

South Sacramento – Florin Community Air Protection Steering Committee
Steering Committee Meeting #11 Notes
Tuesday, October 8, 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)
Bishop Chris Baker	Advocate for Education
Jennifer Ablog	Kaiser Permanente
Denise McCoy	SacACT
Joelle Toney	City of Sacramento
Shirley Banks	Resident
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
Jaime Lemus	SMAQMD
Angela Hughes	SMAQMD
Public and Other Organizations	
Karen Buckley	CARB
David Ridley	CARB
Jose Saldana	CARB
Alex Cole-Weiss	CSUS
Adrian Rehn	Valley Vision
Scott Andrews	Aclima
Muriel Strand	Public
Amber Thomas	Public
Herman Barahona	United Latinos

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

Welcome and introductions:

The Steering Committee Chair began the meeting at 6:11 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.

1. Administrative Items

A motion was made to approve the meeting notes from September 24 Steering Committee (SC) meeting. Steering Committee Member (SCM) motioned, another SCM seconded the motion, and the motion was approved.

The District shared information regarding the NorCal Clean Fleet Expo and the Survey Working Group meeting. A SCM noticed the location of the event was not updated from the Samuel Pannell Community Center to the Fruitridge Collaborative Community Center. Prop. 1B Goods Movement solicitation will open Oct. 16th. The Goods Movement applicant workshop will be on Monday, Nov 4th, from 4-7 pm in the Southgate Library Community Room.

A SCM had questions about clean cars for all and the pricing of vehicles after rebates and incentives. The District responded that it depends on household factors such as income, etc. The District offered to speak more about the prices after the meeting.

The District mentioned the enhanced CAP incentive funding are different from AB 617 implementation funds.

The District wanted the SC's help in the process of creating a Request for Proposals (RFP) for improved bus stops. The District explained that there are numerous bus stops, but limited funding. The District needed the Steering Committee's help in identifying bus stops that need to be targeted. The District notified the SC that the District will begin work on the RFP for the bus stops enhancement at the beginning of November. A few members are interested in aiding the District in developing the RFP for bus stop enhancing.

The District discussed the PM symposium in the Bay Area. The District sent information out to SC. SCM needed to email the District and work out transportation to and from the symposium. There will be enough space for two SCMs and this will be an all-day event. The vice chair asked if there are any interest from SCM in the events. One SCM was interested in attending the PM Symposium in the Bay Area.

The Chair wanted to change the order of the agenda to discuss the agenda in reverse starting with the Year 2 Discussion first.

A SCM wanted to reiterate that at the end of each section to include public comment in the process.

2. Upcoming Year Discussion

a. Facilitator Presentation and Discussion

The facilitator thanked everyone and wanted to let everyone know about services that they can provide. The facilitator described that their services include working to build capacity of public agencies, stakeholder groups, and public to use collaboration strategies to improve policy outcomes. The facilitator mentioned that they have worked with and advised California Air Resources Board and other community meetings, workshops, and summits around the state. The facilitator discussed that they conduct events and conferences for community air quality issues.

The facilitator described that they help facilitate with CARB's environmental justice advisory committee. The facilitator listed off the scope of services available: Neutrally support inclusive participation, shared understanding, and making progress; work collaboratively with SC and

District to plan agendas/meetings; support workload planning, tracking action items, and time management; conflict resolution if needed.

SCM asked why the facilitator was invited to process now instead of earlier?

The facilitator answered that this was a small group, with a clear path forward. The group originally thought a facilitator was not needed. Issues have come up in this SC. Other committees across the state have also had issue. Many other communities found it helpful to have a facilitator. This was a lesson learned from last year. There have been growing pains throughout the state. The facilitator reassured the SC that conflict is healthy and helps the SC and the District get to the end goal.

District asked Steering committee members (SCMs) if hiring a facilitator is something the committee wants to explore?

A SCM said that to her understanding a facilitator will aid in the issues that came up so far in the process and it would be a very good idea. Another SCM thought it will be beneficial to provide another perspective and a bridge between the District and SC. This SCM sees no disadvantage at this time. Another member thought it's a great idea for all parties involved. Several other SCMs agreed with previous member's comment.

The District asked about official motion. The District did not budget for the facilitator in original contract and will need to go through board of directors to get the contract changed.

A SCM asked about payment of the facilitator. The District answered that it would be out of the AB 617 implementation funds. Another SCM asked if CARB can bridge the time to get the facilitator quickly on-board. The District replied that the District will ask CARB to see if CARB can bridge the time to get the facilitator ASAP.

SCM asked if the money will come out of something that is already funded. The District discussed that they had salary savings from staff vacancies at the District. The facilitator cost would be covered by these savings. The savings are not permanent, thus the cost from the facilitator will eventually come out of Year 2 funding.

The SCM asked about budget. The District directed the SC to the budget in the packet provided at the beginning of the SC meeting. The District mentioned that they will continue to provide this summary going forward. Equipment expenditures will be updated as appropriate. The District explained the budget to SCM.

A SCM asked about fund allocation and thought the funds were \$13 million. The District explained that the \$13 million was for incentive projects only. The amount allocated for year one was \$1.5 million, which includes all AB617 elements, and not just monitoring in South Sacramento.

