

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

June 22nd, 2026, 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) (AD) Karissa White called the meeting to order at 5:30 PM

Present: Co-Lead Dr. Y’Anad Burrell, Co-Lead Shaun Cotten, Co-Lead Ariel Xi, Nancy Aguirre, Suzanne Coffee, Bryana Gastelum, Michelle Gomez Garcia, Lizbeth Ibarra, Jeffrey Kilbreth, Joseph Koscinski, Dr. Omoniyi Omotoso, Dave Severy, Althea Skinner, BK White (non-voting),

Absent: Sandra Castaneda (non-voting), Marisol Cantu, Kerry Guerin, Simren Sandhu, Derebew Shankute, Samir Shrestha

Also Present: Bay Area Air District Staff, Diana Ruiz, Ayah Hassan, Karissa White, Joelle Toney, Nina Garde, Victor Douglas, Joseph Lapka, Joseph Palmer, Marcia Raymond, Laura Cackette, Manuel Oliva, Grace Leung, Jerold Brito; Member of the public, Ashley Dominguez Garcia; Acterra Staff, Genevieve Lucas-Conwell, Michelle Kim, Leilani Lezskay

Co-Lead Ariel Xi welcomed the Committee members to the June meeting, welcomed Air District staff present at the meeting, and thanked and recognized departing CSC members, including Beverly Dynes, Martha Gruelle, and Luna Angulo Castro. The two action items on the agenda to be reviewed and voted on are:

- March 23, 2026 Meeting Minutes
- Sunsetting the Community Benefits Standing Committee

Laura Cackette provided an update on the 2026 CSC overview. She shared that Air District staff are continuing to work with the CSC Co-Leads to finalize plans for the remainder of the year. Ms. Cackette noted that the third-quarter meeting, scheduled for September 28, 2026,

will include regular standing report-outs and a review of the Year 2 Annual Report. She also announced plans for a special meeting in October to discuss key topics that will inform the development of the Year 3 Implementation Plan. The fourth-quarter meeting will include the annual regulatory development update and a vote on the Year 3 Implementation Plan ahead of implementation in 2027. Ms. Cackette also introduced a new [topical meeting request form](#), allowing CSC members to submit ideas for future meeting topics throughout the year.

Committee Comment

None

Committee Action

None; receive and file.

Public Comments

None

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES FROM MARCH 23RD, 2026 (ACTION ITEM)

00:08:31

The Committee approved the Meeting Minutes for March 23, 2026, with a roll-call vote. Committee Member Nancy Aguirre noted an error in the draft minutes, explaining that one CSC member had been listed as both present and absent. Air District Staff Karissa White confirmed that the attendance record would be corrected as part of the motion to approve the minutes. Committee Member Suzanne Coffee made a motion, seconded by Committee Member Dr. Omoniyi Omotoso. The motion was carried by the following vote of the Committee.

AYES: Co-Lead Dr. Y'Anad Burrell, Co-Lead Shaun Cotten, Co-lead Ariel Xi, Nancy Aguirre, Suzanne Coffee, Shaun Cotten, Bryana Gastelum, Michelle Gomez Garcia, Jeffrey Kilbreth, Joseph Koscinski, Dr. Omoniyi Omotoso, Dave Severy, Lizbeth Ibarra

ABSTAIN: Althea Skinner

NOES: None

ABSENT: Marisol Cantu, Simren Sandhu, Derebew Shankute, Samir Shresta

Committee Comment

None

Committee Action

None; receive and file.

Public Comments

None

3. CSC LIAISONS AND STANDING COMMITTEES REPORT-OUT

00:12:21

Committee Co-Lead Ariel Xi moderated.

Refinery Committee Bi-Monthly Meetings Group

Committee member BK White reported on the May 22 Refinery Communities Bi-Monthly Meeting. Discussion topics included the health risk assessment process, Flaring 101, recent flaring activity at the Valero refinery, and general community discussion. Mr. White summarized the health risk assessment process, including development of emissions inventories, air dispersion modeling, and evaluation of chronic, acute, cancer, and non-cancer health risks. He noted that members engaged in a robust discussion of the Flaring 101 presentation, expressing concerns with terminology suggesting that flaring during refinery startup and shutdown is "normal" or unavoidable. Committee members emphasized that flaring should occur only under abnormal operating conditions and questioned several aspects of the presentation.

