

AB 32 Environmental Justice Advisory Committee (EJAC) Meeting

Date: June 2nd, 2023

Time: 1:30pm-4:00pm

EJAC Members in attendance: Martha Dina Argüello (Co-Chair), Angel Flores, Juan Flores, Dr. Catherine Garoupa (Co-Chair), Kevin Hamilton, Thomas Helme, Matt Holmes, John Kevin Jefferson III (Co-Chair), Luis Olmedo, and Jill Sherman-Warne

EJAC Members not in attendance: John Harriel Jr., Rey León, Sharifa Taylor

CARB Board Member: Gideon Kracov

CARB Staff: Johnnie Raymond, Radhika Majhail, Deldi Reyes, Meghan Kaff

Facilitator: Orit Kalman

Interpreters: Aldo Renteria and Leticia Reyna

*Disclaimer: Notes were recorded by the Zoom meeting's automatic transcription, and lightly edited to preserve clarity where possible. Some language may not be captured fully due to distance from microphones or other factors. The use of "*****" denotes profanity.*

Verbatim Transcript

Translation for EJAC Meetings

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: This applies only to those who are using the Spanish language to only hear the interpreted language, click mute original audio.

Interpreter: Esto aplica para todos los hispanohablantes.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: And just to reiterate that everyone joining remotely has to go through the process of selecting the language today.

Luis Olmedo, EJAC Member: I have a question. For Spanish speakers that that may be here, or may show up, are we going to translate the entire meeting like we take pauses and then it gets translated? Or are there devices out there?

Interpreter: Great question actually, that's why in a moment, you will see the interpretation instructions in the bottom and you click on the in the channel and we'll be interpreting the back end. That way your meeting is just going to be smooth and we're interpreting the back end. It won't be any conflict.

Luis Olmedo, EJAC Member : No, I'm talking about for those in person.

Interpreter: In person I'm not sure if it's connected because we're, only interpreting for online. This meeting, if it is connected for in person, they should be able to hear as well with the device.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Your question is if there are any headphones or opportunities for people in the room to listen in.

Luis Olmedo, EJAC Member: So, can that be noted?

Deldi Reyes, CARB: I want to explain our discussion yesterday, which you were not part of. We agreed that if there's anybody in the audience today who does need Spanish translation, that we would bring the interpreter who's currently on zoom out of the back channel so that they could hear the audio in the room and then sequentially translate if that is needed today. That's the plan.

Luis Olmedo, EJAC Member: It was determined that we didn't need it because we didn't expect anyone that spoke Spanish, or any other language I suppose.

Deldi Reyes, CARB: We have the plan to do that if anyone is here, so no, it's not that we didn't expect anyone. But this was the plan.

Luis Olmedo, EJAC Member: To move them into a different room.

Deldi Reyes, CARB: No, nobody will move be moved physically. We will move our interpreter, who is on the zoom, electronically, out of the Spanish channel that they're in so that they can hear the audio in this room and then sequentially translate for everyone.

Luis Olmedo, EJAC Member: Seems logistically complicated, but may I recommend in the future just do it how it's tradition that you have an online and they have physical translator here with the headsets. That way we have simultaneous translation and neither the online or the in person there is language barrier.

Deldi Reyes, CARB: Thanks for the suggestion.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: We will track the interpretation as an item to come back to for future planning, just to clarify our approach moving forward. In the next slide we have some instructions in terms of participation today. There will be dedicated time for public comments. For those in the room, we will review the sign in sheet in the front to see if anyone checked that they would like to make a comment or during comment period. You can physically raise your hand, and we'll call on anyone who wants to provide comments. And if you are joining by zoom, use the hand raise function to get into a queue. Those who are calling in so zoom phone participants may dial #two to raise their hand, and again we will inform those who are calling in when they are invited to speak so they can unmute during public comment. To mute and unmute you dial Star 6. These are the instructions. We'll come back to this later during public comment. If there are still any issues for those joining remotely, please reach out for help we. Of CARB staff Johnnie Raymond you can text or phone Johnnie at 916-264-9787. And just as a reminder, the meeting is being recorded and I'm assuming will be available later on the website. Yeah, all right. And I think that with that we can move to call roll and invite Members to introduce themselves.

Attendance

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: Thank you, Orit. So first we have Martha Dina who is participating remotely.

Martha Dina Argüello, EJAC Co-Chair: Hello, everybody. Good afternoon.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Can excuse me can just while you're calling the names for those that are called, would you mind also just sharing your affiliation just so people just know who you are beyond just a name.

Martha Dina Argüello, EJAC Co-Chair: Sure, I'm Martha Dina Argüello. I'm one of the Co-Chairs. I'm with Physicians for Social Responsibility and have served on the EJAC since 2006.

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: Thank you Martha Dina. Juan Flores.

Juan Flores, EJAC Member: Hello everyone, can you hear me? Juan Flores, with the Center on Race, Poverty and the Environment. I've been part of EJAC for just a little bit over a year.

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: Great, thank you. Angel Garcia.

Angel Garcia, EJAC Member: Good afternoon, everyone, I'm glad to see you. I'm with California Surpassing Reform.

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: Thank you. Dr. Catherine.

Dr. Catherine Garoupa, EJAC Co-Chair: Dr. Catherine Garoupa, Central Valley Air Quality Coalition. They/she pronouns.

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: Thank you. Kevin Hamilton.

Kevin Hamilton, EJAC Member: He/him pronouns. Went on the EJAC since 2011.

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: Thank you. John Harriel Jr.

EJAC Member: Oh, Kevin Hamilton forgot to say he's with Central California Asthma Collaborative.

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: Thank you, Kevin. Big John, are you remote? OK, Tom Helme.

Thomas Helme, EJAC Member: Hello Tom Helme, co-founder of Valley Improvement Projects. This is my first round on the EJAC.

Matt Holmes, EJAC Member: Matt Holmes, California Environmental justice Coalition coming out of Stockton. This is my first go around on the EJAC.

Luis Olmedo, EJAC Member: Luis Olmedo, Comité Civico del Valle.

Jill Sherman-Warne, EJAC Member: Hey, Jill Sherman here, member of the Hoopa Tribal Council and the Executive Director of the Native American Environmental Protection Coalition. My first go around here on the EJAC and the first Native American to be a part of this. Super excited. Pronouns are she/her.

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: And back to Kevin.

Discrimination at Cal EPA Headquarters

Kevin Jefferson, EJAC Co-Chair: John Kevin Jefferson III. Member of Urban Relief. I have participated in-- I don't know-- three or four scoping plans. I've been in this building for a long time, many years. I have to share what took place today. Today I walked into the building. And I asked, well, I didn't ask. I said I'm Kevin Jefferson. I'm the Co-Chair. I'm looking for the Natural Lands working room. Can you help me? No one was able to help me, so I did what I naturally do. I went up to the second floor where we usually meet, which is here, and I wandered around a little bit. One of the employees saw me wandering around and said, hey, what are you doing? I'm looking for the Natural Lands CARB blah. Oh, well, let me help you. So, we walked around for about 15 minutes, couldn't find it. So, she's like, I don't know what to tell you. So, I go back down to the security desk. On the 1st floor and say, can you help me? I'm already checked in; I've already got a badge. I've already been in the building for 15-20 minutes. Security guard sitting there says I don't know where the room is but let me get some help for you. He knocks on the

