

South Sacramento – Florin Community Air Protection Steering Committee
Steering Committee Meeting #9 Notes
Tuesday, September 24, 2019 – 6:00pm – 8:00pm
Location: Florin Creek Recreation 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
Jennifer Ablog	Kaiser Permanente
Denise McCoy	SacACT
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)	
Levi Ford	SMAQMD
Jamie Arno	SMAQMD
Quintin Phan	SMAQMD
Amy Roberts	SMAQMD
Mark Loutzenhiser	SMAQMD
Janice Lam Snyder	SMAQMD
David Yang	SMAQMD
John Henkelman	SMAQMD
Jaime Lemus	SMAQMD
Public and Other Organizations	
Amber Afshin	CARB
Neomi Vitela	CARB
Karen Buckley	CARB
Jose Saldana	CARB
David Ridley	CARB
Alex Cole-Weiss	CSUS
Ariel Ambruster	CSUS
Duyen Kauffman	OEHHA
Brenda Erikson	Trinity Consultants
Janise Powell	Self
Meg Arnold	Valley Vision
Kathleen Ave	SMUD
Karen DeGannes	PG&E
Stephanie Williams	Self

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 6:10 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. A motion to accept the meeting notes from the previous Steering Committee was made. It was seconded and passed unanimously without discussion.

2. Administrative Items

District staff had announcements of upcoming meetings and events that might be of interest to the Steering Committee.

The first event discussed by the District was a 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 also provided information about a flyer for the NorCal Fleet Expo that was part of the meeting materials. The Expo will have information on zero emission vehicles (ZEV). Steering Committee members can contact Jamie Lemus to make arrangements to attend the Expo. A Steering Committee member asked if the Expo would have information on zero emission cars and expressed concerns about the out-of-pocket costs associated with ZEV cars. The District indicated that the Expo was focused on heavy duty ZEV and that it would work to provide some information on the out-of-pocket costs for ZEV passenger cars.

The third announcement the District made was for a 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.

The Vice Chair requested an email from the District summarizing dates and information about the events announced by the District, and the District agreed to provide that summary. The Vice Chair also indicated that Steering Committee members that attend the events should expect to report back on what they learn. She also noted that the symposium conflicted with the Survey Workshop.

A Steering Committee member provided a report from a meeting held by several Steering Committee members outside of official Steering Committee meetings on September 17th. They reported that the outside meeting was with some members of the public and environmental justice (EJ) groups and had six requests:

- The District present the Steering Committee with a budget at each Steering Committee meeting, so the Steering Committee knows what budget is available for monitoring and funding incentives.
- Public comment should be allowed after each item on the Steering Committee meeting agenda.
- A facilitator should be provided.
- The District should provide a calendar and updates for the next three months showing deadlines and critical dates.
- The Steering Committee should request support from the state to extend deadlines for the District and Steering Committee to have more fully engaged discussions.
- The Steering Committee charter should be amended to include a partnership agreement between the Steering Committee and the District.

The Vice Chair noted that action and discussion on these requests cannot be taken at this meeting because action items must be on the agenda, but the items can be put on the agenda for later meetings.

It was requested that the comments be provided to the District via email, and the Steering Committee member agreed to the request. The Vice Chair indicated that the potential facilitators were present at the current Steering Committee meeting, but they were only observing the meeting. The facilitators introduced themselves again.

3. Community Air Monitoring Update

The District provided an update on the Community Air Monitoring. Progress on the Community Air Monitoring includes developing a Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP). The CAMP includes 14 elements. The District provided a draft of the first five elements as part of the meeting materials. The District made it clear that it did not request approval or action on those elements at the Steering Committee meeting, but the District was seeking feedback based on what the Steering Committee and District had discussed for the previous eight months of Steering Committee meetings. The District explained that the first five elements were related to the concerns, actions, and objectives summarized in the table provided as part of the meeting materials for the previous Steering Committee meeting.

