DOCKETED	
Docket Number:	25-BUSMTG-01
Project Title:	2025 Business Meeting Agendas, Transcripts, and Public Comments
TN #:	266068
Document Title:	Transcript of the August 29, 2025 Business Meeting
Description:	N/A
Filer:	Kim Todd
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	9/18/2025 2:47:54 PM
Docketed Date:	9/18/2025

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

FRIDAY, AUGUST 29, 2025

11:30 A.M. - 3:00 P.M.

Physical primary location:
CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES BUILDING
MEDIA ROOM 2-201 (SECOND FLOOR)
715 P STREET

FIRST FLOOR AUDITORIUM SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814 (Wheelchair Accessible)

Teleconference location:
HOLIDAY INN EXPRESS
(BREAKFAST AREA/ROOM)
2700 LENWOOD ROAD
BARSTOW, CA 92311

The California Energy Commission (CEC) aims to begin the business meeting promptly at the start time and the end time is an estimate based on the agenda proposed. The meeting may end sooner or later than the time indicated depending on various factors. Commissioners may attend remotely in accordance with Government Code section 11123.2(j).

Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations (CCR), title 20, section 1104(e), any person may make an oral comment on any agenda item. To ensure the orderly conduct of business, such comments will be limited to two minutes or less per person.

Please visit the CEC Business Meeting web page for more information and materials at https://www.energy.ca.gov/proceedings/business-meetings.

Reported by:
Martha Nelson

APPEARANCES

COMMISSIONERS

David Hochschild, Chair (remote/Barstow)

Siva Gunda, Vice Chair

Andrew McAllister, Commissioner

Noemi Gallardo, Commissioner (remote/Barstow)

STAFF

Drew Bohan, Executive Director

Sanjay Ranchod, Chief Counsel

Jeremy Smith, Deputy Director, Energy Assessments Division

PUBLIC ADVISORS

Mona Badie, Public Advisor

Ryan Young, Deputy Public Advisor

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jamie Court, Consumer Watchdog

Andy Gerber, Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers Local 4

Jason Lindsey, Ironworkers Local 378

Refugio Pinedo, Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers Local 4

John Hershey, Plumbers & Pipefitters Local 447

Joe Jawad, United Steelworkers Local 326

Erica Valentine, UA Local 393

APPEARANCES

PUBLIC COMMENT (cont'd)

Tanya DeRivi, Western States Petroleum Association

Mark Mulliner, California State Building and Construction Trades Council

Daniel Barad, Union of Concerned Scientists

Tim Sbranti, Contra Costa Cui and Construction Trades Council

Chuck Leonard, Plumbers & Steamfitters Local 443

James Holland, Boilermakers Local 92

Timothy Jeffries, International Union of Operating Engineers Local 3

Aureliano Ochoa, Heat & Frost Insulators Local 16

Anthony Viscuso, Heat & Frost Insulators Local 16

Thomas Kohlenberg, International Union of Operating Engineers

Che Timmons, Plumbers & Steamfitters Local 342

Randy Thomas, Boilermakers Local 549

Mike Smith, United Steelworkers

Tracy Scott, Retired President, United Steelworkers Local 5

Albert Duarte, Riverside & San Bernardino Building and Construction Trades Council

Stephen Rosenblum

Julia May, Communities for a Better Environment

Woody Hastings, The Climate Center

APPEARANCES

PUBLIC COMMENT (cont'd)

Julian Vinatieri, IBEW Local 302

Mitchell Bechtel, District Council of Ironworkers

Pete Wohlgezogen, UA Local 250 Steamfitters & Refrigeration

Martin Rodriguez, Ironworkers Local 433

Brandon Dennison-Borja, IBEW 302

Alfonso Ruiz, Heat & Frost Insulators Local 5

Woody Little, Last Chance Alliance

Gracyna Mohabir, California Environmental Voters

Danny Bernardini, Napa-Solano Building & Construction Trades Council

Jon Munoz, UA Local 250

Mitch Ponce, Iron Workers Local 433, and Los Angeles/ Orange County Building & Construction Trades Council

Alissa Reed, Kern/Inyo/Mono Building & Construction Trades Council

Tom O'Connor, ICF Consulting

Michael Hernandez, Contra Costa County Electricians Local 302

INDEX PAGE 8 Public Comment 2. Agency Announcements 16 3. Consent Calendar 17 Maximum Gross Gasoline Refining Margin and 18 Penalty Implementation Timeline (Docket No. 23-OIIP-01) 99 Lead Commissioner and Presiding Member Reports 99 7. Executive Director's Report 99 Public Advisor's Report 8. Chief Counsel's Report 99 Adjournment 100

1 PROCEDINGS 2 11:36 a.m. 3 FRIDAY, AUGUST 29, 2025 4 (Whereupon an introduction video is played and not 5 transcribed.) VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Thank you. Good morning, 6 7 everyone. My name is Siva Gunda, Vice Chair of the 8 California Energy Commission. Today is August 29th, 2025. 9 I call this meeting to order. 10 Joining me from the Sacramento meeting location 11 is Commissioner McAllister. Joining us from our noticed 12 Barstow meeting location is Chair and Commissioner Gallardo. Commissioner Skinner is absent and we have a 13 14 quorum. 15 With that, let us stand for the Pledge of 16 Allegiance. 17 (The Pledge of Allegiance is recited in unison.) VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Thank you. 18 19 Before we begin, I wanted to announce that the 20 revised agenda was posted, removing Item 5 from the agenda. 21 That item will not be heard today. 22 We will first take public comment, then move on 23 to agency announcements. The Public Advisor will provide the instructions. 24 25 Mona?

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Good morning. My name is Mona Badie. I'm the Public Advisor for the California Energy Commission. We're going to do a few public comment periods today, and we're going to take public comment from both noticed locations for the business meetings. So we've got one location here in Sacramento and we have a second location out in Barstow, California for today's meeting.

And this first public comment period is an open public comment period, so for any item on the agenda. But we do ask if you're here for Items 3 or 4, that you use the dedicated public comment period for those, for comments for those items. So it's the consent agenda and the regulatory item that's on the agenda. And then -- but right now we'll take comments on any of the agenda.

And first we will -- I'm going to check the QR code queue for in the room in Sacramento. We've got no one in the room.

And then Ryan, for our Barstow location, is there anyone who would like to comment on Item 1 in-person at this time?

MR. YOUNG: There's no one in the room at this time. Back to you, Public Advisor.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

All right, and then I'm transitioning over to

Zoom.

And we've got Jamie Court. Jamie, I'm going to open your line and we're asking for comments to be two minutes or less. There will be a timer on the screen. It is helpful if you can state and spell your name for the court reporter, as well.

MR. COURT: Jamie Court, Consumer Watchdog. I'm the President.

I just have to make a comment about this reduction, the freezing on the price gouging penalty. You know, I'm thoroughly troubled and disgusted that we would consider a five-year freeze on this penalty.

And it's not that you didn't come out with a penalty. It's the fact that you didn't even begin the deliberations on a penalty. I saw Governor Newsom say, we're getting screwed. The companies are making billions and billions of dollars. We needed a price gouging penalty. We went to a special session. And the Energy Commission was directed to create a public process by which we would determine whether a penalty is going to be necessary. And you did not even start that public process. And it's been two years.

And I understand your need for investor confidence. But it has been proven by the DPMO and the CEC that companies price gouged. They profited excessively.

1 The DPMO has even said that we think, because of the 2 consolidated market, a price gouging penalty would help. 3 And by putting this on freeze for five years, you are 4 giving the refiners the opportunity to make enormous 5 profits and not be penalized for it. And I know you say it can be paused at any -- un-6 7 paused at any time, but not without the analysis you haven't begun. So that is a year and a half out. And that 8 9 gives the refiners open range to make the type of margins,

You are setting the next governor back in a huge way. Governor Newsom is going to be left from office.

Commissioner Gunda, you're going to be out in January 2026.

And you're leaving the next governor and the people of

California with nothing to do but pay more.

like \$2.00-plus that they were making in 2022, which was

the reason we created the penalty in the first place.

I urge you not to do this or to reduce the timeframe because this is an abdication of your duty and the governor's duty to follow through on the mandate of the legislature. And it is a tremendous abdication. I urge you to really reconsider this.

Thank you.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

All right, and that is all the raised hands for

25 | Item 1.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Ooh, we've got one more. Andy, I saw your hand. We temporarily lost you. All right, so, Jamie, I know that your comment will be for Item 4.

And then, Andy, I'm going to open your line.

You'll unmute on your end. We are asking for comments to
be two minutes or less. And it does help our court
reporter to state and spell your name.

8 MR. GERBER: So can I comment on Item 4 or not 9 yet?

MS. BADIE: You can, but we do request that if you are coming to Item 4, that you wait for the dedicated public comment period. But if you are not able to stay for whatever reason, then you can comment now on Item 4 and we'll note that.

MR. GERBER: Okay, well, I'll just comment on

Item 4 right now. My name is Andy Gerber, A-N-D-Y

G-E-R-B-E-R. I am the President of Bricklayers and Allied

Craft Workers Local No. 4 in Southern California.

And I just want to comment that, you know, refineries, you know, they need to stay open. They need to stay with the maintenance, keep going, because we have a tremendous workforce that, you know, take care of these refineries. They line the whole vessels with fire bricks. And it's just going to lose a lot of jobs. It's going to displace a lot of people. And we just feel like, you know,

gas is going to -- gas is not going anywhere. Let's try to get a transition to better without just immediately, you know, getting rid of jobs.

So I want to say that jobs are going to be lost because of this, so thank you.

MS. BADIE: Thank you for your comment.

All right, let's see, okay, Jason Lindsey, I'm going to open your line again. Again, if you're here for Item 4, it does help us if we have all those comments heard at the same time, especially since, you know, most folks are joining for Item 4. But this is an accommodation if you're able to stay. And, Jason, I'm going to open your line. It does help us if you can state and spell your name for our court reporter. There will be a two minute timer on the screen.

MR. LINDSEY: I'll just go ahead and wait and make my comments during Item 4.

MS. BADIE: Thank you. I appreciate it.

All right, Refugio, I'm going to open your line.

Again, just a reminder, if you're here for Item 4, it does help if we can hear all those comments at the same time.

But we have this comment period open as an accommodation for folks that cannot stay for the dedicated public comment period. I'm going to open your line. We do ask that you state and spell your name for our court reporter so we can

capture that in the record. And there will be a two-minute 1 2 timer on your screen. 3 MR. PINEDO: Yes, hello. This is Refugio Pinedo, 4 Jr. Can you hear me? 5 MS. BADIE: Yes. MR. PINEDO: Okay, sorry about that. Anyways, 6 7 first name is Refugio, that's R-E-F, as in Frank, -U-G-I-O. Last name is Pinedo, P, as in Paul, -I-N-E-D-E-O, Jr. 8 9 I'm with BAC Local 4 also. I just have a question, but it is regarding Item 10 4, but I just want to make my comment now if that's okay? 11 12 Okay, so what I want to know is how in the 13 heck -- we've got two refineries that are getting ready to 14 shut down in Southern California. We're paying the highest 15 prices in the nation. And you guys are considering 16 penalizing the refineries and making it harder for them to 17 stay in business so they can supply energy. What kind of 18 modern society exists without energy, is what I want to 19 know? It's freaking ridiculous. We're already paying 20 through the nose. How much more do we have to pay? 21 are politicians going to have common sense, is what I want 22 to know? 23 So I would seriously hope that you guys would 24 reconsider what you're trying to do with the refineries. 25 Modernizing them and make them efficient and make them safe is the way to go. But to come up with these freaking ridiculous taxing and all these other freaking ridiculous fees to shut them down or to force them out of business, and then we're going to start importing oil from other parts of the world or from other states, is freaking ridiculous.

And where the hell is the governor on all this stuff? He wants to be president of the United States. Are you serious?

I mean, come on, you guys have to snap out of this and start thinking about the people of California. If not, every single politician in California needs to go.

That's just the bottom line. I don't give a damn what party you're with. But what you're doing to working people is freaking ridiculous. You're closing down and shutting down good paying jobs, raising the price of fuel, which is going to raise the price of everything because there's oil in everything, including the nice Teslas that you guys drive. There is oil in some of the products that are put together in that car.

