

**FILED**  
**JUN 26 2024**  
HEARING BOARD  
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY  
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**BEFORE THE HEARING BOARD OF THE  
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL OFFICER of the BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT	)	DOCKET NO. 3751
	)	FINDINGS AND DECISION FOR A STIPULATED ABATEMENT ORDER
Complainant,	)	
vs.	)	BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT REGULATIONS (“REGS”) 2-1-307 AND 2-6-307
TESLA MOTORS, INC.	)	Hearing Date: June 25, 2024 Time: 9:30 AM Place: 375 Beale St, San Francisco, CA 94105
Respondent.	)	

**FINDINGS AND DECISION OF THE HEARING BOARD**

In accordance with Health and Safety (Health & Saf.) Code sections 42450 and 42451, a hearing on the Accusation and Motion to Enter a Stipulated Conditional Order for Abatement was heard on June 25, 2024, pursuant to notice and in accordance with the applicable provisions of Health and Saf. Code sections 40800 et seq. The following members of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Hearing Board (“Hearing Board”) were present: Valerie Armento, Chair; Barbara Toole O’Neil, Vice Chair; Amelia Timbers, Rajiv Dabir, and Dr. Peter Y. Chiu. Complainant Air Pollution Control Officer (“APCO”) of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (“Air District” or “Complainant”) was represented by Alexandra Kamel, Senior Assistant Counsel. Respondent Tesla Motors, Inc. (“Tesla”) was represented by Rick Rothman.

At the aforementioned hearing, the public was given an opportunity to testify, testimony was received and the matter was submitted. The parties have stipulated to issuance of this Order. The Hearing

1 Board finds and decides that good cause exists to issue the Stipulated Order for Abatement (“Stipulated  
2 Order” or “Order”). This finding of good cause is based on the following:

3 1. The Air District is a body corporate and politic established and existing pursuant to Health  
4 & Saf. Code sections 40000 et seq., 40200 et seq., 40700 et seq., and 42300 et seq., and is charged with  
5 the primary responsibility for controlling air pollution from nonvehicular sources, including the sources at  
6 issue in this proceeding, in all or portions of the nine Bay Area counties, including all of Alameda  
7 County, where Tesla’s North and South Paint Shops are located. (Health & Saf. Code, §§ 40000, 40200.)  
8 Complainant is authorized by law to adopt and enforce rules and regulations related to air quality in all  
9 nine of the Bay Area Counties, including Alameda County. (Health & Saf. Code, §§ 40001, subds. (a) &  
10 (b).) Complainant APCO is appointed by the Air District’s Board of Directors, (Health & Saf. Code, §  
11 40750), to “observe and enforce” all District regulations, permit conditions, variances, and enumerated  
12 provisions of the Health and Safety Code. (Health & Saf. Code, § 40752.) The APCO may impose  
13 conditions in any permit that are “reasonably necessary to ensure compliance with federal or California  
14 law or District regulations.” (Dist. Reg. 2, rule 1, § 403.) The APCO is also authorized to seek an order  
15 for abatement from the District’s Hearing Board to stop a person from violating “any order, rule, or  
16 regulation prohibiting or limiting the discharge of air contaminants into the air.” (Health & Saf. Code §  
17 42451(a); Hearing Board Rules § 4.1 (June 2, 2011).)

18 2. Respondent is owns and operates an electric vehicle manufacturing and assembly facility at  
19 45500 Fremont Boulevard, Fremont, California (“Facility”), at which it operates the North Paint Shop and  
20 the South Paint Shop (collectively, “the Paint Shops”), where Tesla paints electric vehicles that it  
21 produces for sale. The Paint Shops are located and operate within the Air District’s jurisdiction, and Tesla  
22 is required to obtain a permit(s) for the Paint Shops from the Air District, and to operate the Paint Shops  
23 in accordance with the permit(s) issued by the Air District. The Paint Shops emit Precursor Organic  
24 Compounds (“POCs”) and Toxic Air Contaminants (“TACs”). To protect air quality and public health,  
25 Tesla’s permits require it to control emissions of these air pollutants using an abatement system that  
26 captures and collects the pollutants and then abates them, primarily through incineration using a device  
27 called a thermal oxidizer.

28

1 3. Regs. 2-1-307 and 2-6-307 require Tesla to operate the Facility, including the Paint Shops,  
2 in accordance with all its permit conditions.