The same SCM asked if the budget can include the entire \$1.5 million budget at once. The District responded that balance of the \$1.5 million not reflected in equipment is budgeted to staffing and resource costs. A breakout of the most significant staffing elements will be added to the summary.

The District asked about a motion to hire facilitator. A SCM asked about how long the facilitator would be hired for. The District responded that the facilitator would be hired for 15 SC meetings.

A motion to hire the facilitator for 15 meetings was put forth. A SCM motioned, another SCM seconded the motion, and the motion was carried.

b. Year 2

The District invited all the current SCMs to continue into year two. The District received 5 applicants. Out of the 5 applicants, 3 meet the criteria and 1 applicant applied after the deadline. A SCM asked if the applicant that were not submitted before the deadline, did they meet the criteria. The District responded that the applicant met the criteria. The vice chair responded that the process had a deadline and since the applicant did not meet that deadline, they would not be considered. The District clarified that the applicant who did not make the deadline will not be included.

One SCM expressed interest to continue into year two.

c. Upcoming meeting agenda topics

The District discussed with the SC about the remaining Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP) elements. The District provided an update on monitoring locations, working with SMUD, and City of Sac., and asking about properties that the District would be able to place monitors at.

The District mentioned to the SC about Elements 12 and 14. Element 12 will evaluate the effectiveness of monitoring program and what process used to show that the objectives were met. Element 14 will describe how to communicate the results of the actions to the community and interested groups and stakeholders.

The District mentioned that the SC will be presented with a draft of the CAMP and was aiming for March 2020 to have the draft completed.

Other agenda topics:

- i. Sac. tree foundation (10/22) give presentation on next SC meeting.
- ii. Community sensor loaning program. Low cost sensor pilot program.

The District wanted open discussion about requests and events that help the SC's and District's cause.

A SCM asked about Element 12 of the CAMP. The District showed the SC the CARB Community Air Monitoring Plan Blueprint and clarified that the District was letting the SC know that this discussion will happen in a future meeting. No discussion on this portion of the CAMP would be occurring at this meeting.

A SCM talked about EJ historical data and would like to hear a presentation on that. A SCM also suggested a presentation from Ms. Margaret Gordon with the West Oakland community and ask them about elements to build collaboration and work towards success.

A SCM asked to revisit element 3 and change the scope of the actions, and revisit goals of the CAMP. This SCM wanted to do more and meet with decision makers like land use employees and planners.

Revisiting element 3 can be part of a future discussion. There are a number of factors including timing to complete the initial Air Monitoring Plan and a recommendation by the committee.

The District asked clarifying questions to SCM about a meeting with decision makers. There are land use employees and planners at the District, the county, and state. The SCM wanted as many decision makers in the same place at the same time to hear feedback from the community. The District responded that this could be added to the list of potential future agenda topics.

A public member asked about element 12 if the effectiveness of meeting the objective will be based on a grading scale and if it achieved certain grade, then monitoring can stop. The District provided a qualified answer of yes. The District wanted to know the process to make the evaluation if monitoring objectives are met. The District asked CARB if there are any specifics that they would like to add. CARB said that it was up to the SC to consider and what metrics do the SC want to see when and how the monitoring objectives were met.

A public member asked if Phase 1-3 will answer the questions from element 12. The public asked because the sensors and professional grade equipment would determine the effectiveness of the monitoring program and if the objectives were met. The District answered that the Phase 1-3 would not fulfill element 12 of the CAMP. Element 12 would determine the criteria in which the objectives or the monitoring program was effective or not. CARB gave an example for Element 3 in which one of the concerns of the SC was to increase air quality education and outreach efforts. CARB suggested that for example in Element 12 to show education and outreach was completed, there would be a criteria that six outreach events must be held in a year to effectively increase air quality education and outreach efforts. If six events were held, then the objective was met. This was just an example from CARB.

A public member asked about emission reduction and asked if CO2 reduction was a part of the SC objectives. The District answered that CO2 reduction would not be a part of the SC objectives. CARB explained that the legislation was made for criteria pollutants, so CO2 will not be included.

The District presented a calendar of future upcoming meetings and agenda items. District asked the SC to help create the agenda items. A SCM wanted to have a better understanding about what deadlines are important or hard deadlines and wanted the District to provide two months of advance notice. The SCM brought up the incentive decisions that were recently discussed and felt the SC did not have enough time to make an informed decision about incentives. A SCM mentioned the incentives and how the incentive money was not related to Carl Moyer program. The District answered that AB 617 incentive funding utilized the Carl Moyer program guidelines. There will be a set deadline in mid-December for incentives. Community Emission Reduction Plan (CERP) decision needs to be made prior Oct. 31, at the next SC meeting.

3. Community Emission Reduction Program (CERP)

CARB presented on CERP background. CARB wanted to support and balance resources at CARB and air districts. Timeline: By Fall 2019 air districts work with communities to submit recommendations; CARB

will hold a webinar for outreach on proposed recommendations; late 2019 December release final staff recommendations looking to add three new communities.

