

# Community Air Monitoring Plan Appendix K

California Statewide Mobile Monitoring Initiative (SMMI)  
Public Meeting Evaluations and Survey Response Counts



July 1, 2025



The Statewide Mobile Monitoring Initiative is part of California Climate Investments, a statewide initiative that puts billions of Cap-and-Trade dollars to work reducing greenhouse gas emissions, strengthening the economy, and improving public health and the environment – particularly in disadvantaged communities.

Community Air Monitoring Plan: Appendix K  
Statewide Mobile Monitoring Initiative

CAMP	# Survey Responses	Meeting 1 Evaluation	Meeting 2 Evaluation
Bloomington, Fontana, Rialto	1	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, we were able to go through the full presentation.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes participants understood the meeting topics and were able to answer questions for anything they didn't understand.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: We had participation from 12 people in person and 8 people online.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive? The community was very responsive and we were able to have great conversations on air quality, air monitoring, and air monitoring priorities for the residents.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes we were able thoroughly discuss all the topics in the meeting.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: We repeated the timeline more than once so that felt redundant in a way but I also feel it was important to make sure folks understood what to expect.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes folks understood the decision making process and we were successful in</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 10</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Folks were interacting and participating. Almost everyone gave great feedback</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Everything felt thoroughly discussed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes this process was explained and every participant expressed their understanding.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Focused on its goals.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Engaging and productive!</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or</p>

		<p>choosing where to focus the air monitoring.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: There were some points that the meeting got off track when folks asked questions on other topics but facilitators were able to steer the discussion to the right directions. There was a community member who brought up anti climate change conspiracy theories during the presentation but facilitators were able to stay respectful and have a productive discussion and follow up.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Yes very engaging and productive because community members were willing to participate and answer or ask questions.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: There was only one moment of noticeable disagreement which I mentioned in another answer. A community member expressed their distrust in government, in moving away from fossil fuels , and their belief that the only thing we should be worried about is planes leaving chemtrails.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Facilitators were able to answer every question and concern and when we got into topics that needed a longer conversation were able to make sure we followed up afterwards.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p>	<p>disagreement?: Every participant was aligned with the project goals.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Staff was able to answer all questions.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They expressed their appreciation of the food.</p>
--	--	--	---

		They liked how their feedback was taken and they felt heard.	
Buena Park, Anaheim, Fullerton, Orange	486	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, the main objectives of the meeting were largely achieved. We successfully introduced the goals and scope of SMMI to attendees, emphasized the importance of community involvement, and began building foundational understanding around air quality monitoring. Participants were really engaged, asked thoughtful questions, and helped identify areas of air quality concerns they were familiar with. We expect deeper conversations and community feedback to grow over time, and this meeting served as a strong first step.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, the majority of participants, including community members, appeared to understand the meeting topics. The presentation was designed to be accessible and used visuals and real-world examples to explain technical concepts. We had a zoom for members who could not attend in person and we paused frequently for questions and provided clarification where needed, and many participants engaged in the discussion and asked follow-up questions that reflected understanding. We also had live Spanish translations. We'll continue to adjust our language and materials to ensure full accessibility moving forward.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 20</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, the main objectives of the meeting were achieved. Community members were given a comprehensive overview of the Draft Community Air Monitoring Plan and actively engaged in reviewing the proposed monitoring boundary. Participants provided thoughtful feedback, offered location-specific recommendations, and voiced concerns that will help refine the plan to better reflect community priorities.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, participants asked relevant questions, shared location-specific concerns, and made insightful suggestions. Their comments reflected a clear grasp of both the goals of the air monitoring program and the potential impacts on their communities.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 10</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was productive, with active participation and open dialogue around air quality concerns. We addressed all items on the agenda and successfully finalized our draft, ensuring the monitoring boundaries reflect broad community input and priorities. One suggestion was the inability to see the map from a distance but those participants came up after the meeting to take a closer look at the maps.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes, key topics were thoroughly discussed,</p>

		<p>The meeting was productive because there were many people actively participating and listening to others give their feedback on their air quality concerns. People were very passionate about the topic, which led to some bringing up additional concerns such as unregulated cars manufactured before 1970, the impact of gas-powered leaf blowers, facilities of concern in their city due to smoke observed or truck traffic and even talking about the impact of nightly fireworks from Disneyland. People left with a heightened interest in air quality and wanted to know what actions will be taken from the data.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes, important topics were thoroughly discussed, and everyone had a chance to share their perspectives. While a few side topics came up, they were still relevant and helped enrich the conversation rather than take away from the main focus. Overall, the meeting felt balanced and nothing major was left unresolved.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: The meeting had a nice flow to it starting with an introduction of the project, the timeline of events, and then a discussion of areas of concern related to air quality. Finally we did a deep dive into the survey data and the areas we outlined. We were rather efficient and were able to finish everything in one hour and a half.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Since we had a large group of people and four cities to cover, we opened it to feedback and noted everyone's input. We are incorporating all their suggestions and making sure the areas of concern that they pointed out are in the final boundary selected for air quality monitoring. People</p>	<p>and everyone had the opportunity to share their perspectives. The meeting encouraged open, respectful dialogue among participants. This led to more informed and inclusive decision-making. Nothing was left unresolved and we were able to cover everything. We kept the Meeting #1 recap brief, highlighting key discussions and decisions to avoid repetition. The agenda flowed smoothly starting with a review of the project scope and decision-making process, followed by a summary of meeting 1, a review of the draft CAMP, and time for participants to suggest changes. We then wrapped up with a discussion of next steps, ensuring the focus remained on finalizing the draft CAMP.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: There was some redundancy that was necessary as we recapped the first meeting, project goals and purpose of meeting 2 - but it was necessary for those attending for the first time.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Given the large group and the need to cover four cities, we invited feedback and carefully recorded everyone's input. We are now incorporating those suggestions to ensure the final boundary for air quality monitoring addresses all identified areas of concern. Participants were receptive to one another's ideas, and since we still had flexibility within our area budget, we were able to include additional areas of concern that were raised, ensuring all feedback was considered.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused on its goals. The agenda was clearly outlined, and discussions remained centered on reviewing the draft plan and addressing air quality concerns. While there were some opportunities for additional input, they were still relevant to the overall objectives, ensuring the meeting remained</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>were open to each other's feedback and we still had room in our area budget to add additional areas of concern that people voiced ensuring all feedback was taken into consideration.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting largely stayed focused on its goals, with discussions centered around air quality, community health, and identifying concern areas. While there were a few moments where participants brought up broader environmental issues or wanted to point out areas that were not included in our borders, these comments were still relevant and tied back to the overall goal of identifying where air quality monitoring should occur. Overall, the conversation remained productive and aligned with the meeting objectives.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: We thought some participants might have been motivated by the gift card compensation, but most were very engaged and interested in the discussion. People brought up thoughtful feedback and others responded and reacted to it showing they were very interested in the discussion. We noticed people enjoyed voicing their opinions and we did our best to make them feel heard. Everyone was respectful of each other and supported what others said.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants generally seemed aligned in their views, with shared concerns and collaborative additions. There was strong consensus around concern areas, such as proximity to freeways, industrial zones, and schools. While there wasn't noticeable disagreement, participants contributed</p>	<p>productive and on track.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Yes, the meeting felt engaging and productive. While there wasn't as much new feedback as in the first meeting because many concerns had already been addressed, participants were still actively involved. We had a detailed review of the plan, followed by a discussion of any additional air quality concerns, allowing for a focused and constructive exchange. The meeting structure kept everyone on track, ensuring productive collaboration and the opportunity to refine the plan further.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seemed to have aligned views and agreed that their previous feedback we provided was correctly selected on the map. Only a few new concerns were mentioned and we ensured the concern areas were properly selected within the boundaries.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, staff effectively addressed participants' questions and concerns, offering clear and helpful support on topics ranging from air quality issues to sign-in assistance. Spanish-speaking staff were also available to support Spanish-speaking participants, ensuring language was not a barrier to engagement. To our knowledge, all questions were answered and concerns fully addressed.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Many community members expressed that they greatly appreciated the work being done to monitor air quality and the meetings we held to get their feedback. They also gave</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>different perspectives and built upon each other's observations—highlighting additional environmental and health concerns within the same general locations. This created a productive and thoughtful dialogue rather than tension, and it demonstrated community alignment on the importance of air quality monitoring in these areas. There was some criticism of Disneyland's nightly fireworks but another participant who is a passholder pointed out that the park takes the air direction and other environmental factors into consideration when launching the fireworks. Other than that, most were in agreement.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p> <p>Yes, staff were able to answer participants' questions and concerns in an adequate and helpful way. Whether the questions were related to air quality concerns or assistance with signing in, staff provided clear support. Additionally, Spanish-speaking staff were available to assist Spanish-speaking participants, ensuring that language was not a barrier to participation. As far as we were aware, no questions were left unanswered or concerns unaddressed.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>People seemed inspired by the meeting and wanted to stay connected for continued advocacy. We did invite people to give us feedback on the meeting but did not receive any negative feedback or suggestions for improvement.</p>	<p>some constructive feedback about making the city maps easier to look at by providing a QR code so people could access the map on their phone or display the map after the meeting so they can take a better look at the concerned areas selected.</p>
Central and East Riverside, Rubidoux	10	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes, the main objectives were achieved (presenting the draft street map and</p>



	<p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, and participants asked clarifying questions to be sure they understood the topics</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 4</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Attendees identified specific streets and neighborhoods that should be prioritized for mobile air quality monitoring.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Important topics were thoroughly discussed. Because we had so few attendees, each person had ample time to talk and elaborate. The facilitator also had time to ask follow-up questions. However, we didn't have much time to discuss how the meetings can be improved.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: The slide about cap-and-trade dollars being the funding source was perhaps unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Decisions were made by coming to a consensus. Decisions were made about what streets/neighborhoods to include.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused on its goals.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and</p>	<p>reviewing locations for targeted monitoring)</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, participants understood the meeting topics and asked multiple clarifying questions</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: About seven participants were active in the discussion</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Participants approved the map boundaries and asked questions to clarify their understanding of the project. Participants also expressed interest in following the project.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Important topics were thoroughly discussed. Attendees had ample time to ask questions and discuss their concerns.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: The slide about cap-and-trade dollars being the funding source was perhaps unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Decisions were made by coming to a consensus.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused on its goals (reviewing the map and answering questions).</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive. Participants expressed deep concerns about</p>
--	--	---

		<p>productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive. Participants shared their views and lived experience.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seemed aligned in their views. There were no major disagreement.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Staff were able to answer questions and concerns adequately. No concerns were left unaddressed.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Participants suggested promoting meetings with local elected officials and on the local university radio station (KVCR).</p>	<p>air quality, but these concerns were expressed in an open and engaging manner.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seemed aligned in their views about the need to monitor air quality and about concern for warehouse development.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Participants had some questions and concerns that were left unaddressed: (1) How long will the data be available from Aclima or CARB (for several years)? and (2) How can other communities be nominated for the program? Also, several residents of the Perris-Meniffee-March Air Force Base area expressed concern about their community, given that it is a center (perhaps the epicenter) of warehouse development in Southern California.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Community members liked the snacks and expressed the desire for more meetings to be offered.</p>
Chiriaco Summit	9	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: Two people</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 4</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, the main objectives were achieved (presenting the draft street map and reviewing locations for targeted monitoring)</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Participants approved the map boundaries and asked questions to clarify their understanding of the project. Participants also expressed interest in following the project.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 6</p>

		<p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The virtual meeting itself was unproductive because it was unclear if attendees were truly residents, and feedback provided was insubstantial; a supplemental visit to the community was more productive</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: In our conversations with those during our visit, the topic of the project background was rushed, as there was limited time to speak. The topic of air quality concerns was the focus, although residents shared that they had few concerns.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: The slide about cap-and-trade dollars being the funding source was perhaps unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Due to the dynamics of the virtual meeting, no decisions were made, save for emphasizing that the single paved street in Chiriaco Summit will be included for monitoring.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting (and supplemental conversations) felt neither engaging nor tense, but somewhat disengaged. It is possible that we interacted with those with little knowledge or concern about air quality.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their</p>	<p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 7</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Participants were able to get their questions answered and better understand the project</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Important topics were thoroughly discussed. Participants were able to ask multiple questions.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: The slide about cap-and-trade dollars being the funding source was perhaps unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Decisions were made by coming to a consensus.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes, the meeting stayed focused on its goals. Discussion centered on the nature of the monitoring project, where monitoring will take places, and general community needs.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive because participants asked relevant questions and seemed to understand the nature of the project.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants were aligned in their views. There were no noticeable tension or disagreement.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way?</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seemed aligned in their views.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes. One possible concern is that Chiriaco Summit is a small community, and to adequately gather community feedback, we may want to widen our net to include people with friends and family in Chiriaco or those who work (but do not live) in Chiriaco. That is, we may want to include non-residents.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: No substantive comments were made by community members</p>	<p>Were there concerns left unaddressed?: There were at least one questions staff were unable to address: Will the vehicle/platform measure humidity and air temperature, in addition to pollution levels?</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: The participants liked that the meeting was bilingual (English/Spanish).</p>
Colton, Grand Terrace, San Bernardino (southwest)	7a	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 2</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Attendees identified specific streets, intersections, and locations that should be prioritized for mobile air quality monitoring.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, the main objectives of presenting the draft street map and soliciting feedback were achieved</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, participants understood the meeting topics and asked clarifying questions</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: Five participants were active in the discussion</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Attendees identified specific streets, intersections, and locations that should be prioritized for mobile air quality monitoring. The map wasn't changed, and several</p>

		<p>unresolved?: Important topics were thoroughly discussed. Because we had so few attendees, each person had ample time to talk and elaborate. The facilitator also had time to ask follow-up questions.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: The slide about cap-and-trade dollars being the funding source was perhaps unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Decisions were made by coming to a consensus.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes, the meeting stayed focused on its goals.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seemed aligned in their views.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They want to invite their family and friends to the next meeting.</p>	<p>locations were added to a list of places to have special monitoring</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Important topics were thoroughly discussed. Attendees had ample time to ask questions and discuss their concerns.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: The slide about cap-and-trade dollars being the funding source was perhaps unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Decisions were made by coming to a consensus.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused on its goals (reviewing the map and identifying locations for special monitoring).</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seemed aligned in their views regarding the map contours and locations for special monitoring.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Several questions were left unaddressed: (1) What's the perimeter of air that is tested by the truck (for special monitoring)? Also, how high is the perimeter above the truck (of air the truck is able to sample)? (2) How high is the perimeter above the platforms/vehicles (of air that the car is able to sample)? (3) What times of day will the platform/vehicle be driven? At what frequency? (4) Why will it run</p>
--	--	--	--

Community Air Monitoring Plan: Appendix K  
Statewide Mobile Monitoring Initiative

			<p>for 9 months and not 12 months? (5) Will results be available in real time? If there a major pollution source concern, would that information be made public in real time? (5) At what frequency will the trucks be running (for targeted monitoring)? What times of day/days of week? (6) Will data be available in real time? Or will data only be provided at the end of the project (in spring 2026)?</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>They liked the snacks and \$20 gift cards. They suggested making future meetings better by inviting elected officials, planning councils, and AQMD representatives (HARC contacted AQMD early in the project, but no response was given). They also suggested holding future meetings in San Bernardino rather than Grand Terrace.</p>
Compton, Rancho Dominguez, Willowbrook, Lynwood	3	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes, it was a very productive and community members have lively discussion.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>12</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>The community members have been and are directly impacted by air quality concerns as well as industrial pollution and runoff. They have various recommendations, questions, suggestions, to continue building capacity and using</p>	Not provided.

		<p>the data that will be provided.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Absolutely. Community members were eager to continue this discussion and invite other organizations to continue building capacity around air quality and community health access.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: The PowerPoint could have been condensed also adding more prompting questions for community members.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: It went off track a few times to related tangents but overall was revolving around air quality concerns and the monitoring to take place.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Mostly engaging and productive with skepticism from community members about the work of CARB and utilization of funding.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Mostly in alignment.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, most questions and topics were addressed. Non relevant questions were properly addressed with appropriate</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>sources of information or capacity to answer questions.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>They liked that they had an in person option to discuss. They also liked the style of facilitation by Breathe Southern California as a non partisan agency there to serve the community.</p>	
Corona, Temescal Valley	1	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>Two</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>7</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>Attendees identified specific streets, intersections, and locations that should be prioritized for mobile air quality monitoring.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>Important topics were thoroughly discussed. Because we had so few attendees, each person had ample time to talk and elaborate. The facilitator also had time to ask follow-up questions.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p> <p>The slide about cap-and-trade dollars being the funding source was perhaps</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes, the main objectives were achieved (presenting the draft street map and reviewing locations for targeted monitoring)</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p> <p>Yes. Participants asked questions to clarify their understanding.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>4</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>Participants made suggests to change the monitoring map and add one more targeted monitoring area site.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>Important topics were thoroughly discussed. Attendees had ample time to ask questions and discuss their concerns.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p> <p>The slide about cap-and-trade dollars being the funding source was perhaps unnecessary.</p>



		<p>unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Decisions were made by coming to a consensus.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused on its goals</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It felt engaging and productive</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants were aligned in their views</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, staff adequately answered participant questions. Participants were interested in the driving job position and also how the SMMI would eventually bring resources to the city</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Participants wanted more people to attend and offered advice on how to get the word out, including partnering with the City of Corona</p>	<p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Decisions were made by coming to a consensus.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused on its goals.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive, as the discussion focused on air quality concerns, the contours of the map, and possible sites for monitoring. Participants were largely in agreement with each other.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants were largely aligned in their views. There was no disagreement about the monitoring map boundaries or targeted monitoring areas.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: There were two questions that staff weren't able to answer: (1) Will air quality data be available in real time during the nine months? (2) How frequently will the trucks pass by the targeted monitoring areas?</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They liked the background information provided. They suggested holding the meeting in a different location that might draw more people.</p>
Delano	28	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p>

		<p>Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: Roughly over 15</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The people's enthusiasm, for the air monitoring and the possibility of knowing the pollutants around their community, made it easy to have a very open and dynamic conversation.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Topics were thoroughly discussed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes there was a clear process specifically around identifying possible pollution sources.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: It remained focused</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It felt very engaging and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: They definitely aligned.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 17</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: It was very productive</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes, important topics were thoroughly discussed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: It stayed focus.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It was very engaging.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: They were aligned</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, questions were answered.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Staff was helpful</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They like the fact that the topic was important and that given that it was a late meeting they thought that it was very considering for us to provide food.</p>	<p>better?: They like the time of the meeting. They said evening meetings allow them to participate more.</p>
East Contra Costa County (includes Pittsburg Bay Point)	21	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: The main meeting objectives were achieved in large part because of our focus group the week before. Since we had already done the focus group our team was familiar with the facilitation and overall flow of the meeting and were able to ensure that each objective was thoroughly addressed in our community meeting.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: While community members generally did understand the meeting topics, we went out of our way to make sure we explained things in a simple, clear way so that everyone felt comfortable with the topic at hand. For example, the project overview section and the slides about broad/targeted area monitoring and what the data will look like were jargon heavy. To address this, we added a slide with the project overview flyer and were able to explain the SMMI that way; similarly, we "zoomed out" a little bit for the monitoring and data slides to explain how/why different pollutants can show up once data is collected and why the visual representation would look like that.</p> <p>Additionally, our team took a screenshot of the types of pollution sources that had been included in the printable survey to</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: The main objectives were achieved, but our monitoring boundary was a little unclear, as most of the community was highlighted, so there weren't many suggestions with regards to adjustments. Community members gave valuable feedback with regards to the community profile and caught a few key details that needed to be updated.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Participants generally understood the meeting topics, and we spent a significant amount of time going through the CAMP on a page-by-page basis to explain it. This proved to be very helpful, and community members appreciated the time and thought that went into explaining the CAMP in such a detailed way. This was done to make sure community members not only understood it but were able to give meaningful feedback, which they did.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 7/9 in-person participants were active in the group discussion, as well as three staff members. Nobody on the virtual portion was active in the discussion during the explanation of the CAMP.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p>

