

**BEFORE THE HEARING BOARD OF THE
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**



In the Matter of the
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL OFFICER of the
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT
DISTRICT

Complainant,

vs.

TESLA MOTORS, INC.

Respondent.

Re: Tesla Motors, Facility No. A1438

Docket No. 3751

JOINT PETITION FOR MODIFICATION OF
STIPULATED ORDER OF CONDITIONAL
ABATEMENT

Hearing Date: May 27, 2025

Time: 9:30AM

Place: 375 Beale St, San Francisco, CA 94105

Complainant Air Pollution Control Officer (“APCO” or “Complainant”) of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (the “Air District”) and Respondent Tesla Motors, Inc. (“Tesla” or “Respondent”) (collectively, the “Parties,” and individually, “Party”) hereby jointly petition the Hearing Board to modify Paragraph 4 of its June 26, 2024, Order for Abatement directed to Respondent to change “ninety (90) calendar days” to “one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days,” as allowed by Hearing Board Rule 10.13(b). The Parties also jointly request that this be placed on the consent calendar.

DISCUSSION

On June 26, 2024, the Hearing Board issued a Stipulated Order for Abatement directed to Tesla that requires Tesla to, among other things, hire an engineering firm that must produce a report within 90 days of being hired. (Findings and Decision for a Stipulated Abatement Order, ¶ 4.) After the Hearing Board issued the Order, the Parties began working to implement the Order. Tesla timely submitted the names of three to five engineering firms and a draft scope of work (SOW), in accordance with Paragraph 2.a. of the Order, to the Air District. Since then, the Parties have been meeting and conferring on the scope of work, pursuant to Paragraph 2.b. of the Order. The Parties believe they have now reached agreement on the Scope of Work and the engineering firm soon will begin work on its required report.

1 During the above-described SOW meet and confer process, Tesla has been engaging with the
2 engineering firms whose names Tesla submitted to the Air District under Paragraph 2.a. of the Order.
3 These engineering firms have asked for additional time to complete a report. The Parties believe that
4 allowing additional time would be in the best interests of the public and both the Parties because it will
5 allow for the hired firm to complete a report that is consistent with and more assured to meet all the
6 requirements of the Hearing Board's June 26 Order.

7 The Hearing Board has the authority to modify its Order under Hearing Board rule 10.13(b),
8 which provides that:

9 The Respondent or APCO may file an application to modify the conditions of an order of
10 abatement, including the final compliance date. The Hearing Board may consider the
11 application at a regular hearing or on the Consent Calendar with 10 days public notice.
12 Therefore, the Parties respectfully request that, after public notice and a hearing, the Hearing Board
13 increase the amount of time for the selected engineering firm to complete the required report from 90 days
14 to 180 days by issuing an order as an addendum to the June 26 Order that states that the language in
15 Paragraph 4 of the Order saying "Within ninety (90) calendar days of being hired, the firm(s) shall" with
16 language saying "Within one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days of being hired, the firm(s) shall."

17 Dated: May 15, 2025

ALEXANDER G. CROCKETT, ESQ.
General Counsel
ALEXANDRA KAMEL, ESQ.
Senior Assistant Counsel
Attorneys for
Dr. Phillip M. Fine
Executive Officer/APCO
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

22 By: Alexandra Kamel
23 Alexandra Kamel, Esq.

24 Dated: May 15, 2025

RICK R. ROTHMAN, ESQ.
DAVID K. BROWN, ESQ.
Attorneys for TESLA MOTORS, INC.

26 By: Rick Rothman
27 Rick R. Rothman, Esq.
28

**BEFORE THE HEARING BOARD OF THE
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**



In the Matter of the)
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL OFFICER of the)
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT)
DISTRICT)
Complainant,)
vs.)
TESLA MOTORS, INC.)
Respondent.)
Re: Tesla Motors, Facility No. A1438)
_____)

Docket No. 3751

DECLARATION OF HARI BHARADWAJ IN
SUPPORT OF JOINT PETITION FOR
MODIFICATION OF STIPULATED ORDER
OF CONDITIONAL ABATEMENT

Hearing Date: May 27, 2025

Time: 9:30AM

Place: 375 Beale St, San Francisco, CA 94105

I, Hari Krishna Bharadwaj, declare:

1. I am an Environmental Affairs Manager with defendant Tesla, Inc. ("Tesla"). I have personal knowledge of the following facts and, if called upon to testify as a witness, could and would testify competently to these facts. I submit this Declaration in Support of the Joint Petition for Modification of Stipulated Order of Conditional Abatement.

