

JOINT MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD
AND
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

SACRAMENTO CENTRAL LIBRARY
TSAKOPOULOS GALLERIA
828 I STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 2019

1:04 P.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 10063

A P P E A R A N C E S

CARB BOARD MEMBERS:

Ms. Mary Nichols, Chair

Ms. Sandra Berg, Vice Chair

Dr. John Balmes

Mr. John Eisenhut

Ms. Judy Mitchell

Mrs. Barbara Riordan

Dr. Alex Sherriffs

Professor Dan Sperling

Ms. Diane Takvorian

CTC COMMISSIONERS:

Ms. Fran Inman, Chair

Mr. Paul Van Konynenburg, Vice Chair

Mr. Bob Alvarado

Ms. Yvonne Burke

Ms. Lucy Dunn

Mr. Carl Guardino

Ms. Christine Kehoe

CARB STAFF:

Mr. Richard Corey, Executive Officer

Ms. Edie Chang, Deputy Executive Officer

Mr. Steve Cliff, Deputy Executive Officer

A P P E A R A N C E S C O N T I N U E D

CARB STAFF:

Mr. Kurt Karperos, Deputy Executive Officer

Ms. Ellen Peter, Chief Counsel

Ms. Veronica Eady, Assistant Executive Officer

CTC STAFF:

Ms. Susan Bransen, Executive Director

Mr. Mitch Weiss, Chief Deputy Director

Mr. Garth Hopkins, Deputy Director

Mrs. Laura Pennebaker, Associate Deputy Director

Mrs. Teresa Favila, Associate Deputy Director

Mrs. Laurie Waters, Associate Deputy Director

Mrs. Dawn Cheser, Associate Deputy Director

Mr. Matthew Yosgott, Associate Deputy Director

Mrs. Christine Gordon, Assistant Deputy Director

Ms. Amy Macpherson, Public Information Officer

Mr. Doug Remedios, Associate Governmental Program Analyst

SPECIAL GUESTS:

Mr. Chris Ganson, State of California, Office of Planning and Research

Ms. Kate Gordon, State of California, Director, Office of Planning and Research

Ms. Tilly Chang, San Francisco County Transportation Authority

A P P E A R A N C E S C O N T I N U E D

SPECIAL GUESTS:

Mr. Laura Podolsky, University of California, Institute of Transportation Studies

Mr. Alvaro Sanchez, Greenlining Institute

Ms. Dara Wheeler, Caltrans

ALSO PRESENT:

Dr. Alberto Ayala, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

Mr. Rob Ball, Kern Council of Governments

Mr. Bill Boyce, Sacramento Municipal Utility District

Ms. Kristine Cai, Fresno Council of Governments

Mr. Andrew Chesley, San Joaquin Council of Governments

Mr. James Corless, Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Ms. Rosa De León Park, Stanislaus Council of Governments

Mr. Chris Flores, Sacramento Regional Transit

Ms. Kevin Hamilton, Central California Asthma Collaborative

Ms. Kim Kawada, San Diego Association of Governments

Mr. Bill Magavern, Coalition for Clean Air

Ms. Sunne McPeak, California Emerging Technology Fund

Ms. Nancy Pfeffer, Gateway Cities Council of Governments

Mr. Dylon Stone, Madera County Transportation Commission

Ms. Tanisha Taylor, California Association of Councils of Government

Ms. Ella Wise, Climate Plan

I N D E X

	PAGE
Call to Order	1
Opening remarks by ARB Chair Nichols	1
Pledge of Allegiance	2
Roll Call	2
Comments ARB Chair Nichols	4
Comments CTC Chair Inman	9
Comments CTC Executive Director Bransen	12
Presentation by Mr. Ganson	21
Presentation by ARB Board Member Sperling	31
Panel Discussion - Innovative Mobility	41
Presentation by Ms. Gordon	75
ARB/CTC Discussion and Q&A	87
Public Comment	
Dr. Ayala	102
Ms. De León Park	103
Mr. Chesley	104
Ms. Cai	105
Mr. Ball	106
Mr. Stone	107
Mr. Corless	107
Ms. Kawada	109
Ms. Taylor	109
Ms. Pfeffer	110
Mr. Boyce	111
Mr. Magavern	112
Ms. Wise	113
Mr. Hamilton	114
Ms. McPeak	115
Mr. Flores	117
ARB/CTC Discussion	118

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PAGE

Adjournment

128

Reporter's Certificate

129

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: If I could get people to take
3 their seats. I see most of you are already. But the time
4 has come. The acoustics in this room are amazing.

5 (Laughter.)

6 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Wow. Wow.

7 It's been suggested that I open with a song, but
8 I've decided not to do that today.

9 (Laughter.)

10 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Good afternoon, everybody,
11 and welcome to the third joint meeting of the California
12 Air Resources Board and California Transportation
13 Commission. For those of you who have not been with us
14 before, my Co-Chair of this joint body Fran Inman and I
15 have taken turns chairing these meetings. So since she
16 got to Chair the last one in Los Angeles, I get to be the
17 Chair of this one. But we will also look forward to
18 hearing from her and to having a very strong discussion
19 later on in this meeting with all of the Commissioners who
20 are here today.

21 The topic for today's meeting is innovative
22 mobility. And I'm looking forward very much to hearing
23 from our speakers on this topic, as well as to the
24 discussion with our fellow Board members and
25 Commissioners. It's growing to be important for us, all

1 of us, to identify opportunities where our respective
2 agencies can incentivize innovative mobility to improve
3 the overall transportation system. That is a mission for
4 all of us.

5 I'd like to begin the meeting, as we normally do
6 at CARB, by asking everybody to rise and face the flag,
7 which is over there, and we'll say the Pledge of
8 Allegiance.

9 (Thereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was
10 recited in unison.)

11 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. We'll begin the roll
12 call, starting first with the CARB Board members, and then
13 turn it over to the Chair of the California Transportation
14 Commission. So would the clerk please call the roll for
15 ARB, wherever you are?

16 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Dr. Balmes

17 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.

18 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Mr. De La Torre?

19 Mr. Eisenhut?

20 BOARD MEMBER EISENHUT: Here.

21 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Senator Florez?

22 Assembly Member Garcia?

23 Ms. Mitchell?

24 ARB BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Here.

25 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Senator Monning?

1 Mrs. Riordan?

2 ARB BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.

3 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Supervisor Serna?

4 Dr. Sherriffs?

5 ARB BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Here.

6 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Professor Sperling?

7 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Here.

8 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Ms. Takvorian?

9 ARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Here.

10 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Vice Chair Berg?

11 ARB VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.

12 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Chair Nichols?

13 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Here.

14 ARB BOARD CLERK DAVIS: Madam Chair, we have a
15 quorum.

16 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

17 And now Chair Inman, would you like to call the
18 roll for your organization?

19 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Okay. I'm going to quickly
20 delegate. Doug, will you please call the roll?

21 CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Yes, Madam Chair.

22 Mr. Alvarado?

23 CTC COMMISSIONER ALVARADO: Yes.

24 CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Commissioner Burke?

25 CTC. COMMISSIONER BURKE: Here

1 CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Commissioner Dunn?

2 CTC COMMISSIONER DUNN: Here.

3 CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Commissioner Ghielmetti?
4 Commissioner Guardino?

5 CTC COMMISSIONER GUARDINO: Present.

6 CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Commissioner Kehoe?
7 Commissioner Tavaglione?

8 Commissioner Van Konynenburg?

9 CTC VICE CHAIR VAN KONYNENBURG: Here.

10 CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Chair Inman?

11 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Here.

12 CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Madam Chair, we have a
13 quorum.

14 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. If I may then, I'd
15 like to start with just a few announcements before we
16 begin. First of all, for safety reasons, I'd like to ask
17 everybody to note the emergency exit at the rear of the
18 room through the lobby. So if you're sitting towards the
19 front of the room, you can exit out the doors behind me
20 and through the patio gate. In the event of a fire alarm,
21 we're required to evacuate this room immediately and to
22 assemble outside, until we get the all-clear signal.

23 I also want to urge anyone who thinks they might
24 want to testify to fill out a request-to-speak card, which
25 is available either outside the meeting room or from the

1 clerk of the Board, and to do it as soon as possible,
2 because we're going to have to allocate the time according
3 to the numbers of people that we have.

4 Usually, at the Air Resources Board, we impose a
5 3-minute time limit on just regular public comment. And
6 we ask people to summarize their -- any written remarks
7 that they have and then to submit their written testimony.
8 For today, it's going to be a matter of the amount of time
9 that we have available to hear from members of the public
10 and still have the presentations and the discussion among
11 the two Boards that we need to have. So we've allocated
12 about an hour for the public.

13 And depending on how many of you there are, we'll
14 divide up the time accordingly. I'll talk about that more
15 when we get to that point, but I did want to just make
16 sure that people understand that it's really important
17 that we hear from you as soon as possible, if you are
18 planning to speak. And we want to hear from you. It's
19 just that we have to -- we have to be careful about using
20 our time efficiently.

21 So, first of all, I want to give a very brief
22 update on the talks that are going on between the Air
23 Resources Board and our federal government partners
24 regarding the fuel economy standards and the greenhouse
25 gas emission standards. I'm sure many of you have been

1 following this in the press.

2 But we have been making news lately, not in
3 our -- not necessarily because we wanted to. But we were
4 in a situation where when the Trump administration
5 announced that they had broken off talks with California
6 over vehicle fuel efficiency standards, we had to start
7 preparing for what might come next. Frankly, the
8 administration in Washington is insisting on proposing and
9 carrying out a regulatory action, which will have the
10 impact, no matter what, of increasing the amount of
11 allowable pollution, and also undermining the programs
12 that all the auto companies have to achieve better fuel
13 economy in their vehicles.

14 California has been and is ready to make
15 adjustments in our program. And we have stated that
16 publicly and privately, when we've met both with industry
17 and with the administration. But unfortunately, we have
18 not been able to find a partner to engage in that kind of
19 a substantive discussion.

20 If the rule goes forward and it's a final rule --
21 and the comment period has closed officially now.
22 Although, there's a period of months where the agencies
23 are working on their final rule, where without being part
24 of the formal record, there are opportunities to speak to
25 agencies and others about what's going on. But if -- as

1 we anticipate the rule comes out, either later this spring
2 or in the summertime, along the lines of what the
3 administration has said they are intending to do, we are
4 going to have a situation in which California will once
5 again be enforcing our standards while the federal
6 government is enforcing their standards. Separately,
7 there will undoubtedly be -- undoubtedly be litigation.
8 There will be a period of confusion, probably uncertainty
9 about which standards are applicable.

10 We understand that industry intends, by and
11 large, to proceed as they would have if this had never
12 occurred. In other words, if there were no changes, they
13 still want to continue to work on increasing fuel economy.
14 But unfortunately, all of the fundamental models and
15 findings that we base our actions on will be called into
16 question if the rules change. And I know that many people
17 are beginning to start to look at what the impacts of that
18 could be on things like federal highway funding, and
19 conformity determinations and so forth.

20 And I think it is important that as we begin to
21 figure out what those questions are, that we are
22 articulate them to our leaders in Washington, so they
23 understand what the implications of all of this might be.

24 The other update that I wanted to give you that
25 has occurred since our last meeting has to do with the

1 discussion about the Sustainable Communities Progress
2 Report known as the SB 150 report. Last month, the Board
3 heard a presentation from staff that recommended some next
4 steps in light of that report. Many of my Board members
5 commented on the important role that all levels of
6 government and local government, in particular, play in
7 decreasing transportation emissions.

8 Board members discussed opportunities to further
9 incentivize local governments who are getting it right,
10 and to encourage other local agencies to get more engaged.
11 Many Board members also commented on the importance of
12 interagency collaboration. I think that these joint
13 meetings, such as the one that we're having here, can play
14 an important role in helping our agencies work together in
15 giving our staff direction as to -- and places in which we
16 want to see them working together and identifying
17 opportunities to do even more.

18 One example that was recommended in the SB 150
19 report is the collaborative production and implementation
20 of a new State Mobility Action Plan for Healthy
21 Communities. At the CARB March Board meeting, we agreed
22 with this recommendation and approved a resolution
23 expressing our support. The resolution also encouraged
24 CARB staff to consider new pilot programs that advance
25 access to clean mobility, especially for priority

1 populations. These pilot programs will be integral when
2 it comes to the topic of innovative mobility, which is our
3 focus today.

4 It will be important for our agencies to learn
5 what we can do to encourage innovation in mobility that
6 improves transportation options while decreasing
7 congestion, which, of course, is very costly both to
8 the -- our economy and to our health, and also decreasing
9 emissions and advancing equity and health.

10 I'm eager to hear the input that we're going to
11 have today from our speakers that have been assembled. I
12 want to particularly thank our staffs, both Executive
13 Officers and our Board Member Sperling for the work that
14 they did in putting together today's agenda. So that's it
15 as far as -- as far as updates from me.

16 And I would now like to turn the program over to
17 Fran to provide any updates from her Commission or to
18 introduce staff or whatever else she'd like to do.

19 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you, Mary.

20 So just a couple quick comments from me and then
21 I'll let Susan give our update. But I do think this SAFE
22 Vehicle Rule to really come together and figure out what
23 in the world it might mean and how best to make sure that
24 we can navigate as efficiently as possible through. I
25 think we have a lot more touchpoints where we might run

1 into this than we even realize in terms of our transit,
2 our streetcar, you know, name it. You know, I think just
3 about everything has a potential to be touched.

4 I saw a list of the exemptions, but it seemed
5 like a pretty short list. And I think for all of us with
6 the SB 1 funding that we are trying to deliver to our
7 communities and to -- also, the work that we're doing on
8 the AB 1282, which is the efficiency work group of really
9 trying to have our agencies come together. And I was very
10 encouraged at our last workshop, in terms of the progress
11 that we've made to figure out how we can all work a little
12 more simultaneously and integrated than in the past, and I
13 think for all of us.

14 So we've asked our MPOs to really help us all
15 identify the list, as best they know it, of what the
16 impacts might be. I believe it's kind of a two-pronged
17 issue. As Mary and I were talking earlier about this
18 nebulous rule, I'm not sure what's going to happen with
19 the truck rules. We were supposed to be working on some
20 heavy-duty CAFE standards. And so I don't know. And
21 maybe, Richard, you know where that might be. But it
22 sounds to me like that might be a little disruptive, or
23 this SAFE Vehicle Rule, if that's the right name, might be
24 disruptive to the progress that we're trying to make on
25 the heavy-duty standards.

1 And then also, as the waiver, which we haven't
2 needed because we've been aligned, but we would need and
3 what would happen, I think we could all be kind of in the
4 desert of not having the tools that we need with the
5 modeling and everything.

6 So I think for all of us to really -- I don't
7 know if it's a side-bar workshop where we talk about this.
8 You know, I think we've had mention of it. I can tell you
9 in the Southern California region, it seems to me that
10 most of our talk in our discussion has been around the
11 2023 deadline, when we knew. And I don't think a lot of
12 people were really looking at this infamous August 3rd
13 deadline. And that is really just around the corner for
14 all of us.

15 So I -- we can talk more about how best to get
16 across the goal line. I'd be the first one also to say
17 who else in the U.S. is going to have this problem. You
18 have to be a non-attainment area, I think, to be
19 struggling. So unfortunately, I believe we have the
20 corner on that market, not the list you want to be on the
21 top of, but I think we're there.

22 So I would just really encourage us all to see
23 what we can do quickly. I know the comments are
24 officially closed, but I'd say let's comment anyway. And
25 I think as we look at housing, I worry that, you know,

1 we're desperately trying to solve our housing crisis in
2 the State. And clearly, we have impacts with the -- there
3 is the nexus with transportation and housing. And I think
4 this could really be some handcuffs that we don't
5 necessarily want to be operating with.

6 And so with that, Susan, I'd like to ask our
7 Executive Director to give an update.

8 CTC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BRANSEN: Commissioners
9 and Board members, I wanted to just update you on two
10 major areas that the Commission has been embarking on
11 since our last meeting. The Commissioners -- every --
12 every -- with every funding cycle, we move forward on the
13 next funding cycle -- the next cycle of funding. And we
14 do that by revisiting our guidelines that are used. These
15 guidelines are used to not only inform the projects that
16 are selected for funding, but the manner in which the
17 Commission will administer those projects funding and
18 report.

19 And so we are embarking right now on developing
20 guidelines for three competitive programs. One is the
21 Solutions for Congested Corridors. That program is \$250
22 million annually. It is designed to achieve a balance set
23 of transportation, environmental, and community access
24 improvements to reduce congestion throughout the state.

25 The other program is the Trade Corridor

1 Enhancement Program. That program provides 300 million of
2 State funds a year. There is federal funds in this
3 program as well. And this program I believe, you know, we
4 have such major air quality issues with regards to our
5 transportation program, our goods movement program in the
6 state.

7 This program, the Commission is informed by the
8 guiding principles that are in the Sustainable Freight
9 Action Plan, as an example of one of the areas that the
10 Commission does look to when determining projects for
11 selection of funding.

12 The other program is Local Partnership
13 Competitive Program. This program actually -- the Local
14 Partnership Program is 200 million annually, but the
15 Commission has made a decision in the past to program
16 these funds 50 percent through a formula and the other 50
17 percent through a competitive process.

18 That formula will be relooked at as the
19 Commission embarks on updating the guidelines for the
20 program. And I guess what I would want to share with the
21 Board members -- commissioners know this. But one of the
22 key -- there are a few key focus areas that we're looking
23 at revisiting in these guidelines. We always look at, you
24 know, what did we do well, what can we do better?

