

AB 617 Steering Committee Meeting Agenda

4/28/2020

6:00 pm - 8:00 pm

Zoom Webinar

NOTES

Link to all presentations and meeting materials:

<https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/apcd/en/community-air-protection-program--ab-617-/ab-617-steering-committee-documents.html>

Meeting Objectives

- Provide an update on how Steering Committee Meetings will continue to take place virtually during shelter in place order
- Provide an update on community questions from February meeting regarding CERP Timeline
- Provide an update on Incentive Funding Proposed Projects
- Provide an update on the process to update the charter

Meeting Action Items

- Approval of 2/25/2020 Meeting Notes and 4/28/2020 Agenda with no edits
- Approval to establish four (4) formal subcommittees for the AB 617 Steering Committee
- Approval of two (2) motions with guidance to SDAPCD on submitted Incentive Funding Proposed Projects:
 1. Move ahead with all electric projects and the port's bonnet system projects.
 2. Allocate time in May meeting to assess the alternative fossil fuel projects, their benefits and why the staff is recommending those projects versus devoting all the resources to electrification.

I. Introduction (Daniela Simunovic and Chuy Flores, Facilitators)

- a. Welcome by Bill Brick, APCD
- b. Overview of Virtual Meeting logistics
- c. Review Meeting Objectives & Agenda
- d. Roll Call of Meeting Participants

II. Vote: Approval of 2/25/2020 Meeting Notes and tonight's agenda

- a. **MOTION by Ted Godshalk to approve:** Committee members approved 2/25/2020 Meeting Notes and 4/28/2020 agenda with no edits
- b. Motion approved by consensus

III. Discuss Plan for Steering Committee During Shelter-in-Place Order (Bill Brick, SDAPCD, and Daniela Simunovic)

- a. Recognized Joy Williams, EHC for winning 2019 Haagen-Smit Clean Air Award
- b. Overview of plans and protocols for virtual meetings

IV. Discussion and Vote: Proposed Subcommittees (Daniela Simunovic, Facilitator)

a. Overview of proposal to establish 4 subcommittees:

1. CERP
2. Port
3. Land Use
4. Trucks

b. Subcommittee will:

1. Meet regularly, in-between Steering Committee Meetings
2. Provide a report back to the full Steering Committee to provide a summary of the evaluations, discussions and recommendations for Steering Committee to act on

c. Proposed Subcommittees

1. CERP Subcommittee:

A. Overview:

- i. Work with the Air District and technical experts to help in the development of the Community Emissions Reduction Program (CERP)

B. Composition:

- i. Community members
- ii. Steering Committee members
- iii. Technical experts
- iv. Air District Staff

C. Goals/Responsibilities:

- i. Evaluate the needs of the community
- ii. Identify a list of projects that could be funded by the AB 617 incentive funding to achieve emission reductions, balance of new advanced zero or near zero technology in the port-side community
- iii. Work with Air District staff to understand the monitoring data being collected in portside communities
- iv. Provide staff advice on how to present data in way that is easy to understand for members of the public

2. Port Subcommittee:

A. Overview:

- i. Identify strategies that can be incorporated into CERP and Maritime Clean Air Strategy Plan (MCAS), created by the Port of San Diego

B. Composition:

- i. Community members
- ii. Steering Committee member
- iii. Air District Staff

C. Goals & Responsibilities:

- i. Provide a set of recommendations for projects that can reduce emissions from port-related sources with:
 1. Quantified emission reduction estimates
 2. Dates
 3. Costs
 4. Potential funding sources
- ii. Identify projects and actions for the Truck, Cargo handling ship sectors
- iii. Anticipate that recommendations will include:
 1. cargo handling equipment from the port industrial waterfront tenants
 2. port-cargo terminals and related drayage activity
- iv. Submit recommendations to the Port Commission for their concurrence by July 2020

3. Land Use Subcommittee:

A. Overview:

- i. Focus on land use issues focused in Portside communities

B. Composition:

- i. Community members
- ii. Steering Committee members
- iii. Air District Staff

