

## AB 32 Environmental Justice Advisory Committee June 21, 2016

### Committee Member Attendees

Gisele Fong (GF), Tom Frantz (TF), Katie Valenzuela-Garcia (KVG), Sekita Grant (SG), Rey Leon (RL), Luis Olmedo (LO), Mari Rose Taruc (MRT), Eleanor Torres (ET)

### ARB and State Agency Attendees

Trish Johnson (TJ), Floyd Vergara (FV), Dave Mallory (DM), Johnnie Raymond (JR), Senator Dean Flores (DF)

### Facilitator

Stephanie Lucero, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)

Cindy Teague, CCP

Mark Wilson, Technical Writer

### Action Items

1. LO will provide some language for recommendations on natural desert forestation.
2. RL and SK to partner on language later for item "ad." under Energy.
3. ET can collaborate with LO on resources for community workshops.
4. Doodle poll for August 2016 meeting will go out from CCP. Please respond by 6/24 so time and location can be determined.
5. In response to public comment regarding item "f" under Industry: ARB (FV) said these could include discussions with the Mexican government.
6. KVG will create draft outline of talking points and send to the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee (EJAC) Members prior to presentation to ARB on 6/24.
7. EJAC Members will send in suggestions they would like to see presented at the 6/24 ARB meeting.

### Attachments

- Meeting materials are available at:  
<http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scopingplan.htmnds>
- Appendix A, Revised Recommendations.

### Welcome and Introductions

SL opened the Webinar once a quorum arrived. Introductions were made in English and Spanish. SL thanked everyone for joining the EJ Advisory Meeting. Committee Members introduced themselves. SL reviewed the Agenda and meeting objectives. The purpose of this

meeting is to review and vote on those Draft Recommendations that were revised after the June 6, 2016 teleconference. SL reminded EJAC members that:

- These recommendations will be discussed and refined again at a later date.
- These are intended as initial broad-based recommendations. Modification will take place at a later date.
- After outreach to the community groups is completed, input can be added to these before anything final is put forth.

TJ noted that initial recommendations are handled in a similar fashion to the original Scoping Plan recommendations. Initial recommendations were a part of the proposed Scoping Plan. This includes economic and CEQA analysis. TJ shared that the Board will review input by the public and all recommendations. The updated timeline is [posted on ARB website](#). Scoping Plan recommendations are not due until August 2016.

## Overview

Sector Workgroups reviewed and revised those recommendations flagged as yellow on June 6, 2016. Each workgroup provided a brief overview of changes and the revised yellow initial recommendations are voted on. Members will provide a green light if they are in support of recommendation moving forward as is for now. EJAC members were reminded that additional changes can be made through July. The Sectors were reviewed in the following order:

1. Overarching Issues
2. Transportation
3. Energy, Green Buildings Water
4. Industry
5. Natural & Working Lands, Agriculture, Waste

The approved recommendations for the Scoping Plan are in the Appendix A. Comments made regarding changes or advice for future revisions are summarized below:

### Transportation Comments

- KVG acknowledged that some of the recommendations in “a1-4” are beyond the scope of the ARB and other state agencies, but felt they were important to include in this initial set of recommendations.
- LO knows Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is partnering with ARB, what correlation exists between impacts relative to land use and guidelines that actually reflect OPR’s recommendations?
  - FV explained EJAC’s work is passed along to sister agencies. ARB’s efforts are seen as the conduit, but ARB tries to ensure the dialogue is occurring.

- LO commented relative to “e.” some border locations have very unique needs. SG would like additional information on this issue.
  - Action Item: LO to share information on border locations.
- LO: Reduce border wait lines and times and provide more efficient public transportation systems to assist the workers traveling back and forth between the US/Mexico border.
- SG: Any specific organizations, policies and/or funding you could suggest at this time would be appreciated.
- LO: Build the infrastructure on the California (CA) side. Same agencies that are already involved should be addressing these issues. It’s just giving it more attention – there are public transportation opportunities that could be explored. Thousands of vehicles could then be eliminated. Interconnection between CA and Mexico is the issue, not just looking at it from the CA side.
- TF said “j” needs to have methane credits added to dairies.
- Sustainable Community Strategies should be kept separate from “k”.
- Re: “u”, the Title XI expectations are not clear to GF. It would be helpful to have refinement of terms.
- Local agencies need to be aware of how they are funding/defunding opportunities that are more accessible to people of color. The point is to have equitable transportation options.

### **Energy, Green Buildings and Water Comments**

- SK: Item “b” California Independent System Operators (CAISO), which is more focused on grid and grid flow, should be separated out.
- Both “a” and “b” should be fleshed out more, but are able to move forward for now.
- LO felt “d” needed additional language regarding specific technologies.
- Items “j” and “m” should have specific communities identified. This has to do with CalEnviroScreen, but all members would like clarification on native trees i.e. in high desert.
  - **Action Item:** LO can provide some of the language for these recommendations on natural desert forestation.
- Whenever there is a conflict between current and prior (2014) recommendations, the EJAC prefers that current recommendations be used.
- Items “o” and “p” were both approved but with clarity required on overall recommendation to include incentives not being offered on energy sources that are not considered renewable.
- Item “ad.” was discussed and RL asked for rebate or compensation to low income communities to be added into language for community-owned solar generation. Approved for now, but RL and SK to partner on language later. Wording on residential or

small business needs addressing because large business gets its limits on the subsidy by federal government already.