Refinery Technical Working Group

Committee Member Jeffrey Kilbreth reported that the group is not currently holding formal meetings, with the next scheduled for July 8. He noted the group's large refinery workforce representation creates a valuable forum for discussions on topics such as air monitoring, flaring, health risks, and permitting.

Mr. Kilbreth emphasized the importance of refinery worker participation in providing industry perspectives. However, he observed that discussions on topics including flaring rules, air monitoring, and permitting have remained preliminary and have not yet produced actionable outcomes. He encouraged the group to better focus future discussions on developing practical solutions and collaborative approaches with refinery stakeholders.

Rule 11-18

Committee Member Lizbeth reported that the Rule 11-18 Working Group last met in January and expects to reconvene later this summer. She noted that the Air District Board of Directors adopted amendments to Rule 11-18 at its June 3 meeting.

Ms. Lizbeth emphasized the group's focus on ensuring Community Steering Committee (CSC) input is reflected in the rulemaking process. She highlighted that community feedback was

gathered through public comments, workshops, and Path to Clean Air meetings, with responses to those comments documented in Appendix G. She noted this process as an example of maintaining an ongoing feedback loop between the CSC and the Air District during the rule amendment process.

Legal Enforcement Working Group

Co-Lead Shaun Cotten reported that the working group provided additional feedback on the draft enforcement policy during its April 22 meeting and reviewed a more formalized draft town hall policy on May 13. Air District staff are incorporating the group's input and will continue refining both policies before releasing them for a 30-day public comment period, followed by revisions and Board consideration.

Mr. Cotten noted that updates to the draft town hall policy include the addition of meteorological measurements, an emphasis on major incidents, and a "no wrong door" approach to ensure environmental complaints are directed to the appropriate agency. The group also discussed improving immediate responses to incidents and considered the appropriate role of business representatives in community engagement discussions.

Refinery Fenceline Air Monitoring Working Group

Committee Member Bryana Gastelum reported that the working group last met on April 15 and is currently on pause while Air District staff review and respond to public comments on the rule amendment concept paper. At its last meeting, the group discussed root cause analyses, mitigation measures, public access to monitoring data, approval of fenceline air monitoring plans, audits, and Air District implementation of the program.

Ms. Gastelum noted that the working group is expected to reconvene once a draft rule is released, at which point members will have an opportunity to review and provide comments.

Committee Comment

Committee Member Althea asked when the health risk assessment would be shared with the Community Steering Committee and the public, and requested an overview of its key findings.

Committee Member B.K. White explained that the full health risk assessment (HRA) remains in the early stages of development, with the Air District and Chevron still working through technical requirements. Air District Staff Ayah Hassan added that the preliminary Chevron HRA has been completed and is being documented, with public release expected by the end of the summer or early fall. The assessment will be shared with the public and Chevron for review, followed by a public comment period, and a dedicated Community Steering Committee meeting may be held to discuss the results and process.

Committee Member Nancy asked whether Community Steering Committee liaisons in the Refinery Technical Working Group feel their voices are being heard or if refinery representatives dominate the discussions. She also asked whether additional community participation is needed to ensure a more balanced and effective dialogue.

Committee Member Jeffrey Kilbreth responded that it is too early to judge whether the group's composition is unbalanced, though he suggested adding one or two more community voices could help. He added that a key issue is the lack of a clear charter or defined goals for the group, noting that the Air District has not yet clarified its intended purpose.

Co-Lead Shaun Cotten asked what types of refinery processes make flaring unavoidable, and whether there are situations where flaring is required as part of normal operations.

Committee Member B.K.White responded that most flaring is preventable, estimating that roughly 90–95% could be avoided. He explained that while flaring is documented during startup and shutdown, many events occur when processes are rushed or operations are pushed too close to safety or operational limits. He noted that truly unavoidable flaring is typically limited to rare process anomalies or safety-related upsets.

