

BEFORE THE
SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

IN RE THE MATTER OF:)
)
PUBLIC HEARING:)
)
SCAQMD 2016 AIR QUALITY)
MANAGEMENT PLAN)
)
)
)
_____)

DATE AND TIME: THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2016
 9:00 A.M.

PLACE: NORTON EVENTS CENTER
 1601 EAST 3RD STREET
 SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA 92408

REPORTER: KRISTIN RIVERA, CSR
 CERTIFICATE NO. 11858

BRS FILE NO.: 99072

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

SPEAKER INDEX

<u>PRESENTATION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
DR. FINE	6
MS. SUTKUS	27
DR. GHOSH	31

<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
JOSHUA TADRES	40
ANDREW TORRES	41
LEA PETERSON	42
DR. JOHN HUSING	44
MARY JANE O'MASSO	47
DEBORAH BARMACK	48
CHRIS SHIMODA	50
CAROL BANNER	51
CARLA WALECKA	54
HARVEY EDER	56

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SAN BERNARDINO, CALIFORNIA; THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2016

2 9:00 A.M.

3

4 MR. NASTRI: GOOD MORNING. WE'RE HERE THIS
5 MORNING TO TALK ABOUT OUR REVISED DRAFT AIR QUALITY
6 MANAGEMENT PLAN. AND HERE TODAY TO START US OFF IS MAYOR
7 LARRY MC CALLON, ONE OF OUR GOVERNING BOARD MEMBERS.

8 MAYOR MC CALLON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, WAYNE.
9 WELCOME EVERYONE. I'M GLAD TO SEE ALL OF YOU HERE. SO
10 MANY FAMILIAR FACES. I WISH THERE WERE MORE. THEY'RE
11 STRAGGLING IN, I GUESS.

12 WELL, AS YOU SAID, I'M THE MAYOR OF HIGHLAND,
13 AND I REPRESENT 16 CITIES OF SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY ON THE
14 AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT BOARD PLUS I'M A MEMBER
15 OF THE SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY -- I MEAN THE SOUTHERN
16 ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT REPRESENTING HIGHLAND AND SAN
17 BERNARDINO. AND I'M ALSO ON THE MOBILE SOURCE BOARD
18 REPRESENTING SANBAG.

19 I GUESS I'VE BEEN CALLED TO OPEN THIS PUBLIC
20 MEETING AS TO AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN OR AQMP TO GIVE
21 US SOME CONTEXT AS TO THE PROPOSED PLAN THAT WAS PREPARED
22 IN A JOINT EFFORT WITH THE U.S. EPA AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL,
23 THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD AT THE STATE LEVEL, AND SCAG,
24 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS. WE ALSO
25 HAD AN EXTENSIVE OUTREACH TO STAKEHOLDERS THROUGHOUT THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REGION AND SOLICITED INPUT THEM FROM INCLUDING OUR STATE
2 AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT BODIES, BUSINESSES AND TRADE
3 ASSOCIATIONS AND RESEARCHERS AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND
4 COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS. THE PROPOSED PLAN WE'RE SEEING
5 TODAY INCORPORATES POLLUTION CONTROL MEASURES THAT
6 REFLECT THE FULL RANGE OF THE RESPONSE AS WELL AS ALSO
7 ADDRESSING REQUIREMENTS OF STATE AND FEDERAL LAW. AT ITS
8 CORE, THE AIM OF THIS PROPOSED PLAN IS TO ENSURE THAT WE
9 ATTAIN AIR QUALITY STANDARDS BY THE VAST APPROACHING
10 DEADLINES SO THAT OUR REGION WILL NOT HAVE FEDERAL
11 SANCTIONS PUT ON US FOR NOT MEETING OUR OBLIGATIONS IN
12 THE CLEAN AIR ACT. IN PARTICULAR, THIS PLAN HAS
13 DEMONSTRATED BY THE NUMBERS HOW WE'RE GOING TO MEET
14 STANDARDS FOR OZONE AND FINE PARTICULATE IN A TIMELY
15 MANNER.

16 ALTHOUGH OUR REGIONAL AIR QUALITY HAS
17 DRAMATICALLY IMPROVED IN RECENT DECADES, WE STILL HAVE
18 THE HIGHEST LEVELS OF AIR POLLUTION IN THE COUNTRY. SO
19 THERE ARE TWO POINTS I WANT TO MAKE. FIRST THIS PROPOSED
20 AQMP CONTAINS THE NEXT ROUND OF POLLUTION CONTROL FOR
21 BOTH STATION AND MOBILE EMISSION SOURCES AS WE'VE HAD IN
22 PAST VERSIONS OF THE PLAN. BUT THE PROPOSED PLAN ALSO
23 REFLECTS THE REALITY THAT 88 PERCENT OF OUR REMAINING
24 SMOG EMISSIONS COME FROM MOBILE SOURCES, AND OUR AIR
25 DISTRICT HAS LIMITED AUTHORITY ON THOSE SOURCES. WITHOUT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SIGNIFICANT AND TIMELY REDUCTIONS OF MOBILE SOURCE
2 EMISSIONS, WE CANNOT REACH ATTAINMENT OF FEDERAL CLEAN
3 AIR STANDARDS.

4 SO AS YOU'LL HEAR, THE PLAN LOOKS TO OUR STATE
5 AND FEDERAL PARTNERS TO DO THEIR FAIR SHARE OF POLLUTION
6 CLEAN-UP AND ASSIST US IN ACQUIRING FINANCIAL RESOURCES
7 TO DO THE JOB. SECOND, I ALSO WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT
8 THIS HAS BEEN A VERY TRANSPARENT AND INTERACTIVE
9 POLICY-MAKING PROCESS. PUBLIC MEETINGS HAVE BEEN HELD
10 THROUGHOUT THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS, ALL THE PLANNING
11 ANALYSES HAVE BEEN DOCUMENTED FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD, ALL
12 THE MEETING PRESENTATIONS AND MINUTES ARE AVAILABLE ON
13 LINE. THE MEETINGS FROM THE DIAMOND BAR HEADQUARTERS
14 WERE WEB CAST LIVE AND ARCHIVED SO YOU CAN VIEW THEM
15 ONLINE. YOU CAN ALSO USE GOOGLE TO LOOK UP THE 2016 AQMP
16 COMMENT LETTERS AND READ THE ORIGINALS OF THE COMMENT
17 LETTERS WE RECEIVED.

18 AS A GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER, MY GOAL TO STRIKE A
19 POSITIVE BALANCE AMONG OUR REGION'S ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC
20 HEALTH AND BEING ECONOMIC NEEDS. WE WANT TO ARRIVE AT
21 THE MOST EFFICIENT AND COST-EFFECTIVE PATH TO ACHIEVE
22 MULTIPLE TARGETS. SO TODAY WE'LL BE LISTENING TO YOUR
23 FEEDBACK ON THOSE ASPECTS OF THE PLAN. WE'RE IN A
24 CRITICAL TIME IN INFRASTRUCTURE FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH IN
25 THIS REGION. HOW WELL WE WORK TOGETHER TO DO THAT WILL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AFFECT OUR COMMUNITIES AND OUR FAMILIES FOR MANY YEARS TO
2 COME. THERE'S A LOT AT STAKE IN ARRIVING AT AN
3 EFFECTIVE, LEGALLY APPROVABLE AQMP, BUT WE BELIEVE WE'RE
4 UP TO THE TASK WHEN WE LISTEN AND WE LEARN FROM EACH
5 OTHER.

6 SO THANK YOU AGAIN FOR COMING. AND AFTER THE
7 PRESENTATION, WE'RE HERE TO LISTEN TO YOUR THOUGHTS ABOUT
8 THIS REVISED PLAN.

9 THANK YOU, WAYNE.

10 MR. NASTRI: THANKS, MAYOR. LEADING OUR
11 DISCUSSION TODAY ON THE AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN IS
12 DR. PHIL FINE, OUR DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER.

13 DR. FINE: THANK YOU, WAYNE, MAYOR. A LITTLE
14 BIT OF HOUSEKEEPING. IF YOU WALKED IN, YOU'VE PROBABLY
15 SEEN THE BATHROOMS OUT IN THE HALLWAY TO THE LEFT OUT
16 THIS DOOR HERE. THE EXITS ARE AT ALL FOUR CORNERS HERE.
17 SO IF THERE'S AN EMERGENCY, WE MAY ASK YOU TO EVACUATE
18 THE ROOM OR SHELTER IN PLACE. AND PLEASE SILENCE YOUR
19 CELL PHONE OR PUT THEM ON VIBRATE SO WE'RE NOT
20 INTERRUPTED IN THE PRESENTATION FOR TAKING PUBLIC
21 COMMENT.

22 I ALSO WANT TO TALK ABOUT THE AGENDA A LITTLE
23 BIT. WE'RE DOING THIS IN THREE PARTS. I WILL KICK IT
24 OFF WITH A GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT
25 PLAN. WE ARE ALSO JOINED TODAY BY OUR COLLEAGUE CAROL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SUTKUS FROM CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD. AND AS
2 YOU'LL HEAR, THERE IS A CRITICAL ROLE OF THE AIR
3 RESOURCES BOARD IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THESE PLANS. AND
4 THEN FINALLY OUR HEALTH EFFECTS OFFICER, DR. GHOSH WILL
5 TALK ABOUT THE HEALTH EFFECTS OF AIR POLLUTION IN OUR
6 BASIN. THIS IS A PUBLIC HEARING ON THAT PORTION OF THE
7 PLAN AS REQUIRED BY THE HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE.

8 BEFORE WE GET STARTED, I WANT TO MENTION SOME
9 NAMES AND MENTION EVERYONE UP HERE. ON THE END WE HAVE
10 BILL WONG, WHO IS FROM OUR GENERAL COUNSEL'S OFFICE TO
11 HELP WITH THE PLAN DEVELOPMENT. SO WITH THAT, I'LL GET
12 STARTED ON THE FIRST PRESENTATION.

13 SO AS YOU'VE HEARD AND PROBABLY KNOW ESPECIALLY
14 LIVING OUT IN THE INLAND EMPIRE WE'VE HAD SIGNIFICANT
15 IMPROVEMENTS IN AIR QUALITY NOT JUST IN THE PAST COUPLE
16 DECADES, BUT OVER THE PAST FIVE OR SIX DECADES. AIR
17 POLLUTION USED TO HAVE OVER A HUNDRED DAYS A YEAR THAT
18 WERE STAGE 1 OR STAGE 2. SMOG ALERTS WE DON'T HAVE ANY
19 MORE. BUT AS THE MAYOR HAS SAID, WE STILL HAVE THE WORST
20 OZONE POLLUTION IN THE COUNTRY AND PROBABLY THE SECOND
21 WORST PARTICULATE MATTER POLLUTION IN THE COUNTRY. THE
22 SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY IN CENTRAL CALIFORNIA HAS THE WORST
23 AIR POLLUTION AND THE SECOND WORST OZONE. SO BETWEEN
24 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND NORTHERN CALIFORNIA WE HAVE BY
25 FAR THE GREATEST AIR QUALITY CHALLENGES IN THE COUNTRY AS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 A WHOLE. BUT, AGAIN, WE HAVE MADE GREAT IMPROVEMENTS,
2 BUT THERE'S A LONG WAY TO GO.

3 SO JUST BY WAY OF BACKGROUND, FIRST LET ME
4 MENTION THAT THIS IS A PUBLIC HEARING SO WE ARE TAKING
5 TRANSCRIPTS TODAY, AND THESE TRANSCRIPTS WILL BE PROVIDED
6 TO ALL GOVERNING BOARD MEMBERS. AND SO ALL THE COMMENTS
7 YOU MAKE TODAY WILL GO INTO THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS
8 OF THE ADOPTION OF THE AQMP.

9 SO JUST BY WAY OF BACKGROUND, AND MANY OF YOU
10 KNOW THIS, THE WAY THE REASON WE DEVELOP THESE PLANS IS
11 REQUIRED BY THE FEDERAL LAW AS WELL AS STATE LAW. SO
12 UNDER THE CLEAN AIR ACT, THE U.S. EPA SETS NATIONAL
13 AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS, THEN THEY LOOK AT ALL THE
14 DATA WE COLLECTED ON ALL THE MONITORING STATIONS
15 THROUGHOUT OUR AREA. AND IF YOU DON'T MEET THOSE
16 STANDARDS, YOU'RE DESIGNATED AS NONATTAINMENT OF THOSE
17 STANDARDS. WHAT HAPPENS THEN IS IT KICKS IN A WHOLE
18 SERIES OF REQUIREMENTS BUT ALSO PLANNING REQUIREMENTS IN
19 TERMS OF HOW YOU'RE GOING TO MEET THOSE STANDARDS. SO
20 WHAT THIS AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN IS IS OUR
21 LIMITATION PLAN UNDER THE FEDERAL CLEAN AIR ACT FOR OUR
22 AREA TO MEET THOSE STANDARDS. IT'S A BLUEPRINT FOR WHAT
23 MEASURES ARE WE GOING TO TAKE AND WHAT ACTIONS WE'RE
24 GOING TO TAKE TO REDUCE EMISSIONS TO IMPROVE AIR QUALITY
25 STANDARDS.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SO WE'VE BEEN DOING THIS FOR MANY YEARS SINCE
2 THE BEGINNING OF THE AQMD IN THE LATE '70S. THIS IS OUR
3 11TH PLAN THAT WE'LL BE SUBMITTING TO EPA FOR APPROVAL.
4 STATE LAW ALSO REQUIRES PERIODIC UPDATES TO OUR AIR
5 QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN AS WELL.

6 SO THE TWO POLLUTANTS WE FOCUS ON ARE
7 PARTICULATE MATTER OR WHAT WE CALL PM2.5 AND OZONE. AND
8 THESE ARE THE TWO POLLUTANTS UNDER THE FEDERAL CLEAN AIR
9 ACT THAT WE STILL DO NOT ATTAIN THE STANDARDS. AND
10 CURRENTLY THERE'S FIVE STANDARDS ON THE BOOKS FOR WHICH
11 WE DON'T ATTAIN; TWO PM2.5 STANDARDS, ONE AN ANNUAL
12 STANDARD, ONE A DAILY STANDARD; AND THREE DIFFERENT OZONE
13 STANDARDS WHICH WE DO NOT ATTAIN. SO WHAT WE TRY TO DO
14 IN THIS PLANNING PROCESS IS TO INTEGRATE OUR PLANNING SO
15 WE CAN HAVE ONE STRATEGY TO MEET ALL THE STANDARDS. THIS
16 IS THE MOST EFFICIENT PATH RATHER THAN HAVING A SEPARATE
17 STRATEGY MAINLY FOR -- THERE'S INEFFICIENT ACTIONS AND
18 MEASURES AND WE WANT TO MAKE SURE WE HAVE A PLAN TO MEET
19 ALL THE STANDARDS AS THE DEADLINES COME UP.

20 SO YOU CAN SEE THE DEADLINES THAT WE HAVE HERE.
21 SO THE 2022, 2019, AND THE 2031 IS THE FURTHEST ONE OUT.
22 AND WE ALSO HAVE NEW DATES FOR THE SUBMITTAL OF THIS
23 PLAN. YOU'LL NOTICE THAT WE'RE A LITTLE BIT LATE ON A
24 COUPLE OF THESE. HOWEVER, WE HAVE BEEN TALKING TO CARB,
25 WE'VE BEEN TALKING TO EPA. THE CONSEQUENCES OF BEING A

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LITTLE BIT LATE ARE NOT SEVERE AND LESS IMPORTANT THAN
2 GETTING THE PLAN RIGHT AND HAVING A FULL PUBLIC PROCESS
3 AND GETTING INPUTS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLAN. I'LL
4 TALK ABOUT THE SCHEDULE A LITTLE BIT LATER.

5 SO THE BIGGEST CHALLENGE WE HAVE IS REDUCING
6 EMISSION OF NITROGEN OXIDE OR NOX. AND NOX IS EMITTED
7 FROM ANY TYPE OF COMBUSTION PROCESS, WHETHER IT'S IN YOUR
8 CAR ENGINE OR TRUCK ENGINE OR IT'S A NATURAL GAS OVEN OR
9 INDUSTRIAL FACILITY OVEN OR PROCESS HEATERS OR ALL THE
10 WAY DOWN TO YOUR HOT WATER HEATER, SPACE HEATER, AT YOUR
11 HOUSE. SO ANY COMBUSTION PROCESS WHERE YOU'RE BURNING
12 ANY TYPE OF FUEL PRODUCES NOX. AND THIS IS OUR BIGGEST
13 CHALLENGE. IF WE CAN REDUCE NOX, WE WILL NOT MEET OUR
14 OZONE STANDARDS, WHICH IS OUR BIGGEST CHALLENGE, WE WILL
15 ALSO MEET THE PM2.5 STANDARDS.