2. On June 26, 2024, the Hearing Board issued a Stipulated Order for Abatement directed to Tesla that requires Tesla to, among other things, hire an engineering firm that must produce a report within 90 days of being hired. (Findings and Decision for a Stipulated Abatement Order, ¶

3. In order to implement the requirements of the Order, Tesla and representatives of the District have engaged in several meet and confer discussions. Tesla timely submitted the names of three engineering firms and a draft scope of work to the District as required by Paragraph 2.a of the Order and has been working with those engineering firms to confirm the time needed to complete the report required by Paragraph 4 of the Order.

4. I have been in touch with the engineering firms submitted to the District and they informed

me that they will need more time for the preparation of the report required by Paragraph 4 of the order. One firm proposed a timeline of 150 days and another has proposed a timeline of 160 days for report preparation. Based on these discussions and discussions with District staff, it would appear that 180 days should be sufficient time for the preparation of the report.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 12th day of May, 2025 at Fremont, California.

Dated: May 12, 2025

B. Hari Krishna

Hari Krishna Bharadwaj



**BEFORE THE HEARING BOARD OF THE
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL OFFICER of the
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT
DISTRICT

Complainant,

vs.

TESLA MOTORS, INC.

Respondent.

) DOCKET NO. 3751

) FINDINGS AND DECISION FOR A
) STIPULATED ABATEMENT ORDER

) BAY AREA AIR QUALITY
) MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
) REGULATIONS ("REGS") 2-1-307 AND

) 2-6-307

) Hearing Date: June 25, 2024
) Time: 9:30 AM
) Place: 375 Beale St, San Francisco,
) CA 94105

FINDINGS AND DECISION OF THE HEARING BOARD

In accordance with Health and Safety (Health & Saf.) Code sections 42450 and 42451, a hearing on the Accusation and Motion to Enter a Stipulated Conditional Order for Abatement was heard on June 25, 2024, pursuant to notice and in accordance with the applicable provisions of Health and Saf. Code sections 40800 et seq. The following members of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Hearing Board ("Hearing Board") were present: Valerie Armento, Chair; Barbara Toole O'Neil, Vice Chair; Amelia Timbers, Rajiv Dabir, and Dr. Peter Y. Chiu. Complainant Air Pollution Control Officer ("APCO") of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District ("Air District" or "Complainant") was represented by Alexandra Kamel, Senior Assistant Counsel. Respondent Tesla Motors, Inc. ("Tesla") was represented by Rick Rothman.

At the aforementioned hearing, the public was given an opportunity to testify, testimony was received and the matter was submitted. The parties have stipulated to issuance of this Order. The Hearing

1 Board finds and decides that good cause exists to issue the Stipulated Order for Abatement ("Stipulated
2 Order" or "Order"). This finding of good cause is based on the following:

3 1. The Air District is a body corporate and politic established and existing pursuant to Health
4 & Saf. Code sections 40000 et seq., 40200 et seq., 40700 et seq., and 42300 et seq., and is charged with
5 the primary responsibility for controlling air pollution from nonvehicular sources, including the sources at
6 issue in this proceeding, in all or portions of the nine Bay Area counties, including all of Alameda
7 County, where Tesla's North and South Paint Shops are located. (Health & Saf. Code, §§ 40000, 40200.)
8 Complainant is authorized by law to adopt and enforce rules and regulations related to air quality in all
9 nine of the Bay Area Counties, including Alameda County. (Health & Saf. Code, §§ 40001, subds. (a) &
10 (b).) Complainant APCO is appointed by the Air District's Board of Directors, (Health & Saf. Code, §
11 40750), to "observe and enforce" all District regulations, permit conditions, variances, and enumerated
12 provisions of the Health and Safety Code. (Health & Saf. Code, § 40752.) The APCO may impose
13 conditions in any permit that are "reasonably necessary to ensure compliance with federal or California
14 law or District regulations." (Dist. Reg. 2, rule 1, § 403.) The APCO is also authorized to seek an order
15 for abatement from the District's Hearing Board to stop a person from violating "any order, rule, or
16 regulation prohibiting or limiting the discharge of air contaminants into the air." (Health & Saf. Code §
17 42451(a); Hearing Board Rules § 4.1 (June 2, 2011).)

