













































































































































































1 and Berkeley, like two of the respective communities  
2 they're in. I think Caltrans is showing they are up for  
3 stuff, and so I encourage CARB to really push, much like  
4 how CARB has had a lot of success on the electricity side  
5 of things, cleaning up -- you know, forcing PG&E to clean  
6 up its act if they -- we need to recognize that Caltrans  
7 is just, you know, a PG&E with cars rather than that. And  
8 so hold them accountable.

9 Thank you so much.

10 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

11 Chance, I've activated your microphone. Please  
12 unmute and begin.

13 CHANCE BORECZKY: Okay. I hope I'm audible all  
14 right. Good morning, commissioners. My name's Chance  
15 Boreczky. I'm here representing East Bay for Everyone.  
16 And I do want to take a moment to recognize all of the  
17 excellent work that went into the preparation of the  
18 progress report. You know, it's really fantastic stuff.  
19 But at the end of the day - and I do want to be extremely  
20 blunt about this - the elephant in the room - it's not  
21 representative of the room here - is Caltrans. And we're  
22 not going to be able to achieve those VMT goals or really  
23 any of the State's climate goals until Caltrans stops  
24 subverting legislative intent and public will to build and  
25 expand more highways. It's as simple as that.

1           Honestly, some of their decision making is quite  
2 farcical and shows that they have no concern whatsoever  
3 with public input or with their reputation as an agency.  
4 And that include things like - I don't believe I heard it  
5 mention by another commenter - you know, diverting shop  
6 funding that's intended to pay for freeway maintenance and  
7 operations into freeway widening projects under the excuse  
8 that, you know, having auxiliary lanes is for operations  
9 and safety rather than, you know, a back-door way to widen  
10 and expand freeways.

11           And I've -- you know, I want to join the call to  
12 enact a moratorium on new highway expansion until proper  
13 audits can be conducted and until, you know, Caltrans can  
14 be forced to bring its spending priorities in line with  
15 the State's actual climate goals and not, you know, its  
16 own -- what appear to be its own entirely internal  
17 prerogatives. And, frankly, at a time like this, with  
18 Caltrans -- the public image of Caltrans being what it is,  
19 it's shocking that they're continuing to act in this way.  
20 But at the end of the day, it's got to stop if we want to  
21 hit our VMT goals, if we want to hit our climate goals, if  
22 we want to make a difference to the future of transit and  
23 of transportation in the State.

24           Thank you very much.

25           CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

1 Paul, I've activated your microphone. Please  
2 unmute and begin.

3 PAUL BICKMORE: Hi. My name's Paul Bickmore. I  
4 also volunteer with East Bay for Everyone.

5 We know that increasing road capacity only  
6 increases VMT, with no benefit to alleviating traffic  
7 congestion. And all this money that we spend on it,  
8 all -- in essence, all we get from it is more particulate  
9 matter, more carbon pollution, and expansion of  
10 communities that, you know, it's a subsidization of  
11 sprawling communities that generally have difficulty  
12 funding their own infrastructure costs given how disperse  
13 they are. So we don't really get anything out of it. All  
14 we get is a downside. There's no benefits to congestion.  
15 We need to be focusing on going forward on reducing VMT  
16 and ending the expansion and spending on our road  
17 capacity, which we know does not work.

18 Thank you very much.

19 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

20 Nailah, I have activated your microphone. Please  
21 unmute and begin.

22 NAILAH POPE-HARDEN: Hello, everyone. Nailah  
23 Pope-Harden, the executive director of ClimatePlan and  
24 also a member of the Equity Advisory Committee.

25 I want to first support comments made by my

1 colleagues demanding -- or asking for a moratorium on  
2 highway widening; and also that this body, the joint  
3 meeting, at the next joint meeting takes up VMT reductions  
4 and the allegations against Caltrans pretty seriously.

5       What I want to talk about though is justice and  
6 equity, and the three prongs of justice and equity, which  
7 first is process. When CAPTI was being developed it was a  
8 great process, two years of intentional stakeholder  
9 feedback, an engagement which ClimatePlan and many of our  
10 network members engaged in. The process was great and  
11 felt -- made a lot of us feel really hopeful.

12       The outcome and final CAPTI product was something  
13 that other states are aspiring to achieve themselves. It  
14 is something that is not perfect; did not go far enough.  
15 But if implemented, would really move transportation and  
16 housing spending and the way that we think about climate,  
17 equity, and housing altogether.

18       So in terms of the three prongs of justice, the  
19 first two CAPTI checked all the boxes. The third prong of  
20 justice and equity though is a sense of justice. Does it  
21 feel right? And as I sit here and listen to this report  
22 that says by the end of next year all of the initial  
23 actions of CAPTI are completed, doesn't feel right and  
24 should not feel right with anybody, especially given the  
25 allegations of Jeanie Ward Waller against Caltrans of



















1 most polluting segment. We need a big shift. We need  
2 to -- a big shift of spending to support public  
3 transportation, which is the segment required to go  
4 zero-emission first, after all. And the support -- better  
5 support of public transit supports both climate and equity  
6 goals, so we need to figure out how to make that shift.

7           Please do ensure that the next joint meeting can  
8 focus on VMT reduction and accountability of our dollars  
9 to be well invested to meet desperately needed climate  
10 goals, and we need to renew focus on public  
11 transportation.

12           Thank you very much.

13           CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

14           Guy, I've activated your microphone. Please  
15 unmute and begin.

16           GUY HALL: Thank you very much. I appreciate the  
17 opportunity to speak. This is Guy Hall with the Electric  
18 Vehicle Association policy team. And I wanted to point  
19 out that we know that the ability to charge -- for  
20 charging at home is a crucial aspect to enable the  
21 adoption of clean EVs to cross the state. You know,  
22 keeping in mind that 20 to 30 percent of our residents  
23 live in multi-family homes without affordable or  
24 convenient safe charging at home, this becomes really a  
25 major obstacle in the broad adoption of EVs across the

1 state. If -- at the same time, we need to avoid proposed  
2 solutions that might result in charging costs two times or  
3 greater -- higher for apartment families than for single  
4 family home residents; and at the same time significantly  
5 higher than the price of gas while becoming less  
6 convenient, less reliable and less safe.

7           So without providing equitable charging solutions  
8 for multi-family homes, this State is likely to lose 30  
9 percent of the California families in the migration to  
10 clean transportation.

11           I appreciate the opportunity to address the team.  
12 Thank you very much.

13           CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

14           Jared, I've activated your microphone. Please  
15 unmute and begin.

16           JARED SANCHEZ: Hi. This is Jared Sanchez,  
17 Policy Director for CalBike. I don't have a lot to add  
18 from what previous commenters have already said. But  
19 definitely appreciate the presentation from CalSTA. The  
20 incremental progress is certainly there and definitely  
21 want more of that.

22           I guess what I really want to underline here is  
23 what everyone has been already talking about in terms of  
24 highway expansion and what a previous commenter called  
25 climate arson. That's a great descriptor.

1 I really want to hear from commissioners, board  
2 members, all of the decision makers here in this meeting,  
3 and have a full discussion about that, whether now or at  
4 future meetings, and really to demand Caltrans'  
5 accountability on this issue. It's just a common-sense  
6 topic and something that needs to be in the public  
7 discourse, and I think you all should be leading that.

8 So I look forward to discussion. And thank you  
9 for allowing me to speak.

10 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

11 And after Sven we're going to hear from a phone  
12 number ending in 673, and then a phone number ending in  
13 850. And then we have one more in-person commenter, and  
14 that will be the close of the comments for item 2.

15 So, Sven, I've activated your microphone. Please  
16 unmute and begin.

17 SVEN THESEN: Good morning, commissioners and  
18 board members. This is Sven Thesen, founder of the  
19 Electric Vehicle Charging For All coalition. And I'd like  
20 to commend Housing & Community Development for -- come  
21 2026, for mandating that every new parking -- every new  
22 unit in multi-family housing, apartments and condos has  
23 access to charging. That took us three years to get  
24 there. That's a long time. And what we see is a shift in  
25 transportation to electric bikes. And right now Housing

1 and Community Development under AB 2863 has the  
2 opportunity to do something to address vehicle miles  
3 traveled, which is in addition to provide bicycle storage  
4 in parking lots in multi-family housing. But also has the  
5 option to include electric bike charging. I know lots of  
6 people that are using electric bikes as their second car.  
7 They are even driving them -- riding them to Costco. But  
8 they need to also -- likewise the advantage -- the  
9 privilege that someone in a single-family home has, which  
10 is ease of charging that electric bike, that cargo bike.  
11 So in addition to everyone's what they talked about in  
12 terms of highway expansion, let's accelerate, let's be  
13 flexible, let's move faster in getting people off of --  
14 out of cars and on to bikes and their feet. And one way  
15 of doing that is by providing bicycle charging at new  
16 apartments and condos.

17 I yield the rest of my time.

18 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

19 Phone number ending in 673. I've activated your  
20 microphone. Please unmute and begin.

21 THERESA GONZALES: Yes, hello. My name is  
22 Theresa Gonzales, project specialist with the Fresno  
23 Building Healthy Communities. Pollution and public health  
24 has equity concerns for Black and Brown low-income  
25 communities, new interchanges always end up in

1 disadvantaged communities.

2 California's transportation system directly kills  
3 4,000 people every year in preventable traffic violence.  
4 With that, I ask that this Board address California's  
5 highway expansion problems and that you hold Caltrans  
6 accountable for its harmful highway widening habits.

7 Thank you.

8 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

9 Phone number ending in 850. I've activated your  
10 microphone. Please state your name for the record and we  
11 can begin.

12 You may need to dial Star 6 to unmute.

13 GIA SANTIAN: Hi. Good morning, everyone. My  
14 name is Gina Santian. I'm a project specialist with  
15 Fresno Building Healthy Communities. And I'm just echoing  
16 what my colleagues have said to please address California  
17 highway expansion problem and hold Caltrans accountable  
18 for the harmful highway habits.

19 Thank you.

20 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

21 And then our last in-person commenter is William  
22 Walker.

23 WILLIAM WALKER: Hi. Good morning. And I  
24 appreciate your willingness to take public comment.  
25 Actually I wasn't planning to speak. But things happen

1 for a reason.

2 I'm one interagency equity advisory committee.  
3 But since that committee doesn't have a charter -- we have  
4 a charter, as you heard. But we don't have officers. I'm  
5 not going to reveal what my opinion is on this matter but  
6 you probably already know.

7 But what I will say is as far as how to implement  
8 true VMT reductions. N-19-19 was an executive order that  
9 was authored by our governor. And the Governor's Office  
10 of Planning and Research was charged with implementing it.  
11 I worked there in 2020 and I came to these meetings. And  
12 I always wondered why no one from OPR was required to come  
13 to these meetings. SGC also gives out a lot of the  
14 funding for reductions of VMT. They are not required to  
15 be at this meeting. They are commissioners just as many  
16 of you are.

17 So it seems that a lot of people aren't in the  
18 room and we should look at why we have all the plans that  
19 were presented on the CAPTI side of the different plans.  
20 Are they coordinated? Do they look at this executive  
21 order that we're charged with implementing?

22 My last comment -- since I -- I wasn't going to  
23 come up. That's one thing I wanted to share. But  
24 immediately as this item started I looked at the  
25 representation of the people in the room that spoke at

1 public commenting. So I'm very thankful of video and  
2 telephone comment. But for organizations that do this  
3 lobbying, you should look within and ask yourselves why  
4 most of the representation was white.

5 Thank you.

6 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

7 That concludes the commenters for item 2.

8 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you very  
9 much.

10 Okay. So now we'll bring it to the Commission  
11 and Board Members for comment. We're going to start with  
12 Commissioner Norton, who raised her hand quite early, on  
13 Zoom.

14 So, Commissioner Norton.

15 CTC COMMISSIONER NORTON: Yes, thank you. I  
16 really appreciate this time. And I'm actually here about  
17 to get to the meeting but charging up my electric vehicle  
18 so I can actually have enough power to get to Riverside.

19 I wanted to ask Darwin a few questions about the  
20 report and talk about what I feel has been a great  
21 partnership thus far in implementing CAPTI.

22 One of the things that I wanted to ask was that  
23 during COVID, many, many, many flights were canceled and a  
24 lot of people drove because their flights with canceled.  
25 I was just wondering if you have taken a look at what that

1 impact was and how that has really affected some of the  
2 data from those years about VMT.

3           The other question I have is we've had a  
4 fantastic partnership with many of the speakers today  
5 about moving away from a straight widening and to look at  
6 managed lanes, to look at multimodal corridors, to look at  
7 one billion dollars of investment in active  
8 transportation. If we have a meeting on this in the  
9 future, which I hope we do, will there be an opportunity  
10 to include the vehicle miles traveled predictions  
11 reductions -- predicted reductions of those projects that  
12 we have all approved with joy based on the CAPTI  
13 implementation? And, finally, just because it's hard to  
14 know when the -- Mike, you can get off. But finally, if  
15 we have a joint meeting to talk about this, I would like  
16 there to be an overlay with HCD as to the RHNA analysis  
17 locations of all the new housing, where that is as  
18 compared to where our transit network and roadway network  
19 is to date. I think it's really important that we look at  
20 where we're approving new housing, how we're going to get  
21 people to and from new housing. And as part of the  
22 approvals of the work that we're doing on freeways,  
23 managed lanes were an opportunity to move people by bus,  
24 by other types of transit, and fund to reduce falling off  
25 that transit cliff and also use that net toll revenue to

1 fund more biking and walking. And I know that those were  
2 all goals that we've all had to reduce VMT.

3 Thank you very much.

4 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Does the staff want  
5 to answer any of the questions posed by Commissioner  
6 Norton?

7 CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Sure. Thank  
8 you so much, Commissioner Norton, for those questions.

9 Regarding the impact of air travel on VMT during  
10 COVID, I don't have any data or numbers obviously in front  
11 of me here. But I would be happy to circle back on that  
12 in terms of, you know, what information we have and what  
13 trends were observed that can be correlated to those  
14 impacts.

15 In terms of the VMT reduction predictions of our  
16 investments, I think you know was -- the preliminary  
17 results I showed here are the analysis we've done in that  
18 frame. The full report will be out in the winter. So I  
19 think the question was around the next joint meeting. So  
20 certainly can dive deeper into the MTI report and the  
21 analysis we've done there in the spring if so desired.

22 And I will defer to -- I don't know if the HCD  
23 staff has any comments on the RHNA item.

24 HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: I'm Megan Kirkeby,  
25 Deputy for Policy for HCD.

1           It would be very doable for us to bring an  
2 overlay of where the housing need is with the transit  
3 network.

4           But I'd also recommend making sure that, you  
5 know, we also overlay in jobs and amenities as well.  
6 Obviously VMT reduction is not just about taking transit.  
7 It's about access to community amenities and taking  
8 shorter trips as well.

9           So those are a lot of the things and thought that  
10 go into where the housing need's located. So we -- yeah,  
11 that would be fair and doable for us to show that overlay.

12           CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

13           Vice Chair Guardino.

14           CTC VICE CHAIR GUARDINO: Thank you, chair  
15 Randolph. And thank you to everyone in person as well as  
16 remotely who participated in today's hearing. It's always  
17 heartening to see that type of engagement.

18           Question actually -- question actually to Darwin  
19 and then one question to one of our presenters, if I may.

20           If we could pull back up your CAPTI investment  
21 framework slide. There were actually three of them. One  
22 of them had three boxes, transit, ATP, and EV. If we  
23 could pull that slide back up.

24           Only if that's doable.

25           CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: It looks like

1 they're working on that. Let me get the slide number to  
2 help folks.

3 CTC VICE CHAIR GUARDINO: They didn't seem to be  
4 numbered, or I would have asked. My apologies. It was  
5 about the first third of the deck.

6 CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Yep, right.

7 CTC VICE CHAIR GUARDINO: I think 6 or 7.

8 CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: There we go.

9 CTC VICE CHAIR GUARDINO: Great.

10 As we continue our work together, something that  
11 one of my colleague commissioners brought up just a most  
12 recent example from this weekend, and it's the seamless  
13 transfer from transit, which we are working so hard to  
14 develop and support; and active transportation, which we  
15 are working equally hard to develop and support. And  
16 as -- as a long-time commuter by bike, trying to make that  
17 transition to trains or buses myself would also  
18 acknowledge some systems are better than others in terms  
19 of accommodating bikes and where and how many and what  
20 times of day, et cetera. So as we continue our work  
21 together, is there a way that we can look at this in a  
22 more thoughtful way to tear down those walls that are  
23 preventing those two forms of transportation from working  
24 better together?

25 Can we do that? Can we make a note of that? Or

1 are you al -- you may be way ahead of me, Darwin.

2 CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: It's certainly  
3 a great point, Vice Chair Guardino. And, you know, I  
4 think there's obviously some work underway with the  
5 California Integrated Travel Project. In terms of looking  
6 at seamless connections to transportation and transit. In  
7 particular, can certainly talk more about that. But I'll  
8 make note of an area -- to look at it as an area further  
9 collaboration and brainstorming if we look at where we go  
10 next with CAPTI.

11 CTC VICE CHAIR GUARDINO: And it's okay with our  
12 professional team at CTC. If this commissioner can help  
13 put some sweat equity into that effort, I'm volunteering.

14 The other comment for the gentleman from NRDC, I  
15 haven't had the pleasure of seeing the report that was  
16 cited several times. I would love to read that. I travel  
17 a lot by plane and it's great reading time. So if there's  
18 a way during the break we can exchange contact  
19 information, I'd like to read it.

20 I was not sure I heard correctly some speakers in  
21 referencing the report mentioned 80 percent of our current  
22 transportation investment as being for highways. Others I  
23 thought I heard say it was for highway expansions. It was  
24 unclear if it was streets and roads included in that as  
25 well. So I would benefit from reading more. Again, as

1 someone who cycles and takes transit, I depend on decent  
2 roads to ride my bikes on, which is why I've long  
3 advocated for complete streets.

4           So I'd like to see -- I'd like to dive into the  
5 data of your report and probably with a lot of follow-up  
6 questions of the difference between a highway expansion  
7 and what we often do was shop funds, which is make them  
8 safer -- not expanding them but make them safer. And then  
9 street maintenance pothole repair funds are the bane of  
10 the existence of many cyclists by -- like me who hit a  
11 bump and go down.

12           So we can exchange information later?

13           Thank you, sir.

14           CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

15           Board Member De La Torre.

16           CARB BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you.

17           Before a talk about this issue, I wanted to thank my  
18 colleagues on the CTC for including the 710 in SB 671 last  
19 month. It just made a whole lot of sense, as I said when  
20 I testified there. It's very much needed. If we're going  
21 to do this transition to green heavy-duty -- medium- and  
22 heavy-duty vehicles, we need that infrastructure, and the  
23 710 has to be right in the middle of it. As a senior  
24 government -- State government official told me, our  
25 region is ground zero for this transition.

1           And so thank you.

2           So I'll start with the 710 because I think it's  
3 very relevant to this discussion of VMT.

4           Not all highways are created equal. I would tell  
5 you flat out any highway -- new highway or expansion that  
6 is going into an area that will impact sprawl, no.  
7 That -- these are my strongly held views.

8           In most urban areas, if it's just commuting, you  
9 know, just normal passenger vehicle transportation,  
10 probably not. However, there are instances where  
11 operational improvements need to be made. And I'll bring  
12 it back to the 710 freeway that has these incredible truck  
13 counts, more than any other highway in the State of  
14 California. And I shared those with you last month. But  
15 I haven't shared them with my colleagues, so I'm going to  
16 repeat them. 108-truck-trip-count per mile, by far the  
17 highest in the State of California;  
18 46-mean-truck-trip-counts per mile, by far the most in the  
19 State of California; 42-median-truck-trip-counts per mile,  
20 by far the most in the State of California.

21           So in that instance - and I'm not talking about  
22 widening, Joe -- Joe and I serve on the task force about  
23 that. But there are operational improvements that need to  
24 be made for safety and for the flow. Otherwise, those  
25 trucks end up on our streets. I live a block from

1 Garfield Avenue, which is a main arterial that parallels  
2 the 710. Those trucks are on Garfield at least twice a  
3 month because the 710 is completely clogged. So I'm not  
4 talking about expansion. I'm talking about things that  
5 would fix -- improvements that would fix the flow of that  
6 and the safety, because it is one of the most dangerous  
7 freeways in this -- in the country, not even the State.

8 So that being said, that's my preface, that not  
9 all freeways are the same. However, we do have to address  
10 VMT. So...

11 The legacy projects. How does the pipeline work?  
12 For those of us that are not transportation experts. How  
13 do you decide, you know, what goes into the pipeline for  
14 projects, and those legacy projects that are out there?

15 Two, what are the costs and benefits and the  
16 short- and long-term impacts when you're thinking of those  
17 costs and benefits of these kinds of projects?

18 And then, you know, going forward obviously, more  
19 of a focus in CAPTI 2.0, or whatever you're going to call  
20 it, that is focused on reducing VMT.

21 As I've been having conversations over the last  
22 several months with staff about this, it is not good  
23 enough to stay the same on VMT. And we have to go down.

24 And as I say always at CARB, there were three  
25 sectors that did not contribute any GHG reductions to us

1 reaching our 2020 goals. Transportation -- and then you  
2 don't care about the other ones. That's not your turf.  
3 But transportation, short-lived climate pollutants and  
4 natural and working lands. Actually you could impact both  
5 of those other ones.

6 But for our purposes today, transportation; and  
7 so we need to really dig in on VMT, just not in a  
8 cookie-cutter way.

9 Thank you.

10 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

11 All right. I'm going to be alternating between  
12 commissioners and Board members.

13 Dr. Lyou.

14 CTC COMMISSIONER LYOU: Okay. Thank you, Madam  
15 Chair. You completely caught me off guard.

16 I have pretty specific question for you, Darwin.  
17 And thank you for presenting on the progress with CAPTI  
18 implementation. It would have been nice to have known  
19 that the new report was available prior to this meeting;  
20 but thanks to a decent internet connection, I now have it  
21 before me.

22 In that there was a strategy on improved planning  
23 and project partnerships. And the very first action item  
24 under there was to develop and implement the Caltrans  
25 system investment strategy to align Caltrans project

1 nominations in with the CAPTI investment framework. And I  
2 have a question about the status of CSIS -- what we call  
3 CSIS. There was also a typo in the original.