16 SO YOU KIND OF BOIL DOWN OUR CHALLENGES TO THIS
17 ONE SLOT. WHAT YOU SEE HERE IN THE BLUE BARS IS THE NOX
18 EMISSIONS THAT OCCURRED IN 2012 AND THE PROJECTED NOX
19 EMISSIONS THAT WILL OCCUR ALL THE WAY TO 2031. THE
20 REASON THE BLUE BARS GET SMALLER IS THAT THERE'S ALREADY
21 ADOPTED RULES AND REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTED AT THE LOCAL
22 LEVEL ON STATIONARY SOURCES AND AT THE STATE AND FEDERAL
23 LEVEL FOR MOBILE SOURCES THAT WILL CONTINUE TO REDUCE
24 EMISSIONS GOING FORWARD TO RESULT IN AIR POLLUTION
25 BENEFITS AND GAINS.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THE ISSUE IS THAT THE BLUE BARS DON'T GET LOW
2 ENOUGH FAST ENOUGH IN ORDER TO MEET THE STANDARD
3 DEADLINES OF THE CLEAN AIR ACT. SO WE HAVE THESE
4 DEADLINES IN 2022, 2023, AND 2031, AND WE NEED TO GET THE
5 NOX EMISSIONS DOWN FROM WHERE THE BLUE BARS DOWN TO WHERE
6 THE RED BARS ARE. SO THAT REPRESENTS 43-PERCENT
7 REDUCTION BY 2023 AND 55-PERCENT REDUCTION BY 2031. BUT
8 AS I MENTIONED, THIS IS ONLY SIX OR SEVEN YEARS AWAY. SO
9 THIS IS REALLY WHAT'S DRIVING THE BULK OF THE PLAN
10 BECAUSE IF WE CAN GET DOWN TO THIS LEVEL WE'LL OBVIOUSLY
11 ALREADY -- WE'LL PROBABLY MEET THAT 2022 STANDARD IN TIME
12 AND IT WILL MAKE IT EASIER TO MEET THE SIX YEARS, SIX TO
13 SEVEN YEARS, OUT IN 2023 IS THE MOST CHALLENGING TARGET
14 THAT WE HAVE IN TERMS OF NOX REDUCTIONS. AND THE AIR
15 QUALITY BENEFITS AND HEATH BENEFITS WILL GO ALONG WITH
16 MEETING THAT STANDARD. SORRY ABOUT THIS SLIDE. LAST
17 TIME WE WERE HERE WE HAD THE SAME ISSUE.

18 AND THIS SLIDE IS TRYING TO SHOW YOU THE SAME
19 THING MAYOR MC CALLON MENTIONED IS THAT SMALL YELLOW
20 SLIVER THERE IS THE EMISSIONS IN 2012 OF NOX FOR
21 STATIONARY SOURCES, TWELVE PERCENT; WHILE 88 PERCENT OF
22 THE EMISSIONS COME FROM MOBILE SOURCES. SO THE CHALLENGE
23 FOR THE AGENCY THAT HAS PRIMARY AUTHORITY OVER STATIONARY
24 SOURCES WE DON'T HAVE AUTHORITY FOR THE MAJORITY OF THE
25 SOURCES THAT ARE LEADING TO THE NONATTAINMENT PROBLEM.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WHEN WE LOOK AT THE OVERALL PLAN STRATEGY -- AND
2 I'M NOT GOING INTO A LOT OF DETAIL MEASURE BY MEASURE.
3 WE JUST DON'T HAVE A ENOUGH TIME. IT'S A VERY COMPLEX
4 DOCUMENT. WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE OVERALL STRATEGY AND
5 WHERE THE EMISSION REDUCTIONS ARE COMING FROM OUR PLAN IN
6 ORDER TO MEET THE STANDARDS, YOU CAN SEE IN ORDER TO MEET
7 THE 2023 STANDARDS WE NEED 400 TONS PER DAY OF NOX
8 REDUCTIONS AND THEN BY 2031 A LITTLE BIT MORE. BUT WHERE
9 THESE REDUCTIONS ARE COMING FROM ARE MOSTLY FROM ALREADY
10 EXISTING REGULATIONS. THAT'S ABOUT 70 PERCENT THAT BIG
11 BLUE SQUARE THERE. AND THAT IS EXACTLY THE SAME REASON
12 THOSE BLUE BARS ARE SHRINKING IN THE PREVIOUS SLIDE IS
13 THAT ALREADY ADOPTED RULES AND REGULATIONS ARE GOING TO
14 GIVE ABOUT 70 PERCENT OF THE REDUCTIONS. SO THIS IS A
15 REGULATORY PLAN. WE'VE PASSED SOME TOUGH AND VERY
16 STRINGENT REGULATIONS UP TO THIS POINT, AND THAT IS
17 GETTING THE BULK OF THE EMISSION REDUCTIONS TO MEET THE
18 STANDARDS.

19 AS IN EVERY PLAN, WE BUILD UPON THAT. WE DO
20 THESE PLANS EVERY THREE OR FOUR YEARS. WE LOOK AT WHAT
21 TECHNOLOGY ALLOWS US TO DO IN TERMS OF FEASIBILITY OF
22 CONTROL OPTIONS, COST, ALL THOSE THINGS. AND IN
23 ADDITIONS TO THAT, WE HAVE ADDITIONAL MEASURES. THESE
24 ARE THE ADDITIONAL MEASURES IN THIS PLAN. THERE'S NEW
25 REGULATIONS PROPOSED, AND IT DOES LOOK LIKE A SMALL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SLIVER THERE, BUT IT IS ABOUT THE SAME LEVEL OF
2 ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS THAT WE HAVE PROPOSED IN THE LAST
3 THREE OR FOUR PLANS. WE DID EVERYTHING WE COULD IN THE
4 2012 PLAN. FOUR YEARS LATER THERE'S A FEW MORE OPTIONS
5 AVAILABLE TO US, BUT IT'S ANOTHER, YOU KNOW, EIGHT TO TEN
6 TONS PER DAY, BUT IT'S VERY SIMILAR TO THE PREVIOUS
7 PLANS.

8 WE ALSO NEED REDUCTIONS IN FEDERAL SOURCES.
9 WHAT WE MEAN BY FEDERAL SOURCES IS THERE ARE FEDERAL
10 SOURCES SUCH AS TRAINS AND SHIPS, INTERSTATE TRUCKS
11 THAT -- AND AIRCRAFT THAT ARE BEYOND THE PURVIEW OF THE
12 STATE TO CONTROL UNDER THE CLEAN AIR ACT AND OTHER LAWS.
13 SO WE NEED COMMENSURATE REDUCTIONS IN THOSE SOURCES AND
14 THAT WILL BECOME THE BIGGER PIECE OF THE PIE. SO THE
15 STATE PLAN, WHICH WE'LL HEAR ABOUT IN A MOMENT, INCLUDES
16 REDUCTIONS, NEEDED REDUCTIONS, IN THE FEDERAL SOURCES.
17 AND, OF COURSE, WE'RE WORKING WITH EPA ON THAT.

18 AND THE REMAINING PIECE HERE, THE GREEN BAR, IS
19 ONCE THESE REGULATIONS DO GET PASSED ON THE MOBILE
20 SOURCES AND STATIONARY SOURCES, WE NEED TO ACCELERATE
21 DEPLOYMENT OF THIS CLEAN AIR TECHNOLOGY. AND YOU COULD
22 ONLY GO SO FAR WITH REGULATIONS. WHAT YOU NEED TO DO IS
23 INCENTIVIZE THAT RAPID DEPLOYMENT OF THAT CLEAN AIR
24 TECHNOLOGY. SO WHAT YOU'LL HEAR ABOUT IN THE PLAN AND
25 HAVE HEARD ABOUT IN THE PLAN IS A VERY SIGNIFICANT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 INCENTIVE PROGRAM TO ACCELERATE FLEET TURNOVER IN ALL
2 SECTORS.

3 AS YOU GO FURTHER IN THE FUTURE, OBVIOUSLY WE
4 HAVE MORE REGULATORY REDUCTIONS BECAUSE WE HAVE TIME TO
5 IMPLEMENT. AND WE HAVE LESS INCENTIVE VENTURES BECAUSE
6 REGULATIONS WILL TAKE CARE OF A LARGER FRACTION AS THIS
7 REGULATION WILL HAVE THE ADVANTAGE OF REGULATIONS DRIVING
8 FLEET TURNOVER OVER A LONGER PERIOD OF TIME.

9 BUT AS I MENTIONED, WE'RE ONLY 88 PERCENT FROM
10 THE NOX EMISSIONS FROM MOBILE SOURCES, AND WE HAVE
11 LIMITED AUTHORITY THERE. AND SO OUR PLAN CANNOT BE A
12 LOCAL PLAN. WE'LL HAVE TO INTEGRATE MEASURES AND
13 REDUCTIONS AT STATE LEVEL. CARB HAS RELEASED A DRAFT
14 STATEWIDE SIP STRATEGY OR PLANNING STRATEGY OR PLANNING
15 STRATEGY INCLUDING FEDERAL SOURCE REDUCTIONS. SO YOU'LL
16 HEAR A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT THAT FROM THE AIR RESOURCES
17 BOARD.

18 JUST TO FOCUS ON THE STATIONARY SOURCE STRATEGY
19 FOR A MOMENT, AS WE DO IN EVERY PLAN, THIS IS WHERE WE
20 START. WE CLEARLY EVALUATE ALL THE DIFFERENT SOURCE
21 CATEGORIES, AND THERE'S HUNDREDS OF SOURCE CATEGORIES ON
22 STATIONARY SOURCES. WE LOOK AT WHERE THE EMISSIONS ARE
23 COMING FROM, WE LOOK AT WHERE THE OPPORTUNITIES ARE, AND
24 WHERE TECHNOLOGY HAS ADVANCED TO HAVE FEASIBLE
25 REDUCTIONS. WE'RE ALSO REQUIRED TO LOOK AT ALL THE OTHER

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REGULATIONS THAT ARE PASSED THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY AND
2 THROUGHOUT THE STATE AND MAKE SURE ALL OUR RULES AND
3 REGULATIONS ARE STRINGENT AS THOSE. TYPICALLY WE DO HAVE
4 THE MOST STRINGENT REGULATIONS IN SOUTH COAST GIVEN OUR
5 AIR QUALITY CHALLENGES. BUT FROM TIME TO TIME, WE'LL
6 FIND SLIGHT DIFFERENCES IN ANOTHER AREA.

7 AND THEN WE HAVE A FULL PUBLIC PROCESS. WE WENT
8 THROUGH A SERIES OF LIGHT PAPERS, WORKING GROUPS. WE HAD
9 A TECHNOLOGIES SYMPOSIUM, AND WE'VE HAD AQMD ADVISORY
10 GROUP MEETINGS FOR THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS THAT HAVE GONE
11 OVER SPECIFIC MEASURES AND TECHNOLOGIES THAT ARE
12 AVAILABLE TO US. AT THE END OF THE DAY WHAT WE LOOK AT
13 WHAT THE REGULATORY OPTIONS ARE, THERE ARE SOME. AND WE
14 FOCUSING ON THE -- WE THINK THERE ARE SOME OPPORTUNITIES
15 FOR REDUCTION IN NON-REFINERY FLARING. WE THINK THERE'S
16 OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMERCIAL COOKING OPERATIONS IN TERMS
17 OF NOX CONTROLS. RIGHT NOW THERE IS NO CONTROLS OR NO
18 STANDARDS AT ALL FOR ANY COOKING OPERATIONS IN COMMERCIAL
19 ESTABLISHMENTS OR RESIDENTIAL HOMES, AND THERE ARE
20 SOME -- THERE'S EQUIPMENT OUT THERE THAT'S ALREADY LOW
21 NOX, AND WE NEED TO FIND A WAY TO ENCOURAGE THAT.

22 WE HAVE PROPOSED FURTHER REDUCTIONS FROM OUR
23 LARGEST INDUSTRIAL SOURCES. ABOUT 270 OF OUR LARGEST NOX
24 SOURCES COME IN UNDER WHAT WE CALL OUR RECLAIM PROGRAM
25 WHICH IS OUR NOX EMISSION CAP AND TRADE-IN PROGRAM. WE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 JUST ADOPTED LAST YEAR A 45-PERCENT REDUCTION IN NOX
2 EMISSIONS FROM THOSE SOURCES, AND WE'RE PROPOSING ANOTHER
3 35 PERCENT ON TOP OF THAT IN THIS PLAN. WE'RE ALSO
4 LOOKING AT THE COMMERCIAL AND RESIDENTIAL APPLIANCES AND
5 EQUIPMENT. THERE'S SOME OPPORTUNITIES FOR LOW NOX OR
6 ZERO-EMISSION EQUIPMENT THERE AND ALTERNATIVES TO DIESEL
7 BACK-UP GENERATORS. THERE HAVE BEEN ADVANCEMENTS IN
8 POWER SUPPLIES AND BATTERY TECHNOLOGIES AND OTHER
9 TECHNOLOGIES THAT MIGHT MAKE SOME APPLICATIONS OF DIESEL
10 BACK-UP GENERATORS LOW NOX.

11 BUT AS I MENTIONED BEFORE, THE ONLY 12
12 PERCENT -- IF WE TOOK ALL OUR STATIONARY SOURCES TO ZERO
13 EMISSIONS TOMORROW, WE WOULD STILL NOT MEET ATTAINMENT
14 STANDARDS. WE WOULD STILL NOT HAVE A PLAN. WE WOULD NOT
15 BE HALFWAY TOWARDS ATTAINMENT UNLESS WE GET EMISSION
16 REDUCTIONS FROM THE MOBILE SOURCES.

17 I MENTIONED WE DO HAVE LIMITED AUTHORITY OVER
18 MOBILE SOURCES. AND THAT LIMITED AUTHORITY COMES UNDER
19 THE FEDERAL CLEAN AIR ACT AND THE STATE CLEAN AIR ACT,
20 AND IT'S CALLED WHAT WE CALL INDIRECT SOURCE AUTHORITY
21 RULES. AND UNDER STATE LAW WE HAVE SOME AUTHORITY OVER
22 FLEETS. SO WE DO HAVE RULES ON THAT, ON THE FLEETS, IN
23 TERMS OF ISR. WE DO HAVE SOME AUTHORITY. INDIRECT
24 SOURCES ARE LISTED HERE THAT ARE STATIONARY. THEY'RE
25 FACILITIES THAT ATTRACT MOBILE SOURCES THAT LEAD TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED ON THE ROAD BECAUSE MOBILE SOURCES
2 ARE ATTRACTED OR IT CAN BE CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT. WE'RE
3 TALKING ABOUT DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECTS.

4 SO THESE ARE VERY CONTROVERSIAL AUTHORITY, SO
5 WE'RE PLANNING TO TAKE AN APPROACH THAT WORKS IN
6 COLLABORATION WITH THESE FACILITIES AND SEE IF WE CAN SIT
7 DOWN AND FIND ENFORCEABLE MECHANISMS IN ORDER TO BRING
8 ABOUT EMISSION REDUCTIONS IN THESE AREAS. MANY OF THESE
9 FACILITIES HAVE ALREADY GONE THROUGH -- HAVE ALREADY
10 TAKEN ACTION AND REDUCED EMISSIONS. BUT UNTIL WE CAN
11 FIND A WAY TO MAKE IT ENFORCEABLE UNDER FEDERAL LAW, WE
12 WON'T GET CREDIT FOR THOSE UNDER SIP, THEREFORE, WE WOULD
13 HAVE TO DO SOMETHING ELSE TO FIND EMISSION REDUCTIONS
14 ELSEWHERE.

15 A GOOD EXAMPLE OF THIS IS THE PORTS WHO WORKED
16 SEVERAL YEARS AGO WITH AIR QUALITY AGENCIES AT ALL LEVELS
17 TO DEVELOP A CLEAN AIR ACTION PLAN TO BE ABLE TO ACHIEVE
18 SIGNIFICANT EMISSION REDUCTIONS WITH THE TRUCK PROGRAM
19 AND OTHER PROGRAMS WITHOUT POTENTIAL OVERREGULATION THAT
20 FORCES IT. THERE'S A SYSTEM THAT WILL MAKE THAT
21 ENFORCEABLE UNDER THE CLEAN AIR ACT. THERE ARE SOME GOOD
22 IDEAS. SO OUR PLAN IS TO START THE WORKING GROUPS AND TO
23 START MEETING WITH THESE FACILITIES AND LOOKING AT THE
24 ACTION THAT HAS BEEN TAKEN. AND AT THE END OF THE DAY IF
25 IT TURNS OUT WE CAN IDENTIFY OTHER MECHANISMS THAT WILL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WORK UNDER THE CLEAN AIR ACT TO GET CREDIT FOR THESE
2 EMISSION REDUCTIONS, THEN THAT'S GREAT. BUT IF WE CAN'T
3 DO THAT OR THE COLLABORATIVE PROCESS IS NOT IDENTIFYING
4 PATHWAYS FORWARD, THEN WE DO HAVE THIS REGULATORY
5 AUTHORITY, AND WE CAN MOVE TO DO THAT VERY QUICKLY. SO
6 WE'LL START THE PROCESS. WE'RE GOING TO START IT VERY
7 SOON EARLIER NEXT YEAR TO TRY TO STRUCTURE SOME WAY TO
8 MAKE THESE WORK UNDER THE CLEAN AIR ACT.

