

MEMORANDUM

August 4, 2020

TO: Bay Area Air Quality Management District

FR: MIG, Inc.

RE: Summary of July 29, 2020 Richmond-San Pablo Area Community Air Monitoring Plan Steering Committee Meeting #15

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) is partnering with the Richmond-San Pablo Area to develop a Community Air Monitoring Plan (Monitoring Plan) through the state of California's [Community Air Protection Program](#), also known as Assembly Bill 617 (AB 617). Community engagement is critical to the development of the Monitoring Plan to ensure a community-driven plan that reflects the community's values, needs and preferences.

In April 2019, the Air District formed a Steering Committee to advise the development of the Monitoring Plan and act as liaisons between the community stakeholders they represent by disseminating information and transmitting input as appropriate. The Steering Committee will: identify the monitoring plan boundary; identify areas of concern for air pollution; potential contributing sources; and vulnerable populations; review existing studies on air quality to provide input towards Plan development; and disseminate information and consider input from the broader community. Initial monitoring efforts began in July 2019. Steering Committee members are listed in Table 1.

On July 29, 2020, the Steering Committee (or Committee) held its fifteenth meeting. Following guidance from the Contra Costa health department regarding public gatherings and Covid-19, the Steering Committee met virtually using online video conferencing. The Air District offered a Zoom tutorial prior to the virtual meeting to ensure that all Steering Committee members and members of the public were able to participate throughout the meeting. Live Spanish translation was provided.

Twenty-seven (27) Steering Committee members out of 35 were in attendance. A breakdown of the number of representatives by sector is available in Table 2. The meeting agenda and presentation materials are available in Appendix A. Jamillah Jordan of MIG provided meeting facilitation and ensured that key agreements and discussion topics were documented. The meeting recording can be viewed here: <https://migcom.egnyte.com/fl/aELts7JyaS>

Table 1: Steering Committee Membership

Steering Committee Member Name	Alternate	Organization	Attendance
Adam Oliver	Todd Osterberg	Chevron	Present
Amanda Booth		City of San Pablo	Present
Annie M. King-Meredith		Resident	Present
Arnon Oren		Anaviv Catering	Present
Boris Lukanov	Lee Ann Hill	PSE Healthy Energy	Present
Bryana Gastelum		Resident	Present
Cesar Zepeda		Hill Top Neighborhood	Absent
Demnlus Johnson		City of Richmond	Present
Don Lau	Larry Lewis	Resident	Present
Dr. Henry Clark		West County Toxics Coalition	Present
James Holland		Levin Terminal	Present
James Lee		Richmond Chamber of Commerce	Absent
Janet Johnson		Sunflower Alliance	Present
Jessica Range		Resident	Absent
Jill Rodby		Sims Metal	Present
Joe L. Fisher		Coronado Neighborhood	Absent
Julia Walsh		No Coal in Richmond	Present
Kate Hoag	Kristen Law	BAAQMD	Present
Katrinka Ruk	Fred Glueck	Council of Industries	Present
Leydi Maldonado		Resident	Absent
Linda Whitmore		Santa Fe Neighborhood	Present
Maria Martínez Resendiz		Resident	Absent
Martine Blake	Marin Trujillo	WCCCUSD	Absent
Matt Holmes	Jen Fong	Groundwork Richmond	Present
Melvin Siegel		Resident	Present
Monique Davis	Anna Scodel	CARB	Present
Dr. Naama Raz-Yaseef		Richmond Heights Neighborhood	Present
Nain Villanueva de Lopez		First Five	Present
Oscar Garcia		Iron Triangle Neighborhood	Present

Steering Committee Member Name	Alternate	Organization	Attendance
Paul Ehara		Idle No More / Rich City Rides	Present
Randy Joseph		Resident	Present
Dr. Rohan Radhakrishna	Dan Peddycord	Contra Costa Health Services	Present
Roxanne Carrillo Garza	Pierre Thompson	Healthy Richmond	Present
Rudy Lara	Mirna Cervantes	Multicultural Institute	Present
Willie Robinson		NAACP: Richmond Branch	Present

