

AB 617 South Central Fresno Community Steering Committee - Meeting #3
February 13, 2019, 6 p.m. - 8 p.m.
Boys and Girls Club of Fresno

1. Doors Open/Meet and Greet/Refreshments

2. Welcome

Jessica Luternauer, Facilitator

Luternauer welcomed attendees and presented a proposed new approach to the meeting format following feedback received after the last meeting. This included increased engagement of the steering committee and the public via more opportunities for public comment and a more structured approach to obtaining steering committee member comments. She indicated the proposed format would include a presentation by Air District staff (if applicable), a roundtable of steering committee comments, public comment, the opportunity for additional committee member comments and the ability to vote if consensus cannot be reached.

Further, Luternauer indicated staff would be tracking questions and follow up on large posters during the meeting. She also indicated that, while everyone is welcome to provide their opinion during this process, if steering committee members would like to express their agreement with a particular viewpoint for the sake of time, they can indicate that in their comment and it would be reflected via asterisk on the poster.

3. AB 617 Committee Deadlines/Calendar Review

Jessica Luternauer, Facilitator

Luternauer provided an overview of the proposed calendar for steering committee review and feedback. She indicated the calendar outlines the goals and what needs to be accomplished by the steering committee pursuant to AB 617. She indicated that the steering committee can add additional items if they would like and opened the item to committee comment.

At this time, a steering committee member asked what the protocol is if information that was sent to the group needed to be corrected. Luternauer indicated the member could follow up with the staff offline or bring this up during the meeting itself for follow up. Another committee member mentioned they would like to see changes to how the word "toxicity" is used on the acronyms sheet and indicated he would follow up with staff on his proposed edits.

4. Charter Review

Jessica Luternauer, Facilitator

Luternauer provided an overview of the charter as follow up to the last steering committee meeting. She indicated the goal was to establish a good public process. In addition, she mentioned that in instances when the committee cannot reach a consensus, the charter includes the option for the steering committee to vote. She also indicated that the minority opinion would be documented for the record in these situations.

A steering committee member asked how repetitive comments would be handled during the meetings. Luternauer indicated agreement with particular viewpoints would be indicated via asterisk on posters. That member also asked how it would be determined whether or not consensus was reached. Luternauer indicated this could be addressed as it arises during discussion.

5. Community Boundary Discussion

Jessica Luternauer, Facilitator

Luternauer provided an overview of the community boundaries proposed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). She explained CARB's Blueprint for AB 617 implementation indicates the Air District and steering committee can work together to modify the community boundaries as they see fit. At this time, a steering committee member asked how the boundaries were set. The Air District's Chief Communications Officer Jaime Holt indicated the Air District made suggestions to CARB based on a variety of factors from the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen). The member then indicated their support for expanding the committee if the boundaries were expanded to leverage local expertise on any new areas that were previously not included, they also indicated that expanding the boundaries would potentially minimize the benefits that limited resources would have on improving air quality – as it could lessen grant amounts and/or incentives received by stakeholders for air quality improvements as part of AB 617 implementation.

A steering committee member provided more information about CalEnviroScreen, and indicated it looks at census tracts that are the most overburdened by pollution. That member would like to expand the community boundary to include adjacent tracts that are among the top 1% of census tracts that are the most overburdened by pollution in the state. The next eight steering committee members expressed support for the proposed changes. A member would like increased monitoring of exhaust data along freeways, and another member emphasized the importance of increased representation of people of color on the steering committee if the boundaries were expanded. Several members spoke in support of the above mentioned items.

At this time, Luternauer opened the agenda item to public comment. A member of the public indicated that their air quality monitoring indicates there are pollutants near west of Edison High School and north of State Route 180. Steering committee member clarified what the facility discussed was Penny-Newman Grain Company. A member of the public commented that maps put together by steering committee members did not use the most recently available data regarding population and racial diversity. Two community members expressed support for expanding the boundaries.

Committee member asked if the committee can consider sources of pollution outside of the community boundaries, and Luternauer indicated they could. Another member of the public expressed support for expanding the boundaries, as did a representative from Fresno City Councilmember Miguel Arias' Office. Another member of the public expressed support for including South West Fresno in the boundaries. Steering committee member mentioned the construction-related impacts of the \$70 million received for the state's Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) program should also be examined as a hotspot.

Luternauer indicated she would take the committee's recommendation to expand the boundaries to the Air District, who would create a map and present it at the next meeting. Steering committee member asked how adding new members would be handled logistically (e.g., whether applications would be

accepted between meetings or if they would have to wait until the April meeting to be officially included as steering committee members). Luternauer indicated she would follow up with the Air District and report back on this between meetings.

Steering committee member asked for clarification about the boundaries (and whether removing sections had been requested by some steering committee members). Luternauer stated the proposed changes to include adjacent tracts that are among the top 1% of census tracts overburdened by pollution and asked if any steering committee members disagreed or wanted to remove portions of the existing boundary. No hands were raised.