		<p>give examples/context of what that means, especially as we moved to identify pollution sources of concern.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All of the in person participants were very engaged and a little less than a quarter of the virtual participants were engaged as well. After the break, however, the majority of the virtual participants dropped off/left the meeting, so the monitoring activity was largely done with the in person crowd. This ended up being helpful because they were able to stand up and point out the locations they were suggesting and the other community members were able to agree and give input, which would have been taxing for the virtual participants to sit through.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 7</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The energy that the community members brought to the meeting made it productive overall, along with our team's understanding of what we needed to do. However, the most unproductive and challenging part of the meeting was trying to navigate the mapping tool, as it kept deleting our progress when we went to highlight a new area. When we finally (thought we) understood how to use it, it cleared our progress towards the very end of the meeting. Our team has to go back and redraw all of those boundaries. Despite having practiced using this tool, this was by far the most challenging part of the meeting but we are thankful that the community members were so understanding and willing to keep going even when the progress was erased.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly</p>	<p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Being able to explain the CAMP in detail made the meeting productive; otherwise, it could have easily not been productive due to the volume of information contained in the CAMP. Community members did an excellent job voicing their feedback and suggesting adjustments, and we are thankful that they participated.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: We were able to thoroughly discuss the contents of the CAMP, which made the meeting a resounding success despite not having as many participants as we had hoped (we had around 50 people register for the event, but many of them were virtual registrants that were not community members at all). The monitoring boundary review felt unresolved, but since many of the in-person attendees were present at the first meeting they had a better understanding of what we had mapped in the first community meeting but were generally unsure about how to recommend adjustments to the monitoring boundary. However, it seems that the majority of the community was selected for mobile monitoring, which is why there also wasn't too much feedback regarding places to add.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: While the review of SMMI process could have been redundant, we were aware of the fact that there might be community members who had not attended the first community meeting so we did our due diligence to make sure that we covered the project as a whole and were able to provide that information in an efficient, informative way without anything being too redundant for the community members who had attended previously.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?:</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>None of the discussions felt rushed, as we had plenty of time during the two hour allotment- if anything, some parts of the discussion were drawn out and at times it was unclear if people had things to say, were listening, or were otherwise checked out. That being said, the mapping tool portion of the meeting was thoroughly discussed and had a proper amount of time allotted for it, which was beneficial, especially since our progress kept getting deleted.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p> <p>There were parts during the beginning of the meeting/presentation that felt a little bit redundant, but that's because we added the project overview flyer into the presentation, as we feel that it is the simplest, most straightforward explanation of the project. Otherwise, we could tell that we were losing the audience a little bit with the provided slides, which is also why we did so much explaining. For our meeting, the decision making process was unnecessary/redundant since there were not enough attendees to warrant voting or consensus since the community members have a shared understanding of the area that they live in and places that they collectively wanted monitored and were able to suggest locations that either came from their direct lived experience or general locations that a community would want monitored/attention paid to. All of the community members, especially those in person, were very respectful and collaborative in their approach and we wish we had been able to navigate the tool a little better to have been able to explore more parts of the map that they would have wanted to zoom in on, make suggestions for, or otherwise pan over for further discussion.</p>	<p>This was a community discussion, and participants were respectful and attentive of one another.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?:</p> <p>The meeting was mostly focused on its goals, however, there were some off track conversations about community engagement and awareness of the project looking towards the engagement work that will be done in Spring 2026 once monitoring ends, which wasn't necessarily the goal of this particular meeting.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?:</p> <p>The meeting felt engaging and productive, and we are thankful for the participation of all of the community members who attended our community meetings and focus group to get us to this point.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?:</p> <p>Participant views were aligned aside from the conversations about the Spring 2026 work.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p> <p>Staff was able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way, as we made sure to thoroughly read and annotate the CAMP prior to the meeting in order to be able to explain it to the community members.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>They appreciated the attention to detail that we were able to delve into, including the overall familiarity with the document and the time taken to go through each page of the CAMP, explain it, and have community members be able to ask their questions right</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: The mapping area for East Contra Costa is relatively small and the natural collaboration from the community members who attended lent itself well to a "step up, step back" environment. We also made sure to impart the importance of the expertise that each community member possesses of the area and their lived experiences, which in turn influenced the types of suggestions we received, especially as people were able to relay areas where they live and frequently travel (especially road wise) that others agreed with or added on to.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting remained focused on its goals, but there were not enough discussions generated for it to go off track. Our in person crowd was extremely engaged, but it was hard to take the pulse of the virtual participants, as their contributions came only after being specifically prompted and even then, only a few virtual participants were adding to the conversation.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Overall, the meeting felt engaging and productive and there many points in the meeting where our team was able to express our gratitude for their attendance/participation as true community experts, especially given that nobody knows the community as well as they do. There were some feelings of disengagement on the virtual end, but presentation wise, we focused our efforts on being as open to all participants as possible, which didn't continue as much after the break when the virtual participants left.</p>	<p>then and there.</p>
--	--	---	------------------------

		<p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?:</p> <p>Participants were aligned in their views, and though we wish more people had been able to make it, the crowd that did come was especially engaged and passionate about bettering the community and being involved themselves in efforts like these.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p> <p>Staff members did their best to address participant's questions, many of which had to do with the timeline of the project and why it was so short, how the mapping tool boundaries were decided (why Antioch is not included in this), and a general wish that more people could have come/been involved. There did not appear to be unaddressed concerns, but our team anticipates that there may be some in the second meeting from people who were not involved in this meeting or our focus group about the participatory process and short timeline.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>Community members praised our team for planning and facilitating the event and the hybrid format for being accessible to people who could not attend in person. As far as making future presentations better, there were a lot of comments about having the mapping tool be more user friendly with straightforward ways to save progress and written instructions on the page itself. Additionally, it would have been helpful to be able to print or otherwise reference the map of the community alongside the mapping tool, especially since a lot of roads and other community landmarks were covered unless we majorly zoomed in</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>to specific areas, at which point we could not see much of the rest of the map. This also speaks to community member expertise, as they were able to navigate us through the mapping activity without seeing those landmarks, but it made the process more clunky for our team to navigate since we couldn't immediately identify landmarks and major roads and navigate the map from there.</p>	
East Palo Alto	79	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: In East Palo Alto, we had 19 people in person and I would say close to 90% participated in person, and virtually about 50%, so an average of around 75% (estimated)</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The set up and flow of the meeting went really well, having the explanation of what was going on, and how we also led the discussion as well, noting that we want to hear their concerns and work with them to address the air pollution issues they are really concerned about.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: There was enough time to discuss each topic. At the end of the East Palo Alto meeting, we did have to rush out, but it was mostly because the boundaries in the</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, we reviewed the draft CAMP report for East Palo Alto with community members and received excellent feedback from them. The community was able to voice their concerns and we were able to include them in the meeting 2 report.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, community members understood the topics discussed and we were able to answer their questions.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: A majority of the participants were active in the discussion.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: We were prepared with presentation slides customized for the East Palo Alto community. A Spanish translator was present during the event. There were copies of the draft report available for community members to review during or after the meeting.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Important topics were thoroughly discussed and community members were asked if they needed additional information or time. At the</p>



		<p>tool would not accurately mark the map as much as we wanted.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: The decisions were not formal, but there was group consensus around the different locations that needed a lot of attention</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The discussions stayed on track</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt really engaging and productive, everyone there was really passionate about their community and concerned about what happens next.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: No disagreements, everyone was pretty aligned. The only tense moment was that folks were not super happy that Belle Haven/Menlo Park area was considered East Palo Alto in the Aclima boundary tool.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: There were only some questions we couldn't have answers to that was regarding the boundaries for East Palo Alto and how it was going into Belle Haven.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make</p>	<p>end of the meeting the participants felt like we thoroughly covered the topics presented.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: There were no redundant or unnecessary parts of the meeting.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: A clear process for decision making was explained and we were able to come to agreement as a group.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused on its goals.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Yes, the attendees had Spanish translation and were able to participate in the discussions. There was no tension and the community was engaged in the topics being discussed.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Yes, participants were mostly aligned in their views and there was no noticeable tension.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, our Director of Air Quality was able to answer participants' questions and educate them more on pollution sources. No concerns were left unaddressed</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Community members expressed gratitude in having a space to voice their opinions and concerns, and to learn more about air quality monitoring projects in their community.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>future ones better?: Folks mentioned how they felt heard, how they really were excited about the potential to understand more about the air pollutants around their community.</p>	
<p>El Monte, South El Monte, Avocado Heights, Hacienda Heights, La Puente (west), Bassett</p>	6	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The mapping activity, conducted in small breakout groups, allowed participants to choose areas for street monitoring and pinpoint locations where they believed pollution was originating.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: The project was thoroughly discussed, but the personal impact of air quality on people's lives was not fully explored.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: We removed the decision-making slides from the presentation.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: The mapping activity and small group discussions were collaborative and it allowed us to collect broad feedback from each group.</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 30</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Good meeting</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes, but some left unresolved. Especially the request to know more about heavy metals/radiation that come from airports.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: no</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: yes</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: yes</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views,</p>

		<p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes, the meeting stayed focused on its goals.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: The discussion was collaborative and a lot of the groups had similar feedback in terms of pollution hotspots and where they wanted the Aclima platform street-level monitoring to occur.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, the meeting had time for questions and the facilitator was able to answer the questions asked.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They loved having dinner provided, a kids zone, and an interactive activity.</p>	<p>or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: yes</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: yes, except for technical question on heavy metals and radiation</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They loved the interactive approach</p>
Fairfield	7	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 7</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 10-15</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p>

		<p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Low turnout was a little disappointing, but the folks that did attend were very engaged.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes, with a small group it was possible to go deep on specific topics.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes it stayed focused</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Yes it felt engaged and productive</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Mostly aligned in their views.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes we were able to answer participant questions.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: The biggest criticism we heard was that outreach was not strong enough. They</p>	<p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Use of visuals, enough staff to walk around and have one-on-one conversations, invested community members.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: We were able to talk about most topics and areas of the city in depth; did not feel rushed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes it stayed focused</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Yes it felt engaged and productive</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Mostly aligned in their views.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes we were able to answer participant questions.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: The biggest criticism we heard was that outreach was not strong enough. They offered to help with outreach for the 2nd meeting. Also suggested moving the 2nd meeting date from May 1 because there are lots of</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>offered to help with outreach for the 2nd meeting. Also suggested moving the 2nd meeting date from May 1 because there are lots of community actions planned for that day. Suggested that street names be included on the map for the map exercise. Feedback on what went well: ran smoothly, food was good.</p> <p>Other notes from the meeting: strong desire to include Suisun City down the the intersection of 12th and Walters. Also mentioned general health concerns about asthma, unhoused people living along Rt 12 being exposed to pollution. Truck routes to industrial areas (including Air Base) pass right by many schools, including the high school. General concern about smoke from wildfires. Also noted some future planned development is worrying people - Tech city and proposed ship building dry dock facilities in Collsville would result in extra truck traffic through fairfield. Nearby in Vacaville and Cordelia there are a number of warehouses (also near the Valero refinery).</p>	<p>community actions planned for that day. Suggested that street names be included on the map for the map exercise. Feedback on what went well: ran smoothly, food was good.</p> <p>Other notes from the meeting: strong desire to include Suisun City down the the intersection of 12th and Walters. Also mentioned general health concerns about asthma, unhoused people living along Rt 12 being exposed to pollution. Truck routes to industrial areas (including Air Base) pass right by many schools, including the high school. General concern about smoke from wildfires. Also noted some future planned development is worrying people - Tech city and proposed ship building dry dock facilities in Collsville would result in extra truck traffic through fairfield. Nearby in Vacaville and Cordelia there are a number of warehouses (also near the Valero refinery).</p>
Fairmead	8	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, residents were introduced to the objectives of this project and we were able to gather additional information on what their air quality concerns were within their community meetings.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 9</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was productive, because residents were able to provide direct</p>	Not provided.

		<p>feedback on what areas around the community are areas of concern.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Important topics were thoroughly discussed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: While it was good for residents to see other communities participating in the online forum, some of the questions were not applicable to all communities. Having segments that are tailored to the specific communities present would be important moving forward.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Conversations were had as a group, and the group was in consensus about topics covered and areas that should be monitored.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting predominantly stayed on track. There were also various conversations regarding water issues within the community of Fairmead. Folks noted that many of the air quality issues and water issues in Fairmead overlapped in their sources, mainly industrial agriculture.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging. The residents present in the meeting knew the community very well, and they were able to name cross sections and streets off of the top of their heads or pull up areas of concern with their neighbors and fellow community members.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seemed to be aligned within their views.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: a) There are prescribed and unprescribed burnings in the community of Fairmead. Will Aclima's reporting take this into account? If so, how? b. Will monitoring be able to distinguish between agricultural burning and trash being burned? c. How will Aclima's air monitoring schedule align with harvesting and pesticide sprayings within the community?</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Residents liked that we were gathering information directly from them, and specifically about their community.</p>	
Gardena, Alondra Park, Lawndale	2	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 7</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The volume of engagement, and questions.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: Yes, mostly asked questions and shared</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Enthusiasm from the participants paired with some of them having their kids with them.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p>

		<p>Yes, given the time constraint, we weren't able to utilize the boundary map as I would have liked to.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: No, this was definitely more of an informative meeting.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Was focused, with discussions diving into direct impact of air quality.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It felt engaging and productive because everyone was able to relate to this challenge.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Alignment absolutely.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: No concerns were left unaddressed, all questions presented had a sufficient response.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: N/A</p>	<p>It was paced accordingly, some participants came in later so we made sure to fill them in accordingly.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: None, had to make sure the basis of the project was covered for context.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: No key decisions were made.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: We kept it brief and too the point with the brief of the project and confirming the boundaries.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It felt engaged and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: They were aligned.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, the team was knowledgeable and were able to address any questions.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: That we were present and having thoughtful dialogue.</p>
Gilroy	13	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community</p>



		<p>members) understand meeting topics?: yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 12</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: active conversation and interest in the topic</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: yes</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: no</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: yes</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: yes, because they stayed on topic and discussed the map possibilities</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: yes</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p>	<p>members) understand meeting topics?: yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 13</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: What made the meeting productive was the use of incentives and providing a survey for community members to fill out</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: yes</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: no</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: overall, the meeting stayed focused, but the discussion went slightly off track when community members raised interest in other types of pollution monitoring outside of air</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: yes</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: yes</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>yes</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: n/a</p>	<p>yes</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: N/A</p>
Greater Oakland	22	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, everyone had a pollution concern to share with the group within Greater Oakland.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 9, all in-person attendees were active. Online attendees seemed to just be listening in.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting engaged residents living in the initial target neighborhoods and produced a list of pollution concerns. Everyone contributed to the meeting and asked questions regarding the SMMI project, AB 617, and the CAMP.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: There was not a lot of space within the meeting to talk at length about health impacts of pollution exposure. Also, for many people attending, this was their first time engaging in the issue of air quality and emissions concerns. I think more information could have been shared about CARB and Aclima and their impacts on local air quality concerns.</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, I feel the main objective of reviewing and providing feedback to the draft CAMP for Greater/Central Oakland was achieved. Community members had opinions on expanding the draft monitoring borders.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, community members understood the meeting topics and asked questions for clarity when needed.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: Around 7 participants were active throughout the entirety of the discussion and exercises.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was productive as we met our goals and discussed the CAMP. Thought many attendees were not participating in the conversation as much as I hoped for. Even with questions directed towards their personal experience.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Topics were discussed thoroughly- particularly what specific pollutants can be found in this community and what the health impacts are of pollution exposure. There is nothing that felt unresolved in this meeting.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt</p>

		<p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: We did not feel the need to have decision making processes. Most of the meeting revolved around everyone sharing their lived experiences.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting mostly stayed focused on its goals with some tangents.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive as everyone who participated in person was involved in discussion and sharing their lived experiences with pollution in their neighborhoods.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: For the most part people seemed to be aligned in their views. There were moments of minor disagreements within the discussion but no noticeable tensions.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes. There were some questions about specific emissions sources that still need to be addressed.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: The feedback was mostly general and positive. No specific feedback about what</p>	<p>redundant or unnecessary?: None.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: The main decision made for this meeting was expanding the monitoring boundary for Greater Oakland to include regions above Interstate 580. We reached this decision just by discussion and getting a consensus towards the end of that segment.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting focused on its goals. However, most of the participants arrived 30-40 minutes into the meeting so a recap was needed to get everyone up to speed.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt somewhat engaging. There were 7 participants who engaged more within the discussion than others did. I believe maybe incorporating other communication tools that don't rely solely on discussion could help engage everyone.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants felt mostly aligned in their views on what they wanted to see in the CAMP. There were back and forth discussions about certain ideas but no noticeable tension or major disagreements.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: No questions were left unaddressed. Participants were encouraged to email staff with any questions they may have after the meeting. Having Air District staff present was very helpful for questions that needed more explanation or context.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community</p>
--	--	--	--

		could make future meetings better.	<p>members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>People seemed to view the meeting positively and appreciated the resources and food provided. Many people are engaging in air quality issues for the first time and found much of the content accessible.</p>
Hayward	3	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes - we informed the community about the project, heard about specific community air quality concerns, and identified locations on the map to prioritize monitoring.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All of them</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Higher turnout would have made it more productive.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: We discussed the topics thoroughly. The small group made it possible to go into detail.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: No key decisions were made, but suggestions for monitoring and air quality concerns were received by the project team to incorporate into the CAMPs.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: It would</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 10</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: We were able to move around the room and have one-on-one discussions with individuals and families about their pollution concerns. We also left time for community members to discuss/compare their ideas.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Topics were thoroughly discussed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting ran on track and stayed focused.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It felt collaborative and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or</p>

		<p>occasionally go off track into discussions about other types of environmental concerns (water, soil, noise pollution etc). Otherwise stayed on track.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Engaging and productive. In part because it was a small group. No arguments.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Yes, they all seemed aligned.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: One community member offered to help with outreach. Low turnout was the main criticism.</p>	<p>disagreement?: Generally, they were aligned in their views, though some had different ideas about how to prioritize broad area monitoring.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: N/A</p>
Huron, Avenal, and Coalinga	30	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, the main objectives of the meeting were achieved. We were able to stay focused on our goals, share important updates, and ensure everyone understood their roles moving forward. The discussion was clear, and by the end of the meeting, there was a strong sense of alignment and purpose among the group. Everyone left with a better understanding of the project and the next steps needed to move forward effectively. -Huron</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: "Yes, participants were able to digest the information well, especially because I took the time to break the project down into simple, easy-to-understand parts. I used</p>	Not provided due to alternate work plan.

