

**South Sacramento – Florin Community Air Protection Steering Committee
Steering Committee Meeting #9 Notes
Tuesday, January 28, 2020 – 6:00pm – 8:30pm
Location: Sacramento County Sheriff Service Center**

Steering Committee Members	Organization
Bill Knowlton (Chair)	Mack Road Partnership
Patricia Shelby (Vice Chair)	NLCNA Community, Resident
Gary Johansen	Resident, North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association (President)
Vincent Valdez	United Latinos EJ Committee, Resident
Bishop Chris Baker	Advocate for Education
Shirley Banks	Self
Tido Thac Hoang	Vietnamese American Community of Sacramento
Rhonda Henderson	North Laguna Creek Valley Hi Community Association
Preston Jackson III	Southgate Recreation and Parks District
Stephanie Williams	Self
Denise R. McCoy	Sac ACT
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)	
Alberto Ayala	SMAQMD
Levi Ford	SMAQMD
Jamie Arno	SMAQMD
Levi Ford	SMAQMD
Janice Lam Snyder	SMAQMD
Mark Loutzenhiser	SMAQMD
David Yang	SMAQMD
John Henkelman	SMAQMD
Jaime Lemus	SMAQMD
Kathy Pittard	SMAQMD
Public and Other Organizations	
Karen Buckley	CARB
Jeremy Herbert	CARB
David Ridley	CARB
Rai Hann	CARB
Jennifer Magana	CARB
Veronica Eady	CARB
Ariel Ambruster	CSUS
John Lane	Tiechert
Gabriell Dela Cruz	Valley Vision

Note: All presentations and meeting materials are available on the District website at <http://www.airquality.org/> under Community Air Protection and Steering Committee.

Meeting Summary

- The meeting notes from the October 22 and December 3, 2019 meetings were approved.
- Facilitators provided an update on the facilitation process, including upcoming individual assessments with each Steering Committee member.

- The Steering Committee provided feedback on how the CAMP should evaluate progress (Monitoring Plan Element 12) and recommended criteria for monitoring progress toward the CAMP objectives.
- The Steering Committee provided feedback on how the CAMP should communicate results of the community air monitoring. The discussion included a breakout brainstorming session.
- The Steering Committee discussed requirements of subcommittees and whether there was interest or need to form a subcommittee.

1. Welcome and introductions:

The Steering Committee Chair began the meeting at 6:02 PM. The Steering Committee was facilitated by the facilitator from California State University of Sacramento (CSUS).

Meeting attendees introduced themselves and the group/organizations they represented. The new Steering Committee member, Preston Jackson III, provided a short background on himself and why he wanted to be involved with the Steering Committee.

2. Administrative Items

a. Previous Meeting Notes

Steering Committee members were provided copies of the presentations and other information. Copies of meeting materials were also made available to the public.

- **A motion to accept the meeting notes from the October 22 and December 3, 2019 meetings was made. It was seconded and passed unanimously and without discussion.**

b. Monitoring Locations Update

The District provided an update on its progress toward securing monitoring locations for Phase 2 of the monitoring program. The District informed the Steering Committee that it has secured access to four of the six monitoring locations. The District stated that it thought that it would be able to work with Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) to secure monitoring locations but that safety and security concerns associated with power substations made most sites unsuitable.

The District has worked with the City of Sacramento Fire Department to secure access for a Phase 2 monitoring location at Fire Station 56. Securing the location required presenting before the Fire Department board and approval from the Station Chief.

The District has secured access to a Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) post. It had initially tried to secure a location in a cell tower station but that the cell tower company wanted excessive rent and fees.

The District was working with Impact Community Church to use their property or a cell tower on their property as a monitoring location.

The District is working with the City of Sacramento and has secured a monitoring location at Sump 50.

The District is working with SMUD to use one of their facilities near Priority Area 3. The SMUD facility being considered does not have the same safety and security that the SMUD substations do.

