Bay Area Air Quality Management District
375 Beale Street, Suite 600
San Francisco, CA 94105

DRAFT MINUTES

Richmond – No. Richmond – San Pablo Community Emissions Reduction Plan Community Steering Committee

October 27, 2025, 5:30 P.M

1. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL

The Richmond – North Richmond – San Pablo Community Emissions Reduction Plan Community Steering Committee (CSC or Committee) Co-Lead Nancy Aguirre called the meeting to order at 5:33 PM.

Present:	Co-Lead Nancy Aguirre, Co-Lead Dr. Omoniyi Omotoso, Co-Lead Marisol Cantú, Y'Anad Burrell, Suzanne Coffee, Shaun Cotten, Bryana Gastelum, Michelle Gomez Garcia, Martha Gruelle, Kerry Guerin, Lizbeth Ibarra, Jeffrey Kilbreth, Joseph Koscinski, Jessica Range, Simren Sandhu, Dave Severy, Derebew Shankute, Samir Shrestha, Ariel Xi, Emily Warming (non-voting), BK White (non-voting), Sandra Castaneda (non-voting)
Absent:	Luna Angulo-Castro, Beverly Dynes, Samir Shretha, Althea Skinner
Also Present:	Air District and Air Board Staff: Diana Ruiz, Ayah Hassan, Mausam Jamwal, Karissa White, Nina Garde, Joelle Toney, Marcia Raymond, Erika Trinidad, Grace Leung, Wendy Goodfriend, Alicia Parker, Kevin Olp, Janet Carrasco, Chad White, Joseph Lapka Interpreter: Tony Mejia Acterra staff

The Meeting Agenda, procedures and Meeting Goals were reviewed by Co-Lead Nancy Aguirre. She noted that being mindful of the packed agenda, a one-minute timer would be used for comments instead of the normal two-minute timer.

Air District staff member Mausam Jamwal reviewed the 2025 Agenda Planning timeline since April, where the CSC is now – Discuss Year 2 Implementation – and what needs to be completed by the end of December – Draft the Just Transition Vision Plan and Finalize Year 2 Implementation Plan.

Committee Comment

None

Committee Action

None; receive and file.

Public Comments

None

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 22ND, 2025 (ACTION ITEM)

00:07:40

The Committee approved the Meeting Minutes for September 22nd, 2025, with a roll-call vote. Co-Lead Dr. Omoniyi Omotoso made a motion, seconded by Committee member Y'Anad Burrell. The motion carried by the following vote of the Committee:

AYES: Co-Lead Nancy Aguirre, Co-Lead Marisol Cantú, Co-Lead Dr. Omoniyi Omotoso, Y'Anad Burrell, Bryana Gastelum, Michelle Gomez Garcia, Martha Gruelle, Kerry Guerin, Lizbeth Ibarra, Jessica Range, Simren Sandhu, Dave Severy, Derebew Shankute, Ariel Xi

ABSTAIN: Suzanne Coffee, Shaun Cotten, Jeffrey Kilbreth, and Joseph Koscinski

NOES: None

ABSENT: Luna Angulo-Castro, Beverly Dynes, Samir Shrestha, Althea Skinner

Committee Comment

None

Committee Action

None; receive and file.

Public Comments

None

3. CSC LIAISONS REPORT-OUT

00:10:30

Committee Co-Lead Nancy Aguirre moderated.

Committee member and Refinery Communities Bimonthly Meetings (RCBM) Group Liaison BK White reported out on the Group's last meeting, held on October 21, 2025. At that meeting Liaisons and Committee members White and Lizbeth Ibarra gave a presentation on the Year 1 Annual Report and the Year 1 Implementation Process. Another presentation at the meeting looked at perspectives relating to emission inventories and crude slate reporting requirements. The Air Board is considering removing crude slate requirements from Rule 12-15 when the Rule is opened to consider fenceline monitoring. Community perspectives on air monitoring in the refinery corridor with a lot of discussion around inaccurate ozone measurements and "background creep" as the system "slowly forgets what clean air looks like" as the baseline is reset because "there is a constant background of dirty air." The next RCBM meeting has yet to be scheduled; there is a meeting concerning community funds is scheduled for Wednesday, October 29.