C. Goals & Responsibilities:

- i. Identify specific actions and policies to reduce emissions from local sources
- ii. Identify the entities, such as cities, that have the decision-making authority about these issues
- iii. Work to get commitment from responsible entities to take recommended actions from the subcommittee

4. Truck Subcommittee:

A. Overview:

- i. Formalize ad hoc group that has already been meeting focused on the technological and institutional challenges to electrification of heavy-duty truck fleet as subcommittee; specifically, trucks that serve the port's cargo terminals

B. Composition:

- i. Community members
- ii. Steering Committee members
- iii. Air District Staff

C. Goals & Responsibilities:

- i. Compile information about the truck fleet and the distances the trucks travel
- ii. Identify solutions that can facilitate a shift from fossil fuels while protecting truck drivers from unsustainable burdens

d. **Questions and Feedback from Steering Committee members:**

1. **Larry** – What is the process for selecting or appointing people to participate in each one of the four subcommittees?
 - o **Bill** – People volunteered by email for several of the subcommittees. We could put out announcement for additional volunteers and then put out the list of who has already indicated interest.
 - o **Daniela** – In the chat box, today, write down if you are interested in a subcommittee or send an email to either me or Bill with your interest in any of the subcommittees.
2. **Joy** – Agree membership would be self-selected but would like to add that work being done by the subcommittees would be coming back to the full committee so we all know what is going on and the process is transparent.
 - o **Daniela** – Can add language to the Charter.
3. **Montserrat** – What is deadline to decide if we want to be on a subcommittee?
 - o **Daniela** – There is a tentative two-week deadline to volunteer. You can email either myself or Bill to cast your name.
4. Will the subcommittees be open to the public?
 - o **Bill** – I believe that the public can volunteer themselves to be on subcommittees but I am not sure if they are going to be held in this type of forum or not.
5. **Alicia** – Will subcommittees be organized by communities? For example, National City folks versus San Diego folks.
 - o **Daniela** – It will be by subject area, not necessarily limited in geography.
6. **Elisa** – Will Air District staff be convening as well as participating in all the subcommittee meetings?

- **Bill** – APCD staff is not a voting member of this body, and will not be voting members on the subcommittees either. Will monitor everything, and District is responsible for putting everything into action. We will help formulate them, get the list of people and then they will have to put a chairperson in charge to set up the meeting. We can listen in and participate but will not lead them.
- 7. **David** – Requested that two-week subcommittee volunteering deadline be reduced to one-week, May 5 deadline
- 8. **Jack** – Agreed with David's request to change deadline to 1 week
- 9. **Olympia** – What skills, experiences or observations would be helpful for community members to have so they can actively participate in the different subcommittee?
- 10. **Jim** – Anyone with interest in the topic is welcome. For example, in the CERP subcommittee, if you have an idea on what you want to see that would be perfect for the subcommittee.
- 11. **Olympia** – Many members of the community on the Steering Committee want clean air but do not have the technical background. Aside from being interested, what is the benefit of my presence as a community member in one of the subcommittees? Described experience as a nurse.
 - **Daniela** – Good to have diverse range of experiences that may not be directly correlated with air quality to advise Air District staff. Experience as a nurse will be helpful to CERP subcommittee.
 - **Bob Kard** – Having a diverse range of people whether you have expertise or not on these subcommittees is important. Part of our job is to help you understand if there is something you do not know. Your input is already valuable but becomes more so if we can help you understand things so you can participate more fully.
- 12. **Daniela** – Advised that at least one staff person for the Air District be participate on each of the subcommittees.
 - **Jim** – Agreed with Daniela and mentioned he will be participating in the CERP subcommittee. b
- 13. **Philomena** – Draft charter indicated the meetings would be conducted in compliance with the Brown, how will rules apply for quorum.
 - **Bill** – Subcommittees should not have enough Steering Committee members to constitute a quorum so that they have to come back and report to the entire Steering Committee.
- 14. **Margarita** – Would these subcommittee meetings be set up in a way to accommodate folks who may have other commitments of their time in order to facilitate their participation? Will there be flexibility in setting up meetings dates and times?
 - **Bill** – Each subcommittee will be responsible for determining when they meet.
 - **Daniela** – The first step will be to establish the subcommittee and then once they have volunteers, they can discuss meetings dates and times that work for everyone while being mindful of course of the rules in the charter.

