

## DRAFT: Community Air Protection (AB 617) Consultation Group Hybrid Meeting

**Date:** June 28, 2023

**Time:** 1:30pm-4:00pm

**Consultation Group Members Present:** Davina Hurt\*, John Balmes\*, Jesse Marquez, Kevin Hamilton\*, Tung Le, Ryan Hayashi, Christine Zimmerman\*, Christine Wolfe\*, Paul English, Dave Edwards, Will Barret, Veronica Eady, Luis Olmedo\*, Michael Kleinman and Susan Nakamura (\*Present in person)

**Members not present:** Nayamin Martinez, Ms. Margaret Gordon, Jana Gannon

*Disclaimer: Notes were recorded by the Zoom meeting's automatic transcription, and lightly edited to preserve clarity where possible. Some language may not be captured fully due to distance from microphones or other factors.*

### Verbatim Transcript

#### Attendance

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** We're going to make sure that we have quorum by starting with our roll call. I'm going to turn it over to Adrianna.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** Hi. Before we get started, let me pull up our slide for a member roll call. Okay, we have Board Member Davina Hurt?

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Present.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** CARB Board Member, John, Dr. John Balmes?

**John Balmes, CARB:** Here.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** EJ organization, Nayamin Martinez? EJ organization, Jesse Marquez?

**Jesse Marquez, WCFASE:** Present.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** EJ organization, Kevin Hamilton?

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Kevin advised that he's going to be about 20 to 30 minutes late.

**Liliana Nunez, CARB:** I think Kevin has joined via his car.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** Can we get a confirmation that Kevin has joined via phone?

**Kevin Hamilton, CCAC:** I'm here. I've joined via phone. I am about 10 minutes away.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** Okay, thank you for the confirmation. EJ organization, Luis Olmedo? EJ organization, Ms. Margaret Gordon? Tribal Government, Jana Ganion? CAPCOA, Tung Le?

**Tung Le, CAPCOA:** Tung Le, here.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** Air District, Samir Sheikh?

**Ryan Hayashi, San Joaquin APCD:** Ryan Hayashi here for San Joaquin.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** Thank you, Ryan. Air District Veronica Eady? Air District Wayne Natri? Industry, we have Kathy Rees or Christine Zimmerman?

**Christine Zimmerman, WSPA:** Present. Christine Zimmerman.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** From industry, Christine Wolfe?

**Christine Wolfe, CCEEB:** Here.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** Academia, Dr. Michael Kleinman? Public health organization, Paul English. Excuse me, Dr. Paul English?

**Paul English, Tracking CA:** Here.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** OEHHA, Dr. Dave Edwards?

**Dave Edwards, OEHHA:** Present.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** Public health organization, Will Barrett?

**Will Barrett, American Lung Association:** I'm here. Thanks.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** We've reached quorum. I counted 11 members here today with this.

**Liliana Nunez, CARB:** I just want to add that I do see Veronica here on the phone, and I'm not sure if she didn't have time to unmute.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** Got it.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** We also want to welcome Luis Olmedo, Comite Civico, if the roll could reflect Luis's presence. Luis?

**Luis Olmedo, CCV:** This is Luis Olmedo with Comite Civico.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** We have quorum.

### Online Translation and Zoom Logisitics

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** Okay, give me one moment to share the slides one more time. With that, we'll commence our meeting today. Welcome everyone to the AB 617 Consultation Group meeting. Liliana, would you like to give us instructions for the interpretation?

**Liliana Nunez, CARB:** Sure. So we'll begin the meeting after some setting up the language interpretation for audio, and we also have slides in English and Spanish that you can choose from.

### [INSTRUCTIONS ARE GIVEN IN SPANISH]

**Liliana Nunez, CARB:** For anyone that is English-speaking only, and will need interpretation if anyone is speaking Spanish into the English channel, we ask that you also go to the globe at the bottom of your screen and then click "English." If you are using a smartphone, an iPad or a similar device, you'll look for the 3 dots at the top of the right of your screen, and you'll click on the little globe, and then also, choose language interpretation for English. Thanks very much, and that concludes the instructions for the audio. If you are for any reason seeing slides in a language that you do not want to see it in, you can go to the top of your screen and click view options and then click on "English slides" or "Spanish slides." Thank you. And I'll pass it over to Adri to continue some Zoom orientation.

**Adrianna Hernandez, CARB:** Hello, everyone. Oh, I forgot to introduce myself in the beginning. Sorry, my name is Adrianna Hernandez, and I work for the Office of Community Air Protection here in CARB. Before we dive into today's meeting topic, I'm going to give a quick review of how Zoom controls – of the Zoom controls we have here today so we all know how to best participate in today's discussion. The options may differ, depending on if you are a panelist or an attendee. Panelist view is for the consultation group members. Attendee's view is for everyone in the public not a member. Here, we have a few visuals to help describe how everyone can participate. Today the Reactions feature is enabled. During participation or discussion periods, to raise your hand, you may have to click "Reactions" and then click "Raise hand" to be placed in the cue to speak. For those joining us on the phone today, to raise your hand, please dial "hashtag" or "pound 2," and to unmute dial "star 6." We encourage consultation group members to use their videos so that the attendees can

see you, and to do so simply click on the video icon. The chat feature today will be used by staff or panelists only to share links and information with the public. Now we have public comment periods throughout the meeting. But if panelists and attendees have any questions, you can use our Q&A function which is available for you to submit your question at any time. Staff will be monitoring the Q&A to address your question during public comment. But please put your question into the Q&A, and make sure your name is displayed correctly on Zoom. For Consultation Group members, that means name and affiliation, please. If you have any technical challenges, please reach out to Mr. Ambrose. And with that I'll now pass it on to our Board – our co-chairs, sorry.

### Introduction and Opening Remarks

**John Balmes, CARB:** Hello, everyone. John Balmes, physician, member of the Air Resources Board. I just want to extend a welcome and a thanks to everyone, both, especially the Consultation Group members, but also the public that are participating. And I especially want to thank the Consultation Group members for responding to staff's pleas, because we really needed a quorum today. This is the last time we can have a hybrid meeting, is it? Or can we always have a hybrid meeting?

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** As of this moment, after the end of this month, if we are to meet again, we need an in-person quorum.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Yeah, because of the pandemic, there was a Governor's executive order that allowed us to bypass the Bagley-Keene requirement that groups like this – state agency groups -- have to meet in public in person. So again, I thank the Consultation Group members for making the effort. This is a key time for the Community Air Protection Program. We have to move AB 617 forward in terms of implementation. And you know, as my co-Chair, Vice Chair -- excuse me -- Vice Mayor Hurt will go through, you know, we have to move on the staff Blueprint 2.0. I will turn it over to Ms. Hurt.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you. So yes, Davina Hurt, CARB Board Member and Vice Chair of the Bay Area Air Quality Management district. Happy to be with all of you here in Sacramento as well as online. Our meeting objectives and agenda for today. We had an agenda setting meeting on June 15<sup>th</sup>, and the Consultation Group members in attendance agreed on these meeting objectives and agenda. Today we will reflect on the incident that occurred on June 2<sup>nd</sup>, involving a member of the CARB's EJ Advisory Committee and a security guard at the Cal EPA building. We will provide an update and listen to feedback on the Blueprint 2.0. We will consult with a range of stakeholders in developing the statewide strategy to reduce emissions of toxic air contaminants and criteria air pollutants and communities affected by a high cumulative exposure burden. And as part of our discussion today, we will have two

opportunities for public comment, and, as you see on the slides before you today, there is a visual representation of what we'll do.

**John Balmes, CARB:** And so the agenda for today's meeting is on the slides. But just to be clear. we're going to start out with a discussion as Ms. Hurt just, said, EJ and the safety of our community. Public comment. An update on Consultation Group membership. General updates from OCAP. A Blueprint introduction, and a discussion of Staff's Blueprint 2.0. And then another time for public comment.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** As the next slide shows, just want to look at the meeting agreements and just emphasize that we truly want to have a conversation where people can express their thoughts, even if differing points of views are present, and still maintain mutual respect and civility. I know we all know how to do that, and so look forward to us, diving into this document, and having that as the backdrop, or at least a foundation of our conversations.

### Safety of Our EJ Community / Incident at CalEPA Headquarters

**John Balmes, CARB:** And, you know, we have to start off with an unfortunate incident that has already been alluded to, where one of the EJAC co-chairs had a negative encounter with one of the security guards here at the building. And Deldi is going to frame that discussion.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Thank you, Board Member Balmes, and thank you for you and Davina's continued leadership and co-chairing of this group. First, before I go there, I do just want to reiterate my thanks to all of the Consultation Group members for making the effort to be here today, whether in person or virtual. We know there's so much happening right now, so I really appreciate everyone making the time. Later on, as we talk about the Blueprint, you will hear us talk about one of the changes that we see in the Blueprint, which is to explicitly center our commitment to nondiscrimination laws. And that's incredibly relevant when we think about -- and reflect on -- the experience, the very unfortunate experience of John Kevin Jefferson III. Kevin Jefferson is one of the co-chairs of CARB's Environmental Justice Advisory Committee. He has long been in that role, or not in the role of the co-chair, but very much in the role of climate justice and in advocating for that in in lots of different ways. On June 2<sup>nd</sup>, we had a hybrid meeting here in our building, and as Dr. Baums mentioned, it was a very negative experience. Kevin needed help finding his room. He approached the guard desk. At some point the guard said to Kevin that he would call the police. What we want to reflect is that we take this incident very seriously at the highest levels of our organization as well as Cal EPA, and that there is an investigation underway. As you I'm sure would understand, because the investigation is underway, there's very little else that we can say about the incident. We do know that once the report is final, we will be sharing that publicly. So there will be more time to reflect on this incident in the future once we know more, and the

investigation report has been shipped. I would say, too, that what we want to make sure to do is that everyone who comes into our space, whether it's virtual or physical, feels welcome and that they feel safe to be in in our space. Any comments from anyone on the consultation group?

**Luis Olmedo, CCV:** Okay, good afternoon. Luis Olmedo here. There's a not a whole lot that I want to spend my energy on in saying that, to me, has been obvious. Not only in my 50 years of living, what we sometimes characterize as a lived experience, but 23 years working on environmental justice, 23 years running an organization working on environmental justice issues. And it's great when, after so much hard work, policies and opportunities and institutional changes have created progress on environmental justice. It's really hard to be in a seat like this and not recognize that environmental justice isn't happening, like something is getting in the way, and I don't know what that is. But when you're an expert in a in a subject matter, whether it's personal or combined professional experience, you know things aren't right. What happened to my colleague, Kevin Jefferson, is an unfortunate situation. And he was put in a situation by, what I would say, failures in the agency. Because of those failures, he was put in that situation that unfortunately led to my colleague -- who certainly can speak for himself and explain it himself, and he has -- put him in a situation of what he considers risk. I'm saying that's not the entire summary of it. And I'm here today. And I'm fully committed to being where environmental justice is happening. In a bit, a group of students -- which, every 4 months, we have a cohort of youth, environmental health interns, and we spend a significant amount of time out here in the capital, showing them how to get involved, showing them how to make a difference for their communities, for disadvantage students that are in high school -- and they're going to be here. So we spend, Environmental Justice spends a considerable amount of time, but we reach situations like the situation that I feel, that is happening at California Air Resources Board. It's disheartening. It really makes us, at least it makes me feel like, where do I put my energy? Because we don't have resources to wait, whenever we have shifts, an amount of interest in carrying out environmental justice, and putting environmental justice and positions of power or delivering on equity.

**Luis Olmedo, CCV:** So I have had many conversations throughout the entire leadership ladder, and it's always like, "Oh, you know, that's what you're thinking, that's not what it is." Nothing's happening here, nothing to see here. And, like, we put so much work into this. And then we've seen it, right? Administrations come in, leadership comes in, priorities change. And people have to do whatever their job is, right? They either get marching orders or they are leading the charge. And I am not going to just stand quiet and be okay with pretending that we're still doing environmental justice, when we're not. 23 years doing this work. I consider myself an expert of environmental justice. I don't consider myself an elder, because I still check in with elders, and I make sure that I'm on the right path. Especially those things that I'm not sure enough. But when the tides change, I know, I feel the currents. It's like, this isn't what it was yesterday, and nobody's going to sell me on, "Oh, it's better

today." It is not better today. It is worse today. We had a point in time where we could go to an executive officer, and have a conversation, and tell them things aren't going right in your administration. And we would be able to go up further up the chain of command. I feel like I'm just spinning my wheels. People are telling me, "You just you don't know what you're talking about. Everything is perfect." It is not perfect. 23 years of my career, working day and night. I didn't grow these gray hairs by just having an 8 to 5 job. This is a 24/7 job. It is those situations that put my colleague, Kevin Jefferson, the situation that he's in. And whether it's here, at the AB 617 Consultation, or whether it's Environmental Justice Advisory, we have to stop calling things that are not really what they are. It is not, it is disingenuous. If it's not going to be real, just call it what it is. Let's not pretend that its environmental justice, because it's not. So, I'm sorry that I, an environmental justice advocate, I'm going to be true to what I believe in. And I trust that 23 years of my life, of my career, in working in an organization day in, day out, on environmental justice. I know things are not right. I'm only one person. I'm not going to change everything. We just have to wait for better weather, I suppose. It's how it is. I'm in it for the long -- this is long distance -- 23 years. I've seen the tides change over and over. You know, there is a lot of good environmental justice happening. I'm just heartbroken that isn't happening at the California Air Resources Board. Despite the great leaders that we have, despite the Board Members that support environmental justice, there is a problem happening at the Air Resources Board. And it's a lot of talk, but we're still having problems. Thank you.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Thank you, Luis. I see Jesse Marquez has his hand raised. Jesse.