18 2. Respondent is owns and operates an electric vehicle manufacturing and assembly facility at
19 45500 Fremont Boulevard, Fremont, California ("Facility"), at which it operates the North Paint Shop and
20 the South Paint Shop (collectively, "the Paint Shops"), where Tesla paints electric vehicles that it
21 produces for sale. The Paint Shops are located and operate within the Air District's jurisdiction, and Tesla
22 is required to obtain a permit(s) for the Paint Shops from the Air District, and to operate the Paint Shops
23 in accordance with the permit(s) issued by the Air District. The Paint Shops emit Precursor Organic
24 Compounds ("POCs") and Toxic Air Contaminants ("TACs"). To protect air quality and public health,
25 Tesla's permits require it to control emissions of these air pollutants using an abatement system that
26 captures and collects the pollutants and then abates them, primarily through incineration using a device
27 called a thermal oxidizer.

3. Regs. 2-1-307 and 2-6-307 require Tesla to operate the Facility, including the Paint Shops, in accordance with all its permit conditions.

4. Complainant alleges that Tesla violated, and continues to violate, Regs. 2-1-307 and 2-6-307 by failing to operate the Paint Shops in accordance with conditions of the Paint Shops' permits; specifically, by failing to properly abate emissions from the operation of the Paint Shops, and by failing to properly maintain and operate its abatement equipment. In particular, the APCO alleges Tesla bypasses the abatement equipment at the Paint Shops, venting the emissions to the atmosphere without proper abatement or shutting the abatement equipment down and venting the emissions to the atmosphere without proper abatement when other components of the production lines in its paint shops malfunction. Tesla filed a notice of defense in which it denied all of the allegations.

5. Complainant and Respondent have agreed to stipulate to the issuance of this Conditional Order for Abatement pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 42451(b). The Hearing Board may issue a stipulated order without finding that Tesla violated any Air District order, rule, or regulation prohibiting or limiting the discharge of air contaminants into the air. (Health & Saf. Code § 42451, subd. (b).)

6. This Stipulated Order represents a compromise between the Parties and does not serve as an admission of liability or guilt as to any of the violations alleged in the Accusation.

7. Respondent stated during the hearing that it can comply with the conditions of the Stipulated Conditional Order for Abatement, which are set forth below.

CONCLUSIONS

8. The Parties have stipulated to issuance of this Stipulated Order pursuant to Health & Saf., Code section 42451, subdivision (b).

9. It is not unreasonable to require Tesla to comply with District rules and regulations.

10. The issuance of this Stipulated Order after a fully noticed hearing would not constitute a taking of property without due process of law. The issuance of this Stipulated Order is not expected to result in the closing or elimination of an otherwise lawful business, but if it does result in such closure or elimination, it would not be without a corresponding benefit in reducing air contaminants.

11. This Stipulated Order is not intended to be, nor does it act as, a variance, and Respondent remains subject to all rules and regulations of the Air District, Air District permits, and with all other applicable provisions of federal and California law. Further, nothing herein shall be deemed or construed to limit the authority of the Air District to issue Notices of Violation; seek civil penalties, criminal penalties, or injunctive relief; or to seek further orders for abatement or other legal relief, as allowed by law.

ORDER

THEREFORE, based on the foregoing and good cause appearing, the Hearing Board hereby orders Tesla to comply with all of the following conditions, or in the alternative, cease any operation of the North and South Paint Shops in violation of Rcgs. 2-1-307 and 2-6-307:

1. Engineering Evaluation and Recommendations for Addressing Unabated VOC Emissions:
Tesla shall hire and pay one or more engineering firms, in accordance with this Order, to evaluate and make recommendations on potential options for Tesla to eliminate the emission of unabated VOC emissions from its North and South Paint Shops, as detailed in the scope of work developed under Paragraph 2.a.ii. of this Order, in violation of Tesla's permit conditions and other regulatory requirements.