Committee Member Y'Anad Burrell asked whether the Phase Two plan and upcoming annual report include clear, detailed goals and timelines that respond to issues raised in recent working group report-outs. She referenced concerns such as avoidable flaring and permitting delays, and asked whether these are being translated into specific actions and accountability measures. She also asked whether staff will report at that level of detail or whether co-leads should ensure these items are formally tracked, emphasizing the need for clarity on next steps after issues are identified.

Air District Staff Laura Cackette responded that working group liaisons are intended to carry information between staff and the CSC, and that many report-outs reflect information already shared within those working groups. She noted that new issues raised in CSC meetings should be routed through liaisons back to the appropriate staff so they can be incorporated into ongoing work. Ms. Cackette also said the annual report is still being developed but would likely include a broader evaluation of whether the liaison and working group structure is functioning effectively, while also remaining open to feedback on how to better capture and reflect that process.

Committee Action

None; receive and file.

Public Comments

None

4. CSC STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT OUTS - CBSC UPDATES

00:36:38

Committee Co-Lead Ariel Xi moderated.

Community Benefit Standing Committee (CBSC) Summary

Committee Member Althea Skinner reported that the CBSC was created to ensure community benefit funds and penalty dollars are directed to the PTCA area. The 11-member committee advised the Air District's Community Investments Office (CIO) on equitable funding guidelines, integrating environmental justice and just transition principles, and expanding outreach to community-based organizations.

She highlighted key outcomes, including 10 substantive changes to CIO grant guidelines, stronger equity and workforce development priorities, increased indirect cost support for CBOs, inclusion of qualitative impact measures, and expanded outreach to 69 organizations.

She also noted lessons learned, including early delays due to unclear role alignment, a reduced scope from initial expectations, and the usefulness of subcommittees for research and outreach. She emphasized that outreach tools alone were insufficient for deep engagement and recommended continued CSC involvement, stronger integration of equity principles, and ongoing participation in funding updates and review processes.

Committee Comment

Committee Member Jeffrey Kilbreth asked how the committee should handle grant applications that are not clearly tied to air quality or public health, but instead propose general community benefit projects with limited alignment to the program's core mission. He noted that the high volume of applications is difficult to manage and suggested the lack of clear funding priorities makes it harder to evaluate proposals consistently, raising the need for clearer guidelines on what should be prioritized.

Committee Member Althea Skinner shared that, based on experience managing a large global grant process with hundreds of applicants, an eligibility screening step should be added before applications reach community reviewers. She explained this would ensure only proposals aligned with program goals are reviewed and reduce the burden on reviewers. Ms. Skinner also added that many current applications appear only loosely connected to the fund's objectives and suggested clearer criteria to filter out ineligible proposals. She also noted that the committee previously developed a draft set of funding priorities that could help guide review decisions and offered to share those materials.

Committee Action

Committee Member Dr. Omoniyi Omotoso made a motion, seconded by Committee Member Nancy Aguirre. The motion was carried by the following vote of the Committee:

AYES: Co-Lead Shaun Cotten, Co-lead Ariel Xi, Nancy Aguirre, Suzanne Coffee, Michelle Gomez Garcia, Lizbeth Ibarra, Jeffrey Kilbreth, Joseph Koscinski, Dr. Omoniyi Omotoso, Dave Severy, Althea Skinner

ABSTAIN: Bryana Gastelum

NOES: Dr. Y'Anad Burrell

ABSENT: Marisol Cantu, Simren Sandhu, Derebew Shankute, Samir Shresta

Public Comments

None

5. CSC STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT OUTS - JTSC UPDATES

00:53:21

Committee Co-Lead Ariel Xi moderated.

Just Transition Standing Committee (JTSC) Summary

Committee Member Bryana Gastelum reported that the group is not sunsetting. She also noted that the secretary role has transitioned from Shaun to her following his election as Co-Lead. She shared that a member survey is underway to assess participation, meeting schedules, and capacity, and encouraged additional members to join the Just Transition Standing Committee (JTSC).

Ms. Gastelum added that the group is currently reviewing the Air District work plan and CERP actions, with upcoming discussions focused on aligning or clarifying differences with the Air District's plan. She noted that a key priority moving forward is developing educational resources for the CSC and Air District, along with continued discussion on target audiences and collaboration opportunities.