So you guys need to snap out of it and get out of this fantasy land and get serious about this. I would hope that you guys would reconsider.

Thank you.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

1 And just a reminder, I've got two more hands up, 2 if you're here for Item 4, we're asking folks to wait for 3 the dedicated public comment period for Item 4. 4 John Hershey, are you here for Item 4 or are you 5 here for another item on the agenda? John Hershey, you will have to unmute on your end for us to get your audio 6 7 feed. MR. HERSHEY: Hello. Mic check. 8 9 MS. BADIE: Hi. Are you here for Item 4 or 10 another item on the agenda? 11 MR. HERSHEY: Yeah, so I understand you'd like to 12 have speakers wait for Item 4, but I was hoping to do that 13 now as I'll have something coming up shortly. 14 MS. BADIE: Yes, go ahead. 15 MR. HERSHEY: Yeah, hi. So my name is John 16 Hershey, J-O-H-N H-E-R-S-H-E-Y, with the Local 447 Plumbers 17 & Pipefitters in Sacramento. 18 And I just want to just echo our support for the 19 position of the staff on postponing the implementation of 20 the penalties and taxes on the -- on refineries, and that we will also stand with the State Building Trades on this 21 22 question.

And then last hand, Joe Jawad, again I'm going to

Thank you.

Thank you very much.

MS. BADIE:

23

24

25

ask, are you here for Item 4? Can you wait for the dedicated public comment period? It's coming up. Are you here for Item 4, Joe?

MR. JAWAD: Yeah. Mic check.

MS. BADIE: Yes.

MR. JAWAD: Yeah, I'm here for Item 4. As well as previous talkers, I do have something coming up at noon, so I'd like to speak, if that's all right.

MS. BADIE: Yes, that's fine. Thank you.

MR. JAWAD: Yeah, I just want to mention, you know, along with all the, you know, sustainable wage -- living wage jobs for these families that will lose over this, if we make it harder for facilities, refineries, renewables facilities to make product in California, we're going to be importing this stuff from a place that's, you know, not regulated the way that we're regulated without the same safety regulations.

So I just, I urge that we' rethink it and that we support the postponing of this only because, you know, along with losing jobs, we're putting this product and the refining in the hands of people that don't have the same safety regulations.

And I just wanted to get on here and show support from that. That's from Local 326 United Steelworkers. We need to capitalize and show major support for making this

```
product in California instead of incentivizing importing
 1
    it.
 3
              That's all I got.
 4
              MS. BADIE: Thank you.
 5
              Erica Valentine, I'm going to open your line.
    Again, if you're here for Item 4, I do ask that you wait.
 6
 7
    It's going to be called very shortly.
 8
              MS. VALENTINE: I am here for Item 4. When you
9
    say shortly, how shortly do you mean, like within the next
10
    30, 40 minutes? Sorry. I know you guys have a lot on your
11
    agenda.
12
              MS. BADIE:
                         (Indiscernible.) Right after this
13
    item, we're going to skip through the next two so we can
14
    get to Item 4, so it will be very shortly.
15
              MS. VALENTINE: Okay, I'll wait as you -- as
16
    requested.
17
              MS. BADIE: Thank you so much. Appreciate you.
18
              All right, that is all there is for item one.
19
    Vice Chair, back to you.
20
              VICE CHAIR GUNDA:
                                 Thank you, Mona.
21
              Thank you for the comments that were just made.
22
              So now moving to Item 2, Agency Announcements,
23
    any Commissioners, discussion for Item 2, Agency
24
    Announcements?
25
              Anything from the location in Barstow?
```

1 Seeing none, so we'll move forward to the Consent 2 Calendar, Item number 3. We have just one item on consent. We will now hear public comment on the Consent 3 4 Calendar. 5 MS. BADIE: Thank you. The Commission welcomes public comment on item 6 7 three. That's the AB 209 Report. If you're here to 8 comment on that report, you can use the QR code in the room 9 with us. And if you're on Zoom, you'll use the raise-hand 10 feature on your screen, it looks like it's on palm, or star 11 nine if joining by phone. 12 We're not seeing anyone in the room in 13 Sacramento. 14 Is there anyone in the room from Barstow who 15 wants to comment? 16 MR. YOUNG: Thank you. No public here in Barstow 17 who wish to comment. Back to you, Public Advisor. 18 MS. BADIE: Thank you. 19 All right, I don't have any raised hands on Zoom, 20 so back to you, Vice Chair Gunda. 21 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Move this item. 22 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Yeah. Anyone want to second 23 from Barstow? Commissioner Gallardo or Chair, would you 24 second? 25 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Second.

VICE CHAIR GUNDA: With that, we'll move and take 1 2 a vote. 3 Commissioner McAllister? 4 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Aye. 5 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Chair? CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Aye. 6 7 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: I heard aye there. Commissioner Gallardo? 8 9 COMMISSIONER GALLARDO: Aye. 10 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Okay, I vote as aye as well. 11 Thank you. And the vote is 4-0 and the motion passes. 12 With that, let's move to Item number 4, Maximum 13 Gross Gasoline Refining Margin and Penalty Implementation 14 Timeline. 15 And I welcome Executive Director Drew Bohan to 16 present. 17 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BOHAN: Thank you very much, 18 Vice Chair. And good morning, Chair, Vice Chair, and 19 Commissioners. For the record, my name is Drew Bohan and I 20 am the Commission's Executive Director. 21 In 2023, Governor Newsom signed Senate Bill X1-2. 22 This bill directed the CEC to do a number of things to 23 ensure Californians have a safe, reliable, and affordable 24 supply of transportation fuels for as long as they need 25 them. To date, we've made substantial progress meeting the requirements of this bill. For example, I'll just run through a couple.

We've collected and posted for the public a wealth of data about the operations of the refining industry.

We adopted, last year, a Transportation Fuels

Assessment that is an excellent primer on the way the

petroleum market works here in California from crude oil

production to shipping to refining to retail distribution.

And we've looked very closely at the issue before you today, the maximum gross gasoline refining margin, GGRM, or I'll refer to it as the max margin, and the penalties for refiners that exceed it.

This grant of authority from SB X1-2 is extraordinary and it directed us to evaluate the propriety of utilizing this tool. We're grateful to the governor and to the legislature for entrusting us to carefully look at this consumer protection tool.

And to be clear, the law does not direct us to adopt a penalty. Rather, it directs us to analyze the issue and then only impose a max margin and penalty if the likely benefits to consumers outweigh the potential costs. Our job is to evaluate that question. That's the central issue. We're doing this to improve the situation for consumers and keep prices down and increase supply for now.

For the last two-plus years, we have worked with our sister agencies, including the Division of Petroleum Market Oversight. We've hosted numerous public workshops. We've met with a wide variety of stakeholders, including representatives of the refining companies who operate here in California. We've done our homework and we've learned a lot.

Four months ago, in April, Governor Newsom sent a letter to Vice Chair Gunda requesting that he make recommendations on changes to state policy to ensure a couple things: one, that Californians have access to safe, reliable and affordable transportation fuels; and refineries continue to see value in serving California even as demand for their product decreases.

Vice Chair Gunda responded with a letter stating that we simply need to do more analytical work before establishing a maximum chain of penalties. It's a very difficult task, very complicated. We've looked at a lot of sources from around the world in our analysis.

Vice Chair Gunda's letter noted that California is in a mid-transition phase as we move away from vehicles powered by petroleum to vehicles powered by clean electricity. In this mid-transition that we're in, there's some great news. Today, about one in four new vehicles sold in California is electric. At the same time, we still

have 20 million-plus vehicles in California that rely on fuel.

The Vice Chair's letter to the Governor recommended that we focus on managing this very complicated transition and then return to our evaluation of a maximum margin and penalty after a reasonable period of time. The resolution before you today presented by staff recommends the Commission do just that. It states that, I'm going to read this,

"The CEC will not take further action on a maximum gross gasoline refining margin or penalty for a period of five years. And if the CEC establishes a max margin prior to 2035 and a refiner requests an exemption from the imposition of a penalty, the CEC will consider the following two issues to be good cause to grant an exemption, either the refiner made significant investments in its gasoline producing units between January 1 of 2026 and the end of 2030 or other factors that the Energy Commission would ordinarily consider in determining whether there's good cause for an exemption."

The PowerPoint presentation will briefly walk you through the reasons why staff is making this recommendation.

And my apologies, can you advance back to the

first slide? I just want to walk through these quickly.

So we talked about this one. I don't need to go through that again. Please, please go ahead.

Okay, this is just a quick timeline to show that reporting on these GGRMs began a couple of years ago. We opened an informational proceeding. We held workshops.

We've gotten a lot of recommendations and I already talked about the ones from Vice Chair. I just wanted to show the public and you, Commissioners, that this has been a long process and we've held a lot of different activities during it.

Next slide, please.

Okay, this graph shows the gross margins of the refining industry in California. It goes back to 2013 up until June of this year and it shows significant volatility. We see that line moving up and down and up and down. The red line describes sort of the straight steady upward trend that we've observed. The spikes that you see where prices -- where the gross margin gets as high as just shy of \$2.00, we've seen those in recent years, they've largely been tied to extraordinary events like global crude oil price shocks, supply chain disruptions, and unplanned outages. When a refinery has a problem and has to shut down, that constrains supply.

But outside of these sorts of events, margins

tend to return to historical norms. You can see a spike when something happens and then you'll see the refining margins then return to a more stable level. Sometimes they dip quite low, as the graph shows, where they're negative, and they can be as low as about \$0.50 negative margin.

So let me ask that we move on to the next slide, please.

I just want to conclude by saying that the data at this point just is not sufficient to indicate that there's ongoing market manipulation or a structural failure that would justify immediate regulatory intervention.

Now, this slide I want to spend a minute on, Commissioners. Many of you have seen this slide before. The public who have joined us may have seen it as well. I just want to take a minute because I think this illustrates why we need to be very careful with the use of this tool.

The line at the top of the black dots that goes across the top of the graph is demand in California. As you can see it peaked in 2019 and it's been descending ever since. Our analysis shows that is, in significant measure, due to the adoption by Californians of electric vehicles. And we don't know the future but we're describing on this chart a downward trend in demand.

The horizontal bars, the green ones at the bottom and the different colors, those represent refineries in

California, and collectively, they represent the refining capacity in California. As you can see, when we get to 2025, it's been going down. And the sort of yellow light slashed area in the upper right corner of the -- of that figure shows the delta between our refining capacity, our ability to produce our own fuel, and what we need to get from elsewhere, which is from shipping. It's really our only material source of additional fuel in California.

So these closures, refineries have been closing.

And Northern California has been particularly hit by this.

Marathon Martinez closed recently, as did Philips Rodeo.

They didn't close but they no longer produce gasoline.

So while demand is declining, as the chart illustrates, supply is declining faster, and it declines in chunks. When a refinery closes, you lose that chunk of production versus what you can see from the graph is a relatively steady decline in demand. We hope that picks up and gets fast but, you know, as we look now, it's moving down steadily. So this imbalance between the demand for fuel and the supply of produced fuel in California is what's caused us concern and triggered the proposal that's before you today.

So we can make up that delta. When we're not producing enough to serve Californians' needs, we can make it up through imports. But there's a challenge in doing

that. Imported fuel is extraordinarily helpful to
California, but over-reliance on importing fuel poses risk
to our consumers. It poses the risk of greater exposure to
global price volatility as we rely on refineries from
around the world to produce the fuel. The fuel we use in
California is a special blend called CARBOB. It's isn't
widely used outside of California. And only a handful of
refineries produce it.

There's also longer wait times. When we -- when California -- when businesses do order fuel from overseas, it can take 30 days or longer to get to California. This makes us less flexible to respond to market disruption. If we experience some maintenance, one of those refineries you see in green on the graph, if one of those goes down, we're going to be immediately faced with a significant shortage of fuel. We do have some storage in California, but we're going to need to import. And if we can get it from another state nearby, that really helps. But if we can't, it's going to take a while to get here and California is going to be negatively impacted.

Next slide, please. And this is the last slide, I'll just mention, before final recommendation.

