this time line is so aggressive and where are these market forces that are driving these -- these deadlines. And -- and I think they've been made very clear that we're not going to be able to provide meaningful input.

I also would like to hear at some point of how we're going to be able to fill in those other requests that the committee has had. So I think that you were able to do that, at least until now, very rapidly for a couple of requests, and how were the other requests going to be met. And I think some of that is already in motion, so if we can just get a time line that can fit into the overall plan and give us a confidence that we're going to be able to have what we need to be able to carry regulations forward.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So we'll go to Kevin and Martha, and then we're going to check in on time because it's going to be 9:00 o'clock.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Thanks. From my perspective, it seems like a rush to nowhere, so these deep dives are what we should have been seeing from the very start. This
is the kind of support that EJAC members need. Board
members, when faced with complex issues, we're looking at
the entire Scoping Plan, all facets of it. This is a
multifaceted, complicated plan that in total, of all the
documents, probably comprises 5,000 pages of documents.
To somehow expect those of us who work in the community
and have to continue to work at our jobs every day, to
read all of this and be able to understand it very -- in
that short time line, I think is unreasonable. If we were
board members, we would have staff who would be tasked to
explain it and bring it to us and answer our questions,
highlight areas that we might want to look at first,
review the whole thing with us, and then a short review,
and that's what's going to happen in these deep dives.

Each one of the deep dives at our meeting has
been like Chapter 1, so now I'm ready for deep dive
Chapter 2. Now that I've had a chance to internalize and
ask questions on the first one and staff has had a chance
to go back and think about those questions and the
comments that came from the group that attended those, I
think we're ready for that next round at this point. But
what I don't feel ready for is the ability to -- is having
the ability to make an intelligent Scoping Plan
recommendation based on the information that I have right
now. So -- and I believe other committee members feel the
same way.

So, you know, I don't know why we have this rush. Again, if there's market forces pushing and nipping at the heels of the ARB and there's fear somewhere that somebody else is going to do something that's -- who's on the opposition to the whole plan and -- and everything that it means, and if their agenda could potentially affect our ability to implement a plan like this, we need to know that. Let's be transparent. Let the community know, as well, so we can get folks engaged who would be able to maybe counter those portions.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Martha?

MARTHA ARGUELLO: So I want to echo some of the -- and I actually have an echo -- some of the things that folks have said. So I -- I want to speak directly to Katie, your question, and I think -- and to borrow your line -- I think we need to go slow to go fast. And we know certainly the last two EJACs, when you're rushing us, those key things around the ground truthing and really helping -- you know, being able to listen to a community who is telling you where the problems are in the actual implementation or, you know, what we have to fix. So without that, this isn't really going to work.

And I -- I actually think it's political forces more than market forces that we need to worry about, and
so I think we do need to be good board members. I also think that we should start meeting at the Governor's office, because it seems a very long time you keep telling us you just don't know about the time line, and I just think that's unacceptable to keep us sort of hanging on and, again, force us to do work that we don't think is our best work. And what we're telling you is, we're committed to giving you our best work, but for that we need your best work, and we need your commitment, and we need you to keep your word. And that means giving us an answer. I think you can find another six months to four months on this time line.

SEKITA GRANT: I want to quickly just double tap and agree with what's already been said around kind of the stress on resources and time line, as well as the need for more transparency. I think it's critical. And I think that the deep dives have been great. I -- I feel concerned. I'm new to this -- well, new to this side of the process. I worked on the Scoping Plan previously for the State. But very concerned that we're wasting time on things that, you know, might not be all the way pertinent to what we end up seeing in that first draft. So I think getting a first draft is absolutely critical. And, you know, the deep dives are good, but I just want to make sure folks around the table have really limited time and
resources, and just making sure that we're as focused as possible on what's relevant for us to be as productive at the Scoping Plan.

And I want to look to our -- I am not a community organizer, and I want to look to our EJAC members for us to think about in addition, and I agree with Martha in terms of talking to the Governor's office, and I -- I would love to have the ability to talk to other state agencies that I know have already been thinking about what's going into the Scoping Plan, because I worked for one of those state agencies, and there was a lot of work that was done prior to us getting out into the communities. So I think it's -- for me, when I was working with the state, it would have been very helpful to meet with EJAC members much earlier on. We never met with them, and then we got a list of recommendations way late into the process, and it wasn't helpful for us. And ideally, we would have been meeting in person much earlier as things were getting developed. I think that's critical if you're meaningfully going to integrate EJAC recommendations into the Scoping Plan.

And so my point is for us to think about, in addition to putting pressure on time line and more resources and having access to staff that's drafting, I think also us thinking about how -- what is the plan for
getting to the communities? Even if we don't have the
content and time line all the way ready, you know, should
we be thinking June, July, August, September, whatever we
have, let's start thinking about what meetings we're going
to have in the communities, and then put pressure on
making sure we have the information we need to present
what we have at those times. But kind of, you know, doing
what we can at the time -- the time frame, but just moving
forward with a community engagement strategy, basically.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you, Sekita.

This is Sarah. So I want to check in. It's
9:00 o'clock. We did start this agenda item quite late.
We've got Rey and Eleanor. I want to come to you. But I
am just wanting -- back to the moving slow to going fast,
I want to make sure you have enough time for the
presentations and discussion, and at 3:00 o'clock, our
plan is to revisit the time line and be pointed. And I'm
thinking that during the day, through using the
three-by-five cards or these Post-its, people can rewrite
or think through the specific asks and the specific next
steps, and then we can catalog those at the end.

So Rey and then Eleanor, if you could be short,
and then I want to get us moving to our next agenda item.

And Floyd, do you want to respond now, or after?

FLOYD VERGARA: I can respond after.
SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Go ahead.

REY LEON: Just I think to recognize, but also to recommend the deep dives were good. Unfortunately, I was only able to make the -- there was a fake one, and able to engage with those on the line from staff. And the thing is, one of the reasons a lot of us have the expertise that we do is because we're on the ground and working with the community, and it's quite labor intensive. So schedules don't always, you know, provide the ability and the flexibility to -- to partake in, you know, all the deep dives. So my recommendation would be that we do a webinar, where we're able to record it, get some sound, so that when we do miss one, we can go back, capture it in its essence. Because I think sometimes in the notes, which may be good, it's a little bit different. And so that's my recommendation. Thank you.

ELEANOR TORRES: Having started coming to these meetings in December, I've been able to -- you know, just observing things, and as things continue to be discussed, having a meeting with Chairman Nichols was something I was really interested in seeing, and actually really hopeful about after the meeting. I was looking forward to this meeting to see what ARB was really going to step up and do. One of the questions I have is, you've only talked about one contract you've engaged in or are trying to work
on, and that's the trans- -- the stuff that you are doing.
I'm sorry, I'm losing words here.

In any case, I'd like to know what are the other contracts you're looking at doing. But I honestly, as we're sitting here, I don't see how we can effectively engage community. And at the heart of it, we really need to engage community. So anyway, I am a little bit disappointed and I'd like to see -- understand why there is such a drag upon the time. What are the issues driving this? Because if indeed our commitment is first and foremost to disadvantaged communities, we're doing a huge disservice as far as allowing this time line to drag.

FLOYD VERGARA: Thank you, Eleanor, and for everyone else's comments. I really appreciate them.

Going back to Luis's comments, just to reiterate the need for the time line, as we talked about it at the last meeting. So, you know, what we discussed at the last meeting was the need for the Cap-and-Trade Regulation, where we're going through this rule-making with Cap-and-Trade, amendments that would be needed in order to be in effect before the third compliance period for Cap-and-Trade. That rule-making needs to be completed and approved -- assuming OAL approves it -- approved by the Office of Administrative Law by Fall of next year. So that would be like the October time frame of next year in
order for the provisions of that rule-making to be in
effect, and that would be in effect for the third
compliance period and post 2020.

Moving backwards from the October time frame, we
need to look at, okay, so how much time is needed for the
Cap-and-Trade rule-making in order to go to the Board, in
order to go through the 15-day comment period, amendments,
and then going to OAL for approval and filing with the
Secretary of State. Moving backwards from there, we're
looking at Spring, late Spring sort of time frame, for
going back to -- you know, we have these two board hearing
processes. For the Cap-and-Trade rule-making, we're
looking at the second board hearing sometime in late
Spring of next year. So that is the time frame that we're
working off of. Our preference is to complete that
Cap-and-Trade rule-making by that October -- you know, to
have it completed by the October time frame.

Now, the reason that's affected by the Scoping
Plan is the Scoping Plan needs to be completed prior to
that Cap-and-Trade Program going to the board, and that's
because the idea is that the Cap-and-Trade rule-making is
supposed to be informed by the Scoping Plan process.
Right? I mean, that is -- you know, those two things are
linked together since Cap-and-Trade is an important part.
And if it's not going be an important part of the Scoping
Plan, then that's something we need to understand before the Cap-and-Trade rule-making is completed.

So in order to do that, we need to move backwards and do the Scoping Plan process. That's why we're looking at completing it by the end of this year, so that there's sufficient time to complete the Cap-and-Trade rule-making. As Steve said, we're looking at that period between the end of this year and the Cap-and-Trade rule-making to see what sort of flexibility we have to move -- you know, to move the end date for the Scoping Plan process.

Now, going back to the -- the deep dive comments, you know, I just want to reiterate, the deep dives are there to provide information to the EJAC that was requested on those programs and efforts that are related to the Scoping Plan and not necessarily the Scoping Plan itself. So things like clean power plant, adaptive management, short-lived climate pollutant, all of those things that the EJAC felt were needed in order to be better informed about the Scoping Plan. We could not discuss the Scoping Plan itself at that point, because we didn't have a discussion draft at that point.

Like we said at the last meeting, we're proposing to have a discussion draft out in the public by May, and what you'll hear Stephanie Kato talk about for
the rest of today, is basically provide you with a preview of those measures that we're looking to have in the Scoping Plan. So we're already accelerating in response to the EJAC's concerns. We're accelerating the time by which you would have to actually look at those specific measures that we're looking to put into the Scoping Plan. We're doing basically a deep dive on the Scoping Plan starting today. We will be having further discussions on that.

As I said at the last meeting, we are -- you know, we are committed to holding, you know, as many EJAC public meetings as possible to address the key issues that Katie brought up. I think we talked about up to ten public meetings. As Rey mentioned, that's very challenging logistically, but we are committed to doing that, if needed. And, you know, we're going to start off with the deep dive on the Scoping Plan today. We fully expect there will be more discussions that are needed, but you know, in response to the ques-- to the concerns you folks have raised, we are providing that preview today. And that will be a discus-- the beginning of that dive on those specific measures for the Scoping Plan.


Luis, is yours burning? Quick, and then we're
going to turn to Stephanie. We're going to go into our
next agenda item so we don't get too far behind. I think
what I want to call out, that everything you just said
Floyd, I think unless you really have it at the tip of
your tongue, it's a lot to just follow, and maybe at the
break, which we need to take at 10:00 o'clock because we
need to give our court reporter a break, maybe you could
do a dive round about these dependencies, or maybe you
guys want to put something else up on the time line we
have on the back wall to help other people visualize on
these dependencies you're talking about.

Okay. Luis, we're gonna be real short, because I really want to move to Stephanie.

LUIS OLMEDO: Well, could you just further explain in terms of the Cap-and-Trade. Is that what I'm hearing, that we make it important to be part of the Scoping Plan or not? Can you explain that, what you mean by that?

FLOYD VERGARA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.

LUIS OLMEDO: Whether -- the Cap-and-Trade, whether we make it important or not. Can you just clarify what -- what you meant by that comment?

FLOYD VERGARA: Whether we what?

LUIS OLMEDO: You mentioned about the Cap-and-Trade.
FLOYD VERGARA: Uh-huh?

LUIS OLMEDO: And you wanted to know now whether it's going to be an important part --

FLOYD VERGARA: No, the Scoping Plan --

LUIS OLMEDO: -- or not. And I want to know how -- how do you make that --

FLOYD VERGARA: Okay. Well, the -- the Scoping Plan is there to identify the measures and programs that we need to have in place in order to get us to our 2030 GHG target. Right? And, you know, I think we mentioned in the economic analysis workshop and in other discussions that we're looking at a couple of scenarios for analysis for the Scoping Plan. One of which was a specific ask by the EJAC, which is to look at a world without Cap-and-Trade. So that is one of the scenarios that we're looking at for analysis in the Scoping Plan. Right?

And what we need to do is complete that part of the process for the Scoping Plan in order to inform the Cap-and-Trade rule-making. Because if we need to make changes to the Cap-and-Trade rule-making, these things have to work in sequence. Right? Otherwise, it just doesn't work -- work well. So that's why we're trying to -- we're trying to work backwards from the Cap-and-Trade rule-making, and making sure that we give ourselves enough time to complete the Scope and Plan.
process so that it does inform the Cap-and-Trade
rule-making.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

So Mari Rose, Diane, and then we're going to
move on.

MARI ROSE TARUC: All right. I'm going to put
this up on the time line. I -- I think for the discussion
draft, I think this is a process that I can see us being
able to work through, and in terms of dates, we'll have to
figure that out. So I'll read this out.

So the deep dives have to be completed,
including all of the sectors, because all the sectors have
not been covered in the deep dives. And then, we
concurrently are presenting initial recommendations. So I
think a bulk of our work today is about those initial
recommendations based on what we know so far, and I know
we need to know more. Then the EJAC work groups need to
come together and refine or continue to develop the
recommendations. We need to talk with the authors. As
Sekita was saying, there are those who are writing the
Scoping Plan now. We need to talk with the sector authors
to be able to explain and -- and walk them through our
recommendations initially, and then the discussion draft
can come out. And then from there, we need workshops.
And not just in Sacramento. We need workshops in the
community, at least five that I see. It certainly can be more. And then, our next -- one of our next EJAC meetings is capturing what we heard from community feedback about the discussion draft.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Diane, can I use that? For everybody -- for the EJAC members and for those of you in the audience, I just want to point out when Mari Rose is bringing up the deep dives, on this wall you have all different sectors, and the orange stickies represent deep dives that have already taken place. Those are in depth like conference calls or webinars. And the blue -- what color -- the yellow are planned. So you can see that there's quite a few where nothing has happened or planned, and that needs to happen.

DIANE TAKVORIAN: Quickly, I just want to say I appreciate everybody's work around the table. I appreciate the articulation that's so clear from the EJAC to the ARB staff. And I definitely am hearing and ARB staff is hearing that there needs to be an extension in the time line, and I think everyone is appreciating that. That said, it feels like the basics of a public meeting that's really core and critical to this process are just in place at this meeting with interpretation and the stenographer. So in a lot of ways this is a great first meeting to really have all of those pieces in place,
even though I know other work has been done.

I guess selfishly, I don't want to be sitting on
the dais at the ARB and hear the EJAC come forward and say
that you didn't have enough time and that you have deep
problems with the Scoping Plan because of that. So I want
to implore the ARB staff to figure this out and give
concrete changes to the time line right away. And if that
means getting on the phone while we're having these
meetings today with these briefings and having a concrete
answer by the end of today in terms of how the time line
could be changed, that would be ideal, really.

And I have to say that in my own conversation
with Cal EPA and OEHHA, I don't think December is moving.
Maybe magic can happen, but it didn't sound like that was
going to happen, so I think we ought to work off of the
assumption that it won't. And if magic happens and that
happens, then great. But in my world, that doesn't happen
very often. So -- so I would just say we should assume
it's not going to happen and that we need time to really
look at that report, because that's something that EJAC
asked for a long time ago and that there have been
repeated requests for from various sectors. So if there's
a way we can get a concrete answer when we return, I just
hate to have the same information at the end of the day as
now.
SEKITA GRANT: Thank you. Senator?

Here, try this one.

SENATOR DEAN FLOREZ: That's okay. I got it.

Thank you.

Just to add to my colleague Diane's comments, I guess what I hear -- maybe starting with Kevin's earlier frustration I could hear, having known Kevin Hamilton for a while, the deep dive is what's missing and about a month or two lag of information, I believe we mentioned in the meeting with Chairwoman Nichols. It's kind of leading to this somewhat of a frustrated point, because you all know that December is the deadline.

I guess the question, Floyd, really, is can we eke out six months, four months out of that? And if we can, and if it's possible, I'd like to get back to I think probably the -- the most important point made, at least what I'm hearing, was by Sekita that said, you know, from a community engagement perspective, what's our four-month plan? What's our six-month plan? Because 12 months isn't going to happen.

So if it is six or four months, what kinds of things from ARB do you need, as Diane just said, to make this like super, super, hyped-out effective? And I would say that if you're waiting for another meeting maybe next month to discuss this, we're -- we can just say that it's
not going to work. So I would say, even if the committee has to get together in the next ten days, I would suggest that you get together, that ARB have the right staff, and you come -- I think really -- I think Mari put up, you know, five workshops or something. It sounds more like ten is kind of the right number. And you need resources, you need staff time, you need organization, you need money, you need outreach in order to make any of those effective.

So I think -- but to do that, I think as Sekita said, what's the plan? You know, what's the community engagement plan for a four-month ramp up, and what's the community plan for six months, would be preferable, and I get that. But how many of these can we really do? And I agree with Diane. I think I hear the time line for Cap-and-Trade is still going to stay at December to keep everything on time, but I'm also very sensitive in hearing the frustration that if you would have had the deep dive in December or maybe earlier, we'd be well along in the process.

So I would say that at some point in this planning session that you really lay out how many workshops you are going to need in a four-month period and see if that's even doable, and then allowing the staff to come up with a very, very concise, powerful way to give
you the information you need at each of those workshops.

I think Rey is correct. At some point, all of
those workshops need to be taped. All of those workshops
need to be put in a webinar format. All of those need to
be online and available for any community to access, both
in English and in Spanish and in other languages. Because
that's what's going to allow you to scale this up in a
much quicker way for those who can't get to the four, ten,
or however many workshops you're going to have. So I
would say that we also have to count that in as well,
because if not, we're just going to be talking to each
other in this echo chamber.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

Okay. Rey, I see you have your card up, but it
is 9:20. Your first meeting goal up on the wall is to get
out recommendations. If we do not move towards pulling
the recommendations out of you, you will not meet your
goals. So I'm wondering if you can hold on and we can
move on.

REY LEON: I just wanted to say that it would be
great to be able to --

SARAH RUBIN: No, I'm going to give you the
microphone.

REY LEON: -- to be able to have and to see this
type of environment. You know, I would like to see, you
know, say, one of the deep dives happen perhaps in Huron
and different communities that are the most impacted, so
that the opportunity is not just to get online, but to be
present and participate. You know, keeping it a little
bit more real, you know.

SARAH RUBIN: Great idea.

All right. Stephanie.

So everyone, we are on agenda item listed as
Number 3, 2030 Target Scoping Plan: Part 1. Stephanie is
going to kick us off with an overview, we're going to turn
to Trish for Economic Analysis, Short-Lived Climate
Pollutant Reduction Strategy, and then we're going to be
coming to you EJAC members to start sharing your suggested
recommendations.

MARI ROSE TARUC: Just logistically, Sarah, do
we have a projection? What's going to need to happen?

SARAH RUBIN: We do not. We're going to have to
record people, and I can do charting, but the projector
isn't working.

ROY DORANTES: Well, we have a Plan B. We've
got a portable projector and a laptop, and as soon as you
take a break, we're going to run it in the middle and set
it up for you guys.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So we're going to take --
let's hear the -- the presentation, and then let's take
our break early so they can set up, and then we'll do the
recommendations.

Does anybody object to that?

Okay. Great.

- 2030 TARGET SCOPING PLAN: PART 1 -

STEPHANIE KATO: So I was going to just give an
update to you all on what staff has been working on
lately. We are not as far along on the modeling for the
Scoping Plan as we thought we'd be actually at this point.
You know, we've had a number of public workshops. The
most recent one was kind of like -- was like a deep dive.
It was on a natural working lands at the end of last
month. Something that we're working on for later this
month is hopefully a similar format workshop for energy in
the Bay Area and transportation and land use for the
Southern California area.

We -- there's -- there's three core staff,
myself and two others, that are working on Scoping Plan
measures. I'm responsible for green buildings, water and
waste sectors, and the other two for the other areas. We
have about 25 different State agencies participating on
these interagency working groups, so the handouts that you
did get are kind of a -- were prepared by us, but they're
intended to kind of give you an inventory of the various
measures, both existing, newly adopted, and some of the
concepts that we've been discussing in order to get us to
the 40 percent reduction target.

Because we're not that far along with the
modeling, the interagency discussions have really just
been focused around getting a good vision for each of the
sectors, and then in making sure we have all the measures
accounted for. So this meeting today is actually very
timely to help us with that process, so if EJAC, you know,
could weigh in on the suite of measures that are there.
If you have any ideas on the measures that we haven't
already been talking about, this is just a great kickoff
for that to make sure your interests actually become part
of the modeling scenarios.

And that's one of the things we want to do is,
we only have the bandwidth to actually, you know, model a
few scenarios, so if we could get your feedback on if we
were to build those scenarios, what would they look like?
You know, what components would be a part of it? Where
are the areas that are of the most concern to you? That's
really what we're trying to get.

I also wanted to mention that we've been having
conversations with the California Air Pollution Control
Officers Association. In past Scoping Plans, local action
has been mentioned as a key component of getting to our
targets. I guess in past Scoping Plans, though, a lot of
the information has kind of just been put in an appendix,
and I think folks were unclear about what to do with that.
One of the things we're talking about is although we have,
you know, State-level measures, we'd like to use the
Scoping Plan as an opportunity to identify some core local
actions for each of the sectors and under each of the
measures that could be put forth in order to actually get
us to our goals. And those could actually be, you know,
more at the kind of City Ordinance level, or they could
actually be kind of a list of best practices for
individual projects that we'd be looking at to shore up
the State measures and get us to our goals.

So that's kind of the -- the overview I wanted
to give you folks leading into the more specific sector
discussions we're going to have later, just to get you
into it, so you know what we've been talking about and see
if you have any questions about that.

TRISH JOHNSON: Thank you, Stephanie. This is
Trish, and I was just going to add a little bit to what
you had to say, especially with regards to the economic
analysis.

I'm aware that there was a request from the EJAC
to see draft economic models at this meeting. And like
Stephanie characterized, we're actually not to that point
quite yet. This meeting actually is going to affect --
the State agencies right now are developing the package of
policies that would be submitted for the economic
modeling, and Stephanie today is going to go over each of
the different sectors in the Scoping Plan, and what we'd
like to hear from the committee is, you know, your
thoughts about those different actions and whether they
are, you know, on the right track to meet the 2030 target
or if they need to be made more stringent.

There was also an ask from the EJAC to have an
economic reviewer with expertise in economics as they
affect disadvantaged communities and air quality impacts.
Specifically, a few names were provided, Manuel Pastor
from USC or Jim Sadd from Occidental. We have had a deep
dive on the Scoping Plan Economic Analysis with our Chief
Economist, Emily Wimberger. In addition, she did have a
specific conference call with a few members to talk about
the request that was made in February at the EJAC meeting
for a Southern California Economic Reviewer.

Since she was just recently provided these
names, we will be working with her and will provide you
feedback as soon as possible whether we can get one of
these reviewers added to the panel of reviewers with the
economic analysis, or if -- it kind of depends. I know
that she knows these reviewers really well, and so I'd
have to find out if she's had any discussions with them and where they stand on this.

KEVIN HAMILTON: So I'd like to see Jonathan London added to that group so that we have that expertise on the Valley and economic issues. Thank you.

DIANE TAKVORIAN: So Stephanie, when you talked about meeting with the Air Pollution Control Officers, are you also meeting with some of cities that adopted a plan of action plan to get their -- what ordinance -- what plans have been put forward and any ordinances, any best practices? I don't think it's all held in the air pollution districts.

STEPHANIE KATO: Specifically, CAPCOA had approached us. We haven't yet reached out to the specific local entities. I know they're a part of those discussions. I've kind of -- we've been relying somewhat on, you know, OPR and some of the other State agencies to kind of bring forth, you know, those perspectives, but, you know, certainly that -- that is an area we could work on, especially as we start doing the workshops in the regions. You know, on the specific sectors, I think that's probably a -- you know, a very good idea of that role, to reach out to those local entities to having them as part of that -- those workshops.

DIANE TAKVORIAN: I think it's a good idea. I
mean, our Air Pollution Control District had virtually no
part of the Climate Action Plan that was adopted by the
City of San Diego in December, so -- and I know -- and two
of us just had a Climate Action Plan for four years. So
it's -- those -- and they -- again, there wasn't that
involvement. So I think it would be great if there was
and there would be more expertise, both from the State as
well as from the local agencies.

STEPHANIE KATO: Are there certain agencies that
are a conglomeration that would represent some of those
individual locals, or is it -- is it best to -- if we're
going to have a workshop in a certain region, then just
contact those -- those specific --

DIANE TAKVORIAN: Probably. I think I was
thinking about when you were talking about pulling
together like best practices and ordinances or plans that
have been put forward. I don't know of a collaborative
that they have. There may be one.

SARAH RUBIN: All right. So Katie, and then I'm
going to check in and move us towards our break.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So in general, for the
Scoping Plan, one of the questions I'd really like to see
each agency answer -- well, I have three.

First is how is there -- how are the
recommendations this time different than 2014 and why?
And specifically, you know, when you read the 2014 Scoping Plan, it's a lot of justification, even in the policy decision, but there isn't a lot of breakdown of the data. So I'd really like to specifically know what data those agencies have on the programs that they're recommending, and what's it's telling them specifically about EJ communities, and I'd also be really interested in a breakdown of the data that they don't have.

I was really struck in the energy paper from 2014, they say, Oh, we saw this constant reduction between 2008 and 2011, but we don't really know if that was due to change in consumer demand or our policies and programs that we adopted. And like those types of gaps, I'd really like to identify, because one of my objectives today --

SARAH RUBIN: A little slower.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Sorry. Sorry. I do the -- I had some extra expresso today.

Because one of my objectives for this Scoping Plan is to identify data and metrics. That we can use data that we want to see the agencies start collecting that we can use to check in every couple of years to make sure that the programs are meeting their targets. And so for each agency, I'd like to see a breakdown of the data that they will collect, the metrics that they will install for their programs, and how we can check in starting in
2020 on that, and that will give them three years potentially to start collecting that data, so that we can check right at 2020, and then every two years after that, where are you at in your metrics, what are you seeing as far as shifts and demand, and do we need to make adjustments to the policies that we're assuming that you will carry forward.

