

Meeting Highlights*
AB 617 Stockton Community Steering Committee Meeting #17

March 3, 2021 | 5:00 pm - 7:30 pm

Virtual Zoom Meeting

Action items for the Stockton Community Steering Committee (CSC):

- Look out for information about the next special CSC meeting to discuss port measures and possible inclusion in the CERP

Action items for San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (District):

- Confirm with CARB that the special meeting the agency hosted about Port measures can be shared with CSC
- Set up a 2nd CSC meeting to discuss Port measures
- Draft language about CSC approach to collaboration and convening technical advisory groups or committees and include that language in the CERP
- Ensure the CERP includes language about how the CERP and the CAMP are integrated with one another

Welcome and Introductions

Erica Manuel, Facilitator & Executive Director/CEO, Institute for Local Government (ILG)

Ryan Hayashi, Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer, District

Erica welcomed the Stockton CSC participants, introduced the ILG facilitation team, explained that the CSC will likely vote during the meeting and flagged the extended meeting time.

Ryan expressed his excitement and appreciation of the CSC for their commitment and time to moving the CERP forward. He thanked the District staff, board members, and CARB staff.

Erica congratulated the CSC on reaching the milestone of the CERP approval. She reminded the CSC of the goals of the CERP to keep in mind while reviewing the document.

Vote: Final CERP Review and Support

Jessica Olsen, Program Manager, District

Jessica presented an overview of the CERP, including the feedback from the CSC. Presentation highlights included:

- CERP is driven by community-identified exposure reduction and outreach strategies
- CERP is supported by strong emissions reduction strategies
- Six main CSC-identified sources of concern:
 - Motor vehicle/idling
 - Heavy duty trucks
 - Port operations
 - Illegal trash burning
 - Industrial processes

- Trains and railroad emissions
- Several CERP measures do not currently exist as District programs, highlighting how innovative and unique the Stockton CERP is
- Including the five remaining measures to be discussed, the CERP may be able to achieve up to 918 tons of emissions reductions
- Without the five remaining measures, the CERP would be able to achieve 274 tons of emissions reductions

Erica asked the CSC if they wanted to discuss the current version of the CERP and specific measures and updates to the language or discuss the five remaining measures. The CSC members began a discussion about the best approach for the dialogue.

Question: Can the budget for air filtration in schools be changed or is the price assigned to it set?

District Response: That is the estimate for what the District thinks it would cost to implement that measure. However, as the CSC moves forward, if we find it costs a little bit more than originally allocated, we can adjust the funding.

Comment: I move to review the strategies the CSC didn't approve and recommend we table the Port strategies to a special session so the CSC can get more adequate information.

ILG Response: Thanks for that feedback.

Comment: I agree, CARB had a meeting earlier today that was informative about the Port and it's wise for everyone on the CSC to get that information. The Port is creating a Community Engagement Committee (CEC) and I think talking about the emissions reductions strategy without a true grasp on what that advisory committee is going to be is premature. The members of the CSC should have a chance to design that CEC.

ILG Response: Thank you.

Comment: I support taking a pause on the Port measures and suggest there be some disclosure on Port commitment to this CEC. The CSC wants to continue to monitor and have meaningful dialogue with the Port.

ILG Response: Thank you.

District Response: The District listened to the CSC and heard the desire to have a forum to discuss what was going on at the Port. The District will continue to bring that collaboration with the CSC to the implementation phase. The District wants to better understand the reason behind postponing the Port measures. What additional information does the CSC need or want to move forward?

Comment: When the CSC heard from the rail folks, we realized we were never going to get clean trains, so some positions changed on whether or not the CSC wanted to allocate money to switcher engines. Now that the CSC has information about the Port, maybe there is a way for us to make this bonnet work. Maybe we provide the funding for the bonnet, but first figure out where the Port is going to find the other \$4-\$6 million. The CSC doesn't want to give \$2 million

to something that may not materialize—there are a ton of other improvements that can be made at the Port.

District Response: The District fully understands those concerns. Through the implementation phase, we can talk about how we formulate what that measure would look like. The CSC can impose time commitments on the Port in order to get that installed in order to receive that funding or the CSC can target a date and if the Port doesn't get it by that date, maybe that funding amount drops. The regulation doesn't start until 2027, so the CSC can get five years of early emissions reductions with a strategy like this.