So we view our staff proposal not as an action -not as inaction, but as to deliver a strategic signal to
the market. Staff believes the proposed resolution will

build investor confidence in California's refining sector at a really critical moment. Industry needs to continue to invest in significant maintenance. Large refinery turnarounds are typically planned years in advance and can cost hundreds of millions of dollars.

The resolution as proposed will give refineries the certainty to invest in critical maintenance and reliability upgrades, knowing they can plan for one or two full turnaround cycles without sudden policy shifts. We believe this will reduce the likelihood of additional refinery closures or supply disruptions due to outages.

We also think it will help protect workers and the public because when prices go up, that can harm the public, and certainly maintenance that is foregone can also cause risks.

While we're proposing this pause, we plan to continue to gather evidence needed to make the best long-term decision as we move through this mid-transition.

Staff's proposal aligns with our broader energy strategy, which is protecting consumers while supporting an orderly decline in the legacy system and a shift to clean transportation fuels.

Finally, staff's proposed approach preserves our regulatory authority, so if future conditions warrant, we can act at that time.

1 Next slide, please. 2 For those reasons, we request that the Commission 3 adopt the resolution that's before you. 4 And before I close, I just want to say, the list 5 is long of all the staff who helped out with this. I'm grateful to so many people that I can't name, but I want to 6 7 call special attention to a few folks. One of them is Jeremy Smith. He's the best data 8 9 expert I've ever met, hands down. 10 Aleecia Gutierrez, who is Jeremy's boss, has been 11 helpful throughout this process. 12 And finally, and I'm sure my boss will recognize 13 them, as well, but from the Vice Chair's Office, Aria 14 Berliner and Theresa Keetes have worked incredibly hard on 15 this. 16 So thank you very much for your time. 17 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Thank you, Drew, for your 18 presentation. 19 I just want to make sure, you were breaking up a 20 little bit for me and I want to make sure we correct the 21 record. 22 If we can go back to slide number five that Drew 23 presented? 24 Yeah, just want to make sure. I think, Drew, you

misspoke as negative. I believe it's negative relative to

25

the mean you were speaking about. So I just want to make sure that's corrected. And --

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BOHAN: You are correct.

VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BOHAN: That was a mistake. Thank you for blaming me on the fuzzy connection.

VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Yeah, so I think it's kind of, you know, just restating that I think is an important part.

There's two points I want to make sure.

I think, one, the observation that there is a slight increase in the GGRM is true, and it's something we need to continue to investigate. It's also important to recognize the volatility that we pointed to in the past since the Torrance refinery fire with the decreased supply. And, you know, we've seen more and more volatility. So while the average has been increasing, it's also the volatility has been higher. So that's an important thing to think through.

And I want to recognize some of the work that the Department of Petroleum Market Oversight has done on this to also further look at the nuances in the last staff report that has been posted today. Looking at just the gross margins industry-wide doesn't give the full picture. It's important to note how the business models of different industry players would impact that. And I think that's

1 | further investigation we need to continue to do.

Again, I think not disagreeing with what Drew has just said, which I all agree with, it's important to note that that this chart has a lot of nuance and details that have to be continued to investigated and analyzed.

With that, can we go public comment? Thanks.

MS. BADIE: Yes. Thank you.

The Commission welcomes Item 4 at this time. We're going to start with folks in the room in Sacramento, then move to anyone in the room in Barstow, and then we'll go on to Zoom.

If you're in the room with us, we've asked folks to use the QR code or sign up with the Public Advisor's table. And same with our Barstow, or just raising your hand. And then if you're on Zoom online, use the raisehand feature on your screen, it looks like an open palm, and star nine if joining by phone.

So starting with folks in the Sacramento location, I will call your name. And then we are asking for folks to come up to the podium, and that's just to my right up here.

And we have Tanya DeRivi. And then after Tanya, we'll hear from Mike Mulliner.

And then just a reminder for our in-person commenters, we're going to have a timer on the screen.

We're asking for comments to be two minutes or less.

MS. DERIVI: Good afternoon. My name is Tanya DeRivi, T-A-N-Y-A D, like David, -E, capital -R-I-V, like Victor, -I, with the Western State Petroleum Association.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments on the recommended decision for this Commission to not set a gross gasoline refining margin cap under SB X1-2. While this is a step in the right direction, it stops well short of a full statutory repeal or the 20-year pause WSPA recommended. California's refiners will need appropriate signals from the state to have the certainty necessary to continue investing in the state.

The recommendation before you today is a step towards the governor's direction to the Energy Commission to quote, "help ensure that Californians continue to have access to a safe, affordable, and reliable supply of transportation fuels and that refiners continue to see the value in serving the California market," end quote, contributes to a possibility of a more predictable regulatory environment, which is critical for investors' decisions related to providing the transportation fuels needed by Californians and, for a limited time, avoids imposing a penalty that could reduce in-state gasoline supply and unintentionally drive up pump prices by forcing refiners to cut production to stay below a revenue cap, an

outcome directly contrary to the intent of the authorizing legislation.

This recommendation is informed by the Commission staff's analysis of real-world data and market conditions, including the fact that California does not have enough instate refining capacity left to meet its own demands and announced upcoming refinery closures will only worsen the situation. WSPA continues to warn that a future margin cap or any other policy that detours investments won't solve fuel market issues beyond refiners' control, including economic, geopolitical, or systemic realities.

Finally, we appreciate the Commission's collaborative efforts with stakeholders given the pressing need to stabilize California's refining sector and look forward to working with the CEC to advance policies that are in the best interest of consumers.

Thank you again for the time.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we're going to hear from Mark Mulliner.

And after Mark, we'll hear from Daniel Barad.

Dan, if you want to come up and have a seat at the podium, that would help us.

MR. MULLINER: Good morning, Vice Chair Siva, Commissioners. Mark Mulliner, California State Building and Construction Trades Council. You know, I'm here

representing 450,000 of our members, 70,000 of our apprentices. We have millions of manhours and many thousands of affiliate members that work in these refineries.

We want to say thank you. The State Building
Trades recognizes that this is, in a lot of people's eyes,
a stutter step that maybe is what's happen. But what it's
telling us at the Building Trades is that common sense and
that working together with the Commission and working
together with our affiliates, we can prolong, we can make
it a better positive outcome for these refineries. These
refineries aren't going anywhere.

And we want to say thank you for recognizing that we as constituents, we as people that drive vehicles, that use fuel, we are here — high paying jobs, apprenticeship opportunities, everything that those refineries do, and at the same time they have made a commitment to produce the cleanest fuel in the world. And that's the fuel that's not being tanked in here from other countries. That's not being tanked in here from other states. This is California fuel.

Do add to this, we need to go a little bit further and we need to help these refineries with the volume of crude that they need to be able to produce to be profitable, and recognizing the money they spend, billions

of dollars, when a fire happens. Nobody wants to talk about all the billions that goes into bringing a refinery back online, okay? They just want to talk about the base consumer cost.

But at the end of the day, California having grown to the fourth largest economy is because, partly, of all of our refiners and the amount of money that we all made through these refiners going back into the industry, going back into the community.

So State Building Trades is here to say thank you for this resolution. Thank you for the five years. And we are here to support you and your Commission.

Thank you very much.

MS. BADIE: Thanks Mark.

Next, we're going to hear from Daniel Barad. And after Daniel, we'll here from Tim Sbranti.

Tim, if you want to come and have a seat at the front? It does help us with (indiscernible).

MR. BARAD: Good morning. I'm Daniel Barad on behalf of the Union of Concerned Scientists, D-A-N-I-E-L B-A-R-A-D.

And as the Commission staff and Vice Chair constantly remind us, California is in the midst of the transition away from fossil fuels and to clean transportation. We have a scientific and moral imperative

to transition to zero-emission transportation as quickly as possible to meet our climate goals and to achieve our federal air quality standards. But we also need to ensure that gasoline prices and supply remain stable in the face of impending refinery closures to ensure that the impacts of this transition don't disproportionately fall upon lowincome Californians.

UCS supported all of the tools given to the CEC in the special sessions as they increase the state's ability to manage the decline -- declining gasoline demand and protect consumers. But as concerned scientists, we also recognize the need to lead with the data and prioritize the right tools for this moment.

We support the staff recommendation to postpone the refining margin and penalty but reserve the right to use it if and when that is where the data leads. The CEC must prioritize regulations that stabilize supply while planning for the transition and working with other agencies and legislature to keep the pedal to the metal on the transition. This will include advancing recommendations in the agency's forward (phonetic) report and working with the legislature to secure continued funding the transition.

We look forward to continuing to work with the CEC and the state in an urgent but stable transition.

Thank you.

1 MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we will hear from Tim Sbranti. And then after Tim, we'll hear from Chuck Leonard.

Chuck, it does help us along if you wanted to take a seat near the front.

And then just an overall reminder, we're asking for comments to be two minutes or less. There's a timer on the screen.

MR. SBRANTI: Great. Thank you. Tim Sbranti, Tim, T-I-M, last name S, as in Sam, -B, as in boy, -R, as in Ronald, -A-N-T-I. I am the Executive Director of the Contra Costa Building and Construction Trades Council. We represent, I represent 35,000 members of our Council, 20 affiliates, and we have millions of manhours in the refineries in Contra Costa County.

And I just want to thank you for bringing this item forward. I want to thank the staff, I want to thank the Commission for really taking a critical look at what is going on. And we want to speak wholeheartedly in favor of the staff recommendation.

I think the phrase that was used was a strategic pause. And I think that's very, very prudent, especially given, I think, the chart that was really compelling, was the volatility. I mean, you can see it. There was one graph, and you can talk about, you know, a lot of different

things, but that graph now shows the volatility in the market. And if we're going to save the market, I think having that pause right now is really, really important.

Obviously, it's evident the jobs we have working in the refineries, but this impacts every one of our members. You know, our members, if you are in the building and construction trades, you don't have the luxury of telecommuting. You don't have the luxury of working from home, of taking transit, or taking the trail, all the different things. You know, our members have to get in their trucks and drive to work each and every day. They're called journeypersons because they have to journey to where the work is. That's where the phrase comes from. And so for the consumers, you know, our members that are consumers are members that are workers, you know, having a stable gas prices is important.

And it relates to the safety of our members, too, because the refineries reinvest in their operations, and that was another one of the bulletins, the bulletins in the staff report, for safer operations, for more energy efficient operations. So, you know, having a little bit of certainty in the market will allow them to make those investments in those facilities to make it a safer place for our workers.

So, again, we really thank you for bringing this

forward. And we thank the critical study.

And I just want to close with this, is we want to be a thought partner as you look at future things to help stabilize the industry. Those of us in the building trades really want to contribute to that conversation and make sure we do all we can for this critical need for our state.

Thank you so much.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we're going to hear Chuck Leonard. After Chuck, we'll hear from James Holland.

James, it would help us if you take a seat near the front.

MR. LEONARD: Good afternoon. Chuck Leonard, C-H-U-C-K, Leonard, L-E-O-N-A-R-D. I am a 43-year member of Plumbers & Steamfitters Local 342.

For well over 30 years, I wore a hard hat and work boots in these oil refineries. And as a political rep, I'm here today to thank the leadership of Vice Chair Siva Gunda and the Commissioners at the CEC and the staff of the CEC. It takes great leadership. Thank you for your leadership, Vice Chair Siva Gunda. Thank you for the leadership of the CEC and of the staff recommendation. I have a business manager that's here today, along with over half of our business agents that are here just to say thank you.

My organization represents over half of the workers that work in these five -- in these four facilities in Contra Costa County. And we are the black and brown, the fenceline community, the workers that work in these facilities. So when you take the politics aside, these middle class jobs matter.

My son, my son-in-laws, my grandson, generations of workers work in these facilities. These jobs matter. You know, there's people out there today that are working and these jobs matter. So the decisions that you make, when you take all the politics out of the decisions that are being made, these are important. These decisions that you're making are extremely important.

So we're here today to say thank you. This is just a Band-Aid in a situation. We know the transition is going to happen and the workforce is here today, but today we're here to celebrate and to say thank you for the decisions that you're making.

And so for our members, out of Plumbers & Steamfitters Local 342, thank you for the decisions you're making today and we support it wholeheartedly.

