JOINT TELECONFERENCE MEETING STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

AND

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

ZOOM VIRTUAL MEETING

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2020 9:05 A.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. Hector De La Torre

Mr. John Eisenhut

Senator Dean Florez

Supervisor John Gioia

Ms. Judy Mitchell

Mrs. Barbara Riordan

Supervisor Phil Serna

Dr. Alex Sherriffs

Professor Daniel Sperling

CTC COMMISSIONERS:

Mr. Hilary Norton, Chair

Ms. Yvonne Burke

Mr. Rocco Davis

Ms. Lee Ann Eager

Mr. Carl Guardino

Ms. Fran Inman

Ms. Christine Kehoe

Dr. Joseph Lyou

Ms. Michelle Martinez

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION AGENCY:

- Mr. David Kim, Agency Secretary
- Mr. Darwin Moosavi, Deputy Secretary

CARB STAFF:

- Mr. Richard Corey, Executive Officer
- Ms. Edie Chang, Deputy Executive Officer
- Mr. Steve Cliff, Deputy Executive Officer
- Mr. Kurt Karperos, Deputy Executive Officer
- Ms. Ellen Peter, Chief Counsel
- Ms. Analisa Bevan, Assistant Division Chief, Sustainable Transportation and Communities Division(STCD)
- Mr. Mario Cruz, Branch Chief, Climate Investments Branch, STCD
- Ms. Monique Davis, Staff Air Pollution Specialist, Climate Investments Branch, STCD
- Ms. Jennifer Gress, Division Chief, STCD
- Ms. Suzanne Hague, Staff Air Pollution Specialist, Climate Investments Branch, STCD
- Ms. Carey Knecht, Manager, Climate Investments Branch, STCD
- Mr. Pedro Peterson, Air Pollution Specialist, Climate Investments Branch, STCD
- Mr. Jamie Tipton, Air Resources Engineer, Climate Investments Branch, STCD

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

CTC STAFF:

- Mr. Mitch Weiss, Executive Director
- Ms. Tanisha Taylor, Chief Deputy Director
- Mrs. Laura Pennebaker, Acting Deputy Director
- Ms. Brigitte Driller, Assistant Deputy Director
- Ms. Julia Kingsley, Assistant Deputy Director
- Ms. Brandy Fleming, Analyst, Administration and Financial Management
- Mr. Doug Remedios, Clerk of the Commission

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT STAFF:

- Mr. Gustavo Velasquez, Director
- Ms. Megan Kirkeby, Deputy Director
- Mr. Paul McDougall
- Ms. Claudia Mildner
- Mr. DC Navarrette
- Mr. Kevan Rolfness
- Mr. Josh Rosa
- Mr. Weston Starbird
- Ms. Daniella Stepek

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

SPECIAL GUESTS:

- Dr. Karen Chapple, University of California, Berkeley
- Ms. Coleen Clementson, San Diego Association of Governments
- Ms. Hana Creger, Greenlining Institute
- Mr. Hasan Ikhrata, San Diego Association of Governments
- Mr. Ray Major, San Diego Association of Governments
- Ms. Nailah Pope-Harden, ClimatePlan
- Ms. Lynn Von Koch-Liebert, Deputy Secretary, Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency

ALSO PRESENT:

- Mr. Will Barrett, American Lung Association
- Ms. Patricia Chen, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- Mr. James Corless, Sacramento Area Council of Governments
- Ms. Beverly DesChaux, Electric Auto Association
- Ms. Chanell Fletcher, ClimatePlan
- Mr. Rick Longinotti, Campaign for Sustainable Transportation
- Ms. Julia Randolph, Coalition for Clean Air
- Ms. Therese Trivedi, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- Ms. Helen Walter-Terrinoni, Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute
- Mr. Brian Wilcox, Marine BioEnergy
- Mr. Mike Woodman, Nevada County Transportation Commission, North State Super Region

INDEX PAGE Call to Order 1 Roll Call 2 5 Opening Remarks CARB Chair Nichols 8 CTC Chair Norton 14 HCD Director Velasquez 17 25 CalSTA Secretary Kim CARB Executive Officer Corey 30 CTC Executive Director Weiss 3.5 HCD Deputy Director Kirkeby 39 Item 1 - Recommendations for How State Agencies Can Better Align Their Programs and Policies to Achieve Transportation, Housing, Air Quality and Climate Tools CARB Chair Nichols 51 PRESENTATION 1 Mr. Ikhrata 53 Mr. Major 56 65 Ms. Clementson 76 Discussion and Q&A PRESENTATION 2 Ms. Pope-Harden 90 Ms. Creger 97 Discussion and Q&A 107 PRESENTATION 3 120 Dr. Chapple Discussion and Q&A 132 Mr. Wilcox 136 Mr. Corless 138 Ms. Trivedi 140

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D PAGE 142 Ms. Fletcher Ms. Randolph 145 Ms. Walter-Terrinoni 146 148 Mr. Woodman Afternoon Session 152 Item 2 - Climate Action Plan on Transportation Infrastructure CARB Board Member De La Torre 152 154 Mr. Moosavi Mr. Barrett 174 Ms. Chen 178 Ms. Randolph 180 Ms. Fletcher 182 Ms. DesChaux 184 Mr. Longinotti 186 Discussion and Q&A 189 Item 3 - Near-Term State Actions that Integrate Housing, Transportation, Air Quality, and Climate Program/Policies Mr. Moosavi 213 Ms. Von Koch-Liebert 216 Next Steps 217 223 Closing Remarks 227 Adjournment Reporter's Certificate 228

PROCEEDINGS

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning and welcome to this joint meeting of the California Air Resources Board, the California Transportation Commission, and the Department of Housing and Community Development. This is a -- it's great gathering here this morning.

I have one winner to congratulate this morning and that's the new CTC Chair, Hilary Norton, as well as to welcome a new CTC Commissioner, Michelle Martinez. We're looking forward to working both of -- with both of you and as agencies continue to expand and deepen their collaborations.

We have had several meetings now where we've learned a lot about each other's agencies, the different ways in which we are set up and how we work at our missions. Today, we're going to focus on how we can do more to align our work in order to advance the state's climate, air quality, transportation, and housing goals and to find new opportunities for action.

We're going to begin with a roll call of the Board members for the CARB Board. And then I'm going to turn the imaginary gavel over to the Chair of the CTC for their roll call. And then that will be followed by the Director of the Department of Housing and Community Development who introduce their team.

2

```
So CARB Board Clerk, I believe that's Ryan
1
    Sakazaki. It is. Please call the roll for CARB.
2
             ARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you. Thank you,
 3
   Madam Chair.
 4
             Dr. Balmes?
5
             CARB BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Here.
 6
             CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Mr. De La Torre?
7
8
             CARB BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Here.
9
             CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Mr. Eisenhut?
             Supervisor Fletcher?
10
             CARB BOARD MEMBER FLETCHER: Fletcher, here.
11
             CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Senator Florez.
12
             CARB BOARD MEMBER FLOREZ: Here.
13
             CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Assembly Member
14
    Garcia?
15
16
             Supervisor Gioia?
             CARB BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: Here.
17
             CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Ms. Mitchell?
18
             CARB BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Here.
19
             CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Senator Monning?
20
             Mrs. Riordan?
21
             CARB BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Here.
2.2
23
             CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Supervisor Serna?
             CARB BOARD MEMBER SERNA: Here.
24
             CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Dr. Sherriffs?
25
```

3

```
CARB BOARD MEMBER SHERRIFFS: Dr. Sherriffs,
1
    here.
2
             CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Professor Sperling?
 3
             Ms. Takvorian?
             CARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'm here
 5
             CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Vice Chair Berg?
 6
             CARB VICE CHAIR BERG: Here.
7
8
             CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Chair Nichols?
             CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Here.
9
             CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Madam Chair, we have
10
11
    a quorum.
             CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Now, I'll call upon
12
   CTC Chair Norton to have your clerk please call the roll
1.3
   for the Commission
14
             CTC CHAIR NORTON: Thank you so much, Chairwoman
15
16
   Nichols. And Douglas, would you please call the roll for
    the California Transportation Commissioners.
17
             CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
18
             Commission Alvarado?
19
20
             Commissioner Burke?
             Commissioner Davis?
21
             CTC COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Here
22
23
             CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Commissioner Eager?
             CTC COMMISSIONER EAGER:
24
                                      Here.
             CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Commissioner Guardino?
25
```

4

```
CTC COMMISSIONER GUARDINO: Masked up and
1
2
    present.
             CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Commissioner Inman?
 3
             CTC COMMISSIONER INMAN:
                                      Present.
             CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Commissioner Kehoe?
 5
             CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE:
                                      Here.
 6
7
             CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Commissioner Lyou?
8
             CTC COMMISSIONER LYOU: Here.
             CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Commissioner Martinez?
9
             CTC COMMISSIONER MARTINEZ: Present.
10
             CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Commissioner Tavaglione?
11
             Chair Norton?
12
             CTC CHAIR NORTON: Present.
13
             CTC CLERK REMEDIOS: Madam Chair, we have a
14
15
    quorum.
16
             CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Then I'll turn to
    Director Velasquez. I see that we've also been joined now
17
   by Professor Sperling. So we had a quorum, but we'd like
18
   to have our automotive engineering expert present.
19
20
             Okay. Director Velasquez, please.
             HCD DIRECTOR VELASQUEZ: Thank you, Madam Chair.
21
    It's great to be with you again. This is my second
2.2
23
   meeting of this joint committee. We have with us our
    Deputy Director for the Division of Policy Development,
24
    Megan Kirkeby and her team, Josh Rosa, David Navarrette,
25
```

Paul McDougall and Daniella Stepek. So great to be here.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. It's good to see you. And now just a couple of initial announcements before we get underway. Since this is a virtual meeting, even though I think most of us have become quite used to Zoom, I want to ask the clerk to describe the process for how this meeting will be conducted today.

Mr. Sakazaki.

2.2

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you, Chair Nichols. Good morning, everyone. My name is Ryan Sakazaki and I'm one of the Board Clerks at the California Air Resources Board. I will provide some information on how public participation will be organized for today's meeting.

If you wish to make a verbal comment on one of the items or if you wish to make a comment at the end -I'm sorry. If you want to make a comment at the end of each item, you must be using the Zoom webinar or be calling in by telephone. If you are currently watching the webcast on CAL-SPAN, but wish to comment, please register for the Zoom webinar or call in. Information for both can be found on the public agenda.

To make a verbal comment, we will be using the raise hand feature on Zoom. If you wish to speak on an item, please virtually raise your hand as soon as the item

has begun to let us know you wish to speak. To do this, if you're using a computer or tablet, there is a raise hand button. If you are calling in on the telephone, dial star nine to raise your hand.

2.2

Even if you have previously registered and indicated you wish to speak, please raise your hand at the beginning of the item, if you wish to speak on it. If you don't raise your hand, your chance to speak will be skipped.

When the comment period starts, the order of commenters will be determined by who raises their hand first. I will call each commenter by name and then activate each commenter when it is their turn to speak. For those calling in, I will identify you by the last three digits of your phone number. We will not show a list of commenters. However, I will be announcing the three or so next commenters in the queue, so be ready to testify and know who is next. Please note, you will not appear by video during your testimony.

I would like to remind everyone, commenters,
Board members and Commissioners to please state your name
for the record before you speak. This is important in
this new remote meeting setting.

We will have a time limit for each commenter. The normal time limit is three minutes. However, this

could change based on the Chair's discretion. During public testimony, you will see a little timer on the screen. For those calling in by phone, we will run the timer and let you know when you have 30 seconds left and when your time is up.

2.2

If you wish to submit a written comment today, please visit CARB's send-us-your-comment page or look at the public agenda on our webpage for links to send those documents electronically. Comments will be accepted on each -- comments will be accepted for today until the meeting adjourns.

I would like to give a friendly reminder to everyone to please mute yourself when you're not speaking to avoid background noise. Also when you do speak, please speak from a quiet location.

If you experience any technical difficulties, please call (805)772-2715 so an IT person can assist. Once again, that's (805)772-2715.

Thank you. I'd like to turn the microphone back to Chair Nichols now.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Could I just clarify a couple of things. Did you mean to say that members of the Board and Commission also need to state their name before they say anything in order to have that be recorded?

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Yes, that would be ideal, if you could, please.

1.3

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Then I hope we can remind all of our -- all of our fellow panelists, I guess we're called. And then the other question just I want to be sure here, that it's my job to recognize members of, what we would call, the dais, if we were all together. If -- when they raise their hand, either on screen or through the Zoom feature.

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Yes, so for Board members and Commissioners, we'll ask that everyone virtually raise your hand using the raise hand button on the Zoom screen that will pop up for you Chair Nichols, during Board discussion.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: And then you'll call the queue.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Great. I just want to make sure that we have maximum participation here today. So hopefully everybody now -- now knows what they need to do when they want to speak.

So let me start this proceeding this morning to getting to the substance of why we're all gathered here today. I'd love to share my reflections on what's going on in our country and with the elections, but I'm not

going to do that, partly because I was up until way too late last night, but also because we are still in the midst of counting. So I think we can put that aside for the moment.

1.3

2.2

But those of you who may be simultaneously trying to look at your phone or some other device to follow up what's going on, if you let out a cheer at some point, that's okay. You just have to share it with the rest of us and let us know what -- what good news there is to report this morning.

But what I want to do is to begin by acknowledging that we are painfully reminded of the fact that climate change is happening right now. And while the fires may have given us a little bit of a break here. This has been a terrible season, another record-breaking season. And we've once again lost millions of acres of and a tremendous amount of valuable property, as well as -- as well as lives. And it's been devastating.

So there is urgency to moving forward. Moving forward as we are now and even doubling down, particularly to reduce emissions and to make our communities more resilient and capable of withstanding the change that's already under way.

In recognition of the urgency of this crisis,
Governor Newsom issued an Executive Order in September

order N-79-20, which requires sales of all new passenger vehicles, light trucks, off-road vehicles and drayage trucks to be zero emission by 2035. New trucks and buses will need to be zero emission by 2045.

1.3

2.2

The order also includes a number of other aggressive actions to move us away from fossil fuels and provide the infrastructure to support zero-emission vehicles.

This is groundbreaking. And achieving the Executive Order's milestones will require terrific coordination and serious action by all of our agencies and many others. It will transform transportation in California. And help us to achieve dramatic emissions reductions and public health benefits associated with those reductions. Cleaner vehicles are a fundamental part of the solution.

But I say part, because we need to go further in transitioning to the -- this new future. The zero-emission vehicles are big, but not enough, to meet our long term climate goals. We also need to pursue other big changes within our transportation system, including policies that can reduce the amount of vehicle miles that are traveled.

Even with all new cars sold being zero emissions in 2035, that means that 30 percent of the passenger

vehicles on the road will still be gas powered in 2045, by which time, we are slated and need to achieve net neutrality in carbon emissions in order to prevent the worst impacts of climate change. Furthermore, ZEVs will not be carbon neutral until their entire lifecycle is zero emission, meaning everything from their creation to their end-of-life or recycling.

1.3

2.2

Furthermore ZEVs will not be -- sorry, the vehicle and the battery manufacturing come with embedded emissions and fueling ZEVs requires electricity, so reducing emissions across the lifecycle, again that's the point is -- is the way we have to go to promote our goals and not just focus only on the vehicles.

This is also important if we're going to achieve the related benefits that we hope to achieve from improved public health, from criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants that are currently most strongly associated with gasoline and diesel vehicles.

So along with reducing emissions, reducing driving has substantial health benefits, including reduced respiratory and cardiovascular disease, traffic-related injuries and fatalities, the stresses and poor mental health outcomes from our auto-dependent lifestyle and other related consequences.

Furthermore, auto ownership is expensive and we

know that reducing transportation expenses by driving less also helps people to meet other critical household needs, accumulate wealth, buy homes where they want to live, and increase their discretionary income.

1.3

2.2

So less driving will reduce congestion, save money by not having to build expensive new infrastructure, and reduce overall costs to maintain the road system.

California's roads have seen some of the worst congestion in the nation. And we could still see ten million more vehicles on the road in California by 2050. Maintenance costs have ballooned to over \$500 million a year in California. So utilizing travel options, other than single-occupancy vehicles, will help to address all of these issues.

Electrifying transportation, reducing VMT and addressing mobility and housing needs we'll need every tool in the toolbox. And we State agencies need to do more to align our policies to reduce emissions and do it in a way that achieves other benefits and is equitable as well. So we need to think big is the bottom line here, when it comes to addressing climate change.

These meetings, like the one we're having today, are an opportunity for us to look at where we have joint actions that we could take that would help us all to move forward. We need more housing that's affordable, and

close to jobs, and key destination. We need a broader range of transportation options. And we need to do this in a way that also assists in fighting climate change and helping us to improve air quality. So we -- we have to solve for multiple needs at once.

2.2

I'm excited about today's agenda, because we'll not just be hearing about the problems, we're also going to be talking about specific things that we can do to strengthen our work together and take action to solve these problems.

Our first session this morning will give us an opportunity to hear recommendations on how our agencies can better align our policies and programs. This discussion will also help us to inform the discussions during our afternoon session, when we will hear from the California State Transportation Agency on their efforts to develop an action plan to ensure that the State's discretionary transportation funding programs are designed to achieve these multiple objectives.

We will also hear from staff at the Business

Consumer Services and Housing Agency about some current

collaborations that are going on between State agencies

and their work to identify future joint actions.

And we're going to be also then hearing from the public. And we encourage you throughout the day when the

opportunities are available to weigh in on these issues as well.

1.3

2.2

So hopefully we'll come out of this meeting today with a clearer direction for our staff and some clearer understanding among ourselves as to what our next steps are going to be on implementing the changes that we need to make. And I'm looking forward to the rest of this discussion.

And now, I would like to ask Chair Norton to share some opening remarks with us as well.

CTC CHAIR NORTON: Thank you very much,
Chairwoman Nichols for your thoughtful and inspiring
opening remarks. It is good to be here and I wish a good
morning to my fellow Commissioners, Board members and HCD
leadership.

I'd like to welcome our new Commissioners -- the California Transportation Commissioner Davis, Eager and Martinez. And I want to thank Chairwoman Nichols for welcoming them as well.

2020 has not been an easy year. And I'd like to start out by acknowledging the Californians who have been impacted by COVID-19, the resulting economic crisis, devastating wildfires, power outages, and the continued effects of systematic racism and economic information and mobility disparities.

I want to thank you for all coming together today to start thinking about what our recovery from all of those challenges looks like.

2.2

In addition, I want to thank all of the people who joined us for this important meeting. And I am grateful that we have the forum to discuss pressing questions such as:

How do we reduce driving and incentivize the production of housing that is served by quality transportation and resilient to the impacts of climate change?

How do we ensure a clean and resilient electrical grid that will support the transition to zero-emission vehicles at scale, as Chairwoman Nichols discussed. How can we deliver justice to communities burdened by environmental pollution by delivering clean transportation without contributing to increased living costs or displacement, while also promoting safety.

And, of course, how do we achieve this while also achieving our economic recovery?

As we consider the thoughtful plans, Executive Orders, and State plans before us, we are focused on the three Es of sustainability, equity, economy, and environment, and are examining the ways that we enhance these three Es in CTC's guidelines and programs, including

our enhancing our over two billion in active transportation funds that we've allocated thus far.

1.3

2.2

We also look forward to working with CalSTA and Caltrans on the CTC's upcoming equity listening sessions to identify the disparities and avenues for solutions.

CTC's Executive Director, Mitch Weiss will outline more about this in his infrastructure presentation.

And as we anxiously await the final election results of who our next President will be, we look forward to working with CARB, HCD, CalSTA, Caltrans, the Legislature and Governor Newsom to insert that we have an even stronger federal partnership to restore our transit operations and invest in our EV networks on a scale necessary to meet California's goals.

I'm looking forward to the presentations we will hear today as our --our CTC Commissioners who've been working on all of these issues, in both the Commission roles and their day roles. And I want to thank the California Air Resources Board for hosting today's virtual joint meeting.

But I do not want to end my remarks without taking a moment to recognize my friend Chairwoman Mary Nichols, for her leadership at CARB. Your regulatory and policy contributions in the areas of air quality and

greenhouse gases have tangibly and forever improved the health and well-being of Californians. And these benefits will continue to extend into the future.

2.2

Moreover, other states and countries have looked to California's Cap-and-Trade Program and vehicle efficiency standards as a model for achieving environmental sustainability goals. You will be greatly missed at your -- at these joint meetings, but your impact will never be forgotten. And I look forward to our work together today and beyond.

Thank you very much. That concludes my remarks.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you so much. That was lovely.

Let's hear now from the Housing and Community Development Director, Mr. Velasquez.

HCD DIRECTOR VELASQUEZ: Thank you, Madam
Chair -- Madam Chair Nichols and Madam Chair Norton. I'm
pleased to be here again second -- only second time in
this joint committee California Transportation Commission
and CARB have been highly collaborative and productive
partners with our department in recent years. And we see
a growing urgency really to continue collaborating.

For once, this year has seen the impacts of climate change sparking the most destructive wildfire season in California history.

Greenhouse gases, Madam Chair Nichols, you pointed out from personal vehicles are growing as Californians are driving more. You know, I -- this is my first time living in California. I come most of my adult life has been living in New York, Philadelphia, and D.C. So it's not a fair comparison the neighborhoods there with neighborhoods in cities here in California.

1.3

2.2

But I can attest to the fact, for sure now living here, that the neighborhood in California was built having in mind very much the car, the car. That is — that is just a fact in California, you know, continues to see more and more people driving. Also, California continues to face a significant shortage of affordable housing as we know. To me one of the biggest problems we continue to have before us, is that Californians lack affordable housing options in the right places, in the places where they need to be every day.

This problem results in Californians driving longer commutes to work, residing in high fire risk areas. Let's just say it like that, residing in higher fire risk areas, and in older, vulnerable communities, and converting -- this from also impacts converting natural and working lands to suburban sprawl.

So I think our State's approach to this challenge must focus on affirmative actions to promote infill, as

much as the preventive actions to avoid sprawl. And taking this two-pronged approach will require, obviously a multi-agency government-wide effort, because we each hold a different piece of the puzzle, right? That's -- that's really what it comes down, you know, CARB, CTC, HCD, many others, you know. It just -- they just have different pieces of the puzzle, and we can do this. We can do this working together.

2.2

For instance, today, we'll hear from HCD present of our -- on our upcoming Prohousing Designation Program. For the past year, the Department has worked to create a framework for incentivizing local governments to take actions that will promote location efficient -- very important, location efficient affordable housing production. We gathered input from a wide range of stakeholders, cities, counties, advocates, universities, and from a range of State agencies, including CARB and CTC.

All of this collaboration helped create a first-of-a-kind framework for measuring and acknowledging the local policies that we know will work. But establishing those goal posts for cities and counties is only effective if we give them incentives to pursue it. So the prohousing program will set real stretch goals for our local partners, which is what California's housing and

climate crisis requires.

2.2

So they will need State's strong support to reach those goals and significant incentives attached to the Prohousing Designation. And you'll -- you'll see the presentation. It's -- it's really innovative. The prohousing statute tees up the opportunity for any competitive funding program to incentivize prohousing.

But again, prohousing based on the right location. So I hope my colleagues on the Transportation Commission and the Air Resources Board will consider these possibilities, as we learn more about prohousing in today's meeting and in future decisions.

Quickly, a couple other things I want to mention, before I turn it over to you. I also want to highlight HCD's longer standing programs which, target housing development in infill areas near jobs and transportation, moving growth away from natural and working lands and away from high-risk areas.

Allocation process, some of you are familiar with the RHNA process, and directly administers it for rural counties. This includes administering new statutory objectives for the sixth cycle of RHNA, which is getting underway, to promote several things.

It promotes infill development, protection of

environmental and agricultural resources, growth near transit, and reductions in greenhouse gases, all of it combined.

2.2

Local jurisdictions are beginning to challenge the RHNA plans as we speak, citing inconsistencies between the State's climate goals and the State's housing goals. We need to be careful of that narrative. I see that we today on the agenda presentations from our friends at -- of the San Diego regions, SANDAG. We are beginning to see some challenges there. We are beginning to see challenges in the SCAG, in the Southern California region.

We in State government should not fall in this trap of this conflict between climate and State housing goals. NIMBY communities are great at putting people against each other, especially claiming more housing opportunities also destroys our climate goals.

The answer is if we do it, we have to do it strategically. We have to find ways to do it strategically, building in strategic locations. You know, we have to kind of dissipate this conflict that some people continue to exacerbate.

Every one of those RHNA objectives should be reflected in the region's Sustainable Communities

Strategies. So the requirements and incentives we're giving local communities are aligned and implemented.

And pursuant to AB 101 of 2019 HCD is preparing a comprehensive and inclusive effort aimed at long term -- long-term RHNA reform next year. And we invite and encourage the input of CARB, CTC and other agencies.

2.2

And finally, I believe we have a abundant common ground to work together, because our goals are so complementary. Reducing vehicle miles traveled, not only addresses climate change, it also helps to promote household affordability and equity. We've talked -- at least at the previous meeting that I joined we spent a fair amount of time talking about equity. And Chairwoman Norton mentioned equity again.

How many times we say we care about equitable outcomes. We have an opportunity here to walk the talk. Several years ago our Department published a statewide housing needs assessment where we found it's not just the price of rent, it's also the commute that disproportionately burdens low income communities.

Over half of California households are housing-cost burdened, which means they -- the households pay more than 30 percent of their income on the rent or mortgage.

But at the same time, the average household in most counties is also paying more than 20 percent of their income in transportation. This exceeds the recommended

share of household spending on transportation, because it diminishes the ability of households to pay for food, utilities, health care and other vital expenses. And this is not going away, especially in the midst of disproportionately affects of communities of colors, from COVID, and a declining economy. This double burdens, especially prevalent among low income household that are least capable of teleworking, both housing costs and transportation costs. The effects of COVID-19 again exacerbate these inequities.