3 4. Complainant alleges that Tesla violated, and continues to violate, Regs. 2-1-307 and 2-6-  
4 307 by failing to operate the Paint Shops in accordance with conditions of the Paint Shops' permits;  
5 specifically, by failing to properly abate emissions from the operation of the Paint Shops, and by failing to  
6 properly maintain and operate its abatement equipment. In particular, the APCO alleges Tesla bypasses  
7 the abatement equipment at the Paint Shops, venting the emissions to the atmosphere without proper  
8 abatement or shutting the abatement equipment down and venting the emissions to the atmosphere  
9 without proper abatement when other components of the production lines in its paint shops malfunction  
10 Tesla filed a notice of defense in which it denied all of the allegations.

11 5. Complainant and Respondent have agreed to stipulate to the issuance of this Conditional  
12 Order for Abatement pursuant to Health & Saf. Code section 42451(b). The Hearing Board may issue a  
13 stipulated order without finding that Tesla violated any Air District order, rule, or regulation prohibiting  
14 or limiting the discharge of air contaminants into the air. (Health & Saf. Code § 42451, subd. (b).)

15 6. This Stipulated Order represents a compromise between the Parties and does not serve as  
16 an admission of liability or guilt as to any of the violations alleged in the Accusation.

17 7. Respondent stated during the hearing that it can comply with the conditions of the  
18 Stipulated Conditional Order for Abatement, which are set forth below.

19 **CONCLUSIONS**

20 8. The Parties have stipulated to issuance of this Stipulated Order pursuant to Health & Saf.,  
21 Code section 42451, subdivision (b).

22 9. It is not unreasonable to require Tesla to comply with District rules and regulations,

23 10. The issuance of this Stipulated Order after a fully noticed hearing would not constitute a  
24 taking of property without due process of law. The issuance of this Stipulated Order is not expected to  
25 result in the closing or elimination of an otherwise lawful business, but if it docs result in such closure or  
26 elimination, it would not be without a corresponding benefit in reducing air contaminants.

27  
28

1 11. This Stipulated Order is not intended to be, nor does it act as, a variance, and Respondent  
2 remains subject to all rules and regulations of the Air District, Air District permits, and with all other  
3 applicable provisions of federal and California law. Further, nothing herein shall be deemed or construed  
4 to limit the authority of the Air District to issue Notices of Violation; seek civil penalties, criminal  
5 penalties, or injunctive relief; or to seek further orders for abatement or other legal relief, as allowed by  
6 law.

7 ORDER

8 THEREFORE, based on the foregoing and good cause appearing, the Hearing Board hereby  
9 orders Tesla to comply with all of the following conditions, or in the alternative, cease any operation of  
10 the North and South Paint Shops in violation of Regs. 2-1-307 and 2-6-307:

11 1. Engineering Evaluation and Recommendations for Addressing Unabated VOC Emissions:  
12 Tesla shall hire and pay one or more engineering firms, in accordance with this Order, to evaluate and  
13 make recommendations on potential options for Tesla to eliminate the emission of unabated VOC  
14 emissions from its North and South Paint Shops, as detailed in the scope of work developed under  
15 ~~Paragraph 2.a.ii. of this Order, in violation of Tesla's permit conditions and other regulatory requirements.~~

16 2. Selection of Engineering Firm(s) and Development of Scope of Work: To comply with  
17 Paragraph 1 of this Order, Tesla shall do the following:

18 a. Within thirty (30) calendar days of the Hearing Board issuing this order, Tesla shall  
19 submit to the APCO for approval the following items, in writing:

20 i. The names of three to five engineering firms that each have expertise in  
21 either evaluating equipment like that at Tesla's North and South Paint Shops, or in evaluating reliability  
22 and preventive maintenance programs, particularly vehicle production facility preventive maintenance,  
23 with summaries of applicable past projects and the kind of expertise provided by each of the firms; and

24 ii. A written scope of work consistent with this Order that Tesla proposes to  
25 provide to the selected engineering firm(s).

