

**South Sacramento – Florin Community Air Protection Steering Committee
Steering Committee Meeting #16 Notes
Tuesday, March 10, 2020 – 6:00pm – 8:00pm
Location: Mack Road Partnership**

Steering Committee Members	Organization
Bill Knowlton (Chair)	Mack Road Partnership & Relmagine Foundation
Patricia Shelby (Vice Chair)	NLCNA Community, Resident
Gary Johansen	Resident, North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association (President), Resident
Vincent Valdez	United Latinos EJ Committee, Resident
Bishop Chris Baker	Advocate for Education, Resident
Shirley Banks	Self, Resident
Stephanie Williams	Self, Resident
Denise R. McCoy	Sac ACT
Rhonda Henderson	North Laguna Creek Valley Hi Community Association, Resident
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)	
Janice Lam Snyder	SMAQMD
Mark Loutzenhiser	SMAQMD
David Yang	SMAQMD
John Henkelman	SMAQMD
Public and Other Organizations	
Karen Buckley	CARB
Samar Lichtensten	CARB
Jennifer Magana	CARB
Veronica Eady	CARB
Ariel Ambruster	CSUS
Yzabelle Dela Cruz	Valley Vision
Rachel Pallatin	CAPCOA

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 Steering Committee participated in a teambuilding exercise to increase comradery
- The Steering Committee discussed concerns with the AB617 process

1. Welcome and introductions:

The Steering Committee Chair began the meeting at 6:16 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.

2. Steering Committee Team-Building Activity

The Steering Committee Vice Chair explained that the Steering Committee meeting would begin with a teambuilding exercise. She explained that the purpose of the exercise was to slow down and appreciate what others were bringing to the AB617 process. She noted that knowing and

trusting each other would be important if the Steering Committee wanted to create a CERP. She explained that the participants would include all the Steering Committee members plus Mark, Janice, and David from the District, and Karen from CARB.

Another Steering Committee member asked who had made the decisions about the exercise, including the decision to invite District staff to participate. The Vice Chair explained that the invitation came from the Chair and Vice Chair. The Steering Committee member said that he thought that planning should involve the rest of the Steering Committee. The Vice Chair stated that better communication is part of the goal going forward and part of the team building exercise.

The facilitator explained that the exercise is to learn about each other. Participants would pair off to learn about each other. Each person would speak for a bit. The facilitator provided suggested prompts for the discussion:

- Tell a story about where you grew up.
- What is something that brings you joy?
- What is one of your most treasured memories?
- What is something you'd like others to know about you?

The facilitator also provided suggestions to draw others out or to reflect what was said back to the person who said it.

The participants began the exercise by forming random pairs. Each participant spoke to their partner for about five minutes, then each pair switched roles. Then a second five-minute period had passed, the Steering Committee regrouped, and each participant introduced their partner with what they had learned.

The Chair said that this might be a good time to discuss the concerns and noted that a lot of Steering Committee members were nodding their heads in agreement. There were no disagreements expressed by Steering Committee members. The Chair asked the Steering Committee member what the issues were.

Some Steering Committee members brought up some topics that made them unhappy or feel that trust was broken. One topic was the removal of a Steering Committee member from the Steering Committee. Some Steering Committee members expressed desire to reinstate the Steering Committee member. The District responded that it was not responsible for removing the Steering Committee member from the committee and that the decision had been made by her employer. Some Steering Committee members discussed that the Steering Committee or District may not have the power to have the former Steering Committee member reassigned and that the Steering Committee should not allow something beyond its control be an impediment to its progress.

Another topic was a CARB staff who was no longer a liaison for the Steering Committee. Some Steering Committee members questioned why he had been removed as liaison to the Steering Committee but continued to serve as liaison to other steering committees. CARB staff stated that they could not discuss personnel matters but that the South Sacramento-Florin Steering Committee did have a CARB liaison who had attended previous meetings and was at the current meeting but had missed several while she was out bonding with her baby but would be attending meetings going forward.

Some Steering Committee members also questioned why a District staff was no longer with the District and who is the District point of contact for the Steering Committee. The District stated

that it could not go into personnel issues, but the point of contact was David Yang, who had been the previous point of contact.

The Steering Committee asked about the size of the Steering Committee and how new members were added. The Steering Committee and District discussed how it should bring new members onto the Steering Committee, what the composition of the Steering Committee should be, and what the appropriate size for the Steering Committee was. The Steering Committee and District also discussed the onboarding process for new Steering Committee members. There was a consensus that on-boarding was required but no specific decisions were made.

The Steering Committee also discussed the atmosphere of recent Steering Committee meetings. Members noted that finding new members while tensions were high and apparent during meetings may be difficult and that the Steering Committee would have to create a more welcoming atmosphere if it wanted to attract new members.

The Steering Committee members discussed the process for putting new items on the Steering Committee agenda. They discussed processes used by other steering committees, including an agenda subcommittee and a "New Business" process at Steering Committee meetings.

The Vice Chair noted that the Steering Committee may need to have a subgroup review and revise the existing Steering Committee charter and that several of the issues discussed were part of the charter. Revising the code of conduct in the charter was also discussed. No decisions on about revising the Steering Committee charter were made.

The Steering Committee, the District, and CARB briefly discussed the availability of monitoring data. CARB noted that data were available from its online AQ-View website and that it was working with vendors and the District to resolve data quality issues and to make reporting clear and understandable.

The Steering Committee discussed whether a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) should be formed and how a TAG could be formed by the Steering Committee. Some Steering Committee members advocated for the Steering Committee having a better understanding of what its objectives would be after adopting a Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP). Other Steering Committee members advocated for the Steering Committee to create a TAG sooner. There was also discussion of what the composition of a TAG should be and the process the Steering Committee should use to create a TAG.

A Steering Committee member asked who was interesting in staying involved in the AB617 process until the end. All Steering Committee members responded that they were staying with the process until it was complete.

3. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

- **The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 PM.**