door. Some guy comes out. And then he says, where are you supposed to be? I'm not supposed to be anywhere. I'm just in the building to go to a meeting. Can you help me? He says well, since you don't know where it is, maybe I need to call the police. I was born in 1968. I'm 54 years old. So, I have an absolute understanding of racism. That's why I participate in the environmental justice. Because the **** that's going on is *****. And unfortunately, I've been having to see it since 1968, but to come into the Environmental Protection Agency building to go to a meeting, and no one can help me, but more importantly, the solution was to call the police. And I have a good trouble, John Lewis ***** T-shirt on. Am I here to cause problems? Yes, I am. But is it good trouble? Perhaps. Is a solution police? Perhaps. So, my answer to him was use my phone and call them, because we do have a problem. So, then his solution was to go on the door and close the door, so he didn't call the police. He didn't help me get to the room. But he had the propensity to speak the language of hostility by informing a black man that the solution to his problems was calling the police. So that happened a couple of hours ago. So since so a couple of hours ago, I've been having to contemplate, should I tear his ***** head off because I'm a United States military veteran that does not have it all? But I have to have it all to be a citizen of this world that we live in. So, I have to do what I have to do to coexist. So how I coexist is I work hard. I show up every day. And I do what I got to do. You just called my name. I couldn't answer to my name because the Union that I work for just called me and asked me if I could be in charge of a team to complete a job next week. The job that we're talking about is a \$50 million ***** event. I'm not going to make \$50 million off of it, apparently or no, but it's a big event. And apparently, I should be in charge. Right? But to have to coexist in this planet? With the ***** by some idiot that has a job. So, with his job and his **** that he's grown up with, he has a propensity to tell me where I need to be and how I should be there. But that's just a minuscule amount of the ***** we're dealing with right now. Right? And what I'm talking about is the ***** we're dealing with right now is that. We have been a part of the California's way of doing business for a while. Let me break that down. They've allowed us to be a part of the scoping plan for the last 20 years. Correct? Right. But that relationship consisted of coming into this ***** building once a year, every five years, after one or two years of a lot of work and preparation to give recommendations on how we could be feasible human beings on this land and space called California. Are you kidding me? But we show up and we give those recommendations. 20 years into the plan, we come to realize that the recommendations were some **** on the end of the page addendum. That didn't mean anything. They didn't go anywhere. So, 20 years into this, we're saying, what the **** are we really doing here, if we're just going to give addendums at the end of the page or the booklet or the manual, whatever you want to call this. So, then we have the understanding to say that, OK, we need to make this permanent because the recommendations have just been some conversations. We need them around so that that conversation becomes reality. But in the middle of making that conversation become reality, we decide to just change the whole program. The young lady who was very instrumental in 20 years with the program, kicked to the ***** curb. OK, I'm not going to name names because we know who we're talking about. OK, but the very person that knew the agenda, the very person that had our badges ready when we came in the building, the very person that had signs up, that would tell us which room to be in, the very person who could rent a vehicle for us, and it'd be good, the very person who made sure that the hotel that we're staying is ready. OK. That very person, right? It's told to us that we're going to give her promotion and send her over there so that she could do a better job for us. ***** OK. And because she's gone is the reason why I got disrespected in this ***** building. The very reason why I'm here is because of that person. Because I at 54 years old understand that my life is in jeopardy once I walk out of my door in the morning every day, so my

every move is calculated. There was a 25-year-old rapper that said that, and as soon as he said that he was murdered. OK. But my every move is calculated. So, a part of my calculations was speaking to that young lady to make sure that my moves were OK. Because if my moves are not OK, I don't need to ***** be here. Because my life is in jeopardy. And guess what? That's what happened today. My life was in jeopardy. Whenever a black man is told that the police could be called on him is every moment that George Floyd situation could happen. So that's what I had to deal with today. I'm twice as old as that ***** guy, and he isn't even here no more. Right. So, this is the **** that's real. So, when we talk about environmental justice, it's not just two ***** words we're talking about these communities that have to deal with calculated moves every day. Upon air problems and water problems. And all kind of other problems like this is not for play. You feel me? We're all in here. Because we are in here, why are we in here? We've got a ***** job, and we got a ***** house to go to, and we're safe. So, because we're safe, we've got some extra time to go over there and deal with their problems. With their problems, it's my problems. Because every day I have to leave my house wondering, am I going to get the **** back to my bed? That's a ***** ** thought. It's a ***** ** thought to have one day. I'm going to be 55 in September. So that amounts to 22,000 days. If you do the math, $365 * 20$, it's a couple of days. And then if you do the minutes, it's a couple of minutes. Do the hours. I'm a math guy so I can break that down to you, but at the end of the day, that's what this **** is really about. So, I paced, I paced in front of the ***** building for two hours wondering should I come in this building? That's what I did the two hours before I came in this building, I paced. Trying to put in my mind, it's OK for me to go in that building that I've been in for 20 years. If you got to deal with all of that and you were born in a situation where the oil refineries across the street, so low birth rate, cancer ridden, all of that. I was born in Hunters Point, San Francisco. That's where I was born. Right in 1968, not far after the ship blew up. So, there's all kinds of chemicals and madness in me. And then I went in the military, got a couple more chemicals introduced to me. I'm able to be free enough to walk in any building in America. But is that the truth? I'm sorry for ranting. But that **** was ***** **.

Matt Holmes, EJAC Member: I think it was generous of you to contextualize it in the history of environmental justice. But the fact of the matter is a well-known member of this committee was threatened with institutional violence today showing up for his independent consultant job. And you know what are the badges for if they don't protect you from those types of threats? I think it's something needs to be looked into. And Kevin, I am sorry you had to experience that. My old man walked around this building for half an hour the other day when I was here for the 1757 committee last week. White baby boomer stomped all over this building and nobody gave him a side eye. He had no idea where he was going. That's an experience that I've never experienced, but it really is an outrage that you've been invited here on behalf of, you know, a community and treated that way by somebody who was so culturally incompetent and is still collecting a paycheck from the state of California.

Deldi Reyes, CARB: Kevin, Mr. Jefferson. Just want to thank you for sharing this experience with everyone. You're absolutely right, it is completely wrong, and I am personally sorry that you had to experience that. I am going to look into it, and we will report back. I am glad that the CARB representative that you met on the 2nd floor tried to be helpful. We will endeavor to do better with signage and to have people on hand from the program to greet you as you're in. We have shared our texts and phone information so that any of you can reach us. I know that many of you have my cell phone number, and you are always welcome to reach out to me.

Kevin Jefferson, EJAC Co-Chair: I would say thank you, but I would say, let's exert that energy on how we could move this EJ agenda. I'm not concerned about him. He's been here a long time. He's the boss, so he's not going anywhere. I'm not concerned about that. What I'm concerned about is that the next time we come here. That there's signage so that we know where we're going so, we don't have to go there.

Deldi Reyes, CARB: Absolutely yes, right.

Kevin Jefferson, EJAC Co-Chair: But more importantly, what I'm concerned with is that that we move this agenda of environmental justice from the addendum.

Deldi Reyes, CARB: Great. That's why we're here.

Luis Olmedo, EJAC Member: If I may, and with the permission of the Co-Chairs, the most importantly with the permission of my colleague. It's very disheartening. This is not an isolated issue. This is an ordeal that environmental justice has been having to deal with. And a lot of times we get an answer, an immediate answer, we'll do better. I'd like to have this be elevated to the executive officer, to the chair, and the board; and that there be an investigation. Is not just an isolated situation. It's an issue where an institution that has made expressed commitments all the way from the top of the leadership, the Governor's office, executive orders. And when it feels like there's a step forward. Now, suddenly there's four steps backwards. And I thank my colleague, Mr. Jefferson, for his service, for his leadership, for his commitment over decades. Dealing with his own struggles and yet having a heart with the interest of helping others, as he did in his service, as he continues to serve US environmental justice, continues to serve his community. California Resources Board is an agency of the people. That includes environmental justice. I want to thank you for speaking out on the fact that we had the assistance we had. And I will say it, Trish Johnson did a phenomenal job for the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee. I think there's an opportunity for the Air Resources Board to bring those capacities back and add all of you who are here as well. And I thank all of you who are here. But we're in a situation that equity for environmental justice means we add. It's very simple. It's not complicated. We don't take away. Because that very well-known graphic that says: you've got to add so that we all get to see on the other side, the greener side. Hopefully one day we get to step on the greener side, but right now at least we want to see the greener side. We want to see what that looks like. But we're not going to see it if we continue to remove boxes. And that's the scenario that we are facing right now, and it could all be given an explanation to us. But the reality is that I commend my colleague. It is disheartening for what you went through. And I hope that this does reach the highest levels of the California Air Resources Board in that a plan not only to address the risks of coming into the building, but also, the risk of being excluded in very critical conversations that are impacting many lives in environmental justice communities. Thank you.

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: And Sharifa Taylor is not in attendance today and that concludes the roll.