4 Did you know that? You misnamed CSIS.

5 CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: I'm aware.

6 CTC COMMISSIONER LYOU: Yeah, okay. I caught  
7 that too. I should have caught it the first time around,  
8 but I butchered --

9 CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Three years  
10 ago.

11 (Multiple voices at once.)

12 CTC COMMISSIONER LYOU: We will try to forgive  
13 that typo. You've got it right. Both annual reports have  
14 it -- have -- you know, have it titled correctly.

15 But the timeline in here - and this is a draft  
16 report, so this definitely needs to be changed, because  
17 the timeline doesn't seem realistic, because 2.0, the  
18 draft was just released. I asked Director -- Caltrans  
19 Director Tony Tavares about this at our last meeting a  
20 couple weeks ago. He said that it's going to take another  
21 six months to approve 2.0. And you have 3.0 being adopted  
22 and implemented by July. So that for our cycle 4 SB 1  
23 projects we can actually use it to make better decisions.

24 I'm concerned that we've fallen so far behind now  
25 with CSIS that we're not going to have something in place

1 to actually use for those SB 1 cycle 4 decisions.

2 Can you straighten me out on where we are and how  
3 we're going to get there in time so we can do that?

4 CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Sure. Thank  
5 you, Dr. Lyou, for that comment and the apologies both for  
6 the typo from the 2021 report and also for -- the fact  
7 that the report dropped this morning. We were scrambling  
8 to get it public in time. So -- but, yeah, I understand  
9 it didn't give you a ton of time to review before the  
10 meeting.

11 In terms of CSIS -- and I'd defer to Caltrans on  
12 their specific plan on how to deliver it in a timely  
13 manner. But in terms of the commitment that they've made  
14 in the report, so the 2.0, 3.0 distinction, my  
15 understanding is they're basically splitting up components  
16 of what would have otherwise been delivered in 2.0, and  
17 committing to do some of those components in what's it  
18 calling a 3.0 by the end of this fiscal year still. That  
19 is to be able to deliver something on the original  
20 timeline of a couple months from now. So the idea being  
21 that instead of what was having originally framed as a  
22 six-month delay, that there would be a component of CSIS  
23 that would hit sooner than that, and then other component  
24 that needs a little bit more work would be delivered  
25 before the end of the fiscal year. In terms of, yeah, the

1 details of that, I certainly can, you know, follow-up with  
2 Caltrans and get you more information.

3 CTC COMMISSIONER LYOU: Okay. And I guess I have  
4 a couple questions, one for staff. Given that timeline,  
5 Tanisha, will we be able to use CSIS for our cycle 4 SB 1  
6 decisions?

7 CTC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TAYLOR: Well, I can't  
8 speak to CSIS but I can speak to how we develop  
9 guidelines, which may answer the question that you're  
10 looking for.

11 I'm Tanisha Taylor, Executive Director of the  
12 commission.

13 When we develop guidelines there are often many  
14 things that are in flux. CAPTI was in flux. Our ATP  
15 program is in flux. A lot of different policies. The  
16 Scoping Plan was in flux. That doesn't mean that we can't  
17 incorporate the larger policies, the specific action items  
18 that are developed along the way as we coordinate with the  
19 different State agencies that we work with. We saw that  
20 in our cycle 3 guidelines. We've started thinking about a  
21 lot of these things as CAPTI was being developed as we  
22 were working with Darwin on the development of CAPTI.  
23 We'll continue to do that. If CSIS continues to be  
24 developed, we have to recognize and respect the CSIS  
25 process and the engagement process. But that doesn't mean

1 that things that we would do anyway we can't do anyway.

2 And so I think that we can commit to that.

3 CTC COMMISSIONER LYOU: Well, thank you for your  
4 can-do attitude and optimism on that. I do appreciate it.

5 And I don't know if there's anyone from Caltrans  
6 who can comment on that up here or virtually.

7 They only have like 30,000 employees. One of  
8 them couldn't make it.

9 CTC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TAYLOR: I don't believe  
10 we have somebody that can comment on that right now, no.

11 CTC COMMISSIONER LYOU: Okay. Well, please have  
12 them get back to me. I'm really interested in the timing  
13 of all this.

14 Thank you.

15 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Dr. Shaheen.

16 CARB BOARD MEMBER SHAHEEN: Thank you, Chair  
17 Randolph.

18 I wanted to just first start by thanking  
19 everybody for all the time and energy put into the CAPTI  
20 reports, to Darwin and the whole team there.

21 Also want to thank our colleagues from NRDC and  
22 NextGen for your reports. I have recently downloaded them  
23 and took a quick look. My assessment is quite similar to  
24 yours.

25 What I want to do is not ask questions but

1 provide some observations. So...

2           Dr. Serena Alexander's study, which is being  
3 produced by MTI for CAPTI. So I took a look at the  
4 methodology. It was pretty difficult to get into the  
5 details there. So I would love to see a follow-up  
6 briefing on this particular study, but also one by Susan  
7 Handy, which is underway at UC Davis - I assume, Darwin,  
8 you're aware of that - which is really looking at guidance  
9 and methods for assessing VMT as part of the CEQA process.  
10 Her study also includes potential mitigation measures for  
11 State highway system projects. And among other things,  
12 assesses methodological approaches for regional travel  
13 demand modeling, off-model adjustments, and also looks at  
14 the CARB quantification methods.

15           So I've joined the board recently. I think one  
16 of the things that I'm really eager to look at is science  
17 and methodology and really rigorous data.

18           I was delighted to hear that Dr. Alexander's  
19 study does more than directionality. I had the impression  
20 that's all it was doing from the slides. And that it  
21 gives us some degree of precision on magnitude, but I have  
22 no sense of what that means.

23           Percent change in reductions would be very, very  
24 helpful. As any of you know who measure VMT, it is  
25 extremely tricky to do. I do this work myself and have so

1 for over 25 years. It's very important that the tool take  
2 into consideration induced demand effects; and we know  
3 that there's existing tools that do that. So I'm very,  
4 very eager to see the CAPTI tool and how it is handling  
5 induced demand as well as sensitivity analysis in the  
6 production.

7           So I was also delighted to see that one of the  
8 goals of the CAPTI toolkit is to help us produce  
9 understanding of specific project changes. And I think we  
10 need more of these tools, more of these metrics to help us  
11 with this moving forward as we think about what happens  
12 with CAPTI moving forward.

13           Terms of the equity measure. It's measured by  
14 multimodal investment. And so I'm not sure that's the  
15 best tool. I understand that that's a starting point.  
16 But I think we ultimately really need to be focusing on  
17 ridership and access - which was previously mentioned by  
18 Commissioner Norton - and also the relationship to  
19 housing.

20           In terms of the economy metrics, it's measured in  
21 terms of jobs. I'm assuming this primarily is focused on  
22 construction jobs. Is that correct?

23           Okay. But oftentimes when we're looking at jobs  
24 and we want to look at the quality of that job, not just a  
25 quantification of that job.

1           And then my final comments at this stage, I'm  
2 really looking forward as well. And so thank you for  
3 including that, Darwin, in your slides. Transforming  
4 transit I've got explanation points, right. This is --  
5 this is absolutely essential that we look at that. I  
6 think there's huge opportunities to align with CARB's  
7 Scoping Plan here as we move forward, and looking well  
8 beyond the 5 billion on highway expenditures. I think  
9 we're missing a lot. Roadway pricing. We focused on that  
10 in the last joint meeting. I think we need to revisit  
11 that. I know you've got a working group underway as part  
12 of CAPTI. Love to see a lot more on goals, metrics, and  
13 deadlines associated with pricing associated there.

14           VMT reduction. I think we need to look at this  
15 frequently and what's in the pipeline. So things are  
16 dynamic. How are we measuring and tracking progress over  
17 time.

18           And then my final comment about looking forward  
19 relates to safety and public health. We really have to  
20 look at safety and traffic fatalities and collisions as  
21 well as the benefits of different types of infrastructure.  
22 So it's not so much a lot of questions but comments. I  
23 really appreciate how hard you're working on this. I  
24 think we can all work together and do more. And let's  
25 bring in more science and more rigor and more study. And

1 love to be briefed on that CAPTI report.

2 Thank you.

3 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

4 Commissioner Grisby.

5 CTC COMMISSIONER GRISBY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

6 And thank you to the advocates in the room who  
7 expressed your opinions and shared your reports. NRDC and  
8 NextGen in particular.

9 Want to join in with prior comments by Dr.  
10 Shaheen. I agree with your assessments of the system.

11 And I'll make some broad comments here and a  
12 couple questions for Darwin.

13 Darwin, thank you for your work, by the way.

14 It takes me back to the idea that when you are  
15 used to using a hammer, everything's a nail. And I think  
16 that might be the case with some of our highway  
17 investments.

18 Case in point, I spoke to one project sponsor of  
19 a new freeway that's not under construct -- well, parts  
20 was under construction. I asked why the project was not a  
21 light rail system or a light rail extension. They told  
22 me, quote, that we want to maintain the character of the  
23 community, end quote. Lots of old ways of thinking.  
24 Culture. Things that need to change over time. That's  
25 really frustrating on our investment strategies.

1 I also wanted to voice my connection with  
2 Hilary's comments -- Commissioner Norton's comments about  
3 the importance of mapping our transportation investments  
4 alongside our housing plans. I don't know how many times  
5 I've actually asked project sponsors about what the land  
6 use was going to be in the area around their  
7 transportation project, and they claim not to know.  
8 That's a little frustrating and it happens more often than  
9 it needs to.

10 And when we talk about transforming transit, you  
11 know, I like the fact that we're speaking more about  
12 multimodalism these days and making highway projects more  
13 multimodal. We know that oftentimes when you make it  
14 easier to drive, you take away a lot of the power of  
15 transit. You reduce the ability of us to have mode share  
16 shift, which is one of our key goals to reduce VMT and GHG  
17 emissions.

18 So I think all the above strategies sometimes is  
19 not going to help, especially when the transit project is  
20 an afterthought. Slow light rail, community rail that  
21 comes, you know, infrequently, good luck.

22 So these are all problems that we still need to  
23 address and think about when it comes to transporting in  
24 transit, because there are other investments due to the  
25 fact, in fact, impact transit.

1 Another thing for me is -- Commissioner Lyou  
2 mentioned CSIS, and, you know, CSIS is important to me as  
3 well. And I'm really curious about what kind of feedback  
4 you've gotten about the next round of CSIS, what's look --  
5 has anybody filtered up to your position? Have you heard  
6 anything about what folks would like to see in the next  
7 round of CSIS? I'm just hoping that the strategy that you  
8 laid out for curing projects and scoring projects will  
9 still be a value-add after all of the public comment has  
10 been collected.

11 And also I noticed your jobs analysis talked  
12 about indirect jobs. I would encourage the use of induced  
13 jobs as well, because a lot of those times we make  
14 investments and so-called alternative transportation, the  
15 big bang for our buck, is going to be in those types of  
16 jobs.

17 And I'll stop there. Thanks.

18 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you, Commissioner  
19 Grisby.

20 Board Member Takvorian.

21 CARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you, Chair.  
22 And thanks to everyone who's here today. Thanks to Darwin  
23 and your team for all of the work that you've done on the  
24 CAPTI. And thanks to all the commenters who are here  
25 today, particularly those from environmental justice

1 communities who are most impacted by air and climate  
2 pollution, and who have continued their call for reduction  
3 of pollution from transportation and particularly from  
4 heavy-duty-related pollution.

5 I'd also like to add my gratitude to NRDC and  
6 NextGen. Really appreciate your work. And while I've had  
7 an opportunity to read the executive summaries, I want to  
8 dig into the entire report.

9 And I think I heard a request as we are -- from  
10 Vice Chair Guardino. And I'm going to make a request that  
11 we devote our next meeting to all of these subjects. And  
12 I think that having you in the room and able to spend more  
13 than your two minutes of allocated public time to talking  
14 about the report and your findings would be very  
15 beneficial. So I hope we can make that happen.

16 All the commenters have noted that CARB's recent  
17 Scoping Plan have called for the reduction of VMT in a  
18 significant way, 25 percent by 2030 and 30 percent by  
19 2045. So we really have to work on VMT reduction.

20 And I also noted that the Scoping Plan as well as  
21 CAPTI are calling for and actually executing actions on  
22 equity. What I haven't seen is as much discussion of that  
23 intersection of equity and VMT reduction. And I'd like to  
24 see us lift that up more because we really know that if  
25 only 19 percent of the State budget is allocated to

1 VMT-reducing projects, as one of the reports indicated,  
2 even if it's 40 percent out of the CAPTI in this recent  
3 time, that all of those projects that are inducing more  
4 VMT and causing more pollution are likely impacting the  
5 communities that are already overburdened.

6 And I don't -- I don't actually see that that  
7 analysis is included in CAPTI. If it is, I'd be -- I can  
8 turn that into a question, and you can tell me where that  
9 is. But we know that these VMT-increasing projects are  
10 very likely to increase inequity and environmental racism  
11 as well as health impacts.

12 The SB 150 report, which I would also like to see  
13 be a focus of our next meeting, tells us that there's an  
14 estimated total of around 8,000 deaths that would be  
15 avoided for their combined scenario that increases active  
16 transportation, increases transit use, and decreases VMT.

17 So I think that's a very important element that  
18 we need to be including in a more intentional way in these  
19 discussions.

20 One question I have, as I think it's slide 7, but  
21 it's the same -- it's the next slide after the one that  
22 you called up, that one of the investment framework  
23 elements is promoting projects that do not increase  
24 passenger vehicle travel. So it doesn't say promoting  
25 projects that decrease VMT. And I'd like to learn more

1 about what that language difference is and to talk about  
2 how we might be able to shift it to a more active element  
3 I guess.

4           And then the other one is that you do talk about  
5 strengthening our commitment to social and racial equity  
6 by reducing harms and maximizing community benefits. What  
7 I don't see is how that's -- what that metric is and how  
8 you're quantifying that. I agree with Dr. Shaheen in  
9 regards to the metrics that -- and elements that could be  
10 added. I -- again, I'd like to see health metrics added  
11 to that and include that in our next meeting.

12           I'd like to also support what I think Dr. Lyou's  
13 comment was in terms of -- I'm not sure, maybe it was  
14 after -- the legacy projects.

15           CTC COMMISSIONER LYOU: It was Hector.

16           CARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yeah, sorry.

17           CARB BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: You can't tell us  
18 apart?

19           (Laughter).

20           CARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: I'm not even going  
21 to answer that question.

22           (Laughter).

23           CARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Yes. I think it's  
24 really important for us to take a look at what -- how --  
25 how if we're at 19 percent or 40 percent, depending on

1 wherever we are, it's not good enough. It may have been  
2 good enough - this was 20 years ago - but it isn't now.  
3 So the question I have is, what's the pathway to get from  
4 whatever the two low percentages to a hundred percent of  
5 that investment being for VMT-reducing and  
6 health-promoting and equity-promoting projects.

7 So that's my overarching question. I'm sure you  
8 have a two-line answer to that.

9 (Laughter).

10 CARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: And my request  
11 again is that the next meeting be fully devoted to a  
12 discussion of -- that has been raised by almost every  
13 commenter, and that is to eliminate funding for projects  
14 that increase VMT, including the SB 150 report. And I  
15 think I'd also like to invite Caltrans to engage with us  
16 at the next meeting. We have Dr. Lyou's comment as well  
17 as I think many others that would be important for us to  
18 engage them in that conversation.

19 CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Thank you so  
20 much, Board Member Takvorian, for those comments.

21 Going real quick -- before I get into a couple of  
22 those, going back to both your comment as well as Dr.  
23 Shaheen's comment about, you know, what is and isn't  
24 included in the report. What we share here today is a  
25 snapshot. Should the -- the full MTI report when it comes

1 out, certainly happy to have a deeper briefing for you all  
2 if interested and have MTI dig into their methodology. So  
3 we'll keep you posted on the full release of the report.

4 That report will include mapping from an equity  
5 perspective of the intersection of VMT and equity looking  
6 at where those projects, VMT-increasing and decreasing  
7 projects, are as it relates to CalEnviroScreen. So I  
8 think that will be a really helpful component. But we're  
9 not quite there yet. So once that report is done, we can  
10 certainly dig into that.

11 I think to some of your other questions, Board  
12 Member, in terms of the overall -- I believe you asked  
13 about the overall kind of funding pie and how to -- how --  
14 you know, what it'll take to shift those dollars to  
15 VMT-increasing dollars, I think one thing that's really  
16 important to note about the transportation funding and the  
17 NRDC report in particular that points out I think -- I  
18 forget the exact number but around 80 percent of the  
19 dollars not contributing to VMT-reducing projects, the  
20 majority of those dollars are operation and maintenance  
21 dollars that, through the passage of SB 1 in 2017,  
22 increased the shop's funds specifically for those  
23 purposes -- for those purposes. And as -- you saw in our  
24 slide, even with those dollars that have that really  
25 important role, Caltrans is thinking about how to operate

1 and maintain the system in a way that better aligns with  
2 climate change both towards investments and climate  
3 resilience as well as multimodal operational improvements.

4           But to -- you know, I think it's a much larger,  
5 more fundamental question if you're really talking about,  
6 you know, is that not a good use of funds versus -- you  
7 know, and should we be spending on something else, I think  
8 most folks here would say that maintenance and operations  
9 of the State highway system are critical and essential.  
10 So I do think it's a little bit of a -- a bit of a  
11 misrepresentation in what's possible and what's probably  
12 both practical and needed. I think we'll continue to need  
13 maintenance and operations fund. But I do think it's  
14 certainly fair to talk about the dollars beyond those  
15 dollars. And looking at how do we make sure we're  
16 contributing to VMT reductions with as many of our other  
17 dollars as we possibly can.

18           You mentioned the framing around -- on slide 7,  
19 not promoting projects that increase passenger vehicle  
20 travel. So in terms of VMT reductions with the first  
21 slide that included transit, active transportation, et  
22 cetera, is really meant to center how -- you know, what  
23 does VMT-reducing projects look like. I think the purpose  
24 of the guiding principle around projects that do not  
25 increase vehicle travel is meant to say that it's not

1 enough to just invest in VMT-reducing projects but we  
2 really need to think about projects that increase VMT. So  
3 that's why there's that negative, you know, tone to it.  
4 It's saying, "Let's move away from investments that  
5 increase driving," was the point there. So the flip side  
6 of the VMT-reducing investments.

7           Hopefully that answers your questions.

8           CARB BOARD MEMBER TAKVORIAN: Thank you.

9           Can I just add -- I'm sorry.

10          But hurry up.

11          Yes. Well, okay, so just as the comment is -- I  
12 think based on what you were saying is, then how do we  
13 look at those projects that increase transit ridership and  
14 reduce our reliance on roads - not that we're not going to  
15 need maintenance on those roads - I think many of us are a  
16 little cynical and a little concerned about that  
17 percentage and what's billed as highway maintenance that  
18 often looks like highway expansion. So being schooled on  
19 that would probably be pretty helpful.

20          And I think the other that I forgot to mention is  
21 I hope that we can get further into the road pricing  
22 strategies and what the update on that is, because some of  
23 us in our local municipalities have -- we failed, and our  
24 MPOs have rejected that. So we are very reliant on the  
25 State to take action.

1           So I don't know if we're going to hear more about  
2 that today, but I would certainly want to add that to my  
3 list for the next meeting.

4           Thank you.

5           CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

6           Board Member Hurt.

7           CARB BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you, Chair.

8           Thank you to the public commenters and definitely  
9 NRDC and the NextGen reports. I think the biggest  
10 eye-opener I read after reading both of those reports was  
11 on average each VMT-increasing project receives nearly  
12 four times the funding of a VMT-reducing project. An  
13 average pre-project funding allocation of 12.3 million  
14 versus 3.2 million. That's kind of upsetting and makes us  
15 think this is an important conversation that we are having  
16 timely.

17           I'm too thinking a lot about who has and has not  
18 benefited from the work that's happened thus far, and the  
19 necessity of the embedding equity; and not just words but  
20 in actions, as one of the public speakers said earlier.  
21 And what is the gap, you know, when you look around in  
22 disadvantaged communities how's CAPTI really impacting  
23 them. And how do we connect AB 617 plans to what CAPTI  
24 investment frameworks look like? - I think is going to be  
25 really important for the future.

1           Someone said earlier, "Who's not in the room?"  
2 And what should that tell us about future partnerships  
3 that we should all be working on? That impacts me as  
4 well.

5           I think -- in my backyard we have a highway  
6 expansion project. Some people looking forward to it.  
7 And others who are extremely concerned and upset. But  
8 both sides are carrying pitchforks, as I say. They're  
9 both wondering what are we going to do? And so I'll tell  
10 you many of the city stakeholders, as the Chair of a COG,  
11 they are afraid of seeing the money leave the county and  
12 the region for other projects. So what is the mechanism  
13 we need to create flexibility and reimagining that money -  
14 not necessarily the project but reimagining the money -  
15 and how can we streamline it so that people can work two  
16 projects that really do reduce VMT? And who is the entity  
17 that should best lead that reimagining? Because there are  
18 so many of us together working on this that I think we  
19 need to identify that.

20           I agree that road pricing is one tool to assist  
21 with reducing VMTs. I think it's most equitable though  
22 that we talk about the true alternatives to  
23 single-occupancy driving; and the conversation at the same  
24 time, how are we massively supporting these alternatives,  
25 whether it's public mass transit - definitely needs a

1 massive boost - and increasing multimodal projects that  
2 actually connect? We have pieces that I know it's going  
3 to take time. But how are we doing that in a streamlined  
4 and fast way so that we can bring more people along in  
5 this transformation?

6           For example, what does a superbike highway look  
7 like instead of widening highways? And similar to Vice  
8 Chair Guardino, refocusing funds on boulevards and city  
9 streets, instead of again highways, how do we do that in a  
10 way that again educates and brings people along?

11           I do have a real fear despite our best intentions  
12 that we don't deepen existing inequities in transportation  
13 by being too solo or siloed in the way that we're looking  
14 at the money, and how we're not as flexible, and all the  
15 different levels one has to go through in order to get a  
16 project across the finish line. I think we need to  
17 rethink that space. And again think of it holistically as  
18 in a region and a group versus individual projects.