Thank you.

MS. BADIE: Thank you for your comments.

Next, we're going to hear from James Holland.

And then after James, the last in the room that we have

It was

1 signed up is Timothy Jeffries. 2 Timothy, it does help us if you can you come take 3 a seat near the podium. 4 MR. HOLLAND: Commissioners, Vice Chair, Chair, 5 appreciate your time. I'm James Holland, J-A-M-E-S H-O-L-L-A-N-D. I'm a Business Agent for Local 92 6 7 Boilermakers down south in Southern California. We're a small organization, but our bread and butter is the 8 refineries. We average 1.2 million hours in the refineries 9 10 every year. 11 And on behalf of the 750-plus members we have in 12 the refineries doing maintenance as we speak, we fully 13 support the recommendations of the CEC staff. 14 Thank you. 15 MS. BADIE: Thank you. 16 Next, we'll hear from Timothy Jeffries. 17 MR. JEFFRIES: Good morning, Timothy Jeffries, T-I-M-O-T-H-Y J-E-F-F-R-I-E-S. I'm the International Rep 18 19 for the Boilermakers in the state of California, 20 representing the Locals in Northern California and Southern 21 California. 22 As previously stated, I'm aligning my comments

stated that this is a good first step. I also would like

to echo my thanks, as well, to the Vice Chair Gunda, as

with those in the State Building Trades and WSPA.

23

24

25

1 well, too. This is a good step in the postponement of it. 2 But I have a question. Why not a full recall? 3 And then this can't be the, to emphasize, this 4 can't be the only stabilizer we want to put into the 5 market. There should be other stabilizers in the market to help stabilize the investments and the economy here in this 6 7 industry, and for the building trades labor, we're here to 8 help, too. 9 So thank you. 10 MS. BADIE: Thank you. And if there's -- that was the last folks signed 11 12 up in the QR code. If there's other people that want to 13 comment in the room, if you could please visit the Public Advisor table in the back of the room? Dorothy Murimi is 14 15 there to sign you up. And if you want to make a comment --16 yes? 17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: She did sign up. 18 MS. BADIE: Oh, okay. Great. Thank you so much. 19 And then, oh, here we go. Anthony, this is --20 MR. OCHOA: Aureliano Ochoa. 21 MS. BADIE: Oh, sorry, Aureliano Ochoa. 22 thank you. 23 And then after Aureliano, we're going to hear 24 from Anthony Viscuso, if you want to come take a seat up 25 front? Thank you so much.

MR. OCHOA: Hey. Hello. My name is Aureliano 1 2 Ochoa, A-U-R-E-L-I-A-N-O, last name O-C-H-O-A. It's a hard 3 one, so -- and I'm here representing the Heat & Frost Insulators Local 16. We represent 48 counties in 4 5 California. On behalf of our membership, we want to tell you 6 7 to support the resolution. The refiners represent 33 percent of our work hours. If this resolution doesn't 8 9 pass, Californians will lose thousands of jobs. Local businesses will be affected. Even schools. Because if we 10 11 don't have jobs, we're going to move and we're going to try 12 to relocate to another county, and maybe out of the state. 13 And as a personal level, I work almost 20 years in the refinery. I live in Solano County. And I'm an 14 15 example of what the refineries representing the working 16 class, because if we don't have that, I'm probably going 17 to -- I would have moved out of the state already. 18 Unemployment is probably, what, \$2,000 a month. And I 19 won't be able to pay -- if I don't have a job, I won't be 20 able to pay the \$2,600 payment on my house just like that. 21 I'm not even talking about feeding my family. 22 So behalf of the insulators, and personally, I 23 want to say thank you for taking a step forward. 24 And that's it. Thanks.

Thank you.

MS. BADIE:

25

Next, we'll hear from Anthony Viscuso.

MR. VISCUSO: Okay. My name is Anthony Viscuso, A-N-T-H-O-N-Y V-I-S-C-U-S-O. And I also represent the Heat & Frost Insulators Local 16.

Again, we, just to echo what was already said, we do want to also thank -- thank the -- thank you guys, the Commissioners, for looking at this. This is really important to us.

You know, any -- you guys have been mandated to try and consent -- try and protect the consumer. And ultimately, you guys are doing that. I know that you've been looking at these price spikes and everything, that we're ultimately trying to protect the cost over the long run. This helps. This puts, as was said, this puts a Band-Aid on it. What will really kill us is if we lose another refinery. The graph you guys had up there that showed if, you know, when and if we lose the next two refineries, we're going to have to -- we're going to have to input more and more fuel, that cost is directly going to get passed down to the consumers.

When I was still on the tools, I was driving 25,000 to 30,000 miles every year, and every single one of our members drives about the same. We are the people who are directly going to be impacted by that fuel cost.

So I thank you guys for this suggestion.

1 Anything you guys can do to help, to help maybe restore 2 those other two refineries, I know you guys are limited 3 with what you can do, but we're sure here to support. 4 Again, thank you. Appreciate it. 5 MS. BADIE: Thank you. Next, we're going to hear from Thomas Kholenberg. 6 7 And after Thomas we'll hear from Che Timmons. Che, if you want to come take a seat up front, 8 that would help. 9 10 MR. KOHLENBERG: Thomas Kholenbewrg, T-H-O-M-A-S, 11 last name K-H-O-L-E-N-B-E-R-G. I'm a representative for 12 the International Union of Operating Engineers Local 3. 13 I'm a Refinery Rep. I've worked inside of the refineries for quite a few years of my being in the field. I'm here 14 15 representing about 700 current members working inside of 16 the refineries and we're in support of the staff's 17 recommendations, and hopefully you will go forward. 18 Thank you for your time. 19 MS. BADIE: Next, we'll hear from Che Timmons. 20 MR. TIMMONS: Good afternoon. Che Timmons, 21 C-H-E, last name Timmons, T-I-M-M-O-N-S. I'm the Business 22 Manager of Local 342 Plumbers & Steamfitters in Oakland, 23 California. I represent thousands of members that work in 24 the refineries in the Bay Area. 25 I just want to -- I want to commend the staff and the Commission on doing such a thorough analysis on the effects that this would have, not only to my members but also to the citizens of this great state.

The postponement of the margin cap implementation for the next ten years, and then, once against, do another analysis I think is very prudent in how that's moving forward.

Once again, I support you guys and I thank you guys for supporting the recommendation today.

Thank you.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we're going to hear from Randy Thomas.

Randy, if you want to approach the podium? And then just a general reminder, we're asking for comments to be two minutes or less. There will be a timer on the screen.

MR. THOMAS: Hello. My name is Randy Thomas,
R-A-N-D-Y T-H-O-M-A-S. I'm the Business Manager of
Boilermakers Local 549. We have quite a few members that
work at the refineries who travel long distances.

I think California has always been kind of a staple for making changes. We have Cal/OSHA. There's a lot of things that start with California. A lot of that was pushing a need for cleaner fuels in this area.

I definitely appreciate you getting a chance to be able to sit down with us and listen for our concerns

with what's happening too. There is going to be an energy transition. We're in the middle of it at this point in time but we don't have that replacement, so a lot of people are going to wind up doing without. And when it comes to the industries that we represent and the craftswomen and craftsmen that work in these refineries, they're also going to transition as industry transitions out of here; right? So without opportunity, California isn't the great state that we live in here today.

Thank you for making some changes now to where we can hopefully move in the right direction. But we are the ones that are going to make the decisions that is going to either be California's economic prosper or demise.

Thank you very much.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

All right, we're going to transition to the Barstow location.

But if there's anyone in the Sacramento location in-person and you decide you want to comment, you can go to the Public Advisor's table. Dorothy Murimi is there assist you to sign you up, and we will come back to the room if you change your mind.

So right now, let's check in with the Barstow location.

Ryan, do we have any commenters in person at

Barstow?

MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Public Advisor. Seeing none in the room, back to you.

MS. BADIE: Thank you so much.

All right, we're going to transition over to Zoom. I'm going to call on Erica Valentine.

Erica, let me find you really quick. Thank you for your patience. I'm going to open your line. And just a reminder to please state and spell your name for our court reporter. And we're asking for comments to be two minutes or less. There will be a timer on the screen.

MS. VALENTINE: Hello. Thank you. My name is Erica Valentine, E-R-I-C-A, Valentine, V-A-L-E-N-T-I-N-E. I am the Political and Communications Director for UA Local 393. We have 3,100 members throughout our state that work. And we also support the winery -- I mean, the refineries.

We stand with the California State Building
Trades to say thank you for your leadership. We thank you
for all the research you have done. We look forward to a
collaboration and solution that reflects the leadership in
our state with all parties at the table. My workers thank
you because penalizing or shutting down refineries
compromise jobs and safety of the state.

As the fourth largest economy, it is a shame that some groups are proposing to impose penalties that would

force thousands of people to choose between rent or gas, taking their kids to school or going to work, being able to feed their family or going to work, being able to have heat in their home or gas to go to work. By closing refineries, we'd put several families into homelessness that would be life-threatening and cause even a greater harm.

We thank you for your leadership and acknowledging the technology advancement that we have made, and acknowledging the safety that we have when we use skilled and trained workforce in these refineries as we have today. We ask you to consider all these things as you continue to move forward and you collaborate in a way that will continue to provide jobs, provide safety, keep construction working and workers employed. We thank you for your commitment, and all of our union members thank you as well.

Thank you.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we'll hear from Mike Smith. Mike, I'm going to open your line. You'll unmute on your end and then we can begin.

MR. M. SMITH: Good morning -- or good afternoon. My name is Mike Smith, M-I-K-E S-M-I-T-H. I am the Chair of the National Oil Bargaining Program for the United Steelworkers. We represent about 30,000 oil workers

throughout the country, mostly proprietary inside the refineries, including over 4,000 in the state of California.

We support the recommendation of the staff and appreciate the work that was done and put into this. I think the understanding that we are in a transportation fuels crisis in the state, with the looming closures coming forward, it's necessary to look at all the tools to ensure that we stabilize the current market, as well as create investor confidence to ensure that the refineries get the funding to operate safely and responsibly into the future.

We've always supported the transparency and using the tools to require the transparency of the industry. And we think that the information is helpful as we continue to move forward. We just want to ensure that the communities that — the communities and workers that I think the rules are trying to protect aren't disproportionately harming when companies make decisions to shut down refineries and leave a state, you know, in need of transportation fuels.

So that's about it, and thank you very much.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we're going to hear from Jason Lindsey.

Jason, I'm going to open your line. Just a reminder, we're asking for comments to be two minutes or less.

MR. LINDSEY: Well, good afternoon,

1 Commissioners. My name is Jason Lindsey, that's J-A-S-O-N 2 L-I-N-D-S-E-Y. I'm President and Business Agent of Ironworkers Local 378. 3 4 So the way to clean the environment is to modernize and further innovate the refineries that are in 5 operation as we work toward a more sustainable energy 6 7 future. The maximum gross gasoline refinery margin and 8 penalty threatens to prevent essential investments in 9 refinery infrastructure, investments necessary to keep the 10 facilities open and reliable and safe. Our members and our 11 communities rely on these refineries staying open. 12 As a reminder, UC Berkeley did a study in Contra 13 Costa County as concerns our four refineries, and 35 percent of the county's funding comes from these 14 15 facilities. So it's not just the jobs in the refinery that 16 will be lost, it will be other ancillary jobs that are 17 lost, good paying jobs. 18 So I stand with the State Building Trades. 19 Thanks for this. This is a good first step, but let's go 20 further. 21 Thank you. 22 MS. BADIE: Thank you. 23 Next, we're going to hear from Tracy Scott. 24 Tracy, I'm going to open your line. Just a reminder, we're 25 asking for comments to be two minutes or less. Tracy, if

you could unmute on your end? Thank you.

2 MR. SCOTT: Yes. My name is Tracy Scott, 3 T-R-A-C-Y S-C-O-T-T.

Good afternoon, Vice Chair Gunda, Commissioners.

I'm a retired President and Staff Representative from

United Steelworkers Local 5. I'm speaking in strong

support of Item 4 to adopt staff's recommendation on the

maximum gross gasoline refining margin and penalty

implementation timeline.