Thomas Helme, EJAC Member: I just feel like it should be mentioned for maybe there's folks watching her in attendance that don't know this, but it was only a couple of years ago when several black employees of CARB felt the need to write a letter together about racial discrimination, they had experienced. Not just in this building, but in this department a couple of years before that. I remember I was involved in speaking at a panel where a Department of Toxic Substances Control had whistleblowers bring out racist emails, making fun of people of color, their names. The fact that we're a bunch of scientists and educated people. Why do we always have to listen? To you know, these community members that come in and want to complain about everything. So, I think it's already the points been

made. This isn't just a, you know, one time experience, there's there are systematic issues here and I just wanted to add that in for context.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: So, I see that member Jill Sherman, you have a hand raise. We want to get to our agenda, but this is so foundational to the work that you do. I want to make sure that at least we have an opportunity for Members to share their thoughts. So go ahead, Jill Sherman.

Jill Sherman-Warne, EJAC Member: Thank you so much. I feel so bad because, you know, I was in the room waiting or in the virtual room, waiting for Kevin and I had no idea any of this was going on and really confused by the way the agenda or the way things happened today with the meeting and the confusion that's happened. I, as a EJAC member, would like to sign on to a letter that maybe we can write something to address this issue. I don't know why I'm feeling so embarrassed for CARB, but I do. I guess that we weren't even involved in. You know we miss Trish, she was right on, and I don't know where that decision came from. Now I just have a lot of questions in my mind and a lot of concerns for the EJAC moving forward, just in terms of being able to be in our meeting space to get the work that we need to get done. So that's all I want to say, I think we should formalize this issue.

Kevin Jefferson, EJAC Co-Chair: I have to say that I that I absolutely appreciate the love, the camaraderie and the understanding. And that's why I'm here, because I appreciate my brothers and my sisters because this is a battle that we're in. The difficulty is that I just so happen to be multi degreed, military veteran, Honor Society, homeowner. So, I have all of these American credentials to be in America. But there's a lot of folks that don't have those. Right? My mother is 90 years old. Born as sharecropper, is still living. So, I have my lived experiences. And I hear her about her lived experiences. And she, too, has a lot of American credentials. But there's eight billion plus people on this planet that don't have a lot of credentials. In fact, I would say maybe 80% of the of those 8 billion don't have those credentials. But we are all on this same planet. Using this same water, breathing the same air together. So, it's not about the credentials. Or is it really? Right? And fortunately, I have the immune system to deal with this, shall I say I don't have a degree in sciences or anything. I have a degree in education in psychology. I got a degree in psychology not to become a paid psychologist, or a doctor, but simply to understand what it will take my mindset to exist in this land that we're in. That's the sole purpose of me getting a degree in psychology, to understand how to exist. But the work that we're putting in is trying to help those that do not have the credentials to exist where those have the credentials are and share the same spaces. Get our **** together to find out a way to help those that don't have the credentials who are right next to the ones with their credentials in the same manner. Because we only have so much water and so much air, meaning the same water in the same air. That's our duties. We hear so many problems and see so many problems on the news every day that it's normalized. Right? The problem of the black and brown is normalized. So, then we hear it. We feel it. And then we go eat dinner and go to sleep and that's that. How do we get out of that? How do we get out of that? How do we get out of normalizing the *****? Because it's *****. I've been trained. I've been legally trained right to take charge of people that disrespect me. But then I'm also trained to know the consequences of dealing with the legalities of what I know. And that's what these people have to deal with every day. They legally know that they should have a righteous way of living, but it's not existing. So how do we get to that? Let's concentrate on that.

Matt Holmes, EJAC Member: Again, Kevin, I appreciate you conflating this with the big picture around the historic structure of environmental justice, but I want to focus on the fact that you were threatened

with this total violence coming here as a, as a servant of a community. And I think I want to make a motion to request that the Executive Officer investigate security around independent, non-regular visitors to this building. I've stomped around this building. I've never been scared. Nobody threatens me with calling the cops. I haven't earned half the stuff you've been through, so I'd like to make a motion to request an investigation of your threat by security staff in this building, and that also request a resolution apologizing to you for your treatment here. In this building. That's my motion. I don't know. If I have a second, do we do motion?

Martha Dina Argüello, EJAC Co-Chair: We got 2 seconds.

Jill Sherman-Warne, EJAC Member: I'd like to 2nd.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Martha seconded the motion.

Martha Dina Argüello, EJAC Co-Chair: Jill and I both said it at the same time.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: We do have a hand raised from Member Angela Garcia, so I want to give Member Garcia an opportunity to share thoughts, go ahead.

Angel Garcia, EJAC Member: Brother Jefferson, thank you for bringing this into this space. I'm sorry and my chest hurts because it reminds me of moments where I've experienced something similar. And as you mentioned and shared because we're able to employ certain articulation of the matter; and we are being in, or a degree of experience, being in these types of spaces, at least in in my case, maybe to sort of finesse my way and get through. But I also feel for the countless brothers and sisters out there that don't have it the same. And in the realm of environmental justice, or in this case, environmental racism, I mean it's very much real. We have, in the case of, I often am focused in on pesticides, I mean this is this is too real. It hits home. It reminds me of that, what am I supposed to tell the mother who has a child that's been diagnosed with autism when she's not even making ends meet? And so, thank you for reminding us that this is not just out in the communities, but it's also very much entrenched in the building and there's a lot of work ahead of us. So, I commend you and, so sorry. Sorry for us.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Thank you, member Garcia. And I think this is really an important place for us to start. I'm really sorry for the experience, but it is really important that as you do the work that it's always grounded in individual experiences. This is not just about policy, it's about humanity. And there is important work ahead and keeping in mind individuals are incredibly important, so we don't lose sight what this is all about. I want to check with Co-Chairs how you want to proceed with this motion. That was just seconded as well. If somebody wants to formulate it, if you want to vote on it, we still haven't started our welcoming an agenda, so we do want to make sure that we get to that.

Luis Olmedo, EJAC Member: I did want to make a comment. It's about coming together regardless of our credentials, degrees, or where we live, and I think that's always the goal. But I did want to take opportunity to say couple of things. One is I do want to recognize that we're in the Cal EPA building, where we're very fortunate to have the first Latina Secretary, Yana Garcia. For the first time, a woman of color in such an important office. We are also in assignment within the California Air Resources Board, so I wanted to make that distinction, but not necessarily that separation. The California Resources Board, as far as my understanding, is predominantly scientists and engineers. It is an agency that does operate based on credentials. And because of its formal actions around equity, inclusion, diversity that have been widely discussed within the board, I think this is an important moment to recognize. Is this vision

possible then? This instance with Mr. Jefferson is presented to us when we have an institution that is so exclusive, a board that is so exclusive. And is that potentially a driver and permission for the type of behavior and risk that my colleague Mr. Jefferson had to experience? I hope that this really generates an external conversation. Thank you.

Deldi Reyes, CARB: Luis, I do want to interject because you did mention our board and I think it's an appropriate time to again remind the group that previously, Kevin, when I responded to you that I said that I would be looking into this. I've already alerted our executive officer, Steve Cliff, and our board member. We're joined here today by Gideon Kracov, so I just wanted to make sure to acknowledge for everyone's information that he is present and listening.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Thanks, Deldi.

Gideon Krakov, CARB Board Member: I was going to say something. Can I say something? This is Gideon. So, I'm off video today traveling, but I wanted to be here and just so apologetic, Kevin, I'll call you afterwards to see exactly what happened and we'll figure out next steps working with staff. Don't really know what to say. I did already alert Leanne and Steve to what has happened here, and Steve said it sounds terrible. He'll make sure that Secretary Garcia knows, and he asked that I apologize to you, Kevin. So, we'll get to the bottom of this and try to move forward, but I am listening in today and I'm so sorry that this has happened.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Thank you very much. Member Flores?

Juan Flores, EJAC Member: Just to add into the motion. One of the things that I would like to say, because today it was completely different from any other time that I have been on this building, and I've been coming here for at least three times a year for the last 12 years and today was the first time that I was told, as many of us were, if you need to move from one place to another place within this building, you need to be escorted. I understand their security protocols. But they failed today. I think what I would like to add on the motion. Could we also do an investigation when that security protocol changed? Who designed it and who approved it? Because it was very oppressive. If those security guards receive orders, who those orders came from, who ultimately was the one that approved that? Because that is a reflection within the leadership of this building, and that needs to be addressed. The fact that we still have to be told you need to be escorted because you might take something that doesn't belong to you. OK? I'm not here for that. I'm here because our community members are dying in our communities. And we're here because we need to represent them. But when you create these situations, what hope is there left for our communities? When the public building that our taxes is paying for cannot be felt like a safe place for us to be, I really want to take a look into that security protocol. When did it change? Who approved it?