19           I want to also appreciate that we're on track per  
20 CalSTA's review on the seven programs and in our goal to  
21 reduce VMTs. But clearly there's still a lot of work to  
22 be done. And so one of my questions is, how much of this  
23 work is benefiting large cities, who have internal  
24 capacity to obtain program benefits, versus rural, small  
25 cities and regions, who lacks the staff sometimes within

1 cities to really get reducing VMT projects moving forward?  
2 I'd love to hear any statistics or any of your thinking  
3 around that.

4           And I also am very curious about more -- you  
5 know, I have a critical eye to some of the conclusions  
6 that these strategies are completed when I think about a  
7 lot of the communities I see that still have a lot of  
8 issues. So I'd love to understand how you're quantifying  
9 strategy completion a little bit more; and how you're  
10 rural communities working group specifically, that that  
11 convening is going forward, because I think a lot about  
12 how that area is a part of our transformation.

13           CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Thank you so  
14 much, Board Member Hurt, for those questions.

15           I'll start with your question around kind of  
16 completion and how we're framing completion. It's a  
17 really important question and something that I think is  
18 important to clarify. We are judging completion purely  
19 by, what was the action listed and what did we say we were  
20 going to do and did we do it? That is different from, are  
21 we done addressing the topic? And I think that's an  
22 important distinction, right.

23           So, for example, you brought up the rural work.  
24 We had a rural convening that was an action in CAPTI. The  
25 rural convening is complete. There were some

1 recommendations with some other level convening. We want  
2 to pursue those recommendations. The action -- with all  
3 the convening, the action was complete. We're going to  
4 take those recommendations and move them forward. But  
5 it's reflected as complete in the plan.

6           So I think this is why the conversation around  
7 what comes next is really important, because a lot of  
8 these actions do lead to more work and additional work  
9 that we need to consider, and that's exactly the  
10 conversation we want to have is now that we've finished  
11 this phase, where do we go from here?

12           Related to that you asked about kind of the funds  
13 and where they're going. I don't have any unfortunately  
14 specific statistics on that. That is one thing that we  
15 have kept in mind and have been monitoring closely. And I  
16 know CTC --

17           CTC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TAYLOR: Ron, maybe if I  
18 can --

19           CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Yeah.

20           CTC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TAYLOR: -- I can jump in  
21 here.

22           CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Sure.

23           CTC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TAYLOR: I don't have any  
24 specific details on the numbers that go to rural versus  
25 urban. But it is one of the things that we at the

1 commission look at in terms of geographic equity across  
2 our programs to make sure that we're not only investing in  
3 those cities that can't afford to apply. Our team also in  
4 each of our programs does technical assistance for each of  
5 our applicants that request it to help those cities that  
6 may need a push over the finish line on: "Does this look  
7 good? Does this not look good? How can we align these  
8 things?"

9           We also do numerous workshops. Our ATP team does  
10 workshops that actually provide technical assistance in  
11 the workshop as they're developing the guidelines so that  
12 they can adjust the guidelines to meet the needs of the  
13 communities that we're trying to serve. And those are  
14 just a couple of ways that we, the commission, look at how  
15 we're funding projects.

16           Some of the things that we considered as well  
17 are: Do we have set-asides for rural agencies to ensure  
18 that they're getting funding? Do we have set-asides for  
19 tribal governments where we fund tribal governments to  
20 ensure that there is a level playing field and that we're  
21 bringing everybody up at the same time to the best that we  
22 can.

23           CARB BOARD MEMBER HURT: I'll tell you some of my  
24 experiences they don't even get to the applicant stage.  
25 Because they don't have the expertise within their agency

1 to -- or the time because there are a million other  
2 things, as we all know, that need to be dealt with  
3 especially when you only have a team of a hundred folks.

4           So wondering how we can think about the region  
5 and maybe help with that holistic view instead of per  
6 applicant, per project. What's needed in that space?

7           CTC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TAYLOR: One of the things  
8 that the commission does as well is we often look at who's  
9 not doing well in our programs and try to target those.  
10 We did that with the Tulare counsel -- the Tulare County  
11 in our active transportation program. They are now very  
12 successful in our program, because they were  
13 underrepresented before we asked the question: "Why are  
14 they underrepresented?" Before we'd done a similar  
15 analysis with our 535 communities to say which are not  
16 competing well so that we can target our outreach. To  
17 your point, sometimes since they don't even know that  
18 there's a program available to help with some of those  
19 things, and how are we making sure that we're reaching  
20 those communities as we're going through this process.

21           One of the other things we did and just recently  
22 developed, a program which Vice Chair Guardino mentioned  
23 in his remarks, which is a first-of-its-kind program, the  
24 Local Transportation Climate Adaptation Program. It is  
25 one of the few fund sources where we can fund tribal

1 governments. And one of the things that we really wanted  
2 to understand was what actually works for a tribal  
3 government? Because to your point, they often don't apply  
4 because, one, they don't think they can win; that it's too  
5 hard competing against the larger cities; and all of those  
6 different things. And so we actually went to the Caltrans  
7 Native American Advisory Council to, before we put pen to  
8 paper, say, "What works?" and "How do we make it work?  
9 What are those barriers to success?"

10 Now, we didn't have any tribes apply in this  
11 program. But our next question is: "Why didn't they  
12 apply?" and "What do we need to change?" One of the  
13 things that the admini -- a bill that the administration  
14 to fund, the governor to fund, helps with tribal  
15 contracting. That was one of the barriers that our  
16 programs were facing. That barrier has been removed.  
17 And so we are trying to look at how do we ensure that  
18 those communities that aren't at the table - and there's a  
19 myriad of reasons why they're not at the table - how do we  
20 help them get to the table and then be successful at the  
21 table as well.

22 CARB BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you.

23 CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: If I can add  
24 one point to Director Taylor's remarks. In terms of what  
25 our study and I think what the MTI study will show, we

1 don't -- I don't have the specific data, but we have  
2 observed more first-time applicants and first-time award  
3 recipients across all the programs. You know, some of  
4 these programs are still relatively new. So there's a --  
5 you know, a big opportunity for that. But the fact that  
6 the money is going to places that were not previously  
7 successful, as I think it also shows, that a lot of the  
8 strategies that the CTC's talking about are successful.  
9 And the TIRCP program is particular this last round. So a  
10 major increase in the amount of funds going to rural  
11 applicants. And that's for transit capital projects.

12 CARB BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you. Thank you,  
13 Chair.

14 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

15 Board Member Reacts.

16 CARB BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Thank you.

17 My comments really go to next steps. I know many  
18 of us will be talking about it at future meetings and some  
19 of which have been addressed already.

20 As my colleagues on both the commission and the  
21 board have noted, we clearly need a paradigm shift in what  
22 we're doing. It's not enough simply to sell the rate of  
23 VMT increases. We need to reduce them dramatically over  
24 the next few years and going forward.

25 So I'm very interested in finding out in the

1 context of CAPTI and other programs what are we doing to  
2 engineer this paradigm shift? It's -- I don't think it's  
3 enough that we're meeting the goals of CAPTI, if they  
4 don't engineer this kind of profound shift.

5 Don't -- I have two -- well, I have a question  
6 and a comment for you.

7 You answered in part in response to Board Member  
8 Takvorian and De La Torre sub-specifics about how to  
9 prioritize or rearrange projects in the pipeline. And  
10 I -- I maybe expand the focus, and I think that would be  
11 something that I'd like to see us continue to talk about  
12 going forward: What can we do differently to make sure  
13 that the projects we really want go forward and that  
14 they're -- or they're reconsidered in the way to make them  
15 go forward. Do we need to do more than that to slow them  
16 down or otherwise rearrange them?

17 One thing you said that intrigued me - and maybe  
18 we just put this off till the next session - you said one  
19 of the things on your agenda is identifying the future of  
20 the state highway system. What do you mean by that?

21 CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Thank you,  
22 Board Member. Thanks for giving me an opportunity to  
23 address that, since we didn't get to dive into the "Next  
24 Steps" slides in detail. I believe you're referencing  
25 something listed on the looking-forward slide.

1           In terms of the future of the state highway  
2 systems, this is listed in the original CAPTI report. We  
3 acknowledge that, much as the conversation here has talked  
4 about, that the role of the state highway system and how  
5 we use it needs to significantly change to meet these  
6 goals.

7           So I think what we're alluding to there is how do  
8 you manage the system differently, how do you move more  
9 people through that system with less emissions, how do you  
10 price the system differently? And when I say price, I  
11 don't just mean tolling on the system. I mean who is  
12 paying how much, what transportation burden are they --  
13 are they -- cost burden are they taking on, that relates  
14 to, you know, how transit moves on the system.

15           So it's really alluding to the broader shift. I  
16 think -- I believe one of the public commenters, Matt  
17 Maloney from MTP, brought this up that -- this is just --  
18 this is beyond just looking at highway expansion projects  
19 and reducing those projects. But thinking about still  
20 providing a functional transportation system, and thinking  
21 about the management of the state highway system is a big  
22 part of that.

23           CARB BOARD MEMBER RECHTSCHAFFEN: Thank you.

24           CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you.

25           Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

1 CARB BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you so  
2 much. I have really appreciated all this conversation and  
3 the public comment as well.

4 I think -- I have two questions. One, Darwin,  
5 you made a comment when responding to Board Member  
6 Takvorian's questions about the funding you need to stay  
7 in place for existing highways. So maybe I heard that  
8 wrong. But it seemed like you were talking about like  
9 there are two different ways in which funding needs to be  
10 looked at that seemed like separate, that the highway  
11 funding seems separate from the conversation. So I just  
12 wanted to learn a little bit more about that comment.

13 And then also you said there will be more  
14 analysis in the CAPTI, the full report, around jobs; and I  
15 was wondering if some of that will also include using some  
16 of the census data or your own data on how many people are  
17 actually employed and living in the areas where we're --  
18 where these projects are being funded. One of the things  
19 that, you know -- you heard a lot about the commenters  
20 from Fresno, which is where I'm from, and one of the  
21 things that's very curious about that specific project is  
22 that those surrounding communities -- while the project is  
23 being targeted for the economy in the surrounding  
24 communities, there were 90 percent of those jobs actually  
25 were going to people that were living outside of that

1 area. And so I just wanted to learn more about what we  
2 expect to see under -- on the jobs-front and then if you  
3 could speak a little bit more about the hallway funding  
4 separation.

5 CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Thank you so  
6 much, Board Member, for those questions.

7 I think to your first question about the funding  
8 makeup, so what I was speaking to earlier was the fact  
9 that a large portion of the overall State investments  
10 under CAPTI under the seven programs goes to the State  
11 Highway Operations Program, the SHOP that is mainly for  
12 maintenance and operations. And so really envisioning  
13 those dollars as being the driver of VMT reduction is  
14 rather -- is rather challenging and not necessarily the  
15 intent of those dollars, although I did acknowledge the  
16 opportunities we do have there that we're working on.

17 In terms of your question about jobs,  
18 unfortunately in terms of limitations of the data, the  
19 direct jobs that are measured we don't have data on  
20 whether or not -- or where the location of demographic  
21 data, where the location of those individuals and those  
22 jobs are from and where they're living. But in terms of  
23 the indirect jobs analysis, a lot of the indirect benefit  
24 from projects jobs analysis, that would be in the  
25 community. So, you know, that's more location -- location

1 specific. So we can infer that there's definitely  
2 benefits coming to those communities where those projects  
3 are located.

4 And, yes, certainly happy to give you more  
5 information on that analysis when the report is out.

6 CTC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TAYLOR: And, Darwin, can  
7 I add a little bit to your discussion about the SHOPP.  
8 And when we talk about what's maintenance, I think it's  
9 important to define the types of projects and in giving  
10 samples of those types of projects that we're talking  
11 about.

12 When we talk about there's a subset of funding in  
13 SB 1 that's for Fix It First, we're talking about  
14 maintaining our bridges so they don't fall, we're talking  
15 about maintaining our roadways so that the safety issues  
16 that come with pavement and asphalt being kicked up  
17 because they're in a state of disrepair aren't happening,  
18 and we're talking about safety improvements. We're also  
19 talking about drainage. We saw -- during our atmospheric  
20 rivers we saw some of our culverts wash out. At the  
21 Commission we saw our emergency reservation jump from a  
22 little under a billion to almost 2 billion dollars worth  
23 of damage. And so those are the types of things that  
24 we're talking about when we talk about how we maintain the  
25 roadways, really keeping it safe for the traveling public.

1 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay.

2 CTC VICE CHAIR GUARDINO: Thanks for emphasizing  
3 that, Executive Director Taylor.

4 And I would just mention another best practice  
5 that we've tried to take on at the CTC is to not stay in  
6 Sacramento for our hearings. When I joined the commission  
7 17 years ago we had about seven public hearings lasting  
8 two days each a year. And six of the seven would be in  
9 Sacramento, and once a year we would go out to somewhere  
10 else. It's inverse now. Six of the seven times we're in  
11 one of those 482 cities and one of the different 58  
12 counties, and once we're in Sacramento. So that when  
13 we're in Madera County three weeks ago, we're experiencing  
14 what Madera residents are dealing with on a daily basis.  
15 And it's -- I believe it's been eye-opening for this  
16 commissioner.

17 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Dr. Balmes.

18 CARB BOARD MEMBER BALMES: Thank you, Chair.

19 So one advantage of coming late to the dais  
20 spiels is mostly what I wanted to say has already been  
21 said, so I'll be brief.

22 So first of all I want to thank Darwin and  
23 CalSTA's staff for, A, a good presentation, B, for being  
24 willing to be responsive to the questions and comments  
25 from the board. I want to thank all the public speakers,

1 and especially NRDC and NextGen.

2           So I think we all agree that aligning  
3 transportation events investments with Scoping Plan is  
4 necessary to meet our very heavy lift VMT-reduction goals.  
5 And so unless I'm living in an alternative universe, one  
6 of the big parts of the paradigm shift that Board Member  
7 Reacts suggested would be major -- underlying major  
8 investment in public transit. And this is the alternative  
9 universe at least in the Bay Area. You know, mass  
10 transit's fallen off the cliff, you know. We can talk  
11 about increased use of public transit to decrease motor  
12 vehicle VMTs. But, you know, not just a little bit. It's  
13 like major investment that's required.

14           So I guess I need -- you don't have to respond to  
15 this, Darwin. But I think for our combined -- the board  
16 and commission and HCD, for that matter, we need to really  
17 come to grips with the fact that public transit is  
18 underfunded. It was underfunded before the pandemic, and  
19 now it's really underfunded. So that's number one.

20           And that number two is the whole equity issue,  
21 which I'm glad my fellow board members have -- and  
22 commissioners have brought up. I heard a presentation  
23 yesterday -- you know, I'm a Cal Berkeley faculty member,  
24 and I heard a presentation from environmental engineers  
25 which, you know, talked about the fact with data to show

1 that while the air is getting much cleaner in California,  
2 the disparity between low income communities of color and  
3 more white affluent communities haven't gone away at all.  
4 It's just everything's going down in parallel. And what  
5 is the driver for that? It's mostly motor vehicle --  
6 motor vehicles and, you know, VMTs. And it's actually  
7 more important -- gas-powered light-duty vehicles are  
8 actually more of a problem than heavy-duty vehicles. I'm  
9 all about reducing dirty diesel. We have to do that. But  
10 in terms of the -- there's more air pollution that comes  
11 from gas vehicles than from the heavy-duty vehicles in  
12 total, just because there's so many more motor vehicles.

13 And we always talk about getting rid of the  
14 diesel trucks in low-income communities of color. But the  
15 freeways go through those communities too. So we can  
16 have -- matter of fact these folks -- these colleagues of  
17 mine at Berkeley showed that if we made everything  
18 electric, there'd still be disparity because of exposure  
19 to tire and brake.

20 So I think investment in public transit is  
21 actually an important part of the picture, both for  
22 meeting our VMT reduction and climate goals, but also for  
23 our equity issues in terms of health.

24 So my last two things were -- I want to endorse  
25 thinking more about roadway pricing because in various

1 jurisdictions around the world they've been very  
2 successful. So I think I would like to see more specific  
3 goals and metrics on roadway pricing, you know, for the  
4 future steps. And then I totally endorse the call for a  
5 focus on VMT reductions and, you know, a rethinking of our  
6 transportation system for our next meeting.

7 Thank you.

8 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Commission Falcon. Fall  
9 awe finance awe Wednesday your team for a very author'

10 CTC COMMISSIONER REYES FALCON: Thank you, Chair  
11 Randolph. And thank you, Darwin and your team, for a very  
12 thorough presentation, and to all of the commenters.  
13 Appreciate all the thoughtful comments and the comments  
14 from my colleagues from CARB and from CTC.

15 I don't want on add too much to all the  
16 thoughtful comments that were made by my colleagues. But,  
17 you know, as we're looking at -- and, first of all,  
18 congratulations to -- you know, to the achievements so far  
19 on trying to reduce VMT and implementation of CAPTI. But  
20 it also does lay bare the work that is ahead of all of us,  
21 not just one or two agencies. We have to do this  
22 collectively.

23 And the one thought I had as I was listening to  
24 my comments -- my colleagues, especially on the equity and  
25 looking at things holistically, changing, you know,

1 paradigm -- a paradigm shift, more and more, you know, as  
2 I listen to projects and how they connect to the needs of  
3 people, is that relationship between land use and  
4 transportation, how to get folks to where they need to go.  
5 That is -- that is the crux of what we look at, right.  
6 And so in a -- regions are trying to implement SB 375, a  
7 suggestion, you know, as we look at meaningfully  
8 implementing further reductions of VMT and getting folks  
9 to reduce their vehicle usages, how land use is responding  
10 to our collective desire to reduce VMT.

11           And how are we looking at that strategically?  
12 How are we looking at the behavior and the population  
13 going into 2030? So I was looking at a statistic right  
14 now for the master plan for the aged. And by 2030, a  
15 quarter of our population will be aged; myself included,  
16 by the way. How are we going to respond to that? How do  
17 we match our land use and our transportation to serve  
18 these folks, including myself, as we typically when we  
19 look at transportation we're trying to get folks to their  
20 jobs. Well, how are we also looking at population that  
21 needs to get to their doctors' appointments, right, for  
22 example, or get food on their table, or where they live?  
23 Are we locating housing for the aged close to transit  
24 corridors? Does it make sense for them? Right. And how  
25 do we make it comfortable and safe?

1           So I don't want add too much to what's been said  
2 except for, you know, I think as we look to the next --  
3 our next efforts as it relates to reduction of VMT is that  
4 we look at strategically how we're incorporating land use.  
5 And I think it goes beyond agencies that are here and  
6 Caltrans. I think we need to look at, you know, what does  
7 the Strategic Growth Council say, right, for example.

8           So I think if we really want to be meaningfully  
9 doing this work, that we need to include more players at  
10 the table.

11           So thank you.

12           Oh, one more question. When we were looking at  
13 the VMT calculation, does that include -- and I think Vice  
14 Chair Guardino asked this and I missed the answer -- did  
15 that include local streets and roads in your VMT  
16 calculation?

17           CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: So the  
18 calculations that went into the MTI study looked at VMT of  
19 various different project types depending on what was  
20 funded. So where local road expansion, for example, or  
21 other operational improvements were funded, there was a  
22 VMT attribute assigned based on research of the average  
23 amount of VMT increased or reduced of that roadway. So  
24 including local roads where we funded those types of  
25 projects.

1 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

2 Board Member Guerra.

3 CARB BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Thank you, Chair. Let  
4 me go through my points here.

5 Number 1, I agree with Board Member De La Torre  
6 here. I represent an area that has a lot of industrial  
7 movement, and so we are trying to do everything we can to  
8 move the heavy freight off of areas like Stockton  
9 Boulevard and keep them on the areas of 99.

10 To that point -- the second point on the VMT  
11 side -- and Stockton Boulevard in Sacramento, by the way,  
12 you know. People confuse that with Stockton, you know.

13 But -- and a lot of industrial corridors.

14 But on the VMT side I agree with my colleagues  
15 here. Our next meeting should be about what are those  
16 hard actionable decisions that need to be made about  
17 prioritization, funding or shifting in funding. And then  
18 I will probably -- I'll -- I don't need an answer on this,  
19 but I would -- maybe my question, as more of a statement  
20 to CalSTA, is that, has there been thought about something  
21 doing -- this may be sacrilegious -- is moving funding  
22 from some of these programs even to not only another  
23 program but a completely other agency? And I'll bring up  
24 the example here of the -- and maybe this parallels to the  
25 next presentation, and that's the REAP program -- REAP

1 2.0. People drive because they have very limited housing  
2 choice decisions. And I will credit and I -- I credit the  
3 advocacy of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments for  
4 their Green Means Go Program that advocated for this type  
5 of resources.

6 But when you look at the REAP program it's HCD,  
7 Strategic Growth Council. But nothing -- but we don't see  
8 the CTC involved in that funding of that program. And  
9 that's digging into our major commercial corridors, our  
10 boulevards, where we're having to rip up the roadways to  
11 put in the infrastructure to actually make housing even  
12 viable.

13 So what I'd like to see is how we can actually  
14 make commercial corridors which we know retail is dying or  
15 we can actually get housing close to the job centers, and  
16 revisit that, versus what I think Dr. Shaheen mentioned,  
17 the in -- capacity inducing challenges of reducing VMT by  
18 people driving 50 miles. So I think that would support  
19 our local cities and counties much more. So I know it may  
20 sound extreme. But should we be looking at moving money  
21 more towards the REAP? Maybe that makes, you know,  
22 Board -- our HCD director happy. Or even to the LPP,  
23 changing the structure of that, so that it focuses more on  
24 infill and more on areas where it will actually support  
25 the transit lines, because density on these corridors are

1 partly why the transit lines are falling apart.

2           So let me stop there and say that -- I think our  
3 next meeting is on that. But I'd like to actually see if  
4 CalSTA would consider how would that look if we made some  
5 drastic changes in where our funding pattern goes.

6           CalSTA DEPUTY SECRETARY MOOSAVI: Thank you,  
7 Board Member.

8           And I think -- in terms of considerations of  
9 funding I think, just stepping back, it's important to  
10 acknowledge that the purpose of this particular effort and  
11 CAPTI was to look within the bounds of our existing  
12 funding framework and think about, you know, how we -- how  
13 we make shifts there. So I can't, you know, speak to  
14 anything beyond that in terms of greater efforts.

