

**AB 617 Incentives Strategies Public Consultation Meeting - October 15, 2020  
Breakout Room Discussion**

Group:   Main Room  

Moderator:   Evangelina Barrera  

Notetaker:   Pedro Piqueras  

Volunteer to provide summary to the larger group:   Conchita Pozar  

**Incentives Strategy Exercise: Discussion Questions**

1. What are the top 3 factors we should use to prioritize?
2. What other factors should go into deciding which projects to recommend?

**Discussion Notes for Question 1: What are the top 3 factors we should use to prioritize?**

Suggested Factor or Criteria	Notes	Rank (Top 3)
<b>Area characteristics:</b> rural areas vs urban areas, population size, air pollution emissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Erica: Population size and sensibility of the population.</li> </ul>	1 Vote
<b>CERP impact:</b> prioritize projects that directly support the CERP goals		
<b>Community emissions:</b> prioritize projects in communities with more emissions		
<b>Consider previous funding:</b> can consider providing more funding toward projects in communities that received less AB 617 funding previously		Higher priority
<b>Cost-effectiveness:</b> prioritize projects that reduce more pollution for the cost		
<b>Emissions reduced:</b> prioritize projects that reduce more emissions, regardless of cost or location	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conchita: It is urgent that the air is better. The dust must stop entering the houses.</li> <li>Maria R Lopez: They have high percentages of children with asthma. The Port of Long Beach and San Pedro are sources of contamination.</li> <li>Dulce Altamirano: Prioritizing projects that reduce emissions without looking at the cost. Something also needs to be done with schools and homes. These are surrounded by refineries. It would be great if they added filters.</li> <li>Maria Reyes: There are many points to improve. Have a true approach to stop companies from doing violations. Trucks are also</li> </ul>	

**AB 617 Incentives Strategies Public Consultation Meeting - October 15, 2020  
Breakout Room Discussion**

Suggested Factor or Criteria	Notes	Rank (Top 3)
	<p>important. Traffic also contributes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rebecca Zaragoza: Reduction of emissions in ECV 8 votes.</li> <li>• Ada Trujillo: The industry has to stop polluting so much.</li> <li>• Yaneth: Focus on the important emission points and strategize for immediate impact. Reduce pavement dust as an immediate thing.</li> <li>• Conchita: Focus on projects that emit diesel. You also have to prioritize paving and planting trees.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Emission reduction vs exposure reduction:</b> prioritize projects that reduce emissions rather than only reducing exposure (e.g. air filtration)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maria Reyes: Filters in schools.</li> <li>• Rebecca Zaragoza: Strategies must be found that can protect families while reducing emissions. There is an ozone problem at ECV coming from Los Angeles.</li> <li>• Ada Trujillo: Filters should be installed in homes as well as schools.</li> <li>• Yaneth: They are cost efficient and are a direct impact solution for families. Focus on home</li> <li>• Erica: Focus on more exposure reduction</li> </ul>	5 Votos
<p><b>Project location/impacts:</b> prioritize projects located near schools/homes, other factors</p>		
<p><b>Project type:</b> mobile, stationary, or exposure reduction projects</p>		
<p><b>Type of technology:</b> prioritize zero-emission projects (vs. near-zero emission)</p>		
<p><b>Type of pollution reduced:</b> prioritize projects that reduce toxic air pollutants vs criteria pollutants only</p>		
<p><b>Type of applicant</b></p>		
<p><b>Distribute funds across communities</b></p>		
<p><b>Public vs private entity as applicant</b></p>		
<p><b>Innovative projects</b></p>		

**AB 617 Incentives Strategies Public Consultation Meeting - October 15, 2020**  
**Breakout Room Discussion**

**Discussion Notes for Question 2: What other factors should go into deciding which projects to recommend?**

- Conchita: We have to find ways for the community to monitor how the funds are being distributed. We do not want one community to benefit and the others do not.