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: So, I want to check in about the motion and the language around that so we can have a good understanding what exactly is the wording. We'll vote on it, and I think then we'll take a short break. I think this is not something that you can just gloss over. We're going to all need a moment to reflect and regroup after a few minutes. Yeah, go ahead.

Matt Holmes, EJAC Member: I think the language can be summed up as a request for an investigation into the security incident that threatened the member of the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee and to refer to the governing board details about the incident, and that's the governing board to respond

as they see fit and hopefully it's something in the form of a resolution apologizing to Mr. Jefferson for his treatment in this building.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: OK, so I have that EJAC is requesting an investigation on security protocols to understand the incidents where a member of the advisory committee was threatened. Refer that to the governing board and share what had happened, and with that to receive a response on how they look to address it, preferably with a resolution and an apology.

Kevin Hamilton, EJAC Member: Addition on there. I would put on the end and report back to the EJAC on what process is put in place to ensure that this travesty doesn't occur a second time. This was obviously a managed massive communication **** ** on the part of, no offense, but the leadership team here that should have let this security team know what was happening in this building. This will reflect back on you as a leadership team. If it was me doing it, I'd be accountable to it as well if it happened in my office. So even though someone else is responsible for that, I'm ultimately responsible because it's my office and I lead that organization. So, they obviously didn't know we were coming. Now their response was on them to not call their boss and see what was happening. I'm assuming those people have a phone number they can call; somebody they can contact 24/7 if they're working in this building to see if something is happening that they didn't know about and that they're briefed at the beginning of the day if there's something unusual that's going on. I mean, these are simple processes that could have avoided this whole problem, but it's a mindset of the person at the table who's left on their own. But I'm really concerned about because there were more ways than one to respond to that. And a primary one was how can I help you. Oh, I don't know anything about that. I'll find somebody who does. Can you just sit over here for a moment, Sir? And I'll get you taken care of. Instead, we got to, I can't even talk about it. Anyway, I'm going to go through that again, but just add in that we want to report back on processes, what went wrong and how it's being corrected so that we can be assured that it won't happen in the future and that we have something to fall back on. That can make us all confident that whoever we bring to this building, whether it's a member of this committee or a guest, they'll be treated with respect from the door in, and can expect that kind of hospitality that you would get in my house or in my office. And if you didn't, I'd damn sure make sure that something happened.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Thank you, Kevin. So, three components to their response, a resolution and apology and sharing what went wrong in concrete steps to be taken to avoid this from happening in the future. So, with that, is there a second for this motion to approve it? Second was Kevin Hamilton.

Kevin Hamilton, EJAC Member: I heard thought I heard somebody else as.

Martha Dina Argüello, EJAC Co-Chair: Well, but that was Martha.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: All right, so Martha and Kevin, second, the motion. And so, do you want to go through roll call to vote on this, what is the EJAC process for this? So, you're going to call everybody's name to pass the motion. OK, that's my question. I see confused faces. I'm just checking in.

Kevin Jefferson, EJAC Co-Chair: There's a motion and there's a second, there's a vote, and that has to go through what was.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: There is a second.

Dr. Catherine Garoupa, EJAC Co-Chair: Can you say what you were saying in the mic?

Deldi Reyes, CARB: My understanding and again the that is that there is no voting process for the EJAC.

Martha Dina Argüello, EJAC Co-Chair: We operate by consensus, and I have a feeling that there's consensus here.

Deldi Reyes, CARB: OK. So then let's check for consensus.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Through a roll call. OK. So, we're going to check for consensus with the roll call.

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: So, check in for consensus on roll call.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: So just hold on. So just to make sure that we have done the process in the way that is consistent with your understanding, we had a discussion, there was a motion. We had a follow up discussion. We updated the language with an amendment, and we got a second on that and now we're calling roll call to gain consensus from the committee before we move forward. Is that your understanding of how you do this? Yes, I see a nod.

Kevin Jefferson, EJAC Co-Chair: A better question is that is that your understanding of how it should be done and how it is done?

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: That's my understanding, yes, yes.

Kevin Jefferson, EJAC Co-Chair: That's the confusion. Seems like it's coming from that side, not over here.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Here my understanding that that's how you would do that. And I want to make sure it's consistent with your process because this is my first meeting with you.

Luis Olmedo, EJAC Member: Where is legal?

Kevin Hamilton, EJAC Member: Martha is a chair, and so is Catherine. So, what is the process, Martha and Catherine, as chairs, what do you understand the process to be? I heard Martha talk about working to consensus. We have had votes on things before where we've had roll call. I can't remember why we've done one once and then work the consensus on other things.

Martha Dina Argüello, EJAC Co-Chair: I think when we haven't had consensus or there's been some confusion, we've done the roll call. But I think in this case we should do the roll call.

Kevin Hamilton, EJAC Member: There you go.

Matt Holmes, EJAC Member: We'd be done with it already.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Thank you, Martha. OK, so let's go ahead and call that Johnny and move forward, OK.

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: Yes, we'll do a consensus roll call by calling first names.

Martha Dina Argüello, EJAC Co-Chair: I vote yes on the resolution, including the addendum in the public in the chat that the response be made public.

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: Kevin Hamilton, yes.

Matt Holmes, EJAC Member: It's my motion.

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: John Kevin.

Kevin Jefferson, EJAC Co-Chair: I'll refrain, so it doesn't seem personal.

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: Sharifa is not attendance. Roll call is done.

Motion called, and seconded: A request of an investigation on a security incident that threatened a member of our Environmental Justice Advisory Committee and refer to the governing board details regarding the incident. We wish to see a response of how they look to address that, preferably with a resolution and an apology. We want a report back of processes, how it went wrong, and how it is being addressed. We want to ensure that any member of this committee or visitor will be treated with respect from the door in. The response should be made public.

Vote:

Ayes: Martha Dina Argüello, Juan Flores, Angel Garcia, Dr. Catherine Garoupa, Thomas Helme, Luis Olmedo, Jill Sherman-Warne

Refrain: John Kevin Jefferson

The motion passes with a majority vote.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: All right, you have a majority there. So, the resolution passes and approved by everyone, it is 2:41. We are going to take a 10 minute break to reflect and think about this conversation, and then we'll come back, move forward with our agenda. So, we'll be back at 2:50. One for those of you who are joining remotely, I believe, to be able to see us, you need to use the streaming link. And I'm going to ask Johnny, can you put the link for people who want to use the streaming so they can see us? All right. Thank you, everyone. We'll be back at 2:51.

Introductions and Opening Remarks

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Welcome back, everyone. I hope everybody had a chance to take a moment and rest and recharge, and we're ready to move forward. Before I turn it to the Co-Chairs, I'd like to invite Deldi Reyes to introduce the CARB staff who are here with us today.

Deldi Reyes, CARB: Alright and thank you for the opportunity to say hello to everyone. My name is Deldi Reyes. I work for the California Air Resources Board. I manage the Office of Community Air Protection and I'm here today on behalf of Deputy Executive Officer Chanel Fletcher, who is on extended maternity leave. So, I'm here today and I'm joined by the great team at the Office of Environmental justice, Tribal Affairs and Border Relations. I'll hand it off to Radhika.

Radhika Maijhail, CARB: I'm Radhika Maijhail. I'm the Branch Chief for the Environmental justice and Equity branch. And today I have with me, Johnnie Raymond.

Johnnie Raymond, CARB: Johnnie Raymond, California Air Resources Board. So, this is really kind of like a coming home for me, working with the EJAC again because I was with you all right at the beginning. Right when AB 32 Environmental Justice Advisory Committee was basically established in 2007, so

helped work with the committee and Martha Dina was a founding member and so it's great to work with her again. Had that role until 2010, took a time off working on cap and trade and some of the other climate programs, helping the committee do some EJAC outreach and public engagement in 2017. Now part of my assignment is to help lead the EJAC as a liaison, so looking forward to working with you all. I extremely apologize for what happened today. It's not right and we need to mitigate it and fix it. I'm going to hand it off to my colleague Meghan.