15           But to your point about REAP, I think that  
16 investment and that program, particularly REAP 2.0 and the  
17 investment there, is an acknowledgment of the influence of  
18 those investments. So I think it's important to note  
19 that, you know, all these different sets of funds have  
20 various different purposes and we're put toward those  
21 purposes for a reason, many of which are statutorily or  
22 even constitutionally directed in terms of where they go  
23 on our thought to say that other sources of funding aren't  
24 important. But right now we're focused on how do we use  
25 the existing framework that we have and maximize those

1 investments towards these uses, but the best uses for  
2 where the dollars were intended by the Legislature and the  
3 Governor.

4 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

5 Commissioner Lugo.

6 CTC COMMISSIONER LUGO: Thanks, Chair Randolph.

7 I know -- I had to step out for a work call, so I  
8 missed some of the context at the discussion. But I think  
9 that's never stopped an appointee in the past, so I'm just  
10 going to charge ahead with making some comments. And I  
11 will be brief.

12 So, I'm a cultural anthropologist. And, you  
13 know, we're the kind of researchers who don't usually have  
14 findings that are actionable in policy processes, and --  
15 but I do have something that I think is relevant here in  
16 terms of the fact that infrastructures, you know, are  
17 these living systems, right. We talk about them as though  
18 they are -- especially in transportation, we tend to talk  
19 about what it is that they'll do in the future. Like when  
20 we make an investment, it's -- you know, oh, it's going to  
21 change roadway behavior in this way, it's going to induce  
22 VMT in this way. But there's also a reality that the  
23 investments we make in infrastructure have more immediate  
24 effects, right, in terms of jobs and things like that.

25 And I think that if we could get to -- in terms

1 of paradigm shift, if we could get to a place of speaking  
2 more holistically about what it is that is happening with  
3 our infrastructure investments across the Board so that  
4 instead of being more focused on certain kinds of effects  
5 like, you know, the air pollution effects and induce VMT,  
6 we could also be thinking about, well, what do these  
7 systems work well for now? You know, building highways is  
8 a pathway to a solid job. That means a lot to a lot of  
9 people in our state. So what are we thinking about? And  
10 this is me speaking as a participant in the sustainable  
11 transportation advocacy landscape. What are we projecting  
12 as the future of sustainable transportation that is going  
13 to similarly support the economic health of working  
14 families? Because I think unfortunately we've tended to  
15 focus more on how we're going to save money with  
16 sustainable transportation infrastructure. And I think we  
17 need to start talking about how we're going to spend  
18 billions of dollars. But it's not going to be on  
19 highways. It's going to be on our comprehensive, you  
20 know, active transportation networks, it's going to be on  
21 the rail projects, it's going to be on all the people we  
22 need staffing in the system so that they work. Because I  
23 can tell you as an EV driver, having a charger there isn't  
24 enough if you don't have someone there to help you out in  
25 case it's not working.

1           So how can we be talking about infrastructure as  
2 this living, breathing thing that involves a whole lot of  
3 people to build it, maintain it? It's like in some ways  
4 we talk about it that way, you know. It's right there in  
5 the name of SHOPP, State Highway Operations, you know,  
6 P-P.

7           But then in other ways we don't talk about some  
8 of these aspects. So I would just love to see us, you  
9 know, using this finding from -- you know, I'm not the  
10 only anthropologist who has studied human infrastructure  
11 and social infrastructures and infrastructures, this  
12 living thing. How could that idea of it help us to see  
13 more clearly who's benefiting, who's not benefiting, and  
14 who we want to see benefiting in the future, and come up  
15 with some plans that are going to bring everybody along.  
16 I would love to see that happen.

17           So -- not to keep us from lunch. Thanks.

18           CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you, Dr. Lugo. That  
19 was -- I liked that system perspective. That was  
20 really -- really interesting.

21           Okay. So I think as we typically do at the end  
22 of these joint meetings, we will do a little wrap-up and  
23 kind of talk about next steps. There's testimony I hear a  
24 lot of interest in doing a deep dive into how we can take  
25 action to reduce VMT, understanding the SB 150 report.

1 And so I think there's an opportunity to do that.  
2 We only meet twice a year, so I don't that we can devote  
3 an entire meeting to that one topic. But that's something  
4 we can absolutely consider along with our CTC partners.

5 For instance, I've been asking for a while for a  
6 conversation about the 671 report. And so I think there's  
7 an opportunity to do that. And of course there's sort of  
8 VMT adjacent topics like road pricing and housing, as was  
9 mentioned earlier.

10 So we can give some thought to how best to tee up  
11 these topics at future meetings.

12 And with that, I think we're going to take a --  
13 since we are extremely behind time, I think we're going to  
14 take a 45-minute lunch break, which would put us back  
15 here -- can somebody do some math for me -- at 1:25. So  
16 we'll do 47 minutes. 1:25

17 Thank you very much.

18 (Off record: 12:38 p.m.)

19 (Thereupon a lunch break was taken.)  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



1           A region's RHNA plan, which is certified by HCD,  
2 is required to be consistent with the region's sustainable  
3 communities strategy, which is accepted or rejected by  
4 CARB. Today's presentation provides a useful basis for  
5 our agencies to continue working toward advancing our  
6 respective goals through greater alignment of these two  
7 processes.

8           Next, CTC will present its work of updating its  
9 guidelines for regional transportation plans, or RTPs.  
10 The guidelines explain how regions can develop their  
11 regional transportation plans to be consistent with  
12 Federal and State planning requirements. They also  
13 present an opportunity to provide additional guidance,  
14 above and beyond planning requirements, for RTPs to set  
15 the stage for long-term sustainable development, VMT  
16 reduction, and helping equitable growth patterns.

17           CARB has a responsibility for evaluating a  
18 critical component of every regional transportation plan -  
19 the sustainable communities strategy. Under SB 375, CARB  
20 evaluates whether to accept a determination that the  
21 sustainable communities strategy, if implemented would  
22 meet the region's greenhouse gas reduction target set by  
23 CARB for light-duty trucks and cars.

24           CARB has been working closely with CTC in the  
25 work of updating the RTP guidelines, and we look forward

1 to continuing that partnership.

2           Finally, Ma'Ayn Johnson with the Southern  
3 California Association of Governments will provide a  
4 practitioner perspective, detailing how SCAG pursues its  
5 goals for the climate, health and equity through both  
6 processes, the RHNA plan and the Regional Transportation  
7 Plan.

8           Both of these processes, the RTP and the RHNA,  
9 are tasked with multiple complex goals that overlap in  
10 some cases and may be seen as competing in other cases. I  
11 encourage this joint body to use today's discussion as an  
12 opportunity to explore how we can improve both processes  
13 to better advance multi-objective planning that produces  
14 not only the completion of the plans, but the  
15 implementation of real sustainable communities.

16           I will now turn it over to staff for the  
17 presentations.

18           Oh, I forgot. Director Velasquez wanted to say a  
19 few words. And he told me he wanted to say a few words,  
20 and then I completely forgot.

21           Director Velasquez.

22           HCD DIRECTOR VELASQUEZ: Thank you, Chairwoman.

23           I'm going to turn it over to Megan Kirkeby, our  
24 Deputy of Housing Policy, and then she will turn it to Ms.  
25 Osterberg that will do the presentation on RHNA reform.

1           But I wanted to just remind everybody that in the  
2 context -- you know, the backdrop of this RHNA  
3 conversation is that we are short of housing by 2.5  
4 million homes that we should plan for and build roughly in  
5 the next seven years across the state. This number is  
6 also consistent with the 6-cycle RHNA numbers that are on  
7 their way right now for the 8-year cycle -- 6-year cycle.  
8 And this is also consistent with the allocation that each  
9 region and then cities plan for the current cycle.

10           Now, you may have seen probably in reports in the  
11 news that this current RHNA cycle, the volume has been  
12 somewhat controversial, that, you know, it's been a real  
13 shock for many, many cities. Just to give you -- I always  
14 like the example of Beverly Hills, that they have to plan  
15 for three homes in the fifth cycle -- in the fifth cycle.  
16 And now I was either shocked that now they have to plan  
17 for a few hundred more homes in the current cycle. So  
18 this is why many, many cities get really shocked when they  
19 see the amount of housing that they need to plan for.

20           And it's not only that, but Governor Newsom and  
21 this State Legislature have been clear that this is a  
22 contract, that this is contract between the State,  
23 regions, cities and that is an imperative to plan through  
24 housing elements and through the certification of these  
25 housing elements by the State for this housing across the

1 income spectrum.

2           And so we are -- this presentation will be a  
3 report that we're preparing for the Legislature in order  
4 to propose or recommend certain changes to the way that we  
5 estimate RHNA. But it is important to say that all of  
6 this is in like great alignment with the purpose of this  
7 committee, with ARB and CTC, because this housing has to  
8 plan for in a way that reduces racial and economic  
9 disparities across the state, and in a way that reduces  
10 vehicle miles traveled, that housing that is done in the  
11 right locations - not if the housing is created but how  
12 the housing is created and where the housing is created -  
13 those are imperatives in the current RHNA cycle and it's  
14 embedded in each and every one of the housing elements  
15 that we certify. A lot of these housing elements are yet  
16 to be certified. That's another controversy that is going  
17 on, because the bar is high. The bar is high in order to  
18 meet climate goals, the bar is high in order to meet  
19 equity goals.

20           And so I look forward to your input about how  
21 this process is going. But I just wanted to, you know,  
22 clarify the important connection between this work and our  
23 climate goals that is on their way. And thanks to all the  
24 regions, the SCAG obviously being a top -- top on my list  
25 of regions that are, you know, moving and cities that are

1 moving in the right direction to achieve this housing need  
2 that we all need in the State.

3 Thank you, Madam.

4 HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: Thank you, Director  
5 Velasquez.

6 I'm Megan, our Deputy for Housing Policy for HCD.  
7 And I have the nice pleasure -- and I hope everyone gets  
8 this in their career, but I got to work on -- my first job  
9 at HCD was working on the 6-cycle RHNA that we are quite  
10 proud of I think today. And I have the distinct pleasure  
11 of getting to pass on that work to people who are much  
12 smarter than myself, who can take it even further than  
13 we've been before.

14 But, you know, just to underscore what Director  
15 Velasquez was saying, absolutely if you are not planning  
16 for, accounting and affirmably working to meet your  
17 housing needs, then you are not maximizing your transit  
18 ridership, your trip reduction, your VMT reductions and  
19 your equity obligations as a local or regional government  
20 to ensure that every community has access.

21 And so I think you'll enjoy the presentation  
22 today. But I will say, you know, RHNA is not loved by  
23 all.

24 (Laughter).

25 HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: As many -- as many

1 change implementation strategies, RHNA is essential. If  
2 we are not meeting our housing need, we cannot succeed as  
3 a state. And while this work is essential, we know that  
4 that change is hard. It is going to feel different at  
5 times. And so I'm not going if hide the ball and pretend  
6 that everyone is as in love with this 6-cycle RHNA as I  
7 am.

8 (Laughter).

9 HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: But I think -- I  
10 think you'll see from the presentation why this work is so  
11 essential and why that change is really necessary. And of  
12 course we're not to the end of the road yet and still  
13 looking to really make sure that we have good insight into  
14 all the dynamics at play before we get started on our next  
15 big 8-year cycle, the 7th cycle.

16 So thanks.

17 Annelise. Go ahead.

18 (Thereupon a slide presentation).

19 HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: Thanks,  
20 Megan.

21 Hello, everyone. My name is Annelise Osterberg  
22 and I am a senior housing policy specialist at HCD.

23 CTC VICE CHAIR GUARDINO: Would you mind speaking  
24 up just a little bit. We're hanging on your every word.  
25 But we want to hear it.

1           HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: Is this  
2 better?

3           CTC VICE CHAIR GUARDINO: Yes. Thank you.

4           HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: I'm  
5 here to give you an update on the California's Housing  
6 Future 2040 initiative through which HCD is developing  
7 recommendations for how to improve the Regional Housing  
8 Needs Allocation process, also known as RHNA.

9           Through this initiative we have gathered input  
10 from a variety of stakeholders on ways that HCD and the  
11 Legislature can improve RHNA for the 7th cycle and beyond.  
12 The name California's Housing Future 2040 reflects the  
13 fact that all regions in California will finish their 7th  
14 cycle RHNA by approximately the beginning of 2040. And so  
15 through this process, we are now turning our eyes towards  
16 planning for the home that will meet California's housing  
17 needs by 2040.

18           In today's presentation, I will first give a high  
19 level overview of the RHNA process. I'll then discuss our  
20 process to date implementing the California's Housing  
21 Future initiative, and then I will highlight some of the  
22 key themes that have emerged from our conversations with  
23 stakeholders including those at the intersection of  
24 housing and transportation planning.

25           Next slide.

1                   --o0o--

2                   HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: So  
3 again, to start off today I'm going to first provide a  
4 quick overview of what is RHNA and how it helps achieve  
5 the State's housing and climate goals.

6                   Next slide.

7                   --o0o--

8                   HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: So  
9 again RHNA stands for Regional Housing Needs Allocation  
10 process. It is a component of California's broader  
11 Housing Element Law.

12                  Broadly speaking, RHNA is a process by which HCD  
13 quantifies the housing need in each region of the state  
14 over a period of time, usually an 8-year cycle. RHNA is  
15 not a prediction of building permit construction or  
16 housing activity. It's not a ceiling of potential housing  
17 market demand or production. And importantly, it's not  
18 limited due to existing land-use control, as rezoning is  
19 often necessary to accommodate the RHNA.

20                  The RHNA process has been around since the 1970s  
21 and it has required that all cities and counties plan for  
22 the housing needs of Californians. RHNA has always been  
23 rooted in fair housing, and its focus has been on reducing  
24 concentrations of poverty and segregation through  
25 planning.

1           In recent years the law was updated to  
2 incorporate principles of Affirmatively Furthering Fair  
3 Housing or AFFH. And the RHNA process is also called out  
4 in the reparations report as a key tool for addressing  
5 racial injustices in California.

6           Next slide.

7                           --o0o--

8           HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: So  
9 through the RHNA process, HCD estimates the amount of  
10 future housing needed statewide. And after that, each  
11 regional government comes up with a plan for distributing  
12 that housing need among each of the member jurisdictions.  
13 When allocating the RHNA, Councils of Governments, or  
14 COGs, are required to develop a methodology that furthers  
15 five statutory objectives, which are listed on this slide.  
16 These objectives represent the main principles that RHNA  
17 is designed to promote.

18           The five objectives include:

19           One, increasing the supply and mix of housing  
20 types in an equitable manner; promoting infill  
21 development, the protection of environmental resources,  
22 and the achievement of the region's greenhouse gas  
23 emission reduction goals; promoting a better jobs/housing  
24 balance; allocating more lower income housing to higher  
25 income areas; and then, lastly, Affirmatively Furthering

1 Fair Housing.

2           And it's important to note that all of these  
3 objectives not only help us meet our housing goals, but  
4 also help to ensure that regions are working to address  
5 their climate change goals during the RHNA allocation  
6 process.

7           So; for example, the first example is focused on  
8 promoting a greater density and mix of housing types,  
9 which is key to supporting transit-rich walkable  
10 communities.

11           The second objective directly focuses on a range  
12 of environmental concerns and promotes alignment between  
13 RTP SCS and RHNA.

14           The third objective is focused on putting more  
15 housing near job centers to allow people to drive less and  
16 reduce their vehicle miles traveled.

17           The fourth objective, which requires RHNA  
18 allocations to balance disproportionate household income  
19 distribution, is similar to the third objective. The more  
20 that our communities are stratified by income, the longer  
21 commutes become for low-income families, such as gardeners  
22 or childcare providers or other service workers.

23           And then lastly, with AFFH, as all our agencies  
24 know from our equity work, shaping regional planning with  
25 an equity lens is a tide that raises all boats and leads

1 to better outcomes for everyone. But particularly the  
2 disadvantaged community is most impacted by the effects of  
3 climate change.

4 And so, in summary, the RHNA process represents a  
5 key tool for achieving both the State's climate and  
6 housing goals by promoting equitable and efficient  
7 development patterns across the state.

8 Next slide.

9 --o0o--

10 HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: So next  
11 I'm going to provide an update on the work that HCD has  
12 done over the last year to implement the California  
13 Housing Future 2040 initiative. I will provide an  
14 overview both to the stakeholder engagement that we've  
15 done as well as some of the themes that have emerged from  
16 the engagement.

17 Next slide.

18 --o0o--

19 HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: So for  
20 context, AB 101, passed in 2019, directed HCD to conduct  
21 stakeholder engagements and develop recommendations on how  
22 to improve the RHNA process. AB 101 directed HCD  
23 specifically to focus on recommendations that could  
24 promote and streamline housing development and  
25 substantially address California's housing shortage. Due

1 to the requirements of AB 101, HCD is required to submit a  
2 report to the Legislature summarizing its finding and  
3 recommendations by December 31st of this year.

4 Next slide.

5 --o0o--

6 HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: This --  
7 oh, sorry. Go back, yeah.

8 This timeline summarizes the process the team has  
9 engaged in over the last year. The initiative included  
10 three main faces. The first was a four-month intensive  
11 stakeholder engagement period, which is in orange. Then  
12 for the next three months our team worked to summarize  
13 stakeholder input and draft our recommendations report,  
14 which is in white. And we are now currently in the  
15 leadership approval stage, which is in blue.

16 I do want to note that their recommendations  
17 report is fully drafted and currently under review by  
18 leadership. So we are providing a preview today of what  
19 we heard through the stakeholder process. But we are not  
20 at this point able to gather additional feedback.

21 Next slide.

22 --o0o--

23 HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: This  
24 slide summarizes the main strategies that we used to  
25 conduct stakeholder feedback during the last year. In

1 early March we launched the intensive stakeholder  
2 engagement period with a public kickoff webinar that  
3 described the ways stakeholders could participate. At the  
4 same time we launched a public email inbox and a survey.  
5 The survey was open for eight weeks and received 350  
6 responses. About 40 percent of the survey responses were  
7 from local governments, 10 percent from private residents,  
8 and the remaining 50 percent were from a variety of other  
9 interested stakeholders.

10 Next we convened a group of approximately 30  
11 stakeholders to what we called our sounding board, which  
12 was focused on brainstorming ideas and recommendations on  
13 in-the-weeds policy questions around RHNA implementation.  
14 The sounding board included academics, advocates, local  
15 and regional government representation, and State and  
16 Legislature stakeholders.

17 We also held approximately 30 one-on-one  
18 listening sessions which stakeholders have specific  
19 expertise in certain topics that relate to RHNA. In these  
20 sessions we talked with a wide range of stakeholders  
21 including other State departments such as CARB, CalSTA,  
22 Caltrans and CTC.

23 And then lastly we presented at the CARB, CTC,  
24 HCD joint meeting in April and received feedback on issues  
25 related to land use and transportation policy. HCD

1 considered the comments shared at the April joint meeting  
2 as it drafted its recommendations report which were  
3 particularly helpful as we wrote sections of the report  
4 regarding encouraging housing and infill locations near  
5 jobs and daily destinations.

6 Next slide.

7 --o0o--

8 HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: So that  
9 summarizes the main components of the California's Housing  
10 Future 2040 initiative. So next I'm going to provide a  
11 summary of some of the key themes that emerged from our  
12 engagement.

13 Next slide.

14 --o0o--

15 HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: So  
16 first there were a few high level themes that applied to  
17 the overall RHNA process. One many stakeholders stressed  
18 the urgent importance of meeting the housing need for all  
19 Californians. We also heard a desire from stakeholders to  
20 streamline the RHNA process and increase transparency.  
21 And despite the housing element-related topics being out  
22 of scope for this process, we did hear from many  
23 stakeholders an interest in providing input on housing  
24 elements.

25 Next there were a few themes that emerged on how

1 to improve the first step of the RHNA process, which is  
2 the determination phase. This feedback included, one, the  
3 importance of fully accounting for pent-up housing needs  
4 of the existing population when making the regional  
5 housing need determination; and, second, stakeholders  
6 stressed the importance of fully accounting for the needs  
7 of households at different income levels, including  
8 extremely low-income and acutely low-income families.

9 And then, lastly, there were a few themes that  
10 emerged related to the allocation stage of the RHNA  
11 process.

12 First, stakeholders stressed the importance of  
13 encouraging new housing near community assets and daily  
14 destinations. Stakeholders noted that more consideration  
15 is needed for housing as planned for in unincorporated  
16 areas to promote our climate goals. Stakeholders express  
17 interest in receiving additional guidance from HCD on how  
18 to better balance, furthering the five statutory  
19 objectives when allocating the RHNA. And then, lastly, we  
20 heard a strong desire for further alignment of the RHNA  
21 allocation process and the RTP SCS planning process.

22 Next slide.

23 --o0o--

24 HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: So next  
25 I want to dig a little bit more into the specific themes

1 that emerged around RTP SCS alignment.

2 First, stakeholders stress the importance of  
3 keeping the RTP SCS and the RHNA processes aligned.  
4 Stakeholders emphasized that the changes made by SB 375  
5 were really important and overall represented a  
6 significant improvement in terms of how housing and  
7 transportation planning is conducted in California. And  
8 they emphasized that in order for us to solve our housing  
9 and climate crises, it is essential that planners work  
10 together across silos to ensure that more housing is  
11 planned near transit and low VMT areas.

12 At the same time, stakeholders also identified  
13 several areas where there are opportunities for better  
14 alignment. Although support for some of these options was  
15 mixed.

16 First, some stakeholders noted that there are  
17 opportunities to better align the overall household  
18 projections that underpin the RTP SCS and the RHNA. Both  
19 the RTP SCS from the RHNA processes estimate the amount of  
20 household growth that's expected over a period of time.

21 But the two estimates can vary significantly for a few  
22 reasons. One reason is that the RHNA is required to  
23 capture the needs of both the projected and the existing  
24 population. Whereas the RTP SCS sometimes only captures  
25 the needs of the projected population. So essentially the

1 RTP SCS calculates how many new people or households are  
2 planning to move into the region over a period of time.  
3 Whereas the RHNA also assumes that a certain number of  
4 existing households that might be doubling up currently  
5 due to extremely high housing costs will move out and form  
6 separate households in the future.