25 But looking at improved performance metrics, not

1 only on the front end, how do we better evaluate projects
2 that are proposed for funding, and then at the back end
3 how do we improve the reporting for the projects when
4 they're completed. We're looking at metrics related to
5 reductions in vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gases,
6 with the overall ends towards implementing and moving
7 forward the implementation of the Sustainable Communities
8 Strategies.

9 And so the Commission has kicked off several
10 workshops in the north and the south. And I wanted to
11 thank the Board. We have, at least the Northern
12 California workshop I did see staff from the Air Resources
13 Board. And we're grateful for that. And we hope that
14 your staff will be able to participate in these workshops
15 moving forward.

16 The other program that we are developing
17 guidelines for is the State Highway Operation and
18 Protection Program. And that is really the program
19 designed to rehabilitate and preserve the State highway
20 system.

21 But the workshops will continue through the
22 summer. The goal is that in the fall, the Commission will
23 adopt the guidelines for these programs and issue a call
24 for projects to fund. I also wanted to mention that we
25 are planning to hold a overview of transportation funding

1 workshop that's open to everyone - anyone that wants to
2 attend - to learn a little bit more about transportation
3 funding. The workshop will be held in Sacramento on April
4 30th.

5 And then lastly, I wanted to give you an update.
6 The Commission did adopt a -- another cycle of Active
7 Transportation Program funding. This is the program that
8 is designed to increase walking and biking. The
9 Commission, since its inception -- inception of this
10 program, the Commission has dedicated funding to over 800
11 active transportation projects throughout California, over
12 400 safe routes to school projects. Over 85 percent of
13 the funds have been directed to projects that are expected
14 to provide benefits to disadvantaged communities.

15 But in January of 2019, the Commission did adopt
16 a set of projects for the statewide and small urban and
17 rural components of this program, dedicating over \$280
18 million to 60 projects. And we are planning to adopt a
19 program, projects for the Metropolitan Planning
20 Organizations. The total funding pool there is 175
21 million.

22 So Commissioners and Board members, that
23 concludes my report.

24 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Thank you very much.

25 CTC VICE CHAIR VAN KONYNENBURG: Madam Chair.

1 Madam Chair?

2 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

3 CTC VICE CHAIR VAN KONYNENBURG: Just following
4 up on your opening comments.

5 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

6 CTC VICE CHAIR VAN KONYNENBURG: I would hope
7 there would be a time to ex -- that your staff could
8 expand on your comments related to --

9 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, I was just about to --

10 CTC VICE CHAIR VAN KONYNENBURG: Oh, great.

11 Fantastic. Thank you.

12 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: -- go to our Executive
13 Officer, Mr. Corey.

14 CTC VICE CHAIR VAN KONYNENBURG: Thank you.

15 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you for that set-up.
16 It's perfect.

17 So Richard, would you like to expand a bit on
18 what's going on on the standards, and also address the
19 comment that we heard from the Chair about what might
20 happen with the heavy-duty issues.

21 ARB EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Yes. So with --
22 first, with respect to light-duty and the rules from the
23 Trump administration, which have been -- very clearly
24 signal an intent to rollback the stringency, as well as go
25 after California's authority. One, there are GHG

1 implications, but there are also criteria pollutant
2 implications. Pollutants that contribute to the formation
3 of ozone, as well as PM2.5 in South Coast as well as the
4 valley, because of the displaced zero-emission vehicles,
5 as well as the increased refinement of petroleum. That is
6 the issue in terms of the traditional planning and
7 underlying analysis that was done in the SIP, did not --
8 basically it accounted for a full implementation of this
9 rule. So a scale-back of the rule would have
10 implications, not just with respect to GHG emissions, but
11 criteria pollutant emissions that have a direct bearing on
12 our attainment demonstration as embedded in the SIP. So
13 that's the connection.

14 But to Chairman -- Co-Chairman Inman's point
15 about heavy-duty, we do have both phase 1 and phase 2
16 heavy-duty GHG standards. Those have been adopted. They
17 have not been proposed for challenge. They are being
18 implemented.

19 But what I think you were specifically referring
20 to, and this is equally important, is the SIP also called
21 for us, California, to develop lower NOx rules for
22 heavy-duty on-road diesels, which basically are one of our
23 largest categories. We don't get to our health-based air
24 quality standards without tighter NOx standards or our
25 PM2.5 standards. They are critical to both South Coast

1 and San Joaquin attainment demonstration, so we are
2 actually in that rulemaking process and doing so in
3 collaboration with a number of states across the country.

4 EPA has also indicated an intent to move forward
5 on those rules. But they have not been quick to get out
6 the gate, and we aren't waiting. So we are working with
7 OEMs, automobile -- truck manufacturers, states, local air
8 districts, and others.

9 And just to kind of put a point on why this is so
10 important. The transportation sector represents 50
11 percent of our GHG emissions, 80 percent of our NOx, and
12 95 percent of our diesel PM emissions. We don't get to
13 our health-based air quality standards, or our local
14 protection near ports, railyards, and others without a
15 significant transition to lowest NOx where we can, zero
16 where it's viable. And that also requires clearly close
17 collaboration with our -- with infrastructure and
18 infrastructure related partners.

19 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thanks. I know
20 there's a lot more to discuss about this issue. And I am
21 going to suggest in response to the earlier comments that
22 we perhaps jointly, if we can do it without too much --
23 too much difficulty, organize a workshop that we would
24 open up to local agencies and to MPOs and others, anybody
25 actually, who might be interested to have further

1 discussion about what all this means, what the
2 implications might be.

3 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Thank you. Yeah, I think time
4 is probably of the essence, so --

5 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah. So we'll try to do
6 something informal.

7 CTC CHAIR INMAN: -- however we can be nimble.
8 Yeah. I think my Vice Chair actually had a question. Did
9 you, Paul?

10 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, please.

11 CTC VICE CHAIR VAN KONYNENBURG: I was wondering
12 if we could get some illumination on the Sustainable
13 Communities Strategy Program and Evaluation Guidelines
14 from -- you know, where are we at with those, tell me --
15 staff is developing new metrics and new -- on -- and
16 evaluations. What's the timeline of that? How is that
17 going?

18 I know there's quite a bit of concern within the
19 municipal planning organization community on that. And
20 I'm concerned that many -- at the end of our meeting --
21 joint meeting in December, a lot of concerns were
22 expressed. And I'd like -- you've had now several months
23 to formulate a response to those concerns. Do we have --
24 do you have a response on those issues?

25 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, we had a discussion

1 about this at our March Board meeting. It was a publicly
2 noticed session, and we had quite a bit of input at that
3 point. I don't know if there's more going on.

4 Mr. Corey.

5 ARB EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: What I would add on
6 that is that the guidelines -- the updated guidelines have
7 been worked on for about two years. The March 2018 Board
8 meeting, when the Board considered the updated SCS targets
9 for a number of MPOs for the 2035 standard. Part of that
10 conversation really revolved around -- and we had a number
11 of MPOs actually attended -- many attended and testified
12 at that hearing.

13 It was really focusing on strengthening the
14 tracking, the reporting, the touchpoints in terms of
15 progress relative to plan. And the Board acted on a
16 resolution at that Board hearing, so more than a year ago,
17 to update the guidelines and strengthen them with respect
18 to tracking, reporting, transparency in terms of
19 documentation, progress against plan.

20 Since that time, there's been, I'd say, 10 -- a
21 total of 10 workshops, three webinars, a draft posted,
22 public comments, public comments responded to. So the
23 guidelines were since revised and are posted, so
24 reflecting that entire process.

25 If there are still concerns with respect to MPOs,

1 I'm certainly interested in having that conversation. But
2 they've gone through a fairly extensive process to get us
3 to this point of the guidelines being revised and posted.

4 CTC VICE CHAIR VAN KONYNENBURG: Okay.

5 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I'd like to return us
6 to the agenda, if I may.

7 We are beginning today with a presentation on
8 automotive -- Automated Vehicle Principles for Healthy and
9 Sustainable Communities.

10 This presentation is going to be given to us by
11 Chris Ganson who is a senior planner at the Governor's
12 Office of Planning and Research, and I believe was
13 instrumental in developing this report. And so I would
14 like to invite him to come forward and begin his
15 presentation.

16 Mr. Ganson.

17 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
18 presented as follows.)

19 MR. GANSON: Thank you, Chairman Nichols, and
20 everybody. Thanks for having me here today to talk
21 through these. I want to spend just 10 minutes talking
22 through again the Automated Vehicle Principles for Healthy
23 and Sustainable Communities. But I think that they could
24 be AV principles for functioning of the transportation
25 network and the economy just as well. There's quite a bit

1 of overlap here in what we'll need to do to land these in
2 a way that benefits all of our interests.

3 --o0o--

4 MR. GANSON: So thinking about the arrival of
5 automated vehicles, it's real easy to think about the
6 benefits to each of us. I mean, I certainly think, well,
7 I could get work done on my way to work, or maybe even
8 catch some extra sleep if my commute were long. I could
9 send a kid to a charter school across town. That one that
10 I wanted her to be in, now that I can send her in the
11 vehicle and don't need to take the time myself. I could
12 save time myself with an elderly relative bringing them to
13 the hospital for a doctor's appointment.

14 So there's these -- these real benefits that
15 automated vehicles will bring, and that's to a whole array
16 of the population. And many of them have us in vehicles
17 more and going further in them. And we oftentimes don't
18 think for a little while at least about that everyone else
19 will also want these benefits as well, and create that
20 extra vehicle travel as well.

21 --o0o--

22 MR. GANSON: And that could lead to some big
23 collective action problems, traffic on the highways,
24 traffic on surface streets for that matter, emissions
25 goals, other goals around environment, health, et cetera.

1 So we're beginning to know -- have some rough
2 ideas at least of what this may look like. We have level
3 2 automation out on the streets today, Tesla Autopilot,
4 for example. And we know that these vehicles are being
5 driven more than, for example, Teslas without Autopilot.

6 There are also people driving these with
7 autopilot are inserting themselves more readily into
8 congestion, and thus disproportionately adding to
9 congestion compared to other vehicles.

10 We have -- through the research community,
11 there's been quite a bit of thought put into these -- this
12 set of issues. And we see modeling exercises that show
13 substantial increases in vehicle travel. We also have our
14 first empirical study out now. It's just preliminary, but
15 it's showing -- it used a chauffeurs as a substitute for
16 automated vehicles to see what people -- how their travel
17 behavior might be.

18 And the numbers are small so far in this study,
19 so this is preliminary. But traffic almost doubled, an 83
20 percent rise in vehicle travel. That's beyond what our
21 roadway -- far beyond what our roadways would be able to
22 accept and still function, also far beyond what our
23 climate goals and other environmental goals would be able
24 to accommodate.

25 --o0o--

1 MR. GANSON: So with these big changes in travel
2 behavior in mind, folks at the State gathered from a
3 number of different agencies to pull together the kind of
4 what should we do, what are the -- and starting with what
5 are the principles that we should bring to the table in
6 order to land these vehicles in the public interest
7 broadly.

8 So I'm going to run through these with you fairly
9 quickly. They're on the OPR -- you can find them on the
10 OPR website. I believe there was a handout today as well,
11 if you want to look at them in more detail.

12 The first of these is that they be deployed to
13 the maximum extent possible as shared-use vehicles, kind
14 of the Lyfts and Ubers, but automated. And this
15 creates -- this creates a number of benefits, but not the
16 least of which is it facilitates the second principle,
17 which is pooling, getting more than one person into a
18 vehicle.

19 Sharing use and pooling are the keys to having
20 these vehicles land in a way that works for traffic for
21 sure. And with the third principle landed as low or
22 zero-emissions vehicles, they can actually benefit both
23 our transportation system function goals and our
24 environmental goals, particularly our greenhouse gas
25 emissions reduction goals, and substantially if there is

1 strong coordination.

2 There is widespread agreement among the
3 transportation expert and research community that these
4 are not likely to happen on their own, that these
5 approaches will need a policy to reinforce them and guide
6 them.

7 And the research community has begun to use
8 really strong language for researchers, for academics.
9 Academics aren't normally talking about outcomes in terms
10 of heaven and hell scenarios. But in the realm of
11 automated vehicles, we're hearing that and have been for a
12 couple few years now. So there's a real opportunity here
13 to have things go one way or the other, again for the
14 whole array of our interests.

15 Vehicle right-sizing will be important. Instead
16 of owning that F150 pickup truck, because you need to get
17 lumber at Home Depot once every couple months, you could
18 summon one if we are in a shared-use environment when you
19 need it. And when you just need to get across town for a
20 haircut, you can get the small electric POD in theory, but
21 when you're no longer needing to hang onto a steering
22 wheel and look out the front -- the windshield of the
23 vehicle, you might find yourself wanting to do other
24 things, like maybe exercise or sit on a really comfortable
25 sofa and watch a big screen TV. And these vehicles could

1 go the other way. They could become bigger than today's
2 vehicles. And that would have consequences both for
3 environmental outcome and for traffic, because you can get
4 fewer vehicles through an intersection when they're big.

5 It's important that we think of these as part of
6 an efficient multi-modal system, not that automated
7 vehicles will come and supplant everything we have, and
8 carry us around everywhere. We're not going to get
9 everybody into downtown San Francisco or even downtown
10 Sacramento in automated vehicles on the roadway.

11 We're going to need transit to play a part, and
12 we need active transportation to -- active transportation
13 to play a part for a number of reasons, including its
14 relevance to human health.

15 So having these vehicles rather than run parallel
16 to line-haul transit, BART, Light Rail, et cetera, having
17 them be -- increase the catchment area of stations and
18 drop people off at stations, and make better use of these
19 transport -- these transit investments will be important.

20 However, in the suburbs perhaps or areas where
21 you see three or four people in a bus that comes once
22 every hour or 90 minutes, these vehicles will probably do
23 a much more efficient job of getting people to places,
24 creating better access to opportunities, saving money, and
25 reducing emissions, if they can replace that sort of

1 subsistence or less efficient transit.

2 There's a real opportunity with the control that
3 we will have over these vehicle's behavior to make folks
4 who are biking and walking feel safer. And that in turn
5 has a real opportunity to create more cyclists, to bring
6 more people into biking and walking. That, in turn, has
7 enormous potential health benefits, as well as the
8 emissions and other traffic benefits.

9 And last but not least, as part of the efficient
10 multi-modal system, freight delivery needs to receive a
11 lot of thought. There's a real potential for delivery, as
12 is already happening in Amazon -- in this Amazon world to
13 get delivery vehicles to actually make more efficient use
14 of transport to get goods to people, than us driving our
15 own automobiles out shopping.

16 However, if we can push a button and get a good
17 to come to us in 20 minutes, and everybody does that all
18 the time for each good, we are likely going to be sitting
19 in the traffic created by each others goods traveling on
20 the roads with us.

21 Efficient land use will need more attention than
22 it has before. It will be awfully easy for people to
23 think, well, why wouldn't I go off and live in the
24 foothills on a 5-acre plot of land, because I can sleep or
25 work on my way into town. And that loading our roadways

1 up with a lot more vehicle travel, harming our
2 environmental goals on a number of fronts, but also taxing
3 our transportation infrastructure.

4 These vehicles are likely to use less space,
5 largely because of the less need for parking, but also
6 because a less need for -- less need for width of right of
7 way. And that creates some opportunities to do better on
8 complete and livable streets, create places out of our
9 thoroughfares.

10 And last, but very much not least, we need to
11 think about equity very carefully, as these are -- these
12 vehicles are deployed through two sides -- two facets to
13 equity here. One is the impacts these vehicles will have
14 on neighborhoods and people. When I take my automated
15 vehicle downtown to go to work and then don't want to pay
16 the \$20 parking fee, but send it off to the nearest
17 neighborhood with free parking, whose neighborhood is
18 that, and who is suffering the burden of the additional
19 vehicle travel?

20 And another important facet is, of course, how
21 can people get around at a variety of -- a variety of
22 people, neighborhoods, and income levels. Do we end up
23 creating -- creating really good and easy transportation
24 reporter for wealthy folks and a system that doesn't --
25 doesn't provide that extra benefit for lower income folks.

1 Just an example to leave you with on this front.
2 If you and I get stuck in a traffic jam in an automated
3 vehicle, we're probably going to pull out our laptop and
4 get some work done. If you are a hairdresser, or a
5 welder, you're stuck in that same traffic that we've
6 created by being willing to insert ourselves into
7 congestion, but without the ability to make use of that
8 time, make economic value out of that time.

9 So those are the principles. There is a lot of
10 work to do, of course, in bringing these principles into
11 policy and ultimately landing these vehicles again in the
12 public interests and the array of interest that we bring
13 to the table.

14 But I wanted to share those with you here and
15 hope that they make for good discussion for the rest of
16 your meeting.

17 Thanks.

18 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Before you leave,
19 could you just take a moment to give us a little bit of
20 the background as to how these principles were developed
21 and what kind of input you had in doing it?

22 MR. GANSON: Yeah. Sure. The -- they -- they
23 were collected, I would say, more than developed by the
24 Interagency Working Group. So we have a broad -- the list
25 is on the back of the principles themselves, so you can

1 take a look at which entities were involved, but quite a
2 number of people at the table. But ultimately, we were
3 participating in venues like Dan Sperling's Three
4 Revolutions conference, going to transportation research
5 board meetings, getting to -- getting the thoughts of the
6 thinkers and the academics in this space.