2.2

As many of California's professional workers transition to mass telework, I mean, we're all enjoying that, but we risk leaving behind forgotten burdens on those workers who cannot telework. Health workers, farm workers, those who work in retail, food service, hospitality and other service industries with typically lower incomes will continue to have to physically travel to their worksites. And according to -- there's a study, fewer than 30 percent of workers can work from home. And higher paid workers are six times as likely to be able to telework as lower paid workers.

So the ability to work from home also differs by race. Blacks and Hispanic workers are less likely to be able to telework. Only about one in six Hispanic workers can work from home. And for Black workers, it's less than

one in six. So these workers will continue to need affordable housing options in closer proximity to jobs more now than ever as transit agencies have been forced to reduce services. So the challenge of integrating affordable housing production with transportation in climate planning becomes more important than ever in given the effects of COVID-19.

So again, when we lose our focus on that integration, I think we have a real problem like in the first priority at risk of neglect is equity. So I believe these discussions, the intersections, transportation, climate and health, are so critically important.

And that's why I'm very excited to be at this meeting and look forward to all the presentations and conversations ahead.

So thank you very much. And I'll be here to, you know, answer questions from -- or ask questions more so from presentations that we'll see.

Thank you very much.

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks so much. Those were really inspiring remarks. Your reference to NIMBY groups that have been working to -- to create a wedge between climate goals and housing goals are matched by other groups who are also trying to create a wedge from a different direction, claiming that our climate goals are

preventing building of housing in the more remote areas, because we're forcing people not to be able to build in sprawl developments as they think they have to do in order to create housing.

2.2

So we have a lot of work to do, I think, both to dispel myths, but also not just to say this is not what we're about, but to be able to show what it is that we are about. And I'm really appreciative of your recognition and your dedication to making that happen.

So we now are going to hear one more set of opening remarks and that is from our colleague, the Secretary for the California State Transportation Agency and a good partner in our climate activities, David Kim.

SECRETARY KIM: Well, thank you very much, Chair Nichols and Chair Norton. And a very good morning to all Commissioners, Board members, and Director Velasquez and the entire HCD team. It's great to be with you today. And it's safe to say many of us are running on fumes this morning after a very long night keeping tabs on election -- election results. And I agree with Chair Nichols, if anyone hears any updates and if you let out a cheer, share it with us, for those of us who might not be paying as close attention as you might be. So it's going to be quite an interesting day as results continue to unfold.

For today's meeting, you're going to hear presentations from my staff on two topics. First is the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure, also known as CAPTI. This is the plan being developed right now to implement the Governor's Executive Order on climate change. I should say the first Executive Order that was released in the fall of 2019.

2.2

And second, you'll hear an update on the Housing and Transportation Working Group, which we co-lead in conjunction with the Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency.

And I just wanted to give you some context on the CAPTI effort, which will set the stage for our discussion this afternoon. First, I want to acknowledge the many State agencies that have been working with us to develop CAPTI. It is truly a collaborative effort within the administration led by CalSTA, but in coordination with Caltrans, CTC, OPR, GO-Biz, Strategic Growth Council, Housing and Community Development and CARB. And we've also gotten input from other departments as well. So a big shout-out to our State agency partners for their leadership and contributions to this effort.

I want to echo what Chair Nichols said in her opening comments that we are in the middle of a climate crisis, a climate emergency as Governor Newsom has said on

many occasions. And so the Governor's recent Executive Order N-79-20 is a huge step forward. And it's also worth underscoring the point Chair Nichols made that zero-emission vehicles, as important as they are, will not by themselves get us where we need to go from a GHG emissions standpoint. It's got to be combined with efforts to encourage greater mode shift and reduce our dependence on driving, and also reduce vehicle miles traveled as the Director mentioned.

2.2

So that means advancing transit and inner city passenger rail, walking and biking, micro-mobility options like scooters and e-bikes, and pricing strategies.

They've all got to be part of that toolkit.

So this brings us to the current effort and why EO-79 -- N-79-20 puts a spotlight on the critically important message of the first Executive Order N-19-19. And just to refresh your memory, N-19-19 directs our agency, CalSTA, to leverage discretionary State transportation funds to reduce GHG emissions in the transportation sector. And the main point is that without reducing driving in California we are simply not going to meet our climate goals.

It also means that we need to move away from the long-standing practice of giving a competitive advantage to the automobile when it comes to selecting and funding

transportation projects. The mission is to find ways to prioritize projects that create more travel choices over projects that encourage and accommodate more driving. And I think it needs to be acknowledged that the traditional practice of prioritizing the movement of vehicles over the movement of people has had the effect of widen -- widening inequities throughout the state.

2.2

As has been mentioned, vehicle ownership has become an expensive burden and necessity for many lower income Californians. And as we address how Californians travel, we also need to take a hard look at our freight system, how to move goods in a sustainable way that strengthens the economy and reduces the environmental burden on disadvantaged communities.

And so through these Executive Orders, we're going to lay the foundation for a zero-emission freight system that will serve our State and nation, while at the same time making sure that disadvantaged communities of color, which have long suffered disproportionately from severe air quality and poor health impacts can experience far better outcomes.

When you look back over the past eight months, it's pretty clear that people have dramatically altered their travel behavior in the midst of a pandemic. We've also been reckoning with systemic and institutional racism

for far took long. And as we look to economic recovery, can we do it in a way that will reduce the deep inequities that exist. I also want to emphasize that these ambitious goals will be considered pragmatically and that we can do so within our existing framework and transportation vision.

1.3

2.2

So, for example, our commitment to SB 1 and the fix it first approach within SB 1, will continue and I want to assure you of that. It's also worth mentioning that the principle of fix it first means that we need to take a thoughtful approach when it comes to expanding the existing system. It's important to ask the question, if we invest in projects that ultimately increase long-term maintenance costs without advancing climate and equity goals, is that a trade-off worth making? Something to ponder.

What will it take for all of us to think in a creative, pragmatic, and holistic manner when it comes to investing in projects that provide multi-modal travel options that are equitable, clean, and safe. That's the challenge in front of us. And I'm really excited that the CTC, CARB and HCD are coming together to engage with one another on these critically important issues.

So with that, thank you so much for the chime -- time, Chair Nichols and Chair Norton. And I look forward

to what I believe will be a very productive meeting. Thanks again.

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, thank you. Those are terrific remarks and again help to sort of position us as to what we're -- what we need to be doing right now. So before we move to the panels of invited speakers, I think we are scheduled to have a little bit of an update about what has happened within our agencies, at least some highlights, since the last meeting -- last joint meeting of this group in July.

And so I'm going to start with calling on CARB's Executive Officer Richard Corey to give us a brief update.

Richard.

CARB EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Thanks, Chair.

And actually just reflecting on really inspiring opening remarks, really exciting. I was taking careful notes.

Really looking forward to the discussion over the course of the day.

A few things, and it was touched on by several of your opening remarks really in the progress, in the partnership, and the really relationships that are being strengthened and built that really get at the convergence, the cross-cutting nature of housing, transportation, air quality and climate, as several of you noted, and it's exciting. We have an opportunity here that you all

clearly underscored.

2.2

A lot has happened -- a lot has happened since our last joint meeting in July.

First, on September 23rd, as the Chair noted,
Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-79-20, which is a
bold initiative -- bold initiative for -- to transform and
clean up transportation in California. That Executive
Order has an ambitious timeline. And it will require
actions by multiple State agencies in partnership with
industry and many stakeholders from an implementation
standpoint. New cars, truck, buses, and off-road
equipment will need to shift to zero-emission
technologies. By 2035, all new passenger vehicles, and
some specific truck fleets, will need to be zero emission.
By 2045, all new heavy-duty and medium heavy-duty trucks
and buses will need to be zero emission where feasible.

And at our July meeting, we shared an update on our new Advanced Clean Truck Regulation, which laid the foundation for the Executive Order. With respect to passenger transportation, CARB staff are now engaged in the work of setting the next standards for cars and light-duty trucks. Consistent with the Executive Order, the Advanced Clean Cars regulatory package will need to accelerate the adoption of zero-emission vehicles towards the goal of 100 percent ZEV sales by 2035. We're also

looking at incorporating consumer-facing provisions such as electric vehicle plug standardization and battery and vehicle warranties extended.

2.2

They're aimed at maturing -- at really maturing the zero-emission vehicle market and ensuring that these vehicles meet consumer needs. We're also continuing to work closely with other agencies to develop policies from market and infrastructure development to support these cleaner vehicles and provide broad accessibility for all Californians, including those in our most underserved communities. We have a lot of work ahead of us.

My second update relates to a couple of new CARB regulations to reduce air pollution from the freight sector. In August, our Board adopted the Heavy-Duty Low NOx Omnibus Regulation, which requires cleaner engines, longer warranties, and better test procedures for heavy-duty diesel trucks. This regulation is important to protect public health, because the thousands of internal combustion trucks will be operating on the roads in California for many years to come, even as we move forward with zero-emission technologies.

In August, our Board also adopted a stronger regulation to reduce pollution from ocean-going vessels when they're at berth in California ports. It will expand existing requirements for ships to plug in to the

electrical grid or use capture and control system technologies to cut emissions from their diesel engines.

2.2

Both of these regulations are critical for reducing diesel pollution and improving air quality and public health in heavily impacted communities near ports, railyards and warehouses. We're also supporting these impacted communities by providing substantial funding for cleaner passenger transportation. For example, we'll soon be announcing awards for about \$20 million for a Sustainable Transportation Equity Project, now known as STEP. And later this year, we'll be announcing another 20 million in awards for community transportation needs assessments and mobility projects under our Clean Mobility Options Voucher Program.

Both STEP and Clean Mobility Program provide funding for transportation projects in underserved communities. These projects include a variety of zero-emission transportation options, things like vanpools, bike sharing, transit, and ride on demand services. These programs are designed to provide projects that are directly responsive to community needs, as identified by community members, and the projects reflect our increased focus on equity for impacted communities.

We're also increasing our focus on equity internally at ARB. We've all seen the events the past

year that have laid bare the racial inequities in our country and their devastating impacts, several of you noted. It's made us look at our own organization. And we've realized that we have a lot of work to do internally to create a more diverse and inclusive work environment.

2.2

We recently launched the Diversity And Racial Equity, or DARE, task force to take a hard look at CARB's internal practices and tell us how we can create a more inclusive environment at CARB for all our employees of color. We're looking at our hiring practices and our promotional opportunities. We also just finished a round of excellent implicit bias training. And last month, our Board adopted a resolution on CARB's commitment to racial equity and social justice.

They also appointed Board Member Serna as a liaison to the DARE Task Force to ensure that the intentions of the resolution become concrete and measurable actions. These actions are only the beginning though. Our executive team is fully committed and staff have been extremely supportive of these early steps. And I'm confident that we're moving in the right direction and we'll be making important changes to further improve the agency. So I'm pleased to see that we have a number of equity advocates with us here today that will be speaking and looking forward to hearing their remarks as well.

And with that, Chair, I'll return it to you.

1.3

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. A lot has been going on obviously over the summer and fall months, despite the fact that we have been working almost 90 percent of our people have been working remotely. So it's -- it's been an amazingly productive period. And, of course, we've been spurred on by the terrific Executive Orders coming from the Governor.

So now I'll turn to the CTC and ask Chair Norton to introduce the updates from your agency.

CTC CHAIR NORTON: Thank you very much. I am very pleased to introduce Executive Director Mitch Weiss, who will provide those updates on behalf of the CTC.

CTC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR WEISS: Good morning. I'd like to take a few minutes to update on Commission activities, touch on transportation revenue trends and to highlight a key way that our three agencies have been coordinating outside these meetings.

First, staff is finalizing our review of our competitive funding programs that are funded by the Road Repair and Accountability Act. We received an unprecedented amount of requests. In the Congested Corridor Program, we received twice the amount of requests than we can fund, in the local partnership program three times, and most notably in the Active Transportation

Program, where we received over 450 applications requesting \$2.6 billion, more than five and a half times the available funding.

1.3

2.2

You know, for the Active Transportation Program, we really need to find ways to increase the program's funding. It can be a critical way to get people out of their cars and help cities and counties reach their climate change goals and really improve safety for our most vulnerable travelers.

On November 12th, we will be announcing staff recommendations for the funding of projects in the Local Partnership Program, the Solution for Congested Corridors Program and the Trade Corridor Enhancement Program. The Commission will be adopting these in December. These programs will fund a wide variety of rail, road, transit and active transportation projects across the state. The Commission will begin adopting the Active Transportation Program in March.

The projects recommended for funding in the Commission's programs will support a wide variety of benefits, including economic development, the efficient movement of goods, improved safety, improved air quality and reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

I'd like to thank CARB and HCD staff for their contributions to the guidelines for these programs. In

particular, I want to highlight the creation of a land use efficiency checklist used in evaluating projects in the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program.

1.3

2.2

I'd also like to thank HCD staff for their assistance in evaluating housing and land-use criteria in applications, and CARB staff for their assistance in evaluating air quality and climate change criteria.

I'd also like to touch briefly on equity, which has been mentioned. And, you know, we've all talked before about the impact transportation has had on our communities. The Commission has undertaken internal training of all our staff related to this. We've begun the formation of a equitable -- excuse me, an equity roundtable to advise us on a couple of key issues. And we will be embarking in coordination with Caltrans and the State Transportation Agency on a series of listening sessions.

Next, I'd like to briefly touch on State transportation revenues. They're down. The budget forecasts them to be over the last year and this year to be down almost \$1.9 billion. And we're on track for that level of decrease due to the pandemic-induced economic crisis. You know, there are similar reductions at local levels and transit providers are really facing an existential threat that's brought on by the pandemic's

impact on both operations and funding. You know, we at the Commission haven't had to slow down transportation projects yet, but we certainly will without some action, without either action at the federal level to increase some funding, and some stimulus, and then perhaps a more competitive bidding environment.

2.2

And particularly for transit operators, they -- they will not be able to improve without federal financial assistance.

Impacting transportation funding in the long term is our transition to zero-emission vehicles. This transition underscores the need for us to move deliberately from an excise-based funding system to a mileage-based user fee. To continue discussions in this area, the Commission's Road Charge Technical Advisory Committee will be meeting on February 5th.

Lastly, I would like to join the chorus of thanking Chair Nichols for her many years of leadership, which will leave a lasting remark -- mark on California, and thank you for the opportunity to give this update.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you for that. It almost makes me sorry that I told people I was going to retire, but not really. It's lovely. Thank you so much. I really -- I really do appreciate that.

So let's now turn then to HCD and ask Director

Velasquez to introduce your update.

2.2

HCD DIRECTOR VELASQUEZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. Well, a couple things before I turn it over to our Deputy Director. Megan Kirkeby.

Unprecedented levels of investments in production of affordable housing this year will cost \$2 billion. I mentioned RHNA numbers that have been distributed also for the last year and a half. Very intense work on that front. But again, we -- we have to make sure our investments in affordable housing production are smart investments, are strategic investments. So with that in mind, I want to ask Megan Kirkeby to talk a little bit more on the Prohousing Designation Program that I mentioned in my opening remarks.

HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: Great. And I think you all have access to our slides.

Oh, awesome. Great.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: Well, and just to start off, I'm Megan Kirkeby, Deputy Director for Housing Policy. And, you know, I'll pile on a little bit to just also share some kudos to Chair Nichols. It's been -- I've worked on climate change and housing issues for quite a long time now. And it's -- it's always been nice that I think your leadership has taken a holistic view to an

incredibly difficult challenge. So we appreciate that here.

2.2

And I think you'll see this in the presentation, but I think one of the commonalities between the climate crisis and the housing crisis is that we need a lot of tools in our toolbox. There isn't really one silver bullet that's going to fix everything tomorrow. And so we've really, I think, unlocked, over the last three or four years, quite a few mechanisms that in concert working together really come -- come to give us a shot at this to really -- you know, there's been over 20 pieces of legislation that really work on this issue of getting housing in the right places, to resilient communities, job-rich communities, places with good schools, less pollution.

And then also, not just getting more housing into the right places, but removing barriers to getting that housing approved and moving -- moving the planning decisions up front, so that there still is a lot of thought and community engagement, but that those debates are happening at a high level and not project-by-project negotiations.

And then we've also paired that with a substantial piece of planning grants that we've never had available in this scale to our local communities going

into a new housing planning cycle. So nearly \$300 million in planning grants paired with a giant statewide technical assistance contract is helping each of our cities get prepared to go into this next cycle with a different mindset with a lot of the prohousing mindset you'll hear about today.

1.3

2.2

And then that -- we -- we want to give people that up-front chance to really do the right thing and really get to be prohousing, and then incentivize them to go beyond it. You know, the bar has moved. Those over 20 pieces of legislation I talked about are not going to be without challenges. And so we do want something like the Prohousing Designation on the table to help reward people who are really going that extra mile. And, of course, it's also part of our increased authority to step in if we do see violations happening and see people not meeting that -- that bar.

But all of -- all of those pieces work together to really unlock opportunity. And we also need to not ignore that we have a substantial part of the state that exists in segregated concentrated areas of poverty. We can't ignore that there are many existing communities that need additional resources from us as a state. And so that's another place where Housing, along with many of our partner agencies, will need to work together on our joint

requirement to affirmatively further fair housing and to increase investments, community development, economic development, mitigation efforts, resiliency, truly make sure that we're not leaving -- that we're opening up access to high resource communities, but also increasing resources throughout the state.

So with that, I'll talk about our one piece of the puzzle we're going to talk about today, which is the Prohousing Designation. So if you could move it to the next slide.

--000--

HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: We are getting ready to release the prohousing regulations. These are --today, I'll talk about the program, the regulations, and the next steps.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: So this program was created out of 2019-2020 Budget Act. We started with a framework paper that we got a substantial amount of feedback on. We -- we've shared a lot of our thinking on this through webinars, gotten more feedback, additional collaborative development.

Next slide.

--000--

HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: Some of our collaborators have been housing developers, educational institutions, planners, a lot of conversations and input from Air Resources Board, Strategic Growth Council, Office of Planning and Research, Conservation, Coastal Commission, as well as equity and housing advocates that we've really reached out to to do some up-front work here. Builders associations, housing consultants.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: And so that has been an incredibly collaborative nature that we've done to create these draft regular -- or to create these regulations. But once the regulations are live, there will be additional opportunity. This can be a living program and can continue to evolve over time through feedback and regulation updates.

Today, I'll talk a little bit about the regulation design, the scoring, the principles, and some of the benefits that we have.

So next slide.

--000--

HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: So the regulations are really designed for flexibility, to be adaptable.

Jurisdictions have a lot of different options to get to be

prohousing. So I think all of us are sort of thinking about paths to winning right now. So the Prohousing Designation has lots of paths to prohousing that a jurisdiction could embark on. And it also really tries to not just be about housing, but to be about broader State goals. And the really intersectionality of this work.

One of the other ideas was really to make this an achievable but effective goal. As I said, the bar is raised a lot in the past five years for local jurisdiction of just, you know, what is the minimum legal requirement to do. But the prohousing is really supposed to say what can -- where can you go from there? Can you do -- can you do better? Can you do some of the things that we know will make a difference?

And we think that what we've created here is an achievable but substantial game-changing program.

All right. Next slide.

2.2

--000--

HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: This is just to really recognize that everything you're going to see in the Prohousing Designation is about previously legislated policies. It's building on a lot of what's in statute today, but really trying to reward people for, like I said, exceeding that bar. So places where the law has changed to make it a lot more housing by-right. Like I

said, planning at the up-front level, so that you can kind of approve more quickly project by project.

This -- this unlocks some additional points for going beyond what the law requires, similarly with accessory dwelling units and other -- and other policies.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

Will work is there's a 30-point minimum that you need to meet to be considered prohousing. And a jurisdiction will need to get one initiative at least from each category.

And the categories are favorable zoning and land use, accelerating production time frames, reducing construction and development costs and providing financial subsidies.

So each of these requirements is something that was an objective recognized in statute, but we didn't want to leave it at just that.

So Next slide.

--000--

HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: We also instituted principles of prohousing. So these are a lot of the ways in which I think you'll see the collaboration, between our shared goals. So, yes, it's about increasing development capacity, variety of housing types, making sure we're building inclusive communities, and saying, yes, to

housing. But it's also about planning consistent with State priorities. So a lot of that -- making sure that we are working on our climate change goals, working on our shared goals of protecting open space, as well as promoting equitable communities and really focusing on access -- access to communities. And then collaboration, to align policies and programs and implementation of relevant housing statutes.

2.2

So these are -- these are principles that underline -- underlie the prohousing program. Thank you. And so there is an enhanced scoring opportunity

--000--

you to demonstrate that your policies that you're suggesting align with these principles. And you can get up to an additional point per scoring item there. And we will be enforcing compliance. So we -- we were very, very thoughtful about the -- we got a lot of questions and we really tried to address the issue of what about somebody who is doing everything that they say is prohousing, but doing something that's really antithetical to prohousing.

And the program is designed to really stop that in its tracks. If you are -- if you are violating housing law in some way or breaking with the -- the principles of prohousing, you cannot, in name only, be prohousing. So

there -- there -- there is a lot in the regulations about actions inconsistent with these -- these principles.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: So what are the benefits of being designated prohousing? By statute, there are three programs that require prohousing points. The Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program, the Transformative Climate Communities Program and the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program.

But there -- it is explicit in statute, and I think a good idea that prohousing expand beyond these three programs. It could be other housing programs, but could be non-housing sources. And one of the things I want to emphasize there is the idea behind prohousing is hopefully that we are bringing a jurisdiction that is doing well today up to doing exceptionally well. And the jurisdictions are going to be incentivized by different things. You know, we're a diverse state. Every city, every county cares about different things or has different needs. And so a variety of programs that have incentives is going to be more effective at moving the needle for a jurisdiction to put some of these policies in place.

Next slide.

--000--

things that is important to the team is adaptability. So that a funding program could determine the use of the Prohousing Designation. It could be that your program sets Prohousing Designation as a threshold. You know, that you have to be prohousing in order to get these dollars, whatever they may be.

But it could also be that -- that you get points for being prohousing or that -- that there are basically bonus points built into a program that are accessible to someone -- a jurisdiction that is designated to be prohousing.

You could also break it down to categories that have greater alignment with a particular program. So a jurisdiction that meets some of the more climate-related prohousing initiatives and gets to their Prohousing Designation that way or maybe doesn't get to the Prohousing Designation that way, you may still want to reward certain pieces of the prohousing criteria.

And you can also just focus on enhancement factors. So giving additional a points for those -- those that again maybe are doing some of the more climate related pieces of the prohousing program.

Next slide.

2.2

25 ---00--

are the regulations will be published soon. I don't have an exact date for you, but they will -- they are emergency regulations. So while a great amount of collaboration went into the development of these emergency regulations, they -- they will be effective immediately upon release by the Office of Administrative Law. But then they will move through the process to move from being emergency regulations to full regulations following a public comment period, potential for additional changes following that public comment period, and move towards their adoption as permanent regulations, or non-emergency regulations rather.

So upon their effectiveness, even as emergency regulations, we can begin outreach and receiving applications from jurisdictions to become designated prohousing. We also then will publish a list of all those that do meet that threshold, do become prohousing jurisdictions. And like I said, it's a living -- it's a living program, so there -- there will be ongoing program development and the opportunity to -- to improve the program over time and learn from -- from our early experiences.

So next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

end. Oh, yes. So I went over a lot fairly quickly there, but am -- am able to take questions and comments. And I did want to give a shout-out to Paul McDougall and DC Navarrette who are on the call, who are really the brains, the work behind this program. So they let me talk about it today, but really it's -- it's thanks to the both of them for the -- the work that's gone into this.

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, thank you so much for that presentation. This is really an impressive effort and I suspect a lot more went into it than you were able to cover in a --

HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: Yes

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: -- very short presentation.

But we'll -- we'll undoubtedly be thinking about how it will apply as you move forward. And I see tremendous potential there in taking the proactive approach to trying to find an incentive to get people to do better or to document the good that they're doing, as opposed to, you know, what often is seen for all of us regulatory agencies, as, you know, the approach of just trying to figure out how to -- how to express our disapproval of places that aren't doing everything we want them to do. So it seems like it's a -- it's a good use of psychology to flip this around and I am -- I want to congratulate you

on this.

1.3

2.2

Well, I think what we should probably do at this point is move to our agenda of presentations this morning, unless anybody from the Board and Commission has a question that they want to pose or a quick comment that want to pose right now. I'll pause for just a second in case anybody wants to do that?

And seeing no immediate hands up, I will move to then the next phase of our agenda, which is the three separate actually presentations.

As all of our agencies now have this direction to work together to do more to address the joint goals of climate change, and transportation, and housing, we're going to hear presentations from three speakers who have recommendations to make as to how to strengthen the collaboration across our agencies to address these pressing problems in a more powerful way.

First, we're going to hear from the San Diego Association of Governments followed by a joint presentation from the Greenlining Institute and ClimatePlan. And finally, we will hear from Professor Karen Chapple from UC Berkeley.

And there will be time for Board members to ask questions and make comments following each of the three presentations. And then after that, we will open it up

for public comment.

2.2

So let me just remind people who are interested in public comment, if you want to make a comment, please click the raise hand button feature on Zoom or else dial star nine now and then we can call on you when we get to the public comment portion.

So our first speaker is Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director of the San Diego Association of Governments, also known as SANDAG. SANDAG is the leading research, planning and transportation agency for the San Diego region. Mr. Ikhrata has more than 30 years of public and private transportation planning experience.

Prior to joining SANDAG in 2018, Mr. Ikhrata worked for the Southern California Association of Governments, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, and the South Coast Air Quality Management District. So he's covered it all.

