

AB 617 Consultation Group Meeting Summary

For April 1, 2022, 2 pm - 5pm

Meeting in Brief

The primary focus of this meeting was the People's Blueprint Chapters 5 and 6, which address *Planning and Implementation Emerging Practices* and *Monitoring and Modeling for Community Air Protection*, respectively. The Consultation Group (CG) asked questions and provided comments and suggestions related to these chapters and the topics covered therein. These discussions will significantly inform development of the AB 617 Program Blueprint update.

Action Items

CG Members:

- Email Liliana to express interest in attending the **Governance ad hoc working group** where CG members will develop a draft charter for review and consideration by the entire CG.
- Review People's Blueprint Chapters 7-8 in preparation for the June 7 meeting. [June 7th meeting was postponed to July 22nd]
- For the next meeting, please add affiliation to your name in Zoom so panelists can be identified.

CARB:

- Schedule agenda setting meeting for June 7 meeting. [June 7th meeting was postponed to July 22nd]
- Coordinate a CEQA refresher in the context of the Blueprint 2.0 development

Updates

- At the May 19, 2022 Board meeting, OCAP will provide an informational update on the AB 617 statewide strategy (Program Blueprint). This item will be an opportunity for dialogue with the Board. OCAP plans to organize a representative panel of CG members for this discussion.
- Mindy Meyer is retiring, and many expressed their appreciation for Mindy's participation in the last few meetings. Lisa Ballin will facilitate the next meeting. There is also a new facilitation contract to support meetings underway. Contract and scope to be released soon for open solicitations by late summer at the latest.

Discussion on meeting agreements:

Consultation group members should be a partner in developing meeting agreements. Ensuring the meaningful inclusion of these stakeholders allows for the meeting agreements to appropriately reflect the historic, present, and cultural context relevant to AB 617. CG members emphasized the need for cultural humility and an acknowledgement of history. This is an item that could be discussed in the temporary Governance working group.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Requirements

In response to questions on CARB's CEQA obligations related to the Program Blueprint, CARB will orient the Consultation Group on the certified regulated program to comply with CEQA called an Environmental Analysis. CARB does not create Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs), instead CARB has a separate certified regulated program to comply with CEQA called an Environmental Analysis. CARB will continue to develop and enhance educational materials and trainings on the current and forthcoming revision to the Program Blueprint and how it complies with CEQA.

Process to revise the Program Blueprint:

The Blueprint is a critical document for the work the CG members do and Community Steering Committees and districts are using guidance documents that are outdated. There is urgency for updating the Program Blueprint sooner than September 2023 as the Program Blueprint revision timeline indicates (slide 13). CG members request that revisions be completed by the end of this calendar year, as early as October 2022, to ensure that a new version is available early 2023.

CARB is having robust engagement starting with the Consultation Group going over the People's Blueprint methodically by chapter as discussions here will be significantly informing the Program Blueprint revision. The Board meeting in May will bring the work of the People's Blueprint to the forefront. CARB finds this dialogue very valuable and acknowledges the need to balance CG's timeline concerns with the time that must be taken to conduct robust public and stakeholder engagement as well as in meeting the statutory requirement for the Blueprint update by September 2023.

CG Member Discussion of Chapter 5

This summary identifies some comments, suggestions, and questions on Chapters 5 and 6. The discussion was intended to gather all viewpoints, not to develop consensus opinions. As such, this summary lists all viewpoints expressed.

Defining best practices during the early stages of the Community Air Protection Program:

- The list of identified eligible communities should be updated as means to understand future budget needs to fully realize the goals of AB 617. Program benefits need to be accessed by more eligible communities. The program was thought to be a pilot project so a timeline as to when the pilot will end and plans will reach other communities is important. There may be lessons learned in CERPs that may help other communities which are disproportionately impacted.
- The resources of state incentives, specifically the amount of funds committed to community air grants and capacity building, is small compared to other sources and perhaps more of existing climate funding should go towards capacity building and local priorities.
- Air Districts and CARB should be willing to support the efforts necessary to obtain hyperlocal data. The definitions are too broad, and the process needs to be clearly defined to support the collection of hyperlocal monitoring data. Partnerships among stakeholders is important in developing hyperlocal air monitoring data. CARB and the air districts must be clear and intentional in defining "hyperlocal" and who will be involved/represented in the collection of hyperlocal data. Overall, the monitoring process must be more inclusive.

