

AB 617 Community Air Protection Program

Meeting Notes: Consultation Group Meeting #4

July 22, 2026 | CalEPA Headquarters, Sacramento (hybrid) | 10:00 AM – 4:00 PM

DRAFT, August 11, 2026

Contents

1. Meeting Attendance	1
Committee Member Attendees	2
CARB Staff Attendees	2
2. Meeting Summary	2
3. Action Items Tracking Table	4
4. Key Takeaways, by Agenda Topic	5
4.1 Opening, Chair Sanchez Remarks, and June Board Recap	5
4.2 March 25 Meeting Summary (Approved by Consensus)	5
4.3 Public Comment	5
4.4 GGRF Overview and CAPP Funding Update	6
4.5 Public Comment	7
4.6 Ad Hoc Report Out and Survey Results	7
4.7 Setting the Table for Priority Topic #1 and Blueprint 3.0	7
4.8 Public Comment	9
5. Planning Two Study Sessions Before December	9
5.1 Background: the May-June Ad Hoc Group Process	9
5.2 Study Sessions Proposal and Decision	9
6. Additional Resources Shared in the Meeting Chat	10

AI-Assisted Meeting Summary Disclosure

This meeting summary was generated using artificial intelligence through Zoom’s artificial intelligence meeting summary features and was reviewed by California Air Resources Board (CARB) staff for accuracy and completeness. The summary is intended to assist with capturing key discussion points, decisions, and action items; however, it may contain errors or omissions. Please refer to the original meeting recording [on the meeting webpage](#) when necessary.

1. Meeting Attendance

Quorum met. Alternates are noted *in italics* and virtual attendance is noted with an asterisk (*). Members Not Present: Baldwin Moy, Maximilian Rosa, Mary Valdemar.

Committee Member Attendees

1. Bishop Chris Baker
2. Dr. John Balmes
3. Dr. Y'Anad Burrell
4. Tim Carmichael*
5. Prithvi Deore*
6. Natasha Dulik*
7. Mary Elizabeth*
8. Kevin Hamilton*
9. Ryan Hayashi
10. Dr. Anissa Heard-Johnson
11. Belen Leon-Lopez*
12. Dr. David Lo*
13. Dr. Jonathan London
14. Cassie Lopina*
15. Arsenio Mataka
16. Dirk Piersma
17. Lizette Ruiz*
18. Dr. Rebecca E. Skinner*
19. Janice Lam Snyder
20. Diane Takvorian
21. Paula Torrado Plazas
22. Domingo Vigil*
23. Christine Zimmerman*

CARB Staff Attendees

Chanell Fletcher, Deputy Executive Officer of Equity, Communities, and Environmental Justice

Deldi Reyes, Division Chief, Office of Community Air Protection

Monica Guerra, Branch Chief, Office of Community Air Protection

Kevin Olp, Branch Chief, Office of Community Air Protection

Mario Cruz, Assistant Division Chief for Sustainable Transportation and Communities

Malinda Dumisani, Air Resources Supervisor I

Andrea Juarez, Air Pollution Specialist

Michelle Byars, Air Pollution Specialist

2. Meeting Summary

[Meeting #4](#) was the Consultation Group's first meeting under its Board-approved Charter (June 2026), and included one new primary member and five new alternates. Welcome new members!

CARB Board Chair Lauren Sanchez opened by thanking members and highlighting the \$150 million in General Fund support enacted through [Senate Bill \(SB\) 111](#) – a meaningful

signal of state commitment, though below the historical ~\$250 million annual level. Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) negotiations continue.

Mario Cruz (CARB Assistant Division Chief for Sustainable Transportation and Communities Division) walked through GGRF basics and **Monica Guerra** (CARB Strategic Incentives and Funding Branch Chief for the Office of Community Air Protection) provided a breakdown of SB 111: Community Air Grants (CAGs) rise to \$7.5 million, District Implementation Funding holds at \$50 million, and Community Air Protection (CAP) Incentives fall from roughly \$195 million to \$92.5 million.

That update sparked a governance discussion. **Deldi Reyes** (CARB Director for Office of Community Air Protection) and **Chanell Fletcher** (CARB Deputy Executive Officer of Equity, Communities, and Environmental Justice) were clear: the Consultation Group members may discuss, learn about, and analyze Community Air Protection Program (CAPP) funding, and may advise CARB and its Board (including on the funding levels) – but the Consultation Group may not advocate to the Legislature as a *body* on CAPP. Members have full advocacy rights in their personal capacity and through their organizations.