Mr. Ikhrata is joined today by Coleen Clementson, SANDAG's Director for Regional Planning and Ray Major, the Chief Economist for SANDAG.

So I'll now invite Mr. Ikhrata to begin his presentation.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

MR. IKHRATA: Thank you, Mary -- Chair Nichols.

Good morning, Chair Norton, Director Velasquez, Secretary

Kim, Executive Officer Corey, Executive Director Mitch Weiss. Thank you very much. And if you'd move to the next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

MR. IKHRATA: Thank you very much for having us this morning. It's really an honor to speak to all of you, because combined you play such an integral role in how our State moves forward when it comes to transportation, housing, and climate change.

I am really pleased today to present to you SANDAG's vision for the future. And I'm equally pleased that both Supervisor Fletcher and I were honored to host Chair Norton last month in San Diego. We were honored to host Mr. Kim, Mr. Toks. And we're going to host Mitch next month. But I invite you all to come to San Diego to see the beautiful region and to really understand why we're putting forth the vision we are.

And this picture you're looking at right now, this is something we stole from National Geographic. Fifteen months ago they had an edition where they talked about future cities. So we stole this image and we put San Diego and we said, let us reimagine the future of transportation in San Diego. So I'm honored to be leading an amazing group of professionals here to chart actually a new way of looking at transportation. And we should never

look at transportation without linking it to land use and urban form. And we should be very truly looking at studies that work, regardless of how politically difficult they are.

1.3

2.2

I know Secretary Kim mentioned pricing. I would -- I would tell you that without pricing, any transportation study will have shortcomings. Without linkages to land use, any transportation strategy will have the shortcomings.

So I challenged my team here to reimagine the future of San Diego. And San Diego is an urban region of the State. And what applies here could apply in a few other places in the State. And we hope to set the tone and the example.

When I came here two years ago, we were about to adopt a new regional transportation plan. And I looked at it and I said what's the difference between this, and the last one, and the one before that?

And we decided let us pull the brakes. And we went to the State and asked legislatively for a two-year extension. And thanks to many of your help, we got that. And that has allow -- that allowed us to be here today talking to you about a new vision, a new way of reimagining the transportation system.

And like -- I tell this to my Board and to my

staff, the great artist Michelangelo once said, the greater danger for most of us lies not in setting our aim too high and falling short, but in setting our aim too low and achieving our mark.

2.2

So I hope, after you listen to the presentation today, you will get an understanding of why we are aiming high. That we are aiming high -- as high as we can, because I believe the future of California depends on what kind of visions we put forward for future generations, because future generations depend on us.

And so I will be honored now to introduce my team, our Chief Analytics, Chief Economist Ray Major and our Planning Director Coleen Clementson. At the end, I will tell you a couple of recommendations that we would like to have for you to think about. So thank you.

And Chair Nichols, thank you for your service. You've been an amazing person for not California but the nation. Thank you personally for, you know, looking and mentoring many of us into this field. So I don't know what retirement means to you, but we -- we'll find you. We know where you live. Thank you very much.

So with that, I'll turn it over to Ray Major.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. MAJOR: Good morning. Next slide, please.

--000--

MR. MAJOR: There are really three equally important challenges that we faced when we were putting together our regional plan. We needed to solve for congestion, which is really reducing VMT. We needed to solve for social equity, and also we had to abide by all of the State and federal mandates.

Doing any one of those would have been relatively simple. But in order to balance all three of those and to create a system that's fair, and faster, and cleaner was really a goal that was very large, and Hasan challenged us to do this.

Next slide, please.

2.2

--000--

MR. MAJOR: In terms of the federal mandates, we have a lot of them that we were looking at. We were looking at SB 375 and air quality. Obviously, we were looking at Title VI in compliance with the social equity goals, also CEQA, and SB 743, all to reduce VMT. And we also consulted with all of the tribes in our region. We have 17 tribal nations here in the San Diego region and we were consulting with them.

Next slide, please.

--000--

MR. MAJOR: As we developed the plan, you know, we kept certain things in mind. For instance, we know

that 42 percent of greenhouse gas emissions comes from transportation and passenger vehicles, so we needed to find a way to reduce this.

Next slide, please.

--000--

MR. MAJOR: And we also needed to address climate change. We know that the sea level is expected to rise by two and a half feet by 2050, and we are a coastal region, and so this is a very big concern here obviously in San Diego and also California. And so we take this into account in our planning effort also.

Next slide, please.

--000--

MR. MAJOR: And as we spoke about the wildfires, luckily San Diego didn't suffer any major wildfires this year, but we have, in the past, suffered some incredible wildfires, and we will in the future also. SO urban planning urban and the urban form are extremely important in the way that we design the regional plan.

Next slide, please.

--000--

MR. MAJOR: And, of course, we need to protect the natural habitat that we have here in the region.

Next slide, please.

--000--

MR. MAJOR: So I'd like to talk to you a little bit now about the data and the approach that we took to Building our plan. So when Hasan came to San Diego and then took the leadership role here at SANDAG, he really challenged us to rethink, and reenvision, and really reinvent the entire transportation plan that we had done. We basically scrapped the old one and we started from scratch.

2.2

He wanted us to create a plan that was -- of -that was using objective data to really drive where the
plan was going to go, rather than all of the pre-conceived
notions that we had in terms of where infrastructure
should be placed and what projects should be prioritized
when. And by using the data, we allowed that to really
drive our planning efforts.

And in the past few years, there's been such a huge revolution in data and the availability of information. For the first time ever, we were able to use big data to really to help guide our plan. And this big data was then validated by traditional statistical approaches that we've been using for -- for many, many years.

But what it allowed us to do is to really understand the behavior of our urban area and the billions of decisions that are made by individuals each year in

terms of where they're going to go each and every day in terms of transportation and really to understand our urban ecosystem. And this really allowed us to change the way we looked at planning for the future.

Next slide, please.

--000--

1.3

2.2

MR. MAJOR: Some of the things that we needed to do when we looked at the data is to really create a whole new way of looking at the data and applying it to the problem we were trying to solve. We've always looked at population densities, for instance, in terms of urban planning. And the map on the left shows you that type of information. And this map shows where the people live in San Diego by density.

And then the map on the right is really a new concept that we introduced here at SANDAG, which is the concept of employment centers. And that's really taking a look at where employment is concentrated in the region and then understanding how people move to those particular regions. That's one of the largest trip generators is people moving to and from their workplace. So we created this additional information to really understand how people move.

Next slide, please.

--000--

MR. MAJOR: We also needed to come up with other new ways of looking at data. Historically, we've used census data. We used it at a census tract level or a zip code level to do analysis. But those juris -- those boundaries are not equal in terms of area. And so you can have a big zip code and a small zip code or census tract. And so one of the things that we did is that we completely redid our database so that we were taking a look at the San Diego region in equal areas.

And so we created these quarter mile hexagons for the entire region, over 26,000 of them, that are all equal area. And then we associated data with those. So now we can compare these little areas within the region to each other, so we can look at what the population and employment is and things like that, and we can figure out what the interaction is between those polygons that we've created. And that gives us a completely new way of looking at the region.

Next slide, please.

2.2

--000--

MR. MAJOR: I talked a little bit about big data. And big data is -- is really going to absolutely fundamentally change the way we look at transportation in the region. Historically, we've used surveys to ask people where they went, and they would fill out a diary,

they would send it in. Our last survey was electronic, but it was -- still it's a very small sample of what's happening. But with big data, we're able to actually capture how people move throughout the region.

2.2

This information that I'm showing here is how people move back and forth between the employment centers here in San Diego region. And if you take a look at the top of the map on the left, you'll see that there are three dots over there. And they really draw -- those employment centers are drawing from a localized population, and the trips are relatively short.

But if you move down the coast to where the darker areas are, you can see that those particular employment centers are drawing much, much larger -- a much larger radius in terms of where the trips are coming from. But in addition to that, they're creating much longer trips also. So we can start to understand how to make these critical connections.

Next slide, please.

--000--

MR. MAJOR: There were also a lot of other considerations that we had to put into our thinking as we tried to reenvision the plan. The San Diego region is home to the busiest land port in the Western Hemisphere.

And we needed to understand how people moved from

the border region throughout the San Diego area. And it was data that we didn't have in the past. We used to have information on how many people crossed the borders, but now we can actually tell where they go. And so we have a better understanding of the infrastructure that they're using to get to where they're going.

Another very elusive piece of information are activity centers. So things in San Diego, they would be like Mission Bay Park, or the beaches, or the zoo, or Sea World. These are areas that generate traffic, because people go to those areas, but it's very hard to capture that in a diary type survey. But using big data what we're able to do is to really understand how people are traveling to these different types of areas. And soon we'll be able to be doing that in real-time.

Next slide, please.

2.2

--000--

MR. MAJOR: The military is also a very large -has a very large presence here in the San Diego region.

It's one of the largest employers. And so a lot of
movement happens to get to and from those bases. But this
data is very difficult for us to collect, primarily
because the military doesn't give us information on where
the people who work at the bases, or the enlisted military
where they actually live.

But using cell phone data, we can get an idea -a generalized idea of how people are moving throughout the
region and the length of their trips. And when you put
that all together what you see is that there is a
tremendous amount of data, and that's kind of shown on
the -- on the right-hand side. And what we do is we use
mathematics to really figure out how to optimize a
transportation system for this and to meet those critical
State and federal goals.

Next slide, please.

2.2

--000--

MR. MAJOR: As we were doing that and developing a new transportation plan that really helped optimize what was happening in the San Diego region, we were getting input from the communities. We talked to 13 CBOs, which represent most of the disadvantaged communities here in the San Diego area. We held dozens of public meetings. We talked to thousands of participants. We talked to 125 major employers in the San Diego region to understand what their transportation challenges and housing challenges were when they were trying to work with their work forces.

We worked with the EDCs, the city councils, and Hasan, Coleen and I did hundreds of presentations to public groups where we listened to them and solicited their input into the plan that we were proposing.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

MR. MAJOR: Because the plan is so forward looking and it relies on technology, as Coleen is going to talk about later, what we did was we assembled a Vision Advisory Panel. And this is a panel of industry experts in technology, in things like 5G and autonomous vehicles. The members on this visionary plan -- the Vision Advisory Panel were people from Qualcomm, from UCSD Design Labs, from Cubic Corporation, from Ford Smart Mobility and from Verizon.

And we vetted the plan with them also. And we wanted to understand how technology was going to change in the next 20 years, so that we could really take advantage of that as we built our plan from the ground up.

So just in conclusion, what we did was we employed this data-driven approach to really solve the three problems of congestion or VMT, social equity, and State and federal mandates. We validated that with the communities and then we validated it with experts that this actually could be done.

And with that, I'd like to invite up Coleen Clementson to talk about how -- what we ended up with after all of this research.

MS. CLEMENTSON: Thank you. And what a great

time it is for planning in California. And I think you -the State agencies represented here have brought together
a tremendous amount of resources and support for us to do
some of the best planning possible.

So the next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

MS. CLEMENTSON: As Ray pointed out and Hasan as well in his opening this has been a data-driven process. So it's the data about trip making, it's the data that we've collected from multiple community meetings, from community-based organizations, from industry leaders to make sure that we're on the right track doing something that can truly be a reenvisioning of our transportation future.

With all of this data, we applied the five big moves. And the real game-changer, as many of you noted in your opening remarks, is technology. Technology is what allows us to do the things we've always thought about, but actually really being able to do them.

Transportation on demand, clean transportation, and eventually autonomous, the three big revolutions that we hear Board Member Sperling talk about.

Next slide.

--000--

MS. CLEMENTSON: Technology also enables us to

really think about how we electrify our system. And Chair Nichols the -- in your opening remarks, and we know that you had a big hand in the latest Executive Order about electrifying our system, really thinking about how we use technology for inductive charging.

The next big move -- so the next slide --

1.3

2.2

MS. CLEMENTSON: -- is mobility hubs. And this is really rethinking our urban form. Focusing all of our future growth and development in existing activity centers, where we have commerce, providing mobility options in these locations. And I know, Chair Norton, this is similar to work you've been doing in the LA area as well.

And so how do we really rethink the urban form and make sure that these are places where people can easily walk, allows us to reduce vehicle miles traveled, bike, also helps us reduce vehicles miles traveled, and also providing opportunities for smaller shared electric vehicles to help us get around these areas.

And that leads us to the next slide, which we talk about the flexible fleets

--000--

MS. CLEMENTSON: So thinking about the smaller electric on-demand vehicles that are shared, eventually

autonomous, that help us maybe get between mobility hubs and help us with our smaller shorter trips.

2.2

That brings us to our fourth big move, which is the transit leap. And if you'd go to the next slide.

--000--

MS. CLEMENTSON: This is taking transit to the next level. This is for longer trips, high speed transportation in locations where people are making -- several people are making similar long trips. And these are the trips between the major mobility hubs, utilizing the flexible fleets to get to and from the mobility hubs and then transit leap becomes a truly compelling option to driving alone. It's all five of these moves working together. You cannot select just one. They rely on one another and they each address the shortcomings of each other.

I think all of us who have been doing planning for years, transportation planning, historically we looked at, okay, where are the bottlenecks? Let's widen the roadway to address the bottlenecks, and then let's try to put some transit in that same location as an option. But it's integrating all of these together that makes it all work.

And then the fifth big move is optimizing the trillion dollar investment that we already have in our

transportation infrastructure, our existing roadways, highways, light rail and transit and making them all work maximizing the use of technology, pricing to influence behavior and policies as well that will help influence behavior.

2.2

So it's collectively these five big moves all working together supporting and reinforcing one another. And I think we can't stress enough how important all of this is in shaping our urban form of the future. It's that focused growth and development that ultimately will help us reduce vehicle miles traveled, allows us to focus opportunities for affordable housing and encourage affordable housing in these areas, and really improving the quality of life for all our region's residents.

And we actually believe that this approach of data and these five big strategies working together could be applied statewide. Hasan talked about what a beautiful place San Diego is. And I call it home. I think it's a wonderful special place as well. But we're very similar to other places throughout the state of California.

So the next slide --

--000--

MS. CLEMENTSON: -- has several clicks and just want to kind of show how this all comes together into a bold new transportation vision. So this is a satellite

image of the San Diego region. I think most of you know that we are home to the busiest international border in the world. Seventeen tribal nations largely located in the rural parts of our community. Most of our urbanized areas are close to the coast within the western third of the region.

1.3

2.2

So we're going to go through a series of clicks here. The first one, this is really looking at the complete corridors, if you'll do a click there. Managed lanes on all of our highway corridors. And managing that through policies, technology, and pricing. The next click, this is about improvements on our rural roadways to ensure our tribal nations have equitable access, and also to ensure that we have proper evacuation routes for all of our regions' residents.

The next click shows the high-speed transit. So this is a fully connected high-speed network of rail, above ground, below ground. It's not competing with the automobile, except that it's faster and more frequent. But you're not -- it's not on the same corridors with the vehicle. It's separated again above ground, below ground, or in its own infrastructure.

The next click that shows improvements to our light rail system, a next generation of rapid bus services. Then a network of close to 40 mobility hubs,

that's the next click. And connecting all of this again with technology being the big game changer.

--000--

MS. CLEMENTSON: The next slide I just wanted to focus on something we're very proud of, which is kind of a core of this whole system is a proposed central mobility hub that would include an automated people mover to the airport. So really connecting our whole region through a high-speed network of transit with a direct connection to the airport and a high speed connection down to the border.

The next slide --

2.2

--000--

MS. CLEMENTSON: -- shows an iconic image of what this central mobility hub could be like. And many of you helped support us as we worked on legislation that will help expedite making this actually a reality in the San Diego region.

So the next slide.

--000--

MS. CLEMENTSON: Equity has been an ongoing theme here. Many of you have mentioned it. When we met with Commissioner Kehoe, this is something that she brought up with us. Board Member Takvorian has been a tireless advocate for equity. And we really see this in three

primary categories.

2.2

First of all, the minority population, that's what's shown here on the figure on the left. The darker the blue, the higher the population of minority communities. The middle is low income. So the darker the purple, the higher the concentration of low income folks. And then we also look at seniors. And so the darker the orange here on the figure on your right, the higher the population anticipated of seniors.

And really, I think all of us are seeing throughout the state of California, the growing senior population and the fact that 85 percent of our growth, at least in the San Diego region, and this is most likely true statewide, 85 percent of our growth to 2050 will be people over age 65. So we have to think about how different the mobility needs are.

Then if we go to the next click, this is really showing how mobility hubs, high-speed transit and the infrastructure we're talking about can start to connect all of these communities. So really an integral part of all of this is about equity providing upward mobility and mobility for our most vulnerable populations.

So the next thing -- next slide.

--000--

MS. CLEMENTSON: We do have a two and a half

minute video. And if I could ask you to play this. And then as soon -- we'll wrap up and Hasan will come back up and talk about some of our recommendations about how we can partner together, work together, to make this a reality in the San Diego region, and how we can be great partners with you to help implement some of this statewide.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

(Thereupon a video was played.)

VOICEOVER: Transportation isn't just about getting us from point A to point B. It's about connecting us to each other, to our environment, to our communities, Connecting us to everything and everyone we love.

But congestion and the absence of alternatives are breaking these connections, creating a divide between where we are and where we want to be. We are losing time.

We now have the opportunity to think differently about how we connect, a chance to truly innovate. Across our region, SANDAG's bold transportation vision can accommodate the diverse demands of the entire county, as well as the unique needs of individual communities. At the border, people can be welcomed by a variety of choices to quickly get them where they want to go.

Roadways can be reimagined to balance space between cars and other ways of travel and shift based on

demand.

1.3

2.2

Our neighbors can enjoy new choices for getting to school, to the store and back home. Businesses can move goods more efficiently, while employees can enjoy smart alternatives to the daily commute.

From the edges to its center, our region can be more connected. Through thoughtful planning and careful execution, we can deliver a world class transportation system that protects our environment and strengthens our communities.

The regional plan may be counted in dollars or miles, but its success will be measured in time. Our biggest plans will be repaid in the smallest moments.

(End of video.)

MS. CLEMENTSON: Thank you.

Hasan.

MR. IKHRATA: Thank you, Coleen. And thank you for allowing us this opportunity.

--000--

MR. IKHRATA: Let me thank Coleen and Ray. And let me leave you with some recommendations. And this is going to only take a minute.

You are the agencies that determine pretty much the future transportation, housing, land use and climate goals. And we would love for all of you to embrace a

data-driven approach, which means also to provide and be partner in funding a data-driven approach that require a lot of tools, a lot of data collections that we do not have.

2.2

We also hope that you will embrace the linkages that we always knew, but we never actually put into action, the linkages between transportation, land use and housing. As Director Velasquez mentioned, you know, we just finished our Regional Housing Needs Assessment. And, yes, 4 of our 18 cities filed a lawsuit, because they object to the new way we're moving forward.

We're determined to move this region forward to link the strategies together, but we need your help.

You're the State agencies that set the tone. And I hope you make that clear as we regionally try to figure this out. And I'm really honored to have here locally leaders like Supervisor Fletcher who embrace new ideas. They are politically hard in this region, but we -- we're going to give them a try. We're going to publicly debate them.

So I hope the State agencies come together and make a strong statement about that linkage between transportation and housing.

I also hope all of us, and this became clear after this awful pandemic that we're in, that we'll embrace social equity and social justice. And we

acknowledge the digital divide that exists in our state and our regions. And it should be no longer just checking the box. I think you should make that part of your funding decisions. You should make that part of your reviews of our plans. It's no longer check the box that we met the criteria of Title VI and we meet the criteria. But this is something we always knew, but we ignored. It is no longer enough to say I understand, but do something about the social injustices that happen every day in our regions.

2.2

And I also hope that you make it clear that resiliency is part of the criteria of judging our plans. You know, Chair Norton came last month and visited the Del Mar Bluff. Last winter, we were very close to cutting the services for the second busiest corridor in the country.

These are real things. Sea level rise, the fires, these are real stuff. This is no longer theoretical studies. And the only way to make it real are for all of your agencies to come together and says social equity, resiliency, data-driven approaches, the linkages between land use and housing, are real -- real criteria, not just checking the box.

I know everybody ask you for money. And I'm not here asking you for money, but I'm saying let us put the State and federal local funding together to achieve the

noble goals that we're trying to achieve here in California and to set the example for the rest of the world.

2.2

Let us align Regional Housing Needs Assessment, vehicle miles traveled, and all of these noble goals we talk with. I think your agencies have support to do that. SANDAG is ready to lead. SANDAG is ready to work with our sister agencies, with all of your agencies to actually apply what we did here to other regions and partner with you to give the right data and the right tools.

And with that, thank you very much again, Chair Nichols. Thank you for your service. And we now, my team and I, are -- be happy to take questions.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you so much, Hasan.

This is quite an inspiring presentation. I'd like to open up the floor here and I see the first hand that's in the air is a San Diegan, Christine Kehoe. So, Chris.

CTC COMMISSIONER KEHOE: Thanks very much, Mary.

It's wonderful to hear you -- see you Zoom-wise. And let

me thank Hasan, Ray and Coleen for a great presentation,

visionary as Mary said, and for spending time with me in a

number of settings filling me in on the big moves.

And I relayed this to Coleen and Ray last week -- or a few days ago. On -- and I'm glad you're focusing on transportation equity, along with these visionary, and

modern, and high-tech solutions to better transportation in the region.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And I think, you know, the overview is terrific, You're really doing a good job. Specifically Hasan. though, in the near term, especially now in the pandemic and the high unemployment, and the -- you know, the economic crisis. What do you think SANDAG should be doing with your member agencies, county government, and all the cities in the region, the military, the tribes to get real tools into the hands of the working poor, and others, students, people who are tying to reach their doctors and hospitals, you know, how can we reach low income and unbanked people with travel cards that work across all modes, are you talking to the other agencies and social services about financing those kinds of tools. For people who don't have debit and credit cards, how do we help So spend just a minute on that area.

And I just also want to thank Secretary Kim for pointing out that long commutes, vehicle miles traveled, essential workers, and military people, they are especially burdened by these issues. So take it away.

MR. IKHRATA: Thank you, Senator Kehoe -Commissioner Kehoe, I appreciate you as always. Just to
for a start, our chief economist that you heard Ray Major
have led actually in the state by presenting and

highlighting things we expected but we didn't know about the impact of the pandemic on the Black Americans, the communities of color, the low income.

2.2

So what -- what we actually started and we start to partner with other -- with other counties in Southern California led by our Supervisor Nathan Fletcher. Digital divide for example, we're trying to get the private sector, together with the government sector, to actually overcome some of the divide by doing easy stuff first. We're trying to do a lot of education in our cities about how can they, through this pandemic, provide some services to their residents that don't have access to the same thing that many rich areas do.

And finally, we're making it clear to everyone in the region, that social equity and social injustice are part of our transportation planning criteria, like we do greenhouse gas emissions, we do resiliency.

So I think SANDAG is ready to lead in that area. I think I would welcome the comment to Supervisor Fletcher, but we're really going to make significant short-term immediate things to overcome some of the pandemic things that happened here.

So thank you for your question.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: This is -- unfortunately, I need to sort of go back and say that Senator Kehoe did

exactly the right thing, which was to ask a question. I was supposed to call for questions at this point, and then after we get through the presentations, have the Board members have a broader discussion.

So I'll just remind my fellow Board members, and other Commissioners, and staffers from HCD that this is not the point where we really get into the meat of the discussion, but use this -- use this immediate time here just for any clarifications or questions that you have.

So with that, Chair Norton.

2.2

CTC CHAIR NORTON: Thank you. I just wanted to again commend Hasan for his team's work. It was great to see this up close and work with CARB Member Fletcher on all of the transportation items that were happening in the area.

I was so impressed with the data that you're collecting and working with. And I wanted to ask how you're -- you're work with the elusive concept of telecommuting and how that's affecting the work of thinking about what kinds of transportation options we should have and also getting to those issues about the broadband inequities, so that we can really keep track of the movement patterns and the additional burdens from people who can't telecommute but still are trying to reduce their carbon footprint.

MR. IKHRATA: Yeah. Thank you, Chair Norton. A couple of things and I'll have Ray Major elaborate. On the telecommuting, we're actually doing a survey of San Diegans to know where employers and employees. And we don't have the final results yet, but we're learning a few things, that people who telecommute tend to do actually more vehicle miles traveled than less when you take total. That's not good for greenhouse gas emissions.

2.2

But we're also, I think Director Velasquez mentioned that there is about 70 percent of us who work cannot telecommute. Therefore, we take into account that -- the universe of telecommuting is 30 percent, and how much of that is going to increase due to the pandemic? We're going to factor that in of course. We will talk -- more of us will do it part time.

But at one point, this pandemic will be over.

And at one point, we're going to have to deal with the future of transportation, the linkages to land use. And the linkage is in such a way that we never dealt with before.

On the broadband, I just very briefly, like I said, the digital divide that exists is shameful actually. It's to the point when you think 30 percent of your kids cannot access good Wifi or good broadband. We're going to have to work really hard, especially with the private

sector entities. I know that County of San Diego is providing funds to get tablets and get stuff fast. But the broadband is a larger issue that we have to really deal with at a broader -- Ray, you want to add anything?

2.2

MR. MAJOR: Sure. So in addition to the things that Hasan said, you know, a lot of the data collection that we're doing has to do with finding new sources of data that allow us to track exactly what you're saying. So we now have information where we can really tell where people are going each and every day, so not only for instance to work, but we can tell if they're going to a shopping center, which store within the shopping center they're going to. We can correlate that with credit card data that tells us how people are spending in those different regions.

So all of this big data analytics is starting to help us understand how people move around. And what Hasan said was very true, 30 percent of the people in San Diego can probably telecommute. And what we've seen is that even though the businesses are still shut down here in San Diego, we're back up to about 92 percent of our VMT that we had prior to the pandemic. And so what's happening is there has been a shift in the way people travel. So they're taking more discretionary trips and they're going out at lunchtime, for instance, and, you know, doing some

shopping and coming back home.