15. **Larry** – Intends to participate in port and truck subcommittees
16. **Roman** – Will translation services be provided for volunteers who require translation? If we are sharing technical information will that be translated as well so folks can read before subcommittee meetings?
- **Daniela** – In the charter working group we worked to address translation issues, but we are discovering now in the virtual world that we do have interpretation options and other tools. I do think that there are some ideas for how we can address that if we do have multi-lingual subcommittees and it may take resources. That is important to flag for the air district.
17. **David** – Important for community members to join subcommittees and offer their unique experiences, and perspective.
18. **Joy** - Please clarify the activity of the CERP subcommittee in relation to the other ones?
- **Jim and Bill** – Increase efficiency of reporting of technical information back to entire Steering Committee and have people that understand the technology going to go into emissions reductions
19. **Joy** – Would all subcommittees report back to CERP committee?
- **Jim and Bill** – No, all subcommittees report back to full Steering Committee.
20. **Jack** – Need to identify the level of emission reductions that any strategy, step, funding or program is going to return. That way members of the Steering Committee and the public have a sense of what to expect back from any of these singular strategies or actions. Will we have measurable goals?
- **Jim** – Yes. I will be discussing this later when I give my full presentation, but what we will need to develop is:
 - a. What are these targets we want to get?
 - b. What metrics to use to show the progress we are making?
 - c. What strategies are we going to employ to reach those targets?
21. **Silvia** – Is the CERP subcommittee more focused on analytic actions?
- **Daniela** – CERP subcommittee more focused on the air quality monitoring data in the portside community.
 - **Jim and Bill** – Yes, it was our understanding that we were asked to find ways to present our data a little more clearly. We are looking for ways to make the data more understandable for everybody.
22. **Sarah** – Description of Truck subcommittee seems focused on port activities so how is it separate from port subcommittee? Concerned that two groups go off in different directions.
- **Joy** – Port subcommittee would be tracking what is going on in the truck subcommittee, but it will also be looking at strategies

related to ships, shore power and on cargo handling equipment and the use of diesel by the Port. So that is where we are seeing that body of work. The truck ad hoc group would be taking a real focus on truckers themselves and what is needed to make this work for them.

- **Sal** – What we are trying to do is keep them separate. The trucking community goes into the communities, so we are trying to follow that and see the impacts in the neighborhoods, roads and everything else. So, we do see it as two separate issues, with the truck subcommittee focusing on the transportation part of it and the impacts on the community while ensuring we have a sustainable system for truckers.

e. Public comments on Subcommittee Proposals:

1. **Vernon** – expressed that CARB is available to assist the Steering Committee and Air District as needed for support, inventory, etc.
 - **Daniela** – Asked about how other subcommittees work in other AB 617 steering committees.
 - **Vernon** – This proposal is similar to technical advisory subcommittee formed in the Bay Area. Appreciated Air District subcommittee layout.
- f. **MOTION by Jiapsi Gomez to approve:** The four subcommittees as described and give the Air District one week to come back with more information on how these subcommittees will work.
- g. Motion approved by consensus (using hands in chat box)

V. Discussion: Charter Working Group (Chuy Flores, Facilitator)

- a. Provided an update on the status of the charter since last meeting in February. The charter working group clarified edits to charter in March regarding:
 - Attendance requirements
 - Term limits
 - Virtual meetings clause
 - Temporarily remove stipend section until County can provide green light on the charter
 - District staff will complete the next revision of the charter for the Steering Committee to review in time to make a final vote at the May Steering Committee Meeting

b. Steering Committee questions/feedback:

1. **Sarah** – Is there a more updated version of the charter on the County website? The document online is from November 2018.
 - **Bill** – Explained website complications prevented current draft from being uploaded to the documents section. Reminded

Steering Committee that until the charter edits are final, it will not replace the document online from 2018. Additional files were sent by EA/BWG Team to Steering Committee members

- a. **Daniela** – A revised document was sent today, and another revised draft would be sent out prior to the May meeting so full Steering Committee can vote on final version.