Committee member and Refinery Technical Working Group (RTWG) Liaison Jeff Kilbreth reported out. The last meeting was held on August 27 and the next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 29. While the original focus of the Group was on flaring, at the August meeting the Air District inserted fenceline monitoring into the Group's deliberation sequence. Group members have since completed a homework assignment to ascertain people's key goals and beliefs regarding the value of monitoring, etc. Some of the questions raised by the assignment may be answered at the next meeting on October 29, but then the attention of the Group is to turn back to flaring.

Committee member and Liaison Lizbeth Ibarra reported that public comment period for proposed amendments to Rule 11-18 was open until October 13. Liaisons and Committee members Ibarra and BK White with Air District staff at the end of September to discuss Rule 11-18 Engagement Recommendations and how to increase opportunities for CSC engagement. Both Liaisons attended a Rule 11-18 amendments workshop on October 2. The date for the next Rule 11-18 meeting has not yet been set.

Committee member and Legal Enforcement Working Group Liaison Shaun Cotten reported that the Group discussed goals and expectations at its first, in-person kickoff meeting on October 22 at the Air District's headquarters in San Francisco. At the next meeting, scheduled for November 12, the Group will go over all the tools the Air District has available.

<u>Committee Comments</u>

Committee member Y'Anad Burrell asked Committee member BK White to elaborate on his belief that crude slates had value as a reporting tool compared to combustion rate reporting, which is favored by the Air District. His response stressed differences in off-gassing rates of

volatiles under different refinery operations that may be inaccurately reflected if only combustion rates are tracked. Following up, Committee member Burrell asked how those opinions could be conveyed to the Air District? A discussion ensued around public comments being offered if Rule 12-15 is opened to address possible rule changes related to monitoring. In the interest of time, Committee Co-Lead Nancy Aguirre asked the discussion be moved to emails between CSC members, with the Committee's concerns about the process for providing comments and input, the timing for any prospective rule change, etc., be combined into a single package to be forwarded to the Air District.

Committee member Derebew Shankute asked Committee member White to elaborate further on his comments regarding the problem of "background creep" in collecting air quality monitoring data. Committee member White replied that air quality monitoring is conducted continuously and over time some instruments' measurements are affected because pollutants are present in samples, which are then reported as "normal." The issue was identified during a presentation by Air District staff from Southern California at the October 21 RCBM Group meeting; their presentation included recommendations for changing monitoring programs to eliminate the problem.

Committee member Jessica Range directed a comment to the 11-18 Group that it would be interesting to understand how the Rule relates to existing permitting processes: for example, what happens if a facility modifies a source? Committee member and Rule 11-18 Liaison Lizbeth Ibarra replied that she and Liaison BK White could take the question back to Air District staff for clarification.

Committee member Kerry Guerin commented that she had placed comments in the Chat relating to the Air District's predicted timeline for next year for Rule 12-15 amendments and the different public engagement opportunities. Committee member Guerin also informed attendees that the comment period has opened for the Flare Minimization Plans, which is an annual process.

Committee member Y'Anad Burrell asked if the links provided in the Chat would be provided to the Committee as she was not logged in. Committee Co-Lead Nancy Aguirre replied in the affirmative.

Committee Action

None; receive and file.

Public Comments

None

4. YEAR 2 IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING: ALIGN ON DEFINITIONS OF CSC'S ENGAGEMENT LEVELS

00:26:40

Committee Comment

Committee Co-Lead Nancy Aguirre set out the current CSC Levels of Engagement (Informed, Consulted, Involved, Collaborated With – recently added) and asked the question how the CSC wants to be involved as it moves into Year 2 Implementation.

Committee member Jeff Kilbreth stated that he thought in most cases the CSC's role has been to be involved; with few circumstances where there has been collaboration. He believes that Rule 11-18 is the single most important issue. Will there be there be an opportunity during Year 2 to work with the Air District collaboratively to design the solution?

In response, Committee Co-Lead Aguirre posed the question to the Committee: Do the CSC definitions for levels of engagement provide enough clarity?

Air District staff Mausam Jamwal commented that the activity for the meeting was going to be to talk about where the CSC wanted to go during Year 2 with the levels of engagement, including the collaboration category. She further noted that the CSC Liaisons working on Rule 11-18 were part of the collaboration process.

