South Sacramento – Florin Community Air Protection Steering Committee
Steering Committee Meeting #7 Notes
Tuesday, May 28, 2019 – 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm

Steering Committee Members	Organization
Patricia Shelby (Vice chair)	NLCNA Community Resident
Jennifer Ablog	Kaiser Permanente
Shirley Banks	Resident
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)
Bishop Chris Baker	Education Advocate
Evelyn Craine	South Sacramento Christian Center
Joelle Toney	City of Sacramento
Tido Hoang	VACOS/Little Saigon
Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)	
Alberto Ayala	SMAQMD
Jamie Arno	SMAQMD
J.J. Hurley	SMAQMD
Amy Roberts	SMAQMD
Mark Loutzenhiser	SMAQMD
Janice Lam Snyder	SMAQMD
David Yang	SMAQMD
Levi Ford	SMAQMD
Public and Other Organizations	
Jeremy Herbert	CARB
David Ridley	CARB
Kelly Kerber	CARB
Jose Saldana	CARB
Ping Di	CARB
Veronica Eady	CARB
John Lane	Teichert, Clean Air Partnership
Meg Arnold	Valley Vision/Clean Air Partnership
Karen DeGannes	PG&E
Scott Andrews	Aclima
Chase Stremsterfer	Sacramento County Economic Development

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 6:02 p.m. 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.

2. **Recap and approve meeting notes**
   a. **Recap:** The District showed a recap of the key takeaways/decisions for the first five meetings of the AB617 Florin- South Sacramento Steering Committee and provided a short recap of the last meeting on April 23, 2019 and the goal for this meeting.
   b. **Approve meeting notes:** A steering committee member made a motion to approve the meeting notes from the March 26, 2019 and April 23, 2019 meetings. Another steering committee member asked that it was not clear in the meeting notes from the April 23, 2019 meeting when the monitors will be deployed. The District responded that some monitors will be deployed and collecting data starting on July 1, 2019, and the deployment schedule is a topic for today's meeting, which will be covered in more details. The same steering committee member seconded the motion to approve the meeting notes.
   ✓ The steering committee approved the meeting notes for the March 26, 2019 and April 23, 2019 meetings meeting notes with two abstained vote.

3. **Question Follow-up**
   a. **Status of steering committee member:** The District provided an update on the status of the steering committee member who has yet to attend a meeting. The District tried to contact the individual through various channel, such as telephone calls, emails, and a certified letter, but the District has not heard from the individual. The District provided recommendations to the steering committee to remove the said steering committee member and open the application process to fill the seat.
   ✓ The steering committee approved the District's recommendation to remove the steering committee member and open the application process to fill the seat.

   The Vice Chair asked about the application process. The District said that the District will update the application form and reactivate the online application form. The District will notify the steering committee and send out emails to those who are interested that the District is accepting applications for the steering committee. The request for application will be open for at least 3 weeks and be closed on a Friday. The District will screen the applications to ensure the applicants meet the requirement of living or working in the area and then provide the applications to the same selection panel that determined the original steering committee members. The District expects to select a new steering committee member before the July 2019 meeting.

   b. **Community tour:** The District provided an updated community tour route based on the discussion from the April 23, 2019 meeting. The District stated that the District is looking into transportation options and it might be in a form of driving steering committee members around in District vehicles if no other options are available. The District also said that the District will work with SacRT to get a bus so that the steering committee will be together. The Vice Chair

echoed the suggestion of touring in a bus and adding that it will be important that the steering committee hear the same information on the tour.

The District asked if the steering committee would like to do the tour without stopping or to include several stops along the way. A steering committee member asked if we can walk part of the tour. The vice chair responded that due to the length of the tour, it'll be hard to stop and walk a part of the tour, but if there is a specific location that could accommodate that, then the committee member should make that suggestion. Another committee suggested that the tour should stop at the corner of 47th Avenue and Franklin Boulevard. The vice chair said that she couldn't decide where to stop without looking into the details of the tour and suggested that recommendations should be submitted to the District by the close of business Thursday (May 30, 2019).

A steering committee asked what was the intention behind the tour. Was it to identify potential location for monitoring or to better understand the selected area? Or both? The vice chair responded that it was both. The tour may present areas where the steering committee may want further investigation.

c. **Reference handout:** The District provided a reference sheet in response to a request from the steering committee to better understand some of the terminology used for air monitoring.

d. **Community Air Grants:** CARB presented a quick update on the Community Air Grant Guidelines. Commenting period for the grant guideline is due May 29, 2019. There are two different grants that the community can apply for: Education Grant, which is help provide education to the community and Technical Grant, which is to support a community-lead monitoring program.

e. **Community Air Protection Incentive Guidelines:** The District provided an update on CARB's hearing on the Community Air Protection Incentive Guidelines and thanked the Chair and Vice Chair for their testimonies. The Vice Chair shared her experience of testifying to the state Board to allow for more flexibility in the guidelines to benefit impacted communities as intended by the legislation. The Vice Chair expressed concerns about the constraints of the guidelines will limit the type of projects that will be available for the communities. The Vice Chair also stated that there are confusion at the state level between Staff and the Board on how to implement this program. The Vice Chair suggested that the communities have to be a pressure point to the state to ensure that flexibility is provided within the guidelines.

