

AB 617 Community Air Protection Program

Meeting Notes: Virtual Study Session #1

September 14, 2026 | Virtual (Zoom) | 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM

October 7, 2026

Contents

1. Meeting Attendance	2
Committee Member Attendees	2
CARB CG Support Staff Attendees	2
Invited Presenter Attendees	3
Public Commenters	3
2. Meeting Summary	3
3. Action Items and Next Steps Tracking Table	4
4. Key Takeaways, by Agenda Topic	5
4.1 Welcome, Meeting Objectives, and Housekeeping	5
4.2 Budget Update	6
4.3 Study Session Purpose and Ad Hoc Report Out	6
4.4 CAPP Health Benefits and OEHHA’s ECHO-AIR Tool	7
4.5 Public Comment (ECHO-AIR)	8
4.6 Roadmap to Reduce Air Toxics (CARB Transportation and Toxics Division)	9
4.7 Public Comment (Air Toxics Roadmap)	11
4.8 Closing Remarks and Next Steps	12
4.9 Non-Agenda Public Comment	12
5. Additional Resources	12

AI-Assisted Meeting Summary Disclosure

This meeting summary was generated using artificial intelligence, drawing on the Zoom meeting transcript and CARB staff notes from the study session. It has been reviewed by California Air Resources Board (CARB) staff for accuracy and completeness. The summary is intended to assist with capturing key discussion points and next steps; however, it may contain errors or omissions. Please refer to the original meeting recording and transcript [on the meeting webpage](#) when necessary.

1. Meeting Attendance

This was a virtual study session; per CARB staff, no quorum was required because the session was informational only and no Consultation Group decisions or policy direction were made. Alternates are noted *in italics*. Members Not Present: Prithvi Deore, Dr. Anissa Heard-Johnson, Dirk Piersma, Maximilian Rosa, Mary Valdemar.

Committee Member Attendees

2. *Janice Lam Snyder*
3. Bishop Chris Baker
4. Dr. John Balmes
5. Jasmine Beltran
6. Dr. Y'Anad Burrell
7. Tim Carmichael
10. *Kirsten Uchitel*
11. Mary Elizabeth
12. Kevin Hamilton
13. Ryan Hayashi
15. Belen Leon-Lopez
16. Dr. David Lo
18. *Dr. Charisma Acey*
19. Cassie Lopina
20. Arsenio Mataka
21. Baldwin Moy
24. Dr. Rebecca E. Skinner
25. Diane Takvorian
26. Paula Torrado Plazas
28. Domingo Vigil
29. Christine Zimmerman

CARB CG Support Staff Attendees

Deldi Reyes, Division Chief, Office of Community Air Protection
Kevin Olp, Branch Chief, Office of Community Air Protection

Monica Guerra, Branch Chief, Office of Community Air Protection

Michelle Byars, Air Resources Supervisor I, Office of Community Air Protection

Sarah Sullivant, Air Pollution Specialist, Office of Community Air Protection

Andrea Juarez, Air Pollution Specialist, Office of Community Air Protection

Invited Presenter Attendees

Alvaro Alvarado, OEHHA

Hye-Youn Park, OEHHA

Rose Schmitz, OEHHA

Dr. Joshua Apte, UC Berkeley (OEHHA research partner)

Dr. La'Shaye Cobley, CARB Transportation and Toxics Division (TTD)

Matthew O'Donnell, CARB Transportation and Toxics Division (TTD)

Public Commenters

Ms. Margaret Gordon (West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project), Leonard Seitz, Charles McCaw, Moses Huerta (Community Science, Paramount, CA).

2. Meeting Summary

This was the Consultation Group's first virtual study session, convened to dive deeper into topics the group prioritized through the survey in which members participated in March of 2026 and at its July 22, 2026 meeting: the Community Air Protection Program (CAPP) theory of change and assessing program health benefits, and providing input on CARB's draft statewide Roadmap to Reduce Air Toxics. Study sessions are explicitly informative and deep-dive in nature – no quorum was required and no policy direction or Consultation Group decisions were made.