Finally, the District is working with Consumes River College and has secured a monitoring location near the day care center for Phase 2 monitoring.

A Steering Committee noted that he thought he District would pay for electricity and questioned why it was a problem. The Districted responded that the issue was not paying for electricity and that it was paying at some locations. The issue was having access to a supply of electricity or the lack of infrastructure for power.

A Steering Committee member informed the District that Anna Kirchgater Elementary School and a Kaiser Permanente facility/clinic are near Impact Community Church and may be suitable monitoring locations. The District said it would evaluate those locations for monitoring.

c. Follow-ups

i. Targeted Green Infrastructure Fund

Steering Committee members provided a summary of activities outside of the Steering Committee meetings. Two Steering Committee members attended the Targeted Green Infrastructure Fund (TGIF) meeting. The Steering Committee members informed the Steering Committee about some of the grants awarded by the TGIF.

ii. AB617 Conference at UC Davis

A Steering Committee member discussed an upcoming convening of members of all AB617 Steering Committee members at UC Davis. The convening will be on February 4th, 2020, and the South Sacramento-Florin will be sending five Steering Committee members. The members that will be attending are Vincent Valdez, Rhonda Henderson, Shirley Banks, Bishop Chris Baker, and Patricia Shelby. Another Steering Committee member noted that she had received an invitation and questioned why she was not listed as an attendee. After a brief discussion, it was determined that the Steering Committee member may not have been able to attend for the full duration of the convening. CARB will provide a van for transportation, and Patricia Shelby will drive the Steering Committee members to and from the convening.

iii. Incentives Program Update

The District provided a brief update on its incentive programs. The District hoped that having two Steering Committee members attend the TGIF meeting provided some insight into how the District awards incentive funding. It also noted that there are two separate AB617 funding mechanisms: implementation and incentives. The implementation funding is to be used for monitoring and similar activities, and the incentives funding is to be used to fund emission reduction projects. The District showed a list of projects on its webpage that have received District incentive funding or with grant applications that are being reviewed.

A Steering Committee member asked which Eskaton facility was listed in the tables. Another Steering Committee member noted that the table included the identified community or area and that the Eskaton was within the South Sacramento-Florin community.

Another Steering Committee member asked about the status of the Clean Cars for All program and whether the District had addressed her concerns about issues of access and income she had previously raised. The District responded that the program is scheduled to roll out in the coming months and that it had addressed the issues of access and income.

Another Steering Committee member noted that some of the funding was being used outside the South Sacramento-Florin community. The District confirmed that this was the case, but that the applications in the South Sacramento-Florin community were given priority in the selection process.

Another Steering Committee member asked whether the Pepsi project listed in the tables was using the funding voted on at a previous meeting. The District confirmed that this was the case.

The District noted that it was looking for volunteers to work with the District in the grant application process and encouraged Steering Committee members to participate in the process. Vincent Valdez, Rhonda Henderson, and Stephanie Williams expressed willingness to volunteer.

Finally, a Steering Committee member asked what it meant for the District to be “reviewing” a grant application. The District clarified that it was going through the process of evaluating benefits and eligibility for the grant.

iv. Facilitator Interview Updates

The facilitator informed the Steering Committee that she was continuing to conduct individual interviews with Steering Committee members. She noted that she expected to have interviews completed by the next planned Steering Committee meeting.

v. Steering Committee Composition Changes

The District noted that there were some Steering Committee membership changes. Two previous Steering Committee members, Jennifer Ablog and Joelle Toney would no longer be participating in the Steering Committee. The District would seek out another representative of the health community to serve on the Steering Committee and would be writing a thank-you letter to both former members.

A Steering Committee member questioned whether the other Steering Committee vacancy would be filled. The District responded that after getting a member of the health community to join the Steering Committee, the Steering Committee have 12 members and that it would be within the size range of 11 to 14 members the District had had agreed was appropriate with the Steering Committee Chair and Vice Chair.