1.3

2.2

So it's not cutting down VMT. So this is -- it's important for us to continue to collect this data, because we will use it to validate our mobility hub concept, which is really land use urban design, which is really densifying the land use, putting those activities and resources close together that people need to use, so that we can shorten those trips. And so that's -- we're right now in the data collection mode. And as we move through the plan, we're going to continue to keep an eye on how this all comes together.

Thank you.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Board Member Mitchell.

CARB BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Good morning.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Good morning.

CARB BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Good to see you again, Hasan.

MR. IKHRATA: Good to see you.

CARB BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: First, I want to congratulate you on what I consider to be a brilliant and innovative approach to -- to regional transportation and -- and the justified reliance on big data.

I do have one concern, and I'm looking at slides -- I think it's on page 24. And, you know, I come

I do notice on your plan that some of the very expensive kinds of travel modes in your transit leap part of your big five modes are located very close to the coastline.

And we are expecting with climate change an increase in sea level rise. And so I just wondered how you had approached that and what your plans are to address that with those transit leap investments in your plan?

1.3

2.2

MR. IKHRATA: Thank you and good to see you,
Director Mitchell. It's been a while since I see you in
the LA area, but simple. We're not going to make the
mistake of our predecessors who put the line just on the
beach. Now, we're trying to stabilize it and spend tens
of millions of dollars in State and local funding to fix
it.

These lines will go underground inland, not on the coastline. We're going to take this very seriously. As a matter of fact, one of the things that Secretary Kim created a working group to actually move some of the tracks now inland, so we are going the sea level rise that we're talking about. So while on the map they look like in the coast, but they're not. And I want to make sure they're far enough to overcome any sea level rise that we're -- we're forecasting. But that's a great -- a great notice there, but they're not on the coast. We're

actually moving the Del Mar Bluff one and a half mile from the coast inland. We're looking at ways to move it and pay for potentially a tunnel to do that.

2.2

CARB BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Great. Thank you.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Good response. I think we also had CARB Board Member Takvorian, yes and then Rocco Davis.

Nichols. And thank you Hasan, and Coleen, and Ray.

Fantastic presentation. And I have to say I've had the opportunity to see it previously and watch it evolve. And I would really want to congratulate you for the amazing community outreach that you did, because part of the reason I had the opportunity to see it was because we joined with community members who were given access to the presentation, and that was really, I think, unprecedented, especially for this agency, and really unprecedented in terms of transportation planning in San Diego. So I congratulate you and appreciate what you've done in the regard.

And I think that you heard, and is reflected in the vision, that community members, particularly in disadvantaged and environmental justice communities, really are valuing flexibility, which you've built into the plan. They really need that. Affordability is

critical obviously and clean transportation, zero-emission vehicles.

1.3

2.2

So I have -- I have two questions. I also want to say, and I don't think you showed these slides today, that I -- I know the community has really appreciated SANDAG's mapping of the COVID crisis, the incidence, and infections, and deaths, as well as putting that on a map with the hardest economically impacted communities. I think those were really, really important data points to call -- they're much more than data points, but they really are reflecting the lives of communities that are suffering so much. So I really appreciate that you really looked at that. And I know that that was part of the consideration.

My two questions are related to affordability. You know, what are you thinking about displacement and how transportation planning may impact displacement? And my second question is what role can the federal government, should the federal government, play in enabling us and other regions to achieve this kind of bold vision?

MR. IKHRATA: Thank you. And again thank you for your leadership regionally and at the State level. I appreciate your comment.

Let me just start with the last question. Obviously, we always look to partner with our national

government. And that has to happen for us to move a vision that's going to cost a lot of money, but also going to really set the -- set the tone for the rest of the nation of how we, as urban regions in a great country, in a great nation, that invested trillions of dollars in infrastructure, how can we move forward?

2.2

I think we're trying to say we know how in San Diego. Here is how you collect data. But unfortunately, the time was short today, we couldn't show you those maps that Ray Major and his team did, which actually was used nationally by many of the NACAA members, because the time -- you always expect something, but when you see it in actuality what you saw, I wish we could show it to you.

So how do we overcome the displacement, the social inequity that happened? That is what I meant when I said let us make social equity part of the criteria like we do, you know, greenhouse gas emission or congestion relief. And we're going to look -- every investment is going to look at those factors.

And we're going to take this seriously. It's going to be more than checking the box. But Coleen, you want to add to that?

So we'll make sure that social equity consideration is real, not just to say we did it.

CARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Mr. Davis.

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Commissioner Davis, if you're -- there you go.

CTC COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yeah, I just unmuted -- I unmuted myself. I apologize.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: There you go.

CTC COMMISSIONER DAVIS: My wife keeps me muted all the time, so I'm just used to being muted, so...

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.2

answer on displacement. That sort of ties into -- I think the plan that you've put together is really well done and should be a model for others to look at. The urban infill and the way you're looking at -- trying to make sure that it has the proper equity is really critical.

My question is is that, you know, we're hearing at least from my colleagues within my organization in New York, and in New Jersey, and in Philadelphia, where we are seeing big city flight. People with cooped up in one bedroom apartments with kids are looking to try to get to the suburbs, so that if there's another pandemic, or another lockdown, they've got a little bit of space to breathe and sort of stretch their arms and legs.

Are you guys having any of those sort of conversations when you're looking at how we anticipate

what the next move is for people post pandemic, once we've got a Dr. Fauci-approved vaccine. And just curious how that -- what, if any, thoughts have gone into that sort of thing.

2.2

And then I'll just close with this that -- ask for any good news, if we heard it. And CNN has just called Wisconsin for Biden, and Maine. So I don't know if everybody else is sort of following two different things here every once in a while to catch up.

But a great presentation. Just a little curiosity on my part.

MR. IKHRATA: Thank you, Mr. Davis. Thank you very much for the question.

I will tell you this, yes, we did hear these discussion about would the pandemic change anything moving forward and would it -- would it allow us to change a three-decade plan because of this pandemic? And premature to say one way or another. But I also remind you that many people said oh, my, God, density is the reason why people want to leave the cities.

I remind people that Tokyo is a very dense city in world. And they -- the pandemic didn't affect them, because of their densities, because of other measures. So we're still learning how this is going to impact us moving forward. We did consider the data we have available, but

it will be premature and shortsighted to base our three-decade planning on this pandemic, unless we learn more. We still don't know what the other side of COVID-19 looks like.

2.2

But what we're finding out whether there is a movement from the city to the suburbs, vice versa, people still love to drive. And we need to reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions. And we need to figure out a very logical way to get people from A to B without driving a lot. So we're learning a lot, but that's a great question, Mr. Davis. Thank you.

CTC COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Thank you.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Great.

That's the list of questions from the panel members.

So I'm going to now move on to our next presentation, which involves two speakers, who will be delivering a combined presentation. And they'll be sharing some recommended actions on transportation equity programs, and thoughts about how our agencies can use these joint meetings to help improve the alignment of State policies for achieving long-term climate, air quality, transportation, and housing goals.

The first speaker is Nailah Pope-Harden, policy advocate with ClimatePlan. ClimatePlan is a coalition of

more than 50 partners who work to improve land use and transportation planning to protect Californian's health, communities, environment and climate. And she provides policy analysis on State administrative policy funding and legislation for ClimatePlan.

The second speaker will then be Hana Creger, environmental equity program manager for the Greenlining Institute. Greenlining is a policy research, organizing and leadership institute working for racial and economic justice. Hana's work is focused on the intersection of transportation, climate change and economic opportunities for low income communities of color. So very relevant to this discussion.

And now I would like to ask these two speakers to begin their presentation.

MS. POPE-HARDEN: All right. Good morning, everyone. I am going to be basically doing some type of introduction for Hana who's going to provide all the meaty portions of this presentation.

(Laughter.)

1.3

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

MS. POPE-HARDEN: So Nailah Pope-Harden, policy manager at ClimatePlan. It is -- it is very exciting to be here. ClimatePlan has actually co-sponsored the legislation that created this meet -- these meetings. And

so it is good to see that these meetings are still moving forward. And, yeah, let me start.

1.3

2.2

So I have three disclaimers before I want to start. And the first is I'm just going to offer an analogy for us that's going to help kind of set the stage for conversations about equity. And this analogy would be way better served in a non-COVID world, where we are thinking about the holiday season and planning to gather with families. So as we -- as I give this presentation, please just keep that thought in the back of your head that these is -- in ideal circumstances, this analogy makes a lot more sense, when we're back to normal or whatever the new world will look like.

The other disclaimer that I want to make is that I am extremely biased when it comes to talking about equity. I am South Sac born and raised in a disadvantaged community. And so these conversations are not theoretical for me. I am the product of what happens when these type of meetings that we're at today are not intentional about getting to the root causes of what makes disadvantaged communities disadvantaged. So I have a little bit extra fire under me, because I, firsthand, understand the impacts of these meetings.

And the third disclaimer that I'm going to give is that I am not the originator of this analogy. I heard

it one-off. If you are the originator of this, please let me know so that I can credit you next time I give a presentation and use this analogy. I am just elaborating what I heard.

2.2

So let me begin. I'm titling this portion of the presentation equity is not salt. And what I mean by that is as we're thinking about gathering with our families, and creating, and possibly having some nice Thanksgiving and holiday meals, and thinking about being thankful and reflecting, a lot of our programs are treating equity the same way we treat salt. It's something you just sprinkle on your food.

And so currently, yeah, we sprinkle equity into programs. We hold a public participation workshop, and, you know, we sprinkle a little salt there. We think that comment periods after -- you know, comment periods on some of our plans that are already baked is like a little bit of garnish there at the end of a meal.

And then we sprinkle input from stakeholders throughout. But what I'm offering is that we really start to season our programs and that we need more well seasoned programs moving forward.

We need a fall-off-the-bone, mouth-watering, succulent, satisfying programs and policies for our communities. With the state of the world, we have climate

change and we have racial justice. We call for more robust succulent programs.

2.2

And so we aren't going to create these programs just by adding more salt. We can't create it by adding more equity, by just adding a few more public participation opportunities. We have to really dig deep into what are some of the systemic issues and reach back into our spice cabinet, to the back of our spice cabinet. And we need to add things like the paprika, the cumins, the seasoning salt, the parsleys. We need to add things like technical assistance, language access, holistic planning approaches, leveraging funds between agencies, equity advisory committees. And we need to reimagine how we're even cooking these meals to begin with.

It's about making sure that our meals and our programs are marinated in equity, making sure that they are basted with equity as they're cooking. It's about when the programs were done, adding the garnishment, the sauces, you know, and having equity at every portion of the planning process.

So like a great example is we've been working with the CTC to have an equity -- create an equity advisory committee. I want you to think of that as like having a special rub sauce, right, that's already baked in and in your cab -- already put together and in your

cabinet and it's just sitting there. You don't have to recreate it. It's there.

2.2

Anytime you go to cook a meal, you know you just pull out this equity advisory committee and they can help get whatever program it is beautifully seasoned. That's what we're offering. It's not something that has to be recreated or reinvented. It is something you have to play with the spice levels. You have to figure out how much cayenne pepper your program can withstand or how much public engagement your program can withstand.

So you do have to play with the levels. But once you created it, it's just something that can be sitting there that's going to make everything better.

And it's -- it's honestly not that much harder. It's not that hard to do. It takes time, but it's not that hard to do, because the people we're talking about engaging are not theoretical people. They're not data points on a map. What they are are people living probably in the south side or north sides of the communities we all reside in. We know where our disadvantaged communities are. We know -- the people are there.

They're also the people who are typically next to waste pollution sites or the people that are at the end of our transit lines. These are the people that we need to make sure that we're engaging.

And one of the reasons why I think it's really important to have this conversation here is because we're talking about the impacts of disadvantaged -- we can talk about the whole impacts of disadvantaged communities. We know that these communities aren't disadvantaged by one singular program or agency. It is the intersection of all of these agencies.

1.3

2.2

To like move the metaphor further, right, we're cooking a whole meal here. And what we can do in these meetings is a cook a whole meal. We're not just talking about one turkey at Thanksgiving. But these joint meetings are a place where we can really figure out, well, what are the sides? What do other agencies bring to the program and how can we cook a full feast for our communities?

And we want sides, appetizers, desserts, the seven courses, whatever they are, how do we bake those into these programs?

Let's see, so -- and again, don't get me wrong, I completely understand how these meetings are supposed to go, where you guys -- not -- we are baked programs, we serve them at these meetings, and then everyone kind of tastes them and says, oh, you know, it's good. You know, but maybe next time we could add a little bit of -- a little bit more spice or, you know, we had tried to add

hot sauce on our end to make it a little bit more to our taste. And we're playing too nice. I think it's time to just say that we have bland and dry programs that aren't nourishing us and our communities.

2.2

And so in South Sacramento and many other communities, we have a saying that we're eating. And it isn't the literal saying. It means that you're doing more than surviving. So if someone says, "How are you doing", you can say like, "We're eating", like we have enough. We have on our plate -- we have food on our plate and we are eating.

So how do we make sure that our communities eat?
We cook succulent, fall-off-the-bone, hearty programs.
And I am just asking that we be very intentional about not serving bland and inequitable programs anymore.

And so with that, I am going to pass it to Hana, who's going to give a lot more tangible ways that we can do that. But I also hope that in some ways I have made better and almost ruined the way that you cook from now on, because every time you open your spice cabinet, you will now be thinking about equity.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

MS. CREGER: Thank you so much, Nailah. That was fantastic. A really beautiful analogy.

Hi, everyone. I'm Hana Creger, program manager

with Greenlining Institute. And thank you for the opportunity to speak with you all today.

Next slide, please.

1.3

2.2

--000--

MS. CREGER: So Greenlining is a research and public policy non-profit. And we've been advocating for racial equity for 27 years. And we do this work because of systemic injustices like redlining, which was one of many racist public policies that led to a lack of investment and disparities in transportation, health, wealth in communities of color and particularly in black communities.

Next slide, please.

--000--

MS. CREGER: Now, as I was mentioning before, you know, in reducing GHGs and pollution, if we want everyone to have a better quality of life, particularly black and brown communities, we know that we have to also reduce VMT, because we cannot afford to have a vehicle-dependent future, even if it is electric. We need a comprehensive mobility approach that's tailored to meet the needs of different geographies, whether that's, you know, rural, suburban or urban.

And so that is the work of Greenlining and that should also be the perspectives of the three agencies here

today.

1.3

2.2

Next slide.

--000--

MS. CREGER: Now, we are in this crisis of racial injustice and climate disaster because of a broken redlined economy that is built off of extraction and exclusion. That economy was not built to meet the needs of communities of color and in fact it was explicitly designed to harm communities of color.

And so we are proposing a new paradigm, a greenlined economy, which you can see here on the right, because we need a system that's non-exploitative, inclusive, democratic, regenerative and that meets the needs of people who have suffered the most under our redlined economy.

And at the center of that is communities who have the knowledge and expertise to get us to this new paradigm. So a greenlined economy and transportation system is what's possible, but only with the help of CARB, CTC, HCD and other State and local agencies. And to get there, we have to accept a mutual responsibility and develop clear principles and strategies.

Next slide.

--000--

MS. CREGER: So these strategies include our six

standards for equitable investment. Every single transportation investment should emphasize anti-racist solutions, prioritize multi-sector approaches, deliver intentional benefits, build community capacity, be community driven at every stage and should establish paths towards wealth building.

2.2

And so now I want to share how we are actually applying these investment standards. So for the last eight months, we have been conducting an equity evaluation of a wide variety of clean mobility programs across California and across State agencies.

We want to uncover which clean mobility programs are actually delivering most on equity and how can we improve and expand upon them?

And so next, I'll share some of those programs that are getting close to upholding those standards. And the three agencies here should be playing close attention to those programs and how you all can collaborate, and partner, and co-fund them in order to collectively meet the needs of California residents, particularly low-income, disadvantaged communities and communities of color.

Next slide, please.

--000--

MS. CREGER: So Clean Mobility Options is one of

CARB's programs. And what's unique about it is that communities are really shaping which clean -- clean mobility options to deploy based on their needs. They are identifying how these investments will align with other sectors, such as climate adaptation, anti-displacement, and workforce development.

So this is a reimbursable voucher for zero-emission shared mobility, innovative transit services and more. This program funds both the planning of projects and the implementation of projects. It is targeted towards smaller, rural projects that have had more difficulty competing against larger cities for other grants. There is a set-aside for tribes and transportation needs assessments, based on the feedback from the SB 350 barriers equity process. And lastly, this program includes a bottom-up technical assistance and capacity building approach.

Next slide, please.

1.3

2.2

--000--

MS. CREGER: So the STEP Program is another CARB. And it again -- you know, in an effort to be community driven, this program funds planning activities, capacity building, community engagement. It requires some form of a needs assessment, as well as multi-sector plans for anti-displacement, climate adaptation, and workforce

development. This program's implementation grants are flexible, based on community needs, and are eligible not just for infrastructure, operations and public transit, but also for new mobility, and land use, and pricing approaches, which as we heard earlier is critical for this moment in reducing VMT and unsustainable land use.

And so these community-based solutions are actually providing the tailored transportation solutions that residents are looking for. However, to scale this up, we need so much more investment in these kinds of approaches.

Next slide, please.

2.2

--000--

MS. CREGER: So these are both CARB GGRF-funded programs. And they are both in huge demand and way oversubscribed. Low income and disadvantaged communities from across the state, urban, suburban, rural, tribal communities have put together detailed community-driven, multi-sector, clean-mobility plans and projects. These programs are also identifying metrics of success. They are collecting quantitative and qualitative data to allow for the adjustment of our clean transportation policies and practices over time.

And so these clean mobility projects, they are essentially ready to go. And it's a shame, because these

equity programs are so underfunded. For Clean Mobility Options, the needs assessment voucher was able to fund 57 percent of the demand and the project implementation voucher will be able to fund around 66 percent of the demand.

Now STEP has even more of a dramatic funding disparity. They will only be able to fund 18 percent of the demand this year. So many communities will miss out of this opportunity because of a shortage of funding.

Next slide, please.

2.2

--000--

MS. CREGER: So the Clean Mobility Options and STEP Program I highlighted mall come from this very small slice of funding called the Clean Transportation Equity incentives, which represents only 12 percent of the entire pot of CARB's Low Carbon Transportation programs. Only 12 percent of those funds are specifically earmarked for low income and disadvantaged communities.

Yet, that 12 percent funds a wide variety of innovative, exciting, equitable mobility programs. Just a few, for example, are electrifying rural school buses and electric car sharing at affordable housing sites, and many more.

However, you know, we are only scratching the surface of what these programs could do for equity,

climate and air pollution because funding is so limited.

Next slide, please.

1.3

2.2

--000--

MS. CREGER: So ATP is one of the critical CTC programs that helps meet equity goals and broader community transportation needs. By statute, the program is supposed to dedicate 25 percent to disadvantaged communities. But in practice, the distribution funds is actually closer to 100 percent.

This program is multi-sector. It doesn't just fund infrastructure, but also community education and health programs. The scoring incentivizes community engagement and community driven processes. Ten percent is dedicated for small rural agencies. And so this is a fantastic program. And again, it is very underfunded and only 21 percent of applicants will receive funding this year.

And what's interesting is that, you know, it would be great to understand which of these programs have not been funded and why. So, for example, was there a lack of capacity. And so these are the kinds of connections that we need to make to see where other agencies may be able to step in and help fill those gaps, because it should not be the same communities reaping the same benefits.

You know, we need to diversify these investments to maximize benefits. And that's why these agencies have to be coordinated.

Next slide, please.

2.2

--000--

MS. CREGER: So just to summarize, the programs that I shared are providing multi-sector approaches and intentional benefits by being community driven and meeting the needs of low income and disadvantaged communities.

They are funding transportation needs assessments, technical assistance and capacity building, and they are scoring projects based on the level of community partnership and engagement. And lastly, they are both reducing GHGs and VMT.

And so Clean Mobility Options, STEP, ATP, these programs are already in motion. Folks are familiar with them and they're excited about them. And I think it's really telling that the representatives from CARB and CTC also highlighted these exact same programs earlier. We actually did not coordinate that, but I think that clearly shows that these programs have broad support from agencies and from advocates alike.

And so, you know, we do not need to reinvent the wheel. We just need to get funds to these communities as fast as possible to meet our air quality, equity, and

climate goals. And when we talk about getting funding to communities, it is critical to be looking for these cross-agency funding opportunities and to build on our existing investments.

Next slide, please.

--000--

2.2

MS. CREGER: Now, at the same time that we continue to grow the pot, the money that we already do have must be reprioritized for equity and must be moved away from programs that continue to extend the life of fossil fuels and our dependency on single-occupancy vehicles.

At the same time, how we structure our programs matter. Big projects cannot be pitted against those smaller under-resourced communities. And so we need collective measures of project selection to make sure that dollars are more equitably distributed in meeting their intended benefits.

We also have to ensure that communities have the capacity to apply for these programs, because it's not just about being shovel ready, it's about being community ready, and ensuring that community needs are at the heart of these investments.

And now, you know, all of these equitable strategies that I shared today, they should be uplifted

throughout every single one of California's transportation investments, because to deliver meaningful clean transportation to disadvantaged communities, the scale of investment that we need is enormous.

2.2

We talked so much about equity. I've heard a lot about equity today and it's exciting. However, you know, our funding of transportation equity programs has to also reflect that. And right now, we are not even getting close.

And therefore, State agencies like CARB, CTC, HCD and others must be co-funding these programs that are showing results. And, you know, this is happening in some cases. For example, the CEC and CARB have been co-funding some projects, including on workforce development and training.

And so, you know, to get there, agencies should not just be collaborating with each other, but also with equity advisory committees, as Nailah mentioned, you know, who must have a role in shaping this coordination and co-funding.

And so, you know, in a lot of ways, we already kind of have a very solid foundation. We have the partnerships in place to make this happen. These meetings are a great example, right? But now is really the time to act. And so this is a call to action to prioritize equity

across all programs, but especially those that are providing critical transportation access to communities with the greatest need.

1.3

2.2

So thank you all so much for your time and consideration. That's everything I had. And Nailah and I are happy to answer questions.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay great. Panel members, you are now welcome to ask any clarifying questions that you might have.

Well, I guess I'll -- okay. I'm going to call on Joe Lyou. But before I do call on Joe, I'm going to just ask a question, because I'm not sure exactly whether your preferring that -- again, this is sort of the salt versus baking in analogy, I guess. But I question -- my question is do you think that there should be separate equity advisory committees for each of the agencies' programs or do you think that for this group we should be looking to have a single group?

MS. POPE-HARDEN: You know, that is a great question. And I think it can be answered a few different ways. I'm going to -- it can be answered either way. I think what's really important is to make sure that equity is something that's infused at every agency, and also making sure that that coordination around equity is being coordinated between agencies as well. And so I think even

if each agency had separate equity advisory committees, it would be wildly important that sometimes those communities come together and can make a recommendation to this full body.

We also don't want to fatigue folks that are participating in this and making them have to go to multiple meetings. So it really is about what is the most fix and where we can get the most like equity bang for our buck.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

Joe Lyou.

2.2

Thank you, both, for that presentation. I found it very helpful. And I think the analogy totally works, despite the fact that many of us will be having Thanksgiving with a much smaller number of family members than we normally do this year.

I guess my question is, you know, for what we're doing at CTC is we're -- we're kind of going down a path with the California State Transportation Agency and Caltrans on equity issues and we're waiting to hear back from advocates like you. And I'm getting a little antsy, because we haven't really didn't that yet. We're in the process of forming a roundtable advisory group that's going to then kind of figure out whether we're going to

have a full-time advisory group and then all this other stuff.

2.2

But I would like for -- to give you a little bit of an opportunity to provide us some feedback whether you think we're going in the right direction and we're approaching it too quickly, too slowly? And also, you know, I am appreciative of the fact that we're talking about equity at all of our Commission meetings now. However, I think the concrete action and substantive changes have yet to be really seen.

So, let me throw that out, either one of you, if you wanted to comment on how this approach is going on a transportation side. I worked a lot, many, many years ago on the Air Resources Board side of getting them down this road. And I know it's evolved over the decades. But, you know, we're kind of a little bit new to it on the transportation side. So, please.

MS. POPE-HARDEN: Yeah. I appreciate that question. I'm going to try and link it to my analogy, which is, I think, a lot of the conversations we've been having is about preparing the menu and a lot of communities are just salivating ready to actually eat.

And so we're having all of these really lofty conversations about, oh, where would we infuse equity?

Oh, we did a plan and equity can go here, and we're

creating a roundtable that will inform an equity advisory committee, which is all just like all this menu planning, when we're really hungry and a lot of these communities are actually starving.

1.3

2.2

And so I want to be sensitive to the fact that I understand that this is hard and also that this is -there's a long path ahead and we'll have many missteps.
But that does not mean that we can't move aggressively and we can't prioritize this.

And so I would say the process feels very three steps forward, two steps back, where we are, of course, making progress forward, but is it the most efficient and effective use of our time and are our communities still, you know, suffering from the negative impacts of not making a decision quick enough? Yes. So super happy that we are moving forward, but always wish that it was like at a faster pace.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Dr. Balmes.

CARB BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Chair Nichols. And I want to thank Nailah and Hana for very nice back-to-back presentations. And I also think the analogy works.

And I just want to emphasize something that I've learned being involved in AB 617 implementation process with leading the consultation group, which brings home --

brings together multiple stakeholders to try to further that process along.