STEPHANIE KATO: We've definitely been talking about the presence of data gaps, you know, in these interagency group discussions, and we did realize that this Scoping Plan, if it doesn't have all those answers, then it can at least highlight some of those gaps, and that would call out, you know, the need to actually -- between this Scoping Plan and the next update in five years to see if we can close that gap.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Is your thing still -- okay. I'd like to move us towards a 15-minute break. Before we take a break, I want to reiterate what's happening, which is we're hearing an initial presentation on these different sectors from ARB. We are wanting folks from the EJAC who have comments or questions or who were part of the deep dives to add in, and then the idea is we're going to be going around and calling out suggested recommendations. And we're getting the projector out because Trish is going to type the recommendations.
realtime so that everyone can see them, and if you want to adjust them or edit them or combine them, we can do that. Does anyone have any questions before we move to a break?

All right. Let's come back at 9:47. See you at 9:47.

(Recess.)

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. We're going to get started again. If everyone could please sit down.

Okay. We are back from our break. I know the breaks always feel very short. And it looks like we lost our students, but I know more students are going to be coming back, another group.

I just want to give another shout out to members of the public, folks from the community who are here. We are so grateful. Very, very excited to hear from you. The public comment period is scheduled for noon. And if you want to jot something down or just talk, we definitely are keen to hear what you have to say and what you want to share. I know from planning these meetings, we're always interested in involving and hearing from the public as much as possible, and I just want to give my personal apology that because our meeting is so packed with content, we don't have maybe as much wiggle room for more of a workshop-style feel with members of the public. But
I think that's something we're all excited to be exploring going forward.

So where we left off, as you remember -- I put it down here for now -- hearing from ARB, hearing from EJAC members, pulling out recommendations. We're going to turn it over to Trish for some content presentation.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Because one of our goals was to have the recommendations, as we give them, up like on a screen, I want to make sure that the three I just gave didn't get -- could get posted up there. I mean, they're posted there, but there's --

SARAH RUBIN: I have --

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: No, you missed the one about like I want there to be metrics in the Scoping Plan that we check in on starting in 2020 to allow for adjustments.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So let's pull up a Word document right now and type these.

Okay. Katie, would you mind restating it, and then we'll also have it -- a recommendation for the record.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So my recommendation for the general Scoping Plan is that every sector has established data and metrics that they will start collecting now that can start to be evaluated in 2020.
These are more questions for the draft, but I have the recommendation, as well.

So Trish, just to be clear, that last one is not a question, that is a formal request that there be indicators and metrics identified, and that tracking begins now and our first check-in is in 2020.

TRISH JOHNSON: So do I delete this last part?

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Yeah.

MARI ROSE TARUC: Maybe Trish should do a section of questions and a section of recommendations --

THE REPORTER: I can't hear you, if you want this on the record.

SARAH RUBIN: She's saying make the recommendations separate from the questions.

TRISH JOHNSON: I could maybe do a table, questions on the left, recommendations on the right.

MARI ROSE TARUC: No --

SARAH RUBIN: Well, if you could just to do a hard return after the word "recommendation."

MARI ROSE TARUC: Yeah, it's going to start to be -- become a long list, and so be prepared to --

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So now your presentation on SLCP.

TRISH JOHNSON: Okay. On the agenda, we have a few minutes dedicated to the Short-Lived Climate Pollutant
Strategy that ARB is currently developing. The schedule that that strategy is on is that this month, we will release a proposed strategy and hold a public workshop to detail what's included in that proposed strategy. In May, we intend to present the proposed strategy to the Board with the development of a final strategy, including responses to the environmental assessment in Fall of this year.

This information was presented to a few of the EJAC members as part of one of the deep dives for the Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Strategy -- excuse me Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Reduction Strategy. As a result of that, one member that participated in the meeting, Tom Frantz, an EJAC member, did provide a request to make an immediate recommendation to the Air Resources Board for incorporation in that proposed strategy. So for this discussion, I'm going to turn it over to Tom to talk us through what he's written here, and then get the other committee members to weigh in.

TOM FRANTZ: Tom Frantz here. As you may or may not know, in the Southern San Joaquin Valley, we have massive factory dairies up and down the San Joaquin Valley, and they came in the mid '90s, kind of an invasion. But it's a massive environmental justice issue because of the air pollution and water pollution they
cause, and now we're finding that the global warming pollution from these dairies is also massive, and it's along the lines of from 5 percent to 13 or 15 percent of the total greenhouse gases in the state, depending on which climate warming potential numbers you apply to methane. Because if -- given the state is using different numbers at different times, it's very confusing that, you know, methane is more effective at forcing global warming than CO2, and it's a short-lived climate pollutant, and sometimes you see that it's 25 times more than CO2, sometimes you see it's 80— -- 84 times more. But anyway, it's massive what dairies contribute.

So in lining with reducing short-lived climate pollutants to meet a goal in 2030 of 40 percent below, you know, 1990 levels, dairies -- the dairy industry and the people in that industry must do their part. They have to do their part. And there would be potentially big co-benefits for our communities that live near these dairies.

And so I'm asking today for the committee to actually recommend that short-lived climate pollutants have mandated reductions in this plan that's being written as we sit here, this plan that will be up for approval in May. And so the draft -- we're asking that the draft plan include mandated reductions for all of these short-lived
climate pollutants, and dairies will become a part of that. And then the program, of course, has to be made of how you're going to do this. Are you going to bring industrial-size dairies that emit more than 25,000, what is it, pounds per year or tons per year? Are they going to be under Cap-and-Trade? I don't think so. But you have programs like the low carbon fuel standard, where among fuels, they trade credits back and forth. So you could have a program like that for dairies specifically.

But we're not recommending how you do this right now, but that the reductions must be mandated. And -- and the history of this, dairy digesters were a offset for the early Cap-and-Trade entities, and it totally failed. No dairies are volunteering to take some money and build a digester, unless it's, you know, a massive amount of money. You know, if you give a dairy a million dollars, they might put in a digester and all the claiming facilities so they can make pipeline ready gas, but three years later, they'll probably shut it down because it's not working for them.

Anyway, the voluntary -- we've seen that the voluntary method doesn't work, so we're asking for mandated reduction. Maybe legislation will come along this year that also mandates that, but CARB has the authority already to make these programs. CARB proved its
authority in court, low carbon fuel standard. They could do the same with this if they mandate something and there's a lawsuit. We think it should be mandated. So if there's any questions from anyone else.

This is specific to dairies, but it's also -- the implication is all short-lived climate pollutant reduction should be mandated.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you, Tom.

So I just want to remind you all that your decision-making process is you seek consensus. And for the members in front of you, you should have some red, yellow, green cards, and then if you don't have consensus on an issue after striving for it, this can move to a majority vote of a quorum. So we obviously want to take questions and comments, but Tom has asked that the group look to make a decision, so I'm giving you a heads up that I'm going to ask you for a quick temperature take. Red is you can't live with it, green is you're supportive of it, and yellow would be you have some concern. Okay?

So we're going to go to Sekita, and then I would like to do a super quick temperature check, and then those with red or yellow, I would come to you for comment. Red, yellow, green. Red, I can't live with the proposal, I'm voting against it. Green is I'm supportive. And yellow is you have some kind of concern.
REY LEON: Honestly, the red and the green look exactly alike to me.

SARAH RUBIN: Oh, okay. So we need to write on yours "red" and "green."

MARI ROSE TARUC: I'll help him.

SARAH RUBIN: No, sincerely, I've had sight-impaired folks, and we always make accommodation.

Okay. Go ahead.

SEKITA GRANT: I want to quickly thank you, Tom, for the explanation and for bringing this up. I would be supportive of having that in the Scoping Plan. As Tom alluded to, there is legislation on this, as well. It's going to be highly political, and ideally we have something in the Scoping Plan that has strong mandates, really relying on data and research that's come out of the Air Resources Board itself as a result of SB605.

And the only thing that I would add is, if there's an opportunity to, within this language, embed a mandate around community participation and even approval on the implementation side, I think what goes into the Scoping Plan and legislation and other documents is really great, and then, you know, implementation becomes really critical. So I do believe that there's mandating language within the Scoping Plan that requires community approval, or at least engagement consultation, as the State is
looking at how to actually effect and implement the
requirement.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.
Could I get a very quick -- with the proposal in
its original form, can people please hold up their red,
yellow or green card. I want to get a sense of where the
room is with Tom's proposal, in its original form,
mandating a 40 percent methane reduction from dairies by
the year 2030. Okay. Thank you.

Okay. Luis? Oh, I'm sorry, Rey.

REY LEON: Thank you.

You know, I think Tom makes an excellent point,
and that is applicable to a lot of the industries in the
San Joaquin Valley for sure and other ones in the State of
California. I've been working on air quality issues, air
quality policy since 2003, and former Senator Dean Florez
could also, I think, speak to this, but you know, what --
what we observed is that when you make regulations
voluntary, it's basically not going to happen. You know,
so I think we -- it would be good to put together a
laundry list of all the regulations that are -- or
policies that are -- that are standards that are voluntary
that have to do with the impact of climate change, because
I think we've gone past that period of providing option to
not participate. I think it's critical that everybody
participate, we've just got to figure out, you know, what
that means in terms of time line and -- and other details.
But we should put together a list of existing voluntary
measures that are out there that really should no longer
be voluntary. Thank you.

That's my recommendation for the list, actually.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So for the reporter, court
reporter, or tran- -- fancy name, note taker, I want to
make sure we got that one.

Okay. So let's go to Kevin, Luis, Monica.

KEVIN HAMILTON: I think Monica was first, and
then Luis.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Monica, Luis, Kevin.

MONICA WILSON: Thanks. I have a question for
our process, which is that I wanted to put forward another
or second recommendation regarding SLCP, and I wanted to
know do I need to make that now or --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, what?

MONICA WILSON: Regarding the short-lived
climate pollutants, the same document. So I just need to
know do I make that now, or do we wait until after this is
wrapped up?

KEVIN HAMILTON: Is this related to methane or
to something else?

MONICA WILSON: It's related, but I think it
SARAH RUBIN: I think -- why don't we try to put this to bed, and then come back to you.

MONICA WILSON: Thanks.

LUIS OLMEDO: For my own clarification, the major distinction between a CAFO and a dairy? What is -- what is it that we're looking at different in a CAFO and a dairy?

TOM FRANTZ: It's more related to size. But the regulation under the air quality rules, they are regulated as stationary sources, that are defined as major sources and minor sources according to how much pollutants they actually emit. So it depends on what you are talking about. Some we have some dairies that are major industrial polluters over that 25,000 limit, as other industrial sources, and others are very small. Others have pasture fed cows that virtually become -- the dairy is actually a carbon sink, if everything is done properly.

LUIS OLMEDO: So the major source that you are looking at is based on the actual -- the confinement and the feeding process and the emissions of the actual --

TOM FRANTZ: Yeah, the whole industry as a whole needs to reduce, and smaller dairies can do their part. I understand there has to be a whole protocol set up and a way of measuring some of these things, but if you just
look at the dairy digester itself only, you're just going
to get a small fraction of the total methane emissions
that are out there from the dairy.

And if that's the only thing you incentivize,
then all the other things that dairies could be doing that
are very valuable in other ways, as well, they won't do
any of that other stuff. But if you have a mandate, then
dairies have an incentive to look for the -- all these
different things they could be doing to reduce these
gases. And some of them could actually earn credits by
doing a lot more than others, even the small ones.

LUIS OLMEDO: So the reason I ask is because I'm
more familiar with CAFOs here. And I think at one point
in time, we did have a major industry here from dairy,
so --

KEVIN HAMILTON: So Luis, like -- like Tom says,
it's about the number of milking cows on the dairy. So --
which interestingly enough, is not all the cows on the
dairy. They have non-milking cows on the dairy, too,
heifers, calves, older cows that are out of cycle for the
milking. They don't have to count these as the number of
cows on the dairy.

This has been clearly defined by ARB. There is
large animal operations and smaller animal operations in
three different categories. I can't remember the hundreds
and thousands of cows where the numbers fall out. But it's really -- and what -- what I just want to see happen here in this document, is I want to be sure that we capture this idea that we frame as con- -- the dairy people know it as conservation management practices. And it's important that we are clear about what -- which of those practices actually lead to reductions in emissions on the dairy, and which are simply normal everyday activities that may or may not lead to reductions on the dairy.

And they -- we know now very well exactly where the targets are on a dairy. There's areas called free stalls. If you drive north of here and you see the dairy operation that's got solar panels on it about ten miles north, you will see that the solar panels are covering what's called the free stall area, which are corrals where the cows come to wander around in. And there is a practice for how you maintain those and should really reduce the emissions from those, and, in fact, reverse it and they can become carbon sinks.

The dairy, as Tom points out, a well-managed dairy can actually become a jewel for the carbon folks. But there is nothing in the state that requires that they -- they implement those kinds of management practices. So if this doesn't take that on, we'll see
business as usual. What happened with the local air
districts calling them stationary sources, they would give
them menus of 15 different things they could choose for
conservation management practices, some things as silly as
just locking their gates. So this is more focused to PM
than it is to CAFO.

LUIS OLMEDO: I just want to -- again, what is
the major distinction between a dairy and a CAFO, and why
would the CAFOs also benefit from these measures?

KEVIN HAMILTON: They will benefit from these
measures.

LUIS OLMEDO: So what would be --

KEVIN HAMILTON: Keep in mind, you're talking
about a concentra- -- it's a concentrated animal feed
operation, so now you're talking about potentially
chickens, you're talking about potentially pigs, you're
talking about turkeys exactly. The numbers get much
higher when you get into turkeys. You're talking about
like 50,000 turkeys to reach that CAFO level. There's --
I can't remember how many pigs, but it's an incredible
amount. But it should apply to all of them.

The biggest problem we have -- we don't have a
huge turkey problem as far as the of number of turkey
ranches we have. We don't have a huge hog problem as far
as the number of hogs we have. But what we have a problem
with is the number of dairies we have. In the South Valley, as the dairies moved out of Los Angeles, we have a problem with 20- and 30,000 cow dairies broken up into 10,000 cow segments, but really contain 15- to 17,000 cows apiece. These are huge. We have more cows in the Valley than there are people, and there's almost 4 million people in the Valley. So that's why it's a concern to us.

Sorry.

LUIS OLMEDO: So would it be out of place to say --

KEVIN HAMILTON: It's C-A-F-O.

LUIS OLMEDO: -- why not say dairy and CAFOs?

KEVIN HAMILTON: The rule would -- the rule would apply to all of them.

SARAH RUBIN: So we need to do one person at a time, and my question is, everyone here, including me, might not know what a CAFO is.

KEVIN HAMILTON: I said concentrated animal feed operation.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. I didn't hear you. Okay.

Thank you.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Sure.

SARAH RUBIN: Luis, I didn't hear the last thing you said.

LUIS OLMEDO: My question is why not further
define it -- okay. Right. Exactly. So just further
define dairies, CAFOs. Add the additional language to it
is what I'm recommending.

    SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Senator?

    SENATOR DEAN FLOREZ: Thanks, Tom. Tom and I
have frequent e-mail exchanges on -- on the topic, so my
question simply is on what you are voting, mandated
40 percent methane reduction from dairies by the year
2030. Knowing that Lara has a bill in that could actually
do this, and that would obviously give CARB some reason to
now kind of put regs around.

    I think -- are you voting on CARB doing this
outside of the legislative purview, is my number one
question? And number two is, I would just say, because
I've been involved in this for like a thousand years, as
Tom knows, when you do mandate a dairy or -- I'm not going
to use CAFO for now, I'm just going use dairies because
those are very, very large -- here is my concern and just
to think about, and that is, if you mandate, then some
dairies will make this a business. And if they make it a
business, then you are actually going to find more stuff
coming into the Valley in order to make that business
effective. Meaning, beyond what the dairy is producing
itself. And in some cases, you might find folks trucking
in stuff in order to make some of this stuff workable.
So my question is always one, if we're going to do this, could we cap somehow that it be somewhat local, Tom? I don't know. I mean, in other words, if every dairy is going to be taking care of their stuff, I think that's a positive. You're pulling stuff out of the Valley. But if their -- if you're mandating something that has to pencil out and the dairy is so small it actually has to bring stuff in, then that's actually bringing more stuff to communities that live around dairies, whether they use McFarland, or you use Schaffner, or you use some of these communities, I'm just worried about the fact that, you know, we're not kind of looking at that consequence, as well. Because if you do have a digester, you've got to make it economic, and my worry is that things will come in, not -- it won't just take care of the things around.

I don't know if you guys -- I probably thought about that a million times. I just wondered.

TOM FRANTZ: I think the idea here is that dairies will not have this huge incentive to do digesters if they're mandated to make reductions. But see, perhaps that happening at a huge dairy, I can see it happening right now. That's the problem. See, right now with the -- we're going to talk about the low carbon fuel standard. They get a huge credit for collecting methane
and selling it for transportation fuel, and that gives
them an incentive to bring in material to put into their
lagoon from L.A. to make methane. Maybe become -- they
start making more money making methane than they do making
milk, producing milk. That's the situation right now. So
by making it a mandate to reduce, the small dairy isn't
going to build a big digester. A small dairy can do
numerous other things, like dry-scraping of manure daily
and composting, and perhaps bringing in some local wood
chips from the almond industry to make a fine compost
product. That's -- I don't think they're gonna -- a dairy
will bring wood chips in from L.A. to make compost. It
just doesn't make sense to me.

But there's many options besides a dairy
d digester that a mandate would bring into play, and those
options are really nice synergies with the local farming
community around in this area.

SARAH RUBIN: This is Sarah. I have a question,
and I'm going to be calling for us to do our vote through
consensus, and then we absolutely have to move on. We're
starting to get too far behind in our agenda, and it's
going to become a problem very quickly.

So we have new language that Trish is putting in
that incorporates Sekita's additions. And my question to
you all, hearing what Senator Florez raised about a
potential cap, it seems to me you could do this recommendation now, and then if at another time, through additional discussion, you want to adjust this, say add in that kind of language because after additional discussion at a different time, then you could do that. So I thought I would just raise that, that you all can adjust your recommendations in the future, if you want. Okay. But for the sake of moving on, I think we see if the folks are behind us.

KEVIN HAMILTON: I have just one --

SARAH RUBIN: Yeah.

KEVIN HAMILTON: -- quick comment to Dean's point, which is a very good one.

SARAH RUBIN: Into the mic.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Into the mic. Thank you.

That all additional ancillary missions -- sorry, all additional ancillary emissions generated --

SARAH RUBIN: Wait, I'm sorry. Where should she type?

KEVIN HAMILTON: Right where she's typing.

SARAH RUBIN: Right. But at the end of the word "mandate"?

KEVIN HAMILTON: No.

SARAH RUBIN: Oh, no, down here. Okay.

KEVIN HAMILTON: That's fine.
All additional ancillary emissions generated through achieving this goal must be mitigated.

SARAH RUBIN: Do you want this part of the decision?

KEVIN HAMILTON: Yeah.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Then it needs to be up here, Trish.

TRISH JOHNSON: I'll just move it.

KEVIN HAMILTON: So in other words, everything that Dean illustrated so well, and I hope Tom recognizes that --

SARAH RUBIN: Sorry, we need help --

KEVIN HAMILTON: -- that we actually see, as a dairy is starting to build up the capacity to generate this energy --

SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

KEVIN HAMILTON: -- quote, unquote, it starts leading to impacts on the community surrounding it with increased truck trips, as just a simple example.

SARAH RUBIN: So let's get the words that you all want to vote on.

"All additional ancillary emissions generated through" --

KEVIN HAMILTON: -- "achieving" --

SARAH RUBIN: -- "this goal" --
KEVIN HAMILTON: -- "must be mitigated."

SARAH RUBIN: -- "must be mitigated."

KEVIN HAMILTON: So we know those might happen in the construction process and the setup process, but it all needs to be mitigated. And if it's going to be a long-term insult to the community or generation of some kind of emission, whether it's a short-lived climate pollutant, or greenhouse gas, or in our case criteria pollutant, as well, it needs to be mitigated.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Which may mean they can't do it at all, because there's no mitigation.

SARAH RUBIN: So here is the question on the table for you all to hold up your cards.

The EJAC, you all, would make a recommendation to CARB to mandate a 40 percent methane reduction from dairies and CAFOs by the year 2030, and will require community consultation and approval of the implementation plan for the 40 percent methane mandate: All additional ancillary emissions gathered through achieving this goal must be mitigated.

Can you move them up.

TRISH JOHNSON: Yes.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So cards here. Red, yellow, green. Okay. So we have a consensus support
here. Thank you.

So we are going to move on. I'm going to push you to go a little faster.

Sekita?

SEKITA GRANT: Just a quick -- quick response to Dean's comment about that Senator Lara has Bill 1383 right now that provides percentage reduction requirements for short-lived climate pollutants, including F gases that they -- and black carbon. And I think -- I think if we move forward with the recommendation here as well, that's -- I don't want to use any expletives, but that's going to be political nightmare. I think it strengthens -- it strengthens kind of our chances of getting this through if it's -- if it comes through in the Scoping Plan, as well, but ideally that legislation passes and it's complimentary to what we're doing.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

Okay. So Trish, did you want to present any information before we move to recommendations on this piece? And we're going to start with Monica once we're taking recommendations. Anything else you want to say?

TRISH JOHNSON: I don't believe so, no.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So let's pull up our sheet with just the recommendations, our Word document, and Monica, we're going to take yours.
MARI ROSE TARUC: And just to time check, how much time for finishing out the recommendations for the overall Part 1 section?

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Ten minutes. We have ten minutes.

MARI ROSE TARUC: And so right now, we're just looking for recommendations to be written up, initial recommendations.

MONICA WILSON: Related to the short-lived climate pollution; right?

MARI ROSE TARUC: The whole thing. The whole -- overall short-lived climate pollutants, economic analysis.

SARAH RUBIN: Correct. The three bullets on your Part 1. Overview -- the whole thing, which is what Katie was speaking to, economic analysis, short-lived climate pollutants, and I think starting with that, Monica, is great.

MONICA WILSON: Great. All right. Well, just to preface this, no one will be surprised to hear this is about waste and solutions there, and as ARB has acknowledged, this is really a time for an aggressive approach to prevent greenhouse gases from the waste sector. And I also want to preface this by saying that the short-lived climate pollutant strategy currently includes some really important language, and I am hoping
that we can emphasize that language, the importance of
keeping that language, and actually strengthening it a
bit.

So this is about the -- the -- with the draft
language that prohibits the disposal of food waste into
landfills. And it would be a really big shift across the
State of California, keeping food waste all the way from
the waste collected, either harvested or not harvested on
farms, then once it's harvested, keeping that out of
landfills, making sure that that material, while it's --
when it's edible, that because it's not pretty enough, it
doesn't end up in a landfill, it actually goes to people,
if it's still edible. And if it's compostable and not
edible, that it gets composted. So I just want to
emphasis that that's a really important part of what's in
the current plan, and anything else that's really relevant
is how recycle estimates that if we use that material to
make compost, we could create 14,000 new jobs in the
state. So that's a really -- I think on the economic
side, a really big factor.

So my recommendation would be that -- that EJAC
support the draft short-lived climate pollutant strategy
focused on prohibiting the disposal of organics, and that
that be expanded to explicitly prohibit the disposal --

SARAH RUBIN: I'm sorry --
MONICA WILSON: Sorry.

SARAH RUBIN: -- let's stop. Let's make sure Trish is getting this.

MONICA WILSON: All right. Let me just say one other thing real quickly. In Europe, European policy has prohibited the disposal -- and done the same thing, of food waste to landfills. What's happened then, some of that material has gone to compost; a lot of it has gone to new incinerators. So what happens then, you get more air pollution. You're not just burning food waste, it's plastics and lots of other things. So my recommendation is going to be that we -- that the short-lived climate pollution strategy specifically say no disposal to landfills or incinerators.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So did you get that?

TRISH JOHNSON: Can you say it one more time?

MONICA WILSON: Okay. Specifically say no disposal of food waste to landfills or incinerators.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

KEVIN HAMILTON: And what would be the al-- what would be the "instead" part of that?

MONICA WILSON: The -- well, there -- this is already part of it, the first portion, the short-lived climate pollutant strategy currently says no disposal of food waste to landfills, so my recommendation is to be
that they add incinerators explicitly, and also that
ARB -- this is already -- it came up during the natural
working lands discussion, but I think it's really
pertinent here. If the State be exploring the synergies
for methane reductions from dairies, for example. Because
we've got compostable material, woody biomass --

SARAH RUBIN: Should she start a new one?

MONICA WILSON: I think it would be expanded to
say "and explore synergies with methane reductions from
dairies, and then management of organic waste like wood
waste."

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Mari Rose, and then do you
guys have -- Kevin -- Senator, do you have
recommendations?

SENATOR DEAN FLOREZ: No.

SARAH RUBIN: All right. Mari Rose.

MARI ROSE TARUC: All right. I was part of the
deep dives for the economic review, and in that economic
review, we were given -- finally given, just that team of
EJAC members, the emissions report from 2008 to 2013. And
the biggest conclusion that I made from that chart, seeing
the data, is that overall facilities, polluting
facilities, over -- from 2011 to 2013, so looking at that
since the Cap-and-Trade program started in 2012, overall
facilities have increased 13 million metric tons of
pollution. So not a decrease, but an increase. And the
electricity and the fuel sectors have increased 11 million
metric tons in that three-year period. So we are not
meeting our reduction targets to date, just based on that
set of data.

So to me, there has to be a more aggressive --
so a recommendation is a more aggressive emissions
reduction plan, and to particularly target the oil and gas
sector to reduce their emissions. So I want to see
scenarios to target the biggest emissions sectors to --

SARAH RUBIN: Hold on. To reduce emissions --

MARI ROSE TARUC: So that's -- that's one.

I think with the economic analysis, I want to --
I want to recommend that the models that they look at
include -- so they're obviously going to do a market in
Cap-and-Trade model, I want to see a scenario on a carbon
tax, a scenario on just straight up regulation --

SARAH RUBIN: Slow down. Let's get the first
one.

MARI ROSE TARUC: Regulation, and then a cap and
dividend.

