

AB 32 Environmental Justice Advisory Committee

Location: Huron, CA

Dates: August 11-12, 2016

Environmental Justice Advisory Committee Member Attendees: August 11, 2016

Martha Dina Arguello (MDA), Colin Bailey (CB), Gisele Fong (GF), Tom Frantz (TF), Katie Valenzuela-Garcia (KVG), Sekita Grant (SG), Kevin Hamilton (KH), Rey Leon (RL), Luis Olmedo (LO), Kemba Shakur (KS), Mari Rose Taruc (MRT), and Eleanor Torres (ET)

Committee Member Attendees: August 12, 2016

Gisele Fong (GF), Katie Valenzuela-Garcia (KVG), Kevin Hamilton (KH), Rey Leon (RL), Luis Olmedo (LO), Mari Rose Taruc (MRT), Eleanor Torres (ET), Monica Wilson (MW)

ARB and State Agency Attendees

Trish Johnson (TJ), Floyd Vergara (FV), Johnnie Raymond (JR), Wes Ingram (WI), and Jose Saldana (JS)

Facilitation Support

Stephanie Lucero, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)

Cindy Teague, Note-taking support, CCP

Mark Wilson, Technical Writer

Action Items

1. MRT will share Oakland attendee evaluations with CCP, then they will be added as an attachment to the Oakland Workshop Summary as an attachment.
2. Mark Wilson will share raw notes from August 11-12, 2016 meeting.
3. Mark Wilson will provide revised recommendations to the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee (EJAC) by August 17, 2016, incorporating revisions from the August 11-12 meeting discussions.
4. EJAC workgroups will revise the recommendations and share with the rest of the EJAC, no later than noon on August 25.
5. The EJAC will hold a teleconference call on August 26 to discuss revisions to the recommendations.
6. ET verify whether Title 24 of the State Energy code to determine whether additional recommendation language is needed to addresses implementation.
7. One EJAC member will attend the August 23, 2016 Energy meeting.
8. By August 19, 2016 Mark Wilson will revise and incorporate the notes submitted by SG.
9. Sector leads for N&WL shall discuss coordinating recommendations with Water. See items Water and Climate Change in this summary for reference.
10. Mark Wilson will utilize the 6/21/2016 version of the draft Recommendations for Natural and Working Lands.
11. Mark Wilson will gather KVGs written version for recommendations under California Climate Investments.

12. ARB will update the EJAC on the status of the Economic reviews.
 - a. This includes a status report on adding a San Bernardino economist as a reviewer.
13. CCP will start an email thread for each sector to review and revise recommendations. Emails will include instructions to working/sector teams to:
 - a. Save newer versions with their initials, the new date, and new version number.
 - b. Save revised documents on the ARB Shared Drive. Login is your email address that we have on file and the password sent to all EJAC members.
 - c. EJAC members with issues accessing the shared drive will contact TJ directly.
14. CCP will send a Doodle poll for a September/October EJAC meeting (tentatively held in Kern).
15. EJAC members will deliver their requests for community workshop resources for ASAP.
16. ARB and CCP will schedule EJAC/ARB meetings as follows:
 - a. September/October meeting to review Draft Scoping Plan
 - b. Late Fall/winter (December) meeting to review feedback from second set of community workshops.
 - c. January/February meeting for EJAC/ARB ahead of the January 31 ARB Board meeting. EJAC will approval Final Scoping Plan.
17. EJAC will add to a future agenda the discussion of cross-pollinating EJAC recommendations to all relevant programs.
18. CCP will put together a plan for doing an evening statewide webinar to accommodate smaller meeting sites where local sites would be open to the public during the community workshop cycle.
19. EJAC members that create materials for next phase of workshops will share slides and templates with the rest of EJAC.
20. ARB shall invite Climate Investment staff to the next EJAC meeting.
21. Mark Wilson will review and incorporate the long comment submitted by LO relating to Natural and Working Lands and Waste.

Materials

1. June 21, 2016 Approved Draft Version of EJAC Recommendations for 2030 Target Scoping Plan Update (https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/ejac/meetings/06212016/draft_ejac_notes062116.pdf)
2. [EJAC Working Recommendations, dated 8.10.2016](#)
3. [Suggestions for Recommendations from Public Workshops, for EJAC Review and Approval](#)
4. [Community Meeting Summary Table \(Comments and Recommendations by Sector\)](#)
5. [2030 Target Scoping Plan Update Concept Paper](#)
6. EJAC Recommendations as of 8.17.2016, Appendix A

Day 1, August 11, 2016

Welcome and Introductions

Stephanie Lucero (SL) opened the meeting, stating the primary objective of the two-day meeting was to review and discuss the ~700 recommendations related to the AB 32 Scoping Plan Update that were received from the series of statewide community workshops, and subsequently allow the EJAC the opportunity to revise 2030 Target Scoping Plan recommendations.

Next, Rey Leon (RL) welcomed participants to the community of Huron. The area began as a labor camp in the early 1800's with the settlement of the Basque people. In the 1930's, Huron was the one of the largest cotton producers in the region. It then became an important area for growing produce. RL commented the town was, and still is, a good place for the small business owner and is a community of families, where people support one another. The challenges faced by the community today, especially in regard to air pollution and poor air quality, are important and should be addressed with urgency. No one should be exposed to such conditions.

SL thanked RL for hosting the meeting in his community, and reviewed the agenda and the following meeting goals:

- Increase understanding of Environmental Justice (EJ) community in Central California
- Debrief series of EJAC Community Workshops
- Review and discuss EJ community feedback on 2030 Scoping Plan
- Revise 2030 Target Scoping Plan Recommendations

Update on Scoping Plan Timeline

Trish Johnson (TJ) presented the Scoping Plan Timeline that was presented to the Air Resources Board (ARB). Key dates are as follows:

- August 17, 2016: Deadline for revisions to Draft Scoping Plan recommendations for final review by the EJAC
- August 26, 2016: EJAC confirm Draft Scoping Plan recommendations for submission to ARB
- September 2016: Revised Draft Scoping Plan released. EJAC meeting (to be scheduled)
- Fall 2016: Second set of public workshops to review revised Draft Scoping Plan
- November 17, 2016: ARB Board Meeting
- December 2016: EJAC meeting for the purpose of revising recommendations per input received during the second round of public workshops
- Early 2017: EJAC meeting to finalize recommendations
- March 2017: ARB Board meeting

For scheduling purposes, LO noted the Environmental Leadership Summit on October 22, 2016 and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) October 14, 2016 deadline. There is also tribal conference on Climate Change in Oakland scheduled for September 22, 2016.