Committee member and Co-Lead Dr. Omoniyi Omotoso agreed with Committee member Kilbreth's assessment that collaboration did not occur during Year 1 and that there was a need to determine what the Committee has the capacity to do rather than just what it aspires to do.

Committee member Y'Nad Burrell asked whether the question of collaboration with the Air District could even be answered without the Air District CIO present? Was the CSC pulling together its desires to be presented to the Air District for consideration?

Air District staff Diana Ruiz reviewed how the collaboration category had come together as a draft recommendation over the course of two meetings and probably prematurely inserted into the table. The Air District's is doing its own due diligence, given that there are levels of collaboration and they must consider input from the public. She suggested the breakout groups further discuss and define "collaboration" – it being practice to be built into all the other columns rather than a stand-alone column.

Co-Lead Aguirre expressed concern, as it seemed as though the CSC was being moved aside. Similar concerns were voiced by other Committee members, including Co-Lead Marisol Cantú, who observed that it appeared the CSC and Air District were interpreting collaboration in two very different ways. Committee member Y'Nad Burrell stated that the word "collaboration" itself is important to the community – if the "Collaborate With" column is removed, it would be

important that the word appear in each of the other columns, e.g., Involved & Collaborate, Consult & Collaborate.

Committee member Jeff Kilbreth observed that because the Air District has legal responsibilities it controls everything, leaving open the question as to how the community can be involved on issues of importance to them. The "Collaborate With" column should be removed but more effort is needed to improve "Consulted" and "Involved."

Air District staff Dr. Wendy Goodfriend pointed out that there are actions identified as being CSC-led, but on those actions where the Air District or another regulatory agency is identified as the lead implementer, it isn't realistic for the Air District to co-partner or hand over decision-making to the CSC. However, she believes it is important that the CSC decide "what is successful collaboration?" Other questions include "how do you know it's successful collaboration?" and "how do you know you're being heard/respected/engaged/listened to?" If those are defined, they can be used on an on-going basis between partners to evaluate progress and see what success looks like.

Co-Lead Aguirre proposed that Committee members reach agreement regarding Levels of Engagement in order to move forward as a group.

Air District staff Mausam Jamwal proposed that elements of "Collaborate" be combined with "Involved" to become the new definition of "Involved." The breakout activity for this meeting would continue as planned, the schedule for the Year 2 Implementation Plan would remain on track and the CSC could return to working out the details at a later time. Committee members agreed with Ms. Jamwal's proposed approach proposed.

Committee Action

None; receive and file.

Public Comments

None

5. YEAR 2 IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING: ALIGN ON PRIORITY ACTIONS

00:49:50

Mausam Jamwal of the Air District reviewed the status of the 16 current Year 1 Priority Actions with the goal of asking the CSC to apply the KISS Framework (Keep, Improve, Start, Stop) to consider whether:

- Adjustments should be made to the level of engagement (Inform, Consult, Involve, Collaborate)
- The Year 1 Priory Actions still reflect CSC priorities and capacity
- New actions should be added as priorities during Year 2

Ms. Jamwal then summarized six new Start actions, and reasons each might be considered for addition to the list of Year 2 Priority Actions:

- C&E 1.2: Targeted Investigations of Facilities of Community Concern
- FR 31.13: Improve Refinery Fenceline & Community Air Monitoring Programs
- FR 2.4: Improve Incident Response
- Mobile 1.4: Magnet Source Rule
- FR 4.4: Regular Updates on Rule 11-18 Implementation
- FR 4.2: Prioritize Implementation of Rule 11-18 for Chevron

Following her review of the existing and proposed Year 2 Priority Actions, Ms. Jamwal led a large group discussion built on the KISS Framework.

Committee member Y'Nad Burrell asked whether there was a restriction on the number of Priority Actions allowed. Ms. Jamwal replied there was no restriction but asked that members consider capacity of both the CSC and the Air District.

Using a white board, Ms. Jamwal graphically presented the 16 Year 1 Priority Actions and six new Year 2 Priority Actions, with recommendations for which Priority Actions should remain unchanged during Year 2, and which actions should be modified, for example, being shifted from Consult to Involved, or from Consult to Inform. Eleven of the 16 Year 1 Priority Actions are recommended to go forward into Year 2 unchanged (Keep) and the remaining five be shifted between Inform/Consult/Advise categories (Improve); no Year 1 Priority Actions were recommended to Stop. The six newly recommended Priority Actions were added (Start) to "Consult" (four actions) and "Involve" (two actions). She stressed the CSC did not have to make all decisions relating to the Year 2 Priority Actions during the meeting. (Committee members were referred to the second to the last page of the Pre-Read to view the information presented on the white board. The six Priority Actions proposed to be started during Year 2 are not on the graphic in the Pre-Read.)