9 SO THIS IS -- WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT TODAY IS
10 THE REVISED DRAFT. WE RELEASED THE DRAFT IN JUNE AND WE
11 RECEIVED ABOUT 69 COMMENT LETTERS. AND THEN BASED ON
12 THOSE COMMENT LETTERS AND MANY, MANY MEETINGS, WE CAME
13 OUT WITH THE REVISED DRAFT IN EARLY OCTOBER. I JUST WANT
14 TO HIGHLIGHT SOME OF THE CHANGES THAT WERE MADE IN THIS
15 REVISED DRAFT. BECAUSE EARLIER THIS YEAR WE WERE IN THE
16 SAME VENUE TALKING ABOUT THE DRAFT.

17 SO ONE THING ABOUT IT IS PRIORITIZING AND
18 MAXIMIZING EMISSION REDUCTIONS FROM ZERO-EMISSION
19 TECHNOLOGY, BUT WHERE IT'S COST EFFECTIVE AND FEASIBLE
20 BUT THEN LOOKING AT NEAR ZERO OR ULTRA LOW NOX TECHNOLOGY
21 WHERE IT'S NOT FEASIBLE. WHEN WE TALK ABOUT ZERO AND
22 NEAR ZERO EMISSION TECHNOLOGY, WHAT WE NEED TO DO IS
23 REALLY LOOK AT THE FULL LIFE CYCLE ANALYSIS OF WHERE THE
24 FUEL IS COMING FROM WHETHER IT'S ELECTRICITY OR NATURAL
25 GAS OR EMISSION LOSSES AND THE FULL NOX EMISSION

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 POTENTIAL IN THE BASIN OF THESE DIFFERENT TECHNOLOGIES
2 ALSO LOOKING AT GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION REDUCTIONS MAKING
3 SURE WE DON'T HAVE ANY UNWANTED TRADE OFFS.

4 SO WHAT WE PLAN TO DO IS ENGAGE IN A FULL
5 ASSESSMENT OF ALL THESE DIFFERENT TYPES OF TECHNOLOGIES
6 ESPECIALLY IN THE RESIDENTIAL, COMMERCIAL SECTORS TO SEE
7 WHICH TECHNOLOGIES ACTUALLY NEED TO HAVE REDUCTION OF NOT
8 ONLY NOX EMISSIONS, BUT GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. SO
9 WE'LL BE LAUNCHING AN ANALYSIS. WE'LL DO A PUBLIC
10 PROCESS AND WORKING GROUP VERY SOON FOR THAT.

11 WE ALSO HAD COMMENTS AND ADDED REGULATORY
12 MEASURES TO THE PLAN. WE HAD A LOT OF INCENTIVE MEASURES
13 ON THE STATIONARY SOURCE SIDE LOOKING ON HOW TO
14 INCENTIVIZE THE REPLACEMENT OF DIESEL BACK-UP GENERATORS,
15 THE ISR ENGINES, INTERNAL COMBUSTION ENGINES,
16 RESIDENTIAL/COMMERCIAL APPLIANCES. BUT WE DID GET
17 COMMENTS AND DID FIND SOME OPPORTUNITIES IN THE LONG
18 TERM. THIS INCLUDED REGULATING THESE SAME TYPES OF
19 EQUIPMENT IN THE PAST THAT, YOU KNOW, IN THE NEXT 10
20 YEARS, 15 YEARS, IS PASS BASED ON THE ASSESSMENT OF
21 ADDITIONAL NOX EMISSION REDUCTIONS WE DO THINK GOING
22 FORWARD IN THE LONGER TERM. AND THEN ONCE THOSE
23 REGULATIONS ARE SET, THEN WE CAN USE INCENTIVES TO
24 ACCELERATE THE PLAN WITH THESE NEW TECHNOLOGIES.

25 WE HAVE ALSO TALKED A LITTLE MORE SERIOUSLY

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ABOUT THE RECLAIM PROGRAM. WE ARE PROPOSING TO
2 COMMITTING TO ANOTHER 5 TONS PER DAY AT 14 TONS PER DAY
3 IN THAT PROGRAM. THAT'S 35-PERCENT ADDITIONAL
4 REDUCTIONS. AND WE'RE SERIOUSLY CONSIDERING ONE PATHWAY
5 TO ACHIEVE, AND THAT WOULD ACTUALLY BE LOOKING AT THE
6 SUNSET PROGRAM TURNING THE TRADITIONAL COMMAND CONTROL.
7 SO THAT'S ANOTHER ASSESSMENT THAT WE'LL BE LAUNCHING VERY
8 EARLY NEXT YEAR TO SEE THE BEST PATH FORWARD IN TERMS OF
9 ACHIEVING THOSE REDUCTIONS. AND CURRENT THINK IS THAT
10 THE SUNSET PROGRAM MAY BE THE MOST ORDERLY WAY AND COST
11 EFFECT WAY TO DO THAT.

12 WE ADDED SOME CLARITY AND CERTAINTY ON OUR ISR
13 AND FLEET RULES. WE ADDED A TIME LINE, AS I MENTIONED,
14 TO COME BACK AND REPORT TO THE BOARD ON RECOMMENDATIONS
15 WHETHER WE FOUND OTHER ENFORCEABLE MECHANISMS OR WE NEED
16 TO CONSIDER REGULATIONS. AND THEN OBVIOUSLY WE DO A LOT
17 OF TECHNICAL WORK ON THE PLAN IN TERMS OF EMISSIONS
18 INVENTORY AND CONTINUAL UPDATES ON THAT. AT THIS POINT
19 THEY'RE VERY MINOR UPDATES. ALL THE NUMBERS DO NEED TO
20 ADD UP.

21 SO WE TALKED ABOUT INCENTIVES. AND WHEN WE'RE
22 TALKING -- WHAT WE'RE DOING WITH INCENTIVES IS WE'RE
23 BASICALLY ACCELERATING THE DEPLOYMENT OF THESE ULTRA LOW
24 EMISSION TECHNOLOGIES OR ZERO-EMISSION TECHNOLOGIES. AND
25 WHEN WE ACCELERATE THE DEPLOYMENT, THERE'S MANY WAYS TO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DO THAT. ISR RULES ARE ONE WAY TO DO IT. REGULATIONS
2 ARE ANOTHER WAY TO DO IT AS TECHNOLOGY ALLOWS. BUT WE
3 ARE LOOKING AT KIND OF WORST CASE SCENARIO. WE NEED
4 INCENTIVES AND FUNDING TO DO, AND THIS IS WHAT WE
5 PRESENTED HERE.

6 SO FOR THE FIRST TIME IN PREVIOUS PLANS WHEN WE
7 TALKED ABOUT THE ACTIONS NEEDED TO GET TO ATTAINMENT,
8 WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO PUT OFF SOME OF THESE QUESTIONS OF
9 WHAT WE CALL THE BLACK BOX. THESE ARE EMISSION
10 REDUCTIONS THAT WE DON'T KNOW EXACTLY HOW THEY'RE GOING
11 TO OCCUR, BUT WE'RE RELYING ON FUTURE ADVANCEMENT OF
12 TECHNOLOGY TO COME OUT AND THAT WILL ALLOW US TO GET TO
13 ATTAINMENT. BECAUSE AS I MENTIONED, WE'RE ONLY SIX,
14 SEVEN YEARS AWAY FROM THAT FIRST ATTAINMENT DEADLINE.
15 IT'S TOO LATE TO WAIT FOR MAJOR ADVANCEMENT IN
16 TECHNOLOGY.

17 THE OTHER THING THAT HAS HAPPENED IS THAT
18 TECHNOLOGY HAS ADVANCED OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS OR SO TO
19 THE POINT WHERE WE CAN ACTUALLY MAP OUT A TECHNOLOGICAL
20 PATHWAY TO ATTAINMENT. WE KNOW HOW MANY TRUCKS WE NEED
21 TO CHANGE OUT AND WHAT STANDARDS THEY WOULD HAVE TO MEET
22 ACROSS ALL THE SECTORS IN ORDER TO GET TO ATTAINMENT NOW.
23 SO WHAT THAT ALLOWS US TO DO IS PUT A PRICE TAG ON THE
24 INCENTIVES THAT WOULD BE REQUIRED TO ACCELERATE THAT
25 DEPLOYMENT IN CONJUNCTION WITH REGULATIONS THAT WILL TAKE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 A LONGER TIME TO REALIZE THE BENEFITS.

2 SO WHEN WE DO THAT CALCULATION, IT COMES OUT TO
3 ROUGHLY ABOUT \$14 BILLION A YEAR OVER THE NEXT 15 YEARS,
4 ROUGHLY ABOUT A BILLION DOLLARS A YEAR IN INCENTIVE
5 PROGRAMS, WHICH OBVIOUSLY IS A LARGE NUMBER. BUT THERE
6 ARE CONSEQUENCES TO NOT GETTING TO ATTAINMENT, AND ONE OF
7 THEM IS LOSING FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING, WHICH IS
8 APPROXIMATELY 4 TO \$6 BILLION A YEAR NOT TO MENTION ALL
9 THE HEATH IMPACTS OF NOT REACHING ATTAINMENT, WHICH I'M
10 GOING TO BE TALKING ABOUT IN A MOMENT. SO A BILLION
11 DOLLARS A YEAR IS A LARGE NUMBER.

12 WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE AREA, THE SOUTH COAST AREA
13 REGIONAL ECONOMY IS ABOUT A TRILLION DOLLARS A YEAR. WE
14 SPENT ABOUT \$20 BILLION A YEAR ON TRANSPORTATION
15 INFRASTRUCTURE, ABOUT \$60 BILLION A YEAR ON ENERGY COSTS.
16 SO IT'S JUST A MATTER PRIORITIES AND WHERE SOCIETY WANTS
17 TO SPEND MONEY. IS AIR QUALITY WORTH THAT AMOUNT?
18 THAT'S A QUESTION FOR POLICY MAKERS. AND THEY'LL BE
19 MAKING THOSE DECISIONS IN THE NEXT COMING MONTHS AND
20 YEARS.

21 IN ADDITION TO THE AQMP, THERE IS RELATED
22 DOCUMENTS. WE DO A FULL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ON
23 THE PROPOSED AQMP. WE CLOSED COMMENT ON THAT A FEW DAYS
24 AGO AND WE JUST RECEIVED ABOUT EIGHT COMMENT LETTERS.

25 WE ALSO DO A SOCIOECONOMIC ASSESSMENT OF OUR

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PROPOSED MEASURES ON JOBS AND REGIONAL ECONOMY. SO THAT
2 IS ANOTHER DOCUMENT THAT WE RELEASED MOST OF THE CHAPTERS
3 AND HAD ADVISORY GROUP MEETINGS AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON
4 THAT. AND YOU CAN FIND ALL THAT ONLINE. WE'RE MAKING
5 CHANGES NOW BASED ON COMMENTS RECEIVED, AND WE'LL BEE
6 RELEASING AN UPDATED VERSION IN THE COMING WEEKS.

7 COST OF THE PLAN, HEATH BENEFITS OF THE PLAN.
8 IT ALSO LOOKS AT THE IMPACTS ON THE REGIONAL ECONOMY. IT
9 INCLUDES AN ENVIRONMENT JUSTICE ANALYSIS LOOKING AT
10 WHETHER OUR PLAN BENEFITS DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES MORE
11 OR LESS THAN NON-DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES. IT DOES COME
12 OUT THAT IT DOES BENEFIT DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES MORE
13 THAN THE OTHER COMMUNITIES. THE OTHER DOCUMENT WE'RE
14 WORKING ON AND WILL BE RELEASING IN THE COMING WEEKS IS
15 AN ACTION PLAN FOR TRYING TO SECURE THE FUNDING NECESSARY
16 TO IMPLEMENT THE PLAN INCLUDING THE INCENTIVE FUNDING.

17 SO JUST THE SOCIOECONOMIC ANALYSIS REALLY
18 BRIEFLY. WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE TOTAL COST OF THE PLAN,
19 OVER THIS 15-YEAR PERIOD, IT'S ABOUT \$15.5 BILLION COMING
20 TO ABOUT \$1.4 BILLION. THIS INCLUDES STATIONARY SOURCE
21 COSTS, \$4 BILLION IN THE STATIONARY SOURCE SECTOR AND
22 ABOUT 1.4 BILLION IN INCENTIVES ADDED TO THAT. IT ALSO
23 INCLUDES THE COSTS ON THE MOBILE SOURCE SECTOR, BUT THE
24 MOBILE SOURCE RELIES ON SOME COST SAVINGS IN OUR ANALYSIS
25 BECAUSE IT'S SAVINGS IN FUEL. SO THAT'S A NEGATIVE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 NUMBER THERE. AND THEN YOU ALSO SEE THE LARGER AMOUNT OF
2 INCENTIVES ON THE MOBILE SOURCE SIDE TO ACCELERATE THAT
3 DEPLOYMENT. SO AT THE END OF THE DAY IT'S ABOUT \$1 AND A
4 HALF BILLION A YEAR IN COST FOR THE REGION TO IMPLEMENT
5 THE PLAN.

6 WHEN WE LOOK AT PUBLIC HEALTH BENEFITS, WE COULD
7 LOOK TO AVOID PREMATURE DEATHS DUE TO IMPROVEMENT IN AIR
8 QUALITY, AND WE CAN MONETIZE THAT. THAT COMES TO \$256
9 BILLION OVER THAT TIME PERIOD IN THE REGION, WHICH IS
10 ABOUT \$24 BILLION A YEAR. THIS WAS LARGELY DRIVEN BY
11 AVOIDING PREMATURE DEATHS FROM EXPOSURE TO PARTICULATE
12 MATTER, BUT THERE ALSO INCLUDES THE BENEFITS FROM LESS
13 LOST WORK DAYS, LESS HOSPITAL VISITS, AND GENERAL
14 IMPROVEMENT IN HEALTH FROM OZONE AND PM AND OTHER AREAS
15 OTHER THAN PREMATURE.

16 I WILL MENTION IF YOU LOOK AT OUR DOCUMENTATION
17 ONLINE WE HAVE RELEASED OUR REGIONAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS,
18 AND IT HAS -- THERE IS A DOCUMENT PACK ANYWHERE FROM JOBS
19 WERE GONE ABOUT 11,000 PER YEAR TO JOB GAINS ALL THE WAY
20 UP TO 27,000 PER YEAR DEPENDING WHERE THE INCENTIVE
21 FUNDING COMES FROM. BUT ON EITHER SIDE OF THAT IT'S A
22 VERY SMALL NUMBER COMPARED TO THE PROJECTIONS OF THE
23 REGIONAL JOBS. IT'S A VERY SMALL NUMBER COMPARED TO THE
24 TOTAL GROWTH OF THE REGION.

25 SO WHEN WE LOOK AT THE INCENTIVES, WE ARE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DEVELOPING AN ACTION PLAN FOR INCENTIVES. THEY ARE
2 OUTLINE HERE. WE'RE ALSO LOOKING AT REPORTING BACK TO
3 OUR BOARD ON A FIXED SCHEDULE BUT PROGRESSING WITH
4 FUNDING AND THEN FALLING SHORT ON ALTERNATIVES IN TERMS
5 OF OTHER ACTIONS WE CAN TAKE, OTHER AVENUES WE CAN TAKE
6 IN TERMS OF FUNDING.

7 WE'VE LOOKED A LOT OF DIFFERENT SOURCES OF
8 FUNDING. EVERYTHING IS ON THE TABLE. NOTHING HAS BEEN
9 DECIDED. WE HAVE LIMITED AUTHORITY TO ENACT SOME OF
10 THESE THINGS. A LOT OF IT IS GOING TO HAVE TO COME FROM
11 STATE LEGISLATURE OR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. WE DO SPEND
12 ABOUT 100 TO \$150 MILLION A YEAR NOW IN VERY SIMILAR
13 INCENTIVE PROGRAMS THAT WE WILL NEED FOR THE FUTURE, BUT
14 OBVIOUSLY THAT'S GOING TO GO UP. HERE'S A LIST OF SOME
15 EXISTING FUNDING SOURCES THAT COULD BE EXPANDED AND THEN
16 SOME POTENTIAL NEW SOURCES OF FUNDING THAT WE ARE LOOKING
17 AT.