**AB 617 Incentives Strategies Public Consultation Meeting - October 15, 2020**  
**Breakout Room Discussion**

**Group:** 1

**Moderator:** Nicol Silva

**Notetaker:** Cristina Lopez

**Volunteer to provide summary to the larger group:** Nicole Silva

**Incentives Strategy Exercise: Discussion Questions**

**1. What are the top 3 factors we should use to prioritize?**

SB: Truck drivers in region, local. No funding for corporations. Money designed to clean local areas. Average per capita locks out community. Need incentives for lower price point, focused on industry issues at lower price point for residents.

Focus on mobile sources or stationary sources that focus on community. Need to focus on marginalized community. Absolute lowest price point identified \$20k; incentives not designed for communities.

Prioritize on areas, specifically in rural.

Focus on zero emissions supported by infrastructure.

ECV: Off-road mobile sources; diesel particulate matter; farming equipment

SELA: Importance of cost-effectiveness, prioritize amount of trucks off road / cleaner.

Wilmington/Carson: Incentives funding available to allocate for prevention.

Changes to funding mechanism / voucher system to assist in purchases.

**2. What other factors should go into deciding which projects to recommend?**

Consider additional technologies

**AB 617 Incentives Strategies Public Consultation Meeting - October 15, 2020  
Breakout Room Discussion**

**Discussion Notes for Question 1: What are the top 3 factors we should use to prioritize?**

<b>Suggested Factor or Criteria</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Rank (Top 3)</b>
<b>Area characteristics:</b> rural areas vs urban areas, population size, air pollution emissions	(4) rural (2) urban	
<b>CERP impact:</b> prioritize projects that directly support the CERP goals	(3) overall	
<b>Community emissions:</b> prioritize projects in communities with more emissions	(3) local emissions reduction	
<b>Consider previous funding:</b> can consider providing more funding toward projects in communities that received less AB 617 funding previously	(3) community received less funding first	
<b>Cost-effectiveness:</b> prioritize projects that reduce more pollution for the cost	(3) most emission	
<b>Emissions reduced:</b> prioritize projects that reduce more emissions, regardless of cost or location	(1)	
<b>Emission reduction vs exposure reduction:</b> prioritize projects that reduce emissions rather than only reducing exposure (e.g. air filtration)		
<b>Project location/impacts:</b> prioritize projects located near schools/homes, other factors		
<b>Project type:</b> mobile, stationary, or exposure reduction projects		
<b>Type of technology:</b> prioritize zero-emission projects (vs. near-zero emission)	(1)	
<b>Type of pollution reduced:</b> prioritize projects that reduce toxic air pollutants vs criteria pollutants only		

**Discussion Notes for Question 2: What other factors should go into deciding which projects to recommend?**

**AB 617 Incentives Strategies Public Consultation Meeting - October 15, 2020  
Breakout Room Discussion**

Group:   2  

Moderator:   Arlene  

Notetaker:   Jo Kay  

Volunteer to provide summary to the larger group:   Rafael  

**Incentives Strategy Exercise: Discussion Questions**

1. What are the top 3 factors we should use to prioritize?
2. What other factors should go into deciding which projects to recommend?

