

**South Sacramento – Florin Community Air Protection Steering Committee**  
**Steering Committee Meeting #12 Notes**  
**Tuesday, October 22, 2019 – 6:00pm – 8:00pm**  
**Location: Bowling Green Elementary School**

<b>Steering Committee Members</b>	<b>Organization</b>
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
Jamie Cervantes	District 8, City of Sacramento (alternate)
<b>Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)</b>	
Levi Ford	SMAQMD
Jamie Arno	SMAQMD
Quintin Phan	SMAQMD
Amy Roberts	SMAQMD
Mark Loutzenhisler	SMAQMD
David Yang	SMAQMD
John Henkelman	SMAQMD
Jaime Lemus	SMAQMD
Angela Hughes	SMAQMD
<b>Public and Other Organizations</b>	
Karen Buckley	CARB
Jose Saldana	CARB
David Ridley	CARB
Ariel Ambruster	CSUS
Victoria Vasquez	Sacramento Tree Foundation
Torin Dunnivant	Sacramento Tree Foundation
Karen DeGannes	PG&E
Sue Teramishi	Sacramento Japanese United Methodist Church
Janise Powell	Self
Jennifer Venema	City of Sacramento
Lynne Goldsmid	ECOS/350 Sacramento
J.C. Garcia	UC Davis ITS
Elena Becerril Salas	University of Washington Pacific Wildland Fire Sciences Laboratory
John Lane	Tiechert
Muriel Strand	Self
Adrien Rehn	Valley Vision
Herman Barahona	United Latinos
Remi Mendoza	City of Sacramento

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

## **1. Welcome and introductions:**

The Steering Committee Chair began the meeting at 6:07 PM. Meeting attendees introduced themselves and the group/organizations they represented. Steering Committee members were provided copies of the presentations and other information. Copies of meeting materials were also made available to the public.

The Steering Committee was lightly facilitated by the facilitator from California State University of Sacramento (CSUS). The facilitator reviewed the agenda for the meeting, then described her role and some tools she would be using to facilitate. She indicated that she would be making notes in front of the meeting, and she introduced the “Parking Lot,” a section of her notes for items that were brought up at the meeting that were off-topic for the current discussion and not part of the current agenda item. These off-topic items would be noted in the Parking Lot and could be addressed at later meetings if the Steering Committee determines that the item should be on a later agenda.

- A motion was made to accept the minutes from the previous meeting. The motion to approve the meeting notes was seconded and approved unanimously.**

## **2. Sacramento Tree Foundation Presentation**

The Sacramento Tree Foundation (Foundation) was invited by the Steering Committee and District to speak to the Steering Committee at the request of a Steering Committee member. Two members of the Foundation made a presentation to the Steering Committee on the relationship between trees and air quality. They also presented information on what the Foundation does to provide trees to increase the urban forest canopy in Sacramento. They spoke about established partnerships such as the one with the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) and partnerships that they are attempting to develop, such as one with Caltrans. The presenters also discussed challenges to increasing the canopy in areas such as the South Sacramento – Florin Community, including right-of-way and attitudes toward trees.

After the presentation, the floor was opened to questions from the Steering Committee and the public. A Steering Committee member asked how the Steering Committee could help the Foundation. The Foundation replied that the Steering Committee could spread the word about what the Foundation does and the programs it offers and bring open space for trees to the Foundation’s attention. It was asked whether trees could be incorporated into a future community emission reduction plan (CERP). The District responded that it might be possible but that it would depend on the specifics of the plan. One Steering Committee member suggested that the Community boundary might be revised to match the boundary of the region the Foundation uses for tree distribution. That suggestion was noted as a potential future agenda item in the “Parking Lot” and was not discussed further. Another question was about whether the Foundation could provide fruit trees as part of its programs. The Foundation responded that it could provide fruit trees in some areas of Sacramento, including some of the South Sacramento – Florin Community.

## **3. Administrative Items – Low-Cost Sensor Lending Program Pilot Program**

The District made an announcement on the low-cost sensor lending program pilot program for the Steering Committee members. The District requested that Steering Committee members that were interested in participating in the lending program should fill out the user agreement form and return the form to the District. Steering Committee members that returned the form after the meeting could take home a low-cost sensor, and low-cost sensors would be provided

later if forms were returned at a later date. The District also announced that after the meeting, the District will provide a brief orientation on how to install and use the low-cost sensors.