- Residential is a go for tax credits with “ad.” but do not include small business. Small Business is a yellow and will be split off from residential for solar credits.
- In regards to “ae.” where business was pulled out for Small Business – leave it at yellow for now until committee can revisit this issue.

## Public Comment

1. Imperial Valley: Why should low income communities be forced to switch from electrical to gas for appliances? It is much cheaper to use gas. We need incentives to move over to electrical.
2. Imperial Valley: letter “o” – we would like to see lower electric bills. Renewable energy is getting imported out to other areas like San Diego, but is generated at the expense of lower income communities. Rural low-income communities where renewable energy is produced should receive a benefit.
3. We are looking forward to comment period so we can input into the third phase.
4. LO would like to see study on impacts on increased gasoline prices. What is the incentive to switch over to electric vehicles or alternative vehicles if community members do not have resources to do it?
5. Border crossing accessibility is an issue that needs addressing. Currently we are traveling 1.5 miles to get the store and there is no shade—this fits into accessibility recommendation already discussed.
6. There should be bus transportation to drive people to where the cars are parked. This fits into transportation recommendations.
7. In Sacramento, Shelly with California for Clean Air policy coalition said regulated stakeholders are looking for certainty. We need to know what the allocation assistance will be in the future. TJ indicated ARB is collecting online comments.
8. EJAC recommendations are great. In regards to weatherization of homes and also the neighborhood level work.
9. A pilot study on weatherization seems redundant, as many have already been done on this issue. Washington State includes a cost match for older homes. Goals should be on savings to community members.
10. Green House Gases (GHG)’s seem very sketchy.

## Industry and National Working Lands Comments

- Industry item “b” and “c” were approved. Reduced Emission and Deforestation Degradation (REDD) issue should be thought about by the EJAC, consider the connection with the border with Mexico. Do we have a mechanism to influence pollution coming

over the border? This would have benefits to low-income communities. Benefits would help both sides of the border.

- Benefits in California first with no REDD program. This item is approved as a separate issue.
- Item “g” offsets need to occur where emissions occur. Issue approved.
- Item “a” is looking for “rural desert urban forestry” to be included so it qualifies for tree planting.
- Under California Climate Investments, “a” was approved, but LO wanted a comment that explains what “transformative” literally means so it fits with the community needs.

### **2030 Target Scoping Plan Concept Paper**

Rajinder Sahota with ARB presented overview of the Scoping Plan Concept Paper.

The concept paper will be presented at the ARB Board Hearing this on June 23, 2016. Public comment is open through July 8, 2016.

- In regards to release of inventory, the concept paper looked at progress made with current programs. On page 5, see reducing emissions and GHG’s and 2014 inventory relative to 2020.
- California is now the sixth largest economy in the world, which shows it can reduce GHGs and still grow the economy.
- We made structural changes to GHG accounting.
- We know we need to focus on strategies not siloes. It is important to acknowledge interrelationships. For e.g., how solar has impacts on natural and working lands (NWL). We must look at a portfolio approach, not stacking programs.
- In regards to NWL, it is hard to set targets because of quantifying biological systems. We are working with Natural Resources Agency (NRA) and California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) to come up with new metrics, such as naming X number of acres, versus sequestering.
- We are working with California Department of Public Health to identify synergies, improve equity and access to services and opportunities, especially in more vulnerable areas. We know it is important to understand how to improve how we provide equity and make communities more resilient.
- It is not clear at this time whether or not we can achieve the 2030 targets until some modeling is done. Some sectors have technology barriers. We are inviting the public to provide input on the process to help us.
- It appears work on the Scoping Plan and the cap-and-trade program will be going forward simultaneously.
- Public input is still ongoing in workshops. EJAC is providing input on both processes. Cap-and-trade rulemaking process timeline has not changed. FV is happy to talk more about that issue.

## Comments:

- TF presented his view as to why GHG has reduced. It is a natural occurring process that has been happening since 1972. He does not feel ARB should take credit by giving a glowing report.
- KVG expressed concern that the Cap-and-trade rulemaking process was proceeding simultaneously with the Scoping Plan process.