Recap of Community Workshops

Next, EJAC members reviewed the input received during the series of public workshops, and comments received via email/online submission in the last six weeks. Participants applauded the success of each workshop that was held. EJAC received over 700 total recommendations from the various workshops' and World Café sessions.

EJAC Member hosts were asked to provide a brief recap of major and regional themes from each workshop.

SAN BERNARDINO (July 11, 2016)

A significant success at this workshop was the amiable and productive inclusion of community members who had previously been feeling disenfranchised and were engaged in protesting activities. An ad hoc group of ~75 community members joined together to work locally on these issues. Folks generally left the meeting feeling heard, and with greater understanding of the purpose of the Scoping Plan. The World Café/ round table meeting structure helped EJAC members to hear directly from the people, and to candidly discuss issues and build trust. The June 21 recommendations were circulated at the meeting to allow for deeper discussions. San Bernardino had the following World Café tables: Transportation, Low Carbon Transportation Investments, Water, Green Buildings, Short-lived Pollutants, Natural and Working Lands, Local Jurisdictions, California Climate Investments, and Public Health.

Major themes and topics of concern heard in San Bernardino were:

- Short Lived Climate Pollutants (SLCP)
 - Prioritizing reduced emissions
 - Protecting schools
 - Increased transparency of information
- Transportation
 - How to insure vehicles coming in and out of state meet standards
 - Build infrastructure for Electric Vehicle (EV)
 - Improve safety
- Coordination: Agency partnerships and interaction
- Early Action—community needs to see that something is really being done

SAN DIEGO (July 14, 2016)

The San Diego workshop was very well attended with over 100 people, two-thirds were community participants. Three discussion groups were convened: Transportation, Energy and Industry. The transportation groups were particularly engaged. Major themes and topics of concern heard in San Diego were:

- Transportation
- Coordination among responsible agencies
 - ARB addresses GHG
 - Local Boards address pollutants
- Renewable Energy and Labor issues (keep local jobs in green jobs)
- Cap & Trade.
- Many people want to be a part of programs that reduce emissions
- Infrastructure is not up to quality control standards
- Community members indicated they want to be a part of clean energy, reducing carbon emissions and utilizing dollars available to build transportation systems
- People want to see an end to current pollution-causing practices -- “to stop passing the buck”

- Increased partnerships to achieve goals and see reduced effects of bad air and climate change

OAKLAND (July 19, 2016)

SG and MRT summarized the Oakland workshop. Many community-based organization representatives were present. Future workshops should attempt to include individuals who typically do not participate in these types of meetings. There was a clear desire to see more engagement of community members. A deep presence was felt from the state through ARB representatives. The meeting results were very rich. Oakland had World Café Tables to discuss Industry, Transportation, Energy, and Natural and Working Lands. Transportation. EJAC hosts provided additional insight into some of these World Café Discussions.

The transportation table discussions produced good suggestions, with commentary on race, age and microclimates. Two themes emerged:

- Need for more seamless planning on public transportation, and increased/improved coordination with the agencies that do the planning
- Need for enabling easier use of public transportation systems, and therefore allowing users to lower their carbon footprint
 - E.g., fund the specific buses that low-income folks use; determine how to get small business owners that use large transportation vehicles to transition to cleaner trucks
 - Prioritize projects that are accessible to disadvantaged communities (DACs) and low-income communities, i.e. electric vehicle purchasing and/or sharing programs. The community needs a plan and the accompanying infrastructure.

KS commented that she was happy to meet with many of the attendees. She heard the following comments:

- Draft Scoping Plan recommendations were too broad
- Participants were happy to be at the workshop discussing recommendations, some were networking or looking for funding opportunities
- Increased tree planting was a major recommendation

The Industry discussion was facilitated by MRT. She shared the following highlights:

- The five refineries along the roadway have been very harmful. Many people want to see these refineries addressed, along with the emission reductions efforts.
- AB 32 should do more to help with offsets. Cap-and-trade discussions focused on how to get emissions reductions implemented in specific facilities and/or areas.
- It is important to ensure the cost of carbon adequately includes the impacts experienced by communities from poor air quality. Suggestions to improve fee allowance included:
 - Differentiate between fee allowances sold at auction and other types
 - Price fee allowances to allow for services or positive outcomes for communities impacted by poor air quality (i.e. carbon tax, the true cost of carbon)

- Utilize increased fee allowance prices to fund innovations that address community issues

WILMINGTON & LOS ANGELES (July 25-26, 2016)

MDA and GF hosted the Wilmington workshop. Wilmington is a heavily impacted community. The workshop was well attended by over 100 people, including many younger community members. This was a two-day meeting focusing on Transportation, Energy/Green buildings, Industry and California Climate Investments. Both sessions had a separate gathering of Spanish-speaking attendees. Major themes included:

- Impacts from issues related to pollution, traffic, and water resulted in well-informed people in attendance.
- Participants demonstrated a strong desire to make public transportation successful, but health and safety issues rose to the top of discussion.
- Issues around public transit access arose, specifically “first-and-last-mile” difficulties. Both young and old attendees voiced concerns about improved public transportation solutions. Other transportation issues were also discussed here that have been shared by other communities.
- There is a great desire to improve infrastructure and zero emissions for freight transportation.
- In south Los Angeles, there is a need to address emissions stemming from the oil industry (oil drilling, pipelines, extraction process, refineries, transport, etc.)
- Attendees were interested in knowing if cap-and-trade is resulting in reduced emissions. There is a desire to see more regulations and fixing offsets.
- MDA felt the comments reflected the need for clean energy and bringing it to areas that do not have clean energy access.
- Near zero and zero-emissions discussions were held. Technological innovation was emphasized, as was also how to transition to zero emission regulations.
- Community members were interested in knowing how to employ energy efficiency and clean energy in their own homes (i.e., solar roofs).
- Community members recommended balancing policy solutions to ensure gentrification does not push low-income people out of communities.
- More one-stop shopping opportunities to facilitate Landlords’ ability to make buildings more energy efficient.
 - Enable a command and control culture shift– including churches, schools, community groups, etc.
- Pedestrian, biking safety and lighting issues were also prominent in discussion groups.