2.2

And community engagement, which you both emphasize and was built into some of those regulatory policies that you emphasize, it's something we can't just pay lip service to. I've learned how important that is for our agency. And I -- you know, it would be true for both CTC and the Housing leadership. And so that equity advisory panel that you were talking about, it will have to involve people that can represent communities. And that's -- makes the pro -- the process more complex. It's vital to have that community engagement to really make a difference, in terms of equity, but it's something the agencies have to recognize needs investment of time as well as money. So I just want to emphasize that.

So it's not something we can just sprinkle on, like you said, Nailah. It's -- we have to really bake it in. And that's -- I don't think we've -- we're doing better. I think there's no question about that, but we have a long way to go in terms of, you know, getting the baked good to come out right.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

MS. CREGER: I would just add, I mean, this s just something we bring up in every conversation around community engagement. I think -- I mean, all of us are

constantly kind of evolving our understanding of equity.

And I would challenge us is that as we're trying to hold ourselves to a higher standard of equity, I would love for us to think about how we can move away from just engagement and towards models of community decision making, and power, and self-determination, because I think what we found is that engagement depending -- it can be very varying. It can be very superficial. It can be very check the box. And so how can we expand our understanding of what an equity advisory committee could help do for these agencies.

2.2

CARB BOARD MEMBER BALMES: No. I'm glad you improved on what I was trying to say in terms of engagement. I totally agree. And that's what the AB 617 community groups want is empowerment. And that's actually what we really need to achieve equity. I agree.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Let's hear then from CTC Commissioner Burke and then Secretary Kim.

CTC COMMISSIONER BURKE: Thank you. And may I join in congratulating you and saying how much we will miss you in the future. I would just like to put in my comment in terms of a joint Committee. To me, it would have a tremendous impact on the State of California, if each one of the entities that make up this Commission could join together and share the equity issues. From my

standpoint, I believe that there is a real need that I have not really observed a lot of participation by -- at a Director level or Commission level of minorities in these particular Commissions. There has been some participation, some membership, but it has not been the kind of a participation that had tremendous impact.

1.3

2.2

So I've been on CTC for a while and my experience may be different than those who have been on the other Commissions. But I have some familiarity with those Commissions. There would be a great deal that could be gained, if there could be one joint Commission that met and shared some of the challenges. I see really tremendous challenges. And I also see that there is a great opportunity.

At this particular time, when everyone is at the forefront of talking about ethnic minorities' participation, you have to kind of strike while the ball is hot. And I feel very strongly that to the degree there could be a cooperation -- I don't know how long all of these groups will be meeting together. But assuming they will be meeting indefinitely in the future, I would like to see something joint that can be brought back to individual Commissions to share in terms of program and coordinate.

So I particularly feel that I have not seen an

excess of equity in terms of minorities on the Commissions and of the State of California. I look forward and I hope that this changes. And this is a great time to do the change to bring in, particularly executive level in some of these agencies and many other things, that are real challenges. This is a difficult time, but sometimes you have to use a difficult time to move forward and have innovative approaches.

So with that, I hope that we can look at all of these alternatives.

Thank you.

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks for that comment.

And it just reminds me that with your experience,

particularly as an office holder and an elected official,

that you have experience with reaching out to communities

and can be helpful in terms of understanding that, you

know, as was said earlier, of course, this should not be

window dressing, but to make it real, to make it something

that actually gets baked in, as we say, to the process.

There has to be that commitment to spending the time, to

actually listen, as well as to, you know, create the

committees.

But this could be a way of really lifting up these issues and of also lifting up individuals and organizations that could be making a greater contribution

to our deliberations than they are right now.

2.2

So I really want to appreciate that comment. Thank you for that.

We have two more hands up on my screen, Secretary Kim and then Board Member Takvorian.

SECRETARY KIM: Thank you very much, Chair Nichols. Hana and Nailah, excellent presentation. Greatly appreciate you highlighting the Active Transportation Program, STEP and then the other program as examples of good substantive programs that need more funding. That was the takeaway I think from your presentation.

I would greatly appreciate and welcome your analysis of other transportation programs that are perhaps falling short of the mark from an equity standpoint that could use some improvement. So perhaps at a future meeting of this group or a separate meeting off-line, I would love to hear your analysis and take on other transportation programs that need some improvement.

So thank you very much.

MS. CREGER: Thank you. And I can provide a little bit of a teaser here. So we're evaluating potentially over 21 different programs, quite a range of equity benefits. One of the programs that is not providing benefits to low income people, as we wished it

was, was the Clean Vehicle Rebate Program. And so you'll see many other of the programs that we will do in this evaluation their exact -- though the benefits are not going directly to the communities, and they're also just furthering our dependency on single-occupancy vehicles. And so those are some of the kinds of measures that we're using to evaluate overall benefits to California.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Thank you.

MS. POPE-HARDEN: I just want to add too that at ClimatePlan --

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

2.2

MS. POPE-HARDEN: -- we are working on a scorecard of some of the transportation funding programs that should be out in January that we can use to further that conversation.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Okay. Diane Takvorian.

CARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Chair and thank you Nailah and Hana. Really appreciated your presentation. And I love the analogy. As someone who cooks a lot, I really related to it. So I love that.

And I -- I want to say Nailah that I really felt that you referenced something that I think we all struggle with, which is that, you know, the mantra for the environmental justice community is that we speak for

ourselves. And that's something that we hold dear, and we're exhausted, and we're starving. So we really need to bake in, as Chair Nichols just said, into these programs so it -- it's something that we're -- we're not just -- we're not relying on the very people who are impacted by the inequities to always be there to tell everyone what needs to get done.

It really needs to become part of our culture. So I'm interested in thoughts that you have about how that could occur better.

And I think I agree with Commissioner Burke that having people that are impacted be in decision-making roles and having control of more resources is part of the answer. And so I'd be interested in that, because I -- my last question for you is how do we get to the funding equity that I think that you're slide really -- your analysis really demonstrates that we need to get to, because it's clear that the inequity is there in our own programs across the agencies. And I think everyone is very committed to making that fundamental change.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

MS. POPE-HARDEN: Yeah. Thank you for that question. I think in terms of some of the ways that baking it in -- some of the things that baking it in could look like, I'm just going to throw some pretty like

low-hanging fruit out. And then I would love to have other conversations about how we expand that. But early on, I'm thinking we have more -- we do more partnerships with CBOs. I know in other programs for -- in other agencies for certain programs and funding, you have to have a partnership with a CBO in order to apply for funding and that way you can ensure just a little bit more that community engagement is something that is happening.

2.2

There's like -- that's one solution, how do we make sure that we're partnering with CBOs that already in communities doing this work? How do we creating equity advisory committees, so that we don't have to drum up new people to be a part of this conversation, but we have something that is long lasting and sustainable.

And how do we figure out how these agency -- I mean how this group has enough power to actually impact and isn't just reacting, but can be proactive?

So one of the things that we offer when we ask for the equity advisory committee is can we set a list of priorities that agendas are set around? That way minimum, the discussion starts and rooted in what the community and top of mind for the communities.

And so is there a way for equity advisory committees to prioritize what's -- what's on agendas and what's part of the conversation, instead of the opposite

now, which is we're having to react to something that's already baked and cooked in. And that's the analogy where we're just trying to add like ketchup and hot sauce on our end to try and spice it up, but how do we actually like infuse it in the very beginning.

And then I will stop there in case Hana has anything else she would like to offer?

2.2

MS. CREGER: Yeah, one last thing I'll add, which I think is a pretty low-hanging fruit is, you know, how can we build the capacity of community-based organizations to have the time and ability to even participate in these equity advisory committees and providing some form of, you know, resourcing, or compensation, or something that makes it easier for folks to show up? And I think that's a very critical piece of equity is recognizing that not everyone has the time, ability, access, privilege to always show up in these spaces.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Indeed. Thank you for that.

We're now going to move on to our third presentation of the morning. And I don't want to cut anybody off, but I want to remind you that we have a presentation, and more questions, and then comment period before what was supposed to be a noon lunch break. So we are running late. I don't mind going late and cutting short our lunch period, but I just think people should be

aware of that that's -- that's what's at stake here.

2.2

Now, we did have one more hand up, but it is now down. So I think we can call on our next presenter, and thank you so much to this panel. Our third and final presentation is from Professor Chapple from UC Berkeley. And just by way of introduction, she's Chair of City and Regional Planning at Berkeley. And her work involves housing, equity and anti-displacement. So directly relevant to the topics here as well. And she will be sharing some recommended approaches for promoting equitable outcomes, while meeting our housing, transportation, and climate goals.

Her presentation is focused on infill development and protection from displacement, which is also directly related to one of the strategies in the action plan that we're going to be moving to after the lunch break.

So I would now invite Dr. Chapple to begin her presentation.

DR. CHAPPLE: Thank you so much, Chair Nichols and all. Nice to see you all here.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

DR. CHAPPLE: I'm quite cognizant that I'm last thing between you and lunch, so I will speak fast.

I want to start by taking the opportunity to thank Chair Nichols for her leadership, which has truly

had global impacts. So I -- you could not have been a better Chair all these years. So just fabulous work.

So next -- next slide, please.

1.3

2.2

--000--

DR. CHAPPLE: So California is not going to meet its climate goals, unless the agencies find a way to collaborate. We need to be prohousing together and we need to be pro-transportation together. And together, we need to be pro-climate.

Now, there's a lot of research on this. And in most cases, I think we actually know enough to move ahead with some sensible policies, even if results are quite mixed at times.

I'm going to talk today about what we know about transit-oriented development, about TOD, in terms of its impact on housing and transit. Then I'll talk about some basic economics of sprawl and land, and what that means for policies. Then, I'll touch on a bunch of policies that are always on our minds in Sacramento, SB 375, upzoning, electric cars, and AFFH. And then I'll conclude with some thoughts on anti-displacement policies.

Next slide.

--000--

DR. CHAPPLE: We've supported a tremendous amount of investment in transit in California, in order to reduce

VMT. It's our hope that by building more TOD, we'll get more folks to drive less. The research is pretty consistent on this. Higher income people drive more and when they move to TOD, you get more VMT reduction. We also know that subsidized housing residents living in TOD areas may not be fully utilizing the transit there.

2.2

However, there are potential costs in terms of both VMT and life chances, if you push out low-income residents and they end up in the periphery of the region. And there are crucial co-benefits of living near transit, especially if it's a walkable area with economic opportunity.

So what this means is that when we think about housing near transit, we need to consider how are we going to preserve housing affordability for the residents that are there already?

And this is not just in subsidized housing, but also in naturally occurring affordable housing within a mile of the transit station.

We're going to get a bigger VMT impact, let's face it, from market rate housing. So let's focus on Building market rate housing near transit stations. But let's build subsidized housing too, on bus feeder corridors -- in -- still within access within a mile range of transit. We'll get more housing. We'll get more bang

for our buck if we're more strategic like this.

Next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

DR. CHAPPLE: In terms of displacement, we wrote the book on this. And you can download it free from MIT Press. We looked at Los Angeles, and we looked at the Bay Area, and we found that location near a transit station can lead to gentrification and displacement, but it depends. It depends. It's a story that's really about the downtown central areas of our regions. And for most suburban areas it's taken decades for displacement impacts to materialize. And then it depends on contextual factors, micro-context, how walkable is the area around the station?

The one thing we know, and this came up in everyone of our models, is that if you have permanently subsidized housing nearby, you have less displacement. You have more stability. In other words, a lot of what we're doing, in terms of keeping housing affordable near transit stations, a lot of it is working and we should give ourselves credit, but we should do more, because we know it works.

So we need more tools. Again, preserve housing affordability for existing residents, not just to build new subsidized housing but to preserve the housing we

have.

1.3

2.2

And the transit agencies need to get in -- out there aggressively, get out there in front of their (inaudible) and bank the land, not just right next to the station, but really sites within a mile of the station.

We've seen the joint development in LA has been very effective. And we should be doing more of that throughout -- throughout our transit areas.

Next slide.

--000--

DR. CHAPPLE: We all know that there are tremendous costs of sprawl, because it's inefficient in how it uses infrastructure and land and it leads to a lot of extra driving.

And I just want to make two points here. The first is that we've gotten ourselves in a bit of a pickle, in terms of how we finance infrastructure, because we're doing it through development fees that are making housing so very expensive, and we should be using instead tools, like enhanced infrastructure finance districts to build our infrastructure where we want it to go to meet our VMT goals.

And one other point here, even more critical right now, as a state, I do -- don't think we have come to terms with the climate-related costs of building in the

wildland urban interface in particular, the WUI.

We ask builders now to use fire-resistant materials in high-risk areas. But we are seeing some low-risk areas burning. And we have older homes that will never be upgraded. And many California homeowners are about to lose their fire insurance, and that's going to be something that in the end is going to cost the State a lot of money.

This is a land-use problem not just a building problem, and we're going to have to own it as a land-use problem. We need to use whatever transportation, carrots and sticks, that we have to limit development in the WUI.

Next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

DR. CHAPPLE: Finally, this is an easy one, because we all learned it in urban economics, land costs in the core keep going up and that's not going to change. And by the way, that dynamic is exacerbating wealth inequality. The main source of wealth for the one percent is windfall gains in land.

As the land in the core becomes more expensive, it becomes harder and harder for disadvantaged communities to access opportunity and to build wealth. And so that's one of the core reasons that the racial wealth gap grows bigger and bigger.

So it's time for an aggressive public lands strategy in California. There are enormous stocks of surplus transportation lands that we need to excess, as we say. At the same time, we need to be supporting land acquisition in the urban core in order to preserve housing affordability and accessibility. And since there is sooner or later going to be a conversation about reparations in the state, we ought to get out ahead of that. These lands give us an opportunity to think about restorative and reparative justice.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

DR. CHAPPLE: Now, SB 375, though we all have learned to love it, it has not had quite the impacts that were anticipated. There just haven't been enough implementation tools to really make a difference on the ground.

A group of Berkeley students just did a report for the Housing Transportation Workgroup under the supervision of Egon Terplan. And that report explores what the MPOs would like to see in terms of reforms. And in terms of housing, it's clear that they want new carrots, not new authorities necessarily, but new carrots to help theme meet the RHNA goals.

I recently surveyed California jurisdictions and

ADUs and zoning, and it showed that they're really constrained for capacity in terms of being more prohousing. The State needs to help.

And baking prohousing approaches into transportation and climate funding will be critical. MPOs need to allocate more housing to job-rich areas, but then they're also going to have to help localities meet their targets by using carrots, like funding for greening or active transportation programs investments, as we just heard about, or even just funds for training, or improving data collection under 1483.

The Prohousing Designation process is going to incentivize jurisdictions to grow their housing trust funds. And that's going to be fantastic. But the MPOs also need to help develop regional housing trust funds that pools all this local money into significant pots of funding that can then go towards housing production near jobs or transit.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

DR. CHAPPLE: This overview would not be complete without talking about upzoning. We know enough now that broad brush straight -- state efforts to upzone

California, even if we could pass them at the Legislature, they may actually backfire. Our work at the Terner Center

showed that local zoning and permitting regulations are so complex that upzoning alone is not even going to be enough, but still it is time to reform single-family zoning and address its racist legacy. I do think that the path forward lies in legislation to spur construction of missing middle housing. And this is a logical extension that will build on our fabulous successes in ADU legislation and production.

The survey we recently did of California jurisdictions shows that planning officials, local planners are very supportive of zoning reform that supports missing middle densification.

You're going to have to make sure you have anti-displacement policies in place when you -- when you do it. But it's time to target competitive transportation funding whatever we have to jurisdictions with Prohousing Designations.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

DR. CHAPPLE: And finally on opportunity. In the big picture, I believe that California has been overly focused on rail transit to meet its greenhouse gas reduction goals. And there are other ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that will be more equitable. Communities of color should not have to bear the

disproportionate burden of our VMT reduction goals.

2.2

We know that rail transit is not always the best way for low-skilled workers to reach their jobs, which tend to be dispersed through regions. Women in particular tend to be dependent on buses and cars, for instance, to get to jobs as domestic workers. Women also have complicated activity patterns, because they're responsible for child and elder care. And Evelyn Blumenberg of UCLA has dedicated her career to making this point. So 7920 is a huge opportunity to expand our investment in electric car sharing programs for low income households.

And I also want to think here about opportunity in terms of integrating AFFH, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing policy into our housing elements. We want to think very carefully about our areas of opportunity in our regions, which are mapped in our TCAC/HCD opportunity maps.

Maps like this, and fair housing policies generally show a lot of opportunity way out there in the suburbs. But already Director Velasquez pointed out to us that transportation costs are very, very high out there in those high opportunity areas.

So we need to make sure that low wage workers continue to have good access to jobs, and that means access to the urban core, and it means improving resources

within the high segregation areas that are in the urban core but without displacement.

Which brings me to my last point. Next slide.

--000--

DR. CHAPPLE: And so we need to confront our long legacy in planning of ignoring displacement impacts. We have a number of model anti-displacement policies that we know can work to keep communities in place, but it's time for the State to coordinate on those policies.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

DR. CHAPPLE: This is my kind of favorite list.

I'm not going to spend -- go over 40 policies right now,
but this is my favorite list of anti-displacement policies
that work in the very short term saving individual
buildings and tenants the -- to the very long term
preserving land for our grandchildren.

Next slide.

--000--

DR. CHAPPLE: Now, as it happens, you all know about these. Here is the -- a very similar list in Transformative Climate Communities Program. And in this program, communities are asked to show that they are using one or more of these programs. And it's a -- it helps them get points and get funding. This is a brilliant,

brilliant, brilliant idea and we need to do more of this. We need to bake this in -- into all of our programs that we implement at the State level.

However, a lot of these things are not under State control, so -- next slide.

--000--

DR. CHAPPLE: I want to just focus on what the State can really shape in terms of anti-displacement and affordable housing strategies. And that's where public investment goes. That's where you dispose of public lands. That's how bank -- bank land, facilitate community land trusts, target affordable housing to gentrifying areas, do land value capture, et cetera.

These are where the State can really make a difference. And I look forward to seeing us do it all together in the future.

So thank you very much.

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Oop, Chair Nichols, I think you're muted.

You're muted.

1.3

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you. Just when you think you really have something good to say, you find out that you're on mute, but what I really just wanted to say was thank you very much.

And I think we should take a few more questions,

if there are any burning questions right now. We can also resume after lunch. There's no ironclad restriction, as far as I know, that would prevent us from -- from carrying on into -- a little bit into the -- into the afternoon, because we hear from our remaining panels, the second agenda -- on the second agenda item.

But if there's some burning questions right this minute, and it looks like there's two, let's take those and then -- and then call for the break.

Okay. Gustavo Velasquez.

2.2

HCD DIRECTOR VELASQUEZ: Thank you, Madam Chair. It was just a word of appreciation for Karen's presentation. I thought that was very rich. Karen, I have to say I've been meaning to touch base with you since I started here. Here's where I found you, which is great. Now, I have to put something on the calendar with you, because we need help with our opportunity maps, which are maps that will continue to help our funding decisions, and we need to make them a bit better.

But just on displacement, let me say this is yet again another presentation, the previous one as well, that I think helps us understand the importance of innovative approaches like this Prohousing Designation Program that we presented earlier and the opportunity to treat it as a program with incentives attached, so that we reward

jurisdictions that are actually moving, even on displacement, things in the right direction.

2.2

I mean, when you mentioned value -- land value taxation, I would add, you know, rent control, which now failed twice, but -- but some jurisdictions, you know, may find rent control as a -- as a valuable option.

Trust funds to support purchase of newer properties. Community land trusts, which is something that an area that is growing, especially areas that are facing rapid gentrification and displacement potential, source of income discrimination, higher density, all of these things is just the toolbox, right, that we need in areas that are gentrifying, that -- where low income residents are being displaced just a robust toolbox that are ingrained, in large part, in our Prohousing Designation regulations.

So I continue to, you know, call really -- it's really a call to action to think of this as actionable the steps that we can together take with CTC and CARB working in partnership.

And I -- I'm also going to say thank you for,

Karen, for pointing out the role of our public transit

entities in supporting on just the adjacent areas to rail

stations, but beyond that. You know, we fought so much

WMATA in Washington, D.C. I think is second or third

```
largest transit system in the country to do more, other than just next to rail stations.
```

And it took so long. It took ten years. Finally, they did it, but by the time they did it, many of those neighborhood were gone. I mean, low income residents were already, you know, displaced massively. And so it's an opportunity here for, you know, our transportation agencies to -- to help with our transit agencies across the -- across the state to ensure that they can, you know, implement also new policies to look at affordable housing above and beyond their immediate areas.

And I think they have a great amount of influence in doing that.

So thank you for calling that out. That's all

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Chair Nichols.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Sorry for interrupting. This is Ryan. Just a logistical note. We have four public commenters with their hands up. I was asking if before lunch we can hear from them just so they don't have to wait

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: After Supervisor

25 | Gioia.

1.3

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: I think that would sensible and humane also. So we just have one more Board member with his hand up and that would be John Gioia and then we go to the public comment.

2.2

CARB BOARD MEMBER GIOIA: So I just wanted to acknowledge Professor Chapple's great work over the years at your center. I know we know her well in the Bay Area, and in Contra Costa, and in the East Bay. And although the work is clearly statewide and beyond -- and just to note, Karen, what I've appreciated is that, you know, you always advocate the importance of this work at all levels of government, in working together, right, whether it's a State agency, county government, city government, working with community-based organizations. And I just wanted to express appreciation. It's good to see you and look forward to continuing to see this work.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Great.

Thank you. Okay. Then this will conclude this particular presentation, but we will hear from members of the public who wanted to comment on any of the presentations.

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have five people with their hands currently raised. Brian Wilcox, James Corless, Therese Trivedi, Chanell Fletcher, Julia Randolph and a new hand Joseph

Williams.

1.3

2.2

So if you would like to comment, please raise your hand or dial star nine now, and -- if I didn't call out your name. So I will call out -- I will activate Brian Wilcox's microphone. Please unmute yourself and you can begin.

MR. WILCOX: My name is Brian Wilcox. I'm the Chief Engineer of Marine BioEnergy. And Marine BioEnergy has a contract with the U.S. Department of Energy to develop a system to grow giant kelp native to California in the open ocean. This kelp would be processed by available commercial plants into carbon neutral fuels. Carbon neutral in the sense that the CO2 released in burning the fuel is reabsorbed by the kelp in equal amounts to create each next crop.

One attractive biofuel is bio-crude as input to the existing petrochemical infrastructure to deliver gasoline, diesel, jet fuel, et cetera. Also, kelp is easily processed into biogas to supply the existing natural gas network, and in particular, can stabilize the electrical grid by allowing existing gas-fired power plants to respond to fluctuations that inevitably will result from increased use of solar panels and wind farms.

The premise of marine bioenergy is that kelp will grow in the open ocean when depth cycled from the surface,

where it absorbs sunlight to below thermocline each night to absorb the abundant nutrients that exist there, but not at the surface.

1.3

2.2

Our first test of this concept was conducted in the summer of 2019 off the coast of Catalina Island. That test, performed in collaboration with the marine research facility on Catalina operated by the University of Southern California showed that kelp grew five percent per day when depth cycled while the control kelp grew only 3.5 percent per day in a nearby natural kelp bed.

USC biologists are also part of another DOE award to catalogue the genome of giant kelp off California and create sterile hybrids that can grow much faster than native kelp. Current cost estimates are that the near-term cost to produce kelp will be well below a hundred dollars per dry metric ton with an eventual cost expected to be as low as \$25 per dry metric ton.

This low cost will allow the existing petrochemical and natural gas infrastructure to switch to carbon neutral biofuels seamlessly and without increase in cost.

To replace 10 percent of the U.S. liquid transportation fuels, we would need to cultivate an area about equal to the state of Utah. However, the Pacific Ocean has seven -- an area of 705 Utahs. It is

straightforward to see how to expand kelp farming to ultimately replace all fossil fuels used globally. It is similarly straightforward to accomplish this within 10 to 15 years, as climate scientists have stated is essential.

California is ideally positioned geographically, biologically, and technologically to foster this new industry until it becomes a dominant export of the state. Banning the use of fuels based on the apparent premise that any fuel is a fossil fuel will halt this revolutionary solution to climate change.

Thank you very much.

2.2

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you.

Our next speaker James Corless. James, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

MR. CORLESS: Okay. Thank you. Can you hear me okay?

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: We can.

MR. CORLESS: Great. This is James Corless, Executive Director of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, or SACOG.

Once again, really appreciate the great presentations and dialogue this morning. I want to really just put a finer point on Professor Chapple's presentation and offer us up as a bit of a poster child for the

challenges of trying to implement all of the State goals and State programs.

2.2

SACOG, the six-county MPO in the greater
Sacramento region, we adopted our long-range
transportation plan just last year. Hit a 19 percent
greenhouse gas target. We adopted our RHNA Cycle 6. We'd
hit our RHNA housing goals. But it's not enough just to
have a plan, I think as all you know. We want to
understand how to truly implement, how to truly make a
difference on the ground in the short term, because we are
in a crisis, an economic crisis, a climate crisis, and a
housing crisis.

We've identified infrastructure, the unsexy infrastructure, water, sewer, utilities, that if we had money to do that infrastructure, we could unlock as many as 17,000 housing units, multi-family, affordable, largely suburban on old strip malls and corridors. This is a suburban inland California strategy that would also take pressure off the wildland urban interface. We have high fire risk areas in our region.

But here's the problem. The problem is that all the different State silos of the State funding programs do not work for what we need to achieve. They don't -- they so don't work, that we have jurisdictions who aren't even applying for the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program

because they know they can't compete, because they know they don't qualify based on the State guidelines, so we are really happy to see the three agencies work together. We are putting our hands up and waving furiously saying we want to be a really good regional partner, MPO partner, much as Professor Chapple said, but we are in desperate need of funding. We just don't have anymore. Really about the loss of redevelopment.

And we want to make Regions Rise a real thing. We want to be a pilot program to commingle some of your silos, so that we can unlock this housing potential and meet all of these goals quickly and be a pilot for the rest of inland California, which we think is desperately needed.

