

**South Sacramento – Florin Community Air Protection Steering Committee
Steering Committee Meeting #8 Notes
Tuesday, July 23, 2019 – 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm
Location: Luther Burbank High School**

Steering Committee Members	Organization
Bill Knowlton (Chair)	Mack Road Partnership
Patricia Shelby (Vice chair)	NLCNA Community Resident
Bishop Baker	Education Advocate
Gary Johansen	Resident, North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association (President)
Vincent Valdez	United Latinos EJ Committee/Resident
Rhonda Henderson	North Laguna Creek Valley High Community Association (President)
Tido Hoang	VACOS/Little Saigon
Jennifer Ablog	Kaiser Permanente
Joelle Toney	City of Sacramento

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)	
Alberto Ayala	SMAQMD
Jamie Arno	SMAQMD
J.J. Hurley	SMAQMD
Amy Roberts	SMAQMD
Mark Loutzenhiser	SMAQMD
Ashley Reynolds	SMAQMD
Janice Lam Snyder	SMAQMD
David Yang	SMAQMD
Quintin Phan	SMAQMD
Paul Philley	SMAQMD

Public and Other Organizations	
Karen Buckley	CARB
Monique Davis	CARB
David Ridley	CARB
Samar Lichtenste	CARB
Ambreen Afshan	CARB
Martina Diaz	CARB
Adrian Rehn	Valley Vision/Oak Park Neighborhood
Simeon Gant	Green Tech
Katie Valenzuela	California Environmental Justice Alliance
Herman Barahona	United Latinos
Jackie Cole	VG Consulting

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 6:14 p.m. Housekeeping rules were established. The District went over the agenda for the evening. Attendees who sat at the table (Steering Committee members, a Board of Director, and District staffs) 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.

2. Discussion with Director Phil Serna & Incentives Outreach Plan

a. Discussion with Director Phil Serna: The vice chair presented on the steering committee's experiences and accomplishments since the steering committee was formed. Director Serna thanked the steering committee for their time and service and posed a question to the steering committee regarding their experience. The District asked all steering committee members to respond. In general, all members responded favorably to the current process and appreciated the education on air quality. Director Serna emphasized that these facts will help shape policy. The efforts in the community and the District to collect air quality data through monitoring is a critical first step. The Chair also thanked the District and this opportunity to learn. The vice chair agreed with Director Serna on the need for the data and expanded that this effort should align with community partners, like the two school districts that are within the boundary.

b. Incentive Outreach Plan: The District presented on the incentive outreach plans, provided a handout of future meetings/events, asked steering committee members for events to attend, and went over the draft survey and asked for feedback from the steering committee. Director Serna asked about community outreach for national night out events (August 6, 2019) and suggested it would be nice to distribute these surveys on that night. A steering committee also announced her national night out event that her organization was hosting. The District stated that the District was not aware of these types of event and would like to get more information. If the District can participate in the event, then the District can distribute the survey at those events. (Note: The District received many comments on the survey during this meeting, and the survey will not be ready in time to be distributed at the event.)

A public member asked about incentive money that the District received from the state. The District stated that the District received \$13 million for Sacramento County and \$1 million for Yolo County for Year 2 incentive program. The District explained about the funding received and the limitations on type of projects that could be implemented based on the State guidelines. The District directed the public to the website to find more information about the potential list of projects in the first year.

A steering committee member provided feedback on the survey questions. His comments were on survey question no. 2: Why there were so many similar sources like cars, trucks and transit buses? Why is the District limiting the surveyor to two choices? Why are pesticides not on the list of where the air pollution in the community come from?

The District explained that the funding comes from different places depending on which pollution sources the incentives are targeting. The District limited the number of sources to two because if the District does not place a limit on the choices, surveyors tend to choose all options,

which does not give the District any focus on the needs of the community. The District explained that these options are types of project that can be incentivized today by the program. Since projects related to pesticide are not allowed in the guidelines provided to the District, then these projects were not listed as a potential incentive projects.

A steering committee member was concerned about the nature of the survey and that District was asking leading questions in the survey. The committee member mentioned that there is a scientific method to making a survey. The committee member would like to see a more open-ended survey questions to guide future endeavors in guidance on future incentives.

The District responded by explaining what the incentive programs are and how the guidelines are restrictive to specific projects. Based on historical data, the biggest sources of pollution are from transportation sources, and thus targeting those sources will maximize the use of the incentive funds. The survey was intended to get input from the community to focus on where we need to put the funding. It is also to collect information to help ask for more flexibility in the state guidelines.

A steering committee member asked for a timeline on when the District needed the comments and suggestions on the survey should be completed. The District answered that the sooner the better especially if we want to the survey to be available for national night out.

Director Serna asked what languages would the survey be in? The District answered that the surveys would be printed in all Title XI languages.

A public member asked about survey development and explained the need to use a scientific method for that development. The public member used the analogy that “one cannot ask a fish to fly” and explained that survey need to have context and be culturally understandable and appropriate. A steering committee member reacted to this and emphasized that the information needs to be translated and reviewed by his organization so that people taking the survey could understand it.

A steering committee member provided his opinion in favor of the survey. He explained that he has reviewed many surveys and thought that the survey was well developed.