Summary of Feedback from Posters

Comments that were mentioned multiple times are indicated by *.

- How were the boundaries put in place? What was the thinking?
- Is there anything that would prohibit the committee to look outside the boundary areas if they are extended?
- If there is an effort to extend the boundaries would we have to bring in folks to address?
- Finite amount of money to implement recommendations
- Concern about expanding area where money should be concentrated on
- Map ranks census tracts
- Red and orange areas are top 1% experiencing impacts
- Recommendation to cover top 1% - boot shape covers red zones*****
- Most purple areas are outside of triangle
- Boundaries too far north, include darker areas to west
- Deaths from cancer by those affected in red zone
- Recommended expansion of boundaries – include Chestnut, Golden State
- Same boundaries, expand down to American
- Data would include freeways
- West of 99 there is a large community with no say – Asian, Blacks***
- More representation in this area
- Impacts on those who live near highways
- Disadvantaged communities defined by CalEnviro
- Incorporating areas that have new and existing industrial
- Industrial area near Malaga should be included
- On toxic air emissions map, some businesses no longer there
- Transportation corridors – focus
- Expand borders – are we going to do environmental justice?
- Lack of individuals from Westside, Hmong
- We are sick because of asthma
- If we expand the boundaries how do we add members to the group?
- Expand the map to cover contaminated areas*
- How did McKinley portion make it and Calwa area didn't?
- Several sources are immediately adjacent to but not within the boundaries
- Would recruitment of new members start after next meeting?

- Does expanding mean we will expand instead of remove?
- Recommendation: keep existing boundary plus add red areas

Public Comment

- Edison High (industry near there) – air monitor gives a high reading
- New industry north of 180 freeway
- Industry that’s been dropping dust in Calwa – which? Located on south end of Cedar Ave. on the north side of the Annadale bend (Penny-Newman Grain Co.)
- Population and racial diversity chart isn’t up to date
- Agree to expand boundaries to include communities most impacted
- Expand boundaries to include West Fresno – 5 out of 6 members of my family have asthma, it is not right that my kids don’t have these problems in Monterey.
- Would expanding the boundaries include all sources of pollution?
- Please consider the darker areas
- Expand boundaries, honor public engagement
- Purple air monitors show West Fresno is worse (near Edison)
- Restaurants and laundromats, homeless people burning things
- Expanding boundaries will take into account new development

6. Community Emissions Sources

Brian Clements, Manager of Technical Services, Air District

Clements provided an overview of community emissions sources ([in English/en Español](#)) for the community boundary. This included an overview of criteria pollutants, volatile compounds, and stationary sources of emissions. There are 198 permitted facilities within the community boundaries.

For stationary source emissions, Clements stated the Air District quantifies this information through reporting done on an annual basis and using other factors, like monitoring data, source testing, CARB and/or EPA testing, and permit limits. He provided information using the latest available data on the sources of stationary source emissions within the community boundary.

He then provided an overview of sources of area-wide emissions in South Central Fresno, with cleanings and surface coatings being the largest source of VOC, cooking being the largest source of PM 2.5 and residential fuel burning being the largest source of NOx. He also provided more information about on-road mobile source emissions in South Central Fresno, and he indicated it was a 70/30 split between highways and surface streets in the area. Both mobile on-and off-road sources are regulated by the state and federal governments.

Following the presentation, Luternauer opened the item up to steering committee comment. A steering committee member asked for clarification on how medium-duty trucks were accounted for in the mobile source emissions slide, and Clements indicated these were split between two different categories.

Committee member then asked about when pesticides become airborne and what type of pollutant that counts as in this analysis. Clements indicated that would be VOCs in the area-wide emissions category. A member of the committee asked whether the stationary source surveys were voluntary or required of

entities to which they are sent, and Clements stated they are required as part of the permitting process. The member then expressed an interest in seeing the 2.3 tons/year figure disaggregated and would like to see a heat map comparing the number of permitted facilities in South Central Fresno to the number of permitted facilities throughout the city as a basis for comparison.

A steering committee member expressed support for the maps to be redone to include permitted facilities and would also like to include data that shows per acre emissions by type of land use (e.g., a handout that compares the average emissions for an acre of alfalfa, an acre of heavy industrial and an acre of mixed-use residential with 10 units). The member then asked whether the surveys are self-reporting and how the Air District conducts a quality check on self-reported data. Clements stated it is done via the Air District's Compliance Department. A new map was requested be created that shows where existing monitors are as well.

Steering committee member indicated they would like to see pesticides, as an airborne contaminant, added to area-wide sources. Also indicating they would like to see updated data of stationary emissions sources once the new boundaries are established and that the data should be disaggregated to give the committee a better sense of the stationary sources.

A steering committee member asked when the data was generated, and Clements responded in 2017. It was then stated they would like to see peak period traffic emissions at interchanges within the updated boundary.