3. Element 12 Discussion

The District provided a recap of what Element 12 of the Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP) should contain. The District also provided a recap of the discussion the Steering Committee had around Element 12 of the CAMP. The District informed the Steering Committee that it was requesting that the Steering Committee make a recommendation for Element 12 at the Steering Committee meeting.

The District summarized the objectives that were adopted by the Steering Committee at previous meetings then provided tables that summarized the discussion of Element 12 from the December 3, 2019, Steering Committee meeting. The summary also showed how the District proposed to evaluate progress toward meeting the objectives.

A Steering Committee member asked whether the tables shown were binding, and the District responded that the tables were the result of brain storming from the last meeting and were not

binding. The District was asking the Steering Committee to amend the criteria if it saw fit before adopting a recommendation.

Another Steering Committee member asked whether the objectives had been reworded and thought the wording was awkward. The District responded that the objectives were the objectives adopted by the Steering Committee in May, 2019.

A Steering Committee member asked whether polling could take place through neighborhood associations or Survey Monkey. The District responded that it was possible that neighborhood associations or Survey Monkey could be used. Another Steering Committee described an experience with live polling via text message.

A Steering Committee member stated that polling should include a baseline survey and a final survey to measure the increase in air quality knowledge. Another Steering Committee member asked if final polling should occur after six months of adopting the CAMP. A Steering Committee member noted that studying who is polled and re-polled is an important decision. The District noted that the details of polling could be developed later. The Steering Committee could form an advisory group to decide on the details of the polling while adopting generalized polling criteria in the CAMP.

The District responded to an idea from the December 3, 2019 Steering Committee meeting that the District should increase awareness of reported violations. The District told the Steering Committee that violation reports are specifically not part of a monitoring plan, but information about violations was available from the District and information about violations may be included in reports discussed in Element 14. A Steering Committee member asked whether the District was monitoring violations. The District stated that it was monitoring violations, but that those violations were not always associated with emission violations and that some violations non-emission-related violations such as recordkeeping.

The District discussed evaluating the number of monitors at schools and hospitals every twelve months. The Steering Committee asked when the twelve months started and the District responded that monitor placement could be evaluated on the adoption of the CAMP. A Steering Committee member asked if it would be better to do a preliminary data evaluation to catch potential issues early.

Another Steering Committee member requested data from the air quality monitors that were currently in place. He noted that monitors have been in place at some locations for six months already and that the District has not provided data from the monitors. The District noted that the data from the monitors is available on the District website. The Steering Committee member requested that the District provide charts of the existing data. The District agreed to provide charts from the low-cost sensors that are in place.

Other Steering Committee member agreed that it would be better for the District to provide data and the evaluation of monitor locations every six months rather than annually. A Steering Committee asked why the Steering Committee and District didn't seem to know what would be effective and what other AB617 communities were doing. The District responded that the Blueprint for AB617 Community Air Monitoring asked implementing Districts to consult with communities through the Steering Committee process. The Steering Committee responded that the Blueprint also talked about experts providing information to the Steering Committee to inform them. Another Steering Committee noted that the District had provided the Steering Committee with examples of monitoring plans from other Districts to be used in the discussion and that those monitoring plans used six- and twelve-months evaluation periods. The other Steering Committee stated that she had heard that the San Diego Steering Committee was

unhappy with the District and that the Steering Committee should have more say in who the experts are.

The subject of using traffic counts was then discussed. It was noted that some of the information the District wanted to rely on was being generated by agencies other than the District. The District stated that it was doing its part to collect the air quality information that it could so it could be prepared when data from other agencies, such as traffic or truck counts, was available.