4. **State's toxic modeling update:** CARB provided an update on the State's toxic modeling that show the differences between 2012 and 2016 emission inventory data for the selected community. Overall, the total cancer risk has been reduced because of implementation of state and local programs, including the State's Truck and Bus Rule. CARB stated that the map of the cancer risk shifted from red to green, but green does not necessary means that there are no impacts; it means that there has been improvements.

A steering committee member asked if the model was based on monitoring data. CARB responded that it was not. The District added that there are no monitoring data specifically for the selected community. The data used for the model was based on stationary source emission inventory that was done by the District and the State, and estimated mobile emissions based on the vehicle fleet emissions and the amount of fuel purchased for the region. The modeling used the best information available to estimate what is going on in the community. Air monitoring will help provide more accurate information for the selected community.

The Vice Chair shared about an article she read about the correlation of emissions and asthma rate in southern California and was wondering if something like that can be done here. A steering committee member mentioned that Kaiser does provide a 3-year update on its Community Health Need Assessment, which include an assessment on asthma rate in the community. The member offered to look in the progress of the report to see if she can get a copy of the update.

A question from the public was asked why does the overall PM emission goes up. CARB explained that the graph for the PM emissions show does not include diesel PM. PM emissions are from sources like dust and hairspray, an aerosol product. The increase is mainly due to growth in population in the region. In addition, the data is for the region and apportioned to the community.

5. **Discuss Air Monitoring Proposal**
The District presented an air monitoring proposal, which consisted of using a three-phase approach. Phase I will be the deployment of low cost sensors as an initial screen. Phase II will use stand-alone monitors to provide enhance screening. Phase III will be deploying a portable trailer with professional grade equipment.

The steering committee had the following questions and/or comments on the proposal and the District's responses:
- What's the accuracy on Phase II and Phase III?

   The monitoring equipment for Phase II and III are higher grade equipment that will give us more detailed information than the low cost sensors in Phase 1.

- How many Phase II equipment will be deployed?

   There will be up to three Phase II stand-alone monitors to deploy. The Phase II could be a combination of three types of monitors: aethalometer for black carbons, canister sampling for speciated VOC, and MiniVOl for speciated PM.

- When will the data from Phase I be available and in what form?

   Data from low cost sensors are continuous hourly data and should be available when collected.

- Will the low cost monitors be deploy simultaneously?

  The goal for Phase I is to have some low cost sensors deployed and collecting data by July 1, 2019 to meet the deadline specified by the legislation. All low cost sensors are planned to be deployed and collecting data by the end of August 2019.

- Why not deploy all sensors in the identified priority area? What is the point of identifying areas?

  The District consulted with an outside technical expert on the proposed locations of the low cost sensors. The feedback was that there were likely enough low cost sensor to cover the priority areas and suggested to put some in areas outside of the priority areas to give more spatial representation of the whole community. The District also stated that the low cost sensors cover the priority areas and then some more in areas that were not a priority. Putting sensors in the non-priority area will help see the differences in emissions between areas.

- There is only one Phase III monitor. How are you going to use it?

  The Phase III monitor will give us detailed and more accurate information because it has many types of professional grade equipment. Phases I and II will help conduct initial and enhance screening to determine what location would be best to give us information of where the highest concentrations are. In addition, Phase III is portable and can be moved to different locations if needed.

- We have 3 Phase II equipment and 6 screening areas. How do we cover all six screening areas?

  The District may use up to 3 Phase II monitoring sites provided that the District have the resources available. To cover all 6 screen areas, it will take a staggered approach, where the sites will be moved from one location to another to collect area-specific data.

- A steering committee member posed a question to the rest of the steering committee on how sure are they are about the priority areas?

  Another steering committee stated that there were consensus on the priority areas. The steering committee member stated that it was decision that we came up with and that all sensors should be in the priority areas. Some steering committee members disagreed and said that they like to have some outside to see if there are any differences. The District stated that if the four low cost sensors that are proposed outside of the priority areas are an issue, then the District can get another four sensors to put in the priority areas. The vice chair stated that she understands both sides of the discussion and is interested in seeing the data. She continued and stated that what the committee is doing is providing their best guess as to where they see the

impacts. She suggested that the low cost sensor should be limited to only four in areas not identified as priority areas.

- What is the range of phase III?

    The District responded that there wasn't a range for the Phase III rather than what is being collected by the monitors. The District used the example of the wildfire that occurred last fall where the smoke traveled down to the area and the District was able to collected data from the wildfire.