VI. Review Incentive Funding Proposed Projects (Kathy Keehan, SDAPCD)

- a. Provided a review of Incentive Funding Proposed Projects status:
 - 1. **\$18.2M** in community air protection programs AB 617 funding available to spend
 - 2. **286** applications for overall for district incentive programs
 - 3. Revised project list based on feedback from February meeting to include electrification of trucks
 - 4. Total of **50** projects all together divided by portside and outside-portside census tracts
 - o **\$13M** of portside projects
 - o **\$3.8M** of projects in disadvantaged communities outside the portside geographic
 - o **\$17.1M** total
 - a. Total funding is **\$18.2** leaving room for more project spending in disadvantaged communities
 - 5. Emission reductions, cost effectiveness and electrical equipment data broken down by geographic areas in and out of the portside communities
- b. Reminders to Steering Committee:
 - 1. Projects on the list are not final
 - 2. Some still require CARB approval
 - 3. Potential negative economic impacts of COVID-19 may delay projects
 - 4. Estimate that there is somewhere between **\$1M - \$2M** that will be available for other projects
- c. Recommendation to Steering Committee:
 - 1. Support spending the \$17.1M of incentive funding for those 50 proposed incentive projects
 - 2. Support a second solicitation of projects for uncontracted funds from dropped projects focusing on the electrification of heavy-duty trucks in the portside communities
 - 3. Support District asking the Air Resources Board to extend the deadline for those projects to be completed
- d. **Feedback from Steering Committee**
 - 1. **Roman** – Have you reached out to applicants to see about the probability of moving forward?

- **Kathy** – Starting the process. Did not want to reach out before we knew how the community felt about the projects
- 2. **Joy** – Agreed with proposal for second solicitations to focus on the electrification of heavy-duty trucks and improve timeline flexibility. Shared EHC recommendations (put up via screenshare):
 - In Favor of Approving:
 - a. All the Port electric projects.
 - b. All the electric school bus projects.
 - c. The Port shore power or bonnet system.
 - d. Any truck projects that are electric.
 - Against approving use of incentive funding for the Port and non-Port fossil fuel projects, except for the bonnet system.
 - Recommendation for remaining funds: Re-open the grant application period and outreach to schools for filters and electric buses, to truckers for electric heavy-duty trucks, and to the City for traffic calming to mitigate truck traffic.
- 3. **Kathy** – Provided preliminary estimates of the scenario in which fossil fuel projects were not awarded funding:
 - Removing fossil fuel projects from the funding list will result in lower than predicted emission reduction levels, with the most severe impacts occurring in non-portside communities.
- 4. **Jiapsi** – Will we be able to use the money to fund greenspace projects?
 - **Kathy** – Green space projects are not eligible for current funding program requirements. Could maybe be eligible for AB 617 funds through CERP.
- 5. **Jose** – Do you have a second tier of projects that are not being considered for funding that maybe you could consider?
 - **Kathy** – Do not. Every application that was eligible in portside or disadvantaged communities are on the list.
- 6. **Jack** – Suggested that group consider cost effectiveness and overall emission reduction in order to lower emissions as much as possible.
- 7. **Larry** – Asked for clarification regarding the potential emission reductions lost if fossil fuel-based projects were cut from receiving funding. Offered support for electrification and using state money for projects that will increase emission reductions.
 - **Kathy** – Clarified by confirming projected emission reductions would be lower if fossil fuel projects were cut.
- 8. **Sandy** – Asked for clarification on two points: 1) Why there are no school bus projects slated for funding in the portside communities; and 2) How can the Steering Committee better communicate to magnify the proposed projects and match the current AB 617 funding with the California Energy Commission's Clean Transportation Program?
 - **Kathy** – Answered first question by stating that no applications from the portside communities for electric buses were submitted. For the second question, answered that there is support to explore

options to combine AB 617 funding with other funding sources like the CEC for eligible projects.