7           And so essentially the RHNA is capturing a more  
8 complete picture of what household growth will look like  
9 if we are to make progress addressing a housing crisis.  
10 So some stakeholders express interest in better aligning  
11 the RTP SCS and the RHNA household projection to ensure  
12 they both fully capture the housing need.

13           Stakeholders also noted that every eight years  
14 the RTP SCS and the RHNA are both updated concurrently.  
15 But due to the timing laid out in statute, the regional  
16 housing need determination is not finalized until after  
17 MPOs are close to or have already finalized their RTP SCS  
18 gross projection.

19           And so we also heard interest from stakeholders  
20 in moving up from the statutory deadline for providing the  
21 regional housing need determination so that it can be  
22 incorporated into the concurrent RTP SCS.

23           Stakeholders also noted that the RTP SCS and RHNA  
24 don't always allocate projected household growth in the  
25 same way. That is, the plans don't always allocate the

1 same amount of housing to the same cities. And so there  
2 was interest in further aligning these processes and  
3 making sure that both allocation patterns are promoting  
4 similar policy goals and adequately aligned.

5 And then, lastly, stakeholders expressed a desire  
6 for State agencies, including HCD and CARB, to collaborate  
7 more closely on the implementation of RHNA and the RTP SCS  
8 planning processes given the overlapping nature of the two  
9 projects.

10 Next slide.

11 --o0o--

12 HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: So that  
13 is the end of my presentation today. And next I'll hand  
14 it off to Brigitte.

15 CTC ASSOCIATE DEPUTY DIRECTOR DRILLER: Thank  
16 you, Annelise.

17 Good afternoon, commissioners, board members and  
18 executive leadership. My name is Brigitte Driller. I  
19 serve as the Associate Deputy Director for Transportation  
20 Planning at the California Transportation Commission. And  
21 I'll be presenting on the draft 2024 Regional  
22 Transportation Plan, or RTP guidelines.

23 And I'll wait to pause for my presentation to  
24 display.

25 (Thereupon a slide presentation).

1           CTC ASSOCIATE DEPUTY DIRECTOR DRILLER: Great.  
2 Thank you so much.

3           If you could move to the next slide.

4                           --o0o--

5           CTC ASSOCIATE DEPUTY DIRECTOR DRILLER: I'd like  
6 to start off with a little bit of background before I dive  
7 into the guidelines themselves.

8           California is divided into regional agencies for  
9 transportation, as you can see on the map here. That  
10 includes metropolitan planning organizations, which  
11 represent the State's more urban regions; and regional  
12 transportation planning agencies, which represent the  
13 State's rural counties. These regional agencies are  
14 required by both State and federal law to prepare regional  
15 transportation plans, which are long-range planning and  
16 policy documents that convey the unique needs and  
17 characteristics of a region.

18           These regional transportation plans are  
19 implemented through various programming documents.

20           Next slide.

21                           --o0o--

22           CTC ASSOCIATE DEPUTY DIRECTOR DRILLER: The  
23 California Transportation Commission maintains guidelines  
24 for the development of Regional Transportation Plans. The  
25 Commission last adopted these guidelines in 2017, and we

1 have initiated an update to reflect changes in  
2 legislation, update references, and revisit policy topics.

3 We maintain two separate versions of the RTP  
4 guidelines, one for MPOs and one for RTPAs, since MPOs  
5 have additional requirements for the development of their  
6 respective RTPs.

7 So staff circulated a first draft of the RTP  
8 guidelines for MPOs back in May. And then we held a  
9 workshop in July to summarize what we had heard so far  
10 throughout our public engagement process. And then we  
11 spent another couple of months to incorporate all of the  
12 feedback that we've received to date. And on October 6th,  
13 we released a second draft of the RTP guidelines for MPOs  
14 as well as a first draft of the RTP guidelines for RTPAs  
15 for a 30-day public comment period.

16 Next slide, please.

17 --o0o--

18 CTC ASSOCIATE DEPUTY DIRECTOR DRILLER: This  
19 slide provides an overview of the key milestones in the  
20 RTP guidelines update process, and also gives on where  
21 we're at in the process now and our next steps.

22 So as I mentioned, we are in the middle of a  
23 public comment period for the current drafts that are out  
24 for circulation. And we have requested that public  
25 comments be submitted by November 6th, which is this





1           So the first bullet here is that we have updated  
2 the guidelines to reflect the infrastructure investment in  
3 JOBS Act. And in particular that act includes a new  
4 recommendation that MPOs include a housing coordination  
5 plan as part of their regional transportation plan. What  
6 we've heard from our housing technical work group is not  
7 to reinvent the wheel on this point. As you heard from  
8 Annelise's presentation, California MPOs already  
9 coordinate transportation and housing. And so rather than  
10 create a new housing coordination plan, we've worked with  
11 HCD staff to strengthen the existing connection between  
12 the Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Housing  
13 Needs Allocation.

14           Next we have an update of the guidelines to  
15 reflect the latest in federal transportation performance  
16 management requirements. MPOs are required to set targets  
17 and report on a suite of transportation performance  
18 management goals. And when the commission last adopted  
19 the guidelines in 2017, we were in the middle of the  
20 federal rulemaking process for these transportation  
21 performance management requirements. So we have gone  
22 through the guidelines to ensure that what is reflected  
23 there is consistent with the current requirements.

24           The third change for the MPO version of the  
25 guidelines that I'll highlight is that -- is related to

1 the sustainable communities strategies process, which is  
2 incorporated into the Regional Transportation Plan and  
3 overseen by CARB. Since the guidelines were last adopted,  
4 CARB has updated their program and evaluation guidelines  
5 for the SCS. And so we've worked with CARB staff to  
6 ensure that our guidelines are consistent with their SCS  
7 evaluation guidelines, and also to add resources to the  
8 RTP guidelines to support SCS implementation.

9 Next slide.

10 --o0o--

11 CTC ASSOCIATE DEPUTY DIRECTOR DRILLER: So next  
12 I'll discuss some changes that affect both versions of the  
13 RTP guidelines. And first I'll highlight that there are  
14 no new statutory requirements for the RTPs that are  
15 prepared by those regional transportation planning  
16 agencies. But we have still gone through and evaluated  
17 several policy topics where we have refreshed the  
18 language. And I'll just highlight three here.

19 So first our Equity Engagement and health Work  
20 Group has developed new language related to equitable and  
21 inclusive community engagements, federal and environmental  
22 justice initiatives, and consideration for individuals  
23 with disabilities.

24 Next are climate change adaptation work groups  
25 has pulled together numerous tools and resources related

1 to how we adapt our regional transportation system to the  
2 impacts of climate change.

3 And lastly, since we last adopted the 2017 RTP  
4 guidelines, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research  
5 has updated their California Environmental Quality Act  
6 guidelines, which now provide guidance on using vehicle  
7 miles traveled as a measure of transportation impacts.  
8 And so we have made sure that our guidance is consistent  
9 with theirs.

10 Next slide.

11 --o0o--

12 CTC ASSOCIATE DEPUTY DIRECTOR DRILLER: So in  
13 addition our RTP guidelines collect examples of innovative  
14 regional planning that we hope can help inspire  
15 exceptional regional planning across different agencies.

16 We have included a number of examples in the  
17 draft RTP guidelines that are out for circulation. But we  
18 know that there's a lot of good work happening in regional  
19 transportation plans that would be great to highlight in  
20 the guidelines. And so we are continuing to solicit for  
21 any suggestions of planning practice examples. And in  
22 particular I wanted to call out that we are looking for  
23 more examples related to housing coordination, equity,  
24 land conservation, and then rural examples for all  
25 different policy areas.

1 Next slide.

2 --o0o--

3 CTC ASSOCIATE DEPUTY DIRECTOR DRILLER: So I'll  
4 reiterate that we are currently accepting public comments  
5 on both versions of the draft RTP guidelines through  
6 Monday, November 6th. For anyone listening in who would  
7 like to get more involved, these slides include a link to  
8 our webpage, where you can find those RTP guidelines as  
9 well as contact information for how you can get a hold of  
10 us.

11 And even beyond this Monday. There will be  
12 additional opportunities for public engagement, and we  
13 would certainly be happy to talk at the staff level.

14 Next slide.

15 --o0o--

16 CTC ASSOCIATE DEPUTY DIRECTOR DRILLER: So that  
17 concludes my presentation.

18 Thank you for your time.

19 And I will now turn it over to Darin Chidsey,  
20 Chief Operating Officer at the Southern California  
21 Association of Governments, to introduce our third  
22 presentation.

23 DARIN CHIDSEY: All right. Well, thank you very  
24 much. Darin Chidsey, Chief Operating Officer at SCAG.  
25 Good to see you all. Thanks for having us here today.

1           Before I turn it over to my colleague, Ma'Ayn  
2 Johnson, to talk specifically about our REAP 2.0 program  
3 and the progress that we're making here in Southern  
4 California, I first just wanted to offer some opening  
5 comments.

6           Welcome to the SCAG region. We are honored to  
7 have you here. And in your honor our board was busy at  
8 work today back in Los Angeles, just about 50 miles west,  
9 and adopted for approval and public release our next  
10 Connect SoCal plan, which is our regional transportation  
11 Sustainable community strategy plan. So it's in your  
12 honor and we give it to you in your trip down here to  
13 bring back and spread the good word.

14           But a couple things I did want to offer about  
15 that plan, because we certainly are very excited about it.  
16 I've worked at SCAG, as has Ma'Ayn, for many years. And  
17 when we first started we certainly were a transportation  
18 planning agency. And I think our relationship with the  
19 CTC was always strong, with our county transportation  
20 commissions were strong. But it was focused almost  
21 exclusively on transportation planning. We certainly have  
22 always done a growth forecast, and I think we were one of  
23 the first in the nation going back, you know, 30 years to  
24 really add jobs into that growth forecast, and we  
25 developed what we called an integrated growth forecast.

1           And that was really presented to be a really  
2 important, you know, policy vehicle for us to talk about  
3 what the future of growth looks like in the region.

4           And so I just wanted to add some of those  
5 comments because I know there is going to be discussion,  
6 and rightfully so, about how do you better integrate RHNA  
7 numbers into an SCS growth forecast. And it's a really  
8 important conversation. There are some nuances that are  
9 really critical to understand. And I think some of the  
10 things that have changed it in more recent years and that  
11 we always have had some focus on existing need but in the  
12 SCAG region about two-thirds of our RHNA number was  
13 existing need. That's certainly the reflection on the  
14 importance that housing is in our region and how we need  
15 to tackle that head on and make that really one of the top  
16 regional priorities.

17           But at the same time, as we're thinking about  
18 future growth, if two-thirds of our households are really  
19 just trying to establish what should be there, we can't,  
20 you know, fully integrate that to the same level because  
21 that certainly could complicate what are our future  
22 expectations of needs of growth around transportation,  
23 travel, and has impacts certainly on the federal side.

24           So it's a complicated issue. We certainly look  
25 forward to talking about that as we move through it in the

1 next couple years.

2           The other thing that I do think is really  
3 important to note is we finished up our last Connect SoCal  
4 right before we adopted the final RHNA, as is, you know,  
5 established at the State. But one of the things that was  
6 critical in that was that existing need number was based  
7 on directly where the transportation investments are,  
8 where the jobs are, and where we thought would be the best  
9 opportunity to increase density in the region. And what  
10 that has meant is that the last several years as we've  
11 started to update our growth forecast with all the 191  
12 cities and six counties that we work with here in Southern  
13 California, that we're seeing about a 30 percent increase  
14 in household projections in -- within those plans. That's  
15 just the local input roll-up. So we think that's a great  
16 accomplishment and it's something that's really important  
17 to highlight, because it shows that the State policies  
18 that you all are responsible for working through us is  
19 really starting to resonate in a relatively short amount  
20 of time here in the SCAG region. Remember when SB 375 was  
21 adopted to today. You know, but we're 90 percent of the  
22 housing units are already built, right.

23           So this opportunity to change land use takes  
24 time. And so to have that kind of change in really just a  
25 few short years I think dramatically shows the impact on

1 that.

2           But the other piece that couldn't have  
3 happened -- that that work I don't think could have  
4 happened is without the State's investment in housing. As  
5 I started with, we've been a transportation planning  
6 agency. We have since the mid-60s gotten resources from  
7 the federal government to coordinate transportation  
8 planning in Southern California, moving into RHNA for, you  
9 know, since the seventies. But this was the first time  
10 the State has actually granted specific resources to MPOs  
11 to plan for housing. And without that, we couldn't have  
12 done the work that's been done. So as Ma'Ayn talks about  
13 the great work that has happened not just in REAP 2.0.  
14 And taking, you know, those State level policies and  
15 working into the regional plans and then getting to be  
16 implemented at the local level.

17           Just an important reminder I think that goes back  
18 to something Mr. Guerra said that -- earlier on the item  
19 before, how do we think about funding housing differently  
20 in the State and how do we start to have some sustainable  
21 funding sources so MPOs and COGs continue to prioritize  
22 housing planning with our transportation, and obviously  
23 our air quality planning as well.

24           With that I turn it over to Ma'Ayn. But again  
25 thank you for the time. We'll make sure everybody gets an

1 updated copy of our draft Connect SoCal plan so you can  
2 show it off. It is over the 50 dollar gift guideline.  
3 It's about \$750 billion of investments, but we do think  
4 it's a worthwhile read.

5 MA'AYN JOHNSON: Thank you, Darin.

6 (Thereupon a slide presentation).

7 MA'AYN JOHNSON: Good afternoon. I'm Ma'Ayn  
8 Johnson, Housing Department Manager at Southern California  
9 Association of Governments. And as Darin mentioned, we do  
10 regional planning. And as I go through my presentation  
11 about REAP, I'll be talking about the impacts that we're  
12 having through our regional planning and then taking REAP  
13 and turning that action -- turning those plans into  
14 action.

15 Next slide, please.

16 --o0o--

17 MA'AYN JOHNSON: So what SCAG does. I try to  
18 explain to many people outside. But we're very familiar  
19 with COGs and MPOs, so...

20 But just to go over the vision and plan for SCAG.  
21 We have a very large region, 191 cities, six counties, and  
22 19 million people. So we're not just the largest COG MPO  
23 in the State. We're the largest MPO in the nation. So we  
24 cover suburban, urban, rural, agricultural lands, coastal  
25 inland. It's amazing that we reach a consensus. And as

1 Darin mentioned, we released our draft plan today, which  
2 is an amazing feat on its own.

3           So we cover of course transportation as an MPO,  
4 and we also cover housing as a cog. And part of our  
5 visioning is to bring these two together along with equity  
6 and environmental issues.

7           And we also provide collaboration and advocacy.  
8 And as I mentioned, how varied our region is of these  
9 tools. There isn't a one-size-fits-all approach for our  
10 region. So when we develop programs, we do have to keep  
11 it in mind that what works in maybe Imperial County, which  
12 is more agricultural world, we'll have different needs and  
13 definitions of the terms we use such as infill, what  
14 constitutes a high quality transit area or frequency of  
15 transit to service the community. Those definitions do  
16 vary across our agency or a region.

17           And of course we also provide tools and  
18 resources. I know in the last item there was some  
19 discussion about -- especially in jurisdictions with fewer  
20 resources that aren't able to engage in a regional plan,  
21 let alone barely complete their housing element, for  
22 instance. And so we try to provide tools and resources  
23 that jurisdictions can use to develop their own local  
24 plans. But also now with REAP the opportunity to engage  
25 in the regional plan.

1           Next slide please.

2                               --o0o--

3           MA'AYN JOHNSON:  So our primary roles and  
4 responsibilities, as we mentioned, we do the RTP SCS, also  
5 known as our Connect SoCal plan.  And then we do of course  
6 our FTIP, Federal Transportation Improvement Program.

7           As we've just heard from HCD, there's the State  
8 regional housing needs assessment.  And as the COG, we're  
9 responsible for developing a methodology for that number  
10 given to us, and then we allocate to each individual  
11 jurisdiction.  And so they then develop their local  
12 housing plans and their housing element to the plan for  
13 these units.

14           We also serve as a regional data and information  
15 center.  So again this is very important for jurisdictions  
16 that don't have the resources to look beyond their city  
17 boundaries in order to realize, well, I'm greenhouse gas  
18 emissions through local -- various land use and effective  
19 land-use planning.

20           And of course a forum of -- for issues of  
21 regional significance.  So obviously post SB 375 we're not  
22 just talking about transportation and land use in separate  
23 spheres.  We're bringing these together along with  
24 environmental considerations and equity.

25           Next slide, please.

1                   --o0o--

2                   MA'AYN JOHNSON: So the RHNA methodology. And as  
3 I mentioned -- well, Megan may like it, but I'm kind of  
4 mixed on that. So our RHNA methodology. For the 6th  
5 cycle RHNA, SCAG was assigned 1.3 million units. This  
6 represents both existing and projected need. So in past  
7 cycles, just to give you a sense, our 6th cycle plan, it  
8 was different. It was 412,000 units. So there was some  
9 sticker shock across the region, first some jurisdictions.  
10 But we looked at it as how can we help further our plan  
11 and meet the objective of RHNA, and also need goals that  
12 the Connect SoCal plan is trying to further as well. And  
13 so we connected this. This is moving the needle  
14 essentially.

15                   So we allocated, not just on projected household  
16 growth as we did in prior plans. But as Darin mentioned,  
17 we look at job access, transit access, we look at equity,  
18 we look at disadvantaged communities, in order to further  
19 our objectives. And there's multiple ones as HCD staff  
20 had mentioned, promoting infill, reducing greenhouse gas  
21 emissions, promoting accessibility to jobs, and  
22 furthering -- affirmatively furthering for housing and  
23 equity. Because the RHNA is really just a number. It's a  
24 projection. And so it's through the housing elements at  
25 the local level that determine where these units go,

1 whether or not they can increase access for housing, if  
2 they have access to jobs and access to transit. Those  
3 really make the difference in infill and reducing  
4 greenhouse gas emissions and promoting equity.

5 And so SCAG's role in RHNA while we do --  
6 traditionally it has just been for allocating a need. But  
7 now we're developing plans and trying to turn those plans  
8 into action.

9 Next slide, please.

10 --o0o--

11 MA'AYN JOHNSON: So I'll briefly put you on REAP  
12 1.0, which is currently ongoing, but it will end soon.

13 So REAP 1.0 is actually very groundbreaking from  
14 a regional perspective. At least it's SCAG.

15 So prior to REAP our housing program was just me.  
16 And now we actually have a full department with about 11  
17 people. And right now we're working on \$47 million worth  
18 of grants - thank you, HCD. We've done over a hundred  
19 projects so far. But this will be ending in the middle of  
20 next year. So this has been a 3-year program essentially.  
21 But it's very urgent. There's a critical need for  
22 housing. And so we've developed a variety of programs to  
23 help our subregion, for instance, take advantage of  
24 economies of scale, tailor programs for jurisdictions to  
25 develop and meet their housing element need. And then

1 there's also things such as outreach and engagement  
2 programs that we've done. Grant application tested for  
3 assistance and using existing programs and leveraging our  
4 REAP funding with theirs to create even greater programs  
5 that go beyond just the end date of the project itself.  
6 Next slide, please.

7 --o0o--

8 MA'AYN JOHNSON: So I was just also taking a  
9 quick look at household growth compared to prior plans.  
10 We do see a strong housing production. COVID did have us  
11 lose population. But we still look at growing jobs. And  
12 our demographic panel of experts that we've recently held  
13 to inform our Connect SoCal plan, they're optimistic about  
14 household formation.

15 So our 2035 household projection has  
16 substantially increased compared to four years ago, which  
17 is pre-RHNA. So we are continuing to grow despite some  
18 losses during COVID. But our -- we have a robust plan  
19 with objectives that we'd like to further.

20 Next slide, please.

21 --o0o--

22 MA'AYN JOHNSON: So our REAP 2.0 program. This  
23 was recently awarded. Thank you again, HCD. This is \$246  
24 million. And when I talked about REAP 1, those were  
25 planning activities. Those were very restricted in

1 planning. So housing element adoption, rezoning, outreach  
2 and engagement plans. But it was just planning. And it  
3 just focused on increasing housing production,  
4 accelerating house and supply.

5 But REAP 2.0 was particularly -- is particularly  
6 notable because it now furthers three main State  
7 objectives - promoting infill housing development and  
8 reducing VMTs and affirmatively furthers fair housing. So  
9 it takes REAP 1.0 and it takes it further into meeting  
10 these objectives.

11 So adding to that, SCAG is tying these objectives  
12 to Connect SoCal. So now tying housing objectives, VMT,  
13 infill development, equity. So we're looking at  
14 transformative planning that realizes Connect SoCal and of  
15 course meeting 6-cycle RHNA through our housing goals.  
16 But also representing best practices in VMT reduction.  
17 And of course promoting infill.

18 And why this is particularly important is because  
19 while we can plan for housing, the realization of lower  
20 VMT could happen until we have the production of housing,  
21 because it's the location of housing and the equity that  
22 it promotes that we can reach these objectives. It's not  
23 just planning, but it's the action.

24 So this \$246 million we have for REAP 2.0 we have  
25 three main programs which I'll get into. But we have our

1 transportation partnership program at about a hundred 3  
2 million, early program initiative of 34 million, and their  
3 partnership to accelerate transformative housing at 88  
4 million.

5 Next slide, please.

6 --o0o--

7 MA'AYN JOHNSON: So these are our program areas  
8 by method of delivery, if you will. So our early program  
9 initiatives, this is connecting SoCal implementation  
10 strategy. So these are done through various ways, such as  
11 our subregional partnership program. This is called SRP2  
12 because, confusingly, there's an SRP1 from REAP 1. But  
13 we're partnering with our subregional partners to take  
14 advantage of economies of scale and tailoring those local  
15 programs. So what some subregions have indicated, we'd  
16 like to establish a regional housing trust fund. Which  
17 some actually did as a result of REAP 1, SRP1. And so for  
18 SRP2, we're also encouraging taking this concept of  
19 subregional. So it's not just jurisdiction undertaking a  
20 regional housing trust fund. It's the whole region, which  
21 could be made up of 26 cities to pool their resources and  
22 create great programs to produce housing.

23 There's also decision making tools and technical  
24 assistance. So we have a regional data platform. And  
25 again that's to provide services for data that's very

1 useful in determining, for example, lowering VMT that a  
2 lot of jurisdictions don't have the resources for. So  
3 this helping them use our regional planning at the local  
4 level.