Budget Update. Monica Guerra (CARB) opened with a brief FY 2026-27 budget update: \$150 million allocated through Senate Bill (SB) 111 is split into \$92.5 million for CAP Incentives, \$50 million for district implementation, and \$7.5 million for Community Air Grants; \$1.6 million is coming to CARB from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) via AB 113 to support SB 352 implementation and the Statewide Monitoring Plan update; and \$1 million (also via AB 113) will pass through CARB to the San Diego Air District for the AIRE program to continue air-filter support tied to hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) issues. Up to \$20 million for local-government grants in CERP communities will be available if/when the budget bill is signed. Up to \$250 million to continue CAPP – remain dependent on future Cap-and-Invest auction proceeds, specifically the May 2027 auction.

Assessing CAPP Health impact. Co-Chair Dr. John Balmes framed the session with AB 617's history and its cumulative-impacts approach, and introduced the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment's (OEHHA) work connecting CARB programs to measurable community health outcomes. **Paula Torrado** and OEHHA colleagues (**Rose Schmitz, Alvaro Alvarado, Hye-Youn Park**) and UC Berkeley's **Dr. Joshua Apte** presented

ECHO-AIR, a tool that uses air pollution emission data to model PM2.5 exposure, and health outcomes. It can be used to compare the relative benefits by race/ethnicity, CalEnviroScreen score or other population characteristics, like income

ECHO-AIR results can be used to show which air pollution reduction efforts are providing the most health benefit and which groups are benefitting. It provides a way to track progress and compare strategies, helping inform guidance on how to maximize public health benefits from emission reduction efforts. OEHHA shared examples of analysis from the California Climate Investments programs and who receives the most health benefits from the program investments. Extended member discussion covered how ECHO-AIR compares to and how it can be used in conjunction with existing tools, its current limitations (it does not currently incorporate monitoring data, short-term exposure, or air toxics; it does not capture every health outcome or benefit, and it is designed for statewide and regional estimates, not neighborhood level or community specific estimates), its relationship to the Criteria and Toxics Reporting (CTR) regulation, and how it might eventually help characterize which incentive investments are resulting in the greatest health benefits and which populations are receiving the most benefits. Public commenters urged more community- and region-specific refinement, noting that census tract-level data does not fully capture cumulative exposure or land-use context.

Roadmap to Reduce Air Toxics. Kevin Olp then introduced CARB's draft 2026 Roadmap to Reduce Air Toxics, reviewing the connections to community air protection and AB 617 (the CTR regulation, the Technology Clearinghouse, community air monitoring, and CERPs) and local examples of toxics reduction work. **Dr. La'Shaye Cobley** and **Matthew O'Donnell** (CARB Transportation and Toxics Division) presented the Roadmap as a high-level, collaborative strategy document headed to the Board in November 2026, and members and the public offered extensive feedback – on governance and communication with Community Steering Committees, prioritization criteria, involvement of sister agencies (DTSC, DPR), and the need for concrete, near-term, measurable actions. Several speakers, including Co-Chairs Balmes and Takvorian, endorsed pursuing a pilot project pairing measurement of a specific toxic in a specific community with a concrete plan to reduce exposure. The Consultation Group members emphasized the importance of proactive community engagement throughout Roadmap development and implementation, including direct engagement with the AB 617 Community Steering Committees and Advisory Committees, noting that these entities have already identified toxins and facilities of concern that should be used for prioritization criteria. They additionally stressed the importance of multiscale governance, collaboration with other state agencies, and communication, including widely disseminating information on the types of sources emitting the highest impacting toxics and types of technology controls to reduce emissions.

3. Action Items and Next Steps Tracking Table

The session closed with thanks to presenters, members, ad hoc volunteers, and the public. As a study session, no formal Consultation Group action items or decisions were made. The commitments and next steps noted during the meeting are shown below. Unless reflected otherwise, CARB staff is responsible for the action item.