## Follow up on Community Workshops

- The Workshop timeline has changed. On July 11, 2016, the first workshop will be held in San Bernardino. ET is currently getting a lot of response and they hope to have at least 100 attendees.
- SL reminded EJAC Members to look at email that was sent last week outlining the process for covering Community Workshop costs. A few reminders to consider:
  - You cannot seek reimbursement. Center for Continuing Education (CCE) must contract directly unless other arrangements are made.
  - There are limitations on what types of resources can be provided, those are outlined.
  - ARB needs to know what resources are being requested for budgeting.
- The June 24, 2016 standing call will focus on how data/comments are recorded and reported out to the EJAC and ARB. The goal is develop a process that ensures clear reporting of community thoughts and ground-truthing recommendations.
- EJAC Members should share how they want the information synthesized.
- There is a lot of variety in all the different agendas.
- LO Requested additional information on how the World Café will be structured:
  - SL explained the World Café format generally and how certain sectors may be selected at the “break out” sessions.
    - Attendees can go to the sector topics of their choice – staying at one or attending all of them.
  - FV clarified that prior to the World Café, participants would do the gallery walk for an overview of issues and ARB activities.
  - Experts would then do short presentations on topics.
  - Then people would go out to World Café sessions where experts would appear for discussion and questions.
- ET will use this basic format, but they will allocate two hours for the sessions. They are currently feeding information to community members. ET will allow community members to provide translation at breakout sessions. ET also needs childcare, so her team is looking to provide that. ET will use community folks to also do scribing at each table. ET can collaborate with LO on sharing resources.
- KVG summarized the timing needs of EJAC Meetings:

- Beginning of August meeting should be scheduled to debrief on community input so ARB can then adjust recommendations after that debrief.
- September is a second opportunity to discuss the recommendations
- **Action Item** CCP will send a Doodle poll for August. Please respond by June 24, 2016 so time, location can be scheduled.

## Public Comment

1. Alberto referred to “f” under Industry, asking if there are any emission caps being measured on California companies doing business in Mexico. Do they have to meet the standards? How can we add those emissions to these totals?
2. LO said it is the same as “Can we catch it at port of entry?” like we do for shippers.
3. Department of State and also the Mexican government can be included in discussions because of close proximity. ARB will consider these points.
4. Climate Change Coalition, Shelley asked if there is a mechanism for people who cannot attend sessions.
  - a. Email and paper comments will be made available to the public.
5. Friends of the Earth thanked the EJAC for doing a great job. Support was strongly voiced for the international efforts. They appreciate the REDD. Would like to see an opposition to biomass burning. Forest debris matters to forests. Language is antiquated. “Forests” should replace NWL. It is imperative that GHG inventory actually does a frank and honest accounting of the damage that the timber industry causes. Offset effort is an erroneous assumption that we can counteract with offsets.
6. We need to get the entire state, including northern California involved, especially rural communities.
  - a. KVG did explain Sierra and Northern California is included in Oct/Nov workshops.
7. Comment from Southern California regarding item “aa.” in NWL. They recommend a buffer zone of trees, especially near schools, to buffer the pesticides that travel on the wind.
8. Brawley committee member appreciate being a part of this meeting. They applaud all that is being done and want to continue their participation.

## Closing and Next Steps

The EJAC Advisory Committee has been invited by Diane Takvorian to present to the ARB Board June 23, 2016.

1. KVG is in Sacramento and has volunteered to do the presentation.
2. Timeline is a big issue and LO wants to see advance notice of talking points.

- a. Recommendations should be included from June 21, 2016 revisions—general themes.
- b. Specifics to be touched on include issues of ARB working simultaneously on rulemaking, specifically cap-and-trade.
- c. KVG will create draft and send out to EJAC members prior to presentation on June 23, 2016.
- d. EJAC Members can send in suggestions on what they want presented.

FV appreciates community members being a part of this effort. ARB wants to make this process work for the Scoping Plan, as well as continuing the dialogue with EJAC and disadvantaged communities. TJ thanked everyone for participating.

## Appendix A

### Environmental Justice Advisory Committee's (EJAC) Draft Initial Recommendations for Discussion Draft Version of 2030 Target Scoping Plan Update

#### New Recommendations for Consideration

- There should be public education strategy emphasizing GHG reduction and air pollution reduction benefits associated with consuming less dairy and meat products. (from 6/6/16 meeting)
- There should be public education strategy emphasizing GHG reduction and air pollution reduction benefits of urban forestry. (from 6/6/16 meeting)
- General Recommendation (formerly part of C in Transportation): The state must prioritize the advancement of economic benefits in disadvantaged and low-income communities, including increasing access to and ownership of clean energy and clean transportation technologies, increasing access to affordable alternative transportation options (bike/walk infrastructure, transit), increasing access to clean energy and clean transportation jobs, and promoting a just transition to clean energy and clean transportation for communities, individuals, and small businesses reliant on fossil fuel based transportation.