5 We also have our SCP, Sustainable Communities  
6 Program, technical assistance. For short, we call this  
7 call for, but it was a call for projects providing direct  
8 technical assistance to jurisdictions and looking at ways  
9 to promote diversity and environmental justice.

10 Our transportation partnership program, there's two  
11 components. The County Transportation Commission  
12 Partnership Program and the Regional Pilot Initiative.  
13 And so these are looking at key connections as identified  
14 in our Connect SoCal plan, and furthering those objectives  
15 with partnership with County Transportation Commission,  
16 the other CTC.

17 We also have our PATH program, Programs to  
18 Accelerate Transformative Housing. So you can see we love  
19 our acronyms. NOFA, Notice of Funding for Lasting  
20 Affordability. This I believe -- I feel personally that  
21 this is also moving the needle and that we're providing  
22 financial tools. So not just planning and some  
23 production, but also that gapping in between especially  
24 for developers. What type of funding can we support? So  
25 there's catalyst funds that we're going to be supporting.



1 land availability, a need for policy to support housing  
2 production. So this is increasing capacity on corridors,  
3 area-wide infill housing initiative from her plan. And  
4 then this translates to these types of programs that are  
5 going to increase housing production. So you have our  
6 Call 4 program that's promoting EJ and equity. And we  
7 also have HIPP pilot program.

8 Next slide, please.

9 --o0o--

10 MA'AYN JOHNSON: And then we have the need for  
11 financing to support housing production. As I mentioned,  
12 that gap that a lot of jurisdictions and developers face.  
13 And so this is plugging in that gap of trying to find  
14 affordable housing. Since it's not just about the plans,  
15 it's not just about -- okay, there's a utility support it.  
16 But it's also then how do we get to the actual getting  
17 construction to happen? So our NOFA program does address  
18 this challenge.

19 Next slide.

20 --o0o--

21 MA'AYN JOHNSON: And of course insufficient  
22 infrastructure on -- this is both utility and in  
23 transportation.

24 So on the utility side, especially during the  
25 RHNA process, there were a lot of jurisdictions that

1 indicated that there was a sewer and water capacity. A  
2 lot of aging infrastructure in Southern California. A lot  
3 of homes were built in the '60s, the whole communities.  
4 And so that aging infrastructure may not have the capacity  
5 to increase density, especially in higher-end  
6 neighborhoods that may be older that we want to increase  
7 housing, especially affordable housing there in order to  
8 further AFFH. And so it's increasing that utility  
9 capacity. Storm water, waste water, sewer, electricity in  
10 order to be able to accommodate new housing growth.

11 So that will be through a RUSH Program.

12 And then we have our funding through the port  
13 transportation infrastructure. So our County  
14 Transportation Partnership Program and Regional Pilot  
15 Initiative.

16 Next slide, please.

17 --o0o--

18 MA'AYN JOHNSON: So I just wanted to highlight a  
19 few of the projects that exemplify what we're trying to  
20 match up with the objective of our regional plans.

21 So we have about 2.9 million that was awarded  
22 through the HIPP Call 4 projects for the city of LA. So  
23 they're scaling up housing development on city-owned land.  
24 So essentially they're looking at creative financing  
25 approaches, trying to look at under-utilized sites and

1 parking lots, smaller sites. And they're going to try to  
2 bundle this into RFPs so they can sell these sites for  
3 affordable housing. So this a catalyst in a strategy that  
4 LA is already pursuing but this has helped catalyzing the  
5 housing production.

6 All right. Next slide, please.

7 --o0o--

8 MA'AYN JOHNSON: Another one is the Ventura  
9 County Farmworkers Housing Study and Action Plan. So this  
10 is about \$500,000 awarded under the social equity and EJ  
11 focus, the Call 4 program. So believe they'd be using  
12 survey data to look at farmworker needs, the local needs  
13 and the regulatory barriers that farm worker housing and  
14 housing developments face, and then identifying the  
15 opportunities to meet housing typologies and gaps and not  
16 just housing but social services as well.

17 Next slide, please.

18 --o0o--

19 MA'AYN JOHNSON: And then the final project I  
20 wanted to highlight is our Calexico Intermodal  
21 transportation Center. So about one million dollars was  
22 awarded for this project through the Imperial County  
23 Transportation Committee -- or Commission, ICTC. So this  
24 is now looking at the Intermodal Transportation Center  
25 that's looking to do infill development to increase --

1 without adding new cars. So increasing access and  
2 mobility in the central business district. Looking at  
3 consolidating public and private transportation providers.  
4 But it's combining these resources together -- or these  
5 goals together in order to reduce the reliance on cars,  
6 and especially in areas where they are a little -- they're  
7 more remote. While it's not complete green-fill  
8 development, but it's still in a community that does have  
9 housing need and mobility needs. And so because they're  
10 part of the plan, we want to ensure that they're able to  
11 access these resources to turn that planning into action.

12 Next slide, please.

13 --o0o--

14 MA'AYN JOHNSON: So what does this all mean?  
15 What is that \$47 million? What does RHNA have to do with  
16 it? What does 246 million dollar REAP funds do? And so  
17 as Darin mentioned today, we have the release of our  
18 Connect SoCal plan. And it has a horizon year of going  
19 all the way to 2050. And so this is a very important  
20 long-term plan. So REAP 1 and REAP 2, they're urgent.  
21 And they do end in an urgent -- they do end in the next  
22 few years. And while it's important to acknowledge that  
23 house -- there's housing need now, there will be housing  
24 need in the future. Not only the number of housing  
25 needed, but also where it goes and what our Connect SoCal

1 plan is trying to do. So not only does it help us at the  
2 regional level, but it helped our local jurisdictions, our  
3 stakeholders, our tribal governance to turn these plans  
4 into action.

5 --o0o--

6 MA'AYN JOHNSON: And my last side is just a thank  
7 you.

8 --o0o--

9 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you very  
10 much. I'm going to switch things up a little bit for this  
11 agenda item, and I'm going to start with commissioner and  
12 board questions and comments, and then we'll go to public  
13 comment.

14 So I will ask those of you who would like to ask  
15 a question or comment to put your microphone up. If your  
16 microphone is still up from the last item, bring it down.

17 And those of you who are on line, go ahead and  
18 raise your hand when and if you are ready to comment.

19 We will start with Vice Chair Guardino.

20 CTC VICE CHAIR GUARDINO: Thank you, Chair  
21 Randolph. I have two what I believe are quick questions.

22 The first on RHNA to Annelise Osterberg.

23 If we may put up with an early flight, it was the  
24 timeline flight that had month and different color coding?

25 First presentation.

1 HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: Needs  
2 to be presentation.

3 CTC VICE CHAIR GUARDINO: Yeah, I think that's a  
4 fine idea. Let me start with my second question then.  
5 And that's to HCD as well.

6 Can you speak on the recommendations that have  
7 been shared with stakeholders including the metropolitan  
8 planning organizations and when will the recommendations  
9 be publicly available?

10 And then I'll go to this one.

11 HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: Yeah,  
12 the recommendations have not yet been shared with  
13 stakeholders because the draft is still being finalized.  
14 But it's due to the Legislature December 31st, and so at  
15 that point it will be made public.

16 CTC VICE CHAIR GUARDINO: Thank you.

17 And this slide is -- did you want to add to that?

18 Oh, okay.

19 This slide is terrific. My question was, as the  
20 director commented in the opening presentations, an  
21 historic legislative year for affordable home and  
22 homelessness legislation passed and being signed by our  
23 Governor. How might the passage of new State housing laws  
24 impact the report or the ship already sailed, and/or the  
25 timeline for implementing the report going forward?

1           HCD DIRECTOR VELASQUEZ: I'll just make a general  
2 comment about that.

3           A lot of this legislation is aimed, just like the  
4 prior couple years, at finding ways to streamline, to help  
5 local jurisdictions streamline and put some accountability  
6 measures, so that especially affordable housing is  
7 entitled, approved much faster. We actually just  
8 recently, I say a few days ago, released a report  
9 outlining the constraints, for example, the City of San  
10 Francisco has to delay approval of affordable housing  
11 projects. Sometimes it takes 3, 3 and a half years  
12 since -- from a project that is proposed to when it's  
13 approved by the city. So all of this legislation is  
14 really meant to remove this constraints as a matter of  
15 State law. And holding those jurisdictions accountable.  
16 Where this fits into that picture is it just -- this is  
17 really about how much has to be done and the legislation  
18 is given the tools to local jurisdictions to get it done  
19 in a much faster way.

20           Megan, do you want to add to that?

21           HCD SENIOR HOUSING SPECIALIST OSTERBERG: My  
22 director said it perfectly.

23           HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: Yeah, so just maybe  
24 a little more context there as well is, you know, this  
25 RHNA is really what is the housing need. And I think you

1 guys heard a little bit of the conversation about once  
2 upon a time we were really pretending every cycle that  
3 we'd fix housing policy in California. So for, you know,  
4 the next 8 years, what's the growth we need to plan for.  
5 And six cycle was really the first time that we said, we  
6 probably haven't fixed housing. So our housing need  
7 number needs to account for that pent-up demand, that  
8 overcrowding, that extreme cost burden when we're talking  
9 about what the housing need is.

10 And so the regional housing need allocation was  
11 really thinking about that, what is the housing need part?  
12 And exactly as Director Velasquez said, it's -- this  
13 legislation is incredibly important so that those plans  
14 become reality. It's not just stopping it, how much do we  
15 need? We need to actually make it happen. So -- and I'm  
16 big fan of, you know, there is no one way to make that  
17 happen. We do need all these different bills tackling the  
18 various pieces of the puzzle until we've finally got a  
19 streamlined housing production system.

20 CTC VICE CHAIR GUARDINO: If I may, the 3 homes  
21 in Beverly Hills, how do I go about buying two of those?

22 (Laughter).

23 HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: I don't know. I  
24 wish I had more time for my comedy routine to work on the  
25 response to that joke.

1           But, yes, exactly. It's a different scenario,  
2 you know, and they've -- there is a lot more authenticity  
3 I think in the housing needs goal this cycle. But with  
4 that authenticity comes more work. And, you know, we are  
5 working very closely with a lot of jurisdictions. We use  
6 the REAP funds, the LEAP funds to make that transition  
7 easier and a lot of direct service provider by our team,  
8 and stakeholders embedded in every single region, as well  
9 as we've been doing a lot of work with the AmeriCorps  
10 program, CivicWell to embed planners in lower resource  
11 communities that they have additional support as well.  
12 And then we like to bring those people to come work for  
13 HCD afterwards.

14           Yeah, it's been a good time.

15           CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

16           Board Member Hurt.

17           BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you, Chair Randolph.

18           When I think about the intersection on all these  
19 topics, it really whittles down to how are we building  
20 cities of the future. And we all need to shift to a  
21 futurist mindset, like dreaming big and being ambitious.  
22 And I think getting away from narratives that shock us  
23 with the numbers - I'm always shocked when I see the  
24 numbers - but really focus on describing the benefits and  
25 more of the gold standard of living for all, so that we

1 can bring people along on this journey.

2           When you say RHNA, at least where I live, people  
3 think that there are no longer carrots to this getting  
4 done but there are hammers. And for some jurisdictions  
5 rightly so. However, for others we are really struggling  
6 to keep residents on board and educate them about the  
7 long-term benefits that this will do for the entire  
8 community. And finally, a lot of it is based in fear of  
9 what comes next.

10           And so I hope we can help one another with  
11 supportive narratives beyond "we just need more," and the  
12 numbers.

13           So I have a couple questions. One is on the  
14 allocation-related conversation. I'm wondering, how are  
15 we thinking about potential sites and RHNA methodology,  
16 taking into account building near incompatible uses as it  
17 relates to health? So I'm thinking about airports.  
18 Excessive noises, incompatible with many airport land-use  
19 plans. I'm thinking of highways and other sensitive  
20 receptors.

21           So if folks could maybe speak to how we're  
22 considering potential sites in light of the existing  
23 airports and highways.

24           And then another thing that came to my mind is  
25 cities don't build housing for the most part. We can

1 incentivize and in some cases we subsidize. I'm wondering  
2 what can HCD and State agencies consider to better  
3 incentivize the building of affordable housing in family  
4 units of two and three bedrooms. Because builders will  
5 constantly say, "It doesn't pencil out," and so oftentimes  
6 we're fighting against studios and one-bedrooms when we  
7 really need family homes.

8           And so again getting away from that numbers,  
9 because, yeah, you can have a thousand studios, but how is  
10 that really helping folks? So I would love to hear what  
11 folks are thinking about that incentivizing. Are we  
12 thinking bond financing and tax credits, so that we really  
13 truly can build cities of the future.

14           So just two questions -- two little questions?

15           HCD DIRECTOR VELASQUEZ: Why don't you answer the  
16 first and then I'll answer the second, the incentives.

17           HCD DEPUTY DIRECTOR KIRKEBY: I like that,  
18 Director.

19           On the first piece, I think it is valuable to  
20 think about the housing need as sort of stage one of the  
21 process, but -- and obviously that happens at the regional  
22 level and then we're working with these MPOs on that  
23 specificity of where does each number go for each  
24 jurisdiction. As long as it meets the statutory  
25 objectives, those five statutory objective, then we

1 evaluate that to make sure that's true. And as long as  
2 that's happening, then that has a mean number, it moves  
3 forward.

4 But there's a much, much, much more detailed  
5 process that comes next in terms of the housing element of  
6 the general plan. So that that effort to really take that  
7 number and turn it into a housing plan for that community  
8 has to get to that specific city you're talking about of  
9 where are those sources of pollution.

10 And another change, you know, I could not be more  
11 proud of for the 6th cycle was the integration of the  
12 Affirmative -- Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing  
13 obligation into the housing element process, which  
14 required every single jurisdiction to do a racial analysis  
15 as part of its work, as well as looking at the  
16 environmental justice consequences of where that housing  
17 is going and into, you know, pretty detail about how are  
18 we choosing sites. So, you know, 5th cycle not only were  
19 the numbers probably not the right numbers, but the  
20 reality of where that housing went had not check points  
21 being hit.

22 That beck point is very real now and it only has,  
23 you know, quite a bit of expertise going into that  
24 evaluation, but obviously the -- well, I shouldn't say  
25 obviously, but that Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

1 obligation also brought forth significantly more public  
2 input requirements as well to show that all segments of  
3 the community had been interacted with and consulted on  
4 particular aspects of the housing element.

5           So those are places where I think not our  
6 planning of where housing is going is also better than  
7 we've ever been before.

8           HCD DIRECTOR VELASQUEZ: And just briefly on the  
9 incentives, it's all of the above, right. You mentioned  
10 bonds and tax credits. So \$500 million that the Governor  
11 has proposed for the last three years every year to  
12 finance or subsidize deeply affordable housing, but it's  
13 also new loans and grants programs by HCD and other  
14 housing sister agencies. It's been -- you know,  
15 Prohousing -- our prohousing designation program that  
16 gives additional funding and puts jurisdictions that are  
17 prohousing that have very forthcoming prohousing  
18 incentives and tools with them at the front of the line  
19 for State funding.

20           So just -- you talk about carrots, you know, and  
21 non-carrots. But on the carrot side we do have -- I think  
22 this Governor has shown, and through the budget, the State  
23 Legislature has shown that we do have a ton of incentives  
24 in place.

25           And since you mentioned family housing, you know,

1 it is something that we did study for many, many years.  
2 There's a researcher, Raj Chetty, out of Stanford, that  
3 has -- has a project called the Mobility From Poverty  
4 Project that took thousands of families who had kids under  
5 13 years of age and gave many of the families a voucher to  
6 move to higher resources neighborhoods and follow these  
7 families for 15 years. And after 15 years he proved that  
8 more than 75 percent of the families that went to higher  
9 resource neighborhoods, those kids when they became adults  
10 had a considerable increase in academic achievement and  
11 income generation. And so the wisdom is in the State of  
12 California for the last three years we've created  
13 additional points in all of our programs in order to  
14 ensure that every family unit that is created with the  
15 State dollars has additional points if that unit is built  
16 in the higher resource neighborhood. Knowing that, kids  
17 will be leaving there.

18 So, you know, there -- like we just -- we just  
19 have to follow the data and the research to know what  
20 kinds of incentives we have to put into it.

21 CARB BOARD MEMBER HURT: Thank you all for those  
22 comments. Thank you.

23 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

24 Commissioner Falcon.

25 CTC COMMISSIONER REYES FALCON: Thank you, Chair

1 Randolph. And thank you, HCD staff, CTC staff, and SCAG  
2 for your presentations.

3 I have a very specific question actually for the  
4 SCAG staff. On slide 6 showing the comparison of  
5 household growth to the prior plan, I noticed that  
6 Imperial County actually shows a reduction. The question  
7 I had was, there are plans and active plans that the  
8 County of Imperial is working on -- in full disclosure,  
9 I'm working -- helping with that effort -- on extracting  
10 and processing lithium in the Salton Sea. And what's  
11 going to be coming out pretty soon here is they  
12 anticipate -- the county participates a minimum of 50,000  
13 workers that will be supporting that effort. Was that  
14 taken to account in your growth projection?

15 DARIN CHIDSEY: So we have actually been out too  
16 to tour some of the lithium sites in Imperial Valley, and  
17 our leadership was actually just our last week again.

18 No, that had not been factored in yet. There's  
19 certainly still some uncertainty about exactly what that,  
20 you know, project and growth will look like.

21 But we do know that, you know, Imperial is eager  
22 to build more housing there. Not really a supply issue;  
23 it's more did they have the demand. So that certainly  
24 will help the demand in Imperial, and I have no doubt  
25 quickly turn into supply.

1           CTC COMMISSIONER REYES FALCON: How often  
2 really -- I'm sorry. How often do you update your REAP,  
3 your --

4           DARIN CHIDSEY: We've done every eight years with  
5 the growth forecast. So the plan is done every four  
6 years.

7           CTC COMMISSIONER REYES FALCON: Thank you.

8           CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Okay. Thank you.  
9 Board Member Guerra.

10          CARB BOARD MEMBER GUERRA: Thank you, Chair. And  
11 I want to thank all the staff and presenters for their  
12 work today.

13           First I want to thank the work of the MPOs, you  
14 know. And I think the regional effort, the recognition  
15 that our housing challenges, our air quality challenges,  
16 and our transportation challenges are not localized  
17 issues. They are regional impacts. And, unfortunately,  
18 for many years localities have -- for many reasons have  
19 cottoned silos; and that inability to solve those problems  
20 have led to the State we are in today both on a public  
21 health side and on a housing affordability side.

22           And I think I want to focus my comments  
23 particularly on the issue of that -- the cost of housing  
24 and just the -- the challenges when greenfield production  
25 is still so much more -- easier to build than infill

1 production. And it's no surprise we see larger VMT  
2 numbers. And I -- I firmly believe that if there is a low  
3 hanging fruit in this Board, in this directive from the  
4 Legislature and the Governor saying the CTC, CARB, and  
5 HCD, you know, we need it to affect on the issues of  
6 housing, air quality, and the loss of time to family and  
7 life because of VMT, it's programs like REAP 2.0. If we  
8 don't recognize that intersectionality -- I think the RUSH  
9 program is a great example, the Green Means Go program in  
10 SACOG is a great example where we need to recognize that  
11 the production of housing close to employment centers is  
12 not going to happen without a significant recognition of  
13 the cost of utility in many of these locations. You know,  
14 whether it's in, I'll say, Stockton and Fruitridge in  
15 Sacramento, or Redondo Beach or Boulevard over in Gardena  
16 where there's a lot of these strip malls that were built  
17 with low -- with poor infrastructure -- I wouldn't say  
18 poor infrastructure but infrastructure for a different  
19 time. There's no way we're ever going to have an  
20 apartment or a multi-family housing unit for families  
21 that's going to pencil without that support.

22           So this goes back to my comment earlier about,  
23 you know, given the scarcity of resources where we see the  
24 next few years coming in, you know, is it -- can we look  
25 at these sources of money that we do have available,

1 approve them, overlap them, so that we can address the  
2 fact that when we have to tear up the streets for sewer  
3 water and electrical before we even build a door, can we  
4 overlap this to achieve those goals. Because when we do  
5 build density in front of these commercial corridors that  
6 are happening, we actually support the unfortunate low  
7 ridership in our public transit systems. So that I think  
8 is where I would like to advocate to our body here that  
9 that should be a very significant strong focus of. How do  
10 we increase that amount? Because as my colleague  
11 mentioned, cities don't build housing, the CTC doesn't  
12 build housing. But if developers don't see that, they can  
13 actually pencil it out on the market side and clearly on  
14 the nonprofit affordable housing side. It's becoming even  
15 more challenging, then we're not going to build those.  
16 And we just accomplished getting one project off the  
17 ground.

18           Again, because of that project leading to another  
19 and others seeing that it works, now a BRT system seems  
20 like a viable thing for a corridor.

21           So I'll just end again with saying that I  
22 appreciate the work that our MPOs, our agency here, have  
23 been working on. And to think through -- you know, even  
24 if there are some other ways that we can look at the thing  
25 that never gets on the front of the newspaper, the sewer,

1 water, electrical, some water runoff, that's all  
2 underneath the roadway. And when we go to do our OEMs and  
3 our maintenance, can we look at incentivizing that level  
4 of public infrastructure so that the private development  
5 can move forward.

6 So I'll leave with that, Chair. And I thank  
7 everyone for their presentation.

8 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.  
9 Board Member De La Torre.

10 CARB BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you.

11 Just a couple comments on housing, and then I  
12 want to get into the RTP.

13 On the housing piece, the formulaic approach -  
14 and this gets back to my previous comments about the  
15 freeways - requires I think a little more nuance. So we  
16 have some cities in southeast LA County that are  
17 incredibly small and incredibly dense, a couple of which I  
18 think have higher density than New York City. And yet  
19 they get -- by the formula, they get the same number  
20 everybody -- percentage number everybody else gets. Well,  
21 where are they going to put this?

22 And then you have wealthier enclaves that are  
23 able to, you know, massage their system, and not do their  
24 share. And so -- and I know that's gotten better. But  
25 there's work to be done in that regard.