So thank you.

1.3

2.2

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Therese Trivedi. And I apologize if I mispronounce anyone's name.

Therese, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

MS. TRIVEDI: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you. Therese Trivedi, Assistant Planning Director for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Association of Bay Area Governments. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this very important discussion this morning.

MTC has some similar comments to fellow MPO
SANDAG and SACOG, who you just heard. And with a
reference to Director Velasquez's opening remarks, MTC
supports the need to further line the State's goals
related to climate change, VMT reduction, housing
production inequity, so that regional agencies responsible
for developing sustainable community strategies and RHNA
can work to an all-of-the-above strategy. At present, the
SCS has a primary focus on GHG reduction, where as RHNA
supports multiple goals.

MTC supports additional and consistent alignment of State agency climate, transportation and housing policies, as well as funding priorities to achieve these State goals.

We also support flexibility in the way regions manage goal implementation. MTC looks forward to working with each agency to bring about greater alignment of our planning efforts and investments so that we can make advancements on all of the important goals that have been discussed this morning.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Chanell Fletcher. And then after Chanell, we have Julia Randolph, Joseph Williams, and Helen Water-Terrinoni.

Chanell, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

MS. FLETCHER: Hello.

2.2

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Yep, we can hear you.
MS. FLETCHER: Okay. Great.

Thank you guys so much. I want to say I'm super grateful for these meetings, and the space, and this dialogue, and these conversations. And then on the flip side, because I'm just a very transparent person, I will also say that I feel a little frustrated, because I don't feel like any of this information is necessarily new.

So I've been doing this work since 2009 and I feel like we've heard a lot of these points, you know, before, around like VMT and GHG. And I really appreciated both, you know, my colleagues Hana and Nailah when they were talking about equity and not sprinkling it in.

And I want to bring this up, because I think we're at a point where I think we need to stop necessarily just having the conversation and the dialogue, and we need to start moving to tangible actions. And so like what are we going to do with this information?

And I say that, because I think, you know -- you know, as Hana brought up, for example, transportation, a lot of the programs that we're seeing that are actually pushing forward equity and climate change, they're

underfunded and oversubscribed. And then we have these larger, you know, funded programs, like the SHOPP, the STIP, local streets and roads that were not built around equity. They weren't built around climate change. And in some ways, they probably have actually perpetuated systems of oppression against like low income communities and communities of color.

2.2

And we're not -- we're not addressing that issue, right? We're not looking at those programs and examining that.

And so when I hear, you know, James, and other MPOs talk about the silos of funding, and we need more funding, and we need more integration, I'm like, yes, and we need to have a conversation where we're actually looking at these funding pots and thinking through is this how we want to keep funding?

Like ClimatePlan and Greenlining honestly, I'm glad that we're doing the work to kind of like do, like, examine these programs. But I also think that's what like CARB, CTC, like Caltrans, like you guys should be doing this work.

And so I think that's really what I wanted to kind of -- to elevate was that we need to see more action. We need to see a coordinated plan of like what are we going to do around housing, around transportation, around

land use, around things like 375 to actually achieve our goals.

And I would say for these joint meetings
particularly what are the next steps? Like, what can we
as advocates, you know, get as a commitment from these
three agencies of how you're going to work together, what
is the action, what is the plan? And I if you can't kind
of commit to that at least, I would love to kind of hear
on some level, like, here is how we're moving forward to
tangible action to taking this information versus again
kind of just having these conversations, which although I
do think they're important, I just don't think we're
actually moving the needle and climate change is pressing,
equity is pressing, and none of these are going to stop.

Thank you so much.

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: I don't usually comment on comment, but I have to say stick around, okay, because that's what this afternoon's agenda is all about. This morning was just the panel presentations.

MS. FLETCHER: Thank you.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Julia Randolph. Julia, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

MS. RANDOLPH: Hi. Julia Randolph with the Coalition for Clean Air. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

All Californians deserve clean mobility as it is crucial to having a decent standard of living and quality of life. Bringing clean mobility to all is also essential in achieving clean air and a stable climate. We support the recommendations and equitable investment standards shown in the Greenlining and ClimatePlan presentation. We need equity to be embedded in all programs, and our programs that already doing this well need increased funding.

Programs such as the Active Transportation

Program and STEP and Clean Mobility Options Voucher Pilot

Program already have equity embedded and are community

driven. Yet, while they go above and beyond as programs,

they are oversubscribed and underfunded. We need more

coordination and collaboration from these agencies when it

comes to funding clean mobility for our disadvantaged

communities.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Joseph Williams. I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

Joseph Williams are you there?

1.3

2.2

If you are having technical issues, we have a call-in number and access code on the screen there. But for now, we will skip you and go to Helen. Helen Walter-Terrinoni. Helen, if you're -- yep. Go ahead and begin.

MS. WALTER-TERRINONI: Thanks, Ryan. Thank you.

Hi. My name is Helen Walter-Terrinoni. And I work for the Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute.

And I'm not sure where to insert this comment into this process. And by the way, I think this is a fantastic process. I'd love to see the agencies together to sort through how to move forward with the various important, especially climate goals.

The air-conditioning industry is on the verge of a transition to low global warming potential refrigerants. These are short-lived climate pollutants that will be replaced as required under SB 1383, which tells CARB that they must reduce the use of hydrofluorocarbon refrigerants by 40 percent by 2030 compared to 2013.

In order to enable the use of low global warming potential refrigerants, building codes need to be updated to enable the use of these alternative solutions. That has not taken place yet and it's very important that these

practical matters be addressed in order for -- in order for this transition to occur.

1.3

2.2

So I think that as you're, you know, having these conversations around how State agencies can work together, some of these practical and tedious issues that are not as exciting as lofty climate goals, but are necessary in order to achieve them, must be put on the table. So, for example, this transition requires change to these new refrigerants that have some mild lower flammability characteristics, such that some changes are needed to be made. The industry has invested more than \$7 million in research into how to safely use these alternatives, understanding that these regulations are in play all over the world and this is just something that has to be done to support the world's climate goals.

This change globally is worth a half a degree Celsius and has been incorporated into the Montreal Protocol of substances that deplete the ozone layer. Again, I think that it's very important for the agencies -- so the State agencies to coordinate together, to make sure that Building Code changes and other necessary requirements are enabled to transition as needed, not only for this industry but also for other important goals.

And again, I apologize if this is not in the

right flow and the right place for this comment, but I wanted to make sure that I made this remark.

2.2

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Joseph Williams. And after Joseph, we have our last commenter Mike Woodman.

If you wish to make a comment on these presentations, please raise your hand. This is your last call for that.

So Joseph, you can go ahead and unmute yourself and begin.

Joseph, are there you? I see you're unmuted.

So Joseph, if you're having -- if you're talking, we can't hear you. So if you can call into that number right there and dial star nine, that will let us know that you'll be able to speak then.

So we'll on move quickly to Mike Woodman. Mike,
I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself
and begin.

MR. WOODMAN: Chair Norton, thank you for the opportunity to comment today. Mike Woodman, Deputy Executive Director of the Nevada County Transportation Commission and Chair of the North State Super Region.

For those that may not be familiar with the North State Super Region, this group represents a partnership between the 16 Northern California regional transportation

planning agencies and metropolitan planning organizations in the north state. And it was formed to provide a unified voice when addressing State and federal transportation funding and policy decisions, and also to establish coordination of transportation planning efforts in this mega region.

1.3

2.2

As the state focuses on greenhouse gas reduction goals, and equity, and environmental justice in transportation planning and funding decisions, we need to ensure that there's a focus on geographic and economic equity across the state. Many of the rural areas across the State are economically disadvantaged, they lack affordable housing and are also dependent on interregional connections to access multi-modal options, employment, education, health services and are critical evacuation good movement routes.

Both the policy and funding de -- funding decisions going forward need to acknowledge and address the lack of investment in these areas and also understand the unique challenges and differences. The North State Super Region and Rural Counties Task Force and also the rural county representatives of California need to be meaningfully engaged by CARB, the Department of Housing and Community Development, and CalSTA to ensure that the policies and regulations don't have unintended

consequences, and can be effective in accomplishing the goals of the rural disadvantaged areas of the state.

In closing, the North State Super Region is supportive of the state's climate and housing goals and believe our input can assist in successful implementation, but we have to have a valid seat at the table.

I look forward to further opportunities for further engagement on addressing the challenges we face as a state. And the challenges in the rural parts of our state are unique.

Just one fact for you, it's -- North State Super Region only accounts for six percent of the VMT. So, you know, one-size-fits-all regulations don't work and we need to have honest conversations about what works, and does not have unintended consequences.

So thank you for the opportunity to comment today, and would invite CARB and HCD to participate and join us at a future meetings of the North State Super Region as well as the Rural Counties Task Force.

So thank you.

1.3

2.2

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you.

Joseph Williams has lowered his hand. I don't see a new phone number. So, Mr. Williams, if you are there, we will -- there will be additional comment periods later in the afternoon, if you wish to speak then.

But for now Madam Chair, that concludes the number of raised hands on this item.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, very good. As always happens, we've taken a little longer, but it was a very rich discussion and very substantive comments from the public as well.

So at this point, we will take our lunch break. I would like to be able to resume at 1:00 o'clock. Of course, we're not going off to lunch as we used to. You know, we don't have a catered lunch. Hopefully, people can get lunch somewhere where they are and get back here again at 1:00 o'clock. Is that acceptable to the other Commissions and Directors?

CTC CHAIR NORTON: Yes, especially considering the heft of our agenda this afternoon, absolutely.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes, exactly. All right.

HCD DIRECTOR VELASQUEZ: Yes, Madam Chair. Yes.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Very good. Thank you. Without further ado then, can you leave your screens on and just mute and stop the video. It's so much easier than trying to sign back in again, if you can do that.

(Off record: 12:34 p.m.)

(Thereupon a lunch break was taken.)

1.3

2.2

AFTERNOON SESSION

(On record: 1:14 p.m.)

2.2

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Good afternoon, everyone. Apologies for the wait.

So, Board Member De La Torre, are you there?

CARB BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yes.

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Okay. So do you have all the -- are you good to go?

CARB BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yep.

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you.

CARB BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you. Welcome back, everybody. Sorry for the little bit of delay. We had some technical issues.

So the next item on the agenda -- and I'm stepping in for Mary Nichols. This next item embodies joint coordination between agencies focused on climate, transportation and housing. We heard the earlier speakers share their recommendations on how State agencies can do a better job of aligning their programs.

Now, we will hear an update about a draft action plan, that is being developed jointly by an interagency working group to support the agencies as we address some of those same issues. Last year, the Governor issued Executive Order N-19-19, which is -- which calls for actions from multiple State agencies to reduce greenhouse

gases and address climate change, including by aligning transportation spending with the State Climate Change Scoping Plan where feasible.

1.3

2.2

Recently, the Governor issued Executive Order N-79-20, which Mr. Corey and I both mentioned today that calls for action by multiple agencies to accelerate the use of zero-emission vehicles and to move more quickly toward California's low carbon sustainable and resilient future.

The California State Transportation Agency is leading an interagency working group, to develop an action plan detailing how the agencies will implement the actions called for by these Executive Orders. For the item, we will hear a presentation from Darwin Moosavi, Deputy Secretary for Environmental Policy and Housing Coordination at the California State Transportation Agency. He will discuss how this action plan is being developed.

After we hear the presentation, we will open it up for public comment and agency discussion.

I also wanted to say that from the very beginning of these joint meetings, we've talked about wanting to have an action-oriented agenda. And so this is a very important step in that direction for our joint agencies to collaborate and to really move the needle on the important

climate goals that we have for California.

So back to the public comments. If you wish to provide a comment, please kick -- click the raise hand button or dial star nine now. We will call on you when we get to the public comment portion after Mr. Moosavi is finished.

So I'd like to invite Mr. Moosavi to begin his presentation.

Mr. Moosavi.

1.3

2.2

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Thank you so much, Board Member De La Torre for that introduction and thank you to the Commission, the Board, Agency, and Department staff. Thanks for having me here today to talk about this effort.

As was mentioned, this presentation is on developing the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure, which is currently under development by CalSTA and an interagency team. You know, much of the conversation this morning — that we heard this morning was, you know, inspiring at least personally to me. You know, I think we can — we saw how great of a commitment we have across our agencies to work on these key issues of climate and equity and how they relate to housing and transportation.

But, you know, we all know that at the end of the day our words are only as good as our actions. So I'm very excited to be able to share an action-oriented effort this afternoon on some of the steps we're taking to implement some of this work. You know, this effort is specifically about transportation infrastructure, investments. Which you know I think we need to acknowledge right off the bat is a key part of the solutions that we're talking about here, but also only one part of the solution.

2.2

So, you know, we -- obviously to meet our climate and equity goals around housing and transportation, we need other additional land-use strategies around location efficient, housing and placement of jobs as well as, you know, efforts that go beyond creating options, but also electrifying or cleaning our transportation options as well. So some of that is touched upon here, but the majority of the focus of this effort is really about leveraging those transportation infrastructure investments that we have.

So I'll start off by -- next slide, please.
--o0o--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: -- by talking about, you know, why this effort -- why are we undertaking it. We've talked about this a little bit this morning,

but I'll very quickly reiterate some of those points.

Next slide.

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: So, first off, as has been mentioned many, many times you all know that transportation is a major part of our greenhouse gas emissions. This effort is really borne out of the need for climate action. Although, it does help satisfy many other goals we have as a state.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Particularly looking into the transportation sector, as was mentioned earlier today by Secretary Kim and Chair Nichols, you know, even with our ambitious new Executive Order N-79-20, we know that clean vehicles and fuels alone will not get us to our climate goals. And so VMT reduction, which is really what this effort focuses on, is a key and critical part of making sure we get there. And in addition to that, you know, it's -- this isn't just about climate, even though that's the impetus behind the effort, that VMT reduction piece I think is very necessary to make sure that the transformation that we're undergoing before climate also helps work towards reducing the inequities that we have in our transportation system. And we know

that we can't do that with vehicles alone.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

mentioned, this effort was really borne out of working to implement Executive Order N-19-19 the climate change Executive Order that came out last year. And in that Executive Order, amongst other things, there was a therefore clause specifically asking CalSTA to work towards leveraging state transportation spending to help meet state climate goals. It asked us to do this in five specific ways.

It wants us to work towards aligning planning and programming with objectives of the Climate Change Scoping Plan, to reduce VMT by directing investments in ways that support infill development, especially housing near jobs, to reduce congestion through innovative strategies that encourage mode shift from cars to other modes. You know, I think this is, in particular, a nod to transportation demand strategies such as pricing.

And it asked us to fund -- further fund infrastructure that encourages transit use, walking and biking. And, you know, important throughout all of this is making sure we do so from an equity lens. As was mentioned in the early presentations, embedding equity in

this work rather than it being a kind of additive on top.

And so mitigating for impacts on our low income communities is -- is critical. And this effort seeks to go beyond mitigation, but also, you know, looking at how we can work towards reducing those -- those disparities fundamentally in the types of projects that we're supporting.

Next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: And so this Executive Order specifically mentions -- oh, and it calls out leveraging our funds. It specifically mentions \$5 billion of transportation infrastructure. And so this is an illustration as to which programs we're talking about, when we mention that \$5 billion. So you see a list here, many of these programs are under the jurisdiction of the CTC. There's the transit interstate capital rail program being the one exception that is under the jurisdiction of CalSTA.

What's important to note about these programs is that this effort is really meant to work within the existing framework of these programs. You know, we were, as Secretary Kim mentioned, wanting to work pragmatically within the framework that SB 1 set out for us several years ago with the focus on fix it first, and then looking

at how we can improve these competitive programs to help meet our climate goals.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: And as was also mentioned, all of this work -- another reason we're undertaking it is that Executive Order N-79-20, in addition to setting ambitious ZEV goals for us as a state, it also highlighted the need for expending clean transportation options, and specifically calls out on that work and asked us as agency to work with Caltrans and the CTC in particular to come up with near-term actions for expanding those clean transportation options by July of 2021.

Next slide.

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: So this all takes us into -- you know, that was the need for the plan and now we're developing that plan. And so I'll quickly walk through what the developments look like -- look like so far and where we are in that process.

Next slide.

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: As I mentioned at the onset and as Secretary Kim mentioned this morning,

this effort has really been an interagency one. You can see the various agencies within the State that have been involved. We've been doing a lot of stakeholder outreach, as I will address in a minute. But we thought it was important to start this work by working to align ourselves internally. As a State agency, you know, from my experiences working with our stakeholders, our conversations can be so much more fruitful when we, as a state, can have a common vision that we're working with our partners on versus, you know, kind of coming at things from each of our silos.

So we worked together to develop a draft set of, what we call, an investment framework, and ten strategies as part of that investment framework, on how we think these dollars can best be spent to align that \$5 billion with our climate goals. And that is an item that is part of your packet and we'll be discussing later here as well. And so that item became the basis of our stakeholder engagement.

Next slide.

2.2

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: So the process here, I'll keep this brief, but feel free to reference this for further details of the effort that we've been undertaking. We had a good amount of early community

engagement -- stakeholder engagement on this effort, just having meetings with over 200 agencies and stakeholders in the spring into early summer of 2020. We then had a survey to get stakeholder feedback on our strategies and get ideas for actions, which all led into a workshop that was held in October of this year.

We received, you know, about 80 different agency responses to the survey totaling over 200 action items and 150 additional comments on the investment framework. This was all before the workshop at which point we had break-out sessions and had over 400 people that were invited to listen in on the workshop, and over a hundred so in break-out sessions to have discussions on various topics.

Next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: So what we heard in those -- in those -- out of the stakeholder engagement events, this is a list of some of the key trends and themes that we saw. Again, we heard a lot of different things, so this is just a part of a quick summary of what we heard prior to the workshops. You know, something that was mentioned -- has been mentioned throughout today that I think is fundamental to this work is improving existing guidance and requirements to ensure

meaningful community engagement and participation, and project planning and decision making, particularly by communities of color. You know, talking about tying our equity efforts with our climate efforts, this is the critical piece of doing that. And you know, I think, you know, it needs to kind of fundamentally shape the work that we do.

Advancing an intersectional and cross-sectional approach to transportation investments. It is -- it's something that folks thought was important; aligning our funding program requirements to match climate ambition was something that was asked of us; reward localities through incentives and to race to the top; continue investing in active transportation strategies; explore new or supplemental funding streams; and explore the role of CEQA in helping facilitate climate action.

So you'll see a lot here about, you know, the need for obviously additional funding, but also to work towards figuring out how we can incentivize sort of a greater ambition, if you will, in how we approach that funding. How do you incentivize us to kind of really kind of think out of the box and push further with what we can do with our dollars that -- our limited dollars that we have.

Next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

2.2

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Some additional themes that we heard coming out of the workshop that was held in October. So these are some additional ideas that have been added to the list of stakeholder feedback. We heard the need and desire to fast track projects currently in the planning phase. I think a lot of our stakeholders feel like there's a lot of great planning in more recent years that has happened on projects that align with these goals that we have here, but that there really isn't an immediate pathway to funding.

So anything we could do to move those projects kind of ahead of the line, if you will, I think is what is being asked of there. Support the case for the use roadway pricing mechanisms that result in more equitable outcomes. This was also a theme of -- an ask to the State to find ways to support local and regional jurisdictions that are looking to undertake roadway pricing, particularly in a way that works towards reducing our inequities, not exacerbating them.

Advance actions that help transit agencies recover. We heard at the workshop, and rightfully so, a great desire and need for us to look at all of this work, you know, in the framing -- the current framing of the pandemic we're in, and the economic times we're in. And,

you know, in particular, our transit agencies are really suffering right now, because of those impacts. And so what can we do in this plan to think about where they are and meeting them where they are in helping them recover.

Prioritize VMT reduction in program guidelines was something that was desired. You know, how do we look at supporting projects that really do reduce VMT. Find pathways to lift up rural projects. There's been a strong desire through this effort to make sure that not only do rural solutions not get lost, but also, you know, can we use this opportunity to really lift up rural solutions that align with climate and equity and what does that look like.

Leverage infrastructure funds to accelerate ZEV adoption was an area of obvious interest and connect to other essential efforts. And I mentioned this at the onset that this is just one piece of a broader puzzle.

Next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: And then this is what I called some areas of caution and places where, you know, folks want to make sure we're doing our due diligence and spending time to think about impacts as we implement this work. And this is around, you know, balancing local contacts and needs. You know,

understanding that we have a very diverse state with very unique regions. You know, how do we account for that as we come up with, you know, statewide programs solutions?

Ensure all areas of the state can benefit from realignment of funds was something that kind of related to number one is a theme that we've heard. And then consider how to address local commitments and priorities that may not align with State priorities. You know, we've heard concern that there are, in the transportation planning pipeline, which takes a very long time for projects to move through, there are commitments that have been there for years, if not decades, that may not necessarily align with these priorities. You know, how do we approach those and what's the State role in supporting those?

And finally, consider how changing travel behavior from the pandemic influences transportation needs. You know, this is obviously a critical piece that the folks want to make sure we're thinking of as we come up with our plan.

Next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Right. So on this slide, if you could click one more time or -- yeah, there we go. We have -- we've come up with, as I mentioned, what we call an investment framework that is

intended to really guide, you know, where we're headed and the types of actions we want to take. And this framework kind of lays out the -- where we think investments should be focused. And this is provided in the packet in further detailed, but I'll cover the ten strategies -- investment strategies briefly here.

Next slide.

1.3

2.2

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: So the first one is building towards an integrated statewide rail and transit network. The second one is investing in networks of safe and accessible bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. And the third one is including investment in light-, medium- and heavy-duty zero-emission vehicle infrastructure.

So these three investment strategies that are also called out in EO-79-20 are areas of investment that help expand clean transportation options for Californians and something that we want to try to find ways in our action plan to really support.

Next slide.

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: And then this next set - feel free to bring all seven onto the screen - are seven additional strategies in our investment

framework. And I call these kind of the supportive strategies. So to really make those transportation options work and make them available for folks, we have to think about all of these other pieces. And these are -- these are critical to kind of meeting our goals. And I'll go over them briefly.

1.3

2.2

The first is, you know, making sure that as we're doing this work that we're reducing public health harms and specifically thinking about benefits to disproportionately impacted disadvantaged communities, you know, how do we target our work to reduce those disparities where they exist -- where they're the greatest.

Safety continues to be a very important piece as we think about our investments, particularly in reducing fatalities, many of which on our system are vulnerable on roadways, like bicyclists and pedestrians.

Assessing physical climate risk. We heard about this earlier this morning. But not only do we need to be focused on reducing our emissions, but we are in the middle of a climate crisis and it has arrived and we're already seeing risks to our transportation system, to our communities that we need to be working towards mitigating and addressing. And this work is -- is an important place where we could start doing that.

Promoting projects that don't increase passenger vehicle travel. You know, this is critical. As Secretary Kim mentioned, it really can't just be about providing options for folks, but those options need to be competitive, both from a cost and pricing cost standpoint and a time advantage standpoint. We cannot continue to make investments that further the discrepancies and continue to support and increase vehicle miles traveled, while trying to reduce them at the same time. It makes our job a lot more difficult. So being really thoughtful about how we approach projects that can increase passenger vehicle travel is an important part of this effort.

2.2

Promoting compact infill development with our investments. However, we can, through targeting our investments in places that can support development is important.

Developing a zero-emission freight transportation system. Through our work -- earlier, I mentioned, you know, the need for light-, medium- and heavy-duty vehicle infrastructure. You know, particularly thinking about how that works for freight is key here. And then doing our work while making sure we're keeping an eye towards impacts on natural and working lands and working to protect those lands and ensuring our transportation decisions don't result in conversion of those lands.

Next slide.

2

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: All right. 3 Well, as I've been talking through this, I'm sure you're 4 wondering, okay, what does this look like in terms of 5 actions? And although this is about leveraging our funds, 6 I want to say that this is -- this goes beyond and is a 7 lot more than just, you know, looking at program 8 guidelines and looking for opportunities for improvements 9 on program guidelines. Although that is a key critical 10 piece of this effort, this really needs to be about the 11 entire project delivery process for transportation 12 infrastructure projects. 13

And particularly, and in my mind, as I'm a person with an urban planning background, educationally I'm biased in thinking that planning is a critical place where these conversations need to happen. It doesn't matter what kind of changes we make in programming. If we're not supporting the right type of planning to create the right pipeline of projects, you know, we're -- we're going to have a very hard time making changes.

So this is really kind of a long-term view of supporting better transportation infrastructure decision making kind of from the onset.

Next slide.

--000--

2.2

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: And in terms of, you know, specific actions items, we've kind of grouped -- or thinking about things in five different areas, as to what other types of actions we can take. One are actions that align planning initiatives with this framework. We can, as mentioned, update program guidelines to strengthen alignment with this framework and climate goals. We can improve existing agency processes and practices to remove barriers and accelerate climate action. We can call for pursuing authority for new initiatives. And we can support and coordinate actions led by other sectors that are critical for the plan's success. And so calling those out connecting to those efforts is important.

Next slide.

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: And so now I'm going to kind of quickly walk through some potential example actions, specific actions that -- ideas that we've gotten stakeholders. You know, these are just a random sampling of actions we've gotten and ideas that we've gotten from folks. I have just picked a sampling to spark discussion here, but there's plenty more that we want to think about, and -- you know, and part of our discussion

here would love to hear, you know, suggestions from all of you and discussion from all of you on the types of actions we should be thinking about.

2.2

You know, going back to Chanell Fletcher's comments earlier, you know, I do think that, you know, we're in a moment where we can look towards taking some bold actions and it's going to take bold actions to really see changes in this space. So these are, frankly, what I think are some more low-hanging fruit type actions, but very, you know, interested in hearing from all of you as to what else we should be thinking about.