**Drafted by EJAC at April 4, 2016 and May 24-25 Meetings and approved at June 6 and 21 meetings.  
Initial Draft Recommendations**

| Overarching questions for each sector to respond to in write-up |   |
|---|---|
| a.  | Break down how current recommendations are different from 2014 scoping plan and why   |
| b.  | Clearly identify data gaps in analysis (i.e. RPS considerations)  |
| c.  | Identify clear metrics for each recommendation; data should start to be collected now, with first check-in in 2020 and every two years thereafter |
| d.  | What are the consequences/conflicts of requirements on the ground (e.g., cheap gas can lead to excess emissions)?                                 |

| <b>Overarching Issues, Economic Analysis, Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Reduction Strategy</b> |  |
|--|--|
| a.   | We need public engagement and a culture shift in California. Not for sprawl with equity at center; equity overlay.   |
| b.   | More aggressive emissions reduction plan and target Oil and Gas sector to reduce emissions.  |
| c.   | Interconnectivity between the California/Baja California border regions.   |
| d.   | Consider real-time monitoring, citizen science, and SEPs.  |
| e.   | Carbon Capture and Sequestration – totally eliminated for reducing GHGs (SJV concerns).  |
| f.   | Geographic equity should be a part of the process, need air quality monitors where people are breathing, need meeting in Huron (west side), rural areas need special attention.  |
| g.   | Equity must always be a primary consideration when examining issues in any sector.   |
| h.   | Environmental Justice activities should refocus on neighborhood-level solutions and draw on community input, rather than just taking a top-down approach. <b>[overlap with Overarching Issues: a]</b>  |
| i.   | Coordinate meetings between the interagency working groups (IWG) and EJAC, to encourage information sharing and mutual cooperation between the groups.   |
| j.   | A communications plan should be developed to educate and engage communities on how pollution affect them. <b>[overlap with Natural and Working Lands: a]</b>   |
| k.   | ARB should ensure that a sufficient number and distribution of air quality monitors are placed in disadvantaged regions, to account for air quality differences in the region. <b>[overlap with Overarching Issues: d and f, and Industry: i]</b>          |
| l.   | Identify what tools are being used to gather emissions data on both sides of the rural California/Mexico border, and how California’s approaches interact with the Mexican framework of rules and regulations. <b>[overlap with Overarching Issues: c]</b> |
| <b><i>Economic Analysis</i></b>  |  |
| a.   | Add Manuel Pastor, Jim Sadd, or Jonathan London to Scoping Plan Economic Reviewers. Ensure that reviewers come from various areas around the state.  |
| b.   | The Scoping Plan Economic Analysis should consider carbon tax, straight up regulation, and Cap-and-Dividend or Fee and Dividend.   |
| c.   | Expand the definition of economy to include costs to the public (e.g., U.S. EPA social cost calculator). Conduct an economic analysis that would account for the cost to public health and   |

| <b>Overarching Issues, Economic Analysis, Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Reduction Strategy</b> |  |
|--|--|
|  | environmental burdens from GHGs. Include the ITHIM model in the analysis. Ensure that ARB coordinates with other state agencies in this effort.  |
|  | d. Maximize job & economic benefits, want to see section in Scoping Plan around jobs and economic benefits, target environmental justice communities.  |
|  | <b><i>Short-Lived Climate Pollutant Reduction Strategy</i></b>   |
|  | a. The EJAC hereby makes a recommendation to CARB to mandate a 40% methane reduction from dairies and CAFOs by the year 2030 and require community consultation and approval of the implementation plan for the 40% methane mandate; all additional ancillary emissions generated through achieving this goal must be mitigated. |
|  | b. The Strategy should explicitly state no disposal of food waste to landfills or incinerators; and explore synergies with methane reductions from dairies and the management of organic waste, such as wood waste.  |

| <b>Transportation</b> |   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | <p>a. Sustainable Community Strategies (SCSs) must be improved in the following ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SCS compliance with ARB GHG reduction targets must only be based on documented land use and transportation changes.</li> <li>2. Metropolitan Planning Organizations should only be allowed to authorize implementation of projects that are included in the most recent SCS.</li> <li>3. Transit agencies must be required to adhere to projected routes and costs in the adopted SCS.</li> <li>4. Implementation of SCSs must prioritize investments in disadvantaged communities.</li> </ol> <p>Ensure that these efforts are coordinated with the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR), and continue to ensure that the recommendations align with the California general plan guidelines for local governments on land use that transfer to OPR plan.</p> |
|                       | b. Expand transit services to provide neighborhood level access, use different vehicle sizes and types to ensure economies scale & ensure sustainability; ensure accessibility to disadvantaged communities.  |
|                       | c. Define infrastructure; not just highways & freeways (new fueling stations, roads); support new vehicle types, reach neighborhoods and small communities.   |

| <b>Transportation</b> |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <p>New technologies: CNG, electric.</p> <p>Improve existing transit resources such as bus stops (e.g., covered bus stops). Need inventory assessment – COGs have this inventory; interagency communication.</p>  |
| d.                    | <p>Transportation programs and investments plans must prioritize:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. community needs and mobility assessments,</li> <li>2. robust community participation,</li> <li>3. affordable, reliable, and safe access to clean mobility options in disadvantaged communities,</li> <li>4. battery refueling stations located within freight corridors,</li> <li>5. job and workforce training opportunities in disadvantaged communities, and</li> <li>6. ground truthing the actual impacts of program implementation.</li> </ol> <p>These plans should include activities that reduce U.S.-Mexico border crossing wait times by having a more efficient transportation system, and should work with existing transportation agencies to build the infrastructure on the US side. Efforts should focus on cars, public transportation, and pedestrians.</p> |
| e.                    | <p>Financially support transit operations and restoration of transit service and routes and expansion of services where lacking in disadvantaged communities.</p>  |
| f.                    | <p>There should be a holistic approach for transit options to rectify disadvantaged communities' history of inequities, also shared mobility.</p>  |
| g.                    | <p>Look at mobility regionally as there are different challenges in distinct areas of California.</p>  |
| h.                    | <p>An increase from the current 10% to 30% by 2030 for LCFS should be put in place.</p>  |
| i.                    | <p>Eliminate the assumption in the low-carbon fuel standard Life Cycle Analysis that methane is a necessary by-product of dairies. This will eliminate the awarding of avoided methane emissions credits to dairies. Instead, the methane emissions must count as an emissions debit against the fuel.</p>   |
| j.                    | <p>All Sustainable Community Strategies and transportation project analyses must include metrics around displacement and gentrification.</p>   |
| k.                    | <p>Target truck fleets and vehicle fleets to achieve the quickest, most significant reductions in emissions.</p>   |
| l.                    | <p>Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) while increasing alternative transportation options and accessibility.</p>  |
| m.                    | <p>Design and implement new incentives beyond tax credits to encourage infill development over sprawl. Consider code and permitting changes to streamline planning. Help pay for</p>   |

| <b>Transportation</b> |   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | infrastructure improvements, and mandate that activities target the most pressing needs.  |
| n.                    | Promote and support clean and renewable energy sources to power vehicles, and coordinate those activities with energy and transportation agencies to help ensure their success.   |
| o.                    | Study the emissions reduction benefits from increasing gasoline prices.   |
| p.                    | Conduct equity analyses when evaluating and implementing transportation options, to prevent adverse secondary effects in disadvantaged communities (e.g., the Los Angeles FasTrak program, which resulted in more vehicles on artery streets, creating even worse air quality problem for those communities).   |
| q.                    | Conduct equity analyses in transportation projects to ensure that investments go to the highest area of need. Track where projects are implemented.   |
| r.                    | Measure emissions reductions by per capita VMT.   |
| s.                    | State agencies give local transit authorities more direction about Title VI expectations, specifically regarding any fare increases and route changes that may limit access to transit, to ensure equitable distribution of funds and services.   |
| u.                    | In support of state electric vehicle goals, such as SB 1275, the state must develop and provide funding for a program that ensures deep penetration of electric vehicle use and charging station access in disadvantaged communities. This program should include a pilot program that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Places new and used electric vehicles and electric vehicle infrastructure in at least seven low-income and disadvantaged communities to demonstrate how to accelerate electric vehicle use in these communities,</li> <li>2. Ensures a proper diversity of population density - urban, suburban, and rural areas, Prioritizes areas with aging infrastructure.</li> </ol> |

| <b>Energy, Green Buildings, Water</b> |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| a.                                    | Include considerations for electrical upgrades that need to happen in residential buildings to support electric vehicles or other energy improvements. Conduct community-level assessment of needs for additional infrastructure improvements.      |
| b.                                    | Electric vehicle charging capacity: The California Independent Systems Operator (CAISO) should conduct capacity assessments at the local level, not just statewide, to ensure that local areas have the capacity to handle the new charging demand. |
| c.                                    | Develop aggressive Renewable energy targets, bring back 2014 EJAC Energy  |

| Energy, Green Buildings, Water |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
|                                | Recommendations. <b>overlap with N.</b>   |
| d.                             | Create micro-grids that enable communities to be self-sufficient for electricity. Pilot 10-100 in environmental justice communities. <b>This was green-lighted, but it needs additional language to specify what technologies constitute a microgrid. Luis volunteered to provide this language.</b>  |
| e.                             | Don't dilute California's progress in electricity emissions reductions.   |
| f.                             | Do a pilot project with substandard low-income housing, how retrofit, if HUD has funding ..., if weatherization funding, how that gets done.  |
| g.                             | Include community driven power that promotes jobs.  |
| h.                             | Make pumping of water in California 100% renewable by 2030.   |
| i.                             | Remove special considerations for investor-owned utilities, require them to develop power that is the most efficient.   |
| j.                             | Desert native tree forestation, tree canopy. Caution use of water as energy source, such as geothermal, are there benefits going back into community? <b>This was green-lighted, but it needs clarification on desert native tree forestation (which trees are likely to succeed). Luis said Mexico has developed booklets on desert forestation and he could provide some information.</b>                       |
| k.                             | Solar not on rooftops in desert communities, why?   |
| l.                             | Need low-cost stacking, weatherization technologies, solar.   |
| m.                             | Some DACs do not score fairly in CalEnviroScreen due to a lack of emissions data gathering, perhaps due to absence in monitoring, facility, or systemic failure to document. Additionally, prison facilities may skew demographics changing the outlook of the area one way or another. To fairly identify the communities in low-income bracket, need to approach holistically identifying the multiple factors. |
| n.                             | <b>Incorporate EJAC recommendations from 2014. This was green-lighted, but it was agreed that EJAC and ARB need to have a conversation on how EJAC's 2016 recommendations will align with the 2014 recommendations. Overlap with c.</b>   |
| o.                             | Imported electricity should not be considered renewable beyond the percent of renewable energy production (the renewable portfolio) currently existing in the exporting state. This was green-lighted, with the understanding that there would be further discussion on it. Sekita noted that there should be no double counting or incentives for other states to encourage burning fossil fuels.                |
| p.                             | Encourage a transition from natural gas-based appliances and technologies to all electric   |