California, as you know, is in a mid-transition phase. Demand for petroleum fuels is declining, but we still rely on in-state refining for reliability and price stability. Moving too quickly to impose a maximum refining margin could have unintended consequences, discouraging needed maintenance and investment, increasing outage risks, and even hastening refinery exits that would tighten supply and raise volatility for consumers. Staff's proposal recognizes these risks and proposes a prudent pause.

And I appreciate that Item 4 postpones the margin cap implementation for at least five years while the Commission prioritizes a sector-wide managed transition strategy, including tools like minimum inventory and resupply planning. That timeline spans at least one full turnaround cycle, which is essential for planning, worker safety, and regulatory compliance. It's a balanced path

that protects consumers and the workforce while the state continues building out clean alternatives.

As you move forward, I urge the Commission to formalize robust labor participation in any managed transition proceedings, two, maintain transparency on market data and reliability metrics, and three, set clear milestones for when and how the Commission will revisit the margin cap if consumer benefits ultimately outweigh costs under Public Relations [sic] Code 25355.5.

And for these reasons, I respectfully urge an aye vote on Item 4.

Thank you.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we're going to hear from Albert Duarte.

Albert, I'm going to open your line. You'll unmute on your end. And just a reminder, we're asking for comments to be two minutes or less.

MR. DUARTE: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

Thank you for this time. My name is Albert Duarte and I'm the Business Manager for the Riverside & San Bernardino Building and Construction Trades. Albert, A-L-B-E-R-T, Duarte, D-U-A-R-T-E. And we strongly support the CEC staff recommendation to postpone implementation.

Every meeting that I go to, I hear from my members the concern of these refineries being shut down,

and we're all concerned. We do support this program, but we are also concerned that we're putting limits on -- what I tell my -- our unions and our trades is that we have to be successful or the companies we work for have to be successful. So it's really concerning when we're putting a cap on somebody making a profit. This is a capitalist society. It's not a socialism.

So the only regulation I do ask is that we make sure that we invest in the workers on job sites, keeping them safe, and through that, through skilled and trained workers. There has to be a bar of the people working in these facilities. But I just ask you to continue to fight for us, to keep these refineries open; right? It's concerning that we're going to -- we're moving to one side or the other.

You know, the affordability of fully electric cars for a worker is too much, especially when we have a family of four and we have to pay for our kids' transportation to college and back, and to pay for their college. There's a lot. It's a trickle-down effect with the closures of these refineries.

So we thank you for your support. We ask for your continued support, and we strongly support the recommendations.

Thank you.

MS. BADIE: Thank you. 1 2 Next, we're going to hear from Stephen Rosenblum. 3 Stephen, I'm going to open your line. Stephen, if you can 4 unmute on your end, then you may begin. 5 MR. ROSENBLUM: All right. Hello? Can you hear 6 me? 7 MS. BADIE: Yes. 8 MR. ROSENBLUM: Hello? Can you hear me? Yeah. 9 MS. BADIE: We can hear you. We can hear you. 10 MR. ROSENBLUM: Yeah, thank you. Hi. Ny name is 11 Stephen Rosenblum, S-T-E-P-H-E-N, last name Rosenblum, 12 R-O-S-E-N-B-L-U-M. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. 13 As Director Bohan pointed out, the gasoline need is declining every year since 2019 due to EV adoption, 14 15 which is really necessary to protect our air and our 16 climate. And that's really the goal. 17 It's disappointing to me that union leadership 18 did not recognize that there will be many future jobs in 19 clean energy. And just as a reminder, there are no jobs on 20 a dead planet. We all see the effects of climate change now, wildfires, floods, extreme heat. 21 It's already upon us 22 and we need to do something. We cannot continue business 23 as usual. 24 So I would like to request that the refineries

participate in a just transition for their workers, that

25

they provide job training for new jobs in clean industries, and that they support the communities that they're presently in to replace the tax base that will be removed when they finally shut down.

In regard to some of the points that were made, I think I agree with Jamie Court that it's irresponsible to set a timeline to wait to make a decision on refinery margins. For one thing, something was neglected in the discussion, that we already export 12 percent of our gasoline to Arizona and Nevada. We can easily reclaim that percentage and use it for California needs.

The refineries that were closed were a business decision. They're the smallest and the oldest and the least profitable. So it's not as if that -- that it's a -- that refineries are unprofitable, it's just that the business of certain refineries is unprofitable.

And then I think minimum storage should be required.

19 Thank you.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we're going to hear from Julia May. Julia, I'm going to open your line. You'll unmute on your end and then you may begin.

MS. MAY: Hi. Julia May, J-U-L-I-A M-A-Y, Senior Scientist, Communities for a Better Environment, CBE.

We represent frontline communities of color suffering daily from refineries, oil extraction, and fossil transportation. And we've worked successfully for decades to reduce refinery pollution, but refineries are inherently grossly polluting, even with best available controls.

I blame the oil industry for twisting the news enough to fool people into thinking California regulations are causing refinery closures. They're closing because gasoline demand is lowering, not only in California, but Texas, the U.S. and abroad, due to more electric vehicles, efficiency, and competition, not due to regulation. Even so, California refineries still make more profit than in other states. It's counterproductive to gut regulations to provide sweetheart deals for big oil.

I congratulate big oil on their insane but effective holding of California hostage after 100 years of extracting high profits, heavily polluting the state, and causing catastrophic climate impacts. I keep thinking someone in the industry will realize they're shooting themselves in the foot by killing the earth underneath themselves.

Of course, the industry deserves heavy penalties for spikes in high gasoline prices that particularly harm low-income folks, and we don't support putting off the penalties.

We do support CEC's careful analysis for logistical solutions and greatly appreciate Vice Chair Gunda's efforts to include EJ, as well as the staff's deep work.

The dinosaur industry is starting to crumble by itself. The new problem for workers and gasoline cost is sudden whole closures, unplanned, unlike electricity. We need a smooth plan for smoothly lowering, take into account exports, deal with reserves, and resupply. Consider our partial refinery closure. The only way to solve smog and climate change is planning.

Thanks.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we're going to hear from Woody Hastings.

Woody, I'm going to open your line. Oh, sorry, Woody, we lost your raised hand. If you -- oh, okay. I found you again. We're going to open your line. You will unmute on your end. And we are asking for your comments to be two minutes or less. There will be a timer on the screen.

MR. HASTINGS: Okay, can you hear me?

MS. BADIE: Yes.

MR. HASTINGS: Okay. Good afternoon. My name is Woody Hastings, that's W-O-O-D-Y H-A-S-T-I-N-G-S, Woody Hastings with The Climate Center, a statewide climate and clean energy policy nonprofit founded in 2001. Thank you

for the opportunity to speak.

First, I'd like to align my comments with Julia May of CBE just now in solidarity with our fenceline community friends.

The price gouging penalty is not an arbitrary penalty with no basis. It is also not an attack in any way on the good workers at refineries, nor is it a disregard for the fully acknowledged need for stable and affordable fuel supplies. It is a penalty for improper industry price gouging that has been substantiated by DPMO analysis. It is a penalty imposed for a clear violation, just like a penalty imposed for any other clear violation of rules, regulations, or laws.

what you guys do, TCC, The Climate Center, respectfully urges you to not put the development of the maximum gross gasoline margin, nor any penalties pursuant to it, on pause. Square one is that in order to be ready to respond quickly with any future action the underlying analysis for the rule must be completed as soon as possible. It would be helpful if the anticipated timeline for that could be shared today.

If you do pause, any pause should be for as short as possible, certainly less than five years. In fact, there really should be no arbitrary pause time at all. The

1 CEC must be ready to immediately expedite the rule if DPMO 2 detects market manipulation or excessive profits. 3 Thank you. 4 MS. BADIE: Thank you for those comments. 5 Next, we'll hear from Julian Vinatieri. I'm 6 going to open your line, Julian. You'll unmute on your 7 We are asking for comments to be two minutes or less. There will be a timer on the screen. 8 MR. VINATIERI: Hello. Can you hear me? 9 10 MS. BADIE: Yes. 11 MR. VINATIERI: Hello. My name is Julian 12 Vinatieri, that's J-U-L-I-A-N, Vinatieri, 13 V-I-N-A-T-I-E-R-I. Once again, my name is Julian 14 Vinatieri. I serve as the Business Manager for IBEW Local 15 302, which represents over 1,250 electrical workers across 16 Contra Costa County. 17 I'm here today on behalf of our members and 18 skilled professionals who live and work in our community. 19 Nearly half of our members support their families through 20 the employment opportunities provided by these local 21 These facilities are not only critical to our refineries. 22 members, but to the broader economic stability of our 23 county and state. There is so much at stake which could 24 drive these refineries out of the area, which would have a

devastating impact, not just on our members, but on

25

thousands of other workers and families throughout Contra Costa County and beyond.

With that said, we want to thank the staff for the recommendation. I feel that I've made it clear where IBEW 302 stands. We strongly support the California Energy Commission staff recommendation to postpone this implementation, and we want to thank you for your research on this matter.

Thank you.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we're going to hear from Mitchell Bechtel.

I'm going to open your line, Mitchell. And as a reminder,
there will be a timer on the screen. We're asking for
comments to be two minutes or less.

MR. BECHTEL: Aloha. Mitchell Bechtel on behalf of the District Council of Ironworkers.

We support the recommendation to delay implementation. This is a step in the right direction, but the question becomes, will this be enough to keep refiners in California?

As you're all aware, even one more refiner leaving the state could have catastrophic effects on fuel prices for consumers. We believe additional market stabilizers may be needed to keep costs down for working families in California.

We thank you for your work and appreciate what you guys are trying to do and just hope that we can keep refiners in state so that fuel prices stay low for working families.

Thank you.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we're going to hear from Pete Wohlgezogen.

I hope I pronounced that correctly. I'm going to open your line, Pete. Just a reminder, we're asking for comments to be two minutes or less. There will be a timer on the screen.

MR. WOHLGEZOGEN: Good afternoon. My name is

Pete Wolgezogan, that's P-E-T-E, Wohlgezogen,

W-O-H-L-G-E-Z-O-G-E-N. I am a Representative for UA Local

250 Steamfitters & Refrigeration in Los Angeles. We have

6,800 members that work in industries like refineries. I'm

speaking in strong support of the CEC's recommendation to

propose an implementation.

I have been a member of UA Local 250 for 25 years, and I've spent 21 years working in various refineries in the Los Angeles area. These refineries not only care about the safety of the employees that work in the facilities, but they care about the surrounding communities too. They give back in many ways that benefit the communities.

Our members work many hours in these facilities. Our members are consisted of men, women, veterans, and people granted a second chance. These jobs help our members earn a livable wage in California. Our members' jobs depend on California refineries staying open, and their safety depends on proper maintenance of these 7 facilities. If these refineries continue to shutter, we will be forced to pay more for imported oil and gas from states that don't refine to the highly regulated quality that our local refineries produce. This isn't moving forward. 11 moving backwards at a higher cost. I want to thank the CEC for their consideration on this matter. Thank you. 16 MS. BADIE: Thank you. Next, we're going to hear from Martin Rodriguez. I'm going to open your line, Martin. You'll unmute on your 19 end, and then you may begin. 20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Good afternoon. This is Martin Rodriguez, M-A-R-T-I-N R-O-D-R-I-G-U-E-Z. I'm a Business Agent for the Ironworkers Local 433, and President of Tri County Building & Construction Trades. My thoughts and comments align with the State

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

Building and Construction Trades. There again, this is a

1 move in the right direction. But I feel the frustration of 2 the gentleman from earlier from the Bricklayers. And 3 punitive legislation, a lot of it in the last five years, 4 has got us to this position. 5 I hope moving forward, there will be other good 6 legislation that will follow up with this stopgap measure 7 that I'm thankful for nevertheless. 8 Thank you. MS. BADIE: 9 Thank you. Next, we're going to hear from Brandon Dennison-10 11 Borja. You're going to open your line. You'll unmute on 12 your end, and then you can begin, Brandon. 13 MR. DENNISON-BORJA: Good morning. Can you hear 14 me? 15 MS. BADIE: Yes. 16 MR. DENNISON-BORJA: All right. Good morning. 17 My name is Brandon Dennison-Borja, that's B-R-A-N-D-O-N, 18 Dennison-Borja, D-E-N-N-I-S-O-N dash B-O-R-J-A, and I'm a 19 proud journeyman of IBEW 302 in Contra Costa County. 20 I've been an electrician in this industry for just six years, but during that time, I've spent the last 21 22 three years working in our county's four oil refineries. 23 I've worked in the field, performing maintenance, capital 24 projects, turnarounds, you name it.

