

*BOARD MEETING, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AIR RESOURCES BOARD,
9530 TELSTAR AVENUE, AUDITORIUM, EL MONTE, CALIFORNIA,*

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 2005 1:00 P.M.

(snip)

MR. PETERS: Yes, Madam Chairman and Board. I'm Charlie Peters, Clean Air Performance Professionals. And we represent motorists. This subject matter is a lot of interest to me. I certainly don't have any education or anything that says that I should be paid any attention to. (Laughter.)

MR. PETERS: And there's been a few people who have ignored me a lot over time. But I have provided for you some opinions that are related to this issue, I think. I will give you just a little anecdotal situation that took place here in this neighborhood a little while ago.

I went on a track scholarship to Citrus JC here which is in the neighborhood. At that time it was so bad on some days you could not see across the football field at noon. And that wasn't with any fog. That was just how thick the air was at that time.

I was from an area that at that time was a much, much nicer place that, Madam Chairwoman, you may have some experience with, called Redlands. And I was captain of the cross-country team and so on. And I would go out even during the summer time and run maybe five miles a day just for something to entertain myself.

I went down there and I could not go a hundred yards without stopping and hacking and coughing, and it was pretty amazing.

I will say to you that within probably a week I was whoopin' everybody that was there, which included a guy which was the record -

- quarter mile record holder for the junior college league.

So I also saw a study that indicated that a healthy person subject to .12 ozone level first day on the treadmill would be degraded considerably, second day in the same environment would be degraded a lot less, and by the third day was actually performing better than standard, fourth and fifth days were better than standard.

So what effect the ozone has is of interest to me. And so how does it exactly affect people's health? Certainly when you get into that when you're not used to it, it certainly has a pretty negative impact.

The Air Resources Board may be getting responsibility for a smog check very soon. I have two things in your packet that I am suggesting might solve the problem here or at least significantly contribute to it.

If in the smog check program what was wrong with a car, somebody cared enough to find out if what was broken ever got fixed; which the current regulatory process does not ever do that I'm aware of.

And if we got relief from the requirement of oxygenates in our gasoline, the combination of those two could probably cut our pollution level in half in a year and probably not cost anybody a dime. As a matter of fact, probably save us a bunch of money.

Seems to me as though these heavy standards probably have an awful lot to do with taxing the public, collecting money from people and giving it to pals, not

necessarily with doing policies that would affect the air and clean it up and make it better.

So I have some pretty strong reservations that all this data may require a little additional look before a final decision to go forward takes place. Possibly it might be appropriate to set it a little higher -- it's not - if it's just about setting standards, it's just going to cause people a whole lot of money to build a house or to drive a car or to do anything to be a California citizen, and there isn't any real benefits.

If there's nothing here about making it better, then I suggest that you do further study before you go forward.

Do I believe that we should clean up the air in California significantly? Absolutely.

Do I think there are ways to accomplish that? If somebody would pay attention to looking at the possibility and try it, I think there's significant opportunities that we are ignoring that we could put in place.

I think all it really takes is for Arnold to pick up the telephone and make two one-minute phone calls and this would be on its

(snip)

<http://www.arb.ca.gov/board/mt/mt042805.txt>

The California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) collects \$billions\$ using "Wallet Flushing" car tax. Is it time for CA AG Kamala Harris EPA GMO ethanol fuel waiver conversation?

Did Governor Brown choose a CA/DCA/BAR Chief who can find out if what is broken on a PZEV Smog Check failed car gets fixed? A Smog Check secret shopper audit would cut toxic car fleet impact 1500 tons per day while reducing cost by \$billions.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Zl-Nrep74qg>

Dr. Stan's California water supply opinion

<http://mediaarchives.gsradio.net/radioliberty/121213d.mp3>

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

way.

We sit here and blame the federal government for all of our pollution problem because we're putting ethanol in the gasoline, which costs us more money, gives us less gas mileage, creates more pollution.

And we're going to blame George Bush for this somehow or another just doesn't pass the laugh test. We can regulate the refiners in every way. But, gee, we can't control the amount of ethanol. In my view that doesn't pass the laugh test.

If the public were to provide a little support for Arnold, I think we'd have that fixed, I think we'd have a management of smog check fixed. Because all he has to do is call the Chief of the Bureau of Automotive Repair, and in a one-minute conversation we'd have a management program in to determine if what's broken is getting fixed and to put in procedures to help get that done more often, which would significantly help the public.

If you do all of that, in my opinion, you'd contribute a thousand dollars to every man, woman and child in the State of California in economic positive impact.

HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE ARTICLE 6

Public Information

Section

44070. Public information program

44070.5. Public information program inclusions

44071. Funding

§ 44070. Public information program

(a) The department shall develop within the bureau, with the advice and technical assistance of the state board, a public information program for the purpose of providing information designed to increase public awareness of the smog check program throughout the state and emissions warranty information to motor vehicle owners subject to an inspection and maintenance program required pursuant to this chapter. The department shall provide, upon request, either orally or in writing, information regarding emissions related warranties and available warranty dispute resolution procedures.