CARB mentioned the SC can do community air monitoring, CERP or both.

The goal of a CERP is to reduce cumulative exposure to air pollution, not just sources with the highest concentrations but all sources. The CAMP Blueprint lists all requirements for a CERP. Public engagement is key part of program i.e. How to select communities, how community air monitoring happens, and developing CERP. Community participation is important.

Appendix C in the blueprint details CERP requirements. There is a "Checklist" at end of blueprint to make sure all points are met.

The SC has the technical foundation and base knowledge for moving on to a CERP, if desired. CARB presented 6 reduction strategies: rules, enhanced enforcements, land use, transportation and mitigation.

CARB mentioned that the board was starting with same direction from last year. CARB discussed that they will prioritize monitoring communities to move to community emission reduction programs, guided by data and SC recommendations. CARB drew from recommendation from priority communities.

Once selected by CARB, SC have one year to complete and provide CERP for the district board and then get approved by CARB.

A SCM asked realistically what are the components that the SC should have before going into a CERP. CARB said it depends on the community and how fast the SC wants to work. CARB clarified that the District also needs to provide support too and might need funds reallocation to complete CERP on time. If the SC wanted to be a monitoring community and a CERP simultaneously then resources and funding may need to be reallocated to complete both tasks.

A SCM asked if communities that moved to a CERP had historical data already. CARB answered that many of them did, like San Diego for example.

A SCM discussed they believe that the SC are not at the point ready to commit to the CERP.

A SCM mentioned that committee meetings should be held more frequently and invited the public and the District to attend meetings like the one they had held recently. The District clarified that the meeting recently held was not an official subcommittee meeting and that if the SCM wanted to make a subcommittee, they will need an official SC motion and approval to make these meetings official. The vice chair suggested that the SCM who mentioned the subcommittee meeting provide a presentation.

A SCM believed that the subcommittee meeting was for public outreach and that this would provide public involvement in the process as they do not feel the public is fully informed.

A SCM said that the SC is not ready for a CERP and that there needs to be more public outreach and public participation in the process. The SCM mentioned that they have gone out to events and talked to members of the community and brought them to the SC meetings. The SCM wanted more involvement from the public in this process.

The District responded by saying the District has been attending outreach events and also bringing members of the public to the SC meetings. The District is open to continuing to attend community meetings as appropriate to share about the AB617 process.

A SCM wanted more public comments and involvement. The SCM wanted to enrich the experience for the public and allow them to be a part of the process. The District is available to help provide informational materials as needed. Other SC members discussed their efforts in sharing information with the community.

The District wanted to be a resource for the SC and the public. The District wanted to get feedback and suggestions to make the experience better. The District suggested arriving early for members who can make it to talk more or set up conference calls to get more information.

A SCM asked about making suggestions and making them come to fruition. The District responded by saying suggestions need to be made in the SC meeting to be placed into the agenda due to the Brown Act. The District and SC are bound to the Brown Act guidelines.

A public member asked how are suggestions placed on the agenda. The District responded that suggestions can be made during the SC meetings for consideration. The District will update the calendar with agenda items and suggestions from this SC meeting.

A public member asked if phase one has been completed. The public member mentioned the need for Phase 2 and 3 to find PM and VOC toxic hot spots and use emission inventory and hot spot inventory. The District responded that phase one is currently underway and that Phase 2 and 3 will be used to find PM and VOC toxics hot spots.

A CARB staff member stated that low cost sensors the District has deployed are only for PM and cannot be used for VOC screening. The District clarified that the low-cost sensors will monitor PM2.5 and NO2.

A public member stated that they have been to many SC meetings; many issues have been discussed and this process takes a while, and they think we are making good progress given the number of meetings that have occurred. Many of the other communities have been working on this exact process for 20+ years. Sacramento had just started the process and it takes time to get to that same place.

A public mentioned that SC specified certain sources they are concerned with such as diesel trucks and that the low-cost sensors may not characterize these emissions. The District mentioned that Phase 2 will monitor for more detailed pollutants, and the data will help answer questions about impacts.

A SCM wanted to change the charter to include more members in the committee. The SCM wanted to gather more experts who may or may not be inside the community. Discussion occurred between SCM and CARB on the make-up requirements under CARB's Blue Print.

4. Low-cost Sensor Lending Pilot Program Presentation

The District provided a presentation on low cost sensor pilot program.

The District wanted to gauge interest from SC to see if they will be interested in participating in pilot program and to see if there is any interest in providing a full program for the community. If SC is interested, the District will need the SCMs help to develop the program for the public.

A SCM mentioned limitations on purple air and asked about personal monitors for kids going to school or people running outside for outdoor activities. The District mentioned that there were limitations to purple air sensors; they require power and WiFi. The District answered that personal monitors are possible and that would need to be developed by the SC.

A SCM asked about the restrictions and limitations on where to place the sensors. The location of the sensor would ideally be on the users personal property, and have unrestricted air flow at the bottom of the sensor, and not near an emitting source such as a barbeque grill.

The District clarified that the pilot program is for interest and educational purposes and currently only for committee members.

A motion to adjourn was made at 8:19 PM. It was seconded and passed unanimously.