Table 2: Steering Committee Membership by Sector

Sector	Representatives in Attendance	Total Representatives
Community-Based Organization/Nonprofit	9	10
Education	0	1
Government	5	5
Industry/Business	5	6
Resident/Neighborhood Group	8	13
Total	27	35

I. Welcome, Introductions and Roll Call

Dr. Naama Raz Yaseef of the Co-Lead Team welcome participants to the Final Steering Committee meeting. Jamillah Jordan reviewed participation guidelines and conducted roll call to establish whether the Steering Committee members in attendance constituted a quorum. A quorum allows the Committee to vote on key decisions. According to the Steering Committee Charter, a quorum requires that more than 50% of members are present and of those present, more than 50% of members in attendance must represent residents and/or organizations that represent residents; this does not include members who are residents but represent other sectors during Steering Committee meetings (e.g., industry, government or education).

As each Steering Committee member in attendance introduced themselves, Kristen Law of the Air District took attendance and kept track of how many members represented residents. Of the 27 Steering Committee members in attendance, 16 (59%) represented residents, which constituted a quorum.

II. Process Update

Following roll call, Dan Alrick of the Air District provided an update on the Path to Clean Air process, including the Monitoring Plan and transition to the CERP. Once formed, the Monitoring Outreach Team (MOT) will partner with the Air District in developing monitoring updates and conducting outreach and engagement. The MOT will be responsible for informing and educating stakeholders around the Path to Clean Air process and air monitoring topics throughout the Richmond – San Pablo study area.

III. Final Draft of the Community Air Monitoring Plan

Dan Alrick of the Air District recapped the Monitoring Plan review process and reviewed the Final Draft Community Air Monitoring Plan. A final version of the Draft Monitoring Plan will be published after incorporating the Steering Committee latest input. After the presentation, the Steering Committee members asked questions and provided input on the updated Draft Monitoring Plan. This discussion is summarized below.

- Steering Committee member: On page 13, the Plan states that PM_{2.5} concentrations in the Bay Area have gradually declined over the years and are within EPA health standards. Did the data from the initial monitoring projects also show that?
 - Air District: Analyzing the data collected by the initial monitoring projects will be the next big step. All of that data is coming in and we need to make sense of it and see how it compares to existing data, and how it will inform the CERP.
 - Air District: The data for these initial monitoring projects weren't designed to be compared to national standards. For example, Aclima's initial project was conducted over a three-month period and there aren't air quality standards that cover a three-month period.
- Steering Committee member: In my community people are asking for information about the monitoring efforts. I think it would be helpful for me and for residents to understand data findings related to public health and safety. Will the information be interpreted in terms of health and safety impacts?
 - Air District: We'll be looking at the data through a health and safety lens. Part of the MOT's role is to help us make sure that the data is useful to the community and that the data responds to community needs. This will help answer the "so what?" questions around the data results. One of our main goals is to make sure the data is meaningful.
 - Groundwork Richmond: That's our concern with the data. Data is not good if it can't be used in real time. We have a real time model that shows if air is healthy or unhealthy. The data is not a planning exercise, it's being collected to create actionable information.