| Energy, Green Buildings, Water |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
|                                | technologies.   |
| q.                             | Support tree planting and green infrastructure to reduce the energy needed for cooling. [overlap with Energy: k, and Natural and Working Lands: a, b, g]  |
| r.                             | Approach energy reductions (building retrofits, weatherization, etc.) in a way that addresses the entire disadvantaged community, rather than addressing individual buildings. GHG reduction funds should address the whole disadvantaged community, and the disadvantaged community itself should qualify for funding, rather than having each residence having to qualify individually. SB 535 investments in these communities could address energy efficiency, solar, and microgrids. [potential overlap with California Climate Investments b and i] |
| s.                             | Develop an innovative pilot program to consolidate programs to create a one-stop shop for energy efficiency. Support efforts among state agencies and others to coordinate renovation and weatherization programs so efforts can focus on the whole house, rather than on one aspect at a time, and so multiple program offerings can be more easily accessed.  |
| t.                             | Identify and implement metrics to track savings from energy efficiency efforts, to quantify energy reductions. Standardize the metrics and conduct post-project assessments to ensure accountability. [overlap with Overarching questions: c]   |
| u.                             | Survey local activities to identify which strategies are working and which are not. Use Environmental Justice communities as a resource.  |
| v.                             | Increase the current California renewables target to 100% renewables, to reach emissions reduction targets sooner.  |
| w.                             | Set a target of zero net energy (ZNE) for all new construction by 2020.   |
| x.                             | Set a goal of no natural gas or biogas in new buildings.  |
| y.                             | Support the development of standards for “living buildings” (regenerative buildings that more closely follow natural ecosystems, with features such as solar, water capture, efficient and affordable transportation options, etc.) to encourage development of such buildings.   |
| z.                             | Broaden the definition of a “green building” to include retrofits of existing buildings in disadvantaged communities.   |
| aa.                            | Identify the current state of green building technologies, and set goals for green buildings in California.   |

| <b>Energy, Green Buildings, Water</b> |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ab.                                   | Identify the percentage of GHG emissions that are coming from existing buildings in the state, and estimate the portion of emissions expected for the future, to identify the level of improvement expected.   |
| ac.                                   | Provide direction to industry on best practices for rapidly moving toward widespread design and construction of green buildings, and incentivize developers to adopt the standards and implement them. Ensure that building or retrofit costs are not passed along to low- and moderate-income tenants by providing tax incentives, or adopt policies that prevent having those costs passed on to them. |
| ad.                                   | If federal tax credits for residential solar installations are discontinued in the future, California should make up the difference with state tax credits and rebates.  |
| ae.                                   | If federal tax credits for small business solar installations are discontinued in the future California should make up the difference with state tax credits and rebates. It was agreed that applying the tax credits and rebates to small businesses needs further discussion.  |
| af.                                   | Pumping by the State Water Project should use 100% renewable electricity by 2030, with consumers of the water paying for renewable energy installation and production along with project right-of-ways.  |
| ag.                                   | The SWP pumps at Tracy are the single largest energy user in the state. Identify the energy use that would be associated with the proposed California Water Fix and Eco Restore project (formerly, the Bay Delta Conservation Plan).   |

| <b>Industry</b> |  |
|-----------------|--|
| a.              | California should not commit to continuing Cap-and-Trade through the Clean Power Plan.   |
| b.              | Do not include REDD in Scoping Plan.   |
| c.              | Complete adaptive management analysis for Kern County, keep offsets in California, don't pursue REDD offsets. This was green-lighted, but Sekita suggested that the EJAC think about the possibility of using some GHG reduction mechanism in California that could affect pollution coming over the Mexican border, so it would benefit the entire border region. |
| d.              | Trades cannot be verified, Clean Power Plan should ensure power purchases are from sustainable, renewable power plants.  |
| e.              | One more EJAC member should be added to the Adaptive Management Work Group.  |