I'm currently working at Marathon's Renewable

25

Plant in Martinez. But I can say that all of our refineries provide the local workforce, my brothers and sisters, the opportunities to safe, reliable, and dependable jobs. This enables us to support our families, to contribute back to our local communities, but it's essential to keeping our county as a place for financial prosperity for the working class of California. These facilities have been essential for me, my wife, and many other Californians on being able to afford living in our great state so that we can support our families and further develop our roots in the cities we love and serve.

In addition to the aforementioned potential state and consumer disruptions from Executive Director Drew Bohan, to move forward with this penalty right now as it stands would put thousands of hardworking Californian's livelihoods at stake, reducing lower and middle class upward mobility, especially in these already trying times for our blue-collar members and other union brothers and sisters.

So in solidarity with the State Building Trades, I stand with the Energy Commission's recommendation to postpone this implementation. And I'd like to thank you all for your time and your continued support.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we're going to hear from Alfonso Ruiz.

Alfonso, I'm going to open your line. You'll unmute on your end and then you can begin.

MR. RUIZ: Yeah, good morning, Commissioners. My name is Alfonso Ruiz and I represent the Heat & Frost Insulators Local 5.

And look, no one likes paying too much at the pump. Consumer protection is important, of course it is, but we can't lose sight of the bigger picture. Without reliable refineries, there won't be any gasoline to protect consumers from in the first place.

And here's the absurdity, this penalty doesn't fix the problem, it makes it worse. The very investments required to keep California's refineries safe, reliable, and modern are the ones this policy would choke off. It's a bit like seeing your car running low on gas and deciding that the best solution is to remove the fuel tank altogether. Yes, you'll never worry about buying gas again, but you've also guaranteed the car will never move. That's what this proposal does. It solves a problem in theory by destroying the system -- but destroying the system in practice.

Gasoline isn't a luxury, it's the fuel that keeps the whole economy moving, workers getting to jobs, goods reaching markets, families getting to schools.

Undercutting our refineries doesn't make gasoline cheaper

in the long run, it risks unreliability, unsafe facilities, and thousands of lost jobs.

So, yes, let's protect consumers, but let's do it in a way that actually works. Approving this postponement is a pragmatic choice. It safeguards jobs, maintains safety, and ensures Californians have the reliable fuel supply that we all depend on.

Thank you.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we're going to hear from Woody Little. I'm going to open your line. You'll unmute on your end and then you may begin.

MR. LITTLE: Thank you and good afternoon everyone. Woody Little with the Last Chance Alliance, W-O-O-D-Y L-I-T-L-E.

I'm here to speak in disappointment and opposition to the pause on the penalty and gross margin as recommended by staff and urge you to move forward with all possible speed, not only on development of the policy, but crucially, in the near term, on the analysis. With full respect and appreciation for the staff report, which I have reviewed, that is not the full analysis underlying the rule. That analysis has not yet been done and there's no reason it can't proceed, again, with all haste, in parallel to the crucial logistical solutions around minimum

inventory and resupply that the Commission is also working on.

Volatility in the market is exactly why we should have this policy in place in the first place, not an argument against it. With a well-designed policy, by definition, only those refiners who are doing extremely well, only in the times where they're doing extremely well, would be impacted. Divergence and profitability between some of the larger brands and some of the smaller budget brands is exactly why we need a policy like this as one of a suite of solutions to help us manage the mid-transition, because some folks are going to be doing extremely well and making an extreme amount of money off of the rest of us from a constrained, tight market, even as others may struggle because of their logistics or other issues.

I would urge you to remember that your response right now will really set the tone, not just for the transition of this sector, but of other sectors of the fossil fuel economy. And any giveaways that this Commission or other parts of state government give now will only put the state in a worse position in the future. What will the refiners or other actors come for next?

So I urge you to move forward as quickly as possible, including on the analysis, and I would love to hear a timeline for that underlying analysis to be

complete.

2 Thank you so much.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we're going to hear from Gracyna Mohabir. I apologize if I mispronounced your name. I'm going to open your line. You can unmute on your end and then you can begin.

MS. MOHABIR: Hi. Good afternoon, Gracyna
Mohabir, and that's G-R-A-C-Y-N-A, last name M-O-H-A-B-I-R,
with California Environmental Voters. Thank you for the
opportunity to comment today on the proposed
recommendation. And thank you to staff for their
insightful presentation.

We understand that the Commission is tasked with considering what is necessary for the state as we're entering this mid-transition phase. However, we strongly caution against pausing the development of the maximum gross gasoline margin, and if the Commission moves forward with this pause, to ensure that it's as short as possible. We remain concerned that taking this tool off the table could prevent Californians from reaping the real benefits of protections against price gouging, and it lets industry off the hook.

As stated in the presentation, gasoline demand is declining as we make the necessary and critical transition

to zero-emission transportation. And with this decline, the market power of the remaining refineries within the state is bound to increase. As this is on the horizon, we must be adequately prepared to protect against price gouging. And furthermore, we can't set the precedent of providing giveaways to the oil industry.

Thank you.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we're going to hear from Danny Bernardini. I'm going to open your line, Danny. You'll just unmute on your end. And just a general reminder, we're asking for comments to be two minutes or less. There will be a timer on the screen.

MR. BERNARDINI: Thank you. My name is Danny Bernardini, D-A-N-N-Y B-E-R-N-A-R-D-I-N-I. I'm the Business Manager for the Napa-Solano Building & Construction Trade Council, representing the working men and women of Napa and Solano County, where, you know, in my past 10 years of this job, usually show up to hearings like this with the warning that restrictions like this could close a refinery, and now we are dealing with that with Valero and Benicia. I think you've heard from the city manager and the mayor about the effects of that with the surrounding industrial area, the downtown, the city budget. And so it's not just the refinery, it's the entire town

that's going to suffer if Valero goes through what they say they are.

And so it's refreshing to have a hearing where we're supporting something like this. And thank you to the staff for recommending it, but it's kind of a bummer that it took refineries closing to do that.

So we appreciate the work you're doing to support the working men and women that are working in these refineries, and have yourselves a great Labor Day weekend, and thank you for your time.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we're going to hear from O'Connor. I'm going to open your line. You unmute on your end, and then you can begin. All right, on Zoom, if you're identified as O'Connor, you'll have to unmute on your end to begin your comments. All right, we're not getting any audio from you. If you want to check your settings, I can come back to you later.

Next, we're going to hear from Michael H.

Michael, I'm going to open your line. If you want to, you can share your name and spell your last name for our court reporter if you want to have that in the record. Your line is open. You'll just unmute on your end, Michael H. All right, Michael, we're not getting audio from you. I'll come back to you as well.

Jon Munoz, I'm going to open your line. You'll 1 2 unmute on your end, and then you can begin. 3 MR. MUNOZ: Hello. Can you hear me? 4 MS. BADIE: Yes. 5 MR. MUNOZ: Hi. My name is Jon Munoz, J-O-N 6 M-U-N-O-Z, and I am a Business Agent and Apprentice 7 Coordinator, and I am here on behalf of our over 6,800 members of UA Local 250, Los Angeles, California, United 8 9 Association. 10 We are in support of the appointment of this 11 maximum gross gasoline refinery margin and penalty 12 implementation. Many of our brothers and sisters have 13 commented on why that is, so I won't go back into the same thing, but our members and our apprentices, my apprentices, 14 15 our apprentices, depend on this. We're on-the-job 16 training. 17 And we all know that the infrastructure for 18 electricity is not there. We're not there yet, you know? 19 And I thank you guys all for seeing that and moving forward 20 with this postponement. We are in support of it. 21 And I appreciate your time. Thank you very much. 22 MS. BADIE: Thank you. 23 Next, we're going to hear from Mitch Ponce. 24 going to open your line, Mitch. You'll unmute on your end, 25 and then you can begin.

MR. PONCE: Yes. Hi. Good afternoon. This is
Mitch Ponce, a Business Agent with the Iron Workers 433 in
Los Angeles. I'm also the President of the L.A. and Orange
County Building Trades Council.

The positive step in the -- is -- the positive is this is a step in the right direction, but it should be repealed and is -- it's not paired with other market stabilizers. We are still going to see -- to continue to see and lose refineries in the tens of thousands of union jobs in the area.

So that's all I have, and thank you very much.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

Next, we'll hear from Alissa Reed. Alissa, I'm going to open your line. You'll just unmute on your end, and then you can begin.

MS. REED: Good morning. My name is Alissa Reed, A-L-I-S-S-A R-E-E-D. I'm the Business Manager for the Kern/Inyo/Mono Building & Construction Trades Council.

And I just would like to point out that we are thankful for Vice Chair Gunda and Director Bohan and the recommendation to postpone any action on this matter, because I think it's critical to point out that when you're looking at those margins, those are gross margins.

And so coming out of the refining industry, I have firsthand knowledge that in order to maintain safe

My

1 environments in those refineries, safe working environments 2 for all of our members in those refineries, and to preserve 3 the gas supply for our communities, those margins are 4 sufficient and they're not excessive. So I think it's, you 5 know, Director Bohan or Vice Chair Gunda who indicated That -- who pointed out that there's a lot of nuanced facts 6 7 behind the scenes in that graph showing gross margin. 8 And so I appreciate and am thankful that you're 9 taking the time to say, hey, there's further study necessary here to protect the workforce, to maintain safe 10 11 supply, and that not doing that -- not taking action in an 12 effort to falsely protect consumers. And so we stand with 13 you and support of taking action, in concurrence with 14 staff's recommendation at this time. 15 Thank you. 16 MS. BADIE: Thank you. 17 Okay, Tom O'Connor, we're going to try your line 18 I'm going to unmute. Depending on your settings, again. 19 there's a pop-up that will ask you to unmute on your end, 20 and then you can begin. 21 MR. O'CONNOR: Okay, can you hear me? 22 MS. BADIE: Yes. 23 MR. O'CONNOR: That was a yes?

MR. O'CONNOR: Okay. All right. Thank you.

MS. BADIE: Yes.

24

25

name is Tom O'Connor, T-O-M O apostrophe -C-O-N-N-O-R, and I'm with ICF Consulting. We've been supporting CEC on the transition work, and we presented at the April 11th, 2024 workshop on gasoline margin management.

I worked in the refining and supply business with Mobil Oil until 2000, and subsequently have been with ICF, working on fuels management and infrastructure resilience for a number of states and the federal government.

My purpose in commenting is to support, based on my knowledge of both the market in California and the many stakeholders in California and in neighboring states, the difficult decision that the CEC has made today. The implementation of a margin management program would result in a number of unanticipated consequences, which could ultimately result in even more refineries closing before the growth in electric vehicles reduces gasoline demand. This would be leading to more and more imports of gasoline, as others have said. And also, the sources of additional gasoline would result in higher costs for consumers, many of whom may not be able to afford electric vehicles.

Moreover, consumers in Arizona and Nevada do not have much ability to receive more fuel from other markets, and they are also at risk with California refinery closures.

I think it's important to allow time for the

transition strategy to evolve and appreciate that the state and Commission are working hard to get California where you want to be with a minimum of price volatility and supply shortages.

The early commenter who -- the earlier commenter who suggested that the state wake up should appreciate that the state and Vice Chair are, in fact, recognizing his concerns. And they're also trying to recognize the concerns of citizens in fenceline communities. It's a delicate balancing act. The recommendation to push back the margin management regulation and to focus on a suite of other solutions can make a significant difference to consumers, as well as the industry, as California moves forward with the mid-transition to a cleaner environment.

Thank you for the time.

MS. BADIE: Thank you.

And Michael H., we're going to try to get your audio again. So open your line and then you should see, depending on your settings, you should see a pop-up that asks you to unmute. You'll need to unmute on your end to feed your audio into our Zoom.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay, hey, we got it this time.