#	Action Item / Next Step	Status / Owner
1	Notes and video from today's study session will be posted; notes will also be shared with the Transportation and Toxics Division (TTD) for submission to the public docket for the Roadmap to Reduce Air Toxics.	CARB staff (Done)
2	Second virtual study session.	Scheduled for October 29, 2026
3	Next full Consultation Group meeting, anticipated to focus on ways to strengthen the program.	Scheduled for December 2, 2026, in Riverside (hybrid)
4	Recruit ad hoc volunteers to help plan the December 2 discussion.	CARB staff
5	Assessing health impacts discussion "part two," led by CARB's Research Division, covering the health model and health-endpoint research (e.g., respiratory, neurological).	Planned for Oct 29 th study session
6	Paula Torrado (OEHHA) to follow up individually with public commenters and with Mary Elizabeth/Kevin Hamilton/Jasmine Beltran on community air-monitoring network and ECHO-AIR questions.	Paula Torrado. In progress.
7	Consider Consultation Group and public feedback on the draft Roadmap to Reduce Air Toxics.	CARB TTD. In progress.
8	Provide an update to the Consultation Group on the Criteria Pollutant and Toxics Emissions Reporting (CTR) regulation.	CARB Air Quality Planning and Science Division
9	Dr. Josh Apte and Paula Torrado extended an invitation to further demo ECHO-AIR and its capabilities.	Dr. Josh Apte (UC Berkeley) and Paula Torrado (OEHHA)
10	Have future Consultation Group discussions on how to reinvigorate CARB's land use guidance and how ECHO-AIR data can be used.	CARB staff and OEHHA

4. Key Takeaways, by Agenda Topic

4.1 Welcome, Meeting Objectives, and Housekeeping

- **Sarah Sullivan** (CARB) opened with logistics: cameras on when possible, muting when not speaking, and using the Zoom “raise hand” feature for comments or questions.
- Per Bagley-Keene rules and in response to prior public comment, the chat and Q&A functions were disabled for this meeting; attendees were directed to meeting materials posted on the website for relevant links and resources.
- **Deldi Reyes** reminded attendees that Consultation Group members present as primary would be promoted to panelist status; alternates not acting for their primary would remain in attendee view, consistent with Bagley-Keene’s one-organization, one-representative rule.
- **Michelle Byars** welcomed attendees, thanked ad hoc planning volunteers, and outlined the session’s objectives: dive deeper into Consultation Group-prioritized topics, gather individual member perspectives (not seeking consensus) to help guide Blueprint 3.0, build familiarity with tools for assessing health benefits and what they can be used for, and gather input on the Roadmap to Reduce Air Toxics.
- **Sarah Sullivan** confirmed no quorum was required for this session because it was informational only, with no Consultation Group decisions being made.

4.2 Budget Update

- **Monica Guerra** (CARB) provided a brief update on funding affecting fiscal year 2026–27:
- \$150 million allocated through Senate Bill (SB) 111: \$92.5 million to CAP Incentives, \$50 million to district implementation, and \$7.5 million to Community Air Grants.
- \$1.6 million coming to CARB from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) via AB 113, to help fund SB 352 implementation and the statewide monitoring plan update.
- \$1 million from the General Fund (also via AB 113), passing through CARB directly to the San Diego Air District for the AIRE program, continuing air-filter support related to hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) issues.
- Up to \$20 million (available if/when budget bill signed) committed as grants to local governments in CERP communities under AB 113, to be administered by CARB in consultation with the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation, the Department of Housing and Community Development, and other local agencies, to further CERP objectives.
- Up to \$250 million (dependent on May 2027 auction proceeds) to continue CAPP, which remains in Tier 3 under SB 840 .

4.3 Study Session Purpose and Ad Hoc Report Out

- **Co-Chair Dr. John Balmes** thanked the ad hoc planning group and reflected on AB 617’s history since 2018, its cumulative-impacts framing, and the program’s long-standing challenge of linking emissions reductions to measurable community health outcomes; he introduced OEHHA’s work on connecting CARB programs to community health data.