Representatives of the Consultation Group [ad hoc](#) reported on the member survey (25 respondents): “Reducing Air Pollution” ranked first for 2026 and “Developing Recommendations to Strengthen the Program” first for 2027–28. The Consultation Group accepted the ad hoc group’s recommendation to consolidate these with Program Funding into a single front-loaded Priority Topic #1, with budget becoming a standing agenda item.

The afternoon discussion set the table for Blueprint 3.0. **Deldi Reyes** presented a draft Community Air Protection Program (CAPP) model of change (inputs → outputs → outcomes) as a conversation starter, plus program status: 8 late-phase communities past the five-year Community Emissions Reductions Program (CERP) mark, \$837 million in CAP Incentives expended, top-tier cost-effectiveness among 122 California Climate Investment (CCI) programs, and quantified emissions benefits being eroded by federal actions. Members offered refinements – adding community based organizations (CBOs), industry, community context, interagency collaboration, land use, indoor air quality, and a circular co-governance structure. Air districts (South Coast, San Joaquin Valley, Sacramento Metro) described how the program has changed institutional culture, corroborated – with caveats – by community voices.

The meeting closed with unanimous support for two ~3-hour virtual study sessions in Sept/Oct, planned by a newly volunteered ad hoc, with compensation approved by CARB's Executive Officer for both study sessions and ad hoc participation. Study sessions are deep-dive and informative only – there will be no policy direction or decision-making. Meeting #5 is set for December 2, 2026, in Riverside (hybrid).

3. Action Items Tracking Table

Commitments made during the meeting, including volunteer commitments by members (rows 13-14) are shown below. Unless reflected otherwise, CARB staff is responsible for the action item.

#	Action Item	Status
1	Report completion status of prior follow-up actions in each meeting summary going forward.	Completed and ongoing: incorporated in notes
2	Email budget information to all Community Steering Committee (CSC) members (directly or through districts) and share verbal updates at CSC meetings.	Completed: CSC verbal updates ongoing; emails sent week of July 28, 2026
3	Add a standing budget/program funding item to all future Consultation Group agendas (began July).	Completed and ongoing: program update now includes a standing budget section
4	Convene the new planning ad hoc (~2 weeks) and poll members for two ~3-hour virtual study sessions (Sept/Oct).	In progress: polls sent July 31, 2026
5	Include the August 22 Toxics Roadmap public webinar in the meeting follow-up.	Completed: included in meeting follow-up sent on August 4, 2026.
6	Run open recruitment for the tribal representative vacancy (open until filled; rolling Board approval), with outreach to high-need regions and tribal CAG grantees per Dr. Jonathan London . Same solicitation fills two general vacancies.	In progress
8	Continue checks on CARB webpage availability; agendas confirmed posted per the Bagley-Keene Meeting Act.	Completed: agenda posting. Ongoing: webpage checks
10	Bring a draft of the SB 352 legislative report to the group for input before it goes to the Legislature (March 2027).	Revisit with CG and ad hoc.
11	Share all meeting materials at least 10 calendar days in advance, attach to calendar invites, and distribute more widely (e.g., to CSCs).	In progress and ongoing: meeting materials for December 2 Consultation Group meeting will be posted at least ten days in advance.

#	Action Item	Status
12	Revise the CAPP model of change: add equity at the top as a guiding principle and expand descriptions of inputs.	In progress: an updated draft model based on input received will be shared as part of meeting materials for the Study Session #26-1.
13	Study-session planning ad hoc volunteers: Ryan Hayashi, Dr. Jonathan London, Dr. Anissa Heard-Johnson, Christine Zimmerman, Tim Carmichael, Dr. Rebecca E. Skinner, Prithvi Deore. Poll will ask each which topic they want to work on, per Co-Chair Diane Takvorian.	In progress: staff will convene ad hoc members to prepare for two virtual study sessions.
14	Paula Torrado Plazas offered Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) expertise (cumulative impacts, CalEnviroScreen, evaluation, metrics, accountability) for the toxics deep dive and Blueprint 3.0 review; sister agencies such as DPR will also be consulted.	In progress: CARB and OEHHA coordination ongoing.