7 And there are similar lists put out by other
8 organizations. But we thought it was important to collect
9 them in one place for the state.

10 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

11 We are going to be moving on to a panel that's
12 going to further expand on some of these comments, I
13 think, but it's -- I thought it would be useful for people
14 to hear what work had already gone on under the auspices
15 of the Governor's Office.

16 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Madam Chair?

17 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, go ahead.

18 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Do you want questions now or --

19 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: We were going to wait until
20 we'd been through the full panel. And then they'll be
21 here and we can then have the discussion among us all, if
22 that's okay? Because I think everybody undoubtedly has
23 thoughts, questions, and comments that they'd like to
24 bring up.

25 So I'm going to move now to the next item, which

1 was -- this was kind of a precursor for -- at the
2 conclusion of the December 4th joint meeting, Professor
3 Sperling offered to collaborate with CARB and CTC on a
4 series of roundtables that would cover various
5 transportation topic.

6 Since then, the University of California's
7 Institute of Transportation Studies has hosted four
8 roundtables focused on innovative mobility. Professor
9 Sperling is going to synthesize some of these themes,
10 challenges, goals, and strategies that emerged from the
11 roundtables, and then engage a panel of experts in a
12 discussion.

13 So I would now like to invite him to begin his
14 introductory remarks.

15 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Thank you. Thank you
16 very much. It's a pleasure to do this and to participate
17 and support this process.

18 So this is the third meeting we've held. We've
19 heard from many government leaders. We've heard from
20 NGOs, industry, a lot of different stakeholders. And I
21 think we've made some progress in appreciating the
22 different responsibilities and the different missions, and
23 even the different cultures of the Air Resources Board and
24 the Transportation Commission.

25 I want to highlight a set of themes that have

1 came about partly through those roundtables, partly
2 through other discussions that I'm going to come back to.
3 And those themes are innovation, working between -- State
4 leaders working with local stakeholders, experimentation,
5 and linkages between transportation and housing. And I
6 think those are the foundation for us to be moving
7 forward.

8 So I am -- what I'm going to do here is identify
9 some key strategies and actions that I think the two
10 agencies could do together, what they might do on their
11 own, or might even inspire others to do. And I'm also
12 going to address some actions that the UC Institute of
13 Transportation might do some in supporting these
14 initiatives.

15 Okay. So the starting point here I think is that
16 the world of transportation is being disrupted. That's a
17 fact. And no matter what CTC or CARB does, there are
18 going to be major disruptions. And, in fact, there
19 already are. You know, the first one has been the taxi
20 industry. Airports are being affected. Transit is being
21 affected. So there are major disruptions already
22 happening, and it's going to accelerate in the future.

23 So we're focusing today here in this session on
24 the many new innovations, the new technologies, the new
25 business models that are becoming available and becoming

1 utilized to enhance the transportation sector, in terms of
2 economics, in terms of environment, in terms of equity.

3 And the goal here, I think for all of us, is to
4 how do we steer these innovations toward the public
5 interest?

6 So we just heard from Chris Ganson about the
7 automated vehicle principles that were adopted by a
8 committee of State agencies. And let's look at that as
9 one building block. Another building block has been these
10 roundtables that Chair Nichols referred to. There were
11 four of them held around the state. They were organized
12 by the University of California, but in consultation with
13 CTC and CARB.

14 These roundtables were in Sacramento, Fresno, the
15 Bay Area, and San Diego. There were 62 attendees, and
16 these were all leaders. And they came from a mix of
17 Legislature, regional governments, locals, transit,
18 industry. And I would note there were two CARB Board
19 members that attended and three CTC members that
20 participated. And Laura Podolsky, who's on the panel and
21 really played the lead role, she'll talk a little bit more
22 about that.

23 Now, I want to acknowledge that CTC and the
24 broader transportation community do have a different focus
25 in addressing transportation challenges than does CARB and

1 the environmental community. But I'm going to argue, and
2 I'm going to try to help lead us towards an insight, that
3 these similarities -- that the similarities between them
4 are more than enough to serve as a foundation for moving
5 forward together.

6 So let me suggest that we're all committed to a
7 better transportation system. Okay. So that can be one
8 premise that I think we can all agree to. And better, as
9 a said earlier, that means in an economic sense. It means
10 in an equity sense. It means in an environmental sense.

11 And we all agree that we can improve our
12 transportation system. And I think I would argue, and
13 hopefully others will agree, that we do have major
14 shortcomings in our transportation system. So we can do
15 better. So let me just run through some of these just
16 really quickly. I don't want to quibble about the details
17 of it, but I think there's strong facts underlying this.

18 Okay. So first of all, the fuel tax is becoming
19 increasingly unreliable as a source of funding for
20 transportation, and going to become increasingly obsolete
21 as we go into the future.

22 Number two is transit is losing ridership.

23 Number three is traffic fatalities are very high,
24 and they're flat or even increasing for the first time in
25 many decades.

1 Another is that congestion is increasing.

2 Another is that housing is expensive an in short
3 supply, and it's increasing the cost of transportation for
4 users, for infrastructure suppliers.

5 Another fact is that many people, a large
6 proportion of people, have poor accessibility, what we
7 sometimes refer as disadvantaged communities, but, you
8 know, that includes physically disadvantaged,
9 economically.

10 Another is that greenhouse gases from
11 transportation are rising, unlike the other major sectors.

12 And then there's a whole nother set of issues
13 with freight. And I'm going to not focus on those. I
14 think those are so important, that I'd like to move those
15 to a future meeting, either formally as part of this
16 process or workshops, and try to stay a little more
17 focused on the passenger side for now, even though they
18 are, of course, related.

19 So -- okay. So what are some overarching goals
20 that we can all agree on?

21 Number one is that we really do want to reduce
22 the cost of transportation both to users and to the
23 infrastructure suppliers.

24 Number two is we really want to increase
25 accessibility by all of the mobility disadvantaged. And

1 that's not just an equity issue, but it's a jobs and
2 productivity issue for our economy.

3 We want to reduce fatalities and injuries.

4 We want to reduce greenhouse gases and air
5 pollution. And part of accomplishing all of those is I
6 think we can all agree that, at some level, we need to do
7 a better job of aligning transportation goals, social
8 goals, and environmental goals. And when I say that, that
9 includes jobs and housing as part of that.

10 So I went and dig -- dug through, you know, some
11 of the CARB and CTC staff reports. And I found like that
12 there's actually quite a few commonalities. So the CTC
13 annual report to the Legislature has a recommendation,
14 number 3, is updates State statutory requirements for the
15 California Transportation Plan and regional transportation
16 plans to address the forecasted impacts of advancing
17 technologies in climate change over the 20-year horizon.
18 Dedicate additional planning funds for these purposes.

19 Goal number four was create a technical advisory
20 committee to encourage the development and deployment of
21 advanced transportation technologies, and to provide
22 expertise, and to standardize communication technologies
23 for the transportation sector.

24 On the CARB side, going back to that 150 report,
25 it said, recommendation number 4, pilot test innovative

1 ideas to speed the adoption of clean efficient
2 transportation solutions.

3 Solution number six, complement development --
4 complement deployment of new mobility options and
5 technologies with policies supporting State environmental
6 and equity priorities.

7 Convene a transportation system think tank to
8 provide insight into the demands on the future
9 transportation system.

10 So -- okay. So we get to the question, what can
11 we agree on in terms of moving forward?

12 And that is the focus of what the discussion we
13 want to have. So as I said, a future -- this future that
14 we talked about, this disruptive future is coming, no
15 matter what we do about it. We could do nothing and it's
16 going to happen.

17 And so we're seeing that there's many decisions
18 being made, many investments being made. But it's being
19 done in a very ad hoc fashion. There are many new bill --
20 if you go to the Legislature, there's all kinds of bills
21 that deal with land use, automated vehicles, shared
22 mobility, and how they relate to housing.

23 If you go to the agencies, there's a whole --
24 State agencies, there's a whole slough of investments, and
25 actions, and decisions made that affect all of these --

1 all of transportation in a lot of different ways, and
2 regional and local governments also.

3 So the bottom line is that regardless of what we,
4 CARB and CTC, talk about, there are going to be many
5 initiatives, laws, regulations, funding decisions, and
6 incentive programs moving forward, as I said, on land use,
7 on housing, on transit, on automated vehicles, on road
8 pricing, on shared mobility companies.

9 So the heart of this discussion is not about --
10 necessarily about agreeing on where we're headed, but it's
11 rather agreeing that the future of transportation is
12 coming, is changing, and that we have a very important
13 role to play in that.

14 So let me suggest a set of questions that we
15 could --

16 --o0o--

17 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: -- use to frame the
18 discussion here, and -- both for our panel and for the
19 Commissioners and Board members that we can -- as we go
20 forward here. So remember, we're going forward, one way
21 or the other. Let's do it in a better way than a worse
22 way, okay?

23 Now, we can all have our definition of what's
24 better and what's worse. But clearly, there are a lot of
25 big changes coming, and that we really need to focus on

1 it. So that -- the number one, I think, as we -- as we as
2 a group -- our two agencies, as we think about what our
3 role is, one of the very most important, I think, is to be
4 thinking about how do we at the State level work with and
5 relate to local governments and transit agencies.

6 Because so much of what we're talking about is
7 shifting. The responsibilities, the oversight, so much of
8 it is shifting to local governments, but yet, we have
9 larger public interests at stake here.

10 So as you see there, you just have a few things.
11 You know, how do we link State and local initiatives? Is
12 there some kind of technical assistance? What are
13 programs to support local experimentation? And I think
14 that's another really big theme that we really need -- we
15 can agree on, should agree on, and should think about how
16 to pursue it, because so much is new. We don't know what
17 the real answer is. We have ideas at the -- you know,
18 whether we're experts or political leaders.

19 And so the more we can do to support
20 experimentation and learn from it, whether it's dealing
21 with, you know, these, what we call, microtransit or what
22 we -- shuttles or, automated vehicles, or infrastructure,
23 or pricing.

24 Okay. So number two up there is -- and this is
25 important on many levels, how do we support housing goals,

1 because transportation is closely linked with housing.

2 And so what do we do about that. And it does get
3 into a lot of local issues, in terms of infill
4 development, land use, access to transit, accessibility by
5 the mobility disadvantaged. Okay.

6 So what I'm doing here, by the way, is I'm
7 setting up four, I think, big strategies issues that I
8 want us all -- you know, I'd like all of us to think
9 about. And if you want to come up with new ones, that's
10 great. We're going to have the panel also addressing
11 these.

12 So the third one up there is probably the most
13 controversial of them. And that is, as we go forward, we
14 are -- it's almost certain that we're going to be used
15 more -- using more pricing in the transportation sector,
16 local pricing. You know, maybe it will be cities, maybe
17 it's congestion pricing, road use charging. And the
18 question is -- and then a lot of cities are putting fees
19 on Lyft and Uber. That's what TNCs are up there.

20 So pricing is almost definitely going to be
21 happening. And the question is, you know, how do we
22 unfold that? Is it purely just to raise revenue or are --
23 can we use it in other ways, or should we use it in other
24 ways as well?

25 And the last one, which is one the transportation

1 community and -- especially embraces, is the cob
2 connectivity between vehicles and the infrastructure for
3 safety reasons, for efficiency reasons. And that
4 definitely is happening too, and that can happen in
5 different ways connected up with these others.

6 So with that, can we pull -- call up the panel?
7 Do I do that? Am I that powerful?

8 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Your job is to run this
9 panel.

10 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: All right. Okay.
11 Panel, come on up here.

12 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: And I know we do have time
13 concerns, both in terms of the overall time for the
14 meeting, and also because we're -- we may lose some
15 people, if we don't move it along.

16 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Right.

17 Okay. So what we're going to do -- so I'll
18 introduce each of the four very briefly. And I have a few
19 questions for you.

20 I'd like to open it up. And I think if it's
21 okay, after that, if the Commissioners and Board members,
22 you know, might -- I know that one time constraint is we
23 have Kate Gordon and we want to make sure -- she's going
24 to be speaking at the end of this, and so we'll make sure
25 we have enough time for that, but --

1 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

2 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Okay. SO we have
3 Dara Wheeler on my left. She's Head of Research for
4 Caltrans. And she's been at Caltrans. She was Chief of
5 Staff. And before that, she worked at Office of Planning
6 and Research, and in the Legislature.

7 We have Alvaro Sanchez. He's the Environmental
8 Director for the Greenlining Institute.

9 We have Laura Podolsky, who is the Assistant
10 Director for the University of California Institute of
11 Transportation Studies that managed and oversaw those
12 roundtables.

13 And we have Tilly Chang, Executive Director of
14 the San Francisco County Transportation Authority. And
15 before that, she -- she's worked at the World Bank, the
16 Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and a technology
17 start-up.

18 So we have a really good diversity of abilities
19 and experiences here.

20 So let me start out with a question. And that
21 is, you know, as I -- as we -- you know, the goal of this
22 is to -- who do we move forward, right? So what do you
23 think are strategies that are most important -- that
24 should be the most important to CARB and CTC? And for
25 those, what actions within those strategies do you think

1 individual Commissioners or Board members might or should
2 act upon, either as a group or more individually?

3 So you don't have to all answer it, because I've
4 got more questions for you, but -- Dara, you want to start
5 out. You -- I see a big smile on your face like you have
6 a good idea.

7 It's up on top.

8 MS. WHEELER: There it is. There it is. Thank
9 you, Professor Sperling.

10 First of all, Director Berman sends her regrets
11 for not being able to join you today at the conversation,
12 and has asked that I try to inform as much as I can and
13 take back what I can as well.

14 So to answer your question, CARB, CTC, and
15 Caltrans obviously have different missions. And those
16 missions overlap in many ways, especially when it comes to
17 system efficiency and air quality concerns. So we feel
18 that we should continue to leverage cross-agency research
19 efforts and findings where the topics are of mutual
20 interest.

21 And a couple of ideas related to actions to
22 achieve that are continued coordination through the
23 transportation research round-up group. And CARB and CTC
24 could help influence and establish topics of mutual
25 interest to focus the effort across departments, and

1 additionally to work on a statewide transportation
2 research databases, which was mentioned in the CTC annual
3 report to the Legislature.

4 So thank you.

5 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. That's a great start.
6 Alvaro, you all got some good ideas?

7 MR. SANCHEZ: Sure. Hi, everyone. Thank you
8 for having me.

9 And, you know, I think it's to make the problem
10 bigger, because the solutions are going to be so much more
11 difficult to achieve. And I think this is a really good
12 start, right, to be able to have these conversations, to
13 be able to have cross-agency collaboration. And when it
14 comes to issues of autonomous vehicles, you know, we're
15 talking about employment, about health, about land use,
16 about housing, about safety.

17 So I think that having a robust conversation that
18 even gets more complex -- I know this one is already very
19 complicated. But that's, I think, the degree of the
20 challenge that's in front us, but also the opportunity.
21 The opportunity to really come up with some innovative
22 solutions to be able to advance our goals, social equity
23 goals, climate goals, and otherwise.

24 And I think, you know, just finding the level of
25 both continuing to do the work that's in front of us that

1 we have to do, but also being flexible enough to be able
2 to say, ultimately, we're all here for the same purpose,
3 and we want to have a better transportation system, and we
4 want to address the inefficiencies and inequities that
5 we've built into our system that we currently have.

6 And I think that that's a level of collaboration
7 that we need to be able to instill in a process that
8 unfortunately, in my opinion, gets more complicated on the
9 short-term, but really pays off in the long run, in terms
10 of what we can achieve, if we bring other folks to
11 conversation that need to be here as well.

12 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Great.

13 MS. PODOLSKY: So from the uni -- the perspective
14 of the university -- so the UC Institute of Transportation
15 studies organized these four roundtables to really go meet
16 with stakeholders on the ground to understand their
17 challenges, and how it mapped across what we saw as some
18 big glaring gaps in the data and information we will need
19 to inform policy.

20 And so internally, so among the UC researchers,
21 we identified nine areas that we saw that there was major,
22 again, gaps in information and data, that we knew that
23 would be important to the State moving on. And we
24 presented those and shared those at the roundtables.

25 At the roundtables, we also presented three

1 actions that we were suggesting to the State. And the
2 first one was just to create a framework -- a strategic
3 framework of where the State was going. And there was --
4 actually, that was one of a theme that we talked a lot
5 about at the roundtables, where the locals, regional
6 agencies also saw a lot of value in that. So not only a
7 framework that could help link agencies up and down the
8 government ladder from locals, region, and State, but
9 across the State too.

10 So, for example, DMV is working on its third set
11 of regulations around AVs, total absent of any other
12 direction that the State has on AVs. So they are moving
13 forward setting the policy of the State on AVs, the DMV.
14 And there's a lot that's going on at the local and
15 regional level. And what we heard a lot at the
16 roundtables too is that it is really difficult for city by
17 city by city to set standards and protocols for how you
18 deal with all this data, how do you negotiate with the
19 private sector. So they saw a lot of value in the state
20 assisting and helping to create some protocols around that
21 just to make it easier for locals and region to be working
22 with the private sector.

23 Something else in the sense of what we heard a
24 lot was support to the locals. And this is what Professor
25 Sperling was saying too, is that there is now more than

1 ever access to a lot more data and information. But
2 locals -- it's hard to know what to do with it.