18 AND, AGAIN, WE NEED TO LOOK WHO HAS THE
19 AUTHORITY TO ENACT SOME OF THESE REVENUE RAISING ACTIONS.
20 WE WANT TO FORM A WORKING GROUP OF STAKEHOLDERS TO FORM A
21 COALITION HOPEFULLY TO GET SUPPORT FOR GETTING
22 LEGISLATION TO RAISE THE MONEY. NATIONALLY WE'VE ALREADY
23 STARTED FORMING A NATIONAL COLLABORATIVE WITH OTHER
24 STATES WHO HAVE AIR QUALITY ISSUES GOING FORWARD. WE'RE
25 TRYING TO GET SUPPORT AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL AND WE'RE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ALREADY WORKING AT THE STATE LEVEL WITH OUR PARTNERING
2 AIR DISTRICTS AND OTHER PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.
3 JUST IN TERMS OF SCHEDULE, I MENTIONED WE
4 RELEASED A DRAFT IN JUNE, A REVISED DRAFT IN OCTOBER.
5 AND PRETTY MUCH ALL THE CHAPTERS AND APPENDICES ARE NOW
6 AVAILABLE ONLINE. ALTHOUGH, WE ARE WORKING ON REVISIONS.
7 WE DID RECEIVE ABOUT 30 COMMENT LETTERS ON THE REVISED
8 DRAFT, SO WE'RE TRYING TO INCORPORATE THAT INTO THE NEXT
9 DRAFT, WHICH WE ARE SCHEDULED FOR RELEASE IN EARLY
10 DECEMBER. WE HAVE ONGOING COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP
11 MEETINGS, STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS. UP TO THIS POINT I THINK
12 WE'VE DONE ABOUT 163 PUBLIC MEETINGS OR STAKEHOLDER
13 MEETINGS ON THE AQMP AND SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE AQMP.

14 THIS IS JUST A DEPICTION OF THE SCHEDULE. WE
15 TALKED ABOUT SOME OF THIS, BUT I DO WANT TO HIGHLIGHT
16 WE'RE SCHEDULING A FULL HEARING OF THE AQMP BOARD
17 CONSIDERATION IN FEBRUARY OF NEXT YEAR. THIS IS A
18 WEEK -- A REGIONAL PUBLIC HEARING. SO THIS IS OUR THIRD
19 ONE. ON TUESDAY WE HAD OUR HEARINGS IN L.A. AND ORANGE
20 COUNTY AND THIS AFTERNOON WE'RE GOING TO HAVE OUR
21 REGIONAL HEARING IN RIVERSIDE COUNTY.

22 IN TERMS OF CONTACT, YOU CAN CONTACT ME, PHIL
23 FINE, OR OUR MANAGER WHO'S LEADING UP THE EFFORT AT THE
24 DISTRICT, MICHAEL KRAUSE. WE ALSO HAVE A WIDE VARIETY OF
25 AQMD STAFF HERE TO TALK ABOUT SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PLAN, THE CEQA DOCUMENT, THE SOCIOECONOMIC ANALYSIS, OR
2 ANY PARTICULAR MEASURES. AND WE LOOK FORWARD TO
3 EVERYONE'S COMMENTS. BEFORE WE GET TO COMMENTS, WE DO
4 HAVE TWO MORE PRESENTATIONS ON THE PLAN AND ASSOCIATED
5 DOCUMENTS.

6 SO WITH THAT, I'LL TURN IT OVER TO CAROL SUTKUS
7 FROM THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD TO TALK ABOUT THE STATE SIP
8 STRATEGY.

9 MS. SUTKUS: OKAY. THANKS. I'M GOING TO GIVE
10 YOU A REALLY BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE SIP
11 STRATEGY. I'M CAROL SUTKUS, AND I'M IN CHARGE OF THE
12 PLAN FOR THE SOUTH PART OF THE STATE FOR THE CLEAN AIR
13 ACT, AND I OVERSAW THE STATE SIP STRATEGY.

14 SO WHAT IS THE STATE SIP STRATEGY? AS YOU HEARD
15 AND YOU SAW IN THAT PIE CHART, MOBILE SOURCES AND
16 EMISSION REDUCTIONS FROM THOSE MOBILE SOURCES ARE
17 CRITICAL TO THE PLAN GOING FORWARD TO MEET THE AIR
18 QUALITY STANDARDS. SO THIS IS ESSENTIALLY OUR BLUEPRINT
19 OR HOW WE'RE GOING TO GET THERE, HOW WE'RE GOING TO THOSE
20 MOBILE SOURCE SHARE OF THE EMISSION REDUCTIONS THAT THE
21 AIR RESOURCES BOARD IS LOOKING FOR.

22 IT'S A COMMITMENT TO ACHIEVE EMISSION LEVELS
23 NEEDED FOR ATTAINMENT FOR ALL MOBILE SOURCES. SO WE HAVE
24 TO HAVE FULL COMMITMENT FOR FEDERAL SOURCES AND
25 EVERYTHING IN OUR PLAN. THAT COMMITMENT COMES IN TWO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FORMS. IT'S -- WE HAVE A LIST OF MEASURES IN THE STATE
2 SIP STRATEGY, AND WE COMMIT TO TAKE ACTION ON THOSE
3 MEASURES TO DEVELOP THE REGULATION PROGRAMS, WHATEVER
4 THEY ARE; TAKE ACTIONS ON THOSE; AND BRING THOSE TO OUR
5 GOVERNING BOARD FOR APPROVAL AND ADOPTION. SO WE HAVE A
6 SCHEDULE IN ADDITION TO THAT, AND WE COMMIT TO THAT
7 SCHEDULE AND THEN WE ALSO COMMIT TO AN AGGREGATE AMOUNT
8 ON EMISSION REDUCTIONS IN TOTAL FROM ALL MOBILE SOURCE
9 FUELS AND CONSUMER PRODUCTS AS WELL, SO THAT AGGREGATE
10 EMISSION REDUCTIONS WERE LOOKING FOR. AND WE HAVE KIND
11 OF AN ESTIMATE OF WHAT EACH OF THE MEASURES WILL GET.
12 SOME MEASURES WILL GET MORE. SOME MEASURES WILL GET
13 LESS. AND THEN SINCE WE ALL WORK TOGETHER WITH THE LOCAL
14 MANAGEMENT PLAN, WE ADOPTED AT THE AIR RESOURCES BOARD
15 TOGETHER, AND IT IS THE ATTAINMENT DEMONSTRATION GOING
16 FORWARD TO U.S. EPA. WHEN U.S. EPA ADOPTS IT, IT BECOMES
17 FEDERALLY ENFORCEABLE.

18 SO MUCH LIKE WAS MENTIONED EARLIER, IT'S A BIG
19 LIST OF MEASURES THAT WE HAVE IN THERE, ACTIVITIES WE
20 NEED TO DO TO ACHIEVE THESE REDUCTIONS. THIS IS KIND OF
21 AN OVERVIEW FOR ALL THE CATEGORIES OF MOBILE SOURCES THAT
22 WE'RE LOOKING AT, WHETHER IT'S ON ROAD, PASSENGER
23 VEHICLES, TRUCKS, OFF-ROAD ENGINES, WHATEVER. WE'RE
24 LOOKING TO HAVE THE CLEANEST ENGINE STANDARDS. AND ONCE
25 WE HAVE THOSE CLEAN AIR STANDARDS, WE WANT TO ENSURE THAT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 THEY'RE DURABLE, THAT THEY OPERATE AS CLEAN AS THEY WERE
2 INTENDED TO OPERATE, AND CONTINUE TO DO SO WHILE THEY'RE
3 ON THE ROAD, EXPAND THE USE OF CLEANER FUELS.

4 SO ONCE WE HAVE THE ENGINES AND THE VEHICLES
5 OPERATING CLEANLY, WE ALSO WANT TO MAKE SURE THEY'RE
6 BURNING THE CLEANEST FUELS. AND THIS ONE WE'RE LOOKING
7 FOR THE CLEANEST TECHNOLOGY POSSIBLE. WE'RE LOOKING FOR
8 NEAR-ZERO REDUCTIONS, BUT WE ALSO WANT TO INCREASE THE
9 PENETRATION OF ZERO-EMISSION TECHNOLOGY WHERE IT MAKES
10 SENSE. AND THERE'S SOME TARGETED TECHNOLOGIES TO DO
11 THAT. AND THEN WE ALSO HAVE PILOT STUDIES. WE HAVE
12 PROGRAMS TO DEMONSTRATE NEW TECHNOLOGIES THAT NEED A
13 LITTLE BIT MORE KICK BEFORE THEY'RE READY TO BE OUT IN
14 THE MARKET. AND THEN, FINALLY, THAT LAST INCREMENT, WE
15 NEED TO GET THESE NEW CLEAN ENGINES AND VEHICLES OUT ON
16 THE ROAD OUT FOR USE SOONER THAN THE ACTUAL TURNOVER. SO
17 WE NEED TO INCENTIVIZE THE DEPLOYMENT OF THOSE NEW
18 TECHNOLOGIES. SO BASICALLY ALL THE MEASURES WE HAVE FALL
19 INTO THESE CATEGORIES.

20 SO THE EMISSION REDUCTIONS -- WE'LL GET TO THE
21 STRATEGY. THEY COME FROM BOTH THE CURRENT CONTROL
22 PROGRAM, THE REGS WE HAVE IN PLACE, THE PROGRAMS WE HAVE
23 IN PLACE MOVING FORWARD GETTING MORE REDUCTIONS IN THE
24 FUTURE. BY 2031 THESE SQUARES ARE THE PERCENTAGES
25 THERE FOR EACH CATEGORY. THERE'S FEDERAL SOURCES AND

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 OFF-ROAD EQUIPMENT. THOSE ARE THE PERCENTAGES OF
2 REDUCTIONS WE'RE LOOKING TO GET BETWEEN NOW AND 2031 FOR
3 EACH OF THOSE CATEGORIES. AND I WANTED TO POINT OUT EACH
4 BAR FOR EACH CATEGORY. THE DARK BLUE REPRESENTS THE
5 REGULATORY ACTIONS THAT ARE THE CORE OF THE STRATEGY AND
6 THEN THE LIGHT BLUE IS FOR THAT LAST INCENTIVE PROGRAM TO
7 GET ALL THESE VEHICLES OUT ON THE ROAD. ACROSS THE BOARD
8 WHEN YOU LOOK AT ALL THE CATEGORIES REGULATORY PROGRAMS,
9 ABOUT 80 PERCENT ARE THE REDUCTIONS AND THEN THE
10 REMAINING INCENTIVE-TYPE PROGRAMS WILL BE 20 PERCENT.

11 SO MOVING FORWARD IN THE STATE SIP STRATEGY,
12 WE'RE COMING OUT WITH A REVISED STRATEGY BY DECEMBER,
13 WHICH IS VERY SOON. WE HAVE -- IN THERE WE HAVE SOME
14 INVENTORY AND MODELING UPDATES WE HAVE FOR THE MEASURES.
15 WE HAVE SOME REDUCTIONS FOR THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY THAT
16 HAVEN'T BEEN IN THERE BEFORE. AND THEN ACCORDING TO
17 PUBLIC COMMENTS AND INPUT THAT WE HAVE RECEIVED FROM OUR
18 OWN WORKSHOPS, WORKSHOPS HERE, AND PUBLIC COMMENT
19 PERIODS, WE'LL BE MAKING CHANGES AND ADJUSTMENTS TO SOME
20 OF THE REGULATIONS OR SOME OF THE MEASURES THAT WE HAVE
21 IN THE STRATEGY. AT ONE POINT THERE ALL THE MEASURES IN
22 THE STRATEGY WILL GO THROUGH THEIR OWN PUBLIC PROCESS AS
23 WELL TO START DEVELOPING THEM AND GET THE PLAN IN PLACE.
24 ACTUALLY, WE'RE STARTING SOME OF THEM ALREADY. AND THEN
25 WE WILL CONSIDER THE STATE SIP STRATEGY ALONG WITH THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AQMP NEXT SPRING. WE'LL BRING ALTOGETHER TO THE BOARD,
2 SEND IT TO EPA, AND THEN EPA DOES ITS APPROVAL.

3 AND THIS IS JUST ARB CONTACTS INVOLVED IN THE
4 STATE SIP STRATEGY. I'M THE PERSON IN THE MIDDLE. GIVE
5 ME A CALL FOR ANYTHING THAT YOU NEED OR ANY QUESTIONS.
6 AND I THINK THAT WAS IT. I'M SWITCHING IT OVER TO JO
7 KAY.

8 DR. FINE: I'LL JUST INTRODUCE JO KAY. JOY KAY
9 GHOSH IS OUR HEALTH EFFECTS OFFICER, AND SHE'LL BE
10 TALKING ABOUT THE APPENDIX 1 OF THE AQMP WHICH DESCRIBES
11 THE HEALTH IMPACTS OF AIR POLLUTION IN THE BASIN.

12 DR. GHOSH: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU.

13 SO JUST AS PHIL MENTIONED, APPENDIX 1 IS THE
14 HEALTH EFFECTS APPENDIX. THOSE OF YOU WHO ARE FAMILIAR
15 WITH PREVIOUS VERSION IN PREVIOUS YEARS, THIS APPENDIX IS
16 ORGANIZED IN SECTIONS TYPICALLY BY CRITERIA POLLUTANT FOR
17 OZONE, PARTICULATE MATTER, AND SO ON WITH AN ADDITIONAL
18 SECTION ON TOXIC AIR CONTAMINANTS.

19 AGAIN, THIS IS A VERY BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE
20 HEALTH EFFECTS. WE ARE NOT CREATING ANY NEW SCIENCE
21 HERE. WE'RE PRIMARILY DRAWING FROM SCIENTIFIC
22 ASSESSMENTS AND REVIEWS CONDUCTED BY OTHER AGENCIES,
23 PRIMARILY U.S. EPA AND OTHER SCIENTIFIC AGENCIES AS WELL.

24 NOW, RECOGNIZING THAT THE U.S. EPA SCIENTIFIC
25 REVIEWS DON'T COME OUT EVERY YEAR FOR EVERY POLLUTANT,

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FOR EXAMPLE, THE MOST RECENT ASSESSMENT OF OZONE WAS DONE
2 IN 2013. THE MOST RECENT ASSESSMENT OF PARTICULATE
3 MATTER WAS CONDUCTED IN 2009. SO THERE'S A LOT OF
4 SCIENCE THAT HAS HAPPENED SINCE THEN. SO THERE WAS A
5 SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW TO LOOK FOR STUDIES THAT HAVE BEEN
6 PUBLISHED MORE RECENTLY THAN THE LATEST U.S. EPA REVIEW.

7 I DO WANT TO TALK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT SOME OF THE
8 LEGAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THIS WORK HERE. THERE IS A
9 REQUIREMENT IN THE CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE THAT
10 WE HAVE A REPORT ON THE IMPACTS OF PARTICULATE MATTER,
11 HEALTH IMPACTS OF PARTICULATE MATTER IN THE SOUTH COAST
12 AIR BASIN. NOW, THIS PARTICULATE MATTER SECTION WITHIN
13 APPENDIX 1 IS WHAT SATISFIES THIS LEGAL REQUIREMENT. OF
14 COURSE, THE OTHER SECTIONS ARE ALSO INCLUDED. IT'S NOT
15 ONLY PARTICULATE MATTER THAT HAS HEALTH IMPACTS. THE
16 OTHER POLLUTANTS HAVE HEALTH IMPACTS AS WELL. AGAIN,
17 BASED ON THE STATUTORY REQUIREMENT, THIS REPORT WAS
18 PREPARED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE PUBLIC HEALTH AGENCY,
19 AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH AGENCY HERE WAS COEHHA, CALIFORNIA
20 OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT. AND WE
21 ALSO CONSULTED WITH CARB IN THIS PROCESS AS WELL.

22 ANOTHER REQUIREMENT OF HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE
23 WAS THAT AN ADVISORY COUNCIL WHOSE MEMBERSHIP IS CHOSEN
24 BY THE GOVERNING BOARD AND AQMP ADVISORY GROUPS WAS TO
25 REVIEW AND DISCUSS AND PROVIDE COMMENTS ON THE REPORT.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 ALTHOUGH, OF COURSE, WE PROVIDED THE ENTIRE APPENDIX 1,
2 NOT THE AQMP, TO THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ALSO. THIS
3 GROUP -- THIS COUNCIL WAS FORMED IN LATE 2015. AND THE
4 ADVISORY COUNCIL CONVENED IN AUGUST OF 2016 TO REVIEW AND
5 DISCUSS APPENDIX 1. THIS WAS ALSO A MEETING WHERE
6 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WERE ALSO INVITED TO COMMENT AS
7 WELL. I DO APOLOGIZE. IN THE PRINT VERSION OF THE
8 SLIDES THERE'S A TYPO. IT SHOULD SAY AUGUST OF 2016 NOT
9 AUGUST OF 2015. ALTHOUGH, THE CORRECTED VERSION IS
10 AVAILABLE ONLINE.