SARAH RUBIN: Mari Rose, will you help her with
the --

MARI ROSE TARUC: I can type these up for you
and send it to you, Trish, just capture initial things
there. I don't want to slow us down.

It could be fee and dividends, cap or fee and dividends.

A lot of what we heard from the economists inside ARB is cost containment, cost containment for polluting industries, and so what I want to see is an expansion. So a recommendation is to expand the definition of economy to include the cost to the public, whether those are health costs or social costs. And the U.S. EPA actually has a social cost of carbon calculator, so there are tools out there to use to expand the cost of climate change and its impacts and its effects to the public, and I want to see that included in the analysis.

And I think -- last one for now. I think outside of -- outside of specific policies, we need to have a public engagement and -- and culture shift in California that includes education of our communities. The public communications and -- and the partnership of environmental justice communities is key to making sure we achieve these reductions.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Okay. I'm going to ask everybody in the room to please stand up. Everyone. Unless you can't stand up. And I'm going to ask one of our new group of students to tell us what grade they're in and the name of their school.
STUDENT: Brawley Union High School.

SARAH RUBIN: Here's today's students. Hi.

We're glad you're here.

Okay. We are going to move to our next agenda.

You can sit down. Great job, EJAC. Good job standing up.

You get a gold star. Anyone in the room who wants a snack, go grab it.

So as a reminder, it is 10:30. We are taking public comment at noon, and we are taking our lunch break at 12:15. Right now, we're just 15 minutes behind. We're on Agenda Item 5, 10:15, 2030 Target Scoping Plan: Part 2, Transportation.

If everybody wants to look on the wall that's to my left, you'll see the EJAC members who are signed up to be part of the transportation sector, and you can see that three deep dives already happened and that two are planned. Stephanie, you ready for me to turn to you?

Okay. So as a reminder -- we have it right here -- we're going to hear from ARB, we're going to want to hear from the EJAC members that were at those deep dives, and then Trish is going to capture the recommendations.

- 2030 TARGET SCOPING PLAN: PART 2 -

STEPHANIE KATO: So for this sector, what we've
been working on, basically we're planning to subsume all of the current plans that are going on right now in terms of measures, and that would include the Mobile Source SIP Strategy, which is using data from our revision model, assisting -- strategy, advanced clean cars --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't understand you. Can you repeat that?

STEPHANIE KATO: Sure. So for -- for this sector, for transportation sector Scoping Plan, our base assumption is to incorporate plans that are, you know, ongoing now or already in place. Those include advanced clean car regulations, our sustainable freight strategy which is going on right now, our Mobile Source SIP strategy which is also going on right now, our low carbon fuel standard, which has been adopted, and so that's what -- we've been working with E3 consumer pathways model on making sure that pathways does reflect those base assumptions in those strategies, because pathways is very detailed on the energy and fuel and on vehicle stock, on components, and so they've been making sure that they incorporated data from the energy commission models and from our own models to make sure that there's consistency across what's going on now and what -- the Scoping Plan.

Some of the newer strategies that are reflected, our SB350, and that's actually focusing a lot more on
transportation electrification, so we are talking about scenarios that would, you know, push -- push that. If you remember from the Scoping Plan kickoff meeting, basically the strategy that's being built around the sector is kind of like a four-legged stool, so we've got the vehicle technologies, which are moving towards, you know, plug-in hybrids and electrification. We're moving towards, on the fuel side, low carbon fuel standard or, you know, low carbon intensity fuels, renewable biogas, things like that.

The other critical piece that we're trying to include here is the whole idea of land use, you know, more emphasis towards infill developments, smart growth, incorporating SB375. So our internal SB375 people are also working with the pathways folks to incorporate the NPO targets into the modeling work that's going to go on for our Scoping Plan.

And so I think what we're interested to hear from you all is whether or not some of these core strategies that are outlined on this table are inclusive. We'd like to know about some of the -- the details that you'd see, that you you'd like to see in the scenarios in terms of whether certain scenarios should just focus on electrification, if you see a role of NG in some of these scenarios.
Also, we're looking at a scenario that would include Cap-and-Trade and not Cap-and-Trade. So if Cap-and-Trade is removed from that scenario, then I think the assumption is that we're going to need to ratchet down an individual program area. So do you have any ideas in terms of, you know, moving forward farther with some of the regulations that are already in place, or are there other areas that aren't included here on this list that if we can look at pursuing further measures.

Also, going forward with the implementation, if you have ideas about whether measures should start as regulations, or there needs to be some type of phasing period, or certain strategies really should be more incentive based. So those are just -- that's just a flavor of the discussions we've having, and I really hope to hear some specific recommendations from this group.

SARAH RUBIN: Great. So we're ready. Who's got recommendations, or who wants to see -- all right. Katie, you're ready.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: I was up late last night doing homework --

SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Oh, no, this is better.

So we know -- so I'm going to focus mostly on
SB375, specifically the Sustainable Communities Strategies. We know, like in Sacramento, for instance, we just adopted our new strategy, and before ARB's even approved it, the local governments are already moving forward with it all, and I thought would go outside of the projected growth areas for our Sustainable Communities Strategy. So clearly that incentive program isn't really working all that well. And I've heard similar stories from Kern County, where I'm from, where the council of government has actually given GHG reduction credit for lower than expected population growth, when there were no actual changes in land use patterns or transportation investments. And if that's what we're trying to incentivize, my recommendations --

Just to give Trish a few.

So I would like to see the Sustainable Communities Strategies or SCSs be based on land use and transportation changes.

Further, I would like to see increased enforcement on how implementation matches the plan, either from ARB or SGC, and wherever else they think that's appropriate.

I would like to strengthen the transit planning components of SCSs.

And finally, I'd like to prioritize the
investments from SCSs in environmental justice communities.

So like Sacramento, all of the projects that are getting funded are in our urban corridors, the transportation corridors, and not in the neighborhoods that need the most investment. Thank you.

SARAH RUBIN: All right.

KEVIN HAMILTON: So with regard to -- to transportation, specifically, there was some recommendations made from 2014 and some modifications that I think need to happen. One of the things that is in the old plan was the idea of preserving and investing in current transit services as being important. I disagree. I think while that needs to be included, that we need to focus on expanding transit services to provide neighborhood level access. We need to use different vehicle sizes and types and modalities to reach community -- economies of scale that ensure these are sustainable.

You want me to say that again?

TRISH JOHNSON: Yeah. Expanding transit services --

KEVIN HAMILTON: Expanding transit services to provide neighborhood level access. Use different vehicle sizes and types to reach economies of scale that ensure
sustainability.

MARI ROSE TARUC: I think he said to reach economies of scale.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Yes. Reach, yes. I actually said to ensure. I'm sorry. And that's economies, plural.

TRISH JOHNSON: Okay.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Next, I want to more clearly ensure that we clearly define what we mean by infrastructure. After meeting with transportation people, I worry that infrastructure will become more highways, freeways, and support for more highways and freeways, basically, knowing that they view everything as needing more concrete to solve the problem.

So we want to be sure that the infrastructure includes support for this new vehicle type that we're going to develop or that we're -- we already have and we'd like to see expanded. That infrastructure needs to reach down again into the neighborhoods. You're going to hear me saying this a lot, because that's what I'm afraid of, is we're already installing infrastructure at large corporations around the communities and -- and other public places. The idea that these neighborhoods and these small areas that we work with, and even in our larger cities could have access to those is ludicrous. It certainly isn't going to help them to step into an
electric vehicle. It certainly isn't going to help them
get to work every day.

So if we can't reach them with mass transit, we
need to be able to invest in their infrastructure. In
other words, their home, their neighborhood, to make sure
that it has the capacity to embrace this new technology.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Do you have another
one?

KEVIN HAMILTON: Yes, but I'm waiting.

SENATOR DEAN FLOREZ: Kevin, are you specifying
the technology, or are you talking about specifically
electric vehicles?

KEVIN HAMILTON: Yes, I'm specifically speaking
not just to electric vehicles, but also natural gas, CNG.

Again, there's no infrastructure in any of our
communities that's readily accessible to support any of
this. So again, going back to a higher level,
infrastructure at this point often means new fueling
stations, new roads, and running high voltage electricity,
high amp, carrying electricity into big commercial centers
where these charging stations are located. But that's not
what we need. People can't go there, charge their car and
go to work. That's just not going to work for them. They
need to be able to access this at home. Or if it's CNG,
then they need to be able to go to the same gas station
they get gasoline at and get CNG instead. So that's a big infrastructure expansion. But it's the level we need to go to to reach communities, especially again at the neighborhood level, which is where people are working from, their neighborhoods, their homes.

So moving on -- sorry. I do -- I do want to include in that the idea of improving the existing transit resources, such as bus stops. The majority of the bus stops in the communities we see don't even have covers on them. We've got bus stops where the bus comes through twice a day, maybe three times a day out in the rural areas, and it's a bench sitting under the sun. You know, and the Transportation Department says they just don't have the money to be able to put up covers, and they could have solar covers. We've seen exactly on tour yesterday what they could have. So that -- that needs to happen in those communities. There needs to be an inventory assessment, and COGS all have these inventory assessments already. No one needs to go out and do them again. They know where all of these assets are. So it's a matter of, again, that interagency cooperation, that interagency communication needs to happen.

So sorry, one -- one more here. It's very simple. There is a suggestion to financially support transit operations and restoration of transit services and
routes that have been dropped, and I agree with that. But I would add "and expansion of services where lacking."


SARAH RUBIN: Great. Thank you.

Okay. Rey, Luis, Sekita, we're going to do a time check, Gisele.

REY LEON: Okay. I don't know if later we'll be sharing the data regarding the freight deep dive where we were talking about the trucks that were passing through the Valley. And I just think that it's -- it would be really important for us to learn which trucks were -- were just bypassing the Valley, the amount of them, which ones are doing business in the Valley, and to get a better understanding also of, you know, how to -- you know, what -- what could we do about that, you know. The other thing is with the -- trying to remember -- but with the --

You know what, let me come back to that.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Yeah, so the more we can be pointed in getting up these recommendations, kind of knocking them out, the kind of quicker we can go into discussions.
So Luis?

LUIS OLMEDO: So I missed the first one. I stepped outside for a minute, and I'm not sure if this was mentioned, but I want to say that a holistic approach for transit options to rectify DAC histories of inequity --

THE REPORTER: Of the what?

LUIS OLMEDO: Holistic approaches for transit options to rectify DAC histories of inequity, shared mobility for disadvantaged communities. DACs, disadvantaged communities. Also, shared mobility, and I'm still trying to figure out how to word this, but look at mobility in a regional way when on the -- when -- I need a little more thinking about that, but there are many communities in California that are in the outer edges of metropolitan areas, and we have a very distinct, a very unique challenge here with -- you know, all my fellow board members and others from ARB got to see yesterday there's a political line that divides us, but yet we have this inflow daily of large amounts of population vehicles moving in because they are still working. Although there's a lot of great work that's been done, there's a lot more. And I think that's goes back to my first thought about holistic approach, but also how do we go beyond that when you have a political line? And no matter what you do, if you ignore that political line, you would
still have a disadvantage. So that's what I need to
figure out, the right words.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So Luis, would you
maybe accept, Luis, like equitable regional planning and
investments for transportation? Like is that maybe a good
way to think about it, in terms of like the Sustainable
Communities Strategy and Metropolitan Transportation Plans
that the region does, we want to focus on access and
equity ensured mobility?

LUIS OLMEDO: That's great language. You're
still -- you're still not getting beyond the challenges of
California and Baja California. That's where I need some
help on the language.

SARAH RUBIN: Perfect. Thank you.

Okay. We're going to go to Rey, Sekita, Gisele,
Tom -- who else has theirs up? And when we -- we have
about 20 more minutes for this agenda item.

And students, I'm warning you that in between
this agenda item and the next agenda item, when we stand
up, I'm going to ask a couple of you to share something
that you think is either interesting or boring about this
meeting. Okay? So get your thinking caps on.

Here we go.

REY LEON: All right. Now I'm ready. Thank
you, Luis. You touched on part of the point that I wanted
to make. We've been working on a -- we've got a program called Green Raiteros. It's a rural ride-sharing program that is based on the existing culture of the raiteros in the community, which are mostly farm workers and rural. In our case, that take -- raiteros take people from the rural towns of Huron and Avenal and other communities to Fresno and Madera to the Children's Hospital. Mostly it's related to medical.

But we submitted a couple years ago, and I might as well tell that -- but the reality is that, you know, small towns like Huron can't compete against like big towns like Fresno. Big towns like Fresno can't complete against big cities like Los Angeles or San Diego, you know. And -- and so, you know, that makes me think about, you know, equity in terms of investment. There's a lot of great ideas, and I think we're putting down some really great recommendations, but at the end of the day, if we're not able to allow the similar-sized communities to compete with each other, you know, I think we're -- we're doing a lack of service to a great deal of the communities that are disadvantaged and may never get the resources they require after being overlooked for so many decades.

And so -- so just a regional equity investment. We need to figure that out. I know there's two -- two policies that are currently at the legislature, you know,
to identify mid-size or, you know, whatever, and I haven't really read the language of them, but perhaps we could put together some language that -- that we could recommend to them and set up something more solid in our Scoping Plan recommendations to make that happen.

Another one -- you know, and I speak from really the effort and the struggle to try to make it happen and the poorer cities in the state, at least as the statistic shares it, which is my hometown of Huron, 6,000 population (Spanish) and close to a hundred percent (Spanish), Latino. But we've been working to try to put in what we call -- well, I mentioned it yesterday, multi-moral culturally relevant rescue and refuge, aka una plasa. Right? Where the -- the regional and the local transit goes through, a space where multi-generations are able to hang out, come together. It's about social cohesion, which is heated in respect to climate resiliency. Right? So some of the old school models of planning that our, you know, communities are very familiar with, especially our old schoolers, the braceros (Spanish) --

THE REPORTER: I have no idea what he just said.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Okay.

REY LEON: -- to make that happen. Right?

SARAH RUBIN: You know what, you're going too fast and she can't --
REY LEON: Oh, I'm pulling a Katie. I'm pulling a Katie.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Do you have a recommendation you want to --

REY LEON: So let me finish that. So so the recommendation in that respect is also, you know, looking at -- at those plans, those developments that are also, you know, in these communities, and I think the regional equity kind of comes -- Disculpe, I'm excited.

SARAH RUBIN: Plans/developments --

REY LEON: But so if we could get these type of models funded and developed in the communities, where they could be similar to the one that we seen yesterday, but they could also be -- but separate from the grit. You know, so then they're emergency islands. There's a blackout that goes out, everybody could go there, charge up their phone, call who they're going to call, maybe there was an earthquake, maybe -- you know, the climate changing and the times are changing, and the land is responding in ways aren't always, you know, appreciable to our quality of life.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Sekita?

SEKITA GRANT: Okay. So I have sev- -- these are awesome. I'm really excited to see all of these ideas coming together. I have a few to add.
I would like to add -- where's Kevin? He left.

He stepped out -- a friendly amendment to one of his recommendations. He talked about using a different mobility types to ensure sustainability in economies of scale. I think it was up higher, but I would love to add in addition to ensuring sustainability to economies of scale, also ensuring accessibility to -- so I'm proposing an amendment to one of your recommendations around using different vehicle sizes and types to ensure economies of scale and ensure sustainability, and I recommend that we also include ensuring accessibility to the disadvantaged communities in addition to that.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Absolutely.

SEKITA GRANT: Okay. A couple more. And I -- this really goes to what Rey was talk-- actually, everybody who's spoke, and Katie coming in, as well, and Luis.

Having community driven mobility needs assessments that inform equitable investments, regulations, and implementation strategies.

So if you are talking about the need for more proper shade for bus stops or supporting programs like Green Raiteros, or the una plasa for people to come chill at, whatever it is that kind of plays in to one creating more sustainable communities, but you're coming up with
ideas and programs and projects that are from the community. It's not folks coming from outside to say this is how -- you know, everybody should have an electric vehicle, or everybody should be in public transit, because that might not work for the community.

Assessments -- inform equitable investments, not assessments. Investments, regulation and implementation strategies.

And one -- yeah, thank you.

A couple other ones. One is this broad concept of increasing access to clean mobility options. And this is something we'll talk about a little bit in our deep dive that's happening with the 350 studies, but how do we increase access to these technologies? Whatever it is, whatever is -- you know, with the right form of mobility for the community, whether it's trackable, walkable, electric vehicles, how do you increase access to technologies, particularly if their upfront costs are really high, particularly if the business model is not yet in those communities? How do we get the technologies there?

Another thing is thinking about -- I want to definitely support Luis mentioning shared mobility. He's already talked about that, but two more things.

Just transition for communities, individuals,
and small businesses reliant on fossil fuel based transportation. And that is to say, as we're moving from this fossil fuel based economy to a clean energy economy, making sure that we're not burdening communities, disadvantaged communities, underserved communities, you know, whatever the term being used, but that we are providing pathways into the clean energy economy through jobs, through investments, through technology access.

And then the final thing is around research. So how do we infuse environmental justice consideration and equity in the pre-policy -- and this is broadly through the Scoping Plan -- pre-policy research? There's a lot that goes into when staff starts drafting a Scoping Plan. There's a lot of research that starts years before that -- you know, the Energy Commission does, Air Resources Board, they're, you know, using consultants like E3, and UC Berkeley and UC Davis to do studies on what the future of our transportation and our energy systems should look like. And those studies do not have EJ at the table. And they're starting to, but we need to, I think, vocalize the need for that. Because a lot of what's getting pulled into the Scoping Plan is starting from conversations that we don't even see. So I think it's important to have that as a recommendation here.

SARAH RUBIN: Gisele. Thank you.
KEVIN HAMILTON: Can you go down a little, Trish, because I saw something on the bottom that I was looking at recommending.

Oh, see, so I didn't mean -- second line down from the top now, this wasn't specific to just communities near Fresno and the San Joaquin Valley. This is for -- for, by the way, 75 percent of California, the 25 percent that's not in L.A. or San Diego or in the Bay Area.

SARAH RUBIN: Great. Gisele.

GISELE FONG: So first, I have a process question. So I thought that we were doing the deep dive kind of processing, so I have actually a comment about the deep dives and maybe suggestions on it, but then I also some have recommendations. So one thing --

SARAH RUBIN: So just process wise, so your comments on the deep dives, or anyone's, those get captured in the notes, and then once you switch to recommendations, she's capturing the recommendations on the screen. That's the distinction.

GISELE FONG: Okay. So one thing about the deep dives is that we had a deep dive on sustainable freight strategy, and we also had a deep dive, sort of a cursory one, on SB350. So what would be really helpful for me as an EJAC member, would be to get a clearer sense of how those different parallel efforts are intersecting with the
Scoping Plan. Because there's so many different pockets and different, you know, pieces of this work, that it would be very helpful for me to understand, you know, where those different puzzle pieces fit in. So that's one thing.

And I think secondly, just -- you know, we recognize that the draft Scoping Plan is not out yet, but for me as an EJAC member, there -- it was helpful as an overview. It was -- I -- I have so many more questions, though, you know, really echoing exactly what the EJAC members have said. You know, how are -- how is this all going? You know, what are the metrics? What is the data that we're, you know, using to evaluate the efforts. So that would be really helpful. And I hope -- hopefully that will come in round two, but just as a general feedback on the deep dives that it was helpful as an overview, not so helpful as getting into the -- what would help me as an EJAC member evaluate and to make deeper recommendations. Okay. So that's that.

So I just wanted to -- in terms of recommendations, I really wanted to lift up the work of the California Cleaner Freight Coalition, because in terms of the work on sustainable freight strategies and the intense work that has gone on, that this is our -- for us on EJAC. And there's many of us on the EJAC who are part
of the California Cleaner Freight Coalition. The work is already being done here. Right? And -- and we can actually learn a lot from the recommendations that are being shaken. Certainly, it would be up for a discussion for us as EJAC members to consider those, but I really wanted to make that known to us as EJAC members, that there are white papers out there, you know, there -- and what I'm going to do right now to lift up some of the recommendations that come actually directly from the -- the California Cleaner Freight Coalition.

And I know that the CCFC has been meeting with ARB monthly, and so one of the questions that I have for ARB is how actually that continuous relationship with the Cleaner Freight Coalition is being responded to, or how -- how that is actually being used to shape Scoping Plan recommendations? So that -- I would like some feedback on that.

But let me just kind of list out a few things for EJAC consideration on the recommendations around freight transportation. And I think that it's very, very parallel with the types of thoughts on moving towards cleaner personal transportation or public transportation, and that we're focusing on first freight transportation here, that the goal, obviously, is to work towards zero emissions.
And some of the -- for those of us that live in ports and its communities understand how difficult it is for those -- for us to actually get to zero emissions based off of the difficulties in clear market signals and operationalizing within a larger scale. And so some of the recommendations would be to emphasize technology forcing regulations so that we can give clearer market signal for manufacturers and operators. And I think that it's also, you know, really understanding that there are -- there's a whole kind of pipeline of technology, as many of us know within the room, and to really think about what are those near-term wins, so that those of us that look and can clearly see, for example, port operations, which are the ones that are the near-term wins so that we can actually start creating the stronger pipelines, market pipelines for those technologies that are farther out. And then, you know, just kind of tagging onto Kevin's comment earlier about infrastructure, I mean, the same thing is true of defining, you know, how can be better strengthen infrastructure for zero emissions freight transportation; right? And so I'm not -- so thinking about fueling stations and thinking about battery refueling stations and so forth within the whole corridor of the freight operations. So I just wanted to put a caveat there for infrastructure, but specifically on
freight.

I'm almost done.

And then I think just lastly, just to tag on the community participation, I mean, that should be kind of a overall, you know, for every single piece of the work that we do to make sure that we are ground truthing and the -- it's happening and to really listen to the communities.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. I'm hoping to wrap up this agenda item in about seven minutes. So we've got Tom, we've got Kevin, and we've got Rey, and so if everybody is pretty quick, then we will get ready to move on, and then we'll be heading towards lunchtime.

Go ahead.

TOM FRANTZ: I had my own deep dive, private deep dive with part of staff on the low carbon fuel standard, so that's to lower the carbon intensity of transportation fuels by 10 percent by 2020.

So one rec- -- one strong recommendation, because they're easily making that target. And one thing the low carbon fuel standard is, if you provide gasoline or diesel, your carbon intensity is about 100, so you get that down to 90 by buying credits for the people that are making electric chargers available to the community. And they have a carbon intensity down to about 33. So buying credits from them allows you to say your fuel is down at
10 percent less. So we have to go way beyond that, so we're recommending, I'd say, a 25 percent, to go from 10 to 25 percent, but it should be 30 percent.

Right now, they're lowering the target by about two percentage points a year, and if we do that from 2030 to 20-- -- from 2020 to 2030, we should be able to get another 20 points off of that to go from 10 percent currently to 30 percent for the low carbon fuel standard. That's the first recommendation. Increase that target now, so everybody knows it's coming in 2020. They have to start incrementally going at about the same rate they're going right now, quite frankly, in reducing that. And we'll get a lot of electric chargers built with the credits that are generated.

Secondly, you have to do -- it's unique to the -- kind of unique to the low carbon fuel standard, you have to do a life cycle assessment of each type of fuel, meaning a well to wheels, what all goes into producing that fuel, including land use changes. But one thing -- we recommended this many years ago, the very first time the EJAC was meeting, that they look at if you make fuel out of food, how does that affect food prices around the world? That has never been analyzed by CARB or included one bit in this low carbon life cycle assessment. But there's a huge impact on food prices or basic grain
commodity prices around the world when the U.S. grows so much corn to make into ethanol. So that needs to be included in the life cycle assessment, and the economists can figure that out.

And then finally, the -- I talked to you about how gasoline and diesel is at 100 in carbon intensity and electric charging stations at like 33. If you are a dairy right now that builds a digester, you get to have that -- and if that gas you collect goes to a transportation fuel, you get a carbon intensity rating of negative 307. And there's no life cycle assessment of what went into making that methane, and that's not right. The dairy is so totally unsustainable in its use of cheap fossil fuel, that to say now that they have this waste product that they can sell for a million dollars with no analysis of how that waste product became a transportation fuel in the first place -- it shouldn't even have been produced, that methane, yet now that they do it in a very unsustainable way, now they get a huge carbon credit for it. There's got to be a better analysis of that. And if we mandate methane reductions from dairies, this problem goes away, but quite frankly, it's a real injustice to subsidize a dairy right now for collecting a little bit of their waste gas and allow them to be paid literally thousands and thousands of hundreds of thousands of dollars from the
gasoline companies so that they can meet the low carbon 

gasoline companies so that they can meet the low carbon fuel standard. It's in my paper. 

TRISH JOHNSON: Yeah, I'm just going to copy them over. For Number 1, you're changing 10 to what percentage? 

TOM FRANTZ: Instead of 25, it should be 30. 

TRISH JOHNSON: Oh, I see. 

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So we're going to go to 

Kevin, Rey, Sekita, and we have to wrap up. We're getting a little too behind. We're really on a two minutes left 

moment. 

KEVIN HAMILTON: I'll be really quick. 

So I just wanted to support Sekita's recommendation for the -- sorry, Gisele's recommendation. 

For those of us who've been working on sustainable freight for seems like all our lives sometimes, but certainly for the last five years constructively and creating and submitting to ARB a vision for a sustainable freight system in California. It does embrace pretty much everything that was discussed today, including the life cycle discussion and the fuels and the batteries and the vehicles themselves. 

If you don't have it, I'm happy to send it to 

Trish so that -- I've got it right here. I'm happy to e-mail it to Trish right now so that it can be sent out to
folks. I think I did the best that I could, and I know
others did as well, to circulate it around at the time.
When the sustainable freight workshop was held at ARB, out
of 15 commenters, 13 were from CC-- from CCFC, and so we
are leading the discussion on this issue around
sustainable freight. So essentially, for this group, I
would ask that you review that document and see if it
meets your needs and make any amendments that you think
you would add to it.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So for the notes, Kevin is
going to e-mail the document, ARB will distribute it, and
the request is for all members to review it and comment.

All right. Rey, and then we're going to wrap up
this agenda item after Sekita.