MODESTO, FRESNO AND BAKERSFIELD (July 28, 2016)

This workshop offered public comments on the draft recommendations through a simultaneous broadcast from Modesto, Fresno, and Bakersfield. This joint workshop covered over 200 miles of geography and were very well attended. Numerous young people, who were very motivated and engaged, also participated. The overarching themes:

- Many comments received were in-line with those already shared in previous workshop report-outs, reflecting the feelings of other community members.
- Infrastructure needs are an afterthought typically because of a lack of planning.
- Small town experiences are shared across the state: many of the residents feel left behind. Many people in small communities believe the large cities are receiving the majority of funding and effort.
- Addressing pedestrian safety requirements with lighting and sidewalks was a request from many attendees.
- There is a need for increased accessibility and transportation systems that allow people to get where they need to go.
- Affordability is a huge issue with electric bills that increase beyond what low-income families can pay for. There is a need for more programs to help people understand and choose energy efficient measures wisely.
- Methane and forest conservation were prominent issues.
- “Keep your trash where you make it” was a common phrase.
- A solution of a four-day workweek was offered in an effort to get more people off the road. An alternative concept was development of a reliable and well-connected mass transit system.
- Concerns were expressed that not enough local action to improve air quality is taken. Community members are told their air quality is improving, but the air monitoring results show no decrease in greenhouse gases (GHGs) over the last 15 years.
- Kern County has the biggest oil industry in the state, yet residents are not seeing any benefits from this industry. However, residents do experience oil industry negative air quality impacts.
- More public service announcements (PSAs) on climate change and global warning are needed so residents can learn more about these critical issues. TF felt this was one of the best recommendations received at this meeting.
- “Fracking” issues were raised often, as this is a technology that uses a great deal of energy to obtain more petroleum, while others seek to reduce emissions.

FRESNO

RL summarized the Fresno workshop. Fresno is a very large county with a great deal of rural space.

- Because the county is so large, a primary concern is how to access public transit.
- Infrastructure is a huge issue for farmworkers.
- Transportation is very expensive. Access and affordability need to be addressed for low-income people who rely on various transportation modalities to get to work.
- Solutions in the form of electric buses in parts of the county would help these community members.
- Renters and homeowners are in need of more access to affordable solar panels so they can participate in the rebate programs.
- Many people cannot afford to be energy efficient, this issue needs considered as the EJAC advocates for change.
- Need to carefully weigh the pros and cons of installing solar farms, especially the unintended impacts on communities and their residents (job loss, loss of farm land, etc.)

- All the recommendations must be thought of in terms of resources available, so investments are made wisely and equitable to all.

SACRAMENTO (July 29, 2016)

Educating the public was an important accomplishment here. Attendance was not as robust as other workshops, but this allowed for one-on-one discussions between community members and ARB staff. World Café tables were available for the following sectors: Transportation, Water, Natural and Working lands, Short-lived Climate Pollutants, and Energy. Key messages included:

- Transportation was a huge issue for the Sacramento area. Businesses in some cases promote more driving, i.e. drive-thru restaurants.
- Community members expressed concern and commented on the “heat island” phenomenon.
- Transportation networks are needed.
- Suggestion of finding a balance of installing solar panels on roofs and planting trees.
- Sustainable soil management as related to economic drivers is a huge issue in Sacramento.
- Attendees asked for more education. This will facilitate the building of better grassroots support for carbon reduction initiatives.
- Long-term planning is essential.
- Agency alignment/misalignment issues were raised often, as was the matter of climate impacts felt locally.
- Community members opposed rebates in solar. Direct install was identified as an alternative.
- Statewide water saving and energy goals should be made permanent.
- “Seventh generation” was the term given to long term planning in the culture shift arena.

Participants raised the need to address national policies in GHGs, and discuss issues of affordability.

ARB PERSPECTIVE ON WORKSHOPS

TJ was very impressed by the efforts of the EJAC members in preparing for the workshops, developing informational presentations, and collaborating with their community members. The staff team provided tremendous support at all of the workshops. Speaking on behalf of ARB staff, FV shared that attending all the workshops and connecting directly with hundreds of community members was a very personal experience. The commonalities among regions were striking. About 90% of all the transportation comments had similar themes. It is now incumbent upon the EJAC and its colleagues to foster actions and activities that will result in making these changes. FV concluded with the importance of and need for increased future engagement with the younger community members. They are a resource historically missed in these types of efforts.

Jose Saldana thanked the EJAC for helping him to be a part of this effort. The workshops allowed him to merge his “groups” of ARB members and Spanish-speaking community members who attended the workshops. Jose pointed out the differences for priority actions between agency staff and residents. JS noted that homeless participants were not included in discussions as much as hoped.

ET shared the Girl Scouts introduced a new badge for *Outdoor Environment* that rewards Girl Scouts for helping the environment. She also commented that public education efforts are beginning to show signs of success.

Summary of Current EJAC Recommendations

The following is a summary of discussions and comments from the EJAC and they revised and updated their recommendations to the Scoping Plan and incorporated community workshop feedback. See Appendix A for recommendations revised pursuant to these discussions.

General Discussions:

- Specificity of EJAC recommendations needs to be considered.
- Critical to ensure specific recommendations do not adversely impact some communities over others.
- Attainment of the air quality improvement goals at the local level is the priority; efforts should not just focus on the statewide reductions.
- State and local governments must work together. Coordination is key.
- Important to ensure there is not an adverse impact on the low-income communities.
- There is a strong need for safe transportation communities (connects to Transportation topic).

EJAC members briefly discussed their approach for reviewing all the recommendations received. EJAC members sought guidance from ARB on what to consider as they refine their recommendations.

- The community input of 700+ recommendations need compared against the EJAC Working Recommendations dated 8.10.2016 (EJAC 8.10.2016). There were additional recommendations or specifications that were not in the existing recommendations.
- ARB Recommendation: Prioritize long-term strategies and versus immediate actions, as well as identifying measures the EJAC see as most important for implementing now.
- ARB Recommendation: Determine strategies and actions that are within ARB's jurisdiction and those that require interagency involvement.
- ARB Recommendation: Incorporate language that discusses specifics of how to meet 2030 reduction targets within the Scoping Plan

SG suggested that the data gathered could be utilized to conduct a "roadshow" to take to the different jurisdictions (e.g. local governments and the various agencies) such that this important community feedback is shared with the widest audience possible. While the EJAC's primary goal is to inform the Scoping Plan, the Draft recommendations EJAC develops can be utilized as its own document to share EJAC and community concerns. The Scoping Plan format should not necessarily limit the format or type of recommendations.

