

---

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Senator María Elena Durazo, Chair  
2025 - 2026 Regular

---

**Bill No:** AB 471  
**Author:** Hart  
**Version:** 7/7/25

**Hearing Date:** 7/16/25  
**Fiscal:** No  
**Consultant:** Vargas

### ***COUNTY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICTS: ANTELOPE VALLEY AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT: BOARD MEMBERS: COMPENSATION***

*Allows compensation for board members of county air districts and Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District.*

#### **Background**

***California Air Resources Board.*** California's efforts to protect the public from the harmful effects of air pollution and help prepare the state for the effects of climate change involves federal, state, and local governments. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) works with the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and spearheads the state's non-vehicular air pollution efforts through 35 air pollution control districts and air quality management districts (air districts). CARB is comprised of 16 members, including 12 members the Governor appoints and the Senate confirms. Five of these members serve on local air districts, four are experts in fields that shape air quality rules, two are members of the public, and one serves as the CARB chair. The remaining four members include two members who represent environmental justice communities (one each appointed by the Senate and the Assembly) and two non-voting members for Legislative oversight (also one each appointed by the Senate and the Assembly). AB 197 (Eduardo Garcia, 2016) established staggered six-year terms for CARB's voting members.

***Local air districts.*** CARB oversees the state's 35 air districts, who adopt and enforce rules and regulations to achieve and maintain state and federal air quality standards affected by businesses and facilities, ranging from oil refineries to auto body shops to dry cleaners. State law spells out the membership of these local air districts' governing boards, but there are many variations. Some are county-specific, while others are regional entities with representation from more than one county, and some have their own specific governing statutes. While governance structures vary, each district appoints an air pollution control officer, whose responsibilities include enforcing all orders, regulations, and rules the district board prescribes.

Air districts generally receive funding from grants, subventions, permit fees, penalties, and/or a surcharge or fee on motor vehicles registered in the district. If these funding sources do not provide the district with sufficient revenues to meet its expenses, an air district can levy an annual per capita assessment on the cities that have agreed to have a member on the district board and on the county or counties included within the district. Any annual per capita assessment imposed on the cities and/or counties included in a district must be imposed on an equitable per capita basis.

There are five different types of air district boards, specifically:

- Eleven single-county districts where the air district board consists only of the five members of the county board of supervisors:
  - Calaveras County Air Pollution Control District (APCD), Colusa County APCD, El Dorado County APCD, Glenn County APCD, Imperial County APCD, Lake County APCD, Mariposa County APCD, Mendocino County APCD, Modoc County APCD, Tehama County APCD, and Tuolumne County APCD.
- Eleven single-county districts where the air district board consists of elected officials from cities and members of the county board of supervisors:
  - Amador County APCD, Butte County Air Quality Management District (AQMD), Eastern Kern APCD, Lassen County APCD, Northern Sonoma County APCD, Placer County APCD, San Luis Obispo APCD, Santa Barbara County APCD, Shasta County APCD, Siskiyou County APCD, and Ventura County APCD..
- Eight unified air districts where the air district board consists of city councilmembers or city mayors, members of a county board of supervisors, and may include public members. There are 8 boards and include:
  - Feather River AQMD, Great Basin Unified APCD, Mojave Desert AQMD, Monterey Bay Air Resources District, North Coast Unified AQMD, Northern Sierra AQMD, San Joaquin Valley APCD, and Yolo-Solano AQMD.
- Four air districts that consist of multi-county or single county air districts, each with an individual statute specifying their exact membership:
  - Bay Area AQMD, South Coast AQMD, San Diego APCD, and Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD.
- The Antelope Valley AQMD where the air district board consists of four city councilmembers, two members of the Los Angeles County board of supervisors, and one public member.

**AB 2522 (Wendy Carrillo, 2024).** AB 2522 increased the compensation that members of various air districts may receive for attending a board meeting or any committee of the board, provided the board approves the increase during an open, regular meeting, specifically:

- Bay Area AQMD's board compensation is set at \$200/day, not to exceed \$24,000/year, via ordinance;
- South Coast AQMD's board compensation is set at \$200/day, not to exceed \$2,000/month;
- San Diego APCD's board compensation is set at \$200/day, not to exceed \$2,000/month;
- Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD's board compensation is set at \$200/day, not to exceed \$12,000/year, via board approval; and
- A unified APCD compensation is set at \$200/day, not to exceed \$7,200/year, via resolution.