Best practices for effective community engagement during planning and implementation:

- Education and training should be done in a way that builds trust with communities, CBOs and co-leaders before entering a space with regulatory agencies.
- CSC members need to have space and opportunity to build relationships with one another and to build community-based power building models. This allows the CSC to also bring forth the trust and knowledge of local issues from local partners.
- Perhaps a published list of disadvantaged communities beyond AB1550 and SB535 definitions with enhanced resolution would be beneficial. The list would identify for example: community names, community-based organizations, and an inventory of community sources. An inventory of eligible AB 617 communities needs to respond to "who else is eligible and has not been able to participate?" and provides a way for CARB and CBOs to improve engagement. CARB should give communities on list an estimate of when they will get to them and in the meanwhile provide tools to help them prepare.
- CARB must clearly define concepts and terminology throughout the Program Blueprint to develop a shared language and understanding of relevant terms and concepts, such as, "capacity building" for both the community and agencies to have a common understanding. An appendix or glossary to define terms should be included.

- There is a need for AB 617 and CARB to develop processes rooted in power-sharing between the community partners and agencies. Capacity building on how the program defines and supports community power.
- The goals and outcomes of the process should be transparent and clearly communicated to community members. Communicating realistic expectations to program participants, CSCs and partners is also imperative. There is a need for knowledge sharing between previous and future selected communities. Particularly the technical selection process for pre-selection should include identifying and suggesting relevant strategies from nearby or similar communities.

Public Comment on Chapter 5:

- There appears to be increasing tensions with communities and CARB about resources to alleviate their pollution burdens. It is important to highlight the need for program expansion and scaling up to support expanding on the Draft Blueprint language surrounding the phase in of eligible communities. There is a need for increased engagement with self-recommended communities as well non-selected communities.
- The tone and structure of CARB meetings, in comparison to CSC meetings, may set an extractive and exclusionary atmosphere in formalized spaces. CARB is encouraged to develop more inclusive, dialogue-oriented processes that are centered in equity and community voices. Dialogue is hindered by the current process and efficiency is prioritized over equity.

CG Member Discussion of Chapter 6

Engaging Community in Air Monitoring Design and Decision-Making

- Community would like ownership of the data regardless of the ownership of sensors and monitoring networks. Accessibility of community monitoring data needs to increase because the use of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) is inefficient and bureaucracy creates additional barriers including a lengthy process.
- There is a need to solicit community input on new technology evaluation. Communities need to be educated on whether these new technologies are being used for regulatory compliance. The guidelines should also address the gap between federal regulatory data and local monitors.
- Communities should be given the option to rent high-end equipment to collect monitoring data instead of low cost (purple sensors) to make data more credible in regulatory processes.
- Educate the communities on what AB617 can actually accomplish and what it cannot, as to not raise false expectations. Developing trust and relationships needs to be built in prior to CAMP development.

- Develop the CAMP prior to selection of community and provide real-time data for community in a user-friendly platform.
- Highlighted the importance of community history for relationship building with air district to create opportunities through the AB617 program. The relationship and history were critical to allow for community driven monitoring.