A member of the public reinforced the idea that AB 617 was meant for the community, not for CARB. An open-ended survey would gather more of the concerns from community. The public member also emphasized that this may be the only chance to survey a person so it would be better to get as much information as possible. The public member expressed concerns about incentive program implementation since the first-year funding was not used for the selected community and wanted to bring that to the steering committee members’ attention.

The District responded that the survey is focused because there are strict guidelines on where the money can go. The District wanted to maximize the funds and stay within the guidelines. The District proposed to re-evaluate the survey based on the public and committee suggestions that there be an open-ended portion.

The District explained the struggles with creating the survey and that was the one reason why the District brought this to the steering committee meeting. The District wanted to find out if the survey was the right direction or if a rework of the survey was needed. The District wanted to hear feedback and improve the survey.

A steering committee member gave an example of a way to rephrase one of the questions. The member suggested that the survey should state what it is that the District want to do. He suggested that if the survey was restricted to this type of project due to the funding guidelines, then say that in the survey.

The committee members suggested to add the “our need” with the questions. The questions are restricted because the money and funds are also restricted.

The District mentioned that if possible, once the survey is complete, that the members be ambassadors for the survey to bring to events and other outreach opportunities. The District also mentioned that the District will work with other organizations like Valley Vision who have conducted surveys already to aid the District’s survey. Because of the comments received, the District stated that the survey will not available at the August Night Out events.

3. **Break** – After the break, the District made an announcement to clarify a statement regarding the incentive funding opportunities for stationary sources. The District will look into including stationary source projects into the survey as the guidelines will allow for those types of projects.

4. **Administrative Items**

- a. **Approve the meeting notes for May 28, 2019 meeting:** A steering committee member made a motion to approve the meeting notes from the May 28, 2019 meeting.
 - ✓ The steering committee unanimously approved the meeting notes for the May 28, 2019 meeting.
- b. **Steering committee inquiries/requests:** The vice chair requested that all inquiries from the steering committee members be routed to the chair and vice chair. The chair and vice chair will work with the District and steering committee on the inquiries.

A steering committee member requested to have other agencies or organizations to come and present on their efforts and how it may impact our work in the selected community. She suggested to invite the Sacramento Tree Foundation at the upcoming meetings. The vice chair stated that it was a good idea. Furthermore, the vice chair wanted to start a list of potential partners to work with, including the school districts in the community. The vice chair requested the District come up with a list of potential partners to work with.

Another steering committee member wanted the District to be proactive about meeting locations. The committee members needed locations ahead of time to post in newsletters. The committee members asked if there were any official literature available for community outreach for community outreach. The District can provide flyers and distribute to the steering committee to pass out. A committee member asked if the District reached out to two of the potential locations for low cost sensor locations they suggested previously. The committee member is most concerned with the location closest to the freeway. The District responded to the member

explaining that they have contacted the two locations and that the list has grown since then and need to plan to ensure the monitors were in the right locations. The vice chair requested that the District provide an update on the community air monitoring program regarding the progress of the monitoring, including equipment procurement. The discussion on the meeting locations were discussed later (see below).

A committee member asked about an update on the schools. The District provided an update that the District has gotten approval from the school districts to put up sensors at schools. The District needs to install the sensors at the schools when we received the equipment. The District mentioned that there was a delay in procuring equipment due to AB617 efforts across the state.

- c. **Steering committee application process update:** The District has chosen a member and is going through our verification process. The District notified the committee that a current committee member is unable to continue their service. A steering committee made a motion to accept the resignation of said member from the committee.

- ✓ The steering committee approved the resignation of the steering committee member and will send a thank you letter to resigning steering committee member.

A steering committee member made a motion to reopen the application to find another steering committee member.

- ✓ The steering committee approved the reopening of the application for a new member.

d. Future meeting locations

The District asked if the steering committee would be interested in a more permanent location in order to better plan for future meetings. The steering committee did not have any objections. The District asked for location ideas for the next steering committee meetings. A committee member suggested to have meetings in the Priority 1 area. One suggestion was to have meetings at the Bowling Green Elementary School or a nearby area. The vice chair suggested that for the next two locations to have it at the Florin Creek Recreation Center to allow more time to coordinate a new meeting location.

- ✓ The steering committee agreed to have the committee meeting at the Florin Creek Recreation Center for next two meetings. The following two meetings may be at Bowling Green School or near the Bowling Green area.

The District asked the committee members to communicate with the chairs to try and figure out the location so the location can be booked ASAP. The District will send out confirmation of location to all members of the committee once finalized.

5. Community Tour Recap

The committee members thought the tour was helpful and insightful. The committee members learned more about the community. They were unaware of how prevalent diesel trucks were in the community, the efforts the schools are taking to help improve air quality, unaware of some sources in the community such as Siemens. All steering committee members on the tour thought it was a great experience, and they would recommend doing it again.

6. Public Comment

A committee member commented to Director Serna about the County's EJ workshop that was cancelled. The committee members are interested in the District and Director Serna working together to allocate resources. Director Serna responded by apologizing that the event was cancelled and that he wants to spread how important environmental justice is for the community. Working with the District will maximize public health, and he wants to be part of doing that in the community.

The District announced that the work in the Community has gain interested from EPA and the District has presented at a national EPA conference regarding low cost sensors. The District has also received a request to present internationally.

Meeting adjourned at 8:14 p.m.