1           The other component of it is a lot of these lower  
2 income communities are heavily renter based already. I  
3 have -- I have a city I have in mind that has 90 percent  
4 renters. And yet this kind of housing that we're trying  
5 to make them build is more renters. And so that doesn't  
6 help. It has to be a mix. You have to get people who are  
7 vested in their communities and are going to lock in and  
8 build wealth and all those positive things that homeowners  
9 should gives. And so, you know, that has to be part of  
10 how we approach this as well. Because just giving them a  
11 number and things, you know, you've got to hit your  
12 targets, is always going to lead to, you know, low and  
13 subsidized -- low-income housing and subsidized, et  
14 cetera, et cetera. It's going to be more apartments.  
15 Which is again normally fine, but not in a setting where  
16 you have so many low income renters that are just on the  
17 cusp of homelessness, right. One thing can knock them on  
18 their butts and they're on the street.

19           And so -- and those are -- just two comments.

20           About the RTP. So vehicle mile -- and we talked  
21 about this this morning. VMT continues to rise. But  
22 every region has developed RTP plans - three of them over  
23 the last decade - that are supposed to reduce VMT. So  
24 what's missing here? If we keep planning for reduction  
25 but we keep getting growth, there's something not quite

1 right.

2           Also, the transportation infrastructure that's  
3 getting built compared to the transportation proposals  
4 that are in the plan, so there's a disconnect there too.  
5 And, you know, what's missing in that piece? Is it a data  
6 thing, or we're not identifying the projects properly?  
7 You know, what's going on there? Could our agencies work  
8 together to make sure that these RTPs have an adequate  
9 level of detail about the projects, the transportation  
10 projects, a list, in a standardized way so that the MPOs,  
11 you know, kind of all do the same exact thing no matter  
12 where they are in the state; and then we externally can  
13 see what this is and not have any surprises, or not have  
14 things fall through the cracks, or not have things  
15 misidentified or mislabeled? Because it seems like after  
16 three cycles, we should be getting closer to being in sync  
17 and not further apart. And that seems like the latter is  
18 what's happening.

19           So those are my questions. Thank you.

20           CTC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TAYLOR: Maybe I can start  
21 and then I'll turn it over to SCAG, if that's okay with  
22 you, Darin.

23           DARIN CHIDSEY: Uh-huh.

24           CTC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TAYLOR: A couple of  
25 things that I want to make sure that aren't lost that are

1 very important to the Regional Transportation Planning  
2 Guide or process that you're talking about is that often  
3 times when we get too identical in what we're listing or  
4 what we're talking or how we're communicating, we're  
5 missing our audience, which is the public. And so I want  
6 to make sure that as we're looking towards, we can  
7 certainly work with the regions to kind of standardize the  
8 things that makes sense to standardize, but I want to make  
9 sure that we also recognize that each region is talking to  
10 a different audience, whether it be their local elected  
11 officials or the public that they're serving, and that  
12 whatever they are presenting in their regional  
13 transportation plans is meeting the needs of the region  
14 and the people within the region that they're serving.

15           In terms of implementation, I think we've heard a  
16 couple of things today that the State can do. We heard  
17 from Ma'Ayn that infrastructure, and not just  
18 transportation infrastructure - and funding for that  
19 infrastructure is needed to support info development. I  
20 know there are a lot of other things. Maybe I'll turn it  
21 over to Darin on my end to talk about some of those  
22 things.

23           But that's one example. There are many other  
24 things that we've heard in the San Joaquin Valley. In  
25 some cases it's: How do we not only have a jobs/housing

1 balance but we heard Megan talk about that best fit for  
2 those job. Because even if we have the right number of  
3 jobs in a region, if they don't fit the people who live  
4 there, they are still traveling to find jobs that meet  
5 their needs, right. And so all of those things and how we  
6 look at it are part of the regional transportation plan,  
7 it's part of the regional transportation plan guidelines  
8 that we're developing an why we're pushing towards  
9 furthering that housing coordination with the regional  
10 planning process.

11 But maybe I'll turn it over to Darin and Ma'Ayn  
12 to add anything they'd like.

13 DARIN CHIDSEY: Thanks, Tanisha. You asked some  
14 really good questions, and they're big questions, right.  
15 After -- this is now our fourth plan, you know, connecting  
16 regional transportation plans, the Sustainable Community  
17 Strategies together. You know, why are we not doing  
18 better? But I think to some degree it's the wrong  
19 question, because we are doing so much better. Right. Is  
20 I think the change that was made obviously when SB 375 was  
21 passed - and we've talked about it a lot today - and  
22 honestly it's the -- we've been wondering why you're all  
23 meeting together today, right, is to have the Air  
24 Resources Board and HCD and CTC together, it forced us at  
25 the local level to have those conversations in a much more

1 meaningful way. And so while, you know, per capita GHG,  
2 as SB 375 was set to measure, you know, maybe has not come  
3 down as much as we would have liked it to. The amount of  
4 coordination and integration on planning for housing and  
5 transportation has completely changed in the last decade.  
6 And so I think we'll continue to see that progress really  
7 come to fruition in the plans ahead, as evident by the  
8 plan - and I referenced earlier - about a 30 percent  
9 increase from our local jurisdictions on housing growth.  
10 That housing growth is more likely to be where there's  
11 good jobs, where there's good transportation and, you  
12 know, positive economic activity around that. That's very  
13 different around that. That's very different than the  
14 plans that we were seeing 20 years ago in the regions.

15 So I think we have to be honest about what the  
16 question is, and is that the only thing that success looks  
17 like is, you know, a per capita GHG reduction? And part  
18 of that too is because that's also a narrow portion of the  
19 plan. You know, from an MPO perspective we only get, you  
20 know, quote-unquote, credit for light- and medium-duty  
21 vehicle GHG reduction per capita, right. There's a lot of  
22 other activity happening in the region, but there's a lot  
23 of progress on.

24 So I think that context is something that we  
25 really need to think about. And I think if we think about

1 the future of SB 375, it's kind of the core question:  
2 What do we want to measure, how do we empower the regions,  
3 how do we think about other goals that we could meet?  
4 Because obviously, you know, reducing VMT and meeting our  
5 climate goals is critical. But there's a lot of other  
6 factors when it comes to housing, when it comes to other  
7 parts of sustainability that we have to integrate and make  
8 sure, you know, we're putting goals together that's  
9 reflecting all of that progress together.

10 But particularly on this plan, you know, it's  
11 about -- say it's about 750-billion-dollar call for  
12 investments in there. About -- you know, I think about 50  
13 percent of it, maybe a little bit less than that, is just  
14 operations and maintenance. It's what you heard Tanisha  
15 talk about earlier. It's we have an amazing  
16 transportation system, but we have a lot of great transit  
17 assets that we certainly need to build on. But we've got  
18 to take care of all those things if we're expecting them  
19 to work now and into the future; until you'll see a call  
20 for most of those resources go into supporting those  
21 elements of a plan.

22 But I think also when we talk about standardizing  
23 projects -- and I know I'm going long on this, but I just  
24 want to add one thing -- is, you know, it's a -- the  
25 beauty of a regional transportation plan is it's a group

1 of projects that work together to make sure our  
2 transportation and mobility goals are being met. We  
3 have -- in this region our major employment is obviously  
4 around goods movement, it's around construction, it's  
5 around the entertainment industry, it's around tourism.  
6 All of those industries are extremely transportation  
7 dependent. They can't happen without us being able to  
8 have great mobility throughout the region. And so, you  
9 know, looking at project by project doesn't do justice to  
10 how important the system is to work as a whole, to make  
11 sure our economy keeps its vibrancy.

12 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you.  
13 Commissioner Norton.

14 CTC COMMISSIONER NORTON: Thank you, guys, so  
15 much. And I think this is actually building on this very  
16 important conversation about synergies, right: jobs,  
17 housing, transportation, community stability really.

18 And I wanted to add -- because I really like the  
19 slide that you have about the RHNA methodology and like  
20 where the ideal locations are and how do we then have  
21 transit to it. I would like, as we were talking about  
22 earlier this morning, that this sort of job attainment,  
23 and especially looking at this new cohort of people that  
24 are kind of falling off the table, which is seniors. We  
25 have so many seniors who are not able to retire. They

1 have to, you know -- some of us are never going to see  
2 Social Security seep. But the people who have a prayer of  
3 seeing Social Security have to work till 67, and are in  
4 homes that they can't afford to leave because there isn't  
5 senior housing. And yet they want to have accessible jobs  
6 and they want to stop driving. And these are the types of  
7 projects that actually the -- even the NIMBY-est of NIMBY  
8 neighborhoods are like, yeah, seniors, they don't drive.

9           What are the things that we could do to have some  
10 opportunities to really meet some of these synergies with  
11 a cohort that is the largest growing cohort of homeless,  
12 that are really, really falling into poverty quickly, how  
13 can we start thinking about -- because I know SCAG has  
14 been very nimble with demographics. And I remember your  
15 point about, that by 2040 we're going to double the number  
16 of people over 65, for example, just an LA County. How  
17 are you using demographics and job attainment as a way of  
18 starting to address some of the housing typologies? I  
19 like Board Member Hurt's ploy about family housing and  
20 nuclear family housing. How are you letting and being  
21 future seekers about what the demographics tell you about  
22 what the needs are going to be and how to meet that in  
23 order to have real stable communities be one of your  
24 optimal outcomes?

25           MA'AYN JOHNSON: Well, I'll take a stab at it.

1           So the growing senior community, they don't all  
2 belong on the same economic bracket. And so obviously  
3 part of planning for that population, so there -- there  
4 will be some that will age in place, and others that don't  
5 want to age in place but they don't have a choice, and  
6 others because they want to live closer to their grandkids  
7 or where our children live is a common theme. And then  
8 they move to North Carolina, and, you know, sometimes the  
9 seniors go with them and sometimes they still stay here.

10           And so I see it as providing the type of housing,  
11 as you mentioned, typologies. And there's actually a  
12 number of REAP projects that focus on that, either missing  
13 middle or different typologies, that can fit -- fits in  
14 our population at every stage of the life cyc -- of a life  
15 cycle. And so especially too of creating communities  
16 where seniors want to live. So if there's no parks -- I'm  
17 not a senior yet, but I imagine that no senior wants to  
18 live where they can't walk safely. They want their place  
19 to live that maybe has open space, that has access to  
20 senior centers. And so creating diverse communities I  
21 think is a big key to that puzzle.

22           CTC COMMISSIONER NORTON: Yeah. And this is for  
23 Darin.

24           Can you talk a little bit -- because I know the  
25 GLUE Council has really been on SCAG about jobs - where

1 are the jobs? Where are we going? How do we get there?  
2 And then how do we make sure that our infrastructure about  
3 housing and transportation meets that?

4 Can you talk a little bit about what you're doing  
5 with the GLUE Council has how that's informing your RHNA  
6 work?

7 DARIN CHIDSEY: Sure. So the GLUE Council is  
8 SCAG's business advisory group. It's called the Global  
9 Land Use and Economic Council. It actually was a direct  
10 creation after SB 375. The housing community in  
11 particular was very concerned about us developing land use  
12 plans and being adopted into a sustainable communities  
13 strategy and what does that mean. So this group was  
14 brought together to really have dialogue and input on  
15 SCAG's plan, and it's been a great success. And certainly  
16 Director Norton has served on it I think since its  
17 inception, right. So appreciate your dedication to that.

18 But what it has really allowed us to do is have  
19 kind of that direct dialogue with the business community  
20 and really being able to frame the work that we are doing  
21 around sustainability and around transportation with an  
22 eye to how it affects the economy.

23 Some numbers that you'll see in our draft plan is  
24 not only: Do we expect the plan to create a lot of jobs?  
25 Obviously you're spending a lot of infrastructure dollars.

1 That's going to turn into a lot of construction jobs. But  
2 the reduction in congestion certainly adds to the overall  
3 efficiency of economy in the region as well. Over the  
4 life of the plan, you know, we are expecting population  
5 not to grow as fast as it once did. So about 10 percent  
6 population growth over, you know, out to 2050. We already  
7 talked about we still are expecting about a 30 percent  
8 increase in household formation. So that's obviously a  
9 positive. But almost an 18 percent increase in jobs. So  
10 if you only have a 10 percent increase in population, 30  
11 percent increase in your jobs is still expected - and this  
12 is through the team of economists that we've brought  
13 together - we think that speaks highly to the confidence  
14 and the future of the region's economy because of the  
15 investments that we're making because that we're  
16 addressing what's been one of our biggest challenges in  
17 Southern California, and that is housing, that that will  
18 naturally probably turn back to, you know, an increase in  
19 population as we're having more and more migration from  
20 internationally or domestically to come to those jobs and  
21 fill them.

22           You're absolutely right, the number of seniors  
23 are expected to double over that horizon. Which is why  
24 attracting others from throughout the country and really  
25 throughout the world to this region to help fill those

1 important roles in the economy is what has really driven  
2 our growth over the last 30 years here in Southern  
3 California. And we need that to continue to be able to  
4 grow the way we've had in the past.

5 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

6 Dr. Pacheco-Werner.

7 CARB BOARD MEMBER PACHECO-WERNER: Thank you so  
8 much, Chair, and thank you so much to everyone.

9 You know, I'm actually at a place, and it's too  
10 loud, so I'll just show you in the background here.  
11 What's interesting about the place right behind me is  
12 that -- I don't know. It's probably blurred, but you --  
13 it's in the Fresno area right next to a highway, and it's  
14 filling very -- in theory on paper it's filling our very  
15 desperate housing need. On paper, it also -- on the  
16 documents that you read it, it will have zero VMT.  
17 Although if you look around, across the street, there's  
18 nothing but orchards. And the fact of the matter is that  
19 we have this -- you know, these types of projects really  
20 popping up everywhere that are -- that we say -- and by  
21 the way, these are priced way, way, way out of the median  
22 of anybody living in the area. So it will definitely be  
23 people coming from other places that are priced out of  
24 other areas as well. And so it -- it has felt to me in  
25 the Central Valley like we are at the lower end of like

1 the reshuffling that happens when there's no plan and  
2 there is no stick to doing -- continuing to do things  
3 wrong or continuing to not make goals. And while I do  
4 appreciate, you know, the RTP guidelines and I appreciate  
5 all of this, I just -- I wonder how do we look at  
6 ourselves? Even as CARB, you know, where do we fall short  
7 in terms of some of the maximizing, some of the things  
8 that we could be doing to reduce mobile source pollution  
9 for places like this that are inevitably going to pop up  
10 next to freeways that are continuously more and more  
11 clogged by trucks. I just wonder like where do we --  
12 where are there opportunities for us to not just kind of  
13 keep going along setting goals, not meeting the goals, you  
14 know, where are there opportunities that we could work  
15 together to really have some teeth, hold ourselves  
16 accountable, hold our municipalities accountable.

17 I know everybody's trying the best, but I see  
18 these pop up and I just -- I don't see an end, and I see  
19 us as being at the end of the reshuffling, when people get  
20 priced out of other places, the people are coming here;  
21 and now, you know, seeing homeless people setting up next  
22 to orchards because that's how far out people have been  
23 pushed. So any reflections or opportunities?

24 CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: Thank you.

25 I actually -- I'm not sure if any of the staff

1 here wanted to speak on Dr. Pacheco-Werner's point, but I  
2 feel like she just perfectly summed up the theme of the  
3 day, right, which is that we keep setting goals, we keep  
4 sort of coming up with plans. But the question is, how  
5 are we shifting the on-the-ground things the way we used  
6 to do it to push them in a way we should be doing it? And  
7 the comments earlier that a lot of that has happened and  
8 continues to happen is very encouraging. But I think we  
9 are all recognizing that we do feel the need for more, and  
10 for really more actionable ways that -- that we can really  
11 take a hard look at how we -- how we do things now and  
12 what are the specific ways we can do them better to have  
13 the results that we need to have.

14           And as Board Member Hurt mentioned, how to -- how  
15 to bring folks along. I mean it was interesting the  
16 contrast, you know, in Board Member Hurt's local community  
17 where they have residents pushing back on the sticks, and  
18 Dr. Pacheco-Werner's community where she's like, "Hey,  
19 wait a minute. Like this is what happens when progress  
20 doesn't happen." So I really appreciate that perspective.

21           Before we go to public comment, did any other  
22 commissioners or board members -- I can't see to my right.

23           No, we're good. Okay.

24           Then, clerk, lets go to public comment.

25           CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

1           We have two in-person commenters and it looks  
2 like eight commenters in Zoom.

3           So we'll start with Thomas Riebs.

4           THOMAS RIEBS: Chair Randolph, Deputy Chair  
5 Guardino, thank you.

6           So having grown up in Denmark, I think about  
7 sustainable communities a little bit differently.

8           And I appreciate Board Member Guerra's comments  
9 about can we look at things that are underground and the  
10 water and all these other things, can we look in a bit  
11 different ways? Yes, we can. And if you'd like to know  
12 more about how we can produce energy from your wastewater  
13 treatment, call me.

14           However, I would like to go back to my earlier  
15 comments -- since you are CARB and since we do have CTC  
16 commissioners here, I would like to go back and talk about  
17 tires, because the interesting thing about these tires for  
18 electric vehicles is it is a very holistic way of looking  
19 at things. So this company produces tires for electric  
20 vehicles that are 16 percent more energy efficient. CEC  
21 is very interested in that. They're produced with premium  
22 materials so they can actually be reclaimed. CalRecycle  
23 is very interested in this. They produce less tire dust  
24 emissions. CARB is very interested in this. They contain  
25 less 6 PPD. SoCal EPA is very interested in this.

1           And this isn't just because I'm very interested  
2 in talking about electric vehicle tires, but it's because  
3 I come from a different place and although I'm -- I grew  
4 up in Denmark as an American. Now I'm a Dane living in  
5 America, which is weird, right. But I grew up thinking  
6 about things in a much more holistic way. And we spend a  
7 lot of time talking about housing. Housing is important.  
8 But I believe it was Board Member Hurt who also said we  
9 need to think about the other things that flow from it.  
10 Where are these people going to go? Where are they going  
11 to work? And how is this housing going to actually reduce  
12 the VMTs?

13           That's it for me. Thank you for all the very  
14 important work that you do, and thank you for sharing it  
15 with us.

16           CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

17           Moiz Mir.

18           MOIZ MIR: Hello again. My name is Moiz, network  
19 and policy advocate with ClimatePlan.

20           One big point as has been mentioned to be of  
21 concern earlier today is the question of access to public  
22 engagement and the civic process generally. I personally  
23 happen to be young and flexible and work for an  
24 organization with the capacity to periodically cover  
25 transportation to send me across the state to attend

1 government meetings like these. As in the case of most  
2 people and particularly working parents, the kind of  
3 person I may hope to grow to become. And it wasn't always  
4 and won't always be the case for me.

5           So should I then plan to join the majority of  
6 people who can't access government meetings? Rather I ask  
7 that the opposite become the case. In the RTP guidelines  
8 is language to provide child care and compensation to  
9 public workshop attendees was removed. And I ask that  
10 they be reinstated, that language in the guidelines.

11           Following this thread, I want to talk about the  
12 project selection process. The public can't be expected  
13 to engage with processes that aren't clear, as was kind of  
14 mentioned in some of this discussion. And so I ask that  
15 the RTP guidelines provide direction for a clear,  
16 consistent process with robust and accessible and  
17 accountable reporting practices.

18           For one example I'll point to the City of  
19 Sacramento, as having a model clear and thorough process  
20 in their transportation priorities process -- or  
21 transportation priorities plan. I began with the  
22 identification of community values through a public  
23 engagement, and I've even asked for co-creation to inform  
24 and shape the rubric by which projects would be  
25 prioritized. The establishment of this rubric proved to

1 even be able to guard against complaints from some of the  
2 loudest voices that often end up having access to the hall  
3 of the power who as we've discussed are not always  
4 representative of every community's interests. And so the  
5 ability to point to a set of values that the community  
6 itself agreed upon establishes a clear baseline of which  
7 priorities and co-benefits to pursue with transportation  
8 investments.

9 Thank you.

10 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

11 Now we'll go to our commenters in Zoom. So first  
12 we'll hear from Sara Toma, Sakereh Carter, Sofia Rafikova,  
13 Sven Thesen, Jonny Kocher, and Jack Shu.

14 Sara, I've activated your microphone. Please  
15 unmute and begin.

16 SARA TOMA: Good afternoon, Chair and  
17 commissioners. Sara Toma, Senior Regional Planner and  
18 here with SANDAG. I'm here on behalf of SANDAG to thank  
19 HCD, ARB, and SGC for the opportunity to benefit from  
20 their regional early action planning grant program.  
21 Through the program we have been able to provide funding  
22 to our local jurisdictions for 22 planning and  
23 infrastructure projects to accelerate housing production  
24 in our region. And soon we will launch a new affordable  
25 housing trust fund available for two developers to support

1 new home construction.

2           We have established new functional components of  
3 our sustainable community program to provide local  
4 jurisdiction support which is equipment members, agencies,  
5 to resources and capacity to implement prohousing best  
6 practices and implement new State legislation data  
7 analysis and policy resources, by compiling data, policy  
8 tools, resources, and best practices for local  
9 jurisdiction stakeholders, and communities; and regional  
10 initiative which offer education, leadership, and funding  
11 opportunities to accelerate housing investments focused on  
12 equitable and sustainable infill development.

13           All of this and more has only been made possible  
14 through the funding provided to our region from the REAP  
15 grant funds. It has given our region the much heeded  
16 resources and funding to accelerate housing production,  
17 provide support to our local jurisdictions, and support  
18 the implementation of our sustainable community strategy.

19           REAP 2.0 funding ends in June 2026, and we hope  
20 to see programs like REAP continue so that we can meet our  
21 regional housing needs assessment goals and continue to  
22 implement a sustainable community strategy, which  
23 historically when related to land use and housing MPOs  
24 have been limited in our ability to influence a change at  
25 the jurisdictional level.

1 Thank you, and I yield my time.

2 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

3 Sakereh, I've activated your microphone. Please  
4 unmute and begin.

5 SAKEREH CARTER: Hello. My name is Sakereh and  
6 I'm a senior policy strategist with Sierra Club  
7 California.

8 Adopting a zero-emissions building code through  
9 CALGreen for newly constructed buildings statewide that  
10 includes gas stoves, clothing driers and electric space  
11 and water equipment is critical for healthy, climate  
12 resilient, and efficient building infrastructure. Several  
13 studies have demonstrated that burning gas in homes  
14 releases multiple toxic air contaminants, lead to various  
15 health ailments including asthma, respiratory dysfunction,  
16 exacerbation of COPD and cancer; also buildings that  
17 account for 10.5 percent of statewide greenhouse gas  
18 emissions. Therefore adopting a zero-emissions building  
19 standard will reduce climate altering greenhouse gas  
20 emissions and toxic emissions from gas infrastructure.