3 So once you've got it, that's one thing, but what
4 do you do with it when you have it? How do you analyze
5 it? So there was discussion on State support in helping
6 locals figure out how do you work with this big data, how
7 do you store the big data, who's there to help with the
8 wig data? And we believe the UC ITS has a role in that as
9 well.

10 So, again, one of our actions was this framework.
11 What can the State do to help provide that framework?
12 Assistance to locals, I touched on that as well. And the
13 third was to really understand where there's gaps in
14 information that we need and to invest in filling those
15 gaps. So that was also one of our recommendations that
16 came out of the UC ITS work and our roundtables.

17 The last thing I'll mention is that something
18 that came up over, and over, and over again was the
19 funding, and the interest to, and the importance of,
20 aggressive, as one person put it, experimentation, and how
21 do we support that? And that's another role that the
22 State could play as helping to support that
23 experimentation. But also it needs to be evaluated and
24 results need to be shared with others.

25 And the other one I'll just mention before I turn

1 it over to Tilly, was just a funding over the long term.
2 So as transportation gets more and more interesting, and
3 there's more and more technologies, and automated
4 vehicles, and the gas tax is becoming obsolete, you know,
5 what do we do to replace that, so that we have the funding
6 we need to run the transportation system of the future.

7 MS. CHANG: Thank you so much for having me as
8 well. Tilly Chang. I appreciate the opportunity and I
9 just want to echo all the other commenters today,
10 especially what Laura was just mentioning about the
11 strategic framework.

12 What was nice about our roundtable in San -- in
13 the San Francisco Bay Area that was hosted by MTC was this
14 idea that, you know, 17 or some other number of states
15 already have their frameworks. And it's Helping them to
16 advocate to be part of the national conversation, whether
17 it's the AV policy, whether it's the next transportation
18 act, whether it's the research -- R&D agenda, California
19 really has everything we need. We just need to put it in
20 a place that is an articulate central locate -- place,
21 where we can use that as a base for advocacy.

22 We're looking -- really looking forward to
23 helping to develop that around new technology, in addition
24 to just traditional transportation and climate policy.
25 Things that we had talked about, as Laura discussed

1 earlier, that echo some of the things that Professor
2 Sperling was mentioning are the land-use connection, the
3 transit-oriented development, the infill.

4 Sustainable Communities Strategies are happening.
5 That's the good news. It's taken a few cycles of regional
6 transportation plans and the SCSs. What's not happening
7 is the funding to implement them. So whether it's the
8 traditional things like safe routes to school and basic
9 infrastructure that a lot of our sales tax counties and
10 regions have some matching funds for, we're not able to
11 show the cities that that promised incentive of, okay, if
12 you do plan for growth, we're going to invest very
13 strongly with you on the infrastructure side.

14 There is funding that is flowing from, of course,
15 the Cap-and-Trade and the AHSC grants, Affordable Housing
16 Sustainable Communities grants. Those are very important,
17 but they're just not enough. So I want to echo that
18 again.

19 Let's keep incentivizing communities for trying
20 to do the right thing regarding planning for growth,
21 transit-oriented development, and show them the benefits
22 of that through the infrastructure and transportation
23 investment.

24 Very importantly, transit, you know, active
25 transportation modes continue to be oversubscribed. CTC

1 staff see this and have been reporting this the tremendous
2 demand. ATP rounds, TFCA rounds, they're just
3 oversubscribed. So we do want to just keep finding ways
4 to leverage the funding that's available and to try and
5 focus that on things that can be perhaps intersectional,
6 which is what's so exciting about this panel -- or this
7 joint workshop.

8 What would that look like perhaps around
9 experimentation? One of the things that I was pleased to
10 do this past week with Director Berman, in fact, and
11 others was at the ITS America conference, there was a
12 mobility on demand convening in Seattle. And there was
13 reporting out on the national sort of mobility sandbox.
14 These are pilots around the country that have been able to
15 harness innovation at the local level, in whichever way it
16 fits your community, but to really report out lessons
17 learned.

18 So my last point is that experimentation is --
19 we're like in the third inning. We're very early, right,
20 in this big transportation disruption and revolution. We
21 do see the pilot funds flowing. The public sector
22 capacity, as Laura mentioned, is really important to be
23 able to invest in that. Some of the recent grant
24 programs, for example, limit how much we can spend on the
25 public sector side for evaluation, or staffing. I think

1 that's something to consider, because it does take all
2 sides to be able to then shine a light on what was
3 learned, so that we can improve and build upon the initial
4 sets of pilots that hopefully are going to be forthcoming.

5 Thank you.

6 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Thanks. So Tilly
7 kind of hit all of the key themes I was talking about. So
8 let me ask maybe the rest of you to talk about what are
9 some specific examples of local experimentation, and local
10 needs that the State could support in some way, whether
11 it's a new or expanded funding program, or, you know,
12 whatever it is? So...

13 MR. SANCHEZ: Yeah. I think you're right.
14 We're early on. And one of the things that I would
15 mention is that when it comes to social -- to issues of
16 equity, we're even earlier than that. And a couple of the
17 programs that I'll emphasize are the Transformative
18 Climate Communities Program at the Strategic Growth
19 Council is one that I think has a lot of opportunity to
20 demonstrate some innovative ways to link all of the things
21 that we're talking about, housing, transportation, green
22 infrastructure, jobs.

23 It's a really modeled program, and one that very
24 few people know about. It's doing tremendous things, and
25 it could have -- it has the potential to be able to

1 integrate all of the things that we're talking about with
2 social equity built at the core of that program. So it's
3 one that I would really identify as needing more resources
4 to be able to provide more funds to 14 planning
5 communities that are doing the planning work with
6 anticipation of being able to apply for funding for that
7 program. But we need to increase the funding for that
8 specific program to be able to make -- to deliver on that
9 commitment.

10 Another one that I'll mention is one that we're
11 really excited that's going to be coming out. This s the
12 Air Resources Board program on mobility pilots for
13 low-income communities. We're super excited about the
14 approach. That it's not just focused on the use of
15 vehicles. It's also thinking about other forms of
16 mobility, like e-bikes, for example, and to able to again
17 rightsize and experiment with how to achieve this program
18 and the goals. It's something that I think we're really
19 excited about.

20 One that we're also really excited about that
21 does the program around capacity building and technical
22 assistance is a bill that we worked on last year, SB 1072,
23 which creates the Regional Climate Collaboratives Program
24 that has the goal of providing technical assistance and
25 capacity building resources to local agencies and local

1 community-based organizations to be able to do something
2 with all this content, and all this data, and all these
3 funds.

4 Because what we've noticed is that underserved
5 communities, who should be able to benefit from a lot of
6 what the State is already doing, just doesn't have the
7 technical expertise, the local capacity building, and the
8 local resources in terms of technical assistance, GHG
9 quantification methodologies, et cetera. And that's
10 really creating a barrier for them to participate.

11 And the last thing that I'll emphasize for
12 these -- all of these three programs is that it really
13 emphasizes addressing community-identified needs. And I
14 think that's something that I just want to introduce to
15 the conversation, that it really has to start there. If
16 we build programs that are not aligned to addressing the
17 transportation, or housing, or other needs of the
18 communities that we're seeking to actually help with this
19 work, we're missing the boat. It really needs to start
20 with them. And they need to be much more meaningfully
21 involved and participating in these processes in order
22 to -- for us to align our strategies and goals to actually
23 address the needs that those communities have.

24 I'll just leave you with this, there's a program.
25 I think many of you might know about it. It's called

1 Green Raiteros. And it's a program that was launched in
2 Huron, California. And the need that they were trying to
3 address there was trying to get senior citizens to go to
4 their hospital appointments in Fresno, but couldn't rely
5 on public transportation. So they ended up creating a
6 car-share pilot using conventional vehicles to meet that
7 need.

8 Now, they've evolved that program to have
9 electric vehicles provide the resource, but the need was
10 the hospital visits. It wasn't so much a new
11 transportation route. So identifying how to address those
12 specific needs of communities with these transportation
13 innovations, I think we really need to embrace that
14 approach and really start with community-identified needs,
15 and how do we address those short-term and long-term needs
16 that people have.

17 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Lots of good
18 examples. So, Dara, I mean, you oversee a very large
19 research program for the State. I guess, clearly the
20 largest transportation research program in the State, now
21 that I think about it, by far.

22 You know, what are some examples or what are some
23 ideas you have about, you know, how Caltrans can play a
24 role in this? I do know that -- I don't know about that
25 Fresno example that Alvaro just did, but I know there's

1 others in the valley that Caltrans has funded fairly
2 substantially.

3 But what are some examples and do you think
4 the -- you know, we're do we -- does this have legs, this
5 whole idea?

6 MS. WHEELER: Oh, absolutely. And I feel that,
7 you know, the beauty of going second and third in the
8 lineup is we're going to be talking about the same thing,
9 but it's already been said. And I just want to emphasize
10 that the need for the additional funding to support these
11 initiatives is critical to look at ways that we can
12 leverage the State's investments to get out of policy what
13 we need to get out of policy.

14 And I like what Laura was saying about the data,
15 and where the university can help us drive data decision
16 making a little bit better and inform policy based off of
17 data. So, yes, this has legs. I think that we're talking
18 about the same topics, you know, in all of our
19 conversations across programs, so...

20 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: And so, Tilly and
21 Laura, do you want to follow up on any other examples on
22 topping of it to add to this discussion.

23 MS. CHANG: Sure.

24 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Turn it on.

25 MS. CHANG: Other examples of pilots that are

1 happening, just building upon what Alvaro is mentioning,
2 even today at my board we were able to put some lifeline
3 transportation funds on things like paratransit plus.

4 What does paratransit look like in the future. You know,
5 this is something that MTA our muni operator is leading,
6 but it's in a new way serving the community in a flexible
7 way, allowing taxis to provide up to \$75 per person to go
8 to your hospital appointment or your pharmacy, with a the
9 taxi being geofenced to just those destinations and not
10 other locations.

11 It's this new way of harnessing the innovation
12 and technology, but really keeping that sort of community
13 based focus on what is the actual need, what is the health
14 care that's being accessed and for whom.

15 Some of the pilots that I know colleagues are
16 doing around the region and the state really are exciting.
17 Contra Costa just received a national grant that many
18 agencies will be participating in to do integrated payment
19 and integrated trip planing and payment apps for the 680
20 corridor. This is certainly something that will involve
21 BART and MTC, which manages our payment systems in the Bay
22 Area, and also our agency to the destinations in San
23 Francisco for the 680 corridor. But it's really looking
24 ahead to see what can we do to market to people to really
25 speak to commuters in the way that they're used to being

1 spoken to in terms of being able to show you all your
2 options, making it as easy as possible, providing sort of
3 that one shop stop in a sort of integrated if Clipper and
4 Fast Trak, you know, had a baby, and you could actually
5 get credit for taking transit for the days that you might
6 want to use an express lane and pay a toll.

7 Those are the types of concepts that we're
8 learning from partners, for example, in Los Angeles to say
9 how might congestion pricing look in a place like San
10 Francisco. Now, this is not something that many cities
11 are looking at, but that's okay. I think other places are
12 looking at other topics. We're looking at pricing.
13 There's all kind of innovation and experimentation
14 happening. We're all laboratories for this discussion.

15 Something that I thought was very impressive
16 about actually going back to Seattle was when they close
17 their Alaskan Way Viaduct, 90,000 trips, they actually had
18 a very smooth experience, because the employer community
19 was so involved early on working with Sound Transit in
20 King County.

21 So we learned a lot about what the private sector
22 can do beyond the mobility companies. The mobility
23 companies absolutely need to be partners with us in
24 achieving our goals around equity, and success, and
25 climate, and congestion relief, but also other parts of

1 the private sector, developers, employers.

2 So when we say the private sector, I think we
3 mean many different players, and the public sector also
4 meaning many different players. But what matters is not
5 focusing on those organizations, these disparate players,
6 but the people who we're trying to help, right? The
7 community that is trying to access services, jobs, school,
8 medical, and other opportunities.

9 MS. PODOLSKY: The one pilot I'll mention -- so
10 it sounds with this panel there's a lot of funding that's
11 going into pilots. And so one thing that CTC and CARB
12 and -- is a part of this framework is just taking an
13 inventory of what's going on and who's doing what. So
14 I'll just use the one project I know of as an example of
15 how pilots are being funded in a really interesting way.

16 So we have a researcher at UC Davis, Caroline
17 Rodier, who's been working in the San Joaquin Valley for
18 about three years now. So she partnered with the
19 Metropolitan Planning Organizations there. They were
20 funded through a Caltrans planning grant to look at
21 different business models for providing rural transit that
22 could leverage some of these new technologies. So transit
23 was really expensive in these areas. And so that was the
24 focus of the planning grant that they received from
25 Caltrans.

1 Once they had that in place, they applied to a
2 pilot program, a CARB program, to actually implement it.
3 So actually take some of the business models that they
4 developed as a part of that planning grant stage and to
5 implement it. For example, purchase -- they -- one pilot
6 that they're testing out is housing electric car share
7 program at affordable housing units, that then also could
8 be used for rideshare. So layering on top of that the
9 ability for residents to be able to drive others around.

10 And they're also working, as part of that pilot,
11 with in San Stanislaus and San Joaquin counties on
12 piloting this mobility as a service. So using technology
13 to better route existing vehicles.

14 And then they also received a grant from the
15 California Energy Commission to assist with this pilot in
16 the communication engagement piece. So there is a lot
17 going on. And I'll go back to, as an outcome of all these
18 roundtables and discussion, what the UC ITS is committed
19 to, and very interested in, is to help take an inventory
20 of what is going on in the state, across the State
21 agencies, but as well as in the region's locals, because
22 that's what we discovered is that there is a lot going on
23 and people don't know about it.

24 So that is something that we have talked
25 internally about trying to come up with the resources to

1 support. And we would like to work. And that's an area
2 that we would like to work with CARB, CTC, and others on
3 is just taking a baseline of where we're at.

4 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Thanks. Let -- let
5 me highlight a couple things from my fellow Board members
6 and Commissioners of what we're hearing here. And then I
7 thought we'd open it up to -- you know, to the
8 commissioners and board members to ask the panel any
9 questions they might have about this.

10 So, you know, you've been hearing a lot about
11 that there's a lot of pilots, but the reality is there
12 will probably be, you know, an order of magnitude more.
13 You know, if you talk to the organizations that are
14 setting these up, they feel like there's a tremendous
15 need. If you talk to James Corless at SACOG or SCAG, a
16 tremendous demand, because there is a lot of
17 experimentation.

18 And I think it can be done in a much more
19 organized way. And part of that is lessons learned. And
20 I think that's kind -- partly where Laura was going is
21 there's a lot happening, but we're not sure what we're
22 learning from it, and we need to do a much better job of
23 learning, so that we can scale up all these ideas.

24 So what you're hearing here is that for the first
25 time in half a century, there's a tremendous amount of

1 innovation happening. This is really a unique time in
2 history for transportation.

3 So I've lived much of it. I come from firsthand
4 experience that it really is different now, and it's both
5 an opportunity as well as a risk.

6 And so that's one of the reasons why we're
7 focusing on this now. And the other theme I think that I
8 want to highlight that they -- that the panel was talking
9 about is local stakeholders. In all of this, the local
10 stakeholders are hugely important. And we've got to
11 figure out better -- you know, kind of Tilly highlights
12 that. We've got to -- and Alvaro also, we've got to
13 figure out how to -- how to partner better and have a
14 stronger collaborative relationship.

15 So let me open it up to any Board members or
16 Commissioners to quiz our panelists.

17 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Dan, before you do that, I
18 was under the impression that we had a special guest who
19 had to leave early.

20 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Right.

21 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: And I just want to make sure
22 she has an opportunity to interject here, because we
23 invited here specially to hear from her.

24 MS. GORDON: No, I don't have to go till 3:15, so
25 if you want to do some questions now, then I can weigh in.

1 after that.

2 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. That sounds great.
3 Let's hear -- let's have a round then at least of
4 comments. I know Lucy you wanted to speak earlier. Do
5 you want to go first here?

6 CTC COMMISSIONER DUNN: More just notes that I
7 wrote as folks were talking for you to kind of think about
8 if that's okay.

9 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Sure.

10 CTC COMMISSIONER DUNN: Under principles, a
11 missing principle is safety that should be included.
12 Where is the private sector? They're the innovators here.
13 It was interesting, because we had a far more in-depth
14 discussion at the last CTC meeting with Washington and
15 Oregon on automated vehicles that I think CARB would find
16 fascinating, if we got into that level of detail, where
17 Mercedes-Benz they won't put a product on the street until
18 safety is their number one consideration.

19 And I think understanding what the private sector
20 is working on, I think would be critically important for
21 us. I just -- I made a snarky little comment here, so
22 take that just for a Lucy-ism, if CAFE standards are
23 reduced, maybe the gas tax isn't dead yet, right? Think
24 about that one for a minute.

25 (Laughter.)

1 CTC COMMISSIONER DUNN: The other thing for me
2 as -- in the world as -- in land planning is the
3 Sustainable Communities Strategies -- and I know I'm
4 speaking heresy, but it's a 10-year old law and the
5 emperor has no clothes. If it was as effective as we
6 think it should have been, we wouldn't be in a 3.5 million
7 home housing deficit, and the transportation issues that
8 we still struggle with and our greenhouse gas issues that
9 we still struggle with would be showing far better
10 improvement.

11 I really do think, as leaders, we need to look at
12 how can we make a Sustainable Communities Strategy
13 effective? And so far in 10 years, the performance
14 metrics are not there.