Committee member Jessica Range commented that some of the Year 1 Priority Actions appeared to be placed in Engagement Level categories that in her opinion did not reflect the actually process between the Air District and the CSC. For example, Dust Rulemaking (C&I 1.1) is listed under "Consult" when she believes it should fall under "Inform."

Committee member Jeff Kilbreth agreed that there were problems with defining each of the Engagement Levels and he suggested that during the next month Committee members communicate by email, sharing their experiences regarding Engagement Levels (including "Collaborate") working on any of the Priority Actions with the Air District.

Committee member Range asked if in the case of Reducing exposure to wood burning (H 2.5) where a rule has now been implemented, whether the Priority Action should be moved from "Consult" to "Inform." Ms. Jamwal replied that such a change might be made, when it has been determined that a certain level of completeness has been achieved.

Committee member Y'Nad Burrell asked for clarification regarding Communications around flaring and major incidents (FR 2.2) – who are those communications going to in the community? Are they going to the people who are being most impacted? For each flaring incident, what is the public health impact? Committee member Jeff Kilbreth elaborated the importance of the public be provided specific information regarding spikes – peak emissions – during the first hours of a flaring event. Without the actual data for each pollutant it is impossible to know how serious the flaring event was. Neither the Air District nor Contra Costa County are prioritizing making that data public.

On a related issue, Co-Lead Nancy Aguirre asked who is being educated (made aware of) the notification system? Committee member Dave Severy commented that the RTWG is working on a Flaring 101 suite of informational materials. Committee member Kilbreth stated the remit of the RTWG is amendments to the Rule, but that public communication is adjacent.

Co-Lead Nancy Aguirre proposed the possibility of moving FR 2.2 from "Consult" to "Involve."

Committee member Kerry Guerin stated that she shared Committee member Burrell's concern that far more health information be shared with the public – to Committee member Kilbreth's point, that more data be collected, and that it be shared more with the public. She sees an overlap between FR 2.2 and Flaring Rule amendments (FR 2.6)

Committee member Kilbreth observed that the CSC has not been informed about the status of Chevron's installation of the wet scrubber, which relates to Implement Rule 6-5 (FR 5.1). Because that action relates to Community Benefits – how the money from the settlement will be spent – the CSC should be informed when they are going to do it, rather than Involved in implementing the Rule.

Committee member and Co-Lead Marisol Cantú suggested that the range of issues related to flaring, which spans several Priority Actions, be gathered together into a subcommittee. Because flaring is one of the top community concerns, that and Community Benefits should be the Year 2 subcommittees and Just Transition should become an ad hoc committee.

Ms. Jamwal reviewed the recommendation for moving M&R 4.1 from "Consult" to "Inform." Committee members Range and Kilbreth both commented that it was probably unnecessary to move the action for now – the schedule for regulating emission reductions from cargo handling are currently unknown, cargo handling is a relatively small source of pollution and the CSC can't offer a lot of value add in formulating the rules.

Ms. Jamwal stated that while FR 3.8 (Legal Enforcement Approaches) and FR 2.6 (Flaring Rule Amendments) are listed as "Consult" in the Year 1 Plan, the actual level of implementation is "Involve" and the recommendation for the Year 2 Plan is to move them from "Consult" to "Involve."

Committee member and Co-Lead Dr. Omoniyi Omotoso asked how different things will be if the

recommended changes are made? Ms. Jamwal replied that it is essentially changing labels to reflect actual engagement levels.

Ms. Jamwal then briefly summarized the six newly suggested or recommended Priority Actions as being ones that have momentum from the Air District side but the CSC does not have to accept or add any Priority Actions, or at the proposed level of engagement.

Committee member Jessica Range acknowledged that Mobile 1.4 (Magnet Source Rule) had been a priority for the Air District for 15 years, so she was happy to see it raised to a priority.