Follow-up Comment: The Port Commissioners don't even know who the CSC is. The CSC should have some input in designing the CEC and the only thing that gives us that authority right now is the \$2 million.

Comment: I agree that there hasn't been a commitment from the Commissioners at the Port. I think before money is allocated, as a condition of being included in the CERP, the Port prepare a commitment letter. The CSC needs to have something formal before we commit to that kind of money.

ILG Response: Thank you.

Comment: I have looked into the technology and haven't seen anything that is available for electric tugboats. If the CSC is thinking about allocating money to the tugboats, is the state of the art ready for us?

ILG Response: Thank you.

Comment: Regarding the Port, there is a PR issue. As a community, we attend these meetings with Port Commissioners and they refuse to read public comment. That makes it disheartening and makes it feel like the CSC doesn't know if the Port is serious about wanting to work with the community. We have been here for over a year, so what makes us believe that the moment we give money to the Port, that they will actually contact us. AB 617 was created so the community could actually have some leverage on its environment and that leverage is about to disappear once we vote on the CERP. We just want a commitment from the Port that they are going to work with us.

Port of Stockton Response: The Port hears you. When I started talking about this CEC group, the timeline was always going to be Feb/March of this year. I don't think the Port has been dishonest with that information. The Port has every intention of being committed to the CEC as a Port measure and including it in the CERP.

Comment: I think there are some structural issues with the CERP. This is going to be the CSC's implementation document for the next four years. We want to reach our deadline, but there is some simple language that can be added to make this a more structurally sound document during implementation. Those changes need to include a technical advisory group—that is recommended in the Blueprint guidance for AB 617 legislation. The CSC will need more technical hand-holding as we assess strategies for implementation. Lastly, the CAMP has not been sufficiently integrated into the CERP. Without the inclusion of a technical advisory committee or the CAMP, I don't think the CERP is ready to be approved.

District Response: I want to acknowledge a couple of the key comments. The District has and will integrate key language into the CERP. What we have seen work well in Fresno and we are 100% supportive of is subcommittees; instead of one technical advisory group that is in charge of all technical information for several strategies that span several types of technologies, we could have multiple subcommittees. The Fresno CSC currently has meetings that specifically dive into the technical analysis of certain strategies. That is something the District thinks needs to happen with implementation of the Stockton CERP to be successful. To your second point, there was a piece missing in the feedback loop because the CAMP mentions how it will be used to inform the CERP, but there is not language that completes that loop and talks about how the CERP and the CAMP are integrated with one another. The District can certainly include and address that with more specific language.

District Response: The District did add language about use of the CAMP data to inform the strategies and to bring that information back to the CSC, as well as taking feedback from the CSC on where to utilize the mobile monitoring van. Regarding the Port measures being considered, each of the measures requires the development of a project plan, which is shown to the CSC in advance for input. There will be ample opportunity to discuss how those strategies are funded. There will be lots of conversations with the CSC before any money gets spent at the Port.

CARB Comment: From monitoring to emissions inventory, CARB takes all of that information and it goes back into the CERP and we can make adjustments in funding amounts or move it to a different category. With incentives, even for Port strategies, they don't get 100% funding of any item. The Port can choose not to participate and not to apply. There are various pieces the CSC can write in the CERP now in order to move forward.

Comment: If we can put in writing our strong concerns about having a better cost-benefit analysis, health studies, and that the CSC reserves the right to change the preference of these allocations, it would give the CSC some solace.

ILG Response: Thank you, I am seeing some agreement with that in the chat.

District Response: This is not something the Air District has done before. We want to build trust and we plan to be very involved and work directly with the CSC.

Comment: The CARB meeting was very last minute and I was not able to participate. I am a little confused about the purpose of the meeting and would like to know what was discussed.

Comment: We learned a lot of technical information about operations at the Port that we didn't previously know.

District Response: The District hears the CSC and sees that people want to have a separate discussion about the Port measures.

Comment: I would like to make a motion to table the Port measures.

ILG Response: We have a motion and a second. We don't have to engage in a formal voting process if we have group consensus on this recommendation to delay discussion of Port

measures until the next meeting. That means we can move our discussion to the other remaining measures.