REY LEON: I just want to remind the -- all the
colleagues that at the last meeting in San Bernardino, we
spoke to the strain that would connect with all of these,
which was workforce jobs and economic development. So,
you know, just keeping that in mind in regards to, say, in
this case, the transportation and land use, you know, how
is it that we can incentivize through GGRF to ensure that
local communities actually -- you know, also benefiting
economically; right? And the people are actually getting
a employed from the local community, as well.

Because at the end of the day, I think -- well,
and additional incentive would be to, you know -- there's a lot of our communities that lack not just infrastructure, but critical resources. My home town has not had a pharmacy forever. We submitted it to Strategic Growth Council to do a veteran and affordable housing unit that will be two stories mixed use with a pharmacy. For the first time ever, we're going to have a pharmacy, hopefully, if it gets accepted.

So, you know, just, you know, identifying those type of situations where, you know, these disadvantaged communities have been lacking, you know, whatever resource for such a long time, and this is an opportunity to basically provide a solution to more than one problem.

Thank you.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

Okay. So after Sekita, we're going to be switching to our next agenda item, but I'm going to remind you all that before we do that, I'm going to again ask folks to stand up to give us a little wiggle break, and students, I'm coming to you. We're going to ask a couple of you if you'd be willing to share in Spanish, so we hear some comments from you all in Spanish. Luis is going to translate. And then we're going to move on to our next segment before lunch. And at 12:00 o'clock we're going to ask for public comment. 12:15 is lunch.
SEKITA GRANT: Okay. I have three -- three comments. The first is around the sustainable freight deep dive. I think one of the reactions I had was there is -- you know, there's three goals or 2030 targets, improve system efficiency by 25 percent by 2030, deploy over a hundred thousand freight vehicles capable of zero emission, and fostering economic growth. And for the last two, I think it's critical that when we put out these policy documents, that there is a -- there's specific language identifying how we're going to -- we're going to achieve this particularly in disadvantaged communities and local areas.

So you have an overarching goal of, say, reaching a hundred thousand freight vehicles capable of zero emission. How are you getting those vehicles into disadvantaged communities? What is the plan or goal or target there? And to raise a point around jobs and other cobenefit. Not even cobenefits, when you have a goal around fostering economic growth, what does that look like? What is the goal specifically within low income areas and disadvantaged communities?

The second piece, I just want to touch on the second deep dive or overview that was had around 350 studies. So right now, one of -- one of the priorities
identified was -- or I identified. I don't know if anybody else agreed with me yet -- but really increasing access to these technologies, these mobility options within low-moderate income communities and disadvantaged communities. The 350 studies are looking exactly at that. They're looking at what are the barriers to getting more public -- permanent public transportation, neighborhood-based public transportation within disadvantaged communities, more electric vehicles, all of these things, what are the barriers or what are the solutions to overcoming those barriers? And ideally, the solutions are coming from the communities.

So really encouraging folks to feel free to reach out to me, but if you have any ideas on how or why your communities are not receiving the -- those clean mobility options that you know exist, feel free -- you know, I can put you in contact with the right person or you can reach out to me, but this is really important for us to be engaged in that. And this is also a call that the Scoping Plan should connect to those studies. There should be -- there should be reference or even integration of the recommendations made in the 350 studies within the Scoping Plan.

SARAH RUBIN: Sekita, what's the time line for the 350 studies right now? Sorry.

And then the last thing that I really wanted to have more of a robust discussion, but I know we don't have time, to have prog- -- how do we -- the process, basically, how do you strengthen the process to ensure that we're meeting these recommendations?

So in preparing for this, I looked at our 2014 -- EJACs 2014 recommendations. It's very difficult to tell what has been done, what has not been done. I think this gets a lot to Katie's points around metrics. And so I really wanted to hear recommendations, and folks can -- maybe we can have a follow-up discussion on this, about how we make -- all these recommendations we're putting down, how do they make -- ensure that there's transparency, there's follow-up, and there's -- there's metrics there? And the three things that I recommended are having quantifiable metrics embedded within all of our recommendations. So that's in part for us to do. Perhaps that's something a consultant can help with if CARB is looking at what the scope is for a consultant.

MARI ROSE TARUC:  Should Trish be writing this down?

SARAH RUBIN:  It's on her paper. It's on Page 2 of her handout.

SEKITA GRANT:  Yeah.
MARI ROSE TARUC: Are we going to include it in the recommendations?

SEKITA GRANT: Trish, the top of the page was -- the bottom is the new stuff.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Oh, so that last of recommendations was for our recommendations. Just clarifying, because I read your thing, and I didn't -- I wasn't clear that those last three recommendations were for our recommendations, not just for the broad Scoping Plan recommendations. So for each thing we recommend, you want a quantifiable metric and detailing that.

SEKITA GRANT: It was intended to be just for transportation, but I think you're bringing up a good point that it could be valuable for -- for overall.

So anyways, those are the three. Having accountable agencies, and maybe even EJAC members who are accountable for a certain recommendation. And I say that to also, along with that, understanding how the nonprofit world works, there needs to be, you know, money for that, whether it's with -- from the State or outside. There needs to be fundraising to ensure that, you know, if the EJAC is able -- ideally, the EJAC continues and is monitoring progress throughout. This is what happens with the SB535 Coalition. There should be something equivalent on the EJAC side.
And then the final thing is just reporting requirements of fault, meaning how are we checking in. And having worked for the State, a lot of reports can be very draining of resources, so maybe that's not the right method or we can work around that, but at least meetings and check-ins.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

So Trish, I'm sorry if you already did this, because it is, as we all know, challenging. Did you copy those recommendations to the top where Katie's questions were at the very top of the document?

Okay. Thank you.

Okay. If everyone wants to -- oh, wait, do I -- have I missed anyone? Are these table tents down?

Luis?

LUIS OLMEDO: I just have a follow-up on Sekita. You've got quantifiable metrics, if you can explain that a bit more. And the reason I ask is because whenever we talk about rural communities, the numbers don't always add up, and so it's -- I just want clarification of what you mean by quantifiable metrics, and how that doesn't create a disadvantage for rural communities, because we're seeing it in the housing, for example. We're seeing it in other areas where the numbers just don't play out, you know. And it's leading rural
communities outside of a competitive process when it comes
to -- when it gets to an investment purpose.

SEKITA GRANT: Yeah. And I think to your -- to
your question, I think that's a great point, and Mari Rose
and I were just talking briefly about how we're defining
costs and benefits, so this -- these definitions should be
coming from this group. And so I think what happens with
rural communities, there's -- you are dealing with metrics
that were designed for L.A., not necessarily for your
community. So that, I think, is a critical point, and you
could even have metrics that are based on job review or
based on size of the community, or something like that.
But ideally, those metrics are coming from -- from this
group.

SARAH RUBIN: Diane?

THE REPORTER: I can't hear you.

SARAH RUBIN: We're adding quantifiable metrics,
community driven quantifiable metrics with geographic
consideration.

Diane, Martha, and then we are wrapping up this
agenda item.

DIANE TAKVORIAN: I just wanted to ask -- I
think Katie may have said this in the beginning, but I'm
not completely sure, and I wonder if there's a question
that can be asked for information about the conflicts that
are created as a result of meeting freight requirements and how those conflict with sustainable transportation recommendations, because that seems to happen on the ground every day. So I thought Katie said that, or something like that, but I'm not sure. So if that could get added -- you didn't?

So the question is, how are the requirements related to goods movement and freight frustrating or conflicting with sustainable transportation requirements and/or the recommendations that I'm hearing that are coming up here? Does that make sense?

SARAH RUBIN: So for the record, that's a follow-up item.

DIANE TAKVORIAN: Well, it's a question.

SARAH RUBIN: It's a question that I think, given time limits, will need follow-up.

Let's come to Martha.

MARTHA ARGUELLO: And it's related to my question, which is clear I did not do enough homework. These all -- all of these actions will have consequences. And I don't like calling them unintended, because sometimes I think they're very well -- they're intended. So these metrics around displacement indemnification are going to be really difficult, and we have to figure those out. And those are going to be
really different in urban ar-- urban, suburban, and rural areas. So this question of -- I don't know how to phrase it, so I'm struggling because it's related to what Diane was saying. Some of our actions on the ground, some of the policies have real consequences on the ground, so, you know, how long -- how much longer do we want to use natural gas in our transportation? You know, what are the drivers of -- of us having that cheap gas?

I'm sorry I don't have a recommendation.

SARAH RUBIN: That's okay. Thank you. Great job.

I think we should give Trish a round of applause because it's hard to have your notes be on screen. Thank you Trish for your perseverance.

Okay. It's stand up and stretch moment before we move to our last agenda item before lunch. Everyone up, up, up. Wave to the ceiling.

Okay. If we could hear from one or two students, whatever you prefer, in English or Spanish, what -- something that was interesting for you about this meeting or boring. Someone's got to do it, or we'll never go to lunch. Say your name.

STUDENT ALBERTO LOPEZ: My name is Alberto Lopez, and I've never been to these type of meetings, but it's actually interesting hearing you guys talk about
how -- you guys throw out ideas, and it's interesting how
the ideas you throw, it helps actually our environment,
and you guys are trying just to better us, you know. It's
interesting for me, and I just want to thank you guys for
doing what you guys do.

SARAH RUBIN: Very cool. Great. Okay. One
more person. One more person. One more. Someone's got
to do it.

STUDENT: (Translated from Spanish.) I just
wanted to thank everybody for what they're doing. It's
very interesting to see there are people that are worried
about our environment, and I'm very grateful to be able to
be present in a meeting like this.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Did I have one last hand,
because we're so happy you're here. Did one of you want
to say something? You don't have to. You don't have to.
You want to?

STUDENT: (Translated from Spanish.) It's very
interesting for me to hear about transportation issues
because I commute a lot to Calexico, so I can actually see
the changes when I commute. And that's all. Thank you so
much for all you are doing for us.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. We've got one quick comment
from Luis. Grab a water, if you want, and then we'll get
started again in a moment.
LUIS OLMEDO: So I just wanted to make a couple of quick mentions. I wanted to recognize that we do have some members of Comites Air Quality Monitoring Program, so we have Anita, and we have Ray, and we have John. They're members of -- advisory members of our air monitoring program. And I want to recognize that we have members of Una Sola Fuerza (phonetic), which are from the Coachella Valley, so we have representation from the Coachella Valley, as well.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So Stephanie, you're going to be back up, if folks want to find their seats. We have one last item. At noon, we are going to take public comment. At 12:15, lunch.

- 2030 TARGET SCOPING PLAN: PART 3 -

STEPHANIE KATO: So the next paper, which is basically similar format to the transportation one, covers energy, water and green buildings. Clearly, we went to water and green buildings to get energy because of the synergies and connections there. As far as energy goes, the main new measure driving reductions there is Senate Bill 350. You know, we're continuing on with a 33 percent RPS at 2020, but SB350 moves us to 50 percent by 2030, I guess at a minimum, and also requires us to look at doubling energy efficiency and electricity and natural gas
uses by that same time frame. So those are some of the
core, you know, new measures that we're -- we're using to
push green house gas reductions in this sector.

 Clearly, we're going to keep relying on our
existing building compliance codes and make progress in
those areas. Also, you know, some of our more locally
driven programs, like the building solar roofs program.
And we also have our SB1122 bioenergy feed-in tariff, so
that's trying to get more bioenergy in certain classes to
deal with waste from dairies and food waste and forest
waste.

 And as far as the water sector discussions go,
those have pointed out that basically the GHG emissions
from that sector are coming from the energy needed to
treat, to move water, so that group has been discussing
basically building off the set of recommendations from the
original Scoping Plan and also the 2014 update. So it
would be looking at what more we could do on the water
conservation front, more use of recycled or gray water,
looking at SB350's doubling energy efficiency and applying
that to the water sector, so looking at how we pump, could
we make the equipment more efficient, looking at
collecting, you know, water from urban runoff, and using
that to better infiltrate into our ground water resources.

 And one of the other main components that's
being driven by the short-lived climate pollutant strategy
for water sector is that to look at ways to better capture
methane that's being generated during the anaerobic
digestion of waste at those plants.

And as far as the green building sector goes,
the energy efficiency mandates are driving a lot of that,
but green buildings, because it looks beyond just energy,
it's looking at buildings in a more integrated manner,
looking at the effects of the built environment, so we're
looking at things we can do to improve transportation
around buildings, you know, how people commute to work,
commute to different business areas, we're looking at
better handling of waste at buildings, use of green
materials or lower carbon intensity materials in
buildings.

We also talked a bit about green roofs, although
that has brought about some issues with water use, and so
more recent discussions have been involved around use of
pool roofs, which is, you know, light gleaning or
reflective materials to reduce urban heat island effects.

Long-term goals we're talking about are to look
beyond just the current zero net energy goals established
by the POC and CEC, and to, by 2050, enter transition to
this more idea of zero carbon buildings. So that's
another one that we see there as a concept.
And one of the things that, you know, we're interested in hearing from this group is, is we've got these large overarching goals, but how do -- how do you see them being implemented, you know, at the local level? So with like the 50 percent RPS, do you see that more being utility-scale renewables, are we talking about, you know, large solar and wind farms and, you know, the land use required around that, or are we talking about a lot more maybe renewable distributed generation?

There's a lot of conversation right now about how to move away from natural gas use in buildings, how do we reduce the greenhouse gases from heating water and that type of thing, so do we move towards electrification on that front, or do you see biogas applications on that front? So that's -- that's the nature of some of the conversations we've been having about what are the specifics, and those specifics can be built into some of scenarios that we're working on, and you can see the resulting GHG impacts and cost effects with -- with the choices being made.

So we're going to hear from this group about their specific recommendations and whether or not we've captured a lot of the major actions going forward in these sectors.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.
So I would suggest we just circle around. We can start with Kevin.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Start on other side.

SARAH RUBIN: Other side. All right. Want to start? Katie, start us off.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Sure.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: I'm starting all the fun, but I'll take that.

So two questions I have for this is, you know, looking at the 2014 report, there wasn't -- it didn't seem like folks were able to disaggregate how much of a percentage of change in the energy sector was due to consumer demand or due to program and regulatory changes. And so I'd really like to see that analysis done, if not for this Scoping Plan, then for the 2020 check-in point that I'm talking about.

My second question is about the percentage of building stock impacted. You give a lot of numbers, but I'd like to know what that represents as far as percentage of building stock that's transitioned and where those buildings are generally located. Specifically, I'm interested in how many -- what percentage of the buildings that have been transitioned are located in environmental justice communities. The same thing for the green
buildings.

And then finally, the point you made about asking about implementation barriers, a big barrier has been roof quality for eligible households, especially for solar panels. Secondary would obviously be incentives for multi-family owners to transition, since a lot of the financial benefit goes to the tenants. We're not seeing any shift in the apartments, where most of our lower income folks are living.

And the final key fact is the electrical upgrades that need to happen in houses. I know we were talking about this yesterday, but a lot of these buildings have really old electrical systems that can't support either solar or EVs, even if we put them -- get them to people for free, they wouldn't be able to charge them at their homes, and that's a big barrier.

So I'd like to see those considerations included, both how we make our funding available for roof and other building and electrical upgrades that need to happen to ensure access.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

ELEANOR TORRES: Well, just a few observations. In terms of the green roofs, for instance, I just want to address green roofs for a moment, that those don't really work in Southern California, not just because of the water
issue. Green roofs are something that started in the east part of the country. The problem with green roofs here is our arid environment, and it really doesn't function that way. However, green roofs have been very effective in insulated buildings.

The other issue I have, particularly with the -- well, smart growth, the fact is, with what's going on in Southern California and in terms of funding that's been made available to them, to Southern California, we only had, by virtue of the criteria that's been established, one city that got funded in Southern California for this kind of affordable housing. So that -- that's a real problem that needs to be addressed.

The other issue is affordable housing. And you -- you started talking about it, Katie, but the -- the stock that is currently available, protocols to weatherize or any number of strategies that you can use, we need to retrofit those houses, because it's great that we're doing new builds that are green, but with -- the fact is, we have a huge stock that needs to be addressed at this point.

Urban forestry, there's a way that we could integrate urban forestry in terms of working with communities to do strategic planting, whether it's the homes or commercial properties or any of that. But with
residential, you can reduce your energy consumption by 20
to 30 percent by strategic planting. I also would like to
include beside urban forestry in the language, green
infrastructure. Because it's not just urban forestry or
just trees, it's the integrated approach of green
infrastructure when we're talking about green building or
great planting.

You asked about how we can get this into the
communities or -- I -- I don't know how it happened, but
this is something that we really encourage regions, is
being able to be a part of the master planning. That's
exactly what we're doing in the County of San Bernardino
with the Director of Land Use for the County to make
recommendations, for instance, to grow -- well, to install
urban gardens into developments or low income developments
and whatnot.

That's it.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

So one of the things that happens is we start to
geretired -- is -- I've been in Trish's spot a lot. So
if -- we have 20 minutes left before we move to public
comment. Can you start by saying, "This is a comment" or
"This is a recommendation," because when you are in her
seat, you are listening, "This is a recommendation," and
it's really tiring.
So go ahead.

REY LEON: Recommendation. I would like EV infrastructure passed. EV is electric vehicles. You know, it's -- as far as I know, the Cal ISO is conducting an assessment of that, but only at a statewide level. My recommendation is that it is conducted at a community basis level. Because we have low income communities, DACs, as we're identifying them, that don't have the capacity yet. On this other end, we have all these incentives, the help Plus-Up and everything else, helping those same communities to purchase a vehicle, an electric vehicle or a plug-in hybrid, and we aren't ensuring that the infrastructure for the future, as it keeps on growing, is not sufficient, then it's a problem. So we need to really do an assessment on the communities, DACs and rural communities, to ensure that -- to get an idea of where -- where it's at in regards to the EV charging capacity and the -- identify what we got to do there. Right? Of course we're going to have to build it up. Thank you.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

Mari Rose, then go to Martha.

MARI ROSE TARUC: I'm going to start with a question. We did not get a deep dive session for energy yet, and so we need to do that. And so I was relying on the 2008, 2013 emissions chart. And so one of the things
that I noticed about electricity there, for the 2011 to 2013 period, is that we -- there were increases in emissions of 9 million metric tons for in-state electricity generation, and then we reduced electricity import emissions by 5.5 million. So I'm wondering -- the question is, why is that happening, where our in-state generation is higher than our imports?

And then, so from there, my first recommendation is for developing aggressive renewable energy targets. I think I want -- I want to echo the EJAC recommendations from 2014. So all of those recommendations, let's bring it back, because I feel like there's -- there's a lot that's in there, both on ideas for bringing in renewable energy and rejecting some false promises of how we reduce our energy or electricity emissions. So bring those all back.

So in terms of the aggressive -- one of the recommendations from 2014 is to aggressively pursue a hundred percent renewables for California. And I know right now in statute, the law is to get to 50 percent renewable energy by 2030, but I think we need to be more aggressive than that, especially if the other industrial sectors are not performing the -- or reducing the emissions that we need to get to to 2030. So we can even benchmark that in terms of achieving the 50 percent
renewables before 2030.

Also, from the 2014 ideas that I want to bring back, and this is a little bit of a new take on it, there are -- we can create microgrids where communities or neighborhoods are self-sufficient in terms of electricity, where we have our own generation and we can use that and access that. So especially when we talk about climate disasters like a wildfire or a big storm that takes out energy, the transmission lines then don't work, and so our communities are left in the dark, literally. And so we can actually create microgrids that are self-sufficient, and I think let's pilot ten to a hundred of those, and the primar-- starting and primarily happening in environmental justice communities.

I also want to recommend that we don't dilute California's progress in electricity emissions reductions. There are clean power plan recommendations to basically continue Cap-and-Trade through the Clean Power Plan, and I don't want us -- I don't want California to commit to that or have this leakage of our renewable energy benefits taken away from California to other states. So I want to maintain the California benefits to our clean energy infrastructure and improve upon those.

And then the last recommendation is to maximize our job and economic benefits, not just through energy,
but I actually think -- so throughout -- and I've heard that idea from Rey and Sekita and others -- I actually want to see a section in the Scoping Plan around job and economic benefits, and that there is a specific plan and target for the environmental justice communities.

SARAH RUBIN: Martha.

MARTHA ARGUELLO: I'm really glad that -- I'm really glad Mari Rose talked about this idea of a pilot project. So I also think that dealing with this -- the -- so these are comments, and then hopefully it will get to a recommendation.

So this idea of how you deal with rental units and all of the barriers that Katie talked about. So I'd like to propose that we do a pilot project. We did one very similar with apartment owners in doing integrated pest management. And when we got them to agree, we went in and did the pest management, came back and evaluated whether it worked. So can we develop a plan that -- with, you know, substandard low-income housing and how we do the retrofits, how we bundle services, so that you're going in and you're -- if HUD has money for lead remediation, well that gets done, if there's weatherization funding, that gets done, all of those things. Much like they're trying to do with access to energy efficient appliances and cars, where there's now one place to call and you get all those
services. And that's how we start getting to the rental units, by working with landlords.

And then I also want to reiterate this idea that we need community-generated power that leads to community-generated jobs.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

Tom. Go ahead.

TOM FRANTZ: Yes. On carbon capture and sequestration, I recommend we should recommend that it be totally eliminated as a possibility in California for reducing greenhouse gases. And the reason why is, it's either going to be done to get more oil out of the ground or enhanced oil recovery, or it's going to be simply injected into the ground next to an environmental justice community like in Kern County, Buttonwillow, or Kings County, Kettleman City. That's where -- the only place it will ever be permitted, so just forget about it. That's the first recommendation.

Second, pumping water in the state is one of the biggest energy users. Northern California water ends up in San Diego and it has to be pumped. There should be a goal of CARB to make the pumping of water in California 100 percent renewable by 2030, both the massive state projects and agricultural and urban water pumping. It should be a specific goal. And too many farmers today are
taking electric pumps out of commission and putting in cheaper fuel pumps, such as diesel and gas. Today.

Something is wrong with that. Something is wrong with our rules that that's even allowed today with all these other goals. But it should be 100 percent renewable, and farmers are doing their part, as well, they're putting in solar panels. Because this is a goal that pays for itself in like seven years. There's no reason not to do it. The investment in renewable energy pays for itself. Solar panels. It's ridiculous that we can't move water with a hundred percent renewable energy in this state, and we should do it very quickly. Thank you.

SARAH RUBIN: Kevin.

KEVIN HAMILTON: So -- comment. We need to be pushing back against the drive-by investor on the utilities to hold back progression of solar in this state. They have launched an aggressive effort saying there's too much solar coming too fast to personal houses and residents, and they want within their districts -- now, it works very well for them, because if you don't live in an investor-owned utility district, this is isn't going to affect you. But they're actually carved out in a plan in various places with special considerations. I would recommend that we remove special considerations for investor-owned utilities. They should be treated like
every other utility in the state. There should be no carve-out, no special consideration.

The second thing is, we need to ensure that in requiring them to develop power that is the most efficient and the most effective and reliable, that the investment in that infrastructure that they have to make does not fall back on rate payers. And that's how the investor-owned utilities have done this to date. So what happens is, I get a solar panel in a community, a disadvantaged community, it gets put on the house, PG&E turns around and says, Well -- and they've actually passed this rule -- you can't really accumulate your benefit from that more than one month. If you feed us more power than you use, then at the end of the month, if it didn't cost as much as you used, you don't get to carry that over into the next month. So they've got the gain of having that power, but they no longer have to pay you back for that.

They also are charging those consumers for simply being connected up to their network. And when they do use power, they're back on higher rate plans. So when they reach peak rate periods, they're paying extreme rates. So we're seeing low-income households all over our community, and the community-based organizations that serve them, that help them pay electric bills, are being just rolled under by the number of people coming to them.
with applications whose electricity is being turned off. Meanwhile, the stockholders in these corporations are seeing the best returns on their investment they've seen in history.

So I have no problem with them getting returns on their investment, but they need to play on the same playing field that the municipally-owned utilities are playing on. There should be no special carve-outs for investor-owned utilities. So I'm just going to leave it at that. I've got other things, but --

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Luis, did you want to add in, or not now?

LUIS OLMEDO: So I've got just a couple of thoughts and recommendations, but desert communities, tree forestation -- so desert community -- add to that desert native tree forestation and tree canopy to reduce energy consumption.

I know we talk a lot about urban forestry and we never think about desert forestry. But as you will experience later today, you're going to go outside and you're going to be under a shade, and the heat will reduce significantly. Desert areas consume an enormous amount of energy because, as you experience today, you need to have air conditioning. You need to have high ceilings. And it's something that, you know, in the desert a lot of
people don't think, Well, why are we going to plant trees? It's the desert. Well, there are native trees that can be planted, and they can be a native forestry plan for deserts. And that's something that has been left out. That's something that has not been considered in the whole scheme of reducing the emissions from -- from -- through energy efficacy.

Another thing is, I want to throw it out there that we should really be careful of what technologies are put on the table when it comes to utilizing natural resources such as water to create an energy source. And there should be considerable amount of reinvestment in the community elsewhere if that is a option that's being sought out, and I want to say such as geothermal.

I know that yesterday we heard about some technology that won't use water, but I really think we really need to pay attention to whether there are community benefits going back or whether it's just taking one natural resource to create energy, and really where is the offset.

The other thing I was going to say is, we talked about solar. For those of you who travel from San Diego, you might have seen some of the desert lands that were once undisturbed, now large scale, but you don't see them on our rooftops. You have to go to San Diego or L.A. or
to large cities. Why is it such a trend to put it on top of ceilings, and why isn't that trend carried out to desert communities. And yet that energy isn't being reinvested in our community, that energy is going to San Diego. Now, how equitable is that?

Another problem that we leave out is, when you talk about job creation, we're actually killing jobs. Because when it becomes too difficult for companies and energy companies to build on desert land because of all the CEQA and DEPA and all other permitting processes, they go to agricultural lands because that becomes easier.

Well, what happens? Well, you take food out of production, you take farm workers out of their jobs. And we never bring that into the discussion. But yet we're saying, Oh, we're creating jobs. Yeah, you're creating jobs, six-month jobs. But then a hundred years of jobs to farm workers have just been eliminated. And so -- so some things to consider.