A clarification of ARB's jurisdictional authority was requested. FV answered that the response to GF's example on safe transportation for walkers/bikers provided a perfect example. Many of those transportation-related issues, such as safe sidewalks and lighting, are compound issues that would

be need to be taken to several different city, county and state agencies for addressing. Direct authority may be lacking by the ARB, but the ARB can help by specifying recommendations to target issues (e.g., motor vehicle emissions, on-road or off-road emission vehicles, vessels coming into port; etc.).

However, the ARB is responsible for climate change investments. KH noted the ARB can assess climate change investments, including those which could be matched with local agencies that sorely need support. Agency partners can have greater involved because of the leverage ARB holds with climate change investments. KH wanted to ensure this was noted that this sometimes gets lost in ARB discussions.

Review of Recommendations by Sector

TRANSPORTATION

- Current sub-headings are satisfactory
- Suggestion to add to *Overarching Issues*:
 - EJAC demands transportation agencies and planning groups be mandated to work with mobility gaps. Note: Under transportation it specifies this, but may be necessary to rewrite to mandate this effort.
- (RL) Many agencies at the local/regional/state level are already developing their own plans in these areas. We are using auction funds that result in gentrification that displaces the community we are trying to help.
- (LO) We need to pay attention to the language, so that it is in the document when guidelines are written, so we do not displace residents.
- (SG) California ARB (CARB) has some anti-displacement guidelines. Maybe we should be working on this with the ARB staff, so we have access to jobs, affordable housing and also ownership over the technologies, so small business owners are included, as these are key ways to avoid displacement. So this information is out there, but this EJAC should be clear about what those policies should be and how they are implemented.
- (KVG) How can we ensure local jurisdictions are answering this in the permitting process?
- (KS) She is happy to see this EJAC bringing this [gentrification] issue to light because in Oakland politicians are setting things up to help friends.
- (LO) I want to give an example of companies that manage properties, where they are installing products and cleaning up the property. They say they got new tenants (low-income) but what happened to the old tenants.
In the Regional Transportation #3 from [Suggestions for Recommendations from Public Workshops, for EJAC Review and Approval](#) (Workshop Recommendations) should be put in regional mobility. Energy and Transportation needs to be integrated: Indicate under Transportation Infrastructure how to reduce transportation emissions.
- Add a section on Coordination around planning groups/planning documents, funding plans.
- #34 Workshop Recommendations, “stopping freeway expansions should read that agency coordination would be important along with GHG impacts.”

- #57—59 Workshop Recommendations Relates to #43 Workshop Recommendations where there are concrete emission reductions. They are related to coordination.
- We need a section on oversight and also one on progress or metrics. For example, how much solar are we seeing in DACs? The overarching issues are not going to affect our communities. Again, who is getting the jobs? The progress and the improvements are not being made in the EJ communities. This should be an overarching theme.
- Mark will send out his raw notes to help the group identify what is required in the overarching issues.
- Make sure all transportation recommendations are integrated around the freight plan. Calling it out as a part of the coordination is important.
- LO wants a definition of “overarching” because he is not sure if there are some items that should occur in that place or if the recommendation should show up in the specific sector. Overarching should apply to “all sectors.” Proposed definition then will be discussed tomorrow.
- Local capacity building needs to be taken into consideration. Should this be an overarching recommendation? Access – this is a focus on the “how” so the jobs and the money come to the people who live there. Utilize local resources/assets. RL provided an example of a community that Rey did not have the ability to receive a reward because of population density. RL: “The model does not fit our community, so we can be a part of the GHG reduction movement.”

Public Comments

Leticia Corona, the Leadership Council representative thanked EJAC. She asked EJAC and ARB to remove barriers for people when holding public workshops. Basic needs must be met with nighttime availability, babysitting, etc. A thank you for the collaborative meeting was issued. She asked for the following:

- Please do not leave out the mobile home residents who are often disqualified for energy rebates and access to low-income programs.
- Many rural communities really need infrastructure. Please consider solar panels in mobile home parks so they can take advantage of these opportunities. Accessibility and affordability are so important for these trailer parks.
- Coordination between school districts for public transportation and token availability needs attention. Make sure this process is equitable.
- Better coordination with other agencies to enforce stronger reductions in pollution is needed. We need more regulations on black carbons because these unfairly affect DACs and communities of color.
- Please do not leave out the undocumented communities.
- We need to do more work with agencies within the small communities.
- There needs to be better oversight for these investments and the limitations of these programs, i.e. mobile home parks.
- Too many people on a single meter, so it ends up people come home from work travel (agriculture, etc.) and face high bills that reach into the thousands of dollars.
- Resources are there, but they are not being managed.

Energy, Green Buildings, Water

- Energy #7 Workshop Recommendations in the past, biomass burning has been counted as renewable energy. Change that one.
- Energy #18 Workshop Recommendations Land Use on solar farms. We should not have negative land use when solar is installed.
- Citing and permitting in general should not have negative impacts on any renewable energy projects.
- Recommendation on community solar to address many of the public comments so we need a concrete recommendation updating building code that addresses energy efficiency. ET to verify whether Title 24 of the State Energy code to determine whether additional recommendation language is needed to addresses implementation.
- CB permitting fees should be addressed for fast tracking the structural issues to support solar installation.
- RL asked a question on whether energy efficiency loans can stay with a property from the Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) program.
 - RL was directed to Jakub and the Energy meeting on August 23 to get an answer that question.
- SG: “How are we tracking the progress on PACE and others. We need more transparency and established targets associated with it. We do not want to see the investments going into wealthy areas.”
- EJAC recommended that studies look at effectiveness and progress in energy assistance programs.
- MRT: #70 Workshop Recommendations. Green Buildings should be included so that landlords cannot raise rents.
- EJAC Discussion on innovation and use of technology. 350 studies show that innovation and technology is located in hubs. The EJAC discussed the need to get these technology and innovation hubs into EJ communities. This feeds into improved technology, jobs and small business, as well as ownership of the technologies. This promotes investors to come in to these areas, which in turn, helps with directing clean energy economic benefits to EJ Communities.
- Net Zero should also be considered as a recommendation to be included under innovation.
- ET: “We really need to regulate new building construction and also retrofitting old buildings.”
- LO recommended addressing community wide needs in innovative technologies, as opposed to just low-income individuals. Low-income and energy efficiency should be addressed in an assembly line fashion to help engage the entire community in climate change goals, especially focusing first on energy efficiency rather than new technology i.e., solar. These all make homes more valuable too, which is important to homeowners.
- RL: Micro grids in communities with public buildings should be included. Helps to lower costs, sets an example too.
- The Energy distribution currently used is inefficient.