**Discussion Notes for Question 1: What are the top 3 factors we should use to prioritize?**

Suggested Factor or Criteria	Notes	Rank (Top 3)
<b>Area characteristics:</b> rural areas vs urban areas, population size, air pollution emissions	Fund some projects addressing rural pollution sources – Sienna, Patricia	Ensure some funding, higher priority
<b>CERP impact:</b> prioritize projects that directly support the CERP goals		
<b>Community emissions:</b> prioritize projects in communities with more emissions		
<b>Consider previous funding:</b> can consider providing more funding toward projects in communities that received less AB 617 funding previously	Prioritize projects in communities that received less funding in first 2 years, as an equitable approach -Niki, Rafael	Higher priority
<b>Cost-effectiveness:</b> prioritize projects that reduce more pollution for the cost		
<b>Emissions reduced:</b> prioritize projects that reduce more emissions, regardless of cost or location		
<b>Emission reduction vs exposure reduction:</b> prioritize projects that reduce emissions rather than only reducing exposure (e.g. air filtration)	Home/school air filtration projects/exposure reduction projects – Rafael, Patricia, Sylvia (couple with education) Tree planting (pollution reducing/trapping trees) - Liz	Ensure some funding
<b>Project location/impacts:</b> prioritize projects located near schools/homes, other factors	Agricultural emission reduction near homes/schools - Sienna	
<b>Project type:</b> mobile, stationary, or exposure reduction projects	Truck projects impacting multiple AB 617 communities (diesel), infrastructure – Niki, Dan	Higher priority
<b>Type of technology:</b> prioritize zero-emission projects (vs. near-zero emission)	Solar technology - Harvey	
<b>Type of pollution reduced:</b> prioritize projects that reduce toxic air pollutants vs criteria pollutants only		
<b>Type of applicant</b>	Prioritize smaller companies, e.g. truck owner operators, small fleets – Liz, Dan Prioritize black & brown owned, women-owned businesses – Niki, Liz	Higher priority
<b>Distribute funds across communities</b>	Equitable distribution -Patricia	

**AB 617 Incentives Strategies Public Consultation Meeting - October 15, 2020  
Breakout Room Discussion**

<b>Suggested Factor or Criteria</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Rank (Top 3)</b>
<b>Public vs private entity as applicant</b>	No funds to private entities - Sylvia	
<b>Innovative projects</b>	Look for innovative projects to fund, e.g. public truck charging infrastructure - Niki	

**Discussion Notes for Question 2: What other factors should go into deciding which projects to recommend?**

**AB 617 Incentives Strategies Public Consultation Meeting - October 15, 2020  
Breakout Room Discussion**

**Group: 3**

**Moderator: Valerie**

**Notetaker: Lindsay**

**Volunteer to provide summary to the larger group: Chris Chavez**

**Incentives Strategy Exercise: Discussion Questions**

1. What are the top 3 factors we should use to prioritize?
2. What other factors should go into deciding which projects to recommend?

**Discussion Notes for Question 1: What are the top 3 factors we should use to prioritize?**

<b>Suggested Factor or Criteria</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Rank (Top 3)</b>
<b>Area characteristics:</b> rural areas vs urban areas, population size, air pollution emissions	Eastern Coachella Valley is rural vs other communities are more urban and therefore trucks while an issue are not the top priority.	
<b>CERP impact:</b> prioritize projects that directly support the CERP goals	Discussion regarded CERP priorities since CSC has weighed in on CERP already	
<b>Community emissions:</b> prioritize projects in communities with more emissions		
<b>Consider previous funding:</b> can consider providing more funding toward projects in communities that received less AB 617 funding previously		
<b>Cost-effectiveness:</b> prioritize projects that reduce more pollution for the cost		
<b>Emissions reduced:</b> prioritize projects that reduce more emissions, regardless of cost or location	Support for higher emissions reductions – prioritize where the money goes based on impact (would mean we are not pursuing projects for air filtration systems and the like)	
<b>Emission reduction vs exposure reduction:</b> prioritize projects that reduce emissions rather than only reducing exposure (e.g. air filtration)		
<b>Project location/impacts:</b> prioritize projects located near schools/homes, other factors	Benefit to AB617 communities	
<b>Project type:</b> mobile, stationary, or exposure reduction projects	Mobile sources affect all communities – investing in mobile source will have benefit for all AB617 communities Certain areas with high truck traffic and multiple trucks idling	1
<b>Type of technology:</b> prioritize zero-emission projects (vs. near-zero emission)	Trucks are an issue in all communities – need to invest in ZE and NZE	
<b>Type of pollution reduced:</b> prioritize projects that reduce toxic air pollutants vs criteria pollutants only	Air Toxics	2
<b>Community Specific</b>		3



**AB 617 Incentives Strategies Public Consultation Meeting - October 15, 2020**  
**Breakout Room Discussion**

Suggested Factor or Criteria	Notes	Rank (Top 3)
	Locomotives seem like they are sometimes secondary thoughts – since they are older lower tier engines should be on the radar	

**Discussion Notes for Question 2: What other factors should go into deciding which projects to recommend?**

Something that affects multiple communities (not opposed to investments in certain areas that will make improvements, but hesitant to dilute the impact in the disadvantaged communities)

AB617 is intended to be community specific. Must have a direct benefit to AB617 communities.