2. Selection of Engineering Firm(s) and Development of Scope of Work: To comply with Paragraph 1 of this Order, Tesla shall do the following:

a. Within thirty (30) calendar days of the Hearing Board issuing this order, Tesla shall submit to the APCO for approval the following items, in writing:

i. The names of three to five engineering firms that each have expertise in either evaluating equipment like that at Tesla's North and South Paint Shops, or in evaluating reliability and preventive maintenance programs, particularly vehicle production facility preventive maintenance, with summaries of applicable past projects and the kind of expertise provided by each of the firms; and

ii. A written scope of work consistent with this Order that Tesla proposes to provide to the selected engineering firm(s).

b. Within sixty (60) calendar days of receiving the scope of work from Tesla under Paragraph 2.a.ii. of this Order, the APCO shall review the proposed engineering firms and proposed scope

1 of work submitted by Tesla under Paragraph 2.a and (i) strike from Tesla's list of proposed firms any firm
2 that does not meet the requirements of Paragraph 2.a.i. and (ii) provide any proposed revisions to the
3 proposed scope of work necessary to ensure that the requirements of this Order are fulfilled. If the APCO
4 strikes any firm proposed by Tesla or provides any revisions to the proposed scope of work, the APCO
5 shall provide Tesla with an explanation as to the basis of such decision for the purpose of assisting Tesla
6 in selecting another firm or to make revisions to the scope of work, but this decision is not appealable.
7 The APCO may require Tesla to furnish additional names of firms should the APCO determine that two
8 or more of the originally proposed firms are not suitable, in which case Tesla shall have 15 calendar days
9 from the date on which the APCO notifies Tesla that two or more of the originally proposed firms are not
10 suitable to provide an additional two or more engineering firm names that meet the requirements of this
11 Order. If there is any disagreement between Tesla and the APCO regarding the scope of work, they shall
12 meet and confer about the revisions provided by the APCO. In the event an agreement cannot be reached
13 between Tesla and the APCO regarding the scope of work, the disagreement shall be presented to the
14 Hearing Board for resolution.

15 c. Within seven (7) calendar days of receiving the APCO's approval of the firms and
16 scope of work under Paragraph 2.b, Tesla shall send the approved firm(s) selected the scope of work
17 produced by the process in Paragraph 2.b.ii, which shall include requiring the firm(s) to:

18 i. Meet with Air District staff and Tesla before the firm(s) begins its study
19 regarding implementing this Order and its scope of work, and then, every two weeks thereafter, give the
20 APCO an update on its work under this Order; and

21 ii. Give the APCO, upon request, a copy of any information it obtained, from
22 Tesla or otherwise. If any such information is trade secret or otherwise confidential under California law,
23 Tesla and the APCO shall follow the Air District rules and, where appropriate, any other applicable
24 California laws for handling such information.

25 d. Within twenty (20) calendar days of sending the firm(s) the scope of work under
26 Paragraph 2.c., Tesla shall attempt to hire one or two of the approved firms, as necessary to fulfill the
27 requirements of this Order. In the event Tesla is unable to hire any of the firms approved by the APCO
28

1 under Paragraph 2.b due to scheduling unavailability, Tesla shall provide the APCO three more additional
2 engineering firm names that meet the requirements of this Order, in accordance with Paragraph 2.a.i, and
3 the APCO shall review them in accordance with Paragraph 2b. Tesla must hire a firm with expertise in
4 evaluating equipment like that at Tesla's North and South Paint Shops, and the same or no more than one
5 different firm with expertise in evaluating reliability and preventive maintenance programs, particularly
6 automotive vehicle production facility preventive maintenance.

7 3. Engineering Firm Access and Independence: Tesla shall do the following with respect to
8 the engineering firm(s) it hires under this Order:

9 a. Include Air District staff in all written communications it has with the selected
10 firm(s);

11 b. Permit the firm(s) to talk freely and confidentially with Air District staff at any
12 time, with or without Tesla present or knowing about the conversation or its contents; and

13 c. Give the firm(s) all access to equipment, control systems, employees, documents,
14 and anything else that the firm(s) determines it reasonably needs to carry out its responsibilities and
15 ensure compliance with this Order. If any such information is trade secret or otherwise confidential under
16 California law, Tesla and the APCO shall follow the Air District rules and, where appropriate, any other
17 applicable California laws for handling such information.