11 SO, YOU KNOW, AGAIN, THE DRAFT OF THE APPENDIX 1
12 WAS RELEASED IN JULY OF 2016. IT WAS RELEASED BOTH TO
13 THE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS AND TO THE PUBLIC. WE
14 RECEIVED COMMENTS BOTH FROM THE ADVISORY COUNCIL AND
15 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. WE'LL TALK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE
16 COMMENTS RECEIVED AND WHAT WE'VE DONE IN THE MEANTIME AND
17 WE'LL MODIFY THE REPORT BASED ON THE COMMENTS RECEIVED.

18 SO JUST A BRIEF SUMMARY APPENDIX 1. THE PURPOSE
19 OF APPENDIX 1 IS, AGAIN, TO PROVIDE A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF
20 THE EFFECTS OF THE VARIOUS AIR POLLUTANTS AND ALSO TO
21 DESCRIBE THE HEALTH IMPACTS OF PARTICULATE MATTER. WE DO
22 HAVE A GREATER FOCUS ON OZONE AND PARTICULATE MATTER. IN
23 OTHER WORDS, THE SECTIONS ON OZONE AND PARTICULATE MATTER
24 ARE FAR MORE DETAILED COMPARED TO OTHER SECTIONS. AND SO
25 THE REASON FOR THAT IS BECAUSE THESE ARE THE POLLUTANTS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WHERE WE ARE IN NONATTAINMENT. SO THE IDEA IN OUR AREA
2 THERE IS PERHAPS GREATER POTENTIAL AND GREATER CONCERN
3 AMONG THE PUBLIC ABOUT THE HEALTH EFFECTS OF THESE TWO
4 POLLUTANTS.

5 THERE IS A LARGE BODY OF SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE
6 THAT SHOWS THE ADVERSE EFFECTS AIR POLLUTION ON HUMAN
7 HEALTH. THIS DRAWS FROM DIFFERENT TYPES OF STUDIES
8 INCLUDING TOXICOLOGY, EPIDEMIOLOGY, AND HUMAN
9 EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES. AND THESE TYPES OF STUDIES ARE
10 REVIEWED BY THE U.S. EPA.

11 AND ALSO MORE RECENTLY THERE IS A LOT OF CONCERN
12 ABOUT CERTAIN GROUPS OR CERTAIN POPULATIONS THAT MAY BE
13 MORE SENSITIVE TO THE EFFECTS OF CERTAIN AIR POLLUTANTS.
14 SO WE'VE ALSO INCLUDED SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT POTENTIAL
15 SENSITIVE POPULATIONS. THESE ARE TYPICALLY DEFINED
16 PARTICULARLY BY AGE. TYPICALLY WE'RE TALKING ABOUT
17 CHILDREN OR ELDERLY. THERE ARE CERTAIN GENETIC FACTORS
18 AND CERTAIN PEOPLE ARE MORE SUSCEPTIBLE TO THE EFFECTS.
19 PEOPLE WITH CERTAIN CONDITIONS SUCH AS RESPIRATORY
20 CONDITIONS OR HEART CONDITIONS. AND THERE'S ALSO SOME
21 RESEARCH ON WHETHER A SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS MAY BE
22 CONTRIBUTE TO THE EFFECTS OF AIR POLLUTION.

23 I WANT TO NOTE A COUPLE MAJOR CHANGES SINCE THE
24 LAST AQMP APPENDIX 1. WE REALLY PUT A LOT OF EFFORT IN
25 CLARIFYING THE PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENTS AND ALSO THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 METHODS THAT WE USED TO PUT THIS DOCUMENT TOGETHER IN THE
2 INTRODUCTORY SECTION OF THIS APPENDIX 1. WE ALSO TRIED
3 TO PRESENT EACH SECTION IN A STANDARDIZED WAY, AND I'LL
4 TALK A LITTLE BIT MORE ABOUT THAT IN THESE NEXT SLIDES.

5 SO IN THE U.S. EPA SCIENCE ASSESSMENT, THE --
6 THOSE REPORTS DESCRIBE WHAT'S CALLED THE CAUSAL
7 DETERMINATION. IN OTHER WORDS, BASED ON THEIR ASSESSMENT
8 OF THE SCIENCE, THEY LOOK AT THE SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM
9 EXPOSURE EFFECTS, AND THEY LOOK AT VARIOUS HEALTH
10 EFFECTS. SO HERE, FOR EXAMPLE, FOR PM2.5 AND BASED ON
11 THE 2009 ISA, WE LOOK AT CARDIOVASCULAR EFFECTS,
12 RESPIRATORY EFFECTS, MORTALITY, REPRODUCTIVE EFFECTS, AND
13 ALSO CANCER, AND, AGAIN, SPLIT SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM
14 EXPOSURE. AND FOR EACH OF THESE CATEGORIES, GROUPS OF
15 HEALTH EFFECTS, THE EFFECTS WHETHER IT'S CAUSAL
16 RELATIONSHIP, LIKELY CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP. AND THERE ARE
17 SOME KIND OF WEAKER CATEGORIES SUCH AS SUGGESTIVE OF
18 CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP AND FURTHER DOWN BELOW. OKAY. THIS
19 IS BASED ON THE WEIGHT OF EVIDENCE APPROACH, AND THIS
20 IS -- THE CRITERIA ARE DESCRIBED IN GREAT DETAIL IN THE
21 U.S. EPA DOCUMENTS AND DESCRIBED JUST BRIEFLY IN APPENDIX
22 1.

23 SO, AGAIN, THE STRONGEST RELATIONSHIP IS CALLED
24 A CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP. SO HERE FOR PM2.5 YOU CAN SEE
25 THAT THE CAUSAL DETERMINATION WAS THAT THERE WAS A CAUSAL

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BOTH SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM PM2.5
2 EXPOSURE AND CARDIOVASCULAR EFFECTS AND SIMILARLY FOR
3 MORBIDITY AS LIKELY CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP FOR RESPIRATORY
4 EFFECTS. OKAY. NOW, THESE CATEGORIES ARE NOT MEANT TO
5 BE MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVELY. FOR EXAMPLE, STUDIES ON
6 MORTALITY LOOK SPECIFICALLY AT MORTALITY FROM
7 CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE.

8 OKAY. SO THIS IS THE SAME TABLE BUT FOR OZONE.
9 AND HERE AGAIN OZONE WAS LAST REVIEWED IN 2013 AND HERE
10 AGAIN A SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM EFFECTS WOULD BE
11 STRONGEST RELATIONSHIPS FOR RESPIRATORY EFFECTS AND
12 SHORT-TERM EXPOSURES TO OZONE THERE'S A CAUSAL
13 RELATIONSHIP. OF COURSE, THERE'S LIKELY CAUSAL
14 RELATIONSHIP FOR SEVERAL OF THESE OTHER CATEGORIES AS
15 WELL.

16 WE DID RECEIVE A NUMBER OF WRITTEN COMMENTS.
17 THERE WERE 25 COMMENT LETTERS RECEIVED, AND THIS INCLUDES
18 COMMENT LETTERS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL AS
19 WELL AS COMMENT LETTERS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. HERE
20 I -- I'M SORRY. SORRY ABOUT THAT.

21 SO HERE I'M GOING TO JUST PRESENT A BRIEF
22 SUMMARY OF SOME OF THE MAIN MAJOR COMMENTS THAT WERE
23 RECEIVED. I TRIED TO ORGANIZE THEM BY THE SECTION OF THE
24 DOCUMENT THAT IT PERTAINS TO. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAD
25 SEVERAL COMMENTS ABOUT CLARIFYING THE PURPOSE OF THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 APPENDIX 1, SO WE PUT WHAT MORE EFFORT TO PROVIDE CLARITY
2 IN THAT AREA AS WELL. WE RECEIVED SOME COMMENTS ON THE
3 AIR TOXIC SECTION. SPECIFICALLY THERE WAS A REQUEST TO
4 DISCUSS VOC'S, TO ADD A SECTION DISCUSSION VOC'S WITHIN
5 THE AIR TOXIC SECTION, SO THAT IS BEING ADDED. AND IN
6 ADDITION, WE ALSO HAD A COMMENT TO ADD SOME DISCUSSION OF
7 THE ADVANCED COLLABORATIVE EMISSIONS STUDY, ALSO CALLED
8 ACES STUDY. THIS IS THE SECTION WHERE WE DISCUSS THE
9 HEALTH EFFECTS OF DIESEL PARTICULATE MATTER. SO THAT WAS
10 ALSO DONE.

11 IN THE OZONE SECTION AND ALSO THE PM SECTION, WE
12 RECEIVED SEVERAL COMMENTS ABOUT, YOU KNOW, THE WAY THAT
13 IT REPRESENTED DIFFERENT HEALTH OUTCOMES. SO WE REALLY
14 ORGANIZED THE SECTION SO THAT WE'RE REALLY FOCUSING ON
15 THOSE HEALTH OUTCOMES WHERE THE U.S. EPA HAS DETERMINED
16 THERE WAS A CAUSAL OR LIKELY CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP. IN
17 OTHER WORDS, THOSE HEALTH ENDPOINTS ARE HIGH ON THE
18 CAUSAL DETERMINATION SCALE. HOWEVER, FOR PARTICULATE
19 MATTER, YOU KNOW, AGAIN, RECOGNIZING THAT THE INTEGRATED
20 SCIENCE ASSESSMENT WAS DONE IN 2009 AND THERE'S BEEN A
21 LOT OF LITERATURE IN THE MEANTIME, WE ALSO INCLUDED A
22 DISCUSSION ABOUT HEALTH ENDPOINTS THAT WERE A LITTLE BIT
23 LOWER ON THE CAUSAL DETERMINATION SCALE AND THE EMERGING
24 AREAS OF INTEREST IN THAT SECTION.

25 WE ALSO EXPANDED THE SECTION ON THE SENSITIVE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 POPULATIONS FOR BOTH OZONE AND PARTICULATE MATTER BECAUSE
2 THERE'S A LOT OF INTEREST IN WHETHER CERTAIN PEOPLE ARE
3 MORE SENSITIVE TO THESE EFFECTS. WE ALSO, AGAIN,
4 PROVIDED SOME ORGANIZATION AND CLARITY ISSUES WITH THE
5 SUMMARY AND THE ESTIMATES OF THE HEALTH BURDEN OF
6 PARTICULATE MATTER IN THE SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN, SO WE
7 SEPARATED THESE SECTIONS OUT TO PROVIDE MORE CLARITY.

8 I DID WANT TO NOTE IN THE HEALTH BURDEN
9 ESTIMATES WE'RE USING ESTIMATES FROM THE CALIFORNIA AIR
10 RESOURCES BOARD WHERE THEY LOOK AT PM2.5 AND
11 CARDIOPULMONARY DEATHS IN CALIFORNIA, AND WE ALSO SPLIT
12 IT UP BY BASIN. SO THE SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN, THEIR
13 ESTIMATE WAS 4,000 DEATHS, ANNUAL DEATHS, DUE TO PM2.5
14 ABOVE BACKGROUND LEVELS, WHICH IS ESTIMATED IN THEIR
15 ANALYSIS TO BE 5.8 MICROGRAMS BY CUBIC METER. I DO WANT
16 TO MENTION THAT IN THIS PLAN WE ARE NOT REDUCING LEVELS
17 OF 5.8 MICROGRAMS PER CUBIC METER. AND BASED ON THE
18 PLAN, THE IMPACTS OF THE -- PUBLIC HEALTH IMPACTS, THE
19 PLAN IS ASSOCIATED WITH THE SOCIOECONOMIC REPORTS. SO
20 YOU CAN FIND THOSE NUMBERS THERE. I KNOW, AGAIN, THESE
21 ANALYSES WE'RE DONE FOR DIFFERENT PURPOSES AND,
22 THEREFORE, THE NUMBERS ARE A LITTLE DIFFERENT.

23 SO IN ADDITION, WE RECEIVED SOME COMMENTS,
24 ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, ON APPENDIX 1. SOME COMMENTS ABOUT
25 SOME DOUBT IN TERMS OF THE HEALTH RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PARTICULATE MATTER IN CALIFORNIA. AND, AGAIN, JUST
2 REEMPHASIZING THIS IS A SUMMARY OF, YOU KNOW, REVIEWS AND
3 CAUSAL DETERMINATIONS BY U.S. EPA AS SUMMARIZED AND NOTED
4 IN THEIR REVIEW DOCUMENTS. I DO WANT TO NOTE THAT WE DO
5 DISCUSS STUDIES THAT WERE CONDUCTED IN CALIFORNIA AND
6 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SO THAT WE TRY TO DRAW THAT FOCUS IN
7 THE DOCUMENT. ALTHOUGH, THERE ARE STUDIES CONDUCTED IN
8 MANY OTHER PLACES AND ARE ALSO PART OF THE U.S. EPA
9 ASSESSMENT.

10 WE RECEIVED A COMMENT ABOUT POTENTIAL
11 CONFOUNDING EFFECT OF SMOKING AND WHETHER THIS WAS
12 ADDRESSED IN THE STUDIES OF PARTICULATE MATTER AND HEALTH
13 EFFECTS. SO WE CERTAINLY RECOGNIZE THAT SMOKING IS AN
14 IMPORTANT CONFOUNDER WHEN IT COMES TO EPIDEMIOLOGICAL
15 STUDIES OF PARTICULATE MATTER EFFECTS INCLUDING
16 PARTICULATE MATTER AND MORTALITY EFFECTS. SO WE
17 CERTAINLY ADDED A LOT OF CLARITY ABOUT SMOKING AND HOW
18 THEY WERE ADJUSTED FOR SMOKING IN THEIR STUDIES.

19 WE ALSO RECEIVED A COMMENT LETTER ABOUT
20 DISCUSSING THE HEALTH EFFECTS OF ODORS. AND THIS WAS
21 SOMETHING THAT WAS NOT PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED IN APPENDIX
22 1, SO WE ARE ADDING A SECTION ON ODORS. AND THIS WAS
23 SOMETHING THAT WAS NOT PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED IN APPENDIX
24 1. SO THIS WILL BE AN ADDED SECTION ON ODORS AND HEALTH
25 EFFECTS OF ODORS. THIS IS SOMETHING WE HAD NOT DONE WORK

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 FOR, SO THIS SOMETHING THAT REQUIRES SUBSTANTIAL NEW
2 WORK. WE DON'T HAVE THE SAME SORT OF U.S. EPA REVIEW TO
3 RELY ON, SO THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WE'RE STILL CURRENTLY
4 WORKING ON.

5 IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, I'M CERTAINLY
6 AVAILABLE. THIS IS MY CONTACT INFORMATION HERE. AND
7 THAT IS THE END OF MY PRESENTATION.

8 DR. FINE: OKAY. SO WE WILL MOVE INTO PUBLIC
9 COMMENTS. AND I HAVE ABOUT FIVE CARDS HERE. IF ANYONE
10 ELSE WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK, PLEASE BRING YOUR BLUE CARD UP
11 AND WE'LL HEAR FROM EVERYONE.

12 SO THE FIRST SPEAKER IS JOSHUA.

13 MR. TADRES: THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO
14 SPEAK. I AM HERE TO ASK THE AIR BOARD TO CONSIDER THE
15 IMPACTS UPON THE LOCAL ECONOMY AND THE ABILITY TO FIND
16 JOBS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. JOB GROWTH IN THE INLAND
17 EMPIRE CONTINUES TO STRUGGLE BEHIND LOS ANGELES AND
18 COASTAL AREAS. AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUNG PEOPLE IN
19 PARTICULAR OUR SCARCE.

20 I UNDERSTAND THAT CALIFORNIA HAS THE TOUGHEST
21 AIR QUALITY RULES AND REGULATIONS IN THE COUNTY. IF THAT
22 IS TRUE, WE SHOULD CONSIDER THAT WE ALSO HAVE SOME OF THE
23 HIGHEST POVERTY RATES AND WHETHER MAKING THE RULES EVEN
24 TOUGHER WILL HELP US FIND JOBS. HELPING PEOPLE GET BACK
25 TO WORK ISN'T JUST ABOUT HAVING JOBS. IT IS ALSO

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IMPORTANT TO HEALTH, WHICH IS AN IMPORTANT TOPIC TODAY.

2 THERE HAVE BEEN STUDIES THAT SHOW THAT POVERTY
3 HAS MUCH GREATER PUBLIC HEALTH IMPACTS THAN ENVIRONMENT
4 CAUSES. THERE IS NO REASON WE CAN'T HAVE BOTH, AND IT IS
5 THE AIR BOARD'S JOB TO FIND BALANCE. PLEASE CONSIDER
6 THESE ISSUES AS YOU FINALIZE YOUR PLAN.