The District discussed monitoring during different seasons and that the evaluation of seasonal coverage would be performed annually because it required evaluation over multiple seasons. A Steering Committee member noted that Phase 2 monitoring would be complete after nine months and asked whether the District could provide results after nine months of Phase 2 monitoring. The District stated that there would be a significant turn-around time from the collection of the last sample to the generation of a report due to laboratory analysis, data processing, and time needed to write the report. A Steering Committee member proposed running additional monitors so there was not a gap in the Phase 2 sampling, but the District noted it did not have the resources to operate Phase 2 sampling additional months. A Steering Committee member noted that the District was not collecting data in all seasons, but the District noted that Phase 1 and Phase 3 monitoring would be conducted during all seasons and that only Phase 2 monitoring was conducted during specific seasons.

The District began discussion of Objective 4 and comparing monitoring data to emission inventory data. The District proposed to annually evaluate collected air quality data for completeness and suitability for use in emission inventory and/or source attribution analysis. The District requested clarification from the Steering Committee on whether it wanted spatial data on toxics to be used to evaluate specifically trucks or all vehicle traffic. A Steering Committee member discussed her thought process behind the suggestion and concluded that if it was possible to collect data on all traffic and trucks specifically, the District should do so. Another Steering Committee member stated that he was interested in all transportation emissions, including road, rail, and air. The District noted that the objective was worded broadly so rail and air transport were included in the objective. The Steering Committee asked what information was available on rail and air transport, and the District indicated it could report back.

Discussion of Element 12 was opened to public comment. The Air Pollution Control Officer made an announcement to the Steering Committee that what the District could do was limited by the resources allocated to the District and that the current proposed state budget cut funding to the AB617 program statewide. A Steering Committee member spoke up to reinforce the District speaker's point and described observing the AB617 Steering Committee meeting in Richmond where they learned about the funding cut in the proposed state budget.

A member of the public noted that Caltrans has traffic cameras and monitors and that the District should see what information was available from Caltrans. The District stated that it plans to get the data and is trying to work with external data sources as part of the AB617 process.

The District requested that the Steering Committee support the amended criteria to evaluate effectiveness. The facilitator asked for clarification on the amendments. The Steering Committee confirmed that it wanted preliminary data evaluation for the Phase 2 data when the data exist, to the extent possible. The Steering Committee also suggested polling at the beginning of CAMP adoption and polling every three months thereafter for Objective 1. A CARB staffer discussed there being two kinds of polls that it sounded like the Steering Committee was discussing. The first kind of poll measures how knowledge in a group of individuals changes over time and the second measures knowledge of the topic within the public at large. The

Steering Committee agreed with the statement and expressed that polling should be done correctly to measure progress and given sufficient resources.

A Steering Committee member noted that the criteria included a lot of items to provide information and not many to offer help to impacted communities. The District noted that the goal of helping communities was discussed more in Element 14 and the deliverables that would be described in Element 14.

- **There was a motion for the Steering Committee to recommend the criteria as amended. The motion was seconded and approved.**

4. Element 14 Discussion

The District began the discussion of Element 14 of the CAMP by reviewing the purpose of Element 14. The District reviewed factors to consider when sharing information, including the target audience, format, and frequency of sharing. The District provided examples of how it has shared information for other air monitoring projects. The District also provided examples of how AQView will display data when the CARB system is operational.

The District described the breakout exercise, which involved breaking the Steering Committee into two brainstorming groups to generate ideas for Element 14. Steering Committee members were encouraged to take the brainstorming worksheet home and complete the table. They could then bring the worksheet back to the next Steering Committee meeting, where Element 14 discussion could continue. Photos of the breakout worksheets are included as Attachment A.

The Steering Committee regrouped at 8:07 PM.

5. Steering Committee Discussion

The Steering Committee Chairs introduced the discussion of the structure of the Steering Committee and the potential formation of a subcommittee. They requested that the District prepare a brief presentation on the subject to clarify different types ways steering committee members can meet to discuss AB617 topics. The facilitator noted that this was being discussed because of a presentation at the December Steering Committee meeting that caused confusion and made some Steering Committee members wonder whether they had missed a vote to form a subcommittee. The facilitator clarified that a subcommittee has not yet been formed by the Steering Committee.