| Industry  |
|---|
| <p>f. Benefits from GHG reduction measures should affect California first (no REDD program).<br/> overlap with b and c</p>  |
| <p>g. Make sure we are measuring and creating caps to emissions based on sectors and facilities. Design fixes to Cap-and-Trade, increase floor price to real price of carbon, highest price offered not lowest, make sure offsets are limited or eliminated. Energy loading order (renewables first, etc.) could be same for Cap-and-Trade (disadvantaged communities, California, etc.). Consultation with tribes and affected communities. 50% reduction in Oil and Gas sector.</p>   |
| <p>h. Offsets need to happen where emissions occur. overlap with c and f</p>  |
| <p>i. ARB and other state agencies (including PUC, CEC, OEHHA, DTSC, and CalRecycle) should undertake a process to examine the growing evidence that biomass and biogenic carbon have real and significant climate impacts, examine long distance transport contribution to overall GHG impacts of burning biomass material, and examine assumptions health and environmental impacts from burning various materials considered to be biomass, including impacts of biomass ash. This is of growing importance as new EPA regulations allow for the increased burning of waste and biomass at industrial facilities (i.e. industrial boilers, cement kilns), and as material deemed to be biomass are exempt from compliance obligations under Cap-and-Trade.</p> |
| <p>j. Need more real time monitoring.</p>   |
| <p>k. Include an emissions profile analysis for both command-and-control and Cap-and-Trade options for the scoping plan, for comparison.</p>  |
| <p>l. Address methane emissions from extraction and production of natural gas. (This is already covered in SB 1371).</p>  |
| <p>m. Through standardized metrics, ensure that emission reductions from AB 32 activities are happening, especially in Environmental Justice communities.</p>   |
| <p>n. Conduct comprehensive analysis of costs to not just the industries participating in Cap-and-Trade, but also to the rest of California's citizens, who pay in other ways for the effects of pollution. Conduct activities that minimize cost and maximize reductions.</p>  |
| <p>o. Instead of just using a sector-wide standard for emissions reductions, examine methods that could be used to reduce pollution from individual high-polluting entities.</p>  |
| <p>p. Expand the definition of "health impact" to include health consequences other than cancer when looking at health effects of industrial emissions.</p>   |

| <b>Natural and Working Lands</b> |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| a.                               | Integrate urban forestry within local communities. Revise the goal of increasing tree canopy by 5% by 2030 to 30%, and conduct research to identify methods of achieving that increase given drought conditions. Include urban tree and greenspace maintenance, not just planting/creation.   |
| b.                               | Implement climate action plan goals for urban agro-forestry and community gardens with integrated composting strategies.  |
| c.                               | Market development for creation, storage and application of compost for environmental health protection and carbon sequestration. Provide a baseline credit for applying carbon back to soils.  |
| d.                               | In consultation with all stakeholders including tribal councils and local communities, design and implement healthy forest management strategies that ensure sustainability of the existing forest canopy and decrease extreme wild fire events.  |
| e.                               | Protect greenspace and expand it in disadvantaged communities, insure equity through better enforcement of SB375/SCSs.  |
| f.                               | Continue to work with local communities and other stakeholders to refine metrics and tools that better quantify the GHG benefits and co-benefits of managing natural and working lands, including urban green spaces and trees. Achieve consensus on how to measure GHG emissions reductions from activities in natural systems.                                      |
| g.                               | Quantify potential jobs created from regenerating forests, both urban and natural, that includes jobs for maintenance of green spaces, and increase funding to support workforce development in support of this industry.   |
| h.                               | Expand the definition of “urban forestry” to include “rural desert urban forestry” and “rural/urban interfaces,” so those areas can qualify for funds to support tree planting.   |
| i.                               | Support training, education, and incentives for architects, planners and developers, to design and develop infill building projects rather than sprawling developments. Provide incentives such as guarantees for a more stream-lined planning and approval processes for infill projects.  |
| j.                               | Support life cycle analyses of sprawling developments to determine long-term economic and societal costs versus infill projects, to identify actual costs.  |
| k.                               | Identify, develop, and implement policy tools to prevent the current trend of gentrification and displacement of local residents, businesses and people of color, pushing residents and people of color out of their communities. Do not provide GHG reduction funds for improvement projects that will displace current local residents, businesses and non-profits. |

| <b>Natural and Working Lands</b> |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| I.                               | We recommend that CARB implement a public outreach and education campaign on the climate and co-benefits of urban agra-forestry. |

| <b>Agriculture</b> |   |
|--------------------|---|
| a.                 | Perform a complete life cycle analysis of dairy and other bio-digester technology and related infrastructure investment. If biogas from dairies is converted to bio-methane, CARB should mandate that vehicles servicing digesters and converters utilize that gas as a primary fuel source. This is a better use of the fuel than building new pipelines and related infrastructure to transport the gas to other locations. |
| b.                 | Ban agriculture burning. Provide a baseline credit for applying carbon back to soils. Quantify and set reduction goals for N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from agriculture.   |
| c.                 | Do not use historically agricultural lands for solar and wind farm projects. Such projects produce only a few, short-term jobs and the electricity is sent to large population centers. This results in farmworkers being displaced and a net job loss.   |
| d.                 | Divert dairy waste as fertilizer and for carbon sequestration before it can be converted to methane.  |