7 THANK YOU.

8 DR. FINE: THANK YOU, JOSHUA.

9 NEXT WE HAVE ANDREW.

10 MR. TORRES: WHAT I'M HERE TO TALK ABOUT TODAY
11 IS THE VERY DIVERSE REGION IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. I'M
12 WORRIED ABOUT THE IMPACT OF BUSINESS HERE AND HOW THESE
13 NEW REGULATIONS MIGHT PREVENT GOOD PAYING JOBS IN THE
14 INLAND EMPIRE. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK WHAT KIND OF RESEARCH
15 HAS GONE INTO THE ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF THESE PROPOSALS AND
16 WHETHER THESE HAVE BEEN TRIED ANYWHERE ELSE AND WHAT THE
17 RESULTS WERE.

18 I ALSO WANT TO NOTE THAT THE INLAND EMPIRE IS
19 DIFFERENT FROM L.A. AND ORANGE COUNTY AND IS NOT SO DENSE
20 THAT WE CAN SOLVE OUR TRANSPORTATION ISSUES WITH MASS
21 TRANSIT. WE NEED OPTIONS TO GET TO WORK OR WHEREVER
22 WE'RE GOING. RIDE SHARING IS ONE WAY TO HELP US WITH
23 PUTTING FEW CARS ON THE ROAD AND REDUCE EMISSIONS FROM
24 TRAFFIC. DOES THIS PLAN ACCOUNT FOR THE DIFFERENCES
25 BETWEEN THE AREAS OF THE REGION AND THE INLAND EMPIRE IN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 HOW PEOPLE CHOOSE WITHOUT PENALIZING THEM FOR DRIVING.

2 THANK YOU.

3 DR. FINE: JUST TO ADDRESS A COUPLE OF YOUR
4 QUESTIONS. THE -- IN TERMS OF HOW THE PLAN IS DEVELOPED,
5 WE ACTUALLY TAKE THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN THAT
6 THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
7 DEVELOPS, AND THAT'S KIND OF THE BASELINE OF OUR PLAN.
8 AND WE TAKE THAT INFORMATION WHERE THEY PROJECT THE CARS
9 TO BE DRIVING OR THE TRUCKS TO BE DRIVING AND DIFFERENT
10 PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS. THAT ALSO GOES INTO OUR
11 PLANNING PROCESS. SO IN TERMS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN
12 REGIONS, THAT'S ALL HASHED OUT IN THE REGIONAL
13 TRANSPORTATION PLAN. AND WHERE THERE'S OPPORTUNITIES FOR
14 PUBLIC TRANSIT, THEY HAVE LOOKED AT RIDE SHARING AS ONE
15 OF THE MODES THAT'S GOING TO HELP AT LEAST THE TRAFFIC
16 ISSUES THAT WE HAVE.

17 MR. TORRES: THANK YOU.

18 DR. FINE: OKAY. NEXT WE HAVE LEA PETERSON.

19 MS. PETERSON: GOOD MORNING. GOOD MORNING. MY
20 NAME IS LEA PETERSON. I'M A PUBLIC AFFAIRS MANAGER WITH
21 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY. SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS
22 COMPANY, AS YOU MAY KNOW, WE ARE A NATURAL GAS
23 DISTRIBUTION COMPANY. WE ARE THE LARGEST IN NORTH
24 AMERICA, AND WE SERVICE THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AREA WITH
25 OVER 500 COMMUNITIES AND OVER 22 MILLION CUSTOMERS.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SO A FEW ITEMS I WOULD LIKE TO SHARE WITH YOU.
2 SOUTHERN GAS COMPANY APPRECIATES THE OPPORTUNITY TO
3 PROVIDE COMMENTS ON YOUR AQMP PLAN, AND PARTICULARLY, THE
4 REVISED DRAFT. WE STRONGLY SUPPORT YOUR EFFORTS TO
5 ATTAIN THE FEDERAL CLEAN AIR ACT STANDARDS AND THE
6 ATTAINMENT OF OZONE AND FINE PARTICULATE MATTERS
7 STANDARDS IN THOSE COMMUNITIES WE PROVIDE SERVICES.

8 WE CONTINUE TO OFFER OUR SUPPORT, EXPERTISE, AND
9 PARTNERSHIP WITH THE SOUTH COAST DISTRICT TO CREATE A
10 TECHNICALLY SOUND AND TECHNOLOGICAL AQMP THAT WOULD
11 PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH BY DEMONSTRATING TIMELY ATTAINMENT
12 OF THE FEDERAL CLEAN AIR ACT STANDARDS WHILE ALSO
13 SUSTAINING THE VITALITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA' ECONOMY.
14 FOLLOWING THE ADOPTION OF THE PLAN, WE LOOK FORWARD TO
15 COLLABORATING WITH THE SOUTH COAST AIR DISTRICT ON THE
16 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONTROL MEASURES, EFFORTS TO SECURE
17 INCENTIVE FUNDING, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF INCENTIVE
18 PROGRAMS.

19 SO SOME ADDITIONAL ITEMS, SO CAL GAS SUPPORTS
20 MAXIMIZING EMISSION REDUCTIONS BY ALLOWING TECHNOLOGY TO
21 COMPETE HEAD TO HEAD. WE ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPMENT OF A
22 WORKING GROUP AND THE PUBLIC PROCESS TO OVERSEE COST
23 EFFECTIVENESS AND FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENTS OF COMPETING
24 TECHNOLOGIES. SO CAL GAS ENCOURAGES AN INCENTIVE-BASED
25 APPROACH AS THE ONLY VIABLE PATH WITH NEAR TURN EMISSION

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REDUCTIONS AS THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE APPROACH. THE
2 DEVELOPMENT OF THE EXECUTION OF THE INCENTIVE FUNDING
3 PLAN IS KEY TO THIS SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
4 AQMP, AND WE URGE COLLABORATION AMONG STAKEHOLDERS AND A
5 BROAD PARTICIPATION OF POSSIBLE AVENUES TO SECURE THE
6 FUNDING FOR OUR REGION.

7 WE WOULD LIKE TO ENSURE SENSIBLE AIR QUALITY
8 REGULATIONS THAT DO NOT ADVERSELY IMPACT OUR CUSTOMERS
9 AND OBVIOUSLY OUR OPERATIONS TO PROVIDE NATURAL GAS. SO
10 CAL GAS SEEKS A LONG-TERM ROLE IN THE SOUTH COAST AIR
11 BASIN THROUGH THE CONTINUATION OF FUEL AND TECHNOLOGY
12 NEUTRAL POLICY. AND WE URGE THE INCENTIVE-BASED
13 APPROACHED AS THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE PATH NECESSARY FOR
14 EMISSION REDUCTIONS TO ATTAIN THE FEDERAL OZONE
15 STANDARDS.

16 THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK
17 BEFORE YOU. THANK YOU.

18 DR. FINE: DR. HUSING IS NEXT.

19 DR. HUSING: DR. JOHN HUSING, CHIEF ECONOMIST OF
20 THE INLAND EMPIRE ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP, AN ORGANIZATION
21 WHOSE PRIMARY WORK IS FOCUSED ON THE ISSUE OF POVERTY IN
22 THE INLAND EMPIRE.

23 A COUPLE OF COMMENTS. FIRST OF ALL, I WANT TO
24 THANK WAYNE NASTRI AND HIS STAFF FOR COMING AND TALKING
25 TO OUR LOGISTICS COUNCIL AND TALKING ABOUT INCENTIVES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AS AN ECONOMIST, I THINK INCENTIVES ARE THE WAY TO GO TO
2 ACHIEVE THE BEST WAY THESE THINGS WITHIN THE MARKET. I
3 WISH, FRANKLY, THAT CARB HAD AS MUCH INCENTIVES RATHER
4 THAN COMMAND AND CONTROL AND WHAT IT IS YOU'RE DOING,
5 FIRST.

6 SECOND, I SPENT A LOT OF TIME LOOKING AT THE
7 ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT, AND I HAVE SOME SERIOUS
8 QUESTIONS ABOUT PART OF IT. ONE OF THE COMMENTS WITHIN
9 THE ANALYSIS IS THAT LOCAL DEMAND WILL BE CREATED IN THE
10 MANUFACTURING SECTOR. BUT ALSO SAID, WE DON'T REALLY
11 HAVE UNDERSTAND IT, SO WE'RE JUST USING THE DATA WITHIN
12 THE MODEL.

13 I HAVE INTERVIEWED COMPANY AND COMPANY AFTER
14 COMPANY, AND ALMOST UNIVERSALLY THEY SAY NOTHING THEY BUY
15 FOR AIR QUALITY IS MADE IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.
16 SPECIFIC EXAMPLE, I DID ALL THE WORK TO BRING FORWARD ON
17 THE ECONOMIC SIDE THE CLEAN TRUCK PROGRAM FOR THE PORTS
18 OF L.A. AND LONG BEACH. I WAS THEIR CONSULTANTS. WHEN I
19 MEET WITH THE TRUCKING INDUSTRY ABOUT LNG TRUCKS, I
20 ASKED, "IF WE CHANGE THE WAY IN WHICH THEY'RE FUNDED
21 WOULD YOU MAKE THEM IN CALIFORNIA SO THEY WOULD BE
22 COMPETITIVE WITH CLEAN DIESEL." THEIR ANSWER WAS "IN
23 CALIFORNIA'S REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT, WE WOULD NEVER COME
24 TO CALIFORNIA TO MAKE THOSE TRUCKS," WHICH I THINK
25 HIGHLIGHTS A DIFFICULTY IN YOUR MODELING.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SECOND, YOU ESTIMATE 11,000 JOBS, ROUND FIGURES,
2 LOSS PER YEAR AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE REGULATORY AND
3 INCENTIVE SYSTEM THAT YOU'RE SETTING UP INCLUDING A LOSS
4 OF 267 LOGISTICS. THAT'S WAREHOUSING, DISTRIBUTION, AND
5 WHOLESALE TRADE WITHIN THE MODELING PER YEAR. JUST ONE
6 PROJECT THAT THIS AGENCY HAS WORKED HARD TO STOP WOULD
7 COST 20,000 JOBS, WHICH IS THE PROJECT OVER IN MORENO
8 VALLEY. SO I STRONGLY QUESTION THE ACCURACY OF THAT.

9 THE OTHER PIECE OF THE PROBLEM THAT I SEE IS A
10 METHODOLOGICAL ONE. AND THAT IS YOU PUT HEAVY EMPHASIS
11 ON THE HEALTH EFFECTS AND THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THOSE
12 HEALTH EFFECTS THROUGH ONE INCREASED MIGRATION TO THE
13 REGION; TWO, LESS HOSPITALIZATIONS; THREE, GREATER
14 PRODUCTIVITY. HOWEVER, IF YOU'RE GOING TO LOSE 11,000
15 JOBS, WHICH AS I INDICATE I BELIEVE IS AN UNDERESTIMATE,
16 THERE IS NO CONSIDERATION OF THE HEALTH EFFECTS ON THE
17 PEOPLE WHOSE JOBS ARE NOT CREATED. IT IS AS IF THAT'S
18 NOT THERE.

19 AND AS ONE OF THE OTHER GENTLEMAN JUST SAID, THE
20 WORK THAT THE ROBERTS WOODS JOHNSON FOUNDATION TOGETHER
21 WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH
22 HAS SHOWN THAT 90 PERCENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH EFFECTS ARE
23 NOT ENVIRONMENTAL. THEY ARE IN FACT RELATED DIRECTLY AND
24 INDIRECTLY TO POVERTY. TO LEAVE THAT OUT AND SAY WE HAVE
25 ALL THESE WONDERFUL HEALTH EFFECTS WHILE EXECUTING THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 PLAN AND TREATING AS ZERO THE IMPACT THAT THE PLAN WOULD
2 HAVE FOR PEOPLE WHO DON'T GET TO GO TO WORK AND THE
3 HEALTH EFFECTS OF THAT, TO ME, I PERSONALLY FIND
4 OUTRAGEOUS BECAUSE IT WAY OVERESTIMATES THE POSITIVE AND
5 BY ELIMINATING ANY NEGATIVE AT ALL WHEN IN FACT THAT IS A
6 MAJOR PIECE OF WHAT OCCURS HERE.

7 I THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION.

8 DR. FINE: THANK YOU. MARY JANE.

9 MS. O'MASSO: GOOD MORNING. THANK YOU EVERYBODY
10 FOR COMING OUT THE CITY OF SAN BERNARDINO. MARY JANE
11 O'MASSO FROM THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO. I HAVE OVER
12 25 YEARS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE HERE IN
13 REGION. NOWHERE ELSE.

14 I HAVE BEEN THE RECIPIENT OF THE COMMENTS OF
15 "CALIFORNIA IS THE LAST PLACE WE'LL DO BUSINESS. NO,
16 MARY JANE, WE CANNOT PUT CALIFORNIA ON OUR SPREADSHEET
17 AND PRESENT TO OUR CLIENT. IT IS OVERREGULATED AND TOO
18 COSTLY." THAT'S HARD TO SWALLOW WHEN I'M WORKING IN ONE
19 OF THE LARGEST STATES IN THE ENTIRE COUNTRY. ALL I
20 ASK -- AND I UNDERSTAND THAT THE FEDERAL AND STATE
21 ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION IS WHAT WE HAVE TO ATTAIN.

22 HOWEVER, HERE'S MY CONCERN. WHEN WE PUT UP A
23 SLIDE THAT SAYS WE NEED A BILLION DOLLARS A YEAR IN
24 INCENTIVE MONEY TO HELP BUSINESS COMPLY, EXISTING
25 BUSINESS COMPLY, THOSE FUNDS AREN'T IDENTIFIED YET, AND

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WE HAVE HAD TROUBLE COMPETING ON EVERY LEVEL ESPECIALLY
2 WITH CAP AND TRADE DOLLARS THAT ARE GOING TO THE BAY AREA
3 AND SOME TO L.A. FINALLY AND NONE TO OUR COUNTY. I HAVE
4 A BIG PROBLEM WITH THAT FUNDING SOURCE NOT BEING
5 IDENTIFIED. AT THE END OF THE DAY I'M A CPA AND I LOOK
6 FOR MONEY. I FOLLOW THE MONEY.

7 WE'VE GOT TO IDENTIFY THE FUNDING SOURCES AND
8 VOLUNTEER FOR THE AD HOC COMMITTEE, BUT THEY HAVE TO BE
9 REALISTIC BECAUSE OTHERWISE THE FOLKS ON THE
10 ENVIRONMENTAL SIDE OF THE HOUSE ARE PARTNERS IN ALL OF
11 THIS ARE VERY QUICK TO SAY AND HAVE ALREADY SAID IN
12 HEARINGS "IT'S OKAY. WE'LL GO STRAIGHT TO RULE MAKING
13 AND START FINING THOSE BUSINESSES WHO ARE NOT COMPLYING."
14 THAT WAS A DIRECT QUOTE FROM THE SHOP. SO THAT SCARES ME
15 TO DEATH. BECAUSE IF WE DON'T IDENTIFY A BILLION DOLLARS
16 A YEAR, WE GO STRAIGHT TO RULE MAKING AND FINES ON
17 BUSINESSES. WE WILL NOT SURVIVE THAT.

18 THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

19 DR. FINE: NEXT IS DEBORAH BARMACK.

20 MS. BARMACK: GOOD MORNING. I'M DEBORAH
21 BARMACK, PRESIDENT OF INLAND ACTION, WHICH IS A GROUP OF
22 COMMUNITY LEADERS AND BUSINESSES THAT WORK TO IMPROVE THE
23 ECONOMY IN THE INLAND EMPIRE AREA. I WANT TO THANK YOU
24 VERY MUCH, FIRST OF ALL, FOR HOLDING THIS HEARING IN SAN
25 BERNARDINO COUNTY SO THAT WE CAN PROVIDE MEANINGFUL INPUT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 INTO THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN. AND I ALSO WANT TO THANK
2 DR. FINE FOR MEETING WITH OUR BOARD OF DIRECTORS TO HELP
3 US UNDERSTAND THE PLAN.

4 INLAND ACTION AND THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY IS
5 COMMITTED TO WORKING WITH SOUTH COAST AIR MAN MANAGEMENT
6 DISTRICT TO ENSURE THAT THE 2016 AQMP FULFILLS ITS LEGAL
7 REQUIREMENTS WHILE ALSO PROTECTING AND PROMOTING JOB
8 CREATION AND ECONOMIC SUCCESS FOR OUR INLAND COUNTIES.
9 INLAND ACTION IS SUPPORTIVE OF AN AQMP ESTABLISHING A
10 POLICY FRAMEWORK THAT PRIORITIZES NON-REGULATORY
11 INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO EMISSION REDUCTIONS THAT ARE
12 COST EFFECTIVE AND MINIMIZE OPERATIONAL DISRUPTION.