15 Transit-oriented development is very important.
16 But without fee reductions and litigation relief, it will
17 just not produce what we're hoping it's going to produce.
18 And at the end of the day, we also need principles for
19 edge development. So that how can we grow carefully both
20 up and out very carefully.

21 So just little notes I took on your presentation
22 that we don't have time to go into all of that detail, but
23 it would really be -- that would really be some meaty
24 stuff to kind of think about as public sector leaders in
25 what the private sector is dealing with on how we manage

1 these issues.

2 Thank you very much for your presentation.

3 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Thank you. Lots of
4 good insights there. Do any of you want to respond to any
5 of that?

6 It's voluntary.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. SANCHEZ: On the role of the private sector,
9 yeah, couldn't agree with you more. And they're not
10 waiting for us to figure it out. They're going to do it.
11 And that's why it's been so disruptive, whether it's the
12 TNC companies - I live in Oakland - scooter companies,
13 bikeshare companies, and soon autonomous vehicle
14 companies. They're going to move forward with their
15 plans. And we really need to be ready for when that
16 happens.

17 We put out a report, you know, to look at the
18 equity considerations related to autonomous vehicle
19 deployment. And we really were looking at everything,
20 accessibility, differently abled populations, jobs,
21 economic opportunities associated with both the deployment
22 of the vehicles and also the potential increase in folks
23 being able to, you know, gain access to supermarkets much
24 easier, et cetera.

25 And it's just a really complicated equation to

1 have to like come up with recommendations on what to do,
2 but we have to engage with the private sector companies.
3 To the degree that they can be partners in developing the
4 kind of equitable approaches that we want to see deployed
5 in communities. And I think pilots are a really
6 interesting way to think about how can we partner with
7 private sector companies to do first and last mile
8 geofenced type of approaches.

9 I think we definitely need to not -- to roll up
10 our sleeves, work with them, and see where we align, and
11 where just the private sector motive and goal doesn't
12 quite align so well with what we need to do for our
13 climate goals, our equity goals, and other goals. And
14 that's where regulation I think is really going to come
15 really handy and important.

16 MS. CHANG: I'd like to just mention in terms of
17 even just what San Francisco has been able to sort of
18 demonstrate through the Transit First Policy, it took 50
19 years. It's been 1973 is when your Transit First Policy
20 was first adopted. And even with that, it's just our
21 eastern neighborhoods that really have that sort of
22 pattern, right, the denser, well served by transit.

23 We still have an outer ring where the VMT and the
24 greenhouse gas footprint is really like many other
25 suburban counties. So we recognize, you know, that this

1 takes time. It's really just been 10 -- or two cycles of
2 on our regional transportation plans. We've -- as I
3 mentioned earlier, we sort of put that out there, that
4 there would be infrastructure funding. But really, it's
5 only been in the last two OBAG cycles, in our region
6 anyway, that we've really put real money and connected it
7 to who's taking the growth and who's demonstrating the
8 production of the housing.

9 So it's really kind of still a bit early. I'd
10 love to be able to -- you know, we've been having this
11 conversation in our region about do we double down, how do
12 we -- how do we go, and how do we recognize that transit
13 might take different forms in different communities, so
14 maybe provide more flexibility around that, and certainly
15 engage the whole community in this conversation.

16 I'm noting that in our area in particular, we do
17 see the suburbanization of the poverty. We do see auto
18 dependency really locking people into these expensive
19 modes. So how do we address that? I think the private
20 sector and folks that are thinking about mobility, the car
21 companies are also thinking about this. So it's
22 documented through the Three Revolutions and other
23 research, but we really are moving toward mobility as a
24 service.

25 And then the question then becomes, I believe,

1 subsidy. And we talked about this at our mobility
2 roundtable in the Bay Area. You know, subsidy is not, you
3 know, a bad word. It just -- it is what it is. In fact,
4 we see subsidy on all sides. The private companies are
5 well funded by venture capital. And certainly that is
6 what is sort of underpinning a lot of the private services
7 that we see in the market, and consumers are responding.
8 But those services are certainly subsidized as well.

9 Public transit has been subsidized. We have
10 subsidy policy for a reason in order to express, you know,
11 how we'd like to shape the market through the weighs that
12 we want to support these things that don't otherwise have
13 a way to be viable.

14 So I just wanted to discuss a little bit about
15 those concepts that we do see subsidy all around. So when
16 companies like Lyft and Uber -- Uber who is in my
17 building, you know, we get together and we talk about what
18 are the solutions? They are for things like pricing.
19 They are for things like congestion pricing, to the point
20 where 10 years ago, when we were looking at congestion
21 pricing in San Francisco and the Chamber of Commerce was
22 like whoa, whoa, whoa, we're not ready. Now, there's a
23 bit more openness to discussing it. Lyft and Uber are
24 members of the Chamber, along with other companies, of
25 course, who have very important and valid concerns about

1 how the policy could potentially move ahead.

2 But the come -- sort of the mindshare, I think,
3 around the table has expanded, and it's because of the
4 awareness of the twin challenge of climate and equity, and
5 the intersection of the two.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. WHEELER: And quickly if I could just add, I
8 agree with Commissioner Dunn's statement that we have to
9 engage with the private sector when developing policies on
10 innovative mobility. And then we also as a state have to
11 be a better partner with our stakeholders.

12 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: You have to press the button
13 there.

14 Got it.

15 CTC COMMISSIONER GUARDINO: Thank you, Chairman
16 Nichols.

17 (Laughter.)

18 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: I wanted to give you
19 technical assistance.

20 (Laughter.)

21 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: See, that was the
22 first step towards technical assistance.

23 (Laughter.)

24 CTC COMMISSIONER GUARDINO: And I'd like to build
25 on Commissioner Dunn's comments. And first, I want to

1 thank each of you for being here. You bring expertise
2 that is invaluable to these conversations, and you bring a
3 perspective from -- of being from government agencies, or
4 transit agencies, or the environmental justice community
5 that are key stakeholders in this process.

6 My day job at the Silicon Valley Leadership
7 Group, when we convene, as you do, I'm sure, we try to
8 think through who are all the stakeholders? And instead
9 of starting with anything in writing, we start with the
10 blank piece of paper, so that we write together. So I
11 want to build on what Commissioner Dunn said.

12 I hope as we do future joint meetings, and we
13 build stakeholder panels, this is about innovation in AV
14 and the policy ramifications of that. We have no
15 innovators on this panel. We can't plan around that. We
16 don't have that expertise, and we need to show the value
17 of having that perspective.

18 So I want to encourage us, and I never -- I never
19 try to provide a direction without providing an offer to
20 help. This is my world in my day job. If it is a problem
21 of finding appropriate people who are not only smart, and
22 innovative, and thoughtful, and want to be a part of the
23 conversation, as well as a part of the solution, I will
24 offer that.

25 The same on the principle of bullet 2 around

1 infill development, discussing infill development at all
2 without infill developers. We would benefit greatly from
3 the perspective of real market conditions. So again, you
4 all were terrific. I learned a lot, and I took a lot of
5 notes. But let's make sure that the conversation are
6 holistic by having all stakeholders at the table.

7 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: I think we all agree
8 with that. And this is really the starting point for --

9 CTC COMMISSIONER GUARDINO: Right. But for us, a
10 starting point includes all stakeholders. Not inviting
11 them when we've already put thoughts on paper.

12 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Yes. Okay. I
13 think --

14 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Start with Ms. Burke.

15 Oh, yea. Putting up your tents will help too as
16 opposed to just waving, right? Send the signal.

17 CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: A very short question, I
18 hope. I'm really interested in the allocation of the
19 resources. We've spent a lot of time expanding our
20 resources. What concerns me is how -- as we allocate
21 those, we have -- and you talk about the data, how you
22 will have the data that keeps track with development of
23 new ideas, of the technology, and how we can make sure
24 that we allocate those resources, so they're not obsolete
25 by the time we allocate them.

1 Very recently, I think we both saw a presentation
2 of a small community in the Netherlands, where the streets
3 have the capacity to take care of the autonomous vehicles,
4 assuming that there will be expansion, and that the
5 autonomous vehicles will be utilizing those streets. Now,
6 we're making tremendous investment in some of those basic
7 streets, highways, transportation centers. I'm really
8 interested in how you put together the data that you share
9 with those who receive the resources, the local
10 governments, so that they can utilize them to be
11 consistent with the expanding technology.

12 I expect, and I understand, that next year when
13 we have this meeting, we're going to be talking about
14 different technology. But at least we can work with the
15 data and the technology we have access to today, to make
16 sure that we don't build in obsolete systems, and that we
17 build in systems that are expandable.

18 And I sit here knowing that in Los Angeles, the
19 buses, the natural gas buses, are blowing up. And so
20 they're going to have to replace those buses with some
21 different technology. I come from a very recent
22 generation of where we believed natural gas was the
23 solution to everything in terms of transportation, just
24 like at this point we talk about electric vehicles as
25 being our solution.

1 We -- when we come back next year, our two years
2 from now, what I'm trying to really figure out is a way
3 that we can plan to have the data and be able to adjust to
4 these new technologies. Simple question, right?

5 (Laughter.)

6 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So is there a...

7 MS. PODOLSKY: I can respond really quickly
8 about -- I think that is a big challenge. And we've been
9 thinking a lot about that at the UC Institute of
10 Transportation Studies. So the resources that the State
11 puts into R&D, into research, how do we make sure that the
12 practitioners and policymakers can use it and benefit from
13 it? So that's what -- that's your -- the proposition,
14 what you're putting forward.

15 So when SB 1 was passed, it did set aside \$5
16 million to support an annual research program for the UC
17 ITS. Now, this was huge for us. Now, \$5 million is
18 smaller, when you compare it to the research going on at
19 the UC ITS. It's much larger than that. But this 5
20 million goes directly to the UC ITS that allows us to be a
21 lot more flexible and nimble in partnering, in responding.
22 We couldn't have done that before, because we were
23 responding to call for proposals from traditional research
24 programs that had their own process of identifying
25 priorities' funding. So we'd be starting research about

1 18 months, two years almost after the challenge was
2 identified.

3 So this SB 1 research program has really allowed
4 us to be much more nimble, much more responsive. And so
5 we're really excited about that. And has also offered us
6 the ability to fund in to some of, what we call, these
7 translational activities. So things that aren't part of
8 traditional research, but really help make sure that that
9 research and data gets outside of the University, so it's
10 funding in the staff and the capacity to actually make
11 those connections.

12 And we really forward to working with Caltrans
13 and others on specifically what you were discussing today,
14 is how do we make sure that this data that is supported,
15 and -- by all the State funded research, actually gets to
16 those who can put it to use. So I just wanted to share
17 that.

18 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So let me just point
19 out one thing about that. And I think then we should go
20 to Kate Gordon here.

21 Just for everyone's benefit, when you hear UC
22 ITS, what that's referring to is the Institute of
23 Transportation Studies at UCLA, at UC Irvine, UC Davis,
24 and UC Berkeley, and then with partnerships with some
25 other universities, but those are the four main ones.

1 Okay. So let me introduce now -- so those of you
2 that still have questions, I think keep your cards up and,
3 you know --

4 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I get to call on them.
5 You just get to finish off the panel.

6 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Oh, I wanted to. All
7 right.

8 (Laughter.)

9 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: I defer to, Madam
10 Chair.

11 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: No. Go ahead. No, you go --
12 go ahead -- you finish the panel discussion.

13 BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Oh, I can do it. And I
14 intro --

15 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: And you get to introduce
16 Kate. This was all spelled out in your script.

17 (Laughter.)

18 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: We're fighting over
19 you, Kate.

20 MS. GORDON: I know. I know.

21 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: So I'm very pleased,
22 delighted to introduce Kate Gordon. I've known Kate for a
23 number of years. She's been an expert in economic
24 development and transportation. She's worked in a lot of
25 the different areas, in a lot of different places. And

1 she was appointed by the Governor just very recently to
2 head up the Office of Planning and Research. And in that
3 role is going to play a key -- will be a pivotal role in a
4 lot of these issues that we're talking about, in terms of
5 the administration.

6 And so Kate has a really long, really impressive
7 resume. But really, she brings a lot to the table here,
8 both as an expert, as well as very experienced working
9 with a lot of different kinds of organizations, at a lot
10 of different levels.

11 So, Kate, we are delighted to have you here.

12 MS. GORDON: Thank you, Dan. Thank you so much.
13 And I will keep this not too long, because I know there
14 are important questions. And this group is a group of
15 people who have an enormous amount of expertise in a lot
16 of different things we've talked about. So your questions
17 are really the meat of the conversation.

18 I will say my role is -- excuse my voice. I'm
19 recovering from laryngitis so I'm just coming back.

20 My role at OPR as the Director is really exciting
21 for me. For those who -- and there are many here in
22 Sacramento who ask me what is OPR.

23 (Laughter.)

24 MS. GORDON: It's okay. I like explaining it.
25 We are -- by statute, we are the long range planning

1 organization within the Governor's office, and we help
2 with long range planning for the Governor and the cabinet.
3 And a lot of that is centered around land use, and the
4 kind of -- which means essentially centered around many of
5 the things we've talked about today. We do some other
6 projects that are related. We actually run the Military
7 Council, so we do a lot of work the Department of Defense
8 on base and operation strategy, and some other issues.
9 But land use is sort of at the crux of what we do.

10 I also have the honor of being the Governor's
11 senior advisor on climate change. So in that dual role
12 get to be kind of confusingly both on the cabinet and on
13 the staff of the cabinet. So I haven't totally figured
14 out how that works, but I'm working on it.

15 As Dan said, in a prior life, I spent a lot of
16 years really working on the intersection of clean energy
17 and climate change and economic development, particularly
18 working with different -- bringing together different
19 stakeholder groups. I've done a lot of bipartisan work,
20 and I've done a lot of work at the intersection of labor,
21 environment, community, and business groups.

22 So the idea of different cultures in one room is
23 very common to me, and I'm very comfort with it. So I
24 think it's great that this group has gotten together and
25 has that requirement.

1 I just want to talk for a minute, responsive to
2 the panel, but also really talk about sort of where the
3 Governor's priorities and OPR's priorities on are on some
4 of these issues. And they're very aligned with what we've
5 talked about today. It's great to hear some of the kind
6 of common themes continue to come back from the questions
7 and from the panel.

8 So let me just start first with -- with the
9 Governor's priorities. I think you've heard him say, I'm
10 sure, and he's emphasized in every speech, this idea of
11 California for all. So really a state -- thinking about a
12 long range state and development in sustainable growth of
13 the state in a way that really is there for everybody in
14 California.

15 He's put a particular emphasis on non-coastal
16 California actually, and really highlighted inland
17 California as a key priority, but also, of course, every
18 region of the state, as is his role as Governor. And I
19 think that that comes through -- that California-for-all
20 idea comes through in some of the key priorities.

21 But underlying it, honestly, really are these two
22 big themes we're talking about in this room. There's --
23 there's a climate element, because the climate is changing
24 and affecting California every day, as we see with the
25 fires, and floods, and extreme heat, and a number of

1 impacts.

2 And it's also -- we also have a strong leadership
3 position on mitigating climate change globally. And Chair
4 Nichols has been hugely involved in that effort, along
5 with ARB, and every agency in the state. And mitigating
6 climate change also is a place where -- where
7 transportation plays an enormous role.

8 So that climate transportation intersection
9 really is at the heart of this California-for-all idea.
10 And I think that transportation at the table as sort of
11 probably the key, along with housing, component of how to
12 achieve our climate goals is really critical.

13 Those priorities that the Governor has laid
14 out -- and I think, Council Member Burke, your point about
15 short-term and long-term priorities and how do we plan for
16 what we don't know is a really good one. One of the areas
17 where we have to plan, to some extent, for what we don't
18 know, and the transportation folks know this well, is
19 investing in things that have multi-decade old lifespans.
20 We're talking about long-term infrastructure and long-term
21 priorities.

22 And the Governor has really emphasized aligning
23 those long-term investments and priorities towards some
24 key strategies that will open up kind of this California
25 dream to everyone, and address two big crises that we face

1 our affordability crisis and our climate crisis. Those
2 are obviously housing and transportation -- the
3 intersection of housing and transportation has been
4 something that the Governor has talked about in every
5 speech.

6 And he's made commitments to housing production,
7 but made very clear that that housing production needs to
8 have in a way that is sustainable. That we're looking at
9 housing near jobs, and near transit, or transportation
10 options, so that we're not seeing a continuation of the
11 current situation, which is the number of one cost for
12 most -- many Californians is housing, the number two is
13 transportation.

14 That is in and of itself an equity issue, and an
15 affordability issue, and an access issue. And it's not
16 sustainable. So how do we think about building housing
17 and transportation strategies that are aligned toward a
18 more sustainable growth trajectory?

19 Some of the areas that he's really emphasized,
20 and we've emphasized on that through the State of the
21 State, through the budget priorities, of course,
22 high-speed rail is a huge one, right at that intersection
23 of how do we think about an area of the state that will be
24 a major growth center as California gets bigger, gets
25 toward what we think is 50 million people by 2050, how do

1 we do that development in a way that reduces trips between
2 some of those key cities, Merced, Bakersfield, Fresno,
3 connects to regional rails, so that it reduces some of the
4 car trips between other populations centers and job
5 centers, but also building up jobs in those areas. How do
6 we think about high-speed rail stations as economic
7 drivers?

