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Presentation Outcome

Provide an overview of staff’s proposed Source Prioritization Process for source evaluations and rulemaking projects
Presentation Outline

• Background/Problem Statement
• Proposed Solutions
• Prioritization Framework
• Next Steps
Presentation Action Requested

None, informational item.
Air District staff should be proposing *emissions reductions strategies* to the Board of Directors in a transparent and consistent way that align with the priorities of the Air District Board and Community.
How is it Currently Working?

• Clean Air Plan is developed
  • Technical assessments of sources
  • Multi-year list of potential control measures created

• Staff presents updates to the Stationary Source and Climate Impacts Committee on rulemaking efforts when rulemaking milestones occur

• Staff presents rules to the Board of Directors for their consideration/approval
What is the Result?

- Perceived lack of transparency around priorities
  - Who/what decides what rules come before the Board?
  - Why were resources shifted?

- Long intervals between updates to the public/Board
  - Long term projected dates constantly shifting/missed due to technical challenges, changes in staffing/priorities
  - Lack of visibility on project = Disappointment in the apparent “lack of progress” in rulemaking
Proposed Solutions

Change framing from “rules” to “emissions reduction strategies”

Rules team does more than rules!
• Work includes source evaluations – research/technical evaluation of sources (“white paper” process)
  • Front loads the technical analysis
  • Once rulemaking is initiated, goes quicker
• Present white paper findings to board, discuss recommended path forward
  • Recommendations: new rule, rule amendments, targeted incentives, policy development, new enforcement strategies, partnership agreements, etc.
• Rules aren’t only solution
Proposed Solutions (cont.)

Focus on short term milestones

- Shorter timelines for white papers (3-6 months)
- When white papers come to Board, outline next steps
  - Research project? Incentive program? Initiate rulemaking?
- If conclusion is initiate rulemaking, outline timing for next few steps
  - Workshop, stakeholder meetings, committee meetings
  - No multi-year timelines – too uncertain, sets false expectations of certainty
Develop a framework to prioritize projects that is supported by the Board and Community

• Long list of sources/rules to address – need to increase trust with transparency

• Previously relied on Clean Air Plan to provide priorities
  • Need a nimbler more frequent process (annual) that can incorporate community priorities (e.g., CERP strategies)

• Consistency in selecting priorities means certainty for staff and increased efficiency
What is the Prioritization Framework?

• The framework by which we will prioritize projects (i.e., source evaluations and rulemaking)

• First step: staff established a list of factors (“prioritization factors”) that will guide the prioritization

• Born out of the multi-divisional work being done to prioritize actions for the Richmond-North Richmond-San Pablo CERP
## Proposed Prioritization Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandate/Commitment</td>
<td>• Legal/prior commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/Health Impact</td>
<td>• Magnitude of emissions, relative potency of pollutant (e.g., GWP, toxicity), and/or exposure potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority/Purview</td>
<td>• Air District's statutory authority or purview to regulate/reduce emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control/Reduction Potential</td>
<td>• Availability and feasibility of controls, and/or achieved and demonstrated performance levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Feasibility Considerations/Impacts</td>
<td>• Economic, socioeconomic, other environmental, and equity impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What Prioritization Factors are Key?

• Mandated commitments: AB 617 BARCT Schedule
  • AB 617 BARCT schedule deadline of December 31, 2023
  • Staff proposal: re-evaluated need, present findings to Board

• Lead with Health
  • Focus on the most impacted communities
  • Prioritize rules/projects that will bring the most health benefits to impacted communities
    • Regional sources (e.g., woodsmoke)
    • Localized sources (e.g., construction impacts, autobody shops)
    • Sources identified in CERPs
What Needs Prioritization?

• AB617 BARCT Schedule Rules
• Sources from the West Oakland Action Plan
• Other commitments (e.g., PM in New Source Review)
• Clean-up Efforts
  • Outdated procedures/methods, clarity needed for enforceability, close compliance loopholes, etc.
  • Staff recommends always including at least one “clean-up” project in annual schedule
  • Will ensure effectiveness of current rules and make process more efficient for the teams enforcing and monitoring compliance
Example Prioritization Exercise

Sources/Rules
- PM Source 1
- PM Source 2
- NOx Source 1
- NOx Source 2
- TAC Source 1
- TAC Source 2

Prioritization Framework
- PM Source 1
- PM Source 2
- NOx Source 1

Clean Up
- Existing Rule 1
- Existing Rule 2
- Existing Rule 3
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Proposed Annual Prioritization Process

- Summer: Using framework, rules team prioritizes sources for evaluation and rules for amendment
  - Includes estimates of resources needed to complete projects
- Fall: Meet internally to discuss prioritization results, timing, and resource needs
  - Consult with Board officers
- Winter: Finalize list of priorities for the coming year
  - Include $ or FTE asks in the budget
- January retreat: Present the year’s priorities
- SSCI Committee meetings: Give updates on progress
Next Steps

• October: Stationary Source and Climate Impacts Committee feedback
• November: Community Equity Health and Justice Committee feedback
• November/December: Test the framework, compile list of priorities, assess resources needed
• January: Present priorities to the Board of Directors
Feedback Requested/Prompt