		<p>plain language, real-life examples, and took pauses to check for understanding, which helped keep everyone engaged. Community members felt comfortable asking questions and sharing their thoughts, which showed they were following along and felt included in the conversation.-Huron</p> <p>Understanding of the meeting topics was about 50/50 among community members. While some participants were highly engaged and grasped the material well, others needed more time or support to fully understand the information being shared. This highlights the need for clearer visuals, simpler language, and more opportunities for open discussion in future meetings to ensure that all attendees can follow along and feel confident participating.-Avenal"</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 30</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was productive because of strong consistency and clear communication. It started on time, followed a structured agenda, and everyone stayed focused on the purpose of the gathering. Regular communication before and during the meeting helped ensure that all participants were informed and prepared. This made it easier to collaborate, share updates, and make decisions without confusion or delay.The meeting was productive largely due to the genuine engagement from the community. Participants showed real interest in the topics discussed, asked thoughtful questions, and shared their personal concerns about air quality in their neighborhoods. Their willingness to participate created a meaningful dialogue and helped ensure that the meeting</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>stayed focused and relevant to the community’s needs. This level of involvement made the space feel collaborative and purpose-driven.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: "Some topics did feel a little rushed. While we managed to cover all the key points, there wasn’t always enough time for deeper discussion or follow-up questions. A few conversations could have benefited from more space to allow community members to fully share their perspectives. In the future, adjusting the agenda to allow more time for critical topics or scheduling follow-up meetings could help ensure that nothing feels overlooked or unresolved.</p> <p>For the most part, we were able to take our time and clearly share the information with the community. Key topics were explained in a way that allowed participants to ask questions and reflect on how the issues relate to their daily lives. While there may have been a few areas that could benefit from deeper follow-up, overall, the meeting felt well-paced and allowed for meaningful conversation around the most important issues.-Avenal</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No, every part of the meeting felt intentional and useful. Each topic contributed to the overall purpose and helped move the project forward. The agenda was well-structured, and all discussions added value by either providing important information, clarifying details, or allowing space for feedback from the community.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, there was a clear and organized process for making decisions during the meeting. Everyone had the opportunity to provide input, and we used group</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>discussion and consensus to move forward on key points. This approach made sure all voices were considered before final decisions were made. As a result, we were able to agree on important next steps and assign responsibilities with clarity and confidence.No formal decisions were made during this meeting. The primary focus was on sharing information, listening to community concerns, and building awareness around air quality issues. While it was an important step in community engagement, the meeting served more as an opportunity to inform and gather input rather than to make decisions. Future meetings may be needed to move toward action and decision-making based on what was shared.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed on track and remained focused on its goals throughout. We followed the agenda closely, which helped keep the conversation organized and productive. While there was space for open discussion, participants stayed engaged and on topic, which allowed us to cover everything we planned within the allotted time.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive, especially during the mapping portion. That activity encouraged participation and allowed community members to visually share their concerns and experiences. It sparked meaningful conversations and helped everyone feel more connected to the goals of the project. The interactive nature of the mapping made the meeting feel more hands-on and collaborative, which kept energy and interest levels high.</p>	
--	--	---	--



		<p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants appeared to be well aligned in their views throughout the meeting. There was a shared understanding of the project goals and a collective sense of urgency around addressing community concerns. Everyone contributed respectfully, and there were no signs of tension or disagreement. The alignment made it easier to collaborate, make decisions, and move forward with confidence.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, we were fully transparent and able to address participant questions and concerns effectively. Staff took the time to listen carefully, provide clear answers, and offer any additional context needed to ensure understanding. Our openness helped build trust and encouraged more dialogue. No major concerns were left unaddressed, and if a question required follow-up, we made sure to note it and committed to getting back with the right information. Staff were fully hands-on and responsive throughout the meeting. They answered questions clearly, provided additional context when needed, and made sure participants felt supported and heard. The team created an open and welcoming environment where community members felt comfortable voicing their concerns. No major concerns were left unaddressed, and follow-up support was offered where needed to ensure ongoing engagement.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: For Huron, there weren't any direct comments about the structure of the meeting itself, but</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>community members did share positive feedback about the project. They were engaged and interested in the work being presented, and many offered input and ideas related to the project's goals. While we didn't receive suggestions for improving future meetings, the overall energy and participation showed that the space felt welcoming and purposeful. In Avenal, community members shared that they appreciated how hands-on the meeting was, especially the interactive activities like the mapping exercise. They felt it helped them better understand the purpose of the project and made it easier to share their concerns. The hands-on approach created a more engaging experience and helped build trust. While no major suggestions were made for improvement, the positive feedback emphasized the importance of continuing to include interactive elements in future meetings.</p>	
<p>Inglewood, Hawthorne, Westmont, Vermont</p>	10	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes! I believe we were able to achieve all the main objectives. We provided an overview of the CAMP monitoring and timelines, and we also created space for community members to dive deeper into air quality concerns, as well as identify specific areas they would like to have tested.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, participants, especially community members, understood the meeting topics. They expressed a lot of enthusiasm and asked insightful questions about the use and next steps of the monitoring data. They also emphasized the importance of making this data publicly available so that community members can stay informed and hold officials accountable. Additionally, there was interest in participating in Phase 2 and contributing to the monitoring plan.</p>	Not provided.

		<p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: Everyone participated and was active throughout the presentation, discussions and exercises.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The well-organized flow of the event contributed to the overall productivity of the meeting. We started with a community-building and networking session during the first hour. Attendees enjoyed a live DJ, free tacos, and had the opportunity to engage 1-on-1 with engagement leads, building trust, and connecting with other community members. This helped break the ice and foster meaningful connections, with participants also playing bingo for prizes. We then transitioned into the informational portion, leaving the last hour for discussion and activities.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Important topics were thoroughly discussed. Here's a summary of main points: Community Concerns Regarding Air Pollution A conversation about air quality issues was led, encouraging participants to express their concerns regarding pollution in their communities. The proximity of the location to major pollution sources, such as LAX and local oil fields, was highlighted, emphasizing the lack of research on their long-term impacts. Participants noted the challenges in addressing these issues due to bureaucratic obstacles.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Community Concerns on Air Quality and Environmental Justice</p> <p>The discussion focused on the detrimental effects of air quality and pollution in South Los Angeles, with personal experiences related to industrial emissions and the aftermath of wildfires. It was pointed out that there has been historical neglect of black and brown communities, which is linked to systemic issues like redlining and environmental racism. Participants called for greater awareness and action to address these ongoing challenges.</p> <p>Empowering Parents for Children's Success</p> <p>One participant urged parents, particularly mothers, to take a stand against educational challenges and advocate for their children. Her own struggles in ensuring her daughter received a proper education, despite initial setbacks, were recounted. A call for collective action among parents to achieve their goals for their children was made.</p> <p>Discussion on Environmental Health and Housing Issues</p> <p>A pattern of environmental concerns in the community was highlighted, noting that issues like air quality and mold are often overlooked. One participant recounted struggles with black mold in a previous apartment, which severely impacted a child's health. It was added that property owners often evade accountability for maintaining safe living conditions.</p> <p>Engaging Youth in Community Activism</p> <p>The need to provide resources and actionable information to the community was stressed. It was proposed that high school students be involved in activism, as they can serve as powerful voices and connectors within their families and communities. This sentiment was echoed, highlighting that engaging younger</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>generations is crucial for fostering future voters and leaders.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No, there were no parts that felt redundant or unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, we began with group norms to promote positive interaction and engagement. Participants were encouraged to express appreciation for everyone’s thoughts, practice active listening, and be their authentic selves. This helped create an informal, light atmosphere, with moments of humor and camaraderie, even while discussing heavy topics. This contributed to a collaborative approach of making decisions.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused on its goals. While discussions briefly veered off track when exploring the impacts of structural racism, especially around personal experiences with education and learning disabilities, it helped highlight the stark differences and disparities between Black and Brown communities versus affluent areas. The conversation encouraged mothers and youth to take action and advocate for various issues, from education to environmental justice.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive. Participants were actively involved, and the discussions were well-received. As mentioned before, the intentional way the GPE Team prioritized community building set the tone of the event, creating a casual and friendly atmosphere. This helped</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>ensure our community input meeting was not extractive but instead focused on cultivating a safe and communal space, which led to participants feeling excited to engage in this conversation.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants were largely aligned in their views, with lots of snapping and “mm-hmm” responses in agreement. They built upon each other’s thoughts, creating a supportive and collaborative atmosphere.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, staff were able to answer participant questions in an adequate manner. The main concern raised was when the results of the monitoring would be available for public use, and we provided the project timelines to address this.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Community members appreciated the all-girls/women space, the fun community aspects of the event, and the opportunity to “clear the air” and discuss the impact of air pollution in their communities. They expressed that their areas are often forgotten and emphasized the need for research on air quality in the region.</p>	
Kettleman City	14	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, The meeting was a major success, reflecting the community’s deep concern for environmental justice and public health.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, many of the topics were review from last meeting and answering community concerns.</p>

		<p>Community members demonstrated a high level of community engagement, a willingness to learn, and a desire to act. Residents are motivated to use air quality data to pursue both short-term health protections and long-term environmental justice victories</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All community members over the age of 18 were involved in the exercises, voting, and discussions.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: We had a clear agenda and we facilitated an interactive activity to guide participants in providing structured feedback.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Important topics were discussed, we did identify a need for additional education on how specific chemicals and pollutants impact health and economic stability.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, Each attendee was asked to document: Their top three environmental concerns, types of pollution of greatest concern, specific locations they believed should be monitored, how they wanted to use the resulting air quality data. They also Identified sites for future monitoring.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals,</p>	<p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: The community was given time to ask questions and state any changes they would like to make to the plan. As well as provide feedback on how the meeting was conducted.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: We reviewed information from the last meeting. This meeting gave the community an opportunity to propose and vote for any changes to the community air monitoring plan.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: We thoroughly went over types of pollutants with slides. This information was requested in the last meeting.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, community members were given time for discussions, voting for any draft changes, and feedback.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes, we followed agenda laid out at the beginning of the meeting.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It felt productive, we incorporated feedback from the last meeting and answered previous questions with visual explanations.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>or did discussions go off track?: Yes, we followed the agenda we laid out beforehand.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting was engaging and productive. Community members were involved in picking areas of interest. Residents were motivated to use air quality data to pursue both short-term health protections and long-term environmental justice victories.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: The community was aligned in their views, most of the members were residents of Kettleman City. This community is united in their concern for environmental justice.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, Individual staff members helped answer community member questions and concerns. There is a need for future environmental literacy programming</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They enjoyed the food, prizes, and child care. They found the online survey to be complicated and needed assistance.</p>	<p>disagreement?: Yes, Kettleman city is a small community united in their goal for environmental justice.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, we dedicated extra time to answer questions from the last meeting such as explaining different pollution types. We answered any question and gave time for community questions. No, concerns left.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Some issues with audio for virtual attendees</p>
Lanare	19	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, they all shared similar experiences and issues</p> <p>How many participants were active in</p>	Not provided.



		<p>discussion and exercises?: It was a small group so each person had a chance to speak</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: each person was able to share their own perspective. This allowed people to resonate with each other and share similar stories on high interest pollution areas</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Because the community is very small the topics were thoroughly discussed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: no</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, there was consensus on sites of interest.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Some non air related issues were also brought up by community members, such as water access.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: people were very engaged. Space was made for each person to speak.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: there was alignment</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p> <p>Answers related to the air monitoring project were answered. Information about non air monitoring issues had to be addressed outside the meeting.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>They liked having a printed map to point out the areas of interest. A voting process took place to choose highest priority issues. A list of how to address other non air related issues would have been helpful to make community members feel heard.</p>	
Le Grand	19	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p> <p>Yes, they voices detailed concerns they face, they also named specific streets, facilities in the area, and farming operations they see as harming their lived environment.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>11</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>We had rich community participation and they provided their local knowledge on issues.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>We provided people with ample time to</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes, the main objectives of the meeting were largely achieved. Community members had the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the Draft Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP), revisit concerns raised during Meeting #1, and begin refining the proposed monitoring boundaries and priorities based on their lived experiences.</p> <p>However, there were some challenges that limited the full effectiveness of the session. Due to delays in submitting Meeting #1 notes, the CAMP was shared with community members only one day after receiving it; not allowing for a full review to take place prior to meeting. As a result, a detailed and thorough breakdown of the plan was not provided during the presentation as originally intended. This limited the scope of the review of the camp to focus on priority areas and may have affected participants' ability to fully engage with and critique the draft plan.</p> <p>Despite this, participants remained engaged, and their feedback helped guide next steps. Moving forward, earlier follow through of materials and more time for community review will help ensure stronger collaboration</p>

		<p>share and express thoroughly their concerns and topics being brought up.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: no</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes, but there was a lot of discussion around water pollution.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: people felt engaged and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: aligned.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: There were questions regarding time of day that cars would be evaluating the air. We let the residents know we would get answers. We were able to provided them with clarity over the phone and some in person in meeting 2.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: earlier time frame to allow for more students to be present.</p>	<p>and co-development of the monitoring strategy.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 13</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was productive because it centered community voice in the decision-making process and maintained momentum from the first meeting. Community members were given a platform to respond to the Draft Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP), which was shaped by their previous input. Their feedback helped identify whether the proposed monitoring boundaries and methods reflected real concerns.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: No, not all important topics were thoroughly discussed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: yes.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: it stayed focused.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?:</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>All the people that were present were engaging and collaborative when prompted.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Aligned, but there were questions brought up about anonymity. How was data going to be reported and if names of those who attended going to be shared or included in the report.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: We feel that we were because no one left wanting to know additional information.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They appreciated the change in time to accomodate for young people to attend and appreciated the incentives, food, and childcare that was provided.</p>
Lindsay	24	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes. People shared their air pollution concerns and outlined which areas in Lindsay they would like to see ACLIMA platforms in.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 20</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The group conversation and mapping outline was engaging for community</p>	<p>Not provided.</p>

		<p>participants; the printed survey was not as easy to follow.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: For the most part, community concerns and air quality concerns were expressed. The survey did not mention agricultural pollutants or at least, there was expressed idea that agricultural pollutants were not as addressed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, there was a clear decision making process.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed on the goals. The template provided was helpful.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and most attendees were participating. The map outline and the mileage allocation was perhaps one of the highlights of the meeting. People felt empowered when deciding routes for Aclima Platforms.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Yes. No noticeable tension nor disagreement.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, staff answered questions adequately.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>People recognized the importance of indigenous communities.</p>	
Lost Hills	7	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes the main objectives were achieved</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: yes, community members understood meeting topics.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>From my observation all residents were actively participating. The young man was less actively but still had great observation and input.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>What made the meeting productive is we took the time to identify areas of concern outside the initial map. we also checked in with residents making sure they understood the presentation and what we were asking them to do in areas that required their input.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>The presentation itself may have been too long but in the meeting, we slowed down and thoroughly discussed important topics residents wanted to discuss.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p> <p>No but participants mentioned that the</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 6</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: community members provided great feedback on how they would like the monitoring to move forward.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Topics were thoroughly discussed. Waiting to hear back if an in-person meeting is possible as suggested by community members.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: no</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Key decisions were made</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Meeting Stayed on Track. Community members mentioned they would like to view the and learn about the equipment in person.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It felt engaging and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views,</p>

		<p>questionnaire did feel confusing and hard to use. It felt like they were answering the same question over and over.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes decision making procedure was determined when the slide came up. An important decision made was the inclusion of different roads they want monitored.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting remained focused on the goal. The off-track portion was where community members wanted additional roads included in the mapping tool. These roads were GP Rd, Holloway Rd. and Lost Hills Road extended southward ending at Lerdo Hwy.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaged and productive because there was active community participation and additional suggestions were made to the mapping tool.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Community members had aligned views.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Staff was able to address community questions and concerns. 2 remaining questions are : 1st can the road expansion recommended for monitoring be included. 2nd can there be an in person reveal of the data once all the data is collected .</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make</p>	<p>or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Community members were aligned in their views. The biggest push from the community was to have data presented at the end of the project in person.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: The only item that remains is the possibility of having a meeting were community members can learn in person about the equipment being used and an in person meeting for the results</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They liked the in person meeting where they were able to ask questions in their language.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>future ones better?: They would like to see the results given to them in person so that they can ask questions.</p>	
<p>Maywood, Commerce (east), Vernon, Bell</p>	6	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, community members were engaged and sharing personal impact stories of air pollution ( asthma).</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, materials were easily explained and conversation was facilitated.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 13</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Community members were responsive and engaged on community pollution sources and impacts to personal and community health.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes, materials were easily explained and conversation was facilitated to engage community members.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: Powerpoint could have been condensed. More prompting questions would have been useful.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, areas of community to target and concerns were identified.</p>	Not provided.



		<p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Mostly, community members felt disenfranchised on what state agencies were doing as well as where funding has gone.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Community members were very engaged and felt this was extremely important to them. They were excited to discuss how the data could be used for future programs, advocacy and other areas.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: They were aligned in wanting better air quality, limiting manufacturing and processing plants emissions, and understanding impacts of transportation fuel use in their communities.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, most relevant questions were able to be answered. Community members had concerns over lack of change with data and studies as well as where the majority of state agency funding is going.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They enjoyed the roundtable discussion as well as the facilitator not coming with a specific agenda but actually informing and building capacity and decision making capabilities.</p>	
Meadowview, Florin, Oak Park, Fruitridge	20	Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, we believe the main meeting objectives were achieved. Residents provided feedback	Not provided.

