

Meeting Highlights*
AB 617 Shafter Community Steering Committee Meeting #20
June 1, 2020, 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm
Zoom Virtual Meeting

Action items/reminders for the Shafter Community Steering Committee:

- Submit interest in participating in a subcommittee for the school filtration measures

Action items for the Valley Air District:

- Provide an answer on the pesticide measures update
- Provide information on dairy monitoring
- Provide an update on the pilot notification for Shafter
- Follow up on number of IC engines in the CRC oil field
- Give the steering committee another opportunity to discuss the response to the comment letter
- Prioritize getting resident participant stipend figured out with CARB

Welcome and Introductions

Hanna Stelmakhovych, Facilitator, ILG

Ryan Hayashi, Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer, Valley Air District

Hanna welcomed the Shafter Community Steering Committee (CSC) participants, went over the Zoom instructions for participation, thanked everyone for attending and held the roll call. Ryan thanked the attendees on behalf of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (District) for their continued participation in AB 617.

Pesticide Measures Update:

Minh Pham, CA Dept. of Pesticide Regulations

Minh provided an update on the mitigation of 1,3-Dichloropropene and the implementation of a pilot study DPR is aiming for early fall. Questions were held until the end. Presentation highlights:

- 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-D) is a pre-plant fumigant used to control nematodes, insects, and disease organisms in the soil, which is specific to the Shafter area; the majority comes from fruit and nut trees
- There are restrictions in place for the use of the material
- DPR is going to be assessing additional control measures to mitigate 1,3-D usage
- DPR is working to set up additional monitoring at the Sequoia Elementary School in Shafter as part of its pilot, but had to change its sampling methodology because they do not have the lab capability right now
- There is currently no viable commercially scalable alternative to 1,3-D and proposing various mitigation options will have a cost effect and may not achieve the results in terms of emissions reductions
- DPR is aiming to reduce 60% of 1,3-D emissions
- Several members of the Shafter community have been vocal about their support for totally impermeable film (TIF) tarping, so DPR looked at the benefits of tarping

- DPR looked at three options for the pilot program, which allow more efficacy and flexibility depending on the crop—70% field capacity, a water seal either post or pre-treatment, and a 24-inch depth injection so the fumigant goes further down and is not able to escape the earth
- The pilot program objectives are to collect and evaluate monitoring data for these new methods and validate what DPR has done on a computer modeling estimate

Question: Interested in hearing slightly more about the scale monitoring and how that looks in Shafter. If it continues, will it be the same amount of constituents being monitored or is that going to decrease as well?

DPR Response: Budget cuts will not affect our ambient air monitoring, we have committed to being in Shafter—it's one of the four sites we were able to save with the budgetary constraints. We will absolutely continue ambient air monitoring. As far as the constituents, normally we would be monitoring for 32 pesticides right now, but because the lab has scaled down, there is nobody doing analysis for us, so right now the only thing that we can do is 1,3-D. We should be coming back online and re-doing all 32 pesticides after COVID-19 travel restrictions are up.

Air Monitoring Plan Update:

Brad Dawson, Supervising Air Quality Instrument Specialist, Valley Air District

Brad presented an update on the AB 617 Community Air Monitoring. Presentation highlights:

- There was a letter sent out recently by a couple of CSC members and this group will be discussing some of those topics in this presentation
- The District is continuing to conduct localized air monitoring for the Shafter community
- The District is actively using the air monitoring van throughout the Shafter community in areas identified as a priority by the steering committee
- Since late 2019, the District has been conducting bi-weekly speciation air sampling and sending filters and canisters to an independent lab to analyze for VOCs and PM2.5
- A PM2.5 monitor will be deployed soon at Sequoia Elementary School
- Pending monitoring sites include: Golden Oak Elementary School, Sequoia Elementary School, and Farm Labor Camp
- The daily PM2.5 is trending very well in the first quarter of 2020
- Our sites on average for the quarter were a couple micrograms per meters cubed cleaner than surrounding communities with sites near Shafter
- During monitoring van outings, the District has not detected any measurements that exceeded the federal standard
- From all of the sampling conducted for 68 different tested compounds, the District only detected nine
- CARB is building a data portal called AQ view
- The District will have quarterly reports available online

Question: We did ask for PM10 monitoring to be in place very quickly so it would be there for the almond harvest and never intended for it to stop at the end of December. We really need to get that back for this coming summer. PM10 is dust. We are already finding dust on our tabletops and we would really like to know what is in our air, so please ask CARB. Another question I have on the

PM2.5 speciation, you have black carbon and organic carbon, which one of those would be from wood burning.

District Response: Organic carbon comes from many different sources, predominantly from fuels consisting of wood. Diesel soot would be primarily black carbon.

Question: So what I noticed is a lot of organic carbon seems to taper off in the warmer months when there is less wood burning for heating, so we'd like to know if there's a relationship there between the winter months and the organic carbon that's in the air and wood burning.

District Response: Once the District gets additional seasonal data and continues to give reports to this steering committee, we will be better able to answer that question.

Question: I noticed a lot of ammonium sulfate rivaling ammonium nitrate. What is the source and is this normal throughout the Valley?

District Response: It is premature to be able to pinpoint where it is coming from exactly; the summer months may provide a better picture. The District will continue to dig into the data to see what the PM speciation profile looks like in Shafter versus Bakersfield or Fresno.