4. Key Takeaways, by Agenda Topic

4.1 Opening, Chair Sanchez Remarks, and June Board Recap

- **CARB Board Chair Lauren Sanchez** framed the \$150 million appropriation as a strong signal from the Governor and Legislature, noted the Board’s May direction to work with the Governor’s Office and Department of Finance on continued support.
- **Andrea Juarez** (CARB staff, Office of Community Air Protection) recapped the [June Board item](#): Charter and six new members/alternates approved; future appointments go to the Board for approval.
- Clarified with **Tim Carmichael**: when a primary member participates, the alternate may only listen and comment as a member of the public – Consultation Group members asked to please inform CARB staff of attendance no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting.

4.2 March 25 Meeting Summary (Approved by Consensus)

The summary was approved via the consensus model, which members endorsed as workable (absent members need take no action).

4.3 Public Comment

- **Chalam Tubati** (CSC co-chair Bayview Hunters Point/Southeast San Francisco) most CSCs don't know the Consultation Group exists; agencies communicate poorly with CSCs about Assembly Bill (AB) 617 developments; the public agenda link failed; disabled attendee chat creates poor optics. CARB staff explained they are in process of emailing all CSC members, either directly or through district and providing verbal updates at CSC meetings.

4.4 GGRF Overview and CAPP Funding Update

- The big picture: ~\$37B deposited into GGRF to date, \$29B appropriated, \$15.5B implemented across 120+ programs, over 75 percent benefitting disadvantaged and low-income communities – and GGRF is volatile. The 2026-27 Cap-and-Invest Expenditure Plan is deferred to August 2026. **Chanell Fletcher** clarified in response to member comment: the \$150M General Fund is locked in via SB 111; it's the GGRF component that remains open.
- The trade-off: CAG rises and implementation holds, but incentives fall by ~\$100M. **Dr. Balmes** noted the cut lands on the component just presented as #1 in NOx reductions among all 122 CCI programs – something the group agreed decision-makers should understand.
- Advisory scope vs. advocacy: the Consultation Group as a body may communicate only to CARB and its Board (all such communication is public), may be educated on and discuss funding openly, and may advise on factual consequences – but may not request funding from the Legislature. **Arsenio Mataka** proposed making Board recommendations visible to the Legislature's Board representatives; **Tim Carmichael** noted that advising the Board already reaches them by design. **Chanell Fletcher** clarified scope: market-mechanism advice comes from the AB 32 Environmental Justice (EJ) Advisory Committee; this group's lane is AB 617.
- Trust and the May Board vote: **Co-Chair Diane Takvorian**, speaking personally, explained her "no" vote and called the meeting a low point in her decade on the Board, while committing to move forward. **Dr. Anissa Heard-Johnson** shared that community members feel talked down to and mistrustful; her line – "just because it is doesn't mean it's just" – flagged a need to help communities genuinely understand funding rules. **Liz Ruiz** traced mistrust to Cap-and-Invest's structure concentrating hotspots in EJ communities; **Christine Zimmerman** reflected on the privilege of access and the primacy of communicating with communities.
- Transparency asks: **Dr. Y'Anad Burrell** requested disaggregated data on where CAG dollars and CCI projects land (answer: the [project-level CCI public map](#); the [CAPP Community Hub 2.0](#) for [CAPP incentives](#) and [CAGs](#)); **Dr. Jonathan London** recommended a dedicated evaluation of the Community Air Grants – flagged by **Deldi Reyes** as a Blueprint 3.0 lever; **Mary Elizabeth** asked that project deliverables be made readily public, citing a month-long response to a Public Records Act (PRA) request for a Supplemental Environmental Project.

4.5 Public Comment

Ms. Wilson (member of the public, Best Health and Wellness Firm) asked whether the \$150M could fund commercial electric vehicle (EV) charging (answer: for the 19 communities, only through CERP projects; elsewhere it is district by district; districts can also tap Carl Moyer Guidelines for infrastructure. CAPP funds can be used for Moyer type projects); **Chalam Tubati** thanked Board members for their May tenacity, emphasized how hard grant paperwork is for community members, and asked whether the advocacy role of the Consultation Group is too restrictive.