Can you hear me?

MS. BADIE: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Yeah, Michael Hernandez,

M-I-C-H-A-E-L H-E-R-N-A-N-D-E-Z. I'm a Local 302 Contra Costa County electrician, and I'm definitely supporting the pause.

And I want to say just real quickly, one of the big things, I've worked in refineries for over 25 years.

I've worked on a lot of PHAs and consent decree projects, which are regulatory projects. And it is definitely, in my opinion, state regulations that have helped these refineries to move out of our state and not help them to stay here. That's just my opinion, but I've seen the hoops that refineries have to jump through.

I will also say, this EV mandate that we're going towards electric vehicles, at this point in time it's completely unsustainable. I mean, we had in Costa -- I live in Solano County, we've had four outages just this week from PG&E. It's not good. So we definitely need to look at a lot of things before we move forward with this.

But I do appreciate the pause that you guys are implicitly, and it is a good thing for us. Refineries are my whole career. I know tons of people in every different craft that work there that have their livelihood there, and, definitely, it would destroy California if we lose another refinery.

And that's really all I have to say, but thank you very much for the time.

Thank you. 1 MS. BADIE: 2 All right, then this is the last call for public comment for this item. All right, I am not seeing any 3 4 further raised hands. 5 Back to you, Vice Chair. VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Thank you, Mona. 6 7 And thank you to everybody who commented. 8 want to say thanks to, you know, the colleagues from 9 consumer advocates, labor colleagues who are in the room, and those who are joining virtually, the environmental 10 11 community, the private citizens in and around the 12 communities, as well as the environmental justice. 13 we've heard from a lot of, you know, stakeholders and the broad diverse perspectives, and that just points to the 14 15 complexity of the mid transition and the importance of 16 being deliberate and cautious and mindful as we move 17 towards an adaptive management over the next 20 years of decarbonization in California. 18 19 I would invite the Commissioners to see if they 20 have any questions, first, and comments. And I will close 21 the call. 22 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Great.

> California Reporting, LLC 229 Napa St., Rodeo, CA 94572 (510) 224-4476

Chair Gunda. I'm really happy to hear all these comments.

VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Commissioner McAllister?

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Great. Thank you, Vice

23

24

25

I want to just thank everyone in the room and online for your attention to this. This is a very big deal; right?

And, you know, I want to first give kudos to Vice Chair Gunda for managing what's been a very, I think, long and complicated process with a lot of stakeholders. And I think all of you can imagine how many conversations, you know, he and his staff have had about this, both large and small, and just trying to connect lots of dots, first, identify those dots, connect them, and try to figure out how to navigate a path through this complicated landscape.

You know, I think the term managed transition really is appropriate here. It sounds like almost everybody agrees that that's what we need, regardless of kind of where they sit or stand in this conversation. And the CEC has been assigned a really difficult task. You know, it's tough homework to get done, and there's urgency. So I think really, again, I just want to appreciate everyone's engagement on this because it has been very active.

You know, markets, a couple of people said, markets like certainty. It's absolutely true. And so, you know, I think the goal here of both acknowledging the trends and the fact that, Drew, you laid out in the presentation, thanks for that, the fact that gasoline combustion vehicles, you know, gasoline consumption is

declining and will continue to decline, that's what the forecasting says, and there's some, you know, uncertainty bars around that, but that's pretty clear that that's going to happen. It will continue to happen.

And so how, the question, how do we maintain some level of predictability and stability in the marketplace, and what, you know, and engage in a planning process in a very intentional way that avoids these discontinuities that we're talking about, right, like the lumpiness of the refinery side doesn't match the relative smoothness of the demand side, and so that presents these discontinuities, and they're hard to navigate. So we have to figure out ways to do that, relying somewhat on imports but not as much as we might; right? So I really appreciate the complexity of this task.

Let's see, I think I also want to just acknowledge, you know, repeat the acknowledgments and reinforce those, you know, Vice Chair Gunda, the staff at the Energy Commission, Drew, you mentioned Jeremy Smith and Aleecia, but also -- and the advisors in Commissioner Gunda's Office as they've been working overtime on this, as well as the Chief Counsel's Office, a lot of legal content.

And I also want to acknowledge or point out that this, you know, I've been briefed periodically on progress and sort of the context here through its evolution. And I

want to highlight just that the data collection authority that, you know, was a previous sort of point of controversy and discussion in the evolution of our work here, the Commission's work, and the standing up of DPMO and, you know, all that water that's now kind of under the bridge, that data collection authority has been incredibly important to get where we are, to underpin the analysis, to give it the level of seriousness and rigor that it has needed and will need.

And so I think I want to also call out the Division and all the analysts that Jeremy leads on this. It's just been a huge amount of work. But I think that data, that informational infrastructure, that knowledge of the landscape, that detailed sort of insight that staff can now develop with Vice Chair Gunda's leadership, that is a huge resource for us to try to get to a point, to do the right thing at each moment and try to get to a point of consensus and sustainability, you know, relative consensus and stability in these markets.

And also to avoid, you know, to create transparency and accountability out there, avoid opening doors to gaming and other. You know, we are looking at market manipulation and trying to understand whether that's happening, and so that's really important. I think that sunshine is really important.

So, you know, we still, in my view, you know, we still need some credible threat of consequences over the longish term as we -- as sort of this unfolds ahead of us, but five years is a good kind of detente period, I think, or sort of horizon, and we will learn a lot. We're only a couple years into this, and I think we'll continue to learn and grow expertise and work with stakeholders and really understand better what the options are for charting a path forward.

So, you know, petroleum prices are volatile in the best of times, right, even when nothing particular is going on. And here, you know, in California, we're in a particularly active moment. So, you know, I think that time, buying a little bit of time here, having a little bit of time to collaborate and to keep the table set for a productive conversation is really important.

And along those lines, I do want -- I do have one question for -- it could be for Drew, or Jeremy, I see you're online as well. What sort of -- so this is we're sort of saying, look, we're not going to use this particular tool for five years if we approve this. Could you sort of describe what ongoing tools we have for doing what I kind of just described, keeping things transparent and accountable and sort of maintaining a conversation that enhances the rigor and the depth of our understanding here

```
so we can continue to -- so we can take advantage of this
 1
 2
    pause?
              MS. BADIE:
                          I think --
 3
 4
              COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Where's Jeremy?
 5
              MS. BADIE: -- we're not hearing from Barstow.
 6
    It might be the internet.
 7
              COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yeah, we're not hearing
 8
    you, Drew.
 9
              VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Jeremy is --
10
              COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Jeremy is on, as well.
11
              EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BOHAN: Can you hear me now?
12
              COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yeah, we can hear you.
13
              EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BOHAN: Okay, so I'll posit
14
    that. Absolutely, we're continuing to move forward
15
    collecting data. We're analyzing the data that's required
16
    for us to evaluate when we're in an implementation-based
17
    senses something. So we're continuing to listen, to learn
18
    from others that are out there.
19
              Our focus is consistently about involving
20
    consumers. As I mentioned earlier, all the tools in this
21
    legislation and its companion legislation for the X2-1 is
22
    designed to benefit of the consumer. Collecting data,
23
    analyzing and sharing reports to eliminate these issues
24
    with the public, these all benefit the consumer. We just
25
    haven't seen any evidence yet that imposing the max margin
```

benefit the consumer. Indeed, we've seen a lot of evidence that strongly suggests that doing so might hurt consumers, I think, if we have precipitously.

So we're keeping an open mind. We've approached this from day one with an open mind and in good faith. And we will look for that evidence. But we're careful about harming the very consumer we're trying to protect by either voting precipitously or not sending a signal to the industry that you should continue to invest and maintain safe facilities for your workers and the communities and for Californians.

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Thanks.

Jeremy, did you want to add something, anything?
MR. J. SMITH: Yeah, I was just going to --

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Drew, thank you.

MR. J. SMITH: Yeah, of course. Thank you. And I was just going to add that, you know, of course, as Drew mentioned, we'll continue to investigate this. And, you know, we also just opened an informational proceeding, recognizing that this is really complex and a lot more work needs to be done. And so we'll continue to investigate the other tools that we have, and they need to, you know, work in symphony to help solve this really complicated problem. And so a lot more work lies ahead.

We need the data to support all that as well and

look forward to a lot of engagement in helping us come to grounded data-driven decisions and policymaking in, you know, the months and years ahead, knowing that we're in this for the long haul; right? This is a really challenging mid-transition, and so we'll use all the tools that we've got in the future.

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Thanks for that.

And finally, I'll just wrap up by saying, you know, really, again, thanks for all the comments from folks paying attention. The labor community, those workforce issues are super important. And the just transition points, you know, we're listening to you on that. And it's important to all of us, no doubt.

But also, the other stakeholders, you know, across really all parts of civil society and, you know, professional engagement, as well, just a lot of knowledge in the room. And we really appreciate you and want to make sure that you -- or want to just ask you to continue to be engaged and help inform this process going forward. That's what the process is for.

So we want to really hear from everybody who has a stake in this. I mean, really, it's all Californians. But those of you who have been engaged, it's really critical to keep doing so. I know it's a lot of effort, but I really appreciate you for helping us get to answers

```
1
    and actions that are meaningful.
 2
              So with that, pass it to you, back to you, Vice
 3
    Chair.
 4
              VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Thank you, Commissioner
 5
    McAllister.
              Chair, do you have any comments or questions?
 6
 7
              CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Yeah, I just really wanted to
 8
    extend my thanks to you, to Jeremy, to the whole team, to
9
    Drew, for all the work, and all the stakeholders for
10
    sharing views of what is a very complex and contested
11
    issue.
12
              I just really want to say I am incredibly
13
    grateful to you, Vice Chair, for leading us and for
    exercising this very, very shrewd judgment on this complex
14
15
    issue and (indiscernible).
              Thanks.
16
17
              VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Thank you, Chair.
18
              So I just want to provide my comments before we
    take the vote. And I just want to begin by saying thanks
19
20
    to the staff and --
              COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: I think
21
22
    (indiscernible)?
23
              VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Commissioner Gallardo, I
24
    believe, has left.
25
              COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Oh, okay.
```

VICE CHAIR GUNDA: She has another engagement.

CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: We're down -- I apologize for not being there in person. We're down in Barstow for a siting hearing for a new solar and storage project, so she's had to go begin that, I'll join her in a minute (indiscernible).

COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: I did not catch that. VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Thank you.

So, yes, I just wanted to begin by thanking the incredible work of my staff. Again, when we say staff, there are many divisions here. The Chief Counsel's Office on the legal side. We have the Executive Office, the Energy Assessments Division, and all the work that they have to do. The groups that are, you know, usually not right in the middle are the Comms, you know, Team, because they get a lot of media requests on trying to explain what we're trying to do, as well as the Legislative Affairs. Apart from that we have the DPMO, who is within the Energy Commission, it's an industry Division, but all the work that they do.

So I do want to call out a couple of staff. You know, particularly, let me just say Chad from the Legal, the amount of time that Chad has been putting into this.

Jeremy, who you just heard from. Drew Bohan from the Executive Office. Just a big thanks to Courtney from the

Media Office, and Nikki and her team -- you know, sorry, from the Media Office and the Legislative Affairs.

I usually kind of forget, you know, to thank the people who are closest to me, who is my office. I tend to forget them in providing thanks. I just want to say thanks to Theresa and Jane and others who work on this. That's really, really important.

But I want to pause and say thanks, Aria. Thank you. It's been an incredible journey for her. She started on this project from day one, and I did not know what I would do without her. So for all the good work that you do and, you know, standing, you know, alongside on this journey, that's been not easy. So thank you for your work and public service, and the lot of money you make. It's important to me.

So with that, I just want to make sure I also kind of ensure that I thank the CEC consultants. We have ICF, who is a part of the team. Stillwater. We have right now professors from the University of Notre Dame, University of Davis, California. So we have a number of consultants who are working with us to help inform this complex issue, and as I mentioned prior, DPMO, who is set up to provide input to do the Commission's work.