The District provided different options that Steering Committee members can meet and form groups, in addition to the formation of a subcommittee. The District provided guidelines for each option and alternative to a formal sub-committee. The District noted that gatherings of steering committee members are restricted to less than a quorum and cannot be held for the purpose of identifying votes on matters before the full committee.

A Steering Committee member noted that there had already been discussion at that meeting of a subgroup to focus on the details of polling as part of Element 12.

A member of the subgroup that was discussed at the December Steering Committee said that the subgroup used the meetings to reflect on what they learned, to build rapport and stated that he feels undercut by the decision of County District 8 to withdraw its representative, who had been a member of the subgroup as well.

Another member of the subgroup said they felt that the Steering Committee was not focused enough on environmental justice (EJ) concerns. The Steering Committee member read from a

prepared statement. The Steering Committee member stated that there were difficulties promoting environmental justice best practices and that the subgroup formed to address those concerns. The Steering Committee member suggested three things to improve the process of creating clean air for the South Sacramento-Florin community. The first suggestion was to expand the boundaries of the community to include the Sacramento Executive Airport, Luther Burbank High School, and Interstate 5. The second suggestion is to require the Steering Committee members to provide input on the admission of additional Steering Committee members to increase the Steering Committee to 24 members. The third suggestion was to create a technical advisory group with representatives from city and county departments, researchers, environmental justice advocates, and agencies independent of the District to provide expert opinion.

The Steering Committee member went on to talk about his disappointment that there was no time allowed to talk about issues like the SMUD's planned solar program. He stated that he thought AB617 would mean more funding in the community. He wanted the Steering Committee to write a letter to oppose the SMUD program and for the Steering Committee to support efforts by the Sacramento Tree Foundation to plant and maintain planting trees on Franklin Avenue, which passes through the South Sacramento-Florin community.

A Steering Committee member responded that the Steering Committee had a limited scope and that it should stick to the scope and accomplish its current mandate. The Steering Committee Chair supported the need to hit current goals and objective to demonstrate the effectiveness of the AB617 program. He also noted that the actions of a subcommittee, if formed, reflected on the Steering Committee as a whole.

A Steering Committee member who had participated in the subgroup stated that the subgroup meetings were for learning. Another stated that the subgroup wanted to learn what other AB617 groups were doing. She stated that it helps the group to be educated about what other groups are doing. She stated that she did not believe that the Steering Committee had the support of the community and that it was being made to learn on the spot.

A Steering Committee member noted that the intention of the discussion was not to stop learning meetings but that the concern was that the subgroup had represented itself as an official subcommittee. Another Steering Committee member stated that some Steering Committee members were going to meetings of other AB617 steering committees to bring back relevant information. A Steering Committee member stated that protocol must be followed, and that the December presentation had been confusing. They continued that if a subcommittee was formed, it must be accountable to the Steering Committee. Another Steering Committee member said that she thought that the Richmond Steering Committee was large because it was a bigger area and had a wider range of pollution sources.

A member of the subgroup said that the Steering Committee needed to educate itself on why Richmond has 35 members and that she wants to understand what is working in other communities.

One Steering Committee member stated that a subgroup could continue to meet if it continued to stay smaller than a quorum.

Another Steering Committee member wanted a letter from the Steering Committee stating its opposition to the SMUD solar plan and made a motion for it. The motion did not receive a second. Another Steering Committee member responded that the Steering Committee needed information on what the SMUD solar plan was and a draft letter that it could make a decision on.

A Steering Committee member proposed creating an optional Steering Committee meeting for education and study. The District responded that it is always an option for the Steering Committee to propose additional meetings. The Steering Committee Chair asked what exactly was being proposed, including the meeting topic. The Steering Committee member explained that the extra meeting would be to learn and to provide more time for discussion, but that Steering Committee members would not be required to attend.