**Jesse Marquez, CFASE:** Yes, I am disheartened in hearing what occurred. I don't know all the details of it. But, just like Luis had mentioned, I am now also 23 years into this environmental justice movement, although I've spent 40 plus years attending public meetings. You know, I probably have made easily 500 trips to Sacramento over the last 40 years for different causes, but all of them were, to me, were personally important, that I needed to attend. Either for myself or my family and my friends. but more so, for my community, who I also have represented in different capacities and positions. and even when I wasn't nominated or voted or approved, you know, some of us as our community's leaders still take it upon ourselves to represent our communities the best we can, because when we help our community, it also benefits other communities as well, and we share in addressing many of the issues that we confront in our day to day lives. But public participation is pivotal and important that, you know, we are allowed to participate in whatever shape or form -- you know, the event, or our meeting, or whatever it might be -- but being able to enter and passing security. You know, I've never had a problem myself personally at CARB or the State buildings, but I have seen individuals who didn't have a proper ID. And typically, the proper ID is a California ID, or a California driver's license or a U.S. Passport. And oftentimes, people have out of State IDs or out of the country passports, and I've seen them encounter problems. So possibly, you know, whoever is in charge of admissions there in the building, in terms of security, then possibly we need to review

those criteria again. And that whenever there is a new employee or a temporary CARB contractor, or a transferred person that may be updated on what are the current CARB policies and directions for that. And if there is a question, by a member of the public -- whether they be part of our AB 617 consulting group, or any group -- there should be an opportunity where they're given a phone number, or allowed to make a call to verify that you know they are attending a meeting. or have received approval to attend a meeting. But everyone deserves that equal right, you know, to be able to justify or prove that you know they are there for a valid reason. I do know and understand that, yes, there are various types of domestic violence and terrorists and other things of that nature that do come up from time to time, so extra precautions need to be taken. But by the same token, the respect and the rights of people still need to be, you know, always in your conscience, and making and weighing those decisions. And when in doubt, that Security Guard, or that person, should have called their superior, or called an appointed CARB person for these meetings, so that they know who to get in direct contact with. And so that would be part of my recommendations and comments. Thank you.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Thanks, Jesse. Is anyone else like to speak about – Kevin, go ahead.

**Kevin Hamilton, CCAC:** Sure. First of all.

**John Balmes, CARB:** You should probably say your name.

**Kevin Hamilton, CCAC:** First of all, my name is Kevin Hamilton. I'm the executive director of Central California Asthma Collaborative. And also a good friend of Kevin Jefferson's, and I feel you've been more responsible, although Kevin would tell me I'm crazy, because I recruited him to the position of EJAC, because Kevin has been an incredible advocate for his community for so many years and is a hard working guy. I work on construction and everything else you can do to just make a living and to walk into something like that and have that happen, of course, was just almost unforgivable. We dealt with it that day, and I thought we dealt with it well. Everything that's been said so far are things that were brought up in the meeting that day. Sadly it ended up taking up the majority of the entire meeting. And so, that person's actions also caused us to lose precious time in in moving forward on our work to reform and implement this new permanent EJAC. However, I would ask CARB -- and I assume Deldi is representing the executive branch here today at CARB, correct me if I'm wrong, and John and Davina for the Board. All the things that were just listed as, "This shouldn't have happened. There should have been a contact person." I had asked at that time, and it was agreed to, that CARB would come forward with a plan. And what sort of structure had been put in place so that this would not happen again. And so is CARB ready to let us know what structures have now been put in place to make sure that this doesn't happen again? So are you ready to talk about that? It has been a good month now. I would think there would be time for something like this. It should be at the top of the list.



**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Absolutely. Deldi Reyes, Director of the Office of Community Air Protection. I am also acting for Deputy Executive Officer, Chanell Fletcher, while she is on maternity leave. Staff did go through the meeting preparations for the EJAC meeting. We did very much consider, for example, how we were going to organize today's meeting in light of what happened. So, I hope that you all recognize that we had signage today throughout the area, directing folks to this particular meeting room. We also communicated with the Security Guard desk to let them know that an event was happening. Today, the electronic signage board is working. Unfortunately, on June 2<sup>nd</sup> it was not working. And as we did with the the EJAC members, staff's cell phone numbers have been shared . . . so folks understand who they can directly contact, and should directly contact staff if they're having issues or challenges. We are happy to go over in more detail those things when we next meet with our co-chairs of the EJAC, which I think is happening this week.

**Kevin Hamilton, CCAC:** So just a quick point in that detail. Is there now a process whereby anybody who is working the security desk has somebody or has a master calendar, because that was a a major defect from my perspective, just doing some simple quality assurance on that. That there appeared to be no access for the front line security folks or their leader of the CalEPA calendar for the day, where they could have looked up the meeting that Kevin was saying that he was part of, and, in fact, had already been in and had a had a badge on. Oh, yeah, he was wearing one of these, only it was green. And yeah. So I mean, it's those kinds of processes that, in the world that I live and work in, that you have to put in place multiple backstops and in the various, you know, communication lines, and kind of anticipate sort of where where there might be a unintentional breakdown. And obviously this was not an intentional breakdown, but it did result in a traumatic experience for somebody who has had plenty of them in his life, and does not need any more. So, was that taken care of? Do we have that now?

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** So, as I said, Kevin, the online system -- the board there, for the meetings -- unfortunately, on June 2<sup>nd</sup>, was down. So that was for the whole thing you were saying, when you said that? Yeah, the one that's on the second floor. That's why we made sure today that, of course, that's working, but also to communicate directly with the Security Guard desk that this meeting was happening. And the Security Guard protocol is is always to ask a visitor, "Who are you meeting with? Where is your meeting being held?" And then that helps them know who to call. That is actually how it ultimately ended up working on the 2<sup>nd</sup>. It just unfortunately took too long. And that is how we're planning to move forward with this and make sure we've got, as you're saying, looking at contingencies for what could go wrong, and what are we putting in place to make sure we can handle it, especially as we start to have more and more in-person meetings.

**Kevin Hamilton, CCAC:** So the word paper springs to mind. I know it's hard in today's world. But there should be a paper log back up for failure of the electronic

system. I mean, it's a -- I know it's horrible, and we're killing trees. And you know, we could recycle that paper. But I really think again, considering the number of people going in and out of this building, if it's truly security we're worried about, we need a backup for the electronic system's failure. But that's, you know, I'll rest my comments there.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Thank you for that suggestion.

**Kevin Hamilton, CCAC:** But I just want to make sure that at the end of the day, we've got a constructed process. It's written down that we can all look at and say, "Oh, great! This is here, and it's part of this building's security plan."

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** You know, your comments are really great, and I think if I could add anything, it would be to also have additional training around how to deal with the public when it relates to issues like this. I think the escalation, whatever the situation may be, is what made the difference. And so, being trained how to de-escalate situations is extremely important. Are there any other commenters?

**Luis Olmedo, CCV:** Thank you for now listening to my concerns. But I did want to put, sort of, a constructive thought, and then also a proposal to add to the things that are already happening. So one thing that I think is important, because there's there's different ways of approaching things, one is, we try to prevent the problem right? So you try to be proactive. So you put measures in place to be proactive to prevent situations. But because there's such a long history of injustice, of environmental injustice, we have gradually, over long periods of times -- and people who are here and gone and those who continue to carry that -- it's recognized that environmental justice is certainly broad, but at the same time, as vulnerable populations. Vulnerable communities. So those vulnerabilities need to be taking care with. With a response to help either alleviate or help manage in the way that these vulnerable populations engages with institutions, with agencies like the California Air Resources Board. So because we're in reactive mode, it's important to recognize that it is consequential when you have, sort of like, one stack of Jenga, to utilize that as a analogy, you have one layer. And then you remove a block, your stack is going to collapse. Because that's all we get as environmental justice. We get one stack and says, "Play with that stack. Now pull blocks out of that stack." That's all we have. So the scenario and the situation that played out is when there is administrative decisions being made that don't take in consideration the vulnerabilities, the risk, and feel permission to just remove a block you're going to have a toppled stack. And that's what we are facing today. So as a as a solution, and it is not the fix, this is just an indication that CARB is willing to solve these problems. California Air Resources and State government altogether, it loves MOU's, it loves to celebrate agreements, and to refresh agreements and MOU's. All right. So it would be a great courtesy, I would say. A great gesture and a great commitment if the California Resources Board -- and I'm glad that two board members are here -- will bring back to the board and refresh those commitments of environmental justice. We do it all the time. State does

it all the time. Got MOU's on international, economics, environmental, on so many things. Enforcement. There's so many MOU's out there. We love to celebrate them. I ask that, given that there are two board members here, that if the Board would consider bringing and refreshing either a resolution or some type of agreement, that environmental justice is and must be a priority for the California Air Resources Board. So that's my proposal, because I think if that kind of direction is given from the highest level and in governance of policymakers at the Air Resources Board, I really feel that it would have a huge impact, a positive impact, on the administration of the agency.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you. Thank you for those comments. I mean, you know, June is a month where various communities are recognized for their civil rights gains, and highlights the need for us to continually fight for equality and dignity under the law. And you know, while you were talking, I was reminded of the MLK quote about the arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice, and I know sometimes it feels like we're not keeping environmental justice front and center. But we are. It's just taking time to get everybody moving. And I know. And during that time communities are suffering. So we're trying to move quickly and have fire under us. I, personally don't have a problem with such -- I think you're speaking of a resolution. I'm looking at Dr. Balmes, and he probably doesn't either. I am willing to have a conversation with Chair and others to see if people are interested and just highlighting -- and and I think you can see that even in all the work that we're doing - - that environmental justice is centered. And we've created the EJAC. We've continued with the Consultation Group. We're trying to have community centered conversations. So while it doesn't feel like CARB is supporting, I really, truly believe that we are. And I know everything in my bones and fibers is fighting for that truth and justice to the work that we do. But it is taking time, and it is also building community, as you know, is really important. I'm looking at the time, and so I will pass it over to my Chair.

**John Balmes, CARB:** I want to thank Luis, Jesse, Kevin, Davina, for the comments have just been made, and like Davina said, I don't have any problem with reaffirming CARB's commitment to environmental justice, because, in fact, I know the Chair CARB: and the board members actually you know, share that commitment. So you know, putting it out in public is something that we can ask the Chair.

### Consultation Group Membership Changes

**John Balmes, CARB:** I'd like to turn the conversation towards other things on the agenda today, because we really need to talk about the Blueprint. But before we talk about the Blueprint, I think Deldi wants to talk about Consultation Group membership which has been an issue that we've kind of been talking about. But we'll also move on that as well. Deldi?

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Thank you. Yes, what we want to do is just reflect on what some of you may have realized during the roll call. We have had a few changes in the membership of this group again. I just want to start out with a big thank you to all of you, particularly those of you who have been with this group since the inception of the Community Air Protection Program. And so what you see here is a list of the members who are no longer participating on the Consultation Group. We see that PSRLA, as represented by Martha Dina Arguello, she's no longer in the group. Paula Torrado had been her backup. But we also have a good news to share in terms of recognizing Paula as a new employee at the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. And I want to turn now to our other Consultation Group member Dave Edwards to introduce Paula. But before I do, I just want to recognize that we had a public comment section that we glossed over. And I want to acknowledge that we have a hand raised from an attendee. So I'm going to just interrupt myself. I'm going to interrupt myself and say, can we please go to the public commenter, and then we can come back to the Consultation Group. It's a phone number ending in 528. Your hand is up. If Staff could unmute this person, please.

**Liliana Nunez, CARB:** You're unmuted and you can unmute on your end.

**Laura Rosenberger, Public Commenter:** You shouldn't hold your meetings at the same time as the SB 54 meeting on recycling. So many people are concerned about incineration pollution, and they want garbage recycled and taken care of, and so many people need to make comments in two meetings with limited Wi-fi, battery is going dead, poor reception, on bicycle, whatever excuses. And the meeting is so long, a lot of people are sick and they're sick. They have encephalitis or dementia, and they can barely make their comment. And if they go try to go through security to get in, maybe to two meetings, and if you've got to ask them a question, they won't give the right answer, and then getting arrested. Probably the brain won't be there. All right. Thanks.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Thank you, Laura, for your comment. We do recognize there are often competing meetings. We do apologize for that. Let's go back now, please, to the Consultation Group composition. I was going to turn to Dave Edwards to introduce Paula in her new role.