Also, many, many stakeholders. As Commissioner McAllister mentioned, we had hundreds and hundreds of

conversations over the last couple of years, and the crossagency Petroleum Strategy Task Force. All the input you provide, you know, wherever we are landing today, I just want to recognize your input and how it shapes the conversation we have. So I just want to give a big thanks to everybody.

I usually don't have this much comments written, so I'm going to go through these comments, because this is really important to state on the record.

So this is definitely not an easy feat on what we're trying to do. I know how much effort went into not only this resolution, but the staff report that supports the findings. Again, thanks to DPMO and their continued contributions into the work we do and all the nuances that go into the analysis and oftentimes really hard to explain in a short presentation.

So we look forward to thinking through how GGRM should be considered et al, and what does it mean for industry participants, and specifically the different business models. The statute asks us to provide one GGRM, so one particular gross margin penalty, for all the industry, and then asks us to work with the industry on the exemptions. So it's complicated enough to first develop, you know, the cost benefits of a margin, but then, you know, implementing that through refinery by refinery and

how best to suite that is not an easy effort. And I just want to put that on record that takes time and that's what we are continuing to do.

The postponement of this work on the margin cap and prioritizing the work at hand, the resupply and minimum inventory, does not mean postponement or pausing of the data collection and continuing analysis by staff and the stakeholders to ensure that we're protecting consumers in the end.

The tools that CEC has available are the result of extraordinary dedication from the governor and the legislature through two special sessions responding to risks to the consumers. We are grateful for their hard work and their attention to this issue. We are in a much better place as a result of their leadership, and we understand now, compared to two years ago, you know, what we did not know.

The recognition that this transition, this mid transition requires a lot of leadership, especially from the governor, the legislature, the powers there are in California, is extremely important to ensure that ultimately the goals of clean, reliable, affordable, equitable and safe energy continues to be available to all Californians. There is no simple answer here. And as we balance these different priorities, we have to understand

the pros and cons and move forward intentionally in the best way we can.

I want to thank, again, the governor and the legislature in trusting us with these tools and understanding the complexity of the issue of consumer protection at the pump and providing us with a toolbox and guardrails to find possible outcomes. Careful analysis are needed to use the tools appropriately, and we will continue that analysis.

I also want to note that the Commission has already done some work on the GGRM. The CEC hosted three workshops, in November 2023, April 2024, and September 2024. A Request for Information was released on March 27th, 2024, and closed on May 3rd, 2024. And this RFI, or a Request for Proposals — or Information, was widely cast given the complexity of the situation to solicit input, not only from California but from experts all over the world. We only received four responses, and the responses did not help us to construct a solution.

At our workshops, we had three specific inputs and views that were provided. The DPMO assessed that if the cap and penalty are introduced, refiners will refiner more product reach the pre-penalty levels. There was an opportunity which we need to continue to investigate.

Stillwater Associates, who is a part of the

consulting team, remarked that if a cap and penalty is implemented, refiners will likely move their prices as close to maximum as possible, as evidenced in Hawaii. This was on the record.

And finally, as ICF has stated, that there can't be a one-size-fits-all solution for the cap and penalty since the various sales channels impact refinery margins, and that's an important thing to consider.

Following these findings and assessments of our current market need for a wholistic approach to the transition, staff are recommending a reprioritization of the GGRM and penalty and focus on the other tools at hand, which should really impact the increased supply in California, that is the resupply and minimum inventory.

Reprioritizing the implementation of the GGRM and penalty is not something I take lightly. I have been part of those two special sessions. And as our office currently counts, I think I've been -- I've testified over 10 times in front of the legislature on all sides of this issue.

And I have been, today with the labor colleagues, you know, in the room, and you expressed, you know, concerns around the passage of these special sessions, I know where I sat.

So I recognize, you know, all of their input today and just want to note for the record that I do not take this lightly as we move forward. I believe that if

analyzed and studied, it could be a useful tool. And we need to continue to truly believe that California has to solve the supply problem to ensure that the consumers are ultimately protected. And as we collect the data, move through a public process, if we do find that GGRM is a valuable tool, we need to debate that in a public sphere to ensure the implementation.

This is not a relinquishment of regulatory authority. What the Commission is trying to do right now represents deliberate and measured action demonstrating regulatory and policy alignment with the needs of midtransition while preserving the CEC's authority to revisit the proposal based on evolving market conditions and analytical findings. And that is within the resolution. The Commission continues to retain the authority to unpause and move forward with margin if that is deemed to be a useful tool.

And I want to make sure, given the comments we've heard on this, I would ask the staff to come back in a year and a half with the analysis, wherever we are, put the time necessary for the analytical progress and come back to the Commission to continue to show the progress in the analysis.

The petroleum supply stabilization (indiscernible) opened at the previous August business

meeting is our way to continue utilizing the tools wholistically given to us by the legislature under AB X2-1, harmonizing with the needs of the mid-transition and enabling the stable supply to support the stable prices at the pump. In the current market conditions, resupply and minimum inventories are assessed to be the strongest tools to have to protect consumers from price shocks and the associated price strikes.

The construct presented today by staff provides investor confidence for businesses necessary to continue investment in their refineries and thereby ensuring a reliable in-state refining capacity are more in line with the demand decline and protect the health and safety of the workers and communities. This is also not a recommendation to implement -- immediately implement a maximum margin and associated penalty in 2030 or in 2035, but to revisit the matter if the implementation is needed and, if warranted, perhaps suggest another similar reprioritization.

The CEC staff recommendation, the reprioritization of GGRM for five years while prioritizing the implementation of resupply and minimum inventory rules, and providing a pathway for the future exemption based on investments into the state, would provide the necessary industry and support a smooth transition in California.

We are now giving up permission to protect

California consumers. I personally truly believe that this pause would be beneficial to ensure that this midtransition is smooth. And as the Commission continues to gather more information and continue analysis, if we establish that GGRM and penalty is best positioned, whenever we use it, it should best positioned to support consumer protection. And if it's so established, the Commission will act accordingly. But at the moment, it does not seem that way.

What we are considering today is one piece of navigating a pivotal challenge we are facing as a state, transitioning away from petroleum-based fuels to clean alternatives to meet the urgency of climate crisis, all while protecting consumers, workers, and communities. This is a hard job. This job is not easy. We need to make sure we are working together, in trust, wholistically and collaboratively.

While in the midst of this transition, we will continue to face many new challenges as we have both legacy petroleum system declining and a new clean system growing at the same time, a period that has been described in scholarly work by Doctors Emily Grubert and Sara Hastings—Simon is a mid-transition phase. During this mid-transition phase, we need careful wholistic planning and policy implementation. We also need investment in both the

legacy system, as well as the new clean system to smoothly and successfully transition.

This is an incredibly complex problem to navigate. No one else has done this in the entire world successfully, and it will require a sector-wide transition approach and adaptive management as we move through uncharted territory. The risks of an unmanaged decline of the legacy petroleum fuel system to consumers, to workers, to public health, and continued progress towards climate goals are substantial. And we need to ensure that the transition is well-managed.

We believe there is an urgent need to take steps now to stabilize the legacy industry for a manageable transition. We are focusing on ways to maximize market-driven solutions in this moment.

At the same time, we must double down. It's really important at the same time that we must double down on our investment in a clean energy future and commitment to protecting public health, consumers, workers, the environment, and chart a path towards a wholistic, managed transition.

In our office's response to the governor in June, we outlined different recommendations for the near to long term, including near-term stabilization and broad transition strategy. And I want to recognize that in the

recommendations we provided to the governor, those are not or, those are and. All of them have to be done. You have to double down on figuring out measures to address climate change while ensuring there is an industry-wide stabilization.

The action we are taking today in considering is

one part of a wholistic picture. We heard from the industry over the last several years that the uncertainty of the level of a maximum margin or the timing of imposition, one, creates uncertainty in financial analysis. And that lack of quality discourages future investment. This risks the safe and reliable operations of infrastructure with the risk to workers and the public, and the rapid loss of refining capacity in the state much faster than the demand decline, with consequences of California consumers, workforce, and communities' struggle.

One of the core things I want to again reiterate as part of this wholistic transition is we need to ensure that there are protections for labor in the communities that work and live around these refineries. Some of the things we can do is to ensure funding for just transition for both communities and labor. We need to think about asset retirement plans. And we need to work on proper safety management regulations. All of them have to be consistently done along with the work that we're trying to

do today.

With this action today, industry understands that CEC is going to be transparent and intentional in developing any use of the maximum GGRM and penalty. Our action, which will support investor confidence to retain safe and reliable operations of refineries as long as we need them and consumers during the potentially period of transition, this is us not walking back. No tools are being given up. This is a careful consideration of implementation of the tools we have been given, including pre-planning, industry transparency, resupply, and minimum inventory, in order to support stable fuel supply devices and a smooth transition of the transportation sector.

We are in this position with tools available to us because of a strong leadership of the governor and the legislature. In the spirit of the responsibility the legislature entrusted us from two special sessions, giving us tools and guardrails, consumer protection is the primary mandate for the CEC. And this recommendation is taken with responsibility and that seriousness.

And I just want to close by saying this.

You know, we've heard a few comments. And, again, I really appreciate the diversity of opinions, and it's -- I appreciate, wherever this Commission is sitting, the accountability we face from different stakeholders. If we

abdicate consumer protections by doing this, we will quickly un-pause this. That is not the current assessment. In the resolution we have today that shows, if the Commission's analysis, continued analysis, show that this is a valuable tool, we have the opportunity to un-pause this.

One of my colleagues commented that, you know, I will not be here, you know, I might not be here to continue this work. I just want to say, this is not about me. This is a whole Commission. This is a thousand staff that come in here, sweat and blood every day, to make sure that Californians are protected. Whether I'm here or not, there will be other Commissioners, other staff that will do what needs to be done to protect the consumers, no matter how hard it is. That is part of the job. And here we are together to make it happen.

And again, I want to make sure I reiterate my ask to the staff, given the input we had today, let's make sure we bring the analysis back, you know, make sure we show the progress, continued data and analysis over the next year and a half, and then have touchpoints, regular touchpoints to ensure that we have that.

In conclusion, just again recognizing the diversity of opinions, we can have very, very different ideas, and reasonable minds can diverge. And this is the

1 staff's recommendation and I fully endorse that this is the 2 right step for the Commission with the knowledge we have 3 today. And I just urge the support of the Commissioners. 4 With that let's progress to vote. 5 And before that, Commissioner McAllister, would 6 you move the item? 7 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yes, move this item. 8 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Chair, would you have a 9 second? 10 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Seconded. 11 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Okay. I will now move to the 12 vote. Commissioner McAllister? 13 14 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Aye. 15 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Chair? 16 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Aye. 17 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: I vote aye as well. Commissioner Gallardo is not able to vote at the moment, 18 19 and we don't have Commissioner Skinner to be present. 20 with that, the resolution is 3-0. 21 Thank you all. 22 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Thank you. 23 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Thank you. Good job. 24 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: So with that, let's move to 25 item -- so Item 5 is removed from the agenda, so we'll go

```
to Item 6, Lead Commissioner and Presiding Members'
 1
 2
    Reports. I know we just did a --
 3
              CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Nothing from me here.
 4
              VICE CHAIR GUNDA: -- business meeting. I do not
 5
    have any.
              Commissioner? Chair?
 6
 7
              CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Well, might we --
              VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Yeah?
 8
 9
              CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: So I would request we postpone
    that until the next meeting. I'm really late for this --
10
11
              COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yeah.
12
              CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: -- next hearing. If that's
13
    okay?
14
              COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yeah.
15
              VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Oh, okay. Great.
16
              CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Thank you.
17
              VICE CHAIR GUNDA: We need you to close. We have
18
    a quorum and close, so let's just wait, quickly.
19
              Moving to Item number 7, Executive Director's
20
    Report?
21
              EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BOHAN:
                                         No report. Thank you.
22
              VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Turning to Item number 8,
23
    Public Advisor' Report.
24
              MS. BADIE: No report.
25
              VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Moving to Item 9, Chief
```

1	Counsel's Report.
2	MR. RANCHOD: No report today. Thank you.
3	VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Thank you. With that, the
4	meeting is adjourned. Thank you all for your
5	participation.
6	COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Thank you.
7	(The business meeting adjourned at 1:42 p.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	