- #83 Workshop Recommendations: College scholarships should be moved to the green energy section.
- #84 Workshop Recommendations: Should be moved to the funding section, and should include eliminate dirty (waste-to-energy and biomass) energy. Specify non-renewables and anything unsustainable.
- Energy in #161 Workshop Recommendations should be added to infrastructure #14 Workshop Recommendations, and add community choice aggregation.
- LO “r” on green buildings from the June 21 version of EJAC Working Recommendations (EJAC 6.21.2016) should go with #18 EJAC 8.10.2016). This is a better iteration of micro grids. LO will send additional language.
- Aggregation is a “how to” for collaboration to get them to engage with each other and could be added to population density issues and perhaps provide more opportunities to obtain grants, incentives, etc.
- CB: Water has a few problems with issues missing around encouraging regional efficiency and conservation. Comments include some good innovative ideas and should be included as bullets #3 through #7 of the Workshop Recommendations.
- Add back in pollution prevention piece, which connects, to energy and GHG reduction.
- Language is missing from the EJAC 8.10.2016. Add back “ARB is subject to code enforcement of making water available.”

Facilitator discussed how to address items remaining on the Agenda, given that many EJAC members would be unable to attend Day 2 of the meeting. CB recommended continued work on the Overarching issues for remainder of Day 1 discussions. The EJAC agreed to move discussions on Industry to Day 2.

KVG recommended for the Waste Management and Water sections from EJAC 8.10.2016. All general points on p. 14 should go to Waste management. #13 EJAC 8.10.2016 should be expanded to state plans and federal.

Public Comment

- Leticia Corona referenced on p. 5 EJAC 8.10.2016, asking if #16 could read not just upgrading. She stressed the need to look at unincorporated areas too, especially solar panels. The biggest cost is obtaining panels, not just installation of renewable energy, i.e., panels. Likewise, what does an ongoing program for renewable energy look like? This kind of upgrade for a low-income family is very important.

Overarching Issues

EJAC Recommended reviewing the Overarching Issues section on Day 2, after finishing all sector discussions. Otherwise, continued discussion can be finalized on August 26. Additional comments and revisions followed:

- A sense of urgency is missing in the Overarching Issues on behalf of the state’s agenda and announcement.

- Are we also including any language addressing the idea of not making other problems worse? Eliminate unintended consequences.
 - How to we build incentives to DACs only, for example.
- EJAC recommended a carbon tax and to eliminate Cap-and-Trade and others said it should go back to the public. That was not studied nor proposed to be studied, in the carbon study.
- EJAC recommended a thorough study of that approach be done – the combination of a fee to industry and rebate to the public as a real alternative. (Connect it to carbon tax in Energy).
- EJAC recommended more low-tech solutions as well, i.e., planting trees to cut energy.
- Overarching Issues #1 EJAC 8.10.2016 should be separated out into the three statements because they address different ideas. The first two points might be the “way” and the other two are the how we implement them.
- Overarching Issues #7 EJAC 8.10.2016, economic reviewers should be selected by the EJAC.
- Overarching Issues #10 EJAC 8.10.2016, maximizing healthy and well-paying jobs. Maybe add capacity building as a part of maximizing jobs. How do we put teeth into this? This relates to enforcement issue and also evaluation so we know if these are occurring in the way we intended.
 - TJ: This does relate to most recent release from the Governor – so some of this happening.
- ET: Land Use should include the term “green infrastructure” i.e., taking out green trees and groundcover. We need to address this.
 - Urban agriculture also needs to be added in besides regular agriculture.

Public Comment

- Leticia Corona, Leadership Council, raised the issue that government will not add or complete a bus stop (in unincorporated areas) unless it meets the Fare Box Rule, so she asked if the Scoping Plan can address this because DACs or rural communities do not get their needs met. A one-rule fits all approach does not work for the people they serve. Population density should not rule out access to these benefits.

Final Discussion

- EJAC recommended that the Leadership Team pull out the major themes before August 26, 2016 meeting.
- Sense of urgency is something that may have us suggesting a phased approach.
- Adaptive Management sector – how do you support industry? How do companies achieve compliance without passing the impact on to the community or its workers?
- The green economy must train people to work in the new industry. The EJAC recognized the complexity and tension of this issue. This could go in the Overarching Green Energy so it protects workers as we transition from “dirty” to clean energy. Make sure we are not harming the workers in dirty industries while the companies attempt to clean up.
- RL recommended talking to food processing industries about adding solar to their huge roofs. This increases green energy without eliminating jobs.
- IECG clean energy program is just now starting and ET would love input from EJAC.

- LO has seen examples of industry that can access DAC funds. There needs to a discussion on how to access those dollars and specify what kinds of programs are accessing them. It could be part of a performance or maybe an assessment issue.
- Remove 5e on p. 3 of EJAC 8.10.2016, it appears in next session.
- LO Recommended that any company that has a reduction technology, also be evaluated for other components of their business. LO does not want to see companies favored for reduction technologies or practices if there are other components of their business that adversely impact DACS and EJ communities.
- Page 43 of Workshop Recommendations #67 or #68 add, “Modernization of industry continues to employ workers in DACs.”

Closing Comments

Tomorrow’s agenda is to go over sectors the EJAC has not covered: Industry, Natural and Working Lands, Agriculture, Energy and Climate Investments. Time permitting, the EJAC will also discuss the overarching issues and how to frame the entire recommendations document.