13 WE SUPPORT A BALANCED, THOUGHTFUL APPROACH TO
14 ACHIEVING AIR QUALITY GOALS IN A MANNER THAT FURTHERS
15 ECONOMIC GROWTH WHILE ALSO AVOIDING AN OVERREGULATORY
16 APPROACH THAT SIGNIFICANTLY DRIVES THE COST OF ACHIEVING
17 EMISSION REDUCTIONS. INLAND ACTION BELIEVES THAT CONTROL
18 MEASURES MUST ALLOW FOR AND INCENTIVIZE VOLUNTARY AND
19 COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES TO ACHIEVING AIR QUALITY GOALS.
20 WE SUPPORT THE ACCELERATED DEPLOYMENT OF AVAILABLE
21 CLEANER TECHNOLOGIES THROUGHOUT INCENTIVE PROGRAMS THAT
22 LEVERAGE AVAILABLE FUNDING SOURCES BUT DO NOT PUT LOCAL
23 BUSINESSES AT COMPETITIVE DISADVANTAGE WITH SIMILAR
24 BUSINESSES IN OTHER REGIONS.

25 SO, AGAIN, I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR ALLOWING THIS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 INPUT AND WISH YOU LUCK IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THAT.

2 THANK YOU.

3 DR. FINE: THANK YOU. CHRIS SHIMODA.

4 MR. SHIMODA: GOOD MORNING. CHRIS SHIMODA OF
5 CALIFORNIA TRUCKING ASSOCIATION. FIRST, I JUST WANTED TO
6 ADD THANKS TO STAFF FOR THE DIALOGUE LEADING UP TO THE
7 DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLAN AND COMING OUT TO SAN BERNARDINO
8 COUNTY TO HEAR THE CONCERNS OF THE COMMUNITY AS WELL AS
9 THE BUSINESS FOLKS THAT ARE GOING TO BE IMPACTED BY THE
10 PLAN.

11 WE WANTED TO, AGAIN, JUST RELAY THE STRONG
12 CONCERN OVER THE FACILITY-BASED REGULATIONS BOTH FROM OUR
13 INDUSTRY. AND THE CONCERN IS ALSO SHARED BY THE BROADER
14 LOGISTICS IN THE MOVING GOODS COMMUNITY PRETTY MUCH
15 UNIVERSALLY. I NOTED IN CARB'S PRESENTATION, THE
16 EXISTING REGULATIONS WE ALREADY HAVE IN PLACE ARE GOING
17 GET TO AN OVER 80-PERCENT, 88-PERCENT REDUCTION IN NOX
18 EMISSIONS IN TODAY'S LEVELS FROM TRUCKS. AND WHAT WE'RE
19 REALLY LOOKING TO DO IS SECURE INCENTIVES TO GET THAT
20 REMAINING INCREMENT TO SEE THE REDUCTION FOR THE FEW
21 EMISSIONS THAT REMAIN.

22 AND ALSO I WANTED TO NOTE SINCE WE WERE
23 DISCUSSING HEALTH EFFECTS, ALTHOUGH THIS IS AN
24 OZONE-FOCUSED PLAN, ON THE PARTICULATE MATTER SIDE OF
25 REDUCTIONS IT'S AN EVEN BETTER STORY WITH OVER 99-PERCENT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 REDUCTION IN PM FROM TRUCKS WHICH HAS RESULTED IN A
2 DRAMATIC DECREASE IN LOCALIZED HEALTH RISKS. SO BECAUSE
3 OF THIS PROGRESS, WHICH I HAVE TELL YOU HAS COME AT GREAT
4 COSTS TO OUR INDUSTRY TO THE TUNE OF ABOUT BILLION
5 DOLLARS A YEAR SINCE 2008, WE DON'T BELIEVE THAT NOW IS
6 THE TIME TO DOUBLE DOWN ON A REGULATORY APPROACH.

7 WE DO SUPPORT AND HAVE EXPRESSED THIS ON MULTIPLE
8 OCCASIONS TO STAFF IN PUBLIC FORUMS AN INCENTIVE-BASED
9 APPROACH TO FURTHER ADVANCEMENT OF CLEANER AIR
10 TECHNOLOGY AND ALSO HAVE NOTED THAT GETTING ADDITIONAL
11 MONIES IS GOING TO REQUIRE A LOT COLLABORATION FROM OUR
12 ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERS, THE INDUSTRY, AS WELL AS OUR
13 PUBLIC AGENCY PARTNERS. SO WE LOOK FORWARD TO
14 COLLABORATION. THERE HAVE BEEN SUCCESSES IN THE PAST,
15 THE VERY RECENT PAST, WITH REAUTHORIZATION OF THE CARL
16 MOYER PROGRAM AND WOULD THINK A SIMILAR EFFORT OF
17 COLLABORATION TO GET THE ADDITIONAL FUNDS WE'RE TALKING
18 ABOUT TODAY.

19 SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

20 DR. FINE: THANKS, CHRIS.

21 CAROL BANNER.

22 MS. BANNER: GOOD MORNING. AND I, TOO, THANK
23 YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY. I REPRESENT THE REALTOR
24 COMMUNITY ON AIR QUALITY REPRESENTING 35 ASSOCIATES OF
25 REALTORS IN THE SOUTH COAST BASIN. WE HAVE PARTICIPATED

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 IN DEVELOPING EVERY AQMP SINCE 1991.

2 THE RCAQ STRONGLY SUPPORTS THE NEED FOR
3 INCENTIVES TO ACCELERATE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AIR
4 QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN. THE DISTRICT HAS MADE THE
5 PROPOSED AQMP MORE REGULATORY IN NATURE IN THE MOST
6 RECENT DRAFT, BUT REGULATIONS ARE NOT SUFFICIENT TO REACH
7 THE FEDERAL AIR QUALITY STANDARD, AND THEY'RE ALSO NOT
8 APPROPRIATE FOR EVERY SECTOR.

9 RCAQ BELIEVES THAT THE EMISSIONS RELATED TO
10 HOUSING AND RESIDENTIAL USE MUST CONTINUE TO BE
11 IMPLEMENTED THROUGH INCENTIVES. AN INCENTIVE APPROACH IS
12 NECESSARY TO AVOID DAMAGING IMPACTS TO THE COST AND
13 AVAILABILITY OF HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF ALL INCOME
14 LEVELS. THE AQMP NEEDS TO FIND A WIN-WIN OUTCOME FOR AIR
15 QUALITY IN CONCERT WITH AFFORDABLE HOUSING TO PREVENT
16 FURTHER EXACERBATING AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND OUR REGION'S
17 HOUSING CRISIS.

18 THE AQMP NEEDS TO PROVIDE INCENTIVES COMMENSURATE
19 TO THE AMOUNT OF EMISSION REDUCTIONS COMMITTED FOR OUR
20 MEASURE. TO THAT END, WE SUPPORT THE DISTRICT'S EFFORTS
21 TO PREPARE AN INCENTIVE ACTION PLAN THAT IDENTIFIES REAL
22 ESTATE SOURCES FOR THE NEEDED INCENTIVE FUNDS. THE
23 DISTRICT ALSO NEEDS TO CLEARLY IDENTIFY THE COSTS THAT
24 INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLDS MUST BEAR TO COMPLY WITH CONTROL
25 MEASURES SUCH AS CMP02, WHICH SEEKS TO CHANGE OUT

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EXISTING SPACE AND WATER HEATERS FOR NEW SOLAR AND ZERO
2 WATER HEATERS.

3 WE LOOK FORWARD TO AN EXPLICIT DISCUSSION OF
4 THESE IMPACTS IN THE FINAL SOCIOECONOMIC ANALYSIS
5 ESPECIALLY NOW THAT THE SCOPE OF THIS MEASURE HAS BEEN
6 DRAMATICALLY EXPANDED. AND, AGAIN, I THANK YOU, AND I
7 CERTAINLY CONCUR WITH OTHER SPEAKERS HERE ON THE ECONOMIC
8 IMPACT ON THE PLAN IN OUR COMMUNITIES THAT REALLY SPANS
9 ALL SECTORS. THANK YOU.

10 DR. FINE: THANK YOU. I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY
11 ONE POINT THAT WAS BROUGHT UP ON CMP02 COMMERCIAL AND
12 RESIDENTIAL APPLIANCE MEASURE. IN TERMS OF CHANGING OUT
13 THE EXISTING EQUIPMENT BEFORE THE END OF USEFUL LIFE,
14 THAT'S WHERE WE FEEL LIKE INCENTIVES CAN BE PROVIDED.
15 TYPICALLY WHEN WE REGULATE THOSE TYPES OF EQUIPMENT WHICH
16 WE DO NOW, IT IS WHEN EQUIPMENT IS SOLD. SO SOMEONE WHO
17 NEEDS TO GET A NEW HOT WATER HEATER OR ALREADY NEEDS TO
18 GET A SPACE HEATER. THAT'S WHEN THOSE REQUIREMENTS WOULD
19 APPLY. BUT THAT MAY NOT BE FAST ENOUGH SO WE MAY WANT TO
20 INCENTIVIZE PEOPLE TO GET THAT NEW EQUIPMENT EVEN BEFORE
21 THEIR HOT WATER HEATER BREAKS DOWN. THAT'S WHAT WE
22 INTENDED TO CLARIFY IN THAT MEASURE.

23 MS. BANNER: WE APPRECIATE THAT. SO AT POINT OF
24 SALE IT IS ENFORCEABLE.

25 DR. FINE: GENERALLY BY THE MANUFACTURES WHO ARE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SELLING THE EQUIPMENT.

2 CARLA.

3 MS. WALECKA: I'M CARLA WALECKA, AND I WORK WITH
4 CAROL BANNER. AND I'M GOING BANG ON THAT NAIL ABOUT
5 CMP02 A LITTLE BIT MORE. THE PUBLIC MAY NOT REALIZE, BUT
6 THIS IS WHERE THE MORE DRAMATIC CHANGE IS IN THE PLAN IN
7 REGARDS TO THAT. IT HAS A BROADER SCOPE AND EFFECTS ALL
8 COMMERCIAL AND RESIDENTIAL AND MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING
9 PRIMARILY. SO IT AFFECTS MANY MORE STRUCTURES THROUGHOUT
10 THE REGION THAN PREVIOUSLY AND IT HAS A NEW NAME, TOO,
11 BECAUSE IT DOES HAVE A BROADER SCOPE. AND IT NOW DEALS
12 WITH REPLACING EXISTING NOX APPLIANCES WITH ZERO OR
13 NEAR-ZERO APPLIANCES.

14 WE THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO RECOGNIZE THAT
15 THE EMISSION INCREASES ASSOCIATED WITH THIS MEASURE HAVE
16 ALSO GONE UP DRAMATICALLY. THERE'S A 90-PERCENT INCREASE
17 IN NOX REDUCTIONS ATTRIBUTED TO THIS MEASURE IN 2031. SO
18 IT'S A BIG-TICKET ITEM FOR PROPERTY BUILDERS AS WELL AS
19 RENTERS. WE BELIEVE THIS MEASURE NEEDS TO REMAIN
20 NEUTRAL. THERE'S NO ONE-SIZE-FITS-ALL SOLUTION FOR
21 HOUSING. OUR HOUSING IS TOO DIVERSE SO FUEL NEUTRALITY
22 IS GOING TO BE IMPORTANT IN FINDING OPTIONS FOR
23 HOMEOWNERS AND RENTERS TO COMPLY.

24 WE ALSO NEED TIME LINES THAT ARE SYNCED UP WITH
25 THE COMMERCIAL AVAILABILITY OF THESE NEW TYPES OF AREA

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 AND SPACE HEATERS, DISHWASHERS, ET CETERA. AND THIS IS
2 LITTLE BIT OF A STICKING POINT IN THE PAST. BUT WE FEEL
3 AS THIS MEASURE GETS FURTHER, IT'S IMPORTANT TO LOOK AT
4 THAT.

5 CAROL ALREADY MENTIONED THE IMPORTANCE OF
6 INCENTIVES TO AVOID INCREASING HOUSING AND WORSENING
7 HOUSING SHORTAGE AND THE AFFORDABILITY CRISIS. HAVING
8 SAID THAT, WE DO BELIEVE THAT THE NEED FOR INCENTIVES
9 MUST BE CLEARLY IDENTIFIED IN THE ACTION PLAN TO AVOID
10 PRESSURE FOR THIS PURELY REGULATORY MEASURE IN THE
11 FUTURE. AND IT'S WORTH NOTING THAT THE INCENTIVES
12 REQUIRED FOR THIS MEASURE HAVE INCREASE FROM 440 TO 520
13 MILLION. SO IT'S EVEN MORE IMPORTANT TO US THERE BE
14 CLARITY ON THAT. WE DO HAVE HOPE THAT THESE INCREASED
15 COSTS AND INCREASED INCENTIVES WILL BE ANALYZED IN THE
16 FINAL VERSION OF THE SOCIOECONOMIC ANALYSIS SPECIFICALLY
17 HOW MUCH OF AN ADDITIONAL BURDEN THIS WOULD PLACE ON THE
18 AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD IN THE REGION.

19 AND, FINALLY, WE HOPE YOU'LL FORM A STAKEHOLDER
20 GROUP TO WORK ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS CONTROL MEASURE
21 AND THE RCAQ WOULD BE VERY HAPPY TO PARTICIPATE. WE,
22 TOO, WANT TO STRIKE A BALANCE IN TERMS OF COMPETING
23 ENVIRONMENTAL HOUSING AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEEDED IN
24 THE REGION. SO WE LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH YOU.
25 THANK YOU ALL FOR BEING HERE.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DR. FINE: ALL RIGHT. I HAVE ONE MORE CARD.
2 HARVEY EDER.

3 MR. EDER: GOOD MORNING. I'M HARVEY EDER
4 SPEAKING FOR MYSELF AND AS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE
5 PUBLIC SOLAR POWER COALITION. WE'VE BEEN AROUND FOR --
6 SINCE THE LATE '70S AND SOLD SOLAR FINANCING MODELS. I
7 WAS THE SOLAR PERSON FOR SANTA CRUZ COUNTY '77 TO '78.

8 WHAT WE NEED IS IMMEDIATE TOTAL SOLAR ENERGY.
9 THE SOLAR INDUSTRY STARTED HERE IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
10 OVER A HUNDRED YEARS AGO. IN 1910 30 PERCENT OF THE
11 PERMITS FOR PASADENA ON NEW HOMES HAD SOLAR HOT WATER.
12 THE GAS COMPANY WANTING TO DISBAND AND PUT IN THEIR
13 LINES, GAVE THREE GAS WATER HEATERS AND HOOK-UPS TO
14 COMPETE WITH THE SOLAR INDUSTRY. IT MOVED TO FLORIDA AND
15 THEN THERE WAS NEED FOR COPPER DURING WORLD WAR II.
16 IT WAS IN ISRAEL IN THE LATE '40S AND '50S. AND THEN
17 WITH THE ENERGY CRISIS IN THE EARLY '70S IT STARTED UP
18 AGAIN AS WELL PHOTOVOLTAIC, WHICH STARTED IN THE 50S
19 WHICH WAS USED ON SATELLITES AND RESPONSES TO SPUTNIK.

20 WITHIN THE LAST SIX YEARS OR SO, THE PRICE OF
21 SOLAR HAS COME DOWN, PHOTOVOLTAIC HAS COME DOWN 50 OR 60
22 PERCENT OR MORE.

23 THERE'S A PROGRAM CALLED "SUNSHINE" THROUGH THE
24 DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY WHICH IS BASED ON THE MOON SHOT
25 PROGRAM WITH KENNEDY IN THE '60S. THIS IS THROUGH THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY THAT BROUGHT IT DOWN TO 600 KILOWATT
2 AN HOUR ANYWHERE IN THE COUNTRY WITH NO INCENTIVES BY
3 2020. THERE WERE INTERIM REPORTS ON THE PATHWAY TO SUN
4 SHOT THAT CAME OUT AND THE ADVISORY GROUP, ALL THOSE
5 STUDIES IN THE RECORD OF THE SPECIAL IMPORTANCE ARE THE
6 ONES ON HEALTH AND THE ONES ON AFFORDABLE TAX AND ON
7 CONCENTRATING SOLAR POWER.

8 THE ISRAELIS CAME HERE IN THE LATE '70S AND EARLY
9 '80S, AND THEY DEVELOPED A SERIES OF POWER PLANTS OUT IN
10 DAGGETT WHERE A SOLAR POWER TOWER WAS BUILT. THEY BUILT
11 A 14 MEGAWATT LINE FOCUS CONCENTRATOR AND THEN WENT ON TO
12 BUILD AT EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE AND IN THE AREA A SERIES
13 OF 30 MEGAWATTS AND 80 MEGAWATTS PLANTS. THESE PLANTS
14 WERE PUT IN AT THE SAME TIME WIND WAS PUT IN BY RIVERSIDE
15 AND WHATNOT AND THEIR 354 MEGAWATTS HAVE BEEN OPERATING
16 FOR 25, 35 YEARS FROM NOW. AND THEY PROVE THAT THIS
17 CONCEPT HAS BEEN AROUND.