- Steering Committee member: The integrity of the data is a concern. Will it be single source? Once that data is collected, how does it get back to the community? We need a discussion on how it reaches daily end users to achieve our goal of improving health outcomes.
- Steering Committee member: How does the *richmondairmonitoring.org* website fit in?
 - Air District: The <https://www.richmondairmonitoring.org/> website is Chevron's Air Monitoring website. We've taken an initial look at the Chevron community data, and while those stations were not sited to collect data that are directly comparable to national air quality standards, the data can still inform other monitoring efforts and actions for emissions reductions. It can be compared to future monitoring that the Air District will begin after the shelter in place activities.
- Steering Committee member: What website should we look at?
 - Groundwork Richmond: We're integrating data into the Shair model that our Ramboll consultants developed. It's nine counties wide but you can zoom into Richmond: www.transparentrichmond.org/stories/s/2ag9-azjv
- Steering Committee member: My understanding is that source apportionment is required by CARB, but it's not clear to me how that is going to be handled in the Monitoring Plan. When will that be included and how?
 - Air District: That's a component required for the CERP that we'll be starting next. There's a technical assessment that makes up a big piece of the CERP and the source apportionment falls under that assessment.
 - Steering Committee member: To clarify, the data from this Monitoring will be used in the source apportionment piece of the CERP?
 - Air District: Yes, the instruments included in the van are designed to help us collect enough information to support source apportionment. The technical assessment is still being developed and will need input from the CERP Steering Committee. That work will include monitoring data and also updated emissions information and modeling.
- Steering Committee member: I want to address questions around the display and interpretation of data. I haven't heard too many specifics and I'd like to suggest that we establish a map-based display within a GIS database and download real-time data. We could coordinate with the coexisting monitoring efforts, construct a website for map-based display and conduct a best practices analysis of the collected data. I think this could go a long way in answer these questions around how the community receives data.
 - Air District: We would love to see everything in one spot, though it's complicated because there are a lot of different types of data being gathered. We have the sensor networks and mobile data being collected over different

- intervals and at different times of the year. We understand that Aclima and PSE Healthy Energy are collaborating to combine different datasets.
- Aclima: Yes, we're really close to integrating different datasets, including PSE Healthy Energy's stationary sensors.
 - Steering Committee member: Do we have a specific timeline for collecting and interpreting data and sharing it with the community? I'm worried that we're collecting data and there's no action.
 - Air District: We're working on that. Now that the Plan is being finalized, we can start looking at the data and getting those results back to the Steering Committee and public. We want to provide that as quickly as possible. There are some aspects of the monitoring timeline that are uncertain.
 - Steering Committee member: When will the data collected by the initial monitoring projects be integrated?
 - Aclima: The integration is an emergent task that came out of collaborating with PSE Healthy Energy, so we are working through the administrative and technical logistics.
 - PSE Healthy Energy: Everything is also taking longer because of COVID-19. The next two weeks will be critical. We should have something ready in August.
 - Steering Committee member: When we started out almost a year ago we discussed developing a Memorandum of Understanding with the initial monitoring projects that would have included timeframes and deliverables. It was never agreed to.

Members of the public were also invited to ask questions and make comments after the Steering Committee's discussion around the Final Draft Community Air Monitoring Plan. These public comments are summarized below.

- Member of the Public: This is important information that the community and local governments need. There should be presentations done in city sessions such as the Richmond City Council and other San Pablo and Contra Costa governments. The cities have jurisdiction over people who live in the study area. There's a whole lot of other people who need to know about this.
- Member of the Public: Page five talks about Richmond residents having more health issues, ER visits and death rates. Can you identify the sources for that information?
 - Air District: That data comes from a few places, including health screening tools, previous analyses, and hospital information that health departments collect and release through various means. We can put you in touch with people who understand those datasets better. Rohan might also want to provide his perspective. We expect the CERP technical assessment process will cover health-related topics in more detail.