26 b. Within sixty (60) calendar days of receiving the scope of work from Tesla under  
27 Paragraph 2.a.ii. of this Order, the APCO shall review the proposed engineering firms and proposed scope  
28

1 of work submitted by Tesla under Paragraph 2.a and (i) strike from Tesla's list of proposed firms any firm  
2 that does not meet the requirements of Paragraph 2.a.i. and (ii) provide any proposed revisions to the  
3 proposed scope of work necessary to ensure that the requirements of this Order are fulfilled. If the APCO  
4 strikes any firm proposed by Tesla or provides any revisions to the proposed scope of work, the APCO  
5 shall provide Tesla with an explanation as to the basis of such decision for the purpose of assisting Tesla  
6 in selecting another firm or to make revisions to the scope of work, but this decision is not appealable.  
7 The APCO may require Tesla to furnish additional names of firms should the APCO determine that two  
8 or more of the originally proposed firms are not suitable, in which case Tesla shall have 15 calendar days  
9 from the date on which the APCO notifies Tesla that two or more of the originally proposed firms are not  
10 suitable to provide an additional two or more engineering firm names that meet the requirements of this  
11 Order. If there is any disagreement between Tesla and the APCO regarding the scope of work, they shall  
12 meet and confer about the revisions provided by the APCO. In the event an agreement cannot be reached  
13 between Tesla and the APCO regarding the scope of work, the disagreement shall be presented to the  
14 Hearing Board for resolution.

15 c. Within seven (7) calendar days of receiving the APCO's approval of the firms and  
16 scope of work under Paragraph 2.b, Tesla shall send the approved firm(s) selected the scope of work  
17 produced by the process in Paragraph 2.b.ii, which shall include requiring the firm(s) to:

18 i. Meet with Air District staff and Tesla before the firm(s) begins its study  
19 regarding implementing this Order and its scope of work, and then, every two weeks thereafter, give the  
20 APCO an update on its work under this Order; and

21 ii. Give the APCO, upon request, a copy of any information it obtained, from  
22 Tesla or otherwise. If any such information is trade secret or otherwise confidential under California law,  
23 Tesla and the APCO shall follow the Air District rules and, where appropriate, any other applicable  
24 California laws for handling such information.

25 d. Within twenty (20) calendar days of sending the firm(s) the scope of work under  
26 Paragraph 2.c., Tesla shall attempt to hire one or two of the approved firms, as necessary to fulfill the  
27 requirements of this Order. In the event Tesla is unable to hire any of the firms approved by the APCO  
28

1 under Paragraph 2.b due to scheduling unavailability, Tesla shall provide the APCO three more additional  
2 engineering firm names that meet the requirements of this Order, in accordance with Paragraph 2.a.i, and  
3 the APCO shall review them in accordance with Paragraph 2b. Tesla must hire a firm with expertise in  
4 evaluating equipment like that at Tesla's North and South Paint Shops, and the same or no more than one  
5 different firm with expertise in evaluating reliability and preventive maintenance programs, particularly  
6 automotive vehicle production facility preventive maintenance.

7 3. Engineering Firm Access and Independence: Tesla shall do the following with respect to  
8 the engineering firm(s) it hires under this Order:

9 a. Include Air District staff in all written communications it has with the selected  
10 firm(s);

11 b. Permit the firm(s) to talk freely and confidentially with Air District staff at any  
12 time, with or without Tesla present or knowing about the conversation or its contents; and

13 c. Give the firm(s) all access to equipment, control systems, employees, documents,  
14 and anything else that the firm(s) determines it reasonably needs to carry out its responsibilities and  
15 ensure compliance with this Order. If any such information is trade secret or otherwise confidential under  
16 California law, Tesla and the APCO shall follow the Air District rules and, where appropriate, any other  
17 applicable California laws for handling such information.

18 4. Report and Recommendations for Addressing Unabated VOC Emissions: Within ninety  
19 (90) calendar days of being hired, the firm(s) shall provide one report to both Tesla and the APCO that (i)  
20 is not edited or changed in any way by Tesla, (ii) is signed under penalty of perjury by a licensed  
21 electrical Professional Engineer, and a licensed mechanical Professional Engineer; and (iii) includes, at a  
22 minimum, all of the following:

23 a. A description of the firm and its qualifications to fulfill Paragraph 1 of this Order;

24 b. A summary of how such reviews are generally conducted;

25 c. A description of the requirements of this Order;

1 d. A summary of all the steps the firm took, the information it reviewed, and a  
2 description of the information and access requested from Tesla and, if Tesla denied any of the firm's  
3 requests for information and/or access, a summary of the information requested and Tesla's response;

4 e. A summary of Tesla's maintenance and reliability plan and its adequacy, as well as  
5 any recommendations to improve it or bring it up to automotive vehicle industry standards;