Energy efficacy, I think we should start looking at how we can not just benefit owners, because there are areas where you have owners, but you have a lot of renters. And they're not getting the benefit. And the formulas just aren't adding up. We need to bring low-cost technologies, stacking technologies, as well, whether it's weatherization technologies to, you know, like Smart, and
learning types of meters for -- for air conditioners, for, you know, solar, and weatherization, and a number of technologies, but make sure that those returns are going back to the renter, as well. Because why? When you put that return back into the renter, you're also creating a lot more confidence that the owner will get the rent. Because people are having to make the choice whether they pay for electricity or they pay the rent, and they're really not a participant, they're not a beneficiary, when they're putting these technologies on roofs.

And the other thing that's really impairing our ability to have more gains is the fact that it's the low-income bracket. If you don't fall within that low-income bracket -- this is a disadvantaged community from top to bottom, from Coachella to the border. It's a disadvantaged community. And we need to start thinking about how do we carpet these technologies in the areas where we can actually have greater gains versus trying to checker board it, you know, here and there. And we spend more money, more resources in consultants and supplies, materials and so on than the benefit. So just another thought that we really need to kind of approach it from a whole disadvantage versus just the low-income. And it may work different in other areas, but here, I believe that that would be the best approach.
SARAH RUBIN: Okay. We're just about to wrap up. We're almost to the top of the hour.

ELEANOR TORRES: Just a question. I haven't heard anything about wind energy. Is there any reason why that's been left out of the discussion? Because as you were saying, Luis, one of the great things about the desert, at least the high desert, where I'm from, wind energy is a wonderful renewable source.

SARAH RUBIN: Last comment.

LUIS OLMEDO: I just want to say that there are other experts in the audience, and I want to encourage them during the public comment to please step up to the mic and bring in your expertise. Because all the discussions here, you might just be sitting there saying, I know the answers, so please utilize the public comment period to bring in your own concerns.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. We have one more comment, then we're going to move to public comment.

REY LEON: You know, I guess to remember, we had a workshop in Huron for the west side of the Valley up there up north, and we had people from Huron and Avenal mostly, but it turned out that the only ones that qualified for the Plus Up, which was, you know, a big prize of $16,500 of an incentive, was the community of Huron. And the community of Avenal, which is very similar
to the community of Huron, didn't qualify. You know, and
this is for the electric vehicles. And so, you know --
and while I'm thinking, it's -- it's dependent on
CalEnviroScreen. We're on the 2.0. I'm very confident
that we're moving towards 3.0 and 4.0. It's getting
better.

But, you know, it's based on the power levels
and pollution. And the situation with Avenal is that they
have a prison, so it muffles up their demographics.
Right? And so -- so I think the, you know -- I guess
the -- for the CalEnviroScreen, we really need to push
that we can, you know, further improve it, and also that
there's no air quality monitors in that little sub valley
that is where Avenal is situated. Although we do know
that 23,000 tons of garbage per day are being shipped in
from the County of L.A., and of course we have to deal
with diesel trucks, and there's no monitors. You know,
we're going to be conducting a survey, and hopefully after
that, do something similar to what our colleagues here in
Imperial are doing, some great work in regards to
monitoring. Thank you.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Okay. We're moving to
public comment. Because we have a lot of people, if
everyone could please -- just a minute, I'm going to her
first. If folks could keep it to two minutes, please, we
would totally appreciate it. You're welcome -- anyone is welcome to comment in English or Spanish.

---

-PUBLIC COMMENT-

ANITA NICKLEN: Thank you so much. Anita Nicklen, and I'm part of the community for the air monitoring project. I just want to say that I think we are in the right direction. The fact that we have, you know, the EJAC at this table, you know, that's very important. 99 percent -- 99 percent of us are not usually part of this type of conversation. It is usually the top 1 percent that create the plans and policies that benefit them. Usually, you know, the motivation is to increase their profits. And adding a little bit more on that, you know, as Luis was saying, yeah, we're here in Imperial County. We're paying, you know, high rates in electricity. All the projects that you have seen here, the solar projects and the wind turbine project, that will -- excuse me. You were asking about that. We can -- after the meeting, maybe we can talk about that. Okay. Because that would be another couple of minutes, and I only have a couple of minutes.

So definitely I support, you know, the proposal of having not only ten, but maybe more workshops, because, you know, those workshops have to be presented in
different communities. They are the experts. They know what they're -- they understand very well what's happening in terms of the environment. They know their own needs, and they are the ones experiencing the greatest environmental challenges.

Like, for example, the Imperial Valley, something that you have not mentioned here, the emissions from off-road vehicles. That has not been, you know, mentioned, or at least, you know, in the time that I have been here.

So someone was saying that adding the economic reviewer to the panel is important. I think that, yeah, that's crucial, but also adding, you know, a health expert is crucial. But this person needs to understand also what's happening in the communities. Because you can hire or get someone on that panel, but if that health expert does not understand the health issues here in Imperial County, it's not worth it. So, you know, you need to have that expert. So yeah, thank you.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

RAY ASKINS: I'm Ray Askins, and recently, I've been using a lot of public transportation. But what you presented here today is a eutopic viewpoint. The practical side is if the Imperial Valley Transit System bus breaks down, you're sitting there for another hour for
the bus to come through, and that makes you late to
wherever you're going, say from Calexico to Costco. So
I'm trying to think from Costco, there's no bus, so I got
to find another way of getting back to Calexico. And so
here comes Numero Uno. That's $2.50 for one way, where I
paid .60 to get to Costco. I think this is where you
don't require the bus companies to make up when the --
when the buses break down. They got to pick up the slack;
otherwise, your public transportation is worthless and
then I got to look for another way. I mean, unfortunately
by the time I get to Costco, it's about 2:30, 3:00 o'clock
in the afternoon, when the bus travels to Calexico. But
if that bus breaks down on the return, there's no bus.
What do you do? This is not included. You must require
these public transportation companies, when they do break
down, they must pick up the slack.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

MARK BAZA: Good afternoon. Mark Baza. I'm the
Executive Director for the Imperial County Transportation
Commission and Local Transportation Authority, which is
the sales tax measure agency for Imperial County.

With that said, we are a self-help county, but
we -- 92 percent of our funds go to local roads on our
sales tax measure, so our community has made a definite
commitment to local roads, as many of our roads are a
hundred years old and are in desperate need of improvement.

I wanted to support the recommendation by Katie that said, you know, where land use and transportation planning is important to us all, but it is -- it's also -- it helps us achieve our SCS goals, but we have a challenge to meet those goals, and funding is a part of that, for transit in particular. Transit is a big part of how we are able to meet those goals, and funding is not -- does not come very easily for smaller populations like ourselves. Yes, we get State monies, yes, we can get Federal monies for transit, but it's based on a population formula. And you don't have the flow population of a hundred and eighty thousand people.

So that is our challenge. You know, just as an example, we are part of SCAG region, multi-county -- six county metropolitan planning organization. Now, we were able to meet our SCS goals, in part because L.A. Metro has a major sales tax measure that helps them to build a lot of transit in the L.A. Metro area. But what does that do for us here in Imperial County. That is our challenge.

To build off of Luis's earlier comments related to our cross-border travelers every day. We have -- here in Imperial County, we have 45,000-plus people crossing into our border every day. We have to provide transit
services for those folks that travel into our county every
day. We also have our own citizens that are transit
dependent, as -- as you heard earlier. And yes, we may
have challenges on occasion, but not very often in terms
of broken down vehicles.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

All right. We've got a couple more comments
here, and then I'm going to come to the other side of the
room. You're next.

Okay.

KIMBERLY CLARK: My name is Kimberly Clark. I'm
from the Southern California Association of Governments,
SCAG, and I wanted to echo Mark's concern regarding
funding. And, you know, funding is so important for the
implementation of a sustainable community strategy. And
the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program
saw a good opportunity for that, but more needs to be
done. Obviously, you know, Southern California needs to
get a fair share of funding.

I also wanted to --

SARAH RUBIN: Can you say what SCAG is?

KIMBERLY CLARK: Sure. Absolutely. There is a
question to basically describe what SCAG is.

SARAH RUBIN: No, just say it.

KIMBERLY CLARK: The Southern California
Association of Governments. We're the metropolitan planning organization for Southern California.

Lastly, I just wanted to add, I applaud ARB and the EJAC for having this meeting in the Imperial County. Imperial County is a very important part of the SCAG region and has meek environmental justice issues, and to see the EJAC have a meeting here is really important.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Thank you.

JOHN HERNANDEZ: My name is John Hernandez. I'm a local community member. Been here all my life and have lived in this -- this community. And we just have a whole shitload of problems, because, you know, fennel is our number one industry. And all the trucks that come from the border go all the way to Long Beach, and you know what they do all along the way. And I just want to thank, you know, folks for looking at our direction, and I want to continue to support your efforts at the State level, at the Federal level, and the local level where we -- we are -- we are crying out. We are desperate for -- for help. People are -- our families and our friends are dying around us. People are -- you know, look at the cancer, look at the asthma, look at the economic depression here. We are a hundred-year, you know, this area. And when I walk in here and I see the time, you know, I said, Yeah, we're going have good times, and then
things started heating up, you know, and that's good, because now things are cooling down and we're processing a lot of this good information. So thank you. I hope I can talk to some more people in the course of the day.

SARAH RUBIN: Everyone who has commented, if you could please give our note taker your name, that way she'll have it for the notes.

Okay. Who wants to go first?

EFRAIN SALDIVAL: (Translated from Spanish.) We're a group of truck drivers in the Imperial Valley, and we are here together to express issues regarding them requesting purchasing trucks. They only give us a certain amount miles. Five thousand miles is all we are allowed to use.

Two years ago, they provided us with 50,000 to work during four months. So now, they're only allowing us 5,000, and because of the generation of smoke, they're only allowing it for four months' use, and this is not beneficial for us. It's not a good offer for us. We work in agriculture, and 5,000 miles are not enough for us to work for these four months. This is a problem for us. We don't know how to deal with this. We would like to get some feedback or advice from you, if you can give us a comment regarding this issue that's a problem for us.

MARTHA ARGUELLO: He said that they are being
required to buy new trucks, and I don't think that was translated. I just want to make sure, because that's important to you.

SARAH RUBIN: With the mic.

MARTHA ARGUELLO: So one of the things he said -- and I'll let you go back, I'm sorry -- said that they're required to buy new trucks. That's the part of the translation that didn't make it through.

EFRAIN SALDIVAL: So they mentioned to us, but he's bringing us a document of the entity requiring to buy the -- purchase the new trucks, and it's California Environmental Protection Agency, Air Resources Board that make this request.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

FLOYD VERGARA: So real quickly, the folks who implement the truck and bus regulations are not here at the table, but if you give me your name and number, I'm happy to follow up with you, get the right folks to talk to you about, you know, what your options are and that sort of thing okay.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

Okay. We have another comment over here.

RITA GALINDO: (Translated from Spanish.) Hello, my name is Lisa [sic], and it's the first time that I'm attending one of these meetings, and I'm very happy to
see there are so many people interested in our issues. I come from the Coachella Valley, and I would like to get some information regarding how I can be involved and be a participant to help with these issues, as well. I understand that we have a lot of needs, and we also need a lot of people to get involved. Thank you.

SARAH RUBIN: Anyone else have a public comment?

Okay. We have one last burning add-in, and then we're going to break for lunch.

ANTONIO CAMPOS: All right. Based on all the comments made by ARB, you have to consider that Mexicali is -- and Calexico is one urban community. Even though they have that political border right up the middle of it, what happens in the Mexicali affects Calexico, or for that matter, Imperial County, and vice versa. So when you do your planning, consider taking that they have -- consider the problems with this urban community, Calexico and Mexicali. Because if you just consider Calexico, then your objectives will fail. But if you include Mexicali, you will reach your goals. Now, I do cross back and forth from Mexicali, and I do see the disadvantage of just saying, Well, Mexicali doesn't exist. And that's wrong. So if you want to meet your objectives, include the total urban community. Thank you.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. We are going to break for
lunch. We're going to come back at 1:00 o'clock. Let's
do a round of applause for the great work this morning.
Great job.
Okay. EJAC members have lunch supplied; other
folks, lunch is on your own. The meeting will reconvene
at 1:00 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at the hour of 12:15 p.m.,
a luncheon recess was taken, the
proceedings to be resumed at 1:00 p.m.)
SARAH RUBIN: We are going to look to wrap up our meeting today before 4:00 o'clock, and just as a reminder, we have our meeting goals on the wall over here in English and Spanish. And the one thing maybe we can get for the meeting notes, I just overheard a future best practice, which is when we have interpreters, to have all the presenters have a copy of the PowerPoint for the interpreters to help them with the -- the wording.

So our first meeting goal is what we're a little more than halfway through, which is draft initial Scoping Plan recommendations after reports from ARB and EJAC. We're doing that within -- kind of dividing it in five parts. We did three this morning. We have two left.

Outline an EJAC working time line for the next three to six months based on ARB updates and EJAC priorities. We started that this morning, and at 3:00 o'clock, here at the back of the wall, we've got the months, and we're going to be coming back to this at 3:00 p.m.

Now, we are about to check off our third goal,
which is learn about California climate investments and identify EJAC's role. So I'm going turn it over to Matt for his presentation, and then we'll go to Q and A and look to clarify the role you want to play.

- CALIFORNIA CLIMATE INVESTMENTS PRESENTATION -

MATT BOTILL: I have the unenviable position of doing a presentation after lunch, so I will do my best to keep this interesting and engaging.

My name is Matthew Botill, and I am a manager with Air Resources Board, and my team works with State agencies on implementation of California on the investments. And I've been sitting in the audience today listening, and I just wanted to say a couple of things about what I've been hearing.

So really, really good and positive discussion on community engagement, how best to do that with talking about state level policies and major programs. So I'll talk a little bit about what our experience has been on the climate investment side in the presentation.

Also, this question about how do you evaluate performance? How are these programs doing, and what kind of information does your committee need? What does the public need to understand what's going on with these different programs? And maybe what you need is
capability, and so I'm going to talk a little bit about how we see that working within the Climate Investments Program and get your feedback, too.

So if you could go ahead and advance the slides.

So what I'm going to do -- and I'll look for visual cues in terms of if I'm going too fast or too slow, or if there's other information you would like to see -- but I know that you have been talking through the individual sectors with ARB staff doing these deep dives on the programs and bringing that information back so you can talk about recommendations that you'd like to make to ARB. I'm going to try my best, in the short time we have, to give you what's called a medium dive on the California Climate Investments Program, so we have some time for discussion at the end.

My presentation is broken up into two parts. One part is on the program design and structure, how it's been established and what are the kind of objectives. And the second part of the presentation is about outcomes. What are we seeing from just a first year and a half of implementation on the California Climate Investments Program. And I also left a little bit of a present in front you to take a look at, but try and restrain yourselves while I get through the presentation so we can talk about it.
All right. So what are California Climate Investments? They are comprehensive and coordinated investments throughout California to further the states climate programs.

You can go to the next slide for me.

Now, the funding for California Climate Investments's, as you all are probably familiar, comes from the State's Cap-and-Trade Program, specifically from the auctioning of allowances under the State's Cap-and-Trade Program --

THE REPORTER: I'm having a hard time hearing and understanding what you are saying.

MATT BOTILL: All right. I'll try and talk slow. I think Katie and I suffer from the same fast talking.

So the funding for California Climate Investments comes from the State's Cap-and-Trade Program. We are, I'm sure, going to be talking at length about that program, but they really are a kind of off shoot of how that program was designed.

To date, the program -- the Cap-and-Trade Program and the State owed allowances in the Cap-and-Trade Program generated a little over $4 billion in State-auctioned proceeds. There's also an important component of that part of the program that is the
California Climate Credit, and that is funding and is generated for the investor-owned utilities that is returned back to the rate payers. So I'm not going to talk about that program, but it is an important component that also provides return on funding back to the communities throughout California on their electricity bills.

So Trish, if you could go ahead and jump to the next slide.

How am I doing on -- better?

THE REPORTER: Better.

MATT BOTILL: So like a said, I'd like to spend a few minutes talking about program design and structure, and I think these are kind of important concepts, but I'm going to try to go as quickly as I can through them.

Next slide.

So I think this is one of the fundamental questions that we all struggle with on this program, is how does funding move through the process? And so the -- the Governor and the Legislature and the reaction that a number of bills in 2012 basically established the framework of how the funding flows from the account that it's deposited in into the individual programs or projects. And the process that they identify includes an investment plan, so there were three years -- and
investment plan was drafted that provides priority recommendations for the use of the proceeds.

That investment plan, I'd like to kind of refer to it as a menu of options. It's here are the types of investments that the State could make. The investment plan is given to the Legislature by the Department of Finance, and the Legislature then decides through either a single budget act or I think the annual budget act where it will appropriately get funded. So the Legislature will look to our state agencies to establish objectives for funding and establish a specific funding amount where the budget process happens. Typically, that's in July.

That implementing statute also set out a number of responsibilities. So the California Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Environmental Protection identifies -- we'll have a disadvantaged community -- we'll talk a little about that in a sec. The Legislation also gave ARB the responsibility to develop guidelines and quantification methods, which we'll talk about. And as I mentioned in how funds are distributed, the legislation and the program's responsibility to the State agencies that receive appropriations on implementing their programs and how they find projects and how to reform.

And then finally, the report on profits, which
we'll talk about quite a bit today.

The next slide, please.

So what are the objectives of the -- the
program? There -- there -- can broadly roll into these
three objectives. So first and foremost, because these
funds come from the implementation of the AB32 program,
the funds need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. There
has been additional legislation that's been passed
through -- the legislation also directing that beyond the
greenhouse gas reductions, these funds need to be directed
towards the State's most disadvantaged communities and
also to maximize economic environmental and public health
cobenefits. So this gives us a set of three main
objectives that we drive out with the use of these funds.

Okay. In terms of disadvantaged communities, I
think you are all familiar with this, but I'll talk real
quickly just for those of you that may not be. Senate
Bill 535, which was the secular benefit from the previous
slide about directing investments to disadvantaged
communities, it sets what we call floors for investment,
which are ten percent of the Cap-and-Trade auction
proceeds should be invested in communities, and 25 percent
to be invested to benefit communities. There's quite a
bit of discussion of what it actually means to benefit a
community, and I'm interested in the feedback.
As I mentioned before, the secretary for environmental protection, Cal EPA, they identify what is a disadvantaged community using the CalEnviroScreen tool, CalEnviroScreen 2.0, which includes socioeconomic and environmental factors and much discussion on what's a disadvantaged community and how to identify them, and it's done currently through CalEnviroScreen.

Next slide.

This is just from statute, and so I won't spend too much time on it. But these are the -- the identified cobenefits that the implementing legislation had directed us to -- that you use with these funds. And it included things like economic climate cobenefits like job opportunities and opportunities for air quality and the public health benefits, as well as engaging with stakeholders. And so that's something that I think you'll all be looking at in terms of the broader Scoping Plan impact, that their Scoping Plan Development, the impact that climate change will have on our communities and trying to lessen the impact that -- of climate change going forward with these investments.

All right. So this is a question I get a lot, which is what exactly is the ARB's role in the California Climate Investments Program? We have three primary responsibilities as an agency. So the first is assisting
the administration, and administration here is the environmental natural resources and energy agencies, as well as the Governor's office and the Department of Finance in developing an investment plan and reporting profit outcomes. So this is not an ARB solo document, this is something that we do on behalf of a broad mix of State agencies.

And then, more specifically, ARB is tasked in legislation to provide guidance on the implementation of the program, and the guidance has to include how to maximize benefits to disadvantaged communities, how to quantify the greenhouse gas benefits from these investments, and how to track and record these investments going forward.

The third responsibility that the agency has is to administer a specific funding pod for low carbon transportation so they have an incentive program that -- for those projects, as well.

The screenshots here, actually, you have the one on the right in front of you, those are the three major documents, the investment plan at the bottom, the annual quorum, and then the funding guidelines on the top.

So beyond the ARB's role, what about the rest of the State agencies role? They are responsible for implementing better rates and incentive programs. They
are responsible for doing it in a way that aligns with ARB's funding guidelines and ensure that project achieve greenhouse gas reductions. The State agencies, they -- they are responsible for identifying specific projects for funding, so they will -- they will pick projects -- they will pick the ones that moved forward. They will be tracking the benefits of those projects over time and reporting them back to ARB and to the administration to be folded up into this annual report.

All right. So visually, what does this whole process look like? It means that we start out with an investment plan, it sets the principles, and it selects the kind of a menu of options for funding. The Governor and the Legislature establish a budget and it identifies the specific programs and funding amounts. ARB's funding guidelines are in effect and they provide general guidance on program recountability, on GHG quantification and on reporting and on disadvantaged community benefits, and then the individual entities can start funding the projects based on the guidelines or solicitations that they issue for that specific entity.

As an example, Community Services and Development has a low-income weatherization program that receives funding through the California Climate Investments, and that program has a set of guidelines --
Community Services and Development has a set of guidelines that dictate which households are eligible, what kinds of measures will be installed on these houses.

THE REPORTER: I need you to slow down.

MATT BOTILL: Like I said, I get on a roll.

So once -- once the agency identifies which projects that it would be funding and a tour of those projects, it then -- they're responsible to report any of the outcomes of the projects and to do an assessment of how they are doing, which is that last slide there.

All right. Next slide.

So in terms of community engagement, I want to spend a little bit of time on this. We have -- in the development of the overall program, the design of the program, we have spent quite a bit of time working with --

You can go to the next slide.

-- working with communities.

Go to the next slide, please.

So these are the specific elements that are in the funding guidelines, kind of accountability and transparency, tracking, performing and guidance on disadvantaged community benefits. I was giving you the average, because I saw that picture, which is from another workshop they left there.

Next slide.
So in terms of guidance for how these funds are benefiting disadvantaged communities -- and I'll bring up just an example here -- we have, as an agency, established the criteria that the agency needs to use to identify whether or not the project is actually benefiting the community. It's not straightforward. This was done through extensive outreach, and it was something that we're committed to revising and upgrading over time.

But what we have here are the current major tenets of identifying whether or not a project is a benefit. The first is that for a project to be of benefit to a community, it needs to provide a direct, meaningful, assured benefit, and this is something that we just added this year, it needs to address an important community lead. And we can talk more about what that means in a second.

The second is that beyond these principles, an individual project needs to meet at least one very specific criteria in the funding guidelines that we have worked on over the last year and a half with community representatives and with the other state agencies in terms of power projects. And so this is just one example. There are I don't know how many dozens in the funding guidelines for the individual projects among the sectors, which is transportation, energy, natural resources. But
1. this example gives you an idea of the level of specifics we need for individual projects.

   So if a transit agency, for instance, is funding the expansion of a transit line, how do we know if that expansion is actually benefiting a disadvantaged community? Well, we set up criteria, and this is what this is more or less meant to get at, that the project needs to reduce air pollution on a fixed route that's primarily the benefiting in the community or for vehicles that serve transit stations or stops in disadvantaged communities. So there's a lot of things here embedded in the criteria. One, that it's providing a quality benefit, and two that it's providing a direct benefit in or near a disadvantaged community, and that requires us to actually understand what the projects are doing on the ground.

   Okay. This is the slide I was talking about.

   In terms of outreach and working with the organizations and State agencies, on the funding guidelines alone, we'll have over 12 workshops over the course of a year and a half, 80 written comments, two ARB board meetings, we heard quite a bit from community organizations as well as folks in this room on the developments of the funding guidelines and how we talk about disadvantaged communities. And you don't see this as apparently one thing, this is something that we're
going to constantly work on over time.

This is what happens when you work on a presentation. Okay. Next slide, please.

Real quickly, and I think there were some questions about cobenefits and cobenefit quantification, and I want to talk about ARB's role in terms of quantifying benefits from the investments that it needs to impose.

So ARB is developing -- has been developing for the past year quantification methods that are very specific, very specific project-level methods that follow and support the overall regulatory and voluntary programs that ARB has established. And we've done over 50 different project types in just the last year alone on how do you quantify greenhouse gas reductions from these investments. And the intent here is to make sure that when these 14 State agencies that are all running different programs in different sectors with different ideas, that these programs, these projects, are being consistently evaluated. That is the number one objective, that we're giving you a fair and equitable representation of the investments that are being made and that we're following the structure the State has set up for greenhouse gas reduction.

So the process, the quantification methodology,
it's knot simple, it takes time, as you can imagine, and it involves things like literature reviews, input from the public, and regular updates and improvements.

Okay. So with all that program design and structure stuff out of the way, let me talk a little bit about the types of outcomes we're seeing. And just to remind folks, too, this is a new -- this program really launched in earnest about a year and a half ago with the first round of budget appropriations that were made, and so we are still very much in the learning phase and in the review phase.

Next slide.

So this is the three-year list of budget appropriations. So if you were to ask me who got money and what is it for, this will give you a little bit of an indication. So you -- you heard some folks talk about this in the different discussions from the sectors today, things like the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program, the Strategic Growth Council has determined its role in the programs that's funded with these dollars that's included on the slide up here.

The gray box is the transportation projects, so these include things thing like helping implement --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, can you say that again?
MATT BOTILL: Sure.

The items on the gray box are transportation projects, and these include things like helping to implement SB375, helping to expand transit in California, helping to connect communities to the point of development of high speed rail, and helping provide intercity community options for communities. As well as zero emission vehicles and near zero emission vehicles helping to provide vehicles and mobility options to disadvantaged communities.

The items in the blue box are energy-related programs. So these are things like weatherization and solar and reducing the carbon intensity of the water that we all use, as well as there's been some projects funded for a dairy digester that we had quite a bit of discussion on this morning. And then at the bottom, these are the natural resources projects.

In total, we have -- next slide.

THE REPORTER: Can you turn off the fan. I can't hear him.

MATT BOTILL: In total, we have a little over 2.6 billion in funds that have been specifically appropriated to the Legislature -- or from the Legislature is to State agencies. So when talking about outcomes, I do want to just pause on the slide for a second. The --
the way the funding moves from the State level down to
local projects is multi-step process. So it involves the
appropriation of funds in a budget act, and the State
gency that has those funds. They didn't identify what
are our priorities? What are our priority projects that
are going to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, that are
going to provide cobenefits and impact disadvantaged
communities. So the term "allocated" is the term we use,
that the agency uses, if the State agency has decided if
they have, let's say, $200 million, we're going to
allocate 50 million to zero emission vehicles, a hundred
million to -- and I'm just making these numbers up -- but
the term "allocating" is used to describe how the agencies
identify different elements for funding.