8 So what is that huge multi-decadal major
9 infrastructure project mean when we think about what
10 California looks like into the future, how do we design
11 well today, so that we're really building for the
12 California of the future and high-speed rail is a key
13 piece of that.

14 And I should say that the Governor has asked me
15 and OPR, and then Lenny Mendonca who's the new head of
16 GO-Biz, to really work together on kind of articulating
17 what that vision starts to look like for the Central
18 Valley and for the Inland Empire.

19 The next big piece that the Governor has talked
20 about a lot, and again at that intersection of housing and
21 transportation, is critically related to climate, and it's
22 this question you've heard about over and over today of
23 vehicle miles traveled or of how much people are driving.

24 And again, that's a budget issue. It's an
25 accessibility issue. It's an equity issue. It's also a

1 huge climate issue. We know from CARB's report on the SB
2 150 report last winter that this is an area where we're
3 unfortunately not showing a lot of leadership on climate
4 change. We're actually growing, and the panel has pointed
5 this out.

6 We're growing our transportation emissions in the
7 transportation sector largely through increases in VMT.
8 We see that again as part and parcel of the housing
9 affordability challenge, and part and parcel of this
10 question of how do you build a sustainability --
11 sustainable growth and California for all.

12 Another one that, you know, I've been thinking a
13 lot about -- I started my job three months ago and it's
14 been three months of near constant thinking about the two
15 big things that are affecting us right this second in
16 California, the two big crises of this administration so
17 far, wildfires and the bankruptcy.

18 While you might ask wild -- how are wildfires
19 related to everything you just talked about? But, you
20 know, it's been really clear to me as we've been -- we run
21 the Catastrophic Wildfire Commission out of OPR, and we've
22 spent a lot of time talking to people in affected
23 communities talking to insurance industry, talking to the
24 private sector. And it's become increasingly clear to me
25 that the fires -- the impact of the fires is also part of

1 our affordability crisis and our VMT crisis.

2 We are looking at communities where seniors in
3 particular, but also low-income folks on fixed incomes
4 have been forced out further, and further, and further,
5 and further from job centers to a -- a two bedroom house
6 in Paradise costs \$800 a month to rent.

7 So you have folks who are -- that is not a price
8 you can get in most of California. Folks being pushed way
9 out, and then you get this geographic isolation and social
10 isolation. And 60 to 70 percent of the folks who have
11 died in these fires have been people over 65.

12 This is a very clear issue for the state and for
13 our sustainable growth. And we need to be thinking about
14 the fires, not just as isolated incidents that are sort of
15 out there, unrelated to our growth centers, you know, out
16 there. We've got to deal with them. We have to do fire
17 management. That's all very true.

18 But we also need to think about long-term growth
19 patterns, again connecting housing, connecting
20 transportation, really bringing together the issues
21 this -- these two groups work on to build more
22 sustainably.

23 So those are three big picture -- I mean, you
24 know, it's a lot to work on already, right? High-speed
25 rail, VMT, and fires, all of which are very related. But

1 underlying both of those are two sort of structural things
2 that I think that these two groups have a lot of
3 experience with, and the Governor has prioritized. And
4 I've done a lot of work personally on with -- mostly with
5 the private sector actually.

6 One of those is climate resilience. So as I said
7 earlier, climate change is both impacting all these
8 structures that we're building for the long term. And
9 it's all -- and it's going to do so even more. We can
10 do -- we could take the scoping plan, and double it, and
11 stop all emissions tomorrow, and we would continue to see
12 the drought and precipitation cycle, and we would continue
13 to see ocean acidification, and we would continue to see
14 sea level rise for some period of time. So these are not
15 things we can just stop.

16 We need to plan for them. And it's incredibly
17 important as we're thinking about our transportation
18 future in particular, because we have these big
19 place-based systems, thinking about what the impacts will
20 be on those systems. I know Caltrans is already
21 experiencing record snow removal costs this year, already
22 experiencing flood costs, already seeing impacts on
23 certain road materials of extreme heat in parts of the
24 state.

25 These things will continue and need to be built

1 in to how we think at the State level in every agency, how
2 we think about we're -- how we're doing our investment,
3 because we owe it to the taxpayers to be fiscally
4 responsible on these things. We owe it to build -- to the
5 taxpayers to build resilient infrastructure, and we owe it
6 to our communities.

7 And I think that the transportation agencies, in
8 particular, have a real leadership role to play here,
9 because of the sheer amount of investment frankly, but
10 also because of the -- that key connection to all these
11 other climate issues.

12 And finally, just one point on something we
13 haven't talked about much today, but it's another kind of
14 equity issue just around who is the workforce who's going
15 to make all this happen. The Governor has made it a
16 priority in the budget to dramatically increase funding
17 for workforce training, for those who are building this
18 sustainable economy of the future.

19 And I think that's -- we sometimes forget that
20 actually we don't get a big emission reduction and we
21 don't get a lot of resilience if things aren't built well,
22 and if they are not built by folks with skills, and if
23 they're built -- not built to standards, and if they're
24 not invested in, in terms of their operation and
25 maintenance.

1 We all know that as State agencies. We have
2 rules on these things. We hire people and train them, and
3 are focused on that. That needs to be part of our
4 investments in the private sector as well.

5 So that's kind of to your point, Counsel Member
6 Burke, about kind of the long term. Like, how are we
7 thinking about these things that will be in place for a
8 long time.

9 But then there's the whole set of things the
10 panel has addressed, and Chris Ganson from my team, I'm
11 proud to say, has addressed, which are more short term.
12 How do we think about the things where we really don't
13 know how they're going to end up. What is the fuel of the
14 future? How are we going to think about these AVs and
15 shared mobility options? What's going to happen with all
16 these scooters and bikes?

17 We just don't know. A lot of that
18 experimentation is happening at the local level, but I
19 just wanted to underscore what the panel said, about the
20 value of kind of pilot projects and local scale projects,
21 and the State partnering to learn from the local level
22 about what works and what doesn't work, because nobody
23 thinks that we should be spending five years coming up
24 with a strategy to invest for 35 years in something we
25 don't fully understand.

1 But what we can do is support some of these
2 really interesting -- I mean, here in West Sacramento has
3 a really interesting mobility project, where they've kind
4 of replaced a lot of traditional transit that was running
5 on 20 or 30 minute cycles with vanpools that are on
6 demand. It's had a tremendous impact on the city in terms
7 of accessibility. And it's interesting. It's mostly used
8 by seniors and teenagers, which I think is a really cool
9 like -- what else brings those two groups together? I
10 mean, I think that's a very interesting social outcome.

11 But thinking about experimentation, there is a
12 role the State can play in that, in leveraging some of
13 this intelligence and nimbleness, at the local level, and
14 particularly to Carl's point, in the private sector, where
15 they're just dealing with this stuff. They're -- they've
16 got money on the table. They're trying to figure it out
17 every day.

18 So we're really excited. From the Governor's
19 office perspective, from OPR's perspective, we're really
20 excited about these changes in the transportation world.
21 We're really excited about what's possible in terms of
22 addressing our climate impacts and mitigating climate
23 change.

24 And I want -- just the last thing to say is that
25 we -- we exist as sort of a place where interagency work

1 happens. We're fortunate to run the Strategic Growth
2 Council, where the transformative climate community, kind
3 of is a pilot project, happens. We learn a lot from that,
4 but that Growth Council, which I chair, has the
5 Secretaries of many of the major agencies, including
6 Transportation, but also -- it also includes agriculture,
7 housing, economic development, a number of others. And we
8 are a great resource, as CalEPA, we are a great place to
9 think about how to do interagency conversation on some of
10 these hard issues, and would just love to be a resource to
11 this group, and support you however we can. We're
12 thrilled you're here.

13 And just personally, I've served on commissions.
14 I know how much work it is. I know how big of a time
15 drain it is, and I know what a commitment it takes to the
16 State, so just thank you all personally for doing that.

17 (Applause.)

18 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. That was a
19 terrific charge to us and gives us, I think, a really good
20 umbrella to cover over some of these conversations that
21 we're -- that we are having.

22 And find the places of commonality where we can
23 all come together and try to address what the real
24 priorities are. So thank you so much for that.

25 We are, of course, running behind sort of

1 predictably, and we have a hard stop. So I think what I
2 would like is to ask those who have their cards up and who
3 want to speak at this point to -- we'll just did a round
4 really quickly, and then we will -- and then we will call
5 upon the people who have signed up to speak.

6 So I will start at this end here.

7 ARB BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you, Madam
8 Chair. And thank you to the panel that came today.

9 A lot of thoughts are floating through my head as
10 I listened to this conversation. And I come from Southern
11 California. I sit on the Regional Council of the Southern
12 California Association of Governments. We are now
13 embarking on the next Regional Transportation Plan, which
14 will go from 2020 to 2045. And one of the things that is
15 striking is the demographics that have been presented to
16 us.

17 Those demographics show that by 2045, 65 percent
18 of the population in our region will be over 65. We need
19 to think about who we are planning for. And as we get an
20 older population, we need to think about their needs, and
21 what may come out of that.

22 The other thing is that when we -- when we do
23 this kind of planning, there isn't one size that fits all.
24 We're looking at communities like Moreno Valley that are
25 way out. And some of those people actually drive all the

1 way into the city and commute for you, know, many, many
2 hours every day.

3 Is -- that's a -- that's a style of living that
4 maybe we want to work -- think about and change. In some
5 areas, there is no central commercial district. I know in
6 SCAG region, we're looking at there are multiple
7 commercial districts, and we should think about
8 development around those multiple commercial areas.

9 We also should think about planning along major
10 arterials, that would be like transportation corridors, as
11 a place to think about planning. Transit-oriented
12 development, yes, but perhaps transportation-corridor
13 development as well. We won't have transit everywhere.

14 And neighborhood-oriented development, we've
15 talked about that too in my region. It's something to be
16 thinking about. This intersection between transportation
17 and land use, that really is a strategy on climate change
18 as well. And there was a very interesting op-ed recently.
19 I think it was Senator Wiener who did an article like
20 that.

21 And I think that's true. What we're -- this
22 intersection between land use, transportation, and air
23 quality is just so intertwined. The collaboration I think
24 is really important. I think big data is really
25 important. These demographics should be playing into

1 that.

2 And the framework. I think Ms. Podolsky
3 mentioned developing a framework for the policies that we
4 are embarking on. One of the persons that came to talk to
5 us last week was from ITS, Brian --

6 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Taylor.

7 ARB BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Say it again?

8 ARB BOARD MEMBER SPERLING: Taylor.

9 ARB BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Yes, from UCLA.

10 And I said to him after his talk, we need some --
11 we need more of academia helping us in these discussions.
12 And they're actually studying these things. And I think
13 this is an important part of the collaboration that we
14 have academia. We have environmental justice communities.
15 We have developers. Who's going to build that housing?

16 Cities, for the most part, don't build housing.
17 We don't have the money. We plan for it. But how does it
18 actually get built? So we need to have those -- those
19 conversations. This collaboration is really important.
20 This discussion has so many pieces and parts to it.

21 I'll close here, but you can see there's a lot of
22 thoughts about how we actually get this done, and how we
23 can do it smart, and right for the future.

24 Thank you.

25 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. That's a lot. I think

1 we'll just take the comment, unless anybody has something
2 they really want to say right away.

3 Okay. Ms. Takvorian.

4 ARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah. Thank you,
5 Dr. Sperling or thank you so much for organizing the
6 panel, and to all of you, and to Kate for all of your
7 comments.

8 I just have a lot of questions about -- that I
9 know we're not going to get answers to. But I think that
10 hopefully they can influence our conversation about I
11 guess it's short and long term. And I feel, Kate, like
12 that's what you were talking about. I felt like some of
13 our panelists were talking about that as well. We have a
14 crises in our communities, in disadvantaged communities
15 particularly, around housing affordability, about
16 maintaining communities, and gentrification issues, the
17 importance of maintaining cultural influences in our
18 communities, maintaining the communities that we've
19 historically had.

20 And those communities are starting to disappear
21 as a result of housing affordability. And I'm just not
22 hearing that as part of the conversation. I know it is
23 part of the conversation, but I just want to insert that.

24 And then accessibility seems critically
25 important, as all of you have really mentioned. They're

1 the same kinds of issues that communities, environmental
2 justice, disadvantaged communities have struggled with
3 forever. How do we get to jobs, how do we get to school,
4 how do we get to that better life?

5 But hopefully, it's not on a freeway in a fossil
6 fuel car that's getting us into a suburb, right? So we're
7 trying to switch that, flip that script. And it seems
8 like we really need to -- we need to look at what the best
9 practices are. But I'm really nervous, I want to say,
10 about experimentation, and about extensive discussion of
11 pilot projects in a certain way. I think they have a
12 role. But, I mean, you've all laid out, and I think we
13 all know we're in a crisis now, and we need to put some
14 solution-oriented practices, and frankly requirements on
15 the table that cities and counties need to comply with at
16 a certain -- not to sound too heavy handed, but we know a
17 lot.

18 So what are those things we know a lot about that
19 we should be requiring through the SCS, to the -- to all
20 of the cities and counties, so that we don't make some of
21 those obvious mistakes? That doesn't mean that we're not
22 allowing cities, and towns, and counties to be who they
23 are. But I'm just nervous about saying, you know, let's
24 just try this stuff out for another 25 years and see what
25 happens, because it seems like the indicators are kind of

1 pointing in a particular direction. So more questions
2 than answers. Sorry.

3 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

4 Dr. Balmes.

5 BOARD MEMBER BALMES: I'll be quick in the
6 interests of time. But I actually am glad that I followed
7 Ms. Gordon, because she brought up a couple of things that
8 I really think are important and need to be highlighted.

9 And, you know, the wildfire. The effects of
10 wildfire on our land use in California can't be
11 underestimated. It's not just that people are being
12 pushed out into the woods for affordability, we actually
13 can't afford to take care of those people in terms of the
14 risk of wildfire. And so it's a key part of land-use
15 planning in California. So I'm really glad you brought
16 that up.

17 The other issue that I've -- I only heard Mr.
18 Sanchez touch on - I'm sure he feels strongly about this -
19 is jobs. And not just new jobs in the green economy --
20 the sustainable economy, and the transportation
21 infrastructure that Ms. Gordon mentioned, but the jobs of
22 relatively low wage workers that are driving Lyft and Uber
23 vehicles. I mean, what are we going to do about that. We
24 need to start planning for that -- a just transition for
25 those workers as we move to autonomous vehicles.

1 And the sooner we start, the better. Because in
2 my experience with job retraining nationally, as well as
3 in California is it doesn't work most of the time. So we
4 have to figure out a better way for the future.

5 Thank you.

6 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Mr. Vice Chairman.

7 CTC VICE CHAIR VAN KONYNENBURG: Thank you for
8 your presentation. Laura, you mentioned data and how it
9 will be stored. My understanding that an autonomous
10 electric vehicle generates anywhere from 2 to 5 terabytes
11 of data per day when it's operating, is that correct?

12 Okay. Well, it's a lot.

13 (Laughter.)

14 CTC VICE CHAIR VAN KONYNENBURG: So the question
15 becomes as we go forward how -- and this is where having
16 someone from the industry would be really helpful, what
17 guidelines will there -- to make sure that's data shared,
18 how will it be disseminated, and who has -- I would assume
19 it would be -- you know, we would have to have a situation
20 whereby there would be shares of a server farm, or we
21 would allow -- have some form of artificial intelligence
22 to -- by a local government to be able to look at that
23 data, and glean information where the infrastructure --
24 that allows us an opportunity to have eyes on the
25 infrastructure much more than a current local government

1 has eyes on the infrastructure.

2 So the question is how we share that data, how is
3 it stored, and how do you build the algorithm to get
4 through an enormous amount of data to get what you really
5 need to improve the infrastructure. So that I would like
6 to see on your point four on connectivity that explored.

7 Thank you.

8 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Turning this
9 direction.

10 Dr. Sherriffs.

11 ARB BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Thank you.

12 You know, clearly, the discussion --
13 transportation is no longer just transportation. It's not
14 just moving people and goods. And we are really having to
15 focus on the secondary effects, the unintended
16 consequences that go along with this. And so the hammer
17 and nail that I always come to these meetings with is
18 health.

19 And, you know, using health is an important
20 strategy, an important measure for really evaluating any
21 project. What are -- and not necessarily that the balance
22 is going to determine whether we do something or not, but
23 we do need to understand what are the health benefits, and
24 what are the health consequences, the negative health
25 consequences to any project we do.

1 And I think that kind of information, it's not
2 necessarily easy to come by, but to focus more on that.
3 Because I think that clearly is something the public can
4 identify with and understand. You know, we talked about
5 more bottom-up rather than top-down. Communities
6 determining what their priorities and worries are that it
7 plays an important role in that as well.

8 Thank you.

9 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Carl, did you want to
10 just interject.

11 CTC COMMISSIONER GUARDINO: I'll go after
12 Christine.

13 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Fair enough.

14 CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: Such a gentleman. Thank
15 you, Carl.

16 I just want to bring up a suggestion, and maybe,
17 Mary, you can help me with the correct title. A few years
18 ago, maybe in the 2013-14 timeframe, the previous
19 administration had a roadmap, a survey, some sort of a
20 plan for electrification.

21 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Um-hmm.

22 CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: It was all the agencies,
23 and timeline specific.

24 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: They did.