6 f. Identification and a brief explanation of any unavoidable emergency and/or safety  
7 hazards that would result in any emission of unabated VOCs from its North and/or South Paint Shops in  
8 violation of Tesla's permit conditions and other regulatory requirements, or a statement that none exist, as  
9 applicable;

10 g. An evaluation and recommendations on ways to eliminate the shutdown and/or  
11 bypassing of the North Paint Shop and South Paint Shop abatement systems while there are any emissions  
12 in the North Paint Shop and South Paint Shop production lines, except in situations where doing so is  
13 absolutely unavoidable for emergency and/or safety reasons. This analysis shall include, for example, and  
14 without limitation, ways for Tesla to keep the bypass vents closed and the abatement systems operating  
15 when there is a production line upset in the North Paint Shop or South Paint Shop, until all controlled  
16 emissions have been exhausted through the abatement system;

17 h. With respect to situations where shutting down and/or bypassing the North Paint  
18 Shop or South Paint Shop abatement systems is absolutely unavoidable for reasons of emergency and/or  
19 serious risk to the health and physical safety of persons, the engineering firm(s) shall evaluate and make  
20 recommendations on how to minimize the recurrence of the root causes and contributing factors that have  
21 given rise to such situations, to the maximum extent feasible. This analysis shall include, for example and  
22 without limitation, evaluation of and recommendations regarding (i) improved preventative maintenance  
23 of the North Paint Shop and South Paint Shop's thermal oxidizers and other components of the abatement  
24 systems, (ii) improved operator training, (iii) replacement of or upgrades to the thermal oxidizers and  
25 related components of the abatement systems, (iv) changes to the control logic and/or design of the  
26 operations of the North Paint Shop and South Paint Shop, and (v) any other area that could potentially

1 reduce the recurrence of situations necessitating the shutdown and/or bypassing of the abatement system;  
2 and

3 i. For each recommendation provided in the Report, an estimate of the minimum time  
4 needed to implement the recommendation.

5 5. APCO Review of Engineering Report: Within forty-five (45) calendar days of receiving  
6 the firm(s)'s report under Paragraph 4, the APCO may identify any concerns with the report by notifying  
7 Tesla and the firm(s). If there is any disagreement between Tesla and the APCO, they shall meet and  
8 confer about the firm(s)'s report, and the APCO shall inform Tesla and the firm(s) of any changes to its  
9 list of concerns. In the event an agreement cannot be reached between Tesla and the APCO regarding the  
10 list of concerns, they shall provide the firm(s) with the APCO's final list of concerns and Tesla's  
11 response, if any. Within thirty (30) calendar days of receiving the APCO's final list of concerns and  
12 Tesla's response, the firm(s) shall go back and address the issues identified by the APCO and issue a  
13 revised report consistent with Paragraph 4 that addresses the APCO's concerns and Tesla's response, with  
14 consideration and notation of Tesla's response, if consistent with this Order and the firm's professional  
15 responsibilities.

16 6. Submission of and Hearing On Proposed Plan to Address Unabated VOC Emissions:

17 a. Within sixty (60) calendar days of the firm(s) issuing a report or revised report,  
18 under Paragraphs 4 or 5, as applicable, Tesla shall file with the Hearing Board and serve on the APCO a  
19 proposed plan and timeline, not to exceed six months, for implementing all of the firm's  
20 recommendations, or, if there are any recommendations that Tesla contends it cannot feasibly implement  
21 or will require more than six months to implement, a response, with supporting documentation from an  
22 outside entity such as a vendor, demonstrating why it cannot feasibly implement those recommendations  
23 or why it will need more than six months to implement those recommendations. Tesla shall not claim it  
24 cannot feasibly implement a recommendation based solely on cost or production effects, and any claim of  
25 infeasibility must also be based on technical infeasibility. Tesla shall attach to its filing an unaltered  
26 version of the firm(s)'s report under Paragraph 4 or 5, as applicable. Tesla's filing required under this  
27  
28



1 Paragraph 6.a. shall be signed, under penalty of perjury, by a Tesla Vice President-level executive with  
2 responsibility for, and control over, the filing.

3 b. Within sixty (60) calendar days after service of Tesla's proposed plan and timeline,  
4 the APCO shall file its response, if any, with the Hearing Board.