There was a comment by a committee member about how various chemicals interact with one another when airborne is not well understood, particularly as it pertains to public health. Clarification about the map of permitted facilities was asked, and Clements indicated all of the permitted facilities on the map were within the community boundaries despite the level of zoom making some appear to be outside the boundaries.

A committee member expressed their desire for the steering committee to focus its attention on PM 2.5 emissions reductions, also stating that their own analysis indicated there were an additional 94 tons of PM 2.5 emitted annually from the top polluters located outside the community boundaries. Another committee member asked if random spot checks happen, and Clements indicated they do. The committee member then cited a study that indicated PM 2.5 can travel 20 to 60 miles away from its initial source, and he expressed his support for including pesticides in the analysis, such as integrating Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) data into future mapping.

A member asked about a specific facility located at a stationary emissions source, and Clements provided more detail about it. A committee member reiterated request to see where monitoring stations are based. Someone then asked a clarifying question regarding spot checks. At this time, Jessica Luternauer opened the item up to public comment. An individual asked about permitted facilities potentially underreporting operations. Another individual asked for clarification about trucks as a mobile emissions source.

Summary of Feedback from Posters

Comments that were mentioned multiple times are indicated by *.

- Descriptions of compounds aren't clearly expressed

- In which of the two groups do we see medium-duty vehicles?*
- Medium duty is delivery vehicles, etc. – important to add category
- Who gets surveys and how often do they go out?
- When pesticides become airborne, which category?
- We want to track pollutants causing hot spots
- Are surveys voluntary?
- What is threshold for air toxicity? What is health threshold? Not helpful for me as a community member
- Are the 198 facilities those in map? Want to know the concentration
- New maps should show where facilities are
- Baseline on what pollutants come out of ag (benchmarks)
- Are surveys self-reporting?
- What does the quality check look like?
- Do you do spot checking on natural gas?
- Is residential fuel burning people's boilers?
- Do you collect data on cooking and PM 2.5?
- Helpful on on-road mobile emissions to better quantify traffic levels and sources of air pollution
- Does the District regulate mobile sources?
- Would be interesting to see where monitoring stations are based on new map
- Will be more pesticides in the air once we expand map west
- Health impacts and pesticides
- Revisit list of top pollutants once map is expanded
- Create map that shows largest sources of emissions similar to documents shared at meeting
- When was most of this data generated?
- Will you come back with a discussion about interchanges and how they impact new map?
- With regard to tons per year, can't say that same mass that we are observing will be as stressful all of the time
- Some of facilities included on map fall outside of boundary
- Are we going to be considering facilities that fall just outside of the boundaries?
- Page C6 of Blueprint says we will focus on two things:
 - Toxic air contaminants
 - PM 2.5
- PM 2.5 are very small particles in the air, so small that they can enter bloodstream
- Most PM 2.5 sources fall outside the boundary
- District can help us learn how to reduce emissions
- If you reduce PM 2.5 you can reduce local air pollution
- Does your compliance department do any direct measurement of what's coming out of the sources?
- How is on-road emission sources map drawn? Is it an estimate?
- ARB has small number of people to cover the Valley
- How often does the District check the records and technology of facilities?
- Are the inspections announced or scheduled? Are there random spot checks?
- In many cases, these toxins are so toxic that small amounts cause health impacts/risks

- Pollutants can go up 20-60 miles
- List of what's in the community is critical
- Larger illustration of sources – request for future meeting
- VOC contributes to air pollution – differentiate and add to map
- Add legend to maps with category description
- ARCO on Tulare only gas station on list – why?
- Want to see where monitoring stations are based
- PM 2.5 regulated monitors – map
- Map of funded programs
- How often are spot checks performed?
- Will you be doing air testing this spring for pesticides in the impacted areas?

Public Comment

- Companies have underreported their level of operations
- If you change the truck routes that could make a difference

7. Topics for Next Meeting

Jessica Luternauer, Facilitator

Luternauer asked the steering committee members for their feedback regarding topics for the next meeting. These were the following items the members would like to see on future agendas: air-monitoring information, including what has been collected and more information about a plan to put a monitor at Roosevelt High School, and third-party monitoring. At this time, a member of the public indicated they do independent air monitoring and expressed they could expand their efforts if someone were to provide them with transportation.

Summary of Feedback from Posters

- See current air monitors and data
- In Southeast Fresno there are mechanic shops that burn things at night
- South Central Fresno – how many members of the committee are residents without business interests?
- What is 2019 air monitoring plan that would impact outcome of boundaries
- Details on potential Roosevelt and Central Unified monitors
- Information on all monitoring being done, including purple air monitors

8. Public Comment

Jessica Luternauer, Facilitator

At this time, Luternauer opened the meeting up to public comment. No members of the public had additional feedback, and the meeting was adjourned.

Refer to meeting audio and video to review the full details and comments from the meeting.