

Submitted to Air District 8/9/19 by committee members listed below.

**Comments from AB617 Steering Committee Community Members on the Air District proposed CERP of 8/5/19.**

Document sign-on's:

Dora Hernandez (Mexican Colony),  
Maria Marquez,  
Felipa Trujillo,  
Socorro Guzman,  
Angelica Lopez,  
Antonio Lopez,  
Fermin Vargas,  
Esperanza Castelan,  
Christopher Marquez, (Shafter Residents),  
Byanka Santoyo,  
Tom Frantz,  
Gustavo Aguirre Jr. (EJ Reps)

Most of the 52 items in the Summary sheet has comments by Committee Members below. An asterisk indicates items where dollar amounts are recommended for change. Names of Committee Members supporting these proposed changes will be provided at the next meeting on 8/12/19.

**SD.1 Incentives for installing solar power and energy storage for homes and businesses. \$0 proposed.\***

There should be a monetary amount set aside for this category. The energy storage is not necessary and should be removed. Shafter does not need to help balance the grid with energy storage projects at this time.

We recommend \$15 million of the proposed \$45 million budget just for this category. These funds would be on top of any other subsidies available which the air district has proposed to coordinate. This will ensure that lower income residents who own a home can participate and help lower middle class home-owners to also participate, perhaps with slightly less subsidy or incentive. To go with this program, there should be funding to convert homes and businesses to electric heat-pump cooling and heating. These heating units, together with solar electricity, pay for themselves very quickly and eliminate the need for natural gas in the home. The inventory shows that NOx emissions from heating buildings in Shafter are significant. Since these emissions are concentrated into the four months of the year when PM2.5 levels are at their worst, reducing these emissions with electric heat-pumps, will have a magnified impact when compared to other emissions in the inventory which are spread out for most of the year or just in the summer. Electric water heaters and electric induction stoves or stove tops should be included and made very affordable to any home receiving solar electricity. A community solar

sharing system should be set up for renters and run by City of Shafter. Purchase of land may be included.

**CC.1 Underfired char-broiler filter systems. \$300,000\***

The air district already has funding set aside for this program. We recommend the worst offending restaurant in Shafter receive one of these filtration units using AB617 funding and hopefully one more restaurant can participate using the other funding already available.

Reduce the amount proposed to \$150,000

**LG.1 Free electric lawnmowers, hedge trimmers, and weed eaters for Shafter residents. \$100,000**

We agree with this proposal and amount of funding. No leaf blowers should be included. Give away brooms and rakes instead.

**LG. 2 Incentives for electric commercial lawn and garden equipment. \$40,000**

We agree but no leaf blowers.

The City of Shafter may want to consider a ban on leaf blowers when there is any blowing dust involved in the activity.

**PF.1 Public Fleet Vehicle incentives # of units? \$100,000 per vehicle? No total amount proposed.\***

The total amount for this proposal and the type of vehicles needs more explanation.

We would recommend that the Post Office receive electric vehicles to replace those old polluting vehicles used currently to deliver mail. We would approve five of those for \$500,000 assuming all would be used within the City of Shafter. This money should not be used to simply upgrade old internal combustion vehicles to new internal combustion vehicles.

**C.1 Tune-in, Tune-up events in Shafter. \$400,000**

We recommend one such event and leftover funds applied to electric vehicle programs in Shafter.

**C.2 Incentives for Electric Vehicles and Hybrid Plug-in Vehicles. 100 vehicles \$1,950,000\***

We recommend this proposal generally. Hybrid vehicles should not be part of this program. We recommend the total funds to be at least \$10 million to ensure full participation in the first round of funding for at least 200 vehicles. The extra \$10,000 on top of current incentives is ok if

residents can take advantage of current federal rebates which are in the form of a tax credit. If not, then additional incentive funding may be needed to cover that rebate. Additional funding may be needed on top of the \$800 PG&E rebate for installation of a 240 volt, 40-50 amp, electric circuit for vehicle charging. In some cases a new circuit may be needed out to the front curb of the home. Also, upgrades to electrical boxes may be needed. This should all be 90% funded by this program.

**C.3 Incentives for Public EV charging stations. 17 units \$100,000**

We recommend this proposal generally. We recommend that at least 8 of these charging stations be level 3 for faster charging. All of them should be publicly accessible and non-profit based. The charging rate should be as low as practical to cover the actual rate of electricity used. Each school site in Shafter should have two of these chargers. Businesses with more than 30 employees, except for schools, should not be given this incentive unless they are within the original proposed Shafter boundary or in one of the outlying residential areas such as the Mexican Colony.