**Dave Edwards, OEHHA:** Great Deldi. So yeah, this is Dave Edwards from OEHHA. We just wanted to introduce a sort of new backup for me. On this Consultation Group is Paula Torrado Plazas, formerly of PSRLA. She started at OEHHA as our first Racial Equity and Environmental Justice Coordinator last week. So we are very excited to to welcome Paula. And I think you guys are gonna move over to the panelists just so she could say hello.

**Liliana Nunez, CARB:** You're doing that now?

**Dave Edwards, OEHHA:** Great, thanks, Liliana.

**Paula Torrado Plazas, OEHHA:** Hi. Can you all hear me?

**John Balmes, CARB:** Yes, Paula.

**Paula Torrado Plazas, OEHHA:** Hi, everyone, good afternoon. Excited to be back in this team. And I've seen a lot of my colleagues here. And yeah, excited to join the Consultation Group as the Racial Equity and Environmental Justice Coordinator from OEHHA and learn more about how our agency can support the AB 617 implementation and environmental justice efforts in your communities.

**Paula Torrado Plazas, OEHHA:** Thank you.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Thank you, Paula. I know you're experienced with AB 617. So it's great that OEHHA has created this position for you.

**Paula Torrado Plazas, OEHHA:** Thank you, John. Thanks.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** All right. Thank you for that. I also want to reflect and thank everyone on this list for their service again, including Erica Manuel, and Dr. Michael Jerrett from UCLA, who was one of our researcher representatives. You all know that the 87104 provisions in California statute, which govern conflicts of interest, have been a major topic of conversation for this group. It did mean that some of our members had to make a hard choice about whether to be able to continue to participate in their advisory body roles versus seeking grants or contracts from CARB. And so, unfortunately, we did have to say goodbye to Erica and Michael for those reasons. We also want to reflect Roger Isom, California Cotton Ginners and Growers Association has not been participating for some time. Deidre Sanders has also stepped off earlier this year, and also our other researcher representative, Dr. Jenny Quintana, also had to step down. Now we also see that the Central California Environmental Justice Network, their representative has been changed. It is now Nayamin Martinez. Nayamin would have liked to have been here, but had a conflict today. That is our updated list of Consultation Group members. This list is updated and is available online. I think next we're going to an update for the Program as a whole. I think we're turning to Liliana for that.

## **Program Budget and OCAP Updates**

**Liliana Nunez, CARB:** Hi! Good afternoon. So now, for the Community Air Protection Program update. We've posted a handout with relevant links. So we posted a handout with relevant links to go along with this update. First is the AB 617 Community Air Protection Program budget and responding to requests to keep this Group up to date with budget news. So a few things to highlight on this slide, there are two budget bills working their way to the Governor. SB 101 passed the State Senate and

Assembly on June 15<sup>th</sup>, and it was signed by the Governor on the 27<sup>th</sup> just yesterday. AB 102 was passed by the Senate and Assembly yesterday, and is anticipated to be signed by the Governor by June 30<sup>th</sup>. So these bills allocate \$300 million for the Program and here are the breakdowns. I do want to point out some changes from fiscal year 2022-23. Cap incentives had \$6 million more before. So it was at \$240 million. And the Community Air Grants had \$4 million more. And then last year there were \$50 million initially allocated to air district implementation and an extra \$10 million from AB 179 passed in September 2022 for the development of new CERPs specifically. And so this year, the implementation is the same at \$60 million for local air district implementation as last year. And I'm wondering if Staff can add to the chat -- oh, English slide deck.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** We've taken care of it, Liliana. We have the English slides showing now.

**Liliana Nunez, CARB:** Okay, great, thank you. And so we want to highlight new tools for the communities. There is a draft Excel workbook that is a compilation of strategies within the 13 CARB approved CERPs. You can explore by community or air quality concern. For example, you can single out what actions and CERPs address heavy duty trucks, so which ones were in the port side community in San Diego. So it's a filterable Excel workbook and I hope it's a good resource for everyone. There is also a video series being developed by CARB with CAPCOA support to provide an introduction to air pollution control and greenhouse gas emissions reductions. So already out, there's a series overview in emission types and health effects of air quality, of air pollution. So three videos are already out. Later, we will release videos where emissions -- that talk about where emissions come from; measuring, tracking, and controlling air pollution; and how to make your community's air cleaner. Lastly, there is a mapping tool for the 65 plus places that's in development. A list of consistently nominated places was built from community nominations, from either CBO's, air districts, or community self-nominations, since the inception of the Program in 2018. There is a recognition that AB 617 must reach communities beyond the 19 selected communities. And later you'll hear more about our approaches on how to expand benefits to other communities. And expected later this summer is this draft mapping tool that can serve as a starting point for programs beyond the AB 617 to identify communities across the State and start engaging with them and associated air district to provide resources to help improve air quality. Thanks so much. And I will, I think that is it for this update.

## Overview of Draft Blueprint 2.0 Part One

**John Balmes, CARB:** Thanks Liliana. So now we need to move to the main item for today, which is reviewing Staff's Blueprint 2.0. So I just want to remind everybody on the Consultation Group that we're greatly indebted to the People's Blueprint writing group. I know several members are on the diocese here with me. Luis and Kevin. And

the People's Blueprint not only brought an environmental justice lens to AB 617 implementation, but actually got the process moving. So I want to thank the writing group for both the process and help in getting things going, but also to the content, which is obviously more important. So, as we've said many times over the course of the Consultation Group, The People's Blueprint was written outside of the agency. It was written with some agency help which was good. But the agency has to write its own Blueprint. This is legally required. But the People's Blueprint informed the Staff Blueprint 2.0 and specific areas where it really made a difference. The People's Blueprint has a focus on civil rights. both in air quality laws, but in nondiscrimination laws in general. And then capacity building, not just for the communities involved with AB 617, but actually for government agencies, both CARB and air districts And I guess, as Luis pointed out, that capacity building has to involve safety and security for members of environmental justice communities. And then participatory budgeting, which is a key feature in terms of power-sharing, which the Blueprint 2.0 has incorporated. So there's going to be a staff overview first. Julia Luongo from OCAP, who was part of the writing team for the Staff 2.0. report, will give us an overview. But we really want to hear from you today, like, what do you support in the Blueprint? You know, what should be added, what goals are missing, what priority actions are missing. So, Julia, get us going.

**Julia Luongo, CARB:** Oh, testing, there we go. Great, thank you, Dr. Balmes. I'll wait for the slide to be put up.

**Liliana Nunez, CARB:** And while the slides are getting put up, I'll just remind folks that if the slides come up in the language that you don't want to read. you can select at the top of the screen next to the green bar "View Options," and then click on the language you want to read. Thanks.

**Julia Luongo, CARB:** Right. I'll just introduce myself really quickly. So hi, everybody. My name is Julia Luongo. I use she/her pronouns and I'm Staff in the Office of Community Air Protection, and I'm here in in the room here in Sacramento. So now that we've got the slides up, here is an outline of today's Blueprint 2.0 discussion. And the Blueprint is the Program's guidance document. So Blueprint 2.0 will be the first major revision of our guidance document. And this draft version of the Blueprint is split into 2 parts. Part One is the overall vision for the program covering the next 5 years. Part Two is more, the nuts and bolts on Program implementation, focusing on how to support completion of our current CAMPs and CERPs, and how to address the air pollution concerns of other overburdened communities, starting with the 65 areas that have been identified over the last 5 years, but have not been selected for CAMP or CERP development. So we'll start off describing Part One of the Blueprint and break for a discussion, and then we'll move into Part Two of the Blueprint 2.0 and break for discussion halfway through. And then we want to share upcoming engagement activities and key dates for the draft Blueprint 2.0 revision. Next slide, please. So for some background on the Blueprint, the Program statutes are the requirements set forth by the Legislature. So while AB 617 established the

Community Air Protection Program, three bills define the legal authority and requirements of the Program which CARB, with direction from community and agency partners, then translates into our implementation guidance, which is what we call the Blueprint.

**Julia Luongo, CARB:** So the first Blueprint was adopted in 2018, September 2018, and we are currently in development of the second Blueprint which we are calling Blueprint 2.0. Draft Blueprint 2.0 recommits CARB and air districts to those requirements in statute; provides key actions to bring benefits to more communities through additional less resource-intensive pathways; it highlights specific communities that have been consistently nominated but not selected for collective government action; centers, equity, environmental justice and civil rights; and affirms existing authorities to ensure nondiscrimination. Next slide, please. Every 5 years, statute requires CARB to update the program Blueprint. So this September will be 5 years since the original Blueprint was established, and the goal of this draft is to incorporate all the lessons learned over the last 5 years from Program stakeholders to ensure completion of current program activities and propose new pathways to support more communities than our current model allows. And that's what we're calling our reimagining of the Program. So the image on this slide shows in dark blue the elements that continue forward from the 2018 Blueprint. Then in light blue are proposed additions to Blueprint 2.0. The yellow outline highlights new pathways to bring resources to communities more efficiently. Next slide, please. So a consistent critique of current Program implementation is the ability to address air pollution concerns is only limited to a limited number of communities through the traditional CERP and CAMP pathways, which creates an atmosphere of competition between communities. So a focus of Draft Blueprint 2.0 is to define mechanisms to bring resources to a larger number of communities, identifying priority areas that have been consistently nominated but not selected for collective government action. CARB staff, with the help of air districts and community self nominations, have developed a list of 65 communities that we are proposing to begin these expanded efforts in the next 5 years, and we will touch on those efforts later on in today's presentation. Next slide, please. So, what is in the Draft Blueprint 2.0? The draft Blueprint 2.0 is posted online now and is open for public comment. The document is broken down into 2 parts. Part One is a five-year strategic plan for the Program. Oh, am I good? I'm hearing a little feedback. Thank you. Sorry about that. So Part One is a five-year strategic plan for the program and lays out a vision. Our mission, which comes straight from statute, guiding principles aligned with the principles of environmental justice and collaborative problem solving, and priority actions that we will take over the next 5 years. Part Two offers practical guidance for air districts, communities, affected industries, and other collaborators on how to implement each component of the statewide strategy. It aims to enable their active involvement in the process of improving air quality at the community level. Part Two's guidance contains improvements to ensure successful implementation of the current plans and details, new pathways to action outside of the historical selection process. Next slide, please. So now I will pass it off to Deldi to speak on Part One of the Draft Blueprint 2.0.



**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Thank you. One thing we want to do is also just reflect a moment on the connection to the People's Blueprint. And, John, you started on this, too. We really want to lift up some of the things that you can see on this slide here that were in the People's Blueprint that we carried forward. including operationalizing equity and EJ and participatory budgeting. The conversation around capacity building, meaning we, as government, need to apply it to ourselves. And then certainly a lot of lessons learned were shared in the People's Blueprint about the first 5 years of the Program that came about through community members actually participating in Community Steering Committees. And particularly important today as we are in the fifth year of implementation for some of the early communities is how we track and communicate the results and the progress and the remaining challenges of the communities in the Program. Next slide, please. In Part One, we do make explicit the link between structural racism and the environmental injustice that we see today, particularly with a focus on disproportionately poor air quality. So I invite you when you have time to read through that part of the Blueprint Part One. We do know that the Community Air Protection Program is only one tool. I still remember the very compelling comments from one of the community members in San Bernardino, who addressed our Board in October a couple of years ago, reminding our Board and CARB staff that the Program is just a tool. And there are many tools. And what we need to focus on are the communities and the risks that they face. And we're trying to take that to heart.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** In this approach, in the next slide we can see a little bit more background in terms of the overall framework for Part One. As Julia said, the vision for this program is actually rooted in CARB's larger vision and commitment to environmental justice and racial equity. Earlier this year, under Chanell Fletcher's leadership, CARB shared publicly a vision statement that we had been working on for some time, where we again are explicit between the link of structural racism and environmental injustice and really committing to work towards the future where everyone in California gets to enjoy the benefits of healthy and clean air. And obviously the mission, as Julia said, comes straight from the statute as described in in AB 617. The guiding principles, we do share a few of them in the Part One. They are, for example, using an equity lens, being transparent and accountable in our work, and supporting power sharing, because we saw a lot of great examples of this emerge from the 5 years of the community work that's happened so far. And we want to try to reinforce those approaches in the next 5 years as well. In the next slide you'll see a list of the guiding principles. It's a little bit more complete. So under each of those 3 areas, you see some more specific principles that we want to hold to, again applying our racial equity lens to our big decisions here at CARB, integrating both environmental justice and civil rights into our processes. And I think, very relevant for today's conversation, making sure that our spaces, both inside our CARB workforce, but also externally and with the public, and in the spaces that are created through the funds that pass through CARB to air districts, that those spaces are free from discrimination. Power-sharing means recognizing expertise at all levels. So we hear

the call, for example, for more opportunities for peer exchange between community leaders. We want to be very intentional about building our capacity as agencies and of course, can support self-direction of communities and governance. We also are working to become more transparent about how this program uses the public funds that we receive to administer the Program, and of course, continue to try to make data more available and accessible.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** In the next slide we share in Part One, the 7 goals. Each of these goals has priority actions underneath them. But here, at a glance, you can see what all the goals are, CARB: and I'll give you a minute to just kind of absorb what those are. And also, while reminding you that one of our discussion questions is to find out your thoughts about what goal areas might be missing, what goal areas might need to be strengthened by adding additional actions. Obviously, partnership is a huge theme in this Program. It cannot run without partnerships. We intend to continue that spirit as we evolve, continue to evolve, the Program over the next 5 years. Environmental justice and the use of regulatory authorities, including enforcement, go hand in hand. And so we at CARB are, of course, continuing to recommit ourselves to taking and using our regulatory actions, our regulatory authority to address mobile sources to reduce exposures and emissions. Again, centering nondiscrimination laws. Making sure that we meet our commitment to the 19 communities that are already in the Program by making sure that we complete and our districts complete the strategies and actions in those community emission reduction plans. While at the same time -- and this is will be a very significant lift -- we want to try to build a focus on those 65 communities that have been consistently nominated over the last 5 years, but not selected into the Program. To do that, we want to try to use our Community Air Grants tool more creatively, to help communities build their own capacity, build their own plans, through what we're calling Local Community Emission Reduction Plans, and again continue to support all of that decision making by making air quality information and tools more accessible. Next slide.