Meghan Kaff, CARB: Hi, my name is Meghan Kaff. I'm the Student Assistant here at the Office of Environmental justice, Tribal Affairs and Border Relations, and I'm excited to be working with all of you.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Thank you to your support for the meeting today. Just a reminder, the cameras in this room are not working today. And so again, just a reminder, there is a link in the chat for streaming so you can see us, not just hear us. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to the EJAC Co-Chairs and I'm assuming I'm starting with you, Dr. Catherine Garoupa.

Dr. Catherine Garoupa, EJAC Co-Chair: I think we're going to do meeting agreements first, which Martha Dina has volunteered to read through if we could pull up those slides.

Martha Dina Argüello, EJAC Co-Chair: I'm going to go ahead and start with the meeting agreements. I want to remind everyone to take a breath. It's been a really difficult morning to navigate all of this. With that said, our meeting agreements are to pay attention to the equity of airtime. If you don't talk and step up, if you talk more than others and give space, right? That's really about making sure all of us have an opportunity to speak, I know it will be hard. We're managing 2 locations, but to watch the queue and folks raise their hand. This will be particularly hard. We've had a really difficult morning that's probably triggering to all of us who've experienced racism firsthand, it takes you back to all the other times you've experienced it, so take care of yourself. Breathe, drink water. Do whatever you need to be able to be in this space. Be open and be flexible in our approaches. Let's be realistic and monitor our ability to get through the full agenda and as always, we seek to create synergies in our work. And do a yes/and so we build upon each other's work, listen and be compassionate and supportive. Reach for and invite inspiration and intuition. Look for ways to move toward action. Respect the agenda. And I feel weird saying trust the process. So, I would say, trust the project that process that we as EJAC members have developed, but know that often these processes within these agencies are not set up for our success and then chairs responsibility for success. And with that, I will hand it back over to Catherine.

Dr. Catherine Garoupa, EJAC Co-Chair: Thank you, Martha Dina, want to underscore what folks have already spoken to that it's been a very emotional start to the day, a lot of feelings to process. And I feel so sorry and so sad for what my fellow Co-Chair Kevin has experienced. It's definitely something that I'm still processing and feeling without words. It doesn't seem right to say welcome or to express excitement about being here based on the way that we've started out the day. It's been a rough start, both in terms of the unfortunate incident that happened this morning and also issues that have been happening behind the scenes. What happened is completely unacceptable and I do want to reiterate and underscore that the report back that happens through the EJAC will happen in a public meeting and that we want to make sure that this is adequately followed up on. I also really want to acknowledge and thank Trish Johnson for all she did as a staff person to ensure that EJAC had what it needed and welcomed the new staff who certainly have a lot of work ahead of us as we move into being a permanent committee. Because believe it or not, this is actually our first committee meeting now that we've become a permanent. So I want to thank and congratulate my committee members again, as

difficult as that feels to try to celebrate in this moment, what I'm celebrating is the honor and privilege that I have of working with you all, how inspirational you are and how much we as a body have accomplished despite the challenges that we have, sometimes it feels like at every step of the process. As one of your representatives at the CARB board meeting where the Charter was adopted, I also think that it's important to report back on the discussion there. We were essentially told by the board that our committee is not diverse enough and that we need more youth and I think it's important for us to keep in mind that issues are intersectional, the environmental justice movement is diverse and the EJAC has never claimed to be a monolith that can represent all of the movement. I think I can only speak for myself, but I think we agree that mentorship and bringing up people is a vital part of this. So, the chair recommended to all of us that we consider what our succession plan is. As a Co-Chair who spends dozens of hours every week that is nonpaid time to help prepare and make sure the committee has what it needs, that is feedback that I'm going to take very seriously and reflect upon, about what that means for myself and for the future of this committee. I was also disappointed to learn that if I am able to find an alternate, which has been very difficult because if organizations staff people are funded by money from the Air Resources Board, they're not allowed to serve on committees. But if I am able to find an alternate at some point, they will not automatically take my seat if I leave the committee, which leaves the question of why am I recruiting an alternate and asking them to invest dozens of hours of unpaid time in showing up and being a part of this committee, if they're being essentially excluded from that opportunity to advance in the process? What we are doing as a committee is precedent setting, and I understand that we all take this commitment very seriously and feel the weight of what we're doing, that this is not just for environmental justice communities, but this has implications for how we try to confront institutional racism and oppression in all of its forms. We absolutely need the resources to match that, and that has been an ongoing challenge for us as a committee. So today, this morning we had the opportunity, some of us, those of us who are not blocked by security, were able to meet as work groups and have the opportunity to discuss what our priorities are moving forward, what needs we have, what goals we have and the things that we would like to take on. This is a conversation that can only begin today and not conclude because it's an ongoing process and because as much as we want to have focus and priorities, we also want to be inclusive of all of the issues that environmental justice communities are facing and I want to take the opportunity to remind fellow committee members that we have gotten a commitment from the board to revisit our Charter 18 months from when it was adopted, and I think there are definitely issues that we're going to need to figure out how to address moving forward together. So, with that, I want to give the opportunity to Co-Chair Kevin Jefferson if he would like to make opening comments before we move into our first agenda item, which will be report outs from the work groups that we're able to meet.

Kevin Jefferson, EJAC Co-Chair: I would just like to say that I never want to be on Front Street, I never want to be in the limelight, I never want to be under a spotlight, so this morning was difficult. Not only did I have to experience some madness, but then I had to be in the limelight. Two places that I don't want to be, and I happen to be in two of those places on the same day. But I'm credentialed to deal with the day. But what I can say is that what I have come to understand is that Trish Johnson was a very integral part of our team. And the removal of Miss Johnson from our team has caused the rift. Some may say that because this is a full committee that we are new. I will beg to differ and say that this is a continuation of the 20 years of work that we put in. And the one person that has been here, one of the people that has been here the longest with a lot of relations and has a lot of information, has been removed from the team. But more importantly, what I do know is that if she was a part of the team, I

personally would not have had to go through what I went through today. So, then I have to question myself and what I'm doing here to say that if a decision is made to remove an integral part of a team arbitrarily to be given, I don't know, we've been told all kind of things. She was given an upward job position. I don't know. Lateral promotion, right? We've been told all kind of madness, right? Unfortunately, the conversation that was told to us did not equal the paperwork that was given. So, then that's in question. But more importantly is that, if she has the power to prevent what happened today, and she has a wherewithal and the knowledge base to help us move in the direction in another direction. Why was she removed is a question right? When is she coming back? I'm seconding and I'm thinking that she returns in some fashion. We have people that are working in a percentage basis. So, then the question was asked, can she work in a percentage basis? The answer given was no. But how does know the answer if someone else is in that position? So that's not the answer. That's just the arbitrary answer. Because there can't be a formula for here. And then not a formula for there. And if it is, that's why some people could come in the building and be free and others can't. Because we have two rules. That apply to the same building. And how does that work? How does that really work? So, I'm just going to want to. I just want to. Put it on a record. That we need our team member back, we need our team member back right now. And we need to push this agenda. We ain't going nowhere. And there's a problem. And for every problem there's a solution.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Just a process question, I don't think we went through the agenda. There was a slide after this with somebody going to.

Dr. Catherine Garoupa, EJAC Co-Chair: So again, the main agenda item we have today is the work group report out then discussion. But I would also recommend, because the other business has come up and because Natural and Working Lands was not able to meet as a work group, that, if necessary, we defer this item to the next EJAC meeting because not only have we needed to discuss the things that happened to Kevin this morning, but I think we do also need time to debrief and discuss what happened when the Charter was adopted because not everybody was there and I think it's important that the committee be aware of the dialogue and the recommendations that we were left with.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: All right, so we have about until 3:40 then we're going to take public comments. I'm going to defer to members to share their comments, their thoughts as this conversation progresses and as you suggested, we come back to the work group meeting at the next meeting. All right, go ahead. And I appreciate the tents up, but if you don't mind, just because I'm still learning who everybody is, turn them, just as my cheat sheet, so I can see who's who and calling you appropriately. So, I'm going to start with member Olmedo, please.