- Member of the Public: Page 12 talks about the Chevron system and lists other pollutants. Could we footnote the other pollutants? I could provide a list of that. I have the same comment for a table on page 13. To provide more detail I thought we could list those other compounds.
 - Air District: We can talk about that. I think it'd be good to list the different compounds that make up that broader category.
- Member of the Public: One of the previous speakers talked about impacts. Greg Nudd and I have had discussions on genetic susceptibility. When you look at these compounds and at the population in Richmond, the African American population, there are certain chemicals that the population is more susceptible to. In Bayview we haven't quantified the risk factor involved but we know it's greatly increased. Are you taking this into account of what is impacting the community and hospitalization rates, and the disease that is being disproportionately carried by the African American community as we see in the virus? In that environmental conditions contribute to their susceptibility. So how is this being incorporated into the information to assist residents and physicians in the health care of their patients? The scientific literature on this has been out for over 30 years and regulatory agencies have not incorporated this, and this is part of the frustration. I've discussed this with the CDC back in '95, on risk assessments. When you do measurements, and I'm talking about the instruments and how this is measured, because there is an inherited bias toward communities of color and specifically African American communities. When we look at this in a new light, how are we incorporating this almost 40- year old scientific knowledge that has not been incorporated by regulatory agencies? Previously in your discussion you were talking about Bay Area regional areas. I would be more concerned with the CARE zones in terms of the change and difference and particulates and the shift, versus the average. Some communities are doing quite well, and other communities are doing quite poorly. So if I could get that differential as well please. This would be a great help to my friend who is a physician, who practices medicine in Richmond. This would be a great help to him in terms of how to treat his patients.
 - Air District: As we put this monitoring data together, and Dr. Clark asked about this earlier, we need to consider the race of the people who are experiencing these exposures. Race, age, there's several factors that need to be taken into account when you look at the impacts of air pollution on the community. That will be an important discussion to have as we move onto the next phase of this project, which will be to come up with actions to reduce emissions in Richmond – San Pablo.
- Member of the Public: When you begin discussing health impacts and other issues, will this Committee be reconvened to inform citizens and allow them to take part in the discussion?

- Air District: We are transitioning from the Community Monitoring Plan into a CERP. We're talking about how to put a Community Steering Committee together for the CERP. That's where we anticipate updates going to the community, augmented by electronic outreach.
- Steering Committee member: I want to thank the doctor for highlighting this Committee's failure for involving the health sector in this process. Apparently, we lack the clout to get anybody involved, even the County health department hasn't been able to get health care providers to get us any data, or any information distribution to the most impacted populations. Because of the lack of involvement from the health care community we've had long winded conversations about atmospheric chemistry and bureaucratic and regulatory gymnastics instead of talking about people who are suffering from poor air quality. This needs to be a very high priority for the CERP Committee. You can't get 6 months down a 12-month timeline without talking about what we're here for. I hope we can marshal some kind of political will and influence to get this done.

IV. Monitoring Process Path Forward

Willie Robinson of the Co-Lead Team recapped the Monitoring Outreach Team (MOT) purpose, roles and responsibilities. The MOT will collaborate with the Air District to review and revise updates on monitoring projects, present updates at public meetings and conduct outreach. Mr. Robinson introduced the five MOT candidates (Dr. Henry Clark, Oscar Garcia, Matt Holmes, Dr. Julia Walsh and Linda Whitmore) and shared the Co-Lead Team's recommendation to vote on the five candidates as a group.

A Steering Committee member asked about the sixth MOT candidate, a young person who is not currently on the Steering Committee. The Air District explained that the criteria for the MOT requires members to be Community Air Monitoring Plan Steering Committee members, but we are working with the youth resident to find ways to engage him in the Path to Clean Air process.

Following Mr. Robinson's presentation, the Steering Committee voted to approve the five MOT candidates as a group. Twenty-two members voted to approve the five candidates and one voted against approval. Three members abstained. The vote to approve the five MOT candidates as a group passed with a 95% majority.

V. Steering Committee Member Reflections

After the vote, Steering Committee members were invited to share their reflections around participating in the Community Air Monitoring Plan and Path to Clean Air process. The

Steering Committee's comments were documented in real time using Mural. The original Mural is available in Appendix A.

The Steering Committee's comments have been grouped by theme and copied on the following page.

VI. Public Comment

At the conclusion of the Steering Committee discussion, the floor was opened for public comment. There were some interruptions made by Steering Committee members during these comments. As such, a transcription of the exchanges is provided for clarity.