Committee Comment

Committee Member Suzanne asked whether the planned materials for the CSC and Air District are primarily educational resources, such as explaining Just Transition concepts, and whether the focus is on integrating Just Transition language into the work.

Committee Member Bryana Gastelum responded that the focus of the educational materials will depend on the intended audience. She said that if aimed at the Air District, the materials would

likely include an overview of current training and how Just Transition is currently being implemented, and where gaps exist. She added that the goal is to build a stronger foundation around Just Transition and support more active facilitation of discussions on how it can be translated into concrete action within the Air District.

Committee Member Dave Severy asked whether the group's meetings are typically held on Fridays, noting a potential typo in the schedule for the next meeting. Committee Member Bryana Gastelum clarified that meetings are typically held on Tuesdays at 6:00 PM, and confirmed the next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 14th at 6:00 PM. She also noted there had been a scheduling typo in the slide and encouraged participants to reach out if the timing does not work for them.

Committee Member Nancy asked for clarification on the Air District's work plan, including whether it aligns with the original Just Transition Committee plan of action or is primarily focused on logistics such as meeting cadence. She also asked whether the work plan is guiding the committee's activities or reflecting a need for additional support due to limited membership capacity.

Committee Member Bryana Gastelum explained that the Air District work plan was created to provide structure and align the committee's work with CERP expectations. She said it lays out a month-by-month schedule focused on preparing for approved engagements, including a webinar, a topical meeting, and a CSC presentation. She noted that the group has not yet fully discussed the plan and that some items still require approval. She encouraged members to provide input, especially on alignment with JTSC goals, as this will be a focus of the next meeting.

Ms. Gastelum also confirmed the JTSC work plan would be shared with the full CSC. She also agreed to circulate the JTSC member survey to gather additional input, including feedback on meeting schedules and potential flexibility beyond Tuesday evenings.

Co-Lead Dr. Y'Anad Burrell was encouraged by the engagement from participants but noted that multiple emails and outreach efforts may be confusing. She encouraged co-leads to better coordinate communication and consider combining efforts like surveys and one-on-ones into a single, clearer process aligned with the Just Transition work.

Committee Member Althea Skinner asked for clarification on what other committee(s) will be starting alongside the Just Transition Standing Committee, noting that up to two committees can run at once. She suggested this information would help members coming off the Community Benefits committee decide whether to join Just Transition or another group

Co-Lead Ariel Xi shared that there will be a few months of planning before launching the second standing committee after the Community Benefits Standing Committee. She encouraged

members to email her, Shaun, and Y'Anad with ideas or input on what the next committee should focus on.

Committee Action

None; receive and file.

Public Comments

None

6. BAY AREA AIR DISTRICT LEGAL DIVISION REPORT OUT

01:12:13

Committee Co-Lead Ariel Xi moderated.

Sandy Crockett, General Counsel and Head of the Air District Legal Division, provided the annual PTCA enforcement update, fulfilling a requirement to report quarterly in writing and annually in person on legal enforcement actions.

He summarized recent enforcement work and how it aligns with both the PTCA plan and the Air District's broader strategic plan, including development of new enforcement and town hall policies and coordination with community representatives and other agencies.

He then reviewed major enforcement cases from the past year in the PTCA area, including Chevron, Chemtrade, Kinder Morgan, and Quality Repair Solutions. Key Chevron actions included Rule 6-5 compliance issues requiring installation of a wet gas scrubber, ongoing violations related to startup/shutdown emissions and monitoring, and significant penalties and settlements totaling millions of dollars, including payments tied to delayed compliance. Additional cases involved monitoring failures, fence-line monitoring delays, sulfur processing violations at Chemtrade, vapor control issues at Kinder Morgan, and a permit lapse at a tanker truck cleaning facility, resulting in smaller fines. He also noted that many of the penalties collected are directed into community benefit funds.

Committee Comment

Committee Member Althea Skinner asked whether the wet gas scrubber should have been required earlier and how the situation reached a point where the refinery is now playing catch-up to install it.