**C.4 Training for EV mechanics 2 events \$30,000.00**

We assume this is mostly for mechanics already working in Shafter to upgrade their skills. We approve this proposal.

**C.5 Incentive for car share program \$250,000\***

We recommend this proposal but see that more money is needed to make these cars more affordable for qualifying residents. The price per mile should be subsidized for the first two years for lower middle-class and low-income residents. We want to incentivize the use of these vehicles. We propose \$1 million, if necessary, to keep the rental cost per mile down to 25 cents per mile for most residents for the first two years. We understand the current price of these programs elsewhere may be as high as 40 cents per mile.

**C.6 Community EV test-drive program. \$200,000**

We generally recommend this proposal. It needs more clarification how it would work and how the money is actually spent.

**RB.1 Enhanced incentives to replace wood burning devices. 200 units \$600,000\***

We propose a full incentive for installing an electric fireplace in the space of the wood burning fireplace. Our emphasis on converting heating in homes to electricity does not include incentivizing residents to burn natural gas. This item could be cut to \$300-400,000 and cover the full cost of 200 electric fireplaces.

**RB.2-5 Education and Enforcement**

We recommend these proposals to take place in Shafter. No extra funding is proposed.

**HD.1 Incentive funding for Heavy Duty Truck replacement with zero and near-zero emission technology. 60 trucks \$6,000,000\***

It is not clear what is meant by near-zero emission technology. We support any replacement of heavy duty trucks with zero emission trucks if they operate daily in Shafter (the original boundary) for at least part of each work day and they are based in Shafter. 60 trucks is too many for Shafter alone. We recommend this proposal be cut to \$3 million and ensure that the trucks are all based in Shafter. Zero emission trucks should have the highest priority.

**HD.2 Zero emission yard trucks and truck refrigeration units. 30 \$4,000,000\***

We have recommended 2 yard trucks for the Almond Huller north of Shafter and next to the Labor Camp. \$250,000 is all that is needed. Please explain where the proposed 30 units would be. If they are in Shafter we would consider a greater amount of funding.

**HD.4 Electric School Buses 8 units \$3,200,000\***

We recommend this proposal. There might also be justification for the Rio-Bravo School and Maple School to receive electric buses for transporting students who live in Shafter to these school locations in the country. Currently, dozens of personal vehicles are transporting these students who live in town, morning and afternoon, in a very inefficient way. Budget could be increased to \$4,000,000 for that purpose if shown to be appropriate.

**HD.5 Electric vehicle(s) for Dial-a-Ride ? units \$400,000**

We recommend this proposal.

**HD.6 Incentives for replacing old diesel locomotives with clean diesel locomotives 2 units \$5,200,000\***

This would be such a tiny benefit to Shafter that we recommend it be removed and the money spent elsewhere. \$0

**HD.7 Incentive for replacing old diesel railcar switchers with clean diesel switchers 3 units \$4,100,000\***

We do not recommend any money spent on this proposal. There are no switch yards in Shafter. They are long gone with the potato and carrot sheds. The distribution center south of Shafter at Seventh Standard seldom uses this type of vehicle. \$0 dollars

**IS.1-4 TBD\***

While we recommend less flaring by the oil industry within the 7-mile radius, this should be nearly eliminated by current regulation being developed. Replacing IC pump engines with electricity should perhaps be minimally incentivized if they are within the 7 miles but paying the oil industry to reduce their emissions is generally contrary to our other proposals which strive to reduce the use of fossil fuel in Shafter. We propose that these multi-billion dollar companies do the right thing for the health of Shafter residents and electrify all their pump engines voluntarily. Maximum amount proposed is \$100,000 for 20 IC pump engine replacements in the CRC and JPOil production areas located within the 7 mile radius.

**A.1 Incentives for electric dairy feed mixing equipment 5 units \$6,500,000\***

**We do not recommend this proposal.** The five dairies within the 7 mile radius should all have electric feed mixing equipment by regulation. Several of them already have large installations of solar panels. These are big polluters but we do not have the details of their pollution until there is thorough monitoring of these dairies for a period of one year. Monitoring for total NOx, VOC, PM2.5 and ammonia must be done from fence line or onsite locations. Monitoring for toxic emissions such as methanol, and GHG emissions such as methane and Nitrous oxide should be done. Soil NOx needs to be monitored. Mobile source emissions need to be calculated. Until this information is available from monitoring the committee cannot recommend any money be spent on dairies. **\$0 proposed.**

**A.2 Incentives for low-dust nut harvesters. 25 units \$2,500,000**

This should say “almond” harvesters, not nut. We generally recommend this proposal but only if there are assurances that these 25 units will each be used more than 50% of the time within the 7-mile radius. We do not recommend this proposal if we do not begin this August, 2019, with PM10 monitoring in Shafter so that when these machines are put into use next year, in 2020, we can see if there is a significant decrease in PM10. \$0 dollars recommended if no PM10 monitoring begins in August, 2019.