DAY 2

Welcome and Introductions

Ms. Lucero welcomed everyone back for Day 2. She reviewed the agenda and identified changes in subject content based on Day 1 deliberations. The Day 2 agenda is structured as follows:

- Natural & Working Lands
- Agriculture

Short Break

- Waste Management
- California Climate Investments
- Industry
- Overarching Issues

Introductions were made. Ms. Lucero recapped highlights from Day 1 discussions and identified recurring themes:

- Early action measures,
- Tracking and measuring,
- **Coordination:** for the areas that ARB does not have authority, but are essential to meeting the GHG targets (public health, education, local jurisdictions)
- **Reduce Pollutants in Environmental Justice (EJ)¹ Communities**
- **Accessibility**
- **Equity:** early action and primary focus on EJ community benefits/needs, no negative consequences (displacement), data collection (more monitors and real time data)

¹ EJ Communities includes: Disadvantaged communities, rural communities, low-income communities, and communities that experience a higher proportion of environmental hardships (pollution, limited resources, etc.)

- **Innovation:** close gaps in implementation of new technologies and changes (i.e. infrastructure gaps in dealing with woody forest waste)
- **Partnership with EJ Communities:** meaning capacity-building, communications, engagement, citizen science, crowdsourcing
- **Long-term:** vision/7th generation

Ms. Lucero reviewed the process to finalize the recommendations.

1. By Monday, August 15, 2016, EJAC will send any additional on how to incorporate workshop recommendations to Mark Wilson.
2. Mark Wilson will incorporate discussions from August 11-12 into a revised set of recommendations, Appendix A.
3. Between August 17 and August 25, 2016, the EJAC will review these revised recommendations and each Sector will work to ensure workshop comments were incorporated and finalize sections. All EJAC members will coordinate with sectors they are not in to incorporate items as well. The EJAC Leadership Team will revise the Overarching issues and identify themes to help focus ARB review and incorporation into the Scoping Plan.
4. Each EJAC sector shall provide revisions to their sector by August 25 at noon.
5. The EJAC will have a quick conference call to discuss revisions on August 26, 2016 at 3pm to review and confirm final changes.
6. Trish Johnson will notice the meeting tentatively set for 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

The EJAC discussed and approved this process. The following discussion evolved in terms of framing the Overarching Issues and the recommendations document generally:

- The Overarching Issues should provide direction across all sectors.
- ET: The recommendations really need to look to the community so this can be implemented from the ground up and be successful. One obvious take away in San Bernardino was that many folks felt it was someone else's responsibility for doing something about Climate Change. People really need to know what they can do to be a part of the action.
- Early Action should be moved to overarching issues.
- The overarching issues should also look at Long term solutions, specifically beyond 2030 – 2050 and seven generations out.
 - One recommendation is to prevent construction of emission producing facilities.
- Primary pollution reduction and reduced GHGs need to be experienced in EJ communities, this relates to a major theme –equity.
- Metrics for specific communities or geography would be included in recommendations; i.e., specify the air basin, EJ community, low-income community, etc.

Industry

- Three sections are listed. MRT wants “analysis” added to the third one.
- Rework #17 EJAC 8.10.2016 to be specifically reworded to read “Eliminate offsets.” Reducing emissions rewording is included here as well.

- #39 of Workshop Recommendations, separate GHG and pollutants out of smokestack; #28 decoupling offsets from forest programs—untie from offsets.
- #6 EJAC 8.10.2016 needs to be strengthened “we want facility-specific cap.” Combine all the following:
 - p. 40 Workshop Recommendations #18 getting rid of cap and trade,
 - Workshop Recommendations #19, #20 and #24, #27 moratorium on refineries,
 - Workshop Recommendations #31 caps on largest polluters and #32 specifically;
 - Workshop Recommendations #37 getting rid of free credits;
 - Workshop Recommendations #63 monitor better near facilities;
 - Workshop Recommendations #79 allowances for facilities near EJ communities so emissions are reduced near EJ communities first;
 - Tiered pricing would make it more expensive to pollute near EJ communities;
 - Workshop Recommendations #93 more information/communication to schools needs to be provided;
 - More ongoing public information, as well as specific incidents (such as flaring should be added to #95 more enforcement at local level at night specifically as it relates to coordination of agencies).
- Thresholds are already high, but incidents also happen. Enroll schools in the advisory network over eight counties.
 - Schools want regular notifications.
 - Communicate where the local sources of pollution in our community are located.
- Adversarial relationships need to be change, so if ARB could support proactive communication with a dialogue focus and utilize innovative methods.
 - For example: Real-Time Advisory Air Network (RAAN) system, is available in an “App.” Individuals can access this system as well.
 - Communities need more communication on these issues. Add this to recommendation.
- LO: Add bearing-the-burden language, which will help deputize the community in terms of monitoring. This starts by giving them the information that they have the right and obligation to do this. Industry is making money and they should invest part of their profits in reducing pollution to aid the adjacent communities. This needs to be included in our recommendations.
 - Secondly, a robust system needs to be in place so that citizen science is utilized to measure hot spots and success. Government cannot afford to pay for all of this. Action needs to take place and the best way is to do this is from the bottom-up. We tend to focus on top-down approach.
 - Set up monitoring systems that are equitable. LO would like this responsibility to transition to ARB. Work on the way monitoring is occurring—more transparent and accessible.
- Economics from Workshop Recommendations, p. 41 starting with #42 we should be incorporating what the cost of operation is in terms of costs that the community bears. Investing back into the community as they calculate the cost of carbon and monitoring. Socioeconomic formula that determines feasibility or cost/ton does not consider cost of pollution being borne by the community where the industry is located. This jurisdiction is

within the local air district where it is calculated. Analysis uses what is appropriate for their area district. Some do regional analysis.