Luis Olmedo, EJAC Member: Co-Chair, Catherine Garoupa. If I understood correctly in your report back, there was a question about the diversity of this group. One comment I wanted to make in response to that is that perhaps one of the reasons as to the why situations like what we spent time on discussing today and taking action on today is, there is the bureaucratic, I would imagine, direction; and then there's the Environmental justice. One of the reasons why there was a point in time and asked for an Environmental justice office, is so that that office was recruited and filled with those who came with expertise, historical record, vetting and understanding, and perhaps may have come, as many offices and positions in the State of California are now, entering into positions of appointment or being hired into know the environmental justice, or come from environmental justice. I have known Dr. Garoupa for 20 years now, who has been committed to the movement in my own community. There are many numerous

people that look like me, that are my same color, who don't necessarily agree with the values of environmental justice. This is a great opportunity to really reflect on what does that mean? Because people make a choice and there are values, and there are their values, you know that environmental justice leaders follow. There are principles that are easily found by searching the Internet that state how we as environmental justice represent ourselves and interact with other communities, as well as those values that we follow. And so, I think its important moment of reflection as to how the California Air Resources Board is filling the jobs of environmental justice. Is it based on helping respond to facilitate and put environmental justice into positions of power? Right? Equal leveling the playing field right where industry can come in and meet with the highest levels. Are we also putting communities that our fence line or are facing risk in the same level of advantage? That's not, you know, to seek answers right now. But I think it's an important conversation because it seems like there is a difference in understanding as to what environmental justice is within the institution. Within the board bureaucracy. The understanding is that we come here to help make a difference, to help influence and succeed in making sure that we are leveling the playing field for everyone, so everyone succeeds. But we know that environmental justices are objectives, and color is not a determinant of success. And I've seen that. Somebody might put somebody of my color and check the box and say we're done, but that person may come from industry to serve industry. And I'm not saying that they should or why not, but a lot of times their values are, you know, this business needs to succeed so it can create jobs. So, you want jobs, or you want good air quality? Take a choice. And people who are environmental justice, we want it all. We want good jobs, we want good benefits, we want protections, we want success for everyone. So, color is not a determinant, you know, and many of these things that we think are determinants are wrong because environmental justice has values and has principles. That's what's important. Now the challenge is how do you build that into a job within the California Air Resources Board so that it can earn its badge and say they are environmental justice? And thank you, Mr. Jefferson, for repeatedly bringing in Mrs. Trish Johnson. I agree with every one of your statements.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: So now we have member Kevin Hamilton and following that will be member Matt Holmes. OK. And then we have Member Juan Flores as well.

Kevin Hamilton, EJAC Member: Thank you. So when we had the meeting where we discussed the Charter and adopted the Charter, some of us noted at that point, everybody's not at the table, but also that the Charter was a way to move the ball forward, so to speak, and get this entity organized and sitting, and so here we are. And so the next step in my world is we make sure everybody gets a chance to review that Charter, and that we make a determination at that point, whether we accept it as is or are there still modifications that need to be put in place based on quite a number of things that have happened just in the last four to five months here in California in the regulatory framework in the California State Budget, and in this agency itself. So, I would propose certainly that I support. Let's just say our work group met and I felt like we accomplished a few things. I was looking forward to talking about it, but I wouldn't want to do that unless we can do it completely with our partners. And I'm sure that we'll convene again prior to the next meeting and have a more complete report. But I certainly support the motion to table that until that next meeting as Katherine requested, and let's be sure that we get this Charter review on the agenda, and I would suggest that we have a committee that spend some time with that and I'm willing to be on that committee.

Matt Holmes, EJAC Member: You know, I think that committee, Matt Holmes, I think that committee might be the sort of the solution to my request after we, you know, passed the Charter and got the

Board to vote on a permanent Environmental Justice Advisory Committee meeting those of us that were here were told that our committee needed to work on its diversity and gender equity. And I'm looking around the room with the only white guy in there feeling pretty targeted. I wasn't going to let them take Kevin out, but you know, and I'm, I'm all for radical over representation of underserved populations in California. We know who dies young, we know who should be on this committee. It should be black women with low infant birth weight, but we don't have those participants. We just saw the anti-blackness threaten one of our committee members in this building. So, I, you know, I'm perfectly OK with leaving this committee, but I want some definitions around what equity looks like. You know demographics are real and maybe we need some more social scientists in the building. 35% of the state of California's white. Whites are underrepresented on this committee. That is not my call to action, but I'm calling out that that there are metrics that we can talk about when somebody says we want diversity. Maybe there should be something concrete to act on as opposed to just sort of a blanket, sort of punch in the belly at the end of a really long day and a long fight for something that I was really happy about and it really colored the whole vote and colored the whole day. We were told that we needed to work on succession, which is what we do for a living in this line of work. I train people, I mentor people, but we also have proxies who can't assume our role, so I would like more guidance on how, you know, we can be intentional about planning succession because nobody wants to sit and nobody wants me to sit here for more than more than this year. And then also to get some concrete guidance on what they mean by diversity, because the numbers are real. And we can do the math, but I don't think anybody likes that math.

Juan Flores, EJAC Member: I'm a little bit concerned about those comments that were said to Dr. Catherine. While I'm all for diversity and inclusion, I'm afraid now of the mere fact of why CARB wanted this committee to be permanent if it's only for a photo op, and not for the expertise that I bring to this table and the expertise that all of my colleagues bring into this table and the people they represent every single day of their lives. I'm really concerned about that. And I'm wondering as well, when are CARB's board members also going to do some self-reflection and perhaps raise their hand and said it's my turn to leave CARB and let young people of color take my seat. I really wonder is that a self-reflection. Then how much autonomy do we have as an Advisory Board and how independent are we? Or is CARB always going to come and smack us on the hand and tell us you shouldn't do things that way, you should do it differently. And that is the very same reason why we wanted to participate on EJAC because our communities often go through that with their supervisors, board meetings, their city councils, decision makers who tell them "You don't belong here". I'm really concerned, and I'll leave it at that.

Martha Dina Argüello, EJAC Co-Chair: I think I'm maybe next, I can't see the room. Yes, it was actually rather offensive to hear this idea of a succession plan, and that younger folks should be here as someone who has spent a lot of time on the EJAC has spent a lot of time trying to recruit people to serve on the EJAC. And when they asked me, will I get anything accomplished? I don't always have a positive answer. Right. You stay in it; you get committed to it. I often felt like there needs to be institutional memory and sometimes having institutional memory that predates different board chairs and staff is actually valuable, and to be told, you know, "Oh you're too old, go get a young person". You know, I'm 64 and I'm kind of sick of hearing that. Right? And I mentor young women. Black and Latina young women. I wouldn't send them to this place. It's not safe. I have thick skin and I've been around the block at least a few times. And so, I've taken the hit to do that, but it's just, it's just incredibly disheartening to sort of think of what we were told. I've also had a really hard time recruiting people, because I'm not going to

bring someone to tokenize them. I refuse to do that. Right? And so if you want us to bring younger folks, if you want us to bring Black folks into this space, and I don't know who else, you know, whatever is internal calculus you've made, then there's a lot of work that the board needs to do and the staff needs to do to make it a space that could be effective. We had hoped that with making the EJAC permanent, that was a step toward doing that. And like I said, I have thick skin and I'm not going to let that stop me from continuing to take you at your word CARB that you actually want the input from the EJAC and the many other voices that we can help bring to the table, and remind them, no, they have not met many of their obligations, but that doesn't mean we should walk away.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Go ahead, Member Jill Sherman-Warne, go ahead.