		<p>about where exactly to monitor, and took part in a majority vote process to approve the monitoring boundary. The community voted to keep monitoring within the original proposed boundary which we shared.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, and some participants asked clarifying questions about how the data will be shared, and when and where monitoring can take place in the community.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 80 % of participants were either active in the discussions or the two activities (mapping activity with sticky-dots and post-its and the majority-vote process for defining the monitoring boundary).</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: We allocated 20-25 minutes for the mapping activity / discussion and 20 minutes for the monitoring boundary approval / discussion. Most community members were actively participating for a majority of these activities. Additionally, community members asked questions and voiced concerns before voting on the monitoring boundary. Those who needed Spanish or Vietnamese interpretations were informed by live translators about the project goals, and were able to participate in the activities with the assistance of interpreters. However, there were some community members who were not actively participating or were not as engaged throughout the entire meeting.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>unresolved?: The health impacts of air pollution and the project milestones / timeline were thoroughly discussed. Perhaps there could be more time allocated to discuss more in-depth about how air monitoring data can be used (e.g. what emissions reduction strategies could community members advocate for and how the data can inform strategies) and additional details about the draft community air monitoring plan felt a bit rushed at the end.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: The slides towards the end about next steps felt redundant. Instead of having 4 slides about next steps, 2 slides would have been sufficient.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, the process for deciding on the monitoring boundary was clear and a key decision was made based on community feedback and questions/concerns. We presented two options based on input provided by community members on monitoring locations during the mapping activity (1. focused monitoring within the boundary and 2. more expansive monitoring to include some dots/locations outside of proposed boundary).</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed primarily focused on its goals of mapping and discussing community concerns and defining the monitoring boundary through a majority vote process. Some discussions did go off track as some residents asked about specific projects happening in communities outside of the assigned communities that were more related to land use than specific to air quality impacts.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt productive overall because we were able to meet our meeting objectives. Attendees commented that they were very informed, the presentation was clear and easy to understand and they liked the activities. Some attendees commented that they felt disengaged because there were some disruptions from guests who dropped in without signing up and were not there for the meeting. Because the meeting location was spacious, the acoustics of the room affected the audio of the presentation; some attendees said they couldn't hear well during some parts of the meeting.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seemed aligned in their views and there was no noticeable tension or disagreement with the activities and voting process. A few residents went off track.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Valley Vision staff was able to answer questions and concerns related to the meeting and project. There were no concerns left unaddressed, but the driving position link which was shared at the meeting was not working. We informed participants that we will find out if the job posting is still available, and will share with them after the meeting. People expressed they were looking forward to the next meeting and seeing the draft plan and proposed driving boundaries.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Participants said materials were well presented, everything was clear and speakers were good.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		Participants suggested for maps to have schools, parks and shopping centers, etc. marked. Some commented that audio of presentation could be better.	
Mira Loma, Jurupa Valley, Eastvale, Pedley	2	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: About half (about 9) participants were active, asking questions and making comments</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Attendees identified specific streets, intersections, and locations that should be prioritized for mobile air quality monitoring. Attendees also expressed health concerns regarding air quality.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Important topics were thoroughly discussed. Both English- and Spanish-speaking attendees had time to express their concerns and ask questions.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: The slide about cap-and-trade dollars being the funding source was perhaps unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Decisions were made largely by consensus (attendees didn't disagree about locations</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, the main objectives were achieved (presenting the draft street map and reviewing locations for targeted monitoring)</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, participants were able to ask questions to clarify their understanding.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: About 10</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Participants approved the map boundaries and asked questions to clarify their understanding of the project. Participants also expressed interest in following the project.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Important topics were thoroughly discussed. Attendees had ample time to ask questions and discuss their concerns.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: The slide about cap-and-trade dollars being the funding source was perhaps unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Decisions were made by coming to a consensus.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?:</p>

		<p>to include in the monitoring plan).</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused on its goals. At one point, the discussion went off track, as one participant had acute concerns about whether Aclima would notify the community (during the nine-month monitoring period) about possible emergency events. This concern was noted, and the participant was spoken with in private by another meeting facilitator as the meeting continued.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive, as attendees identified specific locations to monitor and shared their lived experience with air quality in their community.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seemed aligned in their views in that air quality is a major concern, there is special concern with truck traffic (on several thoroughfares and near warehouses), and that air pollution is a serious threat to one's health.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Staff were able to answer participant questions and concerns adequately. There was a concern about whether Aclima would notify the community (during the nine-month monitoring period) if an emergency air pollution event were to occur and/or what public entities are in charge of notifying the public about emergency air pollution events.</p>	<p>The meeting largely stayed focused on its goals. At maybe a couple of times, the discussion got a little off track (with questions about personal asthma symptoms, for example). But all questions and comments were relevant to the topic (local air quality).</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive, as all participants attentively listened, and many asked questions and made comments. Some participants had strong feelings about pollution but these strong feelings weren't expressed with aggression or hostility but just evident passion.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seemed aligned in their views. All were in broad agreement about the seriousness of air pollution and its harmful effects for residents.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: There were a few questions that staff were unable to answer: (1) will the vehicle/platforms monitor pollen? (2) Will data be compared with past air quality data (from several years ago, for example)?</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Community members liked the snacks but they wanted more water bottles (which ran out). They liked the \$20 gift cards. They wanted local city officials to attend the meeting. They wanted further updates about the project and more meetings about the project.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>Attendees appreciated the offering of food. Attendees asked if the slide projector could be improved, to make the slides more visible.</p>	
Morgan Hill	6	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 10</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Participants incentives and offering an open space for participants to fully express themselves</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: For the most part important topics were thoroughly discussed</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?:</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?:</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Ys</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 8</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>What made the meeting productive was the use of incentives and providing a survey for community members to fill out</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: yes</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: no</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: yes</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?:</p>

		<p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They felt like the only thing that could be better was staying on time</p>	<p>yes</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?:</p> <p>yes</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p> <p>yes</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>N/A</p>
North Bakersfield	38	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>Roughly about 20</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>It was the first time that a meeting of this type had taken place. People were excited that sources of pollution in this part of the city of Bakersfield were finally being able to be monitor.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>They were thoroughly discussed</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>All of them (23)</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>It was very productive because community members were very engaged and provided wonderful feedback.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>They were thoroughly discussed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p> <p>No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making</p>



		<p>No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, people classified the potential sources of pollution base on their proximity to sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: It stayed focused</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It felt very engaging community members were very vocal.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: They were all aligned.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, no concerns were left unaddressed</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They like the time given that it was in the evening and they could attend.</p>	<p>decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: It stayed focused.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It was engaging and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: They were aligned</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, questions were answered.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They said they are very hopeful to see that data that is produces by the air monitoring.</p>
North Central San Mateo	2	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All 21 of them.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All 21 participants.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you</p>

		<p>you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was productive because they were all engaged, participated and were asking questions. The activities were paired with engaging material that allowed them to discuss in groups and also allowed them to stand up and discuss with others. We printed the maps of the boundary area and used a big post-it note to gather participant's input. This was also the first time the Latino community has a meeting discussing air pollution in Spanish and they had a lot of insight and potential solutions. All participants joined the meeting right after work so it was nice to have a warm meal ready for them. Providing childcare and activities for the children allowed for the parents to fully engage and focus in the meeting.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: The two hours we allotted allowed us to discuss all the points without feeling rushed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No, it was well paced and all the information was clear and necessary for community members to understand the project.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, there was overlap with many of the streets/areas participants mentioned so they all agreed with each other. We used the consensus model.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Overall, the meeting stayed on track,</p>	<p>feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The review was helpful to remind them of the project, the ranking exercise activity for the specific areas of monitoring allowed them to discuss in small groups followed by a large group discussion which allowed us to come to a consensus. Having a visual of the maps regarding the specific areas and the monitoring boundary map allowed them to have a better visual of the areas of discussion. One hour was enough and location was walking distance for all the community members. Food and stipend incentives were also very appreciated by community members.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: All the important topics that we needed to cover we thoroughly discussed. One hour was enough for this meeting.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: We did not show the last 10 slides of the presentation which included the specific contaminants and the effects on human health. We felt this would be a better fit in either the first presentation when introducing the contaminants the car can test for or the meeting next year when we discuss the results so community members have a better understanding of the contaminants and its effect on our health.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, we used the consensus model, small breakout activity and facilitated large group discussion and invited community members to express their opinions as to why they prioritized one area over another to convince overall community members on the ranking for North Central San Mateo.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>however there were other environmental justice issues that came such as trash, bike lanes, parking, and lead in households, but we were able to bring the discussion back to the main point of the meeting.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It felt very engaging and productive. We were able to learn a lot about their thoughts on air quality and build a relationship with them, which is very important for future Aclima/air quality meetings and future work in the community.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: They were very aligned - many of the same concerns and streets for monitoring were the same.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Technical questions related to the project were adequately addressed by staff, by questions regarding what comes next after the study were hard to address, but we were transparent and let them know we were unsure. Participants were receptive to our answer and are excited to engage in future next steps. They also proposed attending the meeting with the new North Central San Mateo City Council Member next week.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They liked; the food, childcare, inclusion of everyone's voices, the information was clear, punctuality, 5 minute break, information shared, and patience from the</p>	<p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes because we had one hour and community members stayed on topic.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting was engaging and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants were aligned in their views.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Community members liked the following: the facilitators were clear and concise, topic easy to understand and because of that they were able to make decisions as a collective, we included everyones perspective, interactive, appreciated the reminders through text. Community members said we could improve the meeting by inviting more people, including videos and other visuals in the presentation, but overall they said everything was perfect.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>facilitators when answering their questions and concerns. We can make the future meetings better by; doing more outreach in the community because this is a very important topic and want more community members to know about. They gave us a list of places we could do outreach in the future.</p>	
<p>North Sacramento/Old North Sacramento, Norwood/Del Paso Heights</p>	52	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 28</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was conducted in Spanish and one of the Sac EJC members who assisted also spoke Spanish and helped support individuals with translation. Sac EJC members also assisted members with completing the survey from their phones and with an iPad to help those members who did not have a phone or needed assistance navigating the survey.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes. Due to this project's high priority placed on conducting surveys, break out groups were less relational as most of the time was spent assisting members with navigating and completing the survey. It was helpful to have a Spanish language version of the survey.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that</p>	<p>Meeting 2 not held; outreach was conducted for the public review period instead.</p>

		<p>felt redundant or unnecessary?: Having the members complete the survey sections that asked for pin pointing locations on the map was not optimal and felt unnecessary because we used a different method/approach to getting their input that was more interactive and community centered. We used a large map and colored sticky notes. Community members placed sticky notes on the map to show where they are concerned about pollution.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes. Each community member marked their area of concern on the map and shared the reasons for their concerns.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused and meeting goals were accomplished.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting was very meaningful, engaging, and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Community members were aligned in their views and experiences concerning pollution in the area and its impacts on them and their families.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, and this was successful due to having Spanish speaking presenter and Sac EJC members who are also members of the neighborhood and connected to the parish (St. Joseph Catholic Church). There were no concerns left unaddressed.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>Community members liked having the large map and doing an interactive activity. Some members mentioned they wanted more information on how to address poor indoor air quality. The common theme was that they appreciated receiving the education and outreach being done in their primary language.</p>	
Northern Imperial County Corridor - unincorporated communities of Niland, Desert Shores, Salton Sea Beach, Salton Sea, Bombay Beach, Seeley	21	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes, the residents were informed of the SMMI and were given information on pollution that are already identified and impacting them and what the monitoring will monitor for, how it will be monitored with the mobile sensors, where the information will be housed and how long the program will monitor the areas they want monitored as well as the reports finalized next summer. Residents were engaged to recommend areas they want monitored</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p> <p>Yes, the explanation was clear and we clarified any questions or issues and checked for understanding at each step of presentation to ensure they understood what we were there for and what would happen from their engagement</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>almost all in one way or another. very engaged group</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p>	Not provided.

		<p>The meeting was productive from the standpoint of being able to explain the SMMI and have the residents engage in the recommendations through consensus when prioritizing the sites they most wanted monitored</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>There was no rushed topics, we had a clear presentation with each topic clearly discussed and clarified. the engagement session on their recommendations took the longest as we had robust discussion and brought the residents back to the topic at hand if they diverted on other tangents after allowing them to vent and say their peace.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p> <p>We didn't the residents found all parts of the meeting to be relevant and useful. We as presenters did not feel any redundancy.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?:</p> <p>Yes, we agreed to a consensus mode of agreement and it worked for the prioritization of areas after many suggestions</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?:</p> <p>It was mainly focused, there were a few moments when it strayed to other community issues not relevant to the SMMI but we allowed to an extent some discussion before we brought them back to focus on the matter at hand of the SMMI</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?:</p> <p>The meeting felt very engaged and we were extremely happy with the amount of engagement and the quality of discussion</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>and responses as related to the SMMI. the participating residents are engaged with the air quality issue.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: The residents were pretty much in agreement and lots of consensus as to the issues and how to address it with the monitoring program we presented.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Staff answered all relevant information and even engaged and helped with a few issues that were not relevant to SMMI but relevant to the residents that built trust and confidence in the staff and the presentation.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They liked the straightforward information for understanding and the opportunity to give input for the action plan and want to be updated regularly. maybe record it and have it available for residents to view after.</p>	
Pacoima, North Hollywood, Sun Valley, San Fernando, Sylmar	14	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, we feel that the main objectives of the meeting were achieved.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, they did and were very proactive in sharing their opinions and suggestions.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All 26 community members were proactive in the discussion, although some were more vocal than others.</p>	Not provided.



		<p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>7</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>I would not say that the meeting was unproductive but there were certainly moments where we were not as productive as we could have been. The reason why this happened is because we had some community members who were quite passionate about certain streets and/or sites, and it went and turned into a tangent. For example, we had people mention that the pollution source was a street of street vendors and went off to say why street vendors were the source of a lot of bad things. At times, the conversation did turn a bit hostile with negative comments, and it took time to bring the conversation back to what we were there for.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>Since we did spend some time bringing back the conversation back to what we intended to do, at the end, it did feel a bit rushed because we were trying to get as many comments as possible.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p> <p>Yes, the negative comments that some community members were making were uncalled for.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?:</p> <p>The sites and locations that obtained the most frequency were prioritized but we tried our best to take notes of all that was being shared.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?:</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>I would say that for about 75% of the time, the meeting stayed on its goals.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: A little bit of both. When the group did not engage in the negative comments, the discussion did feel productive. During the 25% where the group did stray away into negativity, it did feel tense.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: The participants did seem aligned in their views, both the good and bad ones. If there were participants who felt otherwise, they did not speak up.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: No, concerns were not left unaddressed. We tried our best; this is why we gave an emphasis to the importance of their opinions. We ensured them that their opinions will be read by someone at Aclima and that their voices would influence the project in some way.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They did not provide feedback on the meeting itself.</p>	
Paramount, North Long Beach		<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Absolutely</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, this community was very engaged and shared health concerns and impacts of business by products in terms of emissions and toxins.</p>	Not provided.

		<p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 25</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Productive</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Community members were thoroughly engaged in process and results of study.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: It went off track at time but facilitator was able to center discussion during these instances.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting was very productive as community members were heavily invested.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Community members were aligned on wanting positive change but had disagreements on how best to meet the objective.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p> <p>Mostly, some community members were asking about different zoning regulation which were out of our scope. Proper channels were recommended as well as how to use the data.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>They liked the ample time to discuss issues as well as having their specific views and comments validated to be utilized.</p>	
Rancho Cucamonga, Ontario (east)	1	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>3</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>Attendees identified specific streets, intersections, and locations that should be prioritized for mobile air quality monitoring.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>Important topics were thoroughly discussed. Because we had so few attendees, each person had ample time to talk and elaborate. The facilitator also had</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes, the main objectives were achieved (presenting the draft street map and reviewing locations for targeted monitoring).</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p> <p>Yes, participants understood the meeting topics and had ample time to ask questions.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>4</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>Participants approved the map boundaries and asked questions to clarify their understanding of the project. Participants also expressed interest in following the project.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>Important topics were thoroughly discussed. Attendees had ample time to ask questions</p>

		<p>time to ask follow-up questions.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: The slide about cap-and-trade dollars being the funding source was perhaps unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Decisions were made by coming to a consensus.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused on its goals.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive, as participants stayed on topic and made concrete suggestions for locations to monitor. Also, participants mentioned general concerns about air quality, such as wind patterns, strange odors, and wildfire smoke.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seemed aligned in their views.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, staff were able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way. No major concerns were left unaddressed.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Participants said they want to know what the air quality is like now and that future</p>	<p>and discuss their concerns.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: The slide about cap-and-trade dollars being the funding source was perhaps unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Decisions were made by coming to a consensus.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused on its goals. Participants discussed their concerns with air quality, their personal experience with air pollution, and what areas of their community should be included for monitoring.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive because participants shared helpful feedback about including low-income neighborhoods exposed to air pollution sources (near the Ontario Airport). Participants also shared personal experiences with air pollution.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seemed aligned in their views. There was no noticeable tension or disagreement.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, staff were able to answer participants questions in an adequate way.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Participants liked the snacks, the \$20 Visa cards, and the Zoom option. Future meetings</p>
--	--	---	--

		meetings could provide an overview of what we currently know about local air quality.	could be improved by holding meetings in Ontario (rather than Rancho Cucamonga).
Redwood City	5	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All 25.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was productive because they were all engaged, participated and were asking questions. The activities were paired with engaging material that allowed them to discuss in groups and also allowed them to stand up and discuss with others. We printed the maps of the boundary area and used a big post-it note to gather participant's input. This was also the first time the Latino community has a meeting discussing air pollution in Spanish and they had a lot of insight and potential solutions. All participants joined the meeting right after work so it was nice to have a warm meal ready for them. Providing childcare and activities for the children allowed for the parents to fully engage and focus in the meeting.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: The two hours we allotted allowed us to discuss all the points without feeling rushed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All 26</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The review was helpful to remind them of the project, the ranking exercise activity for the specific areas of monitoring allowed them to discuss in small groups, followed by a large group discussion, which allowed us to come to a consensus. Having a visual of the maps regarding the specific areas and the monitoring boundary map allowed them to have a better visual of the areas of discussion. One hour was enough. Food and stipend incentives were also very appreciated by community members.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: All important topics were discussed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: We did not show the last 10 slides of the presentation which included the specific contaminants and the effects on human health. We felt this would be a better fit in either the first presentation when introducing the contaminants the car can test for or the meeting next year when we discuss the</p>

		<p>felt redundant or unnecessary?: No, it was well paced and all the information was clear and necessary for community members to understand the project.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, there was overlap with many of the streets/areas participants mentioned so they all agreed with each other. We used the consensus model.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Overall, the meeting stayed on track, however there were other environmental justice issues that came such as trash, water quality, indoor air quality, wildfires, and lack of trees and green spaces, but we were able to bring the discussion back to the main point of the meeting.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It felt very engaging and productive. We were able to learn a lot about their thoughts on air quality and build a relationship with them, which is very important for future Aclima/air quality meetings and future work in the community.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: They were very aligned - many of the same concerns and streets for monitoring were the same.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left</p>	<p>results so community members have a better understanding of the contaminants and its effect on our health.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, we used the consensus model, small breakout activity and facilitated large group discussion and invited community members to express their opinions as to why they prioritized one area over another to convince overall community members on the ranking for RWC/NFO</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused throughout.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: The participants aligned in their views.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Community members liked the following:</p> <p>the facilitators were clear and concise, the topic was easy to understand, and they liked having community agreements for the meeting.</p> <p>Community members said we could improve by having community members be on time, having a microphone (this is because the space is pretty big), and community members</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>unaddressed?: Technical questions related to the project were adequately addressed by staff, by questions regarding what comes next after the study were hard to address, but we were transparent and let them know we were unsure. Participants were receptive to our answer and are excited to engage in future next steps.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They liked: The information shared and that it was clear, all opinions were respected/ there was no wrong answer, a lot of interest from the community, they feel like they can all make positive changes to their community, we shared new information with them.</p> <p>We can improve on: Having a better resolution map printed out, setting group norms, sharing information with local businesses so that they can know the needs of the community, knowing more about the areas affected by pollution, and bringing a microphone.</p>	<p>proposed to help us clean up after the event.</p> <p>Overall, the community members thought the meeting was perfect.</p>
Rodeo to parts of Crockett	12	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: yes! the attendees asked great questions and we had a lot of time to get their input as to where Aclima should concentrate its monitoring activities</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: yes, though several wanted to discuss pollution monitoring other than air pollution, such as soil sampling</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: Nearly all, around 20</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: all - 17</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Each meeting attendee introduced</p>