Modeling to enhance AB 617 processes

- Regulatory staff should leverage collective authority and collaborate. This may save money and time.
- Ensure the technology used is vetted by community. Community should have access to training and knowledge of best available technology. Air districts need to feel confident enough to build these relationships and become experts in how they want to get things done in their community.
- Communities are really focused on certain things that they want to know in a particular area or neighborhood so there needs to be co-ownership/co-authorship of CAMP because agencies may not provide the information and level of detail the community wants. Residents want to see real-time data.
- Air District recommended modifying language to offer more clarity on purpose for measurements and modeling (e.g., change emission measurements to pollutant measurements). Definitions should be broadened to be more inclusive of pollutant concerns. It needs to be clarified that modeling can be done for different purposes. Clarifying the uses of monitoring is key so that CSC members can read the Blueprint, and everyone can have a common understanding on what is the purpose of monitoring.
- Community-based air quality monitoring provides an excellent opportunity to provide internships. It provides neighborhood education and career development opportunities. Furthermore, community air monitors and networks can also work as backups for data. There should also be a PM 1.0 ultrafine standard.
- Introductory language needs to be more intentional and direct regarding the obligations and responsibilities of the district to enforce. It is not the community's responsibility to solve the problem.
- For Engagement and community air monitoring, the best model to use is to give community and EJ partners a level playing field. Community should have access to consultants and resources too.
- Need to resolve parallel discussion on equity and inclusion from all parties regarding flow of money, power, and ownership of data. Somebody must have the skillset to support this balance between all parties moving forward if not, tensions will remain. We should all be on the same page about saving lives.

Public Comment on Chapter 6:

No comment.

Resources Provided

[Presentation](#)

[Discussion Document](#)

[Framing Document](#)

[Proposed CG Work Plan for 2022](#)

[CCP Assessment Report on AB617 CG](#)

[January 25, 2022 Meeting Summary](#)

Attendee List for April 1st CG Meeting

* Consultation Group alternate.

	First	Last	Title	Organization
	Consultation Group Members			
1	Davina	Hurt	CARB Board Member / Consultation Group Co-chair	California Air Resources Board / Member Bay Area Air Quality Management District Governing Board
2	John	Balmes, MD	Professor / CARB Board member/ Consultation Group Co-chair	University of California, San Francisco and Berkeley
3	Gustavo	Aguirre Jr.	Kern County Director	Central California Environmental Justice Network
4	Will	Barrett	Senior Director of Policy and Advocacy	American Lung Association
5	Veronica	Eady	Senior Deputy Executive Officer of Policy & Equity	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
6	Jana	Ganion	Sustainability and Government Affairs Director	Blue Lake Rancheria Tribe
7	Ms. Margaret	Gordon	Co-Director	West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project
8	Kevin	Hamilton	Chief Executive Officer	Central California Asthma Collaborative
9	Ryan	Hayashi *	Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer	San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

10	Kathryn	Higgins *	Director of Community Air Programs	South Coast Air Quality Management District
11	Michael	Kleinman, PhD	Professor / Chair	University of California, Irvine/Chair, Scientific Review Panel
12	Tung	Le	Executive Director	California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA)
13	Erica	Manuel	CEO & Executive Director	Institute for Local Government
14	Jesse	Marquez	Executive Director	Los Angeles Community Environmental Enforcement Network/Coalition for a Safe Environment
15	Luis	Olmedo	Executive Director	Comité Cívico del Valle
16	Paula	Torrado Plazas *	Manager of Health and Environment Programs	Physicians for Social Responsibility - Los Angeles (PSR-LA)
17	Christine	Wolfe	Policy and Communications Director	California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance (CCEEB)
18	Christine	Zimmerman*	Manager of Regulatory Affairs	Western States Petroleum Association
CARB Staff				
	Chanell	Fletcher	Office of Environmental Justice	Deputy Executive Officer
	Deldi	Reyes	Office of Community Air Protection (OCAP)	Director
	Brian	Moore, PhD	Community Planning Section, OCAP	Manager
	Abigail	May	Executive Office	Senior Attorney
	Adrianna	Hernandez	State Strategy Section, OCAP	Air Pollution Specialist
	Liliana	Nunez	State Strategy Section, OCAP	Air Pollution Specialist
	Erika	Trinidad	Community Assessment Section, OCAP	Air Pollution Specialist
Facilitation Team				

	Mindy	Meyer	Sacramento State, Consensus and Collaboration Program (CCP)	Lead Facilitator
	Lisa	Ballin	CCP	Lead Facilitator
	Corin	Choppin	CCP	Associate Facilitator