25 CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: So Caltrans and the

1 Energy Commission, and Air Resources Board, and others. I
2 think we could use some sort of a snapshot like that. And
3 here I am sitting right next to Kate Gordon. What could
4 be more appropriate. Perhaps --

5 (Laughter.)

6 CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: -- the Governor's
7 office, through OPR, could really kind of launch this. Is
8 it going to solve all our problems, ID every issue we have
9 to deal with? No, it's not. It's not even going to tell
10 us everything that's going on in State government. But
11 everyone of these meetings we hear about connectivity. We
12 hear about sustainability. We hear about congestion. We
13 hear about AVs, and many, many, many more items.

14 Particularly interested in wildfires too. San
15 Diego has had their fair share -- or unfair share is maybe
16 the better language.

17 So I would really like to see that. That's not
18 to -- it't not going to capture everything. We do need to
19 beef up our private sector participation. Real innovation
20 and investment is happening on that side, not exclusively,
21 but significantly.

22 I just felt some things had jumped out at me and
23 then I'll close. Local government also is innovative.
24 And I am -- I'm good with innovation and some pilots. You
25 know, the elected bodies and others have to keep an eye on

1 them. Maybe that's the weak link, but it needs to be
2 done.

3 But the things we talked about today that are --
4 seem to be added into the conversation. Shared data, I
5 mean, there's pluses and minuses all over that topic. It
6 is also a very rich and -- it's a money generator, and we
7 shouldn't lose site of that.

8 Wildfires, DM fees and the AV, all these things
9 that we need to get them on one -- maybe perhaps in one
10 document that will help us sort out who's doing what.

11 Thank you.

12 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: So the document that you're
13 referring to was prepared in the last administration was
14 updated several times.

15 CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: That's right, it was.

16 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: And I believe the original
17 impresario of that whole effort was a person who is now
18 part of this administration as Secretary of the Natural
19 Resources Agency, Wade --

20 CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: Crowfoot.

21 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: -- Crowfoot.

22 CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: Yeah.

23 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: So we could probably get him
24 to tell us how he did it. But it was a -- it was a major
25 undertaking and it did include staff from many agencies,

1 and certainly a bunch of people from my agency were very
2 actively involved.

3 CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: I knew you would come up
4 with the right name. And I thought -- I thought of Wade
5 early. We could definitely ask him to volunteer maybe.

6 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Thank you. Okay.
7 Carl, last comment.

8 CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: Thank you, Mary.

9 CTC COMMISSIONER GUARDINO: Very quickly. Thank
10 you, Chair Nichols. I was really struck in a positive way
11 by what Dr. Sherriffs mentioned about health, and what
12 Commissioner Dunn mentioned about safety.

13 We lose about 40,000 American lives a year in car
14 crashes, primarily due to human error. And one of the
15 fascinating items that is almost a moral imperative about
16 AVs, when the technology has gotten to a point where we
17 have bent that curve, and we're going to be saving a lot
18 more lives than we're losing, there's going to be a moral
19 imperative to find ways to employ that technology. And I
20 just think as we have these conversations, we can't lose
21 site of that moral imperative that we can be saving lives.

22 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah. Okay. I am going to
23 now turn to the public comment period, but I'm going to
24 take the prerogative of the Chair to say two things. One
25 of them, which is slightly facetious, is that when I hear

1 the word pilot projects, I think of China, because I've
2 been doing so much work with the Chinese on Cap-and-Trade
3 programs.

4 And I've learned that in China, which has, you
5 know, I forget how many cities that have 10 million people
6 in them that we've never even heard of. The central
7 government has such a hard time imposing policy -- making
8 and imposing policy on their vast empire and population,
9 that they do everything by pilot projects. But when they
10 do a pilot project, what that means is it's coming and
11 everybody is going to be doing it soon. But they give the
12 pilot project city a little chance to, you know, be the
13 first and work out some of the kinks. But it really -- it
14 really is a national policy when they call it a pilot.

15 The other thing I want to say is that, again this
16 is on the climate front, but it's so much on my mind these
17 days, is that when the countries of the United Nations
18 left Paris, having made the commitment that they did to
19 try to hold emissions down, everybody understood that the
20 job of actually making it happen was going to be the
21 private sector's job.

22 That government couldn't possibly do what needed
23 to be done to make the kind of dramatic shifts in fuels,
24 transportation, electricity, everything that had to
25 happen. And we have yet to actually come to the point

1 where we have unleashed all of the power that's there.

2 And one of the things that I keep hearing coming
3 back is, yes, the capital is out there, and some of it is
4 actually, you know, being invested. But big
5 multi-national companies are leaning to governments to
6 give them the safety net to make those investments. That
7 is, they want to be part of the solution, and they want to
8 innovate, and they are eager to be part of it, but they
9 don't feel like they can do it, especially in risky and
10 untried areas without having some assurance that there is
11 government policy, which is going to be stable, and which
12 is going to provide some kind of a pathway towards
13 realizing the benefits of those investments.

14 So I would just urge us to sort of not take an
15 either/or, you know, government mandate versus private
16 innovation approach to these issues, especially given the
17 responsibilities that we who are appointees serving on the
18 boards that we do have, but to recognize that we have to
19 work in this space, where we're trying to bring everybody
20 to the table to actually make something happen.

21 Now, having given my sermon for the day, I would
22 like to actually call on the people who signed up to
23 speak. But given the timing, we're going to give you a
24 minute. And just lineup, and come forward, and give us
25 your thoughts starting with Dr. Alberto Ayala.

1 DR. AYALA: Thank you, Chair Nichols. It's great
2 to be here. Thank you for the opportunity. I'll make it
3 quick. I want to very much emphasize and agree with Dr.
4 Sperling's first bullet. We, in the Sacramento region,
5 want to partner with the State to try out pilots and these
6 new partnerships.

7 But once central principle that I want to
8 emphasize is we need to be equal partners, because we need
9 help. Obviously, we talked about funding, that is a
10 critical issue. But beyond the funding, I think there's a
11 lot happening at the local level that is going to give you
12 some really important lessons.

13 Our community cars-share program is one of those
14 lessons. And in addition to the technology, there's also
15 an opportunity to come up with some ideas for policy
16 innovation. What are the rules and regulations that the
17 State is going to be putting in place and how should they
18 be aligned with local actions to make sure that we support
19 both the supply and demand of AVs and many other
20 technologies that are coming?

21 Thank you.

22 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

23 Okay. I guess everybody can see where they are
24 on the list, so you'll just come on forward, please.

25 Thank you.

1 MS. PARK: Thank you. Good afternoon, Madam
2 Chairs Nichols and Inman, and the Board members and
3 Commissioners. My name is Rosa De León Park. I'm the
4 Executive Director with the Stanislaus Council of
5 Governments.

6 But I am here today as the Chair of the San
7 Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies' directors. On
8 be of the eight Central Valley Metropolitan Planning
9 Organizations, I would like to share our collective
10 thoughts on ARB's Sustainable Communities Strategies
11 guidelines, which are in the process of being updated.

12 The San Joaquin Valley MPOs have engaged with
13 your ARB staff for over a year on the update of the
14 Sustainable Communities Strategies evaluation guidelines.
15 MPO staff have participated in the workshops, have had
16 many phone calls with ARB staff, upper management have
17 submitted multiple comment letters, all which have
18 produced little or no changes to the draft SCS evaluation
19 guidelines.

20 Efforts on the regions that we have been working
21 with our local agencies towards reaching our state's 2030
22 and 2050 climate changes goals, we are working with
23 encouraging types of transportation -- sorry. My members
24 of the --

25 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Finish up your sentence.

1 MS. PARK: -- other valley COGs are here to
2 update you more.

3 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. I saw you were a
4 group. So hopefully all the points will get covered.

5 MR. CHESLEY: Thank you, Chairs, members of both
6 the Boar and Commission. I'm Andrew Chesley, the
7 Executive Director of the San Joaquin Council of
8 Governments in Stockton.

9 I was a member of the Regional Targets Advisory
10 Committee that was put together under the leadership of
11 Chair Nichols. During that process, we had very
12 collaborative effort to develop regional -- that
13 collaborative effort appears to have been lost over the
14 course of the last 10 years. The guidelines that are
15 being promulgated today are universally opposed by the
16 MPOs across the state. Great dissatisfaction with them.

17 I would also point out that the challenge that
18 you're facing with the waiver issue is one that while ARB
19 has taken leadership on that one, last in 2018, it was not
20 a leadership that was shared with the transportation
21 community. As a result, we have had to discover the
22 implications of this on our own. And really, it was only
23 within the last three weeks effectively, the regional
24 transportation planning issues and transportation
25 community have come to understand the challenge that air

1 quality conformity findings are going to have when it
2 comes to the Commission's putting -- trade corridor
3 funding, as well as other funding sources as a result of
4 SB 1.

5 MS. CAI: Madam Chair, ARB Board members and CTC
6 Commissions. My name is Kristine Cai, Planning Director
7 of Fresno Council of Governments. I am here to share with
8 you our concerns about the SCS evaluation guideline
9 update, which is supposed to be finalized by ARB staff end
10 of this month.

11 The new guideline is going to require
12 significantly more technical modeling than the existing
13 version, which we believe is against the direction given
14 by the ARB Board back in March of 2014 to shift -- 2018,
15 I'm sorry to shift away from modeling. Since the
16 inception of the SB 375, the -- San Joaquin Valley MPOs
17 have spent more man \$5 million in upgrading our models.
18 And with the new guidelines we'll be spending millions
19 more dollars on those models.

20 So we believe that the millions of dollars will
21 be better spent in other projects like alternative
22 transits, bike and ped, and other sustainable projects.

23 With high unemployment rates, and air quality
24 issues, and high concentration of disadvantaged
25 communities, the valley has many equally important goals,

1 such as economic development, job creation, et cetera.

2 So we would like to work with the State on these
3 issues.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. BALL: Thank you, Chair, Committee members.
6 Rob Ball, Deputy Director at Kern Council of Governments.

7 And I concur with our previous presenters from
8 the San Joaquin Valley. Just some additional comments
9 related to the guidelines. We need to avoid the potential
10 of conflicting guidance by incorporating this SCS guidance
11 into the RTP guidelines that are adopted by the CTC.

12 Two, we need to tailor the thoroughness of the
13 review that we're going through on these Sustainable
14 Communities Strategies, depending on how close a region is
15 to achieving their target. And that if they're exceeding
16 it by a large amount, they don't need to spend the
17 additional five months of analysis on little items that
18 might just make a minor change.

19 And then finally, three, the valley is committed
20 to meeting our ambitious targets, even with or without the
21 CAFE standards. But about the same time CARB began
22 reviewing our SCS, 200 Bird scooters were dropped in
23 downtown Bakersfield. And we've now seen over 20,000
24 transcription -- zero-emission trips happen within
25 Bakersfield since our SCS started review.

1 So that concludes my comments. Thanks.

2 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: You guys are doing great
3 staying within the time limits. Thank you.

4 MR. STONE: Good afternoon. Dylan Stone, Madera
5 County Transportation Commission. I, too, have some
6 concerns about the proposed guidelines.

7 I'm a modeler. I work on the RTP and conformity
8 analysis, the GHG analysis for our county, among many
9 other things. We have a very small staff. We're the
10 smallest MPO in the state. I'm concerned with the amount
11 of additional work this looks like it will be and to what
12 end, when I can see our finite resources going towards
13 meaningful implementation of these innovative strategies
14 we're talking about. With our finite resources, I'm
15 really concerned we're going to be in an either/or
16 situation when both of these things have a great affect on
17 each other.

18 And I believe our comments should warrant the
19 consideration of CARB, and I'd like to see action that
20 indicates that they do. Thank you for receiving my
21 comments.

22 MR. CORLESS: That was impressive. Can I take
23 Dylan's 20 seconds on that one?

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. CORLESS: I'd just like add on to my...

1 (Laughter.)

2 MR. CORLESS: Three quick points. James Corless,
3 Executive Director of the Sacramento Area Council of
4 Governments. You have heard, and I know you know, about
5 the SAFE Vehicle Rule that's coming out of Congress. And
6 I just want to impress upon all of us, if we go into any
7 kind of conformity lapse, it is economic pain across the
8 State. And we are here, as all the MPOs, to help you get
9 that message to Congress. And our whole delegation,
10 entire delegation, we need to make sure this doesn't
11 happen.

12 Second, pilot projects, demonstration projects.
13 I want to give lots of credit to a lot of my partners here
14 locally in the Sacramento region, whether it's the West
15 Sacramento ridesharing, whether it's microtransit
16 pioneered by Regional Transit right here in some of the
17 poorest communities in our region. We have a real
18 opportunity and a challenge to try to figure out how
19 low-income communities can take advantage of some of these
20 new demonstration projects and microtransit.

21 And finally, both from the State and the federal
22 level, if we want innovation, you have to make it easy.
23 We have been denied spending federal air quality funds on
24 some of our most innovative projects.

25 Thank you.

1 MS. KAWADA: Hi. I'm Kim Kawada, Chief Deputy
2 Executive Director for SANDAG. I just want to touch I
3 know on the SAFE Vehicle Rule. You've heard a lot about
4 it. I just wanted to give you some sort of local color.
5 It does have impacts because of the latest planning
6 assumptions and what would need to be done in terms of the
7 model that affects both our long-range transportation
8 process and how we can meet, you know, our -- the
9 greenhouse gas reduction targets.

10 And it has very real immediate impacts
11 potentially on projects in our TIP: our largest public
12 transit project, our \$2 billion light rail extension,
13 which is midway through construction; a South Bay Rapid
14 Project, which was funded by TRCP projects; our North
15 Coast Corridor Project, which has been held as a model for
16 collaboration in terms of rail, and highway, and
17 environmental.

18 Those are some of the projects that are at risk
19 if we don't address this rulemaking and how it affects
20 sort of planning, and transportation program, in
21 California. So we look forward to working with everyone
22 in terms of this and urge you to basically work with local
23 agencies and regional agencies to figure this out.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. TAYLOR: Thank you. Tanisha Taylor, CALCOG.

1 You've heard from many of our members about the SAFE
2 Vehicle Rule. And I'm here to echo all of the things that
3 they've said about the amount of concern and angst at the
4 SAFE Vehicle Rule and the potential finalization of that
5 rule has.

6 I stand here as a partner in that discussion and
7 offer our services to help identify those -- the
8 implications to the transportation system. We are working
9 with our. MPO regions, as well as our rural regions.
10 Chair Nichols, you identified that the MPOs would be
11 impacted. But there are also some rural regions in the
12 state that would be impacted by the SAFE Vehicle Rule.

13 As you've heard, the SAFE Vehicle Rule and
14 finalization of that rule would have significant impacts
15 on equity, GHG emissions, health, the transportation
16 system, as well as the economy. And so again, we stand
17 here with you as a partner in your discussions for the
18 SAFE Vehicle Rule, and we look forward to working with you
19 and your staff as you work towards workshop on identifying
20 implications throughout the state.

21 Thank you.

22 MS. PFEFFER: Good afternoon. Thank you, Chairs,
23 and commissioners, and board members. I'm Nancy Pfeffer
24 with the Gateway Cities Council of Governments. We're in
25 Southeast Los Angeles County. When you met together in

1 December in Los Angeles, I spoke to you about an issue
2 regarding the 710 freeway and the urgent need for
3 interagency collaboration in order to ensure that we have
4 clean trucks running on those -- on that freeway.

5 To clarify and update you on that, the EPA --
6 U.S. EPA is looking for a commitment from the agencies,
7 especially from Metro, to include that Clean Truck Program
8 as a programmatic part of the I-710 EIS/EIR. And we can't
9 finalize the EIR without that commitment.

10 Metro has now come up with a draft memorandum of
11 understanding that they would like to see implemented.
12 The parties would include Metro, South Coast AQMD,
13 Caltrans, SCAG, the Port of L.A., the Port of Long Beach,
14 the Air Resources Board, and U.S. EPA Region 9. This is a
15 really important opportunity for the State to show
16 leadership and this need for collaboration. So that I
17 hope that all of you will participate. I've spoken with
18 some of you about it. And I hope that you'll support this
19 collaboration and MOU.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. BOYCE: Bill Boyce with SMUD. I wanted to
22 make two points today. The first point is SMUD is helping
23 in the Sacramento community to stand up a new e-mobility
24 center, where we're hoping to gather upwards of 60 to 70
25 million dollars to help attract private industry into

1 Sacramento to work on a lot of these technologies, perform
2 pilots, and help develop a lot of what we see today as
3 coming in the future. As electricity gets used more and
4 more as a fuel, we see this as a natural role for SMUD.
5 So, we're doing that in concert with other partners,
6 agencies, and the academic institutions in the country --
7 region.

8 The last thing I want to say kind of builds off
9 something that Kate Gordon said and Dr. Balmes said.
10 We're also in the process of developing a whole series of
11 low carbon fuel standard, low-income, disadvantaged
12 community projects. And instead of just getting cars and
13 charging infrastructure into these communities, we're also
14 incorporating awareness, workforce development, and
15 economic development in everyone of those. And I suggest
16 that evaluation criteria like those in future projects
17 should be included.

18 MR. MAGAVERN: Good afternoon, Bill Magavern with
19 Coalition for Clean Air. I wanted to say first that I
20 think potentially the greatest value of bringing these two
21 agencies together would be the integration of State policy
22 when it comes to, on the one hand transportation funding,
23 and on the other emissions, from both an air quality and a
24 climate perspective. I think that's why the Legislature
25 wanted you to come together. So as you plan your future

1 meetings, I hope that we'll closer to that integration
2 that's been sorely lacking in State policy.