### Discussion of Blueprint 2.0 Part One Goals

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** So here we are with our discussion questions that we hope will be useful to you all. As you consider this Blueprint, I'll just caveat it by saying, with everything on everyone's plate, you won't surprise us if you haven't read every single page of the draft. So just know that this is a conversation to help orient you to the Blueprint, and that we welcome your feedback in any form, whether it's an email or comment or conversation today. Or, of course, participation in any of the 3 public workshops that we are having later this summer that we will share more details about later. Essentially, again, we just want to know what actions do you support? What should be added? What's missing in terms of the 7 goals? And also, what actions should be should be added? And actually, I'll just point out questions 2 and 4 are duplicative. So we really just have 3 questions here. What do you support? What

should we add? And what big picture goals are missing? I think our co-chairs will help facilitate the conversation.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Sure. Absolutely. Thank you for the presentation, both of you, and giving us that snapshot of the tremendous lift and work that's gone into the 2.0 version. And so I'm going to turn now to fellow consultation group members. The questions before us are, what actions do you support? What actions should be added? What goals are missing? What priority actions are missing? And there is quite a bit in here. But maybe there's some things that rise to the top for you that you have not seen in your review we'd left here. Your thoughts? Are there any folks virtually that'd like to add to that? I have an opinion. But I wanted to see if anyone else.

**John Balmes, CARB:** And this is just Part One so far, right?

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Yes, that is correct.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Yeah, over to you.

**Kevin Hamilton, CCAC:** Kevin Hamilton, Central California Asthma Collaborative. So again, coming back to the language, and I think we're definitely headed to right way here. Am I close enough to the mic? I just want to be sure. I think, in goal one, the evolution of the program is critical, and I think CARB is already participating at least with some groups. I'll hold ours up as as one where we feel like we are active partners with CARB and our air district in evolving this program. The evolution outcome should be control of the program by communities rather than by agency. So I think that's going to be this sort of sticking point. It's very clear that the agencies, and I am referring to the air agencies, but actually, generally because things come up, as we know, in these CERPs that are not specific to air agencies. In our own work, water, for instance, rises in the valley. That's not meant to be a pun, because it has been rising like crazy lately. And so you know, the the air agency has no purview over that, yet community residents have gathered together and are being asked to address and enumerate issues that they feel, environmental issues, that they feel are of concern. And so there is this need, I think, for the agencies to be these strong consultative partners. And there needs to be a central source that's sort of coordinating how the agencies come into the conversation. But we've also seen situations where it feels like, and residents have expressed this, that it feels like there's too much control there. They control the money, they control the structure, they control everything. Even though they've evolved the process, and full credit should be given for learning as they go, into something that is is definitely creating outcomes that people would like to see. However, the flip side of that is capacity. So the agency is very limited in their capacity to be able to handle multiple, numerous communities that may be moving on completely different timelines as to how they might do this work. So I think the agencies are not built to have that kind of flexibility, and the budgets required there, far and away outspend what could be done and what is being done in some cases in local models. So I think the fact that this recognizes that in goal one at

least and is moving that forward, I'd like to see if we can create something a little more structured as far as milestones within the goal, that would let us say, "Okay, where do we want to be here? Where do we want to be, you know, in a year? Where do we want to be in 2 years? 3 years?" You know, what is the the ultimate goal? So that's just my comment on that. But I support moving forward, tentatively, with this as a good draft of goal one.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Thank you for those comments. Are there any additional Consultation Group members with thoughts? Is there any one virtually? I don't have the list.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Oh, perfect, Luis! Sorry, Luis.

**Luis Olmedo, CCV:** Before I make comment. I just wanted to briefly introduce our eighth environmental health internship cohort. These students are from high school and some of them, you know, this is their last year, and they get to get this, sometimes 3 to 4 months, very intense internship. Just a few months ago we took the seventh cohort of Washington, DC. This time we brought them to Sacramento. But we do this 3 or 4 times per year in preparing these leaders. And what's very important to acknowledge is that they are all from AB 617 communities.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Thank you very much.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you all for being here.

**Luis Olmedo, CCV:** And they'll be, you know, headed on their way. They have a full day schedule, visiting the Legislature, meeting with key leaders and showing up in committees, and we still have a long way to go today and tomorrow. So thank you. The comments I wanted to bring forward is it. It's clear this is trying to make some sort of course corrections, adjustments along the way. And I know that there's always sort of this, you know, what belongs to the air district, what belongs to CARB, and then what belongs to other agencies that need to be involved, and what these pieces of legislation, AB 617 being the foundational bill that created this program, how it all interacts with each other as these improvements are being sought out. I would imagine if I'm visualizing this, if I were an air district, I would want all the money that that comes to me without having to necessarily deal with the Community Steering Committee, and we've seen that in some cases. If I understand it correctly, here's a proposal that might have a separate or a new Community Steering Committee that sort of operates independently. Did I understand that wrong? Okay. I just, in the presentation, I kind of thought that there was a Community Steering Committee that would be separate. No? Maybe I misunderstood that.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Well, maybe you might be thinking of the reference to the Community Air Grant and the Local Community Emissions Reduction Plans. Is that what you're talking about?

**Luis Olmedo, CCV:** So it's a Community Air Grant committee?

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Well, so what we're proposing is that one of the ways to help communities do very similar things that they're doing right now. But as Kevin noted, to do it where they're setting the table, and they're creating the space, is through using a Community Air Grant. And in that grant we actually have a project type written into the request for applications where an applicant could propose to write with input from affected residents, a Local Community Emissions Reduction Plan. Is that maybe what you were thinking?

**Luis Olmedo, CCV:** It's just that the concept, idea, seems far too familiar from an air district that, you know, I've heard one air officer bring it up, that "we need to separate the CERPs implementation from 617. 617 needs to go, the community needs to get their own money. There are grants." And it's sort of being sold to us like that's the better deal. "Let's give you your own money and detach you from these other monies," and as far as even proposing Bill language that would do that, I mean. I'll go as far as saying, South Coast Air Quality management district had that plan. And so I just thought, like, you know, I'm just doing the math. I'm like, wait a minute you want to separate, and then you have sort of your free -- do what you want with the rest of your money -- and it's like, that's not the idea of AB 617. I actually was in disagreement the fact that the first year CARB decided to utilize, or I don't know if the bill itself called for that. But Carl Moyer. That status quo. That's what they've always done. and so I'm glad that we move past that into the CERPs. But there's still this, this challenging thing that the air district says that my business is my business and community businesses, is community's business. It's like, wait a minute, isn't this a government of the people? It's like, it's very challenging to work under those conditions when an air district depends on those dollars to carry out their usual, when AB 617 was to be doing those things that weren't being done, to go further, to basically, in some ways, kind of just do your job, because you gotta do this either way. To just do your job. Here's some money, and do it better. And the other part of it that I would just sort of repair work. One is, I would never want to see those CERP monies separated from the community and I would worry about separating the Air Grants because they are very, very clearly, they have been designed to serve certain purposes. So I don't want to end up sort of like this, sorry, bait and switch situation. So those are the things I would, like, caution, not only to the CARB OCAP, but also to Environmental Justice. It need to be very -- keep an eye on all of that. So we don't end up with a bait and switch situation. And the other part is enforcement. Enforcement is... I've seen enforcement change over time. Now everything is in terms of, what is it, administrative. And I'm not sure how many know the difference between administrative decisions that are being made on, sometimes, really egregious crimes. And if you have an administrative direction, you might be sort of doing a slap on the hand on what might really be a criminal situation. So I would love to know, like, what's CARB's authority? And what does CARB do when faced with criminal versus administrative? And that's not very clear to me right now as to how

CARB handles that, because -- I've noticed this, and I get this from the Department of Toxics -- when you, even if you have an office of criminal investigations, if your choice is to not do criminal investigations, and you sort of fast track everything through administrative penalties, the community isn't better off necessarily in those types of scenarios. So I understand, CARB, I would be -- when we talk enforcement, it would be good to get that breakdown, as in, what are we talking about? Not just CARB, but also the air districts. You know, what kind of enforcement do they do? And maybe there's parameters and limits in the law. But it'd be good to know what that is. That way we set expectations.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** I think that's all Part Two, the enforcement aspect. But it would be good to get some of those answers out. Deldi, do you want to?

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Yeah, I would love to just weigh in a little bit. Luis, because the point you made cannot be overstated. The funding for the Community Air Grants is really very precious. If you recall from this from the earlier budget update, that amount is only 6 million dollars for the future year, right? Which is a cut from previous years. So our job is to make sure that those funds are used to support communities and tribal governments in the way that the law intended, which was essentially to support the participation in the AB 617 process, right? And what we are proposing, actually, I want to just give credit where credit is due. This notion of the local CERP comes from an Air Grant that is actually underway. It's the coalition of coalitions in the Central Valley that Kevin Hamilton and others are part of to write local plans for individual communities. And so we took that notion, and we wrote it up as a potential project type for the following request for applications. And we did get some applications this year that are proposing to do that. We want to learn from those efforts so that we can help communities do their prioritizing and planning to come up with what's important to them for air quality. Now you mentioned CERP funds. The funds to implement strategies are actually, by law, allocated to air districts through CARB. And I'm talking about incentives dollars, and you're right. Carl Moyer was used in the first year of the program to kind of get a jump start in getting resources out to communities. But since then, we have really focused those incentives to try to address community identified priorities. And that actually brings us to one of the third pathways we want to try to talk about today, which is increasing the flexibility of how those incentive dollars can be tapped. So that we are learning from the past 5 years about the kinds of incentives projects that communities wanted and needed in their communities. And we're trying to make those more accessible. On the enforcement side of things, I cannot speak to criminal enforcement matters. I don't have that background or expertise. But I will just say again that we want to see, and all of the emissions reduction plans in our communities, enforcement element. And we have seen that in our CERPs. And CARB, and air districts together, are committed to follow through with those commitments. In fact, even just this week we've been working with the California Natural Resources Agency and CALGEM to do joint inspections of oil and gas wells in a couple of communities in the San Joaquin Valley, and we hope to do the same for some of the communities in the South Coast

jurisdiction as well. So that definitely is a big strength of the program, is that it's been kind of a rallying call for air districts and different parts of CARB to come together through CARB's Enforcement division and really focus our Enforcement authorities to address the community's concerns.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Thank you, Deldi. I just want to emphasize two points. And I'll start with enforcement because you just ended with that. So enforcement is in AB 617, in the law. So it is an important component of AB 617 implementation. Just, big picture wise. So you're right. It has to be done correctly. And then I just really want to make it clear, Luis, that when we're trying to talk about innovative approaches like this, what's going on in the Central Valley, that doesn't mean that we're trying to separate what communities get from air district. The CSC approach which has both air district and community members hopefully working together and hopefully doing participatory budgeting. you know, power sharing. that's still the name of the game for AB 617. So, we're trying to come up with some new ways to get other communities involved, that aren't AB 617 designated communities. We only got 19 of those so far. We're trying to be more innovative and get things moving more quickly for CERPs. But that doesn't mean we're going away from the core of the program, which is an integrated, hopefully, a power-sharing approach to implementation.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Sure, Luis, go ahead.

**Luis Olmedo, CCV:** Yeah, thank you for the clarification. And what appears to be sort of a pilot in in progress model, right? On the enforcement, it would be great to get a presentation, if I may ask for that, because I just wonder if enough people know the difference between administrative and criminal. And I wondered to what extent CARB has the legal authority under such a Program, because we're incentivizing basically for air districts to do what they need to do anyway. And that's, you know, am I mischaracterizing that? No? Okay, thank you. There are communities like Imperial, where we don't have an environmental prosecutor. At one time, I remember, the California District Attorney Association had a Circuit Prosecutors Program, and so they would deploy environmental prosecutors to communities that didn't have them. And so I wonder if there is an opportunity at some point, like, I want it to become a discussion so that maybe there is an opportunity to say, well, if part of AB 617 deliverables is enforcement. And updates to policy, it's already there. But there are air districts that, their only enforcement tool is administrative. And we've seen that, because I have been involved in situations where I've had that information, and the cost of operating without proper emissions controls over 7 years, let's say, for example. And the price of the fine through an administrative penalty. I mean, they can go all day. They can go for the next 100 years and pay the fine because it's cheaper to pay an administrative fine. So I think it's important to bring that conversation to the AB 617 program.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** So I think we got a head nod from Deldi that we can have a discussion about enforcement, a presentation at a later time.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Yeah, Staff will note that that's a suggested topic release for this group. Just assume that is what you are asking for, for this conversation. I do want to just clarify, though, I do understand that 617 actually does require new things of districts. That is why they have additional operating funds. It is not just to fund them for what they already should have been doing it. It created a number of new requirements for them.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you for that clarification. I now would like to turn to Christine, and then Kevin for comments to the questions.