- Ad hoc volunteers **Christine Zimmerman** and **Jasmine Beltran** reported out on the ad hoc planning discussions, describing the opportunity in bringing the Air Toxics Roadmap into the Community Air Protection Program space.

4.4 CAPP Health Benefits and OEHHA's ECHO-AIR Tool

- **Paula Torrado** (OEHHA), with colleagues **Rose Schmitz**, **Alvaro Alvarado**, and **Hye-Youn Park**, and **Dr. Joshua Apte** (UC Berkeley), presented OEHHA's ECHO-AIR tool. Two discussion questions were posed: (1) What can ECHO-AIR do now to show the success of AB 617 efforts? (2) How can ECHO-AIR be expanded in the future to support AB 617 advocacy?
- **Kevin Hamilton** asked about the distinction between ECHO-AIR and other existing tools, such as CalEnviroScreen. **Alvaro Alvarado** explained that CalEnviroScreen aggregates data at the census tract level using a snapshot that can be one to two years old, while monitoring shows current conditions or an annual average at a particular monitoring site; ECHO-AIR instead draws on emissions inventories to model changes in emissions and their impacts over time. It has a fine spatial resolution, but the fine resolution is less reliable than when you average over large areas. Aggregating data across several communities is the best way to look at it.
- **Dr. Rebecca E. Skinner** noted ECHO-AIR will be most useful viewed over a longer time period, similar to epidemiological studies which may not help immediate needs; **Hye-Youn Park** said the current version does not capture short-term exposure, for which different health endpoints would need to be chosen. OEHHA may explore shorter-term in a future version.
- **Co-Chair Diane Takvorian** asked how the tool could be added to the group's toolbox and could help reinvigorate CARB's land-use guidance, and asked for clarification on the geographic scale of the fine-resolution data Alvarado referenced; **Dr. Joshua Apte** clarified that individual ECHO-AIR pixels are fine-grained, kilometer-by-kilometer scale, but that several communities should be grouped together to see patterns rather than looking at individual pixels. Dr. Apte explained that it is designed to be fine enough to capture the spatial scales at which disparities exist and trace how emission changes lead to air quality changes, which lead to health impacts. Dr. Apte shared that both measurement and models are valuable for answering questions about the impact at a fine scale.
- **Kevin Olp** highlighted how ECHO-AIR shows that when these emissions inventories and monitors are used in an intentional way, while partnering with communities on where and what projects are selected, the CAP Program really works in terms of disproportionately reducing exposure. Kevin prompted questions about how this technology and data sets could be advanced so that, over time, the tool would be able to accurately provide estimates at the census tract or community level.
- **Jasmine Beltran** asked whether ECHO-AIR findings could trigger regulatory or other actions (e.g., inspections) and whether the tool duplicates existing community-science or fence-line-monitoring efforts. **Paula Torrado** and **Alvaro Alvarado** conveyed that CARB and the districts, as well as community-based organizations and community, are already taking action, and that ECHO-AIR can help prioritize what actions to take. **Kevin Olp** clarified the analysis for this discussion was specifically

about incentive projects – ECHO-AIR can help inform which project types and populations are most effectively reached, more as a way to measure program success and inform investment direction rather than as a direct enforcement trigger.