I'll walk through these quickly. One action we can take is integrating climate risk assessment into our transportation projects, planning and implementation. A way we could do this is by developing a climate risk assessment, planning guide that would be used by Caltrans in looking at transportation projects within their investments.

Another area that we can tackle is looking to align our State-sponsored transportation projects with the Action Plan Investment Framework. So for those of you who are familiar with these transportation investments, you'll -- you know that not only do we get applications from local and regional governments, but Caltrans, as a State agency, often either co-sponsors or applies for

funds.

2.2

And so Caltrans could potentially work towards focusing their investments or their project applications on projects that really hold up our framework that we've laid out here today. Another area of interest that folks have had is creating new mechanisms to mitigate increases in VMT from transportation projects. So this is really about looking towards SB 743 implementation under CEQA and what can the State do to support mitigation efforts in that space?

You know, we can potentially explore the creation of statewide VMT mitigation banking to assist with implementation of that.

Next slide.

--000--

know, mentioned earlier, but the State can play a role in supporting local and regional governments and pursuing pricing strategies. Particularly, I think there's a need to study legislative and administrative opportunities and barriers of pricing to make a supportive case and clear the pathway for those solutions to be able to use -- be used at a local and regional level. There's currently a lot of barriers to their use, so that's an area we could focus.

We can champion a coordinated transit recovery response, whether this focuses on -- on just State-related investments or also leveraging any federal opportunities that may arise. You know, that could be an effort that we undertake together.

2.2

And then finally leveraging existing interagency working groups and planning efforts to focus on zero-emission freight investments. Now, how do we bring the various disparate activities in this space together and think about how we leverage transportation infrastructure investments in particular in thinking about zero-emission freight.

All right. And with that, I will offer some very quick next steps --

--000--

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: -- and then would love to open it up for discussion.

So from here, we will be taking the stakeholder feedback that we received from the workshops thus far, as well as feedback that we here today working towards putting together a draft action plan that we hope to release in early 2021.

And thereafter we'll be holding an additional workshop with a comment period, once that draft is released, that get feedback from your stakeholders on that

draft plan before finalizing that plan with a targeted adoption date of next spring.

2.2

So with that, I would love to turn it back to you all for a discussion and happy to take any questions.

That was a very detailed description of some of the areas that you are at least contemplating taking on as part of the development of and actual plan itself. So that seems to me to provide a lot of room for thought. I think on this item, the staff had suggested that we let the public comment first and then get into a fuller Board discussion about what to do next, since it's really on us.

So, Ryan, can you tell us how we're doing in terms of public commenting?

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Sure. So we currently have two people -- now three people with their hands raised. Will Barrett, Patricia Chen, and Julia Randolph. If you wish to comment at this time, please raise your hand or dial star nine now, if you didn't hear your name. So we'll go ahead and start with Will. I have activated your microphone. You can go ahead and begin.

MR. BARRETT: Thank you, Ryan. I appreciate it.

So I'm Will Barrett with the American Lung
Association. And I wanted to start by saying it's just
incredibly important to hear this conversation today about

each of the Executive Orders, as California is now moving through really critical planning processes related to climate, health, housing and equity. That includes the California Transportation Plan, the CAPTI process, that we just heard about, as well as the mobile source strategy at CARB.

1.3

2.2

The main message that I wanted to convey really is to echo what we just heard in the presentation. In order to achieve a healthy, safe and equitable transportation system, we have to both accelerate ZEV technologies and reduce vehicle miles traveled. This common thread really does need to run through all of the transportation, land use, and investment decisions that are being made in order to achieve success.

We know that the transportation sector is the leading source of California's pollution and climate burdens that drive public health disparities and that there are significant health improvements on the table, if we make meaningful changes focused on health and equity, as we heard from ClimatePlan this morning.

In relation to the Executive Order N-79-20, we know that the health benefits of moving to electric transportation are significant. The Lung Association recently released a report that noted California could yield \$22 billion in annual public health benefits, avoid

nearly 2,000 deaths, and 26,000 asthma attacks by moving to 100 percent sales of zero-emission trucks, buses and passenger cars in the coming decades.

1.3

2.2

Similarly, we're very hopeful that Executive Order N-19-19 contributes to a meaningful shift to more active transportation options that can boost health outcomes in all communities. The ITHIM health evaluation tool on the California Department of Public Health website notes that achieving the scale of active transportation projections included in Sustainable Communities Strategies could avoid about 2,000 deaths per year in California, based on reductions in chronic illness, and even greater numbers if we can achieve the levels of active transportation that were include in the 2030 scoping plan targets.

Unfortunately, we know we're far from achieving our SB 375 goals. And without real changes as are being planned now in our transportation system, we're going to remain far off from achieving clean air and climate standards, as well as addressing disparities in our pollution burdens.

Within the -- what we just saw in the presentation, we very much appreciate the inclusion of public health benefits, and especially focusing on those benefits in our most disadvantaged communities within the

investment strategies.

1.3

2.2

Within the actions item, we support aligning publicly-funded transportation projects with that investment framework, and really building out the zero-emission freight infrastructure as a critical starting point for improving health across the board, reducing our air pollution burdens, and improving health in our most disadvantaged communities.

Within the list of agencies that were among the interagency working group, I just note that the California Department of Public Health was not included. I think they're involved in various planning processes, but I think that -- making sure that there's a formal way to get the expertise of that agency into all of these processes is critically important.

And finally, we just want to say that we look forward to working with all of the agencies to highlight the health benefits that are possible through the Executive Orders and the various planning processes, and really do want to ensure that these processes really do result in real-world benefits for all Californians with meaningful input from our most impacted communities.

We really appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today and really appreciate all the very thoughtful work in how we can create a healthy and equitable

transportation system going forward in California. And we look forward to being a good partner with you, all of your agencies in this regard. So thank you very much.

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Patricia Chen. Patricia, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

MS. CHEN: Hi. Can you hear me?

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: We can

MS. CHEN: Great.

2.2

Good afternoon, Chairs Nichol and Norton,
Directors and Commissioners. I'm Patricia Chen of the LA
County Metropolitan Transportation Authority or Metro.

We're deeply committed to improving mobility for LA County residents and recognize that our work in this area affects and is affected by housing and air quality concerns. We pleased to offer comments for your joint consideration and discussion.

Regarding the transit -- sorry, the transition to zero-emission vehicles, the Metro Board has directed our agency to convert out bus fleet to 100 percent zero-emission vehicles by 2030, 10 years before this is required by the State.

Likewise, we are endeavoring to implement the 710 Clean Truck Program. Metro has committed \$50 million as

seed funding for incentives. In both the transit and goods movement areas, we are working toward our ambitious goals through phase transition. We recommend public and policy support for the development and procurement of a wide variety of technologies, including vehicles and charging equipment and incentives needed to reinforce the accelerated transition. And we would like to suggest for your consideration the diesel settlements may be an excellent source of revenue for these costs.

1.3

2.2

Regarding equity in 2018, the Metro Board approved the Metro Equity Platform. Metro staff recommends expanding its prior -- the priorities of the CAPTI to include communities with preexisting public health disparities, as well as taking care of the -- avoiding negative impacts of future projects. We further recommend that an equity focus apply to all funding programs covered by the CAPTI.

Regarding roadway capacity, LA County has several freeway corridors with exceptionally bad traffic conditions. Express lanes are an important and powerful tool for reducing travel time and they are especially effective when paired with multi-modal infrastructure investments. Examples in LA are Metro Link and the Silver Line Bus Rapid Transit, as well as first/last mile active transportation investments.

We support the investment bank. And it is important to analyze equity impacts for this offsetting project approach. Positive impacts from new projects should benefit communities with past harms and high current needs, and negative impacts should be avoided or mitigated there.

We also have speaking points on the sustainability of electrical power and the land use transportation nexus, which we will include, along with these comments, in a forthcoming letter in respect of your time today.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment.

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you.

Now, we have Julia Randolph. After Julia, we have Chanell Fletcher and Pat Holland. I did notice that someone lowered their hand. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand. You only need to click it once.

So with that, I will unmute Julia Randolph. You can unmute yourself and begin.

MS. RANDOLPH: Hi.

1.3

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: And, Ryan -- excuse me just a second. We are putting the three minute time limit up on the screen, but I would appreciate if you would enforce that as well, since we seem to have multiplied the numbers

of people who want to talk, we want to fit everything in.

1.3

2.2

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Will do. Thank you. Okay. Julia.

MS. RANDOLPH: Good afternoon. Julia Randolph with the Coalition for Clean Air. Thanks for the opportunity to speak today. It was great to see this presentation today. We supported Executive Order N-19-19. And we support the new Executive Order. We are very eager to finally see it implemented and we agree with the goals and directions discussed today for the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure.

I would like to bring up that the recent workshop CalSTA hosted was pretty impressive and the break-out rooms were great. You could really tell that there are people from each sector and the conversations were very constructive.

All the action items and potential action items discussed today are really strong, such as updating program guidelines, VMT mitigation mechanisms, which could really help with supporting SB 743 mitigation and a coordinated transit recovery response.

This is an important piece of work and we need these strategies. Our goals cannot be solved through zero-emission vehicles alone. We need transportation options. We need VMT reductions. And it would be great

for these -- the agencies here today to adopt these actions in some form in the next coming meeting.

Thanks so much.

2.2

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Chanell Fletcher. I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

MS. FLETCHER: Thank you, Ryan. And I will be quick, because I've already spoken and I don't want to belabor myself. I just want to say that thank you,
Darwin, so much. I think it was so, so awesome to kind of see the CAPTI and see it kind of fully fleshed out. And I think I really want to just support what Julia and what Will had mentioned, particularly with Will's point around public health and really kind of fleshing out that ZEV strategy. I know that the Governor just released in terms of that ambition. We would definitely want to make sure that we see that reflected in our transportation programs.

I only actually had two questions. And again, like very supportive of the CAPTI framework, and where it's going. So my one question was really when we're talking about aligning, because I think you mentioned Darwin a couple times and I heard an idea of like aligning funding with like the climate ambition. And I just wondered if we could get really clear and intentional by

what we mean by aligning funding.

1.3

2.2

And so -- and again, Darwin, you know, we -- we can also talk like one-on-one about this too, but there was a part of me that was like, okay, so when we say aligning funding, are we talking about taking the current funding that we have and shifting it, because I notice that that was in the presentation, like, if there are any shifts in funding? Are we talking about increasing funding?

So I just wanted to get some more clarity on what that looked like and what that meant? And I understand that this is a process. And the other thing that I was really thinking through was there's, you know, language in the Executive Order around lowering -- around like basically mitigating the cost for lower income communities. And I did see that that was mentioned in term of pricing.

But I am curious if there's anyways that you expect kind of what the CAPTI framework and this effort around like alignment between climate goals? Are there going to be kind of any places where you think they're going to be kind of any burdens on low-income communities? Are they going to bear disproportionate burdens, and if so, has there been any thought about how that's going to be addressed?

So those are my two questions. And again, just want to emphasize a lot of support and gratitude for this. And I think that it's really great to see kind of again like us moving more and more into action and taking what we heard this morning and putting it into an actual framework that will then influence transportation dollars. So I want to express a lot of gratitude for that.

1.3

2.2

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Pat Holland. After Pat, we have Beverly DesChaux and Rick Longinotti.

So, Pat, I'm trying to activate your microphone, but it says you are running and outdated version of Zoom. So if you could call the call-in number right here and dial star nine, then you can -- we'll give you a chance to speak there.

So we'll move on to Beverly. Beverly, I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

MS. DESCHAUX: Hi. Beverly DesChau with the Electric Auto Association Central Coast Chapter in Santa Cruz. I thought that I would be hearing -- I get that you've got -- you've all done a lot of work here. But when I'm thinking of an actual draft action plan, I'm actually not hearing it. I'm hearing a lot of abstractions. And I have a -- after each of those things

that you say, I'm like how?

1.3

2.2

So how are we going to reduce the public health harms? How are we going to increase the safety? How are we going to do this, and this, and this, everything that you said, how? I don't hear that in the plan. That's one thing.

So we've talked in our area for a long time about infill. And one project in particular was, oh, we have some area near the hospital. Well, any new housing that would be built near the hospital, the doctors wouldn't be living there, the people who are the service workers there, they wouldn't be living there, because they couldn't afford it. So there's a whole lot of issues around thinking of doing this infill and a lot of people talk about housing along the corridors. Well, who wants to live along the corridors?

Already, people who are impacted, those DACs who imported -- impacted already and their health will be affected by living there. You want them to be near -- near the transportation hubs, but really who wants to live there?

So those people who can afford to move away from them, so there's more vehicle miles trans -- of transportation going on. And those people who when there's new housing built, it's definitely not what's

considered affordable housing. Affordable, now that we have the tech industry right over the mountains from us and people live here who go to -- who work there, they have very high salaries, and it's just outpacing what people here who have lived here for many years.

So seniors, what are they doing? You know, anyway, there's just so many difficulties with the -- the trying to get housing near transportation. So -- and those people who can't -- who are the service workers, they have to move farther away, so there's more vehicle miles tran -- of transportation there as well.

So I'm really -- I'm questioning how you plan to actually do this. That's what I have -- that's what I'm left with is the big how.

Oh, but -- so we've handled some of the vehicle miles transferred by having Google come to our town and now it's just causing the housing market to go off the charts and people can't afford to live here anymore. And people who have lived here for 40 years are having to move away, so --

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Rick. I have activated your microphone. You can unmute yourself and begin.

MR. LONGINOTTI: Hi. Thank you. I'm Rock Longinotti and I'm part of the group called the Campaign

for Sustainable Transportation in Santa Cruz County.

2.2

And I'm encouraged by the presentation that I just witnessed. Thank you very much for promoting that. I want to suggest that to -- especially to the members of the Transportation Commission that one sort of simple way to -- to think about aligning our spending with our climate goals and our social equity goals would include the principle that no new projects would be funded that expand auto capacity.

And if you just think about that, it makes sense, even with the current guidelines for all these programs. We have, for example, Solutions for Congested Corridors Program that has a guideline. Well, it needs to -- a project needs to reduce congestion.

Well, what we know about highway expansion projects is that they only reduce congestion for a limited period of time, some less than five years and some less than ten years.

So no -- no projects that expand highway capacity are worthy to be funded under that program. And not even counting the increased vehicle miles traveled that result from these programs. In Santa Cruz County, there's a project coming before the Commission next month to build auxiliary lanes. And the Environmental Impact Report has said that these auxiliary lanes will have nil effect on

reducing congestion, but that they will raise greenhouse gas emissions by around 25 percent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

They will not have any benefit to safety on the highway. According to the Environmental Impact Report, the accident rates will remain the same before and after the project.

So why are -- why is this project coming before the Commission for funding? It's only because there's a sort -- a sort of political misunderstanding that, expanding highways actually benefits the public. And it's up to the Commission to give the signal that that's really not the case. It's just fooling the public. In this case, fooling the mostly 80 percent Latino population of Watsonville, that somehow putting these auxiliary lane in is going to benefit them. It comes instead at a real cost of a project that would benefit commuters, which is buses on the shoulder of the highway. The State of California Legislature passed a bus-on-shoulder legislation just for Santa Cruz and Monterey County. And instead, we're not going to have buses on the shoulder. We'll have them stuck in auxiliary lanes according to the plan.

Thank you very much.

CARB BOARD CLERK SAKAZAKI: Thank you. So Pat Holland, I still cannot unmute you. So I'm not sure if you are -- if you can call the call-in number on screen

right now with access code and dial star nine, if you're on the line right now. Dial star line. If you can't, unfortunately, I don't have a way to unmute you.

So I'll just give it a couple seconds so you can call in here and use the access code.

So, if not, Madam Chair, that concludes our list of speakers for this item. We'll go ahead and move on.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.

Now, to pull it back, because we still have another item on the agenda for today. And I think we need to talk about how to proceed on this item and to have a full discussion on it without impairing our ability to do Item 3 or we're going to have to make a decision as a group that we could move the third item to another day. I'm quite reluctant to do that, because it's -- although it's not the same, it's related in terms of another forum in which we are working together.

So I'm -- I'm curious. Maybe I will actually ask staff to comment on this point as to -- as to what to do, because we are scheduled to go only until 3:00. And I know that there are Board members who have a hard stop at that point and we do want to make sure that we have a chance for everybody who's here to have a discussion.

So maybe without -- without going to the Board at

the moment, I can just ask whether we have any options in terms of Item 3 at this point.

Richard.

1.3

2.2

Option, as you noted, is to -- and I see -- and our sense is a number of folks both with respect to Commission or Board discussion there -- that that's going to take some time. So with respect to the third item, it could be shortened or we could push back to a future agenda item, because I know that you do want to reserve some time for summary at the end. So really those are the two strategies here, keep the item and request that it be moved along pretty efficiently or punt to the meeting in spring.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah, that's what I -- what I thought. Thanks for confirming.

I'm going to -- I know Joe Lyou has his hand up, but I'd like to defer for the moment to Chair Norton and see what -- what you would like to do.

CTC CHAIR NORTON: My feeling is that we move forward with this item and postpone 3, because I think putting the CAPTI discussion together with the three organizations I think it was -- it was important to have it today.

So -- but I -- but in terms of my comments on

this, I just did want to make sure we had a chance to thank Darwin and thank the process. I think this is very timely and being able to sort of show your work and look at what you see as moving forward. I think it's also, as I talked about in my comments, very important that we are highlighting the need for a federal partner and what that federal partner needs to do to get us to some of these benchmarks.

2.2

I would also like, as Darwin was talking about, the goals of working on the economy and fix it first as well, as -- and Secretary Kim mentioned this. I'd like to hear a little bit more about how the private sector is becoming involved in the public comment part of this and to look at what Hasan had put together in terms of data about where trips are going and what's happening with telecommuting, maybe not affecting the trip to and from work, but telecommuting increasing VMT other places. That's something that we hadn't heard before. And I was wondering if you had been coming up with that in the analysis that you're finding with CAPTI as well.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah. That's a very -- a good question. Okay. Let's just leave it that we'll assume that we're moving Item 3 then till -- till the next time that we're able to meet and I'll ask for a response to your -- to your question.

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Great. Thank you so much, Chair Nichols, and thank you so much, Chair Norton, for those questions. As one of the co-presenters of the item that is now being tabled, the next item, happy to come back at a future meeting and discuss the housing(inaudible). And, you know, thanks for making the time for this discussion here, today.

2.2

If I may, Chair Norton, before getting to your points, I'd like to also address some of the points -- or questions that were raised by some of the public comment. And I'll kind of address all of it together.

Just as a point of clarification, before we dive into this, and apologies for, I think -- looking back, it looks like this wasn't made incredibly clear on my end. But we are currently in the process of drafting an action plan. We don't yet have an actual action plan, which is why we're a little short on actions. You know, we're hoping to have a plan released in early 2021 that will kind of detail out some of the -- the specific details of how we actually get there, drawing on some of those potential actions that our -- that our stakeholders raised, and obviously additional things beyond it as well. I just want to put that out there and make -- make that clear.

Your point, Chair Norton, about engagement in

that process, you know, we're -- we're certainly interested in hearing from you all as to who beyond who we're already engaging needs to be engaged from a private sector and business community standpoint. We have -- do have in our stakeholder list various representatives of local business communities, such as local chambers and business associations across the state that -- that have traditionally kind of engaged in the transportation space.

But as we kind of -- you know, I think one of the challenges with this work is that it does take partnerships with new sets of stakeholders as we try to expand the type of work that we do. And so, you know, very much welcome input on how we can improve our engagement there.

Very wholeheartedly agree on the federal partner front as we all sit anxiously as our -- at our phones to figure out what that partner looks like.

(Laughter.)

2.2

CTC CHAIR NORTON: Absolutely.

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: And that will be something regardless of that outcome that we'll be looking to incorporate in this plan is, you know, how do we leverage not just our State resources, but opportunities at a federal level, particularly around recovery. And as it relates to transit agencies, I think

there's some spaces there that there's a lot of stakeholder input that's important.

2.2

And then to your -- your final point about kind of telecommuting and changes in patterns, I think, you know, yes we're very much thinking about and looking at all those trends as we look at this plan. It's, you know, frankly probably one of the most difficult things with timing of this kind of work is to project and predict what the future will look like. But I think the way we're -- we're eval -- or we're approaching this is, you know, this is an effort to help shape what the future looks like, and -- and, you know, try to create pathways out of the situation we're in to build a more equitable future that addresses climate, you know, starting with, you know, the current moment we're in as kind of the baseline and the patterns that exist right now.

And, yeah, I hope that answers your question.

CTC CHAIR NORTON: Yeah. Thank you so much. And we look forward to working with you as this process moves forward. Thanks for being such a great partner.

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Great. Thank you.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. I'm going to call on Joe Lyou finally. Joe, you can take your hand down now.

CTC COMMISSIONER LYOU: Thank you. Oh, yeah, I

guess I have to figure out how to do that. You did it for me. That's -- so thank you.

2.2

Let me just -- I'm going to start off with thanking you, Darwin. And I know you didn't do this all by yourself. You had a lot of support from staff and from the people who you reached out to to get feedback. I want to thank all of them for putting this together. You have really covered a lot of bases here and you have hit on all the things that are important, as far as I can tell. So I'm very supportive of this. I think that the draft action items are good and would love to see them come forward and fleshed out with more specificity of course.

I do have, well, a minor criticism. I'm not enamored with the acronym to tell you the truth, but that's -- that's very minor. I can get over that.

But I do have a question and a concern that's sort of a bigger picture issue that I -- I'm not even a hundred percent sure that it's exactly playing out this way, but it seems to play out this way for me. And that is the disconnect between what we say and what we want, and where we actually end up and what we do at the end of the day.

And, I mean, you're familiar with, you know, how this process works on the transportation side of things.

And we go through this process. We establish guidelines

and policies. We get applicants. We rank and prioritize them. And at the end of the day, sometimes I think we're moving forward with projects that aren't in line with the principles and the aspirations that we have.

2.2

And I'm concerned that this might be a flaw in the process, that there is no point in which we stop, take a look at the overall picture of what we're at -- you know, awarding, prioritizing, and allocating money to. We don't reassess it at any point in that process and then revise our decisions before moving forward.

And I'm kind of wondering if this has come up or if you've thought about this in any way, shape or form, and whether you think that there needs to be a part in the process, and perhaps even at the Air Resources Board too, before they move forward with a regulation or incentive program or, you know, enforcement activities, whatever they're doing. I know they approach the world a little differently from how we do here at the Commission. But do we at the Commission need to have places in the process where we take a step back and say, okay, is this in line with all of these wonderful goals and priorities that we we've established, as well as the Governor's Executive Orders?

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Thank you, Commissioner Lyou, for that. And I a hundred percent

agree with you that that is a critical part of the process. And, you know, I -- to me, this actual creation of the action plan can be that process, you know, in terms of coming up with where we go next and how we actually make -- make these things happen. You know, I think it's very critical and important to reflect on -- on, you know, why the pipeline of projects looks the way it does now, you know, what -- what is or isn't working in -- in influencing it.

2.2

And this is why I spoke earlier about the importance of planning. I think there's frankly only so much the Commission can even do from a programming standpoint. If we're not helping support our local and regional governments in being able to pursue and create projects that really meet what we're asking them to be able to do at the end of the day. And the list of barriers and challenges there are rather complex and different depending what you're talking about.

You know, I mentioned one set around pricing and legislative barriers there, for example, you know -- you know well a lot of the challenges around related infrastructure. And so I think we need to be looking at that entire process and not just the point in time of programming in trying to think about how we get to the outcomes that we're looking for. But, you know, very much

am interested in working with you alon that point of reflections, if you, and certainly don't want this to be yet another set of kind of ambitious actions that we put out there that we can't really kind of realize or have outcomes that match the level of ambition that we say we want to reach.

2.2

So looking forward to partnering with you all to figure out how to -- how to bring those pieces together.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Let's hear from next is Hector De La Torre.

CARB BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you. Thank you, Darwin. I really appreciate what I said at the beginning, that we're actually on the cusp of having an action agenda for our meetings. It's been way to long. That's not a reflection on you. It's a reflection on us. And so I very much just want to -- want to weigh in and say, I look forward to seeing what you guys put together with CARB staff and your staff to bring this back in the spring to our next joint meeting, where we actually get homework assignments for each of our agencies to go and make it happen.

I think that's the whole point of the legislation that created this biannual effort between us. And so I'm very much looking forward to having something that we can react to, and then vote on, and, you know, take -- take

our respective projects and go make them happen.

So thank you very much. And I just wanted to weigh in on looking forward to next meeting where we actually get this done.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Barbara Riordan is next with her hand up.

CARB BOARD MEMBER RIORDAN: Thank you, Madam
Chair. I want to echo what Mr. De La Torre just said.

I'm excited to see it after it's been for a final review and opportunity to go out and have public input and then come back to us.

One of the things that I wanted to underscore. This was an opportunity for me to see at least a recognition of rural areas. I represent rural areas. And as you pointed out, there are many Californias. And not everything is the same in the entire state, so I will be very interested to see what you are considering for those areas that we would call rural in California and how we can help them to achieve some efforts that -- that they're most interested in and will work in their areas.

So that's my input and I look forward to another chance to see this before us.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, with regard to that, let's maybe focus in a little bit. Actually, I don't see

any other hands at the moment. Although I'm sure there will be momentarily. But let me just say here that it seems as though what we've heard today, it really points the way to a specific plan that is actionable. I understand and appreciate the impatience of those who've been thinking that this should have happened a long time ago.

2.2

And, you know, I think that includes some of us as well. But at the same time, we have to recognize that we're starting from the base that we've got. And part of that is that -- and I'm not trying to deflect criticism here, but just to point out that the old pattern of dividing up responsibility and setting the agencies off almost in opposition to each other is one that stems from legislation that we all work with, and funding that we all have, the desire of various entities to, you know, have their own separate programs, that makes it harder to align, coordinate, jointly implement, et cetera, but also because this is a very brig state with big programs and projects, anyone of which would dwarf, you know, the whole entity of many other states.