4.6 Ad Hoc Report Out and Survey Results

- Survey mechanics: 25 respondents ranked six 2026 topics and seven 2027–28 topics. “Reducing Air Pollution” ranked #1 for 2026; “Developing Recommendations to Strengthen the Program” #1 for 2027–28.
- Both #1 topics were consolidated: **Mary Elizabeth** explained it was partly a response to the budget – the group must demonstrate effectiveness now – and noted “reducing air pollution” under-pollled partly because members treated it as a given. [Staff note: “Reducing Pollution” was the highest ranked choice for 2026.] **Arsenio Mataka** argued recommendations “couldn’t wait” until 2027: the Consultation Group should “put pen to paper” before others opine, especially with the Legislature actively interested.
- The ad hoc also flagged interest in sessions on the Toxics Roadmap and Statewide Mobile Monitoring Initiative, called for the standing budget item and study sessions.
- **Co-Chair Dr. John Balmes** praised the ad hoc group as unusually high-functioning and noted the timing case for a toxics discussion: the Board takes up the Toxics Roadmap in November, so input is most valuable early. **Ryan Hayashi** thanked staff for the publicly posted [ad hoc meeting summaries](#).
- **Dr. Jonathan London** connected the survey to the morning’s scope debate – the priority topic itself confirms the group should make recommendations, including on resource adequacy – and asked how the University of California (UC) at Berkeley program evaluation will feed the work.
- **Dr. Rebecca E. Skinner** noted [CalEnviroScreen 5.0](#) now scores air toxics sites, raising the topic’s public visibility.

4.7 Setting the Table for Priority Topic #1 and Blueprint 3.0

- Framing: **Deldi Reyes** positioned the session as the start of the road to Blueprint 3.0 (due October 2028 – “not far away at all”), presented the draft model of change as an explicitly incomplete conversation starter, and reviewed program architecture: a vision rooted in racial equity, statute-driven mission, 8 goals and 45 actions, the four Blueprint 2.0 pathways, and the People’s Blueprint’s role in driving EJ and civil rights content.
- Program status: eight late-phase communities have passed the five-year CERP mark; CERP completion frees district capacity for additional communities and will be lifted up

in the next annual Board report. Time is a real input – CERP development runs 1–3 years and implementation 5–7+ (ex: the community-prioritized Stockton locomotive project will take 5–6 years). Federal actions are eroding modeled benefits in the 16 implementing communities (e.g., 10 of 37 tons per year (TPY) of fine particulate matter 2.5 micrometers or less in width (PM_{2.5}) benefit lost), making community-scale action more important. The Cycle 6 CAG Request for Applications (RFA) needs Consultation Group input via study session, since it must be work-shopped well before December.

- Model-of-change refinements: crisis/community context as an input (**Dr. Anissa Heard-Johnson**, citing the Lineage Fire in East Los Angeles/Boyle Heights); the wider implementation ecosystem – cities, counties, land use possibilities per SB 1075, sister agencies, industry, scientists, residents (**Dr. Jonathan London**); indoor air quality and household-product health education (**Bishop Chris Baker, Mary Elizabeth**); a circular model with community co-governance at every stage and evaluation feeding back into inputs (**Paula Torrado Plazas**, seconded by **Ryan Hayashi**); separating historical discrimination (context) from change agents (inputs) and adding CBOs as an input (**Co-Chair Diane Takvorian**); industry as an input/emitter with a listening obligation (**Christine Zimmerman**).
- Culture change as unexpected outcome (air districts): South Coast described staff cultural-competency work (~85 percent of staff didn't know what redlining was when **Dr. Anissa Heard-Johnson** first started position), a division merger, restorative conversations with Year 1 CSC communities, adoption of co-lead model in South Los Angeles, participatory budgeting, and recognition of the importance of language justice. San Joaquin Valley described valuing community priorities over agency assumptions, mitigation measures (filtration, greening, vegetative barriers), default bilingual communications, air ambassadors, and treating CERPs as living documents. Sacramento Metro described participatory budgeting, a dedicated workshop on a sensitive permitting action, and breaking silos among scientists, engineers, and communications staff.
- Community corroboration, with caveats: **Liz Ruiz** contrasted being ignored 26 years ago with a seat at the table and ~20 rules changed from community concerns – “trust hasn't been completely built... but it's definitely a lot better.” **Dr. Y'Anad Burrell** noted CSC progress is paced by district capacity and that CSCs can't brand communications as AB 617 groups, hampering outreach. **Bishop Chris Baker** urged explaining the full process to new participants up front.
- Measurement issues for future work: **Dr. Jonathan London** questioned the “community-identified projects” category (\$84M, ~10% of incentives) - it needs better explanation, since CSC support is a prerequisite for all incentive projects. **Co-Chair Diane Takvorian** flagged inconsistent air quality modeling across districts (should be a study session topic). **Ryan Hayashi** called for capturing health-protective mitigation value and actual measured reductions.