- Member of the Public: It was really nice sitting and listening to the comments on your reflection, and your experiences that you guys have had. I'm not going to bust your bubble, which I think it does need a little popping but I'll save that for a later time. I want you all to reflect on the fact, that while you all are patting each other on the back, I have had at least three relatives that have passed away within the last 18 months. From COPD, lung cancer and kidney failure. I take it back – a fourth one that had heart failure. So while we talk about monitoring, I task you all to ask, "How is it that Richmond became a CARE community if we're still monitoring?" Our suggestion early on when the agency approached this process, that they put together this committee – which is why we didn't participate in the beginning – was the fact that we felt Richmond had enough data and information and experience, especially with Dr. Clark and others on this committee and I don't doubt their ability at all I know they were probably pushing hard for this, but there should have been an emissions reduction project in place –
 - Steering Committee Member Interruption: We're not there yet [inaudible] stupid. That's the next step you don't know what you're talking about.
 - MIG Facilitator: Excuse me I'm sorry only one person at a time please. Go ahead [Member of the Public] go ahead I'm sorry about that.
 - Member of the Public: OK who was that that made that comment and was that directed towards me?
 - MIG Facilitator: I'm not sure who that was. Let's keep moving though.
 - Member of the Public: Yeah we'll keep moving but if that person was directing that comment towards me I want them to identify themselves, so that I can respond because they need to be put on the spot. That's exactly why we have these issues here. If you reflect on how many people have passed away from air pollution, we would see that it takes more than just going along to get along. You've got to push hard against these processes so that we can really get to some real reduction of pollution – not just sitting monitoring, which equals monitoring the bully continuing to beat up on our communities that are already disenfranchised and disadvantaged. So that's what I wanted to put forward, but I also wanted to identify who had that comment.
 - Steering Committee Member: I would also like to comment...
 - MIG Facilitator: I'm not sure, I'm going to hold you for one second [Steering Committee Member] we've got a whole cue.

- Steering Committee Member: [Crosstalk] I focus on the number of people we have kept rather than the people who have passed away.
- Member of the Public: What did he say?
- MIG Facilitator: Go ahead [Steering Committee Member], can you repeat that?
- Steering Committee Member: I don't focus on the number of people that may have died from whatever cause. I concentrate on how many lives we're saving. How many people are getting better? How much has air quality improved? What situations have we corrected that were polluting or that we will correct? This is more important to me than looking at the number of gravestones.
- Member of the Public: I would say to [Steering Committee Member] because I think he was the one that mentioned earlier that he didn't agree with folks being paid to attend those meetings, that he has the inability to understand the plight of poor folks because there are some folks who are on these Committees who take out valuable time from their families and children, so they should be paid on that front. But also, I am disgusted that a white man in Richmond, representing Richmond, would have the gall to open his mouth and say that he doesn't look at or focus on people that have died. That's because it's not his people. But I guarantee you that if you knock on doors in black communities I guarantee you they would not agree with that man's approach that you don't focus on the deaths. Because you've got to focus on the negatives in order to get some positives. And listening to that man's comment and some of the other comments lets me know exactly why I could not participate in this process because you'll never get to any real pollution reduction activities with those kind of people on your Committee.
- Air District: I don't think the way the member of the public was treated was appropriate. She was very much within her rights to remind us about the real health impacts on the community and hold us accountable for moving quickly. I want to weigh in on that and apologize to [Member of the Public] for the disrespect that she received here tonight.
- MIG Facilitator: Yes and on behalf of the facilitation team that's not the type of environment that we want here, so please accept our apologies.
- Member of the Public: I feel very honored to be here. I am 17 years old and still in high school and I feel honored to be around people taking charge of what's happening in our community. I've been communicating with people and trying to get more resources. At the beginning of the summer I participated in an internship called Public Health Solutions. My community issue that I focused on in that internship was environmental justice, so this was a big experience for me – to talk to different people and get a bunch of resources. I'm happy to be here and since I'm the next generation, my people are the next generation to lead what you guys are going to do. We're here

to try our best and I'm here to learn from what you have done for the community. I appreciate the Co-Leads and everything that has been done for Richmond.

VII. Next Steps

The CERP Design Team, made up of people who live in the community and representatives of community-based organizations, is currently designing the CERP process and developing the application and participation guidelines for the CERP Steering Committee. Once the CERP Steering Committee application is complete the Air District and/or Design Team will send it to all members of the Steering Committee.