A Steering Committee member asked when the Steering Committee could ask about monitor performance.

The District responded that the Steering committee could ask about performance at any time and they have previously presented material on the performance of low-cost, mid-grade, and professional-grade monitoring equipment at Steering Committee meetings.

The District provided the Steering Committee with a summary of the information other elements of the CAMP would include. The summary is available as part of the meeting presentation.

The District informed the Steering Committee that upcoming CAMP Elements 8 and 11 would be discussed with the Steering Committee. The District informed the Steering Committee that Element 8 was related to the location of air monitoring equipment and that the District would request guidance from the Steering Committee about the placement of air monitoring equipment later at that Steering Committee Meeting.

The District would also have a workshop later in the Steering Committee meeting that night to discuss when monitors would be deployed. No action was requested of the Steering Committee that night, but the District would ask for the Steering Committee to make a recommendation based on the workshop at a later Steering Committee meeting. That recommendation would inform Element 11 of the CAMP.

The District indicated that it would seek additional guidance from the Steering Committee on Elements 12 and 14 at later meetings. The District informed the Steering Committee that Element 12 addresses how parties will evaluate how monitoring is effective, and Element 14 addresses how monitoring data and results will be communicated to interested parties.

The District informed the Steering Committee that the California Air Resources Board (CARB) had prepared a Community Air Protection Blueprint (Blueprint) that described the information that should be included in a CAMP. The information is included in Appendix E of the Blueprint and summarized in Table E-2 of the Blueprint. After presenting the information, the District asked the Steering Committee whether it had initial thoughts on the Community Air Monitoring.

A Steering Committee noted that monitors had different values, noting that the Sheriff monitor has a 4, and the Nicholas monitor has a 0 and asked why the monitors had different values.

The District replied that the monitors are very sensitive and can disagree some. The District stated that it does not expect exact agreement between the monitors and indicated that it would provide information about the Air Quality Index (AQI) for the Steering Committee in later slides to help them better understand the information being provided by the monitors currently in place.

A Steering Committee member asked what “ES” stood for and what the difference between “Nicholas” and “Nicholas ES” was. The District stated that “ES” stood for “Elementary School” and that the monitors were at different locations. The Steering Committee member then asked why the Nicholas and Nicholas ES monitors show different values. The District indicated that it addressed disagreements and will review the Phased deployment already described.

The District informed the Steering Committee that it planned to deploy 22 low-cost monitors in 21 locations in the community area. It stated that 18 locations have been secured and that three locations were still pending agreements. The District stated that eight monitors were currently deployed, ten were scheduled for deployment, and that the District was awaiting delivery of four additional monitors. The District informed the Steering Committee that there have been delays in procurement of the low-cost monitors due to the manufacturer not being able to keep up with demand.

The District informed the Steering Committee that it had initially intended to use Purple Air monitors in the Community Air Program, but that the Purple Air monitors were difficult to use due to power and Wi-Fi requirements. The District indicated that it had tried to work with schools to locate Purple Air monitors but that they were unable to connect the monitors to the Wi-Fi used by the schools and that the requirements for power connections were onerous for use at schools. These requirements made the Clarity monitors more appropriate for wide-spread deployment as part of Phase 1 of the Community Air Monitoring program.

The District provided an update to the Steering Committee on the development of Phase 2 of the monitoring program. The District indicated that procurement of the equipment for Phase 2 was underway and that the development of the request for proposal (RFP) was underway. The District then provided a list of locations for low-cost air monitors with agreements in place. The District informed the Steering Committee that based on Steering Committee concerns that there were four low-cost monitors located outside of high priority areas designated by the Steering Committee, the District had added four more low-cost air monitors to Phase 1 and located them in the high priority areas.