Committee member and Co-Lead Marisol Cantú stated that C&E 1.2 (Target Investigations of Facilities of Community Concern) was critical to the community, and FR 3.13 (Fenceline and Community Monitoring) and FR 2.4 (Incidence Response) could both be included in considering all flaring-related issues as part of a subcommittee.

Committee member Jeff Kilbreth stated that the charter of the RTWG is both flaring and fenceline monitoring but he agreed with Marisol that a committee focused on all aspects of flaring is a good idea.

Committee Action

None; receive and file.

Public Comments

None

6. YEAR 2 IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING: DISCUSS PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK AND STRUCTURE

01:44:20

Mausam Jamwal of the Air District introduced this section of the meeting, explaining that it will be about process, building on the Rose/Thorn/Bud reflection activity conducted in August to develop an implementation framework for Year 2. The reflection activity in August revealed there was an interest in developing:

- Deeper Engagement
- Stronger Collaboration
- Improved Communications

Ms. Jamwal then shared the six CSC Implementation Process Objectives developed in part based on survey responses received from CSC members during the previous month. The idea is to

combine Rose/Bud/Thorn Reflection Takeaways with Implementation Process Objectives to yield a Proposed Implementation Framework that achieves Maximum CSC Impact.

One aspect of the Proposed Implementation Plan during Year 2 is to change the frequency of the monthly CSC meetings to quarterly, with these changes allowing resources to be refocused. Proposed schedules for working groups, standing and ad hoc committees would remain the same during Year 2. Topical Meeting Sessions – defined as being working sessions between small groups of CSC members and Air District staff -- can be added as needed.

The plan is to incorporate CSC input on priorities from this meeting's KISS activity, plus input on the Implementation Framework received from survey responses and this meeting's discussions, and present the Year 2 Implementation Plan at the CSC Meeting in December.

Presentation of the Year 1 Annual Report to the Air District's Board of Directors, originally scheduled for October, has been moved to November 12 at 1:00 PM.

(Breakout Activity – Small Group Discussion – Start: 01:54:30; End: 02:19:50)

Committee Comment

Committee member and Co-Lead Dr. Omoniyi Omotoso reported out from the online Breakout Group. That group felt that the big CSC meetings seemed to be about the report outs from the working groups and committees and there was no time for in-depth discussion. Question: How can we make the material more digestible? Smaller work teams might be a way to help committee members understand the information and share with their community. The small groups may make it easier to engage with the materials in different formats. The current means of communication is not effective.

Committee member and Co-Lead Nancy Aguirre reported out for the in-person Breakout Group. The group suggested there should be a pre meeting before any big group meeting, and that big group meetings should be every other month. Concerns were raised about centering community – how to get everyone involved and engaged to work on all the different topics and issues?

Committee Action

None; receive and file.

Public Comments

None

7. NEXT STEPS/ADMIN ITEMS PREVIEW/MEETING DETAILS

02:23:00

The next meeting is scheduled for December 8, 2025, at 5:30 PM

Karissa White, Air District staff, announced that self-reported hours for October stipends were due by Friday, October 31.

Co-Lead Nancy Aguirre announced that the CSC has two industry representative seats open.

Committee member and Co-Lead Dr. Omoniyi Omotoso announced that the Community Benefits Standing Committee (CBSC) has prepared a letter for public comment and to be sent to the Air District's Emi Wang, Community Investment Officer, setting out the Committee's Draft Guideline Recommendations. A special meeting of the CBSC will be held in November related to the Draft Guideline Recommendations. Co-Lead Aguirre sent out an email survey on Friday, October 24, regarding scheduling the CBSC special meeting for either November 10 or November 17.

Co-Lead Aguirre announced that recruitment for new CSC Co-Leads is coming up.

Committee Comments

None

Committee Action

None; receive and file.

Public Comments

None

8. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEM MATTERS AND MEETING CLOSE-OUT

02:26:40

Committee member Jessica Range announced that after eight years she's stepping away. This will be her last meeting.

Erica Trinidad, CARB liaison, announced a webinar scheduled for the evening of November 3 to launch the AB617 Community Peer-to-Peer Network. The purpose is to connect the seven CSCs across the entire state. More webinar details will be sent by email.

Webinar Nov 3 to launch/kickoff Peer to Peer network across CSCs statewide (7) – info will be emailed.

Meeting adjourned by Co-Lead Nancy Aguirre at 8:04

Minutes prepared by Acterra