Another Steering Committee member stated that she would like to know what other committees were doing and that we may be able to use what they have done. The District stated that it could connect with CARB and share back some of the information from experts at Steering Committee meetings, but a Steering Committee member opposed the proposal because the Steering Committee could look to what West Oakland was doing in their AB617 program.

A Steering Committee made a motion to have an additional meeting. The motion was not seconded. The District requested clarification on what the meeting date and topics would be. The Steering Committee member proposed April 16 but stated that he wanted additional time to learn material. The District proposed either call-in hours or meetings to go over material for the Steering Committee.

A Steering Committee member asked about his motion for the Steering Committee to support a letter opposing the SMUD solar plan. The District responded that more information was needed before it could support such a letter.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:57 PM because the facility was not available after 9:00PM.

6. Upcoming Meeting Agenda Topics

The Upcoming Meeting Agenda Topics agenda item was not discussed due to time constraints.

7. Public Comments

Due to time constraints, the facilitator stated that she asked the public attendees if they have any public comments. There were no public comments, and the floor was not opened to final public comments.

Attachment 1 – Breakout session worksheets

DRAFT

Element 14 – Communicate Results to Support Action
Steering Committee Worksheet

1. Type of Information	2. Who is the targeted audience?	3. What are the best communication tools to use?	4. How often to communicate?	5. Other considerations?
General air quality information – Health effects of air pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CHILDREN/YOUTH LEADS PARENTS / ELDERLY SE. LIVING FACILITIES MOBILE HOME SITES RESIDENTS LIVING NEAR STATE SCHOOLS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FLYERS BROCHURES NEWSLETTERS NEPT DOOR WORKSHOPS/PASSENTRIALS SCHOOL WEBSITES w/ INFO SOCIAL MEDIA (EMAIL UPDATES) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30-45 DAYS 1/16 @ SCHOOL WRTGS. SEMI-ANNUAL POSTED 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When Hungry for info. need to be FRIENDLY website
Real-time hourly data – PM _{2.5} , ozone	(Example: Schools, Daycares)	Sac Metro Website, CARB Website	Hourly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> need to be FRIENDLY website Index USER FRIENDLY website
Preliminary raw laboratory data – specific air toxics information	(Example: Industry, scientists, concerned resident)	Sac Metro Website MOST WORKSHOPS w/ EXPLANATIONS OF DATA	Quarterly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peak season for interest Facebook Twitter
Validated, finalized data (includes: hourly data and laboratory data)			Semi-annually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual + COLOR Info to protect size Info from pollution
Community monitoring locations		Sac Metro Website		
Progress Report/Final Report		(Example: Workshop, Sac Metro Website)	Annually	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyses/trends High level report what they need

Element 14 – Communicate Results to Support Action
Steering Committee Worksheet

1. Type of Information	2. Who is the targeted audience?	3. What are the best communication tools to use?	4. How often to communicate?	5. Other considerations?
General air quality information – Health effects of air pollution	Community in general Asthma sufferers Students, Seniors Neighbors, Church	Incentives – Medline fund Community Events Sporting events Radio	Hourly	Multi-lingual Senator Health Outreach Events
Real-time hourly data – PM _{2.5} , ozone	(Example: Schools, Daycares) Local Climate Orgs	Sac Metro Website, CARR Website SOCIAL MEDIA FB, IG, YT Nextdoor	Quarterly	
Preliminary raw laboratory data – specific air toxics information	(Example: Industry, scientists, concerned resident) CSC, CARR	Sac Metro Website	Semi-annually	City Council Meetings State Assembly Meetings
Validated, finalized data (includes: hourly data and laboratory data)	(see above)	Pictures, Charts, Videos		
Community monitoring locations		Sac Metro Website		
Progress Report/Final Report	Visiting Scholars Health Fairs Sporting events	(Example: Workshop, Sac Metro Website) Large Outreach Event Spontaneous music, food etc	Annually Bi-Monthly	Analyses/trends

* EJ information