- EJAC recommended that social costs of carbon be included in the model used at the local district level. The Department of Health does collaborate with ARB using the Integrated Transport and Health Impacts Model (ITHIM) model and is being implemented. This identified in Overarching Issues #9 EJAC 8.10.2016. Ensure it is emphasized in next version of recommendations.
- Local districts are under ARB oversight by statutory authority during ozone and pollution-era (GHGs and toxics) legislation, as well as AB 32. LO suggests more accountability – ARB needs to improve management in their oversight role, especially in DACs/EJ communities. Documentation needs to accompany the promises, because these types of promises do not have teeth. Traditionally these communities are too trusting.
- The analysis of social costs is only considered when: a regulation is created, approval is considered, or when a business is established. EJAC recommends this be considered throughout.
- Short-term solutions are needed: transparency, better communication and more community engagement.
 - Emphasis should be placed on the role communities can play in setting their own future in addressing climate change and pollution.
 - More tools are needed so communities can engage.
 - The threat of enforcement and the know-how to address it, will facilitate implementation of goals.
 - Recommendations must be clear, and to specify the role of local air districts, including what models they use.
- Recommendation: ARB should examine ways to further strengthen their partnerships with local air districts. (Note: some local districts are looking at strengthening rules, so we do not want ARB to block that—best practices should rise to the top).
- Rewording: Equity includes pollution reduction and prioritizing funding with no negative impacts.
- Communication, capacity building and engagement should be under Partnerships in the Overarching Issues.

Natural and Working Lands/Agriculture

The more current versions of the Natural and Working Lands section should refer to the EJAC 6.21.2016 document.

- Themes from this sector and Industry #4 EJAC 8.10.2016 should be compared since they relate to each other.
- The intersection of soil and climate change was referenced in the Workshops and should be incorporated.
- There is significant overlap between the Water and Natural and Working Lands sectors. These two groups should review sections and consider combining their recommendations.
- We touched on issue of expanding climate change and soils Workshop Recommendations #13, #15, #16, #18, #29, #30, and #31. This is a duplicate of Workshop Recommendations #36, #41, #43, and #51.

- Workshop Recommendations #6 in forest waste on sequestering carbon should be added.
- Land use recommendations need to reference and spell out the need to reduce sprawl and avoid displacement through use of infill.
- EJAC 8.10.2016 #3 addresses adding sequestering carbon and chipping trees in the forest. This needs added to the overarching theme regarding biomass and waste. Workshop Recommendations #76, #77 should be included in the general subsection of Natural and Working Lands (N&WL).
- Change EJAC 6.21.2016 N&WL Sector, a. to “Increase tree canopy by 5% by 2030 to 20%–30% by 2030.”
- Expand definition of green space to include urban agriculture in 2 EJAC 8.10.2016.
- Include planners, architects, and engineers in EJAC 8.10.2016, #12.
- EJAC 8.10.2016, #9, Jobs resulting from tree planting, solar installation jobs creation needs to add “local” jobs and “urban agriculture” as well as forest and agriculture.
- Quantify, train and create jobs for “green spaces” so it reads with a definition of green infrastructure—N&WL forestry, agriculture and urban agriculture.
- Add promotion/development of community land trusts into recommendations.
- Creating more local processing centers should go into Agriculture so our food is not being trucked too far.
- Workshop Recommendations #16, add stop overgrazing and add biological intensive agriculture.
- Move the recommendation EJAC 8.10.2016 #3 in Agriculture to Energy as it addresses the building of solar and wind farms.
 - Where lands have been turned into energy-producing farms, a recommendation should be made to require a labor-training center where farmworkers could transition to something else that is long term proving equity and opportunity.
- MW: The following relate to organization of the recommendations:
 - Overarching Issues/Themes needs to be placed in front of specific recommendations because relationship between N&WL, Agriculture and Waste are considered together.
 - Workshop Recommendations for Agriculture #19, scoring system; #20 and #21 should be moved to Agriculture section.
 - Workshop Recommendations #30 should be moved to Agriculture.
- LO: Recommendation is that no solar ever be placed on agricultural land, “there is no bad agricultural land.”

Public Comment

- Shelly Sullivan with the Climate Change Policy Coalition thought that Kevin Hamilton’s comment about communication was very important. She double checked and it is the law that if a company has an incident it must report that to the local authorities immediately (police, emergency response, etc.). That report then triggers a robust communication procedure. She was not sure what the communication procedure is, but has asked for further information.
 - a. Kevin Hamilton responded that the mandated requirement does not make it to the community immediately. Likewise, there may be incidents that schools and

school children should know about that do not trigger the incident reporting. As a first responder he thinks schools should be on the list of people first contacted.

- b. Shelly responded that she appreciated that detail and thought there was an opportunity to coordinate better communication between companies and communities.
- Rosa Moreno, is a support of the IVAN (Identifying Violations Affecting Neighborhoods) monitoring program. Ivan. She works in the valley. She loves all of these ideas. She and her partner were talking about the recommendations and wanted to remind the EJAC not to forget that this is a big circle. At the end of all these discussions are the low-income residents and families that are in urban populations, affected the most. On the other end are these ranchers and big companies are used to making big money. We think about making more laws and rules and she loves the idea of making larger citations/fines for those who do not follow rules. However, some of them do not care. They will go ahead and pay the fine. If the fine becomes too expensive, they will pass that cost onto low-income families in the cost of milk or fresh produce. Please do not forget that.
- Amy Mmagu, California Chamber of Commerce. She likes the comment about bringing perceived polluters and communities together for greater transparency, communication, and discussion. She referenced that there are a lot of issues the EJAC is trying to cover. AB 32 is intended to cover GHGs, she asked the EJAC to think specifically in terms of what CARB can do under the direction of what was intended by this legislation. A lot of these recommendations are outside AB 32 and what CARB is able to do.

Final comments on Natural and Working Lands, Agriculture and Waste:

- Clarifying where long-term outcomes are intended, and where innovation is successful.
- MW identified a concern with how ARB utilizes EJAC input. For example, the cap-and-trade rule. A rule that approves burning plastics was just extended. Even though incinerators only contribute small portion to overall GHGs, this is a very important point. GF said she appreciated the issue being raised.
- MW: A current amendment to the waste-to-energy incinerator exemption is being moved to 2017 (one year added to full compliance period). The incinerator firms are paying for this, but the real issue is the need for communication on these types of issues. We do not need to debate the technical issues at this time.
- EJAC: "ARB should be responsible for informing the EJAC of comment periods so that EJAC knows these recommendations are about to be finalized. We need confirmation that the "spirit" of our efforts, e.g., on SLCPs, is heard."
- A recommendation that Cap-and-trade amendments initial statement of reasons (ISOR) be held up against EJAC recommendations before September iteration.
MW on p. 42, Workshop Recommendations #53, #54, #55, #56, #57 can be moved to (d) or (f) in EJAC 6.21.2016.