**Veronica Eady, BAAQMD:** Also, can you please not forget that people on video also have their hands up?

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you. I'm relying on Staff to let me know, since I can't see whose hands are raised. So thank you, Veronica. Yeah. I don't see you, but I know that voice.

**Veronica Eady, BAAQMD:** It is me, indeed.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** So if Staff could help me with the hands raised, we'll take the folks here who are in person, and then move to virtual comments. Oh, now I see the hands. Thank you. Okay. So, Christine, Kevin. Then I see Veronica, Susan, Jesse, Paul, and Dave. There we go.

**Christine Wolfe, CCEEB:** Okay. Now that I see that there are so many people in line, I'll be fast. But I appreciate all the work that CARB put in on both Parts one and Part Two. I know we're going to get to Part Two at a later time. But I think, in particular, I think the very last suggestion underneath goal 7, about making air quality information and tools more accessible to communities -- which I understand was one of the primary primary driving forces behind the Program of establishing an online dashboard to track overall program and CERP progress, including the status of the commitments that we just discussed and that are up on the screen right now -- I think that's really important. I know that Staff has identified the sort of patchwork approach that folks have taken to implementation reporting, probably because there wasn't adequate guidance, means that we don't have a really good sense of where the program is overall. I also know that there, I'm sure, everybody on the dais and everyone on the phone has different visions for what they want to see from the program, but at a minimum, I think, at least from my perspective, it's important to have some measurable goals around seeing emissions and exposure reductions to the extent that those can be measured in the communities. So to the extent that we can increase visibility around that, I think that would be really helpful for the Program as a whole. I'm also interested in hearing more from Kevin, who, I think, just is walking out, but at some point, more about the experience they've had with the local CERP process in the Valley, and whether or not it's followed the same sort of path of



developing a baseline inventory and the other sort of fundamental data sources that are needed to evaluate progress over time. And how that's working, if the air districts aren't required to participate. It sounds like San Joaquin is actively participating in that program, and so maybe they can talk a little bit about that, too, but without having the agencies required to participate. Although I think the proposal is for CARB, maybe to participate in those local CERPs. I'm just not clear on how we would get the some of the progress reporting and quantitative data that seems like a really important foundation of the Program.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you. Thank you for those comments I am now going to move to online, and if Staff could help me with who raised their hand first.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Jesse Marquez was first. Okay, thank you, Jesse.

**Jesse Marquez, CFASE:** Hello, thanks for this opportunity. Okay, I did want to make some comments. And in my so far preliminary view of the Blueprint. I'm still, you know, digging in deep into some of the chapters and sections and paragraphs and lines in it, but some of the things that I brought up in the past that still did not appear in that, is that we needed CARB to have a mechanism within their staff and departments and in the Blueprint for when we, when CSC's, and members of CSC's, request technical and legal information clarifications. We bumped heads big time right from the get go of launching our CSC, because not even our local AQMD at that time and many other industries and AQMD's did not believe that mobile source emissions were included in the AB 617. And we had asked that several times, that CARB issue a letter memorandum, a letter of clarification, something that would address that issue so it would end it once and for all. And that mechanism still did not come, has not developed, or presented to us for our approval or agreement and for implementation. So I would still like to see that, you know, somehow, because even when I look at the Blueprint. It talked about emissions in general, but again, it did not delve into any detail about, you know, mobile emissions being included when they are a significant part. Especially, we're talking about freight transportation corridors, warehouse communities, and ports where you know all these mobile sources of missions are a significant part of our emissions. It also asks that, you know, when CARB issues different AQMD budgets that, you know, those budgets be shared with the CSC committees, because what happened is that we did bring this up before our CSC. And before our Blueprint board here, that, you know, in our case the South Coast AQMD did a presentation on their budget, and then one of the line items showed monies -- like 5, 6, 7 million -- going towards RECLAIM. Well, we never approved RECLAIM being a recipient of any funds from the AB 617. In fact, we plan had already been voted by the Committee Board to be phased out, and there was already an implementation plan for that. And so we had asked for clarification from that, from the AB 617 staff, and we still not did not get a clarification for that. And just to show you what did happen, is that we had our meeting on like a Tuesday, Wednesday -- and then at East L. A., another group had their meeting on like that Thursday, Friday -- and when it came to the AQMD presentation, they left out that

one slide that showed RECLAIM on it. However, I did have discussions with, like Mark Lopez, with each committee member for environmental justice, about the budget, and when they were presented the budget, the budget was a smaller budget that did not include that one-line item on it. And then Mark asked them, "I thought the budget was this amount. And now it looks like it's a smaller amount." And he didn't get a clarification for that. So what I'm leading to is that, you know, CARB does need to have something set up -- that when we request a technical or legal question, that it be addressed.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you, Jesse, for your thoughts on how to improve this. I'm looking to Staff to see if there is any kind of response, and if not move to the next raised hand.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** I just want to confirm for everyone's understanding, Jesse. Absolutely. We consider both mobile and stationary source emissions as equally important in terms of needing to address them collectively between CARB and air districts, using their respective authorities. So I don't know why there's still a question about that, but I'm happy to talk with you, offline. We will make sure that that is addressed in the Blueprint.

**Jesse Marquez, CFASE:** So just like AB 617 also mentioned the improvement of public health. And there's been no delving into, how do we accomplish that? How do we do that? But it just so happens that you know our Wilmington/Carson/West Long Beach CSC did take a proactive action with one of our partners, which was a Coalition for Clean Air, whereby they submitted an AB 617 air quality grant, that allowed them to conduct a public health survey of which our organization was a part of that, in conducting that public health survey, using the CDC approved CASPER method. So we actually do have some public health data. Because if we're going to improve public health, you must first have a public health baseline in order to say we did improve public health. We can do all kinds of rules and regulations and policies and programs and plans, but if -- at the end -- we cannot show there's been any significant improvement in public health, then we did not comply with the law and meet all of our goals and objectives.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you, Jesse, so it just sounds like more details you're looking for in that space. Let's go to our next raised hand.

**Liliana Nunez, CARB:** That's Paul English.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** I'm sorry, Liliana. Can you...? Okay, perfect. The floor is yours.

**Paul English, Tracking CA:** Yeah. Hi, thanks. Yeah, I like these goals. I thought it was well done. I just had one comment on Goals 5 and 7. So the focus on the consistently nominated communities and making some more, you know, program information more accessible. I didn't really see much in there about trying to eliminate some of

the barriers of some of these communities from applying. Just as far as you know, I think this has been discussed before, many of these groups may lack a fiscal agent. The application is actually pretty difficult to put together. And there's a lot of communities that are, you know, we're really needing these resources. But they're not, you know, really equipped to be able to apply, and I was just wondering if there were any more thoughts on that when this was put together. Thanks.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Thank you, Paul, for that. I will quickly just note for everyone, if you see an action item that you think is missing or needs more work, we definitely encourage you to give us those comments here today, but also in follow up comments in writing. It really helps to have all of those things in the docket. We do have a commitment that we will take a look at our Community Air Grant request for applications using a racial equity lens, which means we're going to do just that, Paul. We want to really take it apart and try to find out what those barriers are in the existing process, and make those revisions so that we can have more communities apply. With that said, I just want to acknowledge that there will always be communities that even, you know, doing a grant is going to be beyond them. And they shouldn't have to, they shouldn't have to apply for funding in order to get attention to address air quality, right? We're just putting this Community Air Grant program out as one option. But we know that we and air districts together need to find ways to support communities in lots of other ways, too.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you, Deldi, and thank you, Paul. The next virtual speakers?

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Susan. Welcome, Susan.

**Susan Nakamura, SC AQMD:** Hi, I'm Susan Nakamura from the South Coast AQMD. I feel like, yeah, I heard you, Luis and I heard you, Jesse. I did want to comment for Jesse that there are mobile and stationary CERP actions in the Wilmington/Carson/West Long Beach CERP and I'm more than willing to sit down with you and talk to you about RECLAIM and other things, and anything that you might have in terms of questions for the Wilmington/Carson/West Long Beach CERP. In regards to -- oh, and then I also wanted to mention for Paula, congratulations. Paula was very instrumental working with us for the South LA CERP and the beginning of the implementation. She's one of the 3 co-leads, but the primary co-lead, in terms of really helping to get moving with us to work together, and really excited to be working with the co-leads on the implementation of the South LA CERP. So I feel like it is a good relationship and collaboration with the community. In regards to Blueprint 2.0 I want to really applaud CARB. I think that you took a lot of the comments that were coming from many, many different directions, taking the heart of what was in the people's Blueprint, and bringing it forward in Blueprint 2.0. And this first part, one of the things that I wanted to highlight is Goal 4. It is our priority to implement the CERPs. We feel like, when we look back -- and we're looking at some of these actions that we feel like we bit off a lot -- but we are

working really hard to really implement those CERPs. And just a recognition that some of these actions will spill over beyond year 5. If we can all be committed to continuing to move forward and to fully implement those, that that is our goal. And I think that's it, so thank you.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you, Susan. Yes. Next speaker?

**Dave Edwards, OEHHA:** Thanks. Yeah, thanks, Susan, for the kind words about Paula. We're we're happy that she's joined the OEHHA team. So looking forward to working with you in that capacity as well. So yeah, I just just to start really, appreciate the sort of tenor and the goals that are associated with Blueprint 2.0. I really wanted to thank you for adding in the emissions and exposures. I think that's really important. One area, just to kind of give a couple of comments in the "Defining the Problem" section. There's a recognition of racial equity and racial and ethnic disparities. It might be, I think, it's important here to also consider adding something that recognizes the importance of health equity issues. I think that could maybe really strengthen the overall Blueprint. And then also just sort of as a goal, and sort of that tracking and the metric side of things, to think about, not only emission reductions, but also sort of getting to exposure reductions, and looking at discussing about health metrics, risk assessments, that can look at sort of the health impacts of given CERPs and the reductions associated within a community. And, so, happy to discuss that further offline. But those are the comments that I have for right now. So thank you.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you. Next speaker? Veronica, you're up.

**Veronica Eady, BAAQMD:** Great, thanks. I would suggest that, and I agree with Dave, I think that those are really important to pay attention to health equity, exposure versus emissions reductions. I mean, obviously, we have to do what is within the wording of the statute. But we have been having conversations at the Bay Area air district just on those issues. How do you get beyond emission reduction to exposure reduction? So that's a really important point. I had several points that I wanted to make. I'll go backwards. So, starting with Dave Edwards, and then with respect to what Paul English had to say about removing barriers with organizations that might be applying for, say, Community Air Grants. I think that's a really critical point. I think that the conversation within bureaucracies is moving in the direction of really trying to remove those barriers. U.S. EPA, as you probably know, has been very creative, and they've just launched what are called TCTAC centers all across the country, we have 2 here in Region 9, to provide technical assistance to nonprofit organizations for those very reasons. I can remember when I was at CARB and here at the air district, the Bay Area, you have people who, you know, apply for grants, and they have really good projects, but might forget to sign their grant application. Or they may not realize that they have to answer every question. And it's heartbreaking to not be able to consider those. So I would recommend that we also make one of the proposed Blueprint Goals, Blueprint 2.0 goals, to remove those barriers, and then

I would just suggest -- and I know nothing about U.S. EPA's TCTAC centers. Except for that there are two in Region 9, and one in Arizona and one in San Diego, and they are the hubs. But then there are spokes, and maybe some of the people in the room know a little bit more about those spokes and what the organizations are that are participating in that. But you know there are some options out there, and people thinking about options. So I would suggest that we embrace that. I did want to just talk about three things that a number of people talked about, things that I may want to know more about. And I think others may want to know, or things that I'm struggling with. So one thing that I would love to know more about is the local CERPs. I know, that's something that we were thinking about in the early days of AB 617. So it's really wonderful and encouraging to know that there are groups in the Central Valley that are working on local CERPs. I think it would be really informative for us, as a Consultation Group to know more about that. I mean, I just know about it at a very high level, but we have experts here in the room, so it would be great at some point in the future to be able to hear about that work that's going on, and also get the perspective of the air district to understand the role that the air district is playing. You know, I'm sure, with any new program, there are probably big successes, but also big challenges. It would be helpful to have those things identified so that we can think about implementing them in other parts of the State, especially as we start thinking about those 65 plus other communities, and especially if the funding for the Legislature remains as it has. So suggesting that we get some sort of a conversation, a presentation about that.