18 4. Report and Recommendations for Addressing Unabated VOC Emissions: Within ninety
19 (90) calendar days of being hired, the firm(s) shall provide one report to both Tesla and the APCO that (i)
20 is not edited or changed in any way by Tesla, (ii) is signed under penalty of perjury by a licensed
21 electrical Professional Engineer, and a licensed mechanical Professional Engineer; and (iii) includes, at a
22 minimum, all of the following:

23 a. A description of the firm and its qualifications to fulfill Paragraph 1 of this Order;

24 b. A summary of how such reviews are generally conducted;

25 c. A description of the requirements of this Order;

1 d. A summary of all the steps the firm took, the information it reviewed, and a
2 description of the information and access requested from Tesla and, if Tesla denied any of the firm's
3 requests for information and/or access, a summary of the information requested and Tesla's response;

4 e. A summary of Tesla's maintenance and reliability plan and its adequacy, as well as
5 any recommendations to improve it or bring it up to automotive vehicle industry standards;

6 f. Identification and a brief explanation of any unavoidable emergency and/or safety
7 hazards that would result in any emission of unabated VOCs from its North and/or South Paint Shops in
8 violation of Tesla's permit conditions and other regulatory requirements, or a statement that none exist, as
9 applicable;

10 g. An evaluation and recommendations on ways to eliminate the shutdown and/or
11 bypassing of the North Paint Shop and South Paint Shop abatement systems while there are any emissions
12 in the North Paint Shop and South Paint Shop production lines, except in situations where doing so is
13 absolutely unavoidable for emergency and/or safety reasons. This analysis shall include, for example, and
14 without limitation, ways for Tesla to keep the bypass vents closed and the abatement systems operating
15 when there is a production line upset in the North Paint Shop or South Paint Shop, until all controlled
16 emissions have been exhausted through the abatement system;

17 h. With respect to situations where shutting down and/or bypassing the North Paint
18 Shop or South Paint Shop abatement systems is absolutely unavoidable for reasons of emergency and/or
19 serious risk to the health and physical safety of persons, the engineering firm(s) shall evaluate and make
20 recommendations on how to minimize the recurrence of the root causes and contributing factors that have
21 given rise to such situations, to the maximum extent feasible. This analysis shall include, for example and
22 without limitation, evaluation of and recommendations regarding (i) improved preventative maintenance
23 of the North Paint Shop and South Paint Shop's thermal oxidizers and other components of the abatement
24 systems, (ii) improved operator training, (iii) replacement of or upgrades to the thermal oxidizers and
25 related components of the abatement systems, (iv) changes to the control logic and/or design of the
26 operations of the North Paint Shop and South Paint Shop, and (v) any other area that could potentially

1 reduce the recurrence of situations necessitating the shutdown and/or bypassing of the abatement system;
2 and

3 i. For each recommendation provided in the Report, an estimate of the minimum time
4 needed to implement the recommendation.

5 5. APCO Review of Engineering Report: Within forty-five (45) calendar days of receiving
6 the firm(s)'s report under Paragraph 4, the APCO may identify any concerns with the report by notifying
7 Tesla and the firm(s). If there is any disagreement between Tesla and the APCO, they shall meet and
8 confer about the firm(s)'s report, and the APCO shall inform Tesla and the firm(s) of any changes to its
9 list of concerns. In the event an agreement cannot be reached between Tesla and the APCO regarding the
10 list of concerns, they shall provide the firm(s) with the APCO's final list of concerns and Tesla's
11 response, if any. Within thirty (30) calendar days of receiving the APCO's final list of concerns and
12 Tesla's response, the firm(s) shall go back and address the issues identified by the APCO and issue a
13 revised report consistent with Paragraph 4 that addresses the APCO's concerns and Tesla's response, with
14 consideration and notation of Tesla's response, if consistent with this Order and the firm's professional
15 responsibilities.

16 6. Submission of and Hearing On Proposed Plan to Address Unabated VOC Emissions:

17 a. Within sixty (60) calendar days of the firm(s) issuing a report or revised report,
18 under Paragraphs 4 or 5, as applicable, Tesla shall file with the Hearing Board and serve on the APCO a
19 proposed plan and timeline, not to exceed six months, for implementing all of the firm's
20 recommendations, or, if there are any recommendations that Tesla contends it cannot feasibly implement
21 or will require more than six months to implement, a response, with supporting documentation from an
22 outside entity such as a vendor, demonstrating why it cannot feasibly implement those recommendations
23 or why it will need more than six months to implement those recommendations. Tesla shall not claim it
24 cannot feasibly implement a recommendation based solely on cost or production effects, and any claim of
25 infeasibility must also be based on technical infeasibility. Tesla shall attach to its filing an unaltered
26 version of the firm(s)'s report under Paragraph 4 or 5, as applicable. Tesla's filing required under this
27
28

1 Paragraph 6.a. shall be signed, under penalty of perjury, by a Tesla Vice President-level executive with
2 responsibility for, and control over, the filing.