		<p>10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The relaxed, inclusive atmosphere and room setup helped people feel comfortable sharing their experiences and concerns, and their opinions as to where air pollution may be coming from</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes. Most of the meeting participants were focused on Rodeo, so areas of concern in Crockett may need further discussion at meeting #2. Off-topic discussions such as soil sampling and bio-monitoring were cut short as they weren't the focus of the meeting.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No; our team edited and practiced the presentation beforehand so it felt pretty tight</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: There was consensus about pollution hot spots, and we made clear that we will provide the community members' feedback to Aclima to develop the CAMP, and will meet again to review the draft monitoring map</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: A couple off track discussions but still related to environmental monitoring and the history of polluting industry in Rodeo &amp; Crockett</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Highly engaged, very productive</p>	<p>themselves and shared specific pollution experiences and concerns. We also had interactive activities going through and adding to the SMMI map, and pinpointing areas community members would like air monitoring to happen. We also discussed broader topics and concerns from the community, including a desire for soil sampling and bio monitoring in the future.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: We were pretty thorough and extended the meeting time by a couple hours to make sure everyone had plenty of time to communicate and connect.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: We did several walkthroughs of the monitoring map that may have felt redundant but we wanted to make sure everyone had the chance to review the route &amp; suggest additions</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, by consensus. We added several new segments to the map with community members' input.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: We were pretty focused but also allowed for some discussion of non-SMMI topics related to public health, environmental justice, and other projects to benefit the Rodeo &amp; Crockett communities, as well as environmental projects and proposals focused on the larger "refinery row" region along the Carquinez Strait</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Highly engaging; every person participated in the conversation and asked questions freely throughout the meeting.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: very much aligned</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, no.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They appreciated the opportunity to have input and connect with other neighbors, they liked the food, they appreciated that Rodeo Citizens Association is looking to expand its activities and community presence, they were grateful for the \$15 gift cards we provided. We didn't get any suggestions about things to improve, but community members were very keen to have more pollution monitoring activities in the future.</p>	<p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Very aligned. There was wide agreement on the need for more environmental monitoring, and many participants expressed concerns about odors, noise pollution, and their experiences with pollution and odor flareups overnight especially in the early AM hours.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, but several people expressed concerns and requested more clarity on how much pollution data will be provided from Aclima, whether it will be publicly accessible as "raw data" / with as much detail as possible so people can understand exactly which pollutants are identified through the SMMI project</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They loved the food and the gift cards! They appreciated our door-to-door outreach to encourage meeting attendance, they were eager to be involved and contribute to increasing general understanding of air pollution in Rodeo &amp; Crockett as a step toward advocating for air quality improvements in the future. Going through the map block-by-block was a highlight of the meeting and everyone was very engaged during that time as we discussed additions to the monitoring map. Many meeting attendees had valuable input as to exactly where &amp; times of day that odors occur.</p>
Salton City	28	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, we feel that all our main objectives of the meeting were achieved. Mostly of all this has given hope to members of the community as our community has been left out of the AB617. However, we did have to go into detail as the slides did not</p>	Not provided.

		<p>provide a brief description of when was the first year of the AB617. Examples of how the program has been beneficial to communities and what projects are in the works in the Eastern Coachella Valley and Imperial County Corridor.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, however we did need to explain what the particles were very brief. We feel that a slide for the pollutants being monitored more detailed was needed.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 35</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: First of all, our meeting had food and was at a time that those if working had enough time to go home and freshen up. We took many things into consideration, and we feel our meeting was as productive as it could've been. Some topics unrelated to the Statewide Initiative came up, and we discussed briefly and continued with the agenda. Our main objective was to ensure members of the community didn't become frustrated or disengaged in such conversation as many have resided in the community from 3 years or longer.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes, all topics were thoroughly discussed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: As a presenter, some of the slides we did change around, therefore the presentation was more effective and understandable</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>when presenting. Other than that we felt it was a great meeting and asked members of the community at the end as well.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, majority vote. However, we did have some decisions that at times would have led to a consensus.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes, other than the comments for the lack of involvement at the local special district for the park bond. However, member of the community was informed that in 2022 this was an item, and the district had been informed that we wished the bond money to be used for the park in the community of Salton City. Therefore, the lack of commitment for the bond has continued on the part of the district.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting as mentioned above was productive and mostly all engaged in conversation. We feel it was a perfect number of attendees for participation to hear each of their voice.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants were aligned in their view, and agreed to others concerns and areas of impacts. We can say that mostly all are aware of their impacted areas and what zones in the area are impacted differently than others.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, we were able to answer all questions. Only one question regarding the survey</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>was unanswered, but Mrs. Nancy Del Castillo stated she would follow up with the member of the community.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>They enjoyed the meeting and the food. Did make a suggestion for next meeting if they could be in separate groups for a more intimate discussion.</p>	
San Francisco	24	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>The main objectives of the meeting -- to gather community air concerns and define the boundaries of the air monitoring project -- were achieved at both iterations of Meeting 1.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p> <p>Participants at the BCC meeting fully understood what the meeting topic was and were very engaged. Participants at the Canon Kip meeting (who were mostly Filipino seniors) seemed to indicate understanding, though they were not as engaged so it was more difficult to know if all participants fully understood the purpose of the meeting.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>At both of the meetings, there were about 5-7 participants who were very active in discussion and contributing information about community air concerns.. These participants tended to command the direction of the conversations by asking questions or sharing experiences.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>The main objectives of the meeting -- to gather input about the draft Community Air Monitoring Plan -- were achieved at both iterations of Meeting 2.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p> <p>Participants at both meeting fully understood what the meeting topic was and were very engaged. Many of the participants felt empowered to ask questions in the middle of the presentation when prompted.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>At both of the meetings, there were about 7-8 participants who were very active in discussion and contributing information about community air concerns. These participants tended to command the direction of the conversations by asking questions or sharing experiences.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>Participants were able to give feedback on what areas they would like to prioritize in the final Community Air Monitoring Plan. Many community members were engaged in the conversation topic and were able to follow</p>

	<p>I feel the meetings were very productive in that many community members were engaged in the conversation topic and were able to follow slides. Many also expressed interest in find out what the draft Community Air Monitoring Plan would turn out to be, based on our input.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: I feel all topics were thoroughly discussed. I was able to incorporate an additional section at the beginning to discuss the health impacts of air pollution, providing a sense of urgency =to learn more about air pollution in our neighborhood. Both meetings were able to be concluded in 30 meetings, and neither felt rushed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: I removed parts of the slides that I thought were too technical for community members to understand (like the different types of chemicals that could be identified) or slides that had too much text on them. Our community members prefer visuals and conversation over text-heavy slides to convey information. As mentioned before, I also added in information that I thought was more necessary to include, like how air pollution impacts health.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Since all roads in the monitoring area (SOMA and Tenderloin) clearly fit within our designated "budget," there was no need to make decisions over what areas to include or exclude. Community members were fine with the designated areas that were already pre-chosen by Aclima.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Some community members had questions</p>	<p>slides, and many are very interested in finding out what data will be collected.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: There were many questions that community members had about how this data will actually work to solve the issues with air pollution that we are facing. This often skewed the discussion into discussing solutions for air pollution as opposed to the actual air monitoring project.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: It was a little unclear what I should put on the slides about the draft Community Air Monitoring Plan. Since the plan was mostly text, I wasn't sure how to best incorporate the information in the plan and translate it to the slides in a way that was accessible.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Key decisions around which areas to prioritize were made, as we decided to prioritize areas/intersections where people had experienced asthma attacks or other respiratory issues.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: As mentioned in the previous question, the discussion skewed into discussing solutions for air pollution as opposed to the actual air monitoring project. Additionally, just as with the last community meetings, some community members were more concerned with drug use and unclean streets when discussing "pollution."</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting was very engaging and productive, and several community members expressed their appreciation for how informative the meeting was and for being included in this process.</p>
--	---	---

		<p>that somewhat strayed from the project. For instance, some questions were about indoor air quality, whether the cars could detect pollution from drug use in an area, and solutions to address sources of air pollution. While all of these questions were related to air pollution, there was little that I could say of how this particular air monitoring project will address their immediate concerns.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting was very engaging and productive, and several community members expressed their appreciation for how informative the meeting was and for being included in this process.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: All participants seemed aligned in their views, and there was no disagreement.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Some concerns about how we can use this data to advocate for more solutions were somewhat left unaddressed. I stated that we'll have to collect the data first before we decide on what solutions to advocate for.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Community members liked that they could feel included in this discussion on how to shape air monitoring in their neighborhood. They also said the meeting should be held in other residential buildings and senior centers in SOMA and the Tenderloin (however, I don't have</p>	<p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: All participants seemed aligned in their views, and there was no disagreement.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: As mentioned in the previous question, some participants expressed dissatisfaction that we can't just start working on solutions already instead of collecting data first. I did address these concerns that we need specific data to present so that our city and state leaders can provide more targeted solutions to address the problems.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Some community members expressed that they were not able to hear some of the audience members' questions and comments. This can be easily addressed by passing around the microphone to the attendees.</p>
--	--	---	---

		capacity to do more).	
San Jose	42	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, community members had the opportunity to voice their concerns about air quality and review the mapping tool.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, they understood the meeting topics.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: Close to 60%</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 7</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: What made the meeting productive was that attendees were passionate about air quality in their community. We had 63 attendees answer the zoom poll questions or place their answers in the chat.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: The topics were thoroughly discussed. We went back to questions if participants needed more information or time. We also asked if attendees needed more time.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: As the coordinator facilitating the meeting I did not feel like the information was redundant.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?:</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, we reviewed the draft CAMP report for San Jose with community members and received excellent feedback from them. The community was able to voice their concerns and we were able to include them in the meeting 2 report.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, community members understood the topics discussed and we were able to answer their questions.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: A majority of the participants were active in the discussion.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: We were prepared with presentation slides customized for the San Jose community. A Spanish translator was present during the event. There were copies of the draft report available for community members to review during or after the meeting.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Important topics were thoroughly discussed and community members were asked if they needed additional information or time. At the end of the meeting the participants felt like we thoroughly covered the topics presented.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: There were no redundant or unnecessary parts of the meeting.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making</p>



		<p>We did not have to make decisions. The whole group agreed on the boundary tool and felt like it represented their community.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: We stayed focused on the goals and ended on time (yay!)</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Despite it being 100% virtual on Zoom the group was engaging and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seemed aligned in their views and there was no tension.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Our Air Quality Director was able to address everyone's questions and concerns.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: No comments around the setting of the meeting, just gratitude for us holding the space.</p>	<p>decisions, and were key decisions made?: A clear process for decision making was explained and we were able to come to agreement as a group.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused on its goals.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Yes, the attendees had Spanish translation and were able to participate in the discussions. There was no tension and the community was engaged in the topics being discussed.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Yes, participants were mostly aligned in their views and there was no noticeable tension.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, participants were mostly aligned in their views and there was no noticeable tension.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Community members expressed gratitude in having a space to voice their opinions and concerns, and to learn more about air quality monitoring projects in their community.</p>
San Leandro	10	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, very well.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: mostly. People generally do not think or</p>	Not provided.

		<p>know much about air quality. Smoke events are the biggest "seller" for getting people involved. People get what PM2 is for the most part, understand the project, but probably are still a bit confused about the players.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: Most- There is always at least one person who clearly are there strictly for a monetary return, and that was the case in this meeting. Others may attend for the check, but are very engaged and everyone (exception of one) talked quite a bit.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: productive is getting people out of seats, assign leaders and for us to back away/stay quiet. They essentially took over from there,</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: People wanted to spend more time on the ice breaker- "what is the best air you have experienced, where was it, how did it feel" We had to cut it off:). I think people wanted to know more about what is going to come out of this work in terms of doing something to resolve these items we discussed , but I had to say that we are still unsure and that it is somewhat unknown, and that they should come to meeting 2 to talk more about it.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: I would have only had them talk about sources and spots as we can drive almost ALL the streets which I did not really comprehend before the meeting.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: The process went really well. We did breakouts and had people outline the sources/ spots of concern and the top areas to monitor on large scale paper maps making notations, there were a active discussions, and people were really into it. I am sure that it was in part because it is a chance to talk about their City and all sorts of things about it. But give people markers and they will get involved.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: A little bit of off track. People are really focused on trees right now and how to expand tree canopy. This seemed somewhat valid and a good alignment with a means of one way we can respond.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Zero tension, closest thing was one participant maybe who talked too much, but no real issue.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Very aligned- maybe too much so. Essentially everyone agreed that there is one area that is very tree lined, not near 880 that should be excluded, only other discussion was prioritization of the other areas (we broke them into most to least in sections)</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Only question that was not really resolved - what is a consistently nominated community (answered to the best of our ability), but who does the nominations was</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>not answered.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: People like 1. sharing food 2. Discussing not listening 3. working together to come to an agreed conclusion- no big surprises. The big thing missing is really clear answers about what we are going to do with this information- precisely- and how this fits into a larger picture of action. This was not explicitly stated said but they circled this question a lot.</p>	
San Rafael	24	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 23</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: 1-Community members actively contributed, asked questions, and shared their perspectives. 2. The conversation was structured, ensuring that all voices were heard while staying on topic. 3-The PowerPoint</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: The digital tool was very difficult for everyone to use.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All participants participated</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Using dot voting for monitoring locations was very effective. Hosting in spanish and english, providing food and childcare, and offering gift cards were all effective strategies. Participants felt that the input they gave in last meeting wasn't incorporated in the CAMP and were somewhat frustrated with that.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes, thoroughly discussed important topics.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: Many of the participants had attended</p>

		<p>felt redundant or unnecessary?: None</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, it was clear</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive because the topic was meaningful and relevant to the community</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seem aligned in their views</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: We encountered only one question that we were unable to answer: participants wanted to know the potential health effects and diseases associated with each pollutant measured by the Aclima platforms</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: The participants felt comfortable and appreciated having an in-person conversation, as it provided a more engaging experience with fewer distractions compared to Zoom</p>	<p>meeting #1 so some parts felt redundant, but were helpful for the few people that were new.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes. Used majority vote as decided at last meeting. Key decisions made by dot voting on monitoring locations and voting on targeted monitoring area.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Mostly stayed focus on the goals, but we had to make some changes to the proposed sites when it was apparent from the participants that their input from last session had not been incorporated.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Felt engaging and productive</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Alignment in views of participants</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Mostly, but some questions and concerns left unanswered, particularly around how Aclima came up with monitoring sites in draft CAMP and how input from Meeting #1 was incorporated.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Liked childcare, food, gift cards, and that we took the time to explain concepts and answer questions.</p>
Santa Ana	48	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: CAC and OCEJ successfully achieved the objectives of our first meeting. Despite low attendance, the audience was engaged on</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, we got more feedback from community members on what facilities Aclima should monitor and also which streets to include.</p>

	<p>the topic of air pollution. Perhaps due to the prevalence of air pollution, every attendee was able to provide testimony regarding its impacts in their portion of the city, down to specific streets and neighborhoods.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Meeting attendees were engaged and understood the topic clearly, and on a scale of 1-10, our organizations would rate our experience as an 8. This is largely due to the fact that pollution from industrial uses throughout the city of Santa Ana is a salient issue that residents have long organized around. In our community profile, it was noted that the city council was due to vote on an industrial rezoning ordinance that would address some of the air quality concerns - this ordinance has been delayed twice now by city leaders, and we made sure to bring awareness to it in our presentation.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All of them</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The slideshow template provided by Aclima proved quite helpful, and very little was redundant. Residents were generally appreciative of the workshop and information presented, and were interested in returning for the follow-up meeting.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p>	<p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, after meeting 1 all the attendees knew the process for how Aclima would monitor air pollution.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All of the attendees spoke up and asked questions multiple times.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 7</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: I don't think we needed to recap all of our meeting 1 activities, but going over the CAMP was the most productive part of the meeting and what we spent the most time on.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: We spent plenty of time on the CAMP, which we had allotted for, so that attendees could voice their opinions on what needed to be included in the CAMP for a fuller picture of air quality in Santa Ana.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: We didn't need a decision making process, people just raised their hands to voice their opinions.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: This was rather informal with hand-raising for questions and coming to a consensus afterwards.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes, it stayed on track with the questions we asked of the community regarding the CAMP.</p>
--	---	---

		<p>The topics were thoroughly discussed, residents were eager to provide testimonies on air pollution in their specific areas.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: In our case, there was not much necessity for a decision-making process, as residents simply raised their hands to provide individual feedback on locations where they experienced air pollution and where the air quality boundary should be.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, we mostly took questions from attendees who raised their hands and arrived at decisions through consensus on the air monitoring boundaries.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes, attendees understood the purpose of the meeting and came prepared with testimonies for us to consider.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It felt engaging, as we were trusted community voices and residents understood the significance of providing good feedback.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: They were all aligned on their feedback, everyone had experiences with the impact of air pollution on their health.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, the slides prepared us well for the meeting.</p>	<p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It was engaging, but was a little tense because community members were dissatisfied with the extent of the CAMP.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: There was broad agreement that the CAMP should include all of Santa Ana, not just certain neighborhoods.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes we were, we answered all of the questions that community members asked.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Attendees recommended we advertise meetings on Nextdoor and with instagram ads, as many people didn't know about the meeting well in advance.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>Attendees asked that we begin the next workshop later in the evening to accommodate traffic concerns.</p>	
Santa Rosa	9	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>Most contributed something</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>We provided maps of Santa Rosa that helped participants locate key areas of concern</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>We mostly took time to discuss each topic, but some kept coming back up and felt unresolved.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p> <p>No, added in some slides for more context though.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?:</p> <p>It was a bit odd to decide with a big group on how to make a decision but we basically used majority vote to decide to use majority vote</p>	Not provided; notes provided to Aclima instead.