The District noted that the original proposal for monitoring in Phase 1 was to locate one Aeroqual monitor at Florin Elementary School. The District proposed also locating a Clarity monitor at Florin Elementary School and explained that collocating monitors of different types would help the District understand the differences between the types of monitors. The District requested that the Steering Committee voice approval of the collocation of the Clarity and Aeroqual monitors at Florin Elementary School.

The District also requested that the Steering Committee make a recommendation about whether to locate a Clarity monitor at either the Parkway Elementary School or the Parkway Swim Club.

A Steering Committee member asked what the different monitors measured. The District responded that both all the Clarity monitors measured fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) and some measured nitrogen dioxide (NO₂). The District also responded that the Aeroqual measures ozone as well as PM_{2.5} and NO₂. The Steering Committee member asked why it was necessary to collocate the monitors and noted that there were no data or complaints. The District noted that Florin Elementary School was in one of the priority areas designated by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee member asked whether the monitoring included the use of canisters, and the District replied that the monitoring was part of

the Phase 1 monitoring, which did not include canisters. Phases 2 and 3 will include canister sampling. The District noted that the Aeroqual had not been deployed yet and that the deployed Clarity monitors monitored PM_{2.5}. The District also noted that it does not expect to detect high concentrations of PM_{2.5} during the summer.

There was a motion for the Steering Committee to accept the collocation with the idea that the monitors can potentially be relocated later. The motion was seconded. The motion was passed with six votes in favor and one against.

A Steering Committee asked whether there were potential concerns with the location of a monitor at the school due to the ongoing budget concerns for Sacramento Unified School District. The District indicated that there are no costs to the School District associated with the monitor. A Steering Committee member note that the Parkway Swim Club was disappointed that they could not participate in the air quality monitoring and that barbeque season was mostly over for the club.

There was a motion to locate the air quality monitor at the Parkway Swim Club. The motion was seconded and passes unanimously.

The District provided a map of deployed air quality monitors, including current monitor values. The District described the information presented on the map. The District noted that the air quality data from the Clarity Node monitors on the map were obtained at a different time than the air quality data from monitors that are part of the AirNow network of monitors. The District noted that the AirNow data is part of a national regulatory network and that the data from that network are typically an hour older than the data from the Clarity Node monitors.

A Steering Committee member asked whether wind changes air quality. The District answered that that air quality does depend on wind and used the example of smoke blowing into the region from a wildfire as an example of how wind can impact air quality. The District also explained that stagnant winds during the winter can also lead to elevated ground level air pollution concentrations.

The District explained that it had not selected specific locations for the Phase 2 and 3 monitoring locations and that it has been prioritizing the selection of Phase 1 monitoring locations. The District welcomes the Steering Committee help in finding and securing Phase 2 monitoring locations. The District noted that Phase 2 monitoring has a larger footprint than Phase 1 monitoring. Phase 2 will require a secure area of approximately four feet by four feet.

The Steering Committee asked about the power requirements for Phase 2 air monitoring equipment. The District indicated that Phase 2 requires a power supply, and that solar power was not appropriate or cost effective. The power requirements and footprint may make school sites difficult to secure for Phase 2. The Steering Committee requested that the District provide the Steering Committee with more information on the areas selected for the Phase 2 monitoring, including more detailed maps. The District agreed to provide those maps. The District noted that the Phase 3 monitoring location had not been selected and would depend on data from the Phase 2 monitoring.

The Steering Committee asked what the dates of the Phase 2 monitoring would be, and the District indicated that it had an exercise later at that Steering Committee meeting that would help the Steering Committee provide feedback on when it wanted Phase 2 monitoring to occur. A Steering Committee member then asked if the District had a recommendation. The District replied that it had thoughts but that it did not have a recommendation and was not requesting a recommendation before the next Steering Committee meeting.

4. Public Comments

The floor was open to public comments. A representative of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) indicated that SMUD would be willing to work with the District regarding power for air quality monitoring equipment.

5. Air Quality Monitoring Exercise

The District explained that it would be working with the Steering Committee on a workshop that would help write Element 11 of the CAMP. The exercise would help the District get information on for Phase 2, which would help determine the location of Phase 3.