**Veronica Eady, BAAQMD:** To Luis's point about enforcement. You know, we have a Community Advisory Council, and some of our members have identified, as their priority issues, enforcement and having more community-engaged enforcement. So we're exploring with community members as well as with our Enforcement staff about what community-engaged enforcement is, and how how do we do that? We do not have the answer in the Bay Area district. It's definitely a work in progress. But I'm sure that other districts and other community groups are thinking about those very same things. So it might be helpful in the future, maybe once you get the Blueprint out, or we get to meetings where it -- you know, it's not so time sensitive, but we don't have to focus on the Blueprint -- that we could talk about things like enforcement. And then somebody mentioned incentives. We are an air district that is not as far along with the community-directed projects. In fact, we don't have any community-directed projects in our district yet. So I think it would be really great to be able to hear more about that from some of the other districts and some of the steering committees who have done that. And when we have those meetings, assuming that we have them, then I would love to invite our Incentive staff, and as well as Enforcement staff and others, to listen in on those conversations. So those are my comments. Thank you.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you, Veronica. I believe Will's hand was next, and then Ryan.

**Will Barrett, American Lung Association:** So I'm Will Barrett with the American Lung Association. And a couple of things that have already been touched on, so I won't go into them. But overall, I wanted to say, you know, I really appreciate the goals that have been laid out, all the attention that the work that this Consultation Group has gone through, and the authors of the People's Blueprint have put forward, and how that's starting to come together in the draft here. It's been good to see. A couple of quick comments that I wanted to just note, and some again have been touched on. But to the points that Dave and Veronica just made on exposure, reduction and health impacts review. Really, you know, I just wanted to echo that I think that's an important maybe next step of working towards. On the Enforcement discussion and really making the air quality and program information more readily available, I think that's generally a very helpful step. So I appreciate seeing that in Goal 7. And then back on Goal 2 on the regulatory authorities. Again on the concept of enforcement presentations. I think that's a really important thing. I just wanted to echo that as well, and it was good to hear the just now the Bay area updates on thinking about how they can approach this going forward. And then on the Enforcement presentation -- maybe it's bringing CARB's Annual Enforcement Division report to this group or in another way that focuses on AB 617 communities, and in this process, to be a helpful starting point. And then the last thing on the issue of -- sorry, just switching screens -- the applying of regulatory authorities under Goal Two. You know, maybe just ensuring awareness of Program progress towards implementation of some of the policies and goals have been put forward and CERPs, that then go through administrative processes that can take, in some cases, years to get to implementation. So right now, there are 3 or 4 programs that are now at EPA pending waivers. You have that kind of thing, reporting those back. When those are completed, or the new information that's coming in from the diesel truck inspection and maintenance program. You know, there's already been -- just in this year -- almost a thousand high emitting excessive emission truck identifications that have gone on, and those are being brought into compliance. So I think those kind of things, if there's a way to localize that information, so that it overlays with the maps of the 617 communities. I think that'd be really another good way to bring that enforcement and, you know, the program implementation process, you know, right into this process overall. So, anyway, just thank you again for the presentation, and the hard work that's gone into this point. Thank you.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you for your comments. Ryan?

**Ryan Hayashi, San Joaquin APCD:** Good afternoon everyone, happy to be here. Thanks for letting me share. I want to echo what you heard from everybody else, and just really share our appreciation for all the work that's been done. And starting with the authors of the People's Blueprint and definitely the CARB staff within taking not only that feedback, but also feedback on the different iterations. And it's been a huge lift. And it's just a lot of work. And we're very happy to start seeing that the product of that work in this, in the graphs that have been presented. I want to touch on a little bit -- and I see Kevin made it there in person, happy that he's there. There's

been discussion about the local CERPs and, you know, when the opportunity for the Community Air Grant arose, very happy that Kevin approached us about providing a letter of support for that, which we did. And then you know, through that we also share that we want to be involved as much as we can, and assisting in any way that we can, and sharing the things that we've learned to try to help those processes run smooth, in addition to providing our own resources. You know, to provide whatever information that those communities may need through the development of the local CERPs. And so you know, happy to say that we've been in attendance, and in quite a few of the meetings, and shared the information that was requested of us. And you know, providing our experiences and information in any manner that we can. You know, we talked a little bit about this program, and you know how important it is. And it's really changed the way I think air districts think about the way that we go about doing our business. And you know, I think much of the work that we do here isn't only, you know, shaping what we're doing for the selected communities. But you know, also, how do we address some of the needs of communities outside of that? And some of the things that we've done – recently, we took 2 items from our Board, and we allocated \$2 million dollars – not AB 617 funds -- towards the Clean Air Rooms program. That provides free air purification, air filtration devices to residents of low income and disadvantaged areas. And we've seen tremendous use of the program. Kind of highlighting the communities that were selected. One of the main ones that we were in communications with and talking with was La Vina, which is a community right outside of Madera. And you know, working with the environmental justice organizations there, in addition to the numerous other environmental justice organizations working in in these communities to make sure that they were able to provide outreach prior to the launch of the program. When the program was launched, doing more outreach and using social media and other platforms to get that information out. And we're seeing tremendous use of the program. So I think, what started with AB 617 is having a much broader impact on the way that we're doing this work. And so just wanted to share those things as well. Thanks.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you, Ryan. I'll turn to Kevin. And Veronica, your hand is still raised. Did you have additional things to add?

**Veronica Eady, BAAQMD:** No, I'm sorry.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Okay, thanks. Kevin, the floor is yours.

**Kevin Hamilton, CCAC:** Sure. Thank you. Kevin Hamilton, again. Central California Asthma Collaborative. CCAC for short to keep it simple. Coming back to the goals for today, there, on the sort of agenda here in this first part. In a response to various comments, one comment that the air districts and CARB have have extra responsibilities and mandates, under AB 617. I agree to a certain extent with that. But I don't agree quite as much with regard to the CERPs, and I appreciate the excerpts from the Bill's language being inserted into the document, by the way, that was very cool. Because we should always be thinking of that. Because so much of

what we're doing right now was created by a group that Luis and I were on as part of, and Dr. Balmes, almost 7 years ago now, to try to set this thing up in the best way that we could. And now we're back at it again, using the lessons learned from the last 4 or 5 years, to hopefully, you know, create a new pathway or a better pathway going forward using that. A couple of things specific. I guess I should go in order. With Number One, or excuse me, Number Two. I already commented on one. With Goal Two, "Apply regulatory authorities to reduce exposures" -- just to be clear, in those responsibilities that air districts and agencies had, you got no new authority. So, in fact, there is nothing new that you're required to put on board in your agencies to deal with this particular part of it. The fact is, all these Community Steering Committees are doing is identifying areas within their communities that have, they feel, require more attention under your existing authority. Not new authority. So I think that's important. And you actually don't have any new authority to do anything else. So I think a lot of it comes of enforcement or lack of access, or just not knowing about Incentives that were available that would have helped them mitigate these problems in their community. So I think again, we often think of -- we look at how much money has been invested, how many millions of dollars have come down the road, and how much of that money is actually dropped into those communities. And we're just finally starting to see the leading edge. But I just think it's important to note that, again, this is a partnership, and it's a partnership of equals. And that the community should lead and drive what happens here and point at the places where the problems are, and it's up to the agencies to respond to that. And as we found, quite a few of those are outside the purview of the agencies. In fact, there's a piece of legislation that's moving on into the Senate right now that addresses that. And that should be interesting, should it make it all the way through.

**Kevin Hamilton, CCAC:** In Goal 4 and Goal 3, where we talk about -- well, I do want to say the nondiscrimination laws and protections piece, I think, is pretty reflective of the conversation that we've had. I'll wait for Miss Margaret to give me the final "Yeah, you're right, Kevin" or "No, shut up" and she will. But with regard to CERPs, I think when we're thinking about these CERPs, these CERPs are not finite, and we need to get off of that. Okay, the CERP is a living document. It's an evolving document. Right? It lives on. There is no -- it's been mentioned that CERPs are taking 5 years to complete. I don't know of any community that had a CERP 5 years ago. I was in the first two, and it took us 2 and a half, almost 3 years to get the first CERP completed and approved through the whole process, so we couldn't even start working on it until about 2 and a half years ago. So we really don't know how long it'll take. We know with that one, because there's so many issues. And they're so complex. It's going to be ongoing for years before we see actual completion of that CERP. And what does completion look like, anyway, at that point? I think that's another piece. Is it a new evolution in a rag that maybe wasn't strong enough, and that rag is now evolving? Is it a technological, you know, discovery, or the ability to bring more technology to the table of a different type to solve a problem that was seeming insoluble? I think that that's, you know, we need to do a little bit more work on redefining that particular area a bit.



**Kevin Hamilton, CCAC:** And then, last, but not least. This focus on -- sorry, my bad. There it is. Goal 6. So use of Community Air Grants to build community capacity and local CERPs. I think this -- you know, Luis referred to this and others. I think, again, this needs to move. Right, the way that it is now, we don't have a choice. There isn't another vehicle that I know of. If anybody has one, I'd love to hear about it. So we're really at the will of various governors as they move through, and how the budgeting process works every year. And so we need to figure out a better way to do this. But we need a more efficient way as well. And I come back to not because I'm disrespecting the air districts, angry at air districts, or feel they're not doing, or CARB is not doing a good job. They're just really expensive. That's all. So we need to figure out how to move as much of the administrative side of this work -- especially working with communities, organizing communities, building CSCs, creating these CERPs -- how do we do that in the most efficient and cost-effective way, using scarce dollars?

**Kevin Hamilton, CCAC:** So, you know, a lot of money was pushed initially toward districts to be able to buy monitoring technology. I'll be honest with you, it frustrated me that the districts went and bought the monitoring technology without having a CSC created to even bring somebody in and talk about the different types of monitors that could be purchased, and how they could be used. On the flip side, they learn quickly, and working with us collaboratively, we've together built a PM 2.5 network that spans the entire valley and is complemented by the district's existing -- and CARB's existing, and EPA's existing, oh, that was terrible redundancy -- regulatory networks! And it is a tool that's now being used by many across the region. We're about to add ozone to that again, thanks to these very CAG grants and to EPA's funding. And that's, you know, at the community level, at the neighborhood level, which is what was envisioned in the first place. But again. If we had waited for the air district to buy the kind of equipment it's required to buy, that equipment is just so crazy expensive. It chews up a lot of money. So again, coming back to that efficiency, where do those things lie? Where does that responsibility for that network lie? Now, validating its results lies with the agency. But does the technology itself need to sit there and be operated from there? So that's a little far in the weeds. Sorry. And again, that comes to Goal 7, though imperfectly, which is making not just information, but the tools more accessible to communities, and models that we're testing in community that is actually housing the equipment. And it's inside their homes, in some cases, for other work that we're doing. And they essentially own it, if you will, and decide where it's going to be placed. And it's up to us to account for that. And in how that knowledge is used, how that information is used, and help them understand it. But at any rate. I think we've got a really great draft going here, and I will support its adoption, by the way, of this one. Thanks.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Thank you. Kevin. All really great comments. One thing that struck me that I just want to include, really quickly, is the necessity to understand local land use. So you can create the CERP. But what is happening? How does one navigate the aspects of that plan within? And I guess I'm wearing my vice Mayor hat

these days. Because they, too, can be a barrier in the work being done and concluded, and a lot of the things that are happening in our spaces is kind of outside of some of their expertise. And so how do we help the community, learn how to navigate, or at least create those partnerships with cities and counties to actually get the CERP done and completed.

**John Balmes, CARB:** So thank you, all, for your comments, including Vice Mayor Hurt. I totally support the land use piece and I know what it'd make Miss Margaret happy if we focused on that a little bit more because she brought that up at the very first Consultation Group meeting.

### Overview of Draft Blueprint 2.0 Part Two

**John Balmes, CARB:** So, I think we should move on, though, because we've only talked about Part One, and we've got Part Two. And so, Julia, can you run us through, quickly, your presentation for Part Two? Because I'm sure there'll be comments about that.

**Julia Luongo, CARB:** Can do. Yes, thank you. Okay, let's see. Perfect. So we'll now talk through some of the changes and new guidance in Part Two of Blueprint 2.0 based on what we've learned so far in the Program. Next slide. So our draft guidance is organized into 2 implementation tracks. One path is for currently selected communities which includes 19 CSCs statewide. And the second path is for consistently nominated communities seeking to engage in this program, who will start off by talking about the about proposed guidance for the 19 CSCs. Some of the new draft Blueprint elements that we'll touch on today -- and I think you can advance one more time, there's a little animation there -- so what we'll touch on today for the 19 CSCs are ensuring completion of CERPs. And so we just talked about that. That's one of our goals in Part One of the Blueprint. Delegation of CERP approval to the Executive Office to streamline and allow more flexibility both in that process and for OCAP staff to support other elements of the Program. So this means shifting the staff resources used internally for preparation of Board hearings externally to support and engage with communities in this program. And one of the ways we wish to better support communities is by facilitating more frequent exchange across CSCs. And finally, a program evaluation. So the Community Air Protection Program has rightly attracted much interest from researchers and community partners who want to assess its effectiveness. The program is in need of a comprehensive evaluation aligned with EJ principles and design through an inclusive process. And CARB has secured funding to conduct this evaluation through a third party, and that funding has not come from our limited AB 617 funds.