- **Tim Carmichael** and **Dr. Apte** discussed whether the tool is refined enough to isolate the effect of specific incentive investments from other, unrelated changes, and whether the tool can identify the most effective investments. **Dr. Apte** noted the tool relies on emissions inventories and wise modeling assumptions, can show different scenarios based on emission changes and is publicly available and can be used by community groups as well as agencies.
- **Cassie Lopina** asked whether ECHO-AIR is a new tool and noted it is difficult to answer the second discussion question without more clarity on the Criteria and Toxics Reporting (CTR) regulation. **Dr. Apte** said ECHO-AIR was first published in 2024 and is being refined under an OEHHA contract; it was designed for PM2.5 with plans to expand to toxics. **Kevin Olp** noted CTR data is still a few years from feeding into ECHO-AIR; **Deldi Reyes** added that CTR is in year six or seven of its rollout and suggested a future update from CARB's Air Quality Planning and Science Division on CTR.
- **Mary Elizabeth** raised several technical questions: whether emission-reduction credits for sale are captured by the tool; how it could inform cumulative-impact considerations when permitted emissions exceed actual emissions; whether referenced monitoring networks are only AB 617 networks (she indicated she would like to see more stationary source monitoring in Stockton); and how mixes of stationary and mobile sources are characterized in the model, and how emission allocations are distributed across California communities. **Paula Torrado** committed to putting together a response to the questions.
- **Kevin Hamilton** raised concerns about the reliability of self-reported facility emissions data and the need to independently verify source emissions, age, and viability. Kevin shared that he was encouraged that ECHO-AIR can cleanly link air, water, and waste data together for a single property and would be interested in a demonstration. **Dr. Apte** responded that many tools are required to be successful. Measuring every source directly isn't feasible, so ECHO-AIR relies on emissions inventories supplemented by other data sets. **Kevin Hamilton** also asked how ECHO-AIR incorporates the existing community air-monitoring network; **Dr. Apte** said the modeling and measurement communities don't currently interact much and that ECHO-AIR does not use monitoring data, though his team thinks all the time about how to combine them, and extended an open invitation to further demo the tool.
- **Kevin Olp** noted that a "part two" on the question of modeling health impacts of incentives, led by CARB's Research Division and covering CARB's own health model and health-endpoint research (respiratory, neurological), is planned for the next study session on October 29th.

4.5 Public Comment (ECHO-AIR)

- **Ms. Margaret Gordon** (West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project) said she was disappointed ECHO-AIR did not break down conditions by region or community –

noting the Bay Area's nine counties each have different conditions – and cautioned against a “one size fits all” model. She noted that while ECHO-AIR uses census tract-level data, census tracts do not capture the full extent of emissions-exposure issues, cumulative impacts, or land-use and permitting context, and urged a more refined tool.

- **Leonard Seitz** (speaking personally, not on behalf of Caltrans) noted that older photochemical/gridcell emissions modeling for vehicles could help inform ECHO-AIR but would need to be updated and shared contact information
- **Charles McCaw** questioned whether ECHO-AIR has the specificity to reflect conditions in his community (near the Inglewood oil field), noted the tool doesn't incorporate measurement data, and asked whether resources might be better spent on other health-improving investments, such as access to jobs, healthcare, and medicine. Indicated that his community recently completed SNAPS air quality monitoring near the oil field.
- **Paula Torrado** responded that ECHO-AIR can break down data by region and by source and can examine racial-equity dimensions, though it cannot currently go down to the individual-community level or assess cumulative impacts, and offered to follow up with commenters individually. **Dr. Apte** added ECHO-AIR can show how different sources affect different communities but is not intended for city block or neighborhood-level granularity. **Hye-Youn Park** noted OEHHA's version uses CARB's EMFAC model, currently covers total PM only (not air toxics), and remains limited for some health-related conclusions given its early stage, though they have an interest in exploring including of additional health and air toxic aspects.