It's seems as though we have to take these steps to actually work through the sometimes painful detail of the kinds of suggestions that we're -- that we were hearing today in the presentation.

201

```
So I think we're on a path, and I think it's a
1
    good one, but I'd like to maybe focus in on what we heard
2
    and find out from all the members of the Commissions, and
 3
    Boards, and HCD whether you feel that they've covered it
    all. Are there any things that you think are missing?
5
    Are there any ideas that you would like to see evaluated
 6
    further? Are there some items that seem to me to be
7
    particular -- seem to you to be particularly promising and
8
   may be able to be implemented faster than going through
9
    the full process? And maybe lastly, are people interested
10
    in having this plan which will, as I understand it now, be
11
    available as -- in a draft form at least early in 2021,
12
    come to this group and have that discussion, you know, in
1.3
    this kind of a setting, where we do have an opportunity to
14
    bring together all the interested parties and really make
15
16
    sure that we are, in fact, all aligning and moving our
17
   programs together.
             I'm just throwing that out in the hopes that this
18
19
    will provoke some further thoughts and comments from --
20
    from our group.
             HCD DIRECTOR VELASQUEZ: Well, let me -- let me
21
    jump in, Madam Chair, just --
2.2
23
             CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Please do.
24
             HCD DIRECTOR VELASQUEZ: -- just to say
```

25

everything --

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Help me out here.

2.2

MAKES A lot of sense. I think also for what I'm observing in my very limited time here, the staff really -- all of our staff work behind the scenes really, really well, so when we come to these meetings, I think things are already kind of half baked, half cooked. And I think it's in thinking about the plan, and next spring, and the additional presentations, you know, it seems like a lot of progress can be made at the staff level, so that when we come back, we have some -- much more concrete actionable steps that we can take.

Just as an observation, you know, I worked in the Obama administration. When I was at HUD, I worked under both Shaun Donovan and Julian Castro. And it reminds me, as a matter of process, a lot -- a lot, I remember then the Secretary is looking for the low-hanging fruit. I remember attending a meeting with both Secretary of Transportation and Secretary of HUD in looking at the -- really the way that the TIGER grants could align really well with Promise Neighborhoods. The Education Department was also involved in Choice Neighborhoods, big -- big place-based programs at HUD.

And I just -- I was just fascinated, as a matter of process, how, you know, sometimes we just find a way to

really complicate things a lot more than what they are. It's just really finding a way. You know, what is the criteria for this -- what is the value set for these programs? What is the criteria for evaluating them? And just kind of beginning just putting three columns and begin kind of carving out what is possible and what is not. And I think I'm -- I'm just saying I think we have -- at the staff level, people that can do this in a very, very well and just come to these meetings to present it. And I -- I look forward for us to continue to look for that low-hanging fruit, maybe more than just low-hanging fruit.

2.2

But I think there's a lot of potential here. And the ideas arrived to these meetings in the future with just very concrete steps that we can take that we cannot affirm, okay, this is the right direction.

I'm a kind of a visual learner myself, so I really like the idea of a chart for just that reason, as well as -- because it really forces everybody to sort of think. And maybe that's something we could specifically ask to have the three groups work together on and present to all of us, and I'm not sure that it takes a meeting, but I am thinking about the fact that, you know, if I'm -- well, putting myself in the shoes of the -- the groups that

spoke to us earlier today, from ClimatePlan, and Greenlining, and others. Where are they -- where do they get hurt? Where do the come in on this?

1.3

2.2

Obviously, we have a process in California where any Board has -- that has a meeting has to give notice, put out the agenda, you know, hear public comment and so forth. Many of the things that the staff are working on take place in a more informal or internal kind of way and it may be harder for other people to access all of that. So I feel like we need to be thinking about how we're going to get that input that we all want. And I think we do genuinely want it. It's just a question of efficiently both for the non-State actor agencies and ourselves, how do we really make that happen?

Well, I've gotten two more hands here, so I'm going to call on Michelle Martinez and then Judy Mitchell.

CTC COMMISSIONER MARTINEZ: Thank you, Madam
Chair. I truly appreciate that. And thank you, Darwin.

A few observations. And I want to thank the Chairwoman, because I wanted to talk about this about input. I do believe that we need a process before plan. And I think many of the advocates that have spoken here today are asking for that. I look at government as always being very prescriptive. And Mr. Velasquez just mentioned about, you know, things are half baked.

And so I think when we're going out to the community or going out to stakeholders, we become very prescriptive and it's just this top-down. And I know we don't want to be top-down, but I think when we don't create a process before a plan of how we get that input, we do become very prescriptive.

1.3

2.2

The second thing that I wanted to highlight that I think it's important, as we move forward in this -- and this framework is ambitious. And I appreciate, you know, us connecting the dots, but I will go back to the bad word. And it -- we don't -- and I heard it today from SCAG and other agency folks that have talked about this is land use. We can't talk about climate change, we cannot talk about transportation, infrastructure or housing or public health without talking about land use.

They're all interconnected. We are all interdependent, whether from the State level and all the agencies that are represented here, all the way to the local level. And there -- and I want to thank Mr.

Velasquez as he spoke earlier about housing and about, you know, cities at the local level now appealing RHNA.

We all know that if we're able to align our transportation investments in our housing, we will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. But let's be honest, when we look at the local level with outdated general plans,

outdated zoning codes, it becomes very difficult to push local governments to move in the direction that we all want them to move into.

2.2

The second thing is the funding mechanisms. When we talk about local control, let's be honest, the majority of our taxes, specifically property tax, the allocation system is governed by the State of California by the -- by the Legislature. And the last time that was updated was in 1979.

We have an archaic fiscal functionality system that is broken, that doesn't allow local governments to want to move to build more housing, to want to ensure that if we built the right housing near transit, that we will be able to grow appropriately. Unfortunately, the way we're growing in local government is trying to figure out how do we fiscalize our land use. And that's what we've done for the past 30, 40, 50 years.

And so I think we've got to have that kind of honest conversation while we're talking about these frameworks, and understanding that at the end of the day, why local governments move, it's going to be based on revenue and money. Can they sustain this? It's not that they don't want to do it. The reality comes can they sustain this with the revenues that they're currently getting. And to be honest with you, I think if we're

looking at this pandemic and what s going to be happening to cities across California, we are in trouble and we have to be realistic about that as well.

2.2

These cities are very fragile financially. And so my last point that I want to highlight is that, you know, as we move forward in ensuring that we're able to look at some of our transportation investments and looking at housing and some of what we want to do with a lot of these executive orders, it's imperative that we continue to take a hyper-local approach and engage as many people as we want.

But when we talk about engagement, we have to give up power. Let's be honest about that. If we cannot give up power in agency to ensure we have -- that we have real meaningful community engagement, we're spinning our wheels. And so I think it's important for us to remove ourselves from this command and control, and continuing to push a lot of these plans, and Executive Orders, and all these policies that we're seeing at the State level and ramming them down at the local level, when there's really no true engagement.

The only way we're going to make this happen and make California move towards the goals that we want collectively is when we're able to truly collaborate with local government.

Thank you.

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

Judy Mitchell.

CARB BOARD MEMBER MITCHELL: Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you, Darwin, for the presentation.

The presentation really sets out for us an action plan that is very broad. And one of our speakers came forward and said, yes, I see the plan, but I don't see how to do it.

And I think that is kind of the issue always when you're setting out a plan, how do we actually do it and when we do it, will we end up with a result that we want?

I think in the process of developing the plan, process is important. I think we need to have that input from community. And the other thing that I would mention here is that what I would like to see in development of the plan is a development of certain priorities, where do we think it is -- are the most important sectors that we would fund and where would we get the most benefit from that, because we're putting together here transportation -- where transportation intersects climate, and how can we get those reductions through the integration of these two sectors.

The other thing that -- and I -- and I will commend Michelle in mentioning this, is that overall, the

policy of the State has been to reduce VMT. And part of that process is -- is relating our housing to the way we travel. And so I -- I haven't really seen in here where the housing VMT element comes together. So I hope in the process we are thing about that. It does get down to land use. And that becomes a very sticky subject, as we can see. But I think there are ways to work together. And the housing program that was set out this morning by the Secretary for a prohousing framework is something that I think is very intriguing and could help with this.

2.2

Those of us who work in local government,

Michelle being one of them, and obviously our supervisors
here, we have, I will put this in quotes, "suffered a bit"
when redevelopment was taken away, because that was a
mechanism where we could -- where we could create
affordable housing, and that is gone. There certainly
were abuses in that program. But I have not seen either a
really big uptick in the use of the enhanced
infrastructure -- the EIFD programs. And so I don't know
whether we're taking on a bigger bite than we need to when
we look at that, but that would help to look and -- to
look and see how we can actually help local government
develop the housing that will then reduce the VMT.

So it's like one step leads to another, leads to another, and it's a really big chunk of work for us cut

out here. But I'm encouraged that we are looking at it in this way and a process is coming forward for us to develop plans to deal with it.

So thank you, Darwin, for the work you've done on this. We can see it's quite extensive and look forward -- look forward to seeing how -- how it develops and how we can actually implement the plan to get our desired result.

Thank you.

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks.

Fran Inman has her hand up now.

CTC COMMISSIONER INMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Great session today. And a couple of thing. One, I love the big data and would love to learn more of the work Hasan is doing, because we've all struggled with not getting timely data, not getting the relevant data. So whatever we can do collectively together to really get our arms around great information, our decisions will be better, I think.

And then also, love the culinary example. It hit right before lunch, so we all --

(Laughter.)

CTC COMMISSIONER INMAN: I don't think I'll ever forget that. And I love the analogy. And I think for whatever we do, we really do need to make sure that that's a key ingredient. And I was thinking about the protein.

And so as we were having that discussion, I think really, you know, we need the protein. And I won't say where's the beef, but where's the protein to make those actions?

2.2

And then I think, you know, we got lots of great data today. I think we need to digest and maybe have -- figure out a way to have some roundtable discussions about what we each heard and how -- how we all kind of process that. You know, the discussions around transit-oriented development and reducing high-income vehicle miles traveled. I mean, there's just so much for all us to learn.

And then finally, I think we'd be remiss if we don't spend a little more time on our economics and our strategy around economic development. Board Member Mitchell mentioned the redevelopment and the lack of that. But I think, you know, with Michelle's comments as well, at the end of the day, we've got to really look at where are our jobs of the future and how do we make sure that we can have all of this integrated together.

So those are kind of my thoughts for the moment.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, your thoughts are most welcome. I want to say we actually have time, if people don't wish to engage further in just general conversation, because I think we have been pretty clear that we think

that we're happy about the direction that we heard about

today on this CAPTI plan. I, too, endorse Joe Lyou's view that maybe even if that is it's correct name, we could give it a better one anyway for working purposes, just so people will know what we're talking about and is something that isn't just an acronym with no other meaning.

2.2

But having -- having survived that part of it, you know, that we want to see more. We want to -- we want to keep doing this and move it to the point where there's actually more -- more meat on the bones to keep on using these food analogies.

But what I'd -- what I was going to say is that the question was raised about housing. I think it was Barbara Riordan who said, well, what about the housing piece and not seeing that really fully integrated with the transportation planning. And that was the subject of the third presentation.

So I guess my question for the staff is could we get a 10-minute briefing on what's going on? I see that Darwin was going to be joining with his colleague, Lynn Von Koch-Liebert, Deputy Secretary of Housing and Consumer Relations. And that we could maybe just get a better sense of how that piece of this is going, and whether there's a way to better integrate it as well.

I think I'm calling on Richard here.

CARB EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: I'm sorry, Chair.

I thought it was Darwin.

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Oh. No, well, I was just going to ask you in terms of the presentations.

CARB EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: My sense is that -- and I'm going -- I am going to call on you, Darwin, in just a minute. My sense was that you had the ability to basically shorten it up to 15-minute kind of to get to the key points that were in that presentation, but let me just confirm that's accurate.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Well, if we can do that, then I don't think we're going to need a lot of closing remarks.

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Yeah. I'm happy to quickly run through that presentation, if it's helpful. I think my colleague Lynn may have left the meeting under the impression that we are not covering it. But you'd like, I'd like to -- I'm happy to cover it. I can also if it's helpful for the discussion, just do a -- CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Well, we could invite her back another day. Why don't we have you give us sort of the preview then and we'll invite her back another time.

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Sure. I can -you know, I think what might be helpful, instead of a
presentation, is what if take a minute or two to just talk

about what we're doing on that front -- CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yeah.

2.2

CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: -- given the time. We have about 14 minutes here till 3:00 and maybe we can -- I can take some questions based on that as well.

But what we were going to present on, and I guess backing up and talking about the comments that you all made, a hundred percent agree that the housing and land-use solutions are a critical part of this -- of this conversation, and are fundamental to seeing these strategies kind of come to realization, you know, as such.

You know at the onset, I mentioned that this is really just one part and piece of that -- of the broader puzzle. The presentation we were going to have after this was going to be on the housing and transportation work group, which an internal state agency work group that was created, when the -- what used to be the former Business, Transportation and Housing agency was through a different agency back in 2013.

And it was originally intended just for coordination between our two agencies and has evolved over time, particularly under this administration and the focus on housing, thinking critically about how we can partner on initiatives to link, you know, work like this Climate Action Plan on Transportation (inaudible) and the various

transportation work that we're doing with the efforts that are happening on housing, and how do we coordinate our efforts.

2.2

So there are, you know, various initiatives underway there to coordinate, including outreach efforts, some research, various program alignment type efforts that we've been undertaking. But, you know, I think one that's critical to mention here that touches on the community engagement piece as folks have brought up is another thing that we're undertaking as part of that effort is a stronger coordination with our regional partners.

In particular, we just relaunched with the help of the Strategic Growth Council, the State agency and MPO work group, which was an effort that has existing since the creation of SB 375, but I've taken a couple year hiatus and we just launched that last month in an effort to really do exactly what you all are mentioning here today, and not just look at these transportation investments in a silo, but how does it -- how do these become supported or realized through the various land use decision both housing standpoint, and as Commissioner Inman mentioned, I think just as important, particularly inland California is from economic development standpoint and a jobs standpoint. How do we bring those pieces together in one conversation?

So there -- the key brief -- those conversations are happening. We're working to take what was mentioned earlier, are, frankly legislatively-created silos, and do the best that we can administratively to -- to work together and a across the silos with our various programs And more than happy to come back with Lynn at the next meeting where whatever future meeting you all decide to present in further detail on that coordination and gather your input on that.

1.3

2.2

HCD DIRECTOR VELASQUEZ: Well, you know, Madam Chair, I think Lynn dial backed in, so she may be at the meeting now.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Great. Lynn would like to just give us a few comments and I apologize for the misdirection there.

BCHS DEPUTY SECRETARY VON KOCH-LIEBERT: That's no problem at all. Are you able to hear me okay?

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes.

BCHS DEPUTY SECRETARY VON KOCH-LIEBERT: Great

Okay. Well, my apologies. I missed the first part of the meeting, so I don't want to be too duplicative, only to say that I think that this -- this has been a -- you know, a really productive working group. I think that there have been a number of initiatives that we have found we've been able to work together on, and

have had a very good impact in this -- in the -- over the last two years as we've really reenergized this group and thought about how it could be used differently.

1.3

2.2

And as we move forward over the next two months working with our membership and the steering committee to identify the areas of focus and our action plan for the 2021 year, we really do welcome input, and ideas, and recommendations on items and actions that the working group can form subcommittees and work through collectively.

And I think that -- that would be my top level comments, and, you know, welcome any questions or areas of focus that the group would like me to address in more detail.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Thanks, Lynn. That's really helpful.

I think we are kind of moving in the direction of next steps -- sort of summary and next steps. You know, we had to ask Richard Corey to be listening, and making notes, and trying to summarize the themes that have come out of this meeting. So I think I will let him do that.

CARB EXECUTIVE OFFICER COREY: Thanks, Chair.

I was reflecting a bit on the comments now with ClimatePlan made in terms of reference to the bill that actually brought us together and reflecting on some of the

early meetings, and the wisdom actually realizing we can't actually achieve our housing, climate, clean air, VMT reduction equity goals without partnering. That's crystal clear and clearly that was reflected in the remarks of the Board members, and Commissioners, and HCD Director, which is really exciting.

2.2

We -- I wouldn't say we fully met or strived, but we -- there is tremendous progress, as I reflect on the last year or two years, and it's incredibly exciting. I'm seeing a path for us partnering going forward, and reflecting on the day, thinking about the -- initially hearing from SANDAG and Hasan, and the creativity in terms of the plan and the thinking that is going on really with the intersection of housing, and air quality, and driving down VMT, and equity.

And, in fact, I already made a note, staff will be following up with Hasan and team from this meeting. So I've been tracking some of our action items going forward.

And with ClimatePlan, Nailah, just the imagery that made us hungry, but also noted the -- you know, not just sprinkling equity around but having it infused. And I thought she made that point extremely well, and made the point about the key role that support for capacity building in community-based organizations. And we're thinking about our different programs and efforts, how --

that is the key question to be asking ourselves.

2.2

And clearly there's some programs that are doing that well, as Greenlining and Han talked about a few programs that are examples. I took notes on that as well, in terms of what can we learn from STEP and the mobility voucher program and apply to other programs. And a key point that was also made during that Greenlining presentation was incorporating principles. She shared principles that are fundamental equity principles that I'm asking the team, in partnership with -- with the CTC staff and HCD to look at how can we incorporate those, in terms of even our basic thinking in terms of programs, equity-focused programs, as we're trying to integrate across our programs.

The equity advisory committee several members referred to that in comments. That's when we're going to pursue in discussion across our three agencies. One is there are already opportunities -- a body about exists. If not, how can we develop that and how do we not do it a bunch of independent, but maybe have a shared collaborative team. It was a really an excellent point and a point that was well taken by us and by myself. Embedded in all your comments, as well as those commenters, was the need for action. We got that. And we -- it was -- that direction and that is coming through

loud and clear, in terms of how do we move forward? And there several examples called out in both the CAPTI or CAPTI, or however it's rebranded, in terms of we'll continue to work with Darwin and Darwin's team, so that as specific actions, actions that support the transition to ZEV, support the driving down VMT, and the housing and equity objectives that were called out here, that's work that we're doing now and we will continue to do.

1.3

2.2

So there will be the spring report that comes back to this body. We'll have those items and it won't be -- it will be progress, in terms of both report and how specific measures been able to move forward initially, and which ones are on their horizon. And a point that many of you made in terms of the spring report that returns is the need for action, but also the need for some sort of response on the part of this body, the three representative agencies here.

So we'll be circling with our team, Legal and others, on what could that look like? In other words, the ability for, one, to consider this spring plan, but also to take some formal or semi-formal action and direction with the expectation of progress reports, and tracking, and so on, which I was relating to Chair Nichols' reference to a -- a matrix of some kind. I think that's measures. I think that's tracking. I think it's

reporting and a shared -- a collaboration, in other words, a matrix that includes measures and who owns them and the different agencies that have a role together and how those are proceeding, progressing.

2.2

So I think we have some work to do to flesh out those details. But the ability to clearly see and understand and now have to guess at where actions are or how progress -- how they're proceeding is -- that point was taken as well.

So many actions. A lot of follow up on this.

But what is coming through in the observations I'm sharing is an enthusiasm, a reality of we can't meet certainly from the -- my role's point in term -- objective of clean, healthy air quality, driving down GHGs, realizing that the direct connection in terms of VMT, which is, in a sense, the bridge driving down VMT to housing, to mobility, to access, to clean healthy air, to GHG.

So it's an exciting time. And we have an opportunity here to really effectively move forward. And prior to this process starting, if you would have asked me who are our partners at the CTC or even to a degree CalSTA or HCD, I probably wouldn't even have been able to name key people in the organizations. I can now. And I can tell you we are -- staff are directly working, and talking, and working together each week, which I really

think was the wisdom embedded in that legislation.

2.2

And it's just exciting to see this emerge at a time it's not a moment too soon here that we're moving forward. So really exciting.

So on that Chair, I'll punt back to you.

that's terrific. I want to add one other thing to your summary before we go to closing remarks, and that is to suggest that even though we as administrative agencies are not free to go around proposing legislation, I think it would be appropriate for the staff to look at areas where targeted legislation could remove obstacles to our working together or produce a better, a more streamlined process. After all, these meetings wouldn't be happening if it hadn't been for legislation that clearly arose from many different stakeholders feeling like there wasn't enough conversation going on.

And now I think it's -- we've seen that, although it took awhile, and, you know, took some time, and some -- clearly, you know, individuals being in position who were ready and willing to do it, we could be thinking about -- about other changes in the way we do things as well.

So I hope that you'll at least give some thought to that in your staff level working groups. And, you know, if you surface ideas that seem to be plausible,

there is a process for elevating these things and potentially at least getting them, you know, looked at. So I'd like to put that on your radar screen as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

And with that, I think I should turn to Chair Norton and ask her for any closing remarks.

CTC CHAIR NORTON: Well, thank you very much Chairwoman Nichols. And I just wanted to say how exciting this is that we are truly fulfilling the goals of collaborating and thinking together. I think that has been very existing. And I felt like today, more than ever before, the participation from the public was also very collaborative, that you could clearly see Nailah, Chanell, James Corless, others that we are listening, that this is part of an intense opportunity for us to get it right I also think that we are just coming back from together. these RTP SCS plans where we've had to think holistically region by region. And I think the point about how we do that, how we then incorporate our equity roundtables and equity listening sessions to really come back in our next meeting in April to talk about how the -- those silos have been broken down and what we -- what we can achieve together in these mutual ways is very, very exciting.

And so I just wanted to say that this is one of the meetings, and the last couple have been really working along a progressive path where we're seeing like if we are going to recover as we need to be, we must continue to be doing it hand-in-hand.

2.2

And I'm just very grateful to be working with colleagues like you all that that hand-in-hand thought is seen as a joy and not work, and that collaborative approach is seen as the way to get it done right, and really have our economy, and our environment, and our housing plus transportation costs work for everyone.

And so I want to thank you all for a wonderful day, full of lots of possibilities as we move forward together. And thank you very much Chairwoman Nichols.

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. Thank you.

And I think we should also then call on Director Velasquez for any final words.

HCD DIRECTOR VELASQUEZ: Not much to add, Madam Chair. Just thank you for the opportunity to continue sharing our thoughts about how to align the strategies and objectives. I should have said this in my previous remarks, but HCD stands ready to continue to support -- supporting the action plan -- the CAPTI action plan. And so we look forward to continue working on that.

I think for the next meeting we'd love to bring back a conversation about RHNA reform and the intersection with the Sustainable Communities Strategies. I think that has to be something that in this group we need to talk

more about. I would -- I would encourage you to consider that for the next meeting. But all in all, thank you for the opportunity. We're very happy to be part of this joint meeting and always thankful for Assembly Member Grayson and others for allowing us to come together and discuss important issues.

2.2

CARB CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Thank you for that.

Well, I'm going to take advantage of the fact, as a number of you mentioned, that this is my last meeting of this group as Chair of CARB to make a couple of additional sort of overarching comments to close out -- close out the day.

I think today's discussion was really remarkable. And it may be that in smaller, less complicated states they can do stuff like this more easily. But we are a very big state, and each of our programs is huge. We also are a very diverse state, both in terms of our rich diversity of ethnic and racial groups, but also very diverse in terms of the wealth gap, and the urban versus rural divides, and we have many layers of government, sometimes seeming like they're working at cross-purposes, even though we all have the same general set of directions.

So I think it's important to acknowledge that Governor Newsom has really made it clear in his Executive

Orders, as well as his appointments, frankly -- and I say this in acknowledgement of my colleagues here from HCD, and CTC, and CalSTA that he wants us to be working together to accomplish this mix of goals, and make them come together in ways that are mutually reinforcing, so that we can have the kind of cleaner, more sustainable, more equitable society as a state that we all would like to enjoy and have here available for our children as well.

2.2

We are also, as we have acknowledged, going through a very bad time in our country, for our states and our cities. The economic collapse due to the COVID-19 pandemic has not left us, and we're going to have to find ways to restart the economy. It does appear that we will have a new President in January. I think that now seems pretty clear, but probably not fundamental changes in the Senate or the House, which means, you know, continued divisiveness, but obvious necessity to infuse more federal funding into -- into states and local governments, if we're going to be able to address any of these issues that we're talking about and put people back to work in our economy.

So I feel like California is now in a position where we can put forth some really creative and powerful suggestions for how to do that kind of stimulus and economic recovery in a way that accomplishes all of our

goals as well. And I am very confident that this group of people is going to be able to succeed.

So it's been a real pleasure for me to work with you on these issues over the past few years and from wherever I am after January, I will look forward to continuing to keep an eye on you.

And with that, I want to thank you and close this meeting. We'll see you -- or you will all be reconvening as a group, but staff will be working in between times until -- until this group meets again in 2021.

So thanks to all who participated. Thanks to all the Boards, Commission members and all the members of the public who have chosen to spend a very good chunk of their day with us. It's much appreciated.

Bye-bye.

SECRETARY KIM: Thank you, Mary.

(Thereupon the California Air Resources Board, California Transportation Commission and California Department of Housing and Community

Development meeting adjourned at 3:08 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 1 I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand 2 3 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify: That I am a disinterested person herein; that the 4 foregoing CARB, CTC, and HCD meeting was reported in 5 shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified Shorthand 6 Reporter of the State of California, and was thereafter 7 8 transcribed, under my direction, by computer-assisted 9 transcription; 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 18th day of November, 2020. 14 15 16 17 James & 18 19 20 JAMES F. PETERS, CSR 21 2.2 Certified Shorthand Reporter License No. 10063 23 24

25