• Staff is requesting feedback on Key Prioritization Criteria and the proposed Prioritization Process
Slate of Recommended Candidates for the Community Advisory Council
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The Community Equity, Health and Justice (CEHJ) Committee will review the recommendations of the application and interview screening panels and recommend a slate of fifteen candidates for the Community Advisory Council (CAC) for review by the full Air District Board of Directors (Board)
Presentation Outline

• Background

• Application Process

• Selection Panel Process

• Selection Panel Recommendations
Background

• June 2021 staff presented an overview of community feedback on the formation of the CAC and sought input from the Board of Directors

• During public meetings facilitated by the Co-Chairs of the CEHJ Committee, community members provided feedback on the ideal characteristics of candidates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal Candidates (Examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Who reflect the diverse demographics of the Bay Area regarding age, race and languages spoken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• With generational history and experience living in communities heavily impacted by air pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• With a diversity of relevant experience—including environmental justice, technical expertise, health, and Air District functions (or knowledge of the Air District and our work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• With access to other people who have a range of relevant knowledge and technical experience (that could help inform the CAC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAC Composition

• At the July CEHJ meeting, the Committee determined the following composition of the CAC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>4 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa County</td>
<td>4 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1 seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>2 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>1 seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>1 seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>2 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>15 seats</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timeline for Appointment

• **July:**
  • Application period opened mid-July

• **September**
  • Application period closed early September
  • Application Review Panel reviewed 148 applications; 29 candidates moved forward to interviews

• **October**
  • Interviews were recorded and shared with interview review panel
  • Interview Review Panel determined slate

• **November:**
  • CEHJ reviews slate of candidates prepared by Review Panels
  • Board of Directors reviews and potentially confirms slate of candidates
### Applicants by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa County</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selection Panel Process

- **Application Screening Panel**: One Community Member, one CARB staff, one Air District staff
  - Reviewed each applicant at their own pace and convened to select candidates for interviews
  - 29 candidates moved forward for interviews

- **Interview Review Panel**: One Community Member and three Board Members
  - Interviewees were given the same two questions and 10 minutes to respond. Interviews were recorded.
  - Each panelist reviewed recordings on their own and then the panel convened to select the slate of candidates
### Selection Panel Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ms. Margaret Gordon</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hana Mendoza</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Joy Massey</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Charles Reed</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>William Goodwin</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Latasha Washington</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jeff Ritterman</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fernando Campos</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Arieann Harrison</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Juan Aguilera</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fagamalama Violet Saena</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mayra Pelagio</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ken Szutu</td>
<td>Solano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>John Jefferson</td>
<td>At Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rio Molina</td>
<td>At Large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographics of Recommended Slate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Ethnicity</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some candidates chose to select more than one ethnicity to self-identify ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Five candidates noted languages spoken at home including Chinese, Samoan, and Spanish.
Next Steps

Air District staff is continuing to coordinate with the Co-Chairs of the CEHJ to consider:

• A youth seat on the Council
• Process for identifying alternate candidates in the case of attrition.
• Process of recruiting and appointing candidates into the future

The Air District may continue to consider applicants from this process
Action Requested

The CEH&J Committee is requested to act on the recommendation:

Review and approve the final slate of fifteen candidates and recommend that slate to the Board of Directors for its review and decision.
Annual Progress Report on Owning Our Air: The West Oakland Community Action Plan (WOCAP)
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The Committee will hear an update on Owning Our Air: The West Oakland Community Action Plan implementation activities.
No action requested. Item is information only.
Owning Our Air Overview

- Co-led by the Air District and West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project (WOEIP)
- Plan developed by community Steering Committee
- Adopted by Air District Board in October 2019
- Implementation guided by Steering Committee, community and agency partners
Implementation Progress

Health
- Health Equity Advisory Committee formed
- City Council to hear health-protective City Planning Code Amendments
- Urban Greening grants from Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Alameda County Transportation Center (ACTC), California Air Resources Board (CARB) and Port of Oakland (POAK) totals 1M+

Land Use & Mobile Sources
- California Waste Solutions (CWS) to move to Gateway Industrial District
- “Electric Vehicle (EV)-ready” buildings are required; Natural Gas (NG) in new buildings banned
- Sustainable Port Collaborative formed
- City develops tools to reduce emissions from truck-attracting businesses

Regulations & Enforcement
- CARB adopts Advanced Clean Truck regulation & amends At-berth reg.
- On-going Air District inspections of all permitted sources in West Oakland
- Air District updates Complaint Policy to improve referral system
- CARB amends TRU reg. in 2022 (expected)

West Oakland Investments
- ACTC awards 2M for bus stop improvements, free transit passes
- Caltrans awards 14M for the 7th Street Connection Project
- Air District awards 3M to deploy 30 hydrogen fuel cell drayage trucks domiciled at POAK
- Over half the tugboats at POAK repowered with cleaner diesel engines
Emission Reductions Between January 2018 and June 2021

- Total Incentive Funds Awarded: $29.8 Million
- Estimated Annual Tons of Emissions Reduced:
  - 14 tons DPM
  - 12.5 tons PM2.5
  - 9821 Tons Cancer-risk Weighted Toxics
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Next Steps

- Continued commitment from partner agencies
- Continued community engagement & recruitment
- Creation of Implementation Teams
Community Perspectives

Committee to hear WOEIP and Steering Committee member reflection on Owning Our Air Implementation