- Under Sector N&WL EJAC 8.10.2016, reduce the number asked for on here. A drop down or a range to 15% from 30% is more likely to be adopted.
- Expand definitions of terms in Overarching Themes.
- Develop educational outreach Workshop Recommendations #55 on p. 23.
- Waste sections need to highlight the issue of the carbon footprint of transport of waste – it should go with trucking and community comments document.
- The General comments from EJAC 6.21.2016 should move to the Overarching Issues.
- Workshop Recommendations #29 and #30 these sections also relate to waste. They address the need for cleaner trucks and preventing transport of waste.
- LO has a very long comment that he wants to submit, but is still working on revising it. Please have that to Mark Wilson by Monday, 8/17/16. Concise but precise is the preferred format.

Investments

The EJAC acknowledged that additional work was completed for the Climate Investments Sector, but they were not shared in time for printing. The EJAC sector team reviewed the EJAC 6.21.2016 notes and identified what changes still needed incorporated as well as identifying items to include from the Workshop Recommendations.

- Transformative should be defined by the community. Investments should be spent on areas that the community defines as transformative.
- Prioritize reducing emissions experienced by DACs.
- EJAC 6.21.2016, Sector Investments, j) should add all grantees, not just local governments. There also needs to be accountability.
- The EJAC requested that ARB Investment Program staff attend all EJAC meetings.
- Expand local contracting, and community-based organizations so programs are more effective.
- Climate investments should be place-based for regional and state programs, this will ensure programs meet goals and are accountable. This will also help engage local communities.
 - Look at increased investments for early detection and notifications by local communities.
- Increase accountability in both local and state programs.
 - Develop monitoring tools for communities.
- EJAC should be responsible for naming investments made in EJ communities.
 - Ensure that investments incorporate anti-displacement language.
- Subsidies should not be provided for industries relying on fossil fuel or non-sustainable processes.
- Workshop Recommendations Investments Section #2. This recommendation should be incorporated with the inclusion of “well-paying jobs” and anti-displacement language. KH recommended including it with EJAC 6.21.2016 L.
- Workshop Recommendations, Investments Section #4. “Create a system that allows community-based organizations/nonprofits to earn points or to receive investments.”
- Workshop Recommendations #10, needs included, but specify that seniors are included in disadvantaged groups.

- EJAC 6.21.2016, Investments (c), needs language on research and development to complete the investment pipeline and ensure the community is “substantially involved in the project.”
 - Workshop Recommendations, Investments #11. Identify how investments can sponsor community-based, technology/innovation programs.
- Add monitors or buttons that bring awareness to kids and adults – coordination with educational system/schools on environmental learning at state level that is not reaching the local level. They have the motivation and direction to do this work, but it needs investment to reach the local level. CCA –STEM program is a blueprint for environmental literacy the state should be emphasizing.
- All GGRF programs should be required to demonstrate that they have talked to the DACs and explain the technology, along with other things they could do.
- State is supporting ARB scholarships in universities, if climate investments need to take money from DACs those funds should be returned back to DACs schools/community colleges and not taken out to support students elsewhere.
- Public health comments from Workshop Recommendations, may fit in the Investments sector. ET said there are students studying health impacts.
- Workshop Recommendations, Industry Section #98. Funds for investment includes increasing the price of carbon to achieve climate goals.
- ET: Public health in SB was handled separately to give it the importance they felt it needed. Published health data does not accurately reflect the health impacts due to inaccessibility to health system. These comments should go into Overarching Issues because this is a beacon for all communities. Community and Outreach category should hold it, as should Equity. Local jurisdictional points speak to the coordination. Local level efforts are important and should be a part of the coordination piece.
- KVG offered some written language for organizing the overarching issues. Action Item: to get KVG’s language.

SLCPs

- Incorporate into recommendations, Workshop Recommendations, section SLCP, #30.
- Add keeping organics out of the landfills and that all people have access to separation of materials.
- Pull out SLCP process impacts from Agriculture, Waste and Transportation those should go in this section.
- Flag LO’s concerns on engagement, education and monitoring progress, and performance measurements that should be in Overarching Issues under partnering and equity headings. Include citizen science and crowd sourcing as tools.
- Scoping Plan recommendation is that economic reviewers come from local communities.
 - Action Item: Specific names were provided from the original Scoping Plan. FV will follow up with Emily on the status of this request.
 - Economic reports are needed immediately.

Cap-and-Trade Rule-Making Process

The EJAC requested time to discuss the link between ARB rule-making processes and EJAC recommendations. The EJAC expressed concern that the cap-and-trade rulemaking processes are running parallel to EJAC scoping plan recommendations. The EJAC intention was for the EJAC recommendations to guide the Cap-and-trade processes. EJAC members and FV discussed the matter. FV clarified that the EJAC requested an adjustment to the timeline for the EJAC recommendations to the Scoping Plan. FV confirmed that ARB was not able to also change the Cap-and-Trade Rulemaking. Some of the EJAC members assumed that both the Scoping Plan recommendation timeline and Cap-and-Trade Rule-Making processes were delayed. KH mentioned that he understood that only one timeline was changed. FV clarified the spring of 2017 is the final Board hearing; the staff sends the full package to Office of Administrative Law, then to the Secretary of State where it gets approved.

- KVG asked how is the Scoping Plan in March going to inform the Cap-and-Trade 2020 rulemaking.
 - FV answered that there is now a two-stage process of hearings for the Board. A proposed rulemaking is considered, public hearings are conducted, and then revisions are taken to the Board.
 - At the second hearing, they either adopt or reject it. The second hearing will look at the Scoping Plan in March of next year, so it would inform them on the Cap-and-Trade before a final regulation is completed.
 - So Scoping Plan should inform the full Board and that is still set up to happen.
- The EJAC and FV did note that the Scoping Plan and Cap-and-Trade recommendation will be decided at very close time frames with little discussion in between.
- KH shared that electronic communication can inform and/or flag the interested groups that items or issues are going to be heard. KH thanked TJ for the current notifications and said her level of detail is very much appreciated.
- LO acknowledged a deeper understanding of the barriers and obstacles that FV confronts, he urged FV to share these obstacles with EJAC so members can see what FV faces.

Public Comment

There were none.

Meeting adjourned with GF saying in conclusion it was a very helpful and successful meeting.