When reviewing the workshop materials, a Steering Committee member asked whether there were only two questions and whether the questions should be answered on personal experience. The District confirmed that the individual portion of the workshop was only two questions and that they could be based on personal experience or other information Steering Committee members had available. A Steering Committee member asked whether the information packet provided to the Steering Committee members was available to the public. The District responded that the information packet was available and that the District would explain the material and answer questions to the groups and the public.

The Steering Committee broke into two groups to go through the exercise at 7:18 PM. The Steering Committee reconvened at 7:56 PM.

The Steering Committee Vice Chair noted that time was running out to discuss additional items that were on the agenda and that it might be necessary to discuss them at a later meeting.

The first group of Steering Committee members presented its conclusions about the exercise. They indicated that they wanted the District to do Phase 2 sampling from December to February and June to August. They wanted the trailer to be deployed after all Phase 2 sampling had concluded but noted that Phase 3 could be deployed earlier if the initial data justified earlier deployment. The group said they wanted sampling to capture seasonality of the air quality and to have all information available when deploying Phase 3.

The second group of Steering Committee members said they wanted to do Phase 2 monitoring in winter, spring, and summer with Phase 3 deployed in August or September, so it would be able to capture winter air quality.

The District stated that it would be coming back to the Steering Committee for a recommendation on Phase 2 and 3 deployment at the next Steering Committee meeting.

The District proposed postponing discussion of the sensor lending program to the next Steering Committee meeting due to time. The District also informed the Steering Committee that the community was currently a monitoring community and that the District was asking the Steering Committee whether they wanted to become a community with a Community Emission Reduction Plan (CERP). The District stated that it needs feedback soon and that the issue would go before the CARB board in December. The District must provide feedback to CARB before the item goes before the board.

A Steering Committee member wanted to add an October meeting due to running out of time for the agenda at the current meeting and due to the upcoming holidays in November and December. The Steering Committee member proposed meeting at the Florin Creek Recreation Center again on October 8 to discuss the Low-Cost Sensor Lending Program, CERP, and the deployment schedule for Phases 2 and

3 of the Community Air Monitoring. Another Steering Committee questioned the location because they had thought future meetings would be in a priority area designated by the Steering Committee. The District noted that it is attempting to get space at Bowling Green Elementary School, which is in a priority area, for future meetings, but that the location would not be available for a meeting on October 8.

A Steering Committee member made a motion to have a meeting on October 8, 2019 at Florin Creek Recreation Center. The motion was seconded and passed with all votes in favor.

A Steering Committee member noted that they want meeting materials to review before the next meeting. The District responded that the materials for the postponed agenda items were included in the materials provided to the Steering Committee information package that evening. The District also emphasized that no decision about monitor deployment was being required of the Steering Committee at the current meeting and that the deployment decision could be made at the October 8th meeting. The District also noted that the District would be providing information at the October 8th meeting on the postponed agenda items and that a decision on whether the Steering Committee wanted a CERP could be made at the next meeting, scheduled for October 22, 2019.

6. Public Comments

The floor was opened to public comments. A member of the public asked where the information presented in the slides was located. The District indicated that the agenda items that were postponed to the next Steering Committee meeting were covered in the slides for the current meeting and that the presentation materials were available to the public.

A representative of Valley Vision commented to inform the Steering Committee that Valley Vision and partner organizations were preparing a Community Air Grant proposal. The proposal is due next week. The representative from Valley Vision was there to provide notice and apologized for not providing a more advanced notice. The group proposes to deploy low-cost monitors in other communities that were considered for by the District for monitoring or emission reductions as part of AB617.

A CARB staff member noted that Appendix C of the Blueprint has information on CERPs for AB617 and that CERPs from other communities are available online.

A motion to adjourn was made at 8:16 PM. It was seconded and passed unanimously.