**A.3 Incentives for alternatives to agricultural burning 2,000 acres \$2,000,000**

We recommend this proposal and the monetary amount generally. But, there must be assurances that all 2,000 acres are within the 7-mile radius. Additionally, the fine must be increased from the current \$500 per acre for burning variances, to at least \$1,000 per acre, with the money added to the \$2,000,000 for all fines paid within the 7-mile radius. Additionally, there should be no incentive for chipping where the chips are sent to a biomass incinerator. The \$1,000 per acre is more expensive than the cost of chipping and hauling the chips to a biomass incinerator. The incentives should only be provided for soil incorporation of the chips.

**A.5 Incentives to replace diesel pump engines with electricity 10 engines \$230,000**

We recommend this proposal but add replacement of natural gas engines also. This proposal should be prioritized to engines closest to Shafter.

**A.7 Incentives to replace diesel tractors with cleanest available equipment. 100 units \$5,000,000\***

We recommend this proposal if every tractor replaced is used 50% of the time or greater within the 7-mile radius. Since this is not likely, in our opinion, this amount should be reduced to 50 units and \$2,500,000.

**A.8 Incentives for the replacement of dairy trucks with zero or near-zero emission trucks. 20 trucks \$2,000,000\***

We recommend against this proposal for several reasons. First, the same reasons against proposal A.1 apply here. Second, we will not recommend proposals for natural gas trucks. Third, we do not think these 20 dairy trucks would be used enough in the 7-mile radius reducing local pollution levels, to justify this expenditure. \$0 recommended.

**A.9 Support dairy digesters**

We will not put our names to a document recommending support for dairy digesters with the massive subsidies currently proposed by the state. These digesters are not a solution to reducing methane (GHG) emissions at dairies. They are not proven to work. They subsidize a broken, unsustainable system of milk production. They actually increase our local air pollution levels. They do not reduce ammonia emissions except temporarily. There is a false statement about that in the accompanying document or slides associated with these CERP proposals.

**A.10 Support Alternative Manure Management at dairies**

We do recommend this proposal for inclusion and want the state, through CDFA and CARB, to put all methane reduction subsidy programs at dairies into this category. This would greatly reduce ammonia emissions, allow for recycling of nitrogen as fertilizer, greatly reduce methane emissions, and reduce groundwater contamination with nitrates.

**A.11 Pesticides \$?\***

We recommend our proposals be implemented and money be made available for the notification system setup. \$250,000 for a notification system setup and operation.

**SC.1 Air Filtration in Schools TBD units \$100,000\***

We recommend this proposal but with a greater amount of money for more classrooms. \$500,000

**SC.2 HAL (healthy living program which is ongoing)**

We recommend this proposal

**VB.1 vegetation barriers around schools TBD\***

We recommend this proposal be pursued further and initially **\$250,000** provided in funding.

**IAQ.1 Mitigate indoor air pollution TBD\***

Money allocated here could be used to replace gas stoves with electric induction stoves. This was mentioned earlier as part of **SD.1**. Eliminates natural gas burning and gas leaks within homes. Better control of heat on the induction stove will lead to less burning or overcooking of food which causes large particulate emissions within the home. **\$1,000,000** should be allocated for **250 induction stoves** to replace natural gas stoves in Shafter if this becomes a separate program.

**UG.1 Tree planting 1,000 trees \$0\***

We recommend this proposal but with money allocated for 5 years of maintenance for each tree planted by the City of Shafter as a green barrier between major pollution sources and sensitive location. We assume appropriate trees will be provided free.  $\$50 \text{ per tree/yr} \times 5 \text{ yr} \times 1,000 = \mathbf{\$250,000}$  Contrary to the question posed by one un-informed person in the audience on 8/5/19, trees will not increase water use within Shafter because they cool the air reducing transpiration rates of all local plants, they will often replace grassy areas which use even more water than trees, and they will incentivize residents to walk more instead of driving vehicles. And, of course, they reduce air pollution levels by absorbing significant pollution.

No funding associated with the final three items **IR.1, O.1, and O.2** but we support them.

**Total proposed funding by committee members: \$45,150,000**

**Original proposed funding by air district: \$44,700,000**