The environmental works projects, we went
through a solicitation process and identified applicants
throughout California based on their product details and
then awarded those funds. And then to implement those
funds, so they actually put those funds into specific
projects, and we've been finding individual locations of
those projects through the implementation stage. You
know, let's say for car-sharing, somebody puts a proposal
in for a car-sharing project in the L.A. basin, and that
car-sharing project is awarded, it's not implemented until
we know where we're specifically going to put those
car-sharing services, where they're going to put their vehicles, and that's the very specific implementation of those funds that were awarded.

And then completed, which is the part of the funds that went out the door, our tracking of benefits of these funds, and we get an understanding of what those benefits are.

So go ahead and do the next slide.

This is the current status of funding, so 2.6 billion appropriated to date. 1.7 of that 2.6 billion has actually been awarded to projects. And then of that 1.7 billion, 912 million has been implemented into very specific locations. And implement is very important for identifying whether or not projects are benefiting disadvantaged communities.

Next slide.

In terms of greenhouse gas reduction -- this is the report in front you -- using our ARB-developed quantification methodology to be working with State agencies, they are projecting an estimated benefit of 14.30 million metric tons of CO2 would be reduced over the lifetime of these projects. There's a lot wrapped in these numbers, but this gives you a sense of the total reductions.

Next slide.
In terms of public outreach, how did they identify these projects? Between ARB and 14 other State agencies, we've held over 300 public meetings, over 16,000 participants in these meetings, and this is one of those things where I'm not saying you're not doing a great job, I'm saying outreach is always important, and it's something that we always are trying to do and trying to improve upon. And I just wanted to highlight the steps that we've taken in just the last year and a half.

So how are we doing the funds that are a benefit to disadvantaged communities? So if we have the statutory floor of ten percent in disadvantaged communities, 25 percent to benefit the communities, what are we seeing in the first year? Using the -- the project data that we've gotten so far, we're finding that a little over 50 percent of the funds is benefiting disadvantaged communities and 40 percent are actually going straight into disadvantaged communities by their location.

And just one point, this is using the $912 million, so we still have -- we still have a ways to go. But these numbers are going to -- they're going to change over time, but as we get information, we'll be updating these figures.

In terms of disadvantaged communities census tracks, we have a map in the report that shows the -- the
communities that have at least some level of investment, and this gives you a sense of which communities are seeing -- which disadvantaged communities have received funds to date. I think we need to make it an objective to try and fill that pink area on the right.

All right. Next slide.

Oh, I know we're running out of time, but this is to Luis' point. So if you can go back one. Luis made a really good comment about large-scale solar, and why aren't we seeing individuals -- household residential solar in Imperial. We are. It's still in the earlier stages of roll out, but the program for Community Services and Development has funded a couple of residential rooftop solar for local residents in the Imperial Valley, and it's also a funded a number of other projects. So it's still in the early stages, but we're starting to see those projects happening, which I think is great. Some of the other projects that are happening locally include zero emission vehicles from the truck side, being the passenger side.

Okay. So I think what I'm going to do, since I'm on the last slide, and since I'm out of time and I want you to ask -- I want you to ask questions, is I'm going to leave these slides for a discussion, if you want to. What I have is individual sector breakdowns. So in
the transportation sustainable community sector, how are we doing? In the energy -- clean energy sectors, how are we doing? And in the natural resources sectors, how are we doing in terms of disadvantaged communities? But I'll leave these for the discussion since we're just about out of time.

KEVIN HAMILTON: I think we'd rather have you finish your talk, if everybody agrees.

SARAH RUBIN: I see nodding heads.

MATT BOTILL: Okay.

MARI ROSE TARUC: Well, can you just say what the goal of this particular section is?

SARAH RUBIN: Yes. So to remind you, on your agenda, Goal Number 3 isn't to just learn, but it's to identify -- sorry -- to identify the EJAC role. So if we want to have a little more and then -- we only have 15 minutes. So if there are questions of clarification or things you don't understand that you need clarification on, I'd say let's prioritize those types of questions, and then dive into what role do you want your group to have.

MATT BOTILL: Okay. So I'll be brief. In terms of the sustainable community and clean transportation projects, a couple pictures on the bottom actually represent --

THE REPORTER: I can't understand you. I'm
MATT BOTILL: I speed up, sorry.

They are examples of projects that are actually kind of kick-off projects that have been funded with these dollars. The chart on the right represents women in the sector, which is the -- this is the biggest sector receiving funding. How are doing in terms of the projects benefiting disadvantaged communities? So that's 30 percent of the funds in and 51 of funds benefit communities.

Next slide.

This is just an example of the car-sharing project that was just done in Los Angeles, that I think would be great for down here in terms of the opportunities.

Next slide.

So in the energy efficiency and the clean energy sector, this sector is a little more discreet, so we're going to put a focus on product locations and things like weatherization, rooftop solar, low-income solar, and then water energy efficiency. So hopefully growers reduce the energy associated with pumping and supplying the fields with water. And so oftentimes, this looks like agricultural pumps and micro-irrigation, and just water pumping needs. For these funds, a little over -- right
around 64 percent is in benefiting communities.

Okay. That's -- this is an example of the water efficiency funding program that the department had.

Next slide.

And then in terms of natural resources, these are projects like urban forestry, the forest health projects, wealth administration projects, and the suburban projects, and these are being funded through the departments like CalRecycle, Natural Resources Agency, Cal Fire, and a little over 41 percent of the projects in disadvantaged communities, and 51 percent benefiting, which I think given the sectors locational dealings, this is a great number.

Next slide.

And this is an example of just an urban forestry project being funded through Cal Fire.

All right. Next slide.

And this is the standard -- information --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't understand you. If we can wait until the students come in. I'm going to move closer to see if I can maybe hear you.

SARAH RUBIN: Students, you are welcome to grab those chairs that are pushed against the back wall. And there's some chairs over here.

Okay. Matthew?
MATT BOTILL: I'm done.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So any questions of clarification? Sorry, just EJAC members.

KEVIN HAMILTON: So I have two questions, but the first one is on slide --

SARAH RUBIN: Louder. Louder. In the mic.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Yeah, in the mic would be good, wouldn't it?

So on Slide 17, which is where you showed the appropriations, what drives the decision-making here? I see money being expanded in certain areas of 2015. I think one of the things that concerned me, is a program that we've been making very effective for our communities by doing outreach and enrollment for families, or facilitating it because the folks who actually are contracted to do it don't do a lot of outreach, but we've been connecting people, is energy efficiency and weatherization.

And it looks like you cut the CEC's energy efficient from 20 to zero, and then in the wetlands and Cal Fire -- and again, Cal Fire has been doing a pretty good job with the money they've had. You cut them to zero. So what happened? What's up with that? Did they just not spend their money, so they didn't need anymore?

MATT BOTILL: So I do want to make one point
really clear, that the Air Resources Board does not have
the authority or the responsibility to identify the
specific funding amounts by State Agency. It is entirely
up to Governor in enacting the budget.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Say no more. That explains
that part.

So the other part of this is, are they able to
use some of this funding -- this came to me after a
conversation with a friend from SCAG here yesterday of how
important this idea -- we're converting and we're sticking
all this technology in these neighborhoods, and we've
talked a lot about hiring people from those neighborhoods,
but of course the people say back to me "where we can."
Well, that's really a way of saying People don't know what
they're doing. They don't know how to do this work. So
do these agencies have the ability to modify these plans
to include workforce development?

MATT BOTILL: Yes, with the additional
expectation that those projects that have funding are
reducing greenhouse gas emissions. So sure, that is an
example of a State agency through the -- energy efficiency
in public buildings, which would include a specific
problem, like a specific building for weatherization, and
part of that project would include bringing in workforce
training, people on the ground training on how to
weatherize the building, how to install solar. So as long as it's met it's component of making those greenhouse gas reductions, that's a component of the program we in fact, in many of the discussions, or through the agencies have encouraged them to do just that and there are people evaluating it to them.

KEVIN HAMILTON: It would seem to me that working with local vocational schools and community colleges, especially, would be a great way to check on some of this money to get more bang for your buck. There is a lot of people who can do work in these kinds of areas, and to do it in the middle of a shovel-ready construction project is really difficult on the contractors. And it really makes the cost -- the program's cost goes way up artificially, because you've got to slow down, or you've got to actually have one trained person for the untrained person. And you're kind of training them on the job. And when the project ends, they may or not -- or may not have enough skill set at that point to actually take another job or go up.

So some formal training and building capacity to work -- to have more workers who are ready to work in these industries that are going to decrease our carbon footprint. So that's the vision forward, I would think, if it would be worth exploring.
MATT BOTILL: And just briefly on that point. So in terms of the responsibilities of my group at the Air Resources Board, we set those funding guidelines regarding a higher level of principles. And we'd like to see the agencies instill the properties and we'd like to see the agencies implement them and move forward with them and the appropriations with the funding that's on the slide.

Those agencies develop their own sets of requirements and expectations for projects that may or may not include workforce developments, so there's been a few touch points of the overarching guidance that we provide and on the agencies development of their individual program. And certainly, with the overarching guidance, one of the big pieces of feedback we've heard from the community groups and from the outreach that we did is that workforce development and employment opportunities are really important, and so we set part of the guidance principles. That's a really great way to benefit disadvantaged communities, agencies, when they're implementing their knowledge and see people do it that way.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

So we have a little less than ten minutes left. We can stretch to ten minutes on this. We want to get to
the EJAC's role.

I want to say welcome students. We're very glad you're here. To warn you, the last group that was here, did you hear that we put them on the spot? Anyone hear that? So we asked for a couple of volunteers when we were between meeting agenda items to share something that was either interesting for boring about this meeting. So be sure to listen.

Luis, question or clarification?

LUIS OLMEDO: So I have a couple questions. I'll try to be quick, though. But, you know, I saw some of the programs that talk about urban forestry earlier, talk about desert areas. In terms of the outreach, is this going be ongoing, continuous?

MATT BOTILL: Absolutely. One of the expectations we set up listed outreach as a really important part of this program, primarily as we move forward, and we've added the expectation that projects are addressing community needs. And so one of the key ways you can identify that a project is addressing community needs is actually talking to the community and conducting the outreach. But beyond that, the additional opportunities include working on -- or doing additional workshops and working with communities on the program design questions like the funding guidelines.
LUIS OLMEDO: I think it's important for EJAC to play an important role in advising on the outreach to DACs. I was doing the math, and for the amount of resources, 300 meetings, the amount of resources from the different agencies, I would imagine between ARB, does not match the parts of the basin. That means that at every meeting, we're gonna have probably less than 50 people, maybe even less than 30 people.

The other thing I was going to ask is what role does Cal EPA have in the outreach, in that they do have a -- at least here, they have a department. But overall, what -- what role does Cal EPA have?

MATT BOTILL: So let me ask our facilitator --

LUIS OLMEDO: Let me ask a few more questions, and maybe --

MATT BOTILL: Yeah.

LUIS OLMEDO: If you don't mind, let me just do this real quick. I know we're limited in time.

I also wanted to put a comment out there in terms of solar. Something that you might want to take a look at is these programs, and can I just -- because I think this falls into the overall concern that I have, is that there's so much more access to those communities that are closest to Sacramento that have a greater ability to be at ARB on a weekly basis, on a daily basis. And I have
concerns that ARB and its different programs may find it
easier to work with those who are there all the time. And
those who are furthest, you know, our reaches and getting
reached aren't enough.

And so you mentioned here about making sure that
it's equitable. And I wrote a note here that uniform,
robust and accessible, and I don't think it's there. And
I think that they are needing to rethink of how it's
reaching out or how it's partnering with a really small
representation versus looking at it from a uniform and
robust and accessible way.

I do want to say that I think the EJAC should
play an important role on the outreach to our DACs and
other parts. We -- we can't have, you know, the left hand
not know what the right hand is doing. And also that all
GGRF projects must be transformative for DACs. They must
be transformative.

And so, you know, I'd like to be able to be a
productive participant in that and through the EJAC. I
think the EJAC -- I think it's more equitable then, again,
having one voice or two voices in Sacramento. I think the
EJAC is more representative of a statewide representation,
and we should play a larger roll in informing. We should
be the first stop for information directly to ARB staff,
and let the politicians deal with everybody else.
SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

Okay. I'm going to make a process suggestion, which is that right now, EJAC members, you work in pairs for maybe a minute and a half, two minutes, and you answer this question together. You can use these big Post-its or the index card. What do you think EJAC's role is? I feel like you have to jump start this conversation.

So quickly, with whoever you are sitting next to, what do you think EJAC's role should be specifically, and then we're going to hear from you. We'll have a report out. Okay. Maybe the three you can talk together. Okay? I'll come back to you in a couple minutes.

(A discussion was held off the record.)

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. I hope you had enough time.

So I am looking -- if I can have everybody's attention. Yoohoo. Yoohoo. So I just want to pop very quickly from pair to pair, and if you can report out what you think the EJAC's role should be.

Here we go.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So outreach and accountability in forming the guidelines in the investment plan, and really -- Like Luis said, outreach, checking in with our priorities --

SARAH RUBIN: Slower, slower, slower.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Sorry. Helping the
agencies prioritize funding as the programs continue to go forward and we see opportunities for changes.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Help me, Katie, because I want to make sure we're getting the biggest -- so accountability with the outreach?

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: No outreach and accountability as two separate, but related.

SARAH RUBIN: All right.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: And helping agencies prioritize and informing the guidelines and investment plan.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

REY LEON: Continuous oversight, just ensuring that the monies are hitting the ground in an equitable way and, you know, geographically. But, you know, making sure that they're making a difference on the ground and not all going into like L.A. or something. So, you know, because right now, the way it is, is the EJAC, we get together like every three years; right? It's just like a short-period type of thing. But having it so it's just, you know, year after year, maybe a couple of meetings, you know, having some oversight or getting information and data, and just making sure that it's happening the way it should be happening.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So just to re-clarify,
especially for those who maybe have just joined the meeting, what you all are saying is you would like the EJAC group to assist with the outreach, or be involved in the outreach, to be involved in the accountability, to help the agencies prioritize, and to provide continuous oversight.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: You missed the guidelines in the investment plan.

SARAH RUBIN: Oh, guidelines --

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: The guidelines on the investment plan.

MARI ROSE TARUC: I think there's also the idea that -- so these investments are additional greenhouse gas pollutant reduction, and so we need to be able to prioritize communities, especially as we're seeing increases in emissions through other programs, whether that's Cap-and-Trade or not; that the EJAC is making those connections and that whether that's to the ARB Board or to the Legislature or the Governor, that we need to be really heavily investing these funds into the most polluted and disadvantaged areas.

LUIS OLMEDO: Two things. One is that I want to make sure members of the public, just wanted to highlight that they're really concerned about the large area in Imperial, highlight it as an area that has not been
touched. So having said that, I do want to recommend that we play a key role in assuring that it's part of the accountability that ARB is uniform, robust and accessible, and that we play a key role in providing that oversight and accountability.

MARTHA ARGUELLO: I think our group said many of the same things. So we said many of the same things. We want to play a stronger advisory role around the investments. We want to -- should review the investments plan. Again, assist with outreach, but also, we want us to be the first line. And this is where we would engage our networks in being able to see on the ground where we're seeing problems with some of the investments, and figure out how we can move upstream to try to correct some of those.

Developing sort of guidance around some of these investments. So defining what -- defining what community benefit is, defining what transformative is, because, as someone from our community says, you know, these catalytic projects have catastrophic impacts on low-income communities. So we want to make sure we're capturing that and assisting with setting priorities.

SEKITA GRANT: Great. I'm glad you went before us, because two of those were the same ones that we had.

To define -- to support the defining and
tracking of the benefits in disadvantaged communities, so I want to support that. The other one, going to ground truthing specific projects and making sure that they are actually -- we are seeing the realized benefits that's being -- that are being claimed. So I want to support that, as well.

And then the additional one is to bring community-driven projects and ideas to funding agencies. So bringing projects from the communities that, you know, are able to receive funding and should receive funding, and knowing that it's not always easy for the State to see exactly everything that's happening, but we can play the role to bring the great projects that the communities are coming up with.

SARAH RUBIN: What was the second word that should be defined besides transformative?

MARTHA ARGUELLO: Community benefits.

SARAH RUBIN: I just want to make a quick little personal apology. I had eye surgery in February, and because the of the change, it's taking like three months for my brain to get back to what it used to be. And so I feel like with this stuff I'm not as sharp as my normal self, and so just thanks for being patient. I can tell I'm not my regular self.

Yeah, go ahead.
FLOYD VERGARA: So I just have a -- kind of a process question here. I'm trying to understand what you are doing here in terms of listing out elements of the EJAC's role and how this operates vis-a-vis the guiding principles that, you know, were discussed extensively in the first two EJAC meetings. So is your intent to kind of incorporate these into the guiding principles to better define the EJAC's role or --

SARAH RUBIN: No. This is completely specific.

FLOYD VERGARA: Just specific to the investment plan?

SARAH RUBIN: Just specific to the investment plan.

And process wise, to answer your question, I actually don't have any intent. This, for me, is just taking what the members say and what the group wants to do with that, how they want to -- if they want to have that be their focus or not. That is something the group needs to decide on.

Let's see, let's do a time check. It's almost 2:00 o'clock. We're almost 15 minutes behind.

Do I have one or two quick reactions when you look at this up here? You know, we had a couple of things where people checked, when we get up and do some stuff around the room, people could put more checks of the items
that are most important. Any reactions to what you see?

No? Okay.

For the sake of getting through everything, I'm going to suggest we let this sit for a moment and we move on. Okay. So Stephanie, you are going to be up next.

Anybody need like a three-minute bathroom break?

So let's take like a very short three-minute break, grab a drink, run to the restroom, and we'll start the next agenda item.

MARI ROSE TARUC: Can people do that individually? I feel like there's two major sections that we need to --

SARAH RUBIN: All right. We'll keep going. Get a drink, stand up if you're getting tired, and why don't we have Stephanie move us to the next agenda item. And can you do a little bigger like what you are going to be talking about since we have new folks here.

- TARGET SCOPING PLAN: PART 4 -

STEPHANIE KATO: So basically, I've been giving updates on some of the interagency working group discussions, and those are groups made up of about 25 different State agencies. They are divided up by economic sector. And so what I'm going to be talking about is the industrial sector, and we've already had some
conversations about transportation and energy.

And what those groups have been doing is, doing an inventory of measures that have been adopted or newly adopted, the concepts that would be new for this Scoping Plan, and then getting, you know, feedback from EJAC on whether these are a complete list, because we're tending to utilize this list of measures in the modeling scenarios to see if can get to our 40 percent reduction target by 2030.

So for this category, I'll just highlight some of the actions since the original Scoping Plan and some of the more recent activity. So ARB has adopted a regulation requiring large industrial facilities to conduct an energy efficiency assessment of greenhouse gases, and also determine potential emission reduction opportunities. Those -- results of those audits have been compiled into reports, and I understand they are being posted on our page as they get completed.

ARB staff is also currently working on oil and gas regulation, and that would apply to the production, processing and storage phase of that. It's intended to reduce fugitive and vented emissions for new and existing gas facilities, and that is anticipated to go to Board for adoption during the first quarter of next year.

Some of the measures on high global warming
potential gas actions, or early action measures that the
ARB did adopt at the January 2010 deadline, several of
those are actually listed in this table. Further
improvement in that area is proposed under the Short-lived
Climate Pollutant Strategy, and in this table, the reason
why the last four line items pertaining to ITWF gases are
listed as possible, is because we feel that the most
traction in that area can be achieved through national and
international agreements. And we're hoping that action on
the Montreal Protocol sometime this year will actually get
us there. If we don't reach agreement, then we are
talking about ARB evaluating feasibility of a program just
for California. So that's why those are listed as
possible, at least at this juncture.

The other major measure for this category is the
Cap-and-Trade Regulation Program. I understand EJAC had a
deep dive conversation with program staff about the
current amendments that we're working on for the third
compliance period, and also to get alignment for the
Federal Clean Power Plan. And so I understand that I
think there was a deep dive last Friday on conversations
about the sector based offset credits --

THE REPORTER: Sorry, I didn't get that.

STEPHANIE KATO: There was a deep dive
conversation last Friday on offset credits for forest
deforestation. So I don't -- those are the main things I wanted to highlight. I don't know if EJAC members wanted to provide updates on the deep dives, but --

TRISH JOHNSON: Just to add to what Stephanie just said, there was a specific ask by three EJAC members and one person from an environmental justice organization, not a member of the EJAC, to specifically discuss concerns about the proposal for sector-based international offsets. So there was a conference call held. Mari Rose was on the phone along with Katie, and Martha was invited, but I don't think she was able to call in. The non EJAC member was Amy Vanderwater.

SARAH RUBIN: Stephanie, do you want to just finish everything else you have to present, and then we'll take comment from the deep dives and then go right into the recommendations, so we can kind of get to the recommendations.

STEPHANIE KATO: I mean, I hadn't intended to go through these line by line. I think they kind of got the flavor that on the GWP side, we are looking to the SLCP Strategy for movement on that if you don't get national and international agreements, you know what's happening Cap-and-Trade, maybe something we can focus on is if either there's specific policy surrounding Cap-and-Trade or because I didn't mention earlier that we were planning
to do a greenhouse gas scenario in the modeling that would not include Cap-and-Trade, then, you know, I think there's the assumption that we will be short of our 40 percent target. So where could we get more traction in some of the other areas, either that are currently regulated or maybe new areas.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

MARI ROSE TARUC: We are also covering reports that there was adaptive management and offsets.

TRISH JOHNSON: Sure. I was wondering if you wanted some additional detail about the deep dives. The bulk of the deep dives actually did pertain to the Cap-and-Trade Program. The first deep dive was regarding the Adaptive Management Program, which is to assess the impacts of Cap-and-Trade as it's implemented. Additionally, we had one specific to the Cap-and-Trade Program, where we talked about the mandatory reporting of greenhouse gas emissions.

Also, there was a second series held, where we talked about the Clean Power Plan and California's compliance with it utilizing the Cap-and-Trade Program. And then finally, a part of that, we did get into the sector-based international offsets, since those are right now going through an informal public process for comment.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So we -- I
participated in most of the deep dives and on the additional REDD calls, after a request from SAHA that sent a letter asking for delays in that, those public workshops. What I had learned -- one of the interesting things that I have learned that I did not know is that an adaptive management tool, for those of you who signed on and looked at, that total number emissions. I was worried that that was an emission like post auction and, you know, numbers, but that is the actual number. And so I appreciated Tom's analysis looking at just a simple comparison of California and the rate of increase in Kern.

What we are seeing across the state is that emissions are going up pretty significantly, and they've been going up since 2010. That rate of change is very different in environmental justice communities. And Tom pulled the numbers for Kern County. He even had a little chart that he generated from the adaptive management tool that illustrated the startling accelerated rate of increase in Kern County versus the state as a whole.

So I think when talk about modeling, I keep noticing that ARB staff was saying modeling without Cap-and-Trade. And I don't just want this to be a if we do nothing modeling scenario. We're also looking for -- and I keep repeating it because I think it's important to clarify -- like, we want a model that's without
Cap-and-Trade that includes other potential programs.
What would it like if it was a carbon tax? What would it look like if it were these other approaches? Not just a with or without --

THE REPORTER: Slow down.
KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Sorry.
Not just a with or without Cap-and-Trade option, because of course, if we just took Cap-and-Trade off the table and didn't replace it with anything, of course it's going to be terrible. Right? So I don't want that to be the restriction of the modeling that we do.
And I also -- we brought this up on the call on Friday, so I'll just repeat it for the group. I'm troubled that there's been really continuous concerns about social justice and environmental justice rights in these international communities, where we're talking about creating these new offset programs. I'm concerned both for their rights, because there is no history of these countries working well with their indigenous populations. There's actually a very different history in those communities that I'm worried would be accelerated with the focus of CARB allowing more industries that play a more active role in those countries. But I'm also concerned from a fact that we are not seeing emissions going down in California, and so before we say, Oh we've used all the
offsets we can use, we're going to move to another
country, I want to see us actually seeing the reductions
here. I want us to actually max out on what we can do
here before we start allowing industries to go out of
state. I think that's important, and I think it's the
least we can do.

And I'm troubled that despite these repeat,
repeat, repeat objections for environmental justice
communities on programs like REDD -- which for
clarification, REDD is the acronym for this international
program that would allow industries to basically go out
and save forests in Brazil and in Mexico instead of when
they pollute here. But despite continued objections, the
process just kind of seems to keep moving forward, and
that's a really big problem, and that's why the SAHA
letter went out, is it was this general feeling that they
-- nobody was being listened to.

So I hope that that's something that the EJAC
would concur, and I would make a formal recommendation
that REDD not be included in the Scoping Plan. And that
is it.

SARAH RUBIN: Gisele.

GISELE FONG: I just have a process question on
the deep dives. So can we just clarify? So for the deep
dives, is it only that those folks that have signed up for
those different group things get invited to the deep
dives? Because I -- I mean, I don't -- I know I wouldn't
be able to come to all, and I appreciate the reports back,
but there are others that I really actually would be
interested in, like the adaptive management tool and so
forth. So just process wise, how -- is it only the folks
that signed up for them or, you know, is there a way of
including more EJAC members if folks want to be part of
those discussions or part of those presentations and
discussions?

TRISH JOHNSON: So the deep dives were proposed
at the February 5th committee meeting. And at that same
meeting, each of you signed up for specific working
groups. That allowed us to have an informal discussion
with a small number of you and not have to publicly notice
it. If there is seven or more members, that's a quorum of
the committee, and we're required to publicly notice the
meeting ten days in advance and make sure we can also
accommodate members of the public that are interested. So
these informal discussions -- they can also be called a
one-on-one -- gives us a chance to go over our program and
also hear specific questions from you so that you can work
on your recommendations for the Scoping Plan.

While we've had the ones that we've discussed
today, we can continue to have more. If you want to have
more than seven members, then we can ten-day notice it in
advance and make sure that the public can also
participate, or you can keep it into a smaller group, and
then we can continue to have these informal, you know,
one-on-one discussions about the program to -- to further
help you specifically so you can contribute to the
committee's recommendations.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you for that clarification.

So especially for the students who came in,
behind you on this wall are these different sector areas
that we're talking about, and you see the names of the
members who've signed up. The orange stickies are these
deep dives or kind of one-on-one deeper discussions that
ARB is putting on, and the yellow ones are proposed. And
my goal is that we get more of those yellow ones on today
so that ARB is clear on what you want.