4.8 Public Comment

- **Chalam Tubati** argued the program's reality is set "in the trenches" by air districts, that district staff capacity needs as much work as community capacity, that "technocratic elitism" – not just resources – impedes engagement, and criticized CalEnviroScreen 5.0's treatment of Bayview Hunters Point Superfund sites. **Rita Loof** (member of the public, RadTech International) urged scrutiny of South Coast AQMD rule proposals phasing out newly listed Toxic Air Contaminants (tert-Butyl Acetate (TBAC), parachlorobenzotrifluoride (PCBTf) with exemptions of up to seven years. **Gustavo Aguirre Jr.** (member of the public, Environmental Director at the Central California Asthma Collaborative) called for capturing health-protective mitigation value and actual measured reductions, interagency collaboration, and better integration with land use.

5. Planning Two Study Sessions Before December

5.1 Background: the May-June Ad Hoc Group Process

At the March 25 meeting, the Consultation Group agreed that a volunteer subset would digest the member survey and shape priority topics. That ad hoc group met three times (May-June 2026), with summaries posted publicly. Its July 22 report out – presented by **Monica Guerra** with reflections from **Mary Elizabeth** and **Arsenio Mataka** – delivered recommendations the full Consultation Group accepted: consolidate the top 2026 and 2027-28 topics with Program Funding into Priority Topic #1; make budget a standing item (implemented as of this meeting); and create supplemental educational meetings open to all members – the seed of the study sessions – prioritizing the ripest topics (Toxics Roadmap, CAG RFA), with the Statewide Mobile Monitoring Initiative addressed at the December meeting. (See 3.6 for the rationale.)

5.2 Study Sessions Proposal and Decision

Monica Guerra proposed two ~3-hour virtual study sessions: cost-saving (virtual only), well-timed before December, and potential to deep dive into topics more than regular meetings allow. Sessions may include invited guest discussion leaders. Support was unanimous. **Deldi Reyes** confirmed the parameters:

- Two virtual sessions, ~3 hours each, both before the December 2 full day hybrid meeting in Riverside; members will receive an availability poll as the first follow-up.
- Study sessions and ad hoc meetings are compensable at (\$100/meeting).
- Sessions are deep-dive and informative, with no policy direction or decision-making. As a full quorum is expected for each session, they will be subject to Bagley-Keene Meeting Act.
- Planned content: (1) model-of-change questions 2 and 3 (leverage points and data needs; elements ripe for evolution in Blueprint 3.0); (2) a deep dive into pollution reductions and measuring progress – metrics, outcomes, and how community informs

them; (3) Community Air Grant Cycle 6 RFA input and (4) Toxics Roadmap preparation with CARB's Transportation and Toxics Division, ahead of the November Board item.

- The new planning ad hoc (see Action Items, row 13) meets within ~2 weeks; its first output is a proposed calendar and topic split. The study sessions are the working engine between now and December – carrying forward Blueprint 3.0, the time-sensitive CAG RFA, and the Toxics Roadmap so the December meeting in Riverside can move from framing to substance.

6. Additional Resources Shared in the Meeting Chat

- [Consultation Group meeting March 25, 2026 resources](#)
- London, J., et al., 2013. [Racing climate change: Collaboration and conflict in California's global climate change policy arena](#). Global Environmental Change, 23, 791-799.
- [Climate Investments Annual Report](#)
- [CalMatters 5/29/2026 article: California overhauls carbon market – critics say it's a giveaway to oil](#)
- [Streetsblog CAL 6/1/2026 article: California Just Pulled the Rug Out From Under Transit](#)
- It was noted that CBE filed a Petition for Writ of Mandate and Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory relief (https://ca-rti.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2026/07/Verified-Petition-for-Writ-of-Mandate-and-Complaint-for-Injunctive-and-Declaratory-Relief_CBE_07.01.pdf), challenging CARB's recent approval of amendments to the Cap and Invest Program.
- [Community Air Protection Program Annual Progress Report, July 2026](#)
- [CARB Board Meeting, July 23, 2026](#)