A Steering Committee member asked whether the loaned monitors would appear on the District's air quality monitoring website. The District responded that the monitors would not appear on the District's website but would be displayed on the Purple Air website. A Steering Committee member also asked whether loaned monitors must be used in the Community. The District responded that they could be kept at the Steering Committee members' home if they live outside the community and do not work in the community as part of the pilot program.

#### **4. Administrative Items – Announcements**

District staff had announcements of upcoming meetings and events that might be of interest to the Steering Committee. The District reminded the Steering Committee of an upcoming symposium about particulate matter (PM) in the Bay Area. The District invited up to two Steering Committee members to attend the symposium and will provide transportation. One Steering Committee member had shown interest, so the District had space for one more Steering Committee member to attend. The District also reminded the Steering Committee of the upcoming Survey Workshop to get feedback on the survey the District initially presented at the July 23, 2019 Steering Committee Meeting. The purpose of the workshop will be to get additional community feedback on the survey before it is finalized and sent out. The meeting will occur on October 28, 2019 and will include different community representatives from Sacramento County. The District announced that handout materials are available if any members were interested in receiving that information today. A Steering Committee member asked if flyers were available, and the District responded yes.

#### **5. Community Emission Reduction Plan Discussion and Decision**

The Steering Committee began discussion of the CERP. The Committee discussed whether the Steering Committee would recommend adopting a CERP for the next year or whether the community should remain a monitoring only community for Year 2 of the Assembly Bill 617 (AB617) program.

The District provided the Steering Committee with a recap of information about the CERP previously provided to the Steering Committee by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and District. The District also provide information on some of the actions it was already taking, including development of a community-level emission inventory, updating penalty provisions to meet AB 617 mandates, enhanced enforcement to identify unpermitted sources, and the Community Air Protection Incentive Program. A Steering Committee member asked what has been done by the District to identify unpermitted sources, and the District responded that additional staff had visited the South Sacramento – Florin community but that not many unpermitted sources have been identified.

A Steering Committee member noted that there was no penalty for not adopting a CERP, and that adopting a CERP required significant work from the Steering Committee and the District. Another Steering Committee member asked whether the emission inventory is the same as the monitoring and whether any data from the already deployed monitors was available. The District responded that the inventory is not equivalent to monitoring data. The District also informed the Steering Committee that data from the monitors are available on the District Community Air Monitoring website for each of the installed monitors but that the District had not done analysis of the data. There were additional Steering Community member questions about how long monitors had been installed and how many were going in. The District noted that installation started in June 2019 and that additional monitors had been installed as recently as the previous

week. District staff noted that a complete list of installed monitors, including locations and installation dates, is available on the District Community Air Monitoring website. The District also noted that 17 of 22 planned sensors have been installed.

It was reiterated that the District was seeking a recommendation from the Steering Committee whether they want to remain a monitoring only community or to develop a CERP in 2020.

There was additional discussion from the Steering Committee about whether the Steering Committee should recommend moving to a CERP. There was a question to CARB staff in the audience about whether CARB thought there was enough data available to develop a CERP. CARB responded that it is up to the Steering Committee to decide if they feel they have enough information to move forward to a CERP.

A member of the public asked what kind of emission reduction programs would be included in the CERP. The District responded that emission reductions would have to be developed by the Steering Committee. In response to a question about the downside to adopting a CERP, CARB noted that other AB617 communities had more community-level monitoring data. They noted that San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) was the most comparable jurisdiction to the District with an AB617 community. CARB noted that the Steering Committee in SDAPCD had elected to adopt a CERP, but they had more monitoring data and a larger steering committee.

There was discussion among the public and the Steering Committee noting that it could be possible to work with only emission inventory data. It was noted that vehicles were the sources expected to contribute most to poor air quality in the community, but that wood smoke is also a significant source of air pollution.

A public participant asked whether the Steering Committee could change direction if the CERP was in progress and the monitoring found something unexpected. The District responded that it would depend on what was found and when it was found. It would be more difficult to change things late in the CERP process than if something were discovered early.

A public speaker from the University of California Davis Transportation Institute (UCDTI) commented that the UCDTI was available as a resource whether the community remained a monitoring-only community or adopted a CERP. There was more discussion about the pros and cons of adopting a CERP.