4.6 Roadmap to Reduce Air Toxics (CARB Transportation and Toxics Division)

- **Kevin Olp** introduced the topic: AB 617 emphasizes toxic air contaminants (TACs), of which roughly 200 compounds are currently formally listed by OEHHA; he also described “emerging” toxics under review, citing OEHHA's May 2026 draft inhalation unit risk findings for acrolein and ethylene oxide, now estimated to be significant drivers of statewide cancer risk. He reviewed existing AB 617 toxics tools – the Criteria and Toxics Reporting (CTR) regulation, the Technology Clearinghouse, and community air monitoring, – and local examples from CERPs, including West Oakland lead emissions from the port, Portside VOC monitoring, the Spray Days pesticide-notification program (Arvin/Lamont/Shafter), San Diego's Tijuana River hydrogen-sulfide monitoring and distribution of nearly 6,000 air filters, South Coast auto-body-shop rules phasing out PCBTF, Richmond/North Richmond/San Pablo refinery flaring rulemaking, and South Coast ethylene oxide monitoring and enforcement.
- **Dr. La'Shaye Cobley** and **Matthew O'Donnell** (CARB TTD) presented background on the draft statewide Roadmap to Reduce Air Toxics, describing it as a high-level, collaborative strategy document – where the state is now, where it wants to go, and how to get there – rather than a compound-by-compound technical plan, with two public comment periods and a Board item anticipated in November 2026.
- **Kevin Olp** posed three discussion questions: (1) What questions do you have from the presentation? (2) What have we learned from the Community Air Protection Program that can strengthen CARB's implementation of the Roadmap? (3) Which

Roadmap commitments should Blueprint 3.0 explicitly reinforce to guide future Program work?

- Co-Chairs **John Balmes** and **Diane Takvorian** both emphasized that member and public feedback will directly inform the Board item, noting the Board views the topic as both critical and new. The Co-Chairs plan to take feedback from the Consultation Group to the Board in November and encouraged additional thoughts to be shared after the meeting as well.
- **Cassie Lopina** asked whether the Roadmap includes development of new Airborne Toxic Control Measures (ATCMs); **Matthew O'Donnell** confirmed ATCMs will be emphasized where they can have the most impact, alongside other not-yet-defined emission-reduction strategies. He indicated that ATCMs are a lengthy process, usually 4-5 years, and tend to be focused on a small number of pollutants. They therefore don't bring about change as quickly as often as desired. Therefore the roadmap includes the desire for additional emission reduction strategies to bring about change more quickly. As a follow up, **Cassie Lopina** recommended widely disseminating information on the types of sources emitting the highest impacting toxics, as well as the types of technology controls that could potentially be utilized to eliminate or significantly reduce those emissions.
- **Dr. Charisma Acey** asked how community-identified toxics from CERPs and Community Steering Committee engagement factor into shaping the Roadmap and what the prioritization method is and whether it is clearly addressed in the Roadmap. **Dr. Acey** recommended the Roadmap explicitly address multiscale governance and communication flows, potentially as its own dedicated chapter rather than only technical information.
- **Dr. Cobley** described the Roadmap as a high-level, collaborative document guiding where CARB wants to go – with few compound-specific details so far beyond acrolein and ethylene oxide (ETO) – and stressed the importance of relationships built across different players that have a stake in air quality, including Air Districts, state agencies, and community groups. She addressed **Dr. Acey's** comments, indicating stakeholder relationships, governance, and prioritization were all aspects of building the framework itself; details will follow during implementation of the Roadmap. She also shared that one of the goals for the Roadmap is to have public consensus on the standard criteria in CARB's decision-making framework.
- **Kevin Olp** discussed the Roadmap as an opportunity for the CAP Program, indicating that CARB is going to be centrally prioritizing toxics as an area in which to invest resources and support regulation development. He highlighted tools working in concert to support AB 617 work to reduce risk from toxics, including the Criteria and Toxics Reporting regulation and Technology Clearinghouse, and the need for a coordinated approach across the 19 selected communities (and future selected communities).
- **Paula Torrado** discussed proactive community engagement throughout the Roadmap development and implementation and prioritization criteria based on existing community-identified needs and information. She echoed other comments related to governance and the roles of different entities, incorporating an

environmental justice “fast tracked” priority, and identifying case scenarios and “bite-sized” concrete, near-term actions that can be groundtruthed with the community to pair with the high-level framing of the Roadmap. **Matthew O’Donnell** expressed appreciation for the group’s interest in the details of implementation and a desire to continue to work together to get input at every step of the process to identify the best approaches. He also cautioned that substantial resources will be needed that the program does not currently have and stressed the value of sharing feedback at the November Board meeting.