Jill Sherman-Warne, EJAC Member: I'm just kind of sitting here in shock because I didn't know that these other conversations were happening, and I feel like when I had inquired about should I attend the meeting where they were going to adopt the Charter and make EJAC permanent, I was really not encouraged to do so because it was handled and now I feel like what was handled was my voice in not being included in that. And just the whole movement of or the lack of understanding of the importance of institutional knowledge, as was just shared, that especially in this space, when we're talking about environmental justice, there has to be somebody who has the institutional knowledge, because we're dealing with an entity that doesn't want to, it's almost like I get the very strong feeling, like it's institutionally being pushed, wanting to be suffocated. I'm blown away by the everything that's happened today, I'm still trying to wrap my brain around it, at my colleagues having to justify their position or, you know, even argue for that, I feel like some sort of craziness, and really kind of has tried to silence the voices that have been at the table. As a newer EJAC person, I'm wondering why do we even have this if really CARB itself isn't wanting it. I mean as we have a place at the table, we are the communities that are being impacted. So, I just wanted to share that.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: So, I'm just going to check in. We have a few more minutes to see if anybody else wants to add on to this. Obviously, the conversation today is going to inform preparing for the path forward. So, we want to make sure everybody has a chance to weigh in. Member Helme.

Thomas Helme, EJAC Member: Just really quickly, just the initial thoughts, I was on the meeting, or I was on virtually when I saw the resolution get passed for the permanent EJAC, but then I had to leave the meeting, so I missed the comments and found out about them second hand. But just my very first thought when I heard that as the comment that one already made was, I mean, have you seen the CARB board? They're really going to, you know, throw this stone in their glass house about diversity. So that was just my very first thought, but my second thought was, you know, how long did it take to recruit a Native American EJAC member? You know, where are these other people going to come from? You're probably looking at the folks who are going to, you know, bring younger people into the movement, I was, I guess that younger person not that long ago. I mean, I just turned 40, but it seems like just yesterday, but you know we have young folks in their 20s working for VIP, but I couldn't make them my alternate because of the grant situation. We have a very small staff of six people, so anybody that's going to be on this committee is going to not be able to work on grants that we get from CARB. So that was the big issue, but if it takes, I mean, I'm not even talking about since when was the first one? 2007, 2005? There was no Native American representative on any of those EJACs, and then even on this round it was like halfway through the process where they were able to do the outreach necessary. So, I'd be very interested to see, you know, how CARB plans on doing that outreach to bring in those folks. Are they

going to look to us as like a non-paid job to find our replacements, or how exactly is that going to work? So, I don't want to go on too long. Those are just my very initial thoughts when I heard about the comments that were made.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: So, moving forward. Thank you everyone for your comments. I know I'm tracking and learning from you to come and just get a sense of where the committee is at, and we'll follow up. Do you want to move to public comment now?

Dr. Catherine Garoupa, EJAC Co-Chair: Yeah, this is Dr. Catherine. I just want to appreciate everybody's comments and support and again acknowledge this is an ongoing dialogue, right. This is not a conversation that stops and ends today, so looking forward to the July meeting, we will have the opportunity to bring back the work group report outs that we weren't able to get to today, and have a discussion about the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, which was one of the priorities that the Carbon Markets Work Group was going to report out on. That being said, I am a watcher of time and want to be respectful of everybody's time, and we committed to end at 4:00 and we absolutely want to make space for public comment. So, we appreciate everybody's feedback and unless anyone who hasn't spoken would like to take the opportunity, I think we can move on now to public comment.

Public Comments

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: All right, so let's see if maybe we can have just a slide back to remind people on zoom how to participate in the comment period. There is the raise hand. Option so you can get into a queue if you are calling in # 2 for a hand raise and then we have star 6 to mute or unmute. So just want to make sure that those who are joining online are able to use the hand raise. And we'll start here in the room with a comment, and we'll go to those joining remotely. And if you can, if you want to introduce yourself as you make your comment, would love to know who you are.

Ernest Hernandez, Southern California Edison: My name is Ernest Fernandez and I'm a Senior Policy Advisor for Southern California Edison. I came prepared to talk about technical issues as we all were, but all I want to say today is provide our strong and full and unequivocal support to Mr. Jefferson to what happened to him today. I am sure all my bosses all the way to the top, and I'm very proud to say our CEO is a member of our minorities, he's a very famous Latino men who is always supporting and reminding us every week of the importance of diversity and equity. In Southern California Edison, we are a perfect photocopy of the communities that we serve, and we are extracted from our communities. Some come from very far away from like me, but this is all I have to say, and in fact we are meeting later on today, of course to discuss engagement with CARB and I will bring this issue to the attention of our executives. Thank you.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Thank you very much. Anyone else here in the room would like to share thoughts, comments? And I can check back, if you're so inspired. On zoom, we have Mike Bullock, go ahead.

Mike Bullock, Oceanside: Yeah. OK. Thank you very much. My name is Mike Bullock. I live in Oceanside, and I've probably followed CARB's work for 10 years or so. I'm a systems engineer. I worked at Lockheed Martin as a satellite systems engineer for 36 years. I've left the company that I don't consider myself leaving systems engineering. Certainly, climate change is a systems engineering problem. Equity issues

are often systems engineering problems, especially economic equity. I am active in the Democratic Party. I was at the Convention. I'm a baby boomer white guy that graduated from Robert E Lee High School in Baytown, TX. So, you know, I've had a lot to learn and continue to learn. One comment I have after, you know being at the Democratic Party convention now where we be without the BIPOC people, you know there wouldn't be much of a party, you know, they are so, so important and insightful. And so, I'm learning all the time, but I'm going to get back to the system engineering. Part of it I have delivered the papers, my focus is in CARBs light duty trucks because that's quite interesting and I guess everybody here understands that CARBs light duty trucks emit the most greenhouse gas by far of any category, and there's also a lot of equity issues that are connected to CARBs light duty trucks and I'm sorry I don't see those called out here very often. One other thing I wanted to call out, back to the convention and my continuous effort to learn more and be a better person so and so forth is I think I need to mention the 1619 book. I haven't read it, but I've held it in my hands, and I've participated in discussions there and wow, I it really taught me things that I should have known 40 years ago, but anyway. It's a system engineering problem. It's code red. 8 billion people and we are on a path to end life on this planet. I did put a link in there about an article which makes that case and there's two requirements. The first was in 2030, that's the one that really matters. Forget a net 0 by 2045 because if our performance is really, really bad by 2030 it looks like we may be in a situation where we're dangerously close to the point of no return, just to use the words that were spoken by the Secretary General of the UN. But I want to say something good about CARB. I've followed for a long time and this latest scoping plan actually gets down and says some things that they probably hated to say, and they probably should have said a ten years ago. They should have done the math. They don't show their math. I don't see their math out when I delivered papers. You know they want to know exactly why everything has been concluded, but CARB got some things really right that are really important. They haven't done the details, they haven't done social equity because the details are down when you get down into the details, that's when the social equity issues are there. But they come right out and say it's a myth to think that we're going to electrify our fleet fast enough, we're just not going to do it, we have to reduce vehicle miles traveled. They got some numbers in there and I think their numbers are about right now they are achieving the 2030 California mandate. That's actually not enough. But it does get them to the correct result. Not quite as large as it needs to be, obviously because they need to go. The reductions have to be greater by 2030, but anyway, they say we have to reduce vehicle miles traveled per capita by 25%. By 2030 everything is 2030 with respect to the driving we did in 2019. Now you can imagine vehicle miles traveled in California are pretty darn high, and its pretty darn high. In 2019, 25% reduction is it doesn't mean we're going to be driving a heck of a lot, but it that's really hard to achieve and they say we don't have. They probably hate to say that because it makes them look totally foolish because they've been telling the metropolitan planning organizations that they have to reduce their driving. Well, here at SANDAG is 19% relative to 2005.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Mike, I'm just going to pause you if you can just kind of wrap it up. I just want to check and see if anybody else wants to provide comments before we have to wrap up the meeting. Can you just give one last sentence and then we'll check with others.

Mike Bullock, Oceanside: OK. Well, the social equity comes how you reduce vehicle miles travel. So, I haven't got to that, but so I'll just leave it there. I'll just say that it's a bit complicated. So, thank you.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Thanks Mike for your comments. And yes, some of these topics are incredibly complicated. And so having just a couple of minutes to try and summarize, it could be challenging. I want

to check again in the room and see if anybody wants to make any comments or share thoughts. And checking online to see if there's anybody else who wants to provide any comments, ideas, thoughts. I don't see anyone. Well, with that, I'm going to turn it to the closing and next steps.