18 WE'VE BEEN COMING TO YOU FOLKS FOR THE LAST 30
19 YEARS, AND YOU HAD THIS INFORMATION ABOUT THEIR LOOPS.
20 NOW THEY'RE CALLED SEGS, SOLAR ENERGY GENERATOR SESSIONS.
21 AND THEY DO HAVE SOME NATURAL GAS. YOU HAD TO HAVE 80
22 PERCENT SOLAR. YOU CAN ONLY USE 20-PERCENT NATURAL GAS
23 UNDER PURA, THE PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY.
24 THEY ALSO USE SHORT-TIME STORAGE.

25 CONCENTRATED SOLAR IS NOW LESS EXPENSE THAN

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 NATURAL GAS BECAUSE THEY USE THERMAL ENERGY SOURCE TO RUN
2 24 HOURS. THIS -- THERE'S A STUDY IN NOVEMBER OF '09 IN
3 "SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN" -- THERE WAS A YEAR -- A MONTH
4 BEFORE COPENHAGEN WAS CONVERTING THE WORLD TO WIND,
5 WATER, AND SOLAR RENEWABLES BY 2030. IT WAS WRITTEN BY
6 PROFESSOR MARK JACOBSON AT STANFORD UNIVERSITY AND A DR.
7 VALUCCI WHO IS AT UC BERKELEY. THEY'VE GONE ON AND MADE
8 STUDIES FOR ALL 50 STATES AND FOR A 139 COUNTRIES.
9 THEY'VE MADE -- IN '14 THEY MADE A STUDY IN CALIFORNIA
10 THAT WOULD CONVERT 88-PERCENT SOLAR RENEWABLES BY 2030.
11 THIS IS IN THE RECORD. I GAVE IT AT THE BOARD MEETING
12 FOR THE ADVISORY COUNCIL. AND THERE WAS NO MENTION IN
13 THIS. THERE WAS A ONE PAGE -- WE ASKED THAT THERE BE AN
14 ALTERNATIVE DONE IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT THAT
15 LOOKED AT SOLAR ENERGY.

16 WE'VE LITIGATED WITH YOU STARTING IN '92. WE
17 INCORPORATED THE RECORD IN THIS PROCEEDING IN OUR CASE
18 EDER VERSUS WALLERSTEIN, ET AL., ET AL, ON THE 12TH PLAN.
19 AND INCLUDED IN THAT RECORD IS '92 LITIGATION. SO WE'RE
20 NOW INVOLVED IN REVIEWING PARTICULATE MATTER WHICH WAS
21 PUBLISHED ON THE 3RD OF THIS MONTH THROUGH PPN AND THE
22 9TH CIRCUIT. THIS HAS TO DO WITH RACK AS WELL. COMMENTS
23 TO OUR LITIGATION AND WHATNOT HAD TO BE RACKED. THAT EPA
24 WOULDN'T ACCEPT THAT THIS AVAILABLE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY
25 AND MORE IMPORTANTLY THIS RETROFIT CONTROL TECHNOLOGY,

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 WHICH IS IN THE 2012 CASE IN DISTRICT 1 AS A SUPREME
2 COURT CASE HERE IN CALIFORNIA WITH THE -- THE CODING
3 ASSOCIATION. AND THEY SAID THAT THIS IS THE DISTRICT'S
4 ARGUMENT THAT THIS AVAILABLE RETROFIT CONTROL TECHNOLOGY
5 IS A TECHNOLOGY FORCING RULE. IT'S IN THE HEALTH AND
6 SAFETY CODE. ALSO WE PUT IN, QUOTING FROM THE REPORT, IT
7 DIDN'T SAY WHERE IT CAME FROM HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE
8 40404.5 THAT SAYS "THOU SHALL USE THE DISTRICT FROM THE
9 STATE SOLAR WHERE IT'S COST EFFECTIVE IN THE PLAN." AND
10 IT IS. IT'S BEEN IGNORED. AND I'M ASKING THERE BE A
11 STUDY DONE ON THIS. YOU PUT ONE PAGE ON A SOLAR
12 ALTERNATIVE ON PAGE 6 AND JUST IGNORED ALL THIS
13 INFORMATION, IGNORED -- YOU STATED "WE'VE COVERED ALL
14 STATIONARY SOURCES FROM SOLAR, AND WE CANNOT MEET OUR
15 GOALS." THE STATIONARY SOURCES GENERATE ELECTRICITY THAT
16 ELON MUSK SOLAR CITY NOW WITH TESLA AND THE BATTERY
17 FACTORY WITH PANASONIC. THIS STUFF IS COST EFFECTIVE.
18 THE STATIONARY SOURCES OF SOLAR AND WIND WILL GENERATE
19 ELECTRICITY TO RUN THE ELECTRIC VEHICLES. THIS IS
20 TOTALLY IGNORED IN YOUR COMMENTS AND YOU KEEP ON HARPING
21 ON INDUSTRIALIZING THE DESERT. THERE'S A LOT OF LAND
22 AVAILABLE AROUND HERE, AROUND L.A. COUNTY, AROUND
23 RIVERSIDE. THERE'S ROOFTOPS. THERE'S COVERED PARKING
24 LOTS. YOU'VE GOT TO BE IMAGINATIVE. ALSO THERE'S PUBLIC
25 POWER IN YOUR OWN DISTRICT, AND THIS NEEDS TO BE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 COORDINATED AND PURSUED WITH THE PLAN.

2 L.A. COUNTY IS GOING THROUGH A JPA, JOINT POWERS
3 AUTHORITY, FOR COMMUNITY CHOICE AGGREGATION COMMUNITY
4 CHOICE ENERGY. THIS IS ALSO HAPPENING IN THE INLAND
5 EMPIRE RIGHT NOW. BUT THERE'S AN OUTFIT BOTH IN SAN
6 BERNARDINO AND RIVERSIDE. THERE'S AN OUTFIT THAT'S COME
7 FROM BACK EAST, AND THEY'RE EMPHASIZING MORE THAN JUST
8 SAVINGS LIKE THE MODELS BACK EAST AND YOU ACTUALLY OWN
9 THAT SYSTEM AND IT'S PART OF THE COMMUNITY AND OWNED BY
10 INDIVIDUALS AS WELL. THERE'S A LOT OF MONEY OUT THERE IN
11 TAX CREDITS. WE USE TAX CREDITS AND WRITE-OFFS AS AN
12 INCENTIVE. THEY'VE BEEN EXTENDED. THEY WERE EXTENDED
13 FOR ANOTHER FIVE YEARS UNTIL '22. AND THEY STEPPED DOWN
14 33 PERCENT IN INVESTOR TAX CREDIT FOR RESIDENCE,
15 COMMERCIAL, AND INDUSTRIAL. THERE'S AN ACCELERATED
16 DEPRECIATION IN THE HIGH GRAPHICS. SO YOU GET IT LIKE AT
17 PERCENT. THIS SHOULD BE WORKED AT ALSO FOR LOW INCOME
18 PEOPLE. IN CALIFORNIA WE HAVE A REFUNDABLE TAX CREDIT.
19 WE HAD IT BEFORE THE FEDERALS DID. AND WE HAD A 55
20 PERCENT IN '76 AND IN '78 IT WAS 40 PERCENT. YOU USED TO
21 BE ABLE TO STACK THEM BOTH. THE CREDIT FOR -- IN
22 CALIFORNIA IS A REFUNDABLE CREDIT SO LOW INCOME PEOPLE
23 CAN USE THIS, TOO.

24 THIS STUFF ABOUT USING NATURAL GAS -- AND THE
25 HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE 53002(B) SAYS IN THE HEALTH AND

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 SAFETY CODE THAT IT'S AGAINST THE LAW. IT'S AGAINST THE
2 POLICY IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA TO USE NON-RENEWABLE
3 FOSSIL FUELS. NINETY PERCENT OF OUR NATURAL GAS IS
4 IMPORTED INTO THIS STATE. IT'S FRACKED IN TEXAS,
5 OKLAHOMA, COLORADO. THERE WERE STUDIES THAT I BROUGHT TO
6 THE DISTRICT SIX TO EIGHT YEARS AGO FROM CORNELL
7 UNIVERSITY SAYING THERE'S A 104 TIMES THE GLOBAL WARMING
8 POTENTIAL. THE DISTRICT AND THE STATE -- THE FEDERAL
9 GOVERNMENT IS STILL USING 21 AND 22 TIMES GLOBAL WARMING
10 POTENTIAL FOR NATURAL GAS. YOU HAVE TO USE THE BEST
11 EVIDENCE AND BEST SCIENCE. THE BEST SCIENCE IS USED BY
12 DR. AARON KATSENSTEIN IN CHAPTER 10-2. IT SAYS MORE THAN
13 A 30-PERCENT INCREASE IN METHANE OVER THE LAST 12 YEARS.

14 THERE'S NO FOOTNOTES IN THIS PLAN. YOU GOT TO
15 HAVE FOOTNOTES. YOU CAN'T RESEARCH THIS STUFF AND COME
16 UP WITH CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM. YOU'RE REQUIRED TO HAVE
17 FOOTNOTES. THE COMMENTS SHOULD HAVE RESPONSES IN THE
18 REVISED DOCUMENT. THIS IS ALSO ILLEGAL. WE GOT TO SEE
19 EXACTLY WHERE YOU'VE DONE YOUR WRITE-OUTS AND THIS KIND
20 OF THING. THERE WAS A STUDY THEY REFERRED TO TED TURNER
21 WHO'S AT HARVARD WHO DID A STUDY IN MARCH OF '16 ABOUT
22 THIS 30-PERCENT INCREASE.

23 THE TUNDRA IS MELTING. THERE'S STUFF IN THE
24 RECORD FROM A DR. KELLY, UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA WHO
25 SPECIALIZES IN THAT ON AIR, LAND, AND WATER AND THE

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 EMISSIONS FROM METHANE RELEASE AND CARBON DIOXIDE.
2 TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT OF NORTH AMERICA IS ARCTIC. THEY'RE
3 HAVING TWO TO THREE TIMES THE WARMING UP THERE. THEY'RE
4 HAVING FIRES. NOW THEY'RE SAYING, "OH, WE'VE GOT
5 RENEWABLE NATURAL GAS." WELL, WE HAVE N2BE2 AND NOW
6 WE'VE GOT 70 PERCENT OF OUR ANTIBIOTICS GO TO ANIMALS AND
7 WE WANT TO TAKE THAT WASTE AND PUT IT INTO THE AIR AND
8 SPIT IT OUT ALL OVER. THEY'VE HAD HUNDREDS OF DEATHS IN
9 THE HOSPITAL IN L.A. FROM SUPER BUGS DRUG RESISTANT
10 SPECIES. AND THERE'S BEEN A SERIES OF ARTICLES ABOUT
11 THAT IN THE L.A. TIMES AND SOME FIGURES MORE RECENTLY ARE
12 AS HIGH AS 300 TO 400,000 DEATHS. THIS IS WHAT YOU GET
13 WITH LANDFILL AND USING THE FECES WASTE FROM BOVINES, ET
14 CETERA. THIS HAS TO BE IN THE HEALTH DOCUMENT. IT HAS
15 TO BE QUANTIFIED AT \$9 MILLION A YEAR LIKE THOSE OTHER
16 2,000 DEATHS -- I HEARD THIS TODAY FOR THE FIRST TIME.
17 YOU SAID 4,000 DEATHS WHICH DOUBLES TO 26 BILLION A YEAR
18 NOW TO 52 BILLION.

19 DR. FINE: HARVEY, I DID WANT TO MENTION THAT A
20 LOT OF THE COMMENTS YOU'RE MAKING ARE ALREADY ON RECORD,
21 AND WE ARE RESPONDING TO ALL THOSE COMMENTS. BY THE TIME
22 THE PLAN IS CONSIDERED BY OUR BOARD, WE WILL HAVE A FULL
23 APPENDIX 1 ALL WITH ALL OF OUR RESPONSES. THE COMMENTS
24 ON CHAPTER 10 ABOUT FOOTNOTES, THERE'S SEVERAL PAGES OF
25 REFERENCES.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 MR. EDER: THAT'S THE ONLY CHAPTER.

2 DR. FINE: BUT IT'S THE SAME WHETHER YOU PUT
3 THEM ON THE BOTTOM OF THE PAGE.

4 MR. EDER: THAT'S GOOD. BUT OTHER DOCUMENTS
5 DIDN'T HAVE THEM. AND YOU LEAVE NO RESULT OTHER THAN AS
6 STATED BY JIM MORRISON PETITIONING -- HE WAS TALKING
7 ABOUT ANOTHER KIND PETITIONING. BUT PETITIONING THE
8 GOVERNMENT AND THEN ACCUSE LITIGATION. AND IF WE HAVE TO
9 GO AND GET AN INJUNCTION AND TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
10 ON THIS WHOLE PROCESS UNTIL YOU STUDY AND IMPLEMENT A
11 SOLAR CONVERSION PLAN THAT IS COST EFFECTIVE WILL HELP
12 THE ECONOMY AND PUT PEOPLE TO WORK. THERE'S 220,000 JOBS
13 IN SOLAR AND HALF OF THOSE ARE IN THE DISTRICT.

14 AND I HAVEN'T TALKED WITH YOU, WAYNE. I'D LIKE
15 TO TALK TO YOU SOMETIME.

16 MR. NASTRI: I LOOK FORWARD TO IT. THANK YOU.

17 MR. EDER: ALL RIGHT.

18 MR. NASTRI: WERE THERE ANY OTHER PEOPLE THAT
19 WOULD LIKE TO HAVE COMMENTS? IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO SUBMIT
20 A BLUE CARD AND COME FORWARD. LET ME JUST THANK EVERYONE
21 FOR BEING HERE TODAY TO PROVIDING COMMENTS. WE'RE VERY
22 FORTUNATE TO HAVE EVERYBODY OUT HERE.

23 I'D LIKE TO INTRODUCE SUPERVISOR JANICE
24 RUTHERFORD.

25 MS. RUTHERFORD: THANK YOU. I'M SORRY I WAS

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1 LATE THIS MORNING. BEFORE THIS I SCHEDULED TO ATTEND
2 THE CALIFORNIA RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT'S ANNUAL
3 CONFERENCE THAT WAS HELD IN ONTARIO. AND IT WAS A REALLY
4 HONOR TO BE ABLE TO WELCOME SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY AND
5 SHARE WITH THEM THE BALANCE THAT WE WORK TO STRIKE HERE
6 WITH THE INCREDIBLE NATURAL RESOURCES THAT WE HAVE BEEN
7 GIVEN STEWARDSHIP OVER. AND WE HAVE FOUND CREATIVE
8 COLLABORATIVE WAYS TO DO THAT HERE IN SAN BERNARDINO
9 COUNTY, AND I THINK THAT THE COMMENTS THAT I WILL HEAR
10 TODAY CERTAINLY REFLECT THAT.

11 OUR RESIDENTS HAVE A DESIRE FOR CLEAN AIR AND
12 CLEAN WATER AND NATURE BEING TAKEN CARE. THEY ALSO HAVE
13 A DESIRE TO INTERACT WITH IT BOTH FOR REACTION AND FOR
14 EMPLOYMENT FOR PROSPERITY. AND IT'S BODIES LIKE SOUTH
15 COAST AQMD TO TAKE THAT INTO CONSIDERATION AND TO
16 UNDERSTAND THAT IT'S NOT ALL OR NONE ON EITHER SIDE. WE
17 CAN BE PROSPEROUS, AND WE CAN TAKE CARE OF OUR
18 ENVIRONMENT AND OUR RESPONSIBILITIES. AND I HOPE THIS
19 PLAN IN ITS FINAL FORM STRIKES THAT BALANCE AND
20 RECOGNIZES THE NEED TO MEET THAT BECAUSE OF OUR
21 GEOGRAPHY. I LOOK FORWARD TO CONTINUING TO READ AND
22 STUDY COMMENTS FROM AROUND THE REGION AND LOOKING AT THE
23 FINAL PLAN IN A COUPLE MONTHS AND COMING UP WITH
24 SOMETHING THAT HOPEFULLY RESULTS IN GOOD OUTCOMES FOR ALL
25 OF THIS.

BARRISTERS' REPORTING SERVICE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION TODAY

DR. FINE: THANK YOU. IF THERE'S NO OTHER
COMMENTS, WE'LL CALL THE MEETING TO A CLOSE. WE'LL TALK,
HARVEY.

MR. EDER: I'VE BEEN TALKING.

DR. FINE: YEAH. AND IF ANYONE WANTS TO COME
UP, THE AQMP STAFF IS HERE FOR ANY QUESTIONS. SO THANK
YOU, EVERYONE, FOR COMING. AND WE'LL SEE SOME OF YOU IN
RIVERSIDE IN A FEW HOURS.

(END OF PUBLIC HEARING.)