9. **Sarah** – Echoed Larry’s point of considering projects based on cost-effectiveness and emission reductions. Acknowledged that while electrification is a great option, it is not always available or the right technology. Offered example that moving from a Tier 1 to a Tier 4 diesel engine can reduce particulate matter emissions by up to 27 times.
10. **Joy** – Clarified that EHC is not recommending to not spend all the funding or forgo any emission reductions but rather focus on prioritizing projects that are pushing projects that are moving technology and air quality into the future for a longer period of time. Emphasized that electric projects have the advantage of reducing greenhouse gasses while non-electric projects cannot.
11. **Roman** – Asked if there is a scenario where the APCD can start looking at the projects that are not being electrified that can potentially move in that direction.
 - **Kathy** – Offered support to facilitate those conversations with applicants but pointed out that fossil fuel-based projects are not easily transferrable to electric projects.
12. **Ashley** – Suggested if Steering Committee potentially votes on those projects that folks are fairly decided upon and provide additional time to review potential alternatives to replace fossil fuel-based projects.
 - **Joy** – Agreed to have a first vote on electric projects and then have a second vote on fossil fuel-based projects.
 - **Ashley** – Suggested a more in-depth presentation next meeting to ensure that members understand the full picture of the projects. Benefits, drawbacks, and limitations from deadlines.
13. **Larry** – asked for clarification on what is being voted on: What’s on the screen or EHC recommendation?
 - Daniela clarified that motion to vote will be determined once motion is brought up by a Committee member after final comments.
14. **Elisa** – Supports the recommendation that was made moving forward with projects that support electrification and pause for the rest.

e. Recommendations from Attendees

1. **Ryan Atencio, (CARB)** – Mentioned that there is the opportunity to talk to CARB about expanding the guidelines to allow more flexibility.
- f. **Motion by Joy for APCD** to move ahead with all electric projects and the Port’s bonnet system projects.
1. **Sandy seconded.** Motion approved by majority (one hand opposed in chat box).
- g. **Additional Motion by Jack** to allocate time in May meeting to assess the alternative fossil fuel projects, their benefits and why the staff is recommending those projects versus devoting all the resources to electrification.
1. **Larry seconded.** Motion approved by majority (no hands opposed in chat box).

VII. CERP Timeline (Jim Swaney, SDAPCD)

- a. Provided an update on the CERP Timeline
 - 1. **August** – present draft CERP to full Steering Committee
 - 2. **September** – Public workshops in National City and Barrio Logan
 - 3. **October** – Return to full Steering Committee with public feedback for approval
 - 4. **November** – Bring CERP to Air District for their approval
 - 5. **January** – Submit CERP to CARB for board hearing
- b. Provided reminder of key CERP building blocks: (Insert Presentation link here)
- c. Provided recommendations to Steering Committee:
 - 1. For those interested, please join the CERP subcommittee
 - 2. Provide feedback on CERP Timeline flexibility and feasibility
 - 3. Brainstorm additional strategies for consideration for CERP

VIII. Public Comments

- a. **Jack** – Do you have a sense of how the committee will go about identifying what it wants to accomplish via the CERP?
 - 1. **Jim** – envisions that the subcommittee would have a brainstorming session(s) and come up with what they think would be a good path forward and then bring that back to the entire Steering Committee to say either: “yes we like that” or “no make these slight changes.” This needs to be finalized in the July timeframe so APCD can write everything up and get that draft CERP back to the Steering Committee in August.
- b. **Joy** – Volunteered to join the CERP subcommittee and noted that other subcommittees could also provide recommendations on CERP targets and metrics to the CERP subcommittee.
- c. **Jack** – Volunteered to join the CERP subcommittee
 - Bill** – Noted partial list of volunteers for the CERP subcommittee.

IX. Closing Remarks (Chuy, Facilitator)

- a. Thanked folks who were able to stay on the meeting and offered updated next steps in preparation for May meeting:
 - 1. Notes will be drafted and sent out to Steering Committee members for review.
 - 2. District staff will be reaching out to Steering Committee members regarding subcommittees as well as the final draft of the charter.

X. Adjourn – 8:20 PM