**Julia Luongo, CARB:** Next slide, please. So what are some of the elements of the Blueprint supporting CERP implementation across the 19 CSCs, of the new proposed Blueprint? So some of the ways that the Draft Blueprint 2.0 supports the 18

communities currently developing or implementing CERPs are through improved guidance on governance, tracking and accountability of CERPs, peer exchange across the program, evaluation of the program, and streamlining the CERP approval process as we just previously spoke on. And we also support the nineteenth community in moving from a CAMP to a CERP and include discussion in Blueprint 2.0 on how to better align CAMPs and CERPs to work together.

**Julia Luongo, CARB:** Next slide, please. So in terms of CSC governance, we learned from the People's Blueprint and through practice in this program what elements contribute to a collaborative process, including community-centered design, skilled facilitation, a co-developed charter and an accessible process. So this draft version of Blueprint 2.0 includes more detailed guidance and new elements to be considered to be included in CSC charters, including eligibility, recruitment and onboarding information, distribution, decision making processes, provisions for dispute resolution, and conflict of interest and disclosure.

**Julia Luongo, CARB:** Next slide, please. We also heard from the People's Blueprint and from communities a few years into CERP implementation as well as today in today's discussion that measuring and tracking the progress of CERPs is vital to transparency and accountability. So while our 2018 Blueprint does include guidance on metrics and tracking, we have updated Blueprint 2.0 to provide more clarity on setting metrics and targets for each individual action in a CERP in hopes of making our reporting both easier to track and easier to understand. We have streamlined annual reporting guidance and tried to make that information more accessible and easily understood. And we have updated our guidance for CERP reporting, that it should continue annually until all CERP actions are complete, again, aligned with our goal in Part One. And we have included guidance on the fifth year Annual Report, meaning the annual report after the CERP has been implemented for 5 years. The 2018 Blueprint included requirements to set CERP targets for the fifth year of implementation. So the fifth year Annual Report is an important checkpoint in the progress towards completion of a CERP.

**Julia Luongo, CARB:** Next slide, please. So that was a quick overview of some of the new things and changes in our implementation track for our 19 CSCs. We'll pause here for discussion, and we'll cover the other track after this discussion, so I will now hand it back to our co-chairs to lead this discussion.

## Discussion of Draft Blueprint 2.0 Part Two

**John Balmes, CARB:** Thank you, Julia. So now the discussion from the Consultation Group is open about Part Two. I know a lot of things came out in Part One that could have been under Part Two, implementation issues. But hopefully, we did present some new information in those slides. And so I think I'll look to the folks online first.

Does anybody want to lead off with comments about Part Two? Part One is the big picture, and Part Two is where the rubber meets the road. To Jesse.

**Jesse Marquez, CFASE:** Again, you know I've gone over Part Two but I still need to read in more detail. But some things that stood out for me are also things that – remember, a lot of us organizations, communities, we were not born and raised in the air monitoring world. We've had to learn over the last few years, and it's always an involved learning process. But now I've learned a couple of new things that I'm now digging into, so that I can share it with a little bit more clarity and details in that. When we're getting information like, for example, we have the fence line monitoring. And I'm registered in the South Coast with all of the oil refinery online reporting alerts, as well as the Rule 1180 alerts. And some of these things take, you know, not a few months, but a few years to grasp -- you know what you're actually looking at and meeting, trying to understand. But what I have now begun to understand and learn is that using the fence line monitoring as an example, that it's important for the communities to also -- know the manufacturer of that air, emissions monitoring equipment as well as software. Because what I'm learning is that different software programs influence, or are designed, to present more accurate information. And so, if we're talking about 3 or 4 different manufacturers of open path type instruments, and each one's using a different software program, then it's important for us communities to understand which are the better instruments, you know, so to speak. And what is the best software. Because now that I'm beginning to share some of the recording that I'm seeing in real time on the website. Different refineries and different locations have set different types of limits. So one might be, say, 25 parts per 1 million per billion, and the other one is 100 parts per 1 million per billion. And it's the same chemical being monitored and ever refinery. So now I'm beginning to have questions saying, "Okay, then why does one refinery have a lower detection limit than another?" So I still need to learn information about that. I'm also learning that some of these instruments, can go down to parts per 1 billion versus parts per 1 million, and some of them, I think I can't even approach the parts per trillion. But that's another future thing coming down the line. But then, when we're talking about those limits, knowing what instrument manufacturer they purchase from, and the exact model and the configuration of that model on how it's been set up, and the limits that have been inputted for that particular chemical. That's something more that we need to learn about. I also, as I began to explore a little bit on the software programs that the different open path use. It appears that some are always having problems, you know, false positive meetings. And it's happened too often and too many times in a month by different manufacturers, instruments. And we have asked to get some type of report to know. Why? Why is this? What's causing this, you know. Why are we having these? Positive-negative path, false positive, and all that? But I don't quite understand. I'm sure all my residents and neighbors and friends don't quite understand also, but that needs to be clarified. We need to have a better understanding about why they are malfunctioning or why there are problems.

**Jesse Marquez, CFASE:** I did learn from, you know, one example which was the Torrance oil refinery where there was an engineering firm involved in doing some fence-line monitoring there with the equipment. And then that one day, I received an alert. I can't remember exactly which chemical, but I'll just say benzene had exceeded the limit, and that's why I received the notice. And then afterwards, I got another notice, saying that to cancel that, that it proved out that there was, you know, a false reading. And then I attended the meeting of the Torrance City Hall, you know, with AQMD and other participants in there. And what was told to us that the reason there was an error that occurred was that there was an intake plastic hose that's connected to the instrument that basically sucks in the air into the instrument, and that tubing – that hose -- was contaminated. Now that that raised a big red flag to me while I was in the room because of two things. Number one. Here was a contractor working with the refinery and its staff. And that tells me they did not do a calibration on site. And typically when we're talking about these high instruments, you do have to calibrate it for that site location, and for all the parameters it'll be exposed to. So that means that they did not calibrate the instrument. And so how did they get away with doing that? Well, they got caught. So that was one bad thing that happened there with that consultant engineering firm, and with the refinery and with those instruments. The second thing that occurred to me was that you purchase instruments, and everyone purchased instruments all the time. You know we're talking about more specialized professional air monitoring equipment. When the manufacturer sells it to you, and you purchase it, and they deliver it, they certify that it was tested at their facility and calibrated. Well. The fact that it was contaminated, and it did not work properly tells me that that manufacturer lied on their certification and a calibration. So now this is another area that we, as community organizations and CSCs, you know, we are getting a little bit more professional in our understanding. And again, it's also a compliment to the AQMD and the ARBs. Those teams that do air monitors are always telling us about the complexity of what's happening. Well, now, here we are. I'm 23 years into this, with the EJ end of it, and I'm still learning little details. And now I need to share with other CSC members as well as all this this advisory committee. Now we need to upgrade what we're looking at, and the information that's being provided to it to us, and then investigating when there are things not working properly.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Jesse, I think you're bringing up a good point. Several points. I think you're not the only member of a CSC who has brought up the issue of technical support so that the Community Steering Committee members can better understand the complexities of monitoring when, especially with low-cost sensors. And so I think you've highlighted a bigger issue than the specifics that you're talking about that. you know, providing adequate technical support for CSC members who are not professional air quality monitoring experts is an important one. And then, I think, sharing across CSCs, which is one of the points for discussion that Julia put up. You mentioned that, and you know, I think perhaps Kevin and Luis – Luis had to leave -- have experience with monitoring equipment that may have helped you in that regard. But I'd like to move on to other people with their hands up. I think Kevin is next.

**Kevin Hamilton, CCAC:** Okay. Sorry I had to stand up there for a minute. That 3 hour drive. And I'm just sitting. Yeah. So with regard to the first comments on Part Two, I want to say focus, first, in specific areas. Number One is BACT and BARCT. So the bill charged the air agency -- and again, most of what is, or what agency is leading 617 is CARB. CARB is the responsible agency for pretty much everything in 617. It gives some of that responsibility or mandates some of those actions from air district boards. I have the whole bill open. Because the only problem with taking sections out of context is they can lose their total meaning if you don't have all the language in front of you that connects them on both ends. But that direction to local air districts, to provide local air monitoring information is really a critical piece, and I think is the most difficult piece to accomplish and the most expensive, and where we focused a lot of our efforts. That that work is driven, or is now being driven, for the most part by community steering committees, which is great. However, once you find a problem, quite often, that problem is a legally permitted entity. And the way the permitting system works, as we know, is the air districts have decided, in the case of a stationary source, that the control technology that entity is using meets a certain standard, or did meet it at the time of the permitting, called best available control technology, and occasionally for companies that are updating their facilities or extending them, they now may have to update it and go to the best available retrofit control technology. Big terms, meaning they have to fix their stuff and make it newer so it pollutes less. Part of what this bill brought to the table was identifying the fact that different air districts, choose different pieces of technology and make different arguments for why they do that. So it may be the best in LA, but it's not the best in the Valley, supposedly, so we can use a lesser one there because of circumstances, or vice versa. So the idea here was CARB would create this, this big inventory of all of this equipment and with costs associated with it and the facilities that are permitted. So we would know in those communities, if there is somebody doing, creating some kind of industrial process, leading it, what equipment is there? What kind of permits does it have, which of those permits are to emit? And there is not the best available control technology being used to minimize or completely eliminate those emissions. That work, to my knowledge, is not completed yet.

**Kevin Hamilton, CCAC:** And how we use that to change the culture of awarding permits to people saying, "Well, you know, that technology is too expensive for your business. So you're going to have to go ahead and pollute. By the way, you're going to have to pay for the pollution that you produce. And we're going to use that to support another entity like yours, who wants to spend money to reduce pollution. But it may not be in the community where that pollution is being created." So in the San Joaquin, for instance, there's examples of pollution being created by a certain industry, that I shall not name, that have permits, but the funding for those permits is then being spent 200 miles away on equipment in those communities. Which is great for them, but not for the community where the emissions originally occurred. because that pollution, of course, is not shared at that point, and the effects or the exposures related to that. So we have a lot of work to do there, and I don't see that well

illustrated in this. Yet again, I like to see milestones and timelines for things. When I write a grant and send it to CARB, I have to give you that. Now, it doesn't mean I'll always meet it. If I don't, then I have to write about why I didn't. So in that particular area, I think there's a lot more work to do, so I'll stick to that one for right now and move on. Let somebody else have a chance.

**John Balmes, CARB:** So I see a couple of hands raised online. The two Christines have been waiting in a while here in person. So I'm going to go to Christine Zimmerman first.

**Christine Zimmerman, WSPA:** Alright, thank you. Thank you very much, Dr. Balmes. An impression I have, an observation and a question, I guess. It's really exciting to me that the Community Air Grant protection funded L-CERP model is a pathway for these 65 track two communities. But I really do want to learn more about them. They're in the air basin where I work. And I'm very excited to learn more about them and understand how they're going to work in practice. And further, how air districts and how non-community stakeholders in the regulated community engage in that process. It seems like there's an opportunity to build that discussion out in the document, and maybe have some workshop, a meeting, some additional discussion around, functionally, what that looks like in the in the Valley, and the other air basins as well.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Thanks, Christine. I think you're at least the second person that's mentioned they'd like to know more about that. So, I endorse that as well. So, Christine. CCEEB. Christine Wolfe.

**Christine Wolfe, CCEEB:** Thank you. Yes, Christine Wolfe from CCEEB. Thank you. So on one of the items that was mentioned on this portion of the presentation around delegating the approval of the CERPs to the executive officer. I haven't fully landed on an opinion about that, but I have some concerns that it seems like the Board has the authority and the obligation to be responsible for the 617 program. And I guess I have some concerns about the CERPs not going through that full approval process with the Board. particularly if we're moving towards a model where measures from CERPs are going to be elevated as potential examples of statewide models, where something that happens in one community is something that's uplifted as something that could also happen in other communities. I think it's important for the Board to be aware of that. I'm sure that the staff plans on updating the Board on that. But anyway, I haven't landed on a complete opinion about that yet. But it was something that gave me pause when that was first raised.

**John Balmes, CARB:** I would just say, Christine, that it's given everybody some pause. You know the Board, and I think I'm speaking for my colleagues as well as myself, you know we like to be on top of things that are -- especially those that are important. But we also want to see efficiency in the process. So I think, in my view, we gave up a little bit of oversight with the -- for the goal of efficiency in the process. But

then we're supposed to get updates. So I'm glad you brought that up, because good to hear somebody else aside from Board members, you know, comment on that. So I see that both Dave Edwards and Mike Kleinman have their hands up. Since Dave had a chance to at least say a few words earlier. I'm going to go to my longtime colleague, Mike Kleinman, next. Fellow academic.

**Michael Kleinman, Scientific Review Panel/UCI:** Mike Kleinman, UC Irvine and the Scientific Review Panel. I just wanted to say, I certainly -

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Dr. Kleinman, I was wondering if you could speak a little bit more closely to your mic. Having trouble hearing you. Thank you.