Some of the pros of moving to a CERP discussed were that it would move more quickly to reduce air pollution within the community and that it is already known that there is poor air in the community. Moving to a CERP in Year 2 would provide a strategy for improving air quality in the community with a firm timeline for achieving air quality improvements and that it would keep the momentum for improving air quality. Arguments against moving to the CERP were that there is not enough community-specific data available, that it would not necessarily come with additional funding or resources, that there is still significant work to finish the monitoring plan and it would be a substantial work load for both the Steering Committee and the District to complete within the CERP timeframes, and that attempting to develop a CERP with insufficient data would be like trying to do detailed work with a blunt instrument.

The facilitator provided a brief recap of the issues and briefly opened the floor for a few more questions before the Steering Committee took a vote on whether to adopt the CERP. The final question was whether additional funds were available if the Steering Committee adopted a CERP and whether the alternative to adopting a CERP was to do nothing for a year. The District replied that the District had already received funds that were being used to reduce pollution as part of the AB617 program and that adopting the CERP did not mean that additional funding

would be made available. The District stated that adopting a CERP may allow more flexibility in the way the District could use the available funding.

The Steering Committee Chairman asked for a vote on whether the Steering Committee wanted to move to a CERP or remain monitoring-only. There were three votes in favor of moving to a CERP and five against it.

- **The Steering Committee voted to remain a community air monitoring only community.**

## 6. Monitoring Plan Phase 2 Discussion

The District provided a summary of the previous discussion and breakout session about the deployment of Phases 2 and 3 for the monitoring plan. The District indicated it was requesting Steering Committee recommendations on which months should be monitored in Phase 2 of the monitoring program and when Phase 3 of the monitoring program should be deployed. The District noted that it was unlikely that it would be possible to deploy Phase 2 in December and that the earliest availability was likely January.

There was a brief summary of what deployment schedules Groups 1 and 2 came up with during the breakout session in the September 24, 2019 Steering Committee meeting.

Group 1 had recommended deployment of Phase 2 from December to February and June to August with Phase 3 deployed after all Phase 2 sampling data were available with the knowledge that Phase 3 could be deployed earlier if Phase 2 data justified earlier deployment. Group 1 wanted to capture seasonality and have all information available prior to deploying Phase 3. Group 2 wanted to conduct Phase 2 over six months in winter, spring, and summer with Phase 3 deployed in August or September so it would be able to capture winter air quality.

A Steering Committee member noted that the two scenarios were similar. A motion was made for the Steering Committee to recommend combining the Group 1 and 2 plans. The motion was seconded. All voting Steering Committee members voted in favor of the motion and none voted against. The District requested clarification on what the Steering Committee was recommending and which six months it wanted sampling to occur. The Steering Committee said that sampling in January through March and June through August were recommended.

- **The motion for the Steering Committee to recommend combining the Group 1 and 2 plans was passed. Sampling for Phase 2 was recommended to start in January through March and June Through August.**

## 7. Upcoming Meetings and Agenda Topics

The District presented Monitoring Plan elements that will be agenda topics for upcoming Steering Committee meetings. The topics presented were needed to get Steering Committee input for the monitoring program, and the District would be requesting recommendations and feedback from the Steering Committee. The District also brought up the idea of informational only meetings for the Steering Committee where no feedback or action items were on the agenda. These informational meetings could be used as needed to provide the Steering Committee and the public with information about AB617 related information - air quality,

environmental justice, or other relevant topics. A Steering Committee member supported the idea. No motion or action was taken on the upcoming topics or for additional meeting dates.

## **8. Public Comments**

The floor was open to public comments. A member of the public asked when the emission inventory for the community would be available. The District responded that it did not have a timeline but that it would inform the Committee when it was available.

Another member of the public asked what was being done with the available funding. The District responded that 3.6 million dollars was being used for programs such as zero emission school buses in the County. The District was also using 14 million dollars of funding for modernizing heavy duty vehicles that transport goods and other zero emission equipment.

A member of the public asked whether any funding was going to improve cycling infrastructure. The District responded that it supports better cycling infrastructure, but that its ability to fund better cycling infrastructure is limited by restrictions on the available funding. A representative from the City of Sacramento noted that the City of Sacramento is seeking funding for cycling safety as part of its Vision Zero program.

- **A motion to adjourn was made at 8:06 PM. It was seconded and passed unanimously.**