Air District Staff Sandy Crockett explained that, in hindsight, it likely should have been required through regulation earlier, but the Air District did adopt a strong emissions rule in 2021 targeting fluid catalytic cracking units. That rule was highly contested and led to litigation from refineries,

which delayed implementation. It included a five-year compliance timeline ending in 2026 to allow time for planning and construction. He also noted that Chevron delayed starting the work while challenging the rule in court, contributing to the current schedule pressure. After the Air District prevailed, Chevron ultimately had to proceed, but because they fell behind, they are now subject to significant settlement penalties and ongoing annual payments until the scrubber is completed and they reach compliance.

Committee Member Jeffrey Kilbreth asked whether the Air District could fast-track its permitting process for the Chevron wet gas scrubber so construction could begin as quickly as possible. Air District Staff Sandy Crockett responded that this is already the intent. The Air District has been working closely with the City of Richmond on parallel permitting rather than waiting for the city to finish first. He also said the goal is for the Air District to issue its permit shortly after Richmond's approval so Chevron can proceed with construction without unnecessary delay.

Co-Lead Shaun Cotten asked how closely the Air District works with the City of Richmond on permitting and what the coordination process looks like. Air District Staff Sandy Crockett explained that coordination depends on the specific permit. For major projects like the wet gas scrubber, there is close collaboration between the Air District and the City because of its significance and emissions impact, with active communication during the permitting process. However, he noted that many permits are handled solely by the Air District without city involvement, so the level of coordination varies by project.

Committee Member Jeffrey Kilbreth asked whether the recent enforcement penalties are included in the \$38 million currently being considered for allocation in the first round of community benefit funding. Air District Staff Sandy Crockett clarified that all amounts are above and beyond the \$38 million already identified for the first round of applications. He emphasized that while the Air District has hoped Chevron would meet the July 2026 compliance deadline, the priority remains getting the facility into compliance rather than relying on penalty funds.

Co-Lead Ariel Xi asked how the Air District determines the size of fines and whether penalties are meant to reflect the actual damage caused by violations. Air District Staff Sandy Crockett explained that penalty amounts are set through a statutory framework that establishes maximum daily penalties based on the type of violation and its severity (whether it is intentional, negligent, or unintentional). He noted that these maximums are adjusted annually for inflation. From there, the Air District would then apply penalty adjustment factors, including the severity and duration of the violation and other circumstances such as emissions impact and ability to pay. Large corporations are generally not given reductions based on ability to pay, while smaller entities might be. He emphasized that the process involves a range from zero up to the statutory maximum, with violators expected to justify any request for reduction. He acknowledged the

system can feel complex and noted that the Air District is working on improving transparency through its enforcement policy.

Committee Member Joseph Koscinski asked whether the five “willful and intentional” violations were common and whether companies effectively accept that violations will occur as part of operations. Air District Staff Sandy Crockett responded that this is not common and is specific to the Chevron situation related to wet gas scrubber compliance and startup/shutdown emissions controls. He explained that the violations were classified as willful because the facility knew it would not meet compliance deadlines and continued operating in ways that triggered enforcement thresholds. Mr. Crockett added that the Air District is actively addressing the issue through enforcement actions and is requiring corrective measures, including installation of the wet gas scrubber, along with applying maximum penalties where appropriate rather than treating such violations as routine or acceptable.

Committee Member Dr. Omoniyi Omotoso asked how repeat offenders are addressed beyond simply issuing fines. Air District Staff Sandy Crockett responded that penalties are increased for repeat violations as part of the penalty adjustment factors, since repeated noncompliance indicates prior enforcement was not sufficient. He explained that if violations continue, the Air District may move beyond fines and require corrective action through settlement agreements, hearing board orders, or court injunctions to compel compliance. Mr. Crockett added that strengthening transparency around this enforcement approach is also being considered in the development of the updated enforcement policy.

Committee Action

None; receive and file.

Public Comments

None

7. BAY AREA AIR DISTRICT FUGITIVE DUST AND METAL RECYCLING RULE AMENDMENT UPDATE

01:38:30

Committee Co-Lead Ariel Xi moderated.