When I look at those lists of people, generally,
you are not really close to seven, so more people
generally should be able to join. So I didn't see the
order that all these things went up, so why don't we go --
we'll go Tom, Kevin, and then we'll circle back.

TOM FRANTZ: Okay. I guess two things on that
adaptive management issue that I made comments on and
Katie pointed out, the draft there showed Kern County
emissions planning 7 million tons over a four-year period,
2011 through 2014. So 7 million increase in that county. That means criteria air pollutants that are associated with those increased greenhouse gas emissions were also climate. That doesn't mean our air quality got worse because there's so many things that come into play there, but we certainly had an increase. So I would like to see -- I don't know if Johnnie does this or who, but you said that when that situation occurs in the future on the Adaptive Management Plan, the study that we have, to see if any of those increases were due to things such as Cap-and-Trade.

So I would like to see a preliminary study done on that Kern County situation to see what the study would even look like in the future if -- you know, explain why emissions went up, how it was or was not related to Cap-and-Trade, and how co-pollutants may have gone up or down at the same time. And I'd like to see -- it would be like a practice study for the future that we could all see and make comments on that to see if it helps out. Is that possible?

JOHNNIE RAYMOND: So -- so what we do is -- the current process, we look at individual facilities and where emissions are going over time. We look at situations where you have a group of facilities and see where the emissions are going. When we're given the
analysis with the grouping of facilities, we'll also
compare that to the corresponding county level emissions
as well as maybe at the air district or a larger
geographic scale. That -- that will all be part of the
research, the review of the emissions and the analysis.
So we look at whether or not emissions are going up, are
going flat, and then also observing if they are going to
be decreasing.

Now, when we prioritize, of course we look at
the increases, but also through this, you were bringing up
co-pollutants. And so if we see situations where
emissions going up, we'll look at the corresponding
criteria and toxic emissions for those facilities and see
if those are going up. Because again, those -- those
would be causing the localized impacts, not necessarily
the greenhouse gases.

Greenhouse gases are used as a surrogate or
proxy for changes in the emissions in connection to AB32
related activities, which could be one reason, could be
Cap-and-Trade, could be changes in the efficiency, or
changes in production, or it could be a whole gamut of
different reasons why emissions are going up or down. And
it would just be part of our analysis to go through try to
investigate what is going on in these situations.

TOM FRANTZ: So I'm requesting, can you do that
FLOYD VERGARA: Let me -- let me answer that question directly. When we go to the Board this year for our proposal for adaptive management, that is exactly what we're planning to do is layout the process and also discuss, to some degree, kind of a preliminary analysis. Basically, a run-through of the process that we've laid out, and kind of discuss with the Board and the public what that suggest. And then, you know, as we define the process in the coming months, we'll get into the, you know, what are the post potential causes and some of the things you are talking about. So that -- the kind of pilot scale evaluation is exactly what we're proposing to do.

SEKITA GRANT: Thank you. I'll look forward to that.

SARAH RUBIN: I just have to remind everyone, we are kind of quickly running out of time. We have 15 more minutes for this piece, and we want to get from you every single recommendation folks have. So even though it's super frustrating, the more you could be like, Here is the wording in my recommendation. If we have time left within the 15 minutes, then we can come back for more Q and A.

TOM FRANTZ: I'm recommending that an analysis be done.
But on the REDD program, this -- let me give an analogy. I'm fortunate enough to own about five acres up in the Sequoia National Monument and several thousand trees up there. I can -- I can, in theory, cut a lot of those trees down. I could do logging up there. I'd have to get -- there's a lot of permitting, but I could do it. Someone could pay me not to do that. That'd be fine. I don't intend to do it anyway.

But about half of my trees died in the last two years. And you know why, it's climate change. It's all these greenhouse gas emissions that we're putting into the air. So even though you are paying me to protect that forest, it would still -- it's still being destroyed. So you got to get real reduction somewhere here in California to stop -- the tropical forests are being destroyed because of the -- because of California's emissions and the rest of the rich world's emissions and our consumers. That's what's driving the destruction of the tropical forest. Our greenhouse gas emissions up here and our demand for more and more and more, it's destroying our topical forests. Yet you are saying with this REDD Program that the oil industry can keep polluting our air in Kern County, keep putting massive amounts of greenhouse gases in the air, and mitigate that by protecting the tropical forests. It makes zero sense. So don't --
disregard that whole REDD idea and get the offsets in California.

Put electric vehicles and solar panels into the hands of low-income people, and that's a real offset for the emissions from our fossil fuel and such. It's just nonsense when you talk about -- you can't validate what you're doing in these tropical forests anyways. No way to validate any gain. There's all kinds of problems with it. I don't have time to go through the five or six more problems with the REDD program, but anyhow, I'll put it in writing.

KEVIN HAMILTON: So I want to support Katie and Tom's position on this. You're right on target. This idea that you would somehow allow the industry in this state to -- the recommendation just stands, essentially, that the REDD program should be dead. Simple enough. I don't want to, you know, keep harking back to the '80s or anything like that. But the point is that program needs to die with -- there's no way to verify in any of the trades that are happening. We're dealing with communities and governments that are not sustainable in and of themselves and have proven in the past that they are not capable of meeting their own obligations or willing to be held accountable to those.

So -- and it just goes against good common
sense. If there is a place within the community, within California, to get that same reduction to invest that credit money and get a credit for it, why would we send it somewhere else? Why would we do that? Again, I agree with you a hundred percent there.

The other piece goes to the Power Plan, the U.S. Power Plan and the National Power -- I would recommend that we use our leverage in buying power peak hours from other states to ensure that that power is coming from a power plant that is a sustainable, renewable energy power plant. So if we're buying that power from Idaho or Utah or Texas, where they still have a lot of coal fire plants -- and communities are fighting the battles right now to get those plants out of there, and some of them are losing those battles. I'm not saying to get our lawyers to go out there after them, I'm saying we've got a lot of money here. We buy that power and it generates a lot of income for the folks who own those plants.

So there are clean energy plants in those same areas, so we need to make sure that it's written into the plan that when we reach peak hours and we're bringing power in from out of state -- and we do and we will. We'll do it again this year. It might come early this year, in fact -- that we ensure that that power is coming from a renewable source. And that's it.
MARTHA ARGUELLO: I have a specific recommendation. I would like to recommend that there be one other member of EJAC put on the Adaptive Management Working Group that CARB has right now. There's myself, someone from the Lung Association, someone from the Center for Economic and Environmental Balance, and WSPA, and Ag Industry. So I think that that is not a balanced group. It would be wonderful to have another person from EJAC on that.

And then the other, I want to reiterate, this is exactly what the first EJAC said. We want benefits in California first. This is what we hear from the Legislature, when they talk about benefits not coming to some communities, the benefits that aren't coming to most communities right now are actually clean air benefits. And until we get that right, we should not be exporting our human rights problems to other places with the REDD program.

SARAH RUBIN: Can you just pass it down.

FLOYD VERGARA: Can I respond to that real quick?

SARAH RUBIN: Yeah.

FLOYD VERGARA: So, Martha, I really appreciate the suggestion for additional representation from EJAC on the Adaptive Management Work Group. We're happy to
consider that. You know, as you noted, there are three representatives for industry, so if the EJAC members would care to nominate someone, I'd be happy to put that together and incorporate that person into the next work group meeting.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Let's keep going with comments. You can think about if you want to nominate someone. Let's keep going around. We'll come back to that.

MARI ROSE TARUC: I was part of the -- I was part of the deep dives for both Cap-and-Trade and offsets, and so I want to be able to give a little bit of a report to get to the recommendations.

I think one of the most shocking things -- and for the folks in the room who aren't familiar with this topic, I think the industrial strategy of the state of California through the Air Resources Board has been the most contentious with the environmental justice community. We -- there have been big fights between the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee and the Air Resources Board because they chose the Cap-and-Trade program, where they allow polluters to instead of reducing their emissions in our communities, they can trade their allowances or buy offsets in other places that aren't in our communities, so that those polluting industries can continue to pollute
it. So this is a big -- an important topic for us to get right and to capture our sentiments around it.

So in the deep dive, one of the things that I learned, especially looking at the Adaptive Management Tool in the emissions reporting, that tool that ARB put out, is that I kept wondering, how do we know if a facility is over their limit of emissions? And basically, right now, we can't -- there is no limit per facility, because the limit is economy wide. Meaning, if the entire economy of California is reducing its emissions, then we're okay. Even if the emissions in EJ communities is going up. So that's not okay.

So there's a problem with the design of the Cap-and-Trade system that's allowing this pollution to go up in our communities as long as it's being reduced somewhere else in California or somewhere else in the world. So that is a huge problem.

We can -- so one of the recommendations related to that, is I think if we were to continue with Cap-and-Trade, we need to make sure that there -- we are measuring and creating caps to emissions based on sectors and facilities. Because if we can't track what those facilities or sectors inside the industry are polluting, then it's not effective, and we can't force them to reduce their emissions.
Another thing that I heard from the deep dives is -- let's see, there's a lot. I have a lot of notes. A lot of what we hear around offsets is -- oh, there's other things. Allowance -- when they -- when they have these allowances per metric ton of carbon, they allow -- right now, it's about -- if you had a ten dollar bill, you could buy a metric ton of carbon dioxide, so, you know, if you're Chevron, you could buy a whole bunch of those.

KEVIN HAMILTON: $12.

MARI ROSE TARUC: $12. Ten dollars is the floor. What we're seeing is they continue to offer the price of the allowance at that low amount, and part of it is in the auctions. The lowest price is what they are accommodating instead of the highest auction price offered. And so that is also design flaw in the Cap-and-Trade system. Yeah, so the price is too low. And I hear that the ARB Board or by statute can actually help increase that amount, so looking to you Dean and Diane.

SARAH RUBIN: Should we be getting that one on the board?

MARI ROSE TARUC: Yeah. If we are to continue with the Cap-and-Trade system, we need some design fixes. So that includes what I said at first around the sectors and the facilities being given limits to their pollution. There's making sure the price is actually the real price
of carbon, not just the lowest price. That the auction price should not be the lowest price offered, but the highest price offered.

And then under offset, so folks have talked about offsets. Most of what I heard from staff is that offsets are allowed into the program because they want to -- to make it affordable for polluters to pollute in California. And so that doesn't make sense to us in EJ communities, because we want it to be as unaffordable as possible so that they can reduce their emissions. So we want to make sure that offsets are not used to pollute more in our communities. So there needs to be some way to limit or eliminate offsets.

So one of the things that I have been seeing -- so in the energy sector, there's actually a loading order for which energy should be prioritized first. Like, for instance, do renewables first and do distributed generation, et cetera, et cetera, before they can get to a gas power plant. So there could be a loading order for the offsets in California. We can say it has -- you know, it should be primarily EJ first, and if you can't do that, then it has to be California, and then if you can't do that, don't do it at all, especially not the international REDD forestry offsets. And that there should be a consultation with environmental justice communities in
California and these indigenous groups, tribes, where these offset programs may be created. So it has to be -- there has to be a consultation to reduce the risk to our communities, or eliminate the risks.

Oh, and last one, we -- since with energy we have an RPS of something like -- in SB350, we have to get to 50 percent renewables by 2030. I think we should -- even though that part of the bill in SB350 around oil and gas didn't get included, let's put it in the Scoping Plan. Let's aim for 50 percent reduction in -- in oil and gas sectors. Okay.

LUIS OLMEDO: Another comment on the deep dives. I think these deep dives need to be attestable to everyone, every member. I'm not here participating partially, I'm here participating wholly. I need to be a part of every -- all materials and all information, and they should be Livestream. We have Livestream here. I don't see why they can't be Livestream and make it available to the public. There should not be any conversations, discussions that are coming out of ARB that should not be available to the public. And I think there's a way probably to Livestream and get all members involved and give them the link. And people can participate as, you know -- as they would like to participate. It may not be as interactive, but I think
people can, you know, have their questions either answered at the moment or later.

But I also wanted to make couple mentions. One is I think it's important to have mandatory reporting and real time monitoring and oversight. And -- and if there is no capacity to do real time monitoring, and if that needs to be built in, then you need to put serious consideration into crowd sourcing and citizen science.

Also, it seems to me that -- you know, just to give you an example of the So Cal mandate, it seems to be always the case that it's cheaper to mitigate elsewhere instead of where these incidents are occurring. And that is something that, again, these types of offsets need to happen where the emissions issues are occurring, not somewhere else.

And the steps is also something I wanted to bring in. You know, with an ARB, what is the mechanism to bring restitution to these communities where these violations are occurring, and what is the responsibility of ARB when it comes to its projects? That's hard to bring out. You know, these programs, you know, these steps need to go back to these communities where these violations are occurring, and I don't think ARB currently has a program or a plan on how they are going to do that. And so I'd like to see more of that going back to the
communities, disadvantaged communities, or any community 
where these violations are occurring.

REY LEON: I just got informed that the webcast 
that is in our EJAC URL or web page is not on the calendar 
or on the workshops page of ARB on the webcast page. I 
would recommend to verify that, I guess.

Also for the deep dives, it would good to 
include them on those, as well.

TRISH JOHNSON: We did put this EJAC meeting on 
the climate change events calendar, on all climate -- or 
all-AB32 relates events.

REY LEON: On the webcast and workshops?

TRISH JOHNSON: Yes.

REY LEON: Okay. Good. Then my contacts are 
fired.

Okay. Now, what I wanted to say, you know, very 
seriously, you know, just been listening the whole day and 
chiming in when I can. But I mean first of all, I'm glad 
we're -- we're having this meeting in a rural area, you 
know, a disadvantaged area, a region that needs a great 
deal of attention. This area reminds of me my region in 
San Joaquin Valley. You know, and many times it feels 
like we're the rural red-headed step children of the state 
of California, where we don't get the -- an equitable cut 
of the resources for infrastructure and a number of other
things.

And so just thinking about that, a couple of sessions back, we put in a recommendation where Luis was able to adjust the language to add geography, but even after we left it there, it said "in consideration," taking geography "into consideration." And I would like to go back to that at some point. You know, it doesn't half to be now and take up more time, but to make it intentional that, you know, the geography should be a part of -- of -- of the process and the -- and the -- you know, equitably distributing resources. That's -- you know, a lot of organizations, that's what we do, but I think sometimes folks forget about us -- us -- us compesinos, you know, and we've got to speak up to make sure that we aren't forgotten.

And Luis makes and excellent point in regards to monitoring, air quality monitoring. When I first started air quality work, one thing that I noticed in the maps showing the pollution, the east side of the San Joaquin Valley was the most polluted. Later, I see a map of where all the air quality monitors were at. Guess where they're at? On the east side of the valley. At that point, I worked with more of the legislators and we starting working towards putting up the first air quality monitor on the west side. We were able to do, but it was one out
of a whole huge span of area that has them. Right? And I think we just need more air quality monitors in a lot of these rural areas where humans are breathing, where humans are living, and where, you know, communities like Avenal don't get left out of the -- the Plus Up program because they don't have a monitor that, you know, shares exactly what's going on in terms of the air quality, and their demographics are muffled because of the prison and whatever, whatever.

You know, I think there's a special attention that needs to be paid for rural areas, and I think sometimes our colleagues just miss. And I think at the next meeting -- I think we -- we need to keep having these meetings in rural areas. I think at the next one, I'd invite it to be in Huron, California, San Joaquin Valley, the west side. You know, the same area that is continuously considered by the American Human Development Report as the poorest, least -- provided the least education and healthiness, you know, in some respects. In other respects, they're a lot healthier because we still eat a lot of tortillas. So anyhow -- so -- so yeah, just a big, you know, reminder that rural areas are -- we need a lot special -- you know, more attention. Let's put it that way.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So Martha has been waiting,
and then I'm going to come back to Luis.

MARTHA ARGUELLO: So some patience from the committee members. I -- I was on the adaptive management, two of the calls, and have been sort of thinking about it. I think -- I think we really do need to think about what are the -- you know, what are the data sources we want CARB to look at.

Then the other issue is this issue of authority. So we've talked about we all want real time reporting about what's happening. But one of the things I hadn't thought about is, actually, some of these aren't violations. They may be increases, but they're not technically violations. So it means that facility by facility may have -- overall in the region, things have gone up. But when you look at facility by facility, that one is still complying with its permit, that one is still complying with its permit.

So these are fundamental design flaws that I don't know that we have a handle on just yet in terms of -- I think we know what data we want, but what to do and how to understand that data, and then what to do once you -- once CARB has collected data. And I can't believe I'm saying this, but there's not a lot they can do because it's at the Air District level who has the authority to act. So we're going to have to figure that out. And
maybe the best thing we can do in this first year is
figure out the architecture for the data collection that
we need and really think about it carefully and what is in
your purview of CARB to do.

And then I'm not sure what to do with the rest
of it, because, you know, we work -- we gave up working at
the Air District because we couldn't do anything under
Barry, and now things just got worse. So, you know,
that's where -- you know, that's where we live. We don't
want emissions to go up at the local level, but we don't
really have the tools not only to measure it, but what
happens when they're legally allowed to permit that much
and what does that mean.

You know, so -- I -- yeah, that -- I know I
don't have a recommendation or a thought, but it's been
really troubling me that we don't have -- yeah, right, we
don't -- we don't have tools. And so we -- all we do is
talk at cross purposes. So that, if anything else, we've
got to figure that one out.

SARAH RUBIN: Johnnie, do you want to respond?

JOHNIE RAYMOND: So one thing I wanted to look
at and maybe know, Martha has been talking about a work
group, and I just didn't want it to get -- get everyone
confused with deep dives with other things that are going
on with EJAC. So let me just give you just a little bit
of an overview of what the work group is and what's the purpose of it.

SARAH RUBIN: Which work group?

JOHNNIE RAYMOND: So it's the adaptive management work group.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

JOHNNIE RAYMOND: So -- so we -- we assembled the adaptive management work group really to help us out with identifying when we review these emission trends -- and, you know, part of Tom's recommendation is looking at county level emissions -- and so at what point does it further -- does it trigger ARB staff to do a full blown analysis of a deeper dive into the data? And so Martha sits on -- as a major environmental justice key player within that work group. Also in the work group, we have industry representatives, as well as public health, environmental, NGOs, we have the local air districts sitting on the work group, and so we've had a couple meetings so far, and we plan to continue a couple more meetings where the work group will, you know, discuss and hopefully come to a consensus on how ARB staff, us, how we proceed with reviewing emissions and identifying emission changes that warrant us to take a deeper dive and further review. So hopefully that helps.

SARAH RUBIN: Go ahead, Luis.
LUIS OLMEDO: Okay. I've got about three points here. One is, when we started the meeting, we talked about the need for resources, the importance of resources. I think we're moving in the right direction. I think there's a lot more that is being provided in terms of resources to the advisory, but we're still not there yet. We still have a lot of cells, locals that are moving along ideas, moving along recommendations, moving along the development and the rule-making, and we're not privy to any of that. And so I want to encourage that we get the proper resources so that we are able to be informed in every aspect and at least have the opportunity to be a part of it. Otherwise, we're not really -- it's -- a fundamental problem is that we're still disadvantaged even as an advisory.

But the only thing I wanted to point out is, just in following up with Rey in in terms of making things -- he said -- what was it that you mentioned --

REY LEON: Instead of consideration.

LUIS OLMEDO: Instead of consider, making it a -- and like for that to happen --

SARAH RUBIN: Geographically.

LUIS OLMEDO: -- right now versus saving it for later.

SARAH RUBIN: Is that on the list? Did we get
that on the list?

LUIS OLMEDO: Yeah, if you could put it on the white paper that I think that should be changed. And so --

SARAH RUBIN: I'm sorry, Trish, is this the list of recommendations?

TRISH JOHNSON: Yeah.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

TRISH JOHNSON: But you said it was on the white paper?

SARAH RUBIN: So do we need to retype it? Let's make sure we have it.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

SARAH RUBIN: For our note taker, we need to speak one at a time. Would someone like to repeat what you would like the recommendation to be so we have it for the record, please?

MARI ROSE TARUC: So the geographic consideration was initially in the transportation recommendation, so -- so you mark it here and you also mark it in the transportation recommendations that instead of putting "geographic considerations," you would put "geographic equity."

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. So Trish, use "geographic equity" rather than "geographic consideration."
Rey and Luis, do you feel like that language gets it, or would you like different language?

REY LEON: Well, Eleanor really makes a good point in terms of -- because it's a density; right? It's one of the reasons why, you know, we are, you know, less competitive is partially or in great part due to the lack of density that, say, you know, Boyle Heights has to, you know, Huron, or something of the sort. You know, and so, yeah, that's -- how can we term that? I mean, you know, I'll put it out there for recommendations.

SARAH RUBIN: Do you want different language, or can you live with this language, at least for now?

LUIS OLMEDO: It's fine.

So here's my final question. There's a lot of recommendations going around, a lot of comments, but I want to hear from ARB. You know, we have, I think, a very good representation. I understand not everybody is here, but I'd like to know how is that going to be moving forward? You know, I just go back to the meeting we had in Sacramento, and that just felt like that worked wonders. But we've had many of these meetings and things seem to go -- moving very slowly. And so I'd like to know how we can make this happen?

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So Luis, if I may, so when we designed this agenda, our goal, our primary goal,
is to make sure that at least we knew what all the initial recommendations were for the first draft, because that's going to come out in May. Part of the next step that I would like to see from staff -- and I was going to bring this up at the end, but I'll bring it up now -- is to have an accounting of the recommendations we made and whether or not they were included in the draft Scoping Plan that we'll see in May and why. So that's part of the next step. But just simply due to time and the urgency for this draft plan, we're trying to make it through all the sections to make sure at least our initial thoughts are recorded before they respond in the Scoping Plan.

LUIS OLMEDO: I understand we're not going to get into details, but let me just say this: That I think there's a lot that can be done in terms of building confidence of the advisory that things are going to get done. And I think everybody here is committed, but it's always a little refresher to know, yes, we're going to make it happen, and I think that's very important. Because that gives the confidence to be able to go to the executive staff, to the board members that I know that are there to help us and support us in this. And I think it never gets old to get the reaffirmation that we have -- we are going to get the resources, we are going to get the access, we're going to make it equitable, we're going to
make it accessible.

FLOYD VERGARA: Thanks, Luis and Katie. I appreciate those comments. What we intend to do is -- you know, part of the reason why we have a court reporter here is so that we can have a much better idea of the exact recommendations that are provided. As you've noted, they were coming out fast and furious there. We need time to get them processed, and then, you know, make sure that the court reporter certifies them as accurate. So we're willing to, you know, pay additional funding to expedite the processing of the transcript so that the staff can then start working on responding to the recommendations and at least at the next one.

I heard earlier that there was a suggestion to have a quick follow up to this one like in ten days. I don't know if we have, you know, the ability to respond to all of the recommendations within ten days, because there is a certain amount time the court reporter requires to go through and validate all the transcript. What I can say is, within that next one, we could -- we will intend to get back to you on the time line issue once and for all, and then as many of these recommendations as we can, with the idea that the next formal EJAC meeting, we will have covered all of those and specifically responded to recommendations.
Let me speak real briefly on the -- the ask that was raised earlier with regard to additional deep dives and one-on-ones. As we noted earlier, we're happy to work with you folks to figure out what additional topics need to be deep dived or revisited and all of that stuff. We went through, just briefly, the need -- well, not the need, but why we went with smaller groups versus larger groups. We're happy to do the entire EJAC, if that's the will of the group. I just want to make sure you understand some of the legal constraints that we're operating under.

As Trish mentioned earlier, if we do a gathering of the EJAC members that's greater -- you know, that's a quorum or greater, we have to publicly notice it. Just so you understand what that means, minimum of ten days public notice, advanced notice before, the -- each member that plans to not be there in person, but calls in, they have to identify the specific location where they are going to be, that location needs to be ADA compliant, and it needs to be open to any member of the public to come in and join you. So if you plan on, you know, calling in from your home, that would be -- you know, you would -- you know, it's not something we'd recommend calling in from your home on these things because of those sort of constraints.

But I'm not saying that's -- you know, we're
happy to work with you, I just want you to understand some of the logistical and legal challenges that's involved. But we're happy to work with you to make that happen, if that's the will of the group.

LUIS OLMEDO: You can turn them into public workshops.

FLOYD VERGARA: And that's -- that's fine, too. You know, each one of these meetings is -- is a challenge for us, so I just want to make sure everyone understands that.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Kevin?

KEVIN HAMILTON: So I -- I had a quick comment -- sorry, did you need to leave?

MARTHA ARGUELLO: No, I'm just standing, but -- because it's in response -- is it okay?

KEVIN HAMILTON: Yeah, of course.

MARTHA ARGUELLO: So I have a real challenge, sort of -- so we fought really hard to have the court reporter, and it's wonderful, but I -- you know, it's sort of like the good cop, bad cop. And so I have a real challenge, and I don't even have the words right now, about actively complying with one of our requests and then using it to justify sort of delaying action on some of the things that we're asking for. So I think that given that Trish is taking notes around the recommendations, that we
may not have to wait. Because I think that's important for our legal record and long-term, but I don't think we need to delay.

   FLOYD VERGARA: That's -- that's a fair point.

   SARAH RUBIN: Okay. Quick, and then I'm going to be making a suggestion for what we do between now and when we adjourn.

   Go ahead.

   KEVIN HAMILTON: So I just wanted to come back very quickly to the geographic equity issue, because I -- I don't think it's clear enough, or at least not to me. And I dealt with this a few years ago with Department of Health Services when they were lending out money to communities to enroll people in the new Medi-Cal programs, when the adults became eligible for medical. And we were able to negotiate this geographic piece, and we -- we got them to change their formula. And there's a formula for applying this funding. And so we got them to agree that geography was equal to density in scoring. So I don't know how to -- I don't know how it put that in here exactly, but that's what it came down to. Because they're scoring all of these proposals for where this is going to go and where the money is going to go.

   So we found that geography was very low on the totem pole when it came to scoring, like a two, whereas
density could be three, four, five, six even, if it's high
density. But we were dealing with, and we continue to
deal with, you know, hundred degree -- I mean hundred mile
trips just to get to certain communities. And so I just
want to make sure that that's -- that that is captured in
there.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Great. Thank you very
much.