A steering committee made a motion to accept the air monitoring proposal for Phase I. A comment made by the public suggested to wait until after the public comments item to hear questions from the public before making a decision. The Vice Chair agreed. (Discussion continued after the public comments item).

6. **Public Comments**
    The following were questions from the public provided on the comment cards and the District's responses.
    1. Can you please point to literature that defines the 1-2 mile radius of influence?

    The District consulted with our outside technical expert and they stated that there was a study that show a radius of representativeness was between 1- 2 mile for low cost sensors.

    2. Phase I: what is you ultimate goal with this monitoring? Source attribution?

    Phase I is a screening phase to give the District information about the community, and the data will not be used for source attribution. Low cost sensors are screening tool to provide relative air quality information.

    3. Will you be able to determine sources of pollution with this plan? Phase II and III?

    Monitoring data from Phase II and III may be used for a source attribution analysis. This analysis will identify the source categories of emissions that are impacting the community.

    4. Will the mobile trailer be used for enforcement and citations?

    The information from the mobile trailer will determine the type of emissions and their concentrations, but it will not specifically give us information that can pinpoint to a specific source. In addition, permitted facilities have permit limits that they must operate within, and it would be hard to tell from just the emissions concentrations without looking specifically at the facilities' operation. If the District suspects suspicious activities, then the District will conduct further investigations, and it will be handled similar to a investigating a complaint, which may include site inspections.

5. Will you calibrate the low cost sensors?

Low cost sensor will be co-located at an air monitoring site before being deploy. Co-locations will give the District an indication of how they may operate with respect to a professional grade equipment. When in the field, if the District suspects a sensor may be malfunctioning, the District will pull the sensor and perform another co-location to see how much the sensors have deviated since the initial co-location.

6. Will you make the Phase 1, 2, and 3 budget public before approval?

The budget is not broken down by Phase 1, 2, and 3, but rather, we have a specific budget item for community air monitoring equipment and lab cost. The budget is provided in the District's overall budget, which is available on our website (see http://www.airquality.org/About-Us/Budget-Finance). Specifically regarding the AB 617 grant from the State that includes all AB 617-related work, the District received $860,000 for the initial preliminary work and $1.5 million for first year implementation.

7. It looks like the PM and NO2 sensors are focused around Hwy 99. Is this to confirm that mobile sources cause pollution? What can this committee do about mobile sources?

Yes. The low cost sensors are to confirm the impacts from Hwy 99. It will be also used to understand the impacts from mobile so that incentive dollars can be targeted to the appropriate type of mobile sources.   The District emphasized the testimonies of the chair and vice chair and the need to add flexibility in the incentive guidelines.

The vice chair added that the guidelines did not provide much flexibility. The guidelines covered specific projects like chrome plating facilities that we don't have here. A CARB staff stated that there is a chrome plating facility called Classic Chrome. The vice chair continued and stated that the point is to make sure that the incentive guidelines allow for more flexibility to allow more projects in the community.

(Note: The District confirmed after the meeting that there is no chrome plating facility in the community.)

8. Does the air district have any data on what PM emissions look like in this area during wildfire events?

Yes. Our monitors collected data during the wildfires when the smoke moved into the county. More recently, we saw this with the Camp fire.

9. Is there a map of where the air district's current monitors are located? If previously discussed, please ignore.

Yes. The map is also on our website (see http://www.airquality.org/Air-Quality-Health/Air-Monitoring).

7. Discuss Air Monitoring Proposal (continued)

After the public comments, a steering committee member made a motion to accept the air monitoring proposal of the 18 low cost sensors on the map with the amendment to be flexible to add monitors to the designated high priority areas. The District stated that the proposal should include all phases, and not just Phase I due to the upcoming deadlines and the need to incorporate this information into the community air monitoring plan.

Another motion was proposed by a steering committee to accept the air monitoring proposal of Phase I, II, and III, and include the flexibility to add more monitors as deemed as necessary. Another steering committee member stated that it seems like we can add monitors for Phase II as well. The vice chair stated that it wasn't the intent but it is the meaning of the motion. The steering committee member stated that he would prefer to have more Phase II monitors to give more than just trend information. The District stated that it will depend on the budget to have more Phase II monitors, but the District will be staggering the Phase II monitors to get more information in the priority areas.

The District stated that the District is willing to add four more low cost sensors to be placed in the four priority areas, making it up to 22 low cost sensors.

The motion was updated. A steering committee member made a motion to accept Phase I with the added four more low cost sensors, Phase II and Phase III of the monitoring proposal. Another steering committee member seconded the motion. The steering committee voted on the motion with all "I" except for one "neh".

- ✓ Motion to accept Phase I with the added four more low cost sensors, Phase II and Phase III of the monitoring proposal passes.

The one opposed stated she voted against the proposal because she like to see the proposal on paper before she can approve it.

Meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm