



COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2

Meeting Summary

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

MEETING SUMMARY PURPOSE

This document provides a summary of California Air Resources Board's (CARB) Community Engagement Model-Community Expert Meeting held on November 14, 2023. This summary is an accompaniment to the presentation slide deck and meeting recordings, both available for review on the [CARB Community Engagement Model website](#) along with other meeting materials.

ATTENDANCE

This meeting was attended by all 19 Community Experts (Experts) in addition CARB Community Engagement Capacity Building (CECB) Workgroup Staff and facilitation staff:

- Community Experts
 - Gustavo Aguirre Jr.
 - Jasmine Elisa Beltran
 - Leonora Camner
 - Ambrose Carroll
 - Alec Castellano
 - Carolina Correa
 - Lisa Flores
 - Richard Falcon
 - Lillian Garcia
 - Catalina Gonzalez
 - Elena Hernandez
 - Anetha Lue, P.E.
 - Emily McCague
 - Maria Ridoutt Orozco
 - Violeta Sandoval
 - Vanessa Suarez
 - Ciara Thrower
 - Esperanza Vielma
 - Heather Zappia
 - *More information about each of the Experts is available on CARB's Community Engagement Model website [here](#).*
- CARB Community Engagement Capacity Building (CECB) Staff
 - Antonio Amaro
 - Samantha Aguila
 - Karina Aguilera
 - Amanda Anderson
 - Jonathan Bluffer
 - Pablo Cicero-Fernandez
 - Aldo Chaney
 - Lisa Chiladakis
 - La'Shaye Cobley, Ph.D.
 - Jose Lopez
 - Gretchen Ratliff
 - Victoria Villa
 - Joyce Wong
 - Deidre Zoll
- Facilitation Staff
 - Julia Csernansky, Lead Facilitator, California State University Sacramento (CSUS)



COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2

Meeting Summary

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

MEETING PROCEDURES

The meeting procedures were designed by CARB in advance and in response to Expert feedback from the first meeting to encourage active participation and engagement among Experts through various interactive platforms, including hand raising, chat interactions, Jamboard, group discussion, and small breakout group discussions. The overarching aim was to establish a collaborative and inclusive environment that allowed Experts to make meaningful contributions to the development of the Community Engagement Model (Model). These sessions are conducted via Zoom in the evening to accommodate diverse schedules, prioritize inclusivity, and ensure that all voices could be heard. Ahead of each Zoom meeting, Experts were provided with comprehensive materials and follow-up surveys, offering them the opportunity to review and provide written feedback.

During the Zoom meeting, the feedback process focused on large group and small group discussions to provide Experts the opportunity to get to know each other in a more focused small group and hear from all Experts in the larger group discussions. The discussions included the utilization of the Jamboard, an interactive digital whiteboard designed to facilitate collaboration among users, allowing them to brainstorm, share ideas, and work together in real-time via a virtual canvas where they can add digital sticky notes, images, text, and drawings.

It is crucial to emphasize that CARB is committed not only to considering Expert's comments but also meticulously recording, responding to, and indicating whether every comment received has been incorporated into the revised Model. In cases where a comment is not integrated into the Model, CARB will provide transparent explanations for their decisions. A written record of CARB's decisions and action items in response to comments from this meeting can be found at the end of this summary in the section "CARB Decisions and Action Items."

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting began with a warm welcome from the Facilitator, Julia Csernansky, and gratitude for the Experts' presence. This was the second Community Expert Meeting for CARB's Community Engagement Model.

Instructions for using the Zoom language interpretation function were explained, and participants were guided on choosing between English and Spanish channels to accommodate all Expert's preferred languages.

Ms. Csernansky reviewed the meeting agenda, which covered various topics, including Model content, breakout group discussions, breakout group report backs, community dialogue sessions, a discussion of stipends, childcare and food, and an overview of evaluation form feedback from the first meeting. The focus then turned to a few housekeeping items and updates related to the Experts contracts.

Karina Aguilera, CARB staff, provided a brief contract update as it related to contract tasks. She urged Experts to finalize Task Two—submitting written comments and a summary of the initial draft of the Model to their respective contract managers by Friday, November 17. Task Three, the current second virtual meeting, was underscored as an opportunity for in-depth deliberation on the first draft's merits and areas for enhancement. Ms. Aguilera also preemptively addressed the temporal gap between Task Three and Task Four, scheduled for 2024, reassuring the Experts that no immediate submissions would be required during this interim period.

Ms. Aguilera highlighted a notable procedural adjustment in the revised invoice process. Contract managers would now assume responsibility for drafting the invoices, streamlining the workflow. Ms. Aguilera outlined the revised approach: contract managers would compose the

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2**Meeting Summary**

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

invoices, share them with the respective Experts for approval or edits via email, and subsequently send the revised versions for final approval. Recognizing the potential for confusion in this new process, she encouraged experts to pose questions in the chat, assuring them of post-meeting support for any lingering concerns.

Following Ms. Aguilera's updates, Ms. Csernansky shared the updated meeting principles. These principles were enhanced by Expert's feedback during the first meeting to include being efficient, keeping language in conversation real but not being offended by other's views, allowing people to agree to disagree, and make space/take space. She thanked CEs for their feedback and highlighted that these core principles will be integral to all future Expert meetings, reflecting a shared commitment to fostering an inclusive and constructive environment.

As a final item, Ms. Csernansky addressed the time allocation for the meeting, recognizing the dual nature of three hours as both long and short. Acknowledging concerns about whether the allotted time would be sufficient, CARB staff expressed a willingness to extend support beyond the meeting. CARB staff offered the option for individual follow-up calls to discuss topics further offline. Additionally, Ms. Csernansky mentioned a forthcoming survey at the end of the meeting, seeking feedback about the possibility of extending future meetings by 30 minutes. This proactive approach aimed to accommodate the diverse needs and preferences of the Experts.

MODEL CONTENT

Ms. Csernansky began the discussion of the Model content and acknowledged Experts for suggesting a group discussion on what to include or exclude from the Model. She introduced the mechanics of using Jamboard, which allowed Experts to contribute their thoughts visually, and guided them through the Jamboard platform to ensure ease of use.

To guide discussion, Ms. Csernansky shared CARB's two outlined goals for the Model: developing an agencywide Model and training to help staff engage and collaborate with diverse communities to implement CARB actions and programs. The Experts were then asked to share their responses to two questions verbally or on the Jamboard:

1. What must be in the Model?
2. What should not be in the Model?

One Expert suggested including a plan to shift from a "customer-oriented to a community-oriented approach" in community engagement. Additionally, they emphasized the importance of incorporating fair and representative democratic processes, such as statistically valid polling and democratic lotteries, to ensure broad and unbiased participation. They noted addressing toxic behavior and harassment in community engagement as a crucial inclusion to the Model.

In response to the question of what to avoid in the Model, one Community Expert recommended excluding discretionary decision-making to ensure fairness and prevent perceptions of bias. Another suggested excluding practices that inadvertently exclude or marginalize certain groups, emphasizing the need to move beyond tokenistic diversity efforts. Experts also touched on the importance of active listening and empathy in community engagement, expressing concerns about meetings where active listening was lacking, hindering the integration of community feedback into projects.

Other Experts provided important insights in the Jamboard. Please see below for a summary of the main themes and feedback provided in the Jamboard in response to the two questions posed to Experts:

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2

Meeting Summary

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

What must be in the Model:

- **Equitable Listening:** Experts emphasized the Model needs to guide staff in listening to all stakeholders without bias. The Model should prioritize equitable listening, accommodating cultural, language, and other differences to ensure fair and inclusive community engagement practices.
- **Cultural Competence:** The Model should promote cultural competence, urging staff to understand and respect the cultural nuances and values of the community. This involves employing culturally appropriate communication strategies to foster trust and inclusivity.
- **Community Empowerment:** The Model should focus on empowering community members by providing them with information and resources to make informed decisions. It should serve as a transparent resource, fostering clarity about CARB processes and facilitating community participation.
- **Community Self-Determination:** Upholding community self-determination as a core principle, the Model should recognize communities as stakeholders and rights-holders in decision-making processes. This emphasizes the importance of involving communities in shaping their own destinies.
- **Undocumented Residents Inclusion:** The Model should acknowledge and include undocumented residents and communities as stakeholders and rights-holders. It should provide examples demonstrating how to achieve equity in engaging these communities.
- **Use of Community Stories:** Community stories were highlighted as a powerful tool for sharing data. The Model should encourage the collection of data-driven stories, visualizing data alongside narratives, and creating dedicated platforms for ongoing community engagement.
- **Inclusivity and Diversity:** The Model should ensure representation from all segments of the community, including marginalized groups. Efforts should be directed towards including diverse voices, perspectives, and experiences, fostering a rich and inclusive community dialogue.
- **Clear and Collaborative Charter Development:** A clear charter for group coordination is essential for community engagement. The Model should encourage the collaborative development of charters with group members to avoid top-down charter development and to ensure transparency and effective coordination of activities.
- **Addressing Abuse and Harassment:** The Model should include a robust plan to address toxic behavior and harassment during community engagement. This is crucial for fostering a safe and respectful environment for all participants.
- **Transportation Access Consideration:** Beyond engagement activities, the Model should prioritize transportation access. Ideally, engagements should be accessible by public transit, ensuring broader community participation.
- **Faith Community Engagement:** Active engagement with faith communities is paramount. The Model should recognize and involve faith communities, acknowledging their significance in the community landscape.
- **Continuous Follow-Up:** The Model should advocate for continuous follow-up after every interaction with communities. This involves both in-person and online engagements, ensuring sustained community involvement and effective feedback mechanisms.
- **Conflict Resolution Skills:** The Model should provide guidance on addressing conflicts respectfully and effectively.
- **Training and Preparation:** The Model should stress the importance of adequately preparing and training outreach teams to respond to opposition or volatile situations.
- **Sufficient Elaboration in Action Summaries:** The Model should provide sufficient elaboration in action summaries.
- **Recognize Community Differences:** The Model should emphasize the importance of recognizing and respecting the unique characteristics of each community to avoid assuming all communities are similar.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2**Meeting Summary**

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

What should not be in the Model:

- **Over-Surveying and Lengthy Meetings:** The Model should discourage excessive surveys and prolonged meeting durations over two hours.
- **Avoiding Acronym Confusion:** The Model should steer clear of speaking in acronyms without providing definitions or explanations. Avoiding over-technical processes and proceedings ensures accessible communication with all stakeholders.
- **Non-Iterative Approach:** Emphasizing that the Model should not be an iterative document is crucial. The Model should provide clarity on its purpose and structure to avoid misunderstandings.
- **Action Processes "Lower" than Collaboration:** Completing CARB actions through engagement processes considered "lower" than collaboration should be avoided. The Model should encourage collaborative approaches for impactful community engagement.
- **Discretionary Decision-Making:** Discretionary decision-making should be avoided in the Model. The emphasis should be on systematic and fair processes, minimizing opportunities for bias and unfair practices.
- **Unclear Communication:** The Model should discourage the use of unclear language, jargon, technical terms, and acronyms. Clear and accessible communication is essential for meaningful engagement.
- **Exclusion of Diverse Perspectives:** The Model should actively avoid the exclusion of diverse perspectives. It should promote inclusive practices, moving beyond tokenizing diversity efforts and incorporating diverse perspectives into systems and processes.
- **Pitfalls to Avoid - Lack of Flexibility and Accountability:** Pitfalls include a lack of flexibility and accountability in outreach and engagement resources. The Model should underscore the need to adjust resources based on the unique needs and opportunities for each engagement, while also demonstrating accountability and results.
- **Tokenizing Practices:** The Model should actively discourage tokenizing practices of diversity and asking communities to rubber stamp pre-baked plans and ideas. It should authentically incorporate diversity into systems and processes, ensuring genuine representation and inclusivity.

The Jamboard responses in their entirety may be viewed here:

https://jamboard.google.com/d/1NV7-GDuRd2EU4X6GTtoDJOkUEchfdJ-4KQsbHnJaD_IM/viewer?f=0&pli=1

MODEL FEEDBACK – BREAKOUT GROUPS

Experts were divided into four groups to engage in a small group discussion to provide feedback via Jamboard on all four sections of the Model: Narrative, Plan, Implement, and Close. CARB provided discussion questions for each of the four Model sections to facilitate feedback and conversation. Please see below for a summary of the main themes and feedback provided in the Jamboard and verbally in response to the questions posed to Experts.

NARRATIVE – BREAKOUT GROUPS FEEDBACK**Question 1: What's missing from the Narrative?**

- Group 1 Experts highlighted key elements missing from the Narrative, emphasizing the need for historical context, particularly related to environmental justice (EJ) communities. The discussion included a focus on the historical impact of redlining in various California cities and the influence of immigration patterns on EJ communities. There was a specific concern raised about the delay in acknowledging or addressing community comments and a suggestion to incorporate a sense of urgency and timing into the narrative. Additionally, Experts stressed the importance of establishing two-way communication mechanisms and ensuring accessibility for all community members, considering factors like language and literacy.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2**Meeting Summary**

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

- Group 2 Experts suggested more straightforward and clear language in the Narrative. They emphasized the importance of calling sections by their plain meaning names and questioned the coherence of the term "Narrative" itself. Furthermore, Experts emphasized the need for cultural competency in the Narrative, particularly in the context of Tribal engagement, addressing urban tribal groups that may not be officially recognized.
- Group 3 Experts recommended incorporating a timeline of CARB's evolution, acknowledging the past and illustrating the agency's journey. They highlighted the importance of showcasing CARB's accomplishments and their positive impact on communities and the state. This historical perspective was seen as essential for building understanding and context within the Narrative.
- Group 4 Experts emphasized the historical background of California's origin as part of Mexico and the history of Mexican Americans in the state. Community distrust of the government was identified as a crucial element to address, with a focus on how CARB is working to overcome such distrust through the proposed Model. The discussion also touched on the importance of trust-building and the need for historical acknowledgment of harms caused by CARB. Key principles recommended for inclusion in the Narrative were community self-determination, honesty, impartiality, dignity, consideration, integrity, and service. Overall, there was a consensus on the significance of acknowledging historical context, fostering trust, and promoting community engagement principles.

Question 2. What would you add to the key principles of community engagement?

- Group 1 Experts emphasized the importance of considering factors such as accessibility, user-friendliness, scalability, and data security when choosing tools and programs. Ensuring alignment with community preferences and needs for an inclusive engagement experience was highlighted. Additionally, Experts recommended the establishment of feedback mechanisms for ongoing dialogue, the implementation of evaluation measures to assess effectiveness, and the development of processes for constructive conflict resolution. Capacity building, respecting community members' time, and consistent follow-up with communities to include their voices were underscored as essential elements.
- Group 2 Experts offered insights that this Model section was more informative compared to other sections, directing attention to the real challenges in planning and implementation.
- Group 3 Experts emphasized keeping the principles at a macro level and highlighted the significance of starting all work with conversations and listening to communities. They suggested clarifying that the principles are not ordered by priority, as each holds equal importance. Identifying priorities in the narrative and emphasizing the link between planning, preparation, and action were deemed crucial. The Experts also stressed the importance of actionable next steps and the need to revisit what was learned.
- Room 4 Experts reiterated key principles for community engagement, including community self-determination, honesty, impartiality, dignity, consideration, integrity, and service. They advocated for brevity in this section, emphasizing that less is more. The iterative nature of the process with continual learning was acknowledged, particularly in the context of adaptability.

Question 3: What additional California history should be included to ground staff in the realities of environmental injustice? What resources or materials should we refer to?

- Room 1 Experts delved into the historical context of California during the 19th and 20th centuries, emphasizing rapid industrialization and urbanization. They drew attention to the expansion's impact on California Tribes by the state government and highlighted the diverse refugee/immigrant communities, including Hmong, Lu Mien, Japanese, Chinese,



COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2

Meeting Summary

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

etc. Major historical cases of environmental injustices, such as the United Church of Christ report on toxics, were cited as significant elements.

- Room 2 Experts stressed the importance of including west Fresno and addressing redlining in that area, particularly environmental redlining, and the historical redlining of the African American community.
- Room 3 Experts did not provide specific comments on this question.
- In Room 4 Experts recommended including examples of structural and systemic racism, such as the case of Allensworth, to provide a real-life illustration. They also suggested incorporating Mexican American history, African American migration post-World Wars, and the history of warehousing and labor unions in the Inland Empire (IE) and environmental justice (EJ).

Question 4. How do you define community engagement?

- Room 1 Experts defined community engagement as encompassing activities like focus groups, door-to-door outreach, and crowd canvassing. They emphasized the importance of cultural, linguistic, and social competence in community engagement, highlighting the need to invite input from all social groups, irrespective of income, ethnicity, or social standing.
- Room 2 Experts characterized community engagement as any outreach aimed at obtaining feedback and providing information to the community. They suggested that effective community engagement involves a predominant focus on listening (70%) and a minority (30%) on informing. Their discussion also touched upon the application of community engagement in emergency situations, stressing the importance of clarity on what the Model is not intended for, such as emergencies or evacuations.
- Room 3 Experts did not provide specific comments on this question.
- Room 4 Experts did not provide specific comments on this question.

PLAN – BREAKOUT GROUPS FEEDBACK

Question 1: What's missing from the Plan template?

- Room 1 Experts noted a need for more emphasis on working with culturally competent staff and community leaders to build trust in the Plan template. The importance of bridging the gap between data and people's realities through the incorporation of community stories was highlighted.
- Room 2 Experts emphasized the need for clarity on collaboration with the community, suggesting the identification and engagement of community/cultural leaders early in the process. Finer details such as event logistics, the distinction between the Plan and Implement Templates, and the involvement of individuals with local knowledge and community trust were identified as important considerations. Additionally, there were suggestions to add a timeline or Gantt chart structure, shorten the document into distinct sections, and incorporate air districts. The idea of a workbook structure was proposed.
- Room 3 Experts recommended connecting with community-based organizations (CBOs) to leverage their knowledge about their communities. They suggested refining goals to be more oriented toward improving outcomes for the community.
- Room 4 Experts proposed integrating evaluation and assessment into the planning phase rather than treating it as an afterthought. The importance of metrics, considering language access, and including relevant stakeholders such as undocumented residents, workforces, and the unhoused community were highlighted.

Question 2. Is the engagement spectrum a good foundation for CARB to design community engagement? Are there other tools, spectrums, or classifications we should consider and why?

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2

Meeting Summary

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

- Room 1 Experts emphasized the use of focus groups involving both community leaders and members. Participants noted that CARB is currently positioned in the “tokenization region” on the engagement spectrum, characterized by consultations held in large venues without a strong community connection. Despite some concerns, there was an overall positive sentiment about the thoroughness of the Model. Additionally, the suggestion to celebrate milestones as a means of recognizing and boosting community achievements was put forward.
- Room 2 Experts did not provide specific comments on this question.
- Room 3 Experts expressed some uncertainty about the use of the spectrum, finding it potentially confusing.
- Room 4 Experts noted that the engagement spectrum was helpful, providing a framework for individuals to assess and push themselves toward higher levels of engagement. The detailed nature of the spectrum was appreciated, and there was recognition of its utility in guiding individuals to move further along the spectrum.

Question 3. Do you have suggestions for how to balance the need for community engagement with community fatigue? Are there best practices or things you would like to see?

- Room 1 Experts highlighted the importance of compensation in community engagement. Experts stressed the need to offer free services that balance engagement, such as providing fact sheets or connecting individuals to relevant services. Monitoring analytics for engagement metrics and celebrating community achievements were also highlighted as essential practices. Diversifying engagement by not relying on a single group and ensuring CARB staff's presence at community events were noted as valuable strategies.
- Room 2 Experts did not provide specific comments on this question.
- Room 3 Experts suggested that CARB could improve efficiency by holding separate meetings and coordinating internally to minimize the total number of meetings. Additionally, they highlighted involving youth in the process, gathering their ideas, and ensuring their awareness and education about environmental issues.
- Room 4 Experts focused on the significance of providing space for community celebrations and highlighted the potential benefits of hiring community coordinators to enhance connections and reduce fatigue. The idea of having liaisons for different regions, building relationships through face-to-face interactions, and doing thorough research before engaging with communities were emphasized as effective strategies.

Question 4. What engagement methods do you find effective?

- Room 1 Experts did not provide specific comments on this question.
- Room 2 Experts did not provide specific comments on this question.
- Room 3 Experts emphasized the importance of prioritizing staff physically going to the community for more engagement, providing more opportunities for questions and dialogue. Leveraging community leaders and champions was suggested as a starting point for effective engagement.
- Room 4 Experts highlighted that the effectiveness of engagement methods depends on the audience, emphasizing the need for culturally appropriate and audience-specific approaches. Multiple methods, including social media, radio, and collaborations with trusted community organizations, were suggested. Engaging with religious institutions, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and CBOs that are already trusted in the community, as well as building structured relationships with schools and incorporating youth engagement, were identified as effective strategies. Additionally, the idea of showing up at various community events like farmers' markets and football games to build relationships was put forward.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2**Meeting Summary**

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

IMPLEMENT – BREAKOUT GROUPS FEEDBACK**Question 1. What's missing from the Implement template?**

- Room 1 Experts highlighted the need for managing discussions effectively, incorporating input from CBOs and racial equity experts, and including visual examples in the Implement template. Emphasizing racial equity and ensuring a flow of conversation with active listening were deemed essential.
- Room 2 Experts raised concerns about discretion in deciding event hosts, with participants suggesting a need to balance the potential discomfort of feeling attacked. The importance of aligning subject matter with inclusivity, anticipating issues well in advance, and clarifying the purpose of the Implement template as a supplement to the Plan template were emphasized.
- Room 3 Experts brought attention to the challenges posed by border patrol checkpoints preventing non-citizens from attending public meetings. Suggestions included adding a step to discuss equitable meeting locations, finding ways to include undocumented residents and DACA residents, and establishing connections with established CBOs in areas of common interest.
- Room 4 Experts stressed the importance of dealing with difficult interactions with community members and providing responses that acknowledge concerns rather than dismissing them. They highlighted the need for effective handling of such situations to improve community relations.

Question 2. What has made you feel welcomed at past public events?

- Room 1 Experts emphasized the importance of using right-sized venues, culturally relevant components like food and presenters, and making space for lived experiences and stories. Additionally, they shared considerations such as accommodating dietary restrictions, having local community leaders present, providing name tags, childcare services, and interpretation services.
- Room 2 Experts did not provide specific comments on this question.
- Room 3 Experts emphasized the significance of a comfortable location with the right temperature, available water, and multiple welcoming staff. Greetings from city leaders, mingling time with CARB representatives, interpreters, and smaller group opportunities for conversations with staff were identified as factors contributing to a welcoming atmosphere.
- Room 4 Experts highlighted the value of being recognized and seen, particularly in the context of government turnover. Regional or cultural food, name tags with pronouns, awareness of LGBTQ identities, and interactive formats that go beyond one-way communication were identified as key elements that make participants feel welcomed at public events.

Question 3. Are there additional trainings we should try to get for staff to improve community engagement efforts?

- Room 1 Experts suggested a range of additional trainings for staff to enhance community engagement efforts, including conflict resolution, restorative justice, and transformative justice training, as well as advancing racial equity and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) training from CBOs and recognized universities. Specific sensitivity training for homelessness and racial issues was also recommended.
- Room 2 Experts did not provide specific comments on this question.
- Room 3 Experts highlighted the need for not only cultural competency training but also community competency training. Additionally, science communication training and training on engaging with unhoused individuals were recommended. Participants stressed the importance of recognizing and incorporating the voices of unhoused individuals in the engagement process.



COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2

Meeting Summary

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

- Room 4 Experts recommended trauma-informed workplace training from the Crisis and Trauma Resource Institute, diversity gap training through resources like books and podcasts (specifically mentioning Bethany Wilkinson's work), and an understanding of regional history. This understanding would be facilitated through agency documents, introductions with organizations, regional elected officials, and other relevant sources.

CLOSE – BREAKOUT GROUPS FEEDBACK

Question 1. What's missing from the Close template?

- Room 1 Experts identified several elements missing from the Close template including suggesting a change in the title from "Close" to something more indicative of an ongoing, living document. They emphasized the need for more information about timing, such as expanding the time for comments and being timely in replying to comments. Real-time and midpoint summaries were also suggested for a more comprehensive closing process.
- Room 2 Experts recommend a change in the title from "Close" to something more descriptive like "Stakeholder Feedback Template," "Closing Comments," or "Record of Meeting." CEs emphasized the importance of the Model being a living document, open for comments on the website. Additionally, there was a mention of the need for templates for other contexts, labeled as "records of discussion."
- Room 3 Experts emphasized giving people more time to talk at meetings, especially when they invest significant time in attending. The need for extended time for deeper conversations and more time for follow-up and continued engagement after the meeting was highlighted.
- Room 4 Experts brought attention to the importance of metrics for follow-up and accountability. They suggested including action summaries and a separate meeting summary, along with links to meeting resources, presentations, recordings, and a mechanism for participants to correct the record. A specific turnaround time of 15-30 days for revisions to the record was also recommended for transparency and accountability.

Question 2. What agencies or organizations actions have made you feel heard and that your feedback mattered?

- Room 1 Experts emphasized the importance of appropriate clothing and language in engaging with Environmental Justice (EJ) communities by suggesting avoiding attending meetings in suits and avoiding using environmental lingo language. Being thankful for the community's time and appreciating comments, particularly when board members directly respond to concerns during calls or meetings, was highlighted. Assigning someone on the spot to follow up with a comment and incorporating community input into agency actions were seen as positive practices. Recognition of individuals' input, celebration of accomplishments, and follow-up emails after meetings were also mentioned as effective strategies.
- Room 2 Experts expressed the need for democratic processes in community engagement, emphasizing the importance of including diverse perspectives and lived experiences. Local agencies, such as cities, were noted to be more responsive than federal agencies. Suggestions included lottery panels for fair access, timely responses within 48 hours, and generating solutions through one-on-one meetings and respectful conversations. Participants highlighted the responsiveness of agencies involved in AB 617, city meetings and police departments.
- Room 3 Experts recommended agencies refer to people by their names and give credit to good ideas. They cautioned against over-surveying or burdening individuals and suggested informal formats like raising hands or smaller meetings after the main meeting for information gathering. Staying for informal chats after meetings was also considered a positive practice.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2**Meeting Summary**

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

- Room 4 Experts cited examples from AB 617, where residents appreciated seeing written comments and emails publicly displayed on the website for transparency and accountability. They underscored commendable initiatives undertaken by agencies, exemplified by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including collaborative group presentations, the provision of summaries for review and feedback prior to broader distribution, and timely and attentive communication.

Question 3. Are there other things CARB should evaluate when asking community members for input on community engagement efforts?

- Room 1 Experts suggested allowing written comments through email for individuals who may not be comfortable sharing verbally in person. They also emphasized the need for realistic expectations regarding presentation time versus public comment time.
- Room 2 Experts did not provide specific comments on this question.
- Room 3 Experts highlighted the importance of asking community members about the initiatives that the city and CBOs are working on and how those efforts overlap with CARB's. Building trust through collaboration with the city and CBOs is crucial.
- Room 4 Experts recommended creating a shortened version for the public, providing concise content for social media, blogs, and other platforms. This approach was exemplified by the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG) desire to gather input on their transportation plan using a brief format.

4. In the past meeting, an expert said that community members don't want a certificate of participation. What other actions, besides stipends, can be used to recognize community participation?

- Room 1 Experts did not provide specific comments on this question.
- Room 2 Experts expressed the idea that actual change is a more meaningful recognition than certificates, which may be perceived as a petty payoff. There was also a caution about how ground rules are applied.
- Room 3 Experts suggested that CARB provide skillset-based training or workshops which participants could use on their resumes. This was seen as a valuable form of recognition and workforce training. Additionally, creating opportunities for joy within communities, such as hosting celebrations or community picnics, and annual recognition were proposed as alternative actions to recognize community participation.
- Room 4 Experts did not provide specific comments on this question.

MODEL FEEDBACK – BREAKOUT GROUPS REPORT BACK

Ms. Csernansky prompted each breakout group to report back the main themes and points of discussion from their groups. She summarized the key takeaways from the discussions, highlighting common themes including the need for historical context, timely and responsive communication, cultural competency, making space for lived experiences, and building authentic relationships. She also pointed to specific suggestions for improvement of the Model involving language clarity, shortening the document, and recognizing community participation through actions rather than certificates.

To view the Jamboard responses in their entirety, please see here:

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/1NV7-GDuRd2EU4X6GToDJOkUEchfdJ-4KQsbHnJaD IM/viewer?f=0&pli=1>

COMMUNITY DIALOGUE SESSIONS

Deidre Zoll, CARB staff, provided a presentation regarding the upcoming Community Dialogue Sessions. She highlighted the purpose of the upcoming public community meetings, where feedback and recommendations would be gathered from the wider public on the Model. The



COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2

Meeting Summary

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

target audience for these meetings includes communities across California, with a focus on priority communities or those directly impacted.

Ms. Zoll shared that there were modifications made to the meeting locations based on feedback received from Experts in the first meeting and subsequent surveys. Responding to concerns that the San Joaquin Valley is too large for a single meeting, they added an extra session, scheduled for Fresno and Bakersfield. She emphasized the effort to select venues accessible to the community. In response to the feedback received, considerations were made regarding venue accessibility, recognizing that not everyone has internet access. Ms. Zoll assured Experts that call-in options, translation services, and other accommodations would be provided for those attending online. She acknowledged the imperfect nature of these solutions but emphasized the team's commitment to addressing accessibility issues.

Ms. Zoll shared a draft agenda for the upcoming public meetings, encouraging feedback from Experts. The agenda included a welcome and introduction, an overview of the document and purpose of the meetings, breakout group discussions, report-back sessions, a wrap-up, and information on additional ways for participants to provide feedback. The draft agenda aimed for a two-hour duration, addressing concerns raised about the length of sessions. Ms. Zoll explained that the breakout group discussions would focus on general questions about effective communication and partnership strategies, emphasizing the importance of follow-through. A variety of feedback channels, such as online submission, email, and voicemail, were highlighted.

Experts were encouraged to provide feedback on the agenda and suggest improvements or additions. Specific considerations were mentioned, such as the potential challenge of fog in Fresno and the importance of notifying parents through schools for meetings held in elementary schools. Ms. Zoll welcomed additional ideas for outreach, suggesting connections with school districts, community colleges, universities, city halls, libraries, and providing signs for directions or welcome.

STIPENDS, CHILDCARE, AND FOOD – DISCUSSION

Heather Arias, CARB staff, began her presentation by expressing gratitude for the Experts' time and leadership. She introduced herself as part of the CARB management team, responsible for supporting the CARB CECB team. Ms. Arias acknowledged the challenges CARB faces in seeking advice from communities and emphasized the need for improvement.

Responding to questions raised in the first meeting about stipends, childcare, and food, Ms. Arias explained the limitations on CARB's authority due to statute and budget constraints. She outlined two ways funding can be allocated: through specific bills or budget language. However, she clarified that, at present, CARB is unaware of broad statute or budgetary authority allowing CARB to provide stipends, childcare, or food. Ms. Arias detailed past challenges, including issues with providing funding to organizations that offered food. She mentioned ongoing efforts to explore partnerships with other agencies and urged participants to share their recommendations with the governor's office and elected officials.

A Community Expert suggested creative methods and mentioned their experience with providing snacks during her time in state service. In response, Ms. Arias explained the legal challenges they faced in the past and emphasized the need for a broader solution. Ms. Arias acknowledged the frustration expressed by participants and reiterated CARB's commitment to seeking changes in statutory or budget language. She encouraged participants to communicate their concerns to elected officials for collective advocacy.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2**Meeting Summary**

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

In the chat, there were requests for a link to the statutory language. Ms. Arias responded by stating that there is not statutory language prohibiting it, but without statutory language allowing it CARB does not have the authority to spend funds on these types of necessities. Additionally, in the chat CEs suggested creative ways to address the issue, such as partnering with organizations for support. Ms. Arias responded, acknowledging the importance of community organizations, and clarifying CARB's inability to financially support them. As the discussion continued, Ms. Arias regretfully informed participants that CARB would not be able to provide refreshments for upcoming meetings due to the current constraints. She thanked participants for their understanding and encouraged them to continue advocating for changes.

An Expert clarified that comments in the chat referred to partnering with community organizations rather than providing direct funding to them. Ms. Arias agreed and expressed her willingness to engage in conversations with participants over email to provide more insights into the issue.

MEETING #1 – EVALUATION RESULTS

Karina Aguilera, CARB Staff, provided a summary of the results from the evaluation taken at the end of the first Community Expert Meeting. She addressed questions related to the purpose of creating the Model and clarified roles for participants. Approximately 30% of attendees had concerns about understanding the Model's purpose and their roles, prompting further clarification.

Ms. Aguilera also discussed the feedback collection process, emphasizing multiple channels for gathering input, such as verbal and written feedback from participants, community dialogue sessions, a public comment docket on the Model's website, a phone number for verbal comments, and email. The feedback will be compiled into a spreadsheet, and detailed summaries of questions and comments, along with responses, will be provided to CEs and the public.

An Expert commented about the Model's use during regulatory comment periods and the need for clarification on its intended applications. Ms. Aguilera acknowledged the importance of specifying what the Model is not intended for and committed to including this information.

WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS

Ms. Csernansky concluded the meeting with gratitude for the robust participation and meaningful feedback received. She requested feedback from Experts via a Meeting Evaluation Form to gather their thoughts regarding this meeting and any suggested improvements to the structure of future meetings.

The meeting closed with a reminder to submit comments on the Model by November 17th.

The next Community Expert Meeting will be held in 2024.

CARB DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS

This section contains a comprehensive overview, organized by meeting agenda topic, of the decisions made by CARB and the actionable items committed to in response to the insights and suggestions shared by Experts.

- Welcome and Introductions
 - CARB committed to addressing Experts' questions and concerns regarding changes to the invoicing process in the chat and to provide post-meeting support.
 - CARB committed to strengthening support of Experts by providing individual follow-up calls to discuss topics further offline.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2

Meeting Summary

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

- CARB committed to follow up with Experts with a survey regarding the possibility of extending future meetings by 30 minutes.
- Model Feedback – Breakout Groups
 - CARB committed to following up with Experts regarding outreach and engagement ideas with unhoused residents.
- Meeting #1 – Evaluation Results
 - CARB committed to continuing to compile all feedback into a spreadsheet, producing detailed summaries of questions, comments, and responses, and sharing those materials with Experts and the public.
 - CARB committed to specifying what the Model is and is not intended for, clarifying its intended applications.

CSUS RECOMMENDATIONS

The following section contains CSUS Facilitator recommendations for improvements to the process of Experts Meetings based on debrief conversations with CARB staff and review of the meeting evaluation results.

- Recommendation to reduce the number of questions asked and instead focus on questions designed to encourage conversation between the Experts.
- Recommendation not to extend the meeting by 30 minutes to reduce participant fatigue and ensure meaningful participation.

POST-MEETING SURVEY RESULTS

CARB staff provided a short survey to the Experts in English and Spanish to assess the meeting. Responses were provided by 13/19 Experts. Findings are provided below:

Question 1: Choose the option that best describes your experience communicating with CARB staff leading up to this meeting.

100% Said communication leading up to the meeting has been clear and effective.

Question 2: Choose the option that best matches this statement “I understand the purpose of creating this Community Engagement Model.”

100% Agree

Question 3: Choose the option that best matches this statement “I understand my role and the time commitment expected of me as a community expert.”

100% Agree

Question 4: What can CARB staff do to make the meeting space more welcoming and collaborative?

1.	Sometimes my point is rephrased by the facilitator but it has a completely different meaning in the rephrasing
2.	Space has been welcoming and collaborative appreciate the staff
3.	The breakout groups and large discussion were good.
4.	I would like to learn about the others more. More about their region, history, strengths, and thoughts of improvement.
5.	I really liked the use of small break out groups. It's also encouraging to hear CARB staff react directly to our contributions.
6.	Maybe breaking up the meetings to two meetings same week instead of three-hour chunks

Question 5: Should we extend the meeting by 30 minutes?



COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL - COMMUNITY EXPERTS MEETING #2

Meeting Summary

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2023, 5PM – 8PM

83% No
17% Yes