21 Also, low income, black, indigenous, and  
22 communities of color are disproportionately impacted by  
23 the consequences of climate change and harmful emissions  
24 from gas infrastructure. So any relief we can provide to  
25 these communities is essential and, frankly, overdue.

1 Further, underserved communities should have  
2 access to affordable newly constructed infrastructure.

3 HCD can avoid hundreds of deaths, severe health  
4 ailments, \$3.5 billion of health care costs, the  
5 exacerbation of climate change, and the unnecessary use of  
6 electricity by adopting a zero-emissions building standard  
7 under CALGreen. We need climate-forward actions and  
8 healthier communities now. So we urge you to adopt  
9 zero-emission standard for newly constructed buildings  
10 under CALGreen.

11 Thank you for your time.

12 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

13 Sofia, I've activated your microphone. Please  
14 unmute and begin.

15 SOFIA RAFIKOVA: Yes. Good afternoon,  
16 commissions, board members, and directors. I'm Sofia  
17 Rafikova with the Coalition for Clean Air. I'm speaking  
18 before you today to urge that changes be made to the  
19 current draft of the Regional Transportation Plan  
20 guidelines to strengthen language surrounding reducing  
21 vehicle miles traveled, improving public engagement, and  
22 improving the project-selection process.

23 While we are thankful that VMT reduction was  
24 added to the guidelines, this language needs to be  
25 stronger to encourage MPOs to prioritize projects that

1 bring us closer to successfully implementing SB 375 and  
2 achieving California's plan of targets. While there are  
3 no State or federal requirements to reduce VMTs, there are  
4 still numerous state agency reports that highlight the  
5 importance of VMT reduction, including CAPTI, 2022 Scoping  
6 Plan and the 2022 SB 150 progress report. Given the  
7 strong push from state agencies for California to reduce  
8 VMT, we ask that the RTP guidelines language be amended  
9 that MPOs comply with the 25 percent VMT reduction goals  
10 set in the CARB scoping plan.

11 We're also concerned that the language to provide  
12 child care and compensation to public workshop activities  
13 was removed from a previous version of the draft  
14 guidelines. According to the U.S. Department of  
15 Transportation, program funds can be spent on incentives  
16 and stipends for public involvement activities if found to  
17 be necessary and reasonable. We strongly believe that in  
18 most cases providing compensation is both necessary and  
19 reasonable, as it will result in representative public  
20 participation since reducing the financial barriers  
21 disadvantaged communities face would help ensure those  
22 voices are included especially in projects that affect the  
23 communities the most.

24 Finally, we do ask that RTP guidelines require  
25 the MPOs include a list of projects being proposed are

1 currently in the construction process in their RTP, along  
2 with information on the type of project, how much funding  
3 it received and the impacts it will have in the community.  
4 Much of the project selection process conducted by  
5 regional transportation agencies is currently obscure and  
6 unclear to the public, and inconsistent reporting  
7 practices undermine the agencies and the public abilities  
8 to valuate or compare RTPs or the project therein.

9           It would also be helpful if the RTP guidelines  
10 provide examples (inaudible) for how to prioritize  
11 projects in the way that helps California reach its  
12 climate goals.

13           Thank you.

14           CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

15           Sven, I've activated your microphone. Please  
16 unmute and begin.

17           SVEN THESEN: Thank you, commissioners. Sven  
18 Thesen, Founder of Project Green Home and the Electric  
19 Vehicle Charging for All Coalition, and chemical engineer  
20 by training.

21           For the first 20 years of my career I worked at  
22 open paper mills, oil refineries and power plants, focused  
23 on combustion engineering. You might say I know what  
24 happens when you burn stuff.

25           Regarding sustainable communities, my first

1 request is HCD under the CALGreen code cycle, with strong  
2 support and guidance from CARB, mandate, with some  
3 exceptions, emission-free new residents, both  
4 single-family homes and multi-family homes.

5           Why? Poison.

6           Every time you turn on the natural gas stove,  
7 nitrogen dioxide is generated. The truth is when you see  
8 that blue flame, you are putting poison into your home.

9           As a dad, I put sunscreen on my kids and teach  
10 them not to blindly run out into the streets. Why would I  
11 knowingly put poison into the air that they breathe?

12           That blue you see is not just the hottest part of  
13 the flame.

14           Second, the carbon footprint of burning that  
15 natural gas, methane, and our need to reduce our carbon  
16 emissions.

17           Please be aware that there are a number, a large  
18 number of low income builders and developers who are  
19 already building emission free. It's not a cost issue.

20           HCD, yes, you guys, it's a lift. But with CARB's  
21 support, you can do this.

22           Second - and this also supports the  
23 transportation department - HCD and CARB simply under AB  
24 2863 include provisions for electric-bike charging in new  
25 multi-family housing. As an up-and-coming senior,

1 hopefully you're going to see me on my three-wheel  
2 electric (inaudible), that is, if I have access to  
3 charging. It's not fair that those in single-family homes  
4 have easy access to charging, while those that live in  
5 multi-family housing, apartments and condos, do not.

6 Thank you. HCD, you can do this.

7 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

8 Jonny, I've activated your microphone. Please  
9 unmute and begin.

10 JONNY KOCHER: Thank you so much.

11 My name is Jonny Kocher. I work at RMA -- RMI, a  
12 nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that works to  
13 transform global energy systems. Thank you for the  
14 opportunity to speak today and for your thoughtful  
15 presentation on sustainable communities.

16 The key strategy to planning sustainable  
17 communities should include the construction of healthy  
18 zero-emission buildings. When building dense housing that  
19 reduces vehicle miles traveled, it's also important to  
20 build building that won't continue to combust, emitting  
21 pollutants that harm communities. Burning gas in homes  
22 and buildings generates four times as much smog-forming  
23 NOx pollution as all the State's power plants and  
24 nearly -- and two-thirds as much NOx as passenger cars.  
25 NOx pollution, such as NO<sub>2</sub>, can cause or exacerbate

1 respiratory symptoms like asthma attacks, reduced lung  
2 function, coughing, wheezing and inflammation of airways.

3           Today a letter was submitted by over 60 climate  
4 and health groups imploring that the Governor and agencies  
5 consider the proposal that would eliminate NOx appliances  
6 in new buildings. California has a new opportunity to  
7 reduce zero-emission buildings during -- or to require  
8 zero-emission buildings during the 2024 triennial CALGreen  
9 Code update, and we urge HCD to follow the recommendation  
10 by the 2022 CARB Scoping Plan and require mandatory  
11 building emission standards as code update.

12           Thank you.

13           CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

14           After Jack we'll hear Chris Peeples, Hana Creger,  
15 Jeremy Levine, Adam Noelting and Evan Adams.

16           So, Jack, I've activated your microphone. Please  
17 unmute and begin.

18           JACK SHU: Good afternoon. Jack Shu, City  
19 Council from the City of La Mesa. I forgot to mention  
20 earlier I do serve on the SANDAG Board and chair the  
21 Transportation Committee. I also am the vice chair of our  
22 Air -- San Diego Air Resources Board.

23           Any case, sorry, some of my comments here may  
24 seem random, but I hope I can speak to all of the things  
25 that I have on my mind today.

1           With regards to housing, it really seems like we  
2 need a statewide inclusionary housing policy. You know,  
3 there's competition between cities, and developers can  
4 pick and choose because there are different requirements  
5 from one city to another. But we really need to increase  
6 the number of low and very low income housing and provide  
7 provisions for people to buy these places, these condos,  
8 and maybe marginal homes as well.

9           We need transportation management programs for  
10 these projects that are deemed to be transit-oriented  
11 development. So we could measure that and maybe  
12 provide -- or require that rental vehicles be available as  
13 part of these multi-residential areas.

14           And, lastly, with regards to the Regional  
15 Transportation Plan, as I said earlier, we really need to  
16 implement the 25 percent VMT reduction by 2030 now, not  
17 later and assuming in the next Regional Transportation  
18 plans.

19           The last thing I want to address is let's come up  
20 with a way to improve the air quality in the most impacted  
21 communities, to close the gap in the air quality. As we  
22 improve air quality across the state, there should be no  
23 differentiation from one community to another. And there  
24 are many means that we could implement right away to do  
25 that. And that should be in the Regional Transportation

1 Plans.

2 Thank you.

3 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

4 Chris, I've activated your microphone. Please  
5 unmute and begin.

6 CHRIS PEEPLES: Good afternoon, board members and  
7 commissioners. My name is Chris Peeples. I've been a  
8 transit activist for over 60 years. And I serve on a  
9 local transit board, which I will not identify because I'm  
10 speaking for myself rather than for the board.

11 I want to make two points. The first was already  
12 made by Commissioner De La Torre. You need to deal with  
13 reality. There are people produce -- the MPOs produce all  
14 these wonderful plans and they meet the requirements of  
15 the planning documents, but -- and they promise that  
16 they're going to lower VMT and increase transit share, and  
17 that does not happen. VMT increases, transit share  
18 decreases. And you need to figure out some way to look at  
19 the past performance of some of these MPOs and figure out  
20 how to improve it. That's point 1.

21 Point 2 is, one of the reasons why these problems  
22 are happening is the inordinate focus on massive capital  
23 projects to the -- and ignoring the need for operating  
24 funds. My agency is in the middle of a very public  
25 process to look at how we're going to do things. But in

1 fact what we're doing is figuring out how to equitably and  
2 efficiently cut 15 percent of our service.

3 Our local MPO has decided that the benchmark for  
4 transit funding should be the transit funding from the  
5 middle of the pandemic. That can't function. We can't  
6 accomplish all our goals unless we can find more operating  
7 funding.

8 Thank you very much.

9 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

10 Hana, I've activated your microphone. Please  
11 unmute and begin.

12 HANA CREGER: Hi. This is Hana Creger with the  
13 Greenlining Institute, a research and public policy  
14 nonprofit advocating for racial equity.

15 First I just want to say I appreciate all of the hard  
16 work that's gone into these RTP guidelines. I am  
17 particularly interested in the need to require MPOs to  
18 regularly report data regarding how prioritized projects  
19 are aligning with the State's strategic priorities on  
20 climate equity, safety and more.

21 And then specifically we need detailed  
22 community-approved definitions for what equity benefits  
23 even are to disadvantaged communities. Because we have to  
24 ensure that projects like highway widening that actually  
25 harms frontline communities are not then misconstrued to

1 allegedly benefit them.

2 I also want to underscore the importance of  
3 setting a VMT reduction target and then holding MPOs  
4 accountable to prioritizing VMT reducing projects. And  
5 this is both important for meeting our climate goals in  
6 California and also for setting a national standard.  
7 Because at Greenlining for the past few years we've  
8 actually been contracted with the Biden administration to  
9 provide capacity building and technical assistance to  
10 other states and the federal government, largely to follow  
11 California's model of equitable climate and transportation  
12 investments.

13 However, when I give these trainings for  
14 workshops across the country, I have to be fully  
15 transparent with these folks. I have to warn them that  
16 while California has set ambitious climate and equity  
17 targets, we are nowhere near to actually meeting those  
18 goals because the State continues to subsidize freeways  
19 and automobile dependency.

20 Meanwhile other states like Colorado and  
21 Minnesota have set bold statewide goals to prioritize  
22 transit and VMT reduction over widening highways. And  
23 especially in light of recent redevelopment at Caltrans,  
24 we have officially lost credibility on the national stage.  
25 An so I really -- I'm looking to all of you to hold all

1 levels of government accountable to reducing VMT and  
2 highway widening. We are in a climate crisis and we have  
3 no time to waste. We have to take action.

4 Thank you all so much, and take care.

5 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

6 Jeremy, I've activated your microphone. Please  
7 unmute and begin.

8 JEREMY LEVINE: Good afternoon, commissioners,  
9 staff. Thank you for your time. Jeremy Levine here. I'm  
10 the policy manager with the Housing Leadership Council of  
11 San Mateo County. Been working on housing elements all  
12 around the Bay Area. I've reviewed every housing element  
13 in Santa Mateo County. And I'm here to ring an alarm  
14 bell.

15 In their housing elements, the vast majority of  
16 jurisdictions in San Mateo County and other parts of the  
17 Bay Area are planning for housing in areas with poor air  
18 quality, with no plan to mitigate that poor air quality.  
19 The city of San Mateo, for example, is planning for 48  
20 percent of its new housing within a thousand feet of a  
21 major transit corridor. The city of Lafayette, across the  
22 bay, is planning for 75-foot densities within 500 feet of  
23 the freeway. Within a half mile they decrease densities  
24 to 30 feet per acre. Or single family, because apparently  
25 people living in higher density housing and more

1 affordable housing are not entitled to quiet neighbors or  
2 good air quality.

3           And in San Mateo County as a whole I can say more  
4 than 50 percent of all rezoning is occurring along major  
5 transit corridors. This is a health catastrophe looming.  
6 These cities are not planning to ensure that the air  
7 quality is good in these corridors. And so I'm hoping  
8 that these guidelines, which have -- I think reflect a lot  
9 of really good work, will require cities to analyze what  
10 they're doing in their housing elements and how they're  
11 rezoning plans are harming air quality for future  
12 low-income residents, and how they're going to mitigation  
13 that risk.

14           Thank you for your time. Looking forward to the  
15 rest of the discussion.

16           CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

17           Adam, I've activated your microphone. Please  
18 unmute and begin.

19           ADAM NOELTING: Good afternoon. My name is Adam  
20 Noelting. I'm principal planner for the Metropolitan  
21 Transportation Commission in association with Bay Area  
22 governments. MTC/ABAG, serving as the Metropolitan  
23 Planning Organization for the nine-county San Francisco  
24 Bay Area, adopted Plan Bay Area 2050, a bold vision that  
25 advances climate, equity and housing goals in late 2021.

1 At its core are 35 ambitious strategies, among them  
2 converting most freeway lanes to toll lanes rather than  
3 building new lanes, focusing transportation monies toward  
4 a hundred-billion-dollar-plus transit expansion program,  
5 emphasizing housing and not just low-VMT, transit-rich  
6 areas but also in high resource areas, and complementing  
7 state electrification efforts with regional and local  
8 programs to accelerate progress, among many other things.

9 In the two-years' time since the plan's adoption  
10 we've made progress in implementing many of these  
11 long-range strategies, leveraging REAP and other monies  
12 similar to our colleagues at SCAG to fund improvements,  
13 accelerate planning, and empower local jurisdictions to  
14 make meaningful change.

15 This is hard work, and it requires deep and  
16 sustained partnership not just between the region and  
17 local jurisdictions but also between the State and its  
18 regions.

19 One such area for collaboration is the  
20 intersection of RHNA and the RTFCS, which highlights  
21 situations where climate, housing and equity goals are in  
22 synergy and other situations where they are in tension  
23 with each other.

24 We've appreciated the opportunity to participate  
25 in several HCD forums, but at this point no specific

1 recommendations have been put on the table in the form of  
2 a draft report. We've been grappling with this issue in  
3 the Bay Area in recent years. We want to underscore what  
4 the State's most robust transit system in our region, low  
5 VMT/high resource places, are limited to just a handful of  
6 cities. We mean that we must strike the right balance in  
7 planning for the remaining regional growth between low  
8 VMT/lower resource places and higher VMT/higher resource  
9 places.

10 Thank you.

11 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

12 Evan, I have activated your microphone. Please  
13 unmute and begin.

14 EVAN ADAMS: Hi there. Thank you for the  
15 opportunity to speak today.

16 There needs to be a connection made at the  
17 regional level down to jurisdictions as to jobs to housing  
18 balance. Cities who create massive job developments are  
19 good. We do need jobs. But as soon as you create massive  
20 job growth without commensurate housing growth create VMT.

21 To continue with this logic. It is currently  
22 almost impossible to track at the local level approved  
23 entitlements that will create demand across different RHNA  
24 cycles. It would help for HCD to have a reporting  
25 requirement from jurisdictions as to how much area broken

1 down by land use is already entitled. Ideally, in the  
2 next RHNA cycle should have a dashboard that would have a  
3 running tally in the RHNA cycle not just of units built  
4 but also of, in title, non-residential square feet. So,  
5 with that we could plan for sustainable local  
6 jobs-to-housing balances.

7 Thank you.

8 CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you. And,  
9 lastly, we'll hear from a phone number ending in 528. And  
10 I've activated your microphone. Please state your name  
11 for the record and you can begin.

12 You need to push the Star 6.

13 Phone number ending in 528

14 LAURA ROSENBERGER HAIDER: I suggest that we both  
15 lower income housing in every community. And -- because  
16 we don't know where the jobs are actually going to be in  
17 the future. Most of it may -- jobs be building farming  
18 out in the country in the future because of the food  
19 shortages in the world. We may not all be in the cities.  
20 But we should put -- like really let's -- the thing is to  
21 get the affordable housing you could get it by having the  
22 size being very small. But still there should be solar  
23 panels on the roofs and should have -- be energy  
24 efficient, solar panels on the roofs, electric stoves and  
25 everything -- electric heaters.

1           And also we should not -- not invest in -- big  
2 projects involve a lot of pipelines, because pipelines  
3 always leak. There just was a recent pipeline leak and  
4 explosion actually and some homes blew up and -- that's  
5 why we can't -- and we shouldn't be putting carbon in the  
6 pipelines either.

7           I'm here to get away from all the -- they don't  
8 need to build all that infrastructure. They're just  
9 having -- if they're doing anything with carbon it's going  
10 to be solid carbon. Don't need to put in the ground.

11           And also -- I think -- industry needs to be  
12 more regulated. I mean even like cooking makes a lot of  
13 emissions. And we didn't even -- not even considering  
14 those emissions. And like the restaurants.

15           And -- all right. That's all. Thank you very  
16 much.

17           CARB BOARD CLERK GARCIA: Thank you.

18           And that concludes the commenters for this item.

19           CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you so  
20 much.

21           To finish up today, I will ask Dr. Vergis to give  
22 us a quick wrap-up and summarize some of the key themes  
23 and next steps.

24           MSCD DIVISION CHIEF VERGIS: Thank you, Chair.

25           To recap the themes that we discussed today:

1           We discussed the CAPTI implementation this  
2 morning, and many commenters in the joint body expressed  
3 support for CAPTI; but also stated that more needs to be  
4 done to generate the paradigm shift that will be necessary  
5 to reduce VMT and create a sustainable transportation  
6 system that serves everyone, notably our most vulnerable  
7 and disenfranchised communities. Members of this body put  
8 forth numerous observations and priorities that CalSTA can  
9 consider as it updates CAPTI starting this spring. CAPTI  
10 is something that crosses all of our agencies, and it  
11 makes sense for this body to continue to be involved in  
12 the discussion as it is updated next year.

13           We also talked today about regional planning  
14 through both RTP guidelines and the RHNA process. CTC  
15 presented their work of updating the RTP guidelines ad  
16 possibilities for implementation strategies for housing  
17 and transportation linkages before those guidelines will  
18 be finalized in January.

19           HCD presented its work of developing  
20 recommendations for revamping RHNA. Then we heard  
21 discussion of how our three agencies can work together to  
22 make those two processes more effective at advancing  
23 multiple State goals for equity, climate, air quality,  
24 housing and transportation.

25           We also benefited from SCAG's presentation, which

1 provided a practitioner perspective on how SCAG leverages  
2 these processes and regional early action planning for  
3 grant funding to advance regional goals.

4           With these themes in mind, I'd like to suggest a  
5 few next steps. First, it seems there's significant  
6 support to take a deeper dive on how transportation  
7 investments can better serve climate goals. And we've  
8 heard an interest in the how. How do we shift real  
9 investments in decisions in ways to better serve  
10 communities? Based on that I'd like staff to think about  
11 the future of the highway system by bringing forward an  
12 item that allows us to understand the project pipeline,  
13 and where in the pipeline there are opportunities for  
14 reprioritizing or reimagining these projects. Keeping in  
15 mind that a one-size-fits-all approach won't work, as  
16 Board Member De La Torre highlighted. That topic will  
17 allow us to explore some key issues such as how to elevate  
18 equity in the State's VMT reduction strategies and how to  
19 better understand how new housing growth relates to  
20 developing thoughtful transportation policy.

21           Second, I heard in HCD's presentation that  
22 there's some ways in which RHNA and SCSs are not  
23 necessarily aligned. As I understand it, there have been  
24 discussions at the staff level on this. And I believe we  
25 all recognize the importance of addressing any

1 inconsistencies that may hamper a respective agency's  
2 administration of these processes and see value in  
3 strengthening our coordination on them. So I would like  
4 our staff to develop an item for this meeting in the  
5 future regarding how we can further develop coordination  
6 to better align RHNA and SCSs.

7           Finally, much of the discussion today focused on  
8 transportation, and also the buildings as another key area  
9 of collaboration between our agencies. As Director  
10 Vasquez and others highlighted, I certainly agree with the  
11 director's opening remarks that we need to keep low income  
12 residents in mind as we look to the transition, and  
13 zero-emission building codes for new residential  
14 construction for which CARB is recommending this building  
15 code cycle present an important opportunity to advocate  
16 equity, housing, and climate goals, consistent with the  
17 Scoping Plan. This is a worthy topic for CARB and HCD to  
18 explore together. And I'm directing my staff to meet with  
19 HCD and report out on those discussions.

20           Thank you.

21           CARB CHAIR RANDOLPH: All right. Thank you very  
22 much.

23           This was a really rich discussion today. And as  
24 the State continues with implementing CAPTI and with  
25 implementing the 2022 Scoping Plan update, our commitment

1 is to keep this ongoing collaboration going with the CTC  
2 and HCD and with our other state agency partners, as so  
3 many commenters have mentioned, to continue this important  
4 work. So we look forward to building even stronger  
5 partnerships to really build those actionable steps that  
6 will result in meeting our goals.

7 So thank you all for attending the CARB, CTC, and  
8 HCD joint meeting. And I will now adjourn the meeting.

9 Have a good evening.

10 (Thereupon the California Air Resources  
11 Board, California Transportation Commission, and  
12 California Department of Housing and Community  
13 Development meeting adjourned at 3:43 p.m.)