		<p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: It stayed focus, although there were many related topics brought up, especially around lack of greenspace and trees.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Felt engaged. Folks were adding their input and everyone stayed the whole time and really seemed to be interested.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Mostly aligned in their views</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Mostly, some remaining questions</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They liked that there was food, childcare, and stipends. In the future they would like to know about the meeting more in advance and they thought the interactive map was confusing.</p>	
South Madera - La Vina, Parkwood, Parksdale, Borden, Italian Swiss Colony, Iragose, and Ripperday	59	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, the main objectives of the meeting were successfully met. We were able to clearly introduce the SMMI project and its goals, provide an overview of the expected outcomes, and engage the community in productive discussions. Participants actively contributed by sharing their air quality concerns, identifying potential monitoring areas, and understanding their role in the project. Overall, the meeting fostered a sense of community involvement and set a solid foundation for</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, the main objectives of the meeting were largely achieved. The in-person meeting provided a valuable space for community members to engage directly in confirming the proposed air monitoring areas and discussing the draft Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP). Although meeting materials were not available during the session, MCCJ communicated transparently about this and assured participants that materials would be shared as soon as they became available.</p>

		<p>the next steps in the project.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, the community members and all attendees at our SMMI Meeting 1 demonstrated a strong understanding of the topics discussed. Many expressed excitement and appreciation for the project, as they feel that their community is often overlooked in similar initiatives. It was clear from their engagement and feedback that they not only understood the content but also felt a sense of empowerment, knowing that their concerns and contributions would help shape the direction of the project.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: We had 15 participants, and all of them were highly engaged in both the discussions and the exercises. Every participant actively voiced their concerns, providing valuable insights that contributed to the success of the meeting and the development of the project.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was highly productive due to a strong level of community engagement, a well-structured format, and a safe space for open dialogue. Participants felt comfortable sharing their concerns and were eager to contribute throughout the discussion. They were especially motivated to complete the air quality survey as a way to voice issues directly impacting their daily lives—such as unpleasant odors at certain times of the day, illegal trash</p>	<p>Despite this limitation, attendees were able to provide meaningful input, ask questions, and better understand the next steps and stakeholder roles. The dialogue and participation reflected strong community engagement and alignment with the meeting's goals</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, participants, especially community members, understood the meeting topics. There was active engagement, with participants asking relevant questions and offering valuable feedback on the air monitoring areas and the draft Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP). While some materials were not available during the meeting, MCCJ clearly communicated that they would be shared once ready, ensuring attendees remained well-informed.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All 16 attendees were active in the discussions and exercises. Every participant contributed to the conversation, asking insightful questions, offering feedback, and engaging in the exercises. Their active involvement helped ensure a thorough and meaningful discussion. The level of engagement reflected strong interest in the topics, and the diverse perspectives shared enriched the overall dialogue, making it a highly productive session.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was productive due to active participant engagement and clear communication. All 16 attendees were actively involved in the discussions and exercises, providing valuable</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>burning, and heavy diesel truck traffic. The clear presentation of project goals, along with interactive activities, kept everyone focused and involved.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: All key topics were thoroughly discussed during the meeting. The agenda allowed enough time for participants to engage in meaningful conversation, ask questions, and share their experiences. No major topics felt rushed or unresolved, and participants expressed that they felt heard and appreciated the opportunity to contribute. The discussion provided a strong starting point for ongoing community input as the project progresses.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No, all parts of the meeting felt relevant and intentional. Each section built on the previous one, helping participants stay engaged and informed. The content was well-paced and directly tied to the project's goals, with no feedback suggesting that any portion was repetitive or unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: The meeting had an organic, participatory decision-making process, encouraging open dialogue where participants shared experiences, raised concerns, and suggested priorities. This input shaped the project's direction and highlighted key areas of focus.</p> <p>One major decision was to prioritize reducing emissions in areas where vulnerable populations, like children and families, are most exposed, such as school zones, parks, and high-traffic areas. Monitoring in these spaces was seen as</p>	<p>feedback on the air monitoring areas and the draft Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP). The facilitator created a welcoming environment that encouraged open dialogue. Although some materials were not available at the time, MCCJ ensured that participants were informed that these would be shared as soon as they became available, which helped maintain transparency. The collaborative atmosphere and clear next steps contributed to the overall productivity of the meeting.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Important topics, including the CAMP, CARB, air monitoring methods, map boundaries, next steps, and missing materials, were all thoroughly covered without feeling rushed. Each topic was discussed in detail, with enough time for open dialogue and participant input. The facilitator ensured that all key areas were addressed, and the meeting allowed for in-depth conversation, leaving space for questions and feedback. While some materials were not available during the meeting, MCCJ communicated that they would be shared once ready, ensuring participants were informed. Overall, the meeting allowed for a comprehensive and unhurried discussion of all major topics.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No, there were no parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary. Each topic discussed was relevant and contributed to the meeting's objectives. Facilitator Mary, along with Noe from MCCJ, ensured that the discussions stayed focused and on track. They covered key points such as the Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP), air monitoring methods, and next steps without unnecessary repetition. The meeting was structured to allow for a clear flow of information, keeping participants engaged and ensuring that all important issues were addressed efficiently.</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>essential for protecting public health.</p> <p>Another concern was the expansion of warehousing and industrial growth in the Central Valley, which many felt worsens air quality due to the region's geography. Participants expressed the need for the state to reconsider such developments to protect residents' health.</p> <p>Though not formally voted on, the meeting captured a shared sense of urgency and clear community priorities.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused on its main goals for the most part. Discussions were lively and participants were eager to share their concerns, which occasionally led to brief tangents. However, these side conversations were still relevant to the overall project, and the facilitator effectively guided the group back to the key topics. The structured agenda helped ensure that the meeting stayed on course and productive, allowing us to cover all necessary aspects of the project.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt both engaging and productive. Participants were actively involved throughout the discussions, contributing their thoughts and concerns in a constructive manner. The interactive format, combined with the opportunity to share personal experiences, helped keep the energy positive and focused. There was a genuine sense of collaboration, with community members eager to be part of the solution. The welcoming atmosphere, along with clear explanations of the project goals, helped foster an environment where participants felt heard and valued. As a result, the meeting maintained a productive tone without any</p>	<p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: While there were no major changes from the decisions made in Meeting 1, participants built on prior discussions and reached agreement on several important issues. Facilitator Mary and Noe from MCCJ guided attendees through a focused dialogue, where community members identified priorities for lowering emissions in high-traffic areas—particularly those impacted by agricultural activity such as La Vina, Ripperdan, Parksdale, and the central corridors of Madera where highways, cargo trains, and heavy traffic create pollution and safety concerns. Participants also highlighted poor road conditions, lack of pedestrian safety due to potholes and heavy traffic, and limited street lighting—especially in the southern and outer areas of Madera, including Italian Swiss Colony and Irrogosa. In addition, concerns were raised about pesticide drift during high winds, which poses health risks to nearby residents. These discussions informed decisions around monitoring priorities and focus areas in the draft Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP).</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes, the meeting stayed focused on its goals, with discussions remaining relevant and on track.</p> <p>Facilitator Mary and Noe from MCCJ effectively guided the conversation, ensuring that participants stayed engaged with the meeting's objectives—reviewing the draft Community Air Monitoring Plan (CAMP), confirming monitoring areas, and identifying key air quality concerns. While community members shared a wide range of experiences and concerns, all input related directly to air monitoring priorities, environmental conditions, and public health in Madera. The structure of the meeting allowed for open discussion without losing sight of the core goals.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive,</p>
--	--	---

	<p>signs of tension or disengagement.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?:</p> <p>Overall, participants seemed largely aligned in their views, particularly when it came to concerns about air quality and the need for more comprehensive monitoring. There was a shared sense of urgency around the issues affecting the community, such as unpleasant odors, diesel truck traffic, and illegal trash burning. While some participants voiced different priorities in terms of specific monitoring areas, these differences were respectful and led to productive discussions about how to best address everyone's concerns. There was no noticeable tension or disagreement, and the meeting maintained a collaborative and solution-focused tone throughout.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p> <p>Yes, staff were able to answer participant questions and concerns effectively throughout the meeting. MCCJ staff created an open and supportive space where attendees felt comfortable asking questions, and responses were clear, respectful, and informative. While some concerns—such as long-term solutions to air quality issues—require ongoing discussion, all questions were acknowledged, and participants were informed that these topics would be revisited as the project continues. No concerns were left unaddressed during the meeting.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>Community members shared that they</p>	<p>or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?:</p> <p>The meeting felt engaging and productive, with strong participation and a collaborative atmosphere.</p> <p>Community members were actively involved, sharing their lived experiences and concerns about air quality, traffic, pesticide exposure, and infrastructure issues. Facilitator Mary and Noe from MCCJ created a welcoming and respectful environment that encouraged open dialogue. Participants felt heard and valued, which contributed to a sense of shared purpose. The discussion remained focused and solution-oriented, making the meeting both meaningful and effective.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?:</p> <p>Participants were largely in agreement, and the conversation reflected a shared understanding of the community's air quality challenges.</p> <p>Rather than conflict, the discussion showed alignment on key priorities—such as addressing pollution in high-traffic corridors, improving safety in poorly maintained areas, and responding to pesticide exposure. Different perspectives were expressed, but they complemented rather than contradicted each other, adding depth to the conversation. The overall tone remained collaborative and constructive throughout the meeting.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p> <p>Staff were responsive and did their best to address participants' questions and concerns. Some questions related to the unavailable materials couldn't be fully answered at the time, but MCCJ acknowledged this openly and committed to sharing that information afterward.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community</p>
--	---	---

		<p>appreciated the welcoming environment and the opportunity to have their voices heard. They particularly liked that all materials were translated into their language, which made the meeting more accessible and inclusive. The meeting's structure, which was designed to accommodate language differences and cultural considerations, was well-received. Many attendees felt that the project was clearly explained, and the interactive format gave them a chance to share their lived experiences. Overall, the meeting was seen as both informative and empowering.</p> <p>For future meetings, some participants suggested allowing more time for open discussion and small group conversations to dive deeper into specific concerns. Additionally, a few members expressed the need for clearer communication about the data collection process. They felt that having specific dates for when data collection would start and end, along with details on the evaluation process, would help set clearer expectations. They were also interested in having a more detailed timeline to better understand when they would receive updates or data collected during the project.</p>	<p>members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>Community members expressed appreciation for the meeting, emphasizing how important it was for them to have a platform to voice their concerns.</p> <p>They were grateful that MCCJ was hosting these meetings, as it gave them the opportunity to advocate for their communities and bring attention to issues, such as air quality and infrastructure, that directly impact them. Many participants highlighted the significance of being involved in decisions that could help bring much-needed resources to areas that are often overlooked. For future meetings, some suggested providing materials ahead of time and incorporating more visual aids, such as maps or data, to make the information easier to understand.</p>
South Merced	4	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 8 out of 13 spoke and engaged, but everyone filled out the survey</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p>	Not provided.

		<p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Technical difficulties of set up and Zoom connection/sound made for a slow start.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: The conversation started with priority areas and then led to discussion of strategy of how to use this information to get local leaders to change for the better.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: Some of the questions felt redundant</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes Next steps were discussed (continuing input survey efforts leading to Meeting #2)</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: They mostly stayed focused.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: engaging and productive</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Yes, residents were aligned and the younger folks helped the elders with mapping priority locations</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, questions were answered. The conversation that continues is the strategy to impact leaders' decisions.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community</p>	
--	--	---	--

		members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: none	
South Modesto (Modesto, Modesto Airport neighborhood)	13	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All participants were actively engaged in both the air quality discussion and exercises.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was productive because we ensured active participation from the community in addressing air quality concerns during the programmed activities. We made it a priority to listen to community members during the survey, air quality concerns discussion, and mapping exercises. While we anticipated challenges with supporting participants in completing the survey, especially given its length and complexity, as well as the need to navigate two languages, we had six team members available to assist. We also fostered a group dialogue during the air quality concerns discussion, providing additional context beyond the survey and air quality monitoring route. The Air Quality Monitoring Route exercise was another collaborative effort, where community members from the same areas worked together to prioritize the monitoring route. This was done on paper, and VIP staff later uploaded the routes based on the input provided during the exercise.</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All participants were actively engaged throughout the meeting. They contributed to recapping the first meeting, reconfirming the monitoring boundaries, identifying broad monitoring areas, selecting targeted monitoring locations, and discussing the proposed language for the Community Air Monitoring Plans (CAMPs).</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was productive, largely due to active community participation in addressing air quality concerns through the scheduled activities. We discussed proposed mobile monitoring routes and reviewed key air pollution sources, prioritizing those that require further investigation. A particularly valuable aspect of the meeting was the detailed discussion of potential air contaminants, which helped residents better understand what's in the air and its associated health impacts as well as how these pollutants are produced. During the prioritization process, community members were encouraged to engage in open dialogue and work together to propose the priority locations for the targeted air monitoring.</p>



		<p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>Yes, important topics were thoroughly discussed. We were able to address the air quality concerns in sufficient depth, as we were covering the issues affecting three different neighborhoods represented by the attendees. The conversations around air quality concerns and the mapping exercise provided valuable insight into the ongoing challenges these communities face, which are expected to worsen with climate change. Community members expressed deep concern about the impact of air pollution on the health of children, elders, and the broader population. This conversation highlighted the urgent need for action to address the air quality issues in their neighborhoods.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p> <p>Similar to the feedback received from the West Modesto community, members of the South Modesto community also expressed that one part of the meeting felt repetitive. Community members noted that the combined air quality discussion and route mapping exercise provided enough information to determine monitoring routes for South Modesto. They shared that many of the questions in the air quality survey overlapped with those discussed in the combined activity, which made the separate air quality survey feel redundant.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?:</p> <p>Yes, there was a clear process for decision-making, particularly regarding the air quality monitoring routes in the communities. We distributed, 11 by 17 inch, maps of each community and organized participants into small groups based on their respective communities (South</p>	<p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>Important topics were thoroughly discussed during the second community meeting. Community members actively reviewed and reconfirmed essential elements for the Community Air Monitoring Plans (CAMPs) through both discussion and group activities. For example, participants collaboratively confirmed the broad monitoring areas and selected targeted monitoring locations using a majority and consensus-based voting process. Attendees worked in small groups to identify their top two preferred locations for targeted monitoring, which were then ranked based on group votes. Facilitators confirmed consensus by asking the full group to approve the final priorities, which were unanimously supported. The final list of selected locations will be provided in response to a separate question.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p> <p>No, there were no parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary. All of the activities were necessary to ensure the community receives a whole picture of the Statewide Mobile Monitoring Initiative. Additionally having a meeting recap gave the community members in attendance a refresher to the project.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?:</p> <p>Yes, there was a clear process for decision-making. As we had done in the previous meeting, we organized participants into small groups based on their respective communities (South Modesto: Bret Harte, Parklawn, and Airport Neighborhood). Each group discussed and selected their preferred locations for target air monitoring. Each community (South Modesto and Airport) was asked to share their top locations where they would want to target monitoring to occur for a total of 6 priority locations. Meeting attendees selected these locations based on the</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Modesto - Bret Harte, South Modesto - Parklawn and Airport Neighborhood. Each group discussed and selected preferred routes and identified specific air quality areas within their communities that they wanted to have monitored throughout the project.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes, the meeting stayed focused on its goals, and the discussion did not go off track.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting was both engaging and productive, with strong participation from everyone, particularly when discussing the air quality issues impacting their communities. The group discussions were meaningful, and a couple of community members shared personal stories. One mother highlighted that families often don't choose where they live, but rather go where they can afford. The meeting also felt more personal because the Salvation Army's Red Shield Community Center is located downwind from the wastewater treatment facility, which regularly exposes the area to unpleasant odors. Overall, the atmosphere was positive and cooperative, with a shared focus on addressing the community's challenges. Like in the other consistently nominated communities, there was no visible tension or disengagement; everyone appeared actively interested and invested throughout the session.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: The community members were aligned in their views throughout the meeting. There was a strong sense of shared concern, particularly regarding air quality issues</p>	<p>majority vote within their own communities.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes, the meeting stayed focused on its goals, and the discussion did not go off track.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Yes, the meeting was both engaging and productive, although residents mentioned that some of the information was a bit dense. Residents shared that the pollution type slides should have been accompanied by an information sheet, as there was a lot of information to consume. With this, everyone was involved, especially when we talked about the air quality concerns affecting their communities. Additionally, other items that helped the meeting feel productive were the community members' alignment on the priority of the locations that should receive targeted monitoring.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Throughout the meeting, community members were aligned in their concerns and priorities. Across all activities, there was a shared recognition of the air quality issues affecting their neighborhoods. Some residents were even surprised to learn about certain nearby facilities, indicating that the meeting also served as an educational opportunity. A key factor that supported this alignment was the initial grouping of participants by their respective communities, allowing each group to speak from direct experience and local expertise. Additionally, it was clarified that even if a specific location was not selected for target area monitoring, broad area monitoring would continue. This reassured community members that air pollution levels in their area would still be tracked and reported.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>and their impact on health. Participants seemed united in their desire to have air quality monitored in their communities and worked collaboratively during the mapping exercise to prioritize monitoring routes. Overall, there was a clear consensus and focus on addressing the air quality concerns in their communities.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, we were able to address all questions related to air quality concerns adequately.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: All three consistently nominated communities learned about air quality and appreciated the opportunity to discuss their air quality concerns in depth. They recognized that many of the issues they face are similar, and they expressed concern and eagerness about the potential outcomes of this project. Lastly, community members expressed gratitude for the commitment to making air quality data more accessible, seeing it as an essential tool for driving solutions in partnership with local and state governments. A couple of community members showed interest in learning more about the Aclima vehicle and potentially applying to drive it.</p> <p>Community members provided some feedback regarding improvements for future meetings, particularly about the air quality survey. Similar to the West Modesto meeting, participants expressed concerns about the time it took to complete the survey, the complexity of the technology, and confusion about how to navigate through the questions. Despite</p>	<p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, we were able to adequately address participants' questions and concerns. While most questions were answered effectively, similarly to the West Modesto 2nd community meeting, a couple of community members expressed concerns about how the monitoring data would be used and visualized. Community members also had questions about how the data would support community advocacy for health impacts relative to pollution sources. These concerns were acknowledged and discussed, with an understanding that ongoing community meetings may be needed to fully address them.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Community members in Southwest Modesto expressed that they enjoyed the meeting and appreciated the opportunity to learn and engage on issues related to local pollution. They shared interest in continuing these meetings to receive more information about different types of pollution and how to protect themselves. To improve future meetings, they suggested providing printed copies of the presentation slides or a worksheet to follow along during the presentation. Additionally, they recommended breaking down some of the meeting content into smaller, more manageable sections to make it easier to understand and more accessible for everyone.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>the VIP team's presence at each table to offer support, many community members still found the survey difficult to complete. Challenges included the need for translation assistance, varying levels of comfort with technology, and differences in age and ability. Additionally, a couple of community members revealed that they did not know how to read or write, which was a new challenge we had not previously encountered. These insights highlight areas for a more inclusive experience in future meetings.</p>	
<p>South Natomas (Community A in District analysis)</p>		<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, we believe the main meeting objectives were achieved. Residents provided feedback about where exactly to monitor, and took part in a majority vote process to approve the monitoring boundary. The community voted to keep monitoring within the original proposed boundary which we shared.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, and many asked clarifying questions about how the data will be shared, and when and where monitoring can take place in the community.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 90 % of participants were either active in the discussions or the two activities (mapping activity with sticky-dots and post-its and the majority-vote process for defining the monitoring boundary).</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: We allocated 20-25 minutes for the mapping activity / discussion and 20 minutes for the monitoring boundary</p>	<p>Not provided</p>