Air District Staff Ana Beard provided an overview of the fugitive dust rulemaking effort to amend Regulation 6, Rules 1 and 6, noting that the proposal responds to concerns raised across AB 617 communities, including the PTCA CERP, and builds on findings from a 2023 white paper identifying opportunities to strengthen existing requirements. She explained that current rules are largely reactive, rely on observing violations in real time, and provide limited oversight

for some unpermitted or less visible sources such as certain construction and disturbed sites, making enforcement more challenging.

Mrs. Beard outlined proposed amendments under consideration, including requirements for best management practices (BMPs) for dust-generating activities such as stockpiles, unpaved roads, and material handling; enhanced controls to prevent offsite impacts such as wheel wash stations, vehicle speed limits, and covering or tarping trucks; and expanded monitoring and accountability measures, including potential fence-line monitoring, demolition requirements, and a registration program for sites over one acre with publicly accessible data. She noted that large facilities may be required to select from a menu of BMP options tailored to site conditions, with additional enhanced requirements under consideration for coke and coal handling operations.

Mrs. Beard concluded by describing the current timeline, noting that staff is finalizing stakeholder engagement and anticipates releasing a draft rule package and staff report in the third quarter, followed by a 30–60 day public comment period, public workshops, revisions based on feedback, and eventual Board consideration for adoption.

After a Q&A session, Air District Staff Annie Anderson presented on proposed amendments to Regulation 6-4 governing metal recycling and shredding operations. She explained that the proposed update would replace these site-specific plans with consistent, mandatory best management practices (BMPs) to address ongoing community concerns about particulate matter, light fibrous material, fires, and toxic emissions, as well as to align with requirements in AB 2851 and findings from prior rulemaking research and public input.

She described how metal recycling facilities process end-of-life materials through four stages: de-pollution to remove hazardous substances, shredding and sorting to break down materials and separate metals, residue handling to manage leftover waste, and chemical stabilization of certain materials prior to disposal. These operations can generate emissions, including particulate matter from multiple processes, light fibrous material that can carry toxic metals beyond facility boundaries, and elevated risks during fires in large stockpiles.

The proposed amendments would establish standardized BMPs across facilities (including controls to reduce dust through enclosures, watering during operations, and shutdowns during high wind events), fire prevention measures (such as monitoring stockpiles with heat-sensitive cameras), and track-out controls including paving, speed limits, and on-site housekeeping practices. Additional elements include a registration program for smaller scrap facilities to improve oversight and requirements for fence-line monitoring at larger shredding sites with real-time detection of toxic metals and community notification.

Ms. Anderson outlined the rulemaking process and timeline, noting that a draft rule package will be released for public comment, followed by workshops, CEQA and socioeconomic impact analyses, further revisions, and anticipated board consideration and hearing in 2027. She

emphasized multiple upcoming opportunities for public engagement and feedback throughout the process.

Committee Comment

Committee Member Althea Skinner commented on the proposed fugitive dust control measures, noting surprise that watering appeared as a key control method across multiple BMP examples. She expressed concern that relying on watering may be inconsistent with broader climate and water scarcity challenges, and emphasized the importance of considering environmental tradeoffs when evaluating dust mitigation strategies. Air District Staff Ana Beard responded that watering is intended as only one optional control measure within a broader menu of best management practices, not a required approach for all sites. She added that additional analysis of environmental impacts and tradeoffs will be included in the draft staff report, which will also be subject to public comment and further review.

Committee Member B.K. White also commented that full enclosures should be designed with appropriate safety measures and coordination with OSHA confined space and ventilation standards. He cautioned that fully enclosed systems could create unintended hazards, such as oxygen displacement, if not properly managed, and emphasized the need to balance emissions controls with worker safety.

Committee Member Y'Anad Burrell requested more specificity on stakeholder engagement efforts, noting that the term is often used too broadly. She asked which specific individuals and groups were engaged, when those engagements took place, what outcomes resulted, how the engagement was conducted, and where detailed documentation of this information can be found.

Air District Staff Ana Beard responded that one example of engagement was with the Air District's Community Advisory Council, a group of community representatives from across the Bay Area. She noted that the Council has been engaged over a longer-term process and provided detailed feedback that has been incorporated into the rule development work.