- **Kevin Hamilton** urged the Roadmap team to consult AB 617 advisory committees directly, noting community members have already identified specific facilities needing assessment, and flagged that other state agencies (DTSC, DPR) should be involved and could help support with additional resources and staff; **Matthew O’Donnell** confirmed outreach to those and other agencies is underway and noted each has separate statutory authority and tools that could be advantageous to this effort, and that communities rightly expect coordinated communication across agencies but it doesn’t happen as much as it should.
- **Jasmine Beltran** raised the value of community monitoring versus reliance on delayed emissions models for immediate enforcement and the importance of incorporating first-responder technology and data; **Kevin Olp** emphasized that OCAP is a big funder of community air monitoring systems and how critical it is for communities to have capacity to measure their own air quality. He highlighted that OCAP works actively with each grantee to make sure they can raise a notification to CARB and the district if they see a high emission level and ensuring the complaint system and other pipelines result in quick enforcement action. He also underscored the importance of validated reporting systems to support enforcement.

4.7 Public Comment (Air Toxics Roadmap)

- **Charles McCaw** urged CARB to move from an aspirational and general “community health” framing – which he described as slow and arbitrary – toward concrete, pollutant-specific, time-bound action, citing acrolein as a compound relevant to his own community as measured during the previously mentioned SNAPS monitoring near the Inglewood oil field.
- **Moses Huerta** (Community Science, Paramount, CA) thanked the co-chairs for framing of the roadmap around whether emission reductions are actually improving health where it’s needed most. He expressed appreciation for the ECHO-AIR system and AB617 strategy as tools that can strengthen the community science and air monitoring work he’s already involved in. Drawing on his own experience with Air District investments leading to real policy action, he stressed the need to keep linking measurement, modeling, and toxics data to drive meaningful progress.
- **Dr. Cobley** responded with recognition that action is wanted, and that the Roadmap is intentionally shifting the program from reactive to proactive, citing early action items already underway (e.g., on ethylene oxide). **Kevin Olp** acknowledged resource and bureaucratic constraints, also indicating that bureaucracy is some of the hardest but most important work to move from understanding a toxic to regulation. He

emphasized the need for collaboration with the Air Districts to leverage resources and accelerate the work.

4.8 Closing Remarks and Next Steps

- **Co-Chair John Balmes** endorsed Paula Torrado's pilot-project idea – measuring a specific toxic in a specific community paired with an exposure-reduction plan – as a concrete complement to the broader Roadmap.
- **Co-Chair Diane Takvorian** thanked CARB (OCAP) staff, the Consultation Group, and the public, calling the first study session a robust and valuable new format, and underscored the need for measurable community-level improvements ("low-hanging fruit" the group can point to as it continues building the program's scientific base.
- **Sarah Sullivant** confirmed notes and video from the session will be posted and shared with the Transportation and Toxics Division for submission to the public docket; the next study session is October 29, 2026, and the next full hybrid Consultation Group meeting is December 2, 2026, in Riverside.
- **Deldi Reyes** reiterated thanks, noted that the December 2 Riverside meeting's main topic is shaping up to be ways to strengthen the program, and reminded ad hoc members that their meetings are compensable and stipends can be requested.

4.9 Non-Agenda Public Comment

- **Charles McCaw** said CARB already has relevant data from SNAPS and other monitoring– including acrolein and PM2.5 data – and identified "underserved" communities, and asked what more is needed before the state acts. He pointed to Lost Hills as an additional location where CARB already holds data and could pursue a pilot project. He called for a specific plan with source attribution, naming oil fields, leaf blowers, and vehicle traffic as examples of sources to examine. He said he believes his community, east of the Inglewood oil field, is ready and willing to work with CARB.

5. Additional Resources

Note: Because chat and Q&A functions were disabled for this meeting (per Bagley-Keene rules and feedback), no resource links were shared in a meeting chat. Materials for this session, including presentation slides, are posted on the Consultation Group meeting webpage: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/events/community-air-protection-consultation-group-virtual-study-session-september-14-2026>