5 c. Within fifteen (15) calendar days after the APCO files its response (or within 15  
6 calendar days after the deadline for the response, if the APCO does not file a response), the Hearing  
7 Board shall hold a hearing to determine an appropriate further order to require Tesla to implement the  
8 proposed plan and timeline for implementing all of the firm's recommendations.

9 7. Extensions of Time: Tesla or the APCO may request, and the Hearing Board may grant,  
10 reasonable extensions of time for any deadline established in this Order upon a showing of good cause or  
11 if the other party does not object. Any such extension shall be subject to the APCOs written consent,  
12 which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld. Any such extension shall be issued after a hearing in  
13 the form of a further Order, unless Tesla and the APCO stipulate to the extension, in which case a hearing  
14 need not be held, but a further Order will still be issued.

15 8. Reporting of Bypasses and Temperature Excursions: Immediately upon the effective date  
16 of this Order, Tesla shall report to the APCO each and every bypass valve opening and thermal oxidizer  
17 temperature excursion (where the thermal oxidizer falls below 1400 degrees Fahrenheit for any period of  
18 time) at the North and South Paint Shop, whether Tesla believes the event is a deviation or not, within 10  
19 calendar days of the bypass event or any thermal oxidizer temperature excursion occurring; in each such  
20 report, Tesla shall include all information required by Standard Condition F of Tesla's Title V permit, as  
21 well as emissions and supporting calculation(s). This reporting shall be in addition to Tesla's reporting of  
22 bypass valve opening and thermal oxidizer temperature excursions that Tesla identifies and reports as  
23 deviations in accordance with Standard Condition F of Tesla's Title V permit. Failing to report a  
24 deviation in connection with Tesla's Title V obligations may result in enforcement action.

25 9. Notices: Where any notice, submission, or communication is required by or related to this  
26 Order, it shall be submitted in writing via email to the representative of record in the Hearing Board  
27 proceeding which gave rise to this Order. Any Party may change its designated notice recipient or notice  
28

1 method provided above in accordance with Hearing Board rules. Notices submitted pursuant to this  
2 section shall be deemed received upon emailing.

3 The Hearing Board shall retain jurisdiction over this matter and this Order shall remain in effect  
4 until the Hearing Board has entered a further order in accordance with Paragraph 6.c, above.

5  
6 SO STIPULATED:

7  
8 Dated: June 25, 2024

By: *Alexandra Kamel*  
ALEXANDER G. CROCKETT, ESQ.  
General Counsel  
ALEXANDRA KAMEL, ESQ.  
Senior Assistant Counsel  
Counsel for  
PHILIP M. FINE  
Executive Officer/APCO  
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY  
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 Dated: June 25, 2024

By: *Rick Rothman*  
RICK ROTHMAN, ESQ.  
DAVID K. BROWN, ESQ.  
Counsel for  
TESLA MOTORS, INC.\_

17  
18  
19  
20 SO ORDERED:

21  
22 Dated: *8/26/2024*

By: *Valerie J. Arriente*  
Valerie J. Arriente, Esq.  
Hearing Board Chair  
Bay Area Air Quality Management District

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

BEFORE THE HEARING BOARD  
OF THE  
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL OFFICER of  
the BAY AREA AIR QUALITY  
MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Complainant,

vs.

TESLA MOTORS, INC.

Respondent.

Docket No.: 3751

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

City and County of San Francisco

ss.

I, Marcy Hiratzka, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury as follows:

That I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of 18 years and not a party to the above-entitled action; that I served a true copy of the attached **Findings and Decision For a Stipulated Abatement Order** on:

<p>Rick Rothman, Esq. Morgan, Lewis &amp; Bockius LLP 300 South Grand Ave., 22nd Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-3132 <a href="mailto:Rick.rothman@morganlewis.com">Rick.rothman@morganlewis.com</a></p>	<p>David K. Brown, Esq. Morgan, Lewis &amp; Bockius LLP 300 South Grand Ave., 22nd Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-3132 <a href="mailto:David.brown@morganlewis.com">David.brown@morganlewis.com</a></p>
--	--

via email and US Certified Mail on June 26, 2024, and on:

Alexandra Kamel, Esq., Sr. Assistant Counsel  
Bay Area Air Quality Management District  
375 Beale Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94105  
[akamel@baaqmd.gov](mailto:akamel@baaqmd.gov)

via email on June 26, 2024

DATED: June 26, 2024

\_\_\_\_\_  
Marcy Hiratzka  
Clerk of the Boards