Next Steps and Closing Remarks

Dr. Catherine Garoupa, EJAC Co-Chair: I'm going to reiterate a couple of details and then also want to utilize this time to open it up to work group members since we didn't have the opportunity to do our full report out. One of the questions we asked you all was what requests you have of EJAC and specifically future agenda items? If you did have things relevant to our July meeting, I want to make sure we account. Just a friendly reminder for folks, our next EJAC meeting is Monday, July 17th. For those able to join in, person will be in Riverside and then the following day we've scheduled a tour of the emissions Testing Center. The Carbon Markets Work Group has already requested an item to discuss the Low Carbon Fuel Standard on that agenda and you also should have received via e-mail yesterday committee members a tentative schedule for the rest of 2023 that we would ask you all to look over and flag if there are any concerns, because the Bagley Keen exemption is expiring, which means that we have to have physical locations and we have to achieve in person Quorum moving forward, where previously people were allowed to join via zoom and we achieved our quorum that way. So please look over your schedule and make sure that you'll be able to join us in person. And with that, I see that Matt has his tent up, so please go ahead, Matt.

Matt Holmes, EJAC Member: I just wanted to flag for the record that, you know, we recommended the Natural and Working Lands be spun out of the CARB scoping plan and be referred to the California Natural Resources Agency. We weren't alone in that thought. So the State assembly passed AB 1757 to create the Natural Working Lands Expert group within Natural Resources Agency, and CARB is co-conducting that experts working group, and I think it's vital that that working group benefit from the input of this Environmental Justice Advisory Committee that's been working on these issues for so many months. I know that our next meeting, we meet every other month, so they don't have a ton of meetings left this year we have a July or September, the November meeting. But July 18th is a meeting of the 1757 Experts Working Group, and I just would just kind of want to raise the flag on somebody helping me figure out how to get these two bodies together. And of course, I will forward emails from my coordinator and Natural Resources Agency, but there are CARB folks in the mix on that as well. And we have Natural Working Lands Subcommittee here, but I really think that this is a this is an important working group that would benefit from the input of the entire advisory committee. This is the opportunity to invest in people and places and not lowball what we can do with our open spaces, with our agricultural spaces, with our wildlands. And I think that the benefits of investing in people and places have been artificially held back, and I look forward to having an opportunity for these two working groups to meet.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Go ahead, Martha.

Martha Dina Argüello, EJAC Co-Chair: So, we the Public Health and Social Costs and Just Transition work group did meet. It was Kevin Hamilton, Lisa Olmedo and me. And I think in terms of what we need, so we went through the recommendations that we made the original set of recommendations and lifted up ones that we think that we want to convene some meetings on. And similar to what Matt Holmes said is

these are sort of system problems and so not just one agency, so we would love to see if the EJAC could convene a presentation or training around Just Transition and a regenerative economy. That will bring together and present some of the best practices and models of Just Transition that are emerging from environmental justice communities and bring together transportation, housing, energy and other sectors, including sustainable and regenerative agriculture, folks who are doing bioremediation, folks who are using Indigenous land practices to restore air and water and soil to talk about what is what this Just Transition will look like, right, that interagency conversation, how we can do that? Secondly, we really need to meet with OEHHA (California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment) and CDPH (California Department of Public Health) to move on some of the recommendations around having a full life cycle and public health impacts assessments of the measures in the scoping plan. Particularly CCUS (Carbon Capture Utilization and Storage) and the rainbow of hydrogen and other solutions that further embed burdens onto environmental justice communities so those, and we didn't finish, there's a lot more work, but those are the two that that came up today.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Any other members who participated in discussion this morning want to comment? Go ahead, member Olmedo.

Luis Olmedo, EJAC Member: I just wanted just to again just highlight the importance of the big focus on the ZEVs (Zero Emissions Vehicles) electrification. Just want to make sure I put those as an important priority as well.

Dr. Catherine Garoupa, EJAC Co-Chair: And I would just connect that to the conversation we're going to have in July about Low Carbon Fuel Standard because the revenue that's generated through that program is supposed to go to electrifying transportation. So it seems like there's a natural complement there in terms of topics and as Martha Dina said, while I convened the conversations around Carbon Markets, Carbon Capture, Use and Storage and Carbon Dioxide Removal, we discussed a ton and we have a lot to report out to you all and to share and request to make that there's not adequate time for today. So, we'll look forward to both following up offline with CARB staff and bringing that back to the July meeting.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Martha, I think you have a hand raise. I don't know if that's from before, or if you want to add to what you just heard. And you're muted.

Martha Dina Argüello, EJAC Co-Chair: That was an older hand.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: OK. Just making sure. Anybody else want to weigh in on key topics to bring back to upcoming meetings? I don't see any. Oh, go ahead.

Luis Olmedo, EJAC Member: Yeah. I just wanted to highlight that you know, I've briefly attended a ZEV taskforce meeting. I know that there's a lot of work that the EJAC will be taking on. This is the first time that we actually got invited, and I want to thank the chair for making EJAC so that we able to view the other part that we haven't been able to do and engage in the life cycle of it. But in attending this ZEV taskforce, it was clear to me that one thing that I think we as EJAC, and I invite the California Resources Board as well, is we need to define what environmental justice is. It seems to me that as more time progresses, and I think there's phenomenal work to be done, but it is all the same ecosystems. We need to take a very close look, if we are drifting away when we talk about climate and environmental justice, when it's all relative. AB617 made that clear that we can't have one without the other, right? That's what

we have. A bill that put forward a climate strategy around cap and trade and there was an emission strategy, but all consequential from an economic standpoint, from an environmental health standpoint, from a job standpoint. In transitioning to just a whole new way of addressing eliminating climate pollutants and impacts on the ground, it's going to be important that we take that look. As a 23-year veteran in environmental justice, I can fairly say that I consider myself an expert. And in that expertise, I hope that those who may be fully submerged in climate may just give us the benefit of the doubt, to entertain us and say and ask us, and I ask the California Air Resources Board to be sort of a lead on that. Why does a 23-year veteran of environmental justice feel that climate has become sort of the status? Market based and environmental justice feels, or at least I feel in my experience, that environmental justice is being left behind. We need to bring a conversation and bring the two because they both need to be married together and both needs to succeed as one. It's one goal, right? Save people, save the planet, and so on.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Well, this is this is an important comment to end our meeting with, is just thinking about the interconnection of climate and environmental justice that those should be on even plains is what you're describing. And so, with that it's 4:00 o'clock and we really appreciate everyone's comments. And looking forward to working with all of you moving forward, really appreciate being invited to this space. Thank you to all who have joined us here in the room. All of you who are joining us online, we look forward to more conversations with all of you and thank you, staff, oh, go ahead Radhika.

Radhika Majhail, CARB: Sorry, I just want to thank everybody for coming out today and I know the meeting the start was very rough, it was emotional, and we all acknowledge that. But we still had some discussions and I'm grateful for those discussions and letting you know we are here to serve, right. We are here to have a journey together. This is our first meeting, so apologies for things that were not done right, but we are here to make it right. So, the team is here. We're happy to work together.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: And thank you to staff who made this happen. Really appreciate everybody's contribution to bring us to learn together and be a community. Thank you everyone.

Kevin Hamilton, EJAC Member: I just want to make one last comment. I did want to say I was really pleased to see the structure start to develop here at EJAC, and welcome Radhika. You know, that we actually have a branch chief now, staying away from the discussion of who's in what seat, the part of what we have been fighting for, for me, for 10 years or more now, 11-12 years, is not only the permanence but the structure and support within EJAC and within CARB itself. And so, while we're not there yet, I feel that from a structural standpoint and again, staying away from who's in what seat, we're actually starting to see some structure that I think may have some long legs to it. What we had before seemed almost ad hoc most of the time. So, despite who's in what chair where, the structure is being established to create, you know, actual longevity for this entity on the EJ side and does show that at least some parts of CARB are committed to this. So, thank you for that. And I didn't want to let it go without recognizing again the new staff because you didn't do anything wrong. You just showed up, OK.

Radhika Majhail, CARB: Thank you. Thank you, Kevin. Very kind words and we are adding structure. We are adding permanence, we are adding resources, so but you know the bureaucracy and state is for real, it takes time. Even though we wish things would move overnight, but they don't. So, thank you for your patience.

Orit Kalman, Facilitator: Thank you everyone. Have a good evening.