Don't want to get into a situation in which AB617 is viewed as a competition. Must respect all communities' exposures and pollutants.

Money spent on things that actually reduce emissions

Mobile, Toxics, Community Specific

**AB 617 Incentives Strategies Public Consultation Meeting - October 15, 2020  
Breakout Room Discussion**

Group:   4  

Moderator:   Ryan Stromar  

Notetaker:   Lisa Tanaka  

Volunteer to provide summary to the larger group:   Matthew Taylor  

**Incentives Strategy Exercise: Discussion Questions**

1. What are the top 3 factors we should use to prioritize?
2. What other factors should go into deciding which projects to recommend?

**Discussion Notes for Question 1: What are the top 3 factors we should use to prioritize?**

Suggested Factor or Criteria	Notes	Rank (Top 3)
<b>Area characteristics:</b> rural areas vs urban areas, population size, air pollution emissions		
<b>CERP impact:</b> prioritize projects that directly support the CERP goals		
<b>Community emissions:</b> prioritize projects in communities with more emissions		
<b>Consider previous funding:</b> can consider providing more funding toward projects in communities that received less AB 617 funding previously		
<b>Cost-effectiveness:</b> prioritize projects that reduce more pollution for the cost		
<b>Emissions reduced:</b> prioritize projects that reduce more emissions, regardless of cost or location		
<b>Emission reduction vs exposure reduction:</b> prioritize projects that reduce emissions rather than only reducing exposure (e.g. air filtration)		
<b>Project location/impacts:</b> prioritize projects located near schools/homes, other factors. Also, understand what is accounted for in emissions inventory and unidentified emissions sources such as abandoned oil wells, tanks, etc.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proximity to elementary schools</li> <li>2. Proximity to childcare</li> <li>3. Residential</li> <li>4. Sensitive receptors – senior, hospital/hospice</li> <li>5. Recreational facilities and parks</li> </ol>	<b>3</b>
<b>Project type:</b> mobile, stationary, or exposure reduction projects	Fund schools and healthcare for communities (Selene)	
<b>Type of technology:</b> prioritize zero-emission projects (vs. near-zero emission)	Prioritize projects which are already available as zero-emissions (J. Marquez, M. Dawoodjee, Selene, E. Nuno)	<b>1</b>
<b>Prioritize Funds for Small Businesses in impacted communities and/or the AB 617 Community. Also, Prioritize Outreach for Local Business Owners (E. Nuno, M. Taylor) Funding Projects That Create Green-Energy Jobs (M. Sanchez-Hall</b>	Priority is echoed in communities. (Chapter 6 [pending] – Community Identified Projects. Unique to communities. Air quality nexus.)	<b>2</b>

**AB 617 Incentives Strategies Public Consultation Meeting - October 15, 2020  
Breakout Room Discussion**

<b>Suggested Factor or Criteria</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Rank (Top 3)</b>
<b>CSC Identify Emission Sources (Non-inventoried – eg abandon oil wells, tanks) (J. Marquez)</b>	Added to Project location/impacts	
<b>Type of pollution reduced:</b> prioritize projects that reduce toxic air pollutants vs criteria pollutants only		

**Discussion Notes for Question 2: What other factors should go into deciding which projects to recommend?**

Added to Question 1.

- Funding Projects That Create Green-Energy Jobs. Prioritize Funds for Small Businesses in impacted communities and/or the AB 617 Community. Also, Prioritize Outreach for Local Business Owners. Priority is echoed in communities. (Chapter 6 [pending] – Community Identified Projects. Unique to communities. Air quality nexus.)
- Concern that programs will be undermined by political issues – Administrative and Legislative policies.