Discuss Inclusion of Remaining CERP Measures

Erica Manuel, Facilitator & Executive Director/CEO, ILG

Erica explained that the only measures to be considered for inclusion at the CSC meeting are school buses and locomotives. The CSC discussed school buses first.

SUSD Comment: Stockton Unified is a good grant partner and ally. We were one of three recipients of the CMIS grants from CARB. We got \$4.9 million, and we are excited about what we've done. We have parlayed other grants. We've gotten two buses from the CEC and five buses from SJVAPCD. Along with PG&E rebates, we have made it almost \$8.2 million. We have created an infrastructure for 24 buses and we are looking for the next 11 buses to fill the yard. We will affect 25,000 students in your direct area.

Erica shared the school bus measure language: the measure would cover up to 100% of the cost of replacing up to 10 diesel school buses with electric buses at \$400,000 each.

Comment: This measure is only looking at elementary school students and special education students. There are a lot of students on the RT buses.

SUSD Response: The Director of Transportation is no longer there. But Stockton needs more buses and less people on the road. We should spend the dollars in our own community and compile all of our resources.

District Response: One of the biggest benefits with measures like school buses is you see the direct reduction in toxic air contaminants where it is needed most.

Comment: I like the idea of the school buses. I don't know if it's necessary at this point to fund ten of them. Let's have them in the CERP and decide on the number later.

ILG Response: Thank you for that.

Comment: I would like to make a motion to approve the CERP, with the addition of language that reflects that the CSC is going to be involved and receive technical information.

ILG Response: Thank you.

Erica asked the CSC if they felt comfortable knowing the District incorporated their suggestions about this measure and other feedback into the CERP or if they needed to see it in writing.

Comment: I believe the District has incorporated our feedback and has captured everything.

ILG Response: Thank you.

District Response: The District can definitely put that formal language about collaboration and oversight together and include it in the CERP document.

Comment: The CSC has made multiple references to a technical advisory group and it would help this process. I look forward to seeing that included in the CERP.

Response from ILG: Thank you.

Due to time constraints, the CSC formally motioned to approve the CERP with the inclusion of the school bus measure and language from the District about continued CSC collaboration.

The ILG facilitation team conducted a roll-call vote and tracked the votes in real time. The motion passed unanimously, with 29 CSC members voting “yes” on the motion.

With the remaining time in the meeting, Erica transitioned the discussion to the last measure. She indicated that the group could still reach consensus to add this measure to the CERP that was just approved unanimously.

Erica shared the locomotive switcher measure language: the measure would provide incentive funding for the replacement of older, high polluting switcher locomotives with new clean-technology switcher locomotives operating within and surrounding the Stockton community. The proposed funding would cover up to 95% of the cost of replacing up to four diesel switcher locomotives at up to \$1,700,000 each.

Question: What is the pollution from a switcher? Why are we investing in this?

CARB Response: The switchers are old locomotives that operate on diesel gasoline, so they are very dirty and carcinogenic.

After some discussion, the CSC reached consensus to include locomotives into the approved CERP.

Wrap Up/Next Steps

Erica Manuel, Facilitator & Executive Director/CEO, ILG

Erica congratulated the CSC for their hard work and approval of the CERP.

Comment: Thank you to the District and CARB. This has been like herding cats at a distance without being able to be in the same room, so thank you.

Reminders

The next CSC meeting will be a special meeting on March 9 via Zoom. The topic for that meeting will be the Port CERP measures. All the presentations, meetings highlights, transcripts and the Zoom meeting recording for this meeting will be posted online.

**Refer to meeting audio to review the full details and comments from the meeting.*

Public Comment on YouTube

Comment from Davis Harper: There's a lot of money in the Port's budget, and if residents need more time and information before making a decision, they should have that. I would hope

that the Port Commission plans to facilitate an accessible space for community members to weigh in and understand its business, including what it's doing to reduce emissions.

Comment from Jasmine Leek: We want the greenest city in America! Stockton should lead the way on green infrastructure and policy.

Comment from Cynthia Pinto: It is clear that residents and local advocates want to ensure that the Port will be transparent and inclusive of community voices and representation before signing off on a large sum of money to them.

Comment from Davis Harper: There should be zero hesitancy in including language in the CERP that addresses concerns of the steering committee members raised. That is going above and beyond for the sake of transparency.