		<p>approval / discussion. Community members were actively participating for the entire or majority of these activities. Additionally, community members asked questions before voting on the monitoring boundary.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: The health impacts of air pollution and the project milestones / timeline were thoroughly discussed. Perhaps there could be more time allocated to discuss more in-depth about how air monitoring data can be used (e.g. what emissions reduction strategies could community members advocate for and how the data can inform strategies) and additional details about the draft community air monitoring plan felt a bit rushed at the end.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: The slides towards the end about next steps felt redundant. Instead of having 4 slides about next steps, 2 slides would have been sufficient.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, the process for deciding on the monitoring boundary was clear and a key decision was made based on community feedback and questions/concerns. We presented two options based on input provided by community members on monitoring locations during the mapping activity (1. focused monitoring within the boundary and 2. more expansive monitoring to include some dots/locations outside of proposed boundary).</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused on its goals of mapping and discussing community concerns and defining the monitoring</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>boundary through a majority vote process. Discussions did not go off track.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting was incredibly engaging and productive. Attendees commented that they were very informed, the presentation was engaging and the activities were fun.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Participants seemed aligned in their views and there was no noticeable tension or disagreement with the activities and voting process.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Valley Vision staff was able to answer questions and concerns adequately. There were no concerns left unaddressed. People expressed they were looking forward to the next meeting and seeing the draft plan and proposed driving routes.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Participants said materials were well presented, everything was clear and speakers were great and engaging. Participants suggested for maps to have schools, parks and shopping centers, etc. marked. They also recommended a better seating layout and for there to be more tables.</p>	
South San Francisco	2	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, the main objectives of the SMMI were relayed to attendees. The role of community members in the project was specified. Community members highlighted facilities,</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, we were able to review the draft CAMP on a detailed level – splitting up table 4.1 into several slides. We received feedback on additions and changes that should be made to</p>

	<p>roadways, and general areas they wanted to see greater monitoring take place in.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: The meeting topics were well understood by attendees. Due to the difficulty of completing the survey on mobile devices and the lack of laptop access for some community members, Rise South City decided to print out surveys at the Spanish-speaking workshop. Aclima provided these printed surveys, which were translated by Rise into Spanish for the Spanish-speaking meeting. When questions arose about the survey instructions, Rise Staff were on hand to provide clear answers and support. A problem we encountered is that several attendees found the survey instructions confusing, particularly regarding labeling the map with letters associated with pollution concerns. Upon evaluating paper survey responses, it became evident that some attendees did not correctly label the map or specify which facility, roadway, or area they were referring to in follow-up questions. Despite these issues, answers were still interpretable, and were successfully transferred to the online survey.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All participants were active in discussion and exercises.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 6.5/7 - Overall, the meeting attendees understood the purpose, scope, and timeline of the SMMI project. However, the community discussion on pollutant sources and areas of concern lacked depth. While attendees were not as involved in the discussion, they were able to address their concerns through the survey. It would have been beneficial for community members to better understand</p>	<p>the CAMP.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, most community members attended our first meeting. However, three community members were not present at the first meeting, so we provided a more in-depth review of the project's scope and discussed the specifics of mobile monitoring.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All participants were active in discussion and weighed in at least once.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 7</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting goals were successfully achieved. Facilitating the meeting in both English and Spanish naturally extended its duration. Community members actively engaged in discussions about the changes they wanted to see in the CAMP. However, the meeting felt slightly rushed towards the end, preventing us from covering the slides on specific pollutant information.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: All topics outlined in the agenda were thoroughly covered. However, we did not have time to discuss the slides containing specific pollution information. To ensure attendees received this crucial information, we sent out the slide deck via email following the meeting and specifically advised them to review the slides related to pollutant information at the end of the deck.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: I believe we spent too much time on the slides summarizing the discussions and takeaways</p>
--	--	--

		<p>how their answers will be integrated by Aclima into the CAMP, as well as more specifics on their role during the monitoring period and beyond.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Splitting up the slides for the community discussion could have enhanced the structure of the conversation. By walking attendees through each prompt and incorporating relevant visuals, the discussion could have been more organized and engaging. It may have been beneficial to include a dedicated slide with clear instructions for the paper survey prior to its distribution. This would have made it easier for attendees to understand the survey format and process. Providing explanations of what 'StoryMaps' entail would be beneficial for attendees unfamiliar with the tool and ArcGIS, ensuring everyone is on the same page.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: For the community members present at the SSF meeting, the 'Decision Making Process for the Meeting' slide was largely unnecessary. Throughout the meeting, there was no requirement to reach a consensus or conduct a majority vote, making the slide redundant.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Attendees seemed to agree with the input from all community members present. There was no need to discern a clear decision-making process (see above).</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Discussion pertained to topics regarding air quality, monitoring, and the SMMI project.</p>	<p>from Meeting #1. Many of these takeaways were detailed later in the CAMP slides, which likely made the information feel redundant for most attendees.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Attendees seemed to agree with the input from all community members present. The group agreed that if a consensus was not reached, a majority vote would occur.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The vast majority of discussions adhered to the prompted topics and areas of focus. However, attendees occasionally veered into unrelated tangents. One member raised concerns about the affordability of public transport and its impact on increasing the number of vehicles on roadways, thereby contributing to pollution. This implied that residents are partially responsible for the region's pollution burden. This led another attendee to highlight the potential role of government regulation and incentives in reducing the number of vehicles on the road. She specifically mentioned how cars in Mexico City have colored stickers on their license plates to indicate which days of the week they can be driven. This sparked a discussion on the feasibility of similar government interventions in the Bay Area, with several attendees noting that the level of intervention seen in Mexico City would likely be impractical in the Bay Area due to significant differences in government, culture, and city layout.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Overall, the meeting felt productive. There was some tension during the discussion on the government's role in transportation and vehicle emission reduction. However, the facilitators suggested that this conversation could continue after the meeting, and the attendees agreed. Toward the end of the meeting, when outlining the next steps of the</p>
--	--	---	--



		<p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting was productive, with all participants actively engaging in discussions about air quality. Participants expressed satisfaction knowing that efforts are being made to address the issue. They also emphasized the importance of involving more people in future discussions, highlighting that this is an important matter that requires widespread participation. Additionally, attendees appreciated the reminder phone call they received the day before the meeting.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: No noticeable tension or disagreement was present at the English and Spanish Workshop.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Staff successfully addressed all participant questions during the meeting. However, the Rise Staff were uncertain about the exact number of mobile monitoring vehicles that will be operating in South San Francisco. We responded by assuming there would be one vehicle, which would drive around at different times. It would be beneficial to obtain and share this specific information with the community. One issue that arose for Rise Staff was the inconsistencies between the paper survey and the online survey. The online survey included options and selections that were not available on the paper survey. For example, the online survey allowed respondents to select the type of vehicles associated with traffic from a drop-down menu, whereas the paper survey did not provide any vehicle</p>	<p>project, attendees appeared less engaged, possibly because the timeline had been covered earlier in the presentation.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: As previously mentioned, some attendees had differing opinions on the government's role in improving transportation costs and reducing vehicle emissions. The conversation remained cordial and concluded after the facilitator suggested continuing the discussion after the meeting. Otherwise, participants were aligned in their views and suggestions for the CAMP.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: The only major question that staff were unable to answer pertained to the detailed workings of the technology in the sensors of the mobile monitoring unit. We directed this participant to Aclima's website for more information. In the follow-up email sent after the meeting, we included a link to Aclima's website, which provides details on the technology behind Aclima's specialized air quality devices, as well as instructions on how to stay updated with project milestones and data collection.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: When asked, attendees did not provide any feedback on what they would change about future meetings. Participants were content with the structure and facilitation of the meeting.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>options. Additionally, option 'C' was presented as a 'select an area' choice in the online survey, but as a 'select a point' choice in the paper survey.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Both the Spanish and English meetings received positive comments and feedback. Participants expressed their appreciation for the efforts of Rise South City, Aclima, and CARB to address air quality issues in South San Francisco. One attendee shared, "I have lived here my whole life and the air quality gets worse and worse, but no one does anything about it. It's great that Rise South City is working on this issue." Another mentioned, "I have some families with children who have asthma, and they need to participate in these meetings to learn ways to help their family." Additionally, attendees were grateful for the invitation, saying, "Thank you for inviting us to this meeting. It's great to learn that something is being done to address the air quality in our city and community."</p>	
South Tulare & Matheny Tract		<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 20</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: resident interest in improving air quality</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 14</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: everyone had a clear understanding of the purpose for the meeting and the objective we</p>

		<p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: no</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: yes the survey was redundant</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: yes, although the survey responses included feedback from every resident in attendance</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: yes</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: no</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: yes aligned / no tension</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: yes able to answer questions - no concerns left unaddressed</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: n/a</p>	<p>were trying to meet. That allowed everyone to provide feedback in an efficient manner</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: N/A</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: Reaffirming residents concerns was helpful, but it does feel a little redundant since the survey also asked the same questions.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: yes stayed focused on goals</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: yes, everyone was engaged in the final determination of community concerns</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: everyone was aligned; some folks were more knowledge about issues with certain polluters than other given their close proximity to the sources, but there was no tension.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: yes, questions were answered, no concerns were left unaddressed</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: folks are just very excited to see the final results of the air monitoring.</p>
Torrance	4	Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:	Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:

		<p>Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: They did yes.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 4</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Productive</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: I felt that something that could have been further expanded upon was how the public could effectively use the data that'll be available next year. It's easier to see how non-profits or government officials can utilize it, but individuals had a hard time considering the usage for their livelihood.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: Not redundant, but I felt my initial presentation might not have directly conveyed how air quality impacts them directly. My presentation had this assumption that everyone want's clean air, and so my project was designed for people who already have an interests; rather, this project was made for engaging minds. I felt some participants who attended might have been just there to be there.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Not necessarily, admittedly on my end. We didn't use the initial boundary survey and instead fielded areas directly from the participants</p>	<p>Absolutely, we were able to share the project and add more to the boundary survey, while creating more awareness around the initiative.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, and added tremendous value and insight to the discussion.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 80% of them were highly engaged and spirited!</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: What made it productive was demonstrating the map that had been established from the last meeting; it sparked earnest conversation as to whether other areas were accounted for or not.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Things were thoroughly discuss and all topics that we set out to discuss were reached.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: None at all!</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, and the decisions discussed were more along the lines of how we were deciding to chart the Tableau.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: It was hyper-focused.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting was engaged; many of the</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The discussion stayed on track! We had two seniors share the history of Torrance and some of how these initiatives even occurred (such as the ExxonMobil Disaster etc.), but everything was within the scope of air quality.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Engaging; these are issues that are self-evident so this project prompted a lot of curiosity about resolving these issues, as well as engagement.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Aligned</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, there were no lingering questions.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: One participant in particular, Eileen, was overjoyed (and I don't use that word loosely) at this project being implemented. She has lived in the community all her life and saw the environmental changes that had occurred. She was apart of the initial effort to implement a fence line monitoring effort around the Torrance Refinery with another non-profit. Being that she is a senior, she was delighted to see us all taking an action, or rather picking up the mantle.</p>	<p>participants shared their own personal experience and history and drew powerful connection to SMMI and the importance of clean air.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Everyone but one person was aligned. The one person who wasn't fully aligned was an attendee at our last Torrance meeting. His view was that GHG emissions are part of the natural earth cycle and provided documents showing the historical component.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: This was a comprehensive (and by far the best) meeting!</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They enjoyed the video I added describing the impacts (health and economic) of poor air quality.</p>
Treasure Island	11	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p>	Not provided.

		<p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All 11 of them.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Productive</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Topics were thoroughly discussed and our time did not seem rushed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting remained focused on goals.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt engaging and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: The participants seemed aligned in their views</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, staff were able to answer participant questions adequately.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They expressed genuine interest and gratitude for the study taking place.</p>	
Tri-Valley	20	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 4</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Low turnout because there was a well-attended protest against Musk and Trump administration about six blocks away. Many of these people are likely to be environmentally aware and may have attended our meeting.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes. One participant asked why we could not just use satellite measurements instead of ground measurements. We responded that ground measurements would provide higher resolution.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No.</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: We had feedback on the proposed routes and added several miles, and we chose a targeted area. However, the lack of widespread attendance from the general public was disappointing. This lack of general public participation was mitigated to some extent by the deep, detailed knowledge and expertise of the TVAQCA staff that was brought to bear. After years of study, the TVAQCA staff is aware of major pollution sources and issues in the Tri Valley area.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes. In particular, the two reporters had been briefed before by TVAQCA and were provided pointers to Aclima documentation. We should expect more enquiries after their articles are published in late May.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All participants made suggestions and/or voted for a targeted area.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 6</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: More participation from the community would have been better. TVAQCA conducted extensive community outreach to advertise</p>

		<p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Decision process shown on slide was discussed, but no decisions made.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed on track.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It felt engaged and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: There was no disagreement. People filled out the surveys in parallel.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: All questions were answered.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: No such comments.</p>	<p>the meeting, including flyers in five libraries, advertisement in The Patch (which reaches 228,000 emails and 21,000 web impressions), notice in The Independent newspaper, notices in Nextdoor, invitations to the Tri-Valley Indivisible Climate Google group (39 members), and invitations to 2 leaders from the Sierra Club Tri-Valley. We had 139 unique user views of our Reels ad in Facebook, and 135 unique user views of our post on Instagram. Finally, we posted meeting notices on our web site tvaqca.org and sent notices to our email list (about 200 addresses).</p> <p>I believe the community engagement process could be made more effective with the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As Aclima is well aware, hackers were continually exploiting the survey to fraudulently claim compensation. For this reason, distribution of the survey link was limited to "known parties." If no compensation were offered for survey response, it could be more widely distributed.</li> <li>2. We could not select some of the road segments when building the route maps. Some of our locations are not connected for this reason. The total mileage for feasible routes will be 5 to 10 miles longer than what is reported in the Tableau application.</li> <li>3. After meeting 2 on Tuesday, we are starting to receive requests to add routes. Such requests are likely to continue throughout the measurement campaign.</li> </ol> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Routes and targeted areas were presented and discussed. Some modifications were made to the routes based upon input from</p>
--	--	---	--



			<p>participants.</p> <p>Four candidates for targeted measurements were presented and participants voted. One targeted area received the most votes (a site East of Livermore Airport with a focus on measuring lead from aviation fuel).</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting stayed focused.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Participants were engaged and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: A consensus was reached without controversy.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Staff could answer questions adequately. No air quality concerns were unaddressed. Someone brought up PFAS in ground water, suggesting in for future study (by another agency).</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They liked the convenience of an online meeting.</p>
Vallejo	7	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, main objectives of the meeting were achieved.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, community members understood meeting topics.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, main objectives of the meeting were achieved.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, community members understood meeting topics.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p>

		<p>9</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>The meeting was productive since community members were informed about the Statewide Mobile Monitoring Initiative and were asked to participate in the project's planing process. Greater attendance would have enhanced meeting productivity. However, information gathered during community outreach helped supplement meeting participation.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>Yes, important topics thoroughly discussed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p> <p>No. The meeting was upbeat, informative, and productive.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?:</p> <p>Yes, there was a clear process for making decisions and conclusions were drawn.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?:</p> <p>Yes, the meeting stay focused on its goals.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?:</p> <p>Yes, the meeting was engaging and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?:</p> <p>Participants were aligned in their views.</p>	<p>11</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>Community members were very engaged and provided thoughtful feedback.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>Yes, important topics thoroughly discussed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p> <p>No. The meeting was upbeat, informative, and productive.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?:</p> <p>Yes, there was a clear process for making decisions and conclusions were drawn.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?:</p> <p>Yes, the meeting stay focused on its goals.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?:</p> <p>Yes, the meeting was engaging and productive.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?:</p> <p>Participants were aligned in their views.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p> <p>Yes, staff adequately answered participant questions and concerns.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, staff adequately answered participant questions and concerns.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Community members did not offer meeting feedback.</p>	<p>better?: Community members did not offer meeting feedback.</p>
Van Nuys	10	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, we feel that the main objectives of the meeting were achieved.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, they did and were very proactive in sharing their opinions and suggestions.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All 13 community members were proactive in the discussion, one in particular was more vocal than others.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Our meeting was mostly productive but there was a moment where we were not as productive. One community member went on a tangent when speaking about one site. They mentioned that the pollution source was a street that is filled with unhoused community members. The conversation turned negative, and it took some time to bring the conversation back to what we were there for.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly</p>	Not provided.

		<p>discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>Since we did spend some time bringing back the conversation back to what we intended to do, at the end, it did feel a bit rushed because we were trying to get as many comments as possible. We did not want to leave those comments disregarded and went to speak about resources the unhoused community needs, such as mental health, etc.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p> <p>Yes, the negative comments that the community member made were uncalled for.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?:</p> <p>With Van Nuys, we decided that it was important to have several main streets made into one category. There are too many streets that were mentioned that we had to include them all.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?:</p> <p>I would say that we were focused on track for about 90% of the time.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?:</p> <p>We felt both, outside of the comments about the unhoused community, it was going well. However, those comments were very negatively impactful and left a dent in the meeting.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?:</p> <p>Sadly, some were in agreeance, but they did not express it with such vocalness. However, since this group was on the smaller side, you can see the head shaking with clarity, and that is how we know they</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>were in agreement.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p> <p>We gave an emphasis to the importance of their opinions. We ensured them that their opinions will be read by someone at Aclima and that their voices would influence the project in some way. No concerns were left unaddressed, even the negative ones.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>One member came up to me afterwards and expressed that we need to have a back up plan for negative comments.</p>	
Wasco	28	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>Roughly around 15</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>Community members were very excited because this is the first time that they are invited to participate in identifying pollution sources within their community.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>They were thoroughly discussed.</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?:</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?:</p> <p>17</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?:</p> <p>10</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?:</p> <p>It was very productive since community members were very productive.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?:</p> <p>Yes important topics were thoroughly discussed.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?:</p>

		<p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, people agree on the sources they would identify as pollution sources.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: It stayed focused.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Yes, it was very engaging and productive people felt that they are finally being heard.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: They all seemed aligned.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, no concerns were left unaddressed.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They like the time of the meeting.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: It stayed focused</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It felt engaging and productive</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: They were aligned</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Everything got answered appropriately</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They like the time of the meeting</p>
West Berkeley	4	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All of them</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, but the West Berkeley residents still need an opportunity to review the plan for targeted air monitoring.</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, it seemed like people were very engaged, but one point that we had to repeat a few times was that this project is for monitoring air quality, which will help efforts to improve</p>