Air District Staff Victor Douglas also added on that engagement included early consultation with the West Oakland CSC during the white paper phase, presentations to the Bayview Hunters Point CSC, and site visits to relevant facilities, including a coal terminal in Pittsburgh to better understand operations and lessons learned from a fully enclosed facility already permitted by the Air District. He added that staff are open to additional meetings and deeper engagement with interested stakeholders throughout the rule development process.

Committee Member Nancy Aguirre raised concerns about potential water impacts from the proposed fugitive dust controls, including whether runoff from practices like watering could affect groundwater, lawns, or nearby gardens, and requested that a full environmental review consider these water-related impacts alongside air quality priorities. Ms. Aguirre further asked

how the proposed registration and fee structure would account for small businesses that may have large acreage but limited resources, and whether the Air District is considering financial or technical support to help smaller local businesses comply with potential new requirements and operational changes.

Air District Staff Victor Douglas responded that sites are generally already regulated through Water Board permitting requirements designed to prevent runoff into waterways, particularly for sites one acre or larger, and noted that the proposed controls are being considered in the context of reducing harmful particulate matter exposure. He added that water use is viewed as one of the cleaner available dust control methods, though the Air District recognizes the need to balance environmental considerations. He further noted that the rule will undergo CEQA review to assess environmental impacts, including water use and runoff. Air District Staff Ana Beard also added that the fee structure is still under development and will include socioeconomic analysis to evaluate impacts on small businesses.

Committee Member Shaun Cotten asked whether the specific types of chemical or vegetative stabilizers referenced in the presentation are already defined or would be specified later in the rulemaking process. He also asked about coordination between cities and construction sites given that some activities do not require Air District permits but still require local permits, and questioned how those sites are tracked or inspected. He further asked whether dust from sources like gas station construction differs from typical construction dust and whether those distinctions are currently understood.

Air District Staff Ana Beard responded that allowable chemical stabilizers are expected to be defined in the rule language and offered to follow up with more detail. She explained that construction sites are largely governed by local ordinances, and the Air District is coordinating with cities to better understand and track these sites. She added that current enforcement is mostly limited to visible emissions, making it reactive, and noted that dust impacts can vary by source, with some facilities requiring stricter controls due to toxicity.

Air District Staff Victor Douglas also added that the proposed rule may include more stringent requirements for dust that is contaminated with toxic materials. He referenced prior work on air toxic control measures for contaminated dust, which require stricter controls. He also clarified that even if a facility does not have a permit, it is still subject to Air District regulations, and noted that a proposed registration program for larger sites would help ensure the District is aware of and can inspect and enforce compliance at these operations.

Committee Member Shaun Cotten asked whether the lower fire risk at Sims Metal in Richmond is due to the absence of a shredder, noting fires at other facilities like West Oakland, and also asked whether the proposed registration program would include fees and apply to smaller or city-run recycling centers. Air District Staff Annie Anderson responded that the lack of a shredder at Sims Richmond likely reduces fire risk because many incidents are linked to

combustible shredder residue, though other factors also play a role. She confirmed the registration program would include a modest fee, to be evaluated through the fee-setting process and socioeconomic analysis, and noted that details on applicability to smaller facilities are still being refined with opportunities for further input.

Committee Member Nancy Aguirre expressed appreciation for the Air District's continued refinement of the white paper and rule development process, noting that the Path to Clean Air functions as a living document that benefits from being revisited and updated over time. She commended staff for incorporating prior input into an updated and expanded white paper and was impressed by how clearly the materials were organized and presented.

Committee Action

None; receive and file.

Public Comments

None

8. NEXT STEPS/MEETING DETAILS

Co-Lead Ariel Xi announced that the next meeting will be on Monday, September 28th, 2026, 5:30 - 7:30 PM, and will be held on-site at the Richmond HQE or on Zoom. Ms. Xi also thanked members for completing a recent survey and emphasized that the feedback helps inform future CSC engagement and planning. She also noted that staff will be scheduling brief one-on-one meetings with all members in the coming weeks to gather additional input and align upcoming work.

Meeting adjourned by Co-Lead Ariel Xi at 7:45 PM

Minutes prepared by Acterra