(b) The telephone number and business hours, and the address if appropriate, of the emissions warranty information program shall be noticed on the vehicle inspection report provided by the test analyzer system for any vehicle which fails the analyzer test.

Added Stats 1984 ch 1591 § 3. Amended Stats 1988 ch 1544 § 57; Stats 1995 ch 91 § 93 (SB 975).

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters

Lawmakers take step toward fulfilling state climate change goals

By Chris Megerian, Los Angeles Times, February 8, 2015

State lawmakers are preparing a sweeping package of bills that would fulfill several of Gov. Jerry Brown's climate change objectives by increasing California's reliance on renewable energy and alternative transportation fuels.

The proposals would also require state pension funds, the two largest public systems in the country, to divest from coal companies. And they would create an advisory committee aimed at turning energy policies into new jobs.

The introduction of the bills on Tuesday will kick-start months of contentious negotiations among lawmakers, oil companies, utilities, environmental advocates and the governor. If the measures pass, California will embark on a 15-year mission to spur investment in clean technology, slash the amount of gasoline used on state roads and boost energy efficiency in thousands of aging buildings.

Overall, the legislative package largely reflects environmental targets detailed by Brown in his inaugural address last month.

"We want the same goal," said state Senate leader Kevin de León (D-Los Angeles), who is preparing the bills with members of his caucus. "We're on the same page."

In a statement, Brown said he and De León "share a strong commitment to dealing with climate change in an aggressive and imaginative way. I look forward to working with the Legislature to hammer out the details."

With their proposals, the senators want to signal that California will continue fostering a growing market for renewable energy and alternative fuels — part of their bid to portray environmental regulations as good

for the state's economy rather than a burden.

"If we're creating the markets here in California, we want those businesses located here," said Sen. Fran Pavley (D-Agoura Hills).

Some lawmakers, even some Democrats, have sought to limit California's fight against climate change.

"There's a lot of people who want to see the governor meet his goals for climate change, who share his goals," Assemblyman Henry Perea (D-Fresno) said last month, "but who also worry about the economy."

By focusing on economic development, supporters hope they can win enough votes to pass the bills.

"Our bet on green energy is paying off," De León said. "If you're skeptical, and you're in an area with high unemployment, the bottom line is: Will jobs be created?"

The Senate proposals follow regulations already on the books, notably a 2006 law that requires the state to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. One of the new bills, by Pavley, would require an additional 80% reduction by 2050, a target set by former Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger in an executive order.

Like previous climate change policies in California, the legislation is being sketched broadly, providing multiple options for state agencies and businesses to reach the goals.

For example, a measure by De León and Sen. Mark Leno (D-San Francisco) sets a series of targets for 2030, including a 50% reduction in the use of gasoline for transportation. The goal could be achieved with a mix of alternative fuels, improved

engine efficiency and cutting the number of miles driven by Californians by promoting public transit.

Oil companies oppose the proposal and question whether it's achievable with so much of the state's transportation fuel — 92% — based on petroleum.

"Legislative mandates designed to constrain the availability of conventional energy supplies are not a smart or effective way to encourage development of available or affordable alternatives," said a statement from Catherine Reheis-Boyd, president of the Western States Petroleum Assn.

Her organization spent nearly \$9 million lobbying in Sacramento in 2014, almost double the previous year and the most of any group.

De León said concerns from oil companies should be taken with "a grain of salt" because "they have to protect their current business model."

Under the De León-Leno bill, California would need to get 50% of its energy from renewable sources such as solar and wind, up from the 33% goal currently on the books for 2020.

Utility companies also have been skeptical, emphasizing a need for "flexibility" in meeting energy targets.

David Modisette, executive director of the California Municipal Utilities Assn., said those businesses would rather be judged on reducing carbon emissions than on increasing renewable energy. That would allow them credit for such acts as installing

recharging stations for electric vehicles.

"It should be a more holistic approach," Modisette said.

Southern California Edison and other large utilities have floated a similar idea, saying it "will help the state reach its goals and do so at a lower cost for customers."

The senators' bill would also require a 50% increase in energy efficiency in existing buildings, which have not been subjected to the same standards as new structures.

All of these policies, supporters say, would be geared toward creating new jobs. A bill from Sen. Ben Hueso (D-San Diego) would create a committee of experts, appointed by the governor and lawmakers, to advise state agencies on ways to boost economic development.

Another bill by De León would require California's two largest pension systems — the California Public Employees' Retirement System and California State Teachers' Retirement System — to divest from coal companies. Less than .06% of the \$296.1 billion managed by CalPERS is invested in coal operations, according to pension officials.

When De León first mentioned this proposal in December, pension officials balked, saying divestment would reduce the funds' ability to influence the marketplace.

De León said he welcomes debate on the legislation.

"This is not some unilateral edict," he said. "It is the beginning of a dialogue"

chris.megerian@latimes.com

Twitter: @chrismegerian

Copyright © 2015, Los Angeles Times

<http://www.latimes.com/local/politics/la-me-pol-climate-change-20150208-story.html>

CAPP contact: Charlie Peters