Comment: Although methanol was detected below the hazardous level, we would really like to know where that methanol is coming from.

District Response: We have seen these compounds be prevalent in Fresno as well. Once we have more seasonal impact data, we will be able to see the trends. I can say that methanol is prevalent in pretty much everything.

Question: Does anyone have an update on the pilot notification for Shafter?

District Response: All unanswered questions will be captured and followed up on at a future meeting.

Question: When are our CERP programs going to start implementation? Are we going to vote on which ones we are going to bring forward as a committee?

District Response: Implementation has already begun. There is a timeline associated with the funding that's available for this particular year. The District been working with CARB to see if there is any way to look at some sort of COVID related delays and the impact that's had on the industry. In terms of what we're doing with getting certain CERP measures off the ground, there are a certain number of those that we are working on now. Those are included in the community air protection guidelines. CARB is about to approve Chapter 6 guidance and we are working with them on that framework.

Question: We had bumped up the money for Shafter for school filtration systems--will that be part of chapter 6 or can that happen now?

District Response: Those are already included and do not have to go through this new process. We are already moving forward with looking at contractors and working with the school districts.

Question: Is there an outline available for us to see the prioritization somewhere on the District website?

District Response: We shared the prioritization a couple meetings ago, but we are trying to make them front and center. We would like to send out a comprehensive reminder of all the measures that still need to go through that guidance process and then maybe that will give us an idea of what this group wants to hear about at the upcoming meetings. We were thinking of getting a group subcommittee and soliciting this group to see who would want to be involved.

Comment Letter Response Review

Jessica Olsen, Program Manager, Valley Air District

Jessica gave a high-level overview of the comprehensive process that went into answering the questions submitted by a few CSC members. Presentation highlights:

- The first couple of questions are follow-ups to the inventory request that CARB and the Air District needed to provide answers to
- There are questions about dairies and how we will continue to get more information about these dairies
- The second question came with an attachment and we located the units that were requested from the facility and our knowledge of all of the different emissions inventory data for all of those units, which hopefully answers the question
- Question three was about IC engines and Ag pumps. One of our measures is to replace anything that runs off natural gas or diesel with electricity, so understanding what the emissions are currently will help us understand what is available to be replaced
- The response to the fourth question should provide detailed information regarding IC dairy engines
- Question five was a specific question about this facility, so it was comprehensive as question two as well
- Question six was a repeat of a request last year; the district and CARB worked together to put together an area-wide and facility source list that breaks down emission by month
- We provide links for those that want to see the monthly uploaded data
- Purple air sensors--we have one in Shafter that is next to the regulatory air monitoring station; we show the tracking of the purple air and the regulatory air monitoring and how they track in each of the quarters
- You can see the different hourly average readings for the pollutants that we measured in the van outside of Golden Oak Elementary. Same with Mexican Colony
- There is monitoring being performed near the local dairies and this information is captured in the quarterly air monitoring reports
- We have provided links to the real-time data and hourly monitoring and this data is updated monthly, while we wait for CARB's AQview system to be begin working again
- We have some DMV information about the types of vehicles registered in Shafter and vehicle age
- The same goes for CARB gathering the yard locomotive and yard tractor questions
- We did provide a summary of all the incentives provided within the seven-mile radius over the past five years. All of the details are attached

Question: I was wondering how the CARB / Railway group meetings went. They had talked about possibly getting the trains to stop doing their back and forth, since it backs up all the traffic.

District Response: Unfortunately, those meetings have been deferred due to COVID. They will resume once we can all get back together and do in-person meetings. CARB's rail group put together a response and will make sure that it gets translated and goes out to the committee.

Question: Regarding the agriculture stationary internal combustion engines, I am still disappointed that we are not getting an answer on how many of those are there in the seven-mile radius. We are just getting numbers on total emissions. We want to know how many engines there are because a lot of money has been allocated for switching those engines to electric. On JP oil facilities, happy to see you have information for us that was missing. From what I read, there are 22 stationary IC

engines pumping oil in the JP oil field and they all burn field gas. Can anybody tell me how field gas differs from the gas people burn in homes?

District Response: Without knowing the specific makeup of that particular field, the quality of the gas varies greatly depending on the field. We did not do an analysis of the gas makeup in this case. At this point, we cannot fully answer that question.

Question: I am assuming there is sulfur in the gas that would not be allowed in the natural gas we burn in our home. Why are they allowed to burn gas with such a high sulfur content? We asked the question about IC engines in the CRC oil field; the District and CARB should have gotten back to us, we asked the question for a reason. I do not know how you can disrespect us so much.

District Response: No disrespect was intended. You can be critical of the process; we probably could have and should have done more. We will take this opportunity to look at it further and get back with the information.

Wrap Up/Next Steps

Hanna Stelmakhovych, Facilitator, ILG

The District would really like to get going on many of these incentive measures. One of the big ones we can get going on is the school filtration measure. If CSC members could use their raise hand function now to indicate their interest in being a part of a subcommittee for this measure, please do so.

Similarly, the details will go out very soon from the District on the rest of the measures and we can use that to help prioritize what we talk about at the next meeting, including following up on any of the other admissions inventory data.

Reminders:

Next meeting is July 13 via Zoom