**Michael Kleinman, Scientific Review Panel/UCI:** Is this better?

**John Balmes, CARB:** Slightly, Mike.

**Michael Kleinman, Scientific Review Panel/UCI:** How about this?

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Much better. Thank you.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Very good.

**Michael Kleinman, Scientific Review Panel/UCI:** So much the earphone. Anyway. I do endorse, you know, the efforts that have been put forward to produce this document. I think it's moving in the right direction. I think, one of the aspects that I'm a little disappointed in, is that although we know that the rationale for AB 617 and developing these community mitigation methods is to ultimately improve community health. Those words aren't showing up in in the document, even as an aspiration we hold. And I think it would be, I'd really like to see something in there indicating that there will be steps eventually to evaluate the effectiveness on these steps taken to improve the health of the community. We've talked about this before, and I know it's, you know. This is a very expensive sort of thing, difficult sort of thing, but there should be some way of benchmarking where we are. I think Jesse got at this issue also. We need to know where we began. And, are we really doing good? And if we are doing good, which are the most effective methods of mitigating?

**John Balmes, CARB:** Thanks, Mike. And I just would say that CARB's research division has funded one study or to come up with metrics to evaluate AB 617 CERPs. So you know, hopefully that research content will produce some indicators that can be applied sort of across the board. But I think you, as a fellow public health practitioner and scientist, I agree with you that that it should be an aspirational goal, even if we can't actually do it with the current funding because that would help us, maybe get future funding to look at the health impacts of our AB 617 implementation. So, Dave Edwards, you're next up. Speaking of health, public health practitioner.



**Dave Edwards, OEHHA:** Thanks. Dr. Balmes. See, I guess my comments are a little bit sort of around the bigger goals of transparency, and sort of making sure that the messaging is clear across the different communities that already do have CERPs. I guess, just sort of if there's, if there would be a good way -- and I think there might be a web page, but I'm not sure if it's broken out this way -- of kind of looking at how different agencies are in the different measures that are being called out. Just kind of focusing a little bit on OEHHA specifically, I think we have either a support measure, or at least a message to help support another agency or coordinate with another agency in 4 communities out of the 19, but not the other 15. So I guess, just to kind of, to be able to have a method, or a way to share across the different steering committees, or at least across, maybe, agencies of ways to encourage engagement and the ability to, if there's if there's a measure that's of interest to another steering committee that can get added in. And then also, just sort of on the transparency and data availability. Just one thing that we've been doing with CalEnviroScreen is we just had our tenth anniversary and put out a story map. But we've also been putting out a dashboard. Some really user user-friendly ways to look at different some trainings on how to use CalEnviroScreen and so forth. And just something to think about that. Maybe there'd be an -- once again, we could talk about this -- about ways to elevate this, sort of a model for how, if there are questions about technical support or data -- that there could be a response to this there. So I think that's it.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Well, Dave, you know, I'm a long time supporter of not siloing our work, and I think OEHHA is even mentioned in the bill.

**Dave Edwards, OEHHA:** Oh, yeah, yeah, it is.

**John Balmes, CARB:** And I remember your boss Dr. Zeiss, actually, you know, contacted me a couple of years ago about OEHHA's role with regard to implementing AB 617. So yes, I totally welcome your call for, you know, integration across State agencies that have, you know, somewhat overlapping responsibility. And certainly, CalEnviroScreen is an important tool.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Deldi has just raised her hand.

### Final Public Comments

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** I just wanted to acknowledge we have a couple of public commenters, and last time we ran out of time for them. So I actually would like to hear from our public commenters and then quickly pivot to Julia so that we can cover the rest.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Thank you, Deldi, that's music to my ears. I was just going to make a similar suggestion. So I don't know who's --

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** We have, let's go with Ashley Werner first, and then we have Richard Grow.

**Liliana Nunez, CARB:** Ashley, I've unmuted you.

**Ashley Werner, Public Commenter:** Okay, Hi! You can, can you hear me now?

**John Balmes, CARB:** Yes, we can.

**Ashley Werner, Public Commenter:** Great. Hi, thanks everyone. My name is Ashley Werner. I work with Leadership Council for Justice and Accountability, and I just want to start by apologizing. I'm here covering for my colleague Mariella, who is way more informed than me about this. So I'm gonna do my best to just relay the high-level comments that she shared with me. And hopefully I do so clearly. So just, I think, four bucket areas. I just wanted to raise a couple that other speakers have touched on. So just want to affirm them. One is that, like others, we would like to see more detail, specifically what a local CERP means. We want to make sure that if we do go that route, it doesn't dilute the responsibilities of local or regional air districts and CARB, as the entities that really have many of the authorities and resources that are needed for implementation and to achieve the goals envision by 617. So that was one comment. Another also is just raising the flag about any limitation in CARB's role in the CERP approval process. in our experience as an organization. CARB and State agencies generally have just been really critical when it comes to ensuring that local planning processes, that local agencies work on, really do everything that they can to improve conditions for disadvantaged communities who have been, you know, often left out of decision-making processes. So we would really encourage CARB to continue to play a strong supportive role in the approval process and making sure that CERPs really getting into the detail, do are going to be effective in achieving their goals.

**Ashley Werner, Public Commenter:** Two other comments, one is about CERP content. So we just wanted to note I think we've mentioned this in a comment letter we submitted. One issue we see with a lot of CERPs is that they'll include a lot of programs that are essentially reciting existing programs or actions that local air districts are undertaking. And so our view is that those actions aren't really, you know, they're not really achieving the goal of 617 because we wouldn't really need 617 if it was just to say that air districts will continue to do what has already been done. And so we see the meat and the really important part of CERPs, being those new programs which are additive, which are different and which are really going to help us tackle the issues that existing programs haven't addressed. So we would love to see some explicit guidance clarifying that really the core and bulk of the CERP should be additive programs. And it should be clear how they're different than existing programs. And then, just finally, we have noticed an issue with annual reports that often, they'll be pretty high-level, they'll state actions that air districts might have

taken over a series of years, but not necessarily provide a lot of specifics about actions taken to implement specific programs in the CERP over the calendar year that the annual report is for. So it does sound like a really positive step that the Blueprint draft 2.0 does include some additional guidance about details for those annual reports. But definitely, that's a point that we wanted to mention and suggest that CARB really take a proactive role and the guidance provide for – CARB taking a proactive role -- to just make sure that annual reports, it gets that the content and is really achieving the purpose of the statute's requirement for those reports which is to both ensure transparency and help support collective efforts to ensure implementation takes place on time. So those are my comments. Thanks.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Thanks, Ashley. I think you did a good job covering for your colleague. So, Richard Grow?

**Richard Grow, Public Commenter:** Oh, hi! I just got unmuted. Thank you for a chance to comment here. And for those of you who don't know me, I retired from EPA about 4 years ago, after several decades, focused on air, civil rights and environmental justice and going back through that time. But since then, I've continued to work with local communities and tribes as far as equity and environmental justice issues. My comments have to do with the civil rights and the equity lens piece, which I have to say, and it also has to do with the fact that I worked with the writing -- the People's Blueprint Writing Committee -- when that was being pulled together. It's really exciting to see what's in the current drafts here on civil rights and the equity lens, because they really interact with each other, but I'll be providing some written comments later. But it still needs some further additions to it.

**Richard Grow, Public Commenter:** And it goes to what shows up in Part One, I think, in the priority actions. I'd like to see some additions there, but also goes to the implementation piece. And it has to do with -- and some of us had this discussion before -- Title 6 and Section 135 on Civil Rights remain fairly confusing to an awful lot of folks within the agencies and also out in the advocacy community, and part of that has to do with my former agency, U.S. EPA, really falling down on the job for the last several decades, doing better the last two years. But as far as explaining what the those requirements mean to environmental agencies, doing better now, but at a practical level, I think what we need in this forum, the Consultation Group, and with the participating communities, we need to start talking and discussing what this stuff means in practical terms, compliance with civil rights and Section 135, and part of where I'm coming from is having sat through, for years, discussions led by attorneys on this. And frankly, they typically make it much more complicated that it needs to be. These discussions need to be really managed and structured well. Part of where I'm coming from is, I say -- not as an attorney, for one thing, I'm not one -- but as a practitioner who's practiced within the Federal Government, practiced with the advocates, helping them getting their civil rights needs met. So I think there's a simple way to go about this. I think the seeds for this could be laid with a fairly not extensive discussion here at the Consultation Group level. And see where that goes

from there. Part of what makes this not all that complex. For one thing, I think compliance with Title 6 and Civil Rights is extremely simple conceptually, and in practice, once we talk about it, some.

**Richard Grow, Public Commenter:** Also, your equity lens is pretty exciting, and it goes a long ways towards getting us past the civil rights compliance requirements. So hoping we can get those discussions going. I'll have some to suggestions that go to the priority actions in Part One and then actually go to the implementation stuff in Part Two. Because frankly, Part Two is excellent discussion, very comprehensive, but it's still sort of in a reactive mode -- how to deal with complaints -- and I think we all share the goal of, let's all be on a proactive path here of doing practices that don't lead anybody to having to file complaints, and that sort of thing. So just the thoughts. Let's start talking. I'd be interested in working with whoever wants to help develop those discussions. Deldi and I have those in one form or another, on an off. But let's start to put them together if we can. That's my whole comment. Thank you.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Thank you, Richard. So I'm going to turn to Deldi. Here we have 6 minutes left. I know there were some slides about, you know, going forward, I think.

### Closing Remarks

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Yes, I think the best way to make use of our remaining 6 minutes is to talk about the immediate next steps for this entire process.

**John Balmes, CARB:** I think so. I agree. So sorry, Julia.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Yeah, Julia, I'm sorry that we are short-changing you a little bit. Julia is amazing, and has been doing so much work to move this forward.

**John Balmes, CARB:** I think we need to have a discussion about, you know the two pathways.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** So I was going to recap. I was going to recap. So Part Two is focused on 2 tracks, our 19 communities and our 65 plus communities. We have another meeting of the consultation group, and it is set for July 26<sup>th</sup>. And folks, it is an in-person meeting, so we want everyone to come and feel welcome so that we can continue the conversation. However, we also have our broader public engagement approach, and for that I'm going to ask Melinda to help wrap us up with reminding everyone the dates and times of our public workshops that are happening in July.

**Malinda Dumisani, CARB:** Certainly the dates for the public 2.0 Blueprint workshops are July 7<sup>th</sup> from 4 to 7 PM. They're online. The next workshop is July 11<sup>th</sup> from 4 to 7 again online. And the third and final workshop will be July the 18<sup>th</sup> from 4 to 7, and

that will be a Spanish led workshop, meaning it will be led in Spanish. The other two workshops will be led in English. We will have simultaneous translation at all the public workshops. Thank you.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Thank you, Malinda. So of course, we encourage you in your role as Consultation Group members to help us spread the word about those workshops. Certainly through your own networks. And then, as we said, when we reconvene at for this group, we will also then be able to reflect back to you, what we have heard at some of those public workshops to better inform the discussion. And when we start that discussion, we will actually start it with where we left off today, to really focus on those 65 plus communities. I will say that in the writing of the draft, we all agreed that we needed to just stop talking in general terms about all the other communities that are eligible for the program, and we actually needed to name them and show them on the map, to help bring attention to them. And that is part of our effort of -- and our shorthand is, we're calling those the 65 plus places. And I think, I hope that that is where we can start the conversation next time.

**John Balmes, CARB:** So Deldi, I didn't hear anybody complain about the approach. They just wanted more details, so that I thought that was a real positive. So thank you for trying to, you know, move us forward and directly thinking about how we reach out to those 65 plus communities and help them.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Well, I think someone said it well when they said this is an organic process that's growing and evolving, and we've come a long way from where we first started. I see we have slide 32 – should we open it up for public comments, open public comments in the remaining few minutes to see if there are any?

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** I am not seeing any hands up. But certainly for anyone who has not commented, you are more than welcome.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** Yeah. And I would just suggest to all the Consultation Group members, if through further reading and examination, things come to your mind that you weren't able to say here, please send it in writing to us so we can collect all those thoughts. Because it seems like there's never enough time to talk about all these great things. We can include it later, as we continue to look at the Staff and tighten it for finality. Okay, so I don't see any hands raised on my side here, so I guess we'll turn it over to Liliana to close out the meeting.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Well, just one last comment. I just want to thank everyone. I thought that discussion was really good today. You know, both from in-person folks and the online participants. And remember, we need everybody to be here in person on July 26<sup>th</sup>.

**Deldi Reyes, CARB:** Please.

**Liliana Nunez, CARB:** Well, thanks everyone for joining. It feels weird to for me to close out the meeting.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** That's what it says.

**John Balmes, CARB:** Just following orders.

**Liliana Nunez, CARB:** Yeah, maybe I wrote that on purpose. Consultation Group members can always, you know, we're certainly looking for your comments and feedback. If you need to get in contact with CARB staff that are working on this, you know where to reach me, and that'll help you reach them. So thank you, everyone. I'll see you on July 26<sup>th</sup>.

**Davina Hurt, CARB:** So I will say, meeting adjourned. Thank you, everyone.