AB 2522 also authorized South Coast AQMD, San Diego APCD, and the unified APCDs to further increase board member compensation, not to exceed the greater of either 5% annually or the California Consumer Price Index-determined annual change in inflation, not to exceed 10%. Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD can raise board member compensation once every 12 months, by either the percentage change in inflation or the California Consumer Price Index, whichever is higher, up to a maximum of 10%.

The California Air Pollution Control Officers Association want the Legislature to allow other air districts to compensate their board members in a manner similar to unified air districts.

### **Proposed Law**

Assembly Bill 471 allows the state's 11 single-county APCDs and the Antelope Valley AQMD to adopt a compensation structure that mirrors the structure unified APCDs and AQMDs can adopt.

Specifically, AB 471 allows:

- Each board member to be reimbursed for all actual and necessary expenses incurred while performing board duties, unless the board member receives reimbursement from another entity;
- Each board member to receive up to \$200 per day, not to exceed \$7,200 annually, in per diem compensation while engaged in board business, provided the compensation level is set during an open, regular meeting;

The air district board can increase those pay levels annually by 5% (for any reason) or up to 10% (to match increases in inflation), provided the board does so in an open, regular meeting. However, it cannot approve any automatic future compensation increases and it cannot provide compensation if the board member receives compensation specifically for activities for the APCD from another entity.

### **Comments**

1. Purpose of the bill. According to the author, "Assembly Bill 471 will help increase participation within local air district boards by providing equitable compensation to board members. Specifically, the bill will allow certain air districts to provide per diem compensation to board members, while setting compensation limits and prohibiting automatic future increases. AB 471 will facilitate broader and more diverse participation on air district boards. Better financial incentives can attract a wider range of candidates from diverse backgrounds who may have been discouraged from serving due to the financial burden."

2. Equity and diverse participation. APCDs and the Antelope Valley AQMD currently cannot provide compensation to their board members. Proponents of AB 471 claim that increased compensation could attract diverse candidates, including those from underrepresented communities that may have not been able to serve as a board member due to the limited compensation levels. However, as noted above, air district board members are, for the most part, elected officials such as county supervisors or city council members. There are a few, often only two or three, if any, members of the public who sit on air district boards. For elected officials that have a seat on the air district board by virtue of their other job, whether they are compensated for attending meetings is unlikely to change the board's makeup. As a result, it is unclear if providing compensation will significantly increase diversity. To ascertain the impact of this measure, the Committee may wish to consider amending AB 471 to add a reporting requirement to evaluate how compensation changed the makeup of any board that opts to provide it.

3. Open and transparent. AB 471 will allow some air districts that cannot currently compensate their members to start doing so. One safeguard the measure establishes is that the board must set its compensation by taking action at an open, public meeting. This way, the board can provide a rationale and justification for their compensation, and the public can weigh in on the decision.

4. What's the difference? With the authorization provided by AB 471, members of 24 out of 35 air district boards will become eligible for compensation and reimbursement for attending meetings. The only air district boards that would not be eligible to receive compensation or reimbursement are single-county air district boards with only county supervisors. All air districts boards covered by AB 471 and the single-county districts are made up of elected officials, with the exception of Antelope Valley which includes one public member. Given that all boards perform similar duties, should all air districts members receive compensation or reimbursement? The Committee may wish to consider whether compensation should be extended to all air districts to ensure consistency and fairness.

5. Incoming! The Senate Rules Committee has ordered a double referral of AB 471: first to the Committee on Environmental Quality, which approved AB 471 at its June 18<sup>th</sup> hearing on a vote of 6-0, and the second to the Committee on Local Government.

### **Assembly Actions**

Assembly Natural Resources Committee:	13-0
Assembly Floor:	66-2

### **Support and Opposition** (7/11/25)

Support: California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (Sponsor)

Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District

Butte County Air Quality Management District

Eastern Kern Air Pollution Control District

Northern Sonoma County Air Pollution Control District

Placer County Air Pollution Control District

San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District

Opposition: None Submitted

-- END --