3 b. Within sixty (60) calendar days after service of Tesla's proposed plan and timeline,
4 the APCO shall file its response, if any, with the Hearing Board.

5 c. Within fifteen (15) calendar days after the APCO files its response (or within 15
6 calendar days after the deadline for the response, if the APCO does not file a response), the Hearing
7 Board shall hold a hearing to determine an appropriate further order to require Tesla to implement the
8 proposed plan and timeline for implementing all of the firm's recommendations.

9 7. Extensions of Time: Tesla or the APCO may request, and the Hearing Board may grant,
10 reasonable extensions of time for any deadline established in this Order upon a showing of good cause or
11 if the other party does not object. Any such extension shall be subject to the APCOs written consent,
12 which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld. Any such extension shall be issued after a hearing in
13 the form of a further Order, unless Tesla and the APCO stipulate to the extension, in which case a hearing
14 need not be held, but a further Order will still be issued.

15 8. Reporting of Bypasses and Temperature Excursions: Immediately upon the effective date
16 of this Order, Tesla shall report to the APCO each and every bypass valve opening and thermal oxidizer
17 temperature excursion (where the thermal oxidizer falls below 1400 degrees Fahrenheit for any period of
18 time) at the North and South Paint Shop, whether Tesla believes the event is a deviation or not, within 10
19 calendar days of the bypass event or any thermal oxidizer temperature excursion occurring; in each such
20 report, Tesla shall include all information required by Standard Condition F of Tesla's Title V permit, as
21 well as emissions and supporting calculation(s). This reporting shall be in addition to Tesla's reporting of
22 bypass valve opening and thermal oxidizer temperature excursions that Tesla identifies and reports as
23 deviations in accordance with Standard Condition F of Tesla's Title V permit. Failing to report a
24 deviation in connection with Tesla's Title V obligations may result in enforcement action.

25 9. Notices: Where any notice, submission, or communication is required by or related to this
26 Order, it shall be submitted in writing via email to the representative of record in the Hearing Board
27 proceeding which gave rise to this Order. Any Party may change its designated notice recipient or notice
28

1 method provided above in accordance with Hearing Board rules. Notices submitted pursuant to this
2 section shall be deemed received upon emailing.

3 The Hearing Board shall retain jurisdiction over this matter and this Order shall remain in effect
4 until the Hearing Board has entered a further order in accordance with Paragraph 6.c, above.

5
6 SO STIPULATED:

7
8 Dated: June 25, 2024

By: Alexandra Kamel
ALEXANDER G. CROCKETT, ESQ.
General Counsel
ALEXANDRA KAMEL, ESQ.
Senior Assistant Counsel
Counsel for
PHILIP M. FINE
Executive Officer/APCO
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

14
15
16 Dated: June 25, 2024

By: Rick Rothman
RICK ROTHMAN, ESQ.
DAVID K. BROWN, ESQ.
Counsel for
TESLA MOTORS, INC._

19
20 SO ORDERED:

21
22 Dated: 8/26/2024

By: Valerie J. Arriente
Valerie J. Arriente, Esq.
Hearing Board Chair
Bay Area Air Quality Management District

BEFORE THE HEARING BOARD
OF THE
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL OFFICER of
the BAY AREA AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Complainant,

vs.

TESLA MOTORS, INC.

Respondent.

Docket No.: 3751

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

City and County of San Francisco

ss.

I, Marcy Hiratzka, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury as follows:

That I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18 years and not a party to the above-entitled action; that I served a true copy of the attached **Findings and Decision For a Stipulated Abatement Order** on:

Rick Rothman, Esq.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
300 South Grand Ave., 22nd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3132
Rick.rothman@morganlewis.com

David K. Brown, Esq.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
300 South Grand Ave., 22nd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3132
David.brown@morganlewis.com

via email and US Certified Mail on June 26, 2024, and on:

Alexandra Kamel, Esq., Sr. Assistant Counsel
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
375 Beale Street, 6th Floor
San Francisco, California 94105
akamel@baaqmd.gov

via email on June 26, 2024

DATED: June 26, 2024

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "MH" or "Marcy Hiratzka" in a stylized script.

Marcy Hiratzka
Clerk of the Boards