		<p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Everybody who was there was very invested in the topic and had specific concerns they wanted addressed. They were very knowledgeable about their neighborhoods and the sources of pollution within them.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: We spent a lot of time on the community members' concerns which was our priority. We only had a little time at the end for next steps.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: We skipped the decision-making part of the discussion, as there were only a few people in the room and it felt unnecessary. Additionally, this meeting was less of a decision-making meeting and more of an information-gathering meeting.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: See above- we mostly collected information and skipped the decision-making slide.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: The meeting mostly stayed very focused. We did once or twice have to remind people that this meeting was more about helping to collect the information that will lead to change, rather than about immediate, specific actions for enforcement and so on. Several of the people there were very frustrated by the inaction of government agencies regarding their specific concerns and</p>	<p>air quality, but is only the first step in that direction. It seemed that some community members wanted an opportunity to communicate their concerns about air quality to someone who could address the issues.</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 10-12</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Our outreach efforts really paid off for this meeting in driving attendance, so we got to hear a wider set of perspectives which was valuable. Many of the Spanish-speaking attendees spoke less than most of the English-speaking attendees, so it might be more fruitful in the future to split the group into two and have a Just Cities staff member facilitate two separate discussions, then bring the two groups together to compare notes.</p> <p>We were able to identify some changes to the proposed monitoring road network that hopefully will address some community concerns. However, it would have been helpful to have a plan for targeted air monitoring to present for community feedback as well.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: The decision-making method felt a little rushed and unresolved; this is typically something we would like to set up plenty of time for but the amount of material to get through made it difficult to set aside sufficient time for this topic in either meeting.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>seemed to be interested in finding additional ways to voice their concerns and drive the change they want.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Everybody was very engaged.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Very in alignment, no tension or disagreement</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Residents wanted to know if the targeted area monitoring vehicles are electric or hybrid like the mobile monitoring platforms. They also had questions about CARB rules for temporary pollution sources such as tar or asphalt work on buildings &amp; roads. Eg, are there requirements that workers notify neighbors prior to doing such work?</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They wanted the next meeting to be in West Berkeley proper, and would have preferred that we do reimbursements not as Target gift cards. They appreciated and enjoyed the food (Toss Noodle Bar).</p>	<p>decisions, and were key decisions made?: We ended up defaulting to consensus as only a few people spoke up in the conversation about decision making and they expressed a preference for that model. When we made decisions about changes to the road network, we tried to make time for everyone to speak and asked if anyone had objections but few people spoke up. No one objected so consensus could be said to have been achieved but I would prefer a more active form of consensus.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Discussions sometimes went off track, but Patricia was very good at reminding us of how much time we had left and bringing us back on track.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: It felt engaged and productive, but also tense at times. There were some disagreements that I think were rooted in people's different perspectives and desires to promote air monitoring rigor in their own neighborhoods, perhaps at the expense of rigor in others.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: See above- the biggest disagreement was over whether Southwest Berkeley needed as much air monitoring as Northwest Berkeley, as the majority of the attendees lived in Northwest Berkeley.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: There were several questions we were unable to answer: 1: Is there a way to include dust from roof construction in air monitoring? (We informed them that this might be difficult due to the extra work it would entail for scheduling) 2: How high above will the targeted air</p>
--	--	---	---



			<p>monitoring sample from?</p> <p>3: Is there any way to account for differences in air quality in the spring, during which there will be no monitoring?</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>Janice Schroeder suggested better signage as it can be difficult to find the Community Room at James Kenney Park; she also suggested setting aside time for self-introductions and an icebreaker in which everyone says why they're at the meeting to build community.</p>
West Modesto	5	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All participants were actively engaged in the combined air quality discussion and route mapping exercises, as well as during the completion of the air quality survey.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was productive, with strong community participation focused on identifying local air quality concerns. Based on feedback from the West Stanislaus County meeting, we adjusted the format to combine the air quality discussion with the route mapping exercise, as community members suggested this would make the survey easier to follow. Community members had suggested that integrating these activities would make the survey process more straightforward and engaging. During the Air Quality Concerns and Monitoring Route Mapping activity, participants</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All participants were actively engaged throughout the meeting. They contributed to recapping the first meeting, reconfirming the monitoring boundaries, identifying broad monitoring areas, selecting targeted monitoring locations, and discussing the proposed language for the Community Air Monitoring Plans (CAMPs).</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 9</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was productive, largely due to active community participation focused on addressing local air quality concerns. Participants engaged in discussions about monitoring routes, reviewed major sources of air pollution, and prioritized those requiring further investigation. We discussed monitoring routes and reviewed key sources of air pollution, and prioritizing those that require further investigation. A particularly valuable aspect of the meeting was the detailed discussion of potential air</p>

		<p>worked in groups to prioritize air monitoring routes in West Modesto. The activity was completed on paper, and VIP staff compiled the notes to finalize a community-informed route, which was then uploaded to the Tableau platform.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes, important topics were thoroughly discussed through the combined air quality conversation and route mapping exercise, as well as the air quality survey. Community members expressed concerns about how upcoming and ongoing projects could impact air quality, particularly due to increased traffic along main streets and arterials. With their input, our team was able to identify monitoring routes with specific details on seasons, days, and times of day. Projects discussed included two new housing developments, potential changes to the local baseball stadium, and the construction of a new stadium to host a semi-professional soccer team. Community members also mentioned the new courthouse and the extension of the Altamont Corridor Express (ACE) train as additional sources of concern regarding traffic and air quality impacts.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: Yes, one part of the meeting felt repetitive. Community members shared feedback that the combined air quality discussion and route mapping exercise was sufficient for determining monitoring routes in West Modesto. They noted that many of the questions in the survey overlapped with those in the combined activity, making the separate air quality survey feel unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, there was a clear process for</p>	<p>contaminants—such as PM2.5, black carbon, and methane—which helped residents better understand what’s in the air and its associated health impacts as well as how these pollutants are produced. During the prioritization process, attendees collaborated in identifying potential locations for targeted air monitoring. Additionally, a suggestion was made to develop a glossary of key air quality terms, as some of the terminology used during the meeting was considered too technical.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Important topics were thoroughly discussed during the second community meeting. Community members actively reviewed and reconfirmed essential elements for the Community Air Monitoring Plans (CAMPs) through both discussion and group activities. For example, participants collaboratively confirmed the broad monitoring areas and selected targeted monitoring locations using a majority and consensus-based voting process. Attendees worked in small groups to identify their top two preferred locations for targeted monitoring, which were then ranked based on group votes. Facilitators confirmed consensus by asking the full group to approve the final priorities, which were unanimously supported. The final list of selected locations will be provided in response to a separate question.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No parts of the meeting felt redundant or unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, there was a clear and inclusive process for making decisions during the meeting. Community members participated in structured group activities to identify and rank preferred locations for targeted air monitoring. Each group selected their top two choices, which were then compiled and ranked based on majority voting. Facilitators</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>decision-making. Each group participated in a combined air quality discussion and route mapping exercise to identify key air quality concerns in West Modesto. Before proceeding to the air quality survey, each group selected a spokesperson to share a summary of their decisions. All input was then collected and used to inform the development of the air quality monitoring route for West Modesto.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes the meeting stayed focused on its goals, and the discussion did not go off track.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The meeting felt both engaging and productive. Community members were actively involved in their group discussions and had meaningful opportunities to provide input during the combined air quality and route mapping exercise. The small group format, along with facilitation support from VIP team members, helped create an inclusive and collaborative environment. Each participant contributed to identifying air quality concerns, which directly informed their survey responses. There was no noticeable tension or disengagement; participants appeared interested and invested throughout the community meeting.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Community members were aligned in their views throughout the meeting. Each group collaborated to respond to the air quality discussion questions, identifying sources of pollution and providing detailed insights, including the location of the sources, odors, health impacts, seasons, and times of day. This shared input supported their responses to the air quality survey and played a key role</p>	<p>confirmed community consensus by reviewing the ranked list with all participants, who unanimously agreed on the final priorities.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes, the meeting stayed focused on its goals, and the discussion did not go off track.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: The second meeting in West Modesto felt both engaging and productive, much like the first. Community members were attentive, asked meaningful questions about air contaminants and their health impacts, and actively participated in discussions. Several helpful suggestions were made to improve communication and understanding of the project, including creating a one-pager with a high-level overview and a glossary of air quality terms, as well as enhancing the clarity of the maps used in the presentation. The meeting also included a collaborative decision-making process, where participants voted on adjustments to the monitoring route and ranked targeted air monitoring locations, reflecting a high level of engagement and shared purpose.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Yes, participants appeared to be aligned in their views during the second meeting. Community members actively engaged in a structured group activity to identify and rank preferred locations for targeted air monitoring, and the final priorities were unanimously agreed upon. Additionally, there was shared support for maintaining ongoing communication and holding future meetings to continue addressing air quality concerns in West Modesto.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes,</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>in shaping the mobile air monitoring route.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Yes, we were able to address all questions related to air quality concerns adequately.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Similar to the West Stanislaus County meeting, community members from West Modesto appreciated having a space to share their air quality concerns and take part in selecting the air monitoring route that will be implemented by Aclima. They also expressed appreciation for the commitment to making air quality data accessible, which they see as a valuable tool for informing solutions in collaboration with local and state governments. A few participants even expressed interest in learning more about and potentially applying to drive the Aclima vehicle.</p> <p>Regarding improvements for future meetings, community members shared helpful feedback about the air quality survey. Some older participants noted that telephone-based surveys can be difficult due to limited phone skills or accessibility, and suggested offering a paper version as an alternative. Although VIP team members were present at each table to provide support during the activities, the survey proved challenging for many community members. Examples include the need for translation support, varying levels of comfort with technology, and differences in age and ability.</p>	<p>staff were able to adequately address participants' questions and concerns. While most questions were answered effectively, some community members expressed concerns about how the monitoring data would be used and visualized. Additionally, there were questions about how the data would support community advocacy for health impacts relative to pollution sources. These concerns were acknowledged and discussed, with an understanding that ongoing community meetings may be needed to fully address them.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: Community members appreciated the engaging and informative nature of the meeting. They valued the opportunity to participate in discussions about air contaminants and their health impacts, as well as the structured group activity that allowed them to collaboratively identify and rank targeted monitoring locations. To improve future meetings, participants suggested developing a one-pager that provides a high-level overview of the project along with a glossary of air quality terms to make the information more accessible. They also recommended using clearer and more detailed visuals, particularly for the maps, to better support understanding during presentations.</p>
West Stanislaus County	3	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community</p>

		<p>members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All participants were actively engaged in both the air quality discussion and exercises.</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was productive because we ensured active participation from the community in addressing air quality concerns during the programmed activities. We made it a priority to listen to community members during the survey, air quality concerns discussion, and mapping exercises. While we anticipated challenges with supporting participants in completing the survey—especially given its length and complexity, as well as the need to navigate two languages—we had six team members available to assist. We also fostered a group dialogue during the air quality concerns discussion, providing additional context beyond the survey and air quality monitoring route. The Air Quality Monitoring Route exercise was another collaborative effort, where community members from the same areas worked together to prioritize the monitoring route. This was done on paper, and VIP staff later uploaded the routes based on the input provided during the exercise.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes, important topics were thoroughly discussed. We were able to address the air quality concerns in a sufficient depth, as we were covering the issues affecting four different communities represented by the</p>	<p>members) understand meeting topics?: Yes</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: All participants were actively engaged throughout the meeting. They contributed to recapping the first meeting, reconfirming the monitoring boundaries, identifying broad monitoring areas, selecting targeted monitoring locations, and discussing the proposed language for the Community Air Monitoring Plans (CAMPs).</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: The meeting was productive, largely due to active community participation in addressing air quality concerns through the scheduled activities. We discussed SMMI travel routes and reviewed key air pollution sources, prioritizing those that require further investigation. A particularly valuable aspect of the meeting was the detailed discussion of potential air contaminants, such as PM2.5, black carbon, and methane, which helped residents better understand what is in the air and its associated health impacts, as well as how these pollutants are produced. During the air monitoring prioritization process, community members were grouped with their respective communities (Grayson/Westley, Turlock, and Patterson). All of the groups were encouraged to engage in open dialogue and work together to propose the priority locations where targeted monitoring will be conducted.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Important topics were thoroughly discussed during the second community meeting. Community members actively reviewed and reconfirmed essential elements for the</p>
--	--	---	---

	<p>attendees. The conversations around air quality concerns and the mapping exercise provided valuable insight into the ongoing challenges these communities face, which are expected to worsen with climate change. Community members expressed deep concern about the impact of air pollution on the health of children, elders, and the broader population. One mother shared a personal story about her son, who has asthma and plays sports. She described the difficult decision she faces between allowing him to participate in sports and managing his worsening asthma, which has required increasing his medication dosage. This conversation highlighted the urgent need for action to address the air quality issues these communities are experiencing.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No, there were no parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, there was a clear process for decision-making, particularly regarding the air quality monitoring routes in the communities. We distributed 8 1/2 x 11 maps of each community and organized participants into small groups based on their respective communities. Each group discussed and selected preferred routes and identified specific air quality areas within their communities that they wanted to have monitored throughout the project.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes the meeting stayed focused on its goals and the discussion did not go off track.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?:</p>	<p>Community Air Monitoring Plans (CAMPs) through both discussion and group activities. For example, participants collaboratively confirmed the broad monitoring areas and selected targeted monitoring locations using a majority and consensus-based voting process. Attendees worked in small and large groups to identify their top two preferred locations for targeted monitoring, which were then ranked based on group votes. The facilitators confirmed consensus by asking the full group to approve the final priorities, which were unanimously supported. The final list of selected locations will be provided in response to a separate question.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No, there were no parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary. The activities were essential to ensure the communities fully understood the Statewide Mobile Monitoring Initiative. Furthermore, the meeting recap served as a helpful refresher on the SMMI project for the community members who attended.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, the decision-making process was clear. Similar to our previous meeting, we divided participants into small groups representing their communities: three for Patterson, one for Grayson/Westley, and one for Turlock. Each group discussed and selected their preferred locations for targeted air monitoring. We asked each community group to share their top locations, identifying six priority locations in total, along with one additional location, the Fink Road Landfill in Crows Landing. Ultimately, the meeting attendees selected these locations based on the majority vote within their respective community groups.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Yes, the meeting stayed focused on its goals,</p>
--	--	---

	<p>The meeting felt both engaging and productive. Everyone was really involved, especially when we talked about the air quality concerns affecting their communities. The group discussions were meaningful, and there was a lot of personal sharing—like when one mother talked about her son's asthma and how worried she is about his health. That definitely made the conversation feel more real and urgent. Another mother shared that her children attend an elementary school near agricultural fields in [City], and her daughter frequently complains about a persistent smell, which the mother believes is due to the pesticides sprayed in the nearby fields. This concern added another layer to the conversation about air quality and its impact on the health of their families. The mapping exercise also helped people feel more connected, as they worked together to prioritize the monitoring routes. Overall, it was a great, collaborative atmosphere where everyone was focused on addressing the issues these communities are facing.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?:</p> <p>The community members were aligned in their views throughout the meeting. There was a strong sense of shared concern, particularly regarding air quality issues and their impact on health. Participants seemed united in their desire to have air quality monitored in their communities and worked collaboratively during the mapping exercise to prioritize monitoring routes. Overall, there was a clear consensus and focus on addressing the air quality concerns in their communities.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p> <p>Yes, we were able to address all questions</p>	<p>and the discussion did not go off track.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?:</p> <p>The meeting was both engaging and productive. Participants were highly involved, particularly during discussions about air quality concerns in their communities. Given their regular community meetings, attendees already had established engagement with one another. The shared agreement among community members regarding the priority of locations for targeted monitoring further contributed to the meeting's productivity. The group discussions were meaningful and included a significant amount of personal sharing.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?:</p> <p>Throughout the meeting, community members consistently shared similar perspectives, notably a strong and unified concern about air quality and its impact on health. The team clarified that while some locations were not chosen for targeted monitoring, they will still be included in the broader area monitoring conducted by the SMML project vehicles. This ensures that all previously identified locations will receive some level of monitoring.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?:</p> <p>Yes, all questions concerning air quality were addressed adequately during the meeting. Several community members did raise questions about the health impacts of their drinking water. While our team provided resources and responded to their concerns appropriately, we encouraged those individuals to speak with us after the meeting or contact us directly for further discussion on issues beyond the specific scope of air quality.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community</p>
--	--	--



		<p>related to air quality concerns adequately. However, there were a few instances where community members raised very specific environmental justice issues. In these cases, we informed them that our organization has an environmental justice task force that helps connect community members with the appropriate enforcement agency to file their complaints. We encouraged these individuals to speak with us at the end of the meeting or to reach out to us directly when the issue arises, ensuring that their concerns are addressed promptly.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>Community members appreciated the opportunity to express their concerns about air quality issues and to identify areas that should be monitored in their communities. One community member shared, "I learned a lot today about air quality, and now I understand why my children have asthma." This kind of feedback highlighted the personal impact of the discussions. For future meetings, a couple of community members suggested that we take the air quality survey together, going question by question while participants complete it on their individual cell phones. This would help ensure that everyone understands each question clearly and feels supported throughout the process.</p>	<p>members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?:</p> <p>Community members expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to voice their concerns regarding air quality issues and to pinpoint specific areas within their communities for monitoring. There was also a shared interest in holding future meetings focused on various types of pollution, as well as workshops on protective measures for individuals and families against pollution in the Central Valley. Additionally, the community noted their preference for this meeting's less technical approach compared to the previous one.</p>
Westlake, Korea Town, Mid-City, Mid-Wilshire	22	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes, community members were informed and provided feedback</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, they were happy to know this was occurring in their communities.</p> <p>How many participants were active in</p>	<p>Do you feel the main objectives of the meeting were achieved?: Yes</p> <p>Did participants (especially community members) understand meeting topics?: Yes, mostly same participants from meeting 1</p> <p>How many participants were active in discussion and exercises?: 7</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you</p>



		<p>discussion and exercises?: 12</p> <p>On a scale from 1 to 10, how productive do you feel the meeting was?: 8</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Community members understood the project and gave specific feedback on community concerns as well as areas they would like monitoring to occur.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Yes, sufficient time was allocated to cover PowerPoint and answer questions. The majority of the time was allocated for community conversation and input.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: No, PowerPoint was not too long and provided the information they needed.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, more interest was taken on specific community concerns and areas for air quality monitoring.</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Mostly on point with few deviations regarding marijuana smoke and residents in proximity.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Individuals felt productive and engaged regarding the issue. They advocated for more actionable items though.</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: No, overall participants were in agreement over poor air quality in</p>	<p>feel the meeting was?: 7</p> <p>What made the meeting productive or unproductive?: Community members who joined are interested in the monitoring taking place. Some stakeholders shared having asthma or a child that does.</p> <p>Were important topics thoroughly discussed, or did some feel rushed or unresolved?: Many questions about what's next after this monitoring takes place. Recommendations given on how data could be utilized for community action.</p> <p>Were there any parts of the meeting that felt redundant or unnecessary?: These meetings could have possibly been condensed into 1 and have a follow up meeting maybe toward project end.</p> <p>Was there a clear process for making decisions, and were key decisions made?: Yes, majority of decisions were made during meeting 1</p> <p>Did the meeting stay focused on its goals, or did discussions go off track?: Most stayed on goals with comments on government spending for more studies always taking place.</p> <p>Did the meeting feel engaging and productive, or did it feel tense or disengaged? Why?: Productive</p> <p>Did participants seem aligned in their views, or was there noticeable tension or disagreement?: Mostly aligned with wanting to see improvements in air quality.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: Questions regarding what is next were asked quite a few times.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>communities.</p> <p>Were staff able to answer participant questions and concerns in an adequate way? Were there concerns left unaddressed?: No, no questions were asked of the technical nature. All questions regarding project were able to be addressed.</p> <p>What comments, if any, did community members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They liked that participant input was being taken regarding the issue. They also liked the follow up. They enjoyed the food, child activities, and incentives to participate.</p>	<p>members make about what they liked about the meeting and how we can make future ones better?: They commented they liked how commentary and decisions from meeting 1 were implemented and follow up meetings were scheduled.</p>
--	--	--	--