| <b>Waste</b> |   |
|--------------|---|
| a.           | Waste from “renewable resources” like geothermal need to be evaluated, managed, and waste and other externalities must be considered, in the determination of renewable energy sources.   |
| b.           | Do not use or provide financial support or investment to gasification and biofuels as qualifying renewable options.   |
| c.           | Communities will take full ownership of their waste and not export it to disadvantaged communities. It will be treated as a resource and infrastructure investments that maximize recycling and composting programs will be created.  |
| d.           | Set composting as the primary goal for incentivizing waste diversion. Promote composting by providing education and assistance to implement composting in all communities. Support the expansion of infrastructure for composting where necessary, and map out the mechanisms for composting in each community. Share best practices between municipalities to ensure all residents have access to programs. Incentivize neighborhoods to compost food waste from schools and at the community level. Establish communication plans that show Californians how to compost and |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>motivate people. Waste needs to be composted as close as possible to its point of origin and/or collection. Ensure that environmental justice communities do not become the repositories of this excess waste. Finished compost can be exported where it's needed to support forestry and agriculture focused carbon sequestration goals.</p> |
|  | <p>e. The states biomass garbage and all other incinerators, including but not limited to gasification, will be treated like other carbon-intensive industries and pay for all carbon emissions under California's Cap and Trade program. Revoke all existing incinerator carbon credits.</p>  |
|  | <p>f. Identify effective methods for implementing food rescue programs, with quality controls to avoid dumping inedible food on communities. Identify strategies for getting edible food to those who need it. Incentivize these programs and promote communication plans for projects, so all communities have access to successful plans.</p>  |

| <b>General</b> |  |
|----------------|--|
|                | <p>a. Need better coordination between ARB, Cal Trans, CEC, CalRecycle, and DTSC and other agencies whose purview include Natural Lands, Agriculture and Waste related emissions. Together these agencies should be available for consultation with EJAC to support plan and policy development.</p>   |
|                | <p>b. Disincentivize/discourage locating biomass/digesters in disadvantaged communities or in close proximity to housing.</p>  |
|                | <p>c. Build biomass, not burn biomass: Instead of incineration of biomass from trees and municipal solid waste which puts more carbon dioxide into air immediately, we recommend CARB expand its work to identify and support methods for returning that carbon to the soil, such as compost biomass together with manure. Investigate growing evidence of carbon sequestration benefits from applying compost to grasslands (resources include Marin Carbon Project, UC Berkeley Dept. of Environmental Science researchers). Additional benefits of such measures are the reduction of methane and N2O, reduced synthetic fertilizer imports, reduced water use.</p>                         |
|                | <p>d. Develop and implement metrics to quantify the GHG benefits of managing natural and working lands. Achieve consensus on how to measure GHG emissions reductions from activities in natural systems. Discuss and agree upon these metrics with the interagency working group.</p>  |
|                | <p>e. Repeat 2014 EJAC Waste Recommendation 2.(f): ARB and other state agencies (including PUC, CEC, OEHHA, DTSC, and CalRecycle) should undertake a process to examine the growing evidence that biomass and biogenic carbon have real and significant climate impacts, examine long distance transport contribution to overall GHG impacts of burning biomass material, and examine assumptions health and environmental impacts from burning various materials considered to be biomass, including impacts of biomass ash. This is of growing importance as new EPA regulations allow for the increased burning of waste and biomass at industrial facilities (i.e. industrial boilers,</p> |

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
|                                       | cement kilns), and as material deemed to be biomass are exempt from compliance obligations under California’s Cap and Trade program.  |
| f.                                    | No credits should be given for GHG avoidance from landfill or for biodigesters.   |
| g.                                    | Research and identify alternatives for dumping biosolids (sewage sludge) in disadvantaged communities. Pilot a program to explore and demonstrate better options.   |
| h.                                    | Ash from burning biomass, urban wood waste, and other materials has been found to be dumped on California agricultural land in recent years, and this ash has been found to be contaminated with dioxin and other health-threatening chemicals. Before pursuing increased burning of biomass in California, CARB, the Natural Resources Agency, and related agencies should investigate where ash from the existing burning of biomass is being ultimately dumped, investigate environmental justice impacts and impact on agriculture, and the cost of biomass ash handling in California. |
| <b>California Climate Investments</b> |   |
| a.                                    | GGRF projects should be transformative for disadvantaged communities. <b>This was green-lighted, but it needs to include an additional description of what <i>transformative</i> means.</b>   |
| b.                                    | Need regional investment equity, look at plans/developments in disadvantaged communities to get type of models funded and developed (separate from the grid).   |
| c.                                    | Emphasize technology forcing regulations, understand pipeline of technology to identify near-term wins to create markets for technologies further out.  |
| d.                                    | Outreach, accountability, & helping agencies prioritize, informing guidelines & investment plan.  |
| e.                                    | Continuous involvement, additional GHG reductions, prioritize disadvantaged communities when GHG emissions increase despite implementation of AB32 programs.  |
| f.                                    | EJAC needs to play a key role in oversight and accountability, review investments plan before adoption, track reports and goals within adopted investment plan, assist in outreach for grant opportunities, and advise agencies in program implementation.  |
| i.                                    | Geographic equity – formula for funding; geographic – density – equity.   |
| j.                                    | Increase accountability of local government with regard to reductions claimed for their GGRF funded activities.   |
| k.                                    | The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) program should provide information at EJAC meetings.   |

I. Spend Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funds (GGRFs) to incentivize local economic development so people do not have to travel far for employment. [overlap with California Climate Investments: a and j]