3 Secondly, earlier, the issue of the Low NOx Truck
4 Standard came up, and I wanted to say that's something
5 that we strongly support. We've met with CARB staff
6 already and look forward to continuing to work on lowering
7 the emissions coming from trucks and other heavy-duty
8 vehicles.

9 On autonomous vehicles, we support the State
10 principles and really everything that Chris Ganson said in
11 his presentation. On the related topic of transportation
12 network carriers, we know that San Francisco and Los
13 Angeles, maybe others, are looking at taxing the TNCs.
14 And we've ordered them to tier those taxes, so that a
15 shared zero-emission ride would be the most lightly taxed.

16 So I would urge both agencies to weigh-in with
17 local governments that are considering those taxes.

18 Thank you.

19 MS. WISE: Hi. Ella Wise from Climate Plan, a
20 network of more than 50 organizations statewide working
21 for equitable sustainable healthy communities. We
22 submitted a letter, and I'll just reflect some of the
23 comments from that letter.

24 We really appreciate the discussion and support
25 using new mobility to achieve our goals. But the -- but

1 new mobility will only really work within a context of
2 sustainable land use, multi-modal system, equitable
3 economy. And that's the power that we have today in these
4 two entities, these two agencies is to effect that greater
5 context. So as others have said, let's maintain focus on
6 aligning our state transportation dollars with our state
7 claim and equity goals. And there's great opportunity to
8 do so.

9 Director Bransen gave a great update about the
10 CTC's work. I don't know about you, but I'm hungry for
11 immediate action today after this long good discussion.
12 There is opportunity to do that in the SB 1 funding
13 guidelines. And I encourage you all to consider that as
14 an opportunity for collaborative action.

15 Thanks very much.

16 MR. HAMILTON: Good afternoon. Kevin Hamilton
17 with Central California Asthma Collaborative here to speak
18 for the San Joaquin Valley environmental justice community
19 on these particular issues, and especially the rural
20 communities that are often left behind in these
21 conversations.

22 And it was great to hear members of the
23 Commission and Air Resources Board raise those communities
24 and their concerns. I heard the Green Raiteros program
25 mentioned. It's a great pilot, because it's built inside

1 the county COGs and the FTCA in Fresno County. So it does
2 have that kind of durability and evaluative ability to be
3 able to be -- cookie cuttered around the region.

4 Also, Imperial County has come up with some
5 really beautiful strategies to get people to work and to
6 school and focus on those areas with low-emission,
7 zero-emission transport of varying types. So we need to
8 learn from those counties in the efforts they've made in
9 getting the rural communities connected to work, and to
10 education, and to medical visits. And these are the most
11 critical things for them.

12 We tend to want to take them shopping I've
13 noticed with our transportation systems, and that needs to
14 stop.

15 Last but not least, we need three commissions in
16 this meeting. What you're lacking here is the CEC. You
17 altogether wield an incredible amount of money and an
18 incredible amount of power. And without it working
19 together collaboratively, we will never achieve any of
20 these goals.

21 Thank you.

22 MS. McPEAK: Good afternoon. Sunne McPeak with
23 the California Emerging Technology Fund, also representing
24 15 regional consortia for broadband, and about 100
25 community-based organizations that address the needs of

1 the digitally disadvantaged, which are the same folks that
2 are your disadvantaged communities you focus on.

3 We're here to say if Dr. Sperling had a fifth
4 bullet on the list, it would be digital inclusion. That's
5 the interface of transportation and air quality. When I
6 was Secretary of BT&H, I used to say the best trip is a
7 virtual trip.

8 If we want to relieve congestion and we want to
9 relieve impacts on the environment, let's avoid a trip.
10 And so we appreciate the California Transportation
11 Commission actually recognizing strategic broadband
12 corridors in corridor planning in the guidelines you
13 adopted.

14 In November, the Air Resources Board listened to
15 us, scratched your heads, and said staff go think about
16 it. The CARB staff met with us yesterday. I think we're
17 making progress. We're here to work with both
18 commissions, and particularly the Strategic Growth Council
19 on how our CBOs could work with the community
20 organizations being funded there on digital inclusion.

21 May I say for the record, since I'm an old
22 has-been in an administration, everything I said is true,
23 except of all your other strategies, the one that is
24 absolutely the most important is getting housing and land
25 use right. We're never going to get to the greenhouse gas

1 emission reductions without adequate housing supply, and
2 that means adequate land supply.

3 So please take to heart all of that and get on
4 with the action. I, too, am getting too old for this
5 stuff

6 (Laughter.)

7 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

8 CTC COMMISSIONER GUARDINO: Should we all
9 Commissioner Dunn to cross-examine her old boss?

10 (Laughter.)

11 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: We were just -- we were
12 commenting on -- yeah, what about BT&H.

13 Okay. You guys.

14 Take it outside.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MR. FLORES: Okay. I'm Chris Flores. I'll be --
17 I'm with Sacramento Regional Transit. I'll be brief as
18 your last speaker. I want to thank the Commission and the
19 Board for hosting important panel discussion. We're
20 seeing great changes in mobility. And customers are
21 demanding more. And Sac RT is listening to them. Last
22 year, we launched three different various microtransit
23 zones in disadvantaged communities, and with the goal of
24 launching those with zero-emission vehicles.

25 We -- prior to that, we implemented a mobile app

1 to alert them the real-time arrival, so they can
2 communicate to us on security concerns, and safety
3 concerns, and allow them to buy fair payment not at the
4 station. So we -- and then we will soon be transitioning
5 to zero-emission vehicles prior to the State mandate.

6 Transit agencies are thinking innovatively and
7 implementing. And we want to -- but we want to have as
8 many -- we want to have a level playing field as we do so.
9 So I hope as the Commission considers different policy
10 considerations, they'll consider what our transportation
11 goals are, and including the aging population,
12 disadvantaged community, and disabled community as well.

13 Thank you.

14 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you all very
15 much. That was a terrific set of comments. And you all
16 kept pretty close to the time deadline, as a result of
17 which, we have a little bit more time if members of these
18 two august bodes want to add any additional comments or
19 questions.

20 Otherwise, we could actually close the meeting.

21 But I do want to say -- and I'm open to anybody
22 who wants to raise their hand and add some additional
23 comments. But I want to say this has been, I think, our
24 best meeting yet. I hope they continue on that
25 trajectory. Fortunately for you all, at the next meeting,

1 you'll have Commissioner Inman in the Chair. So I'm sure
2 she will crack the whip and get us working together before
3 that meeting happens.

4 Do you have any comments you'd like to make at
5 this point, Fran?

6 CTC CHAIR INMAN: I do have a reputation for
7 being a little long. So I'll have to work on that. Mary,
8 you did a much better job of keeping that timer going. I
9 hate that sound personally, but that's just Fran and my
10 lifestyle.

11 I've been taking a whole bunch of notes here.
12 And just a couple of things I have -- too, have also
13 really, really enjoyed this.

14 A couple things to highlight. One, the sharing
15 of what research we have now is something that we ought to
16 be able to do immediately. And so I think on our
17 short-term, and I actually offered that up the UC SB 1
18 ITS, whatever body that was, I was there. But I do think
19 we need to share. And I have struggled with TRB forever,
20 because we all go there, we get all excited, and then we
21 come home and everybody goes back and we don't build on
22 that, so let's share.

23 I also -- the best practices, the microtransit, a
24 lot of discussion about what's going on. Let's figure out
25 a beta -- a way to share that. I was just at a briefing

1 with OC, Orange County Transportation Authority on the OC
2 Flex, where they've had tremendous success. And I know
3 that it's not one size fits all. But let's at least find
4 a good way, so that people can have a good venue for
5 sharing what they've found and the next region can say,
6 oh, I could do something sort of like that.

7 And then I think also just want to reinforce
8 engaging our private sector partners early, because a lot
9 of them are really pushing the bar for all of us. We
10 would not have transportation network companies, in my
11 opinion, if it was left to us. They came to us.

12 And they came to us because we had a sector that
13 hadn't reinvented itself in a very long time. And the
14 customer service level was kind of missing in my opinion.

15 So I think it's -- you know, let's get those
16 folks, let's listen, and learn.

17 And then I also -- I think it was, but it might
18 have been Laura, one of you, really talked about
19 marketing. And we have chided ourselves on the
20 transportation sector. We tend to be having -- have a lot
21 of engineering focus. And we're lousy marketers. And I
22 think we all need to improve our communication talking to
23 our residents, our clients, whatever label we're going to
24 put on our communities. But I think we really do have to
25 raise the awareness, do a better job of communicating

1 effectively to get our multiple solutions.

2 And then just in closing, I think it was this
3 week, but it might have been last, I listening to NPR
4 about the robots on the college campus. So the whole time
5 today when we're having this discussion - and I appreciate
6 Dan is going to do a special goods movement day, so we
7 didn't talk about that today - but I could just see all
8 these robots running around campus, which what I'm hearing
9 now is that they're very accepted by the students. And
10 that's how you order your coffee and everything.

11 And I'm thinking, holy cow, we're trying to
12 figure this out for our communities. And we probably
13 don't know what's hit us yet when it comes to this
14 wonderful world in front of us. So, thank you, Chair
15 Nichols. And with that I'll thank everybody.

16 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you for those comments.
17 We do have an awesome responsibility and opportunity to
18 educate ourselves and try to figure out how we can
19 disseminate the information. I was about to say something
20 very similar to what you said about the fact that the
21 State is pretty good at investing in projects, and in
22 building things, not so good at figuring out to get the
23 information out to the people who need and want it.

24 And I think that's a topic which we could use
25 all, perhaps some education on. But certainly the area

1 that Mr. Guardino represents is one that has had unique
2 success in working its way into people's minds. And maybe
3 we should try to engage with them.

4 CTC CHAIR INMAN: They call it go to market and
5 land and expand. So I do know a few words of your lingo,
6 Carl.

7 (Laughter.)

8 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Oh, Yes. Sorry.
9 You're hidden behind the microphone, I guess.

10 CTC VICE CHAIR VAN KONYNENBURG: Thank you.

11 Well, I want to just thank again Dr. Sperling.
12 And I think we did a good job today looking down the road.
13 However, I think we did a really not so good job dealing
14 with some issues that are right in front of us. The SAFE
15 Vehicle Rule and the draft SCS evaluation guidelines are
16 right in front of us. And if we don't handle those
17 correctly, they could stop a lot of our agencies from
18 doing the things that we expect them to do. And I'm
19 concerned and Director Corley -- Corey, I appreciate your
20 earlier statement.

21 However, 18 MPOs have sent in a letter expressing
22 deep concerns about how the evaluation guidelines will be
23 done, and they don't feel like they've been heard. This
24 Board, the ARB Board, gave direction to staff last March.
25 And those -- that direction included that those evaluation

1 guidelines would be on strategies, actions, and
2 investments. And yet, the current guidelines are all
3 based upon modeling. And these MPOs, especially the
4 smaller ones, have very limited resources.

5 I'm concerned about our two agencies working
6 together going forward. I don't -- I don't -- I don't
7 think we're doing such a good job so far. I don't think
8 we're hearing each other. I want us to be successful. I
9 want us to improve the lives of Californians. Right now,
10 I'm not sure we're doing that. I think we're doing a good
11 job at looking out far. But right in front of us, there's
12 a lot of pent up frustration inside this room.

13 And I'm laying it out on the table. And maybe
14 this is not the right forum. But there's a lot of pent up
15 frustration that we're not hearing each other and we're
16 not listening empathetic to each other.

17 You heard a lot of comments from different MPOs
18 who are very concerned about these two issues, and they
19 don't feel like they've been heard. So my question is are
20 these -- are these SCS evaluation guidelines, are they
21 going to be adopted by staff or are they going to come
22 back to your Board?

23 And number two, are they going to be done
24 before -- you know, I'd like to have some more time for us
25 to -- we've had two joint meetings where this topic has

1 been talked about by people -- members from the audience.
2 And each time they've been desperately asking for more
3 consideration on some items. And they feel like they've
4 been shutdown. And I, for one, feel like they've shut
5 them -- you've shut them down as well.

6 I've watched -- when they start speaking,
7 everyone kind of either leaves the room or starts working
8 on something else. So, Madam chair, I really want us to
9 work together well. And I'm concerned that we need to do
10 a better job of listening to each other and listening to
11 the concerns that all of our collaborative partners have
12 around these things.

13 So hopefully, I didn't foul the good feelings of
14 the meeting, but I have to just tell you that I'm -- I've
15 got some concerns.

16 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, you've expressed your
17 concerns. And you've done it very eloquently and
18 emotionally.

19 I feel on a personal level that there have been
20 multiple meetings and multiple opportunities for staff to
21 meet and talk to each other. And if the results are such
22 that the people that you are attempting to speak for are
23 not happy, that's too bad. But I don't know whether
24 there's an answer to that or not.

25 However, given that you have taken the time of

1 the group and this meeting to raise those concerns, I
2 think that what I should do, as the Chair of the Board, is
3 to offer my personal commitment to sit, and listen, and
4 attempt to see if there's some way that we can make those
5 folks feel more like they've been heard and/or that
6 there's a reason why what they're asking for isn't
7 forthcoming. One way or another, I think this is an
8 opportunity perhaps to have another conversation. Why
9 shouldn't we do that?

10 So I will happily agree to meet with you and all
11 those other people who came in here and explained, or
12 tried to explain, what their concerns are, and we'll --
13 we'll do our best to see if we can't make some progress.

14 CTC VICE CHAIR VAN KONYNENBURG: Thank you.

15 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: You're very welcome.

16 Fran.

17 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Yeah. I just -- on the SAFE
18 Vehicle Rule, Mary, I think in the beginning when we
19 talked about that, we said we'd kind of try to figure out
20 how best to collectively mobilize folks. And I think the
21 first ask we've had of the MPOs is give us some -- give us
22 the project specifics, as best we know them. I'm
23 convinced that the early list probably won't be
24 all-inclusionary, because Vince Mammano is back there from
25 Federal Highways. And he typically tells me don't worry,

1 be happy --

2 (Laughter.)

3 CTC CHAIR INMAN: -- but he didn't say that
4 today.

5 So I think one of the things that we can
6 collectively do is figure out how to communicate early and
7 often. I would also suggest if there are other states
8 that are in this same, let's listen and see what their
9 discussions are going to be.

10 I think the last thing anybody wants is for us to
11 all be handcuffed for 18 months, or 2 years, or however
12 long it would take.

13 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: I should have said in
14 response earlier, but I will say now, I am beyond thrilled
15 that we've identified an opportunity for --

16 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Yeah. I think it's beautiful.

17 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: -- us to work together.

18 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Yeah.

19 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: And I think we do have
20 contacts in other states that are interested in these same
21 issues. And we certainly can use the help and support of
22 the groups that are most directly on the line for having
23 to deal with the issue. So, yes, let's talk about that
24 immediately.

25 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Yeah. Yeah. And I could see

1 us even with a matrix or something of the different topics
2 and impacts. And it's always good also to think of
3 solutions. You know, it's one thing to holler, but given
4 the way the federal government is today, there's too much
5 hollering going on, in my opinion. So I don't -- I don't
6 really want to get into the hollering.

7 I want to see what we can all collectively do and
8 not get ourselves in a -- what I would describe, would be
9 a real pickle. Because I can't even begin to imagine the
10 pilots -- any -- or the projects -- all the stuff we've
11 been talking about I think could really just slow us down,
12 and the economic development that we've been talking about
13 too.

14 So let's put our heads together and figure out
15 who -- how -- as many pieces of the puzzle. Because I
16 said earlier, I think a bunch of us knew parts of the
17 challenge, but didn't -- no one was really knitting the
18 whole scarf, so to speak, to show us that it could be
19 pretty devastating. So let's look at what we could do.
20 Let's see if we can identify all of the potential areas
21 and how to get into action here.

22 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: I just leaned over to whisper
23 to Mr. Corey that I wanted to be able to say that within a
24 week, we would get back to you and circulate an action
25 agenda on this -- on this issue. And let's build --

1 CTC CHAIR INMAN: And let's build it together.

2 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah. But we'll -- we'll
3 take the lead and -- just in terms of doing a draft, and
4 then we'll get it back to you and take it forward.

5 Thank you.

6 CTC CHAIR INMAN: Well, and you all know
7 everybody is watching us. Send us your ideas, too --

8 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Um-hmm.

9 CTC CHAIR INMAN: -- if there's something that we
10 haven't even thought of. Either send it to the Air
11 Resources Board or to our CTC staff, and let's -- let's go
12 into action. I think this is a fun area we could work
13 together.

14 ARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. All right. Any other
15 issues? Anything else we can do?

16 All right. If not, I think I am going to declare
17 this meeting to be adjourned.

18 Thank you, all.

19 (Thereupon the California Air Resources Board and
20 California Transportation Commission meeting
21 adjourned at 3:54 p.m.)

22

23

24

25

1 C E R T I F I C A T E O F R E P O R T E R

2 I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

4 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the
5 foregoing CARB and CTC meeting was reported in shorthand
6 by me, James F. Peters, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of
7 the State of California, and was thereafter transcribed,
8 under my direction, by computer-assisted transcription;

9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
10 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any
11 way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

12 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
13 this 12th day of April, 2019.

14
15
16
17 
18
19

20 JAMES F. PETERS, CSR
21 Certified Shorthand Reporter
22 License No. 10063
23
24
25