

**AB 617 Community Steering Committee - Meeting Number 3**  
**February 11, 2019, 6 p.m. - 8 p.m.**  
**Shafter Veterans Hall**  
**Shafter, CA**

**1. Doors Open/Meet and Greet/Refreshments**

**2. Welcome**

*Jimmy Yee, Facilitator*

Jimmy Yee provided an overview of logistics and housekeeping items. He then discussed proposed changes to the format of the meetings moving forward, which included engaging the committee and the public via increased opportunities for public comment and a more structured approach to obtaining steering committee member comments.

Additionally, Yee mentioned notes would be taken on a poster during the meeting, with a particular emphasis on questions requiring a more technical response for Air District follow up. Yee opened the agenda item up to steering committee feedback. At this point, a steering committee member asked about a few questions that were not fully addressed at the last meeting. Yee mentioned that several of those items are on the agenda to be discussed further at either today's meeting or upcoming meetings.

**3. AB 617 Committee Deadlines/Calendar Review**

*Jimmy Yee, Facilitator*

Yee provided a summary of the proposed calendar prepared by the Air District for upcoming steering committee meetings. He asked the steering committee members if they had any feedback. One of the members requested that the Department of Pesticide Regulation be invited to an upcoming meeting to give a presentation to the group. A different member indicated there was not enough detail provided on the proposed calendar.

Yee opened the item up to public comment. A member of the public requested a copy of the calendar, they were provided a copy and copies were also provided to other attendees who had not received it.

Yee provided committee members the opportunity to comment again. The following items were mentioned: air quality monitoring, air monitoring and plan development, calendar items and deadlines associated with those items; and CERP. Members of the public also provided suggestions for future agenda topics: pesticides and soil contamination, mobile sources and air resources.

**Summary of Feedback from Posters**

- Disclosure form
- New boundaries
- Methodology for consensus building
- DPR as future agenda item
- Community emissions reduction program v. plan

- Concern: no data when plan is put in place
- Agenda items: more emphasis on pesticides and soil contamination
- Agenda items: air sources in addition to mobile and stationary

## **Public Comment**

- Incentive funding from CARB

## **4. Development of Shafter Air Quality Monitoring Plan**

*Jon Klassen, Director of Strategies and Incentives*

Yee introduced Jon Klassen, Director of Strategies and Incentives with the Air District, who gave a PowerPoint presentation on the development of an air quality monitoring plan in Shafter ([in English/en Español](#)). He also provided an overview of the 14 elements for the community air monitoring plan as detailed by the CARB Blueprint, which include the following:

- Community partnerships
- Community-specific purpose for air monitoring
- Scope of actions
- Air monitoring objectives
- Roles and responsibilities
- Data quality objectives
- Monitoring methods and equipment
- Monitoring areas
- Quality control procedures
- Data management
- Field measurements
- Evaluating effectiveness
- Analyze and interpret data
- Communicate results

Klassen also mentioned that, as follow up to last month's meeting where a committee member expressed concern that PM 2.5 monitoring had not yet begun in Shafter, the Air District worked quickly to set up PM 2.5 monitoring at the DMV site, which began last week. Klassen then solicited feedback from the steering committee on what pollutants are important to them and invited them to look at aerial maps of the area before obtaining their feedback.

## **5. Committee Input on Community Air Monitoring Needs**

*Jimmy Yee, Facilitator*

Following the map review, a committee member asked who chose the location for the PM 2.5 monitoring site. Klassen indicated the Shafter DMV site was chosen at a steering committee member's recommendation and because the existing infrastructure was in place to quickly deploy it. He also indicated it could be moved if that was the group's preference. The member also asked where pesticides will be included in the monitoring plan and Yee mentioned that a technical expert will be invited to discuss pesticides at the next meeting.

A committee member mentioned at this time that DPR has a monitoring site and has been collecting data since 2010. That member indicated that could be combined with the monitoring that's being done through the AB 617 process, and that perhaps the Air District did not need to also monitor pesticides since it is already being done by DPR.

A steering committee member mentioned they do not like the horseshoe approach for obtaining steering committee feedback and expressed an interest in finding another way to solicit feedback moving forward. Another member expressed that pesticide monitoring needs to be clarified from the beginning – several committee members indicated their agreement with this comment. That member also thanked the Air District for setting up the PM 2.5 monitoring between meetings and expressed a desire for neighborhood scout air monitoring.

A committee member emphasized the environmental justice component of AB 617, indicating that being community-specific to Shafter means looking at sources and how they impact local residents. This means dealing with how pollutants impact community residents and not the person living next to a dairy. Another committee member expressed his agreement with this statement, and asserted that many state agencies do not work together and share data, expressing support for including DPR as a part of this process with the hope that they will share data and coordinate more closely with the Air District moving forward.

Yee opened the agenda item up to public comment, and a member of the public expressed their willingness to share information with the Air District about a court case that established a legal precedent for the Air District to regulate pesticides that are toxic air contaminants. Another individual commented that there are questions that need to be resolved regarding criteria pollutants and toxic pollutants. Questions were also asked regarding how DPR monitors pesticides, pesticide drift, monitor placement, the adequacy of monitoring locations and if AB 617 grants allow residents to be involved in air monitoring entrepreneurship. Someone asked when data will be available, and Klassen indicated early summer of this year.

### **Summary of Feedback from Posters**

Comments that were mentioned multiple times are indicated by \*.

- How was the location for the PM 2.5 monitor identified?
- How long will it take to move?
- Where is pesticide monitoring in this plan?
- Health impacts as they relate to pesticides
- Can we measure/monitor pesticides?
- Pesticides and their monitoring should be figured out before 7-mile radius is finalized\*\*
- List of pollution sources outside of the boundaries\*\*
- Personal air monitors\*\*
- Measurement of PM 10
- How far can the air monitors measure?
- Who will take the samples?
- How fast will we obtain the results?
- Solar power for powering equipment?
- Adequately address committee on pesticides and monitoring

- Comparative analysis of AB 617 data

#### **Public Comment**

- Agencies partnering to fix air quality issues
- Revisit Authority's jurisdiction regarding pesticides
- Not clear on how pesticides are being monitored
- How were the locations identified?
- How sensitive?
- How many do we need to monitor pesticides?
- Need data (population, etc.)
- When will the data be available?

#### **6. Topics for Next Meeting**

*Jimmy Yee, Facilitator*

In addition to including a presentation about pesticides at the March meeting, Yee asked if there were any additional comments committee members wanted to discuss. The following items were mentioned as future topics: CERP and the need for a monitoring program before discussions about the CERP; and sources of emissions, including open ag burning, fireplaces, a nearby Superfund site, seasonal transit hotspots (specifically almond dusting) and a manufacturing facility.

When Yee opened the discussion up to public comment, a community member suggested the Kern County Ag Commissioner be included as a local subject matter expert on integrated pest management.

A committee member and a member of the public asked what would happen if a consensus could not be reached.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

#### **Summary of Feedback from Posters**

- Monitoring program is critical
- Open ag burning
- Fireplaces
- Vapor recovery information – is it available?
- Seasonal air monitoring
- Flares (CRC)

#### **Public Comment**

- Ag Commissioner potential expert for next meeting
- What happens if consensus can't be reached?

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