



October 21st, 2025

Chair Delgado and Members of the Governing Board
South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD)
21865 Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Email: vdelgado@aqmd.gov
Clerk of the Board: cob@aqmd.gov

SUBJECT: Port and AQMD Negotiation Concerns and Feedback

Dear South Coast Air Quality Management District Governing Board and Staff,

We are writing to follow up regarding the ongoing negotiations between the Port and AQMD, on a contract between the two entities. A regulatory framework, such as an Indirect Source Review Rule, is the most proven, effective, and straightforward way to achieve AQMD's stated goals of reducing air emissions in the region. Strong rules send a signal to both those that are regulated and to the broader marketplace to help accelerate changes in behavior. The warehouse indirect source rule, CARB At-Berth regulations, Commercial Harbor Craft rule, and Ocean-Going Vessel Fuel Regulation, for example, have delivered significant public health benefits, reduction in emissions, and needed modifications to behavior. Conversely, the withdrawal of the Advanced Clean Fleet regulations have slowed down ZEV adoption, as some fleet owners no longer have motivation to invest in clean equipment.

Given the South Coast AQMD's lack of will to pass a rule, however, we believe that the proposed voluntary agreement with the ports can be made better in several ways. Since actions speak louder than words, we would like to see these incorporated into the agreement:

1. The end goal of either a rule or voluntary measures must be the reduction in emissions from the ports. These reductions must be permanent, enforceable, quantifiable, and surplus. Voluntary measures on their own have rarely achieved the emission reductions necessary to clean our air. For example, it is not clear that the airport memoranda of understanding (MOU) has achieved significant emission reductions from the five major airports. The ports' recent emission inventories, which showed that port emissions increased over the past year, underscore the limits of voluntary measures like the CAAP.
 - a. *Please incorporate into the agreement estimated emissions reductions from each infrastructure project planned. This can be from the estimated number of pieces of equipment decommissioned or another measure.*

- b. *Please describe if there are increases of emissions forecasted due to more TEUs, how will the ports and terminal operators prevent emissions increases from these?*
 - c. *Please include target setting measures on the percent utilization of infrastructure projects developed as part of this agreement in the implementation section (uptime of infrastructure used). This should include how the ports will achieve this through mechanisms such as green laning, green appointment times, percent TEU moves by ZEVs, etc.*
 2. The ports have listed the following as potential for delays and offramps:
 - a. If grants are not allocated as planned:
 - i. *If the grants are for planning, the ports should provide us with the data on how much the ports think this infrastructure planning will cost. Can the ports provide sufficient funds to have the plan expenses covered without relying on grants?*
 - ii. *If these grants are for implementation and they are repealed due to unforeseen circumstances (ex federal government) then the ports must provide data on who is responsible for the grant commitments being nullified and any actions they are taking to remedy these.*
 - b. If there are delays with the infrastructure that utility providers can provide. Utility providers already have infrastructure plans in place and say they can provide the ports with adequate supply (they articulated as such at the Mobile Source Committee Meeting 10-17-25).
 - i. *We would like to know what the timeline is for construction, who the entity is that is responsible for permitting and licensing, and what is being done to expedite these processes and for this data to be made available to the public.*
3. How is SCAQMD going to get the commitments of SCE and LADWP in this process?
 - i. *What is the role of CEC and CPUC in this process?*
 - ii. *What measures are being put into place to expedite permitting and licensing?*
 - iii. *What can local governments and agencies do to expedite timelines on their end.*
 - iv. *This plan should also determine how terminal operators will plan to have redundancy and back-up built into their power systems that are not heavily polluting (ex, installation of renewable energy or micro-grids).*
4. Public Process and Public Input. Similar to how the Offshore wind roundtables have worked at POLB there should be periodic (bimonthly or quarterly) meetings with stakeholders to update community members on what progress is being made on the plans and to have accountability integrated in. These roundtable discussions should be a safe space to provide community input, troubleshoot issues, and provide updates. These can be mirrored on how the AQMD process worked for PR 2304 with different groups invited to attend depending on the area of focus (fleet operators, harbor craft, pilots, etc). The following stakeholders should be invited to be at the table and this process should be paid for by the ports and facilitated by AQMD:
 - i. *Community Organizations - public health and environmental, etc.*
 - ii. *Community representatives under AB617, including Community Steering Committees as well as the South Coast AQMD's EJ Advisory Group*
 - iii. *OEMs that are providing equipment*
 - iv. *Terminal operators*
 - v. *AQMD staff (including AB 617 staff as well as team that worked on this agreement)*
 - vi. *POLB and POLA Staff*
 - vii. *Utility Providers*
 - viii. *Labor Groups*

ix. *Consultants: those conducting the emissions inventory and those writing the Infrastructure plans*

5. It is unclear where current revenue from violations will be spent. It seems that the tidelands trust gets a primary decision-making directive (and the port commissioners will approve where it can go). Only after \$100,000 does public notice get triggered. This is antithetical to a violation amount where the violator gets to designate where the monies are spent.
 - a. *The monies need to be spent on reducing port emissions and the public should have a say in this.*
 - b. *Violation amounts should be higher starting at \$50,000 for Tier 1, \$100,000 Tier 2, and \$150,000 for Tier 3.*
6. Public health support and data.
 - a. *There needs to be a parallel Public Health Study funded such as the CASPER study and survey, that looks to monitor and assess the health impact of communities on a continuous basis. This should cover impacts to Wilmington, San Pedro, West Long Beach, and can strengthen ongoing efforts at air quality health impact monitoring.*
7. Efficiency Measures Inclusion
 - a. *Efficiency measures such as Universal Appointment Terminal System systems with green appointment systems need to be made a part of the infrastructure planning process. There needs to be an expedited effort to complete these software modifications in line with Phase 1 ZE plan for drayage.*
8. A backstop measure to all of this must be the implementation of immediate rule-making without delay. The Governing Board relinquishing regulatory authority is antithetical to this effort.
 - a. *The resolution should be modified to remove a regulatory pause on ALL-rulemaking for five years and instead focus on an infrastructure ONLY-regulatory pause.*
 - b. *The other five CAAP+ measures should not be beholden to a pause since they are not yet negotiated.*

While we acknowledge that no process is perfect, the current proposal and process can be made much better in order to ensure success, reduce pollution, and encourage public participation. These five years cannot be yet another delay in needed emission reductions. This is part of AQMD's mandate and the responsibility of all appointed and elected officials in our region. This frankly, is your most fundamental responsibility. With no major emissions reductions made during the last year and up to 10 tons/day of reduced emissions off the table from the failure of Rules 1111 and 1121 to pass, it is time to do something meaningful and impactful.

We hope you will address each of our suggestions and incorporate them into your final agreement and future CAAP+ measures negotiations.

Sincerely,



Dori Chandler

Policy Advocate, Coalition for Clean Air

Cc:

South Coast Governing Board Members

Wayne Nastri, Executive Officer, SCAQMD

Ian MacMillian, Assistant Deputy Executive Officer, SCAQMD

Sarah Rees, Deputy Executive Officer, SCAQMD

Susan Nakamura, Chief Operating Officer, SCAQMD