So here is my recommendation. It's ten minutes
to 3:00. My goal is at 3:00 o'clock, we are moving
towards -- I'm going to be asking you to be using your
Post-its and different things, and we're going to be
moving around the room, putting up what deep dives you
want, getting into issues around the time line. If we do
not get to that, you will leave here frustrated, and we
absolutely have to get to what you are going to be doing
next so there's clarity.

So what I recommend that we do now is we have
Stephanie do her short introduction piece for this last
agenda item, then any recommendations that EJAC members
have, rather than doing them verbally, you write them down
and you hand them in. I do not feel like we -- we had a
very ambitious -- we could have easily had this be a
two-day, ten-hour meeting, or even a 12-hour, two-day
meeting. We don't have time to do 20 more minutes of
verbal comments. You won't have enough time. You'll run out of time.

THE REPORTER: I'm going to need a break.

SARAH RUBIN: And so while you are doing the handwriting, our court reporter could use a break.

So I have one comment here.

Okay. So Stephanie, is that okay with you?

STEPHANIE KATO: Sure.

SARAH RUBIN: Does anyone want to say no, we can't do that, they want to spend the rest of your time verbally doing recommendations and skip next steps?

MONICA WILSON: I don't want to preclude us from moving on to the next topic, but I just want some clarity about how to proceed on the recommendations for this last section. Do I need to give them to you before I leave to try to get to my flight, or can I e-mail them to you, or you know, what time line are we talking about?

SARAH RUBIN: You are welcome to e-mail them.

TRISH JOHNSON: Individual recommendations, for them to come through the committee should really be brought up right now. So I would expect you to say them verbally, at the very least. I'm trying my best to capture them, but from you, individually, through an e-mail, it's just from one member and doesn't represent the whole committee.
SARAH RUBIN: Okay. But each individual person who's sharing their suggested recommendation, are you considering that --

TRISH JOHNSON: We're doing it right here in the public meeting, so I just want to make sure she speaks up.

SARAH RUBIN: So does that mean that my process suggestion that if people write it down and hand it in to you it doesn't count, even if it's happening during the meeting?

TRISH JOHNSON: I don't know how the other members would know what it is.

MARI ROSE TARUC: Can we say key words and then hand it in?

SARAH RUBIN: Yeah, you can do that.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: I mean, honestly, none of this is committee consensus. I mean, we're not taking votes on anything here. This is just for us to throw out all of our ideas to be included in the Scoping Plan. So if I have to take a minute to say the three things I want, I can do that right now. I also have it written down, so whatever you need me to do.

SARAH RUBIN: Right.

So Monica, could you work on writing down whatever you want right now. And the other thing is, if it's said out loud in the meeting, like say you were...
verbally impaired, it would still count. So even if you
have to leave, if you leave it, someone could say it out
loud.

Okay? Is that cool?
Okay. Stephanie?

- TARGET SCOPING PLAN: PART 5 -

STEPHANIE KATO: See if I can do this really,
really quickly and just highlight a few things.

So for the natural working lands sector, on
March 25th there was a workshop in Sacramento. And one of
the things that was produced with that is a discussion
paper, so hopefully the EJAC members did get a chance to
read that. You know, that basically frames out the major
strategy for that sector in terms of, you know, preserving
land, means to enhance carbon resilience, ecological
function, considering research and demo projects that
would improve ecosystem health, and also building green
infrastructure through, you know, reducing the urban heat
island effect, and increasing tree canopy coverage.

To the extent that some of those goals in that
paper were able to be kind of more quantitative, some of
them that are in there, you know, there's some thresholds
of acres of managed wetlands to be restored, I believe the
forest sector also has some, you know, targets for
bringing numbers of acres under managed plans. And so one thing I was thinking about when Luis was talking was, I think one of land areas that might be missing from there is the desert lands. And I know we had a lot of coastal and other things, but maybe we'll want to take a focus on that and see if we have specific recommendations for desert lands.

As far as the agricultural operations go that are not land based, the ones that pertain to animal operations, we're basically subsuming the recommendations from the short-lived climate pollutant strategy, and that's largely focused on the dairies. And so that will be promoting the 40 percent reduction target that you saw in the draft strategy that was released last September.

So I guess some of details we'd like to hear about that, are there is different ways to manage the manure and to do with the -- with the resulting biogas. We know electricity generation is one of them. A lot of folks feel that, you know, if the traditional engine route is not the way to go, maybe you want to see more ARB-certified options like, um, microturbines and fuel cells or further clean up of the biogas into biomethane and injection into the pipeline. Maybe that could be part of an integrated strategy where you use biogas fuel from dairies to replace, you know, diesel that's being used in
the trucks right now.

As far as the waste management sector goes, the major strategy there is also outlined in the short-lived climate pollutant strategy, SLCP, and that is building off of the AB341 goal of diverting 75 percent of organics by 2020 and 90 percent by 2030. That also has, you know, various avenues to deal with organics. We've been talking about perhaps doing a food rescue target as part of that, so that will just, you know, reduce the amount of waste in the first place, and then once that is done, you know, there's different options for managing the organics, composting or putting in a digester.

So those are some of the things that we've been talking about. In the waste water treatment, water is something that we're talking about, that they'll need to capture the methane that's generated there and do something useful with it, whether it be for energy or further clean up and injection into the pipeline.

So those are the -- some of the main points.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. So we absolutely have to give Kim a break. Kim; right? Yes. Kim needs a break. So let's take a few minutes where she rests her hands.

Please write out your recommendations, and then we'll come to you to paraphrase it and hand it in to
Trish. We'll come back to you in a few minutes with your written out recommendations.

(Recess.)

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. If you are feeling an afternoon low, please go get some coffee or drink some water or stand up and run in place, because for the next half hour I really need people to be on their A game.

What I'm asking from folks in the next half hour is really significant. And I know you are all with me. Because at 3:30, we're going to do more public comment, and we have to stay on time because we want to hear from folks who are -- we're so grateful that they've joined us.

And many of us are on the last flight out and we cannot miss our flights, and so we absolutely have to leave on time. So if you're worried about the meeting not ending on time, don't worry, the meeting is ending on time. That's why I'm being so pushy.

Okay. Who wants to read out loud their recommendations for the record? Anyone? No commentary, just read it.

MONICA WILSON: Okay. Well, first I would recommend that an overarching principle that has that the State be building biomass, not burning biomass. And by that, I mean using compost to increase carbon sequestration instead of burning biomass and releasing
more CO2. So it's an overarching principle that I'd recommend, and it's written down. That relates to -- I'd like to repeat a recommendation from the 2014 round, so that could just be cut and pasted. It's -- I wrote it down on here, two -- no, F2F is where you find that recommendation.

Let me see. Another recommendation is that we do -- we integrate the growing research around carbon sequestration benefits of compost on grasslands, and I've got sources on this document.

SARAH RUBIN: Great. And you can hand that in.

MONICA WILSON: Great. And then the last one is the funding and permitting assistance of increased compost operations, particularly in Southern California, as well as markets -- market drivers for using that compost and applying it to areas that are going to increase carbon sequestration and improve health.

SARAH RUBIN: Great. Reading a next recommendation.

TOM FRANTZ: Yeah, for urban areas, the goals for urban canopy -- I mean urban forest canopy need to be far higher than the suggested ones right now, and the goals for more urban gardening with composting needs to be set at a much higher level, with the aim much higher than the current goals in the last few years.
And then reiterating Monica's thing, we got to -- dairy manure need to be composted with biomass because there are so many cobenefits, because you get methane reduction, you get reduced fertilizer imports, you get reduced N2O emissions and reduced water nates. That's far more than what you get from capturing a little methane from just a few dairies.

SARAH RUBIN: All right.

KEVIN HAMILTON: So with regard biogas conversion to biomethane, make that a priority and mandate that vehicles that are servicing the adjusters and convertors utilize that gas as a primary fuel source.

And then, we need to increase accountability of local government with regard to reductions they claim for their Cap-and-Trade funded activities of the counties and cities.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Next. Luis.

LUIS OLMEDO: Okay. So some of the things that come to mind at the moment is the cattle dairy, the dust factor. I know we discussed already the dust factor.

Also, it is talking about fuel burning, as well, pesticides and chemicals, and not to disregard what we discussed earlier about our close proximity to Mexicali and those contributions.

Also, in terms of food rescue, I just wanted to
mention that once we get into the nuts and bolts of it, I think when we talk about foot rescue, really define what that means. Because just in my experience, we don't want to be giving away rotten food and then get credit.

And in terms of waste management, I'd just like you to think about geothermal. You know, it's being presented in many different ways, and not to get into the whole debate, but there is waste and it needs to be managed and it needs to be part of the -- whether it is productive, efficient and useful or not, the waste needs to be a part of that formula.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Eleanor, then Katie, then we're moving on.

ELEANOR TORRES: I'd like to recommend that we identify wildland interfaces. They need to be included in this urban/rural interfaces and the need to design membranes of research BMPs for urban forestry and establish more refined metrics to determine the benefits of trees, including stormwater and sequestration. We need incentives for compact development for urban environments.

We need -- I'd like to recommend that we look at the integration of built environment and green infrastructure and trees as a utility. And thank you, Tom. Increasing tree canopy would be wonderful.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: So Number 1, add urban tree and green space maintenance, not just planning and creation.

Number 2, add forest management for wildfire protection and require tribal consultation in that plan.

Number 3, include urban agriculture.

Number 4, disincentivize and/or discourage locating biomass or digesters in disadvantaged communities, particularly close proximity to housing.

Number 5, protect green space by better enforcement of SB375 and the Sustainable Community Strategies.

And 6, to echo Luis in agricultural farming.

SARAH RUBIN: Great. Martha, do you have one?

MARTHA ARGUELLO: Yes.

SARAH RUBIN: Okay. We've got to wrap this up.

Yeah, go ahead.

MARTHA ARGUELLO: I'd like to recommend better coordination between what CARB is doing and CalRecycle, but also understanding what the Department of Toxic Substances is doing around both its waste reduction and diversion so that they're all working together and not making a mess somewhere else.

SARAH RUBIN: Rey?

REY LEON: Can I go?
SARAH RUBIN: Go. Go. Go.

REY LEON: Conduct an assessment of potential carbon capture and ground water recharge pilot projects, the being --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, can you say that again?

REY LEON: I'm sorry.

Assessment of potential carbon sequestration and ground water recharge pilot projects neighboring DACs, disadvantaged communities. I say this because near Huron, there is a definite opportunity where that can happen, and around this community they've already put in about eight wells and, you know, it's subsided to something that's real and it's impacting underground water resources. And so we need to not only sequester carbon, but also recharge the underground water sources that we have.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

Okay. What I want you to do next is take your big stickies, and I should have been handing out markers. We're going to do -- dive into two things. Have you guys help me pass those out. I want you to put down whatever deep dives you want. So whatever deep dives you'd like to see, write whatever you want, and you're going to go put it on these Post-its. So I'm asking all the EJAC members to get up and get out of their seats, even if you aren't
putting any deep dives up, and then you're going to meet me on this side of the room and we are going to talk about the poster paper over here, which has to do with staffing, what's going to lead us into our time line discussion and next steps, and then we might be moving to the back of the room. Everyone up, put your deep dives, and then meet on this side of the room, please.

KEVIN HAMILTON: You mean, put them on the -- on each one of those?


KEVIN HAMILTON: Can't we just put our name on it?

SARAH RUBIN: Yeah, you can do whatever you want.

KEVIN HAMILTON: Okay. Otherwise, you have to write out a whole bunch of these things.

SARAH RUBIN: Yeah, just put whatever you want.

If everybody on this side wants to get up and walk to the other side, you'll be able to see what we have on the wall and we're about to talk about. If you guys want to move to the other side of the room, you'll be able to see what we wrote on the wall and what we're going to talk about.

Okay. Everybody, we are going to keep going.
Anybody who is on that side of the room that feels like coming to this side of the room is welcome to. Folks who are working on putting up information about new deep dives or deeper dives, you are welcome to keep doing that, but I am going to ask that we all get focused on this corner of the room.

Could I have everyone's attention? Yoohoo. Yoohoo. I'm over here. The meeting is almost over. Just a little more attention. Okay. No more talking. Everyone is listening. I'm so proud of you. We are talking about schedule right now. Put your thinking cap on.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: Okay. I drafted something just because I recognize the time and I don't want to miss my flight. So if you look over there, and I know you can't see it, but basically the idea that I propose is that at our next meeting, the EJAC members bring draft outreach plans for our regions, so that we can start discussing an outreach plan for our workshops. So we come into the main meeting, we're going to review the draft Scoping Plan, because that will be out, we'll spend time in the meeting looking at that, and then we'll discuss outreach.

In June, I'm expecting that we'll need to discuss outreach again before we start it, because we're
going to be thinking about materials, we're going to think about ARB support, what we need and how our schedule is, et cetera.

July, August, outreach, recognizing ARB's capacity, and as much as I'd like to do it all in one day or one month, I don't think that that's just physically possible for ARB staff. So if we say June, July, August we do outreach in our communities, and then in September, we're meeting to debrief all the outreach we've done and to think about next steps. So we're creating a process for the first draft of the Scoping Plan, and then I'm hoping we can replicate again after the 350 data comes out, after the OEHHA report comes out and we have the second draft of the Scoping Plan we're looking for.

Does that sound acceptable?

SARAH RUBIN: So here's what I want to see if you are an EJAC member, thumb up if doing a homework of an outreach plan for your area seems something you're supportive of, thumb side if you're not sure, thumbs down if you don't want to do it. EJAC members put your hands up. Higher. Higher. Monica, I can't see your hand.

Sekita, great. Done.

Let's move over here. Staffing. Where is Eleanor?

ELEANOR TORRES: I'm here.
SARAH RUBIN: Come on. Tell us what we might see on this wall.

ELEANOR TORRES: Okay. When we met with Chair Nichols on trying to scope the staffing plan --

KEVIN HAMILTON: I was going to help you because she assigned me, but I wasn't in the meeting. Only six were allowed.

ELEANOR TORRES: You guys are throwing me to the wolves.

All right. So we're -- we had a group of people that met, Katie, Tom, Luis, and we all talked about what were the scoping plans that the staffing would include for the purposes of administrative and logistical staff supporting EJAC members to participate in meetings, travel, reimbursements, et cetera, all those administrative stuff, facilitator for our EJAC meetings and working with Scoping Plan staff authors to share on up-to-date and all the process and information consults with EJAC on each sector and also integrate the EJAC recommendations.

High level ARB staff ensures EJ is prioritized.

AB32 ARB staff can then attempt the scoping appropriately.

It also would be that we look at community engagement staffing to seek feedback on Scoping Plan from the discussion draft and to the final draft, as well as full
participation of the EJAC by providing per diems for travel, meals and work time for EJAC meetings. Additional meetings, calls, workshops and research.

So we broke down as far as what this EJ unit would look like, and we met with Dean, as well. And we broke it down to we would need a high-level manager, scientists, economists, a community coordinator, someone that's a resource manager, data manager, technical experts, and any other ones you would like to add.


SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Okay. Let's go back to our original seats. We're going to start to begin to close out our meeting.

MARI ROSE TARUC: Can I add something to the time line?

SARAH RUBIN: Yes. Thank you. I don't know how I got so sidetracked. So maybe before you sit down, we need to talk about the time line. And EJAC members, again, if you want to use your large Post-its, we need to add to the time line.

And can you give you the microphone Mari Rose to read those out loud?

MARI ROSE TARUC: Sure. Can I just yell? I have a very loud voice. Can you hear me?
SARAH RUBIN: The webcast. The webcast.

MARI ROSE TARUC: The webcast can't hear me?

All right. So what I did was process a recommendation for how we get our recommendations to a draft, discussion draft of the Scoping Plan. I put them in separate Post-its, and I'm going to post it up here. And it could be -- Yeah, so we'll figure out how that's going to happen.

So additional deep dives in completing the sectors is going to happen in April. I think also the -- so the EJAC's initial recommendations from today and any additional ones, also in April. Convening the EJAC work groups by sector and looking through the initial recommendations and compiling recommendations in April, possibly in May.

The EJAC sector work groups or discussing our recommendations with the Scoping Plan authors, and that ARB needs to introduce us to those authors so that we can engage in discussion with them.

That the release of the discussion draft, when with EJ considerations, that's up to whenever these authors can get them processed. So that could be May, that could be June.

And that these five to ten public environmental justice community workshops to get feedback on the
discussion draft is anywhere from June, July, August.
And that the meeting in September, after these
public workshops, are going to synthesize the community
feedback on the discussion draft. And ARB staff will
staff us to be able to do this.

KATIE VALENZUELA GARCIA: And if I could add,
Mari Rose -- this is Katie -- I think I would love to see
us schedule all of our meetings more in advance. I think
part of what we're getting caught up on is these posting
requirements. And it would be great if we just had
blocks, even if we didn't use them, like two two-day
blocks every month, and then if we need them for a deep
dive or if we need for a meeting, they're available and we
have them held, and we don't have to delay, we can just
post and go.

MARTHA ARGUELLO: I don't know if that -- the
other part is, do we want to consider our future meetings
as two-day meetings or at least one and half days, and so
for all of us to leave here knowing that that's going to
be a commitment.

SARAH RUBIN: EJAC members, can I see the sort
of thumb down side for two -- scheduling for two days? If
you don't need the second day, we won't use it.
Okay. We've got support for that.

All righty, anyone else want to add anything
else to the time line, EJAC members?

Okay. Let's go back to our seats. We're going
to move towards public comment and ending our meeting.
Okay. Again, we're going to do two-minute public
comments.

-PUBLIC COMMENTS-

ANITA NICKLEN: Where can I find the draft on
the Scoping Plan so I can start digesting it, if I can?

SARAH RUBIN: Okay.

ANITA NICKLEN: And then if I have comments, who
do I give them to?

SARAH RUBIN: Someone want to explain that?

TRISH JOHNSON: So based on the time line that
we discussed at the February 5th EJAC meeting, there would
be a discussion draft of the Scoping Plan released in May.
That is the time line that we're working off of. There's
nothing available as we speak. Actually, the detail we
provided today at the meeting, including those tables, is
something you could take a look at. That's on the EJAC
meeting web page, but there's more to come.

My manager is mentioning that we did update the
Scoping Plan in 2014, so that is a document to take a look
at. And the original Scoping Plan was released and
adopted in 2008. I can also help you sign up for an
e-mail list to receive e-mails when we post documents.

SARAH RUBIN: Great. Next public comment.

RAY ASKINS: This may be a little premature to mention, but you know so often you hear the comments that government just does the talk, but they don't do the walk. There is one little plan that could be implemented right away, and it's about trees. And this is something I do in my voluntary time is I acquire trees from the EPA and from Baja California. I also get trees from the Federal EPA. And anywhere I can get free trees, I get them. And then I pot them in a little bowl so I get a nice ball of roots, and then I give them away. And the neighbors plant them, and before you know it, the trees are growing like crazy and other neighbors come up to me and say, Hey, I want some of those trees like that, too, those shrubs.

These are the kinds of things that you get, like the IID can sit there and and grow the plants and then give them out, maybe in exchange for plastic, plastic bottles, or for glass, newspapers, to encourage recycling. These are just -- I'm throwing the seed out there. This is something that maybe you as a group can think about.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

ROBERTO NECOCHEA: I just want to add --

SARAH RUBIN: Say your name.

ROBERTO NECOCHEA: Rob Necochea. I'll spell it
for you later.

I just want to add that our border is a unique situation, and we have the two most polluted bodies of water, the Salton Sea and the New River. And we're an international community right on the border. And even though they passed NAFTA, there are side effects to NAFTA that the Valley, the residents here, have been impacted by NAFTA. And it's severe, because even though the County can have regulations, the State can have regulations, you can't regulate what happens in Mexico.

So I think it's really important to collaborate. I know you're the Air Resources Board and you're appointed by the Governor, Mary Nichols is appointed by the Governor, and sometimes I don't know if commissioners really have teeth or they just, you know, get together and have meetings. And I just think it's very important to collaborate with the different government agencies, especially here. I'm speaking for the Imperial Valley because of our New River, Salton Sea, the toxic air, New River, most polluted river.

And I know our State Assemblyman has been an advocate for this area, but you guys are in Sacramento with the deep pockets. You guys can make the difference for us. And what I'm just meaning to find out, even though I got here late, was there are two more government
agencies that are not here at the table expressing their
opinions on the Salton Sea and the New River and our
quality of air, and here is the Air Resources Board.

    I don't -- I feel like our meetings with
government and stakeholders aren't at the table here, and
I wonder why. It's not my -- I'm nobody in government,
but as a citizen, I think as a state you should mandate
that if you're giving money to other agencies, that we're
all at the same table with the same goals and the same
solutions. Because everyone is operating on their own and
nothing gets done. So you need to get the Federal
Government involved, too, because the NAFTA side effects,
the power energy plants in Mexico is impacting our
communities.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Okay. We're almost
done. Two more.

JOHN HERNANDEZ: Okay. Again, my name is John
Hernandez, local resident, and I'm going to be one of
those people that's going to leave more confused than when
I got here. But that's a good thing, because it's going
to drive me to learn those things that I don't clearly
understand and continue to be part of the process. I echo
the conversation here that the stakeholders are missing.
If this is so important, this AB32 and the billions of
dollars that are being put out, and we have Flint Michigan
happening here right now as we speak, then where are the stakeholders? So I'm going to, you know, try to understand this a little bit more and continue to collaborate with our local community and try to learn a little bit more.

And again, I want to thank all those that came from the outside area, those representing the ARB. You're very important, a very important body for us that suffer from the air quality issues that are affecting us for so long.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you. Okay. Last public comment. We're going to go to some very short closing remarks and adjourn.

JOSE VELEZ: (Translated from Spanish.) I wanted to welcome everybody from this committee. I am a citizen of the valley, and I had two issues to address. I'm worries about the pressure, atmospheric pressure changes in the the community. I know that when there is an increase or decrease of atmospheric pressure, we know that the pollution increase or decrease, and I would like to get some feedback on what we can do as citizens to improve this.

And the second issue -- the other issue I wanted to address was the power companies that are established on the Mexican side of the border, two to three miles across
the border in the city of Mexicali. These do no comply by
electrical or energy efficiency, and this obviously harms
the communities at the border region. I would like to
know what is going to be done to address this problem or
what steps can we take to address this issue, as well.

SARAH RUBIN: Thank you.

So before we have a closing thank you from ARB
and our local host, Luis, I think we should take a minute
to thank and acknowledge our interpreters because they've
done such a great job today.

(Applause.)

State your name.

LUISA: My name is Luisa. Thank you for having
me.

ERICA RUPERT: My name is Erica Rupert, and
we're happy to be here. We've been following these
meetings for the past six years or so, so we're happy to
see the progress.


And Kim, our court reporter, let's give her a
round of applause.

(Applause.)

-CLOSING REMARKS-

FLOYD VERGARA: So I just wanted to spend a few
seconds just thanking the EJAC members. Really appreciate, you know, you allowing us and encouraging us to meet down here. I think this is a valuable experience for us.

I want to thank Luis specifically for, you know, making sure that this facility was available for us. I think it was a really useful, productive discussion. I certainly took a lot of takeaways away from it.

I want to thank the board members and Steve for taking time off from your busy schedules. I think, as you heard here, there was some really good comments that were made, and I think it was -- you know, there were some things that we can take action on and respond to those comments at the next one. So I really appreciate that.

Again, we'll look forward to continuing this dialogue. This is an ongoing process for us. And we'll take a number of these things back with us and take a look at it.

I suspect, even after we get the certified transcript from the court reporter and we look at our own notes, we're probably going to have a lot of questions and clarifications that we're going to need. So I'm going to ask my staff to set up a call, at least with the leadership team, if not a little bit bigger than that, just to make sure we fully understand what the comment or
recommendation was before we proceed with trying to respond.

So again, thank you very much. I appreciate it. And I look forward to the next one.

ANITA NICKLEN: Can I make a five-second comment before? Can I? Five seconds?

SARAH RUBIN: Yes.

ANITA NICKLEN: I would just like to say that that first draft is going to be as good as you allow these members, you know, to be able to give input and also us as a community. That's the only thing I wanted to add.

(Applause.)

LUIS OLMEDO: I can't even find the words. I want to thank everybody for coming here to Imperial, to the city of Brawley, where Comite Civico has operated since 1985.

And I feel like we as -- you know, all of you from ARB to all the members of, you know, the EJAC, I feel we're at a whole different level, you know. You're not from here, you don't understand the issues, but you came to the community and got to experience just the warmth and embrace that the community has.

I want to thank the City of Brawley, because they were very welcoming. They would have done so much more, but there are limitations. But, you know, they
wanted to just roll out the red carpet, and they did in so many ways, so I want to thank the City of Brawley.

I want to thank the two board members who came here and spent all day. There's no doubting their commitment. The meetings in Sacramento -- I'm so glad that we're neighbors -- and we shared the experience with the border region. And so I want to thank all of you. I want to thank the staff who came here, you know, Trish and everybody else. There's too many to mention, so I'm sorry I started it. Trish gets a mention.

(Applause.)

I want to thank our sound, our board member, Antonio. I want to thank him for coming out here and setting up the sound. I want to thank Roy. He's been making sure that the community is aware through his new network as well as providing us the Livestream. And I also wanted to thank the other experts in the audience who came here, committed, the students. I also want to mention that we did have representation here from assembly member Eduardo Garcia's office. She's here if you want to say hello.

(Applause.)

And I think I mentioned most, except the most important one, which is Sarah. I want to thank her because she really helped us pull it together. It's not
easy to pull all these leaders together here. I mean, it's a monumental task, and you did such a wonderful job, and I want to thank you, Sarah. (Applause.)

And I want to wish everybody a safe trip back home. If you stay, please just check with me if you need any directions, places to go. If you want to go to Mexicali, I think it's safe to go, you know, if you want to experience that. So let me know. Whatever you need, I'm still here. And so thank you.

And applause for yourselves, my fellow members, because you bring such a great service. Thank you. (Applause.)

SARAH RUBIN: We are adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.)

-o0o-
I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place herein set forth; that a verbatim record of the proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand, which was thereafter transcribed under my direction; further that the foregoing is an accurate transcription thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my name.

Dated:_______________________

